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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. XX, page 266.)

CHAPTER IV. (continued).

THE AUTHOR AND THE LANGUAGE OF THE INSCRIPTIONS.

PART II. — THE LANGUAGE.

THE language of our inscriptions presents, especially as regards grammar, hardly any absolutely impenetrable obscurities. Much light is thrown upon it by a comparison with the analogous idioms with which literature has made us familiar. Nevertheless, the orthographical or dialectic peculiarities which distinguish the different versions, and the chronological position which our monuments occupy, lend to their study a philological importance, on which it is not necessary to insist.

I propose, in the first place, to sum up, in as condensed an inventory as possible, all the grammatical phenomena worthy of interest. In a second part I shall draw general conclusions from these phenomena. I shall endeavour to determine the true nature of the orthographical processes, to define the extent of the differences of dialect, and to group together those indications which are adapted to throw light on the state of linguistic development in the middle of the 3rd century B.C.

In spite of the continual progress with which attempts at their decipherment are rewarded, the condition of the monuments does not permit us to hope that the texts will ever be fixed with a rigorous certainty. Our facsimiles, moreover, are, at least for several versions, still regrettable insufficient.

It is, therefore, impossible to establish absolute accuracy in our statistics of the grammatical forms; and it must be understood that many of the facts which are about to be recorded, if they are rare and exceptional, are not free from doubt; but, fortunately, the characteristic phenomena reappear sufficiently often to entitle us to establish them on solid grounds, and what remains in doubt is in no way likely to compromise our general deductions.
I. — THE GRAMMAR OF THE INSCRIPTIONS.

A. — GIRDAR.

(a). — Vowels.

Changes of Quantity. — Except in certain special cases, I enter neither here nor elsewhere under this heading, words in which the lengthening or the shortening is the result of compensation, and can be explained either by the simplification or by the doubling of the consonant which follows. It is hardly necessary to add that, among the changes of quantity here noted a great many may be and can only be apparent, being referable either to mistakes of the engravers or to incorrect readings.

Vowels lengthened. — Anaṅkaraṇa, VI, 8; asaṅkṛ-pratipād, IV, 2; āsū (= syuḥ), XII, 7; abhārumakāṇa, VIII, 2; chākākkā, II, 5; sādābhā, V, 8; viśū, VII, 3; viśayaṁyha, XII, 10; tāthā, XI, 4; mañḍhūritāyā, XIV, 4. At the end of words: chā, IV, 11; ākā (nom. masc.), XIII, 4; mītaśaṁśta, III, 4; ud, I, 2; XV, 2; parapāpañḍagarama, XII, 13; sanvāhā, II, 6; tatā, XII, 8; XIII, 4; tatrā, XIII, 1; ātāmā, IX, 2; panāthāśa, II, 8.

A long vowel regularly becomes short before anusvāra, or before a consonantal group, even when, as here, the latter is not represented in writing: but sometimes, instead of doubling the consonant, the preceding vowel is lengthened in compensation: āḍhāma, V, 4; vāra, V, 4; al. Sometimes the vowel remains long, even though nasalized: anuvṛtiyatān, X, 2; atikāntān, VIII, 1; sanvāhā, X, 2; viśāvatān, VIII, 1; samacchākā, XIII, 7. We should, perhaps, add here several cases in which ə represents a Sanskrit ō (see below Nasalized vowels). Sometimes, finally, a vowel remains long before a consonantal group: bādhana, IV, 2; VIII, 3; XI, 2; uṣṭ, passim; rūṣikā, V, 5; tādāpanē, X, 1; ātāpa-, passim; and before a mute followed by r: bhṛr, IX, 6; mātraṇa, XIII, 1; parākramāni, V, 11; parākramāṇa, VI, 14.

Vowels shortened. — Ārādā, IX, 9; ārādhā, XI, 4; ātārśana, IX, 4; ānaś, IX, 7; āpayā, VIII, 5; uṣṭikā, IX, 8; swarna (once susītī). At the end of words mahāparā, IX, 6; prāna, I, 10; III, 4; rāja, V, 1; teṣā, XIII, 5; tatha, XII, 6 (several times tathā); yathā, III, 8 (several times yathā); va (in the meaning of vā), V, 8; V, 1, 2, 3, 9, &c.

Changes of Quality. — Pirrāja or pārīrāja = puḷaṇa (?), XIII, 9; āya (= aira) VIII, 5; 3; IX, 3. E is weakened to ṛ in evadātyaya (for ṛdā) IX, 8; likhāpaṇāṇa, XIV, 4 (for ṛdā). — The vowel ṛ is written va in evadāḥ, II, 8; a in bhāti, XII, 6; vaṭā, XII, 2, etc.; bhātaka, IX, 4, &c.; daṭthā, VII, 3; kuta, passim; kacha, IX, 8; yan, I, 11, 12; maṇḍrayā, VIII, 1; saṅkṣaya, IX, 7; uṣṭa, X, 4; viśālata, XIV, 2; viśāla, passim; — i in tārīśa, IV, 5; ṛārīśa, IX, 7, &c.; ṛārīśa, XI, 1, &c.; — u in pari-puṇah, VIII, 4; viśa, X, 2.

Additions and Suppressions. — Additions: a in garāha, XII, 3; garahakta, XII, 5; i in iṭā, XII, 9; u in pārāyana, XIII, 4.

Suppressions: a in pi (passim) for api which is preserved II, 2; i in it (V, 8; XIII, 11) for āt, which is preserved five times; ə in va for ṛva (passim).

Contraction. — avva into ə in ṛdāthana (passim); evadātyaya, IX, 8; āḥō, IV, 3, if I am right in explaining it as equivalent to athāva; — a(l)u into ə in khaḥ; — a(ṣ)u into ə in mūra, I, 11; — a(ṣ)u into ai in thāra, IV, 7; V, 7; VIII, 3; — a(ṣ)u in ə in viśālata, XIII, 11, and several times in the formative suffix of the causal, ṛājāṭa, &c. Cf. below; — av into ai in traḍāna, V, 4; — ya into ə in pariḥṣiptā, X, 4; — iya into ə in stūka, XIV, 3; — if pāṭēka, V, 5, really represents a corruption of pratiḥsthāna, we should have in it the contraction of a(ṣ)u into ə.

Nasalized Vowels. — The nasal, whether before a consonant, or at the end of words, is, except in two cases in which a final n is preserved by sandhi, invariably expressed by anusvāra. The anusvāra is omitted in a certain number of cases, such as achāyikā for kahu, VI, 7; puṇaṭikā for naṭa, XII, 4; avahā for hinaḥ, IV, 6, &c. These omissions, several of which are, without doubt, only apparent, and due to the condition of the stone, are in every case accidental, and are to be referred to the
negligence of the engraver. I lay no stress upon them.

Certain cases seem to imply the equivalence of a long vowel to a vowel nasalized: āparātā, V, 5; atilktāna, IV, 1; V, 3; VI, 1; susumā, XII, 3; nityā (nītyānta), III, 3; pādā, II, 2; susvā (accusative), X, 2; nīchā (= nityānta), VII, 3; pūjā (acc.), XII, 2, 8; vañā (= va, vai), XII, 6; suñīcha (nom. pl. masc.?), II, 3. But in most of these examples the nasalized vowel is long by derivation, and it may as well be admitted that the sign for anusvāra has accidentally disappeared. It is also possible that the apparent confusion between ā and va may, in some cases, be due to an error in the reading. The second u of suṣumā, being here almost always written short, there are grounds for believing that the anusvāra of suṣumā is due to an inadvertence of the scribe; the reading suñīcha and its interpretation are not certain. There would, therefore, only remain nīchā, an unique example, and but a fragile basis for such a deduction. We might, perhaps, add ētā, IX, 5, which would be equivalent to etān (nom. sing. neut.), unless indeed it represents etān.

In one case also, kara, XI, 4 (et. karaḥ, XII, 4), aḥ appears to be replaced by u; and sometimes by ā in athā, VI, 4, 5; yudd, III, 6; savē (savē) kādē, VI, 3, 8. But several of these facts admit, as we shall see, of a different explanation.

In pravāsaḥ, IX, 2, the nasal is written twice over, by an abuse which is too frequent in the manuscripts to cause us surprise.

(b). — Consonants.

Simple Consonants. — Changes. — gh into k, in hakā, XII, 3; — dentals into cerebrals, in pata for pata (passim); perhaps pata in hiranyapravatīdhanā, VIII, 4, but pra is doubtful: uṣṭa, X, 4; ēsakā, III, 5; vadhā, XII, 2, 3, 9 (beside vadhā, IV, 11); dasaṇā, IV, 3; dasrā, VIII, 3; dasrā (darsanak, VIII, 4); ṣrpaṇ, XII, 4; ghu, V, 5; — th into h in akā (athāvā); — d into r in ārāma, ārāma, yārīa; — bh into h in the base bā: bāṭa, akūrā, &c.; — i into r, if prārūna or pārūna, XII, 9, is equivalent to pulīna. If pēlēnāka,
dy' becomes j in aja, IV, 5; — y in uttrā, VI, 4.

dr becomes d: chhuda, &c.

dv is preserved: dvē I, 11, al.; dēdāsa IV, 12, al.

dh becomes jh: majhama, XIV, 2, &c.

dhr becomes dh: dhun, I, 12, &c.; it would appear to be preserved in (a)dhuna, XIII, 9, according to the reading of Dr. Bühler.

ny becomes mi, n; anā, V, 5, &c.; mañatē, X, 1, &c. The spelling nyās, for niyās, VIII, 1, is connected, in a manner more or less arbitrary, with this transformation of ny into n.

pt becomes t: asamatā, XIV, 5, &c.

pr becomes p: pakaṇa, XII, 3; āvāna-piṇya, XIII, 9, &c.; — it is preserved in: āsakripati, IV, 2, ādvānā-piṇya, I, 1, 3, 6, 8; II, 1, 4; IV, 2, 5, 8, 12; V, 1; VIII, 2; IX, 1; X, 3; XI, 1; XIV, 1; prāchāhūs, II, 2; pradēsi, II, 2; prapūnti, XII, 4; prākaṇa, XII, 4; prajā, V, 7; prajātivā, I, 3; prāṇa, 1, 9, 10; III, 5; IV, 1, 5, XI, 3; prapūnti, VI, 12; prapūnti, IV, 8; prajātivā, XI, 2; perhaps prajātivā, VIII, 3, prāvak, XII, 2; pravāsān, IX, 2; priyadasi, IV, 1, 5, 8, 12; VIII, 2, X, 1.

bh becomes dh: ladhē, XIII, I, &c.

br becomes b: bāṁha, passim; it would appear to be preserved in brāṁha, IV, 2, 6.

bh becomes bh: ārāhi, I, 9; ārāhā, I, 11.

bhr becomes bh: bhād, XI, 3, &c.; it is preserved in bhārā, IX, 6.

my is preserved: smyapratipati, IX, 4; XI, 2.

mr becomes mh: teśhah, II, 2.

ry becomes gš: svaga, passim.

ry becomes gh: dhya, I, X.

rch becomes ch: vachhahumākā, XII, 9, &c.

ry becomes mh: teśhah, XII, 2.

ri becomes t, as in anuvārā, XIII, 9, &c.; — t in svēmatā, IV, 9: V, 2.

rth becomes th, as in atha, passim.

rd becomes d: māda, XIII, 7.

rkh becomes dh, as in evaḥhayati, IV, 7, &c.; — dh, as in vyāhayati, XII, 4, &c.

rth becomes bh: gaha, VI, 3.

rm becomes srm: kahmś, &c.; dhāma, V, 4.

ry becomes y: niyātu, III, 3.

rv becomes v: pusa, VI, 2; sava, passim; — it is preserved in pura, V, 4; sava, VI, 9 (and three other times); sarvā, VII, 1; XIV 2 (and four other times); sarvā, VIII, 8 (and three other times); sarvā, VI, 8 (against eighteen sava or sarvā).

rī becomes ri in ārānī, VIII, 4, &c.; — becomes s in ārānī, IV, 3.

rāḥ becomes s: vasa (vasa), VIII, 3, al.

rūḥy becomes s in kāsāti (for kṛṣṇahyati); V, 3; kāsāti, VII, 2.

rāḥ becomes rah: garahā, &c.

lq becomes p: apa, passim.

ly becomes l: kalās, V, 1, al.

ly is always preserved: aparyayata, III, 5; dīvyā, IV, 4, &c., except in pūjā, XII, 4.

vr becomes v: prajātita, XII, 2, &c.

īḥ becomes ṣh: pachā, I, 12.

śy becomes s: pasati, I, 5; — or sīy: pāṭitvāyē, XI, 3.

śv becomes sv: svētā in the legend attached to the elephant.

śk becomes k in duktā, V, 3; dukkā, V, 1, al.

śkṛ becomes st: rūṣṭika, V, 5.

śh becomes st: adhisthāna, V, 4; stē, IV, 10; nisṭhā, IX, 6; tisṭhā, IV, 9; tisṭha, VI, 13.

śk becomes ōḥ: agīkhindhā, IV, 4.

śt is preserved: asti, passim; &c.; — it becomes st in anuvāsa, VIII, 4, al.

śth becomes st in gharstāna, XII, 1; — and st in stā, VI, 4.

śv becomes mh, e.g. in the locatives in mh.

śy becomes s, e.g. in the genitives in asa.

śr becomes s: pariśeva, X, 3, &c.; — it is preserved in nīrīta, V, 8; sakṣa, I, 9; XIII, 1.

śv is preserved: svāga VI, 12, al., &c., except in sakṣa, IX, 5.
hm becomes mḥ; it is, at least, thus that I believe that we should read the group ṣ, which, strictly speaking, could also be read hm.

(c). — Sandhi.

Sandhi rarely occurs except between the parts of a compound word, and, as an almost invariable rule, requires the elision of final consonants; it is nearly exclusively vocalic.

A final anusvāra is changed into m in kātavyam eva, IX, 3; ṣvam api, II, 2. I further note the form aṅgamāñasa, XII, 7.

A final d is retained in tādopāyād VIII, 5; tādopāyādhi, XII, 5.

a + a greā a, except in dhamadhiesādaya, V, 4; dhamadhiesa, IX, 7. In nāsti (passim), the long vowel is retained in spite of the double consonant which follows.

a + i gives ē in vijayāchādā, XIII, 11.

a + u gives ō in manuṣopāyādhi II, 6.

a + ē gives ē in tānāsūd, VIII, 3; cēśa, IV, 7.

i + a gives i in itihākakhamahāndat, XII, 9.

u + u gives ō in pasopāyādhi, II, 6, a curious form which would appear to be borne out by the other versions.

2. — INFLExION.

It must be understood that, except in special cases, I shall not expressly quote those modifications which are of a purely mechanical character, being merely the applications of the phonetic rules which have just been indicated.

(a). — Gender.

The distinction between the masculine and the neuter tends to disappear. This, as we shall shortly see, is evidently due to the influence of the Māgadhī spelling.

(b). — Declension of Consonantal Bases.

This tends to go over into the declension of bases in a: parishad becomes parisād; karman becomes karmma, and is declined like a neuter in a; of vāchās, we have the locative vacamāhā, VI, 3; the present participle of as, makes its nominative singular sanātā, VI, 7; VIII, 2.

The following are the traces which still exist:

Bases in AN. — nom. s. rājā; gen. s. rāhā; instr. s. rādhā; nom. pl. rājānā.

Bases in ANT. — Kāraṁ, XII, 4, nom. sing. of the participle present, beside karaṁ(m)tē, XII, 5, tisambā, nom. pl. masc., IV, 9.

Bases in AR(II). — Contrary to the other versions, Girnar presents, for these bases, no traces of the passage into the vocalic declension. Instrum. sing. bhrātā, IX, 6; bhrātrā, XI, 3; pītā, IX, 5; XI, 3. Locat. sing. mātari, pītari, passim.

Bases in AS. — Acc. sing. yasā, X, 1, 2; bhuyā, VIII, 5, ought to be bhuyā.

Bases in IN. — Here we have no trace of the vocalic declension. — Nom. sing. piyadasi, piyadasi (passim); the final vowel is always short. — Gen. sing. pi(pri)yadasinī; instr. pi(pri)yadasiṇā.

(c). — Declension of Vocalic Bases.

Bases in A. — Masculines. — The terminations are the same as in Pāli. I only note peculiarities worthy of remark.

Nominative singular. — Besides the regular form in ē, there are several cases of the nominative in ē, as in Māgadhī: apaparīsāvē, X, 3; pūrē, IV, 5; dēvāsāṇyāpē, XII, 1; prādēśikē, III, 2; rājēkē, III, 2; sadātē, X, 3; yē, V, I. To these examples we should add the many more numerous cases in which the nominative neuter ends in ē, instead of, and beside, an. It is the less permissible to suggest a mechanical change of anē to ē, because the termination anē is still retained in the majority of cases. We have, therefore, here an imitation of Māgadhī; and, so far as regards Māgadhī itself, the final reason for the use of the termination ē in the neuter, lies in the obliteration of the distinction between the neuter and the masculine, which has resulted in the common acceptance, for both genders, of the uniform use of the masculine termination. It is clearly in this way that, VIII, 4, we have hirāmnapatīvādānā (for dhārānā).

Accusative singular. — I have quoted above the form in ē in athē, VI, 4, 5, and yuṣṭē, III, 6, for the accusative. Twice, sarē vēlē, VI, 3, 8, corresponds to svamān kālāṁ of the other versions. It must, nevertheless, be stated that

* Dr. Bühler's interpretation would do away with this combination.
sūrē kālē, can very well be explained as a locative, and that yutē could, without difficulty, be understood as a Pāli accusative plural. It is true that we miss parallel examples to authenticate this termination here. However the matter may be, if we must really admit it, I can hardly imagine for the ending ē of the accusative, any origin other than false analogy with neuter nominatives in ē.

Dative singular. — It is always in āya. There is one solitary instance of the form etāyē, III, 3.

Ablative singular. — In ā: hitatpē, VI, 11; kapā, IV, 9.

Locative singular. — In amhi or in ē. The two terminations occur with about equal frequency.

Neuters. — The terminations are the usual ones.

Nominative singular. — As examples of the nominative in ē, I quote: ahē, IX, 5; bahu-vidhā, IV, 7; charayē, IV, 7, 10; āmīē, VII, 3; VIII, 3; dāsaē, VIII, 3, 3; manigalē, IX, 4 (mahānayē, IX, 1, 2, 3, 4); kaauē, IV, 10; mahādaē (vijinaē), XIV, 3; mahapahalē, IX, 4; kātayamahē (lokaetiā), VI, 9; sūṛē, VI, 10; nayē, VIII, 4; sēśē kāmē, IV, 10; nipālē, VII, 3; yē, V, 2; tāriē, yārēśē, radhiē, IV, 5.

Nominative plural. — We have a termination in ē, instead of āli in dasaṇē, IV, 3; prāna (read 983), I, 10.

Feminines.

Instrumental singular. — In āya, as mūdhā-rītē, XIV, 4.

Locative singular. — In āyāh, as parīsē, VI, 7. It is difficult to decide whether sahitraṇē, VI, 9, is, or is not, an error of the engraver.

Nominative plural. — In āyō, in mahādaēyō, IX, 3.

Bases in I. — Of Masculines we find —

Genitive plural. — Nāē, IV, 6, al.

Locative plural. — Nāē, IV, 1.

Feminines. — We have no example of the plural. For the singular, the accusative in śa, and the instrumental in iyā, call for no remark.

Nominative singular. — In ē. I note, however, apachī, IX, 11; hīni, IV, 4; rati, VIII, 6.

Dative singular. — Anuṣaṣṭya, III, 3, ought perhaps to read gē.

Ablative singular. — Toḥbapanṭ, II, 2.

Bases in U. — Masculines.

Nominative singular. — Sāduḥ, IX, 5.

Genitive plural. — Gurūnaḥ, IX, 4.

Ablative plural. — Bahūḥ, IV, 4.

Feminines.

Nominative singular. — Sāduḥ, IX, 4, 11.

Neuters.

Nominative singular. — Bahu, XIV, 3, al.; sāduḥ, IX, 8, al.

Nominative plural. — Bahūni, I, 8, al.

(d). — Declension of Pronouns.

Demonstratives, &c. — I give, according to the alphabetical order of the bases, the forms found at Girnar.


Ima. — Nom. sing. masc., ayāḥ; fem. iyāḥ; neuter, idāḥ. Ayāḥ is, however, used for the feminine: I, 10; V, 9; VI, 13; XIV, 1, and for the neuter with phalāh, XII, 9. — Gen. masc.: imasa, IV, 11. — Dat. fem.: imāye, III, 3. — Instr. masc.: iminā, IX, 8, 9. — Loc.: imāhi, IV, 10.


Eṭa. — Nom. sing. masc.: ēṣa, X, 3; used for the neuter, or rather with a masculine which, by origin, is neuter, such as kaumē, &c., IV, 7, 10; VI, 10; fem. ēṣā, VIII, 3, 5; neuter, ētaḥ, X, 4 (perhaps under the form ētē, IX, 5); the parallel use of ta would lead one to think that ēta, X, 4; XI, 3 = ēṣā, and is not an incomplete writing of ēṣā. — Dat. sing.: ētāya, once (III, 3) ētāyē. — Loc.: ētamē, IX, 2. — Nom. pl.: ētē, which, being associated with śa prānd, indicates again confusion of genders.

Ko. — Nom. sing. masc.: kočhi, XII, 5, neuter: kočhi, passim.
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7.

To. — Nom. sing. masc.: so, XII, 5, and usually sā; fem.: sā, XIII, 10; neuter: tāh, XIII, 2, more often tā, IV, 10, al., whether for tāh, or more probably for tād, preserved in composition, VIII, 5 and XII, 5; sē is employed adverbially as equivalent to tād, I, 10, as frequently appears in the versions in a Māgadhi spelling. — It is unnecessary to draw special attention to tāh, tasa, tāyā, tēna, tamhi, tē, tāsātu, tēhi.

Nā. — XII, 1, we find nē used as an accusative, and applied to neuter substantives.

Ya. — Nom. sing. masc.: yā, once (V, 1) yē; neuter: yān, VIII, 3, but much more frequently yā, for yad, IV, 10; VI, 5, 6, 11; X, 3; XII, 3. — Nom. plur.: yā, yā, XIII, 6; yānī.


Personal pronouns. — The following forms occur of the pronoun of the first person: ahaṁ, maṁa, nē for the genitive and once (VI, 9), for the instrumental, mayā.

(o). — Declension of Numerals.


3. — CONJUGATION.

(a). — Verbal Bases.

The simple bases are, in general, the same as in Sanskrit, after making allowance for phonetic modifications, as when we have side by side, bhavaṁ and hōtī, prāpnotī for prāpnotī. There are, however, changes, as: chhaṁatī, XII, 5, in place of chhaṁatī; karaṁ, XII, 4, participle present, beside karōṁtī, XII, 6; we should note the extension and alteration of the base of the present in prājñātivayaṁ, I, 3. The consonantal conjugation is only preserved in astī; in upahāntī, XII, 6, it passes into the 9th class. For the root kram we have the two bases: parākramāṇī, VI, 11, and parākramātī, X, 3. In the passive, the formative affix ya is combined according to the usual phonetic laws, in ārabhaṁ, I, 11; ārabhisahāṁ, I, 12; ārabhiṁu, I, 9.

In the causals, whether in aṣṭi or in pāya the formative aya is contracted to ē whenever it would take the form aya: atōkāṭpā, XIV, 6; hāpāṭi, V, 3; poviśeṭṭavaṇya, VI, 8; pājētaṇa (etva), XII, 4. One exception: likhīpayaṁtaḥ, XIV, 3. In one case, drādītavaṇya, IX, 8, it is even reduced to i. Likhīpayaṁsuvah, beside the usual likhīpita, presents an analogous weakening in the base.

(b). — Terminations.

Present. — The terminations of the middle voice, which in one case are, for this tense, used to form a passive, ārabhaṁ, I, 11, are generally used with a neuter, or even with an active sense: anuvartā, XIII, 9 (the reading anuvartām of Dr. Bühler appears to be at least very doubtful); maṁñatī, X, 1; XII, 8; parākramātī, X, 3 (by the side of parākramī, VI, 11); karōṭī, IX, 1, 2, 3 (by the side of karotī, V, 1). — In sukhāpayaṁ, VI, 12, associated, on the one hand, with gaccheyon, and, on the other hand, with ārdhaṇāvatās, it is difficult to avoid recognising the subjunctive use.

Imperative. — The 3rd pers. plur.: ārāṭhaṁ, VI, 12; nīyāṇu, III, 3; āṃṣaṇu, IV, 11, require no remarks. The middle termination, with an active sense, is preserved in the 3rd sing.: anuvartiyatā, X, 2; suṣravatā, X, 2. It will be noted that both exceptionally retain the long vowel āṁ and not āṁ. The 2nd pers. plur. borrows, as in Praṅī, and in Pāli the termination tha of the present, poviśēṭṭha, VI, 5.

Potential. — 1st pers. sing.: gaccheyo, VI, 11; plur. dipoyēma, XII, 6. — 3rd pers. sing. in ē in bhāk, XII, 13; in ēga, in tiṣṭha, VI, 13; in ētha, i.e. with the termination of the middle, in patipajīthṛa, XIV, 4; plural: in ēya, in vasēya, VII, 1; in ēraṁ, termination of the middle: in anuvat(ē)raṁ, VI, 14; suṣravon, XII, 7. Dr. Bühler reads sruṇēraṁ, i.e. sruṇēraṁ, XII, 7, the form which to me seems to give sruṇāya. The correct reading would be sruṇēya for sruṇāya. But, at Girnar, we have no certain example of the spelling ē for y. — The verb as makes the 3rd sing. in aṣṭa, X, 3, and the plural asta (aṣu), XII, 7. There is considerable difference of opinion as to the origin of this form; some look for it in the Vedic subjunctive asta, and others in the extension by analogy of sāya, sēha into asta, astus (Kuhn, Beitr. zur Pāli Gramm., p. 104).
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Past. — 3rd pers. plur. aorist: ahunṣe, VIII, 2; arabhīṣu (="ārabhīṣu", passive sense), I, 9. The form ṣayāṣu, i.e. n(i)yayāṣu, VII, 1, may be compared with the 3rd pers. sing. in āṣi, of the dialect of the Gāthās (cf. Mahāvastu, I, 548). The 3rd sing. eyḍa, would seem to be a sort of imperfect, influenced, perhaps, by the analogy of the perfect yāyē.

A solitary example of the perfect, in ṣaḥa, passim.

Future. — The only example of the 1st pers. sing. is in oṃ, for omi, as in Prākrit: likhāpayiṣaṁ, XIV, 3. The 3rd plur. has twice a middle form: anuvataśe, V, 2; ārabhāṣeta (passive), I, 12; in this last case, the i is a material error, unless it has been introduced after the analogy of the termination oṃi.

Absolutive. — In ṭū (="tūd"): alōchēṭpā. XIV, 6; ārabhīṣṭpā, I, 8. Once in ya, in svācchhāya =svācchhāya, XIV, 5.

Infinitive. — Aruḍhēṭuṁ (ṁ), IX, 9. — It is very doubtful whether khamiṣṭe, XIII, 6, is an infinitive. Dikṣaṅka and ordvāṅka (VI, 6), which appear to perform the office of infinitives, are in reality adjectives, like pāchaka, bōdhaka, with this particular shade of meaning, 'which is to be given,' 'which is to be taught.'

Participles. — The middle form of the participle present is preserved in bhūjāmāṇuṣa, VI, 3.

B. — KAPUR DI GIRI.

The readings of Kapur di Giri have of late made marked progress. A few items of uncertainty, no doubt, still remain, a state of affairs which is sufficiently explained by the condition of the rock, but it is only in points of detail that certainty is really impossible, and we may believe that, so far as decipherment is concerned, we have not so much to expect from the future. I cannot, therefore, do better than take for the basis of my grammatical analysis the last publication of Dr. Bühler in the Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft, XLIII., pp. 128 and ff.

1. — PHONETICS.

(a). — Vowels.

The alphabet of Kapur di Giri does not distinguish between long and short vowels. We cannot, therefore, here discuss changes of quantity.

Changes of Quality. — a for u in guramah, IX, 19; pana, ibid., by the side of guru and puna. — i for े, in likhāpayiṣ, XIV, 13; bhagī ānā, VIII, 17; vijñamani, XIII, 3; avatikini, XIII, 9; gṛhaṭi, XIV, 13; duri, I, 1. — u for a in uchaucha, IX, 18; ṣukdhani, II, 5; mūla, XIII, 8; े for a in śīra, VI, 19; śīraka, IX, 20. We cannot say that े has been substituted for a in cases like saviṣkhaye, XIV, 14 and the dātives in aṣṭi; all we can do is to infer the graphic equivalence of aṣṭi and aṣṭi. — े for i in dīśa, XI, 28; al. — In bhuvē (for bhuvṛ) we should not, I think, look for an actual change in this dialect of े into ी, but should simply consider it as an accidental Māgadhism of the spelling. — u for े in likhāpita, I, 1. The vowel pi has no real existence in this dialect, which, however, does not prevent its being represented in several ways by the orthography. It takes sometimes the form r, in grahaṭa, XIII, 4; XII, 1, sometimes the form vi, in vistriṣṭa, XIV, 13, and sometimes ru, in śruṇya, XII, 7; mṛṇṭa, I, 3. It is changed to a in dukaṭa, V, 11; vapaṭa, XII, 9; viyapaṭa, V, 13; uṣṭāma, X, 22; so also in vajrī, in which the influence of the etymological form has introduced an r in the following syllable; — to i in diṣṭa, VII, 5; īdiśa, IX, 18, al.; kiṭa, VI, 14; the influence of the r has here cerebralised the dental, which shows that the orthography kiṭa, II, 4; VII, 12; VII, 5, is purely a learned and affected one; — to u in vudhēṣu, V, 12; viyaṭa, V, 13; paripuṭka, VIII, 17; mūṭa, XIII, 1; dharmavasai, XII, 10. — In rukha, XII, 5, vi would be changed into ru, but Dr. Bühler’s reading, vuta, gives an entirely different word.

Additions and Suppressions. — Additions: initial े in ṭīr, XII, 9.

Suppressions: a in pi (passim); i in ti (passim); े in va = vaśa, X, 22, al.; və and

Note by Translator. — The section regarding Kapur di Giri having been entirely re-written by the author for the purpose of this translation, it is hardly necessary to point out that the following, in no way, agrees with the corresponding pages of the original work.
Changes. — *kh* into *k* in *ku* = *khu* (khalu), *IV*, 9.

*gh* into *h* in *lahuka*, *XIII*, 11.

*j* into *y* in *prayukṭaṇḍa*, *I*, 1; *raya* (by the side of *raja*), *I*, 1; *al*; *kambōya*, *V*, 12; — into *cha* in *vračaṇa*, *XIII*, 10; *vračaṇa*, *VI*, 16.

*t* is cerebralised into *j* under the influence of an *r*-sound, whether vocalic or consonantal.

The spelling, however, fluctuates. Not only does the classical appear side by side with the Pāṇḍita orthography, but we also find intermediate stages in which the *r* is retained in writing, and often in an arbitrary fashion. Examples are, — *prati* becomes *pati*; but *pratīdhiṇa*, *IX*, 19; *sāvṛtīpāti*, *IV*, 8; *pratīpajya*, *XIV*, 14; *pratīvedaṇa*, *VI*, 14; *pratīvedetaṇa*, *VI*, 15; *kāta* is written *kita*, *VI*, 14; *kāta* in *sukata*, *V*, 11; *kita*, *II*, 4; *V*, 11, 12; *VII*, 5; *vīyāpita* is written *vivīyāpata*, passim; *vyapata*, *V*, 13, and also *viyapaṭa*, ibid. I may also quote *vitrīdāna*, *XIV*, 13; *mutō*, *XIII*, 6, and *mutē* (?) *XIII*, 1. — *t* appears weakened to *d* in *hidāsukhaṇḍa*, *V*, 12, by the side of *hita*; ibid.

*bh* into *h* in *ahō (= athava*), *IV*, 8.

*d* into *y* in *iyah* for *idāh*, nom. sing. neut.

*dh* into *d* in *hida*, *I*, 1 = *idāh* (?)

*p* into *v* in *avatīpajya*, *XIII*, 8.

*b* into *p* in *padhāna*, *VII*, 15.

*bh* into *h* in the base *bhoti*, by the side of *bhōti*, *bhavati*.

*l* into *r* in *arubhāti* and its derivatives and in *rocheta*, *XIII*, 11.

*v* into *y* in *yōḥ* for *ēvaḥ*, if Dr. Bühler’s analysis is correct (in *IV*, 9).

*i* into *y* in *badaya*, *III*, 5; *IV*, 10; — into *s* in *anuśchanaḥ*, *XIII*, 2; *samachariya*, *XIII*, 8.

*śh* into *ś* in *manuṣa*, *II*, 4, 5 (by the side of *manuṣa*, *XIII*, 6); — into *s* in *arabbiṣṭaṇa*, *I*, 2; *yēs*, *XIII*, 4; *abhīṣita*, *IV*, 10; *al*.

*j* into *j* in *anuṣkhaṇaḥ*, *IV*, 10; *anuṣkhaṇaḥ*, ibid.; into *sh* in *pauṣhakhaṇa*, *III*, 6 (cf. *shashu* below); — into *h* in *hachā* (= *sachā*), *IX*, 20.

Suppressions and Additions. — Loss of an initial *y* in *āvaḥ* = *yēvat*, passim; — of a medial *h* in *ia*, *V*, 13; *VI*, 16; *IX*, 20; *XI*, 24, if the reading is certain.
Addition of a prosthetic h in hia, IX, 20; kha, XIII, 12; hélīsa, VIII, 17; of a v in vuchati, XIII, 8, in vata II, 5, if this reading (= upa) should really be preferred to the reading rukha.

**Compound Consonants.** — kt becomes t: abhiṣīta, V, 11; &c.

ky becomes k in sañkhyā, XIV, 14; rukha (?), II, 5; khudraśena, X, 22; and kh: mākhaya, V, 13; istridhīyakha, XII, 9; chhamatiṣaya, XIII, 7.

kh becomes kh: mukhamute, XIII, 8.

gr remains unchanged: agrabhuti, XIII, 4; &c.

jñ becomes n, except in the base apāpeta, in which it becomes n.

jy becomes j: jötiśakñadhani, IV, 8.

nj yields n in vaṇānāt, III, 7.

In shakhu, I do not think that the sh can be considered as representing the group ts. We have here an instance of formation of the locative after the analogy of substantives.

ny becomes nūd in panud, XIII, 9.

ny becomes nūd, except in anavān, VI, 16, in which it is written niya.

ṭṭ becomes cerebralisated into t, under the influence of an r-sound, in dharmanuṣa, XIII, 10; niśvaytā, IX, 19.

ṭṭh is written both th and ṛḥ in uṛthana, VI, 15.

ṭn becomes t in atṛa, XII, 1, passim.

ty becomes regularly ch. The Sanskrit spelling is, however, preserved in ekatī (or ekatīya), I, 2; and it is changed into ti in partīti, X, 22, and also, perhaps, in the participle absolutive in ti, if it is to be analysed as equivalent to tāya (by false analogy).

tr remains unchanged, except in tīḍāṣa (or tī) equivalent to trayōḍāṣa.

tv becomes t. I can hardly believe in the absolutely solitary example of a double ti in tadattayā, X, 21, as read by Dr. Bühler. I should prefer to suggest the reading tadattayē, were I not much more disposed to think that it is simply tadattāyā, which we should read. Of satiyaputra, II, 4.

te becomes : chikisa, II, 4; usātēna, X, 22.

dh is cerebralisated into dh under the influence of an r-sound: vuñci, IV, 10; vuṃhanaṇā, VIII, 17.

dy becomes j, except in uṣyana, where it becomes y, VI, 14.

dr remains unchanged in khudraśena, X, 22.

de, becomes d in diyaśa, XIII, 1, and is resolved into dur in duvī, I, 3; II, 4; it is reduced to b in badaya, IV, 10.

dhr remains unchanged: dhāruṣa, I, 3; &c.

nt, instead of the spelling ntt, appears, according to Dr. Bühler, to be written in aṭīkātana, VIII, 17, and karāṇē, IX, 18. This is a detail which deserves verification.

nūr is written nūḍr in auḍhara, XIII, 10.

my becomes mūd: auṣmā, IV, 9; &c.

pt becomes t: natāri, IV, 9; &c.

pn is resolved into pun: prapunati, XIII, 6.

pr usually remains unchanged. Excluding doubtful cases, I, however, note pujapada, IX, 18; pārītha XIII, 11. We have already seen how extremely fluctuating is the spelling of prati: sometimes prati (pratīśiṣya, XI, 24), but also poṣi (passim), prati (samaṇa-pratiṣṭi, IX, 19), and poṣi (patriśāka, patriśādāka, VI, 14).

bīh becomes dh: ladhaḥ, XIII, 8.

br remains unchanged: barama, passim.

bhy becomes bh: arahitānti, I, 3.

brḥ remains unchanged: braṭhana, IX, 19; al.

ny becomes m or nū: abhīrami, VIII, 17. The double m admitted by Dr. Bühler in sammā, IX, 19; XI, 23; XIII, 5, appears to me to be improbable. I prefer to read sammā, and to suggest that either sammā is for sāma, or that sāmyaḥ has taken the form sāmāḥ by analogy.

mr becomes sū in taṃbapati, II, 4.

ry becomes g: sāgaṇ, VI, 16; or is written gr in vṛgṝṇa, X, 22.

rḥ becomes ch, with the r transposed to the preceding syllable, in vṛchāsi (= vṛchasi) VI, 14, if my analysis of the word is justified, and we should not understand *vṛalayasi.

ṛṅ becomes sṅ in taṃbapati, XII, 9.

ṛṭ becomes ṛ (unuṣṭhīṣṭi, V, 11): sometimes written ṛṛ (kṛṣi, written kṛṣ, X, 21),
or with transposition of the r to the preceding syllable (kraṭava, I, 1); sometimes, also, t:

karaṭo, XI, 24.

rth usually gives us th (athā, passim), but also th (athā, IX, 20; anāthēku, V, 12), both one and the other being sometimes written with r, thr (VI, 14; IX, 18) and thr (IV, 10).

rty is written ṭhriya in nṛathriya, IX, 18.

rth becomes dh: vrthāti, IV, 9; &c.

rth becomes us bh with transposition of the r in garbhagarasi (written grābhagarasi) VI, 14.

rta remains unchanged, but with a transposition of r in writing: krama = karma; dhrama dharma. The spelling dhraham, IV, 8; X, 7, marks the real character of this method of riting.

rty becomes viy: anantaṛiyena, VI, 14; namasṛiṇyena, XIII, 8.

rty usually remains unchanged, with transposition of the r either in the same syllable as in sastra, or to the syllable preceding, pravra, V, 11; rastva (??) VI, 11. But the spelling r is very rare: savatra, 11, 5; V, 13 (several times); VI, 14, 15, 16; VII, 1; XIII, 10 (several times); samava, X, 22.

rty remains unchanged with transposition of the r: ṭrāti.

rth is written sh in vāsha, passim. It remains unchanged in prakshanda, scil. parakshanda, V, 12; VII, 2; XII, 1, 2.

rty gives us sh in kṣaṇa, V, 11.

lp becomes p: kṣapa, V, 11; &c.

ly becomes l in kalaṇa, V, 11.

vy becomes either va (vasamva, XIII, 5; katwa, VI, 15; vinta, XI, 24; &c.), or viya (viya-paṇja, V, 13; puseṭra, XII, 2), often in the same words; or it becomes y in mṛtyṇya, VIII, 17.

āch becomes ch (and not chh) in pachā, I, 3; XHI, 2.

šy becomes s in pratiścayena, XI, 24.

sr usually remains unchanged (sūrṣah, passim); it is written sr in svētra, I, 2; svētha, IV, 10.

shk becomes k: daṁkarāṇā, V, 11; dukaṇā, ibid.

škvr becomes kr: base nīkramati, passim.

šṭ becomes st in nṛpita, IV, 10, &c.; and th in athā = aṣṭā, XIII, 1.

št is written st in ratikaṇaṁ, V, 12.

šṭk is written ū in śratī, IV, 10; th in śṛṭā, IX, 20, aukṭhaṇā, V, 13; and st in svētra, I, 2; and tīṣṭi, IV, 10.

sky becomes ā in all futures: aṇaptiṇāṇā, III, 7; &c.

sk becomes k (and not kk) in jāṭikuniṇā, IV, 8.

st remains unchanged, whether written with the special sign to which Dr. Bühlcr appears to have correctly given its true value, or with the group st, as in sahaṭuta, IX, 19.

str remains unchanged: strīya, IX, 18; istīrō XII, 9; cf. also witrīṇa, XIV, 13.

stb becomes th: chirithiṭa, V, 13; grahaṇa, XIII, 4; and also th, grahaṭhauni, XII, 1.

smb becomes s in all locatives in asi; but these forms do not properly belong to the language of Kapur di Giri.

ṣy usually becomes s, as in the genitive in asi. But we find written siya as equivalent to syāt, IX, 20; &c.

ṣr remains unchanged: sahrāṇi, I, 2; &c.

sv is assimilated into s in sarinā, VI, 16; saṃkṣaṇa, IX, 19; and written sp in spasamāna (V, 13), if the reading is really certain, and it is not simply a badly written sv.

hm becomes m: brahmaṇa, passim.

hy becomes h in mahaṁ = māhyan, V, 11.

(c). Sanhīdi.

A final anuvāra is changed to m in ēkamrā, XIII, 9; paraśvikaṁ ēva, XIII, 11.

In compound words, I have noted:

a elided before i: braṃanibhāṣa, V, 12.

a combined with u into ē: manuscāyakāni, II, 5.

a elided before u: pojupādaṇā, IX, 18.

a elided after i: istṛhiṇyachaka, IX, 2.

u combined with u into ē: jad̐yakāni, II, 5.

2. Inflexion.

(a). Gender.

Here, as at Girnar, the nominative singular neuter of bases in ē often ends in ē, e. g. IV, 8: yudāṇā . . . . . sa bhūpaṇca tādīṣe, &c. Another example of the confusion of gender appears in the plurals yuttani, III, 7, and kallīγani, XIII, 2 (if indeed it is thus that we
should read). One is tempted to attribute to the same cause the not unfrequent use of the desinence ō for anō, dharmakāraṇo, IV, 9; pratīcādāvā, VI, 14, 15; kātā, IX, 18, 19; XI, 24; vavara, IX, 19; XI, 24; kāhā, XIII, 7; pranātreyā, I, 3, which I take as equivalent to pranātreyah; but the accusatives imō, IV, 9; anudivāsa, I, 2; ivaśad, XII, 7, and, above all, the nominative karōthā (tor karōthā) XI, 24; XII, 4, 6; (perhaps, also, anūkāh = anūkā, VI, 14); vō = evō (Bührer, in II, 5), appear to shew that in these cases there is only a mechanical equivalence between the sounds ō and anō. There is still, however, ōō, often used (I, 2; IV, 7; &c.) as a particle, equivalent to tād, and which cannot be explained as a mechanical substitute for tōšā. It only remains for us to see in it an arbitrary restitution from the Māgadhī ōō, based on false analogy.

(b). — Declension of Consonantal Bases.

Of this only a few traces survive.

Bases in AN. — Nom. sing. rojā (rayā), pāsām; gen. ražā; instr. ražāna, XIV, 13; nom. plur. rañāna, XIII, 9. I do not believe in the reading rañāni.

Bases in AR (RI). — Except the nom. plur. natarā, IV, 9; VI, 16, the other forms have adopted the vocalic declension, the bases in a having gone over to the declension in a: pitun, bhṛatun, IX, 19; bhṛatunā, spasunā, V, 13; matapitunā, pāsām.

Bases in AS. — Acc. sing. yaḥ, X, 21. The loc. vachas, VI, 14, can indifferently belong to the base vachas or the base varchās. Bhuyē, VIII, 17, is a Māgadhī form for bhuyā.

Bases in IN. — Priyadarśin has gone over to the declension in i: priyadārśina, pāsām. I note, however, the instr. priyadārśina, XIV, 10. We have also the nom. plur. kādinā, IV, 8.

(c). — Declension of Vocalic Bases.

Bases in A. — Masculines. — Here, again, I only note such peculiarities as deserve attention. The nom. sing. regularly terminates in ō, which appears to be weakened to u in bāhupū, I, 1; sometimes it takes the form in ō, the Māgadhī termination (samayē, I, 2; dēvapriyē, janē, X, 21; mukhsmute vijē, XIII, 8; Tūrakayē, XIII, 9; sirśatamati, I, 2;): Dat. sing. aya written more commonly aye — loc. sing. usu-

ally in ē; but often also in asi, as in Māgadhī: mahānasi, I, 2; gaṇanasi, III, 7; dharmayātisi, V, 13; brāhmaṇasi, &c. VI, 14; &c.

We find the locative in ē written as weakened to ē in bhagī api, VIII, 17.

Neuters. — The nominative singular ends in anā, which is several times written ō, as I have noted above. I have also pointed out the frequent Māgadhīm of the nominative neuter in ē, which is sometimes written i, as in ghātīti, XIV, 13.

Feminines. — The loc. sing. in aye: aṭhasukītīrapāya, VI, 15; pariśhāya, VI, 14.


Bases in U. — Masculines. — Cf. bases in AR.

Feminines. — It is questionable whether sadhu, III, 6, 7; IV, 10, represents the feminine, or whether it is not rather the nominative neuter.


(d). — Declension of Pronouns.

Demonstratives, &c.


Ima. — Nom. sing. fem. aye, I, 1; al. I have no hesitation in considering that ayē, VI, 16, should be read aye = aye; neuter, itāh, IV, 10; itē, V, 13; XII, 2 (eyē); ēmā, VI, 16; al. — Gen. sing. imīsa, IV, 10. — Dr. Bührer considers that, in VI, 16, we should read ēka = ēka. I doubt this.


Eka. — Nom. sing. masc. ēkā, XIII, 8; neut. ēkaḥ, IX, 19; X, 22; ēka, X, 22; perhaps ēka, I, 3. — Gen. sing. ēkēs, IV, 10. — Dat. sing. ēkaye, passim. — Gen. plur. ēkāḥ, which should probably be read ēkāḥ, XIII, 5.

Ka. — kichī, the nom. neut. is of frequent occurrence. — IX, 20, Dr. Bührer reads kēsha, which he explains as the gen. plur. This passage should not, however, be considered as having received its definitive analysis.
Tu. — Nom. sing. masc., śa, V, 11; al. — Neuter: tānu, passim. — śa, frequently employed as a particle, when it represents practically the same form: I have already intimated above how this has come about. — Of the other cases, it is sufficient to note śāsha ( śāshā ṭa) XIII, 6.


Personal Pronouns.

1st person. — Nom. sing. shāha, passim.
Gen. sing. mā, V, 11; al. māha (māhanā) V, 11. — Instr. māyā, VI, 15; al.

(o). — Declension of Numerals.

Dvī, nom. I, 3; II, 4.
Chatri, nom. masc. XIII, 9.

4 Paschāshu, loc. III, 6.
Shāsim, loc. of skaf, XIII, 8.

Atha, — ashtub in composition, XIII, 1.

It seems that the form of the numeral adjective for twelve, was bādaya, III, 5, and for thirteen, titāsa, V, 11.

3. — CONJUGATION.

(a). — Verbal Bases.

Save for phonetic modifications, these have, in general, the usual forms. I only note the presents upakāñā, XII, 6; pravāñā for pravā, XIII, 6, and the participle pravāñyāyā, I, 1, with an irregular extension of the base of the present. Atha is transferred to the present under the form atha, never aha.

In the passive, the formative affix ya follows the ordinary rules in combination: āmakāñā, I, 3; arahañāṁ, I, 3; vuchāṁ, XIII, 8. In arahaḥi, I, 2, it is expanded into iya. Cf. anuvirūṣi, XIII, 10.

The causal formative affix, aya is usually contracted to ṣ. Nevertheless, we have, VI, 14, ṣapayaṁi, by the side of anapēmi in the following line.

(b). — Terminations.

According to Dr. Bühler, there survives one example of the middle termination in karontā, IX, 18, but I am very sceptical regarding this reading. Even the passive, as we have just seen, always takes the terminations of the paramāipada.

Potential. — As has its 3rd pers. sing. siya, X, 22, al., which serves in one passage as base of an anomalous plural siyasa, XII, 7, by the side of which appears also asa, XIII, 11. The 3rd pers. plur. ēnya, instead of the usual ēna (brūṇa, XII, 7; auvārapaṇa, XIII, 7) also appears in hauhādaṇa, XIII, 8. The usual formation of the singular is in ēnā, ēna; but the form in ē (Skr. ē) appears to have been retained in titē, IX, 20, and prakāra, XIII, 7 (which it does not appear to me to be possible to analyze as a locative).


The last revisions have revealed the middle form śīpiṣṭa (Pali dipīṭha) IV, 10; V, 13; VI, 16; XIII, 11, with a passive meaning. The 3rd pers. plur. usually keeps the š: nikramishu, VIII, 17; maunishu, XIII, 11; bhaktāthu, IV, 10. We have, however, also, arabhāṣa, I, 2. Abhāsaṁ, VIII, 17, is an anomalous formation, due to false analogy.

Future. — It is written everywhere in ēṣati instead of ēṣaṭi. We have, however, ēṣaṭi = kar(ṣ)ṣaṭi, V, 11. It is doubtful if aṣaṭaḥ, V, 11, ought to be classed as an irregular future of es.

Participle Absolute. — Usually formed in tu, e. g. śruti, XIII, 10, and the irregular vijīṭu, XIII, 2: in ēṇa in sāṃkhyā, XIV, 14. It would appear that we have the termination ti in anāēṣṭi, XIV, 14, and, if the reading will stand verification, in tiṭīti, IV, 10. I still prefer to explain it, after the analogy of purīṣṭhitu (X, 22) for parīṣṭhitu (tya)jītu, as a contraction of tyā, rather than as representing the vedic tu, which Dr. Bühler sees in it.

Infinitive. — I note the infinitive forms adapakaṁ and kramaṇaṁ, VI, 14.

Participles. — I find the following middle forms of the present participle: aśramana, VI, 14 and vijinamaṇi, XIII, 3.

The Future Participle Passive usually has the termination tāviya; but tāva also occurs in kātvamaṇi, VI, 15.
XVII. The fifth upāṇga, sāriyapannatti (sāryaprajñāpti) bhagavati, in 20 pāhuḍas (prabhūtī) of which 1 has eight, 2 three, and 10 twenty-two subdivisions called jāhṇapāhuḍa. This strange name pāhuḍa is found beside here only in the pāva contained in the dīthiśvā. By the use of this word a special connection between the dīthiśvā and this upāṇga is eo ipso rendered probable. Cf. also the direct statement in the introduction to up. 7. In discussing anāga 3 I have remarked (p. 269) that its mention of a sūraipannatti designated as aṅgabāhira had reference to this upāṇga, though it could not be regarded as certain that the present form of this upāṇga was thereby attested for that period. If it is doubtful whether the present form of this up. existed even at the date of the Nandî [402] in which the sūraipannatti also is enumerated among the anaṅgagāpiṭha texts; but there are two other texts enumerated together with (or immediately after) the sūrap., treating in all probability of the same subject, which are at present discussed in books 1 and 9 (see note 1, pages 406, 407). Perhaps the double mention of the sūrap. in Ávāśy. Nijj. 2, 8 and 8 34, is to be referred still farther back, though it is still in dubio whether this mention refers to the present text or not. In the first of these passages, the author says of himself that, besides other texts, he desired to provide both the sūraipannatti and the īsibhāsiya with a nijjuti. If tradition is correct, Bhadrabahusvāmin is to be regarded as the speaker; and Malayagiri in the commencement of his comm. on uv. 5 makes especial mention of a lost nirekṣita of Bhadr. on the fifth usānga. In the second passage both of the texts just mentioned are adduced together with the kāliyasam (the 11 anāgas according to the schol.) and the dīthiśvā as the four anyūgas, i.e. objects of study. In this passage the īsibh. occupy the second place, the sūrap. the third, the dīthiśvā the fourth. The sūrap. occupies here manifestly a very important position. The importance of the work is in fact very great, as is apparent from the thoroughgoing report I have made concerning it in Ind. Stud. X. 274 — 316. It is in it we find the most remarkable statements concerning the astronomy of the Jains arranged in a systematic form of presentation. [403] Apart from these most peculiar lucubrations, this account is of especial interest inasmuch as it displays remarkably close affiliations with the Vedic calendar-text called Jyotisham, with the Naksattarakalpa and the pariśisthas of the Atharva-Veda. The quinquennial yagnam, sun and moon, and especially the 28 nakṣatras, are placed in the foreground. The planets are known (Jupiter and Saturn with their periodic times), though they assert a very unimportant position and are not cited in the Greek order. There is no mention whatsoever of the zodiac. The 28 nakṣatras begin with Abhijit, and the yagnam consequently begins with the summer and not with the winter solstice. The lībido movāndī of the Jains, which has intentionally changed almost entirely everything which they enjoyed in common with the Buddhists or Brāhmans, is here very apparent. In reality, the Jains are but tolerably fitted out with intellectual gifts. In order to conceal and compensate for this lack of originality they seek to possess something that is their individual property, and to attain this end they do not hesitate to indulge in the wildest dreams of fancy. In the province of astronomy they have given full reins to their imagination. The polemical spirit, manifested especially in the sūrap., against other opinions (pādīvatti), proves that they are perfectly aware of the opposition between their own views and those generally accepted. The beginning of the nakṣatras with Abhijit as the sign of the summer solstice, [404] which Malayagiri presumably refers back to Pādaliptasūri (J. I. 286), presupposes Āsvini as the sign of the vernal equinox (i.e. pp. 304, 305). It is

1 In up. 6 — see p. 414 — a division into vattus is ascribed, as seems probable, to our text. The name vattu at least recalls the pūrvas.
2 Īsibhāsiyāmin is explained by the schol. here by uttarkāhyāyanādīni; on 2, 8 by dēvendraśastavādini. See pages 239, 251, 429, 432, 442.
3 An imitation of this passage is the one quoted from Śāṅkṣa on p. 258.
4 In the year Vīra 437 according to the thirteenth of the Kharatarag. see Klatt, p. 23.
based, therefore, upon the rectification of the old Kṛttikā series, which had already taken place, and which upon occasion (see 20, 17) appears as the old traditional series. It is an open question whether Greek influence made itself felt in this rectification; at any rate we have to deal here with an indigenous stage of Indian astronomy antecedent to the authoritative and preponderating influence of the Hellenes. It is probable, therefore, that the period opened up to us by these astronomical conceptions, is the period embracing the first few centuries of our era.

G. Thibaut, in two treatises on the Suryaprajñapti in the Journal As. Soc. Beng. 1880, pp. 107—127, 181—206, has collected some facts of especial interest in this connection, facts which make for the connection of the contents of the Suryapr. with the corresponding statements in the Techen Pey, see Ed. Biot in the Journal Asiatique, 1841, pp. 592—639, the second part of which Biot holds to be not later than the second century A. D. Thibaut does not attempt any answer to the question whether or not there is here any historical connexion. If such a connection be proved, the Chinese must be regarded as the borrowers, through the medium of Buddhism, with which Jainism was frequently confused by the Chinese. The opposite opinion appears entirely removed from the domain of possibility by the actual facts of the case. [405] The text has been handed down to us contaminated by many corruptions. The numerous gāthās contained in it often appear with entirely uninflected noun-forms (used in the nominative or accusative) in a paścita fashion. The nom. sing. of the first declension mostly ends in o and not in e. The numerals appear in a form that is excessively curtailed. If all these are paścita ab origine, they are besides secondary corruptions of the text which are easily traceable. Several gāthās stood originally at the end of several §§ in Book 1; the MSS. containing the express statement: athā gāthān bhūjatavvād, but the words of the gāthās have disappeared. Even Malayagiri is unable to restore them, since they were no longer extant when he wrote: saṁpratī kvā 'pi pustakā na dṛśyantē, l. c. p. 266a.

The text begins with the legend (and in fact in the customary formula: tēnaḥ kālēnā) that Indrachāti, at the time of king Jīnasattu in Mihila, requested that he should be instructed (by Mahāv.) in . . . . , and then follows in 15 gāthās a complete statement of the contents of the 20 or the 33 subdivisions in books 1, 2, 10. The redaction is, therefore, the result of the activity of one individual. Books 10 and 15 close with the formula tī bēm, which we met with in the case of aṅgas 1 — 3. Is it possible from this fact to conjecture [406] that originally they existed separately, before the author incorporated them in his work? In L. 3 there is a reference in the text to the Janibuddhivapavitā which here in turn cites our text. I here reproduce from my treatise cited above a short statement of the contents:

Book I. in 8 chapters, maṇḍalā, the circles traversed annually by the sun,* viz.: —

1. vadāhāvādhī muluttāṇā, increase and decrease of the number of hours for day and night.
2. addhamaṇḍalasaṃthi, the position (of the two suns)* in the semicircle traversed by each daily.
3. kē tu chiiraṇā pariyaṇā? how does one sun traverse the space traversed by the other?, and how great is this space?
4. amataram kiṁ charaṇāti? in what intervening space do the two suns course?
5. ogahāi kēvalyam? how great a surface does each dip into (illuminate)?
6. kēvalyam vikampā? how large a tract does each pass over every day?
7. maṇḍalāṇā maṇṭhāṇē, the figures of the orbits described by them.
8. vikkhaṇṭhhē, compass and extension of the revolutions of the sun.

* I, 5 states their number to be 140! * See l. c. pp. 261, 275, 285.
† See the next note and note 1, page 407.
* maṇḍalapavātē is an erroneous reading the Nandi as a separate text.
* See Colebrooke, Miscell. 2, 327±3 in reference to the two suns of the Jains, etc.
Book II. in three chapters, tirichchhā kiṁ gachhai, how does the sun go sideways?, viz.: —

[407] 1. Eight different antagonistic opinions in reference to the rising and setting of the sun.

2. Of the passing of the sun from one circle to another, etc.

3. Of the speed of the sun’s motion through each of its 184 circles.

Book III. obhāsāī kēvaīyam? how much (space) is illuminated (by sun or moon)?

Book IV. Of the sēyā, śvētātā, the luminous body and field of illumination of the sun and moon.

Book V. Of the resistance which is met with by the light of the sun (20 different prati-pattis).

Book VI. Of the nature of the sun’s light, and of the continuance of the power of its beams.

Book VII. Who draws to himself (absorbs) the light of the sun?

Book VIII. Of the rising of the sun, or of both the suns, in Jambudvīpa, and of the 4, 12, 42, 72 suns in the other dvīpa.

Book IX. Of the amount of shade in the different seasons. See Ind. Stud. 10, 24.

Book X. in 22 chap. (about ¼ of the whole). Of the connection of the moon with the nakshatras, viz.:

1. āvaliya, the order of succession of the 28 nakshatras beginning with Abhijit.
2. muhuttaggē, the number of hours for the connection of each of the naksh. with the moon or with the sun.

[408] 3. bhāga, the parts of the day or night (or of the heavens) which belong to each of the nakshatras.
4. jēgasā, more exact statements in reference to the time of day in which the nakshatras come into conjunction with the moon and the length of this conjunction.
5. kulāī, the family connections of the naksh. with the months.
6. punnamāśī, the days of the full moon; how and with which nakshatra these end during each of the five years of a yuga.
7. sanivā, the mutual harmonious concatenation of the days of the new and full moon.
8. saṁbhī, figures of the naksh.
9. tāraggam, number of stars of the naksh.
10. nēṭā, leader, i. e. which naksh. lead which month?
11. chaṇḍamaggam, relation of the nakshatras to the 15 day-circles of the moon.
12. dēvatāpa ya ajjhayaṇē, the tutelary divinities of the nakshatras.
13. mukuttāpa māmayāi, the names of the 30 muhūrtas.
14. divasarāi, the names of the 15 days and the 15 nights of the karmamāsa, calendar month.
15. tihī, tithayāḥ, ditto of the lunar month.
16. gottā, the families of the naksh.
17. bhāyaṇāpi, the foods which are good during each of the naksh. — That the naksh. begin here with Kṛṣṭikā (!), is due to the influence of the well-known material that is here treated of.
18. āīchchhāṭāra, course (of the naksh.) with the sun or with the moon during the yuga.

[409] 19. māsā, names of the months of the world and those above the world (lōkōttara, chiefly of climatic contents).

10 pūrīṣhmanḍalāc is cited in Nandi as a separate text.
20. pañcama saṃvachcharā, the five years, viz.:

1. the nakshatram year with 12 periodic months of 327¾ \( \nu x \tilde{h} \tilde{m} r a \).

2. the yuga year, lunar year of 354¾ \( \nu x \tilde{h} \tilde{m} r a \).

3. the pamaśā (pra"a) year, of which there are five kinds. In addition to the two just mentioned, the rita year (sāvana) of 360 \( \nu x \tilde{h} \tilde{m} r a \), the solar year of 366 \( \nu x \tilde{h} \tilde{m} r a \), and the lunar leap-year of 383¾ \( \nu x \tilde{h} \tilde{m} r a \).

4. the lakṣaṇa year, divided into the same five groups as above; there are, however, in addition certain requisites or characteristics.

5. the year of Saturn (30 years), during which Saturn completes his circuit though the 28 naksh.

21. jūśaṃsa sayadāraśi, the gates of the nakshatras (in what quarter of the heavens they bring good fortune).

22. nakhkhattavijā (vichayā), transit of the sun and moon through the 28 naksh.

Book XI. Of the beginning of the five lunar years belonging to the yuga.

Book XII. Of the five kinds of year, which were discussed in 10, 20 on pamaśasaṃvatsārasa; they receive a much fuller treatment here.

Book XIII. Of the waxing and waning of the moon.

Book XIV. When is moonlight the brightest?

Book XV. Of the rapidity of the five classes of constellations—sun, moon, planets, naksh.

and tātā. According to Leumann cf. also Jiv. 4, 31, 12.

[410] Book XVI. Of the properties of moonlight.

Book XVII. Of the fall (passing away) and uvarāya (resurrection) of the geniū of the moon, sun, etc.

Book XVIII. Of the height of the constellations above, and their distance from the earth—cf. Jiv. 4, 31, 3 (L.)

Book XIX. Of the number of the suns, etc., in Jāmbudvīpa, etc.; cf. Jiv. 4, 16, 17, 1, 20, 5, 10, 12, 21 (L.)

Book XX. Of the nature and substance of the five classes of constellations.

There is a commentary by Malayagiri.

XVIII. The sixth upāṅga, the Jāmbudivapannatti.

We have seen (above p. 268) that in the third aṅga 4, a work of this name was cited, if not as upāṅga, at least as aṅgabāhira. In that aṅga we find the same minute division of time which we meet with here; hence the existence of this upāṅga is assured even if its present form is different from that then in vogue. In our text upon a definite occasion there is a special reference to up. 5 and up. 7, each of which in turn cites our upāṅga. It is, therefore, probable that these works are synchronistic, supposing that the citations in this instance are not, as usually the case, the work of the redactor.

The legendary introduction to this upāṅga is wholly identical with that which commences [411] upāṅgas 5 and 7, upāṅgas which are connected by a very close tie. This introduction is inserted between upāṅgas 5 and 7 in a very remarkable manner. Our up. is, however, different from these, in that, like aṅgas 1—3, it concludes with the formula ti bēmi, which, it must however, be confessed, is found at the end at least of books 10, 15; see p. 405.

There are no sub-divisions in the text itself, whence the Vidhiprapā calls it ėgasāra. The commentary, however, recognizes seven sections which it calls by the strange title of vakshas-
kāra. 12

11 In 3, 1, however, only the titles of upāṅgas 7, 5 (and the title of a part of up. 5) are mentioned. The title of our up. finds there no mention whatsoever.

12 This recours e. g. in Hānahaśa’s nyékamanjūshā.
The mythical geography of Jambudvīpa, interwoven with many legends, forms the contents of this upāṇa. The chief part — 3/5 of the whole — concerns the description of the seven vāsas (varsha) and of the six vāsaharas (varshadhara). The description of Bharahavāsa which is placed in the fore-front comprises at least 3/5 of the entire account. The legends of king Bharata, from whom it takes its name, claim a good half of the entire section. The detailed account of Bharaha vāsa in the different gradations of the past and present (in all 4), and in the future (in all 8), is preceded by a minute description of the divisions of time and extent; of which we have already (in aṅga 3) met the first, from āvaliyā to sīsapahēliyā (or to usappiṣṭ)—see above, p. 268. One difference is, however, noticeable:—Here13 the increase is by hundreds after the millennium, [412] after 100,000 years by 84’s (chātraśatīvāsasyahassāśām 36 ēgē puvvāṅgē), and from this point on by 8,400,000 (chātraśatīpuvvāṅgasāya... sāhassāśām 36 ēgē puvvē); in aṅga 3, however, we find no more exact statement in reference to the manner of the progression14 (vāsakōṭi ti vā, puvvāṅgē tī vā, puvvā ti vā).

As the result of the above we may observe one divergence as regards up. 5, where in book VI. (see Ind. Stud. 10, 22), the word puva occurred in the signification of a million years, and the increase from that point on (without any special mention of the names in question) simply passing by paliṅvama and sāgarvama, up to ēsappiṣṭ, merely by 10’s.

The enumeration of the 72 kalās in a legend of Usabhā is not mentioned in detail; its beginning and end alone being mentioned. The women of the foreign peoples known to us from the Bhagavatī—see p. 269—are enumerated as servants of king Bharaha:—Tatē mahā tassa Bharahassā raṇḍo bahūdō khuyā15—Chilāti-vāmaṇi-vādabhlī Babbarī-Vaśuviyā Jōṇiyā-Palha-viyyō, Īsīlyā-Īshwrijīyā (Thārakīyā, Chārābhānjiyā) Lāsīya Laśīya Damīlī Śhāllī taha Āravi Pulīndī ya Pakvanī Vahali Marunīṭ [413] (Mura, Müro) Savariō Pareśō ya appigatīyā chaṃḍanākalašahattahayāyō...

According to the commentary, the first four vakshakārata treat of the following subjects:—The first, of the Bharatadhēṣṭavaravāpaṃ; the second, of its special relations during the 14 temporal divisions, Bharatadhēṣṭavaravāparvarṣaṃprastāvanāśarṣāparpiṛ-īśvarāparśāparīśvaropāra-kālačakravāraṇā nāma; the third, the legends concerning king Bharata, Bharatadhēṣṭapravṛttiṇimāttivārā Bhartadharakaricchitra. nāma; the fourth, of the remaining 6 vāsas, or 6 vāsaharas,16 kahudra Himavāḍāvāsabhadharairāvaḥsāvitaravāravāraṇā nāma. The fifth treatises, in legendary form, of the birth and consecration of a tīrthakrīt, tīrthakrījānaśbhiśhēkādhikārāv. The sixth, unfortunately, gives but a very short review of the divisions, extent, mountains, temples, lakes, rivers, etc., of Ānambudīva, Ānambudīvapagatapadārthānaśāmrahav.17 The seventh deals with astrological and chronological matters, jyotihādhikārāv., and especially with the number, etc., of the moons, suns and stars in Ānambudīva. Herein it is in very close agreement with the śāstrānāatti and chaṃḍapannatti, both of which are cited at the end. The answer to the questions under consideration found at the end is based chiefly upon the discussion: paṃchamaṃsu paḍhamā uddēśā, by which [414] Bhagavatī 5, 1, is doubtless meant. It

13 So also in the Anyāyōgadvārasūtra, see Bhag. 1, 47. See Ind. Stud. 13, 168. Ind. Stūrīṇa, 5, 3. Paṅcha-śadadvāprasūtra, p. 27 in reference to the customary use of the number 84.
14 According to the scholiast, we must assume that the relations of modality in aṅga 3 are identical with those here:—pūrva pūrvāṅgūna ča chaturāṅgadhakalakhaṅgūti; pūrvāṅgūna chaturāṅgadānaṅgūti triṣṭikāṅgūti bhavantu...
15 Kubhīṣṭha kubhīṣṭha vākrajanāh, Chilātiyā chilātīdōtāpanāḥ, pāmiṇikāh anuṣrayau kṣetraśravasatīsāyakoshikhāvā, vadhāvāhikā vadhākoshikhāvā, bakunādēsājāḥ, tinikāh tinākārakā; lamākādēsājāḥ, lankaḥ sāhāsājāḥ, tatra chilātīyādāyā 'abādāśa tattadāśabhalvanātā tattamanāmākā āčāīya, kubhīṣṭhaya tu tārā śvēchhasanabhatē; see Leumann in the glossary to the Aup.
16 Then follows: 2. The mountain (vāsahara-pāpaṃ) chilla Himavānī, 3. in Hēmādē vāēś, 4. mount maha-Himākāyāṃ, 5. in Harivās vāēś, 6. mount Nisaha, 7. in Mahāvēṅchē vāēś, 8. mount Nlēvanē, 9. in Bāmāvēṅche vāēś, 10. mount Ruppi (Rukmin), 11. in Hēmādē vāēś, 12. mount Śhēr (Śhikhar), 13. in Āravāṇē vāēś.
17 2) leaves (75b to 77b) in a MS. of the text embracing 66 leaves, of which the fifth section embraces 66b to 75b. A gāhā, which summarizes the contents, forms the introduction. This gāhā is at the head of a sanāthapaṃ in 29 Lṛyā composed in very free Prākrit, by Haribhadraśrī. See above, pp. 371, 372.
closes in treating of the sun: ichch ēśā Jānhūdāvapannattī śūpannattivatthusamāsēdāgh samattā bhavāti. Then, in close conjunction with the above, it, in like manner, treats of the moon, and concludes: ichch ēśā Ja'ittī chaṁdāpannattivatthusamāsētāṃ s. bh. The expression vaṁtha, which occurs here twice, belongs to the puvra sections — see page 361. It does not occur in the existing texts of upāṅgas 5 and 7, which are divided into pāhuḍas, a term which, it must be confessed, is similar to the pūrvas. Next follows a discussion in reference to the five different kinds of year (see above p. 409), viz.: — 1. The nakḥattā year (and by this is meant the revolution of Jupiter through the 28 nakḥstras), 18 in up. 5 (see Ind. Stud. 10, 290), this is cited merely as a pakshāntāram. 2. The luna r y u g a year. 3. The pāmāsā year with its five groups as in up. 5. 4. The lakṣkhaṇa year in five groups. The scholiast says that in the first of the five, the nakḥstras year, the commencement is made with Kṝti and not with Abhiṣijī! The scholiast on up. 5 at least makes mention of Uttarāśādāhā — cf. Ind. Stud. 10, 301, note 7. 5. The year of Saturn or its revolution through the 28 nakḥstras. Then follow the months, days, hours and the karana, which last was omitted in up. 5. The fourth karana is here called thvilīṣaṇa, śrīvīlīṣchaṇa, or thilīṣaṇa (so also in the Capiviya v. 42) and not taitila. The names are as usual: — Bavamā bhāvamā thvilīṣaṇa [415] garāvaṇijāṃ viṭṭiś (these 7 are chaṛa sañjī chaḍāppaya nāgaṃ kintṭhagghanām (these 4 are thīra). The beginning with Bava is the one which usually occurs elsewhere; but in the quinquennial yugam, contrary to other statements, everything has been changed. Of the two ayāgas the summer solstice is in the first place, the rainy season is first among the seasons, Sāvaṇa (Sravas) first among the months, the bauhala - among the pakhha, the day among the abhṛata, and Abhiṣijī among the nakḥstras. Then follows a special discussion of the nakḥstras, — their position as regards the moon, their divinities, the number of their stars, their gotta, their form, etc., just as in the Nakḥstrakaḷpa or in upāṅga 5; and partly in the form of gāhā. The names of the nakḥstras appear here in their secondary form as in up. 5, in āṅga 3 — see Ind. Stud. 10, 296, and above p. 268: — Savana (instead of Śrīṇja), Dharījā (instead of Śravabha), Bhaddavāyā (instead of Praśthāpada), Pusa (instead of Tisya). The conclusion is formed by all sorts of remarkable statements in reference to sun, moon, stars, the extent of their viṃśa, etc.; Mars (iṅgāla viyāla lokaṃ) and Saturn (saṃpījaḥ) are regarded as belonging to the court of the moon; cf. Bhagavati 1, 401. 2. 225. Jupiter was referred to above; but there is no mention of Mercury, Venus, and the zodiac.

The commentary is by Sāntichandra, scholar of Sakalachandra, who lived at the time of the 88th patriarch of the Tapāgachha, Hīrvijayāsūri (1 Saṅvat 1632), recognized by sīl-Akabbara- suratīṣa (Sultan). This commentary19 is very verbose, but in the introduction it contains numerous matters of importance in the relations of each of the [416] 12 upāṅgas; to that of the āṅga which had a corresponding position among the series of twelve, and in reference to the commentaries thereupon — Silāṇkāchārya (on āṅgas 1. 2), Abhayadēva (on āṅgas 3 — 11 and up. 1), Malayagiri (on up. 2 — 7), Chaṁdāsūri (on up. 8 — 12), and finally — see above p. 224 — in reference to the period of advancement suitable for the study of each of the āṅgas. The full statement in reference to the mutual relation of the āṅgas and upāṅgas is: — tatrā iṅgāni dvādaśa, upāṅgāni api aṅgikādēśaprapahancharūpāṇi prīyāḥ prāyaṅgam ēkaikabhāyāt tāvatny eva, tatrā iṅgāni ēkāraṅgaṇāṃ pratītāṇi, teśām upāṅgāni kramāṇā mūni: ēkāraṅgāgasā "pāpātikām 1, sūtraśāṅgāgasā rājaprapātanām 2, sūtraśāṅgāgasā jāghāhāgamāḥ 3, samāvayāśāgasā prajnapanā 4, bhagavatāḥ sūryaprajnapātīḥ 5, jānātādāmāvākāshāgasā jāmbudvālaprajnapātīḥ 8, upāsakaśāṅgāgasā chaṁdāprajnapātīḥ 7, aṅtakriśdaśāṅgāgānām djīṣṭvādāparyātāmāṃ pančchānām apī aṅgānām aviyāvalīkaḥ uṣṭakādigatākalpiṇā, dīpānāhavargāḥ pančāḥ pāpaṁ, tathā hi: aṅtakriśdaśāṅgāgasā kalpiṇā 8, anuttarōpāpātikā-

18 Jāni vā vahasaal mahaggāḥ dvālaaahāni saṃvāčhaahāhāni saṃvānākkhaattamādālamā saṃćhārī s e taṁ nakḥhataasāvavaahāhā.
19 The date of its composition is Saṅvat 1651 (A. D. 1595); the work was, however, revised for Vījayaśāra nine years later.
daśāṅgasya kalpāvataṁsikā 9, praśnayākaraṇasya pushpītā 10 vipākaśrutasya pushpachūlikā 11, dṛṣṭiśvādasya Vṛṣṇidasā 12, itī.

XIX. The seventh upāṅgam, chañḍapannatti.

We have, before, frequently observed that a text of this name is twice cited in aṅga 3, and in conjunction with texts whose titles belong to upāṅgas 5, 6, or to a portion of up. 3; that the order of succession of the titles in aṅga 3 (7, 5, 6) does not agree with the present position of these texts, viz. the title of the chañḍapannatti is there, and, in fact, in both the passages which concern this matter, placed before the others. The chañḍapannatti is cited in the text of up. 6, as before remarked. [417] Taking these facts into consideration, it is in the highest degree remarkable that the existing text is almost completely identical with that of up. 5, differing from it, for example, in about the same way as the two schools of the white Yajus differ from each other. The introduction is, however, quite different. The beginning consists of 4 āryā strophes, of which 1 and 2 sing the praises of Vira etc.; v. 3 characterizes the work in the same words as are found in up. 4, introd. v. 3 and 5, i.e. puvravastrāraṇāsādhā — see p. 394 — and v. 4 traces back the jōśarāṇyapannatti to the questions of Gōtama Indrabhūti. Then follow upon these four strophes the same 15 verses in an interrogatory tone, which in up. 5, too, state the contents of the 20 separate divisions (pāhuḍa) and subdivisions pāhuḍa-pāhuḍa. From this we can draw the conclusion that there is complete identity of subject and method of treatment. The legendary introduction, which refers the whole to a conversation between Mahāvira and Indrabhūti, follows upon these 15 verses, and displays a few minor differences. From this point on, the text is similar to, and in fact, almost identical with, that of up. 5, with the exception of a few linguistic (e.g. rā, night, for rayaṇa, rataṇa, rajaṇ) and stylistic differences. Our text is, here and there, somewhat briefer, which is compensated for by references to up. 3 and 6, which are lacking in up. 5. An exact comparison of the text of each will doubtless disclose many matters of difference between the two. Nevertheless, the inter-relation of the two is a fact, the remarkable character of which [418] is increased when we consider that Malayagiri composed a special commentary on this upāṅga also, which was essentially the same as that composed by him on up. 5, and that in neither of his commentaries does he say anything in reference to the mutual relation of both texts and commentaries. (The statement just made appears to be correct, though I have not made here an examination of Malayagiri’s con. ad anuṣaṁ.)

Until new facts come to light that will solve this mystery, we must be content to accept the present situation. In the passage in up. 6 in which up. 5 and 7 are cited — see above, p. 414 — the text reads as if the first had reference solely to the sun, the second solely to the moon. Our texts of up. 5 and 7, however, treat both uniformly and in a completely similar manner.

XX. — XXIV. The eighth to the twelfth upāṅgas, nirayāvaliyā, nirayāvalikās.

Under this collective name are comprised five small texts of legendary contents (vagga) in one “āṟutakandha.” The first of these either has the special title of “āṟutakandha,” or is called kappiyā, kalpikās. The titles of the others are kappavādaṁsiyā, pupphiyā, pupphachūliyā, or “chūlla,” Vanhidasā. Each of these four has 10, the fifth 12 ajhaya-ānas. 20 In the introduction to the first, all these five texts are characterized — see 372, 373 — as uvaṁga-āṇa paṁcha vagga. We have seen above that this epithet recurs in the interior of no other one of the texts held to be upāṅgas. [419] It must, therefore, be deemed a probable supposition, if we assert that this epithet at the time of the composition of these five texts was restricted to them alone in their totality since they belonged together from the very beginning. Their present position at the end of the 12 upāṅgas is to be explained by their legendary contents, which shows them to be perfectly adapted to serve as a pendant to the

20 Āvi. and Śrī.: aṁtaga-sadasāppaṁcha-kappiyā, uvaṁga-āṇa nirayāvaliyā, tammi paṁcha-vagga: kappiyā, kappavādaṁsiyā, pupphiyā, pupphachūliyā, vanhidasā, chaṭṭu daṇa ajhaya-āṇa, paṁcha-mē bānaṇa.
legendary texts of açugas 7-11, and tradition has — see pp. 373, 416 — brought them into connection with these açuga texts and especially with 8-12. They share with these not merely the common form of legendary introduction; they are referred back to Sudharman and Jambé; they have the names ukkhēva and ukkhēva, usual in the customary introductory and concluding formula; they show the division of each into ten ajhayaṇas, and lastly they have the same form of the citation of a text, i.e. the first ajh is quoted entire, and the catch-words suffice for those that follow. We may well call them an appendix bound to açugas 7-11 by a very close tie. Their interconnection is, furthermore, attested by external evidence: — Their names are placed together in the enumeration of the anaigapatītha texts in the Nandā, though the order of succession varies somewhat, the series there being 20, 22, 21, 23, 24, while between 20 and 22, as a separate text, the kappiyā are inserted, which in the Vidhīprapi, [420] as in Sāntichandra on up. 6, see p. 416, appear merely as the name of the first of these 5 upāṇgas. In the scholiast on the Nandā, however, and in the Nandā itself they are regarded as an independent text existing by the side of the other five: narakāvasās tadvärāminānā charaṇa vratarāvyaṇā; kalpikā ṣaundhārāsirikopavatvātācoharā graṃṭhāpaddhatāyāḥ; evaḥ kalpāvataṃśikā jñeyaḥ; yāḥ tu gṛhihvasamuktena(?) ṭyāgeṇā jivāḥ saṁyamabhāvapushpita bhūṣhitā bhūyaḥ tattvāgaratā duṣkhāvātāmuktena mukulītas tattvāgaratā pushpitaḥ pratipadāvantā śah pushpitaḥ; tadviseshapratipadikāḥ pushpachudāḥ; Anidhaka-Vṛśṇidāsānāṁ siddhagamaśādhikā kṣanānāṁ pratipadākā graṃṭhāpaddhatāyāḥ.

In the account of Rāj, Lāla Mitra, l.c. (above, p. 227), there is no mention of the Vaṅhidāsā, nirayāvālī and kappiyā are enumerated as two separate upāṇgas (8 and 9), and Kappaviṇāsāya, Purphiyā, Pūpahūliyā as Nos. 10-12. In Kashinath Kunte’s report the order is nirayāvalikā, Vaṅhidāsā, Kappaviṇāsāya, Purphiyā, Pūpahūliyā.

It must, furthermore, be noticed that Abhayādeva on açuga 3, 10 is of the opinion that several of the 10 ajh of the dihādāsā cited there are especially closely connected with the narakāvalīśrutakandha — see pp. 273, 423. If this is the case, it supports the probability that the contents is of ancient date, which is indeed great on other grounds. The relation of the five extant texts as follows:

XX, up. 8, uvaṁgānam paṇḍhamē vaggē, the nirayāvaliyā, or kappiyā, treats of the ultimate fortunes of the ten princes Kāla etc., sons [421] of the Açuga king Sēṇiya of Chaṃpā. These princes accompanied their half-brother Kūniya in his campaign against his grandfather, Chēdap of Vēṣaḷi, the Vidēha king, who refused to deliver up the own brother of Kūniya who had fled to his court. Kūniya on this account had declared war against Chēdap, who, in order to meet the impending danger, summoned nine Mallati (Mallaki) and nine Lechhāti (Lichhavī) kings and all 48 Kāśi-Kōsalayā gaṅgāyāṇā (cf. Bhagav., 7, 9, p. 301), and opposed 57,000 elephants, etc., to the 30,000 of the eleven princes (3,000 for each). The mothers[28] of the ten princes, Kāli, etc. (see açuga 8, above, p. 321), each ask in turn of Mahāvīra whether they are destined to behold their sons alive again. Mahāvīra in reply not only informs itiṣuḥabhūti into what hell each must descend after he has fallen in the battle — hence the title of the upāṇga — and his future fate, but also relates the antecedent history of king Kūniya himself, beginning at that point when his mother was three months pregnant. The expulsion of his father Sēṇiya from the throne at his hands is then related and his father’s death in prison. We possess in its complete form the text of the first ajh alone, the second being finished off in six, the remaining eight in two lines.

The reader is referred to Jacobi’s introduction to the kalpas. p. 2 for Sēṇiya Bhīmbhāsā, i.e.

[21] As regards açuga 10 I have mentioned on page 299 my conjecture that from the inter relation of up. 8-12 and açugas 7-11 we have additional testimony for the view that açuga 10 too originally possessed a legendary character. See, however, p. 334 n. 1.


[23] Son of Chellānā, wife of Puṇḍarīkā.


Srēṇika Bimbisāra, and his son Kūpiya Bambhasaraputta,26 e. e. Ajāatasatru, [422 ]contemporaries of Buddha, and also in reference to the synchronistic conclusions which may be drawn in reference to Mahāvīra. It is placed beyond the shadow of a doubt, that the Bandhhas and the Jainas possess herein a common heritage, and that genuine historical traditions form the foundation of the recital. Whether it is necessary to separate Mahāvīra from Buddha is another question — cf. Bhagav. 1, 41. The traditional connection of Mahāvīra with Nātiputta, Buddha’s opponent, can also be regarded as the result — cf. p. 240 — of an intentional variation caused by sectarian hatred.27 The Nirayāvall has been edited by S. Warren, Antwerp, 1879, on which see H. Jacob in Jour. Germ. Orient. Soc. 34, 173 ff. There is a commentary by Chandrasārī.

The enumeration of the women of non-Āryan peoples,27 distinguished in the text merely by vahūhīni khyuyāhīni jāva, is quoted by Chandrasārī in the same form which we meet with in Bhag. 9, 31 (see p. 303), etc. The citation jahā Chittā tti, points to up. (2), jahā Pabhavati to anga 5, 11.

XXI. up. 9. varga 2, kappāvadāhsīsā, kalpāvatahāsīkāh, treats of the ten sons28 of prince Kāla, etc., all of whom were converted to asceticism, as were their grandmothers Kālī etc., and who [423 ] reached their respective heavens.29 The account consists almost entirely of mere catchwords or of references. Emphasis is often laid upon the study of the sāmās-m-ādāhīn ekākara saṁgāmī.

XXII. up. 10. varga 3, pupphāhā, pushpikāh (or 6tāh), treats, with reference to up. 2, of the ten gods or goddesses30 who came from their heavenly worlds31 to pay reverence to Mahāvīra, who thereon tells to Goyama their previous history. They were in a former birth all turned or converted to the study of the sāmās-m-ādāhīn ekākara saṁgāmī, either by the arhat Pāsa or by the Aaya Suvatā or by the thera bhagavantō (see up. 3). These former births, as mānaṇa, gāvastia, satavāhā etc., occurred in Sāvatthi, Vāsāraśi (!), Mālāvatī, Venuṇārāṇi, Mihīla, Hadhināpura, Kākaṇḍi. The enumeration of the Brähmanical sciences here is similar to that in the Bhagavatī (above, p. 303); and their names are similarly explained by the scholiast.

XXIII. up. 11. varga 4, pupphachhula, pushpachhulās,32 ten other histories of a similar nature. We possess the first alone, the Bhatā nāmaṇ dāriā, former birth of the Sirīdēvī,33 is brought by Pāsa to believe in the nīggramthā pāvayapām. The other histories have entirely disappeared with the exception of the names, [424 ] which are found34 in the gāhā in the introduction; the goddesses (not gods) who are here mentioned are for the most part mere personifications of ethical qualities.

XXIV. up. 12. varga 5, Vanhipdāsī, Vriahipdāsī, in 12 ajhayaṇas; 12 similar histories, of which we possess none but the first, the mere names by which the others were called having been

---

26 See introduction to up. 2. More exact information in reference to his history is found in the Brāhmi inscriptions. 27 kūjahābhi vārajagahābhi, chalitābhir aūryadēstotpahābhi, vaṃeśābhir hrasvahārābhī vadhābhābhi mudahakshobhābhi, Vararābhī Varvaradētasahavābhābhi, Vaṃsikābhih Yeṣuṇābhibhi Pushavikābhih Isinākābhih Čārukinikābhih Lāsikābhih Dravīṭībhih Śāhuḥbhih Ārvibhibhi Pakṣapobhih Vahābhibhih Mūrundobhibhih Śaparabhībhih Pātālobhībhih nākāstābhībhih vahāvṛtābhīyappāyadeotpahābhi; cf. p. 412.
28 Pāmē, Mahāpadānē, Bhaddē,Subhaddē, Mahābhadhē, Pañām:bhadhē, Pañām:stēṇā, Pañāmagnūnē, Nālīgnūnē, Āpadēṇa, Nādāpā (but this makes 11 names! Is one to be referred to a son of Kūpiya?)
29 Seated in the Kalpavatansaka Vīmaṇa, Kashinath K.
30 Chāndōjīśumād, Sūrī, Suṅkē, mahāgahā (planet Venus), Bahuputti, Panabhaddē, Māpihaddē, Dattē, Siṅgē, Balī, Anāṣhīṭā; four of these names, see p. 278, among those of the dhādaṇas.
31 Seated in the celestial chariot (Pushpaka), Kashinath.
32 Contains an account of the female disciple of Mahāvīra Svāmi, named Pushpachhula, and of her female attendant, Kashinath.
33 Sirī, kāri, kātā, kīṭhā, vuddhī, lajā, Ṭā ṭevē, sura ṭevē, sarasa ṭevē, gomīhāvē; — The Sirīdevī comes to honor Mahāvīra..., jahā Bahuputti.
preserved. The conversion of twelve princes of the race of Vṛṣabha is here treated of as having ensued through the influence of the arhan Ariṭṭhānemi. The first history deals with Nisaṭha, son of Baladeva, nephew of king Kaṭha-Vāsudeva in Bāravatī. In his former birth he was converted or turned to the study of the sāmān-m-iddiī ekkāraya aṅgāṁ by the Siddhaththānāmaṇ añīryā. A prophecy in reference to his future birth is added to the above recital. At the end the five texts are again called the “uvaṅgāṇi” or the 5 vargas of one śrutasakandha: nirayāvalisutakkañḍhō samattō, samattāṇi a uvaṅgāṇi, nirayāvali-vaṅgāṇi naṁ ēgō suakkhaañḍhō pañccha vaggā pañcchanu divaṅsau uddissamātī.

This last statement in reference to the number of days which are necessary to teach or to recite them, is found [425] in exactly the same form in the corresponding aṅgas — see p. 280. The three sāmāyārīs, contain detailed statements in reference to each.

The historical value of these legends is, apart from the traditions contained in up. 8, without doubt very slight indeed. The largest portion of their contents is as purely fictitious as was the case in aṅga 6 fg. (see p. 338). Nevertheless, since they contain information (e. g. in respect to the activity of Pāsa, which preceded that of Mahāvīra), we may claim for them a value as regards our estimation of the relations under which we have to consider the life and works of Mahāvīra.

We have seen above that the uniformity of the contents, and the homogeneous method of treating it in all the five texts, make for the conclusion that they originally formed but one text. Tradition calls them merely the five parts of one śrutasakandha. Their enumeration as five separate texts was caused by the desire to have the number of the uvaṅgas correspond to that of the aṅgas. The fact is that the special limitation of the number of the aṅgas to eleven, which is found in uv. 8-12, must be regarded as a strange contradiction of the desire to assimilate the number of the uvaṅgas to that of the aṅgas. The title vaggā belongs also to aṅga 6 and 8, as an appendix or supplement to the latter of which two, these five texts may have come into existence. The history of the first vaggā here (uv. 8-12) is, to a certain extent, an elucidatory supplement to the last of the vaggās there, i.e. in aṅga 8.

FOLKLORE IN SALSETTE.

BY GEO. FB. D’PENHA.

No. 11.—Francis and his Uncle.

There was an old woman who had an only son, called Francis. They were in rather poor circumstances, and lived on what the old woman earned during the day. Francis had a maternal uncle, who was very rich and possessed much land and several bullocks and cows.

One day, when the boy was old enough, his maternal uncle called on his sister, and asked her to send the lad to take his cattle to graze, promising to give him something as pay. His sister told him that the boy was mischievous, and said he had better ask him himself to agree to the proposal. His uncle, therefore, called the boy, and said to him: — "Francis, will you come and take my cattle to graze every day? I will give you something in return."

"Yes, I will come," said Francis. "Will you give me a cow as pay, uncle?"

His uncle promised to give him a cow, and Francis went daily and took his uncle’s cattle to graze. Every day Francis asked for his cow, but his uncle put him off, saying:—

"I will give you one to-morrow."

---

25 Nisiṣṭha, Mahāniṣṭha, Aniṣṭha, Vede, Pagati, Juttī, Dasaṣṭha, Dāsika, Mahāṣṭha, Sadāṣṭha, Dasaṣṭha, Satyadāśa, Sadāśa, Sayadāśa.

26 At the head of 10 Daśa: Samuddavijaya etc., 5 Mahāvīra: Baladeva etc., 16,000 kīnga: Uggasāṇa etc., 24 kūṭā of kumāra: Pasyunna etc., 60,000 dūdaṇā (7): Sambaya etc., 21,000 vīra: Vīraśīna etc., 16,000 dēva: Ruppuṇḍa, etc., and many thousand gaṇḍā: Asamangāṇa etc. The same court is found according to Leumann in aṅga 6, p. 326, 1231, and aṅga 8, 1.

1 The original is Farābā, a familiar local form of Francis.
After several days, the uncle, finding Francis importunate, one day said to him: — "There are a lot of cows here, you can choose one for yourself."

Upon this Francis chose a cow for himself, and every day fed her with half of his own rations, which made her grow plump and fat. Now his uncle observed that, while his own cattle remained as before, Francis' cow was growing fat and beat them all in beauty. He soon became jealous, and considered how he might deprive the lad of his cow.

So one evening he came and said to him: — "Well, Francis, my boy, I'll give you a holiday to-morrow, and I will look after the cattle myself."

But Francis said: — "No, uncle, I don't care for a holiday. I will be at my usual work."

His uncle, however, pressed him much, saying: — "Francis, you are yet a child, and you require some rest. So listen to me and take a holiday."

So Francis was at last persuaded to take a holiday, but he asked his uncle to take care of his cow, which, of course, his uncle promised to do.

In the morning the uncle took his cattle for grazing, as also Francis' cow. While his cattle were grazing he drove the cow up a high mountain and from there threw her into the river below, and the cow died at once, and the uncle was satisfied, and taking his own cattle he came home in the evening.

The following day, as soon as Francis arose, he went as usual to his daily work, but to his astonishment found his cow missing. He ran to his uncle and asked him where his cow was. His uncle said: — "Look in the stalls; she must be somewhere among the other cattle."

Francis went to the stalls and searched among all the cattle, but in vain, and therefore suspected foul play. Instead of taking his uncle's cattle to graze, he left them in the stalls, and went all over the forests in quest of his own cow. He searched and searched, and, at last, found the carcass of his cow in the river. Poor Francis sat down by the poor cow and cried for hours and hours, but he made sure that the death of the cow was due to nothing else than his uncle's envy.

Seeing that crying would not bring his cow back to life, he made up his mind to skin the cow, so that the skin might some day be of use to him. So he at once set to work, and, dragging the carcass to the bank of the river, skinned it and dried it in the sun for several days.

When the skin was thoroughly dried, he asked his mother one day to bake him three or four hard-cakes, but she said: — "There is scarcely flour enough to make one cake; and how am I to bake three or four for you?"

Francis, however, bothered her so often that his mother went and begged some rice-flour, and baked four cakes, and gave them to him. Francis tied up the cakes in a kerchief, and, taking the cow's skin, went away. He walked on and on, uncertain where to go, or what to do, for a whole day, and when it was dusk he found himself in a large forest, and here he meant to pass the night; but being afraid that some wild beast might see and devour him, he climbed up a high tree, not forgetting to take the skin also with him.

At dead of night it happened that some robbers, who had plundered a rich house, came and sat under that very tree, and, having thrown down their booty, began to divide it, and to quarrel between themselves.

Said one: — "I deserve the greatest share because I shewed you the house."

"No, no," said a second; "I entered the house first, while you remained outside, and so the biggest share falls to my lot."

And so they went on quarrelling, till our hero got so frightened that he let fall the cow's hide from the tree, which made such a noise, and in its turn so frightened the robbers, that they left everything and took to their heels, thinking some evil spirits had seen them and were coming on them.
Our hero, when he saw the robbers had run away, came down, took all the treasure the robbers had left, and went home in high spirits. When he reached his hut, he told his mother to go to her brother’s house, and ask for the loan of his pharā ani dānādi (basket and spade). His mother told him to go herself; but Francis pleaded, saying: — “Go, go, mother, and ask for uncle’s basket and spade.

His mother at last went to her brother’s house, and asked for the loan of his basket and spade. Her brother said to her: — “Sister, why do you want the basket and spade? What are you going to do with them?”

She replied: — “Francis wants them. The boy is so mischievous. I don’t know what he wants to do with them.”

So his mother took the basket and the spade from her brother and brought them to Francis. Francis took them and measured all the treasure he had got, which made several baskets full. But on returning the basket and the spade, he let two rupees stick to the basket for his uncle to see, and when he saw the two rupees in the basket, he asked his sister how they came there. She told him that Francis had brought a heap of treasure, which he measured it with the basket. When the uncle heard this he immediately came to Francis and asked him how he got all the treasure, upon which Francis said: — “Oh uncle, what shall I tell you? Shall I say one, or shall I say two?”

His uncle then said: — “Go on, my boy, tell me where you got the treasure from.”

Francis then replied: — “Why, uncle, you remember you killed my cow? I am so thankful to you for it. I skinned the cow, dried the hide, and cried it for sale: —

“Jhīḍā chāmbūn, diā dhan; jhīḍā chāmbūn diā dhan.
Take hides, give treasure; take hides, give treasure.”

“There is such a demand for these hides, that for the hide of one cow I got all this treasure. O uncle, if I had half the number of cattle that you have, I should get a heap of treasure as large as your house.”

His uncle was so fired with the desire of amassing treasure, that he went and slaughtered all his cattle, believing every word that his nephew had told him. In due time the cattle were skinned, and the hides having been thoroughly dried, he went from village to village and from country to country, crying out: —

“Jhīḍā chāmbūn, diā dhan; jhīḍā chāmbūn diā dhan.
Take hides, give treasure; take hides, give treasure.”

But who ever heard of exchanging hides for treasure? The poor man wandered day and night for several weeks, and made himself the laughing-stock of every one. Quite fatigued and disheartened, he returned home. His wife asked him what success he had met with, but he only said: — “Oh, you don’t understand these affairs; mind your own business.”

He was so enraged at the trick, that he determined to ruin Francis, and with this determination one night set fire to the boy’s hut. His poor mother ran about like one mad, calling the people to help in putting out the fire. Francis, on the contrary, brought more sticks and other combustibles, and put them on the flames, which helped to burn down the hut quickly and surely.

When the hut was entirely burnt down, Francis collected all the ashes in two bags. He then told his mother again to bake him a few cakes, which his mother did with some reluctance, saying: — “I can’t understand, Francis, where you want to go, or what you are trying to do?”

But he bundled the cakes into a kerchief, and, having borrowed a bullock from one of his neighbours, put the two bags of ashes on it, and drove it away. This time, too, he was uncertain
what to do or where to go for a whole day, and at dusk he was again in a forest where he met a great merchant also driving a bullock with two bags on it. They asked each other who they were and where they were going and what they had. The merchant replied first: — “I am a merchant, and the bags you see on the bullock are full of gold mohars, which I have earned in my trade.”

Francis turned this opportunity to his advantage, and said: — “Exactly like myself. I have amassed a large fortune in the shape of gold mohars in the bags which you see on my bullock, and I am now returning home after several months’ business.”

The merchant believed every word he said, and so they agreed to put up together for the night, and arranged between them to watch their property by turns. The merchant had to watch till midnight, and then go to sleep, after which it was Francis’ turn to watch. Meanwhile they removed the bags from the bullocks to give them rest. Having partaken of their meals, Francis went to sleep while the merchant kept watch. About midnight the merchant awoke Francis and told him it was time for him to keep watch.

“Certainly,” said Francis; “we must, however, put our bags on our respective bullocks, for, should any robbers come, what can I do alone? While if we have them ready on the bullocks, I can awake you and we can then escape with all haste.”

The merchant thought the proposal reasonable, and so each put his bags on his bullock, and then the merchant fell fast asleep, being quite tired with the journey and the night-watch.

In a little while Francis changed the bags, and drove home in all haste, and when he got home again he asked his mother to go to her brother’s house and borrow his phar and dängdi. His mother at first refused to go, telling him to go himself; but at last she went, and said to her brother: — “Brother, brother, lend me your basket and spade.”

“Why do you want the basket and spade?” asked her brother.

“The boy wants them,” replied she. “I don’t know what he is trying to do.”

So Francis’ uncle then gave her the basket and the spade, which she took home and gave to her son. Francis then measured all the gold mohars, which made several baskets full, and in returning the basket and the spade Francis purposely left two mohars in the basket. On seeing them his uncle came in all haste and asked Francis where he got the mohars from. Francis thought this a good opportunity for taking his revenge, and calmly said: — “Why, uncle, didn’t you set fire to my hut? I gathered the ashes and sold them for several baskets full of gold mohars. Oh, if I only had a house like yours, what a lot of mohars it would fetch! You have only to say:—

“Jhīd bhārī, did mōṛī; jhīd bhārī, did mōṛī.

Take ashes, give mohars; take ashes, give mohars.”

“Hundreds and thousands of people will flock to you bringing their mohars and taking your ashes.”

His uncle was again duped, and went and set fire to his large house. His wife was, of course, alarmed at this action, but her husband said: — “Oh, you don’t understand these affairs; you mind your own business.”

The whole house was reduced to ashes, which he collected and put into several bags. As he had killed all his cattle, he was obliged to borrow bullocks from others for the conveyance of the ashes. Having put the bags on the bullocks, he drove them from village to village and from town to town, crying at the top of his voice: —

“Jhīl bhārī, dīd mōṛī; jhīl bhārī, dīd mōṛī.

Take ashes, give mohars; take ashes, give mohars.”

Thus he cried and cried his ashes for days and weeks together, with the result, that he tired himself out and was hooted by all as a fool; for what folly is greater than to ask for mohars in
exchange for ashes? At last he went home quite sick and tired. His wife again asked him what success he had had, but he only said: — "Oh, you don't understand these affairs; you mind your own business."

He now thought of how to punish Francis for his mischief, and hit upon the following plan. He called him one day, bound his hands and feet, and tied him in a saak with the object of throwing him in the river. As he was going with the sack with Francis in it, he felt a pain in his stomach. Round about him were a lot of cow-herds, so putting the burden down, he went to a long distance to relieve his pain. In the meantime Francis pretended to be crying, and kept saying: — "Oh, I do not wish to be married! I am yet young, and the girl is so big! What a shame, my uncle wants me married by compulsion."

One of the cow-herds, who heard what Francis said, asked him to explain what it all meant. So he said: — "Look here, I am so young, and because I do not wish to be married, as the girl is too big for me, my uncle is taking me by force."

Upon this the cow-herd said: — "If that be the case let me take your place."

"Agreed," said our hero; and he was immediately let out of the sack, and was replaced by the cow-herd. Francis, once out of the bag, took the cattle belonging to the cow-herd, and drove them home in safety.

His uncle came after a time, and taking up the sack, marched straight to the mountain, and threw the bag headlong from a precipice into the river, highly elated at the thought that he had at last got rid of Francis. That day passed and on the following morning he saw Francis driving a large herd of cows and buffaloes. He was at his wits' ends to understand how Francis escaped, and how he got such a lot of cattle. He, therefore, said to him: — "Hallo, Francis, where did you get all the cattle from?"

Francis replied: — "Why, from the river into which you threw me. There are hundreds of thousands of them there. The only misfortune is that, being young, I could not manage more; so I contented myself with these. Oh, if I were as big and strong as you are, what a lot more I could have got."

The poor uncle for the third time believed what Francis told him, and so he asked him to bind his hands and feet and to throw him in the river. Francis, too glad of the opportunity offered him to get rid of his uncle, at once set to work. Having bound him well and put him in a sack, he carried him away. On the way, Francis now and then dropped his load on the ground, upon which his uncle would say: — "Oh, Francis, what are you trying to do? You will kill me at this rate."

But Francis would reply: — "No, no, uncle; you see I am so small, and you are so heavy! How can I help it?"

Thus Francis carried his uncle up the mountain and threw him into the river, where he immediately died. When Francis returned home, his aunt came and inquired of him what his uncle was doing. Francis replied: — "Uncle is selecting good cattle, and will not come home for a long time."

For a whole week his aunt came daily and asked Francis why her husband had not returned yet, and Francis always gave her the same reply; but at last he said to her: — "Tūmchād naurā aṭahan ṛdāčhā nāhām. Tāmā vālā ani pōt kārā, ani bāṅgriśa bāṅgriśa pāndā. Your husband will never come now. Remove your vālā and pōt, and break your bangles."

Francis now had abundance of money, with which he purchased a large house, and plenty of landed property, and lived with his old mother happily and in undisturbed enjoyment of his wealth.

*Vālā are anklets and pōt is a necklace of gold which is given by the husband to the wife on their wedding day. The breaking of bangles is pre-eminently the sign of widowhood, as also are the removal of the vālā and pōt, which are called the śimādā of a married woman."
NOTES AND QUERIES.

OFFERINGS TO GODLINGS IN BENGAL.

At Rajulganj and Barddwa in Bengal I found small rude images of horses and elephants, used as offerings to Sattô Pîr by Musalmâns and to Bhoirabh (Bharavâ) and Mañâ Dâvi by Hindus.

Images of horses are offered in a similar way to Pâs at Sâlilkôt in the Pâñjab in token of vows fulfilled. It would be interesting to note how far the custom is spread in India among the more civilized peoples. Among the savage Chhôs of the Mirâgâpur District such images of horses are common.

R. C. TEMPLE.

BOOK-NOTICE.

The Vedanta-Sûchodantamuktavalli of Praâsânanda, with English translation and notes, by Arthur Venis. Benares, 1890. Pp. vi, ii, 186, vi. (Reprint from the Pundit.)

According to the editor, Praâsânanda, the author of this work, "is wedged in between Nrisimha-Áśrama and Appaya-Dikshita," the former of whom converted the latter "from Sâiva heresy to the true Sâvîkara Vedânta," and the latter "had reached a good old age in 1620 A.D."

More precise information regarding this author is not available. Consequently his work has probably to be assigned to the last quarter of the 16th century. Praâsânanda's Sûchodantamuktavalli belongs to a class of works which serve as appendages to the second Adhyâya of Sankara's great Bâdhavya. The object of these works "consists in searching through all the so-called proofs of duality (dvaita) current in the schools (more particularly in that of the Nyâya), in order to expose them as just so many cases of "petitio principii" (simulatea)." The conclusion at which the author arrives at the end of his inquiry is expressed in the following words of the Śrîdharmottarâchârya :-

"Bhâmasamvedanâdibhâgânā daśatâ râjita digam-pûrânakramāni.

śrâda-mūrya-mâyâ-puruṣâdâ kañcam bhâmâjâm vâhây.

"The knowledge of self and Brahman as identical, gained through the Vedâ and attendance on a Guru, consumes like fire every evil deed (though done intentionally)."

Professor Venis has done invaluable service to the student of the Vedânta Philosophy by adding an English paraphrase of the whole work, in which the perplexing terms of the Sûtra are rendered by corresponding ones chosen from European philosophy. The technicalities of the Tarkâ and Sûtra make it a somewhat repulsive subject to those who have followed the close reasoning of the European school. But editions, like the present one, of Hindu philosophical works, published by scholars like Mr. Venis, who can sympathise with the spirit of Hindu metaphysics, go a great deal towards removing such repulsiveness. In the index, which is appended to this edition, is given a clear explanation of some of the most difficult terms of Hindu Logic.

Under the superintendence of Professor Venis is published the Visnunâma Sanskrit Series, the first number of which is edited by Mahâshâmâ-pâtâ Gañgâdharma Sâstrî and is given a fair indication of the scholar-like way in which the others will be done. It contains the Sanskrit text of the Bājânyâlakârâ, a work on the Vedânta Philosophy written by Appaya-Dikshita. The editor discusses, in the preface, at considerable length, the date of the author, and arrives at the conclusion that he was born about 1560 A.D.

He further adds that Appaya-Dikshita was, according to European scholars, the chief Pandit at the court of the Vijayanâgara king Krîshnârâja whose other name was Venkatapati and who was the son of Narasimha alias Narasadāva. It is clear from the following verse which is found at the end of the Kâtausâmananda, another work of the same author, that he was a contemporary of king Venkatapati:—

अतः कुर्द ज्ञानधकतिरक्षितं ||

निग्नासाग्रहायुक्तवाचारानि: ||

From inscriptions and other trustworthy sources we learn that Krîshnârâja, the son of Narasa or Nrisimha, was not called Venkatapati, and that he reigned from about Saka 1430 to 1451 (= A.D. 1508 to 1529). If the date that is established in the preface of the book under review for the birth of Appaya-Dikshita is correct, the sovereign of whose court he was the chief Pandit, must have been Venkatapati I. of Karra, whose grants range from Saka 1541 to 1566 (= A.D. 1580 to 1613). The editor, being a stranger to Dravidian names of places, makes Tiruvalankadu of Tiruvalangadu ("the sacred banyan forest"), where some of the descendants of Appaya-Dikshita are still supposed to live. Further, he attempts to Sanskritize such names as Tañjâvur, Kumbhâgha, and Mâyavaram from their Anglo-Indian forms. Strange irony of fact that these forms should gain permanence even in Sanskrit works in preference to the vernacular names!

V. V.
A NOTE ON THE DATE OF THE BOWER MANUSCRIPT.

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


The Bower manuscript was exhibited to the Asiatic Society of Bengal at the two meetings in November, 1890 and April, 1891. I call it the "Bower MS." in order that Lieutenant Bower, to whose enterprise the learned world owes the preservation of the manuscript, may receive the honour due to him. Some account of the locality and circumstances of its finding will be found in the Society's Proceedings for November, 1890; and a preliminary account of the manuscript and its contents was published by me in the Proceedings for April, 1891. Since then I have spent a long summer vacation in carefully examining the whole manuscript, and, with the exception of a few leaves, I have read and transcribed the whole. I have now, moreover, the pleasure of announcing that the Governments of India and Bengal, with their usual liberality in such matters, have decided to publish a complete edition of the manuscript which I am now preparing.

This paper had been written (in Darjiling, in May), when I received (in July), through the kindness of Professor Bühler in Vienna, an advance copy of his notice of the specimen pages of the Bower MS., which were published in the November Proceedings of the Asiatic Society of Bengal. It was particularly gratifying to me to find that, reading the manuscript, he in Vienna and I in Calcutta, at about the same point of time, we independently arrived at essentially the same conclusions, both with regard to the age and the contents of the manuscript. Such a coincidence most distinctly makes for the truth of our conclusions.

The substance of the paper which I now publish on the age of the Bower MS., and which I promised in the April Proceedings, was originally intended by me to form a part of the introduction to my edition of the manuscript. But seeing the interest which the manuscript has already excited in Europe, I publish it now in anticipation, and hope similarly to publish portions of the manuscript, with translations, from time to time.*

I may state here briefly the results of my detailed examination of the manuscript. It consists of not less than five distinct portions.

The first portion consists of 31 leaves. It contains the medical work of which I have published the commencement in the April Proceedings, and two pages of which are figured in the upper parts of the two plates accompanying the November and April Proceedings. I shall designate it by the letter A.

The second portion, to be called B, which immediately follows the first portion, consists of five leaves, and forms a sort of collection of proverbial sayings. A specimen of it is figured in the lower part (No. II) of the plate in the April Proceedings.

The third portion, C, consisting of four leaves, contains the story of how a charm against snake-bite was given by Buddha to Ánanda while he was staying in Jétavana, the garden of Anáthapiṇḍala. A specimen of this portion is figured in the lower part of the plate in the November Proceedings.

The fourth portion, D, consists of six leaves. It is preserved in a rather unsatisfactory condition, and appears to contain a similar collection of proverbial sayings as the second portion, B.

The fifth portion, E, which also consists of five leaves, contains another medical treatise. It appears to be — so far as I can judge at present — the commencement of a larger work.

---

* The first instalment is published in No. III. of the Journal, As. Soc. Beng., for 1891. It is the fifth portion (E) of the MS.
Besides these five connected portions, there appear to be a few detached leaves, quite unconnected with one another and with those larger portions.

Of the fourth and fifth portions no specimens have been published, but the fifth is written in the same style as the first portion. The fourth portion is written in an exceedingly slovenly and hurried hand, much resembling that of the third portion, but the writing is far more slovenly. It may possibly represent the handwriting of a fourth scribe; though, on the whole, I am disposed to believe that there are really only three distinct styles of writing represented in the entire manuscript. The first is that of the first and fifth portions (A and E); they are so nearly alike, that I believe them to be of the same scribe. The second is that of the second portion (B), which is a fine, ornamental writing. It must be ascribed to a distinct scribe. The third is that of the third and fourth portions (C and D), which seem to me to differ more in the manner than in the character of writing, and may not improbably be due to one scribe, though a different person from the scribes of A, E and B.

I come now to the question of the age of the MS. Here the first points to be settled are the locality and class, to which the characters of the MS. belong. Mr. Fleet has clearly shown, in his Volume III. of the Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum on the Gupta Inscriptions, that, irrespective of varieties, there existed, at the time of the Gupta period, two very distinct classes of the ancient Nāgarā alphabet, the North-Indian and the South-Indian (see Fleet, pp. 3, 4). The test letter for these two great classes is the character for ə, which in the Southern alphabets retains its old form & resembling the figure 8, while in the Northern alphabets that old form has been displaced by a square cursive form Ψ. Tried by this test, it is at once seen that the alphabet of our MS. belongs to the Northern class. Throughout the MS. the square form Ψ is used exclusively. It is particularly distinct in the portions C and D; in A, B and E the left-hand curved line is drawn somewhat straighter.

The Northern class of alphabets, however, is again divided into two great sections, which, though their areas overlap to a certain extent, may be broadly, and for practical purposes sufficiently, distinguished as the Eastern and Western sections. The test letter in this case is the cerebral sibilant ə. In the North-Eastern alphabet its form is Ψ, while in the North-Western alphabet its form is Ψ.4 Examples of the former alphabet we have in the posthumous Allahabad pillar inscription of Samudra Gupta, of about 400 A. D. (Fleet, pp. 1, 6), the Kahau pillar inscription of Skanda Gupta, of 460 A. D. (Fleet, p. 65), and others in Mr. Fleet’s volume.5

The same alphabet is shown to perfection in the Nepalese inscriptions, Bhagwanīlā Indrajit’s Nos. 1 to 10 and No. 12, published ante, Vol. IX., p. 163; also in the Nepalese inscriptions Nos. 1 and 2, in Mr. Bendall’s Journey in Nepal, pp. 72, 74. To this section also belongs a new copperplate of Dharmāditya (Samudra Gupta?), lately found in the Faridpur district in Eastern Bengal. On the other hand, the other Nepalese inscriptions, ante, Vol. IX., Nos. 11, 13, 14, 15, and in Mr. Bendall’s Journey, Nos. 3 to 6, exhibit the North-Western alphabet. The latter alphabet is also to be seen in all the Nepalese MSS., described in Mr. Bendall’s Catalogue of Buddhist Sanskrit MSS., including the two oldest, Nos. 1049 and 1702.

Examples of the North-Western alphabet in Mr. Fleet’s volume are the Bilaq pillar inscription of Kumāra Gupta L., of 415 A. D., the Indōr plate of Skanda Gupta, of 465 A. D., and others.6 Also the Toraṇa inscription in the Epigraphia Indica, Vol. I., p. 288, the

---

4 All subsequent references to “Fleet” refer to this work.

5 At the same time the Indian N.-E. alphabet has the form Φ for the dental ə, the two forms of ə being but slightly distinct from one another. The Indian N.-W. alphabet has Ψ for ə, which is also used by the Nepalese variety of the N.-E. alphabet.

6 The following Nos. in Mr. Fleet’s volume belong to the N.-E. class: Nos. 1, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 15, 32, 64, 65, 66, 68, 75; occasionally the Western form is used in conjuncts, such as əka, əka.

---

7 The following Nos. belong to this class: Nos. 4, 10, 12, 13, 19, 29—31, 33—37, 42, 43, 46—59, 57—59, 63, 67, 70—72, 74, 76, 80. See also the classificatory lists at the end of this paper.
In both the North-Eastern and North-Western sections there are divisions into varieties, some of which Mr. Fleet has noticed. However, for my present purpose, there is no need to enter into any consideration of these. But the distinction of the two great sections is very marked, and can never be missed when once pointed out.

There is one point, worthy of notice, with regard to these two great Northern divisions. It is this, that in India proper the North-Eastern alphabet gradually came to be entirely displaced by the North-Western alphabet, in comparatively very early times. This displacement must have taken place about the beginning of the sixth century A.D. For about 525 A.D. we already find an inscription in Jampur (of Isvara Varman, Fleet, p. 228) which shows an exclusive North-Western character; and there is not a single inscription known (so far as I am aware) after 500 A.D., which shows the distinctive marks of the old North-Eastern alphabet.

Outside of India proper, that is in Népál, the North-Eastern alphabet maintained its ground for about three centuries longer; for the inscription, No. 4, ante, Vol. IX., dated in 654 A.D., still shows the use of that alphabet. This survival is accounted for by the fact that the North-Western alphabet apparently made its way into Népál about a century and a half later than into Eastern India proper. For the earliest known inscription in that alphabet is No. 11, ante, Vol. IX., which must be dated 655 A.D. For the purposes of manuscript writing, as distinguished from documentary inscription, the North-Western alphabet probably made its way into Népál very much earlier, as shown by Mr. Bendall's old MS. No. 1049, if (as I think it may well be) it is dated in 532 of the Gupta era, that is, in 571 A.D.

Now the Bower MS. is distinctly written throughout in the North-Western alphabet. This is an important point; and must be kept in view throughout the following enquiry. The age of our MS. must be judged solely by the facts as disclosed by the circumstances of the North-Western alphabet.

No conclusion that can be drawn from circumstances connected with the South-Indian or the North-Eastern alphabets may be applied to the determination of the age of our MS.. For it stands to reason, that no scribe, who was habituated to write in the North-Western alphabet, would in any writing of his habitually introduce any peculiarity of the South-Indian or North-Eastern alphabets, with which he was not familiar.

Having premised this much, I proceed to the consideration of the points that appear to me to afford the means of determining approximately the date of the Bower MS.

Among the existing varieties of the North-Western alphabet, there is one which has most nearly retained its ancient character. This is the so-called Sáradá alphabet, which is still current in Kásmír and the adjacent Sub-Himalayan provinces, such as the Chambá and Kángra valleys. The most striking point of difference between the Sáradá alphabet and its more ancient parent, the original North-Western alphabet, is the sign for the letter ya. The Sáradá alphabet uses the modern cursive form ग, while the original North-Western alphabet employed the more ancient tridental form ग. This is the test letter by which any inscription or manuscript written in the Sáradá characters may be at once distinguished from any inscription or manuscript written in the more ancient North-Western alphabet. The latter I shall, for the sake of convenience, briefly distinguish as the Gupta alphabet. The oldest MS. in the Sáradá characters of the existence of which we know, is the so-called Horinzi MS., of which Professor Bühler has published an account and illustrative plates, in Volume I. Part III. of the Anecdota Osそのensia. According to him, "it is certain that this MS. cannot date later than the first half of the sixth century A.D." (ibid., p. 64). It employs throughout the modern cursive form of ya. On the other hand, the Bower MS., though showing in the writing of parts A and E, in many

† "Sáradá" is the name of a small group of alphabets, the varieties of which differ a little according to locality (Kásmír, Chambá, etc.) or period or material of writing, etc.; but the essential unity of the group is well known, and it is usual to call it Sáradá.
respects, a very decided resemblance to the Sāradā characters, employs in the portions B. C. D exclusively, in A. E almost exclusively, the older tridental form of the letter ya. It follows, therefore, that the Bower MS. is not written in the Sāradā alphabet, but in the more ancient Gupta alphabet. The general similarity of its letters to the Sāradā probably shows that the locality of its writing was somewhere in the extreme North-West of Indin, but its use of the ancient tridental form of ya shows that its date must be antecedent to the elaboration of the Sāradā form of the North-Western alphabet. When this event took place, I shall now attempt to show.

The old form (though not quite the oldest, which was यि) of the letter ya was य or य. It was made by two separate movements of the hand, one for drawing the left-hand perpendicular, the other for drawing the remaining portion of the letter. The next step was an attempt to draw the letter with one movement of the hand. This led to the contrivance of the form य by which the end of the left-hand crook or loop was brought forward to the point of junction of the perpendicular and horizontal portions of the letter. It was now possible to draw the letter with one stroke of the pen, beginning with the top of the left-hand perpendicular, downwards; then round the loop, from left to right, to the bottom of the perpendicular; then finishing with the right-hand crook or angle. This change was clearly due to the convenience of cursive writing. But the tendency of cursive writing to quickness and economy of effort very soon led to a further change, which produced the form य, by severing the point of junction. This form, which was the final result of the process, is still essentially the modern cursive form. The intermediate form य, as I shall presently show, only existed for a comparatively very short time, and is essentially a mere transitional form.

It is a well-accepted fact that cursive forms first make their appearance in manuscript writing, and may be, and generally are, in use in MS. writing some time before they are introduced in the inscribing of documents on stone, copper or other material. Such documents are of a conservative nature; they have a tendency to preserve old forms, after these have long disappeared from ordinary MS. writing. The common or exclusive use, in an ordinary MS., of a distinctly archaic form is, therefore, a safe means of determining its age.

The old form of the letter ya was once current in all the alphabets of India. In all of them it gradually became displaced by some cursive form. But this displacement did not take place in all of them at the same point of time. In the South-Indian alphabet it survived, at least in inscriptions, down to the twelfth century A. D. The North-Eastern alphabet, as I have already remarked, was, in India proper, as early as the beginning of the sixth century, superseded by the North-Western alphabet; but in Nēpāl it survived about three centuries longer; and there, with it, the old form of ya survived, at least in inscriptions, down to the middle of the ninth century A. D. It should be noted, however, that the old form of ya, in the shape in which it survived in Nēpāl, is somewhat different from the old form in its original shape, as it was once current in the North-Indian alphabets. Its original shape is that of a sort of trident, of which the left-hand prong makes a curve or even a loop, thus य or य. In the Nepalese shape, the curve or loop, is replaced by a ringlet which is poised on the top of the left-hand prong, thus यः. The difference is marked, and the two shapes can be easily distinguished from each other.

The North-Western alphabet was the first to discard the use of the old form of ya. From it, as I shall presently show, the old form disappeared, even in inscriptions, as early as the end of the sixth century A. D.; and from cursive writing in that alphabet, according to the well-known rule, above stated, it must have disappeared much earlier. There is an obvious conclu-

---

8 In the old Kāmareśu, where it much resembles the later Nepalese form with the ringlet attached to the left prong.
See, e.g., the Eastern Chalukya inscription of 1154 A.D., ante, Vol. XIV., p. 50, or the Kēkātiya inscription of 1162 A.D., ante, Vol. XI., p. 9. It has now passed into the various modern cursive forms of the South-Indian alphabets.

9 See, e.g., the inscription No. 8, ante, Vol. IX., p. 171.
sion, which is suggested by these facts; it is, that the invention, so to speak, of the cursive form of ya took place in the North-West of India, somewhere within the area in which the North-Western alphabet was current.

The first document known to us, from which the use of the old form has entirely disappeared is the long Bûggayâ inscription of Mahâñâman of 588 A.D. (Fleet, p. 274). It uses exclusively the transitional form, with one or two exceptions, in which the modern form itself is used. In another short Bûggayâ inscription of Mahâñâman, of about the same date (Fleet, p. 278), the modern form is used exclusively. In fact, after 600 A. D., there is no inscription known, which shows any trace of the survival of the old form. In all of them, the cursive form of ya is fully established in exclusive use; thus in the Moulâ (Lakshmi Mândap) inscription of about 600 A. D. (Epigraphia Índica, Vol. I, p. 10), the Mahâñâman inscription of Harsha, of 631 A. D. (ibid., p. 67), the Apulâ and Shâhpur inscriptions of Adityasêma, of about 672 A. D. (Fleet, pp. 200, 208), the Dô-Parâjâ inscription of Jivita Gupta, of about 725 A. D. (Fleet, p. 214), the Sâranth inscription of Prakàyâditya of somewhere in the seventh century (Fleet, p. 284). To these may be added the evidence of those Nepalese inscriptions, which are not written in the North-Eastern or proper Nepalese alphabet, but in the North-Western characters; thus the Patan inscription of 687 A. D. (see Mr. Bundell's Journey in Nepal, p. 77), the Jâisëd (Kanachand) inscription of 755 A. D. (ibid., p. 79), the inscription of Sîva Dêva, of 748 A. D., another of 750 A. D., and the inscription of Jayâdeva, of 758 A. D. (see auto, Vol. IX, pp. 176-178). In all these inscriptions the modern cursive form is used exclusively.

Another piece of evidence, in the same direction, is the Tibetan tradition respecting the introduction of the Northern Indian alphabet into Tibet (see Journal, Asiatic Society of Bengal, Vol. LVII, pp. 41 ff.). It is said that these characters were introduced into Tibet by the sage Sambhôta, who brought them from Magadha, where he had resided from A. D. 530-630. These characters are known in Tibet as the "Wardt" characters of Magadha; their forms, as traditionally preserved in Tibet, may be seen in Plate I of the Journal (ibidem), and it will be seen that among these the letter ya has the cursive form. This shows that at the time of Sambhôta's visit to Magadha, in the second quarter of the seventh century A. D., the cursive form of ya was in current use in North-India.

I am not aware of the existence of a single dated inscription in North-India, written in the North-Western alphabet, which indubitably proves any use, still less the exclusive, or almost exclusive, use of the old form of ya, after 600 A. D. It follows from this evidence that, since the old form of ya had entirely disappeared from inscriptions, from the end of the sixth century (say from about 529 A. D.), it must have disappeared from the cursive writing of ordinary manuscripts long before. Accordingly a manuscript, like the Bower MS., in which the old form is still used almost exclusively, must be placed long before the end of the sixth century, and much nearer the beginning of it.

This conclusion is fully supported by the evidence of all the ancient dated (or practically dated) MSS. that are, as yet, known to exist. The oldest is the Horinzi MS. The date of its writing has been shown by Professor Bühler to be somewhere in the middle of the sixth century, that is, between 529 and 577 A.D. (see Notes On., p. 63 ff.). It exhibits throughout the exclusive use of the cursive form of ya, thus showing that this cursive form was fully

---

10 The transitional form is here used in a somewhat modified and more ornate shape.
11 The transitional form occurs twice in this inscription, in gehe, ii. 8 and 11, curiously enough, with the vowel e, on which see page 35.
12 The Wardt characters exhibit in all test points the characteristics of the North-Western alphabet. This shows, what I have already observed (ante, p. 31), that the North-Eastern alphabet, which was once current in Magadha, was there in very early times displaced by the North-Western alphabet. It is said, however, that Sambhôta only "partly" adopted the Wardt characters for his Tibetan alphabet (Journal, ibid., p. 41). This explains the fact that the Wardt or cursive form of ya does not appear in that alphabet. For the letter ya that sage appears to have drawn on the North-Eastern alphabet, which he must have known from Nepal, where (as I have shown) it maintained its ground about three centuries longer than in Magadha.
established for MS. writing in the middle of the sixth century A. D. The next oldest MSS. are two, described as Nos. 1049 and 1702 by Mr. Bendall in his Catalogue of Buddhist MSS. in the Cambridge Library, p. xxxix. One of them is dated Saṅvat 522, which Mr. Bendall takes to be in terms of the Harsha era and to be equal to 857 A. D. For my part, I can see no valid objection, on paleographic grounds, to understanding the date in terms of the Gupta era, and as equal to 571 A. D. I do not notice any such material difference between the writing of the Horiuzi MS. and the two Cambridge MSS., as to account for a supposed interval of three centuries. Anyhow, both Cambridge MSS. exhibit the exclusive use of the cursive form of ya.

The conclusion appears to me inevitable, that any MS. which shows, as the Bower MS. does, the exclusive use of the old form, or which shows an uniform absence of the use of the cursive form, cannot be possibly placed later than 550 A. D., and in all probability is very much older. The only question is, whether there are any indications in the Bower MS. that render it possible to fix its date somewhat more definitely.

Here the following facts are to be observed. The first appearance of the modern cursive form of ya in any inscription is met with in the Bijayagād inscription of Vīśṇu Vardhana, of 371 A. D. (Fleet, p. 253), in śrēṣṭh, line 4 (if the plate can be trusted); and it is to be noted that it is used in conjunction with the vowel ś. The old form, however, is more usual, as in nāmaḥbhīṣṭyena, l. 3, and abhīṣṭiddhayē, l. 4, in both cases with the vowel ś. The first appearance of the transitional cursive form is met with about thirty years later (see below), but there can be no doubt that, though on the existing inscriptions, the first appearance of the modern form happens to be earlier, that form, as compared with the transitional form of the letter, is of later development. Probably there was no great interval between the development of the two forms. In any case, the invention (so to speak) of the transitional form and, with it, the first beginnings of the modern form of ya may, thus far, be placed at about 350 A. D.

The actual first appearance of the transitional form is found in the Tusān inscription (Fleet, p. 269). It occurs in the word yogadārṣyaya, l. 3, again with the vowel ś, and side by side with the old form in upayājyāmam. This is a very clear instance; but, unfortunately, the inscription is not dated, though on paleographic grounds it may be referred to about 400 A. D. The first occurrence of the transitional form in a dated inscription is in the Indor copper-plate of Skanda Gupta, of 465 A. D. (Fleet, p. 68), in the words abhīṣṭiddhayē, l. 4, and upayājyāmam, l. 7, in both cases with the vowels ś and ṣ. Side by side, the old form occurs in yogam, l. 9, yō, l. 11, abhīṣṭiddhayē, l. 8. Other instances occur in the Kārīlālā inscription of Jayaṇātha, of 498 A. D. (Fleet, p. 117), in abhīṣṭiddhayē, l. 17, and abhīṣṭiddhayē, l. 15, here also with the vowels ś and ṣ; and side by side with the old form in yē, l. 10, lōpayē, l. 12, prāyēna, l. 16, yō, l. 20. Another instance occurs in the Khōh inscription of Jayaṇātha, of 496 A. D. (Fleet, p. 121), in the word abhīṣṭiddhayē, l. 8, again with the vowel ś, and side by side with the old form in pratvāyōpanamaṇ, l. 11, and prāyēna, l. 17. A very clear instance occurs in the Jaunpur inscription of Śrīvavarman, of about 528 A. D. (Fleet, p. 228), in uvavayē, l. 2, again with the vowel ś. So again in the Mandsār inscription of Yāśōdharman of about 530 A. D. (Fleet, p. 149), in yē, l. 14, again with the vowel ś, and side by side with the old form in pādayē, l. 5. Similarly in the Mandsār inscription of Yāśōdharman as Vishnuvardhana, of 533 A. D. (Fleet, p. 150), in yēna, l. 8, again with the vowel ś, and side by side with the old form in bhārasyā, l. 8, yēna, l. 8, 13, yō, l. 17, 18. Likewise in the Khōh inscription of Savarnātha, of 538 A. D. (Fleet, p. 135), in yāyēna, l. 13, l. yē, 16, and pra-

---

11 A similar case, with regard to the development of the letter m, is noted by Mr. Fleet in his volume on the Gupta inscriptions, p. 3, footnote.
14 This instance was also noticed by Mr. Fleet (p. 270, footnote 4). It is the identical form that occurs in the Bower MS.
15 This is a very good instance for comparison, because in bhārasyā yēna the two forms stand in immediate juxtaposition.
tyāgītpannaka, 1. 9, again with the vowels ē and ē, and side by side with the old form in lōpayē, 1. 18, grāmayār, 1. 27, yē, 1. 25, yē, 1. 27, etc. These are all the instances of the occurrence of the transitional form that I have been able to discover among the 35 inscriptions in the North-Western (Gupta) alphabet, published by Mr. Fleet.

Contemporary with them are the following instances of the use of the modern cursive form. In the Majhagām inscription of Hastin, of 510 A.D. (Fleet, p. 166), it occurs in the words ahuṣayī, 1. 14, yē, 1. 16, pānirēyku, 1. 17, yē, 1. 18, again with the vowels, ē and ō, and side by side with the old form in the words anayēpabhāygas, 1. 10, yē, 1. 11, ahaṇē, 1. 18. The transitional form also occurs in the word abhiṣriddhāyē, 1. 7.

Now as to the conclusions that follow from the above statistics, note, in the first place, the extreme rarity of the transitional and modern cursive forms, as well as the peculiar circumstances under which alone they occur. And here mark the following four points:

1. They occur only in a small proportion of inscriptions. Of course, the only inscriptions with which we are here concerned are those that use more or less exclusively the old form. Those that already use the transitional or modern cursive forms exclusively are outside the question; so are, of course, all those that are not written in some variety or other of the North-Western alphabet. Now there are 35 inscriptions of the former description in Mr. Fleet's Volume III. of the Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum. To these may be added a few others, such as the Toraṇa inscription in the Epigraphia Indica, Vol. I, p. 238, and the Kumāra Gupta seal in the Journal, Asiatic Society of Bengal, Vol. LVIII, p. 88. Among these there are only ten inscriptions, a little more than one-fourth, that exhibit the occasional use of the transitional and modern cursive forms at all. The rest use exclusively the old form.

2. The transitional and modern cursive forms occur, in that one-fourth of inscriptions, exclusively in connection with the vowels ē or ō. With all other vowels, i.e., in every other case, the old form is used.

3. Even in connection with the vowels ē and ō, the transitional and modern cursive forms are not obligatory, but optional. In fact, even with these vowels, the old form is used more commonly than the transitional and modern cursive forms. On the whole the former is used twice as often as the latter.

4. Of the two cursive forms, the transitional and the modern, the former is used much more frequently than the latter (viz., transitional: modern = 13:4).

In the second place, note that the period during which the sporadic use of the transitional and modern cursive forms occurs, is a comparatively well defined one. Its termini, so far as the evidence of the available inscriptions goes, are from 371 A. D. to 533 A. D., or in round numbers from 370 to 540 A. D., i.e., 170 years. Or, if we omit the very early case of the Bijayagadh inscription, of 371 A. D., as perhaps of a doubtful character, the transition period extends from about 400 to 540 A. D., that is, 140 years. Antecedent to this period, we find the old form of ya in undisputed possession of the field, and subsequent to it, the cursive form of ya is in equally undisputed possession.18

Now it appears to me that from these facts there is but one conclusion, to which one is irresistibly driven. It is this, that there is here disclosed to us evidence of the actual point in time, when the invention, so to speak, of the cursive form of ya was made, or, to speak more precisely, the application of it to the non-conjunct ya. For to suit the case of the conjunct or under-written ya, the cursive form had been long before invented and exclusively employed. But to the non-conjunct ya, it only began to be applied about 400 A. D. At first it was only

18 In these cases the peculiarity of the form is also noted by Mr. Fleet, p. 106.
17 Probably it would also be used with the vowels ai and as; though no instance happens to occur in the existing inscriptions.
18 The single exception is the Ashgāḍh seal, of about 566 A. D.; and here there are probably peculiar reasons to account for it.
applied tentatively and hesitating in those cases in which the non-conjunct ya carried the
vowels e or ë (or ai or au). But the convenience of the cursive form gradually carried everything
before it, and displaced the old form entirely about 540 A.D. In all probability this process
commenced, in the case of manuscript writing, earlier than in that of documentary
inscription, perhaps already about 350 A.D., and terminated proportionately earlier,
perhaps about 500 A.D. On the other hand, in documentary inscription the process began
later and ended later. Here the use of the old form may have lingered on to about 600 A.D.;
but from that date, as already shown from the evidence of existing dated inscriptions, the use
of the cursive form of ya enjoyed an undisputed possession of the field.

Accordingly, for practical purposes, the rule may be laid down, that any inscription in the
North-Western Indian Alphabet which shows the more or less exclusive use of the old
form of ya must date from before 600 A.D.

With regard to manuscripts the same rule must hold good, with this modification, that the
termini must be put back by about 30 (or it may be 100) years; that is, a MS. showing the
exclusive use of the cursive form of ya must date from after 550 or 500 A.D., while a
MS. showing the more or less exclusive use of the old form of ya must date from
before 550 or 500 A.D., and may date back as far as 350 A.D.

That this rule, as deduced from the above collected facts, is correct is proved by the
Horiaki MS. This MS. uses the cursive form of ya exclusively, and, as shown by Professor
Bühler, it certainly dates from some time between 520 and 577 A.D.

This rule further proves that the elaboration of the so-called Sáradá alphabet may be
placed about 500 A.D. For it possesses the cursive form of ya. Hence it follows that any
manuscript and a fortiori any inscription, written in the Sáradá characters must
certainly be later than 500 A.D.; though as the Sáradá characters, with slight modifications,
are used up to the present day in Kaśmir and the adjacent regions, a mere consideration of the
form of the cursive ya is insufficient to fix with any approximation the date of such a manu-
script or inscription in any particular year after that epoch.

Now let us see the bearing of the results of the above enquiry on the question of the age
of the Bower MS. It is to be noticed that,

(1) The old form of ya is used almost exclusively throughout the MS. Indeed, in
the second, third and fourth portions it is used exclusively, and it is only in the first and fifth
portions, that the cursive (transitional or modern) form occasionally occurs.

(2) This cursive (transitional or modern) form is never used, except when carrying
the vowels e or ai or ë or au.

(3) Even with those vowels, the use of the cursive (transitional or modern) form
is optional, though on the whole, it is more usual than that of the old form.

(4) Of the two forms of the cursive ya, the transitional and the modern, the former
is used almost exclusively; the modern cursive form occurring only in a few isolated cases.

The following examples are all taken from the two published plates: and I have only to
remark, that the pages, figured on the two plates, are very fair specimens of the whole
manuscript.

The transitional cursive form is to be seen on Plate I, No. I,² in yóga 1. 1, yóga 1. 2 twice
yógánam 1. 3, trayódaśam 1. 5, kalpa-yáét 1. 9; again on Plate III, upper page, in jyóti 1. 2,
práyójáét 1. 4, jyóti 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6,
práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6,
práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6,
práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6,
práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6,
práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6,
práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6,
práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6,
práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6,
práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6,
práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6,
práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6,
práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6,
práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6,
práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6,
práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6,
práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6,
práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6,
práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6,
práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6,
práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6,
práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6,
práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6,
práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6, práyójáét 1. 6,
There is only one instance of the modern cursive form; it occurs in the akshara येत of \textit{prayōjayēt} in Plate III, upper page, in line 11. Here we have the transitional and the modern cursive forms side by side in one word, the former form being used in the akshara यो, the latter in the akshara येत. A similar instructive example of the use, side by side, of the old and the transitional forms, we have \textit{ibidem} in \textit{prayōjayēt}, in line 6, where the old form is seen in the akshara यो, while the transitional form occurs in the akshara येत.

Of the old form there are the following instances. On Plate I, No 1, we have it in \textit{chārynajēt} 1. 10, and on Plate III, upper page, in \textit{upakhajēt} 1. 2, \textit{yēt} 1. 3, \textit{prayōjayēt} 1. 6, \textit{lēhayēt} 1. 8, \textit{pājayēt} 1. 9. Note here again, that all these instances are with the vowel \textit{e}. Of the old form with the vowel \textit{e} there is no instance in the figured pages; but I have noticed a few cases in other parts of the manuscript. Of course, I exclude here, as being beside the precise point in question, all instances of the use of the old form in combination with any other vowel, only remarking, that it is used uniformly with all other vowels.

To sum up, the examination of the two specimen pages shows: \textit{ad} Nos. 1 and 2, that the old form is used exclusively, except with the vowels \textit{e}, \textit{ai}, \textit{a} and \textit{au}; \textit{ad} No. 3, that out of 23 instances, in which the letter \textit{y} is combined with the vowels \textit{e} or \textit{ai} or \textit{a}, the cursive (transitional and modern) form is used in 17, while the old form is used in 6; that is, the former is used about three times as often as the latter; \textit{ad} No. 4, that out of 17 instances of the use of the transitional and modern cursive forms, the former is used 16 times, while the latter occurs only once; i.e., that the transitional form is used almost exclusively.

Now comparing the case of the Bower MS. with that of the Gupta inscriptions, the result is this, that the two cases, while fully agreeing in the main points, differ only in one particular, namely, that the cursive (transitional or modern) form is used in the manuscript rather more frequently than the old form (viz., cursive: old = 3: 1), while in the inscriptions the old form is used rather more frequently than the cursive form (viz., cursive: old = 1: 2). This, however, is nothing more than may be expected, if we consider that on the one side we have a case of ordinary manuscript writing, on the other one of documentary inscription, and remember that (as Professor Bühler says, in \textit{Epigraphia Indica}, p. 68) "everywhere in India the epigraphic alphabets are in many details retrograde and lag behind the literary ones."

One thing, however, is clearly brought out by the evidence above set out, that the writing of the Bower MS. must be placed within that period, which, as we have seen, is marked out by that evidence as the period of transition from the use of the old rigid form of या to the use of the (still existing) cursive form; that is, for manuscript writing, \textbf{within the period from about 350 to 500 A.D.}

It is true that in the second, third and fourth portions of the Bower MS., the old form is used exclusively. There is no trace whatsoever of either the transitional or the modern cursive forms. Judging by this circumstance only, we should have to place the MS. still earlier, somewhere before the fifth century A.D. But this would certainly seem to be wrong with regard to the second portion. For the fact, that this portion was written after the first, seems to be clearly proved by the circumstance that it commences on the reverse of a leaf, on the obverse of which we have the ending of the first portion. Properly considered, however, that circumstance only tends to confirm the conclusion that the main portion (A, B, E) of the Bower MS. was written during the transitional period. For it is only natural to suppose that during that period, some scribes had already more or less adopted the new fashion of cursive writing, while others, more conversative, adhered to the older fashion. On the whole, therefore, considering that the portions A and E of the MS. appear to manifest a decided tendency to a free use of the transitional form, it will probably be safer to place the date of the main portion of the MS. nearer to the end than the beginning of the transition period, that

\textsuperscript{20} Of \textit{au} there is no instance in the figured pages, but I have met with a few in other pages of the manuscript.
is to say, in the middle of the fifth century (say, about 450 A. D.). The portion s C and D, however, may be referred to an earlier part of that period (say 400 A. D.).

This result will probably be startling to most of my readers. There exists — and I admit, hitherto not without reason — a general disposition to discredit any claim to great age on the part of any Indian manuscript. I used to incline to the same opinion, and the present result was an unexpected one to myself. But I do not see how the force of the evidence can be gainsaid.

Let us see what the objections are. In the first place it is said, that the material of the MS. — birch bark — is of a nature too weak and flimsy to permit us to believe that it could endure for such a length of time. This argument has been already well answered by Mr. Bendall in his Catalogue of Buddhists Sanskrit MSS., p. XVII. ff., and by Professor Bühlcr in the Anecdota Oxoniensia, Vol. I, part III, p. 68ff. No à priori rule will apply; all depends on the circumstances under which a MS. may have been preserved; and the argument, from the nature of the material, will not stand for one moment against positive arguments from epigraphic history. According to Lieut. Bower’s account, the MS. “had been dug out of the foot of one of the curious old engravings just outside a subterranean city near Kucha.” These engravings are described as being generally about 40 or 60 feet high, in shape like a huge cottage roof; built solid of sun-dried bricks with layers of beams now crumbling away.” I suppose it cannot be doubted that these engravings are Buddhist stūpas. Such stūpas often contain a chamber enclosing relics and other objects; these chambers are generally near the level of the ground or “at the foot” (as it is said) of the erection, and they are often dug out by persons who search for hidden treasures. In this way the MS. was probably dug out, perhaps not long before it was made over to Lieut. Bower. In such a practically air-tight chamber there is no reason why a birch bark MS. should not endure for any length of time.

Another objection is that the characters used in a MS. are no guide to its age. It is said that “characters of the Gupta type have been used in very late times, and indeed are in use to the present day all along the region from which the Bower MS. comes.” The characters which are here meant are those used in the Kaśmir, Chambā and Kāṅgrā valleys. They are those which are commonly known by the name “Sāradā characters.” These, as already remarked, are a variety of the North-Western alphabet, and are that variety which has, more than any other, preserved the shapes of its ancient parent, the North-Western Gupta alphabet. Now it is not quite correct to say, that the Sāradā alphabet has not changed; it is quite possible to distinguish the modern form of the Sāradā from its more ancient form. But what is really important is this, that the Sāradā alphabet, so far as we have any dated evidence, never possessed, at any period of its existence, the old (Gupta) form of the consonant ya. It always possessed exclusively the modern cursive form of that letter. I maintain, that there exists not a single dated MS. or inscription, written in any variety of the Sāradā alphabet, which does not show the exclusive use of the cursive form. This being so, it follows that any conclusions, drawn from facts connected with the Sāradā alphabet, have no application to a MS. which shows the almost exclusive use of the old (Gupta) form of ya, and which, therefore, is not written in the Sāradā characters. Now, what conclusions can be drawn from the facts connected with the Sāradā alphabet? Its exclusive use of the cursive ya shows that its elaboration is to be dated on this side of 500 A. D. But as it has but little changed the shape of its letters since the date of its inception, it follows, that any undated MS. or inscription written in the Sāradā alphabet must be placed after 500 A. D., but may be placed almost at any time after that epoch. That is really all that can be intended by the principle that the Sāradā characters are no guide as to age. More the principle will not bear, and it clearly is not applicable to a MS. which is not written in the Sāradā characters, but in a form of alphabet more archaic and very possibly the parent of the Sāradā. With the proviso, now explained, I fully agree with Professor Kielhorn’s remark, made with reference to a Chambā Grant (ante, Vol. XVII. p. 7) that “it would be impossible to determine the age, even approximately, from its characters,”
these characters being, as Professor Kielhorn explains, the well-known Śāradā. Judging from these characters, all that one could say would be that the grant may date from any time after 500 A.D., which, of course, would be a futile proposition.

The main argument for the age of the Bower MS. is the preservation in it of the old form of ya. No objection can be raised on the ground that the old form was preserved much longer in the South-Indian and the North-Eastern Indian (Nepalese) alphabets. As these alphabets differ from the North-Western Indian, which is used in our MS., any conclusions, drawn from the circumstances of these alphabets, have no applicability to our MS. It stands to reason that no scribe, used to his own North-Western Indian alphabet, would, in writing a MS., think of introducing the old form of a letter, which did not exist any more in his own alphabet, from another alphabet, unfamiliar to him, in which it did still exist.

POSTSCRIPT.

Since writing most of the above remarks I have, as already stated, read and transcribed nearly the whole of the manuscript. I have carefully noted every occurrence of the aksharas yō, yō, yai, and yau.

In the portions B, C, D, I have found the cursive form (either transitional or modern) used not once. The aksharas yai and yau never occur; the akshara yō occurs 19 times (B 4, C 13, D 2), always with the old form of ya. The akshara yō occurs 9 times (B 7, D 2), again always with the old form.

In the portions A and E, the case stands thus: there are altogether 333 cases of the occurrence of these aksharas, viz., 209 of yō, 125 of yū, 4 of yai and 2 of yau. In every case of yai and yau the transitional form ज़ is used. With yō and yū the transitional form is used 227 times, and the modern form ज़, 16 times. The transitional form occurs 117 times with yō, 110 times with yū, 4 times with yai, and twice with yau. The modern form occurs 12 times with yō and 4 times with yū. Altogether the cursive form occurs 249 times. The old form occurs 73 times with yō and 11 times with yū. The following table exhibits this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aksharas:</th>
<th>yō</th>
<th>yū</th>
<th>yai</th>
<th>yau</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Old</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total             | 202| 125| 4   | 2   | 333    |

Now with regard to point No. 3 (see p. 35), there being 249 cursive forms to 84 old ones among a total of 333 cases, the proportion of cursive to old forms is as 3 to 1. With regard to the point No. 4, there being 233 transitional to 16 modern forms among a total of 249 cases, the proportion of transitional to modern forms is as (about) 15 to 1. In both cases, it will be seen, the evidence of the entire manuscript most accurately bears out the evidence of the specimen pages (see p. 37) and thus confirms my conclusions based on the latter. I may add with regard to the points Nos. 1 and 2, that in the portions A and E, the cursive (transitional or modern) form never occurs in any other akshara but those four: yō, yū, yai, yau. With the aksharas yai, yai, yai, yau, in every case, without any exception, the old form ज़, is used. The occurrence of these six aksharas, especially of ya and yai is very frequent, and this fact all the more accentuates the striking circumstance that the cursive form is only employed with the vowels े, ो, ै, and ू. There must have been some reason for this peculiarity,— perhaps one of mere convenience of writing, though I cannot suggest any satisfactory one. I should note that the vowels े, ो, ै, and ू are drawn, both with the old and the cursive forms, in every possible variety: entirely side-marked, marked half on side and half on top, and entirely top-
marked. The cause of the peculiarity, therefore, cannot well have had any connection with the form of the vowels.

I would suggest that similar statistical enquiries should be made with reference to some other leading letters; e. g., ณ, ㄫ, the sub-scribed 严, the super-scribed 𫞩; also with regard to the numeral symbols. I have little doubt but that from such statistics may result some further useful landmarks for the determination of dates of writing. I hope to pursue the enquiry myself, so far as leisure from official duties will permit me.

ADDENDUM.

Since the publication of the foregoing paper in the Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, I have drawn up a sketch map of the distribution, and classactory lists, of the inscriptions on which my conclusions are based. As they may be found useful, I add them here.

I classify (following herein Mr. Fleet) the early Indian alphabets into the South-Indian and the North-Indian, distinguished by their forms of the letter ։. Inscriptions which show the form  GLES are South-Indian; those which have ถอน are North-Indian.

The North-Indian alphabet I divide into the North-Eastern and North-Western varieties distinguished by their forms of the letter ㄫ (cerebral sibilant). Inscriptions which show the form (bipartite square) ㄫ are North-Western, while those which have the form (looped square) ถอน are North-Eastern.

In the North-Western alphabet I distinguish the earlier Gupta and the later Post-Gupta varieties, which are distinguished by their forms of the letter 严. Inscriptions which show the form �建 are written in the Gupta; those which have ฤ are written in the Post-Gupta alphabet.

In India proper the North-Western alphabet displaced the North-Eastern about the end of the fifth century. The year 500 A.D. may be taken as a convenient epoch of this occurrence.

Not long afterwards the Post-Gupta began to displace the Gupta variety of the North-Western alphabet in India proper. The year 600 A.D. may be taken as a convenient epoch of the final displacement of the Gupta variety. Any inscription showing the old Gupta form of 严 may be placed before that date.

In the following lists the inscriptions are arranged in chronological order. Where the exact date is not known, an average date has been assigned, i. e., some year within the reign of the king named in the inscription. For these reigns I have used my synchronistic table, published in the Journal, As. Soc., Bengal, Vol. LVIII. The average dates may be easily recognised by their having no equivalents in the column of Indian dates. In a few cases, viz., Nos. 16, 19, 20, 21 in List I, No. 11 in List II., and Nos. 11, 12 in List III., there is nothing, at present, available to fix their dates; except the test-letters themselves. These inscriptions, therefore, do not help to support my argument, and I have only included them in the lists for the sake of completeness, and moreover distinguished them by italic type. At the same time, seeing that the lists without them amply sustain my argument, they add some weight to the latter post factum.

With regard to Nos. 10, 11, 12 in List III. (marked by asterisks) I should explain, that in No. 10 (Kōsam inscription) no instance of the letter ㄫ occurs. So far, therefore, the test fails. But it should be noted, that in the North-Eastern alphabet, the dental and the cerebral sibilants are formed very nearly alike, with a looped square; see, e. g., No. 13 (Kahāum inscription). This looped or ringed form of the dental ㄫ occurs frequently in the Kōsam inscription. Accordingly, I have classified it with the North-Eastern list. For the same reason, I have included in that list the two Nos. 11 and 12; for though these inscriptions exhibit one or two cases of the cerebral ㄫ, these are, in the first place, not very distinct, and in the second place, they all occur in ligatures. The latter are not trustworthy tests, for the North-Eastern form of
sh is not always used in them. Thus in the thoroughly North-Eastern inscription of Kahâum (No. 13), we have the North-Western form of sh in the ligature ksh of kahâtita (line 3), while the North-Eastern form is used in the ligatures swh and shkh of varshê and jyâsthà respectively (line 4). I may add, that in the new Farâdpur inscription, in which both the dental and cerebral sibilants are of very frequent occurrence, they can only be distinguished with great difficulty.

Similar remarks apply to No. 4 of List I. No instance of the letter sh is preserved in it, but the characteristic form of the dental s helps to assign it to the North-Western variety.

In the first List I have indicated, by means of a cross (+), those inscriptions which shew instances of the transitional or modern cursive forms of ga; these are Nos. 3, 5, 10, 14, 15, 23, 28, 33, 34, 35.

**List I. — Inscriptions in the Gupta variety of the North-Western Alphabet.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial No.</th>
<th>Publication</th>
<th>Name of Inscription</th>
<th>Name of King, etc.</th>
<th>Saïâv. A.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fleet's No. 58</td>
<td>Bijayagadh</td>
<td>Yaudhâya</td>
<td>... 370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Pahlâpad</td>
<td>Sisupâla</td>
<td>... 370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>†Bijayagadh</td>
<td>Vishnu Varhâna</td>
<td>... 428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Mathurâ</td>
<td>Chandra Gupta II (395-414)</td>
<td>... 400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>†Tudâg</td>
<td></td>
<td>... 400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Bilaâ</td>
<td>Kumâra Gupta I</td>
<td>... 96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Udâyâgiri</td>
<td>(Kumâra Gupta I)</td>
<td>... 106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Mathurâ</td>
<td>(Skanda Gupta)</td>
<td>... 135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Bhitâ</td>
<td>Skanda Gupta (455-468)</td>
<td>... 400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>†Indôr</td>
<td>Skanda Gupta</td>
<td>... 146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Khôh</td>
<td>Hastin</td>
<td>... 156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>do.</td>
<td>do.</td>
<td>... 163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Éran</td>
<td>Budhagupta</td>
<td>... 165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>†Kâstalâî</td>
<td>Jayanâtha</td>
<td>... 174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>†Khôh</td>
<td>do.</td>
<td>... 177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Nrîmanâ</td>
<td>Samudra Sôna</td>
<td>... 500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Éran</td>
<td>Torâmâna (494-610)</td>
<td>... 500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Bhumârè</td>
<td>Sarvanâthâ</td>
<td>... 189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Barîbar</td>
<td>Ananda Varman</td>
<td>... 310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Nagîrânâ</td>
<td>do.</td>
<td>... 310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>do.</td>
<td>do.</td>
<td>... 310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Éran</td>
<td>Gôparâji</td>
<td>... 191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>†Majbhagumâm</td>
<td>Hastin</td>
<td>... 191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Epigr. Ind. I, p. 238</td>
<td>Kurâ</td>
<td>Torâmâna</td>
<td>... 510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Fleet's No. 28</td>
<td>Khôh</td>
<td>Sarvanâthâ</td>
<td>... 193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>do.</td>
<td>do.</td>
<td>... 197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>do.</td>
<td>do.</td>
<td>... 197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>†Jaunpur</td>
<td>Fvarmâna (520-540)</td>
<td>... 525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Khôh</td>
<td>Sanhakhobha</td>
<td>... 209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Gwaliyâr</td>
<td>Mihirakula (515-540)</td>
<td>... 530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Journ. A.S.B., LVIII, 38.</td>
<td>Bhitâri (seal)</td>
<td>Kumâra Gupta II.</td>
<td>... 530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Fleet's No. 33</td>
<td>Mandasör</td>
<td>Yaśôdharmâna</td>
<td>... 530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>† do.</td>
<td>do.</td>
<td>... 530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>†Khôh</td>
<td>Sarvanâthâ</td>
<td>... 214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>†Mandasör</td>
<td>Yaśôdharmâna</td>
<td>... 589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Mathurâ</td>
<td>Yaśôdharmâna</td>
<td>... 230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Asirgadh (seal)</td>
<td>Sarva Varman (565-570)</td>
<td>... 565</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

None of the above inscriptions goes beyond the year 600 A.D.; hardly beyond the middle of the sixth century. The year 600 may, therefore, be taken as the extreme final limit of the use of the Gupta alphabet.

**List II. — Inscriptions in the Post-Gupta variety of the North-Western alphabet.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial No.</th>
<th>Publication</th>
<th>Name of Inscription</th>
<th>Name of King, etc.</th>
<th>Sativ. A.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fleet's No. 71</td>
<td>Bódhgaya</td>
<td>Maháman</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fleet's No. 72</td>
<td>do.</td>
<td>do.</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fleet's No. 70</td>
<td>do.</td>
<td>do.</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Epigr. Ind., I, p. 10</td>
<td>Madhā</td>
<td>Harsha Vardhana (606-648)</td>
<td>610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Fleet's No. 52</td>
<td>Souna (seal)</td>
<td>do.</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Epigr. Ind., I, p. 67</td>
<td>Madhuban</td>
<td>Jischnu Gupta</td>
<td>653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Bhagwanlál's No. 11</td>
<td>Katmandu</td>
<td>Adityasena (640-675)</td>
<td>690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Fleet's No. 42</td>
<td>Aphaud</td>
<td>do.</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Fleet's No. 43</td>
<td>Shalpur</td>
<td>(Udayadéva)</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Bendall's No. 3</td>
<td>Patan</td>
<td>Prakalladéva</td>
<td>725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Fleet's No. 79</td>
<td>Scondh</td>
<td>Jivita Gupta II</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Fleet's No. 46</td>
<td>Déobaranárk</td>
<td>Sivadéva II</td>
<td>748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Bhagwanlál's No. 13</td>
<td>Katmandu</td>
<td>(Jayadéva II)</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>No. 14</td>
<td>do.</td>
<td>(Jayadéva II)</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Bendall's No. 4</td>
<td>do.</td>
<td>do.</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Bhagwanlál's No. 13</td>
<td>do.</td>
<td>do.</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>Add...</td>
<td>Horuzi MS.</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>Add...</td>
<td>Cambridge MS., No. 1049</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

None of the above inscriptions goes back much beyond the year 600 A.D.; the earliest is of 588 A.D. The year 550, may, therefore, be taken as the extreme initial limit of the Post-Gupta alphabet. The latest inscription of the Gupta variety is of about 565 A.D. This shows that in the middle of the sixth century the Gupta and Post-Gupta alphabets were used simultaneously, the Post-Gupta coming into fashion, the Gupta going out of fashion. The process of displacement of the Gupta alphabet was going on through the sixth century. Although, therefore, an inscription, showing the Gupta variety, may not be placed after 600 A.D., one showing the Post-Gupta variety need not necessarily be placed after that date, but it may not be placed before 550 A.D.

To these remarks there is a double proviso. Firstly, they only apply to inscriptions; for manuscript writing the two limits should be placed probably about 100 years earlier. This is shown by the Horuzi MS. which is written in a Post-Gupta variety and dates from about 530 A.D. Secondly, they only apply to India proper, not to Nepal.

With regard to India proper, the following list shows that the North-Eastern alphabet ceases to occur towards the end of the fifth century; the latest inscription is of 467 A.D. (No. 15). At the same time, List I. shows the occurrence of the North-Western alphabet within the North-Eastern area in the early part of the sixth century; the earliest is the Jaunpur inscription of about 525 A.D. (No. 28). The year 500 A.D., therefore, may be taken as the epoch of the displacement of the North-Eastern alphabet in India proper. It was the Gupta variety of the North-Western alphabet that displaced it. Soon afterwards, however, about the middle of the sixth century (cf. No. 28 of List I. with Nos. 1, 2, 3 of List II.), the Gupta variety itself was displaced by the Post-Gupta variety. This shows that there never was a Post-Gupta variety.

---

The Bharati inscription of about 400 A.D. (No. 9, List I.) would be a still earlier instance, but it is too badly preserved to be safely used.
of the North-Eastern alphabet; and as a matter of fact, no inscription has ever been discovered in India proper exhibiting both the North-Eastern form of sh श and the Post-Gupta form of y य.

List III. — Inscriptions in the North-Eastern alphabet (only Gupta variety).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial No.</th>
<th>Publication</th>
<th>Name of Inscription</th>
<th>Name of King, etc.</th>
<th>Sālā.</th>
<th>A.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fleet's</td>
<td>Faridpur</td>
<td>Dharmāditya</td>
<td></td>
<td>390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No. 1</td>
<td>Allahabad</td>
<td>Chandra Gupta II (395-414)</td>
<td>400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>No. 7</td>
<td>do.</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>No. 6</td>
<td>do.</td>
<td></td>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>No. 32</td>
<td>do.</td>
<td></td>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>No. 9</td>
<td>Kumāra Gupta I (414-454)</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>No. 8</td>
<td>do.</td>
<td>447</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>No. 64</td>
<td>do.</td>
<td>420</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>No. 11</td>
<td>do.</td>
<td>429</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>No. 65</td>
<td>*Kśasam</td>
<td>438</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>No. 69</td>
<td>Bhimā Varman</td>
<td>439</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>No. 75</td>
<td>*Dvaitiyā</td>
<td>466</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>No. 15</td>
<td>*Śrāṇḍhī</td>
<td>469</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>No. 12</td>
<td>Skanda Gupta (455-456)</td>
<td>141</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>No. 60</td>
<td>do.</td>
<td>467</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Bendall's</td>
<td>No. 1</td>
<td>Sivadēva I</td>
<td>315</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Bhagwanlāl's No. 5</td>
<td>Katmandu</td>
<td>do.</td>
<td>635</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Bendall's No. 2</td>
<td>Patan</td>
<td>Añuvārman</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Bhagwanlāl's No. 6</td>
<td>Katmandu</td>
<td>do.</td>
<td>639</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>No. 7</td>
<td>do.</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>No. 8</td>
<td>do.</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>No. 9</td>
<td>Jishnu Gupta</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>No. 10</td>
<td>do.</td>
<td>653</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>No. 1</td>
<td>Mānadeva</td>
<td>386</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>No. 12</td>
<td>Sivadēva II</td>
<td>119</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>No. 2</td>
<td>Mānadeva</td>
<td>413</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>No. 3</td>
<td>Vasantāsena</td>
<td>435</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>,</td>
<td>No. 4</td>
<td>do.</td>
<td>535</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With regard to Népāl, List III. shows that the North-Eastern alphabet survived down to the middle of the ninth century; the latest inscription is dated 854 A.D. At the same time it also shows that the North-Western alphabet in the Post-Gupta variety was introduced in the middle of the seventh century. Its first appearance is in the Jishnu Gupta inscription of about 655 A.D. (No. 7 in List II.). This is an instructive instance. Of Jishnu Gupta we have three inscriptions, viz., Bhagwanlāl’s Nos. 9, 10 and 11. Of these Nos. 9 and 10 (see Nos. 22, 23 in List III.) are exclusively in the North-Eastern characters; moreover, No. 9 is dated in 653 A.D. This fixes very approximately the date of No. 11. But this No. 11, exhibits the curious fact of a mixture of North-Western Post-Gupta and North-Eastern forms. In line 2 (keśākhyāte) and l. 16 (parshādi) we have the North-Western form of sh ś; moreover, throughout the inscription we find the Post-Gupta form of y. But in line 9 (jishnu) there is used the North-Eastern form of sh ś. It seems to me, that we have here an indication of the exact time when the North-Western Post-Gupta alphabet was first introduced into Népāl. It must have been during the reign of Jishnu Gupta, in the middle of the seventh century. This alphabet did not, however, at once entirely supersede the older North-Eastern variety. The latter continued to exist by the side of the newer N.-W. Post-Gupta variety, for about two centuries
longer, being used by the Lichchhavī family in their inscriptions, while the Thākuri family adopted the newer variety.

The sketch-map of the distribution of the two Northern varieties throws some further light on the subject. It will be observed that, with two exceptions, all the inscriptions in the North-Eastern alphabet lie from Kōsam or Allahabad east-ward. Those in the North-Western variety lie to the West and South-West of the North-Eastern area. This is the case up to about the year 500 A.D. After this date (as will be seen by the dates noted with the place-names) the North-Western inscriptions spread over the whole of the North-Eastern area. The only exception is the Pahîldāpur inscription, with its very early date of about 370 A.D. (No. 2 in List I.).

Another noteworthy point is, that the North-Eastern inscriptions are nearly all crowded together, just south of Nēpāl, and in (what I may call) the home-provinces of the Gupta empire. Add to this, that, in India proper at least, they are confined entirely to the period of the height of the Gupta rule, i.e., to the reigns of Chandra Gupta II, Kumara Gupta I, and Skanda Gupta. The earliest is the Allahabad inscription under Chandra Gupta II, about 400 A.D., the latest is the Gadhvā inscription, under Skanda Gupta, in 467 A.D. (see List III). Their period is just about a hundred years, from the end of the 4th to the end of the 5th century. The Pahîldāpur inscription certainly falls before that period; for it shows the very ancient Indo-scythic angular form of ્. The exact epoch when this angular form of ્ was superseded by the square form is not yet known; and it is very desirable that this point should be statistically worked out. But the Bijayagadā inscription of the year 571 A.D. shows the same angular ્, and the gold coins of Chandra Gupta I and Samudra Gupta already show the first beginnings of the use of the square form of ્. The Pahîldāpur inscription may, therefore, safely be placed about 370 A.D. or earlier, that is, in the reign of Chandra Gupta I. It seems clear from this fact, that the North-Eastern alphabet has some peculiar connection with the imperial Gupta family. If we remember that this alphabet was also current in Nēpāl and that the Guptas entertained intimate relations with the ruling Lichchhavī family of Nēpāl, it becomes probable that the North-Eastern alphabet was introduced into India proper under the Lichchhavī influence. Chandra Gupta I married a Lichchhavī princess and founded the Gupta empire. Samudra Gupta and Chandra Gupta II gave it its widest extension, and they left their landmarks in the Farīdāpur inscription in the east, and the Mihrāuil and Udaigiri inscriptions in the West and South-West (Nos. 1, 4, 5, in list III). As the Lichchhavīs themselves originally came from North-Eastern India (Pajāliputra = Patna), their alphabet possibly may, after all, claim an indigenous Indian origin.

I see that Professor Bühler suggests, that the dates of Dr. Bhagwanlal's Nos. 1—3 are not to be interpreted (as done by Mr. Fleet and myself) as Guptas, but as Vikrama dates (see Vienna Oriental Journal, Vol. V. p. 219). If this suggestion should prove correct, some of the details in the foregoing observations will require re-adjustment; but the main points of my argument are not affected by this question. Nor, so far as I can see, does it affect Prof. Bühler's own view regarding the origin of the Gupta era. That view does seem to me probably true. We must await Prof. Bühler's promised full statement of his objections to Mr. Fleet's interpretation of the dates. In the meantime the probabilities seem to me greatly in favour of the latter. It seems difficult to understand how the Mālaiva era — for that is really the Vikrama era — should have got into Nēpāl at so early a period.

With regard to the Farīdāpur inscription, referred to several times in the foregoing remarks, I may give the following preliminary information. It was found, not long ago, in the Farīdāpur district of Eastern Bengal. It is written in the early Gupta characters of the North-Eastern class. It shows throughout the old form ્ of ્; the transitional ્ and modern ્ forms never occur. It further shows throughout the North-Eastern form ્ of ્, which is very difficult to distinguish from the dental ્. The inscription refers itself to the reign of
a king Dharmāditya, but is not dated. It records the gift of a piece of land to a Brāhmaṇ Sūrasyāmin of the Lauhitya gōtra and the Vājasinēya śākhā, by a person called Vasudēva Śvāmin, apparently for the erection of a dharmādīla. The inscription commences as follows: —


This commencement strikingly resembles that in the well-known Gupta inscriptions. The term apratisratha, moreover, is one peculiar to Samudra Gupta (see Fleet, p. 14, footnote 4); and there are other indications, pointing to him as being referred to here as the Dharmāditya. All the great Gupta rulers, Chandragupta II., Kumara Gupta I., Skanda Gupta, have honorific titles formed with āditya (Vikramāditya, Mahendrāditya, Kramāditya, respectively). In all probability, Samudra Gupta, who was the first great ruler of the family, also had such a title; and I would suggest, that Dharmāditya was his title. Soldered on to the plate is a seal, showing in the upper portion the standing figure of Lakṣmī, entwined by lotus stalks and flowers, and on each side a very small elephant besprinkling her with water. The scene shows a very close resemblance to one represented on a tympanum in the Ananta cave, and figured in Ferguson and Burgess's Cave Temples of India, plate I., fig. 1. Similar, though not so quite so closely resembling, is the representation on the back of the uppermost beam of the southern gateway of the Sānci stūpa, figured in Ferguson's Tree and Serpent Worship, plate VIII.; also that on the Raypar copper-plate seal, figured in Fleet's Gupta Inscriptions, plate XXVII. In the lower compartment, almost effaced, there seems to be the legend Śrī-Mahārājādhirāja-Dharmādityaga. This, no doubt, is not the usual seal of the Guptas; but there is nothing to show, when the more usual Garuḍa seal was adopted. However, the question of the ascription of the plate may better be reserved till I shall be in a position to publish the whole inscription. Unfortunately the plate has suffered in some places so much from corrosion and inexperienced cleaning that I have not yet succeeded in fully reading it.

FOLKLORE IN SALSETTE.

BY GEO. FR. D'PENHA.


Once upon a time there was a woman whose vocation was to tell the fortunes of people. She was one day invited by the pāṭēl of her village to tell the fortune of his new-born child. The pāṭēl had also invited the prince of that village1 to witness the ceremony.

Late in the evening the fortune-teller went to the pāṭēl's house, but as she was entering the house she was stopped by the prince, who told her to see him on her way home. She promised to do so and entered the house, the prince remaining outside as a sentry to prevent any stranger entering the house during the fortune-telling. The fortune-teller, having performed many ceremonies and read out of many books, told the pāṭēl what would be the fate of his child.

After she had finished her business and received her dues, and was going away, she was again stopped by the prince who asked her what was in the fortune of the pāṭēl's child.

The fortune-teller replied: — "What the child's fortune is I have told the pāṭēl; why do you want to know?"

But the prince alternately begged and threatened, and said he would not let her go till she had told him the child's fortune. So at last she told him what it was. The prince next

1 [This is interesting as showing what ideas the words “king, prince, queen, princess,” &c., convey to the minds of the “folk.” The prose rendering of "king" should no doubt be "local magnate." — Ed.]
asked her to tell him his own fate. She was at first reluctant to do so, but after much pressure, she said:

"Your fate, O prince, is this. To whatever age you may attain; whenever you may die, — now or a hundred years hence, — it is written in your luck, that your head will be pounded by a strange queen! This, O prince, is in store for you!"

When the prince heard this, he thought to himself: — "Surely not! I will not wait to be killed by a strange queen, or have my head pounded."

Thus thinking, he drew his sword and cut off his own head, which flew off and fell into a jar, at close by!

Now it happened that the king of a neighbouring country passed that way on the following morning, and seeing the head of the prince, took it up, carefully wrapped it in a handkerchief, and, carrying it home, put it in a drawer. Every day, before he left the house and as soon as he came home, the king used to open the drawer and look at it. The key of this drawer he kept in his own pocket, while the rest of the keys were in the custody of the queen, who was never told a word about the head. The fact of giving her all the keys but one aroused the curiosity of the queen. So one day she slyly took the key from the king's pocket, and when he was gone, she opened the drawer, and there saw the head. The face being beardless, it looked like that of a woman. She suspected, therefore, that the head must be that of a concubine of the king; and thought that the concubine having died, and the king being very much attached to her, he must have brought her home and kept it in memoriam, that he might at least have the satisfaction of looking at her head! This naturally aroused a spirit of jealousy in her breast; so she took the head, and putting it in a mortar, pounded it into fine powder with a rice-pounder. Thus was fulfilled what was told by the fortune-teller to the prince!

When the fortune-teller got home it was later than she expected, for she had had to tell the fortunes of two persons. Her daughter asked her why she was so late, and she replied she was late because she had had to find out and tell the fortunes of two persons, the pújél's child and the prince. The girl then asked her mother to tell her her own fate, and after much entreaty and pressure, the old woman said: — "In your fortune, daughter, it is written that you will marry a Máng, by whom you will have a son, and later on you will marry your own son. So it is written in your fortune!"

"Surely not," thought the daughter to herself. "I marry a Máng! That will never do. I would rather go to a desert and lead a solitary life than remain here and eventually marry a Máng!"

So saying, she left the house then and there, and went into a desert, where she lived on what leaves and fruit she could get. She lived in this state for some time, when one day she saw a person coming towards her on horse-back. The cavalier asked her who she was, and what she was doing there. She told him that she was a person living in retirement. He, too, said he was also living in retirement, and asked her if she would accompany him and live with him. Not knowing who the speaker was, and thinking he was a great personage, the fortune-teller's daughter willingly agreed to go with him. Now this man's house was several days' journey from there, and on the way she ate and drank with him. When they reached his house, the fortune-teller's daughter found in it the flesh of dead cattle and date-palm brooms, which are the sure signs of a Máng. She cursed herself for agreeing to accompany the man; but she was reminded of what her mother had told her, and which had proved true, despite her living in retirement! She left the Máng's house immediately, and again took to the desert, but this time to another one. She, however, became pregnant, and in due time brought forth a son. She took the child, tore a piece of her own sári, and, wrapping

---

1 A Máng is a low caste person; he is considered even lower than a Mákhr. 2 Euphemism for sexual intercourse.
the child up in it, threw it in a bush, and went to a strange country, where she took employment in the king's house as a washer-woman. The child was picked up by the king of another country, who had happened to pass through the forest, and taken home and well cared for. As the king had no children of his own, he adopted this child as a son, and it was everywhere known as the prince of that country. One day this prince (for so we must call him), when he had grown up, happened, in company of a friend, to pass through the country where his mother was, and saw her at the tank washing clothes. He was so enamoured of her beauty that he asked her whence she came. She told him that she was a servant to the king of that country. He then went home and said to his foster-father:

"Father, there is a young woman at the palace of a certain king, and unless you get me married to her, I will never rest satisfied, and starve myself to death."

The king, who loved him exceedingly, did not like to refuse his request, and at once wrote to the other king and made arrangements for the marriage. Both parties made preparations on a grand scale to celebrate the occasion with befitting pomp, and in due time, on an appointed day, the son was married to his mother unawares. The wedding over, the bride was taken to the bridegroom's house. In the evening when they retired to bed, the bride chanced to see a rag hanging on the bedstead. On close examination she found it to be the very same rag, which she had torn from her sārī, and in which she had wrapped her child before throwing it in the bush. She at once concluded that she had married her own son! But, there being no help for it, she lived with him happily as his wife! She was, however, convinced of the truth of what her mother had told her; and had learnt that no one can ever escape from the fate that is written on the forehead.4

MISCELLANEA.

MISCELLANEOUS DATES FROM INSCRIPTIONS AND MSS.

1. — Mr. Fleet's examinations of Hindu dates have led to the conclusion that "even in Southern India, or at least in some parts of it, the amānta southern arrangement of the lunar fortnights was not coupled with the Śaka years until a comparatively late period," in fact, not before A.D. 804. Compared with this, it may be interesting to learn from some dates in M. A. Barth's Inscriptions Sanscrites du Cambodge, that, in Cambodia, the amānta scheme was used in connection with the Śaka era as early as A.D. 698.

On p. 41 of M. Barth's volume is a date of a stone inscription from Vat Chakret, the chief items of which are—

Pindaḥhitē śāk-ābdē vasu-jaladhi-sārīṁ
vvśārō Mādhav-adau . . . . . . . . kumudavanapatau Tāvastā Kṛittikāyām; i.e., in the Śaka year 548, on the first day of Vaiśākha, the moon being in (the sign) Taurus (and) in (the nakṣatra) Kṛittika.

This date does not furnish sufficient particulars for exact identification, but the fact that the moon is stated to have been in the nakṣatra Kṛittika (No. 3) proves all the same that the first of Vaiśākha spoken of was the first of the bright half, and the month therefore the amānta Vaiśākha. For had it been the first of the dark half, or, in other words, the first of the pārṇimānta Vaiśākha, which follows immediately upon the full-moon day of Chaitra, the moon would have been in Chittā (No. 14) or Śvāti (No. 15). And the possible equivalents of Vaiśākha-ādi 1, i.e., the first of the amānta Vaiśākha, actually are:

for Śaka 548 current, the 13th April, A. D. 625, when the first ādi of the bright half ended 16 h.

4 [This story is interesting for three reasons. It introduces us to a novel and very quaint version of our old friend Blue Beard. It gives us an insight into a queer state of morality, in which it is a more dreadful thing for a woman to marry into a caste beneath than to marry her own son. It is to be observed that the heroine calmly endures the latter evil, however, and cannot bear the former. And the moral of the tale apparently is that it is no sin to follow your fate, whatever it may be. This is a tale among Christians, be it observed. — En.]

1 See Gupta Inscriptions, Introduction, p. 79, note 2; and ante, Vol. XVII. pp. 141 and 142.

2 I quote the words, as corrected by the Editor.
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18 m., and the moon was in Kṛttikā up to about 23 h. after mean sunrise; and —

for Śaka 548 expired, the 3rd April, A. D. 626, when the first tithi of the bright half ended 4 h.
45 m., and the moon entered Kṛttikā about 6 h.
34 m. after mean sunrise.

In a short inscription from Vai Pray Vier, on p. 74 of the same volume, we find an even more interesting date, of which it will be sufficient to quote the words —

Yātē kālē Śakānāḥ nava-tanu-vishayair =
Mādhavē shōdan-ābh Jīvas-chāpe-ja-surya-yo
...... mātritaṁ-iñdur;
ī. e., when the Śaka year 589 had expired, on the
sixteenth day of Vaiśākha, Jupiter being in (the
sign) Chāpa (or Dhanuḥ), the sun in Mēsha,
and the moon in (the nakṣatra) Anurādhā.

Here again the Vaiśākhya of the date was the same as the amanta Vaiśākhya, and the 18th day, spoken of, was Vaiśākhya-badi 1, and the true equivalent of the date undoubtedly is the 15th April, A. D. 667, as may be seen from the following data. The new-moon which introduced the bright half of Vaiśākha of Śaka 589 expired was 9 h. after mean sunrise of the 30th March, A. D. 667. Counted from that day, the 16th day was the 15th April, A. D. 667, when the first tithi of the dark half (of the amanta Vaiśākha) ended 4 h. 28 m., and when the moon was in Anurādhā up to about 22 h. 29 m. after mean sunrise. On the same 15th April the sun was in the sign Mēsha, which it had entered on the 20th March; and Jupiter, as required, was in Dhanuḥ, having entered that sign, by the Sūrya-dhānās rule withoutōṣa, on the 20th January, A. D. 667, and remaining in it till the 16th January, A. D. 668.

The statement that Jupiter was in (the 9th sign) Dhanuḥ in this case is really equivalent to saying that the current Jovian year was Kṛṣṇa, the (12 + 12 + 9 = 33rd year, counted from Vijaśa as the first; and the special interest of this date lies in this that, while the scheme of its lunar month is the amanta, so-called southern scheme, the system followed in regard to the Jovian year is the northern mean-sign system.

On p. 68 of M. Barth’s volume the 10th day of Vaiśākha of the same Śaka year 589 is mentioned with, amongst others, the remark that the moon had reached the middle of the sign Sinha. This date would correspond to the 9th April, A. D. 667, when the 10th tithi of the bright half ended about 17 h. 26 m. after mean sunrise, and when, at sunrise, the moon was in the eleventh degree of Sinha.

2. — On p. 54 of the late Dr. Burnell’s Elements
of South-Indian Palaeography we find the remark that the Javanese Śaka era begins in A. D. 74; and this remark has ante, Vol. X. p. 214, note 7, been quoted by another distinguished scholar, apparently in support of the statement that “in ancient times the initial dates from which the different Indian eras were counted were subject to fluctuations of several years.” Whatever may be the practice of quite modern times, it is certain that down to nearly the end of the 16th century A. D. the Śaka reckoning in Java did not differ from the customary Indian reckoning. This may be seen from the following Javanese Śaka dates, which all work out properly with the ordinary epoch A. D. 77-78.

Professor Kern has published a Sanskrit inscription from Java of the Śaka year 564, the date of which he reads thus:

Sākendrē-tigata śrut-indriya-rasāya = angti
kriyā vataśrē
vārī = ēndau dhava-trayāsā-sītīduh Bha-
драṭārē Kārtikē; i. e., in the Śaka year 654,
expired on Monday, the 13th lunar day of the bright half of Kārttika, the moon being in (the
nakṣatra) Uttarabhadrapāda. — The corres-
dponding day, for Śaka 654 expired, and with the
ordinary epoch of the Śaka era, is Monday,
the 6th October, A. D. 732, when the 13th tithi
of the bright half ended 18 h. 17 m., and the
moon was in Uttarabhadrapāda up to about 15 h.
6 m. after mean sunrise.

And in a paper* of Professor Kern’s “over eine
Oudjavaansche Oorkonde van Śaka 782” there are two other Javanese dates, one of which is —

Sakavarashita 782, Kārttikamāsa, tithi trayāsā śuklapakha, . . . Vri-vāra, . . . Asvini
nakṣatra, . . . Vāpatiṣṭaya-ga, . . .
Taṭhispāti-karaṇa; i. e., Śaka 782, Bṛhaspati-vāra
or Thursday, the 13th lunar day of the bright
half of Kārttika, the nakṣatra Asvini, the yuga
Vṛatipātra, and the karaga Taṭilt; and the other —

Sakavarashita 1295, Asuṣini, tithi trayāsā
kriṣāpakha, . . . Bu-vāra . . .; i. e.,
Śaka 1295, Sukra-vāra or Friday, the 13th lunar
day of the dark half of Āśvina.

* In Verslagen en Mededelingen der Kon. Akad. van
Wetenschappen, LOTTERKUNDE, 2 B., 10 D., Amsterdam
1881, pp. 94 and 102.
Here the proper equivalents, with the ordinary epoch of the Śaka era, are:— for the first date, and Śaka 752 expired, Thursday, the 31st October, A. D. 580, when the 13th tithi of the bright half end the karana Taṭīti ended 10 h. 29 m., and when the nakṣatara was Āsvinī up to 11 h. 10 m., and the yogā Vyāpatā up to 5 h. 16 m. after mean sunrise; and for the second date, and the amāṣṭa Āśvinī of Śaka 1256 expired, Friday, the 14th October, A. D. 1373, when the 13th tithi of the dark half ended 29 h. 49 m. after mean sunrise.

3. — Aste, Vol. XVIII. p. 162, and Vol. XIX. pp. 269 and 426, Mr. Fleet has treated of some Śaka dates which, instead of quoting a lunar month, gives us the sign of the ascina in which the sun happened to be on the day intended by the date. An early Vikrama date, which is very similar to Mr. Fleet’s Śaka date in Vol. XIX. p. 269, occurs in line 32 of the Shēkhañavati (or Harsha) stone inscription of the reign of the Chāhāmāna Vigrahārjuna, first published in the Journal Beng. As. Soc., Vol. IV. pp. 370-384. According to the rubbings and impressions supplied to me by Mr. Fleet and Dr. Burgess, the date, which is given incorrectly in the published version, runs really thus:—

Jātēśvāda(badha) sahasarē trigna-nava-yutē
Śītha-nāya-nāya-gatē-rēkē
śuklē yavasti(tri*[*yā] Subha-Kara-sahiti
Soma-vāraṇa tasāyanē.

i. e., when 1027 years were completed, and when the sun was in the sign Śītha, on the third bright lunar day which was attended by (the nakṣatara) Kara (or Hasta) and (the yogā) Subha, on a Monday. — In northern V. 1027 expired the sun entered the sign Śītha 9 h. 49 h. m. after mean sunrise of the 26th July, A. D. 970, which was the 6th of the dark half of the pāramāṣṭa Bhādrapada. The third of the following bright half of the same Bhādrapada was Monday, the 6th August, A. D. 970, when the 13th tithi of the bright half ended 4 h. 15 m., and when the nakṣatara was Hasta up to 12 h. 29 m. and the yogā Subha up to 13 h. 26 m. after mean sunrise.

Dates of this kind are common enough in Bengāli MSS.1 And some of these dates again are peculiar in specifying the degree in which the sun happened to be on the day of the date. Thus, according to the late Dr. Rājendra-dāla Mitra’s Notices, Vol. VI. p. 238, a MS. of the Saṅkṣēra-paddhati-rāshaya, which is written in Bengāli characters, is dated—

Sākē vān-āchala-tithi-mitē bhāskarē Karkaṭa-
vināśata-sāme Vīdūsuta-dinē śukla-pakshē
tā śāhāyēyē yē;

i. e., in Śaka 1575, when the sun was in the sign Karkaṭa, in the 20th degree, on Wednesday, the sixth lunar day of the bright half. — In Śaka 1575 expired the Karkaṭa-saṃkrānti took place 18 h. 5' 2 m. after mean sunrise of the 30th June, A. D. 1553; and the sun entered the 20th degree of the sign some time on Wednesday, the 20th July, A. D. 1553. This Wednesday was the 6th of the bright half of Śravaṇa, for the 6th tithi of the bright half ended on it, about 15 h. 18 m. after mean sunrise.

These are clearly lunar-solar dates. But in some Bengāli MSS. we also find purely solar dates. Thus, according to Professor Eggeling’s Catalogue, p. 211, a MS. of the Sarassati Prakṛiti is dated—

Sākē saptā-sās-vitaka-saṃkhīyē Mēshāḥ-ītē
ravau!

Trītyā-līni Ravi-vārē lipū pātim-agā-
iyamē Śaka-āpādē 1727;

i. e., in Śaka 1727, when the sun had entered the sign Mēshā, on the third day, a Sunday. —

The Mēshā-saṃkrānti at the end of Śaka 1727 current took place 1 h. 29 m. after mean sunrise of Thursday, the 11th April, A. D. 1595; and the day of the date is clearly Sunday, the 14th April, A. D. 1595, which by the lunar calendar was the first of the dark half of the amāṣṭa Chaitra.

And according to the same Catalogue, p. 33, a Bengāli MS. of Suśrūṣār-chāhāna’s Bṛhadārāmāya-
ka-bhāṣya-gravīttika is dated—

navavatavat-adhikā-chaturdāsa-sata-mitā-śakābdē
Chaitraśya dvādas-ānē Śu(suk)kravārē;

i. e., in the Śaka year 1499, in the 12th degree of Chaitra, on Friday. — By the result of my calculations the year of this date is the current solar year Śaka 1499. In that year, the solar month Chaitra commenced 17 h. 25' 8 m. after mean sunrise of Monday, the 25th February, A. D. 1577, and the sun was in the 12th degree from some time on Friday, the 8th March, A. D. 1577, which was the 12th of the dark half of the pāramāṣṭa Chaitra of Śaka 1499, current.

4. — Dates are sometimes recorded in days of the Kaliyuga. A very interesting date of this description is contained in the following

---

1 Compare e. g. Dr. Rājendra-dāla Mitra’s Notices, Vol. II. p. 310; Vol. III. p. 171; etc.
verses of Shadgurusishya's Veddhradhipika, in which the author tells us that he completed his work, when the number of days of the Kaliyuga was 1553.

Kha-gö-tyā-munē-su-mā-yā=eti Kaly-ahar-gaṇanē satī
Sarrāvukramani-vṛtti-jātā Veddhradhipikāt Lakṣāṣṭā pañcchadāsa vai pañcchashashṭi-sahasram
Sa-dvātrīṇācm-ḥiḥataḥ ch=eti dina-vāky-ārtha irtah II

Expressed in the days of the Julian period, the epoch of the Kaliyuga is—

588 465-75 days;
+ 1553 132 days;

sum 2153 597-75 days of the Julian period = the 24th March, A.D. 1184, 18 h. after mean sunrise.

Accordingly, the day actually given us by Shadgurusishya would correspond to the 24th March, A.D. 1184. But since this is the day of the Mēśha-saṅkrānti, the Shadgurusishya indeed has plainly suggested himself. For there can be no doubt whatever that the true reading of the first half of the above verses is—

Khagō-ntyān-Mēśham-āp=āti kaly-ahar-gaṇanē satī. — i.e., ‘when the number of days of the Kaliyuga was the number denoted by khagō-ntyān = Mēśham = āpā “the sun passed from the last sign to the sign Mēśha;” (kh=2, g=3, y=1, m=5, s=6, v=5, and p=1).

5.—In the Verāval inscription of the reign of the Vāghela Arjunadāva, the Mahāmātā saṅvat or Hijra year 662 is put down along with the Vikrama, Valabha, and Sinha years to which the day of the date belonged. And in MSS. I have sometimes found Hijra years quoted by the side of the corresponding Saka years. The Hijra year, described as the Yāvanē year, is quoted alone in the following date of a MS. of a commentary on the Sāryaśiddhānta, written in Maithili characters (apparently) in Oadh.

Turg-sa-vana-himānsa-khaṃ-āṅkitē Yāvanē bōde
charama Sochā chaturthyāṃ kṛishṇapakhoṇe wī karīātah II

i.e., in the Yavana or Hijra year 1197, on the fourth lunar day of the dark half of the second summer-month (Āśāra), on Thursday. — As the Hijra year 1197 commenced on the 7th December, A.D. 1782, the date should fall in A.D. 1783 or Saka 1705 expired. And for Saka 1705 expired the 4th of the dark half of the amānta Āśāra corresponds to Thursday, the 17th July, A.D. 1783, when the fourth tithi of the dark half ended 21 h. 10 m. after mean sunrise.

6.—Ante, Vol. XIX. p. 6, I have attempted to prove that the Lakshmanaśaṇa era commenced in A.D. 1119, and I have shown that, assuming my epoch to be correct, the difference between a year of that era and the corresponding expired Saka year must always be 1040, or 1041, or 1042. In support of my views, I would now draw attention to two dates in the late Dr. Rājendralāl Mitra’s Notices, which I had formerly overlooked.

According to Vol. V. p. 84 a MS. of Madhusudana’s Kaṃṭakōḍḍhāra which is written in Maithili characters, contains the lines —

chakrā Rāmaṇarāyaṇo śvamipātā śītāśāvand-āmānubhāv
ānī Phālguna-saptami Ravidinī Gaṅgā.
Gaṅgā-aravakā,

which give us for calculation the (Lakshmanaśaṇa) year 491, and the seventh lunar day (of either the bright or the dark half) of Phālguna, joined with a Sunday. Here, the month being Phālguna, the date should fall either in Saka (491 + 1040 =) 1531 expired, or in Saka (491 + 1041 =) 1532 expired; but calculations for Saka 1531 yield no

8 It took place 8 h. 58 m. after mean sunrise.

9 Three of Professor Macdonell’s MSS. actually read mukham (not mukha), and they have the sign of anuśāra above the akṣara preceding thuya.

satisfactory result. In Śaka 1532 expired, the seventh tithi of the bright half of Phālguna ended about 18 h. after mean sunrise of Saturday, the 9th February, A.D. 1611, which also does not suit the requirements of the case. On the other hand, in the dark half of the amānta Phālguna of Śaka 1532 expired —
the 6th tithi ended 1 h. 38 m. before mean sunrise of Saturday, 23 February, A.D. 1611;
the 7th tithi ended 0 h. 17 m. before mean sunrise of Sunday, 24 February, A.D. 1611; and
the 8th tithi ended 1 h. 25 m. after mean sunrise of Monday, 25 February, A.D. 1611.

It is true that by this result no tithi would have ended on the Sunday, and that the Sunday would have been put down in the calendar, like the Monday, as the 8th. But the tithis have here been calculated according to Ujjain time, and considering that the date undoubtedly was written far to the east of Ujjain, the seventh tithi would for the writer of the date really have ended some time after sunrise of the Sunday; and Sunday, the 24th February A.D. 1611, is therefore the proper equivalent of the date, — deduced from the epoch of the Lakshamaṇa era A.D. 1118-19.

7. — A date of the Āśāhādā Vikrama year 1574, which does not admit of verification, is given in Professor Macdonell's edition of Kātyāyana's Sarvasūtrākaraṇāṃ, preface, p. xiii. And another Āśāhādā date, according to Professor Eegeling's Catalogue, p. 406, occurs in a MS, of part of Hāmādi's Āśāhādā āgama, written in Western India, and is worded thus:

Sanvat 15 Āśāhādā 81 varsha 5 śravanav-sūrdi panchamā aparaṃ shasṭhi Budhē.

As might have been expected, the date falls in the northern Vikrama year 1581, expired, and the corresponding date, for that year, is Wednesday, the 6th July, A.D. 1624, when the fifth tithi of the bright half ended 1 h. 25 m. after mean sunrise.

In addition to quoting the 6th tithi which ended on the Wednesday, and from which the Wednesday received its number 5, this date also quotes the following sixth tithi, and it is in this respect similar13 to No. 49 of my Vikrama dates, ante, Vol. XIX, p. 33; but what makes this Āśāhādā date more interesting, is the fact that the 6th tithi also ended on the Wednesday, 1 h. 17 m.

11 I now find that by Prof. Jacob's Special Tables for the Sūryasiddhānta with bīja, published in Epigraphia Indica, Pt. VIII, the seventh tithi, even at Ujjain, ended 3 ghāṭikas after mean sunrise of this Sunday.

8. — In dates like the preceding the ordinals paśchami, śaśādhi, etc., clearly denote the time occupied by the tithi itself, not the civil day on which the tithi ended; and those dates thus help to explain other dates in which the writers undoubtedly have quoted actually current tithis, with the week days on which they commenced.

According to my Report on Sanskrit MSS, for 1880-81, p. 22, a palm-leaf MS. of Abharaśīla's Nīlamuktiśīla is dated:

Śrīmad-Rāmacandrādēva - viṣayārājyē Kunika-pātrīyē gata-Kali 4396
Hēmalambha-samvatāra Jyēśhā-vadi ashtamśyāyām.12 Vṛthaspati-dīnē tā.

By the southern luni-solar system the year Hēmalambha corresponds to Kāliyuga 4398 expired, and the 8th tithi of the dark half of the amānta Jyēśhā of that year commenced on Thursday, the 13th June, A.D. 1297, 1 h. 37 m. after mean sunrise, and ended at mean sunrise of the following day. Here the Thursday, quoted in the date, was civilly badi 7, and the 8th tithi was either a kešaya-tithi or ended after true sunrise of the Friday. And the meaning of the date clearly is, that the writing was finished on the Thursday, during the 8th tithi.

In Professor Bhāndārkar's Report for 1883-84, p. 355, the date of the composition of Mahāvīra's commentary on Purūravottama's Viṣṇubhaktīkalpatala is given thus:

Śrīmad-bhadālayanārāma-jana-lasat-kīrtēr =
uripād-Vikrama-
jaṭē-śaca-(iv)-aṇumadhī-raha-bhāmi - gaṇitē-
bāde Mārgaśīrāhē-rjunē !
pakṣē muhukṣajaya-tīthi Svargu-
(rōr)-vārī Virūpākṣa-bhū-
irmatī sam Mahāvīra guru-kripa-
ṭikām-imām samudārā !

Here, again, the third (or muhukṣajaya) tīthi of the bright half of Mārgaśīrāh of V. 1467 expired commenced on Thursday, the 19th November, A.D. 1690, 1 h. 38 m. after mean sunrise, and ended 0 h. 51 m. after mean sunrise of the following day.

And according to Professor Bendall's Catalogue, of the Saptapadārāki, of which a page is photographed in Dr. Rājendraśīla Mitra's Notices, Vol. I., Satrat 1458 versē Māgha-vadi 6 anantāraha Śaṁyāsū
 vāna (ṣu)ajāyē; corresponding for the pūrṇamadā Māgha of V. 1458, current, to Thursday, the 6th January, A.D. 1601.11 Read ashtamśyām.
p. 39, a palm-leaf MS. of Chandraḡma’s Sīṣhyārākṣa-dharmakīrṭiyā is dated: —

Sauvat 200 . 4. Vaisākha-sūkli-dēṣṭhāmyāni
8 mā-dīnā.

And here, again, the 8th tithi of the bright
half of Vaisākha of the expired Nēvar year
304 commenced on Monday, the 18th April,

A. D. 1064, 8 h. 43 m. after mean sunrise,
and ended 9 h. 59 m. after mean sunrise of the
following day; 14 and I here, too, take the meaning
of the date to be, that the writer finished his
work on the Monday, after the commencement
of the 8th tīṭhi.

Göttingen.

F. Kielhorn.

NOTES AND QUERIES.

AN ENGLISH INSCRIPTION AT MAULMAIN.

At Maulmain, on the platform of the chief
pagoda, is a large bell of the usual Burmese type
with a quaint inscription cut in English thereon,
which is worth preserving:—

“He who destroyed this bell they must be in

the great hell and unable to come out. This
bell is made by Koona Lingahyab the Priest and
weight 600 viss. No one body design to destroy
this bell. Maulmain, March 30th, 1855.”

R. C. Temple.

BOOK-NOTICE.

The Pracīna Gujārātī Sāhitya Ratnakalā, or
Garland of Gems of Old Gujārātī Literature.
The First Gem, the Mūḍhāvyābodhamaṅktika, or a
Grammar for Beginners, of the Gujārātī Language
(V.-S. 1460). Edited by H. H. Dhrūva, B.A., LL.B.,
Printed and published at the Subādha-Praṇakṣa Press,

This work, edited by Mr. H. H. Dhrūva,
B.A., LL.B., is one of a series proposed by
him to be issued with a view to rescue the
old vernacular literature of India from the
oblivion in which it is at present lying. Evidently
Mr. Dhrūva believes this work to be a grammar
of the Gujārātī language of the time to which
it belongs (V.-S. 1400 = A. D. 1394). I
shall presently examine how far this assumption
on his part is based on a correct appreciation of
the subject-matter of the work. But I propose first
to point out some of the many mistakes and
errors which have resulted from the evidently
superficial manner in which Mr. Dhrūva has
studied the work, and the very careless way in
which it has been edited. 1

Mr. Dhrūva has based his edition on a single
manuscript,—the one belonging to the Gujārāt Vernacular Society of Ahmedabad. I have had
the advantage of a look at this manuscript, and I shall
point out some of the results of Mr. Dhrūva's
hurry and carelessness, by instances of disagreement
between his manuscript and his edition.

At the end of page 4 of Mr. Dhrūva’s edition we
find the expression गुढवर्णनविवर्णा. The original

14 Compare No. 168 of my Vikrama dates, ante, Vol.
XIX. p. 361.

1 One viss = 100 tickals = 365 lbs. avoirdupois.

1 [A curious instance of this carelessness occurs one
is the fact that in the very title-page, where the name of the
work is given in Roman characters as “Mūḍhāvyāb-
ōdha Aṅkāk,” but in Devanagari characters as “Mū-
dhāvyābodhamaṅktika.” The latter form occurs also

at the end of the work; while three lines above there is
again “Aṅkāk.” As the title-page declares this book to be
“prathamasak maṅktikā,” the real name seems to
be Mūḍhāvyābodhamaṅktika.—Ernor.]

2 It would be well to indicate here that in Gujārātī प
and नी have each of them two distinct pronunciations,
broad and narrow, or short and long; broad or short
At page 6 and also page 7 Mr. Dhruba has कर्त्ता विक and कृत्ति विक for what is rightly given in the original instance as कर्त्ता विक and कृत्ति विक. The assessetha is not trifling or superfluous. It represents the locative case, कर्त्ता विक being the forms for कर्त्ता, कृत्ति. These may be mere misprints, but as such they are none the less the results of great carelessness.

But a still more serious blunder appears at page 7, col. 1, when Mr. Dhruba puts: — अद्वितीय कर्त्ता कर्मपाली बोलार्थे कर्मपाली विकल्पात्य (sic) कर्मपाली (sic). Mr. Dhruba's edition has कर्मपाली कर्मपाली separated wrongly into कर्मपाली कर्मपाली (which makes no sense. This by the way.) Here the blunder consists in inverting the order of the words कर्मपाली and कर्मपाली in the expression कर्मपाली कर्मपाली. The original has कर्मपाली कर्मपाली. The sense is अद्वितीय, यथा कर्मपाली उद्देश्यम् कर्मपाली उद्देश्यम् कर्मपाली. — this division of विकल्प (voice) represents cases in which the कर्मपाली is used as the कर्मपाली. Mr. Dhruba's reading would make it “कर्मपाली is used as कर्मपाली,” which is not intended. See the instance given संयुक्त शब्दाः पदार्थाः. अद्वितीय कर्मपाली शब्दाः. Here शब्दाः, which is the कर्मपाली, is used as the कर्मपाली. The object in sense is used as the subject in form. The name given to this विकल्प is कर्मपाली and not कर्मपाली. This also indicates the sense above described.

In the opening portion of his edition Mr. Dhruba gives what he calls an analysis of the work. Here he has: —

"(7) Cases — seven," and then adds the remark "vocative not given." Here Mr. Dhruba forgets that the vocative is not known to Sanskrit grammar as a separate case by itself. It is only the nominative case used when addressing another person. This very work, at page 14, col. 1, under the chapter of the Cases, says सः सः गृहः, "the nominative is used in addressing another." Mr. Dhruba seems to have been misled by the facts that in English grammars, as also in Gujarati grammars, the vocative is regarded as a separate case, and that the Sanskrit रेखावान्ता gives vocative forms after the locative. But the as in "care" and "swim," and narrow or long as in "ache" and "boat." When a Gujarati word having ए or ओ has in its antecedent प्रकृत or डेवा form or intermediate stage इ or ओ, or इ or ओ, the pronunciation of the ए or ओ in the Gujarati word is broad. When the antecedent प्रकृत (or डेवा) form or intermediate stage has ए or ओ, the pronunciation (in the Gujarati word) of ए or ओ is narrow; e.g. डेवा main cause of this error of his is his theory that this work is a grammar of the vernacular of the period,—a theory which I shall explode below.

Then the Analysis gives — "(19) Rules of Syntax." This appears to refer to the कुमारका, beginning from the end of page 17 to very nearly the end of page 20 in the body of the work. A glance at these will show that they give no rules of "Syntax." The only rules in these कुमारका which may present an appearance of rules of Syntax, are those which deal with several कोर्क, viz., कर्त्ता, कर्म, करण, संप्रभु, अपावण, अधि-करण, and the संबन्ध sense of the Genitive. But these meanings or significations of the विकल्प (Cases) cannot, in strict propriety, be regarded as falling within the scope of "Syntax."

The Analysis is then concluded with "(21) Prepositions" [more correctly, he should have said 'Prefixes'] — "ten." But Mr. Dhruba strangely omits to notice the concluding chapter of the book which gives a few rules of Prosody. His Analysis should have concluded: — "(22) Rudiments of Prosody."

I hope I have cited a sufficient number of instances to show how superficially the work has been studied, and how carelessly it has been edited by Mr. Dhruba. But the superficiality of this study (if it can be called by the name of study) comes out boldly and strongly in his fundamentally erroneous theory about the nature of the work, which he has sadly failed to apprehend. He seems to regard this work as a Grammar of the Gujarati language of the period (A. D. 1384). It is nothing of the kind at all, as will appear from a little careful examination of the text, which clearly shows that it is merely a राजा मोराधिकार, a handbook for the help of the beginner (सेवक), to teach Sanskrit Grammar through the medium of the vernacular of the period. Along with hurry and superficial observation, this error may be attributed to the feeling of overflowing patriotism which seems to have taken possession of Mr. Dhruba's mind, and has led him to imagine that so far back as 500 years ago his mother-tongue had a grammar of its own.

In examining Mr. Dhruba's theory I shall first point out the errors and wrong conclusions...
into which he has fallen in consequence of holding that theory, and then state our grounds for holding that the work is merely a hand-book of Sanskrit Grammar.

First, then,—in his Analysis Mr. Dhruba says, "Vocative not given." This remark, as has been already hinted above, proceeds from an assumption that this is a Gujarati Grammar, and the fact that Gujarati Grammars regard the Vocative as a separate case.

In his 'Analysis' Mr. Dhruba says:

"(9) Kridanta forms like करी, करा, करीन, करानाद, करतो, &c." Looking at the corresponding chapter in the book we find that this refers to the forms करी, करणा, करत, used incidentally to explain the Sanskrit participial and other forms ending in ति, ि, ा, and शात. But even supposing for a moment that this work is a grammar of the vernacular of the period, Mr. Dhruba should have given the forms करी, करणा, करत, (the forms of the vernacular of the period), and not करी, करानाद, करतो (the forms of modern Gujarati). He has in this instance been run away with by his patriotic hobby, so far as to unconsciously represent modern Gujarati forms as treated of in the text.

Finally, Mr. Dhruba is forced to resort to a rather amusing shift in order to support his tottering theory, whenever at every turn it meets with some shock or other. The work gives अ and other non-Prakrit vowels; this, Mr. Dhruba explains away, as a "Sanskritism." There are three numbers given (Prakrit has only two, having no dual); this Mr. Dhruba says, is a Sanskritism. The case-terminations given are Sanskrit and not Prakrit; this again, says Mr. Dhruba, is a Sanskritism. The rules of Sanshii (which are unknown to Prakrit) are again a Sanskritism, according to Mr. Dhruba. Sanshii giving forms confined to Sanskrit Grammar, the mention of Atmanepada forms of verbs (as Prakrit has only Paramapada forms even in the Passive Voice), the Sanskrit terminations for roots,—all these are "Sanskritisms." For Mr. Dhruba must maintain his theory at any cost. Where, then, we ask, is the Prakritism of the work to be found? Is it in the incidentally used Prakrit terminations which Mr. Dhruba parades in all the importance of a bold black capital type? Mr. Dhruba is in the amusing position of a man who, looking at a peacock, would persistently swear it was a dog, and asked, whence the deep blue colour, whence the thick mass of rainbow-coloured feathers, whence the crest, the wings, the beak, would reply "Oh! that much only is a peculiarity of the peacock"! The fact of the matter is that Mr. Dhruba has started on a wrong line from the outset, with also a wrong foundation, and is therefore compelled to put up a prop here and a prop there to support the tottering superstructure.

I shall now proceed to indicate the grounds on which I base my contention that, the work is a hand-book of Sanskrit Grammar and not of Gujarati Grammar.

To begin, the very Meigalcharana (the opening verse) shows the purport of the work:

अह व्रतम्युपयोगात्तिक्षे निवधितमस्य
प्रायोऽप्रामुख्य महाचक्षुणावस्थमः।

"After bowing to the Arhat, I proceed to make, for the instruction of beginners, a collection of some of the rules of grammar, mostly in the Prakrit (i.e. using for the greater part the Prakrit language in the treatment of my subject)." The author uses the word प्रायो (mostly), because in the latter part of the text he has occasionally treated the whole subject in Sanskrit and not in Prakrit. अह व्रतम्युपयोगात्तिक्षे निवधितमस्य is प्रामुख्य + उपयोगात्तिक्षे (संधि), and hence it cannot mean "a collection of Prakrit Utkis." अह व्रतम्युपयोगात्तिक्षे is connected with अह व्रतम्युपयोगात्तिक्षे and not with अह व्रतम्युपयोगात्तिक्षे. Even if the locative form is allowed, by a strain, to represent the genitive sense, it would conflict with the word प्रायो, which will not then give a satisfactory meaning. The author must, therefore, be taken, even from this passage, to propose a collection of rules of Sanskrit Grammar, treated through the medium of Prakrit.

The facts that the work gives letters like अ, &c., peculiar to Sanskrit only, the dual number, Sanskrit case-terminations, Sanskrit Pradipadikas, the rules of Sandhi and Samasas peculiar to Sanskrit, and Atmanepada forms, clearly indicates that the book treats of Sanskrit Grammar and not of Prakrit Grammar. It is very easy, but not safe, to explain all these facts away by calling them "Sanskritisms." But it involves on the face of it a circumlocutory and inverted way of arguing. It has never struck Mr. Dhruba as peculiar, that so large a fund of peculiarities of Sanskrit Grammar should have crept into a Gujarati Grammar with propriety, and without jarring on the sense of proportion. The author, probably holding that the title of Vyakaranas can be claimed only by an exhaustive work treated in Sanskrit, gave his work a far more modest name.

Mr. Dhruba may possibly have been misled by the facts that the whole treatment in the large portion of the work is carried on in Prakrit, that the Sanskrit terminations are first preceded by the mention of Prakrit terminatics, and that Sanskrit instances are preceded by the citation
of instances in Prākrit. But the whole tenor of the treatment shows that the Prākrit terminations and instances are intended only to afford facility of understanding by the citation of things familiar for the teaching of things unfamiliar.

To cite an instance or two:—At page 4, col. 2—(kriyās) we find the following:—

करोऽदेशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे

करोऽदेशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे

करोऽदेशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे

करोऽदेशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे

करोऽदेशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे

करोऽदेशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे

करोऽदेशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे

करोऽदेशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे

करोऽदेशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे

करोऽदेशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे

करोऽदेशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे

करोऽदेशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे

करोऽदेशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे

करोऽदेशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे

करोऽदेशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे

करोऽदेशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे

करोऽदेशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे

करोऽदेशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे

करोऽदेशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे

करोऽदेशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे देशे

This exposition of the mode of the author's treatment should shew clearly that he is simply teaching Sanskrit Grammar through his vernacular. The same method of treatment has been observed by the author almost throughout this work. And in some places (as in the case of the भूत termination, at p. 5) only Sanskrit instances are given. What does this shew? If the work were a Prākrit Grammar, what need was there to give Sanskrit instances at all, along with the Prākrit instances? And certainly, Prākrit instances could not be properly altogether omitted (as they are occasionally), and only Sanskrit instances given, if this was a Prākrit Grammar. The author has thrown Prākrit into the background to such an extent that as the work proceeds, the treatment in Prākrit is abandoned in a great measure, as in the Sambhaṇa chapter, and finally altogether, as in the Kārikās on Kāraṇa. Could this ever be a feature of a Prākrit Grammar? After the beginner has gradually acquired familiarity with Sanskrit by the Prākrit treatment in the first portion of the book, the author presumes the learner to be able to give up Prākrit and understand the treatment in Sanskrit itself. This is undoubtedly the explanation of the change in the language of treatment. In fact the author has put the qualifying word तात्त्विक in his very opening verse.

I think I may, after all this explanation, hope that it will be regarded as clear that this work is a Sanskrit Grammar taught through the vernacular; and that it will be hardly necessary to point out that the Prākrit and Sanskrit equivalent words at pages 16, 17 are but a vocabulary teaching Sanskrit words, and that the Kārikās at pages 17-20, the Upanāsas and Anubandhas of roots at page 29, the Padās of roots at page 21, and such other features, go entirely against the hasty theory of Mr. Dhrūva, and support my contention about the nature of the work.

The only part of the work which would lend plausible support to Mr. Dhrūva's theory is the chapter on उपक्र (Voices) at pages 6, 7. उपक्र (Straight, Direct) and उपक्र (Crooked, Indirect) Voices are names unknown to Sanskrit Grammar. The author also refrains from giving the corresponding Sanskrit names for the several Voices, उपक्र, उपक्र, उपक्र, कार्य, वाचिक, कार्य, वाचिक is quite a novel division. And immediately after that, the author gives some forms peculiar to Prākrit. These facts might for a moment lead one to suppose this work to be a Prākrit treatise, and not one on Sanskrit Grammar. But against this single short chapter are to be put all the other parts of the book which, as shewn above, clearly
indicate the work to be a Sanskrit Grammar. The probable explanation of this chapter may be that the author took the liberty of allotting a separate chapter to the Voice, which is not done in Sanskrit Grammars, and, therefore, he did not give Sanskrit names at all for the divisions of the Uktis; and, having for once spoken in this manner, he incidentally, by way of a note as it were, gave some peculiarities of the Prakrit language. This view is strengthened by the fact that in giving these peculiarities the author expressly uses the words वाक्यावली, "in the Prakrit language," which he would have done were this not an exceptional case in a work which, for the rest, is a Sanskrit Grammar. Further support is to be found in the fact that the author states in this very chapter that in the कर्मिक विन्यास, verbs take the Paramaihipada terminations ordinarily (पारमाण्वी, i. e. पारमाण्वी), from which it is to be implied that अचान्दक roots will take अचान्दक terminations; and also in the fact that the author states in the कर्मिक and नर Uktis the verbs take अचान्दक terminations, —a feature confined to Sanskrit, for in Prakrit there is no such thing as अचान्दक, verbs taking Paramaihipada terminations even in the कर्मिक and नर forms. This is a very strong point, and we must conclude that this chapter, although giving the original divisions and names of the Uktis, has after all for its main subject-matter the rules of Sanskrit Grammar and nothing else, and is, therefore, in general harmony with the other portions of the work.

I have now surveyed the whole scope of the book, and shewn how and where Mr. Dhruba has allowed himself to run into error. It is clear this has been the result of, among other causes, an undue haste, which is unaccountable and surprising. Mr. Dhruba has not had the patience to wait till he could secure more than one Manuscript for his work. The omission of Manuscripts is out of question in that case. Mr. Dhruba himself speaks of another copy in the Jain Bhãngâr at Ahmedabad, which he did not succeed in securing. But he can have had only his own impatience to thank for this. What hurry was there? What reason was there for him to rush this work through the Press before he returned from the International Congress of Orientalists, to which he had proceeded as a delegate of H.H. the Gaikwar? Could he not have waited till he had returned and had had time enough amidst the arduous and multifarious work of an office he "now occupies" to examine the work with care, diligence, and patience? He could then have secured several Manuscripts and have collated them, —a course the propriety of which ought to have suggested itself, for, although he speaks at one place of the Manuscript he secured as "correct throughout with rare exceptions," he himself at another place complains of the missections in which some parts of the work abound.

It is to be hoped that, when Mr. Dhruba brings out the second edition of the work which he has promised at the end of his Preface, he will exercise greater care, eliminate all errors, minor and fundamental, give up his untenable theory, and present the work in a creditable form. Till then, his publication can hardly succeed in commanding any perceptible circulation or patronage.

Narsingha B. Divatia.

Bijdup, District, 10th May 1891.

P.S. — I subjoin a few additional points for consideration by Mr. Dhruba when he takes the second edition in hand:

1. At page 5, col. 1, 1. 2, the word उदर seems to be misplaced for पूर्व. The Gujarati Vernacular Society Manuscript also has पूर्व. But it conflicts with the sense. Hence the difficulty. For पूर्व is applied in a sentence to the preceding, and not to the succeeding verb. कुल्कारं: परं परं विनां वृणिकां अनवाहिः; in this instance, given by the author, विनाहिः is a verb precedent to अनवाहिः. Mr. Dhruba will see the necessity here of collating several Manuscripts.

2. Page 12, col. 1. Among the instances of विनाहिः the author gives भागवतं वने यास्व आनंदवानि ब्रह्म: This is a curious and evidently ungrammatical instance of dissolving a Bahuvrihi. वन्त for वन्त: would have been correct. But the author seems to give instances of विनाहिः in all the inflections, even including the nominative (which is surely ungrammatical). This requires careful consideration.

3. In the chapter on वैष्णव (Voice), कर्मन- कर्मिक विन्यास is a puzzling and peculiar division. अन्य धर्म: सुलेख रधनानि: here, merely because the object, परं, is in the nominative case and the subject (कर्मिक, the doer of परं) is not intended to be expressed, how does the nature of the कर्मिक form disappear? This requires more light.

N. Dn. D.
THREE FURTHER PATTAVALIS OF THE DIGAMBARAS.

BY PROFESSOR A. F. RUDOLF HOERNIE.

SOME months ago (see ante, Vol. XX, page 341 ff.) I published two paṭṭavāllis of the Digambaras, which were kindly made over to me by Mr. Cecil Bendall for publication. I now publish three more paṭṭavāllis of the same Jain sect, which I owe to the kindness of Pandit Hari Dās Shāstrī, who has now been for several years in Jaipur as Director of Public Instruction in that Principality. The originals of these three paṭṭavāllis I have been obliged to return to their owners. My account of them is prepared from copies which I got made for me. For reasons of convenience I shall designate them by the letters C, D, E; while the two paṭṭavāllis published previously I shall refer to as A and B, and Peterson's paṭṭavali as P.

The main interest of these new paṭṭavāllis is that they seem clearly to show that there exist two distinct traditions as to the exact course of pontifical succession, differing not inconsiderably from one another. It is true that the paṭṭavali E is so slovenly written as to raise one's suspicions as to its trustworthiness. Thus, in the introduction (see below), among the Ten-Pûrvins, Prasthila is omitted; but that this is a mere clerical error is shown by the total number 3, at the end of the 3rd paragraph. Again in the Vraitsvali proper (see below) three names are omitted between Yasyabhrītī and Guṇanandin; viz., No. 9 Yasodnandin, No. 10 Dāvanandin, No. 11 Jayanandin. Here, too, the fact of its being a mere clerical error is shown by the remark1 after the entry of Śanikirtī (No. 21 of the MS., but really No. 26), that till then there had been 26 pontiffs, thus clearly counting the omitted numbers. But these and other similar marks of error are not sufficient to account for the remarkable difference of pontifical succession, disclosed in the introductory portion of E as compared with A and C.

The first point of difference is, that while both traditions agree in making the length of the introductory period to be 683 years (after Vīra), they entirely disagree as to the sub-divisions of that period and the number and identity of the persons composing them. There is no disagreement with respect to the two first sub-divisions; both give the same 3 Kēvalins for 62 years and the same 5 Śrutakēvalins for 100 years. But while A and E enumerate 11 Ten-Pûrvins for 183 years, E allows only 9 Ten-Pûrvins, also for 183 years. The names are the same, but E closes the Śrutakēvalins with the ninth on the list of A and C, Buddhilinga, whom it calls Bahubali; and it transfers the tenth and eleventh of the list of A and C, to the next sub-division of Eleven-Angins. In the latter sub-division A and C enumerate 5 members with a total of 123 years, while E has in it 6 members with a total of 220 years. The list of names also differs greatly. Further A and C have a sub-division of 4 Minor-Angins for 97 years, and another of 5 One-Angins for 118 years; but E allows no Minor-Angins at all, and has only one sub-division of 6 One-Angins for 118 years. The list of names again differs entirely: in fact, the Minor-Angins of A and C are identical with the One-Angins of E, with the addition of one new name, quite unknown to A and C. On the other hand, all the names of the One-Angins of A and C are unknown to E. The subjoined table will best exhibit these differences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tradition in A and C.</th>
<th>Tradition in E.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62 years, 3 Kēvalins</td>
<td>3 Kēvalins for 62 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Gōtama 2 Sudharman 3 Jambhū</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Vishnuṇandin 2 Nandimitra 3 Aparājīta 4 Gōvindhara 5 Bhudrabbhū</td>
<td>5 Śrutakēvalins, 100 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 years, 5 Śrutakēvalins.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 There is here another piece of slovenliness. The remark is misplaced; it should really come after No. 26 (or No. 22 of the MS.) Śanikirtī.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tradition in A and C</th>
<th>Tradition in E.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Vişākha</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Prōśhthila</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Kshatriya</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Jayasāna</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Nāgasāna</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Siddhārtha</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Dhrītisāna</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Vijayasāna</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Daddhiṣinga = Bahuḍhūli</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Deva = Gaṅgādēva</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

183 years, 11 Ten-Pūrvins

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tradition in E.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9 Daddhiṣinga = Bahuḍhūli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Deva = Gaṅgādēva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Dharmaśāna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Nakhaṭra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Jayāpāla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Paṇḍava</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Dhrūvasāna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Kaṃsa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

123 years, 5 Eleven-Angins

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tradition in E.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Subhadra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Yasōbhadra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Bhadrabāhu II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Lōhāchārya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Eleven-Angins, 220 years.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

97 years, 4 Minor-Angins

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tradition in E.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Arhadbalina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Māghanandini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Dharasāna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Pushpadanta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Bhūtavali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 One-Angins, 118 years.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

118 years, 5 One-Angins

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tradition in E.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Arhadbalina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Māghanandini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Dharasāna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Pushpadanta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Bhūtavali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 One-Angins, 118 years.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

683 years.

The new name is Vinayadhar, the last of the One-Angins according to E, which makes the initial period of 683 years to close with him. A and C know him not; on the other hand, E knows nothing of the five last names of the list of A and C.

But there is still another point of difference. Both traditions agree in making the paṭṭāvalī proper commence with a Bhadrabāhu. Who is this Bhadrabāhu? From the dates assigned to him by A and C it is quite clear that, for them, he is identical with Bhadrabāhu II, who is mentioned as one of the Minor-Angins (or as one of the One-Angins in E) in the introduction and as having ascended the pontifical chair in 492 (or 490) A. V. and 4 Saṁvat. In E, however, he is said to have ascended the chair exactly 100 years later, i.e., in 104 Saṁvat. Three distinct names, viz., Srī-Dattaśāna, Sivādatta and Aradatta, are interposed between him and Vinayadhar, the last of the One-Angins, and he is expressly enumerated as the 30th from Mahāvīra (counting the latter as the first of the series), while Bhadrabāhu, the One-Angin, is placed as the 25th. Undoubtedly their numbers are wrong; the MS. is very carelessly written: they should be the 27th and 33rd respectively; but anyhow they must occupy different places. It is clear, therefore, that in E there are three Bhadrabāhus, and that in it Bhadrabāhu III is the beginner of the paṭṭāvalī proper. I may here add, that the difference of 100 years is carried on in paṭṭāvalī E down to its No. 7, Yasaḥkīrtti. With its No. 8, Guṇananda, that difference has disappeared. But between its Nos. 7 and 8, three names are wanting, which (as I have already
pointed out) should really be in it, for they are counted later on among the 26 pontiffs, who resided in Mālā (see No. 25, or its own No. 21). Now it is a pity that these three names should be missing; for they would show how that difference of 100 years was recovered. One cannot help suspecting, that there must have been some design in the omission; the object may have been to evade the difficulty of making up the difference.

I believe the difference, in this particular point, between the two traditions may be accounted for. It will be noticed, that if the beginner of the paṭṭāvalī proper of the Śārasvatī Gachchha is, as A and C will have it, Bhadrabahu II., that Gachchha is only a branch of the main-line that began with Mahāvira. The main-line runs on for, at least, 6 further members, through Lōhāchārya, Abhivalli, Māghanandin, Daharasa, Pushpadanta to Bhūtavali, with whom it appears (according to the representation of A and C) to have become extinct. Now it is quite possible to identify Abhivalli with Arhabalin or Guptigupta of No. 2 of the paṭṭāvalī, and Māghanandin with Māghanandin of No. 3 of the paṭṭāvalī; and we may assume that Bhadrabahu II. was first succeeded by his disciple Lōhāchārya, and afterwards by his other disciple Abhivalli. Guptigupta (Arhabalin), who in his turn was succeeded by Māghanandin. But this supposition does not remove the difficulty; for Māghanandin, the One-Angin, was succeeded by Daharasa in the main-line; while Māghanandin, No. 3 of the paṭṭāvalī, was succeeded by Jina-chandra in the paṭṭāvalī. The difficulty still remains, that the Śārasvatī Gachchha, after all, is only a side-branch of the main-line, which became extinct with Bhūtavali. This difficulty, it seems to me, cannot help having been felt as derogatory to the dignity and claims of the Digambaras; and the object of the tradition, represented in E, appears to have been to meet the difficulty. By that tradition the main-line is carried on from Bhadrabahu II., through Lōhāchārya, Vinaṣyadharas, Sēḷatta, Sivadatta and Aradatta (the last four taking the place of the five One-Angins of A and C) to Bhadrabahu III., who then founded the Śārasvatī Gachchha. The latter is thus shown to be the direct continuation of the main-line.\footnote{I may here note, that Guptigupta, the successor of Bhadrabahu III. and No. 2 of the paṭṭāvalī, is not really omitted in E, for he is counted among the 26 pontiffs, who resided in Mālā. His omission, in his proper place, is only another of the many errors of the MS.}

And yet, in all probability, the tradition preserved in A and C is the genuine one, that the Śārasvatī Gachchha, as well as the three other Gachchhas of the Digambaras, are merely side-branches of the main-line. There is a curious short notice in paṭṭāvalī E, which quite undesignedly supports this view. After noticing Bhadrabahu, the founder of the Gachchha, E adds that “from him the Śvētāmbaras separated and initiated a paṭṭāvalī of their own.” This shows, at all events, that according to E, the Digambaras and Śvētāmbaras separated from the time of Bhadrabahu. Now, if it appeared that the Digambaras were not the main-line but a branch, the presumption would naturally be that it was they who were the schismatics or heretics. Hence the necessity to show that they were the main-line, and therefore that the Śvētāmbaras were a branch and schismatics. Hence the fiction of a Bhadrabahu III. But if the tradition of A and C is the genuine one, and the Śārasvatī Gachchha, i. e., the Digambaras, was founded by Bhadrabahu II., and if, as tradition E says, the Śvētāmbaras separated in his time, it follows that the Śvētāmbaras were the main-line, while the Digambaras were the branch or seceders. It follows further that that famous separation took place between 490 and 513 A. V. (or 61 and 38 B. C., adjusted, see ante, Vol. XX. p. 360), the period of Bhadrabahu’s pontificate.

And this leads on to another point. All paṭṭāvalis agree in representing Māghanandin as the actual founder of the Śārasvatī Gachchha, whence it is also called the Amnāya, or Line of Nand. At the same time they also all agree in making the paṭṭāvalī proper of the Gachchha to begin with Bhadrabahu, two steps before Māghanandin. This, it appears to me, can have but one meaning: before Bhadrabahu the Jain community was undivided; with him the Digambaras separated from the Śvētāmbaras, but remained united themselves; with Māghanandin the Digambaras themselves separated into four divisions, the most important
of which would seem to have been that named after Māghanandin. This view is distinctly borne out by the curious notice in E, that the Śvetāmbara sect separated from the time of Bhadrabāhu. It is also indirectly borne out by the notice of paṭṭāvall C (in §16, see below), that "the Sitapaṭa or white-robed Sangha arose from the Mālasanga." For whether the Mālasanga be taken to mean the undivided Jains or only the undivided Digambaras, in any case the notice refers the origin of the Śvetāmbara sect to a time prior to the Digambara division under Māghanandin.

Now, it is well-known that the Digambaras place the great separation of themselves and the Śvetāmbaras in Saṅ. 136 (or A. D. 79). This tradition of theirs is not borne out by their own paṭṭāvals, as represented in A, B, C, D. For they place Bhadrabāhu in Saṅ. 4 (or B. C. 53), and even Māghanandin is placed in Saṅ. 36 (or B. C. 21). Therefore one of two things: either the tradition about the separation in Saṅ. 136 is false, or the separation took place long after Māghanandin. In the latter case, the Śvetāmbaras separated not from the Mālasanga (or the undivided Digambaras), but only from one of its subdivisional Gachchhas. This latter case is negatived, as already pointed out, by the statements of the paṭṭāvals themselves. It follows that the paṭṭāvals, such as A, B, C, D, contradict the tradition of the great separation in Saṅ. 136. Now, it seems to me, that the object of paṭṭāvall E is to harmonise the two traditions: that the great separation took place under Bhadrabāhu, or at least under Māghanandin, and that it took place in Saṅ. 136. It was apparently thought that this could be done most easily by simply adding one hundred years to Māgharandin's usual traditional date. According to A, B, C, D he succeeded in Saṅ. 36; paṭṭāvall E turns the year into Saṅ. 136. It is a clumsy expedient; for, in the first place, it necessitated other changes and even interpolations to account for the additional century: hence the fiction of a Bhadrabāhu III. In the second place, it was only a half-measure; for it placed the great separation under Māghanandin, whereas the paṭṭāvals really required it to be placed under Bhadrabāhu II. But to have altered the latter's date from Saṅ. 4 to Saṅ. 136 would seem to have been considered too violent a measure.

We have undoubtedly here two contradictory traditions of the Digambaras disclosed to us; that of their paṭṭāvals places the great separation considerably earlier than Saṅ. 136, in the time of Bhadrabāhu. The question is who this Bhadrabāhu was. The Śvetāmbaras paṭṭāvals know only one Bhadrabāhu, who, from the dates assigned to him by the Śvetāmbaras and Digambaras alike, must be identical with the Bhadrabāhu I. of the Digambaras. Considering the varying and contradictory character of the Digambara traditions, the probability is that the inception of the great separation took place under Bhadrabāhu I, who died 162 A. V. according to the Digambaras, or 170 A. V. according to the Śvetāmbaras. The final and definite schism may then have occurred later in Saṅ. 136 or, according to the Śvetāmbaras, Saṅ. 139.

Further, there is another divergence of tradition disclosed in the five paṭṭāvals, now published. This refers not to the succession so much as to the residences or migrations of the pontiffs, and, therefore, of the Digambara sect. On this point, the paṭṭāvals A, B, D altogether agree; paṭṭāvall E also agrees in the main; but paṭṭāvall C presents a considerably different tradition. This may be seen at a glance from the subjoined table. One point of general agreement comes out clearly and is noteworthy, namely, the general direction of the Digambara migration. It was from the South to the North, from Bhadalpur to Dilli and Jaipur. This agrees with the opinion that the Digambara separation originally took place as a result of the migration southwards under Bhadrabāhu in consequence of a severe famine in Bihār, the original home of the undivided Jaina community.

---

The Śvetāmbaras place it three years later, in 82 A. D. See my edition of the Uḍḍāgadāsā (Bibliotheca Indica), Vol. II. p. IX.

Or with the adjustment of 8 years (see ante, Vol. XX. p. 366), 61 B. C. and 44 B. C. respectively.

to identify Bhaddalpur. It is variously spelt. E spells it with the cerebral ā (भालपुर), but the others with the dental d, either single (मलपुर) or double (मलपुर). C places it in Southern India (Dakhina), but the others in Central India (Mālava).

Table of Pontifical Residences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Pañṭāvalla A, B, D</th>
<th>Pañṭāvalla E</th>
<th>Pañṭāvalla C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Bhaddalpur (in Mālava) 26 pont., Nos. 1-26</td>
<td>Bhādālpur (in Mālava) 26 pont., No. 1-26</td>
<td>Bhaddalpur (in Dakhina) 26 pont.; No. 1-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Ujjain 25 pont., Nos. 27-51</td>
<td>II and III, Vārā (Vaḍādā) 37 pont., Nos. 27-63</td>
<td>(Ujjain) 18 p., Nos. 27-44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chandērī 4 p., Nos. 43-48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bhāl 3 p., Nos. 49-51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kunḍalpur 1 pont., Nos. 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Vārā (or Vārō) 12 pont., Nos. 52-53</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vārā. 12 pont., Nos. 53-64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Gvālēr 14 pont., Nos. 64-77</td>
<td>Gvālēr 15 pont., Nos. 64-78</td>
<td>IVa Chīṭūr 10 pont., Nos. 65-74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IVb Vāghēr 4 pont., Nos. 75-78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Ajmēr 6 pont., Nos. 78-83</td>
<td>Ajmēr 5 pont., Nos. 79-83</td>
<td>Ajmēr6 5 pont., Nos. 79-83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Dill 3 pont., Nos. 84-86</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vāgvar (in Gujarāṭ) 3 pont., Nos. 84-86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>Chīṭūr, No. 87</td>
<td>Chīṭūr, No. 89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>(D) Smērskir (?) No. 90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX</td>
<td>(D) Chāṭasū, No. 91</td>
<td>Sāgānēr No. 91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>a (D) Sāginēr, No. 92 b (D) Avēr 3 pont., Nos. 93-95</td>
<td>Avairi 4 pont., Nos. 92-95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI</td>
<td>(D) Dill, No. 96</td>
<td>Dill, No. 96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII</td>
<td>(D) Jaipur 4 pont., Nos. 97-100</td>
<td>Jaipur 4 pont., Nos. 97-100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* MS. C reads 6 pont., but gives only 5 names.
There is still a third point of interest in the three new paṭṭāvalis, now published. They show that the Digambara tradition of the pontifical succession exists in two different recensions. The two recensions differ, in the main, in a certain number of names and dates. From this point of view the whole of the paṭṭāvalis, hitherto published, distribute themselves thus: A, B, D represent one recension (I) and C, E, P represent the other (II). The following two tables exhibit the differences:

**1. Table of Differences in Names.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial Number</th>
<th>I. Recension A, B, D.</th>
<th>II. Recension C, E, P.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Pūjyapāda</td>
<td>Jayanandin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Harinandin</td>
<td>Siśhahanandin (E, P).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Ratnakirtti</td>
<td>Nayanandin (C).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Māṇikanandin (also E)</td>
<td>Ratnakirtti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Srīchandra (also C)</td>
<td>Māṇikanandin (C, P).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Nandikirtti</td>
<td>Srīchandra (E, P).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Vīrachandra</td>
<td>Srīnandin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Guṇaṇandin</td>
<td>Vidyārāndin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Vṛṣabhanandin</td>
<td>Guṇakirtti.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Sīvanandin</td>
<td>Brahmanandin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Vasuchandra</td>
<td>Dēvanandin (C, E).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Sīhanandin (B, D.),</td>
<td>Vīṣvachandra (C, P).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Saṅghananandin (A)</td>
<td>Siyachandra (? E).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Jñānakirtti</td>
<td>Harinandin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Sundarakirtti</td>
<td>Jñānanandin (C, P).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Nēmichandra</td>
<td>Gunāyananandin (? E).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Varadhañchandra</td>
<td>Chārunandin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Sāntikirtti</td>
<td>Nēminandin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Viśālakirtti.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the full particulars of the dates are given only in the paṭṭāvalis A, D, and E, the second table will stand thus:

**2. Table of Differences in Dates.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial Number</th>
<th>I. Recension A, D.</th>
<th>II. Recension C.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>pontificate 51-10-10, total 95-10-15</td>
<td>pontificate 41-10-10, total 85-10-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>6-2.22</td>
<td>6-7.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32-1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>pontificate 44-3-16</td>
<td>pontificate 44-3-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>monkhodd 12-0-0</td>
<td>monkhodd 22-0-0.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>intercalary 15</td>
<td>intercalary 31.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>householder 8-0-0</td>
<td>householder 9-0-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>intercalary 8</td>
<td>intercalary 9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>pontificate 16-6-0</td>
<td>pontificate 16-0-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serial Number</td>
<td>I. Recension A, D.</td>
<td>II. Recension C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>householder 11-0-0, Total 50-4-14</td>
<td>householder 21-0-0, Total 60-4-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>monkhood 25-0-0,</td>
<td>monkhood 15-0-0,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>pontificat 3-4-1, 47-4-5</td>
<td>pontificat 2-4-1, 46-4-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>householder 39-0-0, etc., 55-7-1</td>
<td>householder 7-0-0, etc., 23-6-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>monkhood 40-0-0, 51-8-1</td>
<td>monkhood 24-0-0, 35-8-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>pontificat 5-5-5, etc., 57-5-9</td>
<td>pontificat 5-4-23, etc., 49-5-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>householder 10-0-0, 53-2-1</td>
<td>householder 14-0-0, 57-2-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>pontificat 4-116, etc., 50-6-21</td>
<td>pontificat 4-1-0, etc., 34-8-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>monkhood 37-0-0, 47-3-1</td>
<td>monkhood 27-0-0, 37-3-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>intercalary 9, 35-9-8</td>
<td>intercalary 7, 35-9-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>monkhood 25-0-0, 38-4-1</td>
<td>monkhood 22-0-0, 35-4-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>pontificat 2-1128, 25-0-1</td>
<td>pontificat 2-1128, 25-11-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>intercalary 6, 45-6-21</td>
<td>intercalary 5, 45-6-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>householder 13-0-0, 47-3-9</td>
<td>householder 12-0-0, 46-3-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>monkhood 20-0-0, 33-5-0</td>
<td>monkhood 2-0-0, 15-5-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>pontificat 2-13-19, 28-3-23</td>
<td>pontificat 2-3-16, 28-3-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>monkhood 24-0-0, 96-3-15</td>
<td>monkhood 14-0-0, 86-3-15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To the above tables I may add that both P and E insert an additional name between Nos. 47 and 48; viz., Vâsâvâcandra (E) or Vâsâvâcandu (P). In this point C agrees with the other recension (of A, B, D), which omits that name. Further E omits No. 79 Prakshântikirtti (or as B, D have it Prakshântakirtti), so that its total number of pontiffs is the same as that in the other lists. This pontiff is also omitted in P, for the "prakhyaţâkirtti" of the latter is not a name, but a title of No. 78, Vâsanatâkirtti. In this point, too, C agrees with A, B, D. Though I suspect that E, P are correct, as against A, B, C, D, I am unable to account for the divergence. There is a similar discrepancy between the paţâvâlî C and all others (see below) with respect to the successor of No. 85, Subhâcandra.

One further point I may note. Paţâvâlî A is the only one which gives what I have called the Nâgâr section. All others, B, D, E, F, give the Chitôr section. The two sections separated after No. 87. Paţâvâlî C only goes down to No. 85 (or rather No. 85), and stops short just before the schism. From the remark in paţâvâlî D (see below), referring to this schism, it would seem that the two sections took up their residences in Gâwâlîr and Nâgôr respectively. But paţâvâlî E mentions No. 89, Lâlitâkirtti, as still resident in Chitôr, and with this the passage on the schism in paţâvâlî A agrees. See the passages which are quoted below. This matter of the schism still requires further clearing up.

I now proceed to describe the three paţâvâlëis separately.

**Paţâvâlî C.**

This paţâvâlî is drawn up on the plan of paţâvâlî A, i.e. it begins with an introduction detailing the antecedent history of the Gâchchhâ, after which it gives the list of pontiffs, with all the dates of each life in addition to the year of accession. A peculiar feature are the concluding remarks after the introduction (see below §§ 16-19) as well as after the paţâvâlî proper (§§ 22-26), which give some curious information regarding the three other orthodox Saṅghas, viz., the Dēva, Simhâ and Śâna, as well as regarding some (apparently five) heretical or

---

*In his Jainaṃśa Vîkṣha, or Genealogical Table of the Jains, Muni Âtmâkâmbal makes the following remark: *In Sam. 1572 Rûpa Chandâ Sûrâk, of his own accord, put on the monk's garb and originated the Nâgôr Lepkâra sect.* This appears to refer to the above-mentioned schism, though the name of the founder differs.

---
schismatic Sanghas, viz., the Sītāpāṭha or Svetāmbara, the Kāśyapa, the Drāvida, the Yāpulya or Yāpani, and the Kākṣipīchchha or Nilīpīchchha. Paragraphs 15 and 17 appear to me a little confused; it is not clear whether the same or different sects are spoken of; the names are so similar, that the former seems the more probable view.

Another peculiarity of paṭāvall C are the numerous extracts it quotes in support of its statements. Some of them are identical with those quoted also in paṭāvall A, and these, it now appears, are quoted from the Vikrama Prabandha, a work which I see is mentioned in the Deccan College collection, No. 172. The other extracts are taken from the Nītisāra, a work ascribed to Indranandin, a copy of which (No. 371) also exists in the Deccan College collection (see its Catalogue, p. 145). To judge from the name of its author, he should be a member of the Sarasvati Gachchha, to which the surname Nandin is peculiar; but it does not occur, at least, among the names of the pontiffs.

In the Gāthās, giving the dates of Vikrama's life (see below § 15), there again occurs the puzzling word rasapāṇa. In my previous paper (see ante, Vol. XX. p. 360) I have suggested that it should be read paṇaraṇa, 'fifteen.' From the context on the gāthā in paṭāvall C, however, it is clear that the reading rasapāṇa is, at least, so far genuine that it already existed for the writer of the paṭāvall. For he interprets it as meaning "fifty-six." He, evidently, must have taken it as a compound of the two nouns rasa and pāṇa. The former, rama, is the well-known symbolical expression for 6, while the latter would seem to be a name for 5, though I am not aware of the fact. According to the usual rule of interpreting such symbolic names inversely, the word rasapāṇa would mean 56. It is also to be noted that in paṭāvall C the line, in which rasapāṇa occurs, reads vaiṣṇava kuṇaṇti "he performed sacrifices" of paṭāvall A. If the periods are taken to be consecutive — as one would naturally do — , the verses, as interpreted in paṭāvall C, would give king Vikrama a life of 118 years (i.e., 6 + 16 + 56 + 40)! But possibly 56 years are understood to be the total period of his reign, during the latter portion of which, comprising 40 years, Vikrama was a Jain. If so, there would be a curious coincidence in the fact, that the suggested reading paṇaraṇa, 'fifteen' would give him a reign of 55 years (i.e., 15 + 40). The line in question would then have to be translated: "for 56 years he carried on his rule being at first attached to heretical doctrines." Here, however, the most significant words "at first" would have to be supplied, not being expressed in any way by the verse itself.

I may also note, that instead of the terms viraha or anusya, paṭāvall C occasionally uses the synonymous term antarād; see, e.g., No. 62.

The list of pontiffs in this paṭāvall closes with Subhachandra, who reigned up to Sañ. 150, or A.D. 1440, some time before the separation into the Chitōr and Nāgōr lines took place. In the concluding remarks of the paṭāvall (see § 23) it is stated that Subhachandra was followed by Sakalakirtti, and from the form of the remark it would seem that he must have been the reigning pontiff, at the time the paṭāvall was written. This would give it a date somewhere about 1450 A.D., and would make it the oldest at present known; the next oldest being the paṭāvall P, the date of which must be about 1650 A.D., as it comes down to the pontiff Narendrakirtti (of the Chitōr line, see ante, Vol. XX. p. 335). There is a difficulty, however, in the names. Instead of Sakalakirtti, all the other paṭāvallis (A, B, D, E) give either Jhacandra or Prabhachandra as the successor of Subhachandra. Moreover paṭāvall C gives Vāgvar in Gujarā as the residence of Sakalakirtti as well as of Padmanandin and Subhachandra, while the other paṭāvallis (A, B, D, E) give Dillī as the residence of the two last mentioned pontiffs, as well as of Subhachandra's successor (see the list above). I am unable to clear up this difficulty; but it may be noted that there are in paṭāvall C itself indications that a pontiff may have borne two quite distinct names. In the same § 23, there is mentioned a pontiff Narān-
drakīrtti, who, from the connection in which his name appears, must have been the immediate successor of Jáñakaṛtta, Māhachandra and Sūrachandra (i.e., Nos. 60, 61, 62). Accordingly he must be No. 68, who in the nominal list of C, no less than in all others, is known as Gāngakīrtti. Similarly, we have in § 23 a Kānakačakrī and a Prṣṭhyakīrtti, who would clearly seem to be identical with Nos. 65 Hēṅakīrtti and No. 79 Prakṣhantākīrtti. There is, however, another difficulty in the account given in § 23, which I am unable to solve. That account of the pontifical succession does not agree with the paṭṭāvālī which precedes it. The four pontiffs Sūrachandra, Māhachandra, Jáñakaṛtta, and Nārēṇdrakīrtti are made to follow Vasanakīrtti, whereas in the paṭṭāvālī they preceded him by a long interval. Again in § 23 Vasantakīrtti is made to be the 9th after Kānakačakrī, whereas in the paṭṭāvālī (if Kanaka is the same as Hēṃa, No. 65) he is the 18th after him. The table of residences, however, should be compared.

The introductory and concluding portions I again give in extenso, but the paṭṭāvālī proper, as before, in abstract tabular form. The bracketed remarks in the last column of the tables are again my own.

TEXT.

Introduction of Pattāvālī C.

(1) प्रभु द्वारा लपन में सितारों के साथ आए। प्रभु द्वारा लपन में सितारों के साथ आए।

(2) भ्रमण के साथ कृत्रिम शमन को गद्य के साथ आए। प्रभु द्वारा लपन में सितारों के साथ आए।

(3) वहाँ तात्कालिक रूप से वह स्मृति के रूप में आए। प्रभु द्वारा लपन में सितारों के साथ आए।

(4) वहाँ तात्कालिक रूप से वह स्मृति के रूप में आए। प्रभु द्वारा लपन में सितारों के साथ आए।

(5) वहाँ तात्कालिक रूप से वह स्मृति के रूप में आए। प्रभु द्वारा लपन में सितारों के साथ आए।

(6) वहाँ तात्कालिक रूप से वह स्मृति के रूप में आए। प्रभु द्वारा लपन में सितारों के साथ आए।

(7) प्रभु द्वारा लपन में सितारों के साथ आए। प्रभु द्वारा लपन में सितारों के साथ आए।
वहर ता के पीछे एक अजूि के पारी पाँच द्विव आतं दोहो है । ता का वर्णमान काल पचास वर्ष का है । वहाँ वस्त्राण इंकार का वर्प सातारा से १६ कता है। यह व्यक्ति इहाँ आचार्य अनुसरण है। एक एक अजूि के पारी पाँच द्विव आतं है। ।

(७) वहर ता के पीछे एक अजूि के पारी पाँच द्विव आतं दोहो होते मात्र ता का विवर्तार। अल्पमा्ती मा्त्र वर्ण द्विव है। वहाँ वस्त्राण इंकार का वर्प सातारा से १६ कता है। यह व्यक्ति इहाँ आचार्य अनुसरण है। एक एक अजूि के पारी पाँच द्विव आतं है। ।

(८) वहर ता के पीछे अल्पमा्ती द्विव होते मात्र अजूि के पारी नीली नहीं। ऐसे आचार्य से का परिपार्शा है।
पञ्च, संयम पञ्च, अन्तर्दाहिणसमय जाँचि ।
उपरण खण्ड जगन्त इमजुदारी सुमदयवा इ।
अहवियांगार व धरसेव व मुक्यवर मुहब्बतः।
अहवियांग आदयांग उपरणं तीस भीत गुण सारा।
पञ्चयय अयार धे पञ्च इमजुदारी सुमदयार आशां इ।
छ सय निरंसि व सय सिर निर्दयाण अहुयविषि कषाक्षि जिधि इ।

यह पूर्णक मकार भीमसेनी स्वामी ते संत कारि जितपति जिघे" अनुक्रम हेतु आचायरि की परंपरात है।

(10) वहरि भीमसेन स्वामी मुनि विद्रोही खुद चढ़ा ते संसर ४५० वर्ष गये" पिछे भीमसेनक वाजन राजा का जन्म भया। वहरि पूर्णक सुधारायाम ते। विकार राजा को जन्म है। वहरि विकार के राजावेन हरे वर्ष पश्चात। ५ पिछे गौरव सुधारायाम उपरणं कृि आचार्य का यह अथवा इ। वहरि भद्रायाम का सिहि युगक नाम। ता के नाम नीचे। गृहिुन् ३ विपश्यारण ३। वहरि या के संवार तिथि। नलि हरे नाम जाति के इच्छा के अयारोग्य के विषय यागीया का यह योग धार्या ऐसा मानयति अयारोग्य जीते। नन्दिकृष्ट निपातित कीया। १। वहरि िा ने। तुलना विघे। यह योग स्थानिक कीया, तो निर्धेक नाम नंदिकृष्ट स्थापन करता। २। िाड़ी हरि सिहि की पुरातन विघे योग धार्या, जा ते। सिहिुक स्थापना। ३। िाड़ी िा ने। संवारिा नाम वेदायि के युग के विघे। यह विघे योग धार्या, तो हरि रुप है। ऐसे किसी ने। तर्कमो गात विघे। आचार्यदेश के व्याय जाने।

(11) वहरि पूर्णक नविकल्मक के विघे। नविकल्मक १। पारितराम गृह २, राजाराजेश्वर। २, क्षीरांस्य ५। एते हरि अयारोग्य नाम। तथा इन्दुरक्ष १। दलालराज १। वस्त्रवाहक ३, वायुरक्ष २। वहरि पूर्णक नविकल्मक २, क्षीरांस्य २, इति। वहरि के नाम स्थापना। २।

(12) तुलना भीमसेनी स्वामी ते कु तीतिकर्षिए। श्रीमति।
आहोली सुहृतिक नरसेन परं २।
स्वाधीन विनयक: ऐनघरके महामन।
नरसेन इति स्पष्ट: स्थानिकतिकन्वित। २।

(13) वहरि भीमसेनी स्वामी पिछे ५२९ ख्यात ते व्यायिे यह हमेर गये सुधारायाम का वर्णन ने १२५ गोंडश, दो विकार जन्म है। संयम में वायुदायि द्वा। वहरि ता का राजत्ते वर्ष ५ व्याय जुड़कर नंदिकृष्ट है। जानी।

(14) वहरि भीमसेनी ते। व्याय ते संसर ४५० वर्ष पिछे विकार राजा भया। ता के पिछे भाग वर्ष पच्चीस बालाकोण करती। ता के पिछे दूसरे पच्चीस वर्ष संयम करते। ता के पिछे भाग ५५ वर्ष तारे राज कीया नानाकार अयारोग्य के उपरेक का संयुक्त रहते। वहरि ता के पिछे चाहीरे वर्ष संयम भाग के छाड़ि जिनार अगे रहे। ऐसे किसी राजा की वर्तमान आत्मों है।

(15) तुलना विनयमनम: गाथा।
सरापि भवुरकथा की पीछे कार्य को तन्त्र समाप्त।
अर वस्त्र वायुरक्षा संज्ञा िे संस्कार किथे है। १।
सरापि वायुरक्षा रवी जीतित मित्रसेनसंसूची।
चाहीरे वायुरक्षा भवुरकथा पने हरे विघे लख्य। २।

(16) ऐसे भीमसेनलक्ष्मी के विघे गान-गृह-गद्दि-उपरि नामा मकार की भाख है। ऐसे नीतिविद्यार्क २"।
धूप भीमसेनलक्ष्मी ऐसे की विघि गान-गृह-गद्दि।
तपाराकालिका: गुरुवार ते वायु गद्दि एक।
सरापि भीमसेनलक्ष्मी नीतिविद्यार्क रवी व लक्ष्मी एक।
स्वामी भीमसेनलक्ष्मी ऐसे की विघि गान-गृह-गद्दि। २।

18. MS. मुलबार। 19. MS. भवाकारण। 20. Here the date is wanting in the MS.
(17) बहुरि इस्तायातिक माथि पीठrokes केसके कााल पीठrokes स्नातकर भावा। बहुरि वापसीम गच्छ, केकिलिक्ष्म, स्नेतवार, निपिएस, आठिक, यह नॅग जानलाम काला है। दान का तास सिद्धांत ही है। दो है। मै। अवेना। अवगुणहु जानक के करियो तीज्ञातन का कयो निति चाराधूमिक काला है। धुःस्मृतिन्द्र का माय ्यू व्यधिकारिक काला।

(18) इसके कोई पूर्ण। दुर्यानकः चक्कनाकित्यानुसार, निर्मलकः बहुरि स्नेतवार क्षमाक वर्दि विशेषकः आठिक कन्या, तो दोजन आदि हुः ते हुः ते हैं। दो की मात्र केही हैं। ये मै। परधा बहुनवार्ती मानता है, जा हाम एक माय ्है। जा का उच्च अवन्नानक चाक का माय ्है, तां पर के सुधारण भावा है। तां के बिच कोई भी नहीं है। भोर प्राणीक्षर कबते के विवे। तियार हैस्क, ये मै। बहुरि स्नेतवार के नेक, आकाशम गिते, तो धा। ते है। दो प्रस्थत त्येक रहे हैं, तियार है। बहुरि सिंह संसार के नाकित विस्फोट चार्वी है। जा ते है वह बहुरि ता। सब तये के बिच, प्राणीक्षर के नेक, बहुरि प्राणीक्षर कर्म का नेक, बहुरि आचार का नेक, बहुरि व्यधिकारिक करार, कोई भी परधा जुड़ा ने। नीह, सर्व एक ही है। या के। या के। जे शकायक राष्ट्र है। न सम्बन्धकार्य हे रहित है। नियमणी है, तीर्थसंसार है॥ बहुरि पृच्छण चारता साधन सिद्धित ज्ञान मै। दो है। अन्य है। या के। अव्यधिकारिक है॥ नावार्थ नुः तालाक करियो प्रशिक्षण जो जनविभूमी सी धूरानी है। या के। अन्य करियो स्तानन्दिकारिक करियो प्रशिक्षण है। या के। अधिकारिक है॥

(19) नृतुरुप समाधिकर॥ भक्त्॥

गणमण्डलहृदभे जानेरते परीस्करवाहा। न तव मेन: कोरबालक प्रक्षेपाधुत कर्मस्य ॥ १ ॥ ।

(20) इसके पूर्ण यद्यक भद्राय भावा है। तां के। पूर्ण हो और आचार्य अनुमति ते। भए है। सी किशित मात्र म्हद्वाखन है। जे के। कर का पर्ण अनुमति ते। सिखिया है। बिक्रम रजसा हूः राज्यपति के सिन है। संबंध अनुभव ४ के वैत्तल चौह चारू सबी नव आधुनिक आराम्य भावा है। तां का जाति आधुनिक। गुलफस वर्ष २५ नवीय। नव सब ३० नव। प्रस्तुत २२ वार्षिक के उपरि मात्र १० तब कि। दूर २५ सनाई हीराबीम सिद्धिन ३। सिन का सर्वांगवर्ण छिद्धीर ६। पुनर्जीवन १२ ग्रहण॥

(21) बहुरि तां के। पूर्ण संवर्क्षन छातक २१ का कार्यमय युग १४ चालुवर्य है। कितने मूर्म सुनाम आचार्य जाति परिवार भावा। तां का गुरुहु वर्ष २२ वार्षिक का है। वहुरि वीराध्वं १९ नवीय। प्रस्तुतवर्ण ९ नव। मात्र ६ छह, विन २५ पदोस्त्रों। विन ५ ची। या की सर्वांगवर्ण पैयो दूर २२ मात्र ३ सात ६५५ का जाननी॥

**33 MS. स्नेतवार:**

**34 The reading of the text is not quite reliable here.**
TRANSLATION.

Oho! Salutation to the Perfect ones! In the fifth period, after the death of the Lord Mahāvira, its decadence took place on account of the badness of the times. Of the several pontiffs who came after him, I am going to give a brief account in their proper order.

§ (2) After the death of the last Tirthankar, the Lord Mahāvira, for 62 years, there abode Kāvala-jāmins. These I now name. After the Lord Vardhamāṇa had died, the Gagadha Gautama attained the knowledge of Kāvalin. He abode for 12 years. After him the Lord Sudharman attained a Kāvalin’s knowledge. He, too, abode as a Kāvalin for 12 years. After him the Lord Jambū attained the knowledge of a Kāvalin. He abode for 38 years. Thus, for 62 years there lived three Kāvalins in the fifth period.

§ (3) After this, there came in succession five Shrutasūkālins, men versed in sacred lore, who possessed a knowledge of the eleven Aṅgas and the fourteen Pūrvas. Among them first was Vīśākumāra (who abode) for 14 years; after him (came) Nandimitra for 16 years; next Aparājita for 22 years; next Gāvardhana for 19 years; next Bhadrabāhu I. for 29 years. Thus their total period extended to 100 years. Up to this point of time 162 years must be understood to have passed since the death of the Lord Mahāvira.
(4) After this, there came eleven Munis who possessed a knowledge of eleven Añgas and ten Pûrvas. Their total period extended to 183 years. Among them the Áchárya Viśāka (abode) for 10 years, Práśñihíla for 15, Nakáhatra for 17, Nágasëna for 18, Jayasëna for 21, Súdháhartha for 17, Dhiñtisëna for 18, Vijaña for 18, Buddháliuka for 20, Déva for 14, Dharmáhíka for 16. Thus the total period of these men extended to one hundred and eighty-three years. Up to this point of time 345 years must be understood to have passed from the death of Mahávira.

(5) After this there came five Munis, who (only) possessed a knowledge of the eleven Añgas. Among them the Áchárya Nakšhatra arose 345 years after Mahávira, and abode for 18 years. Next, 363 years after Mahávira the Áchárya, named Jayasëa, arose. His period comprised 20 years. After him, and 383 years after Mahávira, the Áchárya Pándya arose, and his period took up 30 years. After him, and 422 years after Mahávira, the Áchárya Dhrúvasëna arose. His period was 14 years. After him, and 436 years after Mahávira, the Áchárya Kañña arose. His period was 32 years. Thus the total period of these five Ácháryas extended to 123 years. All these only possessed a knowledge of the eleven Añgas.

(6) Again 408 years after the Lord Mahávira there arose the Áchárya Subhádra. His period was 6 years. After him, and 474 years after the Lord Mahávira, there arose the Áchárya Yásóshāda. His period was 18 years. After him, and 492 years after the death of Vyránutha, a second Áchárya named Bhadrálábha (II.) arose. His period was 23 years. After him, and 525 years after Vrásrvämin, came the Áchárya Lóla. His period was 30 years. Thus, the period of all these four Ácháryas was 97 years. Each of these four Ácháryas knew one Añga less than his predecessor; their knowledge extended as far as the tenth, ninth, eighth and seventh Añgas respectively.

(7) After this there came five Munis, who possessed a knowledge of one Añga (only). They are the following: 555 years after the death of the Lord Vardhamâna there arose the Áchárya Arhadbalin. His period was 25 years. After him, and 573 years after Vrás, the chief of the Jinas, there arose the Áchárya Maghañamid. His period was 21 years. After him, and 614 years after Sannatí Nátha, there arose the Áchárya Dharâsâga. His period was 19 years. After him, and 633 years after the blessed Vrás, there came the Áchárya Puspsadanta. His period was 30 years. After him, and 683 years after Mahávira, there came the Áchárya Bhútavali. His period was 20 years. Thus they followed one another; and the traditional knowledge of the Añgas and Pûrvas went on till the year 683 after the death of the Lord Mahávira, but it gradually decreased. The total period of the above named five Ácháryas, Arajákalin and the others, extended to 118 years. Up to this point of time there lived Munis, who possessed the knowledge of (at least) one Añga.

(8) After this there were only Munis, who were Sratajâmines, (i.e., who knew of the sacred lore only by hearsay). Of such as were actually able to recite an Añga, there was none. The above is the traditional enumeration of the Ácháryas.

(9) On this subject there are the following Gáthás:

(See the translation, ante, Vol. XX. p. 347f. The gáthás are the same as those cited in patávalli A, except that the three verses describing the Third period of the Ten-Pûrvas are omitted in patávalli C, apparently by a mere oversight of the scribe.)

Thus it is written in the (work called) Vikrama Prabhändha. This gives the traditional enumeration of the Ácháryas of the Jain religion, as they followed in regular order after the Lord Mahávira.

(10) Now in the year 470 after the death of the Lord Vrás the birth of King Vikrama took place. Now it took place (2 years)²⁹ after the above-named Subhádra Áchárya's (accession to the pontificate). Again the accession to the pontificate of the above-named Áchárya

²⁹ The bracketed clause is wanting in the original text, probably by a mere oversight of the scribe.
Bhadrabahu II. took place 4 years after Vikrama’s accession to the throne. Further Bhadrabahu II. had a disciple named Gupti. The latter had three names, viz., 1, Guptagupti, 2, Arhala-ballin, 3, Visakhacharya. Further he had four disciples, viz., 1, one who used to keep his four-monthly rainy season’s retreat in the (hollows) lower part of a tree of the Nandi species; this was the Acharya Maghamadhin, who founded the Nandi Saigha; 2, one who originated the practice of keeping the rainy season’s retreat under bushes; 3, he was called Jina Glassa, and founded the Sena Saigha; 4, one who used to keep his rainy season’s retreat in the hole of a lion, hence he founded the Simha Saigha; 4, one who used to keep his rainy season’s retreat in the house of a courtesan named Devadatta; (he founded) the Deva Saigha. Thus, there arose four Saighhas of Acharya in the Jain religion during the fifth period.

(11) Further in the before-mentioned Nandi Saighha there were the following names in use (for the Saighha): 1, Nandi Saighha, 2, Parijata Gachchha, 3, Balatkara Gaga; and the following four names for the Munis, viz., 1, Nandin, 2, Chandra, 3, Kirtti, 4, Bhushana. Also the following four names (for the Saighha) were in use: 1, Sri Mulga Saighha, 2, Nandi Amnya, 3, Sarsavati Gachchha, 4, Balatkara Gaga; and the four already-mentioned names for Munis: 1, Nandin, 2, Chandra, 3, Kirtti, 4, Bhushana.

(12) On this subject the following skolos occur in the Nitisara, a work of Indranandin:

The Guru Arhadalin effected the excellent combinations into Saighhas: the Simha Saighha, the Nandi Saighha, the famous Sena Saighha, and the Deva Saighha, which are all known: to be distinguished by the places of establishment.

(13) Further the year 402 after the Lord Mahavira, which was the 24th year of Subhadra’s pontificate, was also the 22nd year after the birth of Vikrama. Again in the fourth year of the latter’s reign Bhadrabahu succeeded to the pontificate.

(14) Now 470 years after Mahavira King Vikrama was born. Afterwards he passed 8 years in child’s play; next he spent 16 years in wandering over different countries; next he passed 56 years in ruling (his own country), being (at the same time) devoted to various sorts of heresy: finally having abandoned his earlier heresies and fostered the Jain religion for forty years, he obtained admission among the gods. Thus was the birth, etc., of King Vikrama.

(15) On this subject there are the following Gahas in the Vikrama Prabandha:

“IT was the year 470 when the birth of Vikrama took place. For eight years he played as a child; for sixteen he roamed over the country; for fifty-six he exercised rule, being given over to false doctrine; for forty years he was devoted to the religion of the Jina and then obtained heaven.”

(16) Thus there arose in the Mulga Saighha Ganas, Gachchhas, Saighhas, and such like (distinctions). On this subject there is the following verse in the Nitisara:

“First there arose from the Mulga Saighha the Sitapata (or white-robed) Saighha, and then the Kshtha Saighha. Then there arose the so-called Dravida (Saighha), and then again a certain Yapuli Saighha. In that Mulga Saighha, adorned by many Munis, there was the Sena and the Nandi Saighha; also the Saighha of wide reputation, which was called after Simha; and as the fourth there was the Deva Saighha.”

Thus then in the original Mulga Saighha there arose first another Sveta Pati, or “white-robed,” Gachchha, after that there came the Kshtha Saighha, after that the Dravida Gachchha, and finally the Yapuliya Gachchha.

(17) Further, some time after the above-mentioned Gachchhas the Svetaambaras came into existence; also the Yapaniya Gachchha, the Kekipichcha, the Svetaavasa, the Nibpichcha, and the Dravida. These five Saighhas are called false Jains. They adopt marks in imitation

---

20 Or rather, Guptagupta.
21 Text: trima-tala vishat, lit. “at the foot of grasses.”
22 Referring to the places probably, where the several retreats used to be kept in the rainy seasons.
of the Jains; but they, drawing on their own imagination, hold tenets in variance with the Siddhântas (or Holy Scriptures), and follow practices contrary to those of the Jînendrâ (or founder of Jainism). On this subject, there are the following ślokas in the Nitisâra:

"Then after the lapse of some time there arose the Śvetāmbara, the Drâvîḍa, and the Yâpanâya (Saṅgha), as well as the Kâkî Saṅgha through arrogance. The Kâkîpîchchha, the Śvetâvâsa, the Drâvîḍa, the Yâpulijâka, and the Nitiţopchchha; these five are well-known as being false Jaina sects. Having in reliance on their imagination elaborated practices in variance with the Siddhântas, they have caused divisions in the religion of the Jînendrâ."

Thus it should be understood

(18) Here the question may be asked: "It has been mentioned that there are (Āchâryas called) Nandin, Chandra, Kirtti and Bhûshâna, and that there are the four Saṅghas called Nandi, Sûna: Dêva and Sinha, now do the Āchâryas of these Saṅghas differ among themselves? In what estimation should they be held? Are they to be considered as differing among themselves, or are they to be considered as one?" To this the following answer (is to be given) — "The Gaṇas, Gachchhas, etc., which, as above mentioned, have arisen, have been the channels of eternal happiness. Among them there exists no sort of difference; and in their mendicant and other practices they are alike. And as to the above-mentioned four Saṅghas into which the Mûla Saṅgha is divided, if any one makes a difference between the Āchâryas, he is devoid of truth and is a heretic; moreover such people have for a long time been leading a worldly life. Therefore in these four Saṅghas there is no difference of images, nor any difference in penitential and other practices, nor any difference of rules, nor any difference in their teaching and in their scriptures; in no single point is there any difference between them; they are all alike. Hence those who maintain a difference, are devoid of the truth and are heretics and worldlings of old standing. And there is no reason to entertain any more doubts regarding such Jina images as are consecrated and adored in the four Saṅghas; all others that there are, are heretical." In short: "any image that is consecrated by the four Saṅghas, should be worshipped; all others, such as the images made by the Śvetâmbaras and others, are heretical."

(19) On this subject, there are the following ślokas in the Nitisâra:

"The Gaṇas, Gachchhas and others that have arisen from them, are the grantors of eternal bliss. There is between them no difference whatever in their monastic and other practices. If any man imagine any difference in the four Saṅghas, he has travelled beyond the truth and is gone completely into the world. In them there is no difference of images nor of penitential observances; nor is there any distinction in their rules and readings. Any Jina image

---
23 It may be useful for purposes of comparison, to add here the notice of the Digambaras, which Munî Âtmârânjî, the head of the Vîjñânapâram of the Śvetâmbaras, gives in his Jaina Mota Vîrâka, or Genealogical Table of the Jains:--"In 608 A. V., Śrîvâdi Sûna, the disciple of Krishna Sûri, originated the Digambara sect (mata). He had two disciples, Kâṅshînâ and Kâŋshîvarâ. After these two there came Dharâsâna, Bâtavâla and Patîgadanta. These commenced, in 608 A. V., on the 5th day of the bright half-month, to compose three śstras, viz., 1, the Dhaâvala comprising 70,000 ślokâs, 2, the Jâyadhâvala comprising 60,000 ślokâs, and 3, the Mahâdhâvala containing 40,000 ślokâs. These three śstras exist to the present day in the Karânpâtaka country; and borrowing from them Nêîmchandâ (No. 17 or 67?) composed the Gomâtâshstra for the personal of Râjâ Chânâjâ. No śstra older than these three is to be found among the Digambaras. Afterwards the Digambaras became divided into four Škîhâs, viz., 1, Nandî, 2, Sûna, 3, Dêva, 4, Sinha. Later on there arose four Saṅghas, viz., 1, Mûlasânga, 2, Kâshîâ Saṅgha, 3, Mâthâ Saṅgha, 4, Goppâ Saṅgha. Still later, there arose the following Pâthâs; viz., 1, the Vîlasânta, 2, the Têrâpânta, 3, the Gomântapânta, and 4, the Têrâpânta, i.e., those who worship a book (prânta) in the place of an image (pratimâ). At first Śrîvâdi originated the Naya-prânta (or the ordinance of nakedness); next he taught that a woman could not be saved (moksha), and that a Kâlava should not at a morsel; finally he taught a mass (fi., eighty-four) of other things. In our days, the Têrâpântas have put forth a mass (bhûshânt bhî) of heterogeneous things, which may be learned by comparing their old with their new books." With regard to the origin of the Têrâpânta he adds in another note to the Vîrâka: "In Srîm. 1700 Lava, the adopted son of Phûlâ Bîl, the daughter of the Bôrâ Vîra of the Lampa sector (i.e., the Nâgar sector; see above, p. 65), together with Dharâsâna, the cotton-printer, originated the prânta (or sect) of the mouth-covering Dhaâphânas. These divided into 22 sections, the second of which is the Dhanâjî sect. Dhanâjî's disciple (chîdâ) was Bhûshâna; his disciple was Râgûnâtha; his disciple Bhûshâna originated the Têrâpânta and propagated the sect of Mûkhalphus (or mouth-coversers)."
consecrated and adored by the four Saṅghas' one should reverence, but not any of any other Saṅgha, because this only leads to heresy."

(20) Thus, in the manner above explained, Bhadrabāhu arose. After him came other Āchāryas in regular order. Of these I am going to write only a brief account in their proper order, commencing with Bhadrabāhu. It was not more than 4 years after the date of the accession to the throne of King Vikrama, on the 14th day of the light half of Chaitra, that Bhadrabāhu succeeded to the pontificate; by caste he was a Brāhman; as a householder he lived for 24 years, as an ordinary monk for 30 years; as pontiff for 22 years 10 months and 27 days; the intercalary days were 3; the total period of his life was 76 years and 11 months.

(21) After him, not more than 26 years (after Vikrama), on the 14th day of the light half of Phālgunī, Guptagupta, a Parārvar by caste, succeeded to the pontificate. He lived as a householder for 22 years, as an ordinary monk for 14, as pontiff for 9 years, 6 months and 25 days; the intercalary days were 5; the total period of his life was 65 years and 7 months.

(22) After this the 86th pontificate began in the year 1450 after Vikrama, when, on the 5th day of the light half of Māgha, Subhaṅchandra succeeded. He lived as a householder for 16 years, as an ordinary monk for 14 years, as pontiff for 56 years 3 months and 4 days; the intercalary days were 11; his total period was 86 years, 3 months and 15 days. This should be understood to be the paṭṭāvall (or list of the pontiffs).

(23) After this (it is to be added that) the 26 pontificates, commencing with Bhadrabāhu down to Mārunākṛttī, took place in Bhaddalpurī in the Southern Country. Again the 26 pontificates, commencing with Mahākṛttī down to Mahīchandra, took place in Mālāvā. Among the latter 18 took place in Ujjainī, 4 in Chandī, 3 in Bhālī, and one in Kuṇḍalpurī. These make up the 26 pontificates. After this, 12 pontificates, commencing with Vrajaśabhaśāstra and ending with Siṁhakṛttī, took place in Vārā. After this 10 pontificates, commencing with Kαnakaśāstra and ending with Vasiṣṭhaśāstra, took place in Chītā. After this, 4 pontificates, viz., of Śūraśāstra, Māghaśāstra, Jānaśāstra, and Nārāyanaśāstra, took place in Vaiṣṇava. After this, 4 pontificates, viz., those of Padmanābhaśāstra and Subhaṅchandra, took place in Vaiṣṇava. After this, 6 pontificates, commencing with Prabhāpatraśāstra and ending with Prabhāpatraśāstra, took place in Ajmer. After this 2 pontificates, viz., those of Padmanābhaśāstra and Subhaṅchandra, took place in Vaiṣṇava. After this, 4 pontificates, viz., those of Vaiṣṇava and Subhaṅchandra, took place in Vaiṣṇava. This is the list of pontiffs in their proper order in the glorious Mūlasaṅgha, the Nandi, the Śrīsaṅgha, the Gachchha, the Pañcakārnī Gaṇa.

(24) Further the paṭṭāvall of the Sēnasāṅgha, Siṁhasāṅgha and Devasaṅgha are separate. In the Sēnasāṅgha there is a paṭṭāvall of Āchāryas in all respects different, commencing with Jinaśaṅgha. In that (paṭṭāvall) there are names in use for the Sēnasāṅgha, viz., 1, Rāja, 2, Vīra, 3, Bhadra, 4, Śena. Again the four names in use in the Siṁhasāṅgha, are 1, Siṁha, 2, Kuṃbha, 3, Aśava, 4, Sāgara. Again in the Devasaṅgha, the fourth after the Siṁhasāṅgha, there are the following 4 names in use, viz., 1, Deva, 2, Datta, 3, Nāga, 4, Langa.

(25) Further it should be understood that the above-named Sēnasāṅgha is known by the (three) names Sēna Saṅgha, Pushkara Gachchha and Śūrastha Gaṇa. Similarly the Siṁhasāṅgha is known by the (three) names Siṁha Saṅgha, Chandra Kapāla Gachchha, and Kauṭiyā Gaṇa. Again the Devasaṅgha is known by the (three) names Deva Saṅgha, Pañcakārnī Gachchha, and Dēśi Gaṇa.

(26) On this subject there are the following gāthās:

"Nandi, Chanda, Kittī, Bhāsaṅa, these are the names of the Nandisaṅgha. Śēna, Rāja, Vīra, Bhadra, are those of the Sēnasāṅgha. Siṁha, Kuṃbha, Aśava, Sāgara are the names of the Siṁhasāṅgha. Deva, Datta, Nāga, Langa are those of the Devasaṅgha."

This is a complete enumeration of the Āchāryas within the Digambara Community.

The intermediate pontificates are given in the subjoined table.
### Table of the Pontifical Succession in the Sarasvati Gachchha of the Digambaras:

from MS. C.

<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>Intercessory Days</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bhadrabha II</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22 10 27</td>
<td>73 6 11</td>
<td>Brähmap by caste.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Guptigupta</td>
<td>C. S. 14</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>9 6 23</td>
<td>5 65 7</td>
<td>Parswr by caste.  (So also C, but A has Parswr, B Parswr. MS. has Gupta-gupta).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Māghanandīn</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3 4 26</td>
<td>4 68 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Jñachandra</td>
<td>A. S. 14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9 32 3</td>
<td>8 9 6</td>
<td>3 65 9 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Kundakunda</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>41 10 10</td>
<td>5 85 10 15</td>
<td>Hunvad by caste (MSS. A, D give him 31 years pontificate, and a total of 90).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Úmāvāmanī</td>
<td>(101)</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40 8 1 5</td>
<td>84 8 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Lāhakārya</td>
<td>K. S. 8</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>16 10 28</td>
<td>6 69 10 26</td>
<td>(So also MSS. B.C, but MSS. A, E have A. S. 14.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Yādavākrtti</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>56 (5) 31 (5)</td>
<td>51 (9) (49)</td>
<td>(MSS. A, D give the same inconsistent dates.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Yaśōnandīn</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>46 4 9</td>
<td>4 79 13</td>
<td>(So MSS. B, D, but MS. A has Ph. V. III.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Dēvanandīn</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40 10 28</td>
<td>4 76 11 2</td>
<td>(MSS. A, B, D add Pārśāy by caste.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Jayaṇandīn</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>44 11 22</td>
<td>7 71 6 22</td>
<td>(MSS. A, B, D have Pārśāy-pāśā.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Γupanandīn</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11 3 1 4</td>
<td>38 8 7</td>
<td>(MS. has 838 Samvat.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Vajranandīn</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2 35 3</td>
<td>(40) 2 209 (9)</td>
<td>(78) 5 (59)</td>
<td>(MS. A gives correct dates.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Kamrānandīn</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11 2</td>
<td>40 2 29</td>
<td>9 66 4 22</td>
<td>(MS. A gives a pontificate of 22, inconsistent with 369 Samvat.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Lākachandra</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25 3 16</td>
<td>10 60 3 26</td>
<td>(MSS. A, B, D have Hārinandīn; P. 10, Simhanandīn.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Prabhuṭchandra</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25 5 15</td>
<td>11 58 5 26</td>
<td>(MSS. A, D give different, though equally consistent months.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Nārāyaṇaṭha</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8 9 1</td>
<td>9 46 9 10</td>
<td>(MSS. A, B, D have Raktakṛti; but (P. 10, Raktanandīn.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Bhānnanandīn</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21 9 24</td>
<td>12 50 10 6</td>
<td>(MS. A gives a pontificate of 22, inconsistent with 369 Samvat.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Nayaṇanandīn</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16 7 15</td>
<td>14 40 7 29</td>
<td>(MSS. A, B, D have Hārinandīn; P. 10, Simhanandīn.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Vajranandīn</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6 7 22</td>
<td>9 46 8 3</td>
<td>(MSS. A, D give different, though equally consistent months.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Vīranandīn</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14 10 52 24</td>
<td>(MSS. A, B, D have Raktakṛti; but (P. 10, Raktanandīn.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Ratananandīn</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22 4 7 11</td>
<td>42 4 18</td>
<td>(MSS. A, B, D have Raktakṛti; but (P. 10, Raktanandīn.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

- MS. adds: "He had five names (vīma): Padmanandīn, Vakragīvī, Gṛdhraspicchhā, Elleschāya, Kundakundāchārya. The special reasons for having these names may be known from another book (grantha)."
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Number</th>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Dates of accession</th>
<th>Householder</th>
<th>Monk</th>
<th>Pontiff</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Māṇikyaṇandajja</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Māṇighosāndra</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Śāntikṛiti I</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Mōrakṛiti</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Mahākṛiti</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>629</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Vīsahgūndara</td>
<td>704</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Śrīvīrūkhārapa I</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>669</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Śrī Chandra</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Srīnāndin</td>
<td>749</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Devabhūkapāpa</td>
<td>705</td>
<td>708</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Anantakṛiti</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>706</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Dharmaṇandajja</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>728</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Vidyānandajja</td>
<td>808</td>
<td>751</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Rāmaśandra</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Rāmakṛiti</td>
<td>837</td>
<td>789</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Abhayaśandra</td>
<td>878</td>
<td>821</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Narasāndra</td>
<td>897</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Nāgaśandra</td>
<td>916</td>
<td>859</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Harināndajja</td>
<td>939</td>
<td>882</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Harichandra</td>
<td>948</td>
<td>891</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Mahākṛiti I</td>
<td>974</td>
<td>917</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Māṇashandra I</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>933</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serial Number</td>
<td>Names</td>
<td>Date of accession</td>
<td>Household</td>
<td>Monk</td>
<td>Pontiff</td>
<td>Interim</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Lakshmanachandra</td>
<td>1023</td>
<td>996</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Gujakrīti</td>
<td>1037</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Gagakrīti</td>
<td>1048</td>
<td>901</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Laksanachandra II</td>
<td>1060</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Śrutakrīti</td>
<td>1070</td>
<td>Bh. 8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Bhūvachandra</td>
<td>1094</td>
<td>C. V. 5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Mahāchandra II</td>
<td>1115</td>
<td>Ch. V. 5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Māghachandra II</td>
<td>1140</td>
<td>Bh. 8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Brahmanandin</td>
<td>1144</td>
<td>P. V. 14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Dēvanandin II</td>
<td>(1148)</td>
<td>V. S. 4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Viśvachandra</td>
<td>1155</td>
<td>Mr. S. 5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Harinabdin</td>
<td>1156</td>
<td>S. S. 6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Bhārānandin</td>
<td>1160</td>
<td>Bh. 5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Dēvanandin II</td>
<td>1167</td>
<td>K. S. 8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Vidyabhārinda</td>
<td>1170</td>
<td>Ph. V. 5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Śrīchandra</td>
<td>1176</td>
<td>Ś. S. 9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Māghanandin II</td>
<td>1184</td>
<td>A. S. 10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Jānānandin</td>
<td>1188</td>
<td>M. S. 1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Gaṅgākṛīti</td>
<td>1199</td>
<td>Mr. S. 11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Śrīnākṛīti</td>
<td>1206</td>
<td>Ph. V. 14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Hēmakṛīti</td>
<td>1209</td>
<td>J. V. 3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Chārunandin</td>
<td>1216</td>
<td>A. S. 3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Pattāvallis of the Digambaras

<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>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Neminandin II</td>
<td>1223</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Nabhikritti</td>
<td>1220</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Narëndrakritti</td>
<td>1220</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Srechandra II</td>
<td>1241</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Padmakritti</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Vardhamana</td>
<td>1233</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Akaalakachandra</td>
<td>1256</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Lalitakritti</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Kesavaachandra</td>
<td>1204</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Chârukritti</td>
<td>1242</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Abhayakritti</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Vasantakritti</td>
<td>1234</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Prakhshikritti</td>
<td>1236</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Vithilakritti</td>
<td>1208</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Dharmaachandra</td>
<td>1271</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Patmakritti II</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Prabhachandra</td>
<td>1233</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Padmanandin</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Subhachandra</td>
<td>1450</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Remarks**

- (So also P.19; but MSS. A, B, D. Neminandaru, A, D have different but equally consistent days.)
- (MSS. A, D. give different but equally consistent years.)
- (So P. 19, but A, B, D. Vardhamana A, D give different, but equally consistent dates.)
- (MSS. A, D. have different, but equally consistent days.)
- (MSS. A, D. have different, but equally consistent days. MSS. B, D have Prakhshikritti)
- (A, B, D. Sthitakritti)
- (A, D. have different, probably consistent dates.)
- (MSS. A, D. have different, but equally consistent days. MSS. B, D. have Prakhshikritti)
- (A, B, D. Sthitakritti)
- (A, D. have different, and most consistent dates.)
- (MSS. A, D. have different, but equally consistent years. He was succeeded by Sakalakritti, see § 23.)

---

**Pattāvalī D.**

This pattāvalī is drawn on the plan of pattāvalī B, with which it also agrees very closely in regard to names and dates; that is, it gives no introductory or concluding remarks, but consists only of the list of successions commencing with Bhadrabāhu II., interspersed with a few short notes. It differs, however, from B, in giving full details of every pontifical life, as is
done in A and C. The list is carried down in it to No. 100, Naipakrti, who succeeded to the pontificate in A.D. 1822. As his successor followed in 1826 (see ante, Vol. XX. p. 353), it follows that pattavali D must have been written between 1822 and 1826.

I now subjoin the short interspersed notes, as well as those successions, in which D differs from other pattavals. From No. 88, D alone gives full details of the lives.

After No. 51 Mahchandra II., there is the following note: —
एता पत्र गा मालके महलपुर (in No. 25 महलपुर) हुआ! २५ हुआ! पर २५ उज्जान ने हुआ! महचंद्र ताइ सब न बन ५१॥

i.e., "These pontificates took place in Bhadilapur (or Bhadalapur) in Malava; they were 25 in number; 25 pontificates took place in Ujjain (Ujjain); down to Mahchandra the total of pontificates was 51."

After No. 63 Gaṅgaṁriti, there is the following note: —
अ पर बार मे हुआ बाबूकालक जी ताई। गान्धर भाल के ले पर १४ हुआ। अनेकान्त जी ताई पर ६५॥

i.e., "These pontificates took place in Vara, down to Gaṅgaṁriti; beginning from here 14 pontificates took place in Gwalār; down to Abhayamriti there were (altogether) 77 pontificates."

After No. 83 Prabhāchandra II., there is the following note: —
संवत १४८१ दिन हूँ एक महाकर्म प्रभाचंद्र जी के आचार्य छी। लोकग्रास जे भी नहके जी ती न झा अरे ले आचार्य श्री छी। लोकी महाजन एक प्रविष्ट जो उद्धम कीण। लोकी जे जी अभिय पविष्ट। बड़ी आचार्य ने सुप्रसिद्ध विश्व भर महाकर्म पविष्ट ज्ञान जी श्रीमध्य प्रविष्ट जी की श्रीमध्य प्रविष्ट जी की श्रीमध्य प्रविष्ट। तसा सु परम पराशुराम ने पर पारस्। आचार्य जी नाम एक हुआ। नाम प्रबैव जी श्रीमध्य प्रविष्ट।

i.e., "In Samvat 1375 there was a certain Acharya belonging to (the suite of) the Bhat̐̂ra-kara Prabhāchandra. Now the Bhat̐̂ra-kara himself was not in Gujarāt, but that Acharya was there. Now a certain Mahājan (or banker) had resolved to perform a consecration. Now he (Prabhāchandra) could not arrive in time; so he (the banker) caused the Acharya to receive the powers of a Sūri and conferred on him the Gujarāt; title of Bhat̐̂ra-kara, after he had performed the consecration. Thenceforth his pontifical residence was in Gujarāt. The Bhat̐̂ra-kara title dates from that Acharya. The name Padmananda was given to him."

In pattavali B, the corresponding note runs thus: —
महचंद्र जी के आचार्य ग्रास ने हुआ। लोक हूँ एक भावक प्रविष्ट जी ने महचंद्र जी ने वालक। सो ने राय। ततः आचार्य जे 'उपनाम (read सूरिये) दे वहार करे प्रविष्ट कराई। ततः वहार जनाजान जी हुआ। वर्ण पाणि कृ तीर विश्व विश्व कुसुम दी॥

i.e., "There was an Acharya belonging to (the suite of) Prabhāchandra in Gujarāt. Now there (i.e., in Gujarāt) a certain Śrāvaka called Prabhāchandra to perform a consecration. Now he could not come. Then having given to the Acharya the powers of a Sūri and having made him a Bhat̐̂ra-kara, he got the consecration performed. Then he became the Bhat̐̂ra-kara Padmanand. He carved a stone figure of Sarasvatī and made it to speak." (See ante, Vol. XX. p. 354, No. 83).

The last circumstance is thus referred to in pattavali P: —
पदमनानदी मुरू जी मानकारण्यानाची जी मानकारण्यानाची जी मानकारण्यानाची जी मानकारण्यानाची जी मानकारण्यानाची जी मानकारण्यानाची जी मानकारण्यानाची जी मानकारण्यानाची जी मानकारण्यानाची जी मानकारण्यानाची जी मानकारण्यानाची जी मानकारण्यानाची जी मानकारण्यानाची जी मानकारण्यानाची जी मानकारण्यानाची जी मानकारण्यानाची जी मानकारण्यानाची जी मानकारण्यानाची

i.e., "The Guru Padmanand then became the leader of the Balātkāra Gaṇa, — he who made the stone figure of the glorious Sarasvatī to speak. (Thus) on mount Ujjayanta the (pure) Gachchha came to be (called) the Sarasvatī. Hence let us give honour to him, the great Muni Padmanand."

From this notice it would seem that the miracle of the speaking figure of Sarasvatī took
place on the mount Ujjayanta, and that it was the cause of the Gachchha being called the 'Sarasvati Gachchha.'

After No. 87, Prabhāchandra, there is the following note:—
एक वर्ष गच्छ का नाम निकटस्थ, ग्वालियर का नगर की, साल १५७२ का ॥

i.e., "Once the Gachchha separated into two, that of Gvālēr, and that of Nāgōr, in the year 1572." Or it might also mean "Once from the Gachchha (at Chitōr) two (branches) came out, that of Gvālēr and that of Nāgōr." But the former version is more probable, to judge from the wording of the corresponding passage in A, which is as follows:—
एक वर्ष गच्छ का नाम निकटस्थ, ग्वालियर का, साल १५७२ का ॥

i.e., "Once the Gachchha split up into two, those of Chitōr and of Nāgōr, in the year 1572."

### Table of Pontifical successions in which D differs from A and E.

<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>Total</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Mānañandia</td>
<td>437 A. D. P. V. 5</td>
<td>544 10 A. D.</td>
<td>18 21 12 16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Megahachandra</td>
<td>601 V. 9 A. S. 10</td>
<td>544 17 7</td>
<td>25 5 13 56 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Abhayachandra</td>
<td>578 S. 10 A. S. 10</td>
<td>544 18 8</td>
<td>23 3 30 67 18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Nāgachandra</td>
<td>916 V. 5 B. V. 5</td>
<td>544 21 23 20 17 11 45 1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Mahāchandra</td>
<td>1150 V. 5 A. D. Ch.</td>
<td>10 12 5 16 30 12 5 25 65 5 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Dharmachandra</td>
<td>1271 V. 5 S. S. 15</td>
<td>11 15 5 25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Jinschandra</td>
<td>1271 J. V. 5 S. S. 15</td>
<td>11 15 5 25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Prabhāchandra</td>
<td>1571 V. 5 Ph. V. 7</td>
<td>12 15 10 5 15 25 65 5 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Dharmachandra</td>
<td>1571 V. 5 S. S. 15</td>
<td>12 15 5 25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Lālitakṛiti</td>
<td>1655 V. 5 Ch. S. 8</td>
<td>12 15 5 25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Chandrašruti</td>
<td>1565 V. 5 V. 5 1655</td>
<td>12 15 5 25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Dēvindrakṛiti</td>
<td>1605 V. 5 V. 5 1655</td>
<td>12 15 5 25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Narindrakṛiti</td>
<td>1605 V. 5 V. 5 1655</td>
<td>12 15 5 25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Surindrakṛiti</td>
<td>1729 V. 5 S. S. 15</td>
<td>12 15 5 25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>Jagatkṛiti</td>
<td>1735 V. 5 S. S. 15</td>
<td>12 15 5 25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>Sukhomānitrīti</td>
<td>1832 V. 5 S. S. 15</td>
<td>12 15 5 25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>Nāiserkṛiti</td>
<td>1842 V. 10 S. S. 15</td>
<td>12 15 5 25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Here A, B, C have each different dates. A, C have different dates.
Inconsistent dates).

(A, E give different dates).

(A, E give different dates).

(A, E give different years).

(A, E give different years).

(A, E differ entirely).

(A, E differ each).

(From here D alone gives details of the lives).

(Down to No. 94, most of the details are wanting).

(From No. 96-100 names and dates as in B, but all details are wanting).

(Here the paṭṭāvali closes).
PATṬĀVALĪ E.

In its general arrangement, this paṭṭāvalī resembles paṭṭāvalis A and C. It begins with an introduction, followed by the paṭṭāvalī proper. But the latter, like paṭṭāvalī B, gives only a list of the names and dates of accession of the pontiffs. A peculiar feature of it is that it adds notices regarding the caste of each pontiff. In a few exceptional cases such notices are also given in paṭṭāvalī D; and these are noted in the tabular statement below. I am doubtful, however, regarding the correct spelling of many of the caste-names; some of them I cannot identify. That the tradition represented in paṭṭāvalī E considerably differs from that of the other paṭṭāvalis has been already referred to; also that it gives the succession list of the so-called Chítōr section. The latter it brings down to No. 102, Mahēndrakirtti, who succeeded in 1980 A.D. and is probably still living.

In the following, I again give the introduction in extenso, and the paṭṭāvalī proper in tabular form. In the latter my own remarks are within brackets.

TEXT.

Introduction of Paṭṭāvalī E.

(1) Abhay bhamâlayā surârî kī tisvârî II. bhimâbâlir kī 9, goñam svaîmî 2, hûrava swâmî 3, jambû swâmî 4 II vrudas 16 2 tîrèh këlaîvî ḫaïa II 11

(2) vënuṇlî kī bhumâbâlirî 9, nuddînî kī bhumâbâlirî 9, ap symptom kī bhumâbâlirî 9, goñânîk kī bhumâbâlirî 4, nandûraâ kī bhumâbâlirî 9 II vrudas yë tîrdë 11

(3) visvâlâkâryâh vâpûrûh kā párih 10, (pnâsîn kī vâpûrûh kā párih,30) sâkâryâh kī vâpûrûh kā párih 11, vâsînîn kī vâpûrûh kā párih 12, nîvînîn kī vâpûrûh kā párih 13, visvâkâryâh kī vâpûrûh kā párih 14, vâsînîn kī vâpûrûh kā párih 15, vâsînîn kī vâpûrûh kā párih 16, vâsînîn kī vâpûrûh II 18 2 vrudas II 11

(4) jambûâryâh kī gîrârâ abhûk kā párih 19, bhumâbâlir kī gîrârâ abhûk kā párih 18, nandûraâkâryâh gîrârâ abhûk abhûk 19, goñânîk kī gîrârâ abhûk 20, nandûraâ kī gîrârâ abhûk 21, nandûraâ kī gîrârâ abhûk 22, vrudas tîrëh rîrë II 11

(5) jambûâryâh prâm abhûk kā párih 22, bhumâbâlir kī prâm abhûk kā párih 23, goñânîk kī prâm abhûk kā párih 24, nandûraâ kī prâm abhûk 25, bhumâbâlir kī prâm abhûk 26, vrudas tîrëh rîrë II 11

(6) bhumâbâlir kī 27, nandûraâ kī 28, abhûk abhûk 29 II nandûraâ kī 30 104 kē sâl pâṭ bëhi kārî kîhî 14 II vëntɪmâb rīvî kī vëntɪmâb kāryâ nûrî II 11

Here follows the paṭṭāvalī. After No. 21 (45)30 there is the following remark—

bëhi pâṭ kē sâl bëhi rîrë II 11

Similar remarks follow after No. 23 (47), 60, 75 (91), 80, 86 (98), 88, 92 (102), 93, 94 (103), 95, 96.

TRANSLATION.

§ 1. Here the Vânsâvâlî (list of succession) of the Gurus is written down:

(1) The glorious Mahâvîra, (2) the Lord Gôtâma, (3) the Lord Sudharmâ, (4) the Lord Jambû. These were Kêvalins for 62 years. Altogether 4.

30 The bracketed portion is wanting in the MS.; owing probably to a mere slip; as the totalisation at the end of the paragraph shows.
31 It will be noticed that the numbering, actually given in the paṭṭāvalī, is very capricious, some members being left unnumbered, without any apparent reason. These capricious numbers are quoted within brackets.


§ 6. Then came (27) the glorious Dattāsēca, (28) Sivadatta, (29) Aradatta, and (30) Bhadrabāhu III, who succeeded to the pontificate on the 14th of the light half of Kāṭik, in the year 104 after Vikrama. The Śvetāmbaras originated at this time and commenced a pāṭāvalis of their own.

Note after No. 21:—Now these 26 pontificates took place in the Mālavā country.

Vaināvali of the Gurus of the Digambaras. From MS. E.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial Number</th>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Dates of accession</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bhadrabāhu III</td>
<td>104-47</td>
<td>From him the Śvetāmbaras went forth and initiated pāṭāvalis of their own. (In A, R, C, D Brham man by caste).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Māghananda</td>
<td>136-79</td>
<td>Savēl by caste (A has Sāh.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Jinachandra</td>
<td>140-83</td>
<td>A Chhārā Pārvāl. (C has Hunvād.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Kundakunda</td>
<td>149-92</td>
<td>Pārvāl by caste.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Umāvāmi</td>
<td>201-144</td>
<td>A Śravak of Ayōdayā.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Lōhāchārya</td>
<td>242-185</td>
<td>Labchē by caste.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Jasākrti</td>
<td>233-196</td>
<td>Pārvāl by caste: (A, B, D have Jāyavāl).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Gūṣananda</td>
<td>363-306</td>
<td>Pārvāl by caste.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Vajrananda</td>
<td>364-207</td>
<td>Gōlāpūrb by caste.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Kumārananda</td>
<td>386-329</td>
<td>Pārvāl by caste.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serial number</td>
<td>Names</td>
<td>Dates of accession</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Mṛukṛtṛti</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>Sahajiyā by caste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(45)</td>
<td></td>
<td>355</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Mahākṛtṛti</td>
<td>686</td>
<td>Sahajiyā by caste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(47)</td>
<td></td>
<td>629</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Vasunandā</td>
<td>704</td>
<td>Vāyjava by caste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Śīrñāṣapa</td>
<td>726</td>
<td>Sahajiyā by caste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(49)</td>
<td></td>
<td>678</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Śrīnandā</td>
<td>749</td>
<td>Śrīmaṇḍa by caste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(43)</td>
<td></td>
<td>692</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Dēvasūdhāśa</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>Nāgadrāha by caste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(49)</td>
<td></td>
<td>769</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Anantakṛtṛti</td>
<td>766</td>
<td>Purvā by caste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(49)</td>
<td></td>
<td>769</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Dharmanandā</td>
<td>785</td>
<td>Nāgadrāha by caste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(50)</td>
<td></td>
<td>788</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Vidyānandā</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>Vaghērvāl by caste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(51)</td>
<td></td>
<td>761</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Rāmacandra</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>Pancham Śrīvāl by caste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(52)</td>
<td></td>
<td>786</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Rāmakṛtṛti</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>Lavēchā by caste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(53)</td>
<td></td>
<td>790</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Abhayachandra</td>
<td>878</td>
<td>Śrī Śrīvāl by caste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(54)</td>
<td></td>
<td>821</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Narasandra</td>
<td>897</td>
<td>Nagam Śrīvāl by caste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(54)</td>
<td></td>
<td>840</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Nāgachandra</td>
<td>916</td>
<td>Bēgā by caste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(55)</td>
<td></td>
<td>829</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Nayanamandā</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>Dumar by caste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(55)</td>
<td></td>
<td>822</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Harichandra</td>
<td>948</td>
<td>Śrī Śrī Vaghērvāl by caste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(57)</td>
<td></td>
<td>801</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Māhākṛtṛti</td>
<td>974</td>
<td>Dākādasī by caste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(58)</td>
<td></td>
<td>917</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Māghachandra</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>Padmāvati Pūrāvī by caste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(58)</td>
<td></td>
<td>933</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Lakṣmīchandra</td>
<td>1023</td>
<td>Purtī by caste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(59)</td>
<td></td>
<td>966</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Guṇakṛtṛti</td>
<td>1057</td>
<td>Gōvālī by caste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(60)</td>
<td></td>
<td>970</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Guṇachandra</td>
<td>1048</td>
<td>Gōpārā by caste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(61)</td>
<td></td>
<td>961</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serial number</td>
<td>Names</td>
<td>Dates of accession</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71 69</td>
<td>Padmakirtti</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72 60</td>
<td>Vardhamana</td>
<td>1253</td>
<td>1196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73 70</td>
<td>Akalaña</td>
<td>1256</td>
<td>1199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74 71</td>
<td>Lalitakirtti</td>
<td>1257</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 72</td>
<td>Keravachandra</td>
<td>1261</td>
<td>1204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76 73</td>
<td>Churakirtti</td>
<td>1296</td>
<td>1205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77 74</td>
<td>Abhayakirtti</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78 75</td>
<td>Vasantakirtti</td>
<td>1264</td>
<td>1207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79 76</td>
<td>Visvakirtti</td>
<td>1266</td>
<td>1209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 77</td>
<td>Subhakirtti</td>
<td>1268</td>
<td>1211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81 78</td>
<td>Dharmaendra</td>
<td>1271</td>
<td>1214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82 79</td>
<td>Ratnakirtti</td>
<td>1296</td>
<td>1230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83 80</td>
<td>Prabhachandra</td>
<td>1310</td>
<td>1233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84 81</td>
<td>Padmananda</td>
<td>1385</td>
<td>1228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85 82</td>
<td>Subhachandra</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>1233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86 83</td>
<td>Jinachandra</td>
<td>1507</td>
<td>1440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87 84</td>
<td>Prabhachandra</td>
<td>1371</td>
<td>1514</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**POSTSCRIPT.**

Since writing the foregoing paper, I have procured the Deccan College MS of the Vikrama Prabandha. On examination I find it to be an altogether different work from the one referred to in the pañavallis. The latter was in Prakrit verse, while the Vikrama Prabandha of the Deccan College Library is in Sanskrit verse, and contains a few folk tales connected with Vikrama in fact, it is identical with the Panchalanda-chhattr Prabandha, published by Prof. A. Weber in 1877.
On the other hand, the Deccan College manuscript of the Nitisāra, which I have also procured, is the work in question. It is a very small work, consisting of 113 ślokas, and giving brief explanations of a number of Digambara technicalities. With the exception of one, all the quotations in the paṭṭavali are confirmed by this manuscript.

The first quotation, in § 12, constitutes the ślokas 6 b and 7 in the Nitisāra. There is, however, a slight difference in the second line, which reads in the Deccan Manuscript as follows:—

śevaśāṅkṣipta nītisāraḥ: śinsaśāṅkṣipta mahasāraḥ:

The third quotation, in § 17, forms the 9th, 10th and 11th ślokas in the Nitisāra. In that manuscript the 2nd, 3rd, and 5th lines read a little differently: —

शास्त्रावर्तमानसंप्रदायिकः कालसारसंप्रदायिकः
शोचिक: स्वेतवासी श्राविक वाप्निवषयः
स्वरुपसारसूत्रियं सिद्धांतं व्यविचारिणः

The fourth quotation, in § 19, forms ślokas 8, 12, 13, 14 in the Nitisāra. In that manuscript they read as follows: —

ग्राममञ्चयावस्थायं जाता: स्वरुपसारसूत्रियं
न तत्र भेष: कालसारसंप्रदायिकं कालसारं
चन्द्र संवधस्तराय: संवधस्तराय: संवधस्तराय: 8 11
चन्द्र संवधस्तराय: संवधस्तराय: संवधस्तराय: 11 11
चन्द्र संवधस्तराय: संवधस्तराय: संवधस्तराय: 11 11

The second quotation, in § 16, I cannot find in the Deccan College Manuscript. It is a verse written in the Sragdhāra metre. The whole of the Nitisāra is written in ślokas, with the exception of the last (113th) verse, which happens to be in the Sragdhāra metre. This last verse, however, does not belong to the body of the work, but contains a laudatory reference to the author, Indranandin. It does not seem probable therefore, that the verse, quoted in § 16, really belongs to the Nitisāra. The Deccan College MS. has all the appearance of being complete.

That the author, Indranandin, belonged to the Śrāvaṇa Gachchha is shown by his being described in verse 118 as a clever follower of Kundakunda. He does not appear in the pontifical succession list. There are, however, certain indications that his dates of himself and his work. In verses 67-70 he enumerates a number of celebrated (tattva) Munis from all the four Saṅghas. The latest in date among those quoted form the Nandi Saṅgha are Prabhāchandra and Jinaachandra, Nos. 86 and 87 in the list. The latter died 1524 A. D. At the end of the manuscript, quite independently of the work,—there is the remark that it was written Sṛi-Lalitaachandra-pathanārthaḥ, 'for the reading of Sṛi-Lalitaachandra.' This person, in all probability, is the same with Lalitaakṛitti II., No. 89, of the pontifical list (Chhitā section), who died in 1565 A. D. Between these two dates (1524 and 1565) Indranandin should have lived and written the Nitisāra. As Lalitaakṛitti (or Lalita Chandra) pontificated from 1546 to 1565 A. D., the Deccan College MS. was most probably written within that period; and there is just a possibility that it is the autograph of Indranandin himself, who may have been a disciple of Lalita Chandra.

\(^{21}\) The MS. has सुभाष्यते, स्रवणा and दीन having the same meaning.
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C. — KHALSI, DHAULI-JAUGADA, COLUMNAR EDICTS, BHAJA, SAHASARAM, RUFNATH, BAIRAT.

The Spelling of the remaining edicts is so similar, that it will be advantageous to group all the facts together in one view.

The edicts are referred to by their initial letters: Dh. = Dhauli; Kh. = Khalsi; S. = Sahasararam; R. = Rupnath; B. = Bairat; Bh. = Bhajra. For the Columnar Edicts, I have taken, as typical, the only complete version, the most correct and that best known, that of the pillar of Firuz Shah at Delhi (D). I only cite the divergencies of the other versions (DARM) when they appear to me to present points of special interest, and to be not merely accidental transformations.

The text of Jaugada is, in the series of the fourteen edicts, almost invariably identical with that of Dhauli. Dr. Bühler only notes four points of divergence; according to his texts I count at most seven or eight; the text of Jaugada, being moreover less complete than that of Dhauli, offers nothing new. The case is not the same with regard to the detached (or 'separate') edicts: here the two versions more frequently shew points of difference, which are not all devoid of interest. Under these conditions Dhauli, as a general rule, answers for both, and I shall content myself with merely drawing attention, in the proper place, to forms peculiar to Jaugada.

The fragments of the Queen's Edict, of the edict of Kanšambi, and of the inscriptions of Barabār, are too short and too damaged to lend themselves to methodical treatment.

1. — PHONETICS.
(a). — Vowels.

Changes of Quantity. — Kh. does not mark, for i and u, the distinction between long and short. The solitary instance in which an i has been read: piyadası, I, 2 (Bühler) is so indistinct, that the facsimile of General Cunningham gives it as short. I have no doubt that he is right. — R. and B. read jatvadipasi, which is not sufficient ground for us to conclude that they would not have marked the long vowel, if the text had brought it again elsewhere; and that especially, because at Bh. we have certain examples of i and u. We must, therefore, conclude that this peculiarity belongs only to Kh.

Vowels lengthened. — Khalsi. — A final very often becomes a, more often, indeed, than it remains short. I quote only a few examples of each case: abhisita, XII, 35, &c.; abhisita, IV, 18, &c.; aha, passim (once only ahā, VII, 6); ajā, IV, 9; chā (more frequent than cha); évā, II, 6, al.; hidā, I, 1, al.; palatā, IX, 27, &c.; punā, passim; mamā, V, 13; vā (= va, évā), III, 7, &c. — In the middle of words, I note sukhamā, VI, 20; lāti, VIII, 23.

Dhauli. — Finals: āhā, III, 9, al. (never ākā); ālā, hāyēs, det. II, 6; chaĉvā, det. II, 8; nikhamā, III, 10; pāpā, det. II, 7; yujja, IV, 8; māmā, det. I, 5; nā, I, 4; vasēvati, VII, 7 (Jang, 3) — In the interior of words, we find several instances of lengthening, some of which are compensatory or accidental: — sahāsini, I, 3; tākhasilatē, det. I, 24; abhikal, V, 23; chilaṭistā, V, 27; VI, 33; nāk, VII, 2; anadāta, det. I, 11; nātikuli, I, 11; hilauna, VIII, 5 (Jang, n°) can only be an error of the engraver.

Dhāl. — Finals: āha (ahā), passim; apahā, VI, 3 (RM 30a), if the form is really equivalent to apahārya; anupahārya, VII, VIII, 17; asvā, V, 18 (RM 30a); bhūyā, I, 4; chā, passim; évā, I, 6 (RM 30a); gōna, V, 18 (RM 30a); hāmā, I, 8; VI, 6 (ARM 30a); jā, nepadasā, IV, 5 (RM 30a); bhāsā, VI, 2, 4, (RM 30a); māmā, IV, 12 (DARM 30a); pāpahā, VI, 13 (ARM 30a); uṣhā, I, 5; uṣhāyā, VII—
Bhābra. — Finals: ēhā 1; chā (four times; twice cha); ēvād, 8. — Medials: chālathitikē, 4.

Sahāsāram. — Finals: avadāndeyā, 6; chā, 5 (more often cha); pānī (≡ paḥka), 6; līkhāpayāthā, 7. — Medials: chālāthitikē, 5.

Rupāth. — Finals: aparādhyāṇē, 4; paka, māndānē, 3; (y)u(ḥ)uنا, 5; vyaḥānē, 5.

Bairāt. — ēhā, 1; chā, 6.

Vowels shortened. — Kālēma. — Finals: ma, XIII, 14; Medials: aṇamīṣya, VI, 20; aṣṭasā, X, 27; ahałkāna, XII, 32; ahałkasi, IX, 24; ahałkanā, XIII, 17; ahałkā, XIII, 23; lājā, X, 28; lājnē, XIII, 5; vyaḥānē, XIII, 36.

Dhauḷi. — Finals: avanuṃṣa (nom. pl.), det. I, IV, 4; — niyā̄kā, det. 1, 1, and other noms. plur.: ichha, det. II, 4; solā̄ya, det. I, 18; lājā, det. III, 4; atha (yatha), four times against twice athā; pạj, V, 27; va (≡ vac), V, 21, 25, 26; VI, 28, 30; det. I, 20, 21. — Medials: niti, det. I, 8, 12 (f); su(s)khina, det. 1, 22.

Dehulī. — Finals: aj̄ka, V, 7 (RM aha); avāthā, IV, 4, 13; atha, VI, 4 (RM ahā); III, 20; ēka (nom. fem.), I, 9 (ARM ēkā); lāja (nom.), passim (by the side of laja); siya IV, 9; tatha, VI, 16 (RM aha). — Medials: ālādhi, VII, 10; avā, IV, 15, (A asa, M aha); avādhi, VI, 6; paliḥaṣaṇ, III, 21; amuviḥiṃti, VII, 7 (ahā, I, 7); avanuṣi, VII, 18, 16, 18; bhuvāṇē, VII, 9; ṛṣaya, VIII, 5.

In the following instances other versions present a short vowel, as against a regular long vowel at D.: abhāt, IV, 4, RM abhāt; D, I, 6; apekte, RM ṃba; D, VI, 8, atanā, RM ṛna; D, IV, 10, atha, D aha; D, IV, 13, avanāma, ṚRM ṛna; D, IV, 3; ṛjata, RM ṃa; likkāpita, D, 1, II, 15, IV, 2; VI, 2, 9, RM ṛta; abhād, D, IV, 12, D ṛbh; atampahāyā, D, V, 15, ṚRM ṛma; D, III, 20, svayākalānē, RM ṛya.

Changes of Quality — Kālēma. — a into i: majhāmēnd, XIV, 8; pichē (=pathē) (≡ paḥche), I, 4; into ē: ēka (= atra), VIII, 23, al.; into u: munīsa, II, 6; — i into ē: ēkādīva, IX, 24; — u into ā: galu, XIII, 36, 38; into i: munīsa, II, 6; — ē into ī: gihāthā, XIII, 36; mi, XIV, 9; — ē into ī, not only at the end of words, but for ah, as in punā, I, 3; mukhāt, VI, 13; — there are some exceptions, as lējāntā, II, 5; kēlālapatā, II, 4; sītānapatā, II, 4; — but in kalēti, V, 13; IX, 24; apakalēti, XII, 32; apakalēti, XII, 32.

Ri changes to a: aṭā, IX, 17; aṇamīṣya, VI, 20; bhaṭi, XII, 33; vadhī and vadhī, passim; bhaṭakāsa, XIV, 37, al.; keta, passim; gahāthēni, XI, 31; maṭe, māte, XIII, 35, 36, 39; nikā, VI, 19; wafāna, X, 28, 29; viyāpāta, XII, 34, al.; vījṛṭēnā, XIV, 18; — into ā: ādīsā, IV, 10; ēla, VII, 22; gihāthā, XIII, 37; ēlaśā, IX, 24; kīlākata, VII, 22, mīga, I, 4; āga, XII, 32; ādīsē, IV, 10; ēla, VII, 22; gihāthā, XIII, 37; ēlaśā, IX, 24; kīlākata, VII, 22, mīga, I, 4; āga, XII, 32; ādīsē, IV, 10; — into u: pālaṅkā, VII, 23; bhukhāni, II, 6; vadhānā, VIII, 23; vunā, XIII, 9.

Dhauḷī. — a into u: avuṣa, VII, 2, IX, 16, (Jaug. avuṣa); munīsa, VII, 11, 1; (by the side of manuṣa); — a into ē: ēka (atra), XIV, 19; — ē into a in puṭkāvani, V, 16; — ē into ā: aṇuṣṭha (for aṭha) VI, 31; — ē into u: munīsa, loc. cit.; pulīsa, det. I, 7, 8; — ē into ē: asamāti, XIV, 19, eṣita, det. II, 6 (for ēdā = ēda); — ē into ē: ēla, VII, 22; ēla, VII, 22, atē, det. I, 4, is doubtless only an incorrect reading.

Ri becomes a: ādīsā, IV, 14; aṇamīṣya, det. II, 9, VI, 16, bhaṭi, V, 23; bhaṭakā, IX, 8; kaṭa, passim; vadhī, IV, 18; wafāna, X, 16; viyāpāta, V, 24; — ē into ā: ādī, IX, II; ēdīvāni, VIII, 3; hēla, passim; dhīti, det. II, 6; ēdī, IV, 14; — u: lāka, II, 8; puṭkāvani, V, 26; vudhā, IV, 15; VIII, 4; perhaps kūtē, det. I, 16.
JAGADAL. — a final changes into u in savatu, II, 8 (Dh. *ta*); i into e in annayagah (= annayagah = durnayagah), det. I, 9; det. II, 13.

DEHLI. — a into e; majjima, I, 7; a into u: *mutte* (ARM), VI, 19; munittaka, VII-VIII, 2, al.; u into i: munisa, passim; pulisa, I, 7, al.; mina, III, 8, if it really is equivalent to punaahu, which appears doubtfu!; into o: goti, I, 10; e into i: socali, V, 8 (Dh. *ti*); ghatikanaah, VII-VIII, 4; likhapatte, passim; a ak) final into e: ite, IV, 15. — Instead of seyathaka, V, 2, a has sayathaka. — Ri changes to a: apakhata, VI, 3 (if really equivalent to *aparitita*); apakhattha, VI, 5; bhakatasu, VII-VIII, 8; vadhi, VII-VIII, 8, al.; kapana, VII-VIII, 8; kata, passim; vihapatte, VII-VIII, 4, 5, 6; into i: vinnikita, IV, 10.

BHABHA. — e changes to i in likhapatayami, 8; ri into i in adhigicaka, 6.

SAHASARAM. — e changes to i in likhapatayatha, 7; munisa, 3; kata, 3; mitha (= mittha), 2, 3.

RUPNATH. — *Pavattasu* (for *o*ta), 4; amisa, 2; kata, 2, al.

BAIRAT. — Bodhi for *o*thi, 2.

**Additions and Suppressions.**

KHALSI. — Additions: galadh, XII, 31; galakhati XII, 33; supaddlaya, V, 14 (if equivalent to supradaryan); sinicchha, XIII, 38; puliwa, passim; kusadi, XIII, 39; suvamiyena IX, 25. — Suppressions: pi, passim; ti (iti, IX, 26); va (= eva), IX, 26, alias.

DAHLI. — Additions: supaddlaya, V, 22; auvoginah, det. II, 4; tita, IX, 7; kallametha, det. I, 11; palikhisa, det. I, 21; puliwa, V, 23, al.; suvamiyena, IX, 10; papanu, det. II, 7. — Suppressions: ti (iti, det. II, 4, 7), pi, va (eva), passim.

DEHLI. — Additions: supadahet, IV, 5; vidakhma, VI, 6; *g(2)havaj, I, 7; asinacch, II, 11, al.; dawadaga, VI, 1; suve, I, 6. — Suppressions: pi, ti, va (eva), passim; annuvkhamb, VII-VIII, 2; pativikkhamad, VI, 4, 7.

BHABHA. — Additions: alakamih, 4; abhikkamith, 7; passime, 5. — Suppressions: ti, 2, al.

SAHASARAM. — Suppressions: pi, ti, passim; va (eva), 3.

**RUPNATH.** — Additions: sumi, 1. — Suppressions: pi; ti; va; didi, 2; sumi, 1.

Contraotions. — KHALSI. — A(I)u into o: khoh, X, 23, al.: aya into e in causals; ava into o: odbhana, V, 16; VI, 18; aya into o in lekhapaya, XIV, 19; a(y)ø into e: tadasa, V, 14; ya into i: patiliti, X, 28; iya into e: etakayye, X, 27.

DAHLI. — A(I)u into o: khoh, IX, 8; ava into o: viyadala, det. I, 1; viyadiitayi, IX, 11; odbhana, passim; awa into o, if aho, IV, 13, is really equivalent to attha vda; aya into e: ujomi, det. I, 23; aya into a in veditu, det. II, 6; aya into e: tadasa, V, 22; iya into e: etak, passim; ya into i: patiliti, X, 15; va into u: atilana, det. I, 11, 12 (Jaug. *stu*); ri into u: su (= svid), det. II, 4; daudale, det. I, 16.

DEHLI. — Nigohati, VII-VIII, 5 (nayroka); jhapatavai, V, 10; khou, passim khu, II, 12; paliyoadda, VII-VIII, 1; odbena, VII-VIII, 6; viyadiitavai, IV, 7; su(vi), VII-VIII, 17, 18.

BHABHA. — Khoh, 3; ovdli, 5; abhivadadana (for *dyo*), 1.

RUPNATH. — Lekhapateavi, vivasdavaiti, 5.

BAIRAT. — Aalikhetu, 6.

Nasalised Vowels. — I do not attempt to point out all the instances in which the anusvara has been omitted, either in negligence or by error. They are frequent, especially at Khalsi.

KHALSI. — A long vowel equivalent to a nasalised one: atapundat (Cenh), XII, 32, 33; *daarat* (Cenh), XIII, 15; *dev nadiyi*, XII, 30, 34; *dhunamule* (Cenh), X, 27; *di* (Cenh), XIV, 21; *hut* (Cenh), V, 14; kanmatatal (Cenh), VI, 20; *puy* (Cenh), XII, 31, 34; puna (= puna), IX, 26; *sawta*, XIV, 17 (if it is really a nom. plur.). — After Dr. Bühler's revision the only trace of a confusion between ah and u which would appear to remain is sukhitanda, XIV, 17 (for sawat). The concordance of several versions in the spelling supadlaya, V, 14, renders, in this instance, the equivalence of sawa and su hardly probable.

DAHLI. — Equivalence of the long and of the nasalised vowel: *bubha* and *bubhaha; bhavasukha (Cdenh), VII, 1; kasantan (nom.
plur.), det. I, 18; kaūnata(lam), VI, 32, as against khānata, at Jang.; kiṭi, X, 13 (kīṭs); sārmādā (cālīn), VIII, 4; palāta, (cālī, cāla); VI, 23; sarvanipā (Jaung. "sāra"); det. I, 17; vatsignā (sāra), det. I, 2; yā (yān), IV, 17. — Sanā (n. s. m.), VI, 30, and vayē (= vayān), det. II, 8, appear to imply the equivalence of aū and ē. — a for aūm in lēṣu aūdānām, det. II, 10. — The nasal is written double in avānādāhā, III, 11; saṃkhyā, IX, 8; subhān, det. II, 5.

Dehli. — Anuvātpatā (cātā), VII-VIII, 3; riśatitā, V, 1, 20; samara (nom. plur.) IV, 13; tisāitā (= triṣṭā), IV, 16; V, 12; yā (yān) (= yān idān), VII-VIII, 7; — kiṃnā, VI, 5, (= kiṃnā).

Sahasaraṃ. — Aśbindra, 2; misāk, 3 (= saū); chaṇa, 5 (= chaṇa).

(b). — Consonants.

Two peculiarities are common to all the versions, which we are now comparing. In the first place they know neither the cerebral ṣ, nor the palatal ś. They replace both by the dental s. There is only one solitary exception: Dh. det. II, 6, would seem to have, according to General Cunningham’s facsimile, paṭānā. I should be much surprised to find this reading authenticated; already, in Princ’s time, the facsimile published by him shewed that, at this place, the stone is damaged and the reading uncertain. I am strongly tempted to believe that the real reading is paṭānā, as at Jangada. As to ṣ Dr. Bühler states two exceptional occurrences of it, one in khaṇaṣi, Dh. det. II, 10, the other in saraṇa, J. det. II, 3. — In the second place, they have no r, replacing it regularly (when standing alone) by l. I notice only two exceptions. — at Ḫupāṇth, where, by the side of odiṭe, 6, we read chaṇacchālā, 1, and chaṇaṭi, 4. Samaviṣṭa, at Kh. XIII, 2, is probably a false reading.

Khaliṣ presents a two-fold peculiarity: the first is the use, for the sibilant, of three signs differing in unequal degrees: nī, b, and d, of which the first is also employed on one occasion at Bairāṭ (svarṣikṣitā). It appears to me to be certain that these signs are all, among themselves, absolute equivalents, and that they do not represent, as has been maintained, the three siblants of Sanskrit. I have already dealt with this question in the Introduction; and I shall return to it later on. I can, therefore, neglect its consideration here. I may remind my readers that in transliteration I represent the sign nī by k. — The second point concerns the use, at Khaliṣ, of a character ( which I, at first, considered as a simple graphic variant of nī. The same sign is employed twice (vadikā, adhikāśikā) at D. I pass over this difficulty here, and content myself, in order to retain consistency in transcription, with rendering the sign in question by k, as I have hitherto done.

Simple Consonants.

Changes. — Khā. — k into g in anūtiṇa, II, 5; XIII, 4, 5.

k into k in mala, XII, 5; aituṣhka, ibid.

gh into h in labhita, XI, 32, al.

eh into ceh in kichhī, passim.

j into d in patīṭa, X, 28.

t into t in bhotaka, XIII, 37, alias; kaṭa, passim; matī, XIII, 39 (by the side of matē); paṭī, passim; maṭā, X, 23, 29; viṇāṇa, passim; giḻhaṇā, XIV, 10, — into d in dōse, VI, 19; hidaṃkāhā = hītasu, V, 15.

d into g in kāṣṭha, VIII, 22; IX, 25 (by the side of edā), dhāvaṇa, III, 7; IV, 13; — into t in tatāpā, VIII, 13 (t); — into y in yān (in the neuter, for yān), passim.

dh into h (t) in kīda, passim.

bh into h in hīṭi, etc., passim.

y into j in majālā, I, 4; — into v: vasī, VII, 21 (ordinarily the termination is ṣvā); — into h: gīhu, VI, 20.

s into h in ha[i]cī, IX, 25.

Dharaṇ — k changes into bh in akṣahkasē, det. I, 22.

g into gh in chaghatī, II, 11, al., if it is really equivalent to jagni, which is extremely doubtful.

ch into j in qalā, det. II, 7, (Jaung. has caḍala); — into ceh in kichhī, passim.

j into ch in chaghatī, loco cit. ; kābābhā, V, 23.

t into ch in chithītu, IV, 17; — into t in paṭī, passim; kaṭa, passim; viṇāṇa, det. I, 15, al.; usṭēna, X, 16.
Additions and Suppressions. — Kail. — Loss of an initial y in: a, XII, 31; omit, IV, 12; X, 28; aśā, IV, 10; aśā, II, 5, 6; aśā, VII, 21; nitha, II, 4; XII, 34; eun, IV, 12; V, 14; IX, 26, 26; avatakt, XIII, 39; e, passim. — Addition of an initial y: yena, IV, 12; XIV, 17; of a medial y: kalikya, XIII, 3, 36 (kalika, XIII, 39); of an initial h: hṛdya, VIII, 22; IX, 25; kāta (atroc), IX, 24, al.; ādī, X, 28; ādī, passim, (ādī, II, 6); ādī, VI, 20, al.

Dhauila. — Loss of an initial y, except in: yaśo, X, 13; yaś, IV, 17; yē, I, 8; V, 21; yēzni, VI, 32; yu, passim; yōna, V, 23; of the syllable ra in hēmēka, det. I, 24. — Addition of an initial y in: yena, IV, 17; of a v in vēla, IX, 10; of an initial h in hēmēka, passim (by the side of ēdīsa); hēmēka; ādī, XIV, 19; kāta(nī), V, 21; ādī, passim (never ēdīsa, ēdī and never hēmēka); ādī, passim.

Deli. — Loss of the initial y in: aśā, VII-VIII, 11; aśā, III, 20; IV, 10; VI, 4; āun, IV, 15 (yēva, V, 19); ā, V, 17; VI, 8; āva, VII-VIII, 11; of the syllable ya in ētālahā (or possibly equivalent to ētālahān)?, VII-VIII, 3; of the syllable ra in hēmēka, VII-VIII, 4, al. — Addition of an initial y in yēva, V, 13; VII-VIII, 8 (by the side of ēva); of an initial v in vēla, IX, 10; of an initial h in hēmēka; hēmēka, passim (by the side of ēvān); ādī, VII-VIII, 6, al.

Bhāra. — Loss of the initial y. — Addition of an initial h in ādī, 3, 8.

Sahāsāram. — Loss of an initial y in om, I, 2 (yad, 7). — Addition of an initial v in virudhā, 7; of an h in ādī, I.

Rupa. — Addition of an initial h in h(ā)yad(ā), 4; ādī, I. — The initial y remains unchanged: yāvatakt, 5; yd, 2.

Bairā. — Initial y lost in om, 3, preserved in ya (yad), 2.

Compound Consonants.
kt becomes t, Kh., Dh., D.
ky becomes kiy: (ek)kīya, S, 3; sakiya, R, 3: sāvaiya(?) B, 6.
k partly becomes k.
kr becomes always k.
kr becomes kaya in kavāpi, Kh. XIII, 39.

kṣh becomes kṣh in abhikṣhakā, Bh.

kṣhy becomes kh in duṣṭāvah, D. I, 19.

kṣy becomes, at Kh., kṣ: sākhā, XIII, 14; — at Dh., kṣy: mākhyana, det. II, 2; det. I, 2 (Jang.: mōkhyina); — at D., kṣ: mākhaṇi, V, 20; and kṣhy: mākhyana, VI, 19.

gn becomes, at Kh., gn: agitaṇḍhānī, IV, 10; — at Dh., gn: agitaṇḍ, IV, 3; and gin: anuvijina, det. II, 4.

gṛ becomes g, Kh., Dh., D.

jū becomes sūr or n, Kh., Dh., D.

śch becomes sūn, at D.: pañadāsa, V, 12, al.; — at S.: pahāna (?), S.


ty becomes niy in anānya, at Kh., VI, 20; — at Dh., VI, 32; det. II, 9; — sūn in kilamāna; — at Khl., VII, 23; at Dh., VIII, 5.

ṭk becomes k, D., S.

ṭh becomes th in utthana, at Kh., VI, 9, al.; — at Dh., VI, 31, al.

ṭm becomes t, Kh., Dh., D.

ty becomes, at Kh., ty: opatīyā, V, 14, &c.; remains unchanged in nityām, XIV, 19; if indeed we are to read thus; changes into ch in nīchā, VII, 22; into t in paticcittu, X, 28; — at Dh., becomes ty: atīyaṇīkā, VI, 19, &c.; changes into ch in ēkṣācha, I, 2 (doubtful; J. has ēkta); nīchā, VII, 2; changes into t in paticcittu, X, 15; — at D., becomes ch: sachi, II, 12; pachāpānāmī, VI, 8; ty in patīya-nāmiṇī, VI, 5, which R. and M. write pataṣ̄ayā.

tr becomes everywhere t.

tv remains unchanged in tadatāyā, at Kh. X, 27, and at Dh., X, 13; — becomes t at S.: mahata, 3; satā, 7; and at R.: mahata, 2; satā, 5.

tv becomes s at Kh.: chikṣa, II, 5; nevertheless chikṣakīchhi, same line, appears to show a certain hesitation between the form chikṣa and the form chikṣṭa; usṣāva, X, 29; — at Dh., II, 13; X, 6; — at D.: usṣāva, I, 5; chh, at R., in chhaṃvadhāvātā.

ty becomes chh at D., in maṭhā, V, 4.

ādh becomes, at Kh., ādh in vadi, XII, 31, 34, 35; remains ādh in vadi, IV, 12, 13; — ādh, at Dh., in vadi, IV, 15; vuddha, IV, 15; VIII, 4; and at D., in vadi, pasmin.

dy becomes j (Kh., Dh., D.), except in uṇāna (Kh., VI, 18; Dh., VI, 29) in which it becomes y, and at D., I, 3, in duaṇḍaṭāyā for dyē, dyē.

dṛ becomes everywhere d.

dc becomes, at Kh., duc: duvāda, III, 7, &c.; — at Dh., duc: duvāda, det. II, 2, &c.; v in anuvijina, det. II, 4; — at D., duc: duvāda, VII-VIII, 8, &c.; — at S., R. and B., d in jāhpātavīyā (S., 2; R., 2; B., 4); and duc at S. in duvā (6).

dhṛ becomes dā, Kh., D.

dy becomes sūn, Kh., Dh., D.

pt becomes t, Kh., Dh., D. — Appears to change into vat in pāvatāvē (praptavē), S., 3.

pr becomes everywhere p.

bḥk becomes dā: ladhā, Kh., XIII, 11, &c.

br becomes b, Kh., Dh., D.

thṛ becomes bh, at Kh., in bhṛṣu, V, 15; remains unchanged, at D., in abhyāsamānāhā, VII-VIII, 19; abhyāsamātā, VII-VIII, 21. — It is written bhṛyā, at Dh., in bhṛṣu, V, 24; dhṛbhṛṣu, I, 3; at Khl., in alabhṛṣu, &c., 1, 3, 4.

bhṛ becomes bh, Kh., Dh.

my remains unchanged in samāyā at Kh., IX, 25; XIII, 37; and at Dh., samāyā, IX, 8.

mr becomes mb, at Kh., in taṁbaṇāmīṇyā, XIII, 6; at D., in saṁbhāvā, VII-VIII, 2.

ry becomes everywhere g.

ryr becomes gh, at D., in niṣṭhāṣṭṣa, VII-VIII, 5.

reh becomes ch, Kh., Dh., D.

ṛs becomes sūn, Kh., D.

ṛ becomes, at Kh., ād in niṣṭhāṣṭṣa, IX, 26; anuvatāṇā, XIII, 8, &c.; t in anuvatāṇā, V, 9; ni(ś)ṭhāṣṭṣa, niṣṭhāṣṭṣa, IX, 26; — at Dh., t in anuvatāṇā, V, 21; ād in anuvatāṇā, V, 27; kṣā, X, 13; — at D., t in pāvatāvīyā, IV, 5, 13; ād in kṣā, V, 14; pāvatavīyā, IV, 11.
rth becomes, at Kh., th or ṭh : atha, IV, 12, al.; atha, VI, 17, al.; — at Dh., th in athaḍ, det. I, 19, 21; det. II, 8; ṭh in atha, passim; — at Dh., th in atha, VII-VIII, 10; ṭh in athān, VII-VIII, 4, al.; — at S., ṭh: athān, 7, al.; — at R., ṭh : athāga, 3, al.

rth becomes thig at Kh. (IX, 23) and at Dh. (IX, 7), in nilathiyāḥ.

rō becomes dh. Kh., D.

rōh becomes, at Kh., ṭh : vaṭhanisati, IV, 12; dīyātha, XIII, 35, &c.; dh in vaṭhiū, IV, 11 (ordinarily vaṭhika); — at Dh., dh : vaṭhanisati, IV, 16, &c.; — at D., dh : adhitihā, VII-VIII, 2, &c.; — at S., dh in adhitihā, 6; dh in vaṭhisati, 3, 9; — at R., dh : adhitihā, 1; vaṭhisati, 4; — at B., dh : vaṭhisati, 7, 8.

rōh becomes, at S., dhīya in adhitihā, 6; dhīya in dīyāth, ibid.; — at R., dhīya and dhīya (same words); — at B., dhīya in dīyāth, 8.

rōh becomes bh. Kh., Dh.

ro becomes, ūn, Kh., Dh., D.

ry becomes, at Kh., liy in adhitihā, VI, 19; lay in simadhā, if we assume it to be equivalent to sopadrātyaḥ; — at Dh., the same, VI, 31; V, 22; — lay at D.: sudhikā, VII-VIII, 10; nihālikā, III, 9, &c.; at Dh.: aligasati, 5; pulyādyā, 4, 6.

re usually becomes r in all texts; — at Kh. and Dh., in pata, passim.

rī becomes, ūn, Kh., Dh., D.

rīh becomes usually r or n (see), Kh., Dh., D., Bh.

rīh becomes, at Kh., chh in kacchā, &c., VI, 13, al. (= kacchā); — at Dh., s in satya, det. I, 10; chh in kacchā, VII, 2, al.; — at D., s in śākalamā, III, 20; chh in kacchā, II, 16, al.

rī becomes lāḥ, at Kh., in galaha, XII, 33; at Bh., in alahā, 4.

lāḥ becomes p, Kh., Dh.

ly becomes g in kāya in at Kh., Dh., D.

ly becomes, at Kh., vyāgā, VIII, 22, viyanānāt, III, 8, &c., except in diyaν, IV, 10; — at Dh. and D., vyāgā, Dvīyā, Dh., IV, 3, &c.; havatīnyā, D, V, 15, &c.; ichhatī, at Jung., det. I, 5, should, probably, be restored ichhitī (viṇa); — at R. vyā (lōkāya-

taniya, 4), except in vyuṭhā, 5; — at B., y in ālāḍhātī, 6.

rr becomes v, Kh., Dh., D.

soh becomes chh, Kh., Dh.

ān becomes sin in paseṇā, at Bh. (5).

ṣy becomes sīy, at Kh., in paṭiṣeṣyā, IX, 25; at J. det. I, 6, we have dāsyāṇa.

sr becomes s, Kh., Dh., D., R.

śv becomes d., s in sētya, V, 6; sv in svucā, I, 6.

shā becomes k, at Kh., in dukkā, V, 13; — at Dh., in the same word, V, 20, al.

śkhr becomes kh : nihānat, Kh., III, 7, al., nihānat, Dh., VIII, 4, al.

śk becomes th, Kh., Dh., D., R., and th, at S., in viṣṇuṭā, 7.

sāḥ becomes, at Kh., th : adhitihā, V, 15; sēṭhā, IV, 12; — at Dh., th : adhitihā, V, 26; adhitihā, V, 23; nihān, det. I, 11; th in chithitā, IV, 17; — at D., th, nihān, III, 20.

śkph becomes, at Kh. (IX, 26) and at Dh. (IX, 10) ph, in niphāti; — p, at D. in chathupā, V, 7.

śky becomes, at Kh., s : abhīṣikā, 1, 4, &c.; — at Dh., s : śāmavān, III, 11, &c.; h in chatha, det. I, 17; det. II, 9 (Jung., in both cases : śathā); — at D., s : abhyāmināvat, VII-VIII, 21, &c.; h in hānāt, VII-VIII, 4, 5, 6 (by the side of hānāt), and, to add it, at once, although h = ṭy, in dhānāt, IV, 13; — at Bh., s : ṭanāta, 5.

śk becomes, at Kh., k in ajjukhaṭān, IV, 10; — at Dh., kh : ajjukhaṭān, IV, 3.

śk becomes everywhere th.

sthir becomes, at Kh., th in chilathikā, V, 17; ghathāni, XII, 31; th in chilathikā, VI, 20; — at Dh., th in chilathikā, V, 27; VI, 33; — at D., th in chilathikā, II, 15 (Āra "thā"); thorākā, VII-VIII, 2; th in chilathikā, VII-VIII, 11; anathikā, V, 4; — at Bh., th in chilathikā, 4; — at S., the same, 5; — at R., th in sīrthū or, 5; th in chilathikā, 4 — thā becomes th in utti (= pāli nīthāhuṭī), Jung., det. I, 7.

śu becomes sin in senā, at Kh., XIII, 38.

śin becomes, at Kh., s in locatives in asi; — at D., remains unchanged in akasā, det. I, 9, 20, 21; becomes s in the locative in asi; ph
in aphê, det. I, 7, &c.; typhê, det. I, 4, &c.; — at D., s in the locative in aśi; — at S., sum in sumi, I, s in the locative; — at R., sum in sumi, I; ph in typh(ā)yamātha(m), 5; s in the locative; — at B., s in the locative in aśi.

sy becomes, at Kh., s in the genitive in aśa; siy in siyā, XII, 31, al.; — at Dh., s in the genitive in aśa; siy in siyā, passim; āśasiyāna, det. I, 11; — at D., sa in the genitive; siy in siyā, IV, 15; VII-VIII, 11; — at R., siy in siyā, 3.

sr becomes s, Kh., Dh.; sin, at D., in āśiṣeṭa, II, 11, al.

ev becomes, at Kh., s in savaṇa, VI, 18; suvaṇa in suvaṇika, IX, 25; remains unchanged in suvaṇa, VI, 20; — at D., remains unchanged; aśasvaṇa, det. II, 8, 10; suvaṇa, passim; becomes suvaṇa in suvaṇika, IX, 10; at D., remains unchanged: aśasaṇa, V, 18; aśasaṇa, IV, 13; — at S., su in suvaṇa, 4; — at D., remains unchanged in suvaṇa, 3; — at B., remains unchanged in suvaṇika, 6.

hu becomes, at Kh., ṣubh in baubhika, passim; once uṇa in baubhika, XIII, 39; — at D., bh, ṣubh in baubhika, IV, 12, &c.; baubhika, IV, 15, &c.; — at D., bh: baubhika, VII-VIII, 4, 8.

(c). — Sandhi.

Khâlsî.

a + a gives ā; but atatā; II, 5, 6; dhāranumusathī, III, 7, al.; &c.

a + i gives ā in chāmē, V, 17; i, in baubhikhaṇḍuṣu, IX, 24.

a + u gives ū: mahupagāṇi, II, 5; pujopādāyē, IX, 24.

a + e gives ē: chēva, IX, 25; yēṇēṣa, XIII, 38.

i + a gives ē in ēṭhāṇvika, XII, 34.

u + u gives ū in pusopagāṇi, II, 5.

ē + a gives ē in ēyān ( ?) (= i ayān), V, 15; ēṭāyāṭhēyē, XII, 34.

u + u gives ū in pusopagāṇi, II, 5.

ē + a gives ē in ēyān ( ?) (= i ayān), V, 15; ēṭāyāṭhēyē, XII, 34.

u + a vowel changes to m in t₄ṭa mā, XIII, 15; tāṭa mā, XIII, 38; hōvām mā, II, 6; XIII, 6.

Dhaṭṭi.

a + a gives ā (but atata, II, 7; dhārahūmanusathī, VIII, 5, &c.); or remains uncombined in: mahāpādāyē, det. I, 15 (Jang, mahāpādāyē); manamāṭikē, det. I, 16; ēṇaṇyute; Jang, det. II, 12 (Dh.: ēṇaṇu).

a + i gives i in baubhikhāyaṇa, V, 24.

a + u gives ū in muniṣopagāṇi, II, 7; pujopādāyē, IX, 26 (J.: pujopādāyē).

a + ē gives ē in chēva, IV, 16.

i + i gives i in niṇīyān ( ?), det. I, 12 (Jang, niṇīyān), and in kāšṭhiṅ (Jang, det. I, 3), if we must really understand kiṅti āntē.

u + u would seem to give u in pasuṣopagāṇi (so also at J.) (= paseṣh)opagāṇi ?), II, 7. But most probably we should take as starting point a form opaga equivalent to upaga.

Before ti (= iṭi), a final vowel is lengthened: patipūjāyātī, det. I, 10; patipūjāyāti, XIV, 10; maṃśaṇi, det. I, 12; aṭāṭhāyātaṇi, VI, 33; oṣṭhāsūti, det. II, 4, &c.

d final remains unchanged in tadopāyā, VIII, 5.

u before a vowel changes to m, or is even written: m in hēdisoṭiṇeva, det. I, 24; suṭhākāṇeva, det. II, 5.

Dehli.

a + a gives ā, or remains uncombined as in "vasaabhrīta", VI, 1 (RM "sabhā"), al.

a + u gives ū: chāhāpāgāṇi, VII-VIII, 2.

a + ē gives ē in chēva, VII-VIII, 4.

i + u gives i in ēṭaṭvēkē, III, 19; pujavēkē, VI, 4, 7.

u + a gives ū in anusvēkhamāṇē, VII-VIII, 2.

u + u gives u in anupāsthāk, V, 13.

e + i gives i, in kiṣaya, II, 11, if my explanation is right.

Before ti, a final short vowel is sometimes lengthened: nāṃti, III, 19; kāsthāti, II, 16 (RM "ōti"); ādāṭhāvātī, IV, 19, &c. (but vaṭhisati ti, VII-VIII, 7; hōti tī, VII-VIII, 10).

d final remains unchanged in tadathē, VII-VIII, 3.

d final remains unchanged in vaṭhisati, I, 1 al.; assimilated in saṁmūṣikē, V, 2.

m final remains unchanged, or is even doubled before a vowel; hēvaṇēva, VI, 6; ēṭēvaṇēva. VII-VIII, 2; kāyāṇāmēva, III, 17 (A "namē").

Bhābra.

Lādhulūvādē, 6; saṇghaṭitī, 2; h(ō)satāti, 4

hēvāmēva, 8.

Sahāsārām.

Sūḍākhē, 2.

Rūpaṇātha.

Sāṭilēka.
AN EARLY KADAMBA ROCK INSCRIPTION.

The following rock-cut inscription, in two lines, was discovered by Mr. Govind Gangadhar Deshpande, at the falls of the Ghaṭaprabhā near Konṭur, in the Gōkāk Talukā, Belgaum District. I transcribe it from stampeges made by him; a note on them indicates that the inscription is "on the face of the cliff on the right of the falls."

TEXT.

1 Pittī-ḥāktas-śuchir-ddakṣaba[ḥ] satvat-ētāha-pratāpavān [1 *]
2 Kadambānāi kulā jātāḥ śrīmān-Dāṃōdarō giriḥ [11 *]

TRANSLATION.

Dutifūlo (his) father, pure, intelligent, possessed of courage and energy and vigour, (such is) the illustrious king Dāṃōdara, born in the family of the Kadambas.

This record gives us a new name in the Early Kadamba family; and may perhaps be taken to indicate a point to the north-east to which the territories of the kings of that line extended. Dāṃōdara is probably to be allotted to a period not long after the last of the connected names given in my Dynasties of the Kanarese Districts, p. 9.

Another point of interest in this record, is, that the characters, which belong to the southern class of alphabetes, are of the same "box-headed" type with those used in the Ēra inscription of Samudragupta and the Nachně-ki-talāki and Siwani Vakṣṭaka records (Gupta Inscriptions, pp. 18, 233, 243). The size of the letters varies from 21° to 4°; the largest akṣara not formed entirely between the lines of writing, viz., the ēr of śrīmān, line 2.—is about ten inches from top to bottom. Line 1 is about 4° 4′ long; and line 2, about two inches longer. It should be noted that the visarga is assimilated to the following sibilant in ṅḥāktas-śuchir, line 1; but the same is not done at the ends of the first and third quarters of the whole verse.

Near the above record, there occurs twice the name of sri-Dāṃōdara: once in "box-headed" characters of precisely the same type; and once in the characters customarily used in the Early and Western Chalukya records.

J. F. Fleet.

A FOLKTALE ABOUT THE KOMATIS.

The Kōmatis are generally the merchant class of Southern India. Economy and frugality are their characteristic traits. If a person goes to a Kōmatī bāḍar to purchase anything, the merchant is all politeness to him and entreats him to take a seat. This politeness is partly superstitious, and leads to one curious practice. Supposing a purchaser asks for pppu (or dāl) and the Kōmati has none with him he will never say tōdu (no), but will answer "Swāmī, uppamandū, Sir, there is salt." "No" is considered to be a word of ill-omen and is never heard from a Kōmati's mouth. In giving an answer to do duty for "no," a Kōmati will usually try to rhyme to the purchaser's remarks.

To the popular mind the word Kōmati, or rather Kumati, taken to be ku (good) + mati (intellect), means a man of sense or a clever man.

In this connection the following story about the Kōmatis is told:

"Once upon a time a Pāndiyan king had a new silver goblet of enormous size made for the use of the palace, and he superstitiously believed that its first contents should not be of the ordinary kind. So in view of making a special use of it, he ordered his minister to publish it abroad that all the subjects of his kingdom were to put into the vessel a chembu full of milk from each house. The frugal Kōmati, hearing of this, thought each within himself, 'Oh! when the king has ordered such a large quantity, and all will bring milk, it will be enough for me to take a chembu full of water, as a little water poured into such a large quantity of milk will not change its colour. It will not be known that I poured in only water, and I shall pass off as having given my tribute.' In this way all the Kōmatis brought each a chembu full of water, and no one of them told the other of the deceit he was about to practise. Now, it so happened that the Kōmatis were the first to enter the palace, while they thought that the people of other castes had come and gone. The vessel was placed behind a screen, so that no one might cast the evil eye on it and the Kōmatis were left in one by one to do honour to it. This they did in all haste and each returned with great joy in the success of his deceit. Thus there was nothing but water in the vessel. Now it had been arranged that the king was to be the first person to see the contents of his new vessel, and when he went to the apartment where the vessel was kept and saw its contents, he was

1 Metro, Śloka (Anuvijjāl).
thunderstruck to see only water, and was greatly disappointed. He became enraged at the impudence of the Kómatis and directed his minister to punish them severely. However the ready-witted Kómatis came forward with all presence of mind and cried out, 'O gracious king! appease thy anger and kindly listen to what we have to say.

We each brought a chembu-ful of water to find out how many chembu-fals your Highness' precious vessel contained. Now that we have taken the measurement, we will forthwith fetch the quantity of milk required.' The king was extremely pleased to hear this and sent them away.

K. SRIKANTALIYAR.

NOTES AND QUERIES.

SIMILAR PASSAGES IN THE BHAGAVATA-PURANA AND THE BHAGAVADGITA.

While recently reading through the Bhágavata-Puráṇa, I came across several verses which are almost word for word the same as are found in the Bhagavadgītā. Others again, though not word for word similar, yet are sufficiently so to prove that the author of the Bhágavata-Puráṇa was familiar with the Bhagavadgītā, and used it freely in the composition of his work. I give below, in parallel columns, a few of these similar verses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bhágavata-Puráṇa</th>
<th>Bhagavadgītā</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:53</td>
<td>3:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:4</td>
<td>3:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:24 56</td>
<td>4:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:33 27</td>
<td>4:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:81 4</td>
<td>9:26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

J. E. ABBOTT.

SANSKRIT WORDS IN THE BURMESE LANGUAGE.

It is generally stated by those who can speak with authority on the subject, that the Burmese derived their culture, religion, and letters from India through the Talaings, and that Burmese civilization dates from the conquest of Thaton by Ananda Hti (Páli Anuruddha) in 1058 A.D. This statement appears to be vitiated to some extent by the fact of the existence in the Burmese language of a number of Sanskrit words, both derived and naturalized, importing not only terms in religion and mythology, but also those relating to social life. The language of Magadha,

in which the Tripitaka and its commentaries are written, being the language of their religion, one would naturally expect that the Burmese would borrow from Páli rather than from Sanskrit. The appended list may, in some degree, serve to corroborate the above statement.

The following remarkable passage, extracted from the preface of Trenckner's edition of the Miliudapoña, will be of interest in the present connection, as showing the use by the Burmese of the Sanskrit, rather than the Páli, spelling of certain Indian words:

"It is, however, but fair to add that, on closer final syllables. In Burmese ky, kr are sounded ch: gy, gr as j. In every case in the table the pronunciation of th is as in thin. The Burmese t and d are practically the English sound of these consonants.—Ed.

1 In explanation of this note it must be remarked that in Burmese pronunciation consonants are seldom aspirated. Where they are the aspirate is shown by '—'. The consonants shown in brackets, as (k), (t), denote the common Burmese trick of barely sounding certain

2 [i represents the sound of aw, as in awful.—Ed.]
acquaintance, certain spellings (found in Burmese MSS.) are met with, which strike our attention by agreeing closer with Sanskrit in etymology than the corresponding Sinhalese forms. Now the Burmese can scarcely be suspected of introducing Sanskritisms, and it is rather to be presumed that, in such cases, they have been the sole preservers of the true and original Pāli form."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Burmese</th>
<th>Pronunciation</th>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Pāli</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adhvān</td>
<td>Advan</td>
<td>Adhvan</td>
<td>Addhanya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amrūtā</td>
<td>Amāika</td>
<td>Amrita</td>
<td>Amata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhīṣikā</td>
<td>Bē(khēk)</td>
<td>Abhisēka</td>
<td>Abhisēka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chakrā</td>
<td>Se(t)chā</td>
<td>Chakra</td>
<td>Chakka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chakrāvalā</td>
<td>Se(t)chawalā</td>
<td>Chakravāla</td>
<td>Chakravāla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chakrāvaṭīg</td>
<td>Se(t)chawadēg</td>
<td>Chakravartin</td>
<td>Chakravatī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chankraṇ</td>
<td>Zinjan</td>
<td>Chankraṇ</td>
<td>Chankama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drap</td>
<td>Dya(t)</td>
<td>Dravya</td>
<td>Dabba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groh</td>
<td>Jo</td>
<td>Graha</td>
<td>Gaha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kambhā</td>
<td>Kahā</td>
<td>Kalpa</td>
<td>Kappa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mṛikkasō</td>
<td>Myē(k)katho</td>
<td>Mṛigaisaras</td>
<td>Mṛigasara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parissad</td>
<td>Pa(yēk)that</td>
<td>Parishad</td>
<td>Parisa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plīsina</td>
<td>Pō(ēk)chā</td>
<td>Pushya</td>
<td>Pushsa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prakatē</td>
<td>Pyagadē</td>
<td>Prakati</td>
<td>Pakati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prasad</td>
<td>Pya(t)that</td>
<td>Prāśāda</td>
<td>Prāśāda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pritāē</td>
<td>Pēktā</td>
<td>Prēta</td>
<td>Pēta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rasēē</td>
<td>Yathē</td>
<td>Rashi</td>
<td>Iṣi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuddarā</td>
<td>Thanūk(dayā)</td>
<td>Samudra</td>
<td>Samudda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sāriputtarā</td>
<td>Thāyip(ēk)dayā</td>
<td>Sāriputta</td>
<td>Sāriputta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sattasāva</td>
<td>Thadawā</td>
<td>Sattva</td>
<td>Satta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sīkraēē</td>
<td>Thajāē</td>
<td>Sakra</td>
<td>Sakka</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Kallil, a famous shrine in Southern India.**

Kallil, which means literally 'a stone,' is the name of a famous pagaṇa situate in the Kannthānad Tālukā of North Travancore, about sixteen miles east by north of Tripoterna, the residence of the Cochin royal family itself, and distant about six miles east of the British port of Cochin.

Members of the small colony of Baniāns (Jain Vaiśyās) settled in Native Cochin frequent knowledge of Buddhism, have naturalized the Pāli word īṣi, in its proper form, while the Burmese have adopted a Sanskrit derivative from rishi.

10 The pronunciation of dēśa is phonetically impossible to a Burman, hence the insertion of an augmentative a between d and r. See a similar augment in the cases of tra and tva in the two next words.

11 The Sanskrit form of the name of the chief disciple of Gautama Buddha is worthy of notice.

12 A fanciful etymology has been invented to derive Śakra from thi, to know, and kṣa, to hear; knowing and hearing of events that happen in the world of men being one of the attributes of the Recording Angel of Buddhism. [In Upper Burma I have known the word spelt (sakkyā) the(b)ja, though pronounced correctly thajā, and the folk etymology of it given as that, to descend, and (kya) cho, to fall, i.e., he who descends and falls, because the Burmese Recording Angel descends to the earth during the great annual festival of the New Year.—En.]
this shrine, and believe that he who proceeds thither a sufficient large number of times obtains salvation. The pagoda is on the top of a precipitous rock, a small portion of which alone touches the earth, affording a beautiful and wonderful scene to anyone who goes up. A Pisharoti (high-caste Sdra temple-servant by profession), who lives close by, has the sole management of the pagoda, although he is looked down upon, because he has not a large family growing up round him. Siva and Bhagavati are both enshrined here. Of recent years a figure of Brahma is said to have sprung up of itself on the top of the rock.

There is a superstition that if Bhagavati's image is not the first to be seen on going up to worship, the pilgrim is sure to die within eight days thereafter, generally by a sudden attack of fever. Several instances in point are cited by the villagers. Pilgrims, therefore, take the necessary precautions to avoid so sudden a termination of their earthly existence.

In Malabar the solar (or Tamil) New Year's Day (recurring on 12th April) is called Vishu, and is observed as a day of rejoicing and festivity. Early on the morning of this day it is the duty of every devout Hindu to see the village deity the first of all things. For this purpose many lie down to sleep the previous night within the pagoda precincts, and people, who sleep in their own houses in the neighbourhood, are escorted thither by those who have been the first to make their obeisance. The good or bad fortunes of the whole year appear to them to turn on this matter. Many go to see the image with their eyes shut, and sometimes bound with a cloth, — a common custom during visits to particular images.

The evening poci to the goddess is offered at the Pisharoti's house, and not at the pagoda on the top of the hill, which is not approached by human beings in the afternoon, or after the midday service is over. The tradition is that the goddess was once coming from Mumbi (a celebrated shrine in the Western Ghats in South Kanara) playing with two pieces of stone and tossing them up and down as she was moving along, with a worshipper in front of her. All of a sudden, as they came near this spot, the man, — according, it is said, to a vow the goddess had taken, — sat down. There are two rocks on the hill, which appear to touch the ground beneath them without actually doing so, and these are said to be the two stones used by the goddess.

Efforts are occasionally made to raise a wall round the pagoda to prevent crows, &c., from coming into it; but the rock always gradually rises, so as to throw down the building. The old men of the village are always willing to certify to this.

N. SUNKUNI WARIAR.

ANTIQUITIES OF MALABAR: PARAL.

Mr. R. Sewell, Lists of Madras Antiquities (Vol. I., p. 255), says —

"Five miles south by west of Trichur — on a rock, here, is an inscription with some large footprints cut in bas-relief and other sculptures."

I beg to subjoin some notes on the place.

The small pagoda here is known as Parola (lit. on a rock, as it actually is). It is dedicated to Vishnu. It belonged to Mayaya Mangalam Namuri (author of the Naishada Champa?), on the extinction of whose family the rights in it devolved on Tarannamullur Namuri. The pagoda was built about 1866 by the present Uday Raja of Cochin.

On the northern side of the pagoda are five thirthams or sacred pools, and one on the western side. These thirthams are named after the Pundavas, who are said to have lived here for some time.

Dharmaputra's is circular in shape. That of Bhimasena is shaped like his gada (instrument). That of Arjuna is shaped like his bow. Those of Nakula and Sahadeva are smaller in size, and are the only ones in which there is no water during the hottest weather. The water in that of Paanchali (the consort of the Pundavas) is reddish, and said to be so because she bathed in it to purify herself after her courses.

On the rock may be traced lines drawn for playing at dice. Here is a small shrine dedicated to Ganesari.

About half a mile to the south is the celebrated pagoda of Ayyappan or Shasthavu, the village deity, nearly opposite which is the fifth milestone from Trichur. It is owned by a large number of Naumburi houses in the district.

The offerings most pleasing to the deity are cakes, kadal plantains, rasayams, nei (gha) and pal (milk).

The god is noted for giving to dumb worshippers perfection in the art of letters, and there are traditions of several men having become famous after a continued worship here. The young Brahmas of the neighbourhood make it a point, before starting in life, to worship here for terms varying from seven days to one year.

N. SUNKUNI WARIAR.
THE AMGACHHI COPPER-PLATE GRANT OF VIGRAHAPALADEVA III.

BY PROFESSOR F. KIELHORN, C.I.E.; GÖTTINGEN.

The plate which contains this inscription was found, in 1806, at Amgachhi in the Dinajpur District of the Bengal Province, by a peasant, digging earth for the repair of a road near his cottage; and it was forwarded to the Asiatic Society of Bengal, in whose Library it is still deposited. An account of the inscription was given by H. T. Colebrooke, in the Asiatic Researches, Vol. IX. pp. 434-38, and republished in his Miscellaneous Essays, Vol. II. pp. 279-82. And a tentative reading of the text was first published by Dr. Horsnle, in the Centenary Review of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, Part ii. pp. 210-13, and reprinted, after revision, ante, Vol. XIV. pp. 166-68. For my own account of this inscription I have used an excellent ink-impression, made and supplied to me by Mr. Fleet.

The plate is a single one, measuring about 12½" broad by 14½" high, and surmounted by a highly wrought ornament of brass, fixed on the upper part, and scattered some distance on the plate so as to occasion a considerable break in the upper lines. It contains 49 lines of writing, 33 of which are on the front, and 16 on the back of the plate.—The writing has suffered much from corrosion, especially on the proper right side of the front and on the corresponding part of the back, where many aksharas are more or less illegible.—The size of the letters is about ½".—The characters may be described as Nīgarī, of about the 11th century A.D., but as a special feature of the alphabet employed it may be pointed out that r, preceding another consonant, is often written by a short line, sideways attached to the right side of the akshara of which it forms part, not by the ordinary superscript sign, — a peculiarity which the inscription shares with others written in Eastern India.—The language is Sanskrit. From about the middle of line 20 to the beginning of line 43 the inscription is in prose; the rest, excepting the introductory duḥ svasti, is in verse.—As regards orthography, the imperfect state of the plate prevents me from saying more than that ḍ is throughout denoted by the sign for v.

The inscription is one of the devout worshipper of Sugata, or Buddha, the Paramēśvara Paramahāyātāra and Mahārájādhirāja, the illustrious Vighrapaladēva, who meditated on the feet of the Mahārajādhirāja, the illustrious Nāyapaladēva (lines 23-24); and both in the arrangement of the matter and in its wording it follows closely the Bhāgulpur grant of Nārapaladēva, published ante, Vol. XV. pp. 395-7. After the words duḥ svasti, it contains (in lines 1-20) fourteen verses on the genealogy of Vighrapāla, the text of which will be given in full below. In the prose portion which follows (lines 20-42) the king — from his camp of victory pitched at a place which was not Mūdagiri, but which is spoken of exactly as Mūdagiri is in the Bhāgulpur plate, — informs the people and officials concerned that, in order to please the holy Buddha (bhagavanānu Vāruṇa-dīha-bhājārahaṃ = udāya, line 38), after bathing in the Gangāes on the occasion of a lunar eclipse (line 40), he has granted to a Brāhmaṇa some land in the Kūṭīraśa vishaya of the Pundravardhana bhukti (line 24); and he directs the people to make over to the donee whatever may be due to him under this grant. This prose part closes (in line 42) with the date, probably the year 132 on the 9th day of Chaitra. Lines 42-48 contain a number of benedictory and imprecatory verses. Another verse (in lines 48-49) gave the name of the dīna, appointed by Vighrapāla for this grant. And the inscription (in line 49) closes with a verse according to which the plate was engraved by the artizan Saśiddha, a son of Mahādharadēva, who, or whose ancestors, had come from the village of Pōsali.

What is of real and, indeed, of very great value in this inscription, — the latest copper-plate grant hitherto discovered of the so-called Pāla dynasty of Bengal, — are the fourteen verses with which it opens. Of these, verses 1-5 are identical with the verses 1, 2, 4, 5

1 See Asiatic Researches, Vol. IX. p. 134.
2 I am unable to make out with certainty from the ink-impression whether the year is 12 or 13.
3 This Mahādharā engraved the Dinajpur plate of Mahāpala which will be mentioned below.
and 7, and the sixth verse is only a slightly altered version of verse 10, of the Bhaṭṭalpur plate of Nārāyanapāla, ante, Vol. XV. p. 305. And the genealogy, furnished by these six verses, undoubtedly is as Dr. Hultzsch, ib. p. 304, has put it:—

1. Gopāla.


4. Vigrāhāpāla.

5. Nārāyaṇapāla.

The verses 7-11 it would have been impossible to make out fully from this Āngāchī plate alone. But fortunately the very same verses also occur in a copper-plate grant of Mahipaladēva, which a few years ago was discovered at Dinajpur, and of which rubbings have been supplied to me by Dr. Hoernle. And although in the Dinajpur plate they are in general even less legible than in the Āngāchī plate, a continued study and comparison of both plates has enabled me to restore the text in a manner which I believe to be substantially correct. The Dinajpur plate also contains verse 14 of the Āngāchī plate, but places it immediately before the verse referring to Mahipaladēva, between verses 10 and 11 of the Āngāchī plate. For the decipherment of verses 12 and 13 (lines 16-19) of the present grant I have had no help beyond the ink-impression.

Now, having (in verse 6) brought the genealogy down to Nārāyanā, our inscription, according to my text, proceeds as follows:—

(Line 11). 'And his son was the protector of the middle world, the illustrious Bājayapāla, whose fame is proclaimed by tanks as deep as the sea, and by temples the walls of which equal the noblest mountains.

As the store of light proceeds from the eastern mountain, so sprang from that king of the east a son, born from Bhāgyadēri, a daughter of the high-crowned Tuṅga, the moon of the Rāṣṭrakūta family, — the illustrious Gopāladēva, who was long the sole lord of the earth, gaily clad by the four oceans, lustrous with many precious stones.

His, richly endowed with the qualities of a king, the Fortune of regal power — energy, good counsel, and majesty, — worshipped as her lord, dear and attached to him, though he served the earth like a fellow-wife.

From him sprang in the course of time, augmenting the innumerable blessings of his parent, Vigrāhāpadēva, who, dear to all, stainless and revered in every art, when he arose, alleviated like the moon the distress of the world.

From him sprang the protector of the earth, the illustrious Mahipaladēva. Having in the pride of his arm slain in battle all opponents, and having obtained his father's kingdom which had been snatched away by people who had no claim to it, he put down his lotus-foot on the heads of princes.

4 My reading of the text of this inscription will be published in the Journal Bong. As. Soc.
5 The words bhāgyadēri and tuṅga of the original text need not, perhaps, necessarily be taken as proper names, but there can be no doubt that the author, by the words tuṅga-deva, wishes to suggest the name of the Rāṣṭrakūta king of whom he is speaking.
6 The reading of the Dinajpur plate is here slightly different.
7 The epithet, applied to the king, would also be applicable to the moon.
From him, in consequence of his religious merits, was born the fortunate prince Nayapāla. Renouncing the attachment to sin, putting down his foot on the heads of princes, eagerly fulfilling all desires, free from mental blindness, beloved by his subjects, and the one home of affection,—he was like the sun which, when it rises from the eastern mountain, moves away from the night, touches with its rays the tops of mountains, opens up quickly all the quarters, drives away darkness, and is pleasant and red.

From him is born the illustrious prince Vigrahapāladeva, full of majesty, eagerly gazed at by the good, always anxious to worship Śmrara's enemy, expert in battle even more than Hari, a god of death for the clan of his enemies, and a supporter of the four castes who phuses the world with the abundance of his bright fame.\(^8\)

When the huge elephants of his army had drunk pure water in the water-abounding eastern land, and had reamed about at will in the sandal-forests at the foot of the Mahāyā range, they like clouds settled down on the ridges of the snowy mountain, having cooled the trees with showers of drizzling rain.\(^9\)

Our Āṃgāchhī plate, then, clearly furnishes the following line of the so-called Pāla kings:

1. Gopāla I.
2. His son Dharmapāla. (According to the Mungir plate he married a Rāṣṭrakūṭa princess.\(^{19}\) And according to the Bhāgalpur plate he conquered Indrāja of Mahādaya or Kanauj, and gave the sovereignty of Kanauj to Chakrāyudha. See ante, Vol. XX. p. 186.)
3. His nephew Dēvapāla; (in his Mungir plate, which is dated in the year 33 of his reign, described as the son of Dharmapāla.)
4. His nephew Vigrahapāla I; (married, according to the Bhāgalpur plate, Lajjā, a Haihayā princess.)
5. His son Narayanapāla. (His Bhāgalpur plate is dated in the year 17 of his reign.)
6. His son Bājyapāla; (married Bhāgyadēvi, a daughter of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa Tuṅga, perhaps to be identified with Jagatūṅga II, who ruled in the first quarter of the 10th century A.D.)
7. His son Gopāla II.
8. His son Vigrahapāla II.
9. His son Mahāpāla. (He issued the Dīnapur copper-plate grant, and the Śrīnath inscription, published ante, Vol. XVI. p. 140, furnishes for him the date V. 1682 = A.D. 1026.)
10. His son Nayapāla. (A Cambridge MS. is dated in the 14th year and a Gāyā inscription in the 15th year of his reign. See Bundall's Catalogue, p. 175, and Introduction; p. iii., and Sir A. Cunningham's Archael. Survey of India, Vol. III. Plate xxxvii.)
11. His son Vigrahapāla III; (issued this Āṃgāchhī copper-plate grant which is dated in the 12th or 13th year of his reign).

As indicated above, this statement of the relationship of the Pāla kings does not, so far as regards Dēvapāla, agree with the account furnished by the Mungir copper-plate, which distinctly makes that king the son of Dharmapāla, and his queen a Rāṣṭrakūṭa princess. This difference I am unable to reconcile. For the rest, I have only to add that all these kings undoubtedly were Buddhists; and that the figures given under 9, 10, and 11, prove this Āṃgāchhī plate of Vigrahapāladeva III. to have been issued after A.D. 1053.

\(^{8}\) My translation very imperfectly expresses the meaning of this verse. It may be sufficient to say that the king is represented as the substratum of four colours (cāraśvarāṇya), manifest as he was yellow (pīra), red (raudra), green (harīta), and black (kāla).\(^{9}\)

\(^{9}\) Var., with the water emitted from their trunks.

\(^{19}\) Was she a daughter of Śrī Valabha? t. e., Gūḍala III. (who ruled in the first quarter of the 9th century A.D.). The lithograph has Śrī-Parasaralaya duḥkita.
TEXT, LINES 1-20.11

1 Īśā12 svasti || Maitrīḥ13 kā[rumya]-ratna-pramudita-hṛidayāḥ prasyaśā sandadhānāḥ
2 [sa]myak-samvī(ṁbā)[(dhī)-vi]dā-sarid-amāla-[jala-kshā]lit-ājñāna-pa-
3 ikaḥ ī jītvā yah kāma-kāri-prabhavam-ahābhāvam śāvatī[ṁ]
4 prāpa śantī[ṁ] sa śrīmāni-lōkānāthō jayati Da[sa]ya(b)lo śnyaś-cha
5 [Gopāladeva]yaḥ || Lakshmi14-jaṃma-nikātānam samakāro vṛdhī[ṣm] kshamaḥ kṣma-
6 bharaḥ pāsha-chānāḍa-bhayaśa upasthitavatām ek-āśrayo bhūbhūri[ṇ]aḥ Ṽ
7 [man]yā-jā-hā-pariyān-an-aika-nirataḥ sau[sa]ṛya[ṁ]-
8 [layō] śrīmad-ahūd-du[goḥ]-āmbhūh-bhīvilā-bāsī-mahīma śrī-Dḥarmapālo upiṇaḥ ||
9 Rāmasya-cāva gṛihita-satya-tapasaḥ tasya-anurūpō guṇaḥ Saumittrē-rudpādi
tulya-.
10 [mahīma Vṛkṣa]-jaṁa-anujah || yah śrīmān-naya-vijrām-aika-vastir-brātṛuḥ
12 Tasmād15-U.
13 [pendra-chvritirjagati|m]panānāḥ putrō va(ba)bhūva vijayā Jeyapāla-nāma ||
14 dharma-avishā[ṁ] samayitā yuddhi Dvēpālaḥ yah pūrvajō bhuvana-rajay-
15 sakhyo-avaï(nai)shīt || śrīmā-17
17 vīnal-āśi-jala-dīrāh || Dīkṣāpalaḥ18 kṣhti-pālanāya dadhataṁ dū[ṛ]cē vibha-
18 [kti]nvagunaṇā19 śrīmantaṁ janayāṁva[ṁb]bhūva tanaṁ Nārāyaṇaṁ sa
19 prabhun i yah kṣhönipatiḥiḥ śrīmaṇi-ruch-āśishtāṁg[ṛ]-piḥ-ōpala[m] nyāy-ōpāttaṁ-saṁchakāra chāritaih
20 [svai]cāva dhrām-āsamaḥ || Tūryāyanaṁ20 jaladhi-mūla-gabhṛu-garbhair-e[ṛ]vālaiyaś-
21 cha kulaḥbhūva(dha)ra-tulya-kṣamaiḥ || vikhyātya-kirttir-abhavat-tanaṁ-achya-cha
22 tasya śrī-Rājyapāla i-
23 ti [madhya]ma-lōka-pālaḥ Tasmāt21-pūrva-kṣhiti-dhrāṁ-nāṭhāṁ ira mahāsa[m]ṃ Rāsha-
24 turkṛt-āṇavaṇţ-ENDOS Tūnsgasy ottiṣṭa-gauḷer duḥhitari tanaṁ Bhāgavedvyāṁ
25 prasūtāḥ [19] śrīmā-17
26 [nē-Gopāla]devaḥ chiritaram-savane-rēkapatnyā īv-aikō bharat-ābhūn naika-ratna-
27 dyati-khachita-chatuḥ-sindhu-chitrā-āśaṅkāyāḥ || Ya[m]22 svāmina[m]ṃ rāja-
28 guṇaṁ-anam-anāṁsaṁ-sēvati caḥ
29 [rata]raaurakā Ṽ utara-mantra-prabhu-ākṣeta-kāśmikī prithviṁ sapatñm-iva ślay-
30 ya[ṛ]a[m] || Tasmād25 eva(ba)bhūva saṅitvāvaṁ-su-kośi-vardhi kālaṁ chandra-
31 īva Vigrahapāladēva-
32 [b i jśa]vaya-prīyāṇa vinnāṇa kalāṇāya jēn-ūdiṭēṇa dalitō bhuvanaśa tāpah ||
33 Hata-saktā-vipakshaḥ saṅgarō vā(ba)ha-dartād-anadhi-kṛṣṭa-vinuptā rūjyaṁ-
34 asādyā pitryāṁ [19]
35 [nihita]-charaṇa-padmō bhūbhūrtaṁ mūrdhaṁ tasmādaḥ-ābhavat-sanipalāḥ śrī-Mahi-
36 pāladēvaḥ || Tyājya23-dēśasānga[m]ṃ śrīrasi kṛṣṭa-pādaḥ kṣiti-bhūrṣrītaṁ vītan-
37 van sarvā-āśāḥ praśāmbhī-
38 [me]na-dāydrē-riva [riva [19]] hata-dhrāntaṁ snigdha-prakṛitir-anurūg-ai[ṛ]ka-vastirte
39 tatō dhanāya punya-rejanjī Nayanapālo narapatīḥ || Pītha20 sajjana-
40 lō(tā) chānaiḥ Smara-rōpōḥ pūjā-.

11 From an impression supplied by Mr. Fleet.
12 Expressed by a symbol. This symbol for īśi is apparently preceded by the akṣara ni, which is also put in the upper proper left corner of the plate. In the Bhāgalpur plate of Nārāyaṇapāla the same akṣara ni is engraved in the upper right and left corners of the plate, above the first line. And in the Dīṇājpur plate of Mahīpāla it stands at the beginning and end of the first line. I am unable to explain the meaning of this akṣara.
13 Metro, Samudgarih.
14 Metro, Vasunatiaka.
15 Originally pūrvaḥ, but altered to pūrvajō.
16 Metro, Ayāh.
17 Metro, Śrīḍharmākṣānta.
18 Read gāndhī-śrīmantaṁ. The Bhāgalpur plate has vihāketē śrīgāṇḍaḥ.
19 Metro, Vasunatīaka.
20 Metro, Mālaṁ.
21 Metro, Śrīkharīpl.
22 Metro, Samudgarih.
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 page 92.)

2. — INFLEXION.

(a). — Gender.

I do not mention here the use of the nominative in `e for the neuter, although, strictly speaking, it should, I consider, be dealt with under this head (cf. at Kh., VI, 9, katavishā kāhākhiśa, &c.).

Khali. — chat(uh) (nom. masc.), XIII, 5; hatthini (nom. plur.), IV, 10; yutuhi (nec plur. masc.), III, 8. Also note the use of rāhū for the nom. sing. neut. (IV, 12, al.).

Dhau. — yätuhi, III, 11; hatthini, IV, 13; rāhū in the neuter, passim; ēsa . . . hēthin, IX, 8; dhamañcaharañānaṁ ēmnā, IV, 16. To the masculine ēmn jātā, Dh., det. I, 12, corresponds, at Jangada, the neuter ēmnā jātā, Dh., det. I, 13, mahāyānā is in agreement with the feminine asamāpiṭati.

Dehli. — annathini, VII-VIII, 20, 1; pulisāni, IV, 6; ēsa (III, 19, 21, al.) and iyān (III, 17, 18, al.), in the neuter; niyāhāri, VII-VIII, 2.

Bhara. — puliyyāni, 6; ē (nom. sing. neuter), 2.

Sahasaram. — iyān for the neuter, 4, 6, and the masculine, 5.

Rādhā. — īlā employed in the feminine: śāyā kādīyu, locative, 2; īlā in the masculine, 3, 4.

(b). — Declension of Consonantal Bases.

Here again we only find fragmentary remains.

Bases in AN. — Kh.: īlā, passim; lājni; lājīnā; nom. plur. lājīnā, XIII, 5, al.; lājīnā

These signs of punctuation are superfluous.

Bases in AS. — Kh.: yasā (acc. sing.), X, 27, 28. On the other hand, VIII, 23, we have bhujā. — Dh.: yasā, X, 18, and bhujā, VII-VIII, 9.
Bases in IN. — At Kh., we have both the consonantal form *piyadasi-, *piyadasa, and the vocalic form *piyadasa, I, 2, 3, &c. — At Dh., along with the nom. *piyadasa (never *vi), we only find the consonant declension *piyadasi-, *piyadasa. — At D., we have only the nom. *piyadasa, written always with the short final vowel, while A has usually *piyadasa. — Bh.: *piyadasa, I.

(c). — Declension of vocalic bases.

Bases in A. — Masculines. — Nom. sing. everywhere ñ. Kh. has two noms. in ñ: kela- taputu and sâñjapatu, II, 4. — Dat. sing. in ñy, everywhere except at R., which has only the two dative ñyā ñāya, and once at M. in ñathāya, corresponding to D., II, 15. — Loc. sing. in set. Anâb bhāday (Kh., VIII, 23; Dh., VIII, 8); and puyōpāday (Kh., IX, 24; Dh., IX, 6) appear to be locs. in ñ. at Jaug, det. II, 10, kauâkhanas of Dh. is represented by khâr setu-ñā, which can hardly be taken as anything but a double locative, sanāñāi being equivalent to setu- (?); Kh. appears to read vīyañāi, XII, 11. — Abl. sing. in ñ in mañatāta, R., II, 5. — The acc. plur. would be in ñ in bahūkā ḍosī, Kh., I, 2, if comparision with G. and J. did not lead us to consider that this spelling represents the singular bahūkā ḍosā. In Dh., det. I, 18; Dr. Bühler appears to take tēse (which is his reading for my tēsē) as an acc. plur.

Neuters. — Nominatives singular everywhere in ñ. Kh., however, has the following nominatives in ñh: anā, IV, 12; XII, 31; anusaska, IV, 12; bāday, VII, 22, XII, 32; XIII, 36; dānā, III, 8; g_columns_start

Feminines. — Dative sing. in ñy; D.: vīhāryāy, V, 10; VII-VIII, 9, &c. — Instr. sing., Kh.: madhūtīyāy, XIV, 20; pujāy, XII, 31; vīvīdīhāya, XII, 31 (read vīvīdīhāy); Dh.: ēsa(ē)sā, det. I, 9; śaṣṭi, det. I, 10; tullānāya, det. I, 11 (Jaug. in ñy; D.: agīyā; I, 3 (RM ṣya); ādāya, I, 4 (M īṇy); onu, pāyā, VII-VIII, 18, 16, 18; avinnāsya, VII-VIII, 9; kāmātāyā, I, 3 (ARM ṣya); pīlīkāhīyā, I, 4 (ARM ṣya); pujāyā, VI, 8 (RM ṣya); vīvīdīhāya, VI, 8; vīvīdīhāya, VII-VIII, 3; sanāñāi, I, 4 (RM ṣya). — Abl. sing., D.: vīhāryāy, II, 18. — Loc. sing., Kh.: sanāñāyā, pujāyā, VI, 19; Dh.: sanāñāyā, VI, 31 (Jaug. has sanāñānīyā, which should probably be read Ṽnāñāyā, VI, 20; D.: anāñākāyā, V, 20; aṣṭiṣaṃkāhāyā, V, 15, 18; chādrānāyā, V, 15, &c.; tīṣāyā, V, 11 (tīṣyā, V, 15, 18). — Nom. plur., Dh.: pujā, V, 17; ānā, IX, 24; Bh.: gāṭhā, 5; uṣūsī, 8.


(4). — Declension of Pronouns.

Demonstratives, &c.


ima. — Kh.: iyan, nom. masc., V, 16; iyan, nom. fem. passim; iyan, nom. neuter, IV, 12; III, 7; VI, 21; IX, 25, 26; XII, 31, 35, XIII, 36; iyan, nom. neuter (?), IX, 26; iyan, acc. sing., IV, 11, 12; ima, gen. sing., IV, 13; ima, gen. masc., IV, 12; imay, dative; ima, nom. plur. masc., XIII, 33; fem. (pajay), V, 17. — Dh.: iyan, nom. masc., V, 4; det. I, 7, 8 (?); iyan, nom. fem. passim; iyan, nom. neuter, III, 6; IV, 8; VI, 32, 34; ima, acc., IV, 16; V, 17; ima, gen. masc., IV, 18; imay, dative masc., V, 26; fem., XIII, 16; imaya, instr., IX, 12, im, nom. plur. masc., V, 26; imaya, instr. plur., det. I, 10. — D.: iyan, nom. masc., II, 4 (?); nom. fem., I, 15, al.; neuter, III, 17, 18, 21, 22; VI, 8, 9, 10; VII-VIII, 7; ima, acc., VII-VIII, 3; ima, nom. plur. neuter, VII-VIII, 9, al. — S.: iyan, nom. sing. masc. (athê), 5; neuter (sawam, phahê), 3, 4, 6; R.: iyan, nom. sing. masc. (athê, pakamâ), 3, 4; imaya, loc. fem. sing., 2.


Ya. — Kh.: ë, nom. sing. masc., V, 16, al. (yê, V, 14); neuter, X, 28; XIII, 36; yê, nom. sing. neuter, VI, 19; XIII, 35; a, XII, 31; ah, IV, 12; X, 28; yam, VI, 18, 20; XII, 35; a,
THE INDIAN ANTIQUARY.

3. — CONJUGATION.

(a). — Verbal Bases.

I only note modifications, which, as compared with Sanskrit, are not of a purely phonetical and mechanical character.

KHÅLSÅ. — Simple bases: kaléti, V, 13, al.; apakaléti, upokaléti, XIII, 32; chhanati, XII, 32; dakhati, I, 2, al.; pàpunáti, XIII, 38; dupakaléti, XII, 33, is the only example of the preservation of the consonantal conjugation; vijnimane, XII, 36; vijniti, ibid.; pàjñhati, I, 1; punáti, X, 32, seems to me to be very doubtful. — Causals: vadhiyati, XII, 32; vadhiyisati, IV, 11, for "dha"; ayi, contracted to 6 in lokháréšáti, XIV, 19; the formative ayi is retained in the participle, in ánapayéti, VI, 19; weakening of the vowel of the base: lokháptéti, XIV, 19. — Passives: ālakhiyamati, ālakhiyisati, ālakhiyamiti, ālakhiyisati, I, 3, 4.


DELÅ. — Simple bases: anugahirasé, IV, 6; anusisómi, VII-VIII, 21; upadáhá, VI, 5; vidaháni, VI, 6; participle retaining the formative: sukhyáti, VII-VIII, 3. — Causals: for ayi in jháptéati, V, 10 (RM "play"); weakening of the base vowel in ánapayéti, VIII, 1; jñápayáti, IV, 7; lokháptéti, passim; lokháptéati, VII-VIII, 10; manáti, for mânañjati, det, I, 7, is to me very doubtful. — Passives: khádiyati, V, 7.

BHÅRA. — Causals: lokhápyáti, 8.

SAHASÅMÅ. — Causals: lokhápyata, 8, 7.


BAIÁT. — Causal: á(6)ákhétyéti, 6.
(b). — Terminations.

Present. — The only trace of the medial termination occurs in Dha., X, 13, if the reading mahānāt is really certain; even in the passive we have ālaḥauyaṇāt, &c. Kh., I, 3. — I note at S. and R., the form saṃi of the 1st person of ae.

It is a question if at Dha., I, 23, 26, the forms kaluti, kalūti (cf. kalāmi, VI, 20) do not represent the subjunctive.


Past. — The perfect remains unchanged in ēha (Kh. always ēha, except III, 6, D. always ēha; D. 3 times ēha; Bh. ēha). The imperfect has survived in the 3rd pers. plur. kuaṇa, Dha., VIII, 3. — Aroisi, 3rd pers. sing., nikhamāt, Kh., VIII, 22; nikhami, Dha., VIII, 4; kuthā, D., VII-VIII, 15, 20; vadhētā, VII-VIII, 14, 17. 3rd pers. plur. in ēu (Kh., Dha., D.), except huṃu, Kh. VIII, 22; huṃu, D., VII-VIII, 12.

Future. — No 1st pers. in ēu. Forms, such as kuchhām, have been previously quoted. It is the same with futures in which the formative
are connected, so far as we can judge, with the orthographic series of the edicts which we have just considered: i-ṇ and i-ṇ, respectively, do not appear to be distinguished in them; the r changes into l; the initial y disappears; neither s nor n have any particular signs; the nominative singular of masculine bases in o, ends in e, &c. As for special points, all I see to quote are the forms udirikā (for adirikā) Bar., I, 2; II, 4; kubha (= guhā), ibid., I, 2; II, 3; III, 3; ujakha, Bar., I, 2, as at Delhi.

WEBER’S SACRED LITERATURE OF THE JAINS.

TRANSLATED BY DR. HERBERT WEIR SMYTH.

(Continued from page 23).

[426] The third group of the texts of the Siddhānta is formed by the ten pañnas’ prakṛitas.

It is as yet undetermined how old is the position of the pañnas, prakṛitas as the third part of the Siddhānta and what caused their location there. In Avī. there follow upon the uvaṅgas first the chhēgaṇās and then the pañnas. In Śvī. and Vī. the pañnas come directly after the uvaṅgas, but the chīḍa texts (with the exception of mahānīṣṭha which is reached after the pañnas are done with) have been placed before (between aṅgas 4 and 5), as if their position at that point belonged to them. Is the mere fact that the pañnas are more numerous the reason that in the present arrangement of the parts of the Siddhānta (see p. 226) they have been placed before the chhēgaṇās? They are certainly very much inferior to the chhēgaṇās both as regards inner worth and external extent. The joint name pañna, by which they are united, does not occur in any other place in the Siddhānta, except in their own text, so far as I have been able to observe. The word pañna is found, it is true, in the Nandi as saujnā, but in another, far more universal signification, etc., as a means of denoting all those texts not contained in the aṅgas. In the passage of the Nandi 84,000 or even 8,400,000 pañnāgas are spoken of!

The texts now extant called pañnas in the pregnant sense of the word, bear a name, which denoting “scattered,” “hastily sketched” pieces, well suits their real nature as a group of texts corresponding to the Vedic parisīṭas. Like the parisīṭas they are, with a few exceptions, composed in metre; [427] and in fact in ārya, the metre which is usual in the kārikā insertions in the aṅgas, etc. They are different from the texts, which we have considered up to this point, in that the nom., sing., masc. first decl. regularly ends in o and not in e (for exceptions see on 5 and 7). This is a proof of their later origin.

In the usual enumeration of the anāṅgavātī texts in Nandi, Pākhikas, and in the three Sāmāyāris we meet with but six of the ten separate titles of the present pañna group. In the works just mentioned, the titles of 1, 3, 4, 10 are lacking, texts which bear a decidedly secondary stamp. (The scholiast on the Nandi appears also in the case of No. 2 to have had before him quite a different text from the one we possess.)

These ten texts did not originally enjoy the distinction of being the representatives of the pañna group; and that they arrived but gradually at this honor is attested by manifold testimony going to prove that considerable dissent at present exists in regard to the representative position claimed by them.


27 Their collective extent is only about 1,000 granthas.
Here then are twenty names, with but one exception (10 vīṇāthaśa) all belonging to the present group. There are five names which recur elsewhere in the Siddhānta — (1, 2, 13, 17, 20) —; [428] two names which at least were mentioned in connection with the Siddhānta — 14, 15, —; and finally there are four names found nowhere else except here — 9, 11, 14, 18. It is of especial interest to observe the ascribing of Nandi and Apūnaga to the paññāna group as being placed before them. This reference recurs in similar fashion in Śvī., where the enumeration is butt fragmentary and limited to the mention of: nāndī 1, āpunagadarā 2, déviṇādattha 7, tāṇḍulavēyāliyam 5, chaṇḍāvēyijā (16) 6, ānapachacakkhāya 8, āpunivijjā 8, pāminagānam. It then speaks of sēsāni but does not enumerate them. In V., the paññāna texts are treated of on two occasions. In the first case we find, for some reason inexplicable to me, in the discussion in reference to the 15th book of nāga 5, an enumeration of ten texts, which are not stated to be paññānas, though the titles of six are found among the titles of the 10 paññānas. At the head (the action in question is called nāndi-mālāya vairūdaya) we again find nāndī and āpunaga; then follow déviṇāda (7) 2, tāṇḍula (8) 4, chaṇḍāvēyijā (16) 6, āpunivijjā (8) 6, mārnāya 7, jhāgavibhāti 8, āura (2) 9, maṇipachakkhaṇa (9) 10. Of these No. 7 is doubtless identical* with mārnasamāhā in Śvī. and No. 8 corresponds to a section in 2. See below. The second passage in V. is that in which the paññānas are directly discussed; [429] and in this passage they appear in the forefront together with nāndī and āpunaga. Fifteen names are there mentioned, among which are all the ten members of the present list, though arranged differently, but at the end they are called only ičchā-ā: saṃpyaṇa paññāna: nāndī, āpunagadarā, déviṇādattha, tāṇḍulavēyāliyam, maṇrasamāhā, maṇipachakkhaṇa, bhuṭtaparīṇāma, chaṇḍāvēyijā, vairūdaya, āpunivijjā, āvagga, etc. The three additional texts mentioned here No. 5 is mentioned in Śvī. and elsewhere — see p. 428 — as belonging to the paññānas; the case is similar with No. 15. No. 14 belongs to the text referred to as No. 13 in Śvī., a text which possesses a considerable antiquity — pp. 268, 389. Is the saṃpyaṇa on it mentioned here identical with the jahūvīpaśaṃgāraṇa of Haribhadra mentioned p. 413 (on upāṅga 6)? In connection with the above discussion V. treats of the isibhāsīya (see pp. 259, 281, 402), and allots to them 5699 ajñāyaṇas. We have already observed that Haribhadra on Āv. 2, identifies the isibhā, quoted there, with the “dēvēṇḍraṣṭavā etc.”, but on another occasion identifies the isibhā with the uttāra-jāyaṇa. We read therefore in V. that the isibhā were regarded as some belonging to the uttāra-jāyaṇa. [430] uttāra-jāyaṇa’s dāyaṁ aṁtābhaṁvanti, to which the maṇihān ishāgoviśi is joined in V.

In the Vīhārāmāṇitasāṅgāraṇa (see p. 355) as in the three sāmāyrī there is an enumeration of the paññānas, which begins with Nandi and Apūnaga. Nineteen and not 10 paññānas are here enumerated, but of these only the first three are given a name. The passage, which is interesting for other reasons, reads in the very corrupt MSS.: āmga 11, upāṅga 12, chāḍasāmgha (5) m̄ulagramaṭhā 4 pramukhā, pratiyata ēva granthāḥ kalpa-bhāṣyādyayuktāt-sūtrasākṣaṅkha-pūtāḥ, yataḥ kva ‘pi yogavīdhaḥ dṛśyamāṇaḥ naṁdy-anunjogadvārā-“tān Staprattyākhyāmadyā-śānti-prakāśaḥ kāṣāya chid ēva jitaka-pañcakalpa-pādāniṁ virāchayitāṁ ānāmbrāhāṁ, na sarvāhāṁ, yāyāṁ kartāro na jñāyāṁ tāṁ gacchadhakrīṇaṁ. Here then, ātmana-pratyākhyānam (2), and not dēvēṇḍraṣṭavā (7), comes after nāndī and āpunaga, at the head of the remaining paññānas. Here as in Śvī., the pañcakalpa and, in connection with it, the jitakalpa seem to be counted among the paññānas, whereas — see below — they are generally held to belong to the chāḍaśaṭṭra.

* The maṇrasamāhā is also mentioned elsewhere. See pp. 429, 431. We might well recall the maṇpavībhāti in connection with the maṇpa, or the maṇpavīṣi in the enumeration of the maṇpavīṣas, or aṅgahāra texts in Nandi etc. All these texts refer without doubt to saṃpyana; cf. pañama 2.

* The connection with both is, however, very slight, for in v. 61 of the jñānaviśa we find the express statement: dēviṇādattha-māḷi pañnyāga, the connection of nandi and apūnaga being ignored.

* In nāga 4, at only 44 ajñā, are allotted to them in connection with the devalānyabhīṣya.

* Either the pāñchaka or the jītaka appears as No. 6. The Vīhāraḥ, however, recognizes only five chāḍaśaṭṭras. See above.
I have been able to discover no further information that would prove the connection of nandi and aṇūga with the pañna group. The lists and MSS. of the pañna group, which I possess, pay no attention to these two texts, [431] and limit the pañnas to a smaller number, generally to ten.

The enumeration in the Ratnasāgara (Calc. 1880) is as follows: chaũsārana (1) 1, saũthāra (4) 2, tanāgula (5) 3, chaũdāvijīya (1) 4, gaṇeṇvijīya (1) 5, devaṇvijīya 6, virathuva (10) 7, gachhāyāra 8, jīṣṭoṭisārana 9, mahāpačeḥakaṭkana 10. Three names found in Bühler's list (2, 3, 7) do not occur here. To compensate for this omission there are 3 texts mentioned, of which one, No. 6, is quite unknown; the second, No. 8, is found in the V., and the third, No. 9, is referred to even in Avi among the pañnas.

In the enumeration of Rājendra Lāla Mitra and of Kashinath, see pp. 226, 227, we find the list of Bühler (arranged 1, 2, 3, 9, 5, 6, 8, 7, 4). No. 10 is omitted and replaced by mārāṇa-samāhi, the acquaintance with which name we had already made in Avi and V., and which here occupies the eighth position (between 8 and 7).

I possess a MS. of the dasa-pannas which contains a recension varying from that given in Bühler's list. The first page having disappeared, a page which does not belong there has been inserted in its place. It is, therefore, doubtful whether the first part is chaũsārana (1) or not. 42 The arrangement of the following parts is (2, 3, 4, 8, 6, 9, 10). Instead of 7 we have the gachhāyāra, [432] which we find in V. (see p. 429) and Ratnasāgara (p. 431); but there is nothing to compensate for the omission of 10.

The foregoing considerations prove conclusively that it is a matter involved in uncertainty what texts really belong to the pañna group, a fact that must be held to render this secondary character a matter of great probability. All that can be drawn from the contents of the present 10 pañnas makes for the same conclusion.

A considerable portion of the 10 pañnas refers to the proper sort of euthanasia, the confession necessary for this end and the abjuration of everything evil. Several portions, however, treat of different subjects, viz.: 5 physiology, 7 mythology, 8 astrology, 10 hymns. That portion which is of mythological content recalls the Atharvaparīśśita, though the Atharvaparīśśita must precede the pañnas in order of time, since the latter contains the Greek terms bōra and dīkkaṇa.

It is difficult to give a review of the contents of most of these small tests, since we possess no commentary. The character of some portions (1, 5, 6–8) is very dissimilar from that of others; 6–8 are of a similar type, which marks them out as a separate inter-dependent group. A peculiar characteristic of this group is that the author speaks of himself in the first person, and addresses his listeners in the plural or singular. In No. 7 a woman is the object of his instruction; and this pañna has a special claim to antiquity since it is said to be identical with the isbhāsīyāin mentioned in angas 3 10 4, 41. See p. 429. It is, however, possible that another text [433] of the same name is there referred to. In the summary which I now give I follow the extant usual list of the 10 pañnas which is found in Bühler.

XXV. The first pañnam, chaũsārana, chaũhārasaṇam; in 63 vv. The first seven verses44 refer to the shadāvaśayakam, the six daily duties necessary for the purification of life. See above pp. 161 5, 244.

42 Though the extent of the chaũsārana with its 63 gāthās, appears to be very large for one leaf, it is, nevertheless possible that the missing leaf may have contained this part, since this MS. has upon each page 10 lines of 74 aksharas so that the 2,800 aksharas of the front and reverse side would be entirely sufficient for these 63 gāthās.
43 No. 9 has here not 36 but 31 verses.
44 The first verse reads: sāvajjaṁ/lavāviraṇa uktiṣṭeṇa guparo ya, padāvatii | kāñcavaśa niṇḍaṇa vāparahēcchā gupachāramō cheṇa || 1 || It recurs in similar form in the Anuyogadvāras, etc.
1. The sāmāyām, sāmāyikam, explained in the text itself by sāvajjajāgaviraś, desistance from all evil.\footnote{43} Cf. the use of this word to denote the first anga also in up. 1, 27 (ib. 122, 125 sāvajjajāgavahāya).

2. chaśvisāthaa, chaturviśāśistavā, explained ibid. by: ukktiɔna, praise of the virtues of the 24 Jinas.

3. vaṁdaṇa, explained by guṇavaḥ padiṭvati, honor of the guru.

4. padjakṣamaṇaṁ, pratikṣamaṇaṁ confession (to the guru), explained by khaśiyaa naṁdaṇa, censure of past misdeeds, conjoined with the intention of not committing the offence again.\footnote{44}

5. kauśasa, kāyotsarga, expiation, explained by: vaṇatigicchā, healing of wounds, further purification of those who have been absolved by confession.

\[434\] 6. pachchhakхаṇa, pratyākhyānam, explained by: guṇadhāraṇa, the observance of all virtues, or really the casting off of all evil.

The following must be noticed as regards the six āvāyaśkas, which we will discuss later on when treating of Nandl, Anuyogavā, Āvāśya. It was to be expected that the explanations given for 1 and 6 should have changed their respective positions, i.e. sāmāya should have been explained by guṇadhāraṇa and pachchhakхаṇa by sāvajjajāgaviraś. Had this been the case a better logical arrangement would have been effected, viz.: — 1. good action, 2. confession of the commission of misdeeds, 5. compensation for the misdeeds committed, 6. desistance from all further sins. Do not these very names seem to indicate that this was the original arrangement? The two āvāyaśkas, cited in the second and third place, interrupt the connection between 1 and 4—6, and are consequently probably to be regarded as secondary additions.

In v. 8\footnote{45} the fourteen dreams are enumerated which the mother of a tīrthaṅkṛt dreams before his birth, an enumeration which is tantamount to a list of his fourteen excellencies or virtues.

With verse 9 the text per se begins (the preceding portion is doubtless a secondary addition) by the author announcing his purpose: ... vaṁduṁ Mahāvīraṁ kusalāṁbhbaiḥśabddhurān ajjhaṁpaṁ kiṣaljassāmi II 9 11. Here we have the older name of the text, since the chaśuṣaraṇaṁ, as will soon be shown, forms but a part of its contents. \[435\] In a MS. which contains all the 10 painas and which is preceded by an introduction in reference to the sacred number four, the name of this paina is stated to be kusalāṁbhbhaiḥjhaṁhaṁnaṁ and not chaśuṣaraṇaṁ.

In v. 10 is described the three-fold contents of the following portions, and an explanation given for this division that refers to the name adduced in v. 9: ča guṇaḥ āparavayaṁ kāyavā kusalāḥtā ṭiti II 10 11. At the head stands 1. the chaśuṣaraṇaṁpaṁ (from which the customary title of this paina has been borrowed), i.e. the prayers by means of which four-fold protection can be obtained: the arīhaṁta (arhaṁ, v. 13—23), the siddha (v. 23—29), the sāhu (sāhu, v. 30—40) and the dhamma (v. 41—43). Then follows 2. dukkhadagarihā, a penitential system (v. 49—54) of confession to the guru, and 3. sukaṇuṇḍamaṇa, the joy arising from a good deed (v. 55—57). Then come promises of reward and a verse (62) which has compassion on him, through whom chaśuṣaraṇaṁ Jinaḥdhammā na kaḥ, chaśuṣaraṇaṁ saraṇaṁ avi na kayaṁ. The concluding verse contains the summons iya ... vira! bhaddaṁtam ċaṁ ajjhaṁnaṁ jhaṁca (dhyāya).

\footnote{43} sāhaḥ 'vadyāna pāpeṇa varmaṁa iti sāvāyām, yogyā maṁvaṁkāyavāyāparā, tēśhāṁ vinatir nirvṛttāṁ.
\footnote{44} sa punah karishāyaṁ 'tyaḥbhyapagamanamaṁ; hence the name, the meeting, pratipāṇa kramamaṁ. The pratikramaṇaṁ is (see Jacobi, Kalpas. p. 117) divided into five parts: 1. dāvanilam (we must accept this and not devaśāla as the reading in Jacobi's text) i.e. to be done daily; 2. rātriṁkāranti; 3. piśāciṁkāranti semi-monthly; 4. every four months; 5. annually.
\footnote{45} Āvāśya. 2, 274, see Jacobi on Kalpasūtra Jina. § 4.
The commentary considers that this implies also a reference to the name of the author Vīrabhadra, presumably a sādhu, one of the 14,000 who joined Vīra.\[49\]

[436] There is a commentary by Sūmasūndara from the Tāpāgachha; according to the Gurmāvall of this gachha (see Kl. 255) born sāmn. 1430, died 1499, A. D. 1374—1443.

In contradistinction to the triad of the Buddhists buddha, dharma and saṅgha, we find here a quadripartite arrangement. The saṅgha is divided into two parts, the earlier and the present saints, the siddha and the sādhu. The Buddhistic saṅgha, as is expressly stated in that of the Avesta, has reference merely to the pious of the present, who, it may be remarked, are divided in the Avesta according to sex: yeñēh āhām ... yāñēhām āhām tātā āhām tātā yāñēhām. The “Holy Ghost” of the Christian trinity, the origin of which we ascribed (Ind. Streifen 3, 54) to gnostic connection with the trinity of the Parsees or with that of the Buddhists, embraces all time.

XXVI. The second pāññāma, āturaṇachakkhaṇā, āturaṇaprayā, c. 70 vv. with an insertion in prose after v. 10 treats of the renunciation of the moribundus, the pāṇḍiya maraṇam, the genuine euthanasia, cf. Bhagav. 2, 1, 49, 70 (my treatise, 2, 206—7, 209). The introduction consists of enumerations of the five apuṇyayas (pāṇḍivaṅcavramaṇa etc.), and of the puṇyayas and sikkhas.\[50\] In v. 8 there is a citation from the third pāññāma: jō bhattaparinīśaḥ (bhakta-prakāśak) uvakamā vittaḥareṇa nidiḥṣṭaḥ i\[50\] sō cēḥ 'va bālpāṇiḍya maraṇē nē hajāhjagam ll. 11. In v. 10 the proclamation of the [437] real intention of the author: ittō pāṇḍya! pāṇḍiya maraṇāpūrṇā vuchchhaṁ samāsātām 11 10 11

The prose paragraph which follows contains a general formula for confession and renunciation, beginning with the words: ichhāmi bhaṁdē uttamaṁ jīvaṁ (uttamaṁ pāṁnaṁ prakāram, gloss: pratirakram, and closes with 63 jāha, dhyāna, formulas, beginning: annaṁ sam hitā.\[52\] Joining to these are corresponding formulas composed in gāthās. The methods of counting the verses vary greatly in the different MSS., since in some the prose part is counted in a, 3 verses, so that the sum is 84 verses; and differences of another nature are also apparent. The scholiast on the Nandī, it may be remarked in passing,\[52\] in his enumeration of the anaṅga-pavitttha texts, held another text than the present one to be the āturaṇachakkhaṇā?

[438] XXVII. Third pāññāma, the bhattaparinī, bhakta-prāparīṇa, in 172 vv., treats of the bālpāṇiḍya-marāṇamaṇa. Cf. the citation just made from v. 8 of the second pāññāma. This pāññāma contains ethical precepts\[54\] which refer constantly to the Jinasāsanam, Jinarāvaṇam, the Jina-paṇḍya-praṇīta doctrines, while at the same time it cites its own title; cf. (v. 9—11, 14, 18, 35, 162, 171). In the verse before this, the pāññāma is said like pāññāma 1 to refer back to (the

\[50\] yō 'sam Virabhadrāsvādhībh ūri Vīpasaktaḥ chaturdasaḥsamañcārayavarti tasya 'dam ētad adhyāyaṇam, śrīm śāstrakartub samāsagarbhah abhidhānam uktam; asya śī tī 'dhyāyaṇasya Virabhadrāsvādāhikritvāvāmāsya yasya jīnasya yāvantāh śādhabhā pratyekabuddhā (see pp. 205, 334) api tāvānta ētsa prakāśayi api tāvāntay bhavasīti 'tī jaṅgita bhavati (see below on the Nandi).

\[52\] In the Viśhāramita-saṅgākhā — see p. 410 — the ārura,\[6\] is placed after nandi and anuyogā, at the head of the pāññāmas.

\[54\] See Windisch in Jour. Germ. Or. Soc. 28, 220 (1874).

\[54\] itah pāṇḍitaśeṣu viśeṣatāḥ 'pāṇ pāṇ prashyate saṁbhāpataḥ.

\[54\] jāha is always construed here with the accus., i.e. probably as 1 p. sing. ātm. of a denominative (dhyāna)?

\[54\] A collection of examples of these dhyānas is to be found in the introduction of Harshakusala’s commentary on the fourth pāññāma: dhyānaheśa tu likhāyati: annaṁjāha, atra māśasādhiṣṭeṣahatā. Harshakusala recognizes the number of these formulas as 41. The words before jāha appear in thematic form, as pūrva-padāni, and not as accus.

\[6\] The scholiast has here: chitrāvasa vidihi: gālapaṅkaḥitāyān gatīthaḥ pachchakkhaśiṇī dīpo 2 darvāhāsam karetī aṁte a savadā papāyaḥ bhavatāraṇaḥ; iñātī aitāvatā padaḥ prakāśavatārajānaḥ (see प्रकाशवताराजानाः kāraṇaṁ) tātī iñātī yatra vargaḥ: mahatpratyākṣhyaṁ yatra keta. Even if the name ārura-praṇītaḥ is not directly mentioned, and the meaning and the position of these words between the explanations of the titles: charuṣavatī and mahāpachchakkhaṇā, makes most decisively for the conclusion that this very corrupt statement of contents, the metre of which cannot be restored, belongs to the title ārura the text is between these two titles. On gatītha see below (pp. 450, 464, 478), on the chēdāsutta.

\[6\] Directions as to how a man should abstain from food, Kaśā.\n
[49] Virabhadrāsvādāhībh ūri Vīpasaktaḥ chaturdasaḥsamañcārayavarti tasya 'dam ētad adhyāyaṇam, śrīm śāstrakartub samāsagarbhah abhidhāham uktam; asya śī tī 'dhyāyaṇasya Virabhadrāsvādāhikritvāvāmāsya yasya jīnasya yāvantāh śādhabhā pratyekabuddhā (see pp. 205, 334) api tāvānta ētsa prakāśayi api tāvāntay bhavasīti 'tī jaṅgita bhavati (see below on the Nandi).

\[52\] In the Viśhāramita-saṅgākhā — see p. 410 — the ārura,\[6\] is placed after nandi and anuyogā, at the head of the pāññāmas.

\[54\] See Windisch in Jour. Germ. Or. Soc. 28, 220 (1874).

\[54\] itah pāṇḍitaśeṣu viśeṣatāḥ 'pāṇ pāṇ prashyate saṁbhāpataḥ.

\[54\] jāha is always construed here with the accus., i.e. probably as 1 p. sing. ātm. of a denominative (dhyāna)?

\[54\] A collection of examples of these dhyānas is to be found in the introduction of Harshakusala’s commentary on the fourth pāññāma: dhyānaheśa tu likhāyati: annaṁjāha, atra māśasādhiṣṭeṣahatā. Harshakusala recognizes the number of these formulas as 41. The words before jāha appear in thematic form, as pūrva-padāni, and not as accus.

\[6\] The scholiast has here: chitrāvasa vidihi: gālapaṅkaḥitāyān gatīthaḥ pachchakkhaśiṇī dīpo 2 darvāhāsam karetī aṁte a savadā papāyaḥ bhavatāraṇaḥ; iñātī aitāvatā padaḥ prakāśavatārajānaḥ (see प्रकाशवताराजानाः kāraṇaṁ) tātī iñātī yatra vargaḥ: mahatpratyākṣhyaṁ yatra keta. Even if the name ārura-praṇītaḥ is not directly mentioned, and the meaning and the position of these words between the explanations of the titles: charuṣavatī and mahāpachchakkhaṇā, makes most decisively for the conclusion that this very corrupt statement of contents, the metre of which cannot be restored, belongs to the title ārura the text is between these two titles. On gatītha see below (pp. 450, 464, 478), on the chēdāsutta.

\[6\] Directions as to how a man should abstain from food, Kaśā.
doctrines of) Virabhadda, though it is perhaps better to assume that Mahâvîra himself is referred to in this verse: — iza iśara-jiṣa-ya-rabhaddadhahānya-āpanśāriṇīm (!) iṣam-ो bhattaparinnām āhâna- paḍhamāni nisaṃaṅāti bhâvaṅātī 11 11 | stārīsayaṁ Jīpāna va gâhâpaṁ samayakbhitapannatām | āraḥmaṁ vihīnā sāsrayaṅkham iñhāi mukkham 11 172 II According to this concluding verse the text should contain only 170 verses, but perhaps the two concluding verses are a secondary addition. The plural of the verbs in v. 171 in opposition to those in the singular jō ... dhâna is at least very peculiar. Instead of the Sanskrit sâriṇīm (sâriṇīm B! both times with m) sâriṇīm is doubtless the better reading.

XXVIII. Fourth paññāma, saṃthāra, saṃstāra, in 123 vv., treats of the bed upon straw. Cf. Bhagav. 2, 1, 78, 74 (my treatise 2, 203, 207) as a preparation for the paññiyaranaṁ, the proper eunthasny. The title saṃthāra is frequently referred to throughout the text; cf. v. 1, 3, 4, 15, 21, 27, 30 etc.), thus e.g.: saṃthārammi nibiṇḍham gnânaparâvîḍīm nisâñēha 11 11 II. This was the case with paññāma 3.

[439] In v. 32 — 44 the qualities of the man who wishes to ascend the saṃthāra, the second hemistich recurring throughout as a refrain; ... are cited all manner of instances of those who died saṃthāram ārûḍhâ. Thus, the flower-gatherer (ṛ pûpphachâli) Ajjà in Pûṣyaâpura v. 58, Sûkâsalarisvad v. 63, examples from Ujjeñi v. 65, Rûhûdagaṁ nayaram v. 68, Pûḍalaputta v. 70, 73, Kûsañgalî v. 78, Kûnâlanagara v. 80, the names Kurudaṭa v. 84, Gavasukûnâla v. 85, Chûlalutta v. 86, Manikhâla v. 87. It concludes: ēvâ(a)n maë ahiṭhûyà saṃthârâgamâdaṅkhaṁ ārûḍhâ 1 susaṁganarînda-chachiṁ suhañisakamānaṁ sayâ dīnâta 11 122 II.

XXIX. Fifth paññāma, taṃḍulavēyaliyaṁ,55 in verse, prose, and again in verse. The contents are of an anthropological and physiological nature, and are briefly stated in the introduction: —

vocchchhâm paṇñâgam iṣām taṃḍulavēyaliyaṁ nāma 11 11 II

saṁsâra gâ̄niţâ 55 dasa dâsâ (dāsâ A) vâsasayāsa jaha vibhajñâni t saṁsâkalî vâgâśî ja+h châ "yañâ sâsayaṁ hōI 11 II

jattiyamittâ divāsâ jàtiya-râi muhuttam ussaśâ 1 gâmbhamma vâsañ ēvâ āhârâvîhîni ya vocchchhâmi 11 11 II.

Then follows the statement that the ēva [440] remained in the womb 277 full ahoṛtattas and one-half of an ahoṛatta (cf. Aup. § 104) — (26 verses + 3). The prose treats especially of the life and development of the embryo in the womb, striking parallels to which are found in the statements in Nirukti 14, 4, 7, and in the Garbhôpanishad (Iad. Stud. 2, 2a). The subject is treated in the form of a dialogue, in antiquity form, between Mahâvîra and Gôyama. The nominative often ends in o and not in a, so that we may suppose an older source is the base of this recital. Then follows an enumeration of the dasa dasā (dāsā A), ten "ages of man" (cf. Ath. 3, 4, 7) : bâli, kîttâ (A, kidâ B, viçâ C), maimâ, balâ, panâ, hâyañâ, pavanâ, pabhârâ, mummâh (A, maœ B, suœ C), mâyâñâ. These are then treated separately in metre. The text then returns to prose, and treats, in connection with the āyus, of the divisions of time: āvaliâ, khaṇâ up to the kṣôkkoḍî, i.e. millions of years, after which it discusses the multiplicity of bodily relations and of the nature of the body in general. Next come the dry measures based upon the māgaḥaḥ paṭṭha, cf. Ath. par. 35, 3 (my treatise on the Jûṭâ, p. 80; Aupap. § 80, 98), measures of length, of time, the number of the bones, sinews and other parts of the body, of all manner of diseases, of women, &c. Here and there we find verses inserted though they are not counted in continuously with the rest. At the conclusion we find 18 verses: —

ēvâm sōnâ sarirāsa (metre !) vâsânaṁ gânìyapâgaḍamahaṁthâm î mokkhasañimassà ētah

55 It is uncertain how we are to translate or explain this. In āgugas 2, 1, 2 vēyâliya means — vârâdârika, in dasavâla = vaśālika. In ms. or fol. 1073 the title is translated by taṃḍulavēyaliyaṁ; and also in Kashinath (the state of a child in the womb, its birth, &c.).
XXX. Sixth pañamañ, chamādvijhayam, in 174 vv. In the introduction, a dārāgāhā (v. 3), with a conspectus of the contents. Vv. 4 - 19 treat of vinaya in general, vv. 20 - 35 of the qualities of a teacher, āyariyaguna, vv. 36 - 51 of the scholar, abhagunā, vv. 52 - 65 of the impediments (?), nīggañcaguna, in the way of the vinaya, vv. 66 - 98 of perception, nāgacguna, vv. 99 - 114 of the conduct of life, chānacgac, v. 115 fg. of death, maracgac. All these sections are clearly separated by a verse which marks the end of one and the beginning of another (20, 35, 52, 66, 98, 115). Thus, e. g. v. 20: viyacārassa gañvavasise ca māc vauñī samāsacmā āyariyagamā ca guñī ēgamāmā mē nisāmāhā. In v. 173 the contents is repeated or recapitulated as in the dārāgāhā; and the concluding verse is closely connected with that of pañama 6:

tahapattaha kāmē jē jaha muchchaha gabbhavāsasahālganā 1 maracgacgacavabhayammana-ducavagīnyagamamāganā 174 II

XXXI. Seventh pañamañ, dēvindrastava; in 300 vv. A systematic enumeration of the 32 dēvānas, and of all the gods according to their [442] groups, dwelling places, &c. The Nom, Sing, M. of Decl. I ends frequently in e, perhaps because the contents partially follows the statements in the āṅgas and upāṅgas. The divisions are here, as in the case of pañama 6, distinctly separated; and the author here, too, speaks of himself in the first person, and addresses not un frequently (cf. p. 458) a suñdari, suñca, as the one for whom his work is intended.

A patent contradiction to this secular method of treatment is found in Haribhadra on Āvāṣyā, in, where the author proclaims himself to be the composer of a nījīta: isibhāṣaya, and explains this word by dēvindrastavādīnām. We have seen above (pp. 259, 281, 429) that on 8, 4 he referred it to the uttarajhāya. That our text should be so honoured as to be brought into connection with a work of such an important title as the isibhāṣaya (cf. āṅgas 3, 19, 4, 44) and to have been thought worthy of a nījīta at the hands of the author of the Āvāṣyānirukti (whom this may have been), seems utterly impossible if we take into consideration the secondary character of this small mythological manual (see above, p. 280, 432). It is, however, worth our attention to note the fact that also in Svi. V. (see above, p. 428 fg.) the pañamas are frequently said to begin with a text of this name.


XXXII. Eighth pañamañ, gañiviyya, ganivyada, in 86 vv. The content is of an astrology character. It begins: vuchchhac ca balābhavithi māvalabhalivithisamāhitā pasatthamā jñarna-
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PART II.

TRANSLATION.

No. 6.

Song sung when the wedding presents are being carried for the bride or the bridegroom.

Five sets of presents for the bride and five for the bridegroom:
(Even) the king has admired them from the balcony (of his palace).
Five sets of presents for the bride and five for the bridegroom,
The wedding guests have been brought from the country of Jasā.¹

5 They have been sung in good words, . . . .²
Joy, joy to him whose side the pipes are being played.
Let us make an ovation with a tray full of pearls.
Come forth, mother of the bridegroom, his aunts, his sisters all:
The petted bridegroom will now mount his horse,

10 And he will have a splendid following.
Graceful flower girl, tripping gracefully along,
Who will buy thy daisies?
His father,³ Mōharwāndjī, will be sure to buy them;
For he is in pressing need of them.

¹ The same jīthāmāla (see Ind. Stud. 10, 293) is found here (v. 11); see p. 380.
² It is not plain what country is meant.
³ The meaning is not quite clear.
His father is overjoyed and spends moneys (freely).
In order to keep up his prestige.
The bridegroom's mother has caused a beautiful sāli to be woven for herself,
And a bodice of cloth of gold.
Father, what shall we admire most in this procession?

I bring my procession (of guests) from the city of Bombay (Mumbai).
Send for jewelers from Surat,
Send for boxes full of jildā and jhumrātā.
And adorn the bride and the bridgroom with them.
Brother, what shall we admire most in this procession?

I bring my procession (of guests) from the City of Surat.
Send for goldsmiths from Surat,
And get boxes full of bangles and bracelets.
Indulge every desire of the marrying couple.
Now, father, you who are a man of influence.\(^5\)

Get together good wedding guests,
The flower girl enters the narrow street,
And brings garlands of buds.
Flower girl, we shall buy what you bring.
We married women shall unite in buying (your flowers).

Get married women to sing songs,
And indulge every desire of the marrying couple.
Sorabji will now ride his horse,
And by his side (will walk) his brother who is a dēśār\(^6\).
Let me scatter mustard seeds under the horse's feet,

And wish the rider every blessing.
Let me sprinkle some jirā\(^7\) under the horse's feet:
I would not entrust any one with the rider even for a moment.
Let me place (some) damū\(^8\) under the horse's feet,
Sorabji will mount his horse with his face to the East.

Let me sprinkle some salt\(^9\) under the horse's feet.
This is the first time in my life that I do such a (meritorious) thing.
Let me break (some) eggs\(^10\) under the horse's feet.
May the rider be as (prosperous as) his ancestors.
Now my Sorabji has mounted his horse,
And has bowed his head to Dādār Hūrmajda.

\(^{\text{4}}\) Ornaments for the ear.
\(^{\text{5}}\) The meaning is not quite clear.
\(^{\text{6}}\) Women under coverture, as distinguished from widows.
\(^{\text{7}}\) The headman of a community invested with certain magisterial powers.
\(^{\text{8}}\) Seeds resembling fennel seeds.
\(^{\text{9}}\) Damū is a sweet smelling herb.
\(^{\text{10}}\) Mustard seeds damū, and jirā, are not, so far as I know, considered auspicious, but salt is believed to carry prosperity with it.

\(^{11}\) Eggs play an important part in Parsi festive ceremonies: whenever a person is to be welcomed, a tray is prepared with a good many things, which are believed to be auspicious. These are: a coconut, an egg, a handful of rice, a little water, and some sugar made up into little cakes. As soon as the guest steps up to the door the mistress of the house, or if she happens to be a widow, some relative of hers, goes forth with the tray in her hand, and first taking up the egg waves it over the head of her guest, and breaks it against the steps or the pavement; then she does the same with the coconut, and finally sprinkles the rice and sugar cakes over the favoured head. This done, she waves her hands over her guest's head, and uttering some blessings cracks her finger joints against her own temples (vide ante, Vol. XIX. page 375, note 18, part 1), and bids the guest step in with the right foot foremost. The coconut, egg, &c., are believed to carry off all evil with them; and they make it a point to break the egg and the coconut, from which it appears that some sacrifice is meant, and the egg does duty for a live offering, which latter the Parsis cannot admit into their nuptial rites, out of respect for the feelings of the Hindus whose customs they have largely adopted.
No. 7.

Another Song sung when the mother-in-law welcomes her son-in-law.

The mother-in-law welcomes her son-in-law, ornaments adorning her head; Seizing upon an auspicious moment, she welcomes the bridegroom and adorns his neck with a garland (of flowers).

With an oblation of flowers and cocoanuts and rings is the bridegroom received, and is made to sit under the māṇḍap.

Shrinbāi, thy husband has come, and wants some place to put up at. Give him an orchard to put up at, and his mother’s heart will rejoice.

5 Give him a garden to put up at, and his father’s heart will rejoice. Give him a palace to put up in, and his sister’s heart will rejoice.

Give him (a place near) a small well to put up at, and his paternal aunt’s heart will rejoice.

Give him (a place near) a sacred river to put up at, and his maternal aunt’s heart will rejoice.

Give him a yard to put up in, and his paternal uncle’s heart will rejoice.

10 Give him a mango plantation to put up at, and his maternal uncle will rejoice.

Let us bestow upon the bridegroom mango and tamarind plantations, And let us bestow towns and villages on him.

Let us give him eighty-four market places, and let us give him extensive forests.

(But the bridegroom says) “I care not for your mango and tamarind plantations, nor do I wish to have your towns and villages;

15 I need not your eighty-four market places nor your extensive forests;

I am come only to take away Phārimēj’s daughter, for then only will my life be worth living.”

The bridegroom is being decorated with twist and has been brought down to marry a virgin. Sprinkle showers of rose-water and hand packets of pās round (to the guests).

Sprinkle showers of saffron on, and hand bouquets of flowers round (to the guests).

20 The guests are welcome, guests of her who has been waiting (for them).

TEXT.

गीत ६.

बरणी गीत.

पांच बरणी ने पांचे आसरणी. बन्धज वालो भालो. पांच बरणी ने पांच कलीआकारी। बरणी कारने ते जाण आनी।

5 दरें बरणी शाब्दो बाप्पी अवन पालब जानी. 16 लाबड़ो 17 लाबड़ो 13 मोहि षाड़गी।

12 The mother-in-law receives her son-in-law when he comes down to marry her daughter in the following manner: — She goes forth with a tray in her hand, in which are placed a diamond or any other kind of ring, or some other ornament for the bridegroom along with kāakā, some grains of rice, some dry dates and almonds, cocoanuts, and a cone-shaped packet of sugar. The mother-in-law makes a mark with the kāakā on the bridegroom’s forehead, and passes some grains of rice on to it. Then she puts a garland of flowers round his neck, and puts the ring on his finger. This done, she throws a few grains of rice over his head and passing her hands over his face or his head cracks her finger joints against her temples (ride the preceding note).

13 काव्या is the word used in the text and is made to rhyme with माणी, a mother’s sister.

14 During the marriage ceremony the bride and bridegroom are made to sit opposite each other, and twist is wrapped round and round both their persons by the priests, who continue repeating prayers and burning incense on a fire. This practice is now being gradually dropped by the Parsis, but is still prevalent among the Hindus.

15 जूड़ा I interpret this word सकारा balcony.

16 This last phrase is unintelligible, separately अवन means first or best, पालब an embroidered border, and जानी we know.

17 See note, note 56, part I.

बरणी is the common name by which all bridegrooms are called before they are married.
NOTES ON THE MANNERS, CUSTOMS, RELIGION, AND SUPERSTITIONS OF THE TRIBES INHABITING THE SHAN STATES.¹

The natives of the Shân States belong to the following tribes:—

(i) Shâns, who belong to the great Tai family, and occupy generally the valleys of the Shân plateau.

(ii) Palaungs, who occupy the highlands.

(iii) Kachins, a hill tribe.

(iv) Karens in very small numbers.

(v) A few Panthays.

(vi) Lâs and Wâs, who occupy a tract of country to the east of the Salween river.

The descendants of the great Tai family of Shâns are the main occupants of the country and

¹ [Printed originally as a Government paper, by Mr. W. R. Hillier, but as the vernacular words were given only in Shân characters, this is practically the first useful publication of these very valuable, though somewhat skilfully written, notes.—Ed.]
rule the States. Their language is both spoken and written, and, like Chinese, is a tonal language. They are Buddhists in religion. Agriculture is their main occupation, and rice the staple crop. It grows luxuriantly both in puddled land and on the hill slopes, yielding good crops.

The Shāns are divided in the Northern Shān States into Northern Shāns or Tainū, and Southern Shāns or Taitaī. Northern Shāns are again divided into Tainū (Northern Shāns) and Tainam’k’am (Namkhgam Shāns) or Taik’ē (Chinese Shāns). The Taik’ē proper and the Taitaī dress alike. The Taitaī are often also called Taileng (Red Shāns). The Tainamk’am and the Taik’ē dress mostly in dark blue (both men and women). The mode of living and habits of all classes are alike, the only difference between them being in dress and accent.

At birth no particular ceremonies are performed. The mother is not secluded. No rules of diet are enforced on the woman during pregnancy; but the mother is for one month after the birth of a child forbidden the following,—

1. sāmbhār flesh,
2. barking deer’s flesh,
3. fish called pumīng,
4. oranges,
5. vermicelli,
6. sesameum oil,
7. p’akūt (an edible fern),
8. p’āwson (onion),
9. mātèk’āson (tomato).

The above articles of food are said not to agree with a newly-born infant. Immediately after child-birth, the mother has her stomach bandaged, and sits with her back exposed to a fire made of any wood, which, when punctured, does not exude any milk or gum. The woods generally used are,—

1. māisim (oak),
2. māikōt,
3. mātèk (tree fern),
4. maimeu,
5. māikā (chestnut).

The mother is considered unclean for seven days, and before entering upon the duties of the household has to bathe and put on clean garments. Pine-wood (sai-jēk) is burnt and the mother inhales the smoke, and also inhales samōnguèk, which is said to prevent a rising of blood to the head, and so to prevent bleeding from the nose and mouth. Should the mother bleed from the mouth or nose, she is given a decoction of turmeric or some monkey’s blood. The husband observes no special diet during the pregnancy of his wife, or after her delivery, but it is considered undesirable that he should,—

1. drive pigs,
2. carry the dead,
3. bore holes,
4. fill in holes in the ground,
5. mock others.

After a month the child is bathed in water, into which, if the child is a boy, have been put silver, gold, precious stones, a 10-tōld weight, a 5-tōld weight, a 2-tōld weight, and other standard weights down to ½ of a tōld. If the child is a girl, silver, gold, and all the ornaments of the female sex are put in the bath water. If the child is of well-to-do parents 1/3 tōld weight of gold is tied as a pendant round the child’s neck, and if of poor people four annas weight of silver. The child is now named by one of the elders, who ties a cord, consisting of seven threads, round the wrist.

The name is given in the following order:—

If a boy (son);—
1st son = Ai.
2nd son = Ai Yi.
3rd son = Ai S’am.
4th son = Ai S’ai.
5th son = Ai Ngo.
6th son = Ai Nōk.
7th son = Ai Nu.
8th son = Ai Nai.

If a girl (daughter);—
1st daughter = Nang Yē.
2nd daughter = Nang Yi.
3rd daughter = Nang Am.
4th daughter = Nang Ai.
5th daughter = Nang O.
6th daughter = Nang Ók.
7th daughter = Nang It.*

These names are kept by both boys and girls, unless changed under the following conditions:—

1. If the boy enters a kyaung (Buddhist monastery).
2. If after three or four years the child (boy or girl) is renamed with a name indicating the day of birth.
3. If illness supervenes, when the name is changed in the following manner:—

A ceremony is performed by which the child is supposed to be exchanged for—

the Hindus borrowed direct from India, hence these primitive customs of the Shāns are peculiarly interesting. — En.}
(a) A piece of coarse cloth, and is then called Master (or Miss) Coarse Cloth, Ai Man or Nang Man;
(b) A portion of silver, when the name becomes Master (or Miss) Silver, Ai Ngeun or Nang Ngeun;
(c) A pair of scales, when, if the child weighs more than a viss (Rs. 100 in weight), the name becomes Ai (or Nang) Swoi Sa, Master (or Miss) More-than-one-viss; or,
(d) The child is put into a roaster and a pretence is made of roasting it, after which it is called Master (or Miss) Roast, Ai Ka or Nang Kä; or,
(e) The child is thrown away, and picked up again by some member of the family, and after a little time given back to the parents and called Master (or Miss) Picked-up, Ai (or Nang) Kip; or,
(f) If there is a visitor in the house the child is given to him, and then taken back and called Ai (or Nang) K’ok, Master (or Miss) Visitor; or,
(g) If it be full moon day, the child is called Ai (or Nang) Mon, Master (or Miss) Full Moon; or,
(h) If the child have birth marks, it is called Ai (or Nang) Mai, Master (or Miss) Marks.

The above changes of name are made to restore the child to health, and if they fail to do so, the child is then taken to the kyawng (Buddhist monastery) with some offerings and called Ai (or Nang) Lu, Master (or Miss) Offering.

All the names under head (3) are subject to further change under heads (1) and (2).

A boy, when old enough to talk and learn, is sent to a kyawng (in this case a monastic school), which he attends till he learns off the first prayer; when he is made to repeat it thrice in the presence of the head pöngyi (Buddhist monk and teacher), exchanging his ordinary clothes for these of a pöngyi, and remaining in the kyawng under a name given by the pöngyi. This name begins or ends with one of the following letters, according to the day of his birth—

- Sunday = a, â, or ã, as Sâna, &c.
- Monday = ka, k’a, nga, or kã, as Kâlya, &c.
- Tuesday = sa, s’a, or ãa, as Santa, &c.
- Wednesday = ya, la, or wa, as Willa’sa, &c.
- Thursday = po, p’a, or ma, as Pansita, &c.

8 The regulation vis 3-15 lbs. (avoid the poise); but this vis must be about 3 lbs. only.—Ed.
8 1st as in voice.
8 San is a qualifying prefix and not part of the name proper. [In the above we have the ordinary Brahmanical system of nomenclature. The remaining customs previously indicated have many parallels among non-Brahmanical natives in India.—Ed.]
after which one of the elders of the village takes the tea and the salt out into the main road, and holding them above his head calls on heaven, earth and sun to witness the union of the two parties. He then re-enters the house, and ties a cord of seven threads round the left wrist of the bride and one round the right wrist of the bridegroom. This is called the matrimonial bond.

The bridegroom next distributes money to the elders of the village and all sit down to a feast.

The bride with all her worldly goods now accompanies the bridegroom to his house, but they are stopped on the road by bachelor friends of the bridegroom, who has to pay his way through them.

Formal marriage is, however, dying away, and marriage now often means cohabitation by mutual consent.

Divorce is by mutual consent of both parties, who give each other letters of freedom to remarry, &c.

If the wife claims a divorce and the husband is not willing, the wife has to pay Rs. 30 to be divorced. If the husband claims a divorce, he forfeits all his household property to his wife.

The forbidden degrees of consanguinity may be thus stated. A man shall not marry his,—

1. mother,
2. grandmother,
3. sister,
4. aunt,
5. wife’s mother,
6. wife’s grandmother,
7. wife’s aunt.

And vice versa with a woman. All other ties are allowed.

A man may have several wives. A woman cannot have more than one husband. Polygamy is sanctioned, as man is believed to be the superior and master of woman. A man obtains a wife by wooing and with her consent; sometimes by purchase; and in case of rulers, as an offering of peace, friendship, &c.

A man is prohibited from cohabiting with his wife,—

1. during menstruation,
2. while she is in the act of suckling her child,
3. when she is ill,
4. on new moon and full moon days,
5. in the open, or in a kyung or saydi.

A widow is free to marry again and act as she pleases, no one in particular having any claim to her.

The causes of disease are held to be,—

1. irregularities of diet,
2. change of water and climate (air),
3. evil spirits.

Diseases from (1) and (2) are treated by medicines (mostly herbs) and shampooing, from (3) by applying irritants, such as chilies to the eye. Children are never killed. Abortion is brought on by shampooing.

Death is considered to be the result of disease and the dead are buried. The corpse is dressed in new clothes. Clothes worn in them are never used under any circumstances for burial purposes, the body being buried naked rather than in such clothes. There is no belief in ghosts. The grave diggers, before getting out of the newly dug grave, sweep it out with branches or thorns to prevent the souls (spirits) from remaining in the grave.

Persons who have handled a corpse are required to bathe before re-entering the village.

No mourning garb is worn by a widow.

The officials (Sābwas, Myōzās, Tamōns and Myōkhams) decide all cases of murder. The murderer has to pay the following compensation. To the next kin of the victim, Rs. 336; to the official deciding the case, Rs. 333; to the amata, Rs. 2½; to the saršs, Rs. 2½; to the bailiff and messengers, Rs. 2½. If he cannot pay these sums his relations have to do so; if his relations cannot, his village; if his village cannot, his circle. If he belong to another clan or state, and refuse to pay the fine, then war is declared between the two states. If two brothers fight and one is killed the whole family are made to forfeit their worldly goods (household). When a murderer pays the compensation he is set free and no slur or stain is attached to him.

Individual property is recognized and inheritance takes the following course:

- Owner

- Wife

- Son and daughter
  (equal shares)

- Mother and father

- Brothers

---

1. [On this Lieut. Henry Daly remarks that the letter is only given by the man, not by the woman. Lieut. Daly is the Superintendent of the Northern Sháns States.—Ed.]

2. [This equals the Indian dharmáshié.

3. [Lieut. Daly says that “this statement is, I believe, incorrect.”—Ed.]
It will be thus seen that property descends to the children and wife, the wife taking 50 per cent. and the children equal shares of the remainder. The eldest son gets the household property, arms, and precious stones. If there be no children the wife is heir; if no wife, the parents; and if the parents are dead, the deceased's brothers divide.

A title or seat (Sāhwaship, &c.) descends to the sons in order of birth. If there be no sons to the daughter's husband, if she be married; if not, to the brothers.

Everything is eaten, only human flesh being forbidden. Men, women and children all eat together. Cannibalism is practiced very seldom, and only by the Bo, or leader of an army. If he be tattooed in a peculiar manner, he eats the flesh of an enemy who has been shot. This is said to render the charm of the tattooing stronger and more permanent.

The ground is tilled with a crude plough. The first produce of the portion is prepared and taken as an offering to a kyaun before any is eaten by the household.

Each man is said to tell his prayers before setting out on a warlike expedition. The wife of the warrior,—

1. rests and does no work on every fifth day;
2. fills an earthen goblet with water up to the brim and puts some flowers into it every day. A decrease of the water or the withering of the flowers is looked upon as an evil sign (death);
3. sweeps clean, and lays out, her husband's bedding every night;
4. is prohibited from sleeping in his bed during his absence.

Mutilation of enemies is carried on to a great extent. The heads are always cut off and brought to the Chief, who gives a reward for every head, according as the head is that of an important or ordinary man.

The country is governed by Chiefs whose office is supposed to be hereditary and not elective, and descends as above explained.

The following story is told of the origin of the Shāns and of their government. A man, aged 5,000 years, started from the east in search of a wife, and at about the same time a woman, aged 5,000 years, started from the west in search of a husband. These two met in the middle of the Shān States and then became man and wife. They had eight sons and seven daughters, who multiplied in their turn and gave rise to a large population. The eight sons and their respective children clamoured for the rulership over the descendants of the daughters, when their language became confused and they then separated and went their respective ways, with their children and clans. The names of the eight sons were—

(1) Ai.
(2) Ai Yi.
(3) Ai S'am.
(4) Ai S'ai.
(5) Ai Ngo.
(6) Ai Nu.
(7) Ai Nōk.
(8) Ai Nai.

Not being able to agree as to who should be the Chief, and quarrelling amongst themselves, the eldest two sons and their children heard of the existence of two kings to the north, and went there to invite them to come and rule the Shān country. These two kings are said to be the sons of K'un Sang, the Chief of the Heavens, who sent them to deliver the Shān country. The emigrant Shāns invited them to come and rule their country, and promised to supply and give them every comfort, and to obey and follow their commands.

On the way home the party met a man called Sang Pan, who expressed a desire to follow the two kings, and they in turn promised to provide for him.

After a short distance they met another man, who called himself Tāriya, and was a songster. He also joined the party, and they all arrived at Sanphūralit, now in the south-east.

The eight essentials of a city (angkāmōngpit pong') were attended to, namely,—

(1) Market.
(2) Water-supply.
(3) Palace buildings.
(4) [F]
(5) Fields.
(6) Monastic buildings.
(7) Heads of armies (bōs).
(8) Roads.

The names of the two first rulers are—

(1) Mahā-K'attiya Yāza.
(2) Mahā-S'amp'engna Yāza.

The first improved agriculture and the second introduced weapons.

10 [See ante, Vol. XX. p. 422, as to the Maipuri rule of descent.—Ed.]
11 [Compare the male nomenclature above.—Ed.]
12 This man and his generations represent the Amat class, and the two "kings" the Sābwā class.
13 [For (1) read Mahā-K'attiya Rāja and for (2) read (f) Mahā-S'amp'enga Rāja. However, compare these names and that of Sanphūralit with the following from the Mahāyāna (Mahādāvāsana), or Chronicle of the Burmese kings:—' Gautama Buddha, in the fifth year
On arrival they found an engraved stone, with inscriptions said to have been written by the deities to guide them in ruling the country.

All Sāhiwás are said to be descendants of the two first rulers and the officials of Sāng-Pan and Pātīra.

The earth is supposed to have been brought from the depths by a species of white-ant. The depth is 84,000 yāsana.11 the height 84,000, and the shape square. Nine spirits from above came down and then established earth, water, heavens, and religion. They divided the world into 16 divisions. The story of the division is as follows:

A lotus with four leaves flowered between three stones. Then the Myinn mountain, which was 84,000 yāsana within the waters, and 84,000 yāsana above, then appeared. It was surrounded by seven mountains, namely, (1) Wikant'o, (2) Yōkkantula, (3) Eks'engda, (4) N'mengdala, (5) S'udatsana, (6) A's'ana, (7) Gandama. These are the world, which was divided into four great islands, namely, (1) Pọpa Widdhā, or the Eastern Island; (2) Anyagawya, or the Western Island; (3) Guru-Utang, or the Northern Island; (4) S'amundipa, or the Southern Island. This last was subdivided into 16 countries. These having been formed, nine Brahmans came down from heaven and created man, animals, trees, flowers, fruits, grain, and water.12

MATERIALS FOR CALCULATING THE DATE OF SUNDARA-PANDYA.

The island of Sīrānγam near Trichinopoly bears two ancient temples, one of Vishnu which is called Rağagānakā, and one of Siva which is called Jambhukēswra in Sanskrit and Tiruvānaiykkōr in Tamil. Within the second of these temples, my First Assistant, Mr. V. Venkayya, discovered an inscription of Sundara-Pāṇḍya, which promises to settle the date of this king within narrow limits. The inscription is engraved on the south wall of the second prākāra which I was not permitted to enter. The subjoined transcript of its first lines is made with the help of another identical inscription, the date of which is lost, on the west wall of the third prākāra.

TEXT.


3 [lātu-nāl].

TRANSLATION.

A. — Sanskrit portion.

Hail! Prosperity!

Hail! The support of the whole world, the ornament of the race of the Moon, the Madhaira (Krishna) of the city of Madhura, the uprooter of the Kōnāla race, a second Rāma in plundering the island of Lonkā, the thunderbolt to the mountain (which was) the Chōla race, the dispeller of the Kāṇchika king, the fever to the elephant (which was) the Kāṇḍa (king), the destroyer of the strongholds of various enemies, the jungle-fire to the forest (which was) Vira-Kaṇḍa-Pāṇḍya, the tiger to the deer (which was) Gaṇapati (who was) the lord of Kāṇchi the best of cities, he who was anointed as a hero in the town of Nellā, who re-established those kings who prostrated themselves before him, the mahārājādhirāja-pramāṇēvāra:—

B. — Tamil portion.

In the tenth—year (of the reign) of (this) king (he) Jātāvārma, alias the emperor of the three worlds, the glorious Sundara-Pāṇḍya-deva, who was pleased to conquer every country,—on the day of (the nakhaṭtra) Anurādhā, which corresponded to Wednesday, the first tiṭhi of the second fortnight of the month of Bishabhā.

Among the enemies of whose conquest the king boasts in the Sanskrit preamble of his inscription, there are two names of individuals, viz. Gaṇapati, the lord of Kāṇchi, and Vira-Kaṇḍa-Pāṇḍya. The dates of each of these are known from other sources. An inscription of the

Vol. XVIII. p. 277ff. and Vol. XIX. p. 487ff., read with this one go far towards settling the origin of these garbled Siṃh tales. Sampurāṇa is possibly the Chandra-puri on the Mekong of Yule and other writers.—En.

11 A yāsana (yāsana) is the measure of the distance the eye can reach.

12 The Indian origin, probably through Buddhist tradition, of the above folktales is obvious.—En.
Kakatiya king Ganaapati of Orugallu (Worangal) which is found in the Ekamratha temple at Kaśchipura, and which I shall shortly publish in this Journal, is dated on Tuesday, the 11th tilka of the dark fortnight of Jyāshīha of Saka 1172, the cyclic year Saumya, which corresponds to Tuesday, the 8th June 1249 A.D. According to a Telugu chronicle (Taylor's Catalogue, Vol. III. p. 458) and an inscription of his successor (Sewell's Lists of Antiquities, Vol. I. Appendix, p. xx), king Ganaapati died in Saka 1189. Vira-Kaṇḍa-Gopaḷa is very probably identical with Kaṇḍa-Gopaḷa, whose date is established by three other Kaṇḍi inscriptions, the beginnings of which are subjoined:—

No. I.

On the south wall of the so-called “rock” (malai) in the Arulmigu Perum Temple.


Hail! Prosperity! In the 16th year (of the reign) of the emperor of the three worlds, the glorious and victorious Kaṇḍa-Gopaḷadeva, which corresponded to the Śaka year 1187, — on the day of the nakhahara Rōṇiṇi, which corresponds to Saturday, the thirteenth tilka of the second fortnight of the month of Mithuna.

No. II.

On the north wall of the second prakāra of the Ekamratha temple.


Hail! Prosperity! In the 16th year of etc., which corresponded to the Śaka year 1187,— on the day of the nakhahara Uṭṭarāśāhāḷa, which corresponded to Saturday, the third tilka of the second fortnight of the month of Śiṅha.

No. III.

On the same wall as No. I.


Hail! Prosperity! In the 16th year of etc., which corresponded to the Śaka year 1187,— on the day of the nakhahara Uṭṭarāśāhāḷa, which corresponded to Saturday, the third tilka of the second fortnight of the month of Śiṅha.

According to an inscription of the Dharmavara temple at Māmanigalam in the Chingleput district, Kanda-Gopaḷa bore the surname Madhurantaka-Pottappi-Chola. A comparison of the dates of Nos. I. and II. shows that his accession must have taken place between the months of Mithuna and Śiṅha in the Śaka year 1172. The units of the two dates of No. III. are not absolutely certain. If the published reading is correct, the dates would be identical with those of No. II, with the exception of the nakhahara. In this case either Uṭṭirnāṭṭi or Uṭṭirnāṭṭi-dēśi might be a mistake for the other.

The manner in which the year of the accession of Sundara-Pändya might be fixed is on the basis of these new data, will be as follows:—The upper limit for the date of the inscription of Sundara-Pändya is Śaka 1172, as the fight between him and Kaṇḍa-Gopaḷa might have taken place in his 10th year, in which his inscription is dated, and also in Śaka 1172, the year of the accession of Kaṇḍa-Gopaḷa. The lower limit is Śaka 1160, as the fight between him and Ganaapati might have taken place in his first year, and also in Śaka 1186, the year of the death of Ganaapati. The details of the date of the inscription must accordingly be applied to each of the Śaka years 1172 to 1190, and the year of the accession of Sundara-Pändya will fall between Śaka 1162 and 1189.

The Sundara-Pändya of the Jambukēvara inscription may, accordingly, be identical with Marco Polo's 'Sender Bandi,' who was reigning in A.D. 1292, and with that 'Sundar Bandi,' who, according to the Muhammadan historians, died in A.D. 1293 [Dr. Caldwell's Comparative Grammar, Introduction, p. 141; History of Travancore, p. 33]. The 'Pändya king Sundara,' who is mentioned in a Śiṅhalēse chronicle (J. As. Soc. Bengal, Vol. XII. Part I. p. 260) as a contemporary of Parākrama-bāhu of Ceylon (1153 to 1186 A.D.), does not appear to have been a reigning king, but a mere prince and general of a Pändya king Kulaśēkha, whose predecessor was a Parākrama-Pändya, and whose successor was a Vira-Pändya. That there was at least one still earlier Sundara, may be gathered from the inscriptions of Rājendra-Chōla, who boasts of having conquered "the crown of Sundara" (South-Indian Inscriptions, Vol. I. p. 89; Vol. II. p. 108).

E. Holzschuch.

After the above note was in type, I received a letter from Mr. S. B. Dickshit, dated Dñulita, 11th March, in which he states that Śaka 1182 expired is the only year that answers for the details of the inscription of Sundara-Pändya.

E. H.

Nawadiroog, 16th March 1892.
NOTES AND QUERIES.

ECLIPSE-CUSTOMS IN MADRAS.

A peculiar sanctity is attributed to eclipses in general. Among the Brāhmanas it is considered most sacrilegious to take food during the period of the eclipse. The food should be taken generally fully eight hours before the first contact, and at first contact everybody, including children, should bathe. A bath in the sea or a river is considered the most efficacious. Previous to bathing, the family priest generally goes through certain rites with a view to washing away all the sins of the party. After the bath, ashes are freely distributed to the poor, and when the last contact is over, or after the clearance of the eclipse, there is a second bath, and then the worshippers may take their food.

A peculiar feature in eclipse customs is, that when the eclipse falls on a day, the presiding nakshatra of which is the same as that of a person’s horoscope, there is fear of its having an evil influence on his futurity. To ward off this the priest has to perform counteracting ceremonies, and to distribute alms freely to the poor, or break a few of both ash-coloured and white gourds. The person influenced for evil as above is also advised to tie round his forehead a small palmyra leaf, on which are written a few Sanskrit verses, in expiation of his or her sins, as the case may be.

K. SRIKANTALAYAR.

GLIMPSES INTO A BHIL’S LIFE.

I once purchased a quiver, filled with arrows, which had been in the possession of a Bhil of some standing. In a pocket in the quiver were found three documents in the vernacular, of which I now give a partial rendering. They are very characteristic of the people to whom the owner belonged.

First came a scrap of a letter to the following effect: — “In the Jēra (? Jēra) District, Jamnā Bhanbhājī’s son is charged with theft from the house of Mānśā Mīnā. She states that so far her son has never stolen anything. If she has lied to her uncle, let her be convicted before the paśchātya. Convey our welfare. Kītak bādi pūchchhāri, St. 1934 (Oct. 1877). Witnesses to the good conduct of Jamnā Bhanbhājī’s son — Ṭhākuri Patēl, Balbān Patēl, Dungar Patēl, Bhagwāni Patēl. Signed by Chauhān Patwāri; the above statement of Jamnā Bhanbhājī is correct.”

Next comes a small scrap of paper giving the name of eighteen persons, all Hindus, who owed the writer Rs. 40-4-0 between them, in sums varying from 12 annas to Rs. 5.

Lastly is a short daily “account of expenditure with one Ali Bakhsh from Asauj (Sept.) sādi 13th, St. 1934 (1877).” It is in five columns, headed respectively flour (dāl), pulse (dāl), gīr mojasses (gur) and tobacco, with an occasional note of cash borrowed, and extends from Asauj sādi 13th to Kītak bādi 8th, or 11 days.

On Asauj sādi 13th the owner must have laid in a stock, for we find him procuring: — dāl, 10 sārs: dāl, 1 sār: gīr, 1 sār: gīr: 1 sār: tāmākā, 6 pātā: pātā, 3 pātā. He bought his dāl, dāl, and gīr regularly every day thereafter, and his gur and tobacco occasionally only. Money he seems to have borrowed in very small quantities. He bought his dāl alternately 1 sār 8 chīlāks, and 12 chīlāks: his dāl nearly always 6 chīlāks: and his gūr nearly always 3 chīlāks. Including his stock on Asauj sādi 13th, he purchased altogether dāl, 35 sārs, 2 chīlāks: dāl, 6 sārs, 12 chīlāks: gīr 4 sārs, 3 chīlāks: gīr, 2 sārs, 10 chīlāks. He also bought 6 chīlāks of sugarcane. The ruling rates for these articles were dāl, 16 sārs: dāl, 10 sārs: gīr, 3 sārs: gūr, 10 sārs. His total expenditure was Rs. 4-14-0, including 1 anna and 3 pies borrowed in cash, in these eleven days, of which nearly one-fourth was on the first day for some reason, leaving an expenditure of Rs. 3-12-0 in ten days, or (say) Rs. 11-4-0 in a month; wherefrom it is to be assumed that our unknown friend was a man of substance in his village.

R. C. TEMPLE.

BOOK-NOTICES.

HANDBOOK OF THE HAKA OR BAUNGSHI DIALECT OF THE CHIN LANGUAGE, BY LIEUT. J. C. MACNAIR, B. S. C., Political Officer, Haka.¹

That the wild Chins and other mountaineers on the Burman Frontier are at present receiving an especial measure of attention is due to the possession by them of peculiarly interesting qualities, but solely to their persistent and inveterate habit of raiding. These raids have taken place with entire impartiality, both against other hill-men living without the pale, and against the more civilised inhabitants of the plains. As has been pointed out by Mr. McCabe with reference to the cognate Nagā tribes, each

¹ Rangoon, printed by the Superintendent, Government Printing, Burma, 1891.
village is frequently foreign country to its neighbours, and raid and counter-raid are carried on with little intermission and in the most blood-thirsty manner. This state of things could not, of course, be permitted to continue in the presence of a civilised power, and as nothing short of annexation was shown to have the slightest effect on these wild hill-men, their country has been received into the British Empire, and measures have been taken to establish in the hill country the Pax Britannica, which already prevails in the neighbouring plains. This has, of course, necessitated the presence amongst the wild Chins of British officers, who, in accordance with the wise foresight of the Government, have been encouraged to make themselves familiar with the language of the people whose destinies they control. The present manuscript, which is designed for the use of military and other officers in Hëkà and its vicinity, is the work of Mr. Macnab, the Political Officer stationed at that place, and is one of the first results of the new régime. The language is that known as the Baungshè or Hëkà Chin, which language we are told in the Preface is spoken over a considerable tract of country. Slight dialectic variations, it is true, occur in different parts, but these do not appear to be so important as one might be lead à priori to suppose.

One direct result, indeed, of the intermicne warfare referred to is the creation of many petty dialects, which, in the case of the Manipúris, have caused travellers to state that the language spoken in certain villages is unintelligible to their neighbours twenty or thirty miles away. Whilst, however, admitting that the conditions of life in the wild forest-covered mountains of the Arakan Yúna are favourable to the propagation of petty dialectic changes, it may reasonably be doubted whether there is much real divergence in the language spoken by different villages of the same tribe. Slight variations in the pronunciation of certain vowels, or in the retention or elision of final consonants, will frequently make alterations in words, which, though sufficiently small in a written language, will often render sentences unintelligible to obtuse savages, and even to educated Europeans, who are not well versed in the language. Of course, also, the absence hitherto of books or writings amongst these savages is eminently conducive to the growth of different dialects, but again there is a strong countering tendency in the pertinacity with which the Mongolid races retain intact the root words of their languages.8

In the present case it may be taken that we have before us the language spoken by a large and important body of these hill-men, and the information concerning it, now for the first time brought to the public eye, cannot fail to throw an interesting light on the ethnic relations generally of the Chins and their cognate races. Before however examining the philologial aspects of the Baungshè or Hëkà Chin Language it may be well to point out a few apparent errors in the book before us. I shall do so in no cavilling spirit, being well aware of the difficulties and pitfalls which await him who for the first time reduces a foreign language to writing; but without laying claim to any knowledge of the language itself, a comparison of the sentences and vocabulary in this book with those already published of Lushai and its cognate dialects will show, that there are a few mistakes, which may with advantage be corrected in a second edition.

Mr. Macnab has, in writing Chin, wisely chosen the Roman character in preference to the Burmesse one, and has selected with slight alteration the Government system of vowel transliteration. This is a most fortunate circumstance, as it both facilitates comparison of the language with others, and enables the learner to grasp at once the various sounds used in speaking. It is to be hoped that the same course will be followed by pioneers in the other hill languages and dialects, and that the error of the American Missionaries in using a garbled version of the Burmesse alphabet (itself drawn from Aryan sources), in writing Karen, will not be repeated.

Objection may be taken to two divergences from the Government system, namely the transliteration of short ə as in 'upon' by ə, and of short a, as in 'full,' by ã. In the former case it would obviously be preferable to write the ə without any mark at all, since the sound in 'upon' is simply that of the ordinary short ə (not found in Burmesse).9

The transliteration of the undefinite vowel by ã is unquestionably wrong and misleading. This vowel is etymologically a, as is shown, for instance, by the words for 'rupee' (tánkā), 'reward' (tâk-saung), and 'path' (tānb), which are derivatives respectively of the Hindustání word tánkā, the Burmesse tâk-saung (let-saung), and the

Bishop Pattison on the languages of the Pacific Islands, and the experience of Mr. Man in the Andamans.—En.] 9 [The representation of ə in 'upon' by ã is, of course, clearly misleading, but I think it requires a dialectical mark nevertheless. Ordinary short ə is usually understood to have the sound of ə in 'opaque,' found

\[8 \text{[e. g., the Hindi कों is the Paújíi ká̄n, words instantly recognizable as the same on paper, but not so in speech. —En.]}

\[9 \text{[The experience of British officers in the Chin Hills is clearly that of those who have to deal with savage languages generally. E. g., the remarks of the late}
Tibeto-Burman root *lam*. If it is considered necessary in writing to distinguish this vowel from that in the word ‘man’ (some simple diacritical mark such as \(\ddot{a}\) would probably suffice, or perhaps Mr. Sweet’s Anglo-Saxon \(\ddot{a}\) might do.

Again, is it correct to talk of \(t\) preceding \(s\) or \(z\) as an aspirate? The latter expression is usually applied to a breathing of some kind, and indeed the sounds referred to are simply inchoate palatals and not aspirated sibilants.

It is doubtless through an oversight that such pre-Hunterian words as ‘a-leen,’ ‘warm,’ ‘a-book,’ ‘cool,’ ‘like,’ ‘to catch,’ occur in the book. These should apparently be written \(\ddot{a}\), \(a\), and \(\ddot{a}\).

On examining the vocabularies in the book, one of the first things to strike the eye is the prefixing of \(k\) to all verbal roots, which seems at first strange, as no known cognate language possesses this peculiarity. A comparison, however, with Lushai, (which will be shown to be the language most nearly related to Baungshê Chin), shows that this \(k\) is in reality the shortened or reduplicated form of the first personal pronoun \(k\). This particle is, of course, a distinct word, and has nothing to do with the verbal root; and it is, therefore, unfortunate that it should have been confused with the latter. The error has doubtless arisen from the difficulty, which has been pointed out by Professor Sayce, in ‘getting a savage or barbarian to give the name of an object without incorporating it into a sentence or bringing it into relation with something else.’ It is, indeed, demonstrable that Mr. Hodgson, though aware of a precisely similar construction existing in Gyarung and other languages, has, in the case of vocabularies of dialects cognate to Baungshê Chin, been misled by this very particle \(k\), which he has mistaken for the well known \(ka\) found throughout the Tibeto-Burman family. In the present case the confusing of the pronoun \(ka\) with the root has led to several mistakes in the sentences; e.g., on page 6—‘Have you ever met me’ should be \(k\) na \(\ddot{a}\) \(\ddot{a}\) \(\ddot{a}\)-\(\ddot{a}\)-\(\ddot{a}\), and not \(k\) \(\ddot{a}\) \(\ddot{a}\); and on page 22—‘You are lying’ should be \(\ddot{a}\) \(\ddot{a}\) \(\ddot{a}\) \(\ddot{a}\) \(\ddot{a}\) \(\ddot{a}\), and not \(\ddot{a}\) \(\ddot{a}\) \(\ddot{a}\).

The word for ‘fowl’ is given throughout as \(\ddot{a}\), but \(\ddot{a}\) \(\ddot{a}\) \(\ddot{a}\) it would seem somewhat doubtful whether there is any \(r\) sound in this word, which is obviously a corruption of the widespread root \(\ddot{a}\), meaning ‘a bird or fowl.’ In no cognate language has this root a final \(r\), nor is there anything to show that the \(\ddot{a}\) suffix which has been pointed out by Mr. Hodgson in Tibetan and other languages occurs in Baungshê Chin. Without, therefore, presuming to lay down how these people pronounce the word, we would suggest that it is possibly \(\ddot{a}\) pronounced in the ‘heavy tone,’ as it is called in Burmese. The fact also of its being a shortened or cut down form of the original root \(\ddot{a}\) lends probability to its being pronounced in this tone.

It may here be remarked that no mention is made of tones in this book, but this can hardly be because they do not exist in Baungshê Chin. It would, indeed, be scarcely credible that this language, surrounded as it is on all sides by those using tones, should be destitute of these adjuncts, which are indeed universal amongst the South-Eastern Mongoloids. At the same time the subject of tones presents unusual difficulties to the European, whose ear can frequently scarcely distinguish between words in different tones, unless the fact of that difference is specially brought to his notice. Moreover, little has been done as yet towards solving the question of the best method of rendering tones when using the Hunterian system of spelling; so that in a handbook like the present one it was perhaps as well to avoid the subject. At the same time we should have been glad to be informed positively as to the existence of tones in Baungshê Chin, and if so, how many could be distinguished. Similarly, it would be interesting to know whether these Chinese ever modify their vowels similarly to the German \(\ddot{a}\)\(\ddot{a}\)\(\ddot{a}\). The use of modified vowels is very common amongst the Mongoloid hill-men, not to speak of the Tibetans, and \(\ddot{a}\) \(\ddot{a}\) \(\ddot{a}\) priori it would seem probable that they exist in the Baungshê dialect. In their case no difficulty exists in writing, since the forms \(\ddot{a}\), \(\ddot{a}\), \(\ddot{a}\), and \(\ddot{a}\) are universally understood. Possibly the word \(\ddot{a}\) \(\ddot{a}\) ‘to build,’ (a stockade), should be written of Andamanese, owing to this very cause. The savage will always say ‘my leg,’ ‘your leg,’ ‘his leg’ in preference to ‘leg,’ and when he speaks, as the Andamanese do, of \(\ddot{a}\)\(\ddot{a}\)\(\ddot{a}\), and \(\ddot{a}\)\(\ddot{a}\)\(\ddot{a}\)\(\ddot{a}\) for the above expressions, and then proceeds to drop the final \(\ddot{a}\) in composition, the unassisted learner is apt to be puzzled; more especially when, as in Andamanese, there are seven varieties of these prefixes, having but little in common with each other and the ordinary words for ‘I, you and he.’—Ed.

Mongolian Affinities of the Circassians.
shâl, for it is very unusual, if not quite unknown, in this class of languages, to find an r prefixed to a final consonant. Similarly it may be surmised that svern, 'to come out' should be written sên.

In the list of the first ten numerals given at the end of the book the prefix pa occurs before each number. A reference to the text, however, shows that this pa is, as in Lushai, merely a numeral co-efficient, the Chins and Lushais placing it between the noun and the number, instead of last of all, as is the case in Burmese. The prefix fan before kîl or kec, 'twenty,' is apparently a numeral co-efficient for some special class of nouns, as on page 25 there occurs the expression mi-pa-kec for 'twenty men.' It would seem not improbable there are other numeral co-efficients in Sângshê Chins besides pa and fan. The suffixing of these particles immediately to the noun is, it may be remarked, a favorable example for Dr. Bleck's theory of the origin of grammatical gender.

To pass to particular words, the translation of kit as 'arm' is apparently wrong, since in Lushai and other cognate dialects it means 'hand,' and, in fact, in the Vocabulary at the end of the book the word abâa is given for 'forearm.' Similarly on the same analogy it seems open to doubt whether the Sângshê Chins do not possess a distinct word for 'leg' apart from ke, 'foot.'

The word pê which properly means 'father' is given for 'man,' both on page 3 and in the Vocabulary, but a reference to the Sentences shows the word used for 'man' is mi, an extremely widespread root. Pê is possibly used, as in other languages of the Tibeto-Burman family, as a suffix meaning 'male.'

The word nga, given in the Vocabulary on page 15, evidently means 'to know,' and not 'to say,' and in practical use it would seem to correspond with the Burmese tât. Burmese and Chin, are, of course, far from being the only languages, which use the verb 'to know' in the same sense as 'to be able.'

Exception may be taken to the giving of different adjectives (such as those of colour, 'deep,' &c.) in the form of nouns, i.e., with short a prefixed. In the Tibeto-Burman family there are no such things as true adjectives, their place being taken by verbs; and the fact that in certain languages they are suffixed to the noun makes no difference.

The words given respectively for 'brother' and 'sister' probably denote either 'elder or younger brother or sister,' as it would be difficult to point to any language in the remotest degree cognate to Chin, in which these relations are not distinguished by separate words, according as they are older or younger than the speaker.

Before leaving the subject it may be as well to point out that in a few cases the Chin sentence, as given in the manual, does not correspond with the English, even according to the freest translation. Thus, on page 20:—Hi byö hi ća-lûmae obviously means 'Is this word (or saying) true,' and has nothing to do with the English sentence 'I wish to get true information about this.' Similarly in the next line:—Nangma paûat-le byö-sûn kan-dû should apparently be translated 'I wish to speak to you alone,' and not 'Do you think your information is true?'

With regard to the place of Sângshê Chin in the Tibeto-Burman family, it must plainly be grouped with those of the hill-men inhabiting the Arakan Yoma Mountains from Manipur to their southern extremity. The principal languages or dialects comprised in this group are Manipuri, Lushai (Dzo), Kani, Shanliu, and the languages of the Wild and the Tame (or Southern) Chins.

Professor Sayce in his Science of Language has, it is true, adopted another classification, making two groups of them and including Burmese and Karen in the second group. A comparison, however, of the vocabularies and grammar of these hill tongues shows them to possess many special points of resemblance, which differentiate them, as a whole, from the Burmese.

These tribes are, in fact, in all probability a later immigration than the dwellers in the plains, and are more closely connected with Sub-Himalayan tribes, such as the Limbu, than is the case with the Burmans. The Manipuris, having for some time past masqueraded as Hindus, have altered their language more than is the case with the hill-tribes south of them, but they nevertheless belong to the same group. Of the different languages spoken in it Sângshê Chin has a markedly close affinity with Lushai, as the following list of words identical in both proves:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bear</th>
<th>vôm</th>
<th>Day</th>
<th>tûn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beet</td>
<td>vel</td>
<td>Dog</td>
<td>û-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before</td>
<td>'mai</td>
<td>Door</td>
<td>in-kû</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behind</td>
<td>'nû</td>
<td>Eye</td>
<td>myût</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bird</td>
<td>vû</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>tûa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bite</td>
<td>shû</td>
<td>Fire</td>
<td>më</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blood</td>
<td>trî</td>
<td>Fish</td>
<td>ngû</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boar (wild)</td>
<td>ngûl</td>
<td>Fly</td>
<td>tô</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burn</td>
<td>kang</td>
<td>Fowl</td>
<td>û</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cold</td>
<td>shûk</td>
<td>Go</td>
<td>kal (kûl)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Come</td>
<td>hûn</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>aû</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daughter</td>
<td>fùnû</td>
<td>Hand</td>
<td>kût</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Compare also mark, 'to divorce' with the Lushai mâ.
In addition to the above list, which is taken almost at random and is very far from being exhaustive, there are many other words, such as kāri and kā, 'I,' which differ very slightly. Both from the number and nature of the alliterating words and from the character of their resemblances, it is apparent that the Baungshê Chins and Lushai must at no distant period have formed one race. Words like those for 'brass,' 'gong,' 'looking glass,' &c., which are the same in Lushai and Baungshê Chin, can only have been incorporated into these languages recently, whilst the fact that the Chin word for 'bruce,' lunkā, is derived, like the Lushai, direct from the Hindustani and not through Burmese, points to the inference that when first introduced to this coin these Chins were probably living to the west of their present habitat; i.e., in the Chittagong Hill-Tracts, where the Lushais still reside. At the same time it may be inferred, from the word for 'guin' in Chin and Lushai being different, that they had already separated when fire-arms were brought to these hills. It is noteworthy, also, that these Chins have an indigenous word for 'sea,' which would hardly be the case if they had resided long where they now are.

One of the points, in which Baungshê Chin agrees with Lushai, is in the use of the sound of in certain words, this being a somewhat rare sound in Tibeto-Burman phonology. The sound of is also used in Karm, which language together with Lushai, possesses the peculiar guttural breathing known in Arabic as 'ain. No mention of this latter sound is made in Mr. McNabb's work, so it may be that it is not found in Baungshê Chin. The sound of would seem to correspond with the cang ch, ts and s in the other Tibeto-Burman languages. Both the and 'ain sounds are very sparingly used, and it is possible that they are foreign sounds introduced into the dialects, in which they occur by contact with some Muhammadan race.

The terminals l, r, and p still exist in Baungshê Chin, as in Lushai, though it is curious to note that, amongst the former, final l is not unfrequently elided. The example of the Chinese and Burmans shows that, with increasing laziness of pronunciation, these letters as terminals are apt to disappear.

One of the most noticeable points in the grammar of Baungshê Chin is that the present tense of the verb consists of the naked root without even a euphonical suffix. It is, of course, open to doubt whether this omission is due to a really primitive method of conjugation, as in Chinese, or whether there was formerly some suffix, which has come to be elided. Perhaps the latter hypothesis is on the whole the more probable, as no other case apparently exists in the Tibeto-Burman family of this want of a suffix, and it can scarcely be contended that Baungshê Chin has alone retained the earliest form of conjugation.

The future particle is lāi, which is, curiously enough, almost the same as that (lāh) used in Southern Chin to denote compulsion, — 'must.' The latter is, however, compounded of the verb must' and aik, the future particle, in the same way as the Burmese ra-moii (ru-nil). In one sentence, indeed, on page 19, na ngai-lai is given for 'you must obey,' but it can hardly be supposed that the particle of the future of compulsion has been given throughout in mistake for the simple future. The termination in Lushai is, it may be remarked, ang. The negative interrogative particles are respectively lo and mame, as in Lushai. The latter of these is evidently the Chinese no, but the only analogy to the former outside this special family of languages is apparently the Dardvian illei or aik.

The present participle lye in Baungshê Chin is, probably allied with the Burmese lye (lyet). It does not seem to have analogies in the other hill languages.

* [I would, however, be cautious as to this assumption on phonological grounds only.—Ed.]

10 [It should be remembered, however, that the sound of is seldom properly taught in India, with the result that the ears of the majority of Anglo-Indians are not so attuned as to catch it in learning a new language.—Ed.]

11 The Kami afi 'tooth' is probably identifiable with the Tibetan a, Burmese aii.

12 It is curious to note that the use of the pronouns with the noun and verb is the same in Baungshê Chin as in ancient Egyptian: though in the latter language they were suffixed and not prefixed. [But is this a remarkable peculiarity?—Ed.]
The suffix ṣ (the same as the old Burmese postposition ṣa) seems to have a wide range of meaning. Thus, after a noun it means 'by,' 'at' or 'to.' On page 16 after a verb it is used for 'in order to.' On page 20 it is similarly used for 'when.' In the examples in this latter case, under the head of "Imperfect Tense," there would, however, appear to be some confusion in the use of the ṣ particle, unless indeed we are to understand that Baungshé Chin is destitute of a particle to express conditions of time. In this case, the sentence—"When I saw him he was running away," would read literally in Chin "I saw him, he was running away!"—a sufficiently primitive method of expression.

On page 36 the form given as a perfect tense passive, 'I have been brought,' is, if correct, a very remarkable one; since the passive meaning is given by infixing a particle di between the root and the ordinary perfect suffix sang. The formation of a passive in this manner is, however, so contrary to the genius of the Tibeto-Burman languages, that we may be excused in doubting the correctness of this form, which apparently does not occur in the Chin sentences.

No example is given of the relative particle which presumably exists in Baungshé Chin, but on page 29 there is an example of a curious construction instead of it, the expression 'the men who come and go' being translated mi-klāng, mi-kāl, literally 'man-arrive, man-go.'

In conclusion, a few words in Baungshé Chin may be selected for notice. Among those specially allied to Manipurā are lāmā 'a path' and avū 'to fight,' which correspond with the Manipurā lāmā and lāl. The retention of the b suffix is especially noticeable, since although the root lāmā is widely diffused in the Tibeto-Burman family, there are apparently no other examples in it of this particle being suffixed to it.

Baungshé Chin has, like Magar and Karen, the form ti for water, as compared with the Lushai tā-i. It seems, however, unreasonable to regard this, with Captain Forbes, as a separate root, for a simple throwing forward of the accent in the word tā-i would probably suffice to alter it into ti. Further: we have a precisely analogous alteration in the word for 'to laugh,' which in Lushai is sač-i, but in Baungshé Chin sa, and in this case there can be no doubt that the root is the same.

Generally speaking it would seem very extraordinary that the Baungshé Chins, who probably at no distant epoch formed one tribe with the Lushais, should yet have retained a different root from the latter for so common a word as 'water.'

In the matter of prefixes we have, in the word ruil for 'snake,' an example of the throwing off the pa prefix (cf. Tibetan brul or prul), and, in that for 'butterfly,' īl, an example of its addition, (Cf. Burmese lī-pyā, (lē-k-pyā.)

In 'vāk, 'mad,' we see the simple root rā, (yā), (as in Burmese), altered first by the aspiration of the initial semi-consonant, and secondly by the addition of the k suffix. An example of the t suffix is seen in rāt 'heavy' compared with the Burmese lā. If klęng 'to exchange' be the same as the Burmese lā, we have in one word both the k prefix and a nasal suffix, which alterations, however, as Mr. Hodgson has so ably pointed out, are common enough in this family of languages. 'ken, "to bind," may be identified with the Burmese krun ('chan), and is a good example of the close relation between h and k or kh (k') in these languages: as also is klā, 'to release' or 'to send,' cf. Burmese k'wet ('hat) with the same meanings. In the word for 'pony' (rang) the Baungshé Chins have dropped the initial nasal of the Burmese wang (mīng), and the same is seen with the word for 'elephant' wi, as compared with the Akyab Chin mei. An example of vowel change is the Baungshé Chin byā (Kami bā), 'speech' compared with the Burmese pyān, whilst the word reā for 'bamboo' shows that the Burmese reā possessed formerly an initial semi-vowel r.

It is easily seen from a comparison of words that Baungshé Chin in many cases prefers k where Lushai has t, and indeed it would appear from other instances that these mountainiers generally are as prone to confuse these sounds together as the South Sea Islanders.

In comparing the Baungshé kluang-var with the Lushai lhuang-vari 'a bachelor' we find, in addition to the above interchange of k, one of the semi-vowels r into l. A further instance of the latter appears in the Baungshé ri and the Lushai le, 'again.' In the Chin k'čē as compared with the Lushai k'čē 'a knee,' we see that a phonetic corruption has taken place precisely similar to that in colloquial Burmese.

R. Houghton, c.s.
ANOTHER INSTALMENT OF THE BOWER MANUSCRIPT.

BY PROFESSOR A. F. RUDOLF HOEHNLE.

The first instalment of the Bower Manuscript was published by me in the Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal for 1891. The portion which I now publish I have chosen for the second instalment, because it represents another of the subjects which are treated of in the several treatises comprising the Bower Manuscript. So far as I can make out at present, these treatises deal with three different subjects, viz., medicine, divination and conjuration. On medicine there are (apparently) two distinct treatises; a long and a short one. The latter I have published in the Journal A.S.B., as a specimen of medicine. On divination or fortune-telling there are two short treatises; one of these I publish in the present paper. On conjuration, or the use of magic spells, there is one short treatise. This I hope to publish as my next instalment of the Manuscript.

The portion now published consists of five leaves. Their shape and size are exactly like those of the portion previously published; that is, the leaves are a narrow oblong, measuring 11½ by 2½ inches. A specimen, being the obverse of the second leaf, is published in the lower part (No. II.) of Plate I., issued with the April Proceedings of the Asiatic Society of Bengal. The treatise to which it belongs is referred to in my paper “On the Date of the Bower Manuscript” (ante, p. 29) as the “second portion, called B.” I have there ascribed the writing of this portion, which is in a fine, ornate hand, to a scribe distinct from him who wrote the portion given in my first instalment. The most striking differences are the two following. In the first place, the palatal ā is made in the form of a square with a circular loop at the lower left-hand corner, exactly like the modern Nāgara m (ṁ), while in the portion given in the first instalment that letter has a rounded top, and no circular loop, but a minute forked tail. The latter is the older Gupta form, while the former already closely approaches the form shown in the Horiuxi MB. and in the Śrīrākon alphabet, in which the letter is also square, but the loop is replaced by a dot. Both forms may be seen on Plate I., above referred to. In the second place, some letters, (especially a, k, g, r, and occasionally t, ṭh), are provided with a very distinct hook at the bottom of the main perpendicular. This hook looks exactly like the mark of the vowel u, as attached to other letters, such as m, s, ṣ, &c. Accordingly, when the vowel u is to be joined to those hooked letters, it assumes a different shape, — that of a more or less large curve, turned to the left. Examples may be seen on the same plate.

Though written on five distinct leaves, the work inscribed on them only occupies eight pages. The obverse of the first leaf contains, as I have already stated elsewhere, the concluding portion of a medical treatise, but whether of the long one, or of some other, I am not, as yet, quite certain. At the bottom of this obverse page, there is the remark ity=atra isiḥ śvādhipatya śatasya-ādhiparānā evah, the meaning of which I do not understand. It is in large cursive letters, in a hand distinct from that which wrote the medical treatise, as well as from that which wrote the treatise on divination; which commences on the reverse of the leaf. It seems to be, however, the same handwriting as that which is seen in some other portions of the manuscript. The most natural conclusion that one can draw is, that the treatise on divination was written after the treatise on medicine, as it commences on the back of the latter.

The fourth leaf is inscribed only on the obverse. It consists of no less than four layers of bark, but they are all so thin and flimsy, that a considerable portion is broken and frayed. Even the obverse is only partially inscribed, and the reverse is probably thought by the scribe to be unfit for writing on. In any case nothing of the text is lost. That part of it which commences on the obverse of the fifth leaf, follows immediately after that which is written on the obverse of the fourth. In fact, the material used for this portion of the manuscript

---

1 Also in Journal Asiatic Society of Bengal, Vol. L.I., Part I., pp. 80, 81.
* See Proceedings Asiatic Society of Bengal, for April 1891, p. 5.
is of the same (if not more) inferior description as that employed in the first portion, previously published. This also explains why only one half of the reverse side of the second leaf is inscribed. For here, too, no material portion of the text is lost.

The leaves are of varying thickness. None of them consists of less than four layers; but the second is of extraordinary thickness. It is difficult to count its layers; but there certainly do not seem to be less than twelve.

The part of the manuscript which I now publish is practically complete. The entire treatise which it contains must have consisted (as I shall show later on) of sixty-four verses. Of these the manuscript gives fifty-nine. Three of the missing verses should have been on the reverse of the second and the obverse of the third leaves. On the former page a "vahula," numbered 234, is omitted; on the latter page two "bhadrās," numbered 412 and 124 are missing. There should be altogether six "vahulas" and six "bhadrās"; but there are extant only five "vahulas" and four "bhadrās." However, the numeral mark 412 is given in the manuscript (see fl. 3a²), though the corresponding "bhadrā" verse is missing. It seems quite clear from these circumstances, that the omission is merely an error chargeable to the scribe of the manuscript. The two other missing verses should have been at the end of the manuscript. They should have been the two "kharis," numbered 211 and 121. If they ever existed in the present copy, they must have been written on the obverse of a sixth leaf; for the extant "kharī" verse 112 closes the reverse of the fifth leaf. In that case, one leaf of the manuscript is lost, and this leaf might have contained the usual colophon, giving the names of the work and its author. But it seems to me doubtful whether a little work of this kind would have contained the usual colophon; and it is not improbable that the manuscript is complete, and that the omission of the two last verses is chargeable to the scribe, in the same way as the loss of the other three verses. The last words on the reverse of the fifth leaf are written in the middle of the line, leaving sufficient blank space to write more matter, if the scribe had intended to write any more. Moreover, the whole is followed by a scroll, apparently indicative of the end. All this seems rather to suggest the alternative of the omission being due to the scribe; probably the original, from which he copied, was already incomplete.

There are many other points to show that the manuscript was not written with much care. Thus on fl. 2a⁴ and 2a⁵ the words prathama māli and tritiya māli are omitted; on fl. 5a² and 5a³ we have deviṣa for tritīya; on fl. 5b⁴ the scribe has cancelled the words tritiya pāḍhā 212, though they were correct, and repeated them on fl. 5b⁵, where they are out of place: another blundered case occurs on fl. 1b⁶. Not unfrequently there occur pāḍas, or quarter-verses, which are short by one syllable. Generally it is the 3rd pāda (5 times: fl. 2a¹, 2a⁵, 3a⁶, 4a³, 5b²): twice it is the 4th pāda (fl. 2a⁴ and 3a³); once each it is the 1st (fl. 5a³) and 2nd pādas (fl. 5b³). In most of these cases the fault is certainly due to the carelessness of the scribe. Thus in fl. 2a⁶ probably kālāna should be read for kālā, in fl. 5a⁵ vipula for pāda. But one or two cases are doubtful: in them the fault may be due to the anomalous nature of the language. Thus in fl. 2a⁶ chaiva artha should be read for (sandhi) chaiva artha; again in fl. 2a⁴ the synonymous nityatā should be read for nityāt. Occasionally the opposite case occurs, of a pāda having one syllable in excess. This always occurs in the 4th pāda, and in all probability is one of the anomalies of the language; (see below). There is only one exception: it is in fl. 5b⁵, where the excess occurs in the 3rd pāda, and is undoubtedly only a blunder of the scribe; as the sense of the verse shows that he should have written asubha instead of subhāsūba.

Undoubted clerical errors of another kind are the following: fl. 1b⁴ suḥ for svāhā; fl. 2a³ kalyaṇa for kalyaṇa; fl. 2a⁵ artha for arthaḥ; fl. 2a⁶ nayam for nāyam; fl. 2a⁵ prāṣasi for prāṣaṇi and artha欺诈 for artha欺诈; fl. 2b⁵ dharma for dharma and dharma; fl. 2b³ *mukta for

---

9 The first number refers to the leaf, the letter to the page of the leaf, and the raised number to the line of the page: thus 2a⁴ = 2nd leaf, obverse page, 4th line.
mukta; fl. 3a1 chanunayikyasi for chánumanyikyasi; fl. 3a1 śrivija=cha for vṛttid=cha; fl. 3a1 na for na; fl. 3a2 sarva=athka for sarva=tha; fl. 3a2 sam=eskya for sam=eski; fl. 3a2 sah/de= for sakayais; fl. 4a2 karas= for kara= (here shown by the metre); fl. 4a2 ya for ya; fl. 5b4 dhar=ma for dharman=; fl. 5b4 vandh=deka for vandh=ma=cha. Thoes cases, however, which are marked with an asterisk, may also be due to the anomalous character of the language.

Occasionally the scribe noticed a mistake and corrected it by interlinear insertions in minute and hastily drawn letters. Thus in fl. 3a4 na sanahyá, fl. 4a3 api, fl. 4a6 si cha, fl. 5a4 bha are added interlinearly. Ordinary corrections, by alterations of already written letters occur; e.g., in fl. 2a7, 5b2 and elsewhere.

The language of the manuscript in the early extra-scholastic Sanskrit of North-Western India with all its usual anomalies in orthography, grammar, prosody and vocabulary. Of these I have noted the following instances:

1. In Orthography: spelling: fl. 1b5 sikhya for sikhya; fl. 2a6 avii for api, fl. 4a3, 5a1, &c. dukkha for dukkha: confusion of sibilants; fl. 2a4 sam=eskita for sam=eskita. Doubling of consonants: before r: throughout with t; e.g., fl. 1b6 sattaras, fl. 2b5 gṛttra, &c.; before y: gatiakara= (for yati=akara=); before e: fl. 5a3 addhe=; Sandhi: fl. 2b5 deityo kiṭṭha for deityo kiṭṭha; fl. 4a3 gṛthāiva for gṛthā eva (gṛthā ēva), fl. 2a3 tatītamanah for tata uttamaḥ (tata uttamaḥ), fl. 5b2 śukri=deva for śukri=deva (śukri=deva). Omission of final consonants: 3b1 kinc= for kinc; 1b5, 2a3, 2b4 kara= for kara= (abl. sing.). Omission of visarga: before s: fl. 3a7 sumittra saha for sumittraḥ; fl. 3a7 devatai śripa for devataḥ; fl. 2a2 nishpha= su or nishphal=; before p: fl. 1b5 prasad= and yuktāpatu=; Nagloet of sandhi: fl. 2a6 drisṭātīgamo, fl. 2b3 viṣṭāhyāśri piṇa, fl. 3a8 arthaḥ antrovēdaṁ.

2. In Grammar: deslension: nom. sing.: fl. 1b1 namō achāryebhyah: often visarga omitted in punaḥ; fl. 2a6 uttama, 2b1 priti, fl. 2b1 atiparikṣaya, fl. 5a4 sandēha, fl. 5b2 sam=upakṣita: nom. neut.; fl. 3b2 janmaḥ, fl. 4a2 karmaḥ: acc. sing.; fl. 3b2 pratyarthin (for pratyarthināḥ): acc. plur. masc.; as a rule ending in uḥ, etc.) fl. 2b4 bhūgaḥ, fl. 2b3, 5a2 rupāḥ sarvāḥ, fl. 5a6 bhūgau vupuṣṇāḥ, fl. 5b2 kāmaḥ, fl. 5b4 yajña, but regular in fl. 5b4 vivilhān: instr. sing. fem.; fl. 1b5 kṣaṭhīyaḥ (for kṣaṭhīyaḥ): gen. plur.; fl. 1b5 sarvevādaṁ (for evādaṁ): loc. plur.; fl. 1b4 riṣhikaḥ (for riṣhikaḥ). Conjugation: imp. for pres.; fl. 4a1 tiṣṭha (for tiṣṭhā): ātm. for āsya; fl. 2a3, 3b6, 4a3 prāpyaḥ (but fl. 3b6 also prāpyaḥ), fl. 2a3, 3a1, 3b5 chintayate: āsya for āstam; fl. 2a7 pratikṣaya (for pratikṣaya). Syntax: exchange of cases: nom. for acc.; fl. 2a6 prāpyaḥ (for prāpyaḥ) u-dyām uttama (for na inam uttamaṁ), fl. 3a2 śratham prāpyaḥ (for tam arthaṁ), fl. 4a6 amhā= tu lapsyani, fl. 2a5 artik=cha grihya: nom. for instr.; fl. 3b4 vṛtta=ivaḥ (for vṛtta=), fl. 3a6 sa sam=eskita (for śratha: but see above): nom. for gen.; fl. 3a1 sri=tita=cha kṣayaḥ (for sri=tita=cha: but see above), acc. for gen.; fl. 2a1 jan=upadraṇa (for upadraṇa): gen. for dat.; fl. 1b2 marudāna ni=yaḥ: loc. for dat.; fl. 2a4 labhaḥ (for labhasāya). False concord: neut. and fem.; fl. 1b4 vṛtta= satya (for satya); fl. 2a7 viruddhāṃ sprāḥ (for viruddhāḥ): masc. and neut.; fl. 1b6 níchchchhā bhaṣyaḥ (for níchchchhā), fl. 3a3 upasthitau viśāṣṭa=te (for viśāṣṭa): perhaps sing. and plur.; fl. 2a5 mahān=ārthaḥ (for arthōḥ), fl. 2b3 mukta=te kiliveṣaḥ (for mukti=).

3. In Prosody: occasionally the fourth paṭā has one syllable in excess; see fl. 2b1, 4a3, 4a6, 5a6.

4. In Vocabulary: new words or new meanings:

kariṭa 'tools', fl. 2a6.
chānga 'clever,' fl. 2b3 (for changa, perhaps false reading).
dēva 'god,' fl. 2a1 (for daiva).
dēva= 'deity,' fl. 1b5, 3a7 (for daiva).
puṭratastā 'sonship,' fl. 2a7 (with double abstract suffix).
prāṇa 'safety,' fl. 5a (but also prāṇa ibidem; perhaps a false reading).

vṛtī 'diagram,' 'a dice-board,' fl. 1b.

śṛiha 'desire,' 'envy,' fl. 2a (for sparha or spriha).

To these words should be added all the technical names of groups of verses or throws of dice; thus:

navikā 'an eulogy,' fl. 1b (a vernacular form of Skr. navikā, from nava; see my Gaugão Grammar, § 195).

patṭābāhīpa 'a decoration,' 'investiture,' fl. 2a.

kālavīdhi 'the regulation of time,' fl. 2a, (apparently a synonym of vikā; otherwise it would mean 'the piercing').

śūpta 'imprecation,' 'abuse,' fl. 2a (a bye-form of śūpa).


vahula 'manifoldness,' fl. 2a.

kāṭa 'a puzzle,' fl. 2a.

bhadrā 'cow,' fl. 2b.

śūka 'power,' fl. 3a.

dundubhi 'kettle-drum,' fl. 3a (a synonym of dundubhi).

śrīśa 'bull,' fl. 3b.

prāṣāya 'maid-servant,' fl. 3b.

vīṭṭ 'yellow sandal,' fl. 3a (in the smaller Petersburg Dictionary; or perhaps vīṭ 'a ball').

kāṣa 'ear,' fl. 4a.

sajā 'armour,' fl. 4a (perhaps for sajā).

kāna or kāṇatana, fl. 5a and fl. 5b (or kaṇatana fl. 5b), 'one-eyed,' also 'a crow.'

chuṇīkuna, meaning unknown, fl. 5b (see below).

pāñci, fl. 5b or pāñcī fl. 5b 'consisting of five' (see below).

kāri 'she-ass,' fl. 5b.

As we shall see presently, all these words are technical names of certain throws of dice and of corresponding groups of verses. The meanings above given are merely the original meanings of the words, and in some cases they are doubtful; probably it matters little what the meanings were, or why the throws were so called. The main point is, that the words are names of certain throws of dice. Dundaika is the only one among them which I have found noted in Sāskrit dictionaries in that sense: in the Petersburg Dictionary it is given as "the name of certain throws in games with dice."6

The subject of the manuscript I believe to be divination or fortune-telling by means of dice. The work is a small treatise or handbook for instruction, or for the guidance of adepts, in the art of divination. This art is to be exercised, as the introduction of the treatise shows, with the help of dice (prāśaka), of which there are three, respectively named, or probably marked, with the figures of a pitcher (kumhāaka), a discus or wheel (arā), and an elephant (nātaṇga). They are thrown on a diagram or board (vṛtii), divided into fields, which are marked with one of the four numerical figures, 1, 2, 3, 4. There must have been twelve fields, of which three were marked with the figure 4, three with 3, three with 2, and three with 1. So far as I can make out, the order in which these fields arranged was immaterial. Every

6 Pañcī or pāñci is at present used as the name of a game played with five dice, and chuṇīkuna is given in the Sāskrit dictionaries as a game of hazard played with seeds of tamarind, instead of dice.
properly made throw of the three dice would, of course, indicate a group of three fields or of the corresponding inscribed figures. Of such groups there would necessarily be three different classes, according as the same number occurred in the group thrice or twice or once; thus the group might be 444, or 443, or 432. It follows that there would be 20 possible groups, and that every throw of the dice would indicate one of these 20 groups. Each of these 20 groups or throws is designated by a special name; and the list given below is that of these names.

Further, within each group the numeral figures constituting it may be arranged in different ways; e.g., the group 443 admits of the three variations, 443, 344, 443. Again the group 432 admits of six variations, viz., 432, 423, 342, 243, 234, 324. In fact, every group, containing the same figure twice, admits of three, and every group containing the same figure only once, admits of six variations; while a group, containing the same figure thrice, admits only of one arrangement. Now, there are four possible groups of the latter kind (444, 333, 222, 111); but there are twelve possible groups containing the same figure twice, and four possible groups, containing the same figure only once. It follows that the number of possible arrangements or variations of the 20 groups is 64, (i.e., \(4 \times 1 + 12 \times 3 + 4 \times 6\), or \(4 + 36 + 24\)).

All this is shown in the First Table below. The groups are arranged in the order in which they would naturally suggest themselves. In the Second Table I have given them in the order in which they follow one another in the manuscript; and this order is also shown in the First Table, in the second column, enclosed in brackets. The bracketed numbers in the fourth column give the summations of the figures which compose the several groups.

### I.—Table of Groups and Variations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classes of Groups</th>
<th>Serial Number of Groups</th>
<th>Names of Groups</th>
<th>Figures of Groups</th>
<th>No. of Variations</th>
<th>Total No. of Groups</th>
<th>Total No. of Variations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With the same figure thrice.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. (I.)</td>
<td>Chantayantā (?)</td>
<td>444 (12)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. (II.)</td>
<td>Navikki</td>
<td>333 (9)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. (III.)</td>
<td>Pattabandha</td>
<td>222 (6)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. (IV.)</td>
<td>Kalaviddhi</td>
<td>111 (3)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. (V.)</td>
<td>Śāpatā</td>
<td>443 (11)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI. (XII.)</td>
<td>Vrisha</td>
<td>442 (10)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII. (VIII.)</td>
<td>Kāta</td>
<td>441 (9)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII. (VI.)</td>
<td>Māli</td>
<td>334 (10)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX. (XIV.)</td>
<td>Viśi</td>
<td>332 (8)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X. (XVII.)</td>
<td>Kāna</td>
<td>331 (7)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI. (XIII.)</td>
<td>Prēshyā</td>
<td>224 (8)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII. (XVI.)</td>
<td>Sajā</td>
<td>223 (7)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII. (XIX.)</td>
<td>Pāñcī</td>
<td>221 (5)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIV. (XV.)</td>
<td>Karṇa</td>
<td>114 (6)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XV. (XVIII.)</td>
<td>Chauśchuna</td>
<td>113 (5)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVI. (XX.)</td>
<td>Khari</td>
<td>112 (4)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVII. (VII.)</td>
<td>Vahula</td>
<td>432 (9)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVIII. (IX.)</td>
<td>Bhadrā</td>
<td>421 (7)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIX. (X.)</td>
<td>Sakti</td>
<td>341 (8)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX. (XI.)</td>
<td>Dundubbhi</td>
<td>321 (6)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II.—Table of Order of Groups in MS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I. 444 12</th>
<th>V. 443 11</th>
<th>VIII. 441 9</th>
<th>XII. 442 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II. 333 9</td>
<td>VI. 334 10</td>
<td>IX. 421 7</td>
<td>XIII. 224 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. 222 6</td>
<td>VII. 432 9</td>
<td>X. 341 8</td>
<td>XIV. 332 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. 111 3</td>
<td>XI. 321 6</td>
<td>XV. 114 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>XVI. 223 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>XVII. 331 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>XVIII. 115 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>XIX. 221 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>XX. 112 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As already remarked, each (properly made) throw of the dice would indicate three fields, or one group of three figures; but in most cases, it would not show what particular variation of the group was to be understood by the throw. Some mark would be needed to show in what order the figures indicated by any particular throw should be read. It is for this reason that the three dice are marked by the emblems of a pitcher, discus and elephant, and that the order of these three emblems is laid down in the introduction. The direction intended to be given in the introduction (as I take it) is that the dice should be thrown on the fields of the diagram, and then the throw read off in the order of the marks of the dice; that is, the figure indicated by the pitcher-die is to be placed first, that of the discus-die is to come second, and that of the elephant-die is to come last. With the aid of this rule, there would be no doubt as to which group and variation any particular throw indicated.

The fortune-teller would first make his diagram or lay his board; he would then make a throw of his dice; from the throw he would know the group and its name, and from the order of the dice he would know the particular variety of the group. For every variety he would know a verse; and the verses would suggest to him what he should prognosticate in any given case. I remember, some years ago, when I was spending my summer vacation in Darjeeling, a travelling Kashmiri (or Afghan) came to the hotel in which I was staying, and told the fortune of any one who wished to consult him by a somewhat similar procedure. I then took no particular notice of him, but I remember that he used a diagram and variously marked oblong dice, by the help of which he made his prognostications. Perhaps some who read this may be able to supplement my information, and tell us whether the same or similar practices in divination as those indicated in the Bower Manuscript are still observed anywhere in India or its northern borders.

One point more may be noticed. The order of the groups in the manuscript is shown in Table II. It may be asked why the groups should be arranged in that order in preference to the more obvious logical order shown in Table I. Perhaps there may be no better reason for it than accident; but the Table shows a curious fact which may possibly account for it. The first four groups may be regarded as the key-groups; and the total of the sums of the figures composing them gives a key-total of 30. Now, if the figures of the remaining groups are severally summed up, and the sums arranged in an order decreasing by 1, it is found that the key-total 30 is repeated four times: and in this order the manuscript arranges the groups. The arrangement, however, is not quite perfect: group X. ought to precede group IX., and groups XVI. and XVII. ought to precede group XV. This circumstance, though it may be due to an error of the scribe, prevents the explanation from having more than the character of a doubtful conjecture.

The Nāgari transcript gives the text as it stands in the manuscript, broken letters being
printed in full. **Aksharas** which are wholly wanting, are indicated by dots, which are in numbers equal to the missing aksharas. **Aksharas** which are now wanting, but which were still extant when I first made my transcript, are enclosed within straight brackets.

In the Roman transliteration, broken **aksharas** of the MS. text are indicated by round brackets, and entirely missing portions, by dots, or longs and shorts. Any restoration of a missing text is enclosed within straight brackets.

In the translation, conjectural portions or explanatory additions are indicated by round brackets.

**I. TEXT.**

**Transcript.**

**First Leaf : Reverse.**

1. [Image or text not visible]

2. [Image or text not visible]

3. [Image or text not visible]

4. [Image or text not visible]

5. [Image or text not visible]

**Second Leaf : Obverse.**

6. [Image or text not visible]

7. [Image or text not visible]

8. [Image or text not visible]

**Second Leaf : Reverse.**

9. [Image or text not visible]
Third Leaf: Overture.

1. ए चलनाविवड़ती पिंडतिसङ्गसंजुक्त धर्म शास्त्रोपयेतः। शर्यानां भवति, २५२ वृत्तिः नाथाक्षारसः। वैकाल्यम्। शर्यानां धर्म शास्त्रं। च २५२। प्रायो। पिंडविवड़ताः

2. साधारणां तथा शिष्यते जिंद्रम्बादरसः। अर्थावताराः वाणिज्याः पिंडतिसः। द्वियाः धर्म। २५४। प्रायो तथा。

3. शर्यानां च अविनाश्याः शर्यानां धर्म शास्त्रं। च २५४। प्रायो। पिंडविवड़ताः

4. २५४ वृत्तिः चालनाविवड़ताः। निमूनानां च धर्म शास्त्रं। च २५४। प्रायो। पिंडविवड़ताः

5. पवित्राः विद्याः २५४ वृत्तिः च शर्याय च धर्म शास्त्रं। च २५४। प्रायो। पिंडविवड़ताः

6. शर्यानां च अविनाश्याः। शर्यानां धर्म शास्त्रं। च २५४। प्रायो। पिंडविवड़ताः

7. पवित्राः विद्याः २५४ वृत्तिः च शर्याय च धर्म शास्त्रं। च २५४। प्रायो। पिंडविवड़ताः

Fourth Leaf: Overture.

1. व द्रुतविबाहु २५५ प्रायो तथा शास्त्रम् वेदान्तम् च रूपाय:। निर्दिष्टिकालाय:। शर्यानां द्रुतविबाहु २५५। प्रायो तथा शास्त्रम् वेदान्तम् च

2. वृत्तिः च शर्यानां धर्म शास्त्रं। च २५५। प्रायो। पिंडविवड़ताः

3. शर्यानां च अविनाश्याः। शर्यानां धर्म शास्त्रं। च २५५। प्रायो। पिंडविवड़ताः

4. पवित्राः विद्याः २५५ वृत्तिः च शर्याय च धर्म शास्त्रं। च २५५। प्रायो। पिंडविवड़ताः

5. पवित्राः विद्याः २५५ वृत्तिः च शर्याय च धर्म शास्त्रं। च २५५। प्रायो। पिंडविवड़ताः

6. शर्यानां च अविनाश्याः। शर्यानां धर्म शास्त्रं। च २५५। प्रायो। पिंडविवड़ताः

Fifth Leaf: Overture.

1. व द्रुतविबाहु २५६ वृत्तिः च शर्याय च धर्म शास्त्रं। च २५६। प्रायो। पिंडविवड़ताः
II. Transliteration.

First Leaf: Reverse.

1. Oṃ Namō Nandı-rudr-Devāryāya — namō Āchāryēbhyaḥ namō Īśārāya — namō Māṇiḥ(bhūd)ṛ(ā)yā [namas-sarvva-Yakṣēbhyaḥ]⁶
2. namāḥ sarvva-Dēvēbhyaḥ Śivāya namāḥ Shāśāthihē namāḥ Pranjāpataye namāḥ Rudrāya namāḥ namō Vaiśravaṇāya namō Marutānāṁ namāḥ prāsa-
3. kā patantu ímasy-ārthasya kārāṇā hili 2 kumblah-āri-mātaīga-yuktā patantu yat-satyaṁ sarvva-Siddhārāṁ yat-satyaṁ Sarvva-vādināṁ tēṇa satyēna satya-samayēna naśtaṁ vinashāṁ
4. [kṣ]ē(m)-āk[sh]ēmāṁ lább-ālabbāṁ jayā-jayāṁ Śiv-ānudārāya svī⁷ — Satya-nārāyaṇē ch-śaiva dévatē Rishīśhu ch-śaiva satyaṁ mantras vṛtīs satyaṁ samakshā patantu svālā satyaṁ ch-śaiva tu draśāntvāyaṁ ni-
5. .. .. . . .. . . .. . .. . nam-br̥ añashadhināṁ cha nimitta-valam=am-antaram³ mpishā-
tāyāṁ dévataṁ Vishnu navikāyaṁ chaṁapāyā īī 444 [Namāḥ 1 Purusha-sīghāṣya prasannām=te Janārddanaḥ [1]]
Second Leaf: Obverse.

1 222 Sarvva-kāma-

3 śamaya tē bhayam19 [n] Kāla-viddhiḥ [n] 111 Paribhāya tē buddhiḥ 4

2. . . . [. ] ārambhās-śhintī tē nishphalā11 sa bhavishyāt [n] Śāpataḥ 443 Vyākhībhīrām-mōkshyāsē kshiprām sukhaṁ vā prāpasyāś 5
tathā [. ] n-śty-nlchān n-śty-nlchān cha phalam-āśdayishyāsē — 6 Dvitiyā-śāpataḥ [n]

drīyatāt kāraṇa prīchchhasē yasya kāraṇā — [n] Tṛitiyā-śāpataḥ [n] 344
drīyatāt kāraṇa prīchchhasē kalyānā13 na cha yuṣhyāt [n] 7

4 na tē śarīra-santāpō bhūgaṁ ch=aiyē-palapasyā [n] 343 Sarvārtha-śiddhi-sanpāda-kāma-bhūgaṁ, samānāvitaṁ14 [n] ačhīraṁ=aiya kālēna bhā-
vishyāt na nītyāt11 [n] Dvitiyā mālī — [n] 334 Āyaṁ sa-puṣyā labhasē 8

5 hy=ānandāḥ prīti-varddhanaḥ [n] atvarāt-sa-mahān=arthaḥ16 tvārītō vai na 9

6 Dēgghānēyaur=sa-mahān=arthaḥ prāpasaṁ n-ayām=atattām [n] dhana-dhānyaṁ 11
kārtiraṁ cha bhūgaṁ-avī cha prāpasaṁ19 [n] Dvitiyō vahuḥā 432 12

7 Tṛitiyō vahuḥā 243 Vahuṁah dṛṣyātāt kāraṇa vahu-puttratvatāṁ cha tē [n] 13


9 spīrī satī paras=ā[nt]bhīyaṁ [n]

Second Leaf: Reverse.

1 ya parā prīphayāshyāsē — [n] Pañchamō vahuḥā 342 Sučī-āgamasya tē chintā 15

2 sanśiddhēs=cha parāv tava [n] anyony-ābhāhastā prīti — kim=āgamasya-ya 16

3 ganyātā22 [n] Kūṭaḥ 414 Rājatō vibhayaḥ st-īti dharmasyās23-ātī- 17

4 parikshaya[na] [n]

5 labhadhān ch=aiya phalaṁ tasmā dharmmanā ṣeva charishyāsē — [n] Dvitiyō 18

6 kūṭaḥ 144 Chāl-achalām=daṁ sthānyaṁ na sukhaṁ prīti-varddhanaṁ 19

7 vīpraṁokshhasē dévē tīgrohitō pi na saṁsāyā [n] Tṛitiyā kūṭaḥ 441 20

8 Asti kṣērāmā bhayaṁ nāsti 21

9 vijayō py=atra drīyatāt [n] bhūkshyaḥ kāma-chāṅgāṁ=cha kutaṁ=chin=āti 22

10 tē bhayaṁ [n] Bhadrā — 421 Parikshīna hy=saṁarthās=tē muktas=ātē 23

11 sarvā-kiśiṅghā [n] vijeyahyā riṣūṁ sarvvaṁ labhas=tē samipasātāh [n] 24

12 Dvitiyā bhadrā — 214 Manasaḥ chintītā chintā-ādipasaṁ tu kāraṇā [n] kiṁ 25

13 chīt-kālam=ndikshasa tātō hastam=upāshyaiti — [n] Tṛitiyā bhadrā — 142

5 [par]j[prā]ṣyāsī kanyāṁ vai

19 In the third pāda one syllable is wanting. Perhaps read stattām.
20 Read kāla-vidhiḥ.
21 Read nishphalaṁ.
22 The fourth pāda is short by one syllable; read nītyātā.
23 Read oṃ.  
24 Read prāpasaṁ.
Third Leaf: Overse.

dēvatāḥ [II] Chaturthā bhadrā 241 Vṛttiṁ-cha nāṁ kṣhayaṁ-sarvāv 22
dēvatāḥśeṣo na tō bhayam [I] yathā kurvāsī kurvāṁ (ā)

2 . . . . [a]vāpyasyai — [II] 412 II Sakti 341 Parīgraḥam chintayasa tach-cha
śighram-saṁvāpyai — [I] artha-kāma-pradātārnam vāṁhayaṁ priti-darsa-
nāṁ [II] Dvitiyā saktī — 134

3 [Saṁ]ga[m]a[ṁ] chintayaṁ tach-cha śighraṁ samēshyatā[ī] aśīṁai . kṛtā
lēkhaṁ nēshyaṁ na bhavishyatā | [II] Tritiyā saktī 413 Upasthitā
viśishtāṁ = tō tathā lābhāṁ-cha
dṛṣṭyaṁ [I] kṛtoucch ch-ātula-vṛddhir-bhavishyatī na saṁśayaṁ
| [II] Chaturthā saktī 314 Eka-ch-chāttārām mahāṁ kṛṣṇāṁ rājā niḥal-
kanṭakāḥ [I] ākāmya bhokṣyaṁ satrumā gaṁsa-samaudāyaṁ-sadā — II

5 Paṁchaṁ saktī — 143 Na ch-ēcchahasi su-mitrāṁ tvāṁ su-mitte
rāmaṁ sadā [I] — krit-ākrītas-cha tē mittrapā śatrrumā yātē-saṁkānaṁ — II

6 Shashtiṁ saktī 431 Saṁgamaṁ chintayaṁ sarvāṇāḥ śa samēshyaṁ | [I]
kēlē prāpyaṁ sō tṛṭhaṁ anīvvaṁ māṁ tathaṁ-sīva cha [II] Dundubhi
321 Yat-te naśthaṁ vinnāthaṁ vā chōraiṁ-apahṛtaṁ cha yat [I]

7 (para-ha)sta-gataṁ vā-āpi na chirāt-tad-avāpyai — [II] Dvitiyā dundubhi
213 Vinuktas-tvāṁ saṁbhās āśu su-mitrāṁ saha vaiṁsas [I] lab
dhavāyā-cha priyā hy-arthaṁ viruddhāṁ dēvatā spīhā ||

Third Leaf: Reverse.

1 [Trīṭi]y[ā] (dundubhi) 132 Parīteśuṁ sarirāṣaṁ dṛṣṭyaṁ tava sāṃpratam [I]
dēvatānāṁ cha pūjayaṁ nirvṛttiṁ-upalabhyātī — [II] Chaturthā dundubhi —
231 Asti tō kalauṁ ghumāṁ

2 satrābbhis-saha dṛṣṭyaṁ [I] na tattra lāpyaṁ kēlaṁ praiyarīthāṁ cha
vijēshyai — [II] Paṁchaṁ dundubhi — 312 Uttama dṛṣṭyaṁ lambhaṁ
puttra-jannāṁ tathaṁ-sīva cha — [I] Īśātmaṁ-śe ch-āiva kāmāṁ

3 prāpyaṁ māīttra saṁśayaṁ [II] Shashtiṁ dundubhi 123 Parībhramatī
duddhistē śthānaṁ ch-āiva chāl-āchalaṁ [I] māsā-śtātanam-udkhaṇaṁ
34 tadā suktam-avāpyai — [II]

4 Prathamā vṛṣṭhaṁ 442 Yat-tau-āni grīhe kīn-chi gāvō dhānaṁ dhanaṁ
tathā [I] visṛṣṭaṁ tvāṁ dvijātībhyah vṛddhiṁ-tē samupasātita — [II]

5 [Dvitiyā vṛṣṭhaṁ 244 Saṁgamaṁ chintayaṁ durastha ch-āiva tē
priyā [I] samṛddhaṁ sarvā-kāmēs hu na chirēga samēshyatā [II]
Trīṭi vṛṣṭhaṁ

6 [242] Vandhanāṁ prāpayaṁ ghōrnāṁ puna śthānaṁ cha prāpyaṁ [I]
bhavishyaṁ phalam ch-āiva nirvṛtiṁ-Śe bhavishyatī — [II] Prathamā
prēḥṣyā —

Fourth Leaf: Overse.

1 [242] . . . . savā vā vidyāṁ vā yādi yīchāś [I] grihi-āiva niratasaṁśitaṁ
sarvān hi tava nishphalaṁ [II] Dvitiyā prēḥṣyā — II 242 Vas-tvāya
39 chintiṭō hy-arthaḥ

35 Read ch-anunayishyasī, i.e., cha anunayishyasī.
36 Read vṛttiṁ-cha, perhaps also na.
37 The fourth pada is short by one syllable.
38 The words, na samālputāḥ, were originally omitted, and have been inserted interlinearly.
39 Perhaps: saṁ-matraṁ. The first anuvātra is uncertain.
40 Read sarvāvāṭāḥ.
41 Read saṁśitaṁ; cf. verse 24.
42 The third pada is short by one syllable. Read kīle, na. etc.
43 Read saṁbhās.
2 tā hi [1] na pārayati tata-karmmana yasya prīchchhasi karanāḥ—[II]
   Trītyā prēshya—224 Yaśaḥ tvayā chintita vācchā tad-arthaṣya tu
karaṇaḥ [I] viṣhyata-artha-lambhasāt-tē
d...[II]
3 pāṭra saṃśayaḥ [II] Prathama viṣṭ—332 Sāttavānīṃ tvīṃ ni[ra]yaṣaḥ
   karmmanyaḥ=ch=āpiṭā jīvitā [I] na tvam prāpyaseṣa dukkhauḥ pratya-
   arthibhiṣ-cha vijñeyaḥ—[II] Dvitiyā viṣṭ—
4 323 Na vyuyasaḥ phal-arthena nirvēccha cha vyuyasaḥ [I] anayatra tvaritō
gachchha lapsyaṣaḥ sukham-uttamām—[II]
5 Trītyā viṣṭ 233 Dṛṣṭaṭē tō abhiprāyō dviṣapada(s)ī(ya) [I] karaṇaḥ [I]
   samāsāyati tē tatvamāṃ marutasya vacho yathā—[II] Prathama-karaṇaḥ
   114 Saṁpūjya
darvva-karmāṇi sauhbhāya-nirupadavānaī [I] rāja-lambhaḥ=tu lapsyaṣe
   na chirad-iha bhavishyaṭā [II] Dvitiyaḥ karaṇaḥ 141 Aiśvāryeṣa pari-
   bhraṣṭā saṃgrāmaḥ=ch=āpi sa cha[II]

Fifth Leaf: Obverse.
1 ch...[II] Dvī(i)yah[II] karaṇaḥ 41[II]
   Āddhva[na]ī ganamaḥ chintā dukkhēna cha samāgamaḥ [I] s-āvāyekaḥ
   karaṇaḥ
d...[II]
2 na saṃśayaḥ [II] Prathama sajā—322 Vijaṣhyaṣi ripūṃ sarvvaṁ
   pratyārthī valavāṃ=ṣ-cha tē [I] lapsyaṣe prathamaṁ sthānaṁ paścāh=
   chokham=avāṣyaṣi—[II]
3 Dvitiyā sajā 232 Na cha jānale karaṇaḥ paścāttapeṇa vyuyasaḥ [I]
   bhavishyaṇi cha tō labhaḥ su-mukhaṁ=tava dēvatā—[II] Dvitiyaḥ sajā
4 223 Sarvē tava sandēḥa samaṭtō dur-āsadaḥ [I] dēvatānām prasādeṇa
   prāguṇyaṃ tava kāvalam [II] Prathamaḥ kāpa 331 Prāguṇam=te
   sarvāṣya
5 labhaḥ=ch=ārthasa-cha prāptaye [I] upasthitān cha tē kalyāṇaḥ (maruta)ya
   vacho yathā—[II] Dvitiyaḥ kānaḥ tantrā 313 Ārāgaṁ pol-ām-
   bhanaḥ cha[II] prēkṣyaṣe n-āṭra saṃśayaḥ [I] lapsyaṣe sarvavathā
   bhadaṁ
6 bhūgah=ṣcha viṣapadān tathā [II] Trītyāḥ kaṣa-tantraḥ 133 Miṣṭaḥ vadaśa
   yate=kīñ̄-chi mittraḥ dviṣhaṣi nityadā [I] dēvatānām prasādāṁ=va
   tishthaṭa śreṇyō bhavishyaṭā [II]—[II]

Fifth Leaf: Reverse.
1 Prathamaṁ=chauṭhunāḥ 311 Bhūgānaḥ viṣapadān=tē na chirāśaiva dhīṣyatē [I]
   anayau saṃprēṣyaṣe sthānaṁ ma vishādaṇi karishyaṣi—[II] Dvitiyaṣa=
   chauṭhunāḥ 131 Arthaśiddhi[ṛ]-d=dvīya[ṃ] cha[II]va
2 kula-sthānaṁ tathā-āva cha [I] prāpityeṣa sarvva-kāmaḥ=ṣ-cha marutasya
   vacho yathā—[II] Trītyāḥ chauṭhunāḥ 113 Viṣapadānīe tvam=arthē
   bhūyo mittraḥ=ṣa suṣhrīd=eva cha [I] utthānaṁ chintayānasya

54 Read karaṇaḥ, or perhaps karaṇaḥ. 56 Read yā. 56 Perhaps read sāttavaṇī or sattavaṇī.
57 Āpi is added interlinearly.
58 The scanning is here irregular; the third pāda is too short and the fourth pāda is too long by one syllable. Moreover, the sense of the fourth pāda requires prathyarthāṣa cha; cf. verse 32.
59 Read tataḥ; the reading of "tī tī" is not quite clear. 64 The fourth pāda has one syllable in excess.
60 The last two syllables (si cha) are added below the line.
61 Read Trītyāḥ.
63 Prathyārthī may be supplied.
64 The syllable bha is inserted below the line.
65 Read yā.
TRANSLATION.

First Leaf: Reverse.

O! Salutation to Nandiradasha! Salutation to the Acharyas! Salutation to Isvara! Salutation to Mahabhadra! Salutation to all Yakshas! Salutation to all Devas. To Siva salutation! To Shashthi salutation! To Prajapati salutation! To Rudra salutation! Salutation to Vaiśravaṇa! Salutation to the Mantras! Salutation!

Let the dice fall for the purpose of the present object (i.e., of soothsaying)! Hili! Hili! Let them fall as marked by the pitcher, discus and elephant!

By the truth of all the Siddhas, by the truth of all Schools, by their truth and true consensus let Siva declare what is lost and perished, peace and trouble, gain and less, victory and defeat, svaḥ! By Satyanarayana, the Devata, and by the Rishis, true is the oracle, trae is the diagram. Let the dice fall openly! svaḥ! Let the truth be seen!

(The efficacy of oracles and medical herbs . . . . . is far from untruth. In praise of the Dvata Vishnu.)

(Verse 1.) 444: Salutation to (thee) excellent man! Janardana is well-pleased with thee. May all thy enemies be killed (if thou so desirest)!

(Verse 2.) A Navikä: 333: Thou experiencest neither sorrow nor fatigue; nor hast thou any fear of either high or low;
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.......

thou wilt receive.

(Verse 3.) Even in the midst of the full enjoyment of all desires, one’s happiness engenders molestation; (but) when it arises, God will ever allay thy fears.

(Verse 4.) A Kālaviddhi: 111: Thy intelligence is at fault; . . . . . ; the undertaking which thou contemplatest will be fruitless.

(Verse 5.) (The first) Sāpata: 443: Thou wilt quickly be delivered from all diseases, and thou wilt also obtain happiness; (but) the advantage which thou wilt attain, will be neither very great nor very small.

(Verse 6.) The second Sāpata: 434: I see a terrible effort against those with whom thou hast a conflict, (but) the work will be fruitless on account of which thou enquirest.

---

49 The second pāda is short by one syllable. Perhaps read dṛṣyatā tī.
50 Probably read samākulaṁ.
51 Read duḥkhena.
52 The third pāda is short by one syllable.
53 The italicised words are crossed out in the original.
54 Read saṁkulaṁ-tē.
55 The third pāda has one syllable in excess. Omit saha and read only saubhadṛśa.
56 The bracketed portion is mutilated in the text; and not quite intelligible to me. Of the syllables caṇḍayatā.
57 I.e. the throw of the dice indicates to me the effort thou art making.
(Verse 7.) The third Sāpata: 344: Thou contemppest a meeting, (but) the fair-one does not join thee; thy body is heated with desire, (but) thou shalt obtain no enjoyment.\(^5^4\)

(Verse 8.) (The first Māli) : 343: The peaceful\(^5^5\) enjoyment of pleasure and wealth, and the fulfillment of all desires will, in a very short time, be thine, and that for ever.

(Verse 9.) (The second Māli) : 334: This is a valuable thing to ask,\(^6^0\) viz., happiness that promotes good will; by patience that great object (will be attained), but if thou art impatient, thou wilt not obtain it.

(Verse 10.) (The third Māli) : 433: This is considered a great object by thee; (but) there is a much better object than that: a safe journey into foreign parts and a (safe) return to one's friends.

(Verse 11.) (The first) Vahula : 324 : Long life is a great thing; thou wilt not obtain this (which is) the best, (but) thou wilt obtain wealth in money and grain, and toolls, and also enjoyments.

(Verse 12.) (The second) Vahula : 432 : I see a place where thou hast determined to go, from thence thou wilt safely\(^6^1\) return with thy goods.

(Verse 13.) (The third) Vahula : 243: Manifold, I see, are the things thou dost in order to obtain many sons (?); (but) look forward to thy own happiness; thou wilt obtain all that.

(Verse 14.) (The fourth) Vahula : 423: Manifold are thy successes, and all thy friends are pleased; while others\(^6^2\) envy thee;
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thou wilt not envy them.

(Verse 15.) (The fifth) Vahula : 342: Thou expectest the return of thy friend, and thou feelest sure\(^6^3\) of success; (but) love is entertained reciprocally; why should he come? thou shouldst go.

(Verse 16.) The first Kūta : 414: There is a quarrel with the king, and that quite ruins thy dharma; (but) thou hast obtained thy advantage; therefore thou shouldst solely attend to thy dharma.

(Verse 17.) The second Kūta : 144: Unsteady is this thy place, nor comfortable, nor a source of pleasure; (but) thou wilt get free of it, even if thou art held fast by a deva\(^6^4\); there is no doubt about it.

(Verse 18.) The third Kūta : 441: There is comfort; there is no fear; I see here also success; thou wilt enjoy women accomplished in the arts of love; from nowhere hast thou anything to fear.

(Verse 19.) The first Bhadrā : 421: Thy evils have disappeared; thy offences are removed; thou wilt overcome all thy enemies; thy gain is imminent.

(Verse 20.) The second Bhadrā : 214: In thy mind thou hast conceived a plan for the purpose of obtaining the first place; (but) wait some time; then it will fall into thy hands.

(Verse 21.) The third Bhadrā : 142: Thou wilt obtain a virgin.
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and wilt conciliate thy friend; the devatās will give thee wealth together with affection and good luck.

\(^5^4\) The negative particle is practically misplaced; it must be constructed with the fourth pāda.

\(^5^5\) I take sama in sam-cūdāna to be the same as śāmaya; or it may be a mis-spelling for śama.

\(^5^6\) Labhaya! I take to be the locutive singular of labhaṁa “one who asks.”

\(^6^0\) lit., “taking thyself and thy goods.” I read arthā-viṣa. The third pāda is short by one syllable, which may be mended by resounding the sandhi and reading ch-a-va arthā-va-chā.

\(^6^1\) I take paras as an adverb “ on the other side,” and parā as the abl. sing., for parāti. Or, parā may be taken as a verbal prefix with sprāhat-syayαι.

\(^6^2\) Parā, nom. sing., sel. chintā.

\(^6^3\) Perhaps read dėvāhai (dēvēhi) ‘by the dēvas’.
(Verse 22.) The fourth Bhadrā: 241: Thou sufferest no loss whatever in thy business; thou hast no cause of fear from the dēvatas; as thou dost thy duties, thou wilt receive (thy desires).

(Verse:—) (The fifth Bhadrā:) 412.\(^{64}\)

(Verse 23.) (The first) Sakti: 341: Thou art planning a marriage,\(^{65}\) and thou wilt soon accomplish it, and obtain an affectionate relative who will bestow on thee wealth and pleasures.

(Verse 24.) The second Sakti: 134: Thou art planning a union, and that will soon come to pass; the order has gone forth from the Aśvinis,\(^{67}\) nor will it be anything unpleasant.

(Verse 25.) The third Sakti: 413: I see that something extraordinary is at hand for thee and also a gain; in thy household also there will be an unequaled increase; there is no doubt about it.

(Verse 26.) The fourth Sakti: 314: As a king who has overcome all obstacles thou wilt, well furnished with troops, conquer thy enemy and constantly rule the whole earth under thy single sway.

(Verse 27.) The fifth Sakti: 431: Thou mayest not desire to have any friend, or thou mayest always delight in having a friend; (but) whether thou makest or dost not make friends, enmity comes without any cause.

(Verse 28.) The sixth Sakti: 431: Thou meditest a meeting; that will certainly come to pass; in its proper time that object will be attained, and there will be no disappointment.

(Verse 29.) (The first) Dundubhi: 321c.: What thing of thine is lost or perished, or stolen by thieves, or passed into other hands, that thou wilt recover after a not very long time.

(Verse 30.) The second Dundubhi: 213: Whether thou art forsaken by friends, or whether thou art supported by friends, thou wilt obtain thy favourite objects, in spite of the envy of the dēvatas.
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(Verse 31.) The third Dundubhi: 132: I see that thou enjoyest health of body at the present time; from the worship of the dēvatas thou obtainest this rest.

(Verse 32.) The fourth Dundubhi: 231: I see that thou hast a grievous quarrel with thy enemies; (but) thou wilt suffer no harm from it, and wilt overcome thy adversary.

(Verse 33.) The fifth Dundubhi: 312: I see that thou wilt make a very good acquisition; moreover a son will be born to thee; thy wished-for desires thou wilt obtain; there is no doubt about it.

(Verse 34.) The sixth Dundubhi: 123: Thy mind is much perplexed; thy position is unstable; only wait one month; then thou wilt obtain happiness.

(Verse 35.) The first Vṛisha: 442: Whatever there is in thy house, cattle, grain and money, thou shouldst distribute among the Brahmans; thy advancement is (then) near at hand.

(Verse 36.) The second Vṛisha: 244: Thou art planning a meeting, and thy beloved is far away; (but) the fulfilment of all thy desires will come to pass in a not very long time.

(Verse 37.) The third Vṛisha: 424: Thou wilt suffer grievous bondage, but thou wilt regain thy place; thou wilt have thy reward and wilt also have peace.

(Verse 38.) The first Prāṣhya:

---

\(^{64}\) This verse, being Mantra 412, is wanting in the MS.

\(^{65}\) Perhaps parīkrama may be intended to be more general: 'possession of things.'

\(^{67}\) Aśvinai I take to be intended for Aśvinis, the lost akṣara may be supplied by reading either aśvin-iṣa or aśvinīśakṣita. As the Aśvinis are always two, probably the latter reading is correct, though an unusual formation. The Aśvinis are givers of luck. Lekha refers to the writing of a man's fate on his skull.
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422: If thou desirest knowledge or ... (but) sittest idly at home, thou wilt be altogether unsuccessful!

(Verse 39.) The second Prāshāya: 242: The thing that thou hast thought of, ... it will not accomplish that business with regard to which thou enquirest.

(Verse 40.) The third Prāshāya: 224: The speech which thou hast meditated for the sake of that thing, it will bring to pass the acquisition of the thing for thee: there is no doubt about it.

(Verse 41.) The first Viśī: 332: Thou hast never to take any trouble, and art clever in thy business; thou wilt not suffer any misfortune, and wilt overcome thy adversaries.

(Verse 42.) The second Viśī: 323: Thou wilt not meet the object of thy advantage, and wilt meet with disappointment; (but) go quickly to another place, (and) thou wilt obtain very great happiness.

(Verse 43.) The third Viśī: 233: I see thy purpose; it is with reference to some biped (man?); it will come to pass for thee as surely as the edict of the deity.

(Verse 44.) The first Kārṇa: 114: Thou wilt be honoured with all ceremonies; and good fortune, peace and the requisites of a king thou wilt obtain; it will take place after not very long time.

(Verse 45.) The second Kārṇa: 141: By the act of God it has been destroyed, and thy whole property .........
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(Verse 46.) The third Kārṇa: 411: Thou meditatest going on a journey, but thou wilt meet with misfortune; (thou wilt return) with thy business unfinished: there is no doubt about it.

(Verse 47.) The first Sajā: 322: Thou wilt defeat all thy enemies, but thou hast (one powerful adversary; thou wilt first meet with success, (but) afterwards thou wilt suffer sorrow.

(Verse 48.) The second Sajā: 232: Thou dost not understand business, and thou wilt suffer regret; but there will be a gain to thee, for thy dēvata is favourable.

(Verse 49.) The third Sajā: 223: A most serious danger of thy life has passed away; thy safety is solely due to the favour of the dēvatas.

(Verse 50.) The first Kāṇa: 331: The safety of thy person, profit and wealth are within thy grasp, and prosperity is at hand as sure as the word of God.

(Verse 51.) The second Kāṇa Tantra: 313: Thou expectest health and abundant power: there is no doubt about it; thou wilt certainly obtain prosperity, and abundant pleasures also.

(Verse 52.) The third Kāṇa-Tantra: 133: Thou speakest the untruth sometimes, (and thou showest always ill-will to thy friend; but wait, and by the favour of the dēvatas there will be prosperity.
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(Verse 53.) The first Chūñchuna: 311: I see that after a not very long time thou wilt be deprived of thy pleasures; (but) thou wilt obtain another suitable place; do not give way to despondency.

(Verse 54.) The second Chūñchuna: 131: Wealth and perfection: these two, and also family and rank, and all thy (other) desires thou wilt obtain, as surely as the word of God.

(Verse 55.) The third Chūñchuna: 113: Thou art deprived of thy money and (forsaken) by thy friends and well-wishers; it appears to me as if thou wert troubled in thy mind about relief.
(Verse 56.) The first Pāñchi: 221: I see that thy position is unsafe and troubled; never mind! thou shouldst undertake some business, and thou shalt be delivered from thy misfortune.

(Verse 57.) The second Pāñchi: 122: All regions are attacked alike; observe thou a seasonable line of conduct; otherwise thou wilt not have either happiness or business in them at any time.64

(Verse 58.) The third Pāñchi: 212: Animal sacrifices and many other sacrifices thou wilt sacrifice; and complete oblations thou wilt give: there is no doubt about it.

(Verse 59.) Thy first Kharī: 112: Thy troubles have passed away and thy misfortune likewise; thou art delivered from thy unlucky star; thy prosperity is at hand.
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CHAPTER IV. (continued).

THE AUTHOR AND THE LANGUAGE OF THE INSCRIPTIONS.

PART II. — THE LANGUAGE1 (CONTINUED).

II. — THE GENERAL CHARACTER OF THE LANGUAGE; ITS HISTORICAL POSITION.

We have now passed in review the majority of the grammatical phenomena which are presented by the inscriptions of Piyadasi, in their different versions. But that is not sufficient. It is on account of the light thrown by them on more general facts, that these particular data more especially claim our interest. We have now reached a stage at which we can investigate these larger problems. Two points of view at once present themselves to us, according as we consider, either directly the condition of the language of which specimens are supplied by the inscriptions, or indirectly the general question of the linguistic state of affairs at the period, to which our texts bring us back. The first problem, again, may be looked at in two

64 The reading here is corrupt; but this meaning seems to be plain.

1 In the original French edition I stated at the conclusion of this study, and I now beg to repeat it at once here at the beginning, that I never intended, when writing these chapters, to examine under all their different aspects the vexed questions about Sanskrit and its history to which they refer. I only wished to bring to light a number of facts — either directly derived from the most ancient epigraphic records or at least connected with them — which to my mind are indeed highly important and which possess direct bearing upon the final settlement of these problems.

While proceeding along this track, I considered it useful to advance resolutely to the ultimate conclusions to which it seemed to me to lead, without dwelling, at least for the time, on the difficulties to which they might give rise, or the conflicts with other lines of argument in which they might result or appear to result. No one, I hope, will contend that the conflict escaped me, or that I meant to dispose of the points in question before having previously settled it one way or the other. But, on this occasion, I have not undertaken a task so vast and so comprehensive. On a ground so thickly overgrown, and so imperfectly surveyed, I fancy it may be advantageous to push on lines of reconnoitring straight forward, in what to some may appear a rather adventurous way. It is highly desirable that those who start from other points of view, and who propose to follow more direct or more beaten paths, should not be too dogmatic, nor dispose in too summary a manner of these side-explorations.

These brief remarks have a two-fold aim. For one, I wish to prevent any misconception, and also to check criticisms which, — probably by my own fault, — the present essay has called forth, and which I cannot find to be justified or to be based upon an adequate, faithful rendering of my views. Secondly, they will explain why, after several years, I have allowed it to appear again in its original tenor. Such changes as have been made in this translation concern only minor points; they aim at nothing but doing away with expressions which were either equivocal or too absolute, so as to mislead the reader as to what I really mean. Everyone knows how easily the preoccupation of one leading idea may carry even a cautious writer to an accidental use of expressions or statements which may disturb in some way his real thought, and let it appear too affirmative, or too exclusive. I have tried my best to obviate this danger in the present, in the main, unaltered reproduction of this essay.
different ways. And, to sum up, we have to examine; (1), whether the monuments disclose differences of dialect in the strict sense of the word; (2), if beside dialectic peculiarities properly so called, they do not exhibit other peculiarities based on differences in the systems of orthography; and (3) if it is possible to draw, from the philological facts supplied by our texts, conclusions regarding the contemporary condition of the religious or learned, the Vedic or Sanskrit language. This would be the most logical order in which to deal with the matter, but I propose to discuss the second point first; so as to render the explanation, I hope, both clearer and shorter.

About one fact there can be no doubt:—Our inscriptions do not pretend to invariably represent in their integrity the sounds of the spoken language.

Proofs of this abound. The most general is that nowhere do they observe the rule of doubling homogeneous consonants.

It cannot, I think, be doubted that the doubling of consonants, resulting from assimilation, e.g., āṭha in aṭṭi, wva in sava for sava, &c., was really observable in pronunciation. It must have been the case no less at this epoch, than in the more recent period when it was graphically represented. Moreover, in the case of doubling a nasal, the duplication is only marked by means of anusvāra, as in dhāma; and in several words, the sporadic prolongation of the preceding vowel, as in dhāma for dharma, kāśāi for kārvaka, vāsa for vasa, is only an equivalent method, largely used to the present day, of expressing a real duplication. The same procedure is followed in texts of more recent date, as at Kaḷhiṣṭā (No. 10), where, in a single inscription, I find dhāma, pāvata, sāva, ādha.

But this is not all. The inscriptions in Indo-Bactrian characters, whether of the time of Aśoka or subsequent to him, do not distinguish graphically the long and the short vowels. This omission might be explained by the want of appropriate signs, but these signs would have been easy to create in an alphabet which has formed itself with the aid of so many conscious and learned additions. If these signs had not been added, it is certain that but small importance was attached to rendering exactly the various shades of pronunciation. The necessary signs existed in the Southern Alphabet, though neither at Kaḷhiṣṭā, nor, I believe, at Bairāt or Rūpāṭā, were they used for the ā or for the ṭ. So far as regards Kaḷhiṣṭā, this might be accounted for by the influence of the north-west, which manifests itself here in several phenomena; but the fact would none the less remain that this practice shows not an exact imitation of the pronunciation, but an orthographical system which, at least in some measure, neglects it. Even the versions which do distinguish the long vowels, display so many inaccuracies that they themselves bear witness to the little care which was taken in making the distinction.

One of two things is evident. Either the distinction between long and short vowels survived in the current language, and the texts noted it insufficiently, or it had become lost in speech, and they endeavoured to restore it in writing. Both hypotheses would thus indicate a lax attention to the exact representation of sounds, and the second also a characteristic tendency towards a learned orthography.

Other inconsistencies lead us to an analogous conclusion.

The diphthong ai has disappeared in all the Brāhī dialects with which we are acquainted, and it is no less a stranger to the inscriptions of Piyādaśī. Yet Gärnār gives us an example: thāra, Skr. sthavīra, is there written thairs, and in one passage trayādaśa is spelt trādāva. Can we believe that the diphthong, lost elsewhere, has survived in these two unique instances? Must we not clearly recognize here a half-learned orthography, inspired by the memory of the etymological origin?

* Unless otherwise stated, I cite the cave inscriptions by the numbers of the Archaological Survey of Western India, Vols. IV. and V.
It is a universal rule in the Prākrit, both in the dialects of the inscriptions and in the literary languages, that before anusvāra a long vowel becomes short. In four or five instances, however, the long vowel of Sanskrit is retained: yātān (VIII, 1), svaruṣatān (X, 2), anuvrāthvatān (bid.), samachērān (XIII, 7) at Girnar. It is plain that we have here purely and simply an orthography influenced by the learned language.

These last instances are mere accidents, but they enable us to judge better regarding those in which variations of orthography more nearly balance each other. In a certain number of consonantal groups composed of a mute and an r, instead of the disappearance of the r, compensated for by the doubling of the mute, we find at Girnar the etymological spelling, pra, tra, sra, rva, instead of pa (ppa), ta (ta∫), sa (sya), va (vva). This spelling is by no means fixed, as may be seen from a reference to the text of any single edict, and it would be of little interest to quote here all the instances, one by one. It will be sufficient to state that we have the spelling pra about 45 times, as against the spelling pa 25 times: for tra, 30 times ta, 20 times tpa: for rva, rva and va each about an equal number of times: for bra, once bra, against 6 or 7 times ba: once sra (for rva, rva), against once sa. Is it possible to contend that such an indifference represents the real spontaneous condition of the popular idiom, and that pronunciations corresponding to such different stages of phonetic decay, and that side by side in the same words, belonged actually to the same period of the normal development of the language? If it were possible to have any doubts on the point, it would be sufficient to refer to later facts in the linguistic history. When we read, in Hindi, priya beside pi∫a, putra beside pu∫a, brāhma∫a beside bāhmāna, we have no hesitation. We know that the first of each of these pairs is an instance of learned orthography: that it is only a tatsama, that is to say, a word borrowed direct from Sanskrit, and restored to the current of the language. When in an inscription of the 24th year of Vāsithiputa Pulmāñi (Kārli No. 22, A. S.), we meet side by side the spellings pu∫a∫a, sva∫a∫a, vatha∫a∫a, and bu∫karha∫a∫a, upa∫a∫a, prajā, paripahā, we are confident that these genitives in asya, this spelling of prajā, cannot, at such a period, have represented the true pronunciation of the people; that there also they are tatsu∫as. How can we avoid drawing the same conclusion from facts which, although more ancient, are none the less strictly analogous?

It is therefore certain that these sanskritized forms do not represent the actual stage of the contemporary phonetic decay. One point, however, appears to be open to some doubt. The tatsu∫as of the modern languages actually enter into circulation, and that with either the ancient pronunciation, or with an approach to it. They are words of special origin, but at the same time real words of the current speech. The tatsu∫as of Mixed Sanskrit are, on the other hand, purely orthographical, for they belong to a purely literary language. That is to say, while in the modern tongues, the loans from the ancient language only deal with bases, and consequently have no effect on the grammar, in the Sanskrit of the Gāthās, the imitations extend even to the inflexions, i.e. to elements which would escape any arbitrary action of the learned in a really 'living language.'

In which of these two categories are we to class the tatsu∫as of Piyadasi? We must, I think, consider them in the same light as those of the dialect of the Gāthās, and recognize them as 'orthographic' tatsu∫as. The examples given above show that little heed was paid to accurately representing the pronunciation and that the etymological form was readily adopted in cases in which the vulgar pronunciation must have been markedly different. That is in itself a strong reason, but we shall see, besides, that the classical language had not yet been so developed into practical application at this epoch as to allow us to assume that it could have penetrated into the stream of popular use. Moreover, in the different versions of the texts, the proportion of these tatsu∫as is very unequal. If it were a case of forms readopted into current speech, such an inequality would be surprising; it is more easily explained by a-

I shall refer to the dialect of the Gāthā or Mixed Sanskrit in the following chapter.
local predominance of a special orthographical system, or rather of special orthographical tendencies.

The observations which still remain for me to make are of a kind to add further proof to these conclusions.

The orthography of Kapur di Giri, as in Sāṅskṛit, distinguishes the three sibilants, ś, ś, ś, Is it really the case that the dialect of this region retained a distinction which, if we are to judge from the parallel versions, was lost everywhere else? It is sufficient to record the irregularities accumulated in the distribution of these sibilants, to convince the reader that nothing of the sort occurred.

We read ś instead of śh in manuśa (II, 4; 5) beside manuṣha (XIII, 6), and in the futures which are formed in sakti for skyati. We have ś for śh in gṛṣu (XIII, 4), arabhīyau (I, 2), beside nārāmyo, &c., in abhīśita, which is never written abhīshita; and for ś in anuvāchana (XIII, 2); sūkramāra (XIII, 8), sūkta (I, 2); śh for s in paṃkṣhena (III, 6), śhena (XIII, 8); ś for s in anuvāsanaḥ (IV, 10), anuvāśīvaḥ (ibid.). It cannot be imagined that this confusion may be referred to the real usage of the local dialect. It can only be accounted for by one theory, the only one which explains analogous mistakes, whether in manuscripts or in more modern Sāṅskṛit inscriptions. The error of the engraver or of the scribe arises in both cases from the fact that he has before him a learned spelling, in the application of which he cannot be guided by the usage of the current dialect, because the distinctions he has to deal with are strangers to it. The locative paṃkṣhena, a clumsy imitative of locatives in ēkā, is very characteristic as illustrating the way in which the sibilants were used at Kapur di Giri.

The fact must not be lost sight of that this method of writing is not an isolated example; it is borne witness to by other parallel ones, which leave us in no doubt as to what conclusions we are to draw from it. It is certain that the distinction between the sibilants did not exist in the dialect of the western coast; yet that does not prevent us finding all three at Nāsik (Nos. 1 & 2, A. S. iv, 114), in dedications, which in every other respect are couched in pure Prākrit, not even in mixed Sāṅskṛit. As at Kapur di Giri, a mistake, śakaśa for śakasa, is there to warn us as to the true character of this use. It is the same in No. 27 of Kanheī (A. S. v, 85), in which the pretension to learned orthography leads to such forms as ṣunānam, sārvāvat-vāṇaḥ.

In the instances which we have just passed in review, we may perhaps be allowed to hesitate as to the origin of the spelling, though not as to the sound which it represents or is intended to represent; the problem becomes more thorny when we consider certain orthographical phenomena, which express accurately neither the learned form, nor the form adopted in popular usage; — which can, in some respects, be considered as intermediate between these two poles of linguistic movement.

Dr. Pischel has correctly pointed out that, at Kapur di Giri, the words which I have, according to precedent, transcribed as dhāra, dāri, dārā, karmaye, vārṣa, purṣa, &c., are really written dhāra, dārā, &c., the r being joined to the consonant dh, d, &c. He adds that here, as in the coin-legends which observe the same method of spelling, this writing certainly represents a dialectic peculiarity, and that the people for whom the tables of Kapur di Giri were inscribed, actually pronounced the word as dhrā, prā, &c. At this point I am unable to agree with his deductions.

He bases his argument specially on certain readings, such as mṛuga, equivalent to mṛiga, in the first edict of Kapur di Giri, graha and dṛiha, equivalent to gṛha and dṛiha in the 13th, pariprākha, equivalent to pariprāchah, in the 8th, vṛcalhā, equivalent to vṛkaḥ, in the 2nd edict of Girnar. He compares the forms rṇa, rī, rd, taken by the vowel rī in several modern dialects.
I think that this comparison, unless I am much mistaken, goes directly contrary to his conclusion. Modern forms like graha, griha, mruga, mrugya, mriga, by the side of which we also find others such as mriga, &c., are in no way direct derivatives of the Sâlskript mriga, but are tattvavas; that is, nothing but simple equivalents of the form mriga, griha, which itself is also used in the modern languages. They are only instances of such approximate spelling as could be realized with the elements really existing in the popular language, instead of borrowing from the learned language a special sign, corresponding to a special pronunciation which has ceased to exist for more than two thousand years. In both cases, the situation is not only analogous, but is identical. I offer for both, one and the same explanation,—that which is incontestable for the more recent one: in mriga, graha, drikha, vrakhha or vrakhha of the inscriptions, I can see, as in mrga, graha, drikha, vrakhha or vrakhha of existing languages, only tattvavas, loans really taken from the learned language, but represented by an orthography which, by the absence (whether voluntary or not is of little importance at the present stage of the inquiry) of the sign for the vowel ri, was condemned to tentative and approximative devices. These examples in no way argue against my method of treating the groups dr̥, pr, &c., in the words which I have quoted. On the contrary, they present certain precedents of a return towards the learned language, operating even at the price of imperfect orthographical expedients. It is exactly in the same light that we must consider the spellings which now occupy us.

In the first place, the state of affairs at Kapur di Giri, so far as concerns consonantal compounds including an r, strongly resembles that which we have established for Girnar. We find there pātī beside pāt (also pātī and pātī), sava, savastra, by the side of sarva, sarva, sarvatra, &c. Without attempting to compile exact statistics, the fact is, in a general way, indisputable. It is natural to deduce from it the same conclusions as those to which we have come with regard to Girnar. We must not, therefore, treat the orthographical peculiarities of this language with absolute rigour. If the r in the words which we are discussing, is taken from the learned language by an arbitrary artifice of writing, why should we be astonished that the writers should have allowed themselves some liberty in the manner of representing it, when they have just as often taken the liberty of omitting it altogether? In Hindi the spellings dharm, krama, gandhara, in no way correspond to any peculiar phonetic phenomena, but are merely equivalent modes of writing the tattvavas dharma, karma, gandhara.

Mr. Beames (Compar. Gram. I, 331) has quoted in the ancient Hindi of Chand, spellings such as śrava (= sarva), dharm (= dharma), śvām (= śvarna), brahna (= sarpa), brahman (= varṣaṇa), prabha (= parvata), krama (= karma), krama (= kara), &c. I do not think that these examples can be appealed to against the argument, which I here maintain. It is more than clear that all these spellings were, at the time of Chand, taken from the vocabulary of the learned language. The doubling of the consonant in śrava, krama, &c., sufficiently proves that the true pronunciation of the people was śrava, krama, &c. Different motives, metrical or otherwise, may have suggested these spellings, but they prove nothing as to the real pronunciation. Far from being contrary to my opinion, they supply, at a distance of some fifteen hundred years, a phenomenon, strictly comparable with that which we have shown to exist at Kapur di Giri. This resemblance of methods is explicable by the resemblance of the conditions which called them into being. In each case we have a language, which, not having as yet a regulated system of spelling, attempts, with groping and uncertainty, to approximate itself, by the simplest means available, to the practice of a language which enjoys a higher degree of reverence.

If we consider the facts by themselves, would this change of dharma to dhrama, of puṣa to prusa, of krama to krama be likely or probable? I think not. Alongside of prusa, there is at least one passage (VI, 14), in which it seems clear that we must read puṣa. So also we find that coins wrote zaṁa alongside of dhrama; that by the side of draṣṣa at Kapur di Giri, we have, at Girnar, an example of darsana. The form which all these words have invariably taken in the popular pronunciation, dharm, prusa, krama, vassa or vasa, &c., depends uniformly on
a former pronunciation, dharma, and not dhrama, varsa and not vrdsa &c. If people said
sava, why should they have said prava?

We should doubtless be glad to discover with certainty the cause of these inconsistencies;
but our hesitation in this respect proves nothing against conclusions, which appear to me to be
satisfactorily proved. It is no use counting all the variations in the mode of writing; by the
side of sava, we frequently have sava; mta beside mitra, puta beside putra, &c., &c.; we find
written kriya, and vadhata, vadhita, &c. It is not surprising that, in an orthography which is
the arbitrary imitation of a learned pronunciation, a certain approximation should have
appeared sufficient. The example of Girnar proves that we must not take the phonetic value of
the signs too strictly. It is clear that in ṣ ṣ and in ṣ ṣ the same character ṣ signifies
at one time, vru, and at another time rva. Reasons of graphic convenience may have had
their share of influence. A cursive sign for r following a consonant had been fixed at this epoch
but they had not fixed one for an r preceding one. It is easy to prove this in the more recent
inscriptions. They retained the first sign, and invented a new one for the second case (often
the inscription of Sui Vihar.†) The direct combination of the characters ያ և ջ was sufficiently easy and symmetrical, but the combination of ջ with ա, զ &c., being more
complicated, gave greater opportunities for confusion. Without doubt such a consideration

6 For example ṣ ṣ = rva. We catch, I think, this new notation in course of formation in instances such as the

† Note by translator.—The following extracts from the statistical portion of this chapter, previously published,
see ante, pp. 3 and 10, will assist the reader in following the argument.

GIRNAR.—t becomes ṭ in ṭpæ, XII, 3, 4, 5, 6.

tv becomes ṭp: alchḍpa, XIV, 6; ṛahṛṭpā, I, 3; chāṭpā, XIII, 8; Ḟaṣṭpā, IV, 4; ṛhitpā, VI, 11;
ścvesṭṭpā, X, 1; ṛahṛṭpā, X, 1; it becomes ṭ in satyapāt, II, 2.

KAPURDI.—t becomes ṭ in ṭtā, XII, passim.

 tv becomes ṭ.
This being said, while I uphold the transcription \( \textit{tpa} \), after Burnouf and (as Dr. Pischel very properly reminds me) Signor Ascoli, I admit that I can produce no decisive facts to prove that this spelling represents something different from its apparent pronunciation. Neither the use, which Dr. Kern has pointed out, of the Javanese spelling of the group \( t \) to express simply the sound \( t \), nor the analogous instances, have any demonstrative force. Nevertheless, the phonetic conditions which Girmar displays in other respects are not such as to lead us to believe that at this epoch, the contact of two mutes, like \( tp \), could have been tolerated by the language without assimilation. Several traits, which would seem to prove the more archaic character of the language of Girmar, disappear if we consider them in their true light as simple graphic restorations, and it would be very improbable that a language which so invariably assimilates mutes when they are primitive, as in \textit{sama\( \lambda \), guth, \&c.}, should have, at the same time, preserved their original power for groups of secondary mutes, resulting from an earlier phonetic alteration. Without, therefore, being in a position to furnish categorical proof of my opinion, I cannot refrain from being impressed with this belief that the group \( tp \) at Girmar represents \( pp \) as its real pronunciation, the etymological origin of which is shadowed forth in the writing by an artifice, which has, so to speak, been arrested half way.

As regards the groups \( st, st \), I have the same good fortune to be in accord with Signor Ascoli, and the same regrets that I cannot agree with Dr. Pischel. I know, and I have expressly stated, that Hémacandra (IV, 290, 291) teaches in Mágadhī the spellings \( st \) for \( \textit{fita} \) and \( \textit{shth} \) of Sanskrit, and \( st \) for \( \textit{shth} \) and \( \textit{rth} \). Dr. Pischel draws attention to the fact that the \textit{Mrícchha\( kṣ\)a\( s \)} has forms like \textit{bhaktaka, chistādī}. I do not wish to insist upon reasons which depend somewhat on individual impression; but I cannot easily believe in dialectic forms such as \textit{pūṣa} for \textit{pūṣa}, \textit{as\( a \)} for \textit{ar\( th \)}. They are phonetic modifications so isolated, as far as I can see, on Hindī soil, that it seems to me very difficult to admit their existence; but I recognize that such a sample has no demonstrative force. We shall at least see from what I shall have occasion to say regarding the Prákrit of the grammarians, that they are entitled to but very weak authority as regards the exact state of the popular language, above all at the epoch with which we are now dealing; and here, for example, the evidence of Hémacandra may very well be taken as only indicating the more or less accidental retention, the more or less arbitrary application, of an archaic spelling. At the same time it must be remembered that the facts thus quoted, agree but imperfectly with those with which it is desired to compare them. Hémacandra mentions this spelling as peculiar to Mágadhī, and we are asked to recognise it again at the other end of India, in Sūra\( ḍ\)a\( ḍ\); we do not find it anywhere in the other versions of our inscriptions, which, owing to several significant traits, the nominative in \( \textit{e} \), the substitution of \( l \) for \( r \), may fairly claim relationship with Mágadhī. This is not of a nature to give strength to the authority of the grammarians, at least as regards their geographical terminology.

---

1 Note by translator.—As this is not printed together with the statistical portion of the chapter which has already been given ante, pp. 3, 4 and pp. 10, 11, the following extracts from that portion will assist the reader to understand what follows.

GIRMAR.—\( \textit{th} \) becomes \( st \) in \( \textit{us\( ṭ \)}\), VI, 3, 10.
\( \textit{rth} \) becomes \( th \), as \( \textit{atha}, \textit{pasa\( m \)}\).
\( \textit{shhr} \) becomes \( r\textit{shhr} \), IV, 5.
\( \textit{shth} \) becomes \( \textit{st} \), \textit{shth\( \)a\( s \)}, VII, 4; \textit{shth\( \)a\( s \)}, IV, 10; \textit{sh\( ṭ \)\( \)ā\( \)ma\( t \), IX, 6; t\( īs\)\( th\)\( th \), IV, 9; t\( ī\)\( s\)\( th\)\( m \), VI, 13.
\( \textit{st} \) is preserved: \( \textit{as\( t \) p\( as\)\( s m \), \&c.} \) — it becomes \( \textit{st} \) in \( \textit{nas\( s m \)}\), VIII, 4, al.
\( \textit{sth} \) becomes \( st \) in \( \textit{ghara\( s\)\( s\)m \), XII, 1; \) and \( st \) in \( \textit{sim\( s \)} , V, 4.

KAPUS DI GIRI.
\( \textit{th} \) becomes cerebralised into \( \textit{l} \) under the influence of an \textit{r}-sound, in \textit{dharma\( s\)\( th\)\( ah \)} , XIII, 10; \textit{ni\( s\)\( th\)\( s m \)\( th \)}, IX, 19.
\( \textit{th} \) is written both \( \textit{th} \) and \( \textit{th} \) in \textit{us\( ṭ \)\( s m \)}, VI, 15.
\( \textit{r\( th \)\( s m \)\( th \)} \) usually gives \( \textit{us\( \th \)\( s m \)}\) (\( \textit{as\( r\)\( th \)\( s m \)}\), \textit{as\( th\)\( a\), \textit{was\( m \)}\), IX, 20; \textit{an\( th\)\( s m \)\( th\)\( ah \)}, V, 12).
\( \textit{sh\( h \)\( th \)} \) is written \( \textit{st} \) in \textit{ra\( st\)\( th\)\( ah \)\( bh \)}, V, 12.
\( \textit{sh\( h \)\( th \)} \) is written \( \textit{th} \) in \textit{ś\( h \)\( th \)\( th \)\( s \)} , IV, 10; \( \textit{th} \) in \textit{t\( h \)\( th \)}, IX, 20; \textit{ad\( th\)\( h\)\( ah \)}, V, 13; and \( \textit{st} \) in \textit{r\( s\)\( a\)}, I, 2, and \textit{t\( s\)\( s\)\( s\)\( s \)}, IV, 10.
\( \textit{st} \) remains unaltered, whether written with the special sign to which Dr. Bühler appears to have given its true value, or with the group \( \textit{st} \) as in \textit{sat\( s\)\( s\)\( a\)}, IX, 19.
\( \textit{sh} \) becomes \( \textit{sh\( r \)\( th \)\( i\)\( t \)}\), IX, 13; \textit{gra\( h\)\( a\)\( s m \)}, XIII, 4; and also \( \textit{sh} \), \textit{gra\( h\)\( a\)\( s s s m \)}, XII, 1.
The groups which the grammarian expressly writes \textit{st}, with the dental \textit{s} (cf. \textit{Sûtra} 289), the \textit{Mrîcchhakāśi}, extending the use of the palatal \textit{s} peculiar to Māgadhî, writes \textit{ś}, and the verb \textit{tisñhasti}, for which the spelling \textit{chisñhadi} is expressly enjoined by \textit{Sûtra} 298, is written in the \textit{dr̥ama} \textit{chisñhadi} (Pischel, loc. cit.). Between the grammarian and our inscriptions there is a still wider discord: \textit{ṭ} is no more written \textit{s} at Gîrmar, than \textit{ṭh} is written \textit{st}.

The mere observation of facts such as those which exist at Gîrmar would be sufficient to awaken our scruples. I find it difficult to believe, as Dr. Pischel has ingeniously suggested, that the absence of the aspiration in \textit{ṣīta} and \textit{ṣēṣa}, are a direct inheritance from the primitive period which existed before the birth of the secondary aspiration of Vedic Sāisīkṛt. Should we further conclude that the word \textit{svr̥sta} at Kapur di Gîrī (1st edit. of Vedīc Sāisīkṛt) is also a witness of the same period, when the sibilant \textit{s} and the other cerebrals had not as yet developed? As for claiming the same antiquity for the Pāli form \textit{āṭha} (equivalent to \textit{artha}) for \textit{artha}, the uniform use of the aspirate in all our versions is far from favouring this conjecture. In any case, the Pāli spelling \textit{āṭha} being uniformly absent from all our inscriptions cannot be relied upon as a basis for the archaic origin of the \textit{ṭ} in \textit{ṣīta}. I therefore consider that I am right in doubting whether the popular pronunciation had really eliminated the aspiration, in a case in which, as everyone knows, as everyone can judge by a reference to Prākrit orthography, the consonant is invariably aspirated, even when the aspiration is not original, i.e., when Śaṅkṛṣṭ does not write it as aspirated. Is it really to be believed that the people pronounced \textit{usṭāṇa} (Gîrmar, VI, 9, 10), when the assimilated form \textit{uttāṇa} is the only one used, even in the learned language and in its system of etymological spelling? If they really did pronounce \textit{ṣṭāṇa}, \textit{ṣṭīta}, can \textit{usṭāṇa} be considered as anything but a purely orthographical approximation to these words, guided and determined by the feeling of etymology? The forms \textit{anuṣṭīti} (for \textit{anuṣṭasti}, the only probable one) beside \textit{sahistata}, \textit{gharatāṇi} (instead of \textit{ṣṭāṇi}), beside \textit{ṣṭāṇa}, and at Kapur di Gîrī, \textit{svr̥sta} (instead of \textit{vṛṣṭa}) by the side of \textit{vṛṣṭha} (IV, 10), \textit{sāṅśīt} beside \textit{tīṭh} and \textit{adhīṭaṇa} (V, 12 ; al.), \textit{dipīśa} beside \textit{āṭha} (= \textit{āṣṭau}) are as many errors which it would be hard to explain if we considered the orthography as an actual expression of the existing pronunciation.

Now, Gîrmar is comparatively near the tract which furnishes us numerous inscriptions for the period following. Would it not be surprising that in none of them, not even in the most ancient, at Śācchī and at Nāndaghāṭ, has a single trace of so significant a dialectic peculiarity been discovered? What we do find is at Śācchī (No. 160), the proper name \textit{dhamaśṭikri}, while in all the analogous instances, \textit{sṛṣṭhi}, \&c., the assimilation is carried out. Again at Kārlī (No. 22), in a text of the time of Vāsaṭhiputa Sātakaṇi, we find \textit{hitamasyākṣṭa}[i]tay[i], beside \textit{niśkītā}. In this instance forms such as \textit{puttasva}, \textit{svasakasya} beside \textit{budharakhāsena}, \textit{upāsaka}, leave no doubt as to the nature of the spelling. We have here a text couched half in Prākrit, half in mixed Śaṅkṛṣṭ, and we know, without any hesitation, that the spelling \textit{niśkīta} is a \textit{tatsama}, or, which comes to the same thing, an instance of learned orthography. Does not all analogy, every probability, compel us to accept the same conclusion for Gîrmar?

It is true that this mode of writing, \textit{ṭ} and \textit{s}, appears at Gîrmar with a certain regularity, but this should not mislead us, after the facts which we have already pointed out regarding groups which contain \textit{r}. I maintain that \textit{ṭ} and \textit{s} are conservative methods of spelling the groups \textit{ṭh} and \textit{ṭh} which arise in Prākrit from a dental or cerebral sibilant followed by its mute. They have been extended to groups originating from \textit{ṭh} and \textit{ṣh} (that is to say a dental or cerebral sibilant followed by an aspirated mute), for the very simple reason that, in the assimilation of Prākrit these groups result in the same pronunciation as do \textit{ṭ} and \textit{ṣh}.

\footnote{1} I do not speak of \textit{chisñhitha} in the inscription of Piyadasi. It is in Māgadhī, and, as we shall see, cannot be taken as an authority for the local dialect.

\footnote{2} At Kapur di Gîrī, the analysis, \textit{ṣh}, which Dr. Bühler has proved for a sign hitherto generally read \textit{ṭh}, has drawn the spelling of the word \textit{svr̥sta} from its isolation: but the inconsistencies which have been cited above in the transcriptions of the Śaṅkṛṣṭ groups \textit{ṣh}, \textit{ṣh}, still remain not one whit less characteristic and instructive.
this point of view, anomalies like utthana and anusista can be easily explained. _utthana_ is only another way of spelling _uttāna_. The cerebralization, for which _anusista_ supplies no pretext, could creep into the pronunciation of _anusathī_ under the influence of the analogy which it suggests with forms like _sīśka, anusīśka_. A practice of this kind, extending even to words in which it has no etymological justification, is certainly not without example in Hindi usage. I content myself with quoting the use of the groups _gr, tr_ in Jain Prākrit, used to represent merely a doubled _g_ or _l_, and that even when it is not justified by etymology, — in _pṛgala_, i.e. _pṛgald_ (pṛgald), as well as in _udagra_. Prof. Weber has not on this account dreamed of suggesting that the pronunciation _agra, udagra_ has been preserved, but very rightly concludes that we must everywhere read _gga_.

The preceding remarks do not exhaust the instances in which we are permitted to infer that the orthography of the Edicts of Piyadasi is not strictly phonetic. Other spellings deserve, from this point of view, to be noticed here. Some are significant by their very character and by their inconsistencies; others, either better preserved or altered more than the mean level of phonetic decay permits, reveal in turn either an accidental imitation of the cultivated idiom, or the contemporary existence of a popular language into which the mode of writing of our inscriptions artificially introduces a regularity unknown in practice.

In the first category is contained the use of _ी_. This brings me again to Dr. Pischel's remarks. I must confess that I can no longer hold to the opinion, originally expressed by me, that the sign _ी_ at Khalsi was only another form of _+_. I admit that this sign, literally _īya_, corresponds to a special shade of pronunciation, although it does not appear to be easy to define it. The concurrence of the forms _kaliṅgya, kāliṅgyan, kāliṅgāni_, which Dr. Bühler has been the first to identify at Khalsi (XIII, 9, 6), does not throw much light on the problem; but to whatever conclusion we are led, it will remain none the less certain that the engravers have displayed a singular inconsistency. According to Dr. Pischel himself, beside seventeen instances in which the suffix _ika_ is written _īya_, there are seven in which the spelling _ika_ is retained. It is very clear that one or other of these two methods of writing does not accord with the exact pronunciation. What are we to say about the Dehi inscriptions, in which we find _k_ in two isolated examples, in _ambāṇḥiṣṭa_ and _ādāksaṇiṣṭa_ (Col. Ed., VII-VIII, 2), whereas everywhere else the suffix invariably retains the form _ika_?

I confess that I find some difficulty in avoiding an explanation, which, at the first glance, will appear singular and rash. In various coins of Spalagadama, of Spalirasa (Sallet, p. 154), and of Gondophares (p. 169), we find _dharmikasa_ side by side with the ordinary form _dharmikasa_. On the other hand, the coins of Lysias (ibid., p. 164) have alternately _ārikasa_ and _ārisa_. The pronunciations _ika_ and _iya_ do not appear to have belonged to the same period of phonetic development, and it is tempting to conclude that the popular pronunciation was _iya_ (or _is_), which is the same thing), of which _ika_ represents the learned spelling; that, in fact, people read the latter _iya_ as seems to be proved by the writing _ārikasa_ for _ārisa_. The sign _ी_ ought hence to be considered as a compromise between the real pronunciation, indicated by the _i_, and the _tātāma_ orthography represented by the _k_. The spelling _ālikasāda_ must be explained by some play of etymology, which, in order to lend to the foreign name a Hindi appearance, seems to have sought in the first portion of the word for the Prākrit _ālka, alīya_, corresponding to the Sanskrit _ālka_. I do not underrate the difficulties of this solution. If it were certain, it would lend a singular confirmation to my method of considering the orthography of our inscriptions, but I recognise that it is in no way certain. I only put it forward, as a conjecture, which is, in my opinion, a likely one, and I do not propose to take advantage of it elsewhere for any more general conclusions. If we neglect it, and content ourselves with a simple statement of the facts, we find at all events that, at least in this particular point, the

spelling of our inscriptions, not being consistent with itself, does not endeavour to accurately present the pronunciation.11

Kapur di Giri in several instances uses j and y, the one for the other: ja[shi] (equivalent to yad). 1, 11; anijaš, VI, 16; samaya, I, 2; kaññogya, V, 12; XIII, 9; rayya, V, 11; VI, 14; IX, 18; X, 21; XI, 23; XIII, 1, beside roja, VIII, 17, &c. Perhaps even at Garnar we find an analogous case, if we must really really read (XII, 7) svunjya, for svunjya, equivalent to svunjya. At any rate, nauydu for niydu, is purely sporadic, contrary to analogy, and, to all appearance, an arbitrary spelling.

These exceptional spellings follow a double direction. Several bear witness to an effort to approach the etymological forms. For instance, suddvicas, against all analogy, retains its final consonant. No one can doubt that Dhauli and Jaungada represent exactly the same dialect, and the same pronunciation, and hence ekatya at Jaungada (I, 2) and saññyaýpatipati (IX, 16), as compared with ekaccha at Dhauli, can only be taken as kinds of tattvas. So also with forms like akaccha at Dhauli. Adhyiggyya, equivalent to adhyiṣṭiya, for adhyiṣṭhika, at Bhabra, shows us an orthography which is undecided and hesitating.

In other places the writing betrays by inadvertencies that the phonetic level of the spoken language has already fallen below that which is usually marked by the ruling habits of the written one. I refer to softening like adhyiṣṭhya for adhyiṣṭhya at Bhabra, liti alongside of tipli at Dehli,ロー, lōgika, lahgya at Jaungada, or, inversely, to irregular hardenings such as kaññokha at Dhauli, paññatagyati at Jaungada, paññak at Kapur di Giri, or, again, isolated inflexions like janāc at Khālsī, mahidas at Garnar.

It would not be impossible to increase the number of indications of this nature; but, neither the condition of the monuments, nor the accuracy of our facsimiles, would allow us to attain to complete statistics. I stop myself here, and proceed to sum up.

---

11 The translator ventures to take the liberty of appending the following note by him on this character, which originally appeared in the Academy for October 1890:—

This character has excited considerable controversy. It is admittedly a compound of the sign for k and the sign for y, and, graphically, it represents kya. In the Khālsī inscription it is substituted (but by no means uniformly) for the k which we should expect in the termination īk; and it also occurs in the foreign word alīkyyoñadal. It is also found twice in the Delhi columnar inscription. All scholars agree that no completely satisfactory explanation has been given for this form. It seems to me that the following is not unreasonable.

The spelling of Piyanasi's inscriptions presents several instances of false analogy. M. Senart has given strong reasons for believing that when Piyanasi at Garnar wrote े, he meant to represent the sound े. It was a mistaken attempt to revive an old-fashioned spelling. The scribe knew that Sanskrit े became े in Prakrit, and hence wrongly assumed that every Prakrit े was derived from े. Therefore, to show his learning, whenever he came to a े, he wrote it े, even in cases when े represented not े, but े.

I think that this े is a similar instance of false analogy. The Māgadhī Prakrit termination īk is liable to have its penultimate vowel lengthened, thus, īkā. Then, by a well-known rule, the i can again be shortened, the consonant following being at the same time doubled in compensation, thus, īkā. Instances of this are not uncommon in literature; and, judging from the modern languages of India, must have been extremely common in conversation. Prakrit examples will be found in § 203 of Dr. Hoernle's Gaudia Grammar and I need not quote them here. As the Khālsī and the Delhi inscriptions were written in Piyanasi's Māgadhī dialect, we need not be surprised if we find this doubling occurring in them too.

Now Sanskrit े does become īkā in Prakrit; and I believe that the scribe, coming upon an īkā with a totally different derivation of which he was ignorant, and wishing to show his learning, represented that īkā also by े, just as his brother at Garnar represented े by े, even when it had nothing whatever to do with that compound. If we assume, as suggested by M. Senart, that the scribe endeavoured to connect the foreign word Añjayadala with the Sanskrit alīka (an instance of a common kind of word-play in Sanskrit literature), we find an additional confirmation of my suggestion. The i in alīka is long; its being shortened shows that the word must have been pronounced alīkā in Piyanasi's time. Accordingly, the engraver, coming upon another े, followed his custom and wrote it īkā.

It will be observed that this accounts for the want of uniformity with which े appears in Piyanasi's inscriptions. M. Senart shows that at Khālsī े occurs seventeen and īkā seven times. At Dehli there are only two instances of alīkā, īkā being used everywhere else. So, also, in Māgadhī Prakrit both the terminations īkā and े appear to have been concurrently and indifferently used, just as at the present day a man of Magadha will say in the same breath, chłojakā and chłojakā, tanikā and tanikā, tanukā and tanukā. — G. A. G.
It is certain that the orthography of our inscriptions does not always exactly reflect the actual pronunciation. It is unequal to the task when it neglects to notice double consonants or long vowels, and it overshoots the mark when, at Girnar, it retains a long vowel, either before ānevāra, or before a group of consonants. Besides this, it elsewhere gives evidence, as, for example, in the notation of the groups which contain an r, of a significant indifference in regard to phonic expressions which belong to diverse periods of the development of the language. It is, therefore, sure that this orthography, in a certain number of cases, obeyed (as we call them) learned historic influences. Like the modern languages, like the mixed Sanskrit of the Gāthās, it is full of words or methods of writing, which constitute so many graphic tattamas, and which consequently form an artificial and learned element. There is no ground for citing against this proposition the ignorance of the engravers. They may be responsible for certain material errors, for certain inconsistencies, but not for a system of orthography. They applied that system, it is true, but, however imperfect it may have been, it must have been founded by persons who were educated, skilled men. Even at the present day, it is evidently the learned caste that takes these loans, which, entering the popular language, gradually extend themselves to the most ignorant. In its generality, therefore, the principle appears to me to be unassailable, and those facts, which are certain, justify by themselves important conclusions as regards the light in which we should consider the language of our inscriptions.

Other facts, such as those which concern the groups st, st, tp at Girnar, allow more room for contradiction, and I only claim probability for my opinion regarding them. I have merely one more observation to add. It is specially at Girnar and at Kapur di Giri that we meet these semi-historic modes of writing. If my interpretation of them is accepted as correct, they will add seriously to the balance in favour of the conclusion to which the undisputed facts tend.

This conclusion has a corollary. It implies that the differences of dialect between the popular languages, which are reflected by the various versions of our inscription, are less decided than we should at first be induced to consider them, judging from the appearance of the orthographies. If they are really separated by some characteristics, they have, in general, arrived at nearly equivalent stages of phonetic corruption. The more prominent points of difference, which attract our attention at first sight, have their origin in tendencies, more or less accidental, of word-borrowing or of modes of writing,—in the greater or less use of tattamas. This result is in itself a priori so probable, that it might almost be invoked in favour of the conclusions which I have endeavoured to establish. It is, assuredly, scarcely probable that, by its mere natural movement, by its spontaneous development, the same language should, in the same time, have reached, in neighbouring provinces, stages of decay so unequal as a comparison between the orthography of Girnar and, for example, that of Khālsī would suggest. The views which I have put forward explain this anomaly. For inadmissible inequalities of phonetic development they substitute the very simple notion of different orthographic systems in parallel use in different regions. If, as everything tends to shew, the epoch to which our inscriptions belonged was still, so far as regards the art of writing in India, a period of feeling the way and of uncertainty, if it is anterior to the regularisation or at least to the general expansion of the Sāskrit orthography and to the codification of the literary Prākritas, the parallel existence of these divergent imperfectly established systems is easily explained. I shall shortly indicate what circumstances seem to have conduced to favour their geographical distribution in the manner to which witness is borne by the evidence of our monuments. These circumstances equally concern the distribution of the dialectic differences properly so called.

(To be continued.)
BHADRABHU, CHANDRAGUPTA, AND SRavana-BELGOLA.

BY J. F. FLETCH, Bo.CS., M.E.A.S., C.LE.

In the first fifteen pages of the Introduction to his Inscriptions at Sravana-Belgola (published in 1889), Mr. Rice has arrived at the conclusions, that the settlement of the Jains at that place was brought about by the last of the Sruta-Kévalins, Bhadrabhu, and that this person died there, tended in his last moments by the Maurya king Chandragupta— the Sandrokottos of the Greek historians, — the grandfather of Aśoka. These conclusions, if they could be accepted as correct, would possess considerable interest. And it is worth while, therefore, to examine the grounds upon which they are based.

It is clear that there are local traditions, of some antiquity, connecting the names Bhadrabhu and Chandragupta with Sravana-Belgola. Thus: — Of the two hills at Sravana-Belgola, the smaller one, Chandragiri, is said to derive its appellation from the fact that Chandragupta was the name of the first of the saints who lived and performed penance there (Introd. p. 1). On this hill there is a cave which is known as the cave of Bhadrabhuśāmin; and also a shrine which is called the Chandragupta-basti (ibid. p. 2, and map). Two inscriptions, said to be of the ninth century, found near the Gantama-kshtra of the river Káveri at Seringapatam, speak of the hill at Sravana-Belgola as having its summit marked by the impress of the feet of Bhadrabhu and the Munipati Chandragupta (ibid. p. 2, note 6). At Sravana-Belgola itself, inscription No. 17, of about the seventh century A.D., mentions "the pair Bhadrabhu, together with the Munendra Chandragupta." And inscription No. 71, of considerably later date, refers to worship being done to the foot-prints of Bhadrabhu.

So far, we stand on safe ground, in respect of the names of a Bhadrabhu and a Chandragupta; provided that we only bear in mind that, as yet, we have nothing to enable us to identify any particular Bhadrabhu and any particular Chandragupta.

We turn next to inscriptions at Sravana-Belgola, which undoubtedly mention Bhadrabhu, the last of the Sruta-Kévalins. No. 40, of A.D. 1163, speaks of "Gautama" [the first of the Kévalins], "in whose line arose "Bhadrabhu, the last among the Sruta-Kévalins; his disciple was Chandragupta, whose "glory was such that his own gana of Munis was worshipped by the forest-deities:" and then, after a break, it takes up a line of succession, placed in the lineage (anuaya) of Chandragupta, beginning with the Munivra Kopajakunda, whose original name was Padmanandin. No. 54, of A.D. 1128, again mentions Gautama, the Sruta-Kévalins, Bhadrabhu (apparently the Sruta-Kévalin of that name), and Chandragupta, "who, by being his disciple, acquired such merit as to be served for a long time by the forest-deities;" and then, like the preceding, after a break, it takes up the succession beginning with Kopajakunda. No. 105, of A.D. 1398, dealing similarly with the succession from Kopajakunda, enumerates, before him, a number of teachers, in respect of whom, for present purposes, it is only necessary to say that the Kévalins Gautama, and five Sruta-Kévalins, ending with Bhadrabhu, are mentioned, but the name of Chandragupta does not occur at all. And No. 108, of A.D. 1458, mentions Gautama; in his line, the Yadhra Bhadrabhu, the last of the Sruta-Kévalins; his disciple, Chandragupta; and in the line of the latter, the Munendra Kundakunda, whose succession is then continued, as in the other records.

1 It may be mentioned, in connection with an altogether different matter of some interest, that, in the further succession of disciples, this inscription mentions one whose original name was Devamanandin; who was called Jñanendra-buddhi, on account of his great learning; who was called Pujyasāda, because his feet were worshipped by gods; and who composed the Jñanendra-grammar.

2 I give this name as it stands in Mr. Rice's text. — Kopajakunda, in No. 40, 54, and 105, and Kopajakunda in No. 108. The variation in the vowel of the first syllable is not material. There is a question as to the proper consonant in the second and fourth syllables. For several variants of the name, see Dr. Hultzsch's South-Indian Inscriptions, Vol. I, p. 158, note 2. In the possessive of the Sarasvati-Gachobha, it appears as Kundakunda (ante, Vol. XX, pp. 351, 555).
These inscriptions undoubtedly mention Bhadrabahu, the last of the Sruta-Kévalins, and allot to him a disciple named Chandragupta. And all that we have to note here, is, that, except through the connected mention of a Chandragupta, they afford no grounds for identifying him with the Bhadrabahu of the inscriptions quoted in the last paragraph but two above; that they furnish no reasons for asserting that the Sruta-Kévalins Bhadrabahu ever visited Sravana-Belgoja, or even came to Southern India at all; and that they give no indications of Chandragupta having been anything but an ordinary Jain teacher.

And now we come to the actual reasons that led Mr. Rice to assert the alleged facts which, in the interests of plain and reliable history, is desirable either to substantiate or to disprove. They are to be found, partly in a compendium of Jain history called the Rájávalikathá, and partly in Mr. Rice's rendering of another inscription at Sravana-Belgoja, No. 1 in his book.

The essence of what the Rájávalikathá tells us is this (loc. cit. pp. 3-6): — "The "Bhadrabahu who came to be the last of the Sruta-Kévalins, was a Brahman's son, and was born at Kátrikapura in Pañávarvadham. He interpreted sixteen dreams of "Chandragupta, the king of Patlaputra; the last of which indicated twelve years of "death and famine. On the commencement of the famine, Chandragupta abdicated in "favour of his son Sinváhasána, and, taking initiation in the Jain faith, joined himself to "Bhadrabahu. Bhadrabahu, having collected a body of twelve thousand disciples, migrated "to the south, and came to a hill in the Karnataka country. There he perceived that his "end was approaching; and so, giving upádhyāya to Vásákâhárya, he committed all the disc "iples to his care, and sent them on to the Chója and Pandya countries. He himself remained "on the hill, and died in a cave there, tended only by Chandragupta, who performed the "funeral rites, and abode there, worshipping the footprints of the deceased saint. After a "time, Sinváhasánas son, Biśakara, came to the place, and did obeisance to Chandragupta, and "built the city of Belgoja near the hill. And eventually, Chandragupta himself died there."

In connection with this account, — the value of which most people will be able to appreciate for themselves, — it is sufficient to point out two things. One is, that, whatever may be the sources on which it is based, this Jain compendium is a composition of the present century (loc. cit. p. 3). And the other is that, by a further extract from the same work, we learn (ibid. p. 9) that the Chandragupta in question was not the well-known grandfat "her of Asóka, — the Sandrakottos of the Greeks, — at all, but a son, otherwise quite unknown, of Asóka's son Kunála. Mr. Rice himself noticed this little difficulty, and got round it by suggesting (ibid. p. 10) that 'the introduction of two Chandraguptas seems to be due to some confusion in the traditions, and is an unnecessary variation, perhaps intended to conceal the defection of Asóka (from Jainism to the Buddhist faith).’ But, by such a process as this, — accepting as reliable an account that is perfectly valueless for historical purposes, and then directly perverting its statement, on a point of leading importance, by deliberately substituting a man's grandfather in the place of his grandson, — almost anything whatever in the way of imaginary history might be evolved.

It is unnecessary to follow Mr. Rice through the process by which, using what seems to be an actual fact, viz. that Bhadrabahu, the last of the Sruta-Kévalins, was a contemporary of the great Chandragupta, he arrived (loc. cit. pp. 12, 14) at about B. C. 297 for the date of the events recorded, on his interpretation, in the inscription that still remains to be considered; or through the steps by which he established a connection of the real Chandragupta with Southern India through the Early Guptas, the Mauryas of the Konkana, and the Gatta chieftains of the Kanarese country (ibid. pp. 10-14). We will turn now to the inscription itself.

The real purport of the inscription, No. 1 in the Sravana-Belgoja volume, is as
follows:—"After the time when (the Jain Tirthankara) Mahāvira attained parinirvāṇa, there "was a certain Bhadrabāhusvāmin, who belonged to a lineage that had been made illustrious "by a succession of great saints who came in continuous order from the venerable Paramashri "Gaṇama, and his disciple Lohārya, and Jambu, Vishvādeva, Aparājita, Gōvardhana, Bhadrabāhu, Viśākha, Prāsthāna, Kṛṣṭikārya, Jyānapāma, Siddhiśrī, Dūrjīṣṭhēśa, Buddhāna, and "other Gurus. At Ujjainī, the Bhadrabāhusvāmin, thus introduced, mastered the science of "prognostication, became a knower of the past, the present, and the future, and announced a "period of distress that would last for twelve years; and the entire saṅgha set out from the "north and migrated to the south, and, by the directions of the saint, came to a country "containing many hundreds of villages, and rich in people, wealth, gold, grain, cows, buffaloes, "and goats. Then, on the mountain Kāṭavapra, the Āchārya Prabhāchandra, perceiving "that the end of his life was very near, and being much afraid of journeying any further, "dismissed the whole saṅgha, with the exception of one unnamed disciple, and engaged in "saṇyāsa until he died."

In interpreting this record, Mr. Rice made two important mistakes. (1) He took the Bhadrabāhusvāmin who announced the period of distress, to be identical with Bhadrabāhu I., the Sruta-Kēvalin, who is mentioned in his proper place between Gōvardhana and Viśākha. But, according to the inscription itself, seven of the Dīya-Pārvīs, and after them a break of unspecified duration, intervened between the two Bhadrabāhus, — in perfect accordance with the lists of Northern India. And (2), in consequence of a mislection in line 6, he translated the inscription as meaning that the Āchārya who died at Kāṭavapra, was Bhadrabāhusvāmin himself, i. e., as the result of his identification, Bhadrabāhu I., the Sruta-Kēvalin, and that the disciple who tended him was Prabhāchandra; to which he attached a note that Prabhāchandra was explained to him as the clerical name assumed by Chandragupta. But all this is distinctly not the case; the reading, in line 6, is, — not āchāryaḥ Prabhāchandrei nām-āvivitaḥ, "the Āchārya, with Prabhāchandra also, [dismissed the saṅgha, and engaged in saṇyāsa till he died]," but āchāryaḥ Prabhāchandrei nām-āvivitaḥ, "the Āchārya, namely Prabhāchandra, [dismissed the saṅgha and engaged in saṇyāsa till he died]."

In short, so far from recording that the Sruta-Kēvalin Bhadrabāhu died at Sravaṇa Beigola, tended by a disciple named Prabhāchandra, who might be assumed to be king Chandragupta of Pātāliputra, the inscription simply states that an Āchārya named Prabhāchandra died there, during or shortly after a migration of the Jain community to the south, which was caused by an announcement of famine made, at Ujjain, by a certain Bhadrabāhusvāmin who came after an interval of unspecified duration, — but plainly a long one, — after the Sruta-Kēvalin Bhadrabāhu. And thus the only possible substantial foundation for the fabric reared up by Mr. Rice ceases entirely to exist.

We may now proceed to examine the real historical bearings of this inscription. It

1 Mr. Rice gives "Khaṭṭikārya." I do not overlook the fact that the name occurs as "Khaṭṭiyāra" in No. 105 in Mr. Rice's book, and in the extract from the Maṇḍhāra Devakachāra given ante, Vol. XII. p. 22, and as "Khaṭṭiyā," explained by "Khaṭṭiyā," in the parīkṣati of the Sarvasvāt-Gacchha (ante, Vol. XX. p. 348). But Mr. Rice's lithograph distinctly has the name that I give. — Since writing these remarks, I have seen impressions of the inscription, which I owe to the kindness of Dr. Hultsch. They show that the name really is Kṛṣṭikārya.

2 The original says, "on this mountain named Kāṭavapra"; i. e. on the hill on which the inscription is engraved, i. e. on Chandragiri itself.

3 See also Introd. pp. 6, 7, where, however, he says only that, "according to No. 1," i. e. the present inscription, Chandragupta "appears" to have taken the name of Prabhāchandra on retiring from the world, in conformity with custom.

4 The passage was supposed to include the word anus, in the sense of saka. — The inscription was first brought to notice by Mr. Rice in 1874, in this Journal, Vol. III. p. 183 (see also Myore Inscriptions, pp. lixxvi., lixxxvii., 309); and the first extract from the Rājāśatikātha was also given. But Mr. Rice did not then find the name Prabhāchandra in the inscription. And in respect of the extract from the Rājāśatikātha he then wrote — "This is a strange story. How much of it may be accepted as historical is not easy to say."
is not dated. But the lithographic Plate which is given by Mr. Rice, shows that the engraving of it is to be allotted to approximately the seventh century A.D.: it may possibly be a trifle earlier; and equally, it may possibly be somewhat later.7 And, interpreting the record in the customary manner, viz. as referring to an event almost exactly synchronous with the engraving of it, we can only take it as commemorating the death of a Jain teacher named Prabháchandra, in or very near to the period A.D. 500 to 700. Who this Prabháchandra was, I am not at present able to say. But he cannot be Prabháchandra I. of the pañjávali of the Sarasvati-Gachchha (ante, Vol. XX. p. 351), unless the chronological details of that record, — according to which Prabháchandra I., became pontiff in A. D. 396, — are open to very considerable rectification. And I should think that he must be a different person, for whose identification we have to look to southern records not as yet available.

As regards Bhadrabáhusvámin, all that should have been of necessity plain at the time when Mr. Rice dealt finally with this inscription, is, that he is not the Sruta-Kévalin Bhadrabáhu. Now that Dr. Hoernle has published the pañjávali of the Sarasvati-Gachchha, he is easily capable of identification. He is undoubtedly Bhadrabáhu II., the last but one of the Minor-Aṅgins who is represented as becoming pontiff in B.C. 53 (ante, Vol. XX. pp. 349-51.)

The same pañjávali enables us to locate properly the Chandragupta of the Sravanā-Belgoja traditions and inscriptions. Such of them as make him a disciple of the Sruta-Kévalin Bhadrabáhu, are plainly mistaken. He is evidently Guptigupta, the disciple of Bhadrabáhu II., — otherwise named Arhadbalin and Viśākhāchárya, — who, according to the same record, became pontiff in B.C. 31 (ante, Vol. XX. pp. 350, 351). And this brings us to a point in which the local traditions are possibly more correct than the northern records. The pañjávali in question tells us that one of Guptigupta’s disciples, Mágahanandin, established the Nandi-Sángha or Baláktára-Gaṇa, as a division of the Mula-Sángha itself. Both names of the gaṇa, as well as that of the Mula-Sángha, are of frequent occurrence, in connection with teachers belonging to it, in inscriptions in the Kanarese country; where, however, the gaṇa is perhaps mentioned most often as the Baláktára-Gaṇa. This appellation for it is attributed by Dr. Hoernle to Guptigupta’s name of Arhadbalin. A gaṇa of his own is allotted to Chandragupta, i.e. to Guptigupta, by inscription No. 40 at Sravanā-Belgoja (see the words quoted from it, on page 156 above), which ultimately deals with the Déli-Gaṇa as a division of the Nandi-Gaṇa in the Mula-Sángha, placing it in the lineage (ansaya) of Kónakunda, just as the lineage of the latter is placed in the lineage of Chandragupta, i.e. of Guptigupta. And the fact that the inscription with which we have been dealing, and others on the Chandragiri hill which similarly record the deaths of Jain ascetics, lie in such a position that they have to be read with the face directed towards the front of the so-called Chandragupta-basti, indicates plainly that some peculiar sanctity or reverence attached to the person commemorated by that shrine. There can be little doubt that the ascetics in question belonged to the same sect with that person; that he was the traditional founder of the sect; and that the tradition at Sravanā-Belgoja was that the Baláktára-Gaṇa was really founded by the Chandragupta of the inscriptions, i.e. by Guptigupta, the disciple of Bhadrabáhu II.8

7 While recognizing, approximately, the period to which the characters really belong, Mr. Rice (loc. cit. p. 15) arrived at the conclusion that, “i. f. this interesting inscription did not precede the Christian era, it unquestionably belongs to the earliest part of that era and is certainly not later than about 600 A.D.” But there are no substantial grounds for this view, which depends chiefly upon Mr. Rice’s acceptance as genuine, of the spurious Western Gaṇga grants. Unfortunately, much of what would otherwise be valuable work by him, is always vitiated in the same way.

8 In connection with a division of the Nandi-Sángha, “the body of saints of Guptigupta,” is mentioned in the Kádab grant, which purports to be dated in Śaka-Samvat 733 (ante, Vol. XII. p. 11.). And inscription No. 105 in Mr. Rice’s book, dated Śaka-Samvat 1320, speaks of Arhadbalin, apparently as establishing a four-fold division of the sáṅgha.
The migration to the south, whether it really started from Ujjain, or from elsewhere, may well be a historical fact. It may be open to argument, whether the inscription intends to imply that it was led by Bhadrabahu II. But at any rate this is not distinctly asserted. And I think that the contrary is indicated, (1) by the description of Bhadrabahu as "a knowers of the past, the present, and the future (traikálya-darín)," which rather points to his predicting a future period of distress, than to his simply announcing the commencement of immediately impending distress; and (2) by the statement that the rich land at which the samgha arrived was reached "by the directions of the saint (áraheña = rishi-vachanéna)," which points to instructions given at the time of predicting the distress, — or at any rate to advice given to people who were leaving him, — rather than to personal guidance. On the other hand, the inscription, whether correctly or not, does make the migration contemporaneous with Prabháchandra; for it says that, at the mountain Kátaúapra, he perceived that the end of his life was very near and became "much afraid of travelling any further (adheñak su-chakitaḥ)," and so dismissed the samgha and remained there till he died. If, then, the record does mean to imply that Bhadrabahu II. led the migration, or even that it took place in his time, it is wrong, either in that respect, or in placing the death of Prabháchandra during the migration; because of the intervention of several centuries at least to between the period of Bhadrabahu II. and the death of Prabháchandra as determined, with close approximation, by the palaeography of the record.

FOLKLORE IN WESTERN INDIA.

BY PUTLIBAI D. H. WADIA.

No. 17. The Princess Malika-Jarika.

There was once a rich old merchant who had seven sons. One day he called them to him and said: — "My sons, it is high time now that you were married and settled in life, for I am growing older every day, and am anxious to distribute my wealth among you before death calls me away from this world."

The young men were nothing loath to do as their father desired, and jumped at his proposal, but the old man added: — "Not so fast, my boys, there is a certain condition to be fulfilled, and a certain test to be applied to you, before you come by your partners in life and obtain possession of my wealth. So listen attentively to what I say."

"On a certain day, which we shall appoint, after consulting the astrologers, you all are to go with your bows and arrows to an open maidán outside the city, where each one of you is to shoot an arrow from his bow in whatever direction he likes best, and I shall trust to the hand of fate to guide it to the feet of the fortunate lady, who is destined to be the bride of the owner of that arrow."

"Agreed," said the brothers, who were all eager both to display their skill in archery, as well as to come by their wives in such a romantic fashion. So they soon set about making preparations for that eventful occasion.

When the day fixed by their father, with the aid of his astrologers came round, the seven young men and their father, accompanied by a number of their friends and relatives, went to the appointed place, and when everything was ready and the signal given, the seven brothers,

---

9 It appears to be mentioned also in the Upanárīh-ávastigala-kathä; see ante, Vol. XII. p. 99, — "the whole assemblage of the saints having come by the region of the south, and having arrived at the tomb of the venerable one, &c."

10 I assume that the post-sála of the Sarasvati-Gachhí is at least approximately correct in respect of the date which it gives for Bhadrabahu II.
who had taken care to put their own particular marks on their arrows, shot them in seven directions.

After a long interval of anxious waiting, the arrows were one by one recovered and brought back to their owners, along with tokens from the fair ladies at whose feet chance or fate had guided them; all except that of the merchant's youngest son. Long and vigorous was the search made for it not only all that day, but for many and many a day following, but to no purpose. The arrow had flown over hill and valley and over river and ocean, for no trace of it could be found over the entire country.

At last, when no stone had been left unturned, and all hope of finding the lost arrow was abandoned, the old man taunted his son about his ill-luck in not being able to procure himself a partner in life, and expressed his belief that he must be a very wicked fellow thus to have incurred the displeasure of God. The poor youth felt so humiliated at this that he quitted the land of his birth in despair, and became a wanderer in distant countries; whilst his father celebrated the nuptials of his six sons with great pomp and rejoicings, and, regardless of his youngest son's claims, distributed his large wealth equally amongst them. One hero roamed about for days and months from one place to another in search of his lost arrow, but in vain, till at last he became a mere aimless and homeless wanderer, for whom life could have no zest or charm.

One day, however, as he was thus roaming through a large forest in an unknown country, his eye chanced to fall upon a large iron ring fixed to what appeared to be a door, and what was his joy to find, in close proximity to the ring, his own long-lost arrow entangled amongst some thorns and brambles that grew there! Naturally the youth's first impulse was to draw out the arrow from its place; but he soon changed his mind, reflecting that perhaps it marked the spot where he ought to look for his bride. So he took hold of the ring and pulled at it with all his might, and to his great joy the door yielded and revealed to his astonished gaze a dark and narrow passage, which evidently led to some subterranean abode.

Without any delay our hero boldly entered this passage, and soon found himself sliding downwards and downwards, as if impelled by some unknown power within. When he at last recovered the use of his legs, he found himself in the midst of a beautiful garden, so tastefully laid out and so well stocked with beautiful fruits and flowers of a strange kind, that he was for a while quite entranced, and felt certain that he could be nowhere but in fairy-land, for such things could not belong to the world he had lived in. He looked about him to see if he could find any traces of the inhabitants of that strange and most picturesque place, but nothing met his eye, far and near, save fruits and flowers, and butterflies and birds of rare plumage, while the only other living being he noticed there, was a solitary she-monkey, that was swinging herself to and fro amongst the branches of the trees.

As he walked about in the garden, however, our hero saw in one part of it, a large and very beautiful palace, and on entering it, found it full of gold and silver jewels. Every piece of furniture in that noble edifice was made either of one of these metals or the other, and was, moreover, studded with diamonds and rubies. But go where he would in it, he could find no evidence of any living being, human or otherwise. As he was sitting, however, in one of the halls of this wonderful palace, he perceived to his great surprise, that a sumptuous feast was being spread before him by invisible hands, while a voice whispered in his ear—"Get up, take thy bath, and partake of these good things." He instantly turned round and looked about to find who it was that had spoken to him, but could see no one. So he got up, and, doing as he was bid, sat down to the repast, and did ample justice to the rich viands that were placed before him, having had no food all that day. By and by, the she-monkey he had observed in the garden came in also, and began skipping about from room to room and making herself quite at home, just as if she were sole mistress of the palace.
Our hero remained in this strange place for several days, and had nothing to do, but to eat and drink and enjoy himself. But at last he got tired of the monotony of his situation, for, besides the monkey, he himself was the only living thing in that palace, and she, he thought; was no company for a young man, notwithstanding that every now and then she went and sat by his side, looked wistfully into his face, and asked him by signs to follow her all throughout the palace and the garden, and to look at the wonderful things it contained. One day, therefore, he secretly ran up the passage, through which he had entered the garden, and lifting up the massive iron door made his way back to his father’s country.

When at last after a long and toilsome journey the long-forgotten wanderer reached home, he received but a cold welcome from his father and brothers, and they all laughed at him, when he related to them where and how he had found his lost arrow. So he thought it prudent not to say anything about the wonderful palace or the she-monkey just then, and kept his own counsel. The six brothers were all happy with their six wives, who were all clever and beautiful, and the old man, their father, extolled the virtues of his daughters-in-law to the skies, and exultingly showed his son the nice and valuable presents the ladies had brought specially for himself. Amongst them were some exquisitely embroidered little carpets worked by the ladies themselves, which the old man admired most of all, though our hero eyed them with contempt, as he compared them to the rare specimens of workmanship which he had seen in the underground palace.

Not desiring under these circumstances to prolong his stay with his father, our hero one day quietly left his home, and speedily returned to the subterranean palace, to which, it need not be mentioned, some strange power was constantly attracting him. When he reached it the she-monkey again went skipping up to him, and played and friaked about him with great glee.

But our hero’s heart was sad to think that he should have only a she-monkey to welcome him in a place, which he felt was to him like a home, and one where he most loved to go, and he began to look at the unsightly animal with tears in his eyes. She seemed, he ver, to understand what he felt, for going up to him she commenced to stroke his head and to shampoo his feet. But our hero turned away from her in disgust, and said in a rage, “Begone, thou ugly creature, I don’t want thee to come so near me!”

“Hold thy tongue,” replied the monkey, all of a sudden speaking like a human being, “I only do as I am bid. If thou utterest one unkind word to me thou shalt have to rue it before long.”

The poor young man was non-plussed at this, and said nothing, but his heart grew sad to think in what an enviable position he had been placed. “My arrow,” he contemplated, “came all the way over to the gate leading to this strange place, in which the only living being I can see is this monkey, and since my arrow was destined to indicate the place, where I was to find my bride, am I to content myself with believing that this she-monkey is my lady-love and this fairy place her bower?” As this thought struck him tears began to gush forth from his eyes and trickled down his cheeks. The she-monkey observing this, looked very much distressed, and thus addressed him words of sympathy and comfort, “Do not lose heart and give way like that, my friend; only confide in me and tell me the cause of thy grief, and I shall do my best to help thee.”

But our hero had not the heart to tell her the real cause of his sorrow; so he said:— “I am sorry I appear unhappy in a place, where no pains are spared to make me comfortable, but I am grieved, when I think how I am taunted by my father and laughed at by my brothers at every turn, owing to my not having as yet been able to secure a wife for myself. The last time I visited my father he showed me some rich and artistically embroidered carpets, which he said had been worked for him specially by his six daughters-in-law, and
cast the cruel fact again in my teeth, that I had not as yet been blessed with a wife, much less
with a clever one."

"Is that all?" cried the monkey. "I doubt whether they can show anything like the
carpets and other beautiful things you see in this palace."

"Certainly not!" replied the youth: "nobody in my country has ever seen anything half
so beautiful and precious; but my only regret is that not one of all these things can I present
to my father as the handiwork of my own bride."

"Oh! yes, you can," cried the monkey, picking out seven rich and beautiful carpets all
studded with diamonds and rubies, out of a heap lying in one of the rooms, "take these to
your father, and lay them at his feet as the results of the unaided efforts of your future
bride."

The youth was quite taken aback at these words. What could she mean by saying
that the carpets had been worked by his future bride? Could it be that they had been worked
by herself? No, the embroidery was too fine and tasteful to be done by a monkey! Surely
there must be some beautiful fairy hidden away somewhere, at whose bidding the she-monkey
was thrusting her odious presence upon him! However, he thought it wise to take the monkey's
advice, and bidding her adieu, once more started back to his native country with the carpets and
many other precious and beautiful articles besides.

As was to be expected, the carpets were greatly admired by each and all of his relatives,
and everyone who saw them desired eagerly to behold the fair lady, whose clever fingers had
worked such superb specimens of embroidery. Our hero, instead of being elated at this, was
downcast and dejected, for he could not, for the life of him, think how he was to produce his
future bride before his father and his relatives, since he himself had not as yet had the pleasure
of seeing her. So he said nothing more about the affair to them, and soon after quietly
turned his back once more on the land of his birth, making a mental resolve at the same time
never to return home without finding a bride worthy of himself.

When he reached the underground palace he found the she-monkey in her usual place
among the trees, and she began to question him as to how he had been received by his father
this time.

Our hero, however, was too much absorbed in thinking of the fair lady, who he imagined
had worked the carpets, to give heed to the monkey's questions. He was wondering when it was
destined that he should see her, when a strange voice thus whispered to him: "If thou wouldst
see her at all, swear to forget thy parents, thy relations, and thy country, and to renounce for
ever all thoughts of ever returning to them, and promise to stay here for weal or for woe."

The youth was surprised at this, but he nevertheless did as he was bid, and in the course
of a few days his eye began to see in the palace living beings such as he had never seen there
before. He could see male and female slaves fitting about from one room to another, as they
did the household work, he could see gardeners tending the flowers and shrubs, and fair ladies
waiting upon the she-monkey, who, to his despair, still appeared to be the mistress of all. His
dislike, however, for the company of this creature began to wear off by degrees, and he tried to
make himself comfortable, since some mystic power appeared to tempt him to stay in that
place.

A good many days passed away in this manner, when our hero one day again heard a
voice that said to him: — "If thou wouldst like to wed thy bride, thou art at liberty to go and
bring thy father and all thy kinsfolk to this place, when thy nuptials will be celebrated with
great splendour in their presence."

"But must I not ask to see my bride first?" cried the youth in answer. "No, that cannot
be!" was the reply. "Thou must place implicit confidence in us, and in return we promise that
thy parents and thyself shall behold as fair a princess as ever was seen by mortal eyes, but
that will be only when all thy kinsfolk have assembled here to take part in the wedding ceremony, and not before."

The youth was fain to put faith in these promises, so tempting were they. So he started off for his native country, and on arriving there, besought his father and brothers to go with him to the underground palace, and witness his nupial with the fair worker of these beautiful carpets. Accordingly, the old man and his sons sent round invitations to all their friends and relatives, and, fixing an auspicious day, they all set out to go, where the youth led them. The latter in his turn tried to look cheerful and composed in their presence, but at heart he was ill at ease, for he was not yet quite sure whether the bride he was going to wed would not after all turn out to be the she-monkey herself, and he shuddered to think what would be his discomfiture in such a case.

After a long and toilsome journey the whole cavalcade of friends and relatives arrived at the door leading to the narrow passage, and on passing through it they all found themselves in that wonderfully laid-out garden. When they had gone about for some time and admired the beautiful fruits and flowers, with which the trees were laden, our hero took them into the palace, where things still more beautiful greeted their sight. But here, as well as in the garden, they were surprised not to meet with any human beings, when all of a sudden they heard a voice that bade them welcome, and told them to wash themselves and partake of the feast that was being spread out for them in one of the large rooms.

As the guests were all very hungry they needed no second bidding, but sat themselves down and began to partake heartily of the sumptuous banquet provided for them by some unseen agency. While they were thus enjoying themselves a voice again addressed them thus:—"My guests, you are welcome to this feast. Eat and drink to your hearts' content, and when you have done, I request each of you to carry away the silver tray and the golden cup that has been placed before you to take your meals from, and to keep them as souvenirs of the memorable wedding of the fairy-princess Malika-jarika with a human being."

On hearing these words all the guests began to look in different directions in the hope of seeing the fairy-bride, but no Malika-Jarika greeted their sight, nor any living being, save the hideous she-monkey, who was all this while moving about here and there with the air of an hostess, and seemed to be in the best of spirits, to the great consternation of our hero, who could not help associating her presence with the thought that she must be the Princess Malika-Jarika herself, who was going to wed him! His doubts, however, were soon laid at rest, for when the feast was nearly over, the she-monkey suddenly drew off from her person, what appeared like a coil or skin, and to their astonishment stood before the astonished gaze of all a very beautiful fairy, such as they had never even dreamed of!

This lovely creature immediately went up to our hero and joyfully exclaimed:—"Behold in me the fairy-princess, to whose abode fate led thy steps. My name is the Princess Malika-Jarika, and I am sole mistress of this beautiful palace and of all the land for miles around. I am ready and willing to marry thee, but on one condition, namely, that thou takest charge of, and guardest as thy own life, this coil or skin that I have just cast off, for know that, as long as it remains intact, so long only shall I go about in this my fairy form."

The young man eagerly took the coil from her hands, and, carefully folding it, put it into a box, and locked it up for safety in one of the rooms of the palace.

The wedding ceremony was soon after gone through amidst great rejoicings, and each and all congratulated our hero on his having been blessed with such a very rich and beautiful wife. The six brothers of the fortunate youth, however, felt jealous of him, and could not bear to see him so happy. So they went up to him while the fairy was away, and with an air of the greatest concern, expressed to him their fears regarding the coil, and told him to beware lest his bride should take it into her head to put it on again, and resume the hideous shape of a monkey. His father and his relatives, too, when they heard this, shared the same fears, and
they all joined in persuading the unsuspecting youth to destroy the coil. For some time he was firm, but at last, being unable to withstand the joint advice and entreaties of so many, he threw the coil into the fire! No sooner, however, did the flames touch it, than the fairy, who was at a distance, uttered a loud and piteous scream, came running up, and speedily thrusting her hand into the fire, drew out the burning coil, and as hurriedly put it on!

All this happened in the twinkling of an eye, and the merchant and his sons and their guests suddenly found the scene around them transformed into a dense and dark forest, all traces of the fairy-palace and the garden having vanished before them. Our hero was beside himself with rage and grief at this, and swore never to return home, until he had found his beloved bride again. So, leaving him to indulge his grief in that lonely forest, his father and the rest wended their way homewards.

When they were all gone the youth again saw the she-monkey jumping from tree to tree, and uttering piteous screams. So he went up to her and besought her to forgive him, and to receive him back into her favour. But she wept bitterly, and said, "No, no, that is not in my power to do; still, if thy repentance is sincere, leave me for the present, and let us hope some day to meet again." With these words she vanished from his sight, and there was nothing but darkness around. Just then a voice was heard to say, "If ever again you seek the fairy-princess, let this be your watchword: — 'What about that affair?'" "Very well," muttered the youth thankfully, "I'll remember it to the end of my days," and then, in obedience to the will of the she-monkey, he made his way out of the forest.

For many and many a month afterwards the unhappy youth wandered aimlessly about from country to country, for he hardly knew in what particular direction to turn, in order to go in search of his lost bride. At last, being fatigued both in mind and body, he saak down under the shade of a large tree, and felt that he was dying.

As to the fairy-princess, having had the misfortune to touch a human being, the poor spirit had lost caste, and was no longer the light aerial being that all fairies are; moreover, she had contracted the odour of mortals by coming into contact with them, and the fairies would not let her mix with them, until she had gone through a severe form of purification. This was nothing less than throwing seven hundred pails of water over her body each morning, and remaining among the trees the rest of the day, so that she might be dried in the sun and cleansed of all impurities. This made the poor fairy very unhappy, and she passed her days in great sorrow.

Meanwhile our hero, whom we had left tired and worn-out under a tree, remained there for some days, being unable to proceed any further. One day he heard a strange noise overhead, and looking up, saw that a very large serpent had climbed up the tree and was going to devour the young ones of an eagle, which had its nest among the branches. So he went up the tree as fast as his worn-out limbs allowed, and succeeded in killing the serpent before it could do any injury to the young eagles. Just then both the parent birds came up and were deeply grateful to the brave young man for having saved the lives of their little ones, and asked him to command their services in any way he wished. But the youth said to them with a sad smile: — "No, friends, it is not in your power to help me, since my only object in life is to discover the fairy-princess Mālika-Jarika, and I am firmly resolved never to taste the sweets of life until I have found her."

"Oh! is that all you want?" exclaimed the male bird, "then it is easy enough. I know the abodes of all the fairies; so you have only to ride upon my back and I shall fly with you to the country of the jins and fairies in no time."

These words of the eagle gave new life to the disabled youth, and he fearlessly mounted the large bird's back, and in a few hours arrived at the country of the jins. At parting the good old eagle gave the youth a sweet sounding fife, and said: — "By simply
blowing into this sife you will be able to produce music so sweet that all the fairies and jins will gather round you to hear it. The king of the jins will be so pleased with your performance, that he will offer to bestow upon you whatever you may ask for, on condition that you consent to stay with him for ever. But remember that you are not on any account to mention the name of the fairy-princess, or to utter the watchword that has been given to you, or your head will pay the penalty of your indiscretion. However much the king may entreat you to accept some present from him, you must only say that you require nothing and have to go back the next morning.

He will then bring you gold and silver and rare jewels and also the most beautiful fairies you ever saw, but you must still remain firm and inflexible. Then at last he will bring forth to you some of the ugliest women in his kingdom, amongst whom will be one strikingly hideous in appearance, whom you will know by her coal-black complexion and her large projecting teeth. This woman you are to express your willingness to have, for underneath that dark skin and ugly features will be found hidden the beautiful princess, whom you are so anxious to meet.

The youth thanked the eagle and promised to remember all his instructions, when the good bird added: "Let us part now, but, before we do so, let me give you this feather of mine. If ever trouble comes over you, hold it before a fire and burn it, and I shall be immediately at your side." And so saying it flew away.

Just then our hero commenced operations. He began to blow into the sife, and although he had no knowledge whatever of music, he produced from it such exquisite melody that, just as the eagle had predicted, there gathered round him a large concourse of jins and fairies along with their king and queen, and the former offered to bestow upon him whatever he might wish for, if he only consented to stay with them. Our hero, however, acted his part admirably, and refused everything that was offered him in succession, until at last the ugly women were brought before him. Then only did his eyes begin to sparkle, and he chose from among them the one the eagle had described to him, and she, to his great delight, soon turned out to be his own long-lost bride.

The two young people lived very happily together for some time, and cared for nothing else besides each other's company. But at last the youth felt a longing to return to his native country and see his father. The fairy-princess, too, was willing to go with him, though her father stoutly refused to give them his permission, and they were thinking of stealing away unknown to him, when an unforeseen difficulty arose. How were they, especially our hero, who was only a mortal, to travel through the air, since no land or sea appeared to connect his father's country with fairy-land? In this dilemma the youth bethought him of the eagle, and forthwith burned its feather. The faithful bird speedily obeyed the summons, and without losing any more time, both the young people mounted its back. The good bird flew incessantly, till it placed its precious burden at the feet of the old merchant; now very feeble and living all by himself in the old house, neglected by his six sons, who were fast throwing away the money he had so thoughtlessly given them. The old man's joy knew no bounds at seeing his long-lost son and his beauteous bride once more. He entreated them to stay with him till death called him away, which he thought was very near. Both the young people readily consented to this, and lived with the old man till the last; and after his death returned to fairy-land once more, where they lived very happily for the rest of their lives.

MISCELLANEA.

THE DATE OF THE GRÆCO-BUDDHIST PEDESTAL FROM HASHTNAGAR.

Dr. Bühler has published in the number of this Journal antike, Vol. XX., p. 394, an interesting note on this unique record. He does not seem to have seen M. Senart's remarks on the same subject, and, I think, it will be interesting to many readers to compare the views of these two scholars.

2 Notes d'Epigraphie Indienne, extrait du Journal Asiatique, III., Paris, Imprimerie Nationale, MDCCCCXC.
Dr. Bühler, having before him both the facsimile rubbing and the photo-etching, reads the inscription as follows:

“Sam II C xx xx xx x iv Pāstavadasa massasa di[ra] sammi par[cha] 5[1][*].”

M. Senart, before the publication of the photo-etching, read “. . . pūrhavadasa massasa di[vās] panchamā, 4, 1.” He doubted the existence of the symbol for one hundred, and read the remaining figures as 74, not as 84. Dr. Bühler notes that the reading pūrhavadasa is linguistically possible, and would be good Pāṇḍīkrit.

Both scholars, therefore, are agreed that the month named is the Sanskrit Praśnāthapada (August—September), and that Sir A. Cunningham was mistaken in reading ‘śvaroramsa,’ ‘intercalary.’ That point may be considered as definitely settled.

Now that the photo-etching is available, M. Senart cannot well doubt the presence of the symbol for ‘hundred.’ The date, therefore, is either 274, as read by Sir A. Cunningham and Dr. Bühler, or 234. As to this detail M. Senart observes: “Quant aux années, dont le chiffre est lu 274 par le général, il paraît certain que c’est par 84 qu’il faut (je ne puis faire aucune différence entre le troisième et le quatrième chiffre des dizaines).”

The difference between the third and fourth symbols for the tens (or rather the twenties) does, however, exist, though it is very slight. The fourth symbol is somewhat more slender and less curved than any of the three preceding ones. I prefer, consequently, to accept 274 as the correct reading.

As to the era used, Dr. Bühler considers as very improbable the suggestion that the Saka era may be that referred to. My only reason for making the suggestion was the inferior style of the sculpture. But M. Senart has pointed out that the workmanship of pedestals is generally much inferior to that of statues. The inscription under discussion is on a pedestal adorned with a relief, and nothing is known of the artistic merits of the statue which stood on the pedestal. Very likely, it was executed in a much better style. I, therefore, give up the suggestion that the Saka era is referred to in the inscription.

M. Senart is a firm believer in the early extinction of the Aryan or Kharāṣṭra alphabet, and remarks that “l’ère de Gondophares est donc seule en cause, parmi celles qui nous sont actuellement connues.” The exact date of Gondophares is not known, but he lived somewhere about the middle of the first century B. C. The probable date of the inscription is therefore approximately 274-50 = A. D. 234, or 274-50 = A. D. 224. By a slip of the pen M. Senart gives the date of Gondophares as “environ 50 après J. C.”

I have sent to the Asiatic Society of Bengal a fuller notice of M. Senart’s paper.

7th February, 1892.

V. A. SMITH.

TAILA II.

The time at which Taila II restored the Chalukya sovereignty in Western India is fixed as being the Srimukharamvatsara, Saka-Bahuvrat 606 current (A. D. 773-743), by a verse which is given in an inscription at the temple of Vīra-Nārāyana at Gadag in the Dhāravat District, and in another, based on the same model, at the temple of Kaliṅga at Kāliṅga in the Tengalī Tālukā, Nizam’s Dominions; both records being long to the time of Vikramāditya VI.

I gave the verse, as far as it could be restored from the transcriptions given in Sir Walter Elliot’s Caradaka-Desa Inscriptions, Vol. I pp. 370, 415, in this Journal, Vol. XII. p. 270. I am now able to give it in correct form, from an ink-impression of the Gadag stone which I owe to the exertions of Mr. Dasu Balwant Bettigeri; and to annex the preceding portion at the beginning of the inscription, the opening part of which is hopelessly unintelligible as it stands in the version given by Sir Walter Elliot’s copyist. The whole passage runs as follows:

TEXT.

Sri-vadhuv-bal-esava Bonthā- dēvīgav-dānām tāmbhavāvan Taila-nīpa [1]

[1] But, in his recently published work ‘Coins of Ancient India’ (Quaritch, 1891), Sir A. Cunningham (page 37) refers to the Haṃtāmārag Inscription as being dated 84 only.
TRANSLATION.

Oṃ! Hail! In the lineage of Soma (the Moon), — the forehead-ornament of the loving woman the night, — who was produced from the eye of Atri, the son of the divine Brahman who was the procreator of the universe, there is the glorious Chālukya race, which is the abode of truth, liberality, heroism, and other virtuous qualities, (and) which has destroyed the races of hostile kings by simply the quickness of its banded armies. In that race:—

(Verse): — To Vikramāditya (IV.), who was accounted the favourite of fortune (end) the favourite of the goddess of victory over enemies, and to Bonthādēvi who resembled the goddess Sri, there was born a son, king Taila (II).

(Metre): — Having first plucked up and destroyed some Raṭṭas; having killed the valiant Muniṣ; having, by the terror of the pride of his arm, taken the head of Panchala in battle; and having possessed himself of the regal dignity of the Chālukyas, — king Taila, unsaid, caused the whole circuit of the earth to be considered free from troubles for twenty-four years, beginning with the year Srimukha.

NOTES AND QUERIES.

THE EVIL EYE.

A.—In Persia.

It is the custom in Persia to keep a wild boar in a stable where valuable horses are kept, in order to keep the evil eye from them. In the same way almost every valuable horse has an amulet strang round his neck, to which may be also attached a boar's tusk, for the same object.

S. J. A. CHURCHILL.

Tehrān.

B.—In Bihar.

The evil eye or nasar is very fatal to children and animals. If a man looks steadily at any child or animal, and says or thinks how beautiful it is, it will soon die. A blue thread round the animal or the child's waist will save it. Tiger's claws and old coins are also a great protection.

It is not right to allow others to look on while you are eating, — especially the hungry. The steady gaze of the hungry at a man eating causes indigestion or a disease in the stomach.

You must never put your feet on the table-cloth (dastarkhād), nor permit a glass of water to be put on it.

The evil eye cast on food can be averted by setting aside a spoonful of each dish and giving it to birds or to beggars, or simply by muttering a prayer.

Sayyid Khairatayt Ahmed.

Gayd.

SUPERSTITIONS AS TO CROWS IN MADRAS.

The crow is held in high estimation by the Brahmins of Southern India, as the following facts clearly show:—

The Brahmins strictly observe the daily pājā or adoration of Siva. Towards the end of it the principal food prepared for the occasion is placed in front of the god and by means of mantras he is invoked in order that he may partake of the same, and for this invocation a handful of the food so presented is taken and kept aside. After the pājā is over, it is put on a tray in the open yard and the crows are invited to eat it. This food is termed the halāṃsam, or the presented food. It is only after the crows have eaten it that the people of the house sit down for their breakfast.

When a crow caws early in the morning in the open yard of the house, or when an unusual noise is heard in the oven of the kitchen, a guest is always expected either for breakfast or dinner.

K. SriKantaLīyān.

Ootacamund.

BAD OMENS IN MADRAS.

If you hear anybody sneezing or you see any sudden putting out of a burning light just at the time of contemplation there will be an utter defeat.

K. SriKantaLīyān.

Ootacamund.

1 First kirit was engraved, and then the r was cancelled.
### 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 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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ए ऐ ऐं</td>
<td>ए, ऐ, ऐं</td>
<td>a, i, i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ऑ ऑं</td>
<td>ऑ, ऑं</td>
<td>o, a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ओ ओं</td>
<td>ओ, ओं</td>
<td>o, a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ऐ ऐं</td>
<td>ऐ, ऐं</td>
<td>i, i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ऑ ऑं</td>
<td>ऑ, ऑं</td>
<td>o, a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ओ ओं</td>
<td>ओ, ओं</td>
<td>o, a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ऐ ऐं</td>
<td>ऐ, ऐं</td>
<td>i, i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ऑ ऑं</td>
<td>ऑ, ऑं</td>
<td>o, a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ओ ओं</td>
<td>ओ, ओं</td>
<td>o, a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ऐ ऐं</td>
<td>ऐ, ऐं</td>
<td>i, i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ऑ ऑं</td>
<td>ऑ, ऑं</td>
<td>o, a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ओ ओं</td>
<td>ओ, ओं</td>
<td>o, a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ऐ ऐं</td>
<td>ऐ, ऐं</td>
<td>i, i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ऑ ऑं</td>
<td>ऑ, ऑं</td>
<td>o, a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ओ ओं</td>
<td>ओ, ओं</td>
<td>o, a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ऐ ऐं</td>
<td>ऐ, ऐं</td>
<td>i, i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ऑ ऑं</td>
<td>ऑ, ऑं</td>
<td>o, a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ओ ओं</td>
<td>ओ, ओं</td>
<td>o, a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ऐ ऐं</td>
<td>ऐ, ऐं</td>
<td>i, i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ऑ ऑं</td>
<td>ऑ, ऑं</td>
<td>o, a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ओ ओं</td>
<td>ओ, ओं</td>
<td>o, a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ऐ ऐं</td>
<td>ऐ, ऐं</td>
<td>i, i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ऑ ऑं</td>
<td>ऑ, ऑं</td>
<td>o, a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ओ ओं</td>
<td>ओ, ओं</td>
<td>o, a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ऐ ऐं</td>
<td>ऐ, ऐं</td>
<td>i, i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ऑ ऑं</td>
<td>ऑ, ऑं</td>
<td>o, a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ओ ओं</td>
<td>ओ, ओं</td>
<td>o, a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ऐ ऐं</td>
<td>ऐ, ऐं</td>
<td>i, i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ऑ ऑं</td>
<td>ऑ, ऑं</td>
<td>o, a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ओ ओं</td>
<td>ओ, ओं</td>
<td>o, a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ऐ ऐं</td>
<td>ऐ, ऐं</td>
<td>i, i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ऑ ऑं</td>
<td>ऑ, ऑं</td>
<td>o, a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ओ ओं</td>
<td>ओ, ओं</td>
<td>o, a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ऐ ऐं</td>
<td>ऐ, ऐं</td>
<td>i, i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ऑ ऑं</td>
<td>ऑ, ऑं</td>
<td>o, a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ओ ओं</td>
<td>ओ, ओं</td>
<td>o, a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ऐ ऐं</td>
<td>ऐ, ऐं</td>
<td>i, i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ऑ ऑं</td>
<td>ऑ, ऑं</td>
<td>o, a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ओ ओं</td>
<td>ओ, ओं</td>
<td>o, a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ऐ ऐं</td>
<td>ऐ, ऐं</td>
<td>i, i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ऑ ऑं</td>
<td>ऑ, ऑं</td>
<td>o, a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ओ ओं</td>
<td>ओ, ओं</td>
<td>o, a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ऐ ऐं</td>
<td>ऐ, ऐं</td>
<td>i, i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ऑ ऑं</td>
<td>ऑ, ऑं</td>
<td>o, a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ओ ओं</td>
<td>ओ, ओं</td>
<td>o, a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ऐ ऐं</td>
<td>ऐ, ऐं</td>
<td>i, i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ऑ ऑं</td>
<td>ऑ, ऑं</td>
<td>o, a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ओ ओं</td>
<td>ओ, ओं</td>
<td>o, a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ऐ ऐं</td>
<td>ऐ, ऐं</td>
<td>i, i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ऑ ऑं</td>
<td>ऑ, ऑं</td>
<td>o, a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ओ ओं</td>
<td>ओ, ओं</td>
<td>o, a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ऐ ऐं</td>
<td>ऐ, ऐं</td>
<td>i, i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ऑ ऑं</td>
<td>ऑ, ऑं</td>
<td>o, a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ओ ओं</td>
<td>ओ, ओं</td>
<td>o, a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ऐ ऐं</td>
<td>ऐ, ऐं</td>
<td>i, i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ऑ ऑं</td>
<td>ऑ, ऑं</td>
<td>o, a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ओ ओं</td>
<td>ओ, ओं</td>
<td>o, a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ऐ ऐं</td>
<td>ऐ, ऐं</td>
<td>i, i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ऑ ऑं</td>
<td>ऑ, ऑं</td>
<td>o, a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ओ ओं</td>
<td>ओ, ओं</td>
<td>o, a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ऐ ऐं</td>
<td>ऐ, ऐं</td>
<td>i, i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ऑ ऑं</td>
<td>ऑ, ऑं</td>
<td>o, a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ओ ओं</td>
<td>ओ, ओं</td>
<td>o, a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ऐ ऐं</td>
<td>ऐ, ऐं</td>
<td>i, i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ऑ ऑं</td>
<td>ऑ, ऑं</td>
<td>o, a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ओ ओं</td>
<td>ओ, ओं</td>
<td>o, a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ऐ ऐं</td>
<td>ऐ, ऐं</td>
<td>i, i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ऑ ऑं</td>
<td>ऑ, ऑं</td>
<td>o, a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ओ ओं</td>
<td>ओ, ओं</td>
<td>o, a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ऐ ऐं</td>
<td>ऐ, ऐं</td>
<td>i, i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ऑ ऑं</td>
<td>ऑ, ऑं</td>
<td>o, a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ओ ओं</td>
<td>ओ, ओं</td>
<td>o, a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ऐ ऐं</td>
<td>ऐ, ऐं</td>
<td>i, i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ऑ ऑं</td>
<td>ऑ, ऑं</td>
<td>o, a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ओ ओं</td>
<td>ओ, ओं</td>
<td>o, a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ऐ ऐं</td>
<td>ऐ, ऐं</td>
<td>i, i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ऑ ऑं</td>
<td>ऑ, ऑं</td>
<td>o, a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ओ ओं</td>
<td>ओ, ओं</td>
<td>o, a</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; whereas the double hyphen, rendered unavoidable in the arrangement of the Texts, is 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 virūma 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 swaghras, or signs 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 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 attact 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.
GORAKHPUR COPPER-PLATE GRANT OF JAYADITYA OF VIJAYAPURA.

BY PROFESSOR F. KIELHORN, C.I.E.; GÖTTINGEN.

The plate which contains this inscription was discovered in the Górákhpur District of the North-Western Provinces, near the river called the Little Gandhak. It was brought to Mr. John Ahmuty, Magistrate of the district, and by him communicated to Captain Wilford, who presented it to the Asiatic Society of Bengal, in whose Library it is still deposited. The inscription was first edited in 1807, with a translation and a facsimile, by H. T. Colebrooke, in the Asiatic Researches, Vol. IX. pp. 406-12; and Colebrooke's paper was afterwards reprinted in his Miscellaneous Essays, Vol. II. pp. 247-54. I now re-edit the inscription from an excellent ink-impression, made and supplied to me by Mr. Fleet.

The plate is inscribed on one side only. It measures about 16½" broad by 12½" high, not including an oval projection, with a raised rim, on the proper right side, on which is riveted a disc of the same shape, similarly with a raised rim, which contains a flat button about an inch in diameter; on the countersunk surface of this button there is some emblem which may perhaps be an animal, but it is a good deal worn and damaged. The edges of the plate are fashioned thicker than the inscribed surface, to serve as rims to protect the writing. Towards the bottom, a small portion of the writing has suffered slightly from corrosion; otherwise the preservation of the plate is perfect, and, with the exception of two akṣaras in line 24, everything may be read with certainty. — The size of the letters is about 3½. — The characters are boldly and well drawn and deeply engraved. They belong to the northern class of alphabets. Of the same type as those of the Apāsa inscription of Adityaśena, they show a further development of the northern alphabet in the direction of the ordinary Nāgarī, and may perhaps be assigned to the beginning of the 10th century A. D. Attention may be drawn especially to the peculiar manner of writing the diphthongs ē, ai, ō and au, when they follow a consonant, which agrees with the practice of some Kaṇāri inscriptions of the 9th century, described by me, ante, Vol. XIII. p. 133. It may also be noted that in the conjunct ry the sign for r is written on the line, in paryayaä, line 3, and āryapūṇ, line 23; and that the sign of anuvāda is several times placed after, not above, the akṣara to which it belongs, e.g., in -satvāṅgu, and vasādāhā, in line 15. — The language is Sanskrit; and, excepting the symbol for ōṃ at the commencement of the first line, the whole inscription is in verse. As regards orthography, b is throughout denoted by the sign for v; the dental sibilant is used instead of the palatal in saṅvat, line 9, and sadāvati, line 16, and the palatal instead of the dental in saṅchivaya, line 21 (but not in saṅchivah, line 9); the dental n is employed instead of anuvāda in sanāḍa, line 2, and pūnasā (for pūnsā, i.e. puṇāsa), line 16; the vowel ri occurs instead of the syllable ri in āḍītya, line 13; before r, t is doubled in satāra, line 6, and bhṛttāra, line 22, and the word āsūkha is (correctly) spelt āsūkha, in line 5. In respect of grammar and lexicography I may point out the unusual and incorrect word utkhaṭin ‘uprooting’ or ‘extracting,’ in line 3; nṛṣipadhaṇi for rājauḍhāṇi, in line 6; the employment of īśīta, in line 12, in the sense of ‘given as a grant;’ and the ungrammatical use of the gerund āḍītya, in line 13.

Opening with four verses in honour of the deities Śiva, Brahmā, Vishṇu, and Pārvati, the inscription (in lines 4-11) relates that at the royal residence of Vijayapura, on the declivity of the northern mountain (utaragiri), there was the king Jayaditya, a son of the king Dharmaditya, and that his minister was Madoli, a son of the minister, the great sūmenta Kritakirti. And it records (in lines 11-12) that this Madoli gave the village of Dummuddumukha, which he had obtained by the king’s favour, as a grant to the goddess Durgā. Lines 13-18 glorify the liberal, admonish future rulers to respect this grant, and deprecate its resumption. Further, three verses in lines 19-22 state that the preceding praṇāsti of the minister was composed by the Kāyastha Nāgardatta; and another verse adds that the verses referring to

1 See Asiatic Researches, Vol. IX. p. 405.
2 See Mr. Fleet's Gupta Inscriptions, Plate xxviii.
Nāgadatta, who was too modest to speak of himself, were composed by his younger brother Vidyādatta. And the inscription closes with another verse, the purport of which appears to be to record that this poem was composed, or the donation made, at Jivanapalli, another village which the minister owed to the royal favour. — The only point of interest, not contained in the preceding, is, that the king Dharmadītya is compared to a Bōhisattva, and the poet Nāgadatta to Sugata, or Buddha; which would tend to show that the authors, if not Buddhists, were at any rate favourably inclined towards Buddhism.

The inscription is not dated; and the princes mentioned in it do not seem to be known from other records. Of the localities mentioned, Vijayapura was by Colebrooke suggested to be the place of that name near Mirzapur on the Ganges, on the northern declivity of the Vindhyā hills; but he has himself stated that śitārogrī-kəfəkə in line 6 would rather signify ‘declivity of the northern mountain,’ and that this interpretation would point to the range of snowy mountains, i.e., the slopes of the Himālaya. On Dummuddumāka Colebrooke has the note that a village of this name is situated in the district of Allahābād, within twenty miles of Bījaypur on the Ganges, and that the name is not uncommon, and may belong to some place nearer to the northern mountains. 1 myself am unable to identify either Vijayapura or the villages Dummuddumāka and Jivanapalli.

TEXT.

1 Oṃ[1*] Kaśiṭyā-āyajamāṇ-ānta-mūrttaṭyē viśvag-ātmanē mūnām dhyāna-gamy[4*]-ya samastā-ṛṣaṇinē ta(m)aḥ [1] Ajāyē(ṇa)
Name=stu Karkhāna(ḥaṁ)-pa-
3 tāyē Sā(kē)ha-paryākṣa-śayinē trailokyā-kaṇṭak-ōtkhāṭi-Viśhavē viśvarūpiṇē [1]
Name(ṁ)=stu nirjītāśāšha-Ma-
viyōga-dahkhaṁ santōha-sa-
nirpadh[1*]-ni [1] Tattva cha chatur-ambhāḍhi-bhrānta-ya-
7 śāh sthira-dayō mahā-sat[4*]vaḥ [1] śrīmān= Dharmadītyō nirpatirambi-haśe=Vō(tō)=
dhiṣat[4*]va iva [1] Tasya cha śäsiva śevya bhā(ḥ)bōgyō
8 lōkasya kalpaśākha-[1*] īva [1*] hrada iva triśūn-āpaharāḥ sutō-bhvaṭa [10] śrī-Jayādī-
tyaḥ [1] Rāj-āpi yō vīntō yuvī-āpi dhīrō
Tasya sachiṁ būtārthō mah-śvabhāvō vi-
Yasya cha saṁharā-mū[1*]-ti[1*]dādaṁ Karṇō-pi
iti [1] Dummuddumāka nāma grāmō rāja-prasti-
hi saṁtām vibhūṭiḥ par-ōpākṛtayē

---

1 From an impression supplied to me by Mr. F. E. 4 Expressed by a symbol.
2 Metre, Śākka (Anuhatam); and of the three next verses.
3 The proper spelling would be viśavē; but the palatal sibilant is occasionally employed in this word, in later works.
5 Read √cauḍaḥ.
6 Metre, Āryā; up to the end.
7 The correction in this word appears to have been made already in the original.
8 Read √hassuch†aḥr̥.
9 Read kēkshō; 'who by nature was striving for final beatitude.'
10 The soon akṣara, dō, of this word is quite clear in the impression.
11 The soon akṣara, dō, of this word is quite clear in the impression.
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 page 156.)

The influence of a learned orthography upon the linguistic aspect of our monuments does not, as a whole, allow itself to be measured in detail with absolute precision. I shall only quote one example, as sufficient to enable the reader to grasp my meaning. Girnar distinguishes between त and त, but only in the interior of bases. Is preserves त everywhere where Saṃskṛt would write त in the base, but it writes only त in terminations, even where Saṃskṛt usage would have required a cerebral ०. I confess that a comparison with the Eastern versions, all of which know only त, makes this invariable practice seem, in my eyes, to be suspicious. I strongly doubt if the popular pronunciation of the people of Girnar correctly distinguished the two ०'s, but I have no means of rendering this doubt a certainty. Whatever may have been the fact in this and in other analogous instances, many of the divergencies which distinguish our parallel versions are not reducible to an orthographic interpretation. However great may be the latter's importance in its legitimate sphere of action, it leaves remaining a series of phenomena which constitute dialectic characteristics. It is this face of the question which still remains to be considered.

From this point of view the monuments of Piyadasi divide themselves clearly into two main groups. In the one there is no cerebral ०, no palatal ०, an initial ० is elided, ० is

13 Originally varṣhpante was engraved, but the ० has been struck out.
14 Read pusaḥ.
15 Originally sasyavatian was engraved, but तृतीya has been altered to तृतीया.
16 Originally pīyān was engraved, but it has been altered to pīṭaḥ.
17 Read abhavajit.
substituted for r, the nominative masculine, and usually the nominative neuter, end in ś, and the
locative in aśi; the other distinguishes the cerebral ṣ and the palatal ̃, retains the initial y and
the r unchanged, makes the nominative singular of masculine a-bases end in ś, and the locative
in aṃhī or in ̃. The first comprises all the inscriptions, except Girmar and Kapur di
Giri, which alone constitute the second class. It is the more impossible to doubt the
existence in this case of a dialectic difference, because certain of the peculiarities which
denote the first group are quoted by the grammarians as proper to the Māgadhi dialect. Such
are the nominative in ś and the substitution of l for r. It must be admitted that these are
also the only points of agreement, and that neither in its omissions — the absence of y, ṣ, ś, the
elision of initial y — nor in certain peculiar usages — the retention of y, of oh, &c., — does
the dialect of the inscriptions correspond with the Māgadhi of the grammarians. On the
contrary, we have seen that the use of the group śt, attributed by the grammarians to Māgadhi
appears only in the orthography of Girmar.

Is it possible to trace subdivisions, to distinguish sub-dialects, within the limits of these
two main groups? Between Girmar and Kapur di Giri, if we except the groups śt and śt on the
one hand, and the use of the three sibilants on the other, both of which, in my opinion, should
not be admitted into the calculation, the only differences of a somewhat general character,
which I note, are the group tā at Girmar, which, according to my theory, corresponds to a
pronunciation pp, and which is represented at Kapur di Giri by t; the locative singular, which is
in mhi, and more rarely in ś at Girmar, and in ś, never in mhi at Kapur di Giri; and the genitive
of bases in m, which is in śn at Girmar, and which, at Kapur di Giri, follows, by the formation
wine, the analogy of the declension in ā. It may also be noted that the group hūr or mū, which
is retained at Girmar, is unknown at Kapur di Giri, where bāmaṇa is written bramaṇa, and that
the termination vya of the future participle passive, which usually at Girmar adheres to the
spelling viya, is, at Kapur di Giri, generally assimilated to va (vya). Finally, we may add
one or two other divergencies, such as the 3rd person plural in arā used at Girmar, and the
accidental substitution of y for j at Kapur di Giri. We can thus have no hesitation in holding
that the two sets of inscriptions, to a certain degree at least, do reflect different shades
of dialect, which are absolutely distinct.

I do not think that the case is the same with regard to the versions which constitute
the former group. If we put out of consideration the alleged use of ś and šh at Khālisi,
regarding which I shall shortly take an opportunity of stating my opinion, and which has
nothing to do with the present discussion, the only appreciable differences refer to the initial
y, the use of r, and the termination of nominatives neuter in m. Khālisi and the columnar
edicts retain the initial y more frequently than the others, but as they present at the same
time a number of examples of its elision, even in the same words, it is clear that no linguistic
conclusion can be drawn from the fact, especially as in the versions which elide it most
regularly, at Jangada and Dhauli, examples are inversely found of its retention. In some
instances Khālisi makes the nominative of neuter bases in ś, in m and not in ś; but it also
contains a more considerable number of nominatives in ś of bases usually treated as neuters;
on the other hand, in one instance, Jangada writes anusāsanam. Rūpānāth writes chhāvachchārē
and chitraḥākē, ārādhatē, pakārē, but, also, sādīkē, apalaḍhīyēna, and ahāli; and if it is
admitted that it throughout retains the initial y, it must not be forgotten that it is short, that
it has only three such examples, and that it is impossible to assume the existence of a peculiar
dialect from such a detail, in the face of its otherwise perfect agreement with those inscriptions
which more nearly resemble Māgadhi. It is plain, however, that we must not neglect sporadic
discrepancies. They have a certain significance which should be cleared up. This problem
appears to me to be an easy one. It will solve itself when we have elucidated one point,
regarding which people have, I think, come to wrong conclusions.

It has been admitted hitherto that each of the versions of the edicts faithfully
represents the dialect of the country in which it has been engraved. I believe that
this is a mistake, and that the deductions, which have been formed on this basis, are altogether unfounded. *A priori* it would be extremely surprising that a single dialect should have reigned, without rival and without shades of difference, throughout the whole of north and north-eastern India, from Khālīsī to Jangada, by way of Bairāt and Rūpnāth. Our scepticism will be found to be strengthened by several particular reasons.

According to this theory, at the time of Āśoka, both at Dhanli and Jangada, as well as at Rūpnāth and Allahabad, people must have employed a dialect which made nominatives masculine of *a*-bases -terminate in ē, and which changed ē into ı. This I shall, for the sake of brevity, term the Māgadhī of Āśoka. Now the inscription of Khandagiri, quite close to those of Dhanli and Jangada, the date of which cannot be fixed with accuracy, but is certainly not more than a century later than the monuments of Piyadasi, and which appears to emanate from a local sovereign, makes the same nominatives in ē and the locatives in ē, preserves the etymological ē, and in a word presents none of the characteristic traits of this dialect. We are thus led to think that Āśoka's dialect was not that of the country. The ancient inscriptions of the Bharhut *stūpas*, mid-way between Rūpnāth and Allahabad, perhaps contemporary with Piyadasi, of a surety not much later, and which are certainly expressed in a language analogous to the local idiom, present no trace of Māgadhism. So also at Sanchi; yet General Cunningham has discovered there a fragment of an edict which, with a probability almost equivalent to certainty, he attributes to Piyadasi. Now, in this, fragmentary as it is, the nominatives in ē, words like *chilākhitikā* leave no room for doubt. It was written in Māgadhī. But all the native inscriptions found in the same locality, either contemporary with it, or belonging to a very nearly contemporary epoch, agree without exception in the use of a Pārśvanātan free from Māgadhismes. In the other localities we are not so fortunate as to be able to use parallel monuments for controlling the apparent evidence of those of Piyadasi, but these facts are sufficiently significant. Evidently, the use of the Māgadhī dialect in his edicts does not prove that it was current and vulgar use in the localities where they have been found. The conclusion readily presents itself to our minds, It was in Māgadhī that the head-quarters of Piyadasi's empire was situated. Māgadhī must have been the language of his court, and nothing can be simpler than to suppose that he used it throughout the extent of his dominions to address his people, and more specially his officers, the representatives of his power.1

But then, it will be said, how is it that the inscriptions of the extreme north-west and of the coast of Surāshṭra escape this common level? The question appears to me to be capable of two explanations, each of which strengthens the other. No one, I think, doubts that it was in the north-west and west that a graphic system, adapted to the necessities of Indian languages, was first elaborated. At least the inscriptions of Kapur di Giri and of Girnar testify that in each case there had been already constituted a peculiar graphic system with its own traditions.

---

1 At the other extremity of India, in Ceylon, we find a sign which favours this theory. However great, as regards details, may be the exaggerations of the Bihārīsa traditions with reference to the connection of Āśoka with Tāmrapāraśi, the testimony of Piyadasi himself would appear to indicate that he held certain relations with that distant island. That he profited by these relations to help forward the diffusion of Buddhism, his zeal and the analogy of his conduct elsewhere do not permit us to doubt. It is hence the more interesting to follow up the traces, which have, in several instances, been pointed out, of the influence of the Māgadhī dialect on the ancient language of Ceylon. The most ancient inscriptions which have been found in the island are without doubt of sensibly later date than Piyadasi. This interval explains the alterations which the Māgadhī tradition has undergone from the time of the earliest inscriptions. The fact itself of its introduction, which it is difficult to refer to any author except Piyadasi, only stands out the more clearly from the persistence of certain traits. I do not speak merely of grammatical peculiarities: the locative in ni, nominative in ù, &c., which have been pointed out by P. Goldschmidt (*Ind. Ant.*, 1877, p. 318; cf. Rajas Davids, *Ind. Ant.*, 1872, pp. 138 & ff.; Ed. Müller, *Ancient Inscriptions of Ceylon*, p. 8; and the recent observations of Prof. Kern in the *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde van Neder. Indië*, IV. 10, p. 553). Two palaeographic facts are equally characteristic. One is the adoption of the sign य before its limitation to the palatal / (see below), and the other is the absence of the palatal ỵ, not employed in the official writing of Piyadasi; and which we see, for example, in the inscription of Kuvinda (E. Müller, No. 37) expressed by the compound ỵy, in ेयमुष्ठः. It is, therefore, probable that Piyadasi had directly or indirectly transferred to Ceylon, as he had done to the provinces of his empire, the methods peculiar to his Māgadhī system of orthography.
These were facts which Piyanasi found established, and which he was obliged to take into his calculations. In the second place, it will be remarked that the two systems of spelling, or, if it is preferred, the two dialects used by Piyanasi, exactly coincide with the distinction between his immediate dominions and the merely vassal provinces which, I believe, have established by arguments perfectly independent, and having no reference to the facts which we are now considering. It was quite natural that Piyanasi should accommodate himself to the local customs of regions which were only indirectly attached to his empire, and in which traditions must have existed which it might have been both suitable and convenient to respect.

Certain useful indications can be drawn from the inscriptions. The various versions are not equally consistent in the application of orthographical peculiarities which correspond to dialectic differences. Even at Dhauli and Jangula, where the initial y is most regularly elided, it is occasionally retained: ye (J. det. I. 4); yu (Dh. IV. 17); yu (Dh. V. 20; det. I. 8); at Khalsi and on the columns this is much more common: at Rupnath, the y is retained in the only three words in regard to which the question could be raised; at Bairat, we have, side by side, ah and yam. On the other hand, it is at Rupnath that we find two or three words in which the r is retained and not replaced by l. As a general rule the distinction between masculine and neuter is lost in the Magadhi of the inscriptions, both genders making the nominative in ē. Nevertheless, at Khalsi, it would appear that we have some nominatives masculine in ē (tattiyapûth, II. 4; dòlalapûth, ibid.; ni, V. 14; cf., also, lādīṇa, II. 5), while neutrers very often have the nominative in aḥ. These inconsistencies can be explained in two ways. They result either from the influence of the learned language, or from the sporadic action of the local dialect entering into the official Magadhi. I do not venture to decide.

Other irregularities, such as those which we meet at Kapur di Giri and at Girnar, are inverse cases. Thus, we have frequently in both versions nominatives singular in ē (i) both for masculines and neutrers. I may quote at Girnar: prādiś, yuit, yārīś, bhūtanuvrī, vadhī, tārīś, appārisūkś, dēravāhiśiyē, sīśē, kauṃē, dhauṃcharanē, manūgulē, dasanē, dānē, vipulē, kaṇē, mālē; at Kapur di Giri: mātī, ni, athi, sakali, matē, avramogē, jīvē, bhūtanuvrī, vadhī, tārīś, dānē, nātē, daravāhiś, ētē, yē, kātvā, khatē, yi, nē, viśē, ghatē, māhālākē, likhī; at Kapur di Giri, several locatives in asi (manasasi, I. 2; gānasasi, III. 7; yutasī, V. 13; dōḍhānasasi, VI. 14; &c. are contrasted with the ordinary form, which is in ē. It is clear that these accidental forms cannot be explained in this case by the influence either of a learned language, or of a popular one. They are so many Magadhisms, whose only possible source can have been the influence of the Magadhi officially employed by the suzerain of the states.

To sum up, the inscriptions of Piyanasi divide themselves, from a linguistic point of view, into two series, of which one, that of the north-west, betrays by certain, though not very important, indications, the existence of a dialectic sub-division. The other must represent the official language of the royal chancery. They bring before us two strongly contrasted orthographical systems; the one more nearly allied to the popular speech, the other with a greater tendency to approaching etymological and learned forms. Neither the one nor the other is subject to definite rules; neither the one nor the other escapes individual discrepancies, or certain local influences. We shall see from what follows, and it is this which gives these facts a real interest, that this state of things marks the first phase of an evolution which was destined to accentuate itself more and more as it pursued its course. We shall see, in the epoch which follows, on the one hand, the Mixed Sāṅkṛt, on the other hand the monumental Prākṛt, each continuing in parallel lines the tradition of which we here grasp the most ancient manifestations.

On several occasions, in the remarks which precede, I have been led to speak of "a learned language," and "a learned orthography." These expressions might lend themselves to
misconceptions which it is my duty to prevent. Now that I have explained myself regarding the popular language, it remains to determine, so far as we can from the indications at our disposal, what was the linguistic situation from the point of view of this other most important factor, Vedic or Classical Śaṅskṛit.

Palaeographic facts here hold the first place. Some are common to both of Piyadasi's modes of writing, others are peculiar to only one or other of them.

The north-western alphabet possesses no special signs for marking the long vowels. It is quite true that many languages are content with a similar notation, but Śaṅskṛit does not present itself to us under ordinary conditions. A language partly artificial and used only by the learned, leaping into existence after a long preparation, ready made and almost immutable, it had a grammar before it was put into writing. Neither in its orthography, nor in its grammatical forms, does it shew any sensible trace of progressive development. It could only be put into writing, at the time when it did commence to be written, under the same conditions as those under which it has continued to be written. A language thus elaborated must have imposed beforehand the power of distinguishing long vowels on the alphabet, by means of which it was intended to record it. An alphabet, which was not capable of making this distinction, would certainly never have sufficed to record it.

I may also mention a peculiarity which is common to both methods of writing. I have just now drawn attention to the fact that neither of them represents the doubling of identical or homogeneous consonants. Now, from the time when Śaṅskṛit first makes its appearance, it observes this duplication, wherever it should be etymologically expected. No one can imagine either the Vedic Śaṅskṛit, or Grammatical and Classical Śaṅskṛit being written without observing this practice. But, once established for the learned language, this duplication could not have failed to introduce itself into the popular orthography, as we shall see did actually occur in the case of the literary Prakṛt. It will, therefore, be asked how the orthography of the dialects, which we are at present considering, did not, of its own motion, adopt so natural a usage. For my part, I only see one satisfactory explanation,—the persistent influence of the Semitic method or methods of writing upon which the alphabets of Piyadasi were founded. A long effort was necessary to overcome this influence, and the sequel will show how the new practice is exactly one of the traits which characterised the constitution and expansion of the literary language.

The Indian alphabet, on the other hand, did possess special signs for the long vowels, but when it is considered that at Khāḷṣ, and perhaps at Bairāt and Rūmpālī, there are no signs for ī and ū long, and that in the other versions instances of inexactness in the notation of long vowels are continually met with, it will, I think, be unhesitatingly concluded that, at the date of our inscriptions, a fixed, arrested form of language, like Śaṅskṛit, had not yet been established in general use, for it would not have failed to act as a regulator and model for the popular languages, or to introduce into their orthography the precision, the unity and the consistency in which they are so much wanting.

The Indian alphabet of Piyadasi has only one sign to represent r; whether it precedes or follows a consonant. Would this have been possible if that alphabet were used to record Śaṅskṛit? Now, it is actually in the period which immediately follows, that it develops new resources in this respect. From the time of the inscriptions of Nāgadhat, we find the definite notation of r after another consonant well established, and, shortly afterwards, the same sign transferred to the top of the consonant which it accompanied, served to express an antecedent r.

* At Bharhut, as in later times at Nāgadhat and elsewhere, r after a consonant is placed below it, either in its zigzag form (上下) as in dakṣiṇ, or in the perpendicular form, as in of brahma. (Cf. Cunningham. Bharhut-Stūpa, Inseripl. Nos. 76, 97, 39.)
We can also assert that the sign for the vowel ā did not yet exist in the time of Asoka. The reason is simple, and is quite independent of any a priori argument. It is clear to every one that the sign J of the vowel r, in the most ancient form in which it appears, is derived from the sign used to mark r in composition with a preceding consonant, viz., J; and we have just seen that this sign did not develop till after the time of Piyadasi.

Another lacuna is more significant still; it is the absence of three distinct signs corresponding to the three sibilants of the learned orthography. I am now speaking only of the Indian alphabet. Khalsi allows us to show that this absence was perfectly real, and that it was neither voluntary or merely apparent.

It will be remembered that Khalsi, in addition to J, the ordinary sign for s, also employs another form, \( \wedge \). This s has been considered as representing the palatal ā. It is true that this last letter has an identical or analogous form in the most ancient inscriptions in which it appears, i.e., at Nasik and at Girnar. But we must understand matters. It is not possible to admit that, at Khalsi, the first scribes and the last ones differ between themselves in dialect, and I consider that the conclusions to which I came in the Introduction of this work are unassailable, that \( \wedge \), at Khalsi, is merely an alternative graphic form of \( \wedge \). Other facts confirm my opinion. The sign \( \wedge \) reappears in the Edict of Bairat, and in the two inscriptions of Rammath, the first presents only a single example, in the word mara, in which the palatal ā has no right to exist. The inscriptions of Rammath are, unfortunately, either badly defaced or very badly reproduced. Such as we have them, they do not lend themselves to a translation, or even to an approximate interpretation; all that we can remark is that the first uses the sign \( \wedge \) and that alone, and the other sign \( \wedge \) and that alone. This is a very strong reason for considering that the two signs are simple equivalents. The demonstration is completed by facts drawn from the other end of India. Mr. Rhys Davids (Indian Antiq., 1872, p. 130) was the first to point out, in the most ancient inscriptions of Ceylon, the parallel use of two sibilants \( \wedge \) and \( \wedge \). The second is clearly only a modification of the \( \wedge \) of Khalsi or of its prototype. Since then, Dr. E. Müller (Ancient Inscript. of Ceylon, No. 1) has published one in which the form \( \wedge \) alone figures. He has drawn from these facts (p. 15) the only reasonable conclusion,—that which Mr. Rhys Davids had already very justly put forward,—that the two signs express indifferently one and the same sound. We cannot come to a conclusion for the north different from that to which we have come for the south. The distance between the two localities of occurrence, and the absolute analogy of the facts prohibit us from thinking of a dialectic differentiation between the two sibilants. The sequel of paleographic history shows us that the form \( \wedge \) came to be subsequently employed to express the palatal ā, when a need to express it, that is to say, to write in Sanskrit, was experienced. At the time of Piyadasi, the Indian alphabet did not yet possess the palatal ā; and it therefore had not yet been applied, in anything like a regular and consequent way, to the learned language.

Another strictly parallel fact indirectly confirms this. By the side of \( \wedge \), the inscription of Khalsi, in its second half, frequently uses a form \( \wedge \). Dr. Bühler (p. 26) transliterates it by str, and approves of my having recognized its relationship with the cerebral str of the complete alphabet. I fear that there has been a misunderstanding here. I do, it is true, believe that the \( \wedge \) of Nasik and of Girnar (Radrāṣṭran) is derived from this \( \wedge \), but I in no way believe that this last form had the value of a cerebral at Khalsi. In spite of the transliteration str, I would not venture to assert that such is even the opinion of Dr. Bühler, and in any case I could not agree with him if it is. The sign does not appear till about the 10th Edict, and only becomes common in the 11th, 12th and 13th, although the form is not absolutely unknown to the former ones, as we have it also in the 4th Edict, l. 11. In the more than 110 instances in which Dr. Bühler reads str at Khalsi, there are only thirty in which the cerebral str could be expected. Under these circumstances, and the transition between the forms \( \wedge \) and \( \wedge \) being easy, the steps being marked out by several intermediate shapes both at Khalsi and elsewhere, it is absolutely impossible to consider the sign \( \wedge \) as anything other than a graphic variant.
of श. The perfect indifference with which the engravers use one sign or the other is really quite evident. All that has happened is the same as what we have already proved for श. In subsequent times advantage has been taken of this duplication of forms to apply one of them to the notation of the cerebral श, and it has become fixed in its new function, but the fact is later than our inscriptions.

To sum up,—neither the North-Western nor the Indian alphabet could have been at this epoch used to write Sanskrit. The Indian alphabet, the only one of the two which subsequently became applied to Sanskrit, appears before us in the condition of undergoing the modifications, which eventually prepared it for that rôle. We know of no trace of any different alphabet, which could have served for the notation of Sanskrit, and we are driven to the conclusion that at the time of Piyadasi Sanskrit had not yet been written, and, as all our arguments apply equally to the religious, (Vedico) language, the conclusion holds equally good for it as well as for classical Sanskrit properly so called.

Between these two languages there is, however, one important difference. The elaboration of classical Sanskrit could only have taken place with a view to a wide, profane use,—with a view to a written use. To say that it was not written, is to say that it did not yet practically exist,—at least in its ultimate form. But it is not so in regard to the Vedico language. Not only could its essential monuments exist in an oral state, but they could have been, in this form, the object of a culture purely oral, and more or less complete. Eminent Indian scholars have considered and still consider that the composition of the prātiśākhyas does not imply the use of writing. I need not here expatiate on a subject to which we shall again be conducted by the conclusions of the following chapter. These remarks have merely for their aim to put forward (while we explain it) a remarkable contradiction between these two propositions: on the one hand the paleographic condition of our monuments proves that the classical idiom which subsequently took so prominent a position had either not received as yet its complete elaboration, or had at least not yet been regularly written, while, on the other hand, the orthography of the popular dialects as it is reflected by our monuments, reveals the action, more or less latent, none the less certain, of a previous philological culture. It is to the oral tradition of the religious literature, to the efforts for its preservation and for its phonetic analysis, of which it was the cause, that we have to trace back this influence. The reader cannot fail to remark how happily this origin accounts for the peculiar character of the action, unequal and indirect, incomplete and accidental, which we have been able to describe.
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(Continued from page 113).

XXXIV. The Tenth paññam, vinratha, virastava, in 43 vv. Enumeration of the names of the siriviśuddhāmaṇa [445] (v. 4). It begins: namiṇa jinaṁ jayajīvambhidhavaṁ bhāvyakusumaraṁyīyāṁ Vismā giriñḍadāśrāṁ tuṇḍāni (staun) payatthanāmehiṁ 11 11 It concludes: iya nānāvali sāṁthuṇayā sīri Viraṇjīpda maṅgasūṇassa (?pasa?) viyayā karuṇāṇa jinavaṇa sitapayamaṇaṇhāthīrāṇa (?) Vīra ! 11 11

The gachhāyāram, which in V., in the Ratnasāgara, and in the second collection of all the pañnas that I have before me, is cited as a part of the collection (see pp. 429, 431) contains in 138 vv. general rules of life, especially those for the bhikkhu and bhikkhunī, in the form of a lesson to Goyama, who is several times mentioned in it. It begins: namiṇa Mahāvraṇa... gachchhāyāram kičchā uddharimā suṣaṃmud享受到 11 11 atth’ ād’ Goyamaḥ pāṇi jā ummañgagapaiṭhiṁ gachchhārami saṁvāṣiṁbhāpāṇi bhamaṁ bhavaparamāṇaṁ 11 11 The metre is almost everywhere sūka, though two syllables are often counted as one, one short being cast away; so for example in v. 15: saṁgaḥōvaggaḥāṁ vibināṁ na karē jāgaṇiṣaṁ samāramaṅ
samaṇin tu dikkhittā | simāyārīṃ na gāhāḥ | 13 | vīhiṇā, samaṇaṃ, samaṇīṃ are to be read as disyllables.

At the end it is called (see verse 1) an extract from the mahānīṣṭhakappā and the vavahāra, sources which explain the use of the ślokā here: mahānīṣṭhakappā | vavahārād tāhē | va ya sahu-sāhuni-asthā | gachhāyānam | sansuddhiḥ | 128 | 1 padharmam sāhunā, caµi nājīhyānīm | vivaśjāntam | 1 uttamasamauśaadam | gachhāyānam | suntamaṃ | 1 127 | 1 gachhāyāram | sūntītaṃ | 1 [445] padhūttā bhikku bhikkhunī | kumāru juha jāhājanī | iĉchahātā hiam apañño | 1 128 | 1

The fourth group of Siddhānta texts is composed of D., the six chāḍasūtras.

So at least according to Bühler’s List (see above, p. 226). In the Āyārvibhi and in the Ratnasāgara (Calc. 1880) these assert a prior place — between the upāgas and the paññas. The name chāḍasūtra (chāḍa, cutting, section?) can be explained in many ways. There is no authentic explanation that I have been able to discover. This name recurs in the texts in question as infrequently as in the paragraphs in the MSN. The first time where it is mentioned, so far as I know, is in the Āvāsā, nijj. 8, 89: jāna cau mahākappām | jāna seṣiṃhī caḥ chāḍa sattāyi, from which passage it is clear that then, besides the mahākappām, there existed several other texts belonging to this group (kalpadīnī Schol.); and in another passage of the above cited work (16, 193), there are enumerated three texts which, at present, still bear this name and which state that they were divided just as we find them. They appear [447] to belong together after a fashion and to form a united group. In the enumeration of the anāgāpavīthā texts in the Nandī, in the Pākhikasūtra and in the same sāmākārās we find these texts arranged in the same order (dasāpāṃ, kappasa, vavahārāsa). In the sāmākārās, in the passage in reference to the number of days necessary to learn them, we find that but one savyakkhaṃḍhā is allotted to them all: kappavavahārādasāpaṃ (so Āvī, Svi, dasākārvāṇam V.) ēgō suvakkantaṃ. The Vidhiprī, however, states that some (kē) “kappavavahārāsaṃ bhinnāṃ savyakkhaṃḍhāh iciousānti.”

The title chāḍasutta is not mentioned in this list of the anāgāpavīthas or sāgabhārās, which cites, in addition to the three texts held to be chāḍasuttas, two others immediately afterward, one name alone intervening. These additional chāḍasuttas are nihāra and mahānīṣṭa, which now stand at the head of the chāḍasā. The mahākappasānaṃ (see p. 478), too, is found in the list, but in a different place — about 24 places previous. From this we draw the conclusion that the author of the list did not regard the mahākappasāna (see p. 478) as belonging to these chāḍasūtras.

The mahākappā2 is mentioned in no other passage. In all other passages, where the chāḍasthās are enumerated, the nihāra is invariably placed at the head of the list. Thus in Āvī, where the number of days necessary for learning the chāḍasūtras is stated, [448] there are enumerated as the “chāḍasasthāna” (here placed between upāgas and pañnas; see p. 446) the seven names: nihāra, dasa, kappā, vavahāra, mahānīṣṭa, paṁchakappā and jākappā. The paṁchakappā is mentioned also under the pañnas. Cf. above, pp. 427, 430. The case is similar in Svi, where, however, the name chāḍa is omitted, and the discussion on this subject is inserted between that concerning aṅgas 4 and 5. In Svi, only sīha, dasa, kappā and vavahāra are treated of together, paṁchakappā and jākappā not being mentioned, and mahānīṣṭa is disposed of at another place, viz.: — at the end of the entire āgayāni after the pañnas. V. agrees herein with

---

68 An older form of the name is perhaps chhasa, chhāḍasuta; thus in a citation in the Vichārāvatīsaṅgīra: “nīṣham-sīhasa, chhāḍasana.” chhāḍasanauga, too, is found in the same place (see p. 430), where it is said that they are five in number.

69 The name of the second group of the charitattāgamapāṇa in the Anuyogavāraśūtra — chhāḍasavadhānasaṃ — may be recalled in this connection.

70 According to the Scholiast these texts are borrowed from the dīthivā (āṅga 12), and, consequently, are to be regarded as rishibhāṣaḥ; mahakāsūtraśāntam api rishibhāṣāntavādād dīthivādād uddhāryaṃ tāhāṃ pratīpātāt śvarasamākārāṅgā vā (gatvā cha?) prasaṅgābhāva.

71 dasa uddesapaśāla dasa, kappasa hûti chhasa chhēva dasa chhēva vavahārāsa hûti | savvē vi chhareta,

---
Svi. completely, with the exception that, as Āvi, it adds pañchakappa and jīrapappa to nisīha, dasā, k. and vav. In the metrical portion at the close, the jāgavīhiṣapagaranasa, however, the first four are treated of either as to be learned together in 30 days or as "sāvānī vi chēhāsattāni," v. 22. In the next verse (23) there are statements concerning jīyak and pañchak (mahānīśha is not discussed till vv. 63, 64). In the Vīcharāmīśitas, the chēhāsam is called nisīha-māvāyam — on jītak, pañchak, see p. 430 — ; and in the commentary on the śrāddhajātalpa — see below — śrī niśīthādi chēhādgranthasūtra is spoken of. We find that this agrees with Bühler's list (above, p. 226).

Besides this arrangement which places niśītha at the head we meet with statements in modern sources in which the number composing the series varies in many ways. The series, as we have seen above, was never fixed, continually varying between 4 and 7 members.

[449] In the Ratnasāgara (Calc. 1880) we find the following arrangement: vyavahāra, vṛtiyakalpa, dasākara, niśītha, mahānīśha, jītakalpa. These names are the same with an exception in the case of jītakalpa (Bühler has pañchakalpa; Āvi has both names). The arrangement of Rāj. L. Mitra and after him that of Paṇḍit Kashinath Kunțe, taking its rise from the Siddhāntadharmasāra, is very remarkable. See my remarks on p. 227.

The uncertainty of modern tradition may, it is true, create an impression unfavourable to the age of the chēhāsūtra texts which we possess. On the other hand, there are sufficient arguments which permit us to ascribe a relatively ancient date to the chief group at least, viz., the three texts: dasā-kappa-vyavahāra. The order which I have here followed is, without doubt, the old arrangement, though, for convenience sake, I adopt that of Bühler from this point on: vyavahāra, dasā, kappa. We must here consider the statements of tradition in reference to the origin and composition of these texts.

Haribhadra, on Āvāy. 8, as, explains the third of the three forms of the sāmāchārī which are mentioned in the text: dhā dasaḥ payavbhāgā, the padavbhāgaśāmāchārī by chēhāmaṭrāṇi, and, as we have seen above, p. 357, he states that this is chēhāsamtralakhanān navamapūrvavāna nirvyādhā. On Āvāy. 7, as he limits the equalization of the padavbhārī to kalpa and vyavahāra (sā cha kaḥhārapā). The same statement exists in the avachārī composed A. D. 1383 by Jnānasaṅgara on the Œghanirunkti: [450] padavbhārī kalpa vyavahāra; and pūrva 9 (vastu 3, prabhurita 20) is referred to as the source — see above, p. 357 — whence this Bhadrabāhuśavāmin nirvyādhā. The composition of these two texts, kalpa and vyavahāra, is frequently referred back to Bhadrabāhu, who is said to have made use of the same sources as they. But in the pishīmaḍhalaśutra (Jacobi, Kalpas, p. 11), (p. 472) the same is asserted of the third member of this group of texts, the dasān. We have consequently here, as in the case of śāṅga 4, to deal with an author whose name is specially mentioned. Whether this claim is correct or not (we will refer to this question below), the connection with the pūrvas according to tradition, is significant.

The contents of the existing chēhāsūtras makes it probable that a large portion of them is of considerable antiquity. This contents refers in general to the clergy and the rules of conduct prescribed for them, though there is a large admixture of subsidiary matter of a legendary character (e. g. the entire Kalpasūtram). The first two rules, according to the existing order, refer to expiations and penances (prāyaschittā)71; while all the rest contain general matters referring to discipline.

70 The same is asserted of the niśīha; see p. 453.
71 It corresponds consequently to the vinaya of the Buddhists with which, despite all differences, it is closely connected in contents and in style of treatment.
There is other testimony of an external character which makes for the antiquity of the chhédasūtras. The first of these is, as is well known, closely connected with aṅga 1, and is, in fact, called a part of the latter (p. 254). Chhédasūtras 2, 4 bear the stamp of antiquity because they resemble aṅgas 1—4 as regards the introduction; and because chhédas, 2 — 5 resemble the same aṅgas as regards the conclusion. The ancient date of chhédas, 4 is eo ipso attested by the thoroughgoing mention of it and its ten sections in aṅga 3, 10.

The testimony is not so favourable in the case of chhédasūtra 2. It must be ascribed to a somewhat later date from the fact that it contains a polemic against the ninhaga, a mention of the dasapuvvin etc. See below. We have exact chronological data for the Kalpasūtram, inserted in chhédas, 4. See p. 472.

It is remarkable that there are old commentaries called bhāshya and chārni, composed in Prākṛt, the first kind of texts written in gāthās, the second in prose, on three of our texts: niṣṭha, vavahāra, kamma The Nom. Sgl. M. of the 1. Decl. ends invariably in e and not in a; and extensive use is made of the insertion of an inorganic m. The Prākṛt shows many traces of a later age, e.g., we find the thematic instead of the declined form. Furthermore, the fact that these bhāshyas are, for the most part, composed in gāthās, whereas the verses in the chhédasūtras are mostly ślōkas, deserves our attention.

The extent of each of the texts is as follows: — 1. niṣṭham 812 (or 815) grautthas, — 2. mahāniṣṭham 4504 gr., — 3. vavahāra 500 gr., — 4. daśārutakamādham 800 gr., exclusive of the kalpasūtra, that contains 1254 gr., — 5. bhīhatkalpa 475 gr., — 6. pānchakalpa (is wanting).

First chhédasūtram, the niṣṭhajāyayām. This name is explained, strangely enough, by niṣṭha, though the character of the contents would lead us to expect nisheda. In the scholiast on Uttarajj, 26, niṣṭhīyā is paraphrased by niṣhedhiki; and so in the scholiast on Dasaśālā 5, 3, 2: asaṃmaṇjanishedhān niṣhedhiki; in the scholiast on Āvāyī, 7, 1, and on Anuyāgayā introduction (26 in A) where Hemachandra explains it by śvaparisthāpanabhūmī, The statements in the text in Āvāyī, 7, 38 fg. are decisive: — jambā tattva niśṣiddhā tātan niṣṭhā hāri m 211 211 jō hōi niśiddhappā niṣṭhā tāsa bhāhāvā hāri m avisaṇṭhāra niṣṭhā kāvalamaṭṭhāy hāvali saddō m 212 212 11; in 10, 40, 41 we read baddham abaddhan tu suhā, baddhaḥ tu dvāḷaśaṃgaṇidīdaḥ baddhaḥ, niṣṭham anishā baddhaḥ baddhaṁ tu 211 211 bhōi pariṇaya-viṣṇu sākṣaśakaṃ saḥ sāva niṣṭham bhāhāniḥ paśchhhanaṁ tu niṣṭham niṣṭham nāmaṁ jahajjhajayyaṁ 211 211 211 211 211 Scholiast here 74: iha baddhaśrutam niṣṭidadhān anishdham anishedhān eh, tatra ranasaiva[458] pāṭhād hāsāyopadēsaḥ cha prachhhanaṁ niṣṭhadhūm ucyatā, prakaśāpāḥāt prakāśāpadaśāḥ cha 'niṣṭhadhā, ... niṣṭhadhām guptārthanam ucyatā. From this we may indubitably conclude that the explanation by niṣṭhā is simply an error, and is to be classed in the same category as the explanation of uṣvāyām by uṣpapātikam and of rāyapāṣaṇāyam by rājapraṇyam.

Whether we are to understand our text under the niṣṭhajāyayām mentioned in aṅga 4 (see p. 280) as part of the first aṅga or under the niṣṭha nāmaṁ aṣjhhajayyaṁ in Āvāyī, 10, 41, is a matter of doubt, since its title is perhaps not passive =paśchhhanaṁ (s. below), guptārthanam, but active in sense. Nevertheless the statements, which (see p. 254 ff.) are found in aṅga 1 in relation to its fifth chhūl called niṣṭha (cf. also niṣṭhiya as the name of ajj 2 of the second chhūl, ibid.), and in the introduction of the niṣṭhamchūrṇi in reference to the identity of the chhédasūtra with

73 It must, however, be noticed that (p. 448) in Sri. and V. the chhēda texts are treated of between aṅga 4 and aṅga 5.
74 See Jacobi Kāpāa. pp. 16, 25.
75 padyagaddanadhanā baddhaḥ, śāṣṭrōpadēvaḥ; dvād. śāṣṭrōgāṇipītaḥ ... lokottaranāḥ; abaddhaṁ hukkhaṁ.
76 In the enumeration of the 10 sāṃkhyāl (aṅgas 3, 10, 5, 7, uttarajj, 26,Āvāyī, 7) the śvavasāya, commandments, are always found together with the niṣṭhiya, prohibitions (Leumann).
77 Intermediate forms are nishūla — see just above — and niṣṭhīla in the scholiast on aṅga 1.
this fifth chhālā, make at least for the conclusion that tradition regards the nīshām ajjhāyaṇam in our chhādāṣṭra as originally forming a part of aṅga I and separated from it at a later period. This does not, of course, exclude the possibility that the text in question existed originally as it exists to-day in an independent condition, and that it was at a later period joined with aṅga I, whence it was again separated.

In the Nandi — see below — [454] the nīshām is mentioned after dāsā kappē vavahārō and before maḥānīshām. It is, therefore, certain that our text is referred to. The statements, which are found in Avāsya, 16, 114 (s. p. 255a) in reference to the three-fold division of nīshām into three ajjhāyaṇas, by name uggāhīyaṇ, anugāhīyaṇ and arūvāṇa, are not in harmony with the constitution of our text, which contains no trace of such a three-fold division, but on the other hand is divided into 20 uḍḍēkas, containing hardly anything but prohibitions for the bhikṣu. The words uggāhīyaṇ and anugāhīyaṇ are, it is true, made use of; but this does not presuppose a direct division into 3 ajjhā. All these prohibitions commence with the following words (cf. the formula in the Prātimokṣhaṣṭra of the Buddhists): — je bhikkhhō; karēti and end with kareṇa va sātījē. We have here then a fixed canonical rule, which makes upon us the impression of being very old. At the conclusion of the uḍḍēka a penitence of one or, as the case may be, of four months is prescribed: taṃ sēvāṃcāvayyati āśīryaḥ pariḥārāṭhāyaṃ uggāhīyaṇ (or anugāhīyaṇ) pīṣahā.

The 20th uḍḍēka treats especially of this penitence and appeals thereby to the first uḍḍēka of the vavahāra.

[455] At the end there are three āryas, in which Visāhāgaṇi is stated to be the writer (!): tassa līhiyam nīshām. These āryas are counted as constituent parts of the text, since they are followed by the words iti nīshāhāyaṇaṁ visamā uḍḍēsatā sammatō.

There is a very detailed commentary (bhāṣya) in Prākrit in ārya, akin to the prose commentary, which Jinaśrībhūmī, author of the commentary on the paryuṣhaśākapaṇṇaṇaṇa, mentions as his source of information under the name niśāṭhaḥcūrī. The bhāṣya offers but little assistance in regard to the explanation of the words of the text, but contains general remarks concerning the contents of each of the uḍḍēkas. It starts with a very lengthy introduction, which at the end is called pēdaḥma, i. e. pīṣahā, cf. pīṣahā in Malayagiri. Each of the paragraphs of the text is called sūtram in every case. This commentary does not discuss the three concluding verses of the text. The writer of the Bārīc MS. (Ahmedābād Śaṅv. 1629) belonged to the stock of Abhayādēva.

XXXVI. Second chhādāṣṭra, the maḥānīshā. Instruction of Goyama in reference to transgressions (sallas) and punishments (pāyacchittas, pachchittas), in 8 ajjhāyānas, of which [456] ajjhā I, 2 have a text composed partly in sīkṣās or triśūlabh, (Nom. in o) and partly in prose (Nom. in e); and in ajjhā 3 ff. many sīkṣās are inserted. The single copy which I have by me, and that a very incorrect one, reproduces the text so very imperfectly that even the writer,

77 Silāśka, in the introduction to the second ārtaṇaśu of aṅga 2 says that the “sāhārapakalpō nīṣāthāḥ” is “nīṣāthāḥ” from pūrva 9, 3, 20. (Leumann); see pages 337, 458a.
78 Haribhadra makes no statement on this head, since he holds the verses to be nīṣāthā. Cf. the five-fold division of the jyāra in aṅga 3, 3, 2 into: māsīcī uggāhīyaṇ, m. anugāhīyaṇ, chāmamāsī, m. apūrgghaḥ, chā. uggāhīyaṇ, chā. apūrgghaḥ ārvāṇaḥ. (Leumann.)
79 I with 48 paragraphs, 2 with 50, 3 with 74, 4 with 62, 5 with 76, 6 with 23, 7 with 37, 8 with 19, 9 with 26, etc.
80 According to Kasū. Kunte the niś, treats “of the duties of Śādhas, and the fines and penalties to be imposed on them when they neglect them.”
81 The 20 uḍḍēka are, however, divided into 3 groups (1—5, 6—19, and 20; Leumann).
82 “Who does this or that and who does not do it.” See Leumann, Ang. Glos. p. 152 s. v. sājī Śārīrīśāyati “take,” “receive,” “accept,” “permit.”
83 A. D. 1307, see Jacoby, Kalpas. p. 25; also author of the Vīśīprapāṇī, above p. 222.
84 Begins: “nāvābhāṣaḥcūrīśiḥ sāhārapakalpō sāhārapakalpo vētē (vēdē, see p. 457) I havati yas anupamḥcūrī bahu bhumitat sadāprakāriṇaḥ 11 1 11 āyāro anupamḥcūrī ṣaṭaḥ chhājlī nīshām 11 1 11 pakapamṇi chhājlīdyā nīshāḥ ya ... V. 1 is cited in the same form, by Silāśka from Bhadrīś’s śāhārapakalpī according to Leumann.
85 Śaṅvat 1569 under Pāṇāśa Mahāmanḍa.
overcome by the difficulties in his way, at the conclusion of the first ajhj, begs in Prakrit, that the fault be not laid at his door. He says that it is not a kulihiyam, but a text sui generis with its mixture of verses, half-verses, prose and even single aksharas. See my remarks on p. 472. If my explanation of his words correct the writer speaks also of marginal glosses and of leaves that have fallen out from his original (puvvayarisa, puvvadarasa). Since these words too are very corrupt, they are not to be ascribed to the writer of the present MS., which is well written to say the least, but to an earlier scribe, whose comments have always been copied together with the text.

A statement in Sanskrit, of not less peculiar nature, but handed down in a very corrupt state, is found at the end of the fourth ajhaya, and is directed, not against the condition of the text, but against its contents. According to this statement Haribhadrasuri had declared that it was impossible for him to believe some of the wonderful accounts contained in the text. [457] The writer first asserts that this scepticism of Haribhadrasuri has reference solely to a few of these statements and not to the entire fourth ajhj, or to the other ajhjs. This scepticism, he says, was caused by the fact that in aigas 3, 4 and in upasugas 3, 4 nothing was said of these matters, "na kathamchid idam achakhyay yathay." We must refer yathay to what follows, and regard the words as a kind of citation from ajhj 4. The latter, however, does not suit the sense, which amounts to this: — cave-dwellers are able to undergo hardships for a year. The meaning of the very obscure words at the end appears to be that since this sotram, according to ancient tradition is an arsham, and in this srntakanda there are contained many excellent "ganadharktani vedaavachanani," it is the conclusion of the writer that there is no occasion for unbelief even as regards these remarkable statements. The great Haribhadrasuri is undoubtedly referred to here, [458] who must have played an important role at the date of this remark of the copyist, to whom the polemic appeared as a bitter necessity.

The wretched condition of the text is perhaps to be ascribed to the fact that the authority of the mahamisithasastra found many opponents even among the Jains themselves. That the text is corrupt is manifested externally first of all in the imperfect tradition as regards its division. According to a special statement in the commencement of the third ajhj, after v. 3.

86 mahamishasastra indicates pdalam as ajhaya as said by dhaavyayana as manmadhanam saumakam api na samatyak draddhanam ita hah Haribhadrasri; na punah sarvam eva 'dhah chaturthidhnyanyam anyai vy dhavyayam saunay va katipayaih parimitair alsapakar araddhanam ity artha; yathay athakh-samavaya-jivabhigama-prajaparitaksha na kathamchid idam achakhyay, yathay | priti (7) samiti-paritaksha mati, tai (7) guhararasi tu manumasya, tosha cha paramadharikam an punah punah saulitaksham yavad upapatte, teha cha tair darsavan vajraalaghara-asparpa aspita gitanam pariyanamparitaksham api samasatasram yavat prapyapattit na bharat (7); vydhadvadhy tu punar yathayad itam artham sotram, viirty na tavad ata, prabhditya cha 'tra srntakanandit arthah sasyan apsyauna (7) pluginyam ganadharktani veda (see 435) vachanamad tad evam etitii na kinchayh aasankhyan.

87 See pp. 371, 372. In Jimadattaasuri's ganadharaasarakhata, v. 50, 114 payara is ascribed to him; and Sarvarajagiri cites in the sholoot the following works: paucchavastika upadipadapanchaabhakshita shaha s微妙akara lokatali(vaninarpa dharmavindu lokabindu yogyadishtamuchchhaya daranesaparitik sadchhiraksha vrishnivyatvamavithatha pancavastikaa samkrittrakhayananabhasyaa anekshitaapakarah sambapada-pravasa parakarikamahddh jalareetvamuchchhaya dharmakarapakaratvamahitina, tatha anayakavrithi dadahtika vrishnavrviti sphsnirakavrithi jivabhigamanaprakasaritvapanchavastikavrithi painchavastikavrithi anekshitaapakarah dhirakavrithi chaityavanramvritti anuyogdvakavrithi maanavrithi sadgnavahyapavrithi kahetramvritti strotavrttivachchhayavrithi arahachchhmdaapi samarikdyacharya kathalokadishasthrpani. The statements in the Vicharaapinavagraha which contains however, a large number of the names. In the Vic. H.'s death is placed (§ 8 begins in the year 1600 after Vira.

88 Probably in four anya, though the metre or rather the text itself is very difficult to make out. The last verse reads: nikhittayibhipapająksah sahagattapam i na mahahita(sh) | varasyakhaanidhan vottava cha asttapapapagapam (7) ti || In the preceding verses the word asilile is found three times: tata alasa uddeve astha tathava amblj: jan tan itam chashthi vishanamamani (7) 'chamani yambile || dasa, chaalas ito, sattamane tinni, athamane 'bile-dasa a] ; this is probably a vocative to amblj, "little mother," and to be explained in the same way as sundari | in pailuna 7 (see 442).
(a statement that perhaps did not belong to the text originally) the mahāniṣṭha consists of 8 ajṭayāṇas, each of which contains a certain number of uddeśas, which is stated. But in our MS. there is no trace whatsoever of any uddeśas. In the first ajṭh, there are between the beginning and the end some §§ numbers (11, 33, and 16, 17 for which 33, 37 are to be substituted). [459] and at the end the number 49. These numbers do not, however, refer to uddeśa sections, since these are generally of greater extent, as is proved in the case of other sections. We have no statement of the kind in the case of ajṭh 1. These numbers are nine for 2, sixteen for 3, eight for 4, ten for 5, two for 6, three for 7, ten for 8. Of the eight ajṭayāṇas only the first six are specially distinguished, four having special names, though only those ascribed to the first two ajṭh, are in harmony with the contents. The sixth ajṭh, closes on f. 703; the remainder is characterized at the close (965) as: pīyā, perhaps bīyā, dvitiyā, chūliyā, so that two chūliyā chapters are here indicated,56 which, if added to the 6 ajṭh, gives the desired number 8. In this faulty condition of the MS. it is worth while to note the statements of the three sāmācharis in reference to the mahāniṣṭha. Avī. treats of this subject (see pp. 447, 448) in discussing the chāggapāṇtha, and states that there were 8 ajṭh with 83 uddeśas. The first ajṭayāṇa had then no divisions of this kind and was ēgasaṃṇa; the second had 9, the third and fourth each 16 each, the fifth 12, the sixth 4, the seventh 6, the eighth 20. This difference between this account and the information, to be drawn from the MS. is very great indeed. (See above.) Svi. and V., on the other hand (see p. 448), separate the mahāniṣṭham from the other chāṭhā texts, and treat, at the conclusion, of the jāgaviḥi of the sacred texts after the pānagavīhi. [460] They too agree with Avī. as regards the number of ajṭh. and uddeśas. The seventh and eighth ajṭh. are expressly called by V. chālārīva (donni chālī, v. 64). Forty-three days are necessary to learn the mahāniṣṭha, tēyālītāe dinēhīm ajṭayāṇasamattā, but as two days are requisite for sanvakhaṇīhūhā samuddeśas and for ānpūṇā, the total number is 45. The chāṭhās 1, 3—5 required together only 30 days. See page 448.

A statement in Wilson Sci. W. 1, 34 (ed. Rost) is of particular interest:—“Vajrayāniṃ”61 instituted the Mahāniṣṭha sect;” and of equal interest are the remarks of Rājendra Lāla Mitra (p. 227) in reference to three different recensions (vācaṃnā) of the Mahāniṣṭha. The question which is proposed in the introduction of chapter 22 of the Vīcharāmṛtitsāṅkhaṇa substantiates the belief that the Mahāniṣṭha is tolerably old. This question is:—how is it to be explained that the prāyāṣcitta prescribed in the Mahāniṣṭha is not practised? The answer to this includes chāṭhās 1, 3, 5, and 6:—adunā mahāśaṅkhaṅgavāhā niśchaitānī prāyāṣcittān(y) annamāntaṁ śrājaṇaṁ.

The first mention of the mahāniṣṭham, of which I am aware, is found in the enumeration of the anāgāpanīthā texts in the Nandī etc., where the schol. on N, explains the word as follows:—niśčaitānī parām, yat grāmatāḥ prāyāṣcittānī mahātām man mahāniṣṭham. [461] We have already mentioned (p. 445) that the gachhāyāra states that it is based upon the mahān, as its source.

The introductory words are the same as in anī 1 etc.: sayanā me aṣuṣaṁ, teṣāṁ bhagavāya ēyam akkāyam, and each of the ajṭh. closes correspondingly with ti bémi. Besides this, there is nothing which directly savours of antiquity with the single exception that the dialogue form between the bhagavant (who is addressed with (s) bhagavān and not with (s) yah bhainṭ) and Indrabhūtī (Gāyamī) is retained. This form, however, ill suits the introductory formula by which the whole is attributed to the bhagavant himself.

The name of the text occurs shortly after the introduction, and is accompanied by laudatory epithets. This fact, together with the epithet mahā in the name, makes it probable

56 The conclusion of the first chūli is not directly marked off, but is to be placed on 308, where a section closes with bémi.

that it is of later date. It had need of a special sanction because of its secondary character. The words are: pavaṇa-vara-mahāṇiḥsasyaḥ khaṇḍhaḥ (ni) sasyānusārāṇāṁ tivihāṁ—but there follows no three-fold division.

The first book is entitled salluddhāraṇaḥ and treats of the most various kinds of salla, sālya. The repeated references to the savaṇgōvaṇga are worth our notice; whence the existence of the uṇāṅga at the time of its composition—see above, p. 373—is eo ipso clear. Then follows the figure of the useful co-partnership of the same with the blind man which is specially emphasized:—hayaṁ nāgaṁ kīyāḥ liyām, hayaṁ annaṇaṁ kīyā ī pāsāṇiḥ paṇguḥ ādayāḥ dhāvāmaṇā a nābhāḥ  kīyā ya vāpāya saṁjñāṅaḥ pāvittāḥ. Furthermore [462] stress is laid upon reverence (vainē, vainādiyā) for pictures (padiḥ) and temples (chēnā, chēlāyā). A special formula seems to have been made use of in this connection, an enigmatic writing of the letters of which occurs after the fashion of the treatment of a = u = m (om) in the Upaniṣads and in similar formulas in the tantric ritual. This entire subject was a riddle to the copyist—cf. p. 456—and so it remains for us. After the real conclusion of the work, in an addition, a similar subject is treated of in like manner merely by means of single letters.

Book II. is entitled kammarivāyaṇaḥ, perhaps karmapivačaṇa (cf. pp. 270, 280, 335). At the end is found an obscure statement which perhaps has reference to ajjh. 1, 2 and which reads: ēsāṁ tu dōṇaṁ ajaḥyāyaṇaṁ vihi puvvāyāgaṁ savyāsāmaṇaṁ vattālāyo (?).

Books III. and IV., without specific titles, are composed almost entirely in prose, and treat especially of the kusaś. It is noticeable that in Book III. frequent reference is paid to the dvālāsāgaṇaḥ savyāsāṇaḥ and the savaṇgōvaṇga dvālāsāgaṇaḥsavyāsāṇaḥ. The commencement with sāmāyaḥ is retained (cf. p. 243), and the savyāsāṇaḥ is then characterized as sāmāyaṁ-mā lōgabīṃduṣagāra (śāra!) pavyāsāṇaṁ (p. 245). [463] We find in the text the following statements which are very characteristic as regards the origina and history of Book III.: tatātha tatthe bahuḥhinī savyāsāṇiḥ sammiliṇaḥ savaṇgōvaṇgadvālāsāgaṇaḥ savyāsāṇiḥ annaṁ-annā uvaṇgōsya (kha) jādayā-ajjhāyaṇa-uddēsāgaṇiḥ saṁmaitheśuṁaṁ kīmchitiḥ kīmchitiḥ saṁvayayāmaṇaṁ etthaṁ līyāni ti, na uṣa sakavakayāni (svakāvyakṛtaṁ) ti. This is an example of the saying quia s'excuse t'accuse. It is more probable that this is a production of the author himself than that it emanates from the hand of a copyist who is inclined to doubt.

Book IV. contains a legend of two brothers, Saumaṭi and Nāilā, in which we may observe an occasional reference (in Sanskrit!) to an old elucidation (!) of aṅga 10: seshauṁ tu prāsaṇyākaśarapīdhaṭhacarād vavṣyāṁ. Whoever, bhikku or bhikṣuṇī, should praise the adherents of that system or schismatics (parapāsasāṃgāṇa pasamaṁ kareya, jē yā vi paṁ niḥhaṃgāṇaṁ p. k.), whoever speaks in favour of the schismatics (niḥhaṃgāṇaṁ apukulāṁ bhāṣyāya), visits their temples (niḥ. ayaṇaṁ paviṣṭāya), studies their texts (niḥ. gaṁthasatthā payakkharānaṁ, parāvṛtya), or follows their ordinances (niḥ. saṁkalī kāyakilēsāṁ tāvēi va saṁjñāṇā va jāi vā vinnāvāi vā suvē vā paḍīvēi vā avimūhasuddhaparīsaṁsāmyagā saṁhaṛīya), his fate will be as disastrous as that of Saumaṭi, sa vi paṁ paramāhammēsulī uvaṇgōdyā jahā Saumaṭi. The hate against the heterodox and schismatics is here so bitter, [464] that the conjecture is not too bold if we assume that the heterodox and schismatics had at that time possessed the text of this book, see pp. 293, 368.

Book V., dvālāsāgaṇasavyāsāṇaḥ navatāyaś (?), mentions the dvālāsāgaṇa, but...
merely in a general way. It treats especially of the relation between the teacher (guru) and scholar (sila), of the áyára (gachháyára, see p. 445), and aśiyára.

Book VI., gíyatathavírá (see pp. 457, 450), treats of the pachhítta práyáśchítta, and contains a legend of a teacher Bhadda and the açiyá (árýiká) Rayá. The mention of the dasapúrvi in the introduction brings eo ipso the date of its composition down to a period subsequent to that of Bhadrabáhu, the last chaturdaśapúrvi, and to that of Vajra, the last dasapúrvi. See pp. 219, 460.

Books VII., VIII., which (see p. 459) are characterized as two chühlýás, a name which per se marks them as a secondary addition, treat likewise of the pachhítta, and, in fact, in such great detail, that the words kim bahaná (186, together with the formal frame-work enclosing them, are occasionally repeated several times in immediate succession. Shortly before the close these words occur again. A legend of the daughter of Snyásivi in Avantí plays a very prominent part in these books.

The solemn adjuration (found also in another passage) to save this sútra from any damage, is another indication of its secondary origin: — jayá náñ Góyama! iñam-ó pachhítta-suttañ vocchhiyiyiñ fayá náñ chañadhicchhá-gaháś '465' rikha-tárgá náñ sattā ahómatte ya no-viphuriyá, imassa náñ vocchhétó Góyama! kasiñasañjamamassaábhávo.

To the conclusion (samattañ mahánísahasuyakkhañhadhán) are joined the reverential invocations to the 24 tittháká, the tittha, the suyakdhyá, the suyakdhyá, all the sáhu, saddha to the bhágavánt arahánt. Then follow the incomprehensible separate aksharas etc., mentioned on page 462. The actual conclusion is formed by the statement concerning the extent of the whole book (4504 súkha): chattári sahassámi páñcha sayámi tahéva chattári i chattári (again !) súkha vía mahánísahamí pácchána m1

The mahánísah is indisputably much younger than the niśtha, and is almost six times its size. It is noteworthy that this sútra, just as the fourth chihélas, according to its own statements (see above and pp. 456, 458. 461) receives suyakkhañhadha, suyakdhañhadha as an addition to its name. This is a title that is used in the case of the angás for larger divisions of an ánga. But in the case of angás 3—5, 7—10, up. 8—12 the expression also holds good for the whole and not merely a part. There is no commentary, as in the case of the niśha, with the exception of the chúrní. See above, p. 445, for the origin of the gachháyárañ from the mahánísah.

FOLKTALES OF HINDUSTAN.

BY WILLIAM CROOKE, C.S.

No. 1. — The Prince and his faithful friend, the son of the Wazir.3

There was once a king who had a son, and his wazir also had a son. Both were of the same age and were great friends. One day both of them planned to go and see their wives. So they went and told their fathers. Their fathers objected to their going, but they would not be dissuaded, and secretly mounted their horses and went off. The king's son first reached his father-in-law's house, where he was treated with great respect, and at night his bed was placed on the top of the roof, but the wazir's son slept below. At midnight the prince's wife got up and dressed herself in her finest clothes, put some sweets and fruit in a tray and came down the stairs2. The prince was asleep, but the wazir's son woke and watched her going out. Then he followed her, and what did he see? She went to a façir, who beat her soundly with a whip, and said: "Why are you so late?" She replied: "I was delayed because my husband

99 The words, however, occur Asu. § 48.
1 A folktale recorded from the lips of Mahtábó, an old Musalmán cook-woman of Mirápur, and literally translated.
2 There is an incident like this, in the Arabian Nights, of the Princess who loved the negro.
came to-day." The faqir answered: "Well! Go, cut off your husband's head and bring it to me. Then I will be assured that you love me." So she went, cut off her husband's head and brought it to the faqir. Then the faqir beat her again, and said: "Since you do not belong to your husband, whose are you? Go, and never come near me again." Then she took her husband's trunk and head and placed them near the wazir's son. He rose, tied them up in a cloth, put them on his horse and rode off to his wife's house. There he was treated with great respect and exactly the same events occurred. For at midnight his wife got up and went out. He took his sword, followed her and saw her go to a faqir. He asked her why she was late, and she answered that her husband had come and delayed her. On hearing this the faqir was greatly pleased, and said: "I will give you whatever you ask." She said: "I will consult my father and mother, and then say what I want." So she went and consulted them. They said: "God has given us all we want. Ask your husband: perhaps he may want something." Then she asked her husband and he replied: "My friend has had his head cut off. I wish him to be restored to life." So the lady went again to the faqir and asked him to restore her husband's friend to life.

The faqir gave her some water, and told her to instruct her husband to *sprinkle it on the head and trunk* of his friend and he *would recover*. So this was done, and when the prince's head was joined on to his trunk and the water sprinkled over him he revived, and said: "I have had a fine sleep. What time is it?" But when he looked round he said: "This is not the place where I went to sleep." Then the wazir's son told him the whole story. The prince thanked his friend, and they stayed there.

Some days afterwards they both went out to hunt, and being tired out the prince became very thirsty. The wazir's son seated him under a tree, and went to search for water. With difficulty he found a tank and brought some water. When the prince drank he said: "This water is very sweet. I want to see the place where you got it." So the wazir's son took him there. But on the way he recollected that *on the edge of the tank he had seen the image* of a very lovely woman, and he thought: "Perhaps he may want her." So he excused himself by saying the place was very dirty. But the prince insisted on going there, so the wazir's son could not help taking him there, but he tried not to take him in that particular direction. However, the prince would walk all round the place, and when he saw the image, he said: "I will never leave this till you marry me to the original of this image." The wazir's son remonstrated, but in vain. Finally, the wazir's son had to promise to search for the woman, and told the prince to sleep in a tree there until he returned. When night fell, the prince ascended a tree on the edge of the tank, and at midnight a snake came out, who had a jewel in his mouth. When he touched the water with the jewel, it all dried up; and in the middle of the tank a door appeared. Then the snake put down its jewel, and by its brilliancy the whole place was illuminated. Then the snake began to drink the dew. When morning approached he again touched the tank with the jewel and the water returned.

In the morning the prince descended from the tree. Then the prince prepared an iron trap and a rope, and again at night climbed up the tree. At midnight the snake appeared and put down his jewel under the tree, where the prince was. When he had gone a little distance, lapping up the dew, the prince put the iron trap down on the jewel, and the moment its brilliancy was obscured the snake came up in a rage, and began to beat his head with such violence against the trap, that at last he died. Then the prince came down, secured the jewel and entered the tank. The water gave way before him; so he opened the door and entered.

When he came into the first room, what did he see but a bed of silver and over it a coverlet of silver, and on it *was sleeping a silver fairy* (chandī kā ek pari). She was extremely lovely, and there were two necklaces of silver — one at her feet and the other at her head. These he took up and examined and put them down, but by mistake he placed the necklaces in the

* The word used is isaur.
* Or raby fairy (la'ī pari).
reverse order: and as he did so the fairy got up and said: "Why have you killed my master the snake, and dared to enter here?" The prince answered: "Yes, I have killed him. Had you killed him, you would have been my mistress."

Then the prince went into another room and saw a golden fairy sleeping on a golden couch. She was even lovelier than the silver fairy. Her necklaces also he dispatched and she woke. She asked him the same question and he gave the same answer.

Then the prince entered the third room and there he saw the red fairy (lil patri) asleep: and she was even lovelier than the other two. Her necklaces he also dispatched. She also awoke, asked the same question and got the same answer.

Then he went into the fourth chamber and there he saw the jewel fairy (jawdbir patri) and she was the queen of all, and it was her image which was set up at the tank. When the prince saw her loveliness he was confounded and bit his finger (dasta se ungli dabat). The fairy was greatly surprised how a human being managed to get there. So she asked him: "How did you find me out, and how did you manage to kill my master the snake, by a blast of whose breath a man will die?" So the prince told her how he had seen her image, and how the moment he saw it he had fallen in love with it. "I made a vow," said he, "that I would never leave this place until I married the woman, of whom this was the image." So he described to her the end of the snake, and she said: "We are all slaves of him who is master of the jewel," and she married the prince and they lived together.

One day the prince and the fairies went for a walk on the edge of the tank, when suddenly they saw an army approaching and retired into the tank. But as she ran in the jewel fairy dropped one of her shoes on the ground."

Now, there was a king of another land, and he had a son, who had only one eye. He had gone out hunting and by chance came to the tank and saw the fairy's shoe. He took it and went home, and threw himself on his couch and refused to eat or drink. Then his father thought he was sick and asked him what was the matter with him. So the one-eyed prince told him the story, and said: "Until I marry the owner of the shoe I will neither eat nor drink." Finally his father induced him to get up, on the promise that he would send a wise old woman to trace the fairy. So the king called all the wise women, and asked each what her powers were. The first said: "I can make a hole in the sky." The king said: "That is no use." The second said: "I can put a patch in the sky." "You are no use," said the king. The third said: "I can neither make a hole in the sky nor patch it, but if you want any particular woman I can get her by fraud and trickery." "You are the person I want, and I will reward you nobly if you bring this fairy."

So the wise woman made a flying bed (wain khoola) and came to the tank. There she stayed some days until one evening the fairies came out, and when she saw them the wise woman began to weep. Then the jewel fairy asked her what was the matter. She replied: "Why are you asking me? Don't you know me. I am your family barberess (nain). Your mother was exactly like you, but she is dead, and you never think of me, and now I am dying of hunger." The jewel fairy believed her, and in pity took her home and entertained her.

When the old woman had been there some time, one day, when the prince was asleep, she asked the fairy where his life was — whether in his heart or in something else. The fairy replied: "Formerly it was in his heart, but since he has become master of this jewel his life has come into that." Then she had to go into the other room and the old woman snatched up the jewel. She went to the jewel fairy and found her feeding her parrot Hiram. So she said to the fairy: "Let us take the parrot out for an airing." She agreed, and they went

---

* We are now embarked on a variant of Cinderella.
* Khd, always an evil sign in India.
* There is an incident like this in Old Deccan Days, Seventeen Bai's necklace held her life. [For many other instances of the life index, see Wide Awakes Series, p. 404, 5th Ed.].
outside the tank. There the flying couch was placed, and the old woman asked the fairy to sit on it. At first she objected, but finally agreed, and the old woman flew off with her, and while she was in the air threw into the sea the jewel, which contained the life of the prince. But, as it fell into the ocean, Hiraman, the parrot, was watching her.

When they reached the king's palace he was much pleased, and his one-eyed son was delighted and wanted to marry the fairy straight off. But she replied: "Take care! this old woman has stolen me by deceit from my husband, and if you say a word to me now I will burn you up into ashes. But this I will do. If any one comes to claim me within six months, I will go with him. If not I will marry you." Then she began from that day to give daily alms (nadd barit) to the poor.

When the wasir's son went to search for the woman, with whose image the prince had fallen in love he went wandering about through woods and lands and cities. One day he met a demon (alād) and they became great friends; and the demon promised to accompany him and assist him in his enterprise. Soon after they met a monkey, and him also they took as their companion. Six months all but passed and the jewel fairy was distributing alms daily, but no one appeared to rescue her, and she was forced to agree to marry the one-eyed prince. On the last day the wasir's son appeared by chance, and he came to get alms, because he had become quite destitute. When he saw the jewel fairy he took out a picture (wasir) of the lady's image and examined it. When the fairy saw him looking at the picture she took him aside, and he told her the whole story. She told him that she was married to the prince, with whom she was well pleased, and that the old woman had stolen her away by fraud. Then the wasir's son told her to prepare to escape with him, that he would arrange to burn the city and destroy the king's people that night, and that she was to keep the flying couch, on which she had been brought, ready.

Then he went to the demon and the monkey and told them that he intended to carry off the fairy. So he instructed the demon to stand at the gate and kill all that passed, and he told the monkey to go, when an hour or two of night had passed, to the shop of a confectioner (halwādi) and take a burning stick from there and set the city on fire. So he went and sat near the place where the fairy was staying, the demon took his post at the gate, and the monkey fired the city. When the people rushed to the gate in confusion the demon began to devour them. Then the wasir's son climbed up to the upper storey.

So he carried off the fairy and the old woman on the flying couch, and as they passed over the ocean the parrot Hiraman dived down and recovered the jewel; and the wasir's son dropped the wicked old woman into the sea. When they came to the tank he left the flying couch outside, and went into the underground palace. When he placed the jewel near the prince he woke and said: "I have had a good sleep." But when his glance fell on the wasir's son he was sore displeased and wanted to drive him out. But when the fairy told him how the old woman had abducted her, and how she had been recovered by the wasir's son, he embraced his friend, wept over him and thanked him.

They stayed there some days, and the prince proposed to go home. When preparations were made they came out of the tank and there saw an old woman, who was weeping with one eye and laughing with the other. The wasir's son asked who she was: and he signed to the king's son to go on ahead. Then the wasir's son asked why she was both weeping and laughing. Then she said: "I am weeping because on the road by which the prince is going there is a tree, and as he passes under it the thickest branch will fall on him and he will be crushed to death. Hence he ought to avoid this tree. Then, when he comes into a certain forest a tiger will charge out and carry off him and his horse. Hence the horses should be sent alone and the tiger will carry off one of them. Then, when he arrives at the palace the iron gate will fall on him. Hence the gate should be knocked down before he approaches it and replaced by a gate of flowers. Then, when the prince sits to eat with his father there will be a great thorn in
the first fruit he touches, which will stick in his throat and kill him, but he will escape if any one snatches the fruit from his hand and flings it away. Then the first night that he sleeps in his father’s palace a snake will come down from the ceiling and bite him and his wife, so that they will die. But if any one were to sit in the room and kill the snake when he appears, both the prince and his wife will live many days. But if you speak a word of this to them you will be turned into stone and will remain stone until the prince and princess dash their eldest son upon you; but when they fling the child at you speak not a word. But behind the palace is a tree and on this a large winged bird (garpankh) has built its nest: take some of its dung, rub it on the child and it will come to life again.”

So the wazir’s son left the old woman and went to the prince, and they all started together. On the way they came to the tree and the wazir’s son prevented the prince from approaching it. Suddenly a branch came crashing down, which would certainly have crushed him, and the prince thanked the wazir’s son for saving his life. Further on the wazir’s son kept the prince away from the horses, and lo! a tiger rushed out and carried off one of them. Again the prince thanked him for saving his life. When they approached the palace the wazir’s son asked the prince to wait a little, and he would go ahead and announce his arrival. He went ahead and removed the iron gate of the palace and replaced it with a gate of flowers. Then he invited the prince to follow him. When the prince saw a gate of flowers instead of the iron gate he was sore displeased and said: “You have caused my father great loss.” But when the gate fell down he saw that he again owed his life to his faithful friend, and promised in future to obey his advice.

His father was delighted to see him again. So, when the prince sat down to eat with his father, the wazir’s son stood on his right, and as he tried to eat the first morsel his friend knocked it out of his hand. Then the prince was wroth and called to one of his attendants to seize him. But the wazir’s son said: “First look at the morsel you were about to eat;” and lo! it was found to contain a deadly thorn. So the prince again asked his pardon.

When the prince and princess retired to their chamber the wazir’s son remained sitting outside, and when it was near midnight he took a sword and entered the room, and immediately a poisonous snake descended from the roof and approached the bed of the prince. Then the wazir’s son cut the snake in pieces, but two drops of the blood fell on the face of the fairy princess and she awoke; and as she awoke, this roused the prince, who raised a sword and would have slain the son of the wazir. But he shewed him the dead snake under the bed. So he again begged the wazir’s son to pardon him, and asked: “How did you learn about all these events?” So the wazir’s son said: “All your dangers are now passed; and you will live in safety. But do not ask me how I acquired this knowledge, or you will repent it.” But the prince said: “You shall not leave this until you explain the matter.” So the wazir’s son perforce had to tell all he learnt from the old woman: but as he went on with the story, he began to turn into stone; and when he had turned into stone as far as his breast the prince began to weep and said: “I have been very careless. Don’t go on with the story.” He replied: “What is the use of my living on in this state?” If you wish to revive me again you must dash your first child at me.” So saying he turned into stone, and the prince never ceased lamenting him until the princess had her first child. Then he threw the baby at the wazir’s son, and he became a man again, and without saying a word to any one he went off and got a piece of the dung of the large winged bird, which he rubbed on the baby, whereupon it revived and they all lived happily ever after. ⑨

⑨ [I have never read a stronger instance than this tale in support of my old arguments, that in the incidents and not in the thread of a story is to be found the true folklore tradition. Our friend Mahtab, the cook, has jumbled together, in the most interesting fashion to the ‘folklorist,’ an extraordinary number of incidents properly belonging to different classes of tales. There is not an idea in it that could not easily be found in the various Indian tales reported already in these columns, but the general thread of the story is the well-worn theme of the friend who saves the hero at the risk of his own life. — Ep.]
A NOTE ON THE TASHÔN AND BAUNGSHÉ CHINS, WITH REMARKS ON THEIR MANNERS, CUSTOMS, AND AGRICULTURE.

Races: — Beginning from the north, we have first the Kanhôs or Kantôn-Kanhôs, who inhabit the hills immediately south of Manipur.

South and south-east of these come the Siyins and Sagylaingas, while farther south lies the great Tashôn country, lying in the hills drained by the Nankaê River south of Manipur and extending to the Tyaus, the north-eastern tributary of the Koladain; farther south lies the Baungshé country inhabited by the Hákkas, Tantliangs, and Yôkwâ tribes, and containing, besides these, many independent villages stretching down to 22° 10' of latitude.

My work has lain entirely in the Tashôn and Baungshé country, and it is about these that I propose to make a few remarks.

Tashôn. — The capital of the Tashôn country is Falam, a village of about 400 houses. Here live Sonpêks, Manlôns, Kalyân, Bwômôns, Winsau, and the other Chiefs who rule the tribe. Falam is situated on the north-west face of the Eulumî range, and looks down into the Nankaê River and across its deep valley on to the steep slopes of the northern side, where many villages can be seen nesting on the hillside.

During our visit to Falam the chiefs showed the greatest reluctance to give information about their country or its resources. Moreover, they pretended to be unable to give us a list of their villages, and we had to be content with knowing their boundaries, which they said were the following:


On the South.—The Yôkwa, Hákkas, and Tantliang Tracts.

On the East.—The Myitkâ Valley and the Yômâlung, west of Minlêduang.

On the West.—The Tyaus River.

For the reasons given above, we could get little information regarding their manners and customs, but, from what we could see, it was abundantly clear that some sort of law and order prevails, and that there is considerable security for life and property. This last was evidenced by the fact that in the Karôn Laiy Valley we came upon single homesteads built here and there like farmhouses; and, except at Minkin, which is a frontier village, there was no attempt at stockades, except such as had been hastily erected near Falam for our reception.

We could also see that the authority of the chiefs, who seem to act collectively and not individually, is very much respected and feared.

The country, so far as we could see, seemed to be thickly populated, considering the enormous areas which it is necessary to cultivate in order to produce sufficient food. Indeed, I should think that, unless improved methods of agriculture are introduced, many of the Tashôn will be obliged to seek fresh fields before many years.

Nowhere in the Tashôn country did I observe any virgin forest, except small patches near the tops of high hills. Elsewhere the country is covered with small-growth trees, shrubs, and grass, which are cut down every three or four years and the land cultivated, as other clearings become exhausted through continuous cropping.

It struck me that there was a greater struggle for existence in the Tashôn than in the Baungshé country, and that this probably accounted for the greater love of order which prevails. Moreover, the people have little time to give to raiding, and it is a curious fact that there are no slaves in the Tashôn country. Altogether, to a casual observer, the Tashôn are much in advance of the other neighbouring tribes, and I have great hopes that, as their country opens up and their people begin to find that money and food can be easily obtained by labouring in Burma, we shall get them to work on our roads and other public works.

Baungshé.—The Baungshés are known as Poi to the tribes on the Bengal border. They are also called Poi by the Tashôn. The term Baungshé is a Burmese word which simply means "long turban." I could see no difference between the head-dresses of the Hákkas and the Tashôn, but to the Burmese the word Baungshé has a well-defined meaning, and does not include the Tashôn, who are known by the latter name only. I have already defined the area inhabited by the Baungshés, by which term I propose to denominate them.

Baungshé Language.—The language spoken by the Baungshés resembles that of the Tashôn in so many respects, that both appear to me to be simply dialects of the same language. Even amongst the Baungshês themselves there is some

1 Printed originally as a Government paper, by the Chief Commissioner of Burma. The notes were made by Mr. D. Ross, Political Officer in the Chin Hills.
diversity of tongue, but the differences are dialectic, and are never so great that an intelligent man from Hákà could not find his way about any part of the Baungshè country.

To the south of the Baungshè, between them and the Chinbôks, there are a number of large villages, whose inhabitants are said to speak a tongue which is not understood either by Baungshè or Chinbôks. These people dwell about the headwaters of the Myiâ, and seldom or never come down to Burma. Consequently little is known about them, but I hope it will be possible to study them soon.

Origin of the Baungshè:—To return to the Baungshè and their origin. I have been unable to meet anyone who can throw even a legendary light on their history beyond five or six generations.

This is not hard to explain, when we remember that they have no written language and no means of recording dates. The Chin has no names for the months or the days of the week, and no division of time except into the wet, cold, and hot seasons, and the changes of the moon, day and night, and morning, noon, and evening.

The headmen of Hákà, while knowing nothing of their origin, say that all the other villages of the circle are offshoots from the parent village.

Religion.—The Chins are spirit-worshippers, and offerings are made to the spirits who control their destinies. The nàts (spirits) have each a local habitation and a name. There are five altogether near Hákà, and of these the greatest of all and the most powerful is the Róng Nât, whose home is in the thick forest or the Róngtlang Peak. After the Róng Nât comes the Mwè Nât, whose favourite haunt is the neighbourhood of a large tree below Hákà village. Other minor nàts are the Hêngtân Ar’mân Nât, the Köring Nât, and the Naurai Nât.

In Hákà there is a high priest, called the Tiang Bwè, without whose presence no sacrifice may be made to the Róng Nât or the Mwè Nât. He it is who makes the incantation over the animal before it is slaughtered. In general the Róng Nât and the Mwè Nât are asked that the rains may be abundant, that sickness and pain may not come amongst the people, that they may be successful against their enemies, &c. These festivals take place at no stated times, but generally once a year. When it is decided to sacrifice to either of these spirits, the whole of the people in the Hákà circle subscribe something towards the purchase of the necessary animal, which is generally a mâiban or a pig, together with a black hen.

These are killed outside of the village and the head is cut off and roasted on the spot and is eaten by the Tiang Bwè and the people of the village. The rest of the flesh is divided into portions, one for each family, the Tiang Bwè taking two shares.

Sacrifices to the minor spirits can be made without the intervention of the Tiang Bwè. When a man decides to make a sacrifice he hangs up a bunch of green leaves at the entrance of his house, which the neighbours know to be a sign that he is offering to the spirits and, therefore, must not be disturbed.

During the day the person making the offering must not talk to any one, neither may he do any work. For sacrifices of this kind a young cock or a mole suffices.

The office of Tiang Bwè is an hereditary one in Hákà, and some peculiar privileges are attached to it. For instance, if a mâiban cow anywhere in the Hákà circle outside of the mother village gives birth to a calf, the Tiang Bwè receives a basket of millet or some other grain.

Funeral ceremonies.—The Chins bury their dead in deep graves dug inside the house enclosure. A chief is buried in a sitting posture with his chief's plume on his head and his best clothes on. In cases where a chief leaves no son his gun is buried with him. The funeral, like all other events in a Chin's life, is celebrated with feasting and drinking, tinged with a strain of mourning. If a Chin is killed by enemies, it is not considered lucky to inter his body in the village, and accordingly it is buried outside. I saw an instance of this at Yóktwa, where a new-looking grave was pointed out to us as the burial-place of a man, who a few weeks before had been shot by a patrol west of Gangò.

Laws.—Amongst the Chins certain customs have obtained the force of law, but in general they have no recognized means of enforcing these customs, except in very small matters, and the only real law is the law of might. Adultery is theoretically punishable with death, but the carrying out of the law depends on the social standing of the parties. For example, a chief's son may commit adultery with the wife of a poor man, or of a slave, and he is protected by his position and the influence of his friends. And this is the same in other cases. Theoretically men are punishable, but practically they are seldom punished. A case in point occurred in our own time. Shwèlèn, son of Chief Lwè Shán, in a drunken brawl injured one of his father's servants so badly that he died. Shwèlèn then ran away to Aibur, not to escape from justice,
but to escape from the wrath of his father, who had lost a valuable servant. In a few days the father's anger melted away and a younger brother went and called Shwelen, who was received like the prodigal son. After his return it was necessary for him to "wash his hands," to use a Chin metaphor, which consisted in slaying a bullock, of which the whole village partook, and thus the guilt was washed away.

**Chiefs.**—The Chief or Boi class is a numerous one amongst the Chins. A chief's son is also a chief, and descent from a chief is regarded with as much pride as a lofty lineage in Europe. A Chin, be he ever so dirty or poor, has only to prove his descent from a chief to be at once accorded an honourable position.

In Hâkâ there are two principal chiefs, Loó Shan and Lyen Mû; but, besides these, there are scores of others, who are related to them, and who claim a voice in the affairs of the tribe. The same may be said of all the other Chin tribes and villages, not only those which are independent, but also those which pay tribute. All the villages in the Hâkâ circle pay some tribute to the Hâkâ Chiefs, but it is very difficult to find out the exact relations which exist between them. This will be understood, when I explain that the right to levy taxes (I use this term for want of a better) is an hereditary one, and a landlord has the right to subdivide it on his decease. Owing to this subdivision, and the intermarriage of members of one family with those of another in a distant village, the Chins to get something are often curiously mixed up. One person has the right to get a pig once a year, another gets a basket of grain, another gets a quarter of any animal slaughtered, and so on.

**Agriculture.**—Agriculture is practised by the Chins in its rudest forms. The only implements used are small axes, damû, and a little hoe. The axe and damû are used for felling the jungle, and the hoe for planting the seed and for hoeing up the weeds and grass.

The principal food-grains grown by the Chins are fang or millet, fungvâi or Indian-corn, mû or Jacob's tears, bê or beans and peas, fænæng or paddy, râ or giant bean. There are ten varieties of millet, three of Indian-corn, four species of legume with many varieties, and three varieties of paddy. The food-staples are fungvâi, or fang with yams. The only fruits cultivated by the Chins are plantains, peaches, figs, oranges, and apples; but strawberries, raspberries, cherries, pears, and plums are found wild. The raspberries are quite equal to those found wild in England, but the other wild fruits are not fit to eat.

The work of the season is commenced by cutting down the jungle and hoeing up the grass and weeds. This is done in December and January, and the clearings are burnt early in March. Seed is sown early in April, when showers may be expected. Fung is the first to ripen and begins to be harvested about the middle of July. This is quickly followed by fungvâi, after which almost immediately come the peas and beans. Sweet potatoes are grown near streams and are obtained throughout the year, but the principal crop is dug in the cold weather. Pumpkins of various kinds, brinjals (aubergines), beans, and peas are the only green vegetables grown.

**Trade.**—Trade amongst the Chins may be divided into two heads, internal and external.

The internal trade is confined to exchanging propery, such as guns, knives, cattle, or grain for food or drink; but trade, as such, can hardly be said to exist.

The external trade is somewhat brisker. The articles in most demand are salt, cotton blankets, iron, silk, and gongs. These are purchased or exchanged for money, beeswax, fishing-nets, an occasional elephant's tusk, salt-petre, plantains, chillies.

The Chins have considerable herds of common cattle as well as mafa, but they show no disposition to sell them and ask extravagant prices. They are used only for slaughter purposes, the hides being eaten and the horns remaining attached to the head, which is impaled on a post outside the village. Goats are also found at most villages, but never in large numbers. These also are killed and eaten.

Fowls and eggs are largely produced and are sold freely. These, however, are articles of local trade and could not be exported at a profit.

**Population.**—I have already stated that the Tashôns were unwilling to afford information about their country, and I am therefore unable to do anything but guess at the population. It is said, but I know not with what authority, that they can collect 10,000 fighting men, which I take to mean that they have 10,000 houses, and, allowing an average of five persons to each house, we thus arrive at a total of 50,000, which I think is not an extravagant estimate.

**Hakâs.**—The Hâkâs possess about 2,500 houses which, at five persons to each house, gives them a total population of 12,500.

**Yôkwâs.**—The Yökwâs, estimated in the same way, have a population of about 3,000.
NOTES AND QUERIES.

GOOD AND BAD OMENS IN MADRAS.

If a person comes across the following when starting on a journey, or on a special errand, it is a good omen: — a married woman, a virgin, a prostitute, two Brahmans, the playing of music, any money, fruit, a light, an umbrella, any food, milk, curds, mutton, precious stones, sandalwood, rice, a cow, a bull, an elephant, a horse, a pot full of water, a pot of tādi, a black monkey, a dog, a deer, a corse, a royal eagle, any honey, fish, the recital of the Vedas.

But if he comes across any of the following, it is a bad omen: — one or three Brahmans, a widow, any fuel, smoke, a snake, a new pot, a blind man, a lame man, a pot of oil, any leather, salt, a tiger.

If a person places his head always towards the east in the sleeping posture, he will obtain wealth and health: if towards the south, a lengthening of life: if towards the west, fame: if towards the north, sickness. So a person should not lay his head to the north while sleeping.

If you dine with a friend, or relative, on Monday, Wednesday, Friday, or Saturday, it is well: if on a Tuesday, there will ensue an ill-feeling: if on a Thursday, endless enmity: if on a Sunday, hatred.

If, when you are leaving the house, your head or feet strike accidentally against the threshold, you must not go out, as it foretells that some mischief will befall you.

When the tali or the sacred jewel on a thread worn round the neck of a Brahman woman is lost, it is an omen that her husband will fall ill or be lost soon.

K. SRIKANTALIYAR.

SOCIAL CUSTOMS IN MADRAS.

When an elderly person calls on his friends or relations and expects to see their children, he should generally take with him some sweets or to be given to the children.

Upanayanam is the ceremony of investiture with the sacred thread. In this rite a mark is made on the forehead with a paste of cummin seed and sugar, which is called the upanayanam (upa = extra, nayanam = eye, or extra eye), and also the mental eye. This ceremony generally takes place before a Brahman boy attains his twelfth year. If it is delayed longer the boy is classed with the Sūdras.

Punyavāchanam are rites of purification. Literally the term means “something said on a good day,” (punya = good, vāchanam = word). The rites consist in bathing the body (vāchara) setting the principal persons upon wooden seats in the midst of assembled guests and relations, and announcing the ceremony of sudikālpan: i.e., the worship of Ganesha as the god of wisdom, who is adored in the shape of a cone made of turmeric powder and water, placed upon rice contained in a silver tray. This ceremony is performed on the twelfth day after confinement or delivery, on which day the days of pollution are said to cease. The husband, who has grown his hair from the day of conception till now, may shave when the ceremony is over.

Among the Brahmas the host and the hostess call with the family priest on their friends and relations in the place on the day previous to a marriage, generally towards the evening, and invite them to the ceremonies and to all meals during the days of the marriage celebration. In token of the invitation the priest presents them with a little holy rice or mantarākshadai. The invitation party is always accompanied with music. Among the lower castes printed invitations are distributed with pān supari by some male member of the house, told off for this duty, to the friends and relations in the place.

K. SRIKANTALIYAR.

SANSKRIT WORDS IN BURMESE.

(1) Thinjān. In the Rangoon Gazette of the 6th April, 1892, there appeared the following paragraph:—

“'At 8 hrs. 34 m. 48s. p. m. on Monday, the full moon of *Naung Tagū, 1253, (11th April, 1892,) three guns will be fired from the Post Officer's Flag Staff at Rangoon and from the
Court House at Mandalay; on account of the Burmese Thingyan (Thinjän). The new year, 1254, B. E., will begin at 0 hrs. 36 m. p.m. on Thursday, the 2nd waning of 'Naung Tagd, 1253, (14th April, 1893)."

Thinjän (th as in 'thin') means to the Burmese, the occasion on which the head of Brahma in the custody of seven female spirits, is transferred from one to another at the commencement of each new year, and has several interesting derivatives, e.g., thinjänjà and thinjän-aldjà, letting go the head; thinjänjât and thinjän-atjât, the passage of the head; thinjän-det and thinjän-al-ddet, taking up the head; and lastly thinjän-kë, the state of washing the king's head at the new year in order to wash away the sins of the people, one of the many curious Court expressions now passing into oblivion.

The word thinjän is, however, the Skr. samkrâma, the passage of a planetary body through a zodiacal sign, by which the Burmese understand the passage of the sun at the commencement of the new year, the samkrânti of the modern Hindu. The word in Burmese is spelt both sankrân and san-skrân, pronounced thinjân. The Pali word is saîkama. The Skr. derivation of thinjän is therefore clear.

(2) Thinthâgayâla = the Sanskrit Language. This word is written Sâṅkâlaya = Sâṅkâtikâ. Compare amârâ (ante, p. 94, there misprinted amârê) for amârita. The Pali word for the Sanskrit Language is Sakkata or Sâkkata. The Skr. derivation of the Burmese word is here very clear.

R. C. TEMPLE.

BOOK-NOTICE.


Uncatalogued cabinets of coins are little better than useless collections of old metal, whereas a cabinet of very modest dimensions, if provided with an adequate catalogue, may prove to be the source of much valuable historical and numismatic information. India, unfortunately, does not possess any collection of coins which can compare with the European cabinets of the first rank, and, until a very short time ago, can hardly be said to have possessed any public collection. Now, thanks to the exertions of Mr. Rodgers, Dr. Hoernle, Dr. Bidie, Mr. Edgar Thurston, Dr. Führer, and others, the patronage of the Government of India and the Local Governments, valuable public collections have been accumulated, and continue to grow, at Calcutta, Madras, Lucknow, and Lahore. I have not heard of the Bombay Government forming any cabinet of coins.

The principal public collection in India is that in the Indian Museum, Calcutta, and I understand that Mr. Rodgers is engaged in cataloguing it. Mr. Edgar Thurston has done good sound work in the issue of several little catalogues of the coins in the Madras Museum. No catalogue of the Lucknow collection has, so far as I am aware, been published. The subject of this notice is a catalogue of the coins in the Lahore Museum, compiled by Mr. C. G. Rodgers, Honorary Numismatist to the Government of India.

Before proceeding to discuss the book under review, I shall take the liberty of recording a protest against the scandalous indifference shown by the Pâñjâb Government to the encouragement of archaeological research, that is to say, to the reconstruction of the history of India prior to the Muhammadan conquest. Madras used to be open to reproach on the same account, but the Government of that Presidency is now wide awake, and is engaged in directing well-planned and well-executed measures for the recovery of the lost history of the territories under its charge. The Bombay Government has given ample proof of its intelligent interest in the past by the magnificent series of volumes of the Archæological Survey of Western India. In the North-West Provinces and Oudh, ever since the time when Sir John Strachey was Lieutenant Governor, early neglect has been atoned for by considerable, though not lavish, patronage of archæological investigations. The efforts of the Government of Bengal have not always been happily guided, but, at any rate, something has been done, and the administration is not open to the reproach of absolutely neglecting all enquiry into the history of the vast regions committed to its care. For the past thirty years the India Office and the Government of India have been most liberal in their support of archæological enquiry, and have done, I think, all that could reasonably be expected of them. It has been reserved for the Government of the Pâñjâb to earn the ignominious distinction of displaying an utter indifference to the early history of its territories, which cannot be paralleled by any other administration in India. Yet, as all readers of the Indian Antiquary well know, the Pâñjâb is to the archæologist, as it is to the statesman, by far the most interesting province of India.
Mr. Rodgers' catalogue of the coins in the Lahore Museum is apparently the only archeological publication issued under the patronage of the Punjab Government for many years past. The book is enclosed, it cannot be said that it is bound, in a flimsy paper cover which falls off at the first perusal. It is to be hoped that the authorities in the Punjab, when next they issue a book for the use of historical students, will harden their hearts, and at least venture on the expense of boards.

In Mr. Rodgers' work nineteen pages are devoted to a general introduction, including an extremely imperfect bibliography, one hundred and forty-nine pages to the main catalogue, thirty-one pages to a supplementary catalogue of coins recently acquired by the Museum, and four pages to Pahlavi coin inscriptions, with transliterations, and a plate of monogrammatic emblems.

It is a great thing to have a printed catalogue of the Lahore cabinet at all, and I fully appreciate the difficulties of the compiler’s task, and the abundant labour and learning which he has expended upon it. Yet it is impossible for any reviewer not to regret the chaotic arrangement of the work, and the neglect of the small details which make perfection. It is confusing to find the early Buddhist Kuminda coins and the Yaudiya pieces (page 23) inserted between the Guptas and the Khalifas, the Indo-Scythian coins with Hindi legends (page 52) placed at the end of the series of the coins of the Sultans of Delhi, and followed by a class dubbed ‘Miscellaneous Old Indian Coins,’ which includes pieces of the Indo-Scythian, Gupta, and medieval periods. Many other instances of eccentric arrangement might be quoted.

Inattention to minor details is shown in a multitude of misprints, in the neglect to distinguish Indian from Bactrian Pali (Kharoshtri) in the table of inscriptions, and in various other ways. The book is printed in such a manner that much space is wasted.

So much for fault finding. I now turn to the pleasanter task of pointing out some of the items of interest to be found in the book.

Mr. Rodgers, in his Introduction, notices sundry desiderata in Indian numismatics, and it may be some practical use to call the attention of readers of the Indian Antiquary to the enormous amount of special work, which is required before it can be said that anything like a general account of the coinages of Northern India becomes possible. Mr. Rodgers remarks how necessary is a Coin Manual for India, which should, in one volume, show how much is known at the present day on the subject. That one volume would, I fear, have to be a terribly thick one, and many and grievous would be the gaps in its contents.

It is odd (page v.) that the Lahore Museum should not contain a single specimen of the Mitra Dynasty, generally identified with the Puranic Sungas. Many of the coins of these princes have been described by Messrs. Rivett-Carnac and Carliyse, but a monograph on the subject is wanted.

"The numismatics of Kashmir are full of anomalies (p. vii)." This puzzling subject was long ago treated by Sir A. Cunningham, but there is plenty of room for a more exhaustive treatise on it.

"Much work remains to be done to the coins of Jaunpore. The various types are, as yet, but imperfectly known." At present the brief notice in Thomas' Chronicles is the standard account.

The coinages of the local dynasties, such as those of Malwa and Kangra, all require further elucidation.

"The neighbouring (i.e., to Kangra) state of Chamba also had a coinage of its own. The coins were of copper only, and the characters on them were a kind of Hill Saka and Thakuri. On some of the coins are the Raja's name, and that of one of the gods of Chamba. They have never been written about."¹ (p. xiii.) Ten of these coins are catalogued (p. 121).

Pages xii to xv of the Introduction contain some valuable observations on the coins of the Mughal Emperors, which, as is truly observed, "form an immense series.” Nothing approaching a comprehensive account of this immense series exists, and perhaps the most pressing need of the Indian numismatist is that of a fairly complete description of the Mughal coinages, from the time of Bahar to that of Bahadur Shâh II., a period of a little more than three centuries. An absolutely complete catalogue is out of the question, because the number of varieties is almost infinite, but the compilation

¹ [The States and petty principalities of Patiala, Nabhâ, Jind, Mâlîr-Kotâl, Kaithal, Kapurthala, Bahawalpur, Ambâla and Jagâkhâl all had coinages of their own, and, so I am told, had many others besides; George Thomas of Hisâr, for example. Since I wrote my paper on the subject, ante, Vol. XVIII. p. 321 &f, I spent a day or so in Patiala, and picked up gold, silver and copper specimens of some of these mintages new to me, and so far as I know, not even suspected to exist by numismatists. — Ed.]
of a sufficiently satisfactory treatise is quite possible, though the task would be far from easy, and it might be difficult to find a publisher.

The absence, throughout the greater part of Mr. Rodgers' catalogue, of references to published catalogues of particular series renders it extremely troublesome to discover whether the Lahore collection contains any remarkable novelties or not, and, as regards most of the coinages, I cannot attempt to examine the collection in detail.

In a recent paper I ventured to doubt the rather hesitating assertion of Mr. Thomas that coins exist bearing the names both of Pritthiví Rája and of his conqueror Muhammad bin Sám. But the billon coin described at page 35 sets my doubts at rest. The description is as follows:

"Billon:—one specimen, very rare, 48 [sects. grains]. Obv. Horseman. श्री पृथ्वीराज बल. 'Sri Pritthiví Rája Dévá.' Thos. p. 18, no. 15. Rev. Bull, श्री महम्मद साम, 'Sri Muhammad Sám.'"

Pandit Ratan Nāriyān of Dehli also possessed a specimen of this rare type. It is entered as unique in the privately printed catalogue of his collection.

The confused arrangement of the book under review must be my apology for referring next to coins of earlier date.

Nos. 5-8. described at page 53, are coins of the Gupta period, or possibly a little later. No. 5, the only one at all distinct, is thus described by Mr. Rodgers:

"Wt. 118.2. Diameter 75. Obv. King in armour, standing to right, left hand grasps staff, right hand is making an offering at an altar. Above right arm is a trisālī with fillet. Under left arm Pasaana or Pasata, letters one above the other as on Gupta coins. To right (?) indefinite. Rev. Female seated on throne, holds cornucopia in left hand, and in right a wreath, as on Gupta coins. To left a monogram not well defined."

I am indebted to Mr. Rodgers for inspection of another specimen of this class. The metal seemed to me to be brass (possibly very impure gold) and the obverse legend clearly to be Pasata. The legend outside the spear (staff) was illegible, and the reverse was without legend. I cannot assign these coins.

A copper coin of Toramāṇa is catalogued on page 54. "Obv. Seated figure to right (वर्त्थ). Rev. Standing figure to left, श्री ति ...." Coins of this type are said to be common. Mr. Rodgers seems to have overlooked the paper by Mr. Fleet on "The Coins and History of Toramāṇa," ante, Vol. XVIII, pp. 225-230.

Like so many branches of Indian numismatics, the coinages of Toramāṇa and Mihrakulka require further examination. Mr. Rodgers catalogues a few specimens of Mihrakulka's copper coinage at page 141, but characteristically omits the king's name from his index.

In his notice of 54 specimens of punch-marked coins (page 110) Mr. Rodgers makes the odd observation that "no paper that I am aware of has ever been written on these punch-marked coins." A good deal has been written on the subject.

The description of a few specimens of the well-known Varāha coins, (p. 112) ignores the demonstration by Dr. Hultzsch that they were struck by King Bhoja of Kanauj in the latter part of the ninth century A.D. (Epigraphia Indica, Vol. I, p. 155, note.)

The Supplement contains some novelties, thus:

Two small silver coins of 'Ali, an early Governor of Sindh (page 6) are stated to be "now published for the first time."

On pages 8 and 9 several new coins of the Sultāns of Ghazni are described.

An unpublished variety of the coins of Razia (Rizly) is noticed on page 17.

Two of the exceedingly rare silver coins struck by Humāyūn at Kandahār are catalogued on page 26.

One of the rare zodiacal coins of Jahāngir, with the sign Taurus, is described on page 27.

V. A. SMITH.

Postscript.

Since the above review was written, I have received a copy of a most valuable little book entitled, Coins of Ancient India from the Earliest Times down to the Seventh Century, A. D., by Major-General Sir A. Cunningham, (Quaritch, 1891). This work, which is illustrated by thirteen autotype plates of coins, and a map of N.-W. India, describes the punch-marked minatages, and the coins of Taxila, Odumbara, the Kunindas, Kosambi, the Vaumbhás, Pačhála, Mathurā, Ayāḍhya, Ujain, Éran or Érakain, the Andhras, Kárvar, and Nepal. It marks a great advance in the study of Indian numismatics. I hope to have an opportunity of noticing it more at length.

14-2-92.

V. A. S.
EKAMRANATHA INSRIPTION OF GANAPATI; DATED SAKA-SAMVAT 1172.

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

THIS inscription is engraved on the north wall of the second prêkâra of the Saiva temple of 
Ekamrâthâ, the largest of the numerous temples at Kâñchipuram. It consists of 17 
Sanskrit verses in the Grantha character and professes to be an edict (jâsana, verses 1, 15, 16, 
17) of king Ganapatî, who traced his descent from the race of the Sun (verses 5 and 11) and 
whose immediate ancestors were:—

Betmaraja (v. 8).

His successor: Prôdarâja (v. 9).

" " : Rudradêva (v. 10).

The eldest of his four younger brothers: Mahâdêva (v. 11).

His son: Gañapatî (v. 12).

Prôdarâja is said to have constructed a large tank, which he called Jagatîkèsara-têjâka 
after a surname of his (v. 9). Ganapatî claims to have defeated Simhâna and the Kâlûng â 
king, and to have the kings of Lâta (Gujarat) and Gauḍà (Bengal) for vassals (v. 14). His 
minister (achivâ) and general (sainyapâla), Samanta-Bhôja, who belonged to the race of 
Dôchi, appears to have held the appointment of governor (chakradhâra) of Kâñchî. He was 
probably a Barhîma, as he claims to be a member of the Kâyapagôtra (v. 15). By order of 
the king, he gave to the Ekamrâ temple at Kâñchî the village of Kâlîtûr (v. 16). The date 
of the grant was Tuesday, the eleventh tilki of the dark fortnight of Jyaistha of Saka 1172 (in 
words), the cyclic year Sauhay (v. 17). According to Mr. Sewell’s South-Indian Chronological 
Tables, the corresponding European date is Tuesday, the 8th June, 1249 A.D.

The dynasty to which Gañapatî belonged, is not named in the inscription. But the 
names of two of his predecessors, Prôdarâja and Rudradêva, are identical with two kings of 
the Kâkatiya dynasty of Worangal, Prôla and his son Rudradêva, who are known from the 
Anumakôja inscription of Saka 1084. This close agreement and the mention of Gañapatî as 
one of the Worangal kings in unpublished inscriptions and local records leave no doubt that 
the two pairs of names are identical, that the Gañapatî of the subjoined inscription was the 
nephew of Rudradêva of Worangal, and that, at the time of his reign, Kâñchî was included in 
the territories of the Kâkatiya kings. According to the Anumakôja inscription, Prôla’s 
father was called Tribhuvaranamalla, while the subjoined inscription mentions Betmaraja 
as the immediate predecessor of Prôdarâja. It follows from these two statements that 
Betmaraja was the real name of the father and predecessor of Prôdarâja, and that Tribhu-
varanamalla was a biruda of his. Thus a combination of both inscriptions furnishes the 
following short genealogy of the Kâkatiyas of Worangal:

1. Betmaraja, surnamed Tribhuvaranamalla, of the race of the Sun.

2. Prôdarâja or Prôla, surnamed Jagatîkèsarin.

3. Rudradêva

(Saka 1084).


5. Gañapatî?

(Saka 1172).

---

1 Kâlîtûr is now a large village, after which the next railway station south of Chingleput is called.
2 Thus the word is spelled in the Prêchpurâdrâja, Anumakôja inscription has the forms Kâkatiya and Kâkatiya.
3 This name is spelled Orakkallu in Brown’s Telugu Dictionary. In a Telugu chronicle (Mudra Saras Journal for 1831, 
p. 238) we find the form Orakkallu, ‘Single Rock,’ which tallies with the Sanskrit name Êla; see below, note 12.
4 Published by Dr. Fleet, ante, Vol XI. pp. 9 ff.
5 Mr. Sewell’s Lists of Antiquities, Vol. II. pp. 114 ff. and 172 ff.
6 Prôla or prêla is a title borne by the Sanskrit prêlaka; see Brown, a. e. prêla.
7 According to local records, Gañapatî was the son of Rudradêva and nephew of Mahâdêva; see Wilson’s Mackenzie 
Collection, p. 27, and Taylor’s Catalogue, Vol. III. p. 488. An unpublished inscription, which is quoted by Sir W. 
Eliot, Coins of Southern India, p. 83, agrees with the Ekamrâthâ inscription.
The Siṃḥaṇa who is reported to have been afraid of Gaṇapati (v. 14), was probably the Yādava king Siṃghaṇa II. of Dēvagiri (Danastābād), who reigned from Saka 1131 to 1169, and who, in his turn, calls himself "the uprooter of the water-lily which was the head of the king of Teluṅga."18 In the Paithana grant of the Yādava king Rāmaḥanda,9 Siṃghaṇa II. is said to have overthrown the Andhra king. The predecessor of Siṃghaṇa II., Jaitugi I. (Saka 1113 to 1133), is said to have slain the king of Trikaliṅga in battle and to have seized the whole of his kingdom. Further "(this) ocean of compassion fetched Gaṇapati, the speech of whose mouth was sweet, from the prison-house and made (him) lord of (his) country." Accordingly, Gaṇapati was a contemporary of both Jaitugi I. and Siṃghaṇa II. The king of Trikaliṅga, who was defeated and killed by Jaitugi I., may have been either Gaṇapati's father Mahādeva or his uncle Rudrādeva.10 The words of the Paithana grant leave it doubtful if Gaṇapati, before he was installed on the throne by Jaitugi I., had been kept imprisoned by this king, or by his own father Mahādeva, or by his uncle Rudrādeva. A still earlier synchronism between the Kākatiyas and Yādavas appears to be contained in the Anumakoṇḍa inscription, which states that Rudrādeva defeated one Mailigīḍēva. This may have been the Yādava king Mailigūj, who, according to the Paithana grant, was the predecessor of Bhilama (Saka 1109 to 1113).

Some additional information on the Kākatiya dynasty may be gathered from the Pratāparudrāyadōḥbhāṣaṇa or Pratāparudrīya, a treatise on Alāṃkāra. The author of this work, Vidyāmātha, must have been a contemporary of Pratāparuḍra, as he illustrates the rules of Sanskrit composition almost exclusively by verses in praise of that king. For the subjoined extracts I am using an edition in Telugu characters, printed at Madras in 1888 with the commentary of Kumāravasvāmi-Sūmapithin, the son of the well-known Kākala-Mallināthasūri and younger brother of Peddayārī. The Kākatiya11 king Pratāparuḍra resided at Ekāśiṇanagara,12 the capital of the Andhra or Trilṅga country. The second of these Sanskrit names of the Telugu country is supposed to owe its origin to three famous liṅgas of Śiva13 at Śrīkalā,14 Kāḷēśvarā15 and Drākshārāma.16 The hermitage of Hīḍīmba (Hīḍīmbāśrāma, p. 130, or Hīḍīmblāya, p. 131) must be looked for in the neighbourhood of Worangal. Anumakoṇḍa, the former capital of the Kākatiyas,17 is referred to by its Sanskrit name Hanumadaschala "the hill of Hanumata" (p. 109). The crest (mudrā) of Pratāparuḍra was the figure of a boar18 (ravaḍa, pp. 35 and 119, or kṛiḍa, pp. 203 and 3:7). The name of his mother was Mummāḷamba (p. 12).

Further details about the king and two of his predecessors are given in a panegyric drama, which forms the third chapter of the Pratāparudrīya. The father of Pratāparuḍra

---

8 Dr. Fleet's Kanaraṇa Dvīpotsaṇī, p. 72.
9 Published by Dr. Fleet, ante, Vol. XIV. pp. 314 ff.
10 Taylor, l. c. states that "Gaṇapati, making war against the Dēvagiri ruler, who had killed his uncle Mahādeva, conquered that chief, and took his daughter, named Rudrāmadēvi, to be his wife." But see Dr. Bhundarkar's Early History of the Dekkha, p. 82.
11 As noticed by Dr. Burnell (Tanjore Catalogue, p. 53 f.), the commentary (p. 7) derives this word from Kākati, a name of Durgā: — काकतिनीम् दुर्गी शिरशिवलिङ्गावलम्बिताः कुलदेवस्त: सा शिवलिङ्गावलम्बिताः काकतिनी।
12 Ēkaśiṇa is the Sanskrit equivalent of Oragallu, on which see p. 167, note 3. The form Ēkaśalā (ante, Vol. XI. p. 12) does not occur in the Pratāparudrīya and is probably due to a mistake.
13 Page 145: — नेवर्ति दीनरावीर यति गर्भी नामात्य नेवरक्षिताय येषाय काकतिरामाराजस्मिनै: अस्लावसहीलां कृतयः । ने देवा: परस्यसहनमुः: भविष्णुकर्ति: सर्वाराजस्मिनै: केत्तिन हस्त्यन्ति ज्ञातवः ॥
14 In the Karoolī district.
15 The temple at Kāḷēśvarī in the North Aroor district.
16 In the Gidāvārī district. The commentary notices the form Drākshārāma, which does really occur in an inscription of Vira-Chōda (ante, Vol. XIX. p. 424), and quotes the following derivation of it from the Śrīkalā: — रक्षास: स्वाहाराजस्मिनै: स्वाहाराजस्मिनैः।
17 ante, Vol. XI. p. 9 f. The original form of this Telugu name seems to be Hanumatskoṇḍa, 'the hill of Hanumata.'
18 This crest is alluded to in verse 13 of the subjoined inscription.
was Mahādeva(?);¹⁹ but his immediate predecessor was the daughter of Gaṇapati (pp. 132 and 136) by Sōma.²⁰ Her father Gaṇapati,²¹ who appears to have been without male issue, had called her his “son” and conferred on her the male name “Rudra” (p. 102). At his death she seems to have succeeded him on the throne. In the text of the drama she is always styled “the king” (rāja) and once (p. 123) Mahārāja-Rudra,²² while the commentary (pp. 101 and 104) calls her Rudrāmba. At the command of the god Svayaṁbhū (Śiva) she adopted her daughter’s son Pratāparudra and appointed him as her successor.²³ Thus the Pratāparudrīya furnishes the following pedigree:


2. Rudrāmba.

3. Mummaḍambā.

3. Pratāparudra.

The local records further suggest that No. 1. Gaṇapati is identical with No. 5. Gaṇapati of the pedigree derived from inscriptions (p. 197, above). Accordingly, Rudrāmba will be No. 6 and Pratāparudra No. 7 in the list of the Kākatiya dynasty. The only event of Gaṇapati’s reign, which is alluded to in the Pratāparudrīya, is, that he founded a Śaiva shrine called Gaṇapēvara (p. 143). Both Rudrāmba (p. 101) and Pratāparudra (p. 42) had the biruda Chalamarťigaṇḍa. Pratāparudra is reported to have conquered a large number of distant countries on his vijarajyārā or grand tour. Repeated mention is made of the defeat of the Yādava king of Sēṇa. This king had crossed the Gautami (i.e., Gōḍāvari) river, north of which his territory must accordingly have been situated, and was put to flight by the commander of an army of Pratāparudra.²⁴ Among the kings of an early branch of the Yādava race, which was settled in the Nāsik district, we find three times the name Sēṇačandra.²⁵ The first Sēṇačandra founded Sēṇapura at, i.e., transferred his capital to, Sindinagara or Sindinēra, the modern Sinnar in the Nāsik district.²⁶ Later on, the term Sēṇačandra was employed as the designation of the territories of the Yādava of Dēvagiri. For, in Hāmāḍi’s account of the reign of Mahādeva (Śaka 1182 to 1193), Dēvagiri is said to be included in the country called Sēṇa;²⁷ and in the Paithan grant of Rāmacandra (Śaka 1193 to 1230), it is stated that the granted village belonged to the country of Sēṇa and was situated on the northern bank of the Gōḍāvari.²⁸ This country of Sēṇa is evidently identical with the country of

¹⁹ This statement rests on the commentator’s explanation of a verse (p. 91) which, in my opinion, rather refers to king Gaṇapati than to Pratāparudra. The local records call Pratāparudra’s father Vīrabhadra.

²⁰ Page 102 : - Sōma is the Śaiva Śīva, the śakti has no name, i.e., Śiva [read Śiva].

²¹ According to the local records, she was not the daughter, but the widow of Gaṇapati.

²² Thus the coins of queen Līlāvati of Ceylon bear the legend Śriājñāsārvabha, and those of queen Raṣṭha of Delhi bear the title "Śrī śambhuḥpadati."²¹

²³ On page 104, Śiva addresses the queen thus:—

"Sārurām jñānaśekhara śaṅkarākṣaśa Śrī Śambhuḥpadati. Ahiṁśikārakha śaṅkaraśa Śrī Śambhuḥpadati."²³

The commentator explains āhāraḥ by āhāraḥ.

²⁴ Page 156 : - Re Śrī Śiva Śambhuḥpadati, Gōḍaśī Śrī Śambhuḥpadati.²⁴

²⁵ Page 291 : - Śrī Śiva Śambhuḥpadati, Gōḍaśī Śrī Śambhuḥpadati.²⁵

²⁶ Dr. Bhandarkar’s “Early History of the Dekkan,” p. 87.

²⁷ Page 291 : - Śrī Śiva Śambhuḥpadati, Gōḍaśī Śrī Śambhuḥpadati.²⁷

²⁸ The commentator explains āhāraḥ by āhāraḥ.

²⁹ ante, Vol. XII. p. 129.


³¹ ante, Vol. XIV. p. 315.
Savana,20 which, according to the Pratapaditya, was situated north of the Godavari and ruled over by a Yadava king. As Pratapaditya reigned from A.D. 1295 to 1328,20 his Yadava antagonist must have been Rameshvara, the last independent king of Devagiri. As suggested by Dr. Bhadra,21 the name Sengadea is perhaps preserved in the modern term Khandeś.

The only inscription of Pratapaditya, of which I have a copy at hand, is a fragment discovered by my First Assistant, Mr. V. Venkayya, on the west wall of the second prakāra of the Jambukāsva temple near Trichinopoly. It is written in the Grantha character, but in the Telugu language. Of the two first lines only the following words are preserved:—

1. [Madhu]prakāsarathavatāra hiranyahara[.]22
2. [Ga]pu prakāsarathavatāra hiranyahara[.]22

TEXT.

1. 22 सति स्वरुपा। [[*]] अतन्तिगगतत्वाय नित्यजयसारमयोऽस्मि। [[*]] सन्तुविष्मिति नित्यजयसारमयोऽस्मि।
2. सहस्यसारमयोऽस्मि। [[*]] अग्निस्वरुपाियसारमयोऽस्मि।
3. वर्तमानसारमयोऽस्मि। [[*]] बद्धविष्मिति नित्यजयसारमयोऽस्मि।
4. वर्तमानसारमयोऽस्मि। [[*]] बद्धविष्मिति नित्यजयसारमयोऽस्मि।
5. वर्तमानसारमयोऽस्मि। [[*]] बद्धविष्मिति नित्यजयसारमयोऽस्मि।
6. वर्तमानसारमयोऽस्मि। [[*]] बद्धविष्मिति नित्यजयसारमयोऽस्मि।
7. वर्तमानसारमयोऽस्मि। [[*]] बद्धविष्मिति नित्यजयसारमयोऽस्मि।
8. वर्तमानसारमयोऽस्मि। [[*]] बद्धविष्मिति नित्यजयसारमयोऽस्मि।
9. वर्तमानसारमयोऽस्मि। [[*]] बद्धविष्मिति नित्यजयसारमयोऽस्मि।
10. वर्तमानसारमयोऽस्मि। [[*]] बद्धविष्मिति नित्य�यसारमयोऽस्मि।

20 A further reference to a king of Sêvana is found in Dr. Fleet’s Kanaresse Dynasties, p. 68. — An inscription of (the Hoppa king) Narasingha II. gives a graphic account of a battle between his father (Ballir II) and a certain Sêvana or Sêvuna, whom he besieged and defeated at Soratur near Gadag, and pursued from there up to the Kripa-pawraga, where he slew him, and who was probably the commander-in-chief of Jaiugri’s army.” Malinishta-Olejy, the commander-in-chief of king Bukka of Vajrayana, claims to be the commander of the Sêvana army (Sêvana-deta) and of other armies.—See Mr. Rice’s Mysore Inscriptions, pp. 2 and 5; I am quoting from impressions of these two inscriptions, the originals of which are in the Samball-Siddahvara temple at Chitaladrag.
21 Mr. Sewell’s List of Antiquities, Vol. II. p. 173.
23 Read ॐ जयः।
24 Read अभिन्नः।
25 The ॐ of जयः is entered below the line.
26 Read ॐ विश्वांशसूत्रस्यः।
27 The syllables लिखिते are entered over the line.
TRANSLATION.

Hail! Prosperity!

Verse 1. This (is) an edict (kāsana) of king Ganapati, which adorns the heads of (i.e. which is obeyed by) all kings, and which shall endure as long as the moon and the sun.

2. Let the power (Ganēśa) which has the face of a rutting elephant, and which has sucked the breast of (Pārvatī) the daughter of the mountain, whose milk was tasted by no other, — produce happiness!

3. Let that boar (Viṣṇu) who is the consort of (Lakshmi) that dwells in the lotus, and on whose big snout, as on a boat, the earth crosses the great ocean (at the end of) each yuga, — produce complete welfare!

4. Let that sickle of the moon on the head of Śiva, which Umā, sporting in the water of the (Gaṅga) river that adorns the head (of Śiva), touches, (exclaiming: “Here is”) a boat of pearls! — procure you everlasting bliss!

5. From the eye of (Śiva) who is the abode of the greatness (which is reached) at the end of the path that is to be known from the Śāman, Rich and Yajas (Vēdas), and who combines the power of the thirty-three crores of gods, — was produced that god (viz. the Sun), who is the friend of the lotus plant, and who dispels intensely deep darkness without and egotism within (the mind).

6. From him was born Manu, the first of kings and master of expedients, who produced (a treatise on) right conduct, which supplies a handy lamp to men who are apt to stumble on the wrong path.

7. After him, Sagara, the lord Bhaiyagāthā, Baghu, Rāma and other (kings) of his race, who were hard to be overcome by approaching dangers, ruled the earth in the course of a long period of time.

8. In this race of warriors, whose arms were respected, was born the renowned king Bṛtmarāja, whom people, when they saw him on his horse (called) Garaḍa, took for the first rider on Garaḍa (i.e. for Viṣṇu) appearing visibly.

9. Then the earth was enjoyed by king Prōḍarāja, who covered the horizon with clouds, (viz.) the rutting elephants offered (as presents) by his (conquered) enemies, and who constructed a tank (litāka) (which he called) by (his) name Jagatikāsāri (i.e. the lion of the earth), which equalled the oceans, and which accumulated the downpour of water.

---

37 The first of i of गार्ड़ा is entered below the line.
38 The syllable श्र is entered below the line.
39 Śiva is here identified with the universal soul of the Vēda philosophy.
40 Literally, ‘the limit, as it were, of expedients.’
41 The Kaḥatriyas are called bhājuja, ‘arm-born,’ because they are supposed to have been produced from Brahmā’s arm.
42 In this compound, as in Kālidāsa and other names, the final of the first member (jagatī) is shortened in accordance with Pāṇini, vi, 3, 63. The synonymous bīruda Avanisinha occurs in verse 20 of an unpublished Pallava grant from Kaśākūṭa.
10. After him, this race was adorned by Rudradēva, who put to flight exalted kings by the attack of horses which rivalled the wind in swiftness, and the proud splendour of whose feet was reflected, as by mirrors, by the multitude of the diamonds in the diadems of (prostrated) kings.

11. The first of the multitude of his younger brothers, the illustrious king Mahādeva, (was produced) from the race of the Sun, as the pārijata (tree) from the ocean. In consequence of the unequalled splendour of his fame, the fame of other kings experienced the fate of a lamp at day-light.

12. From king Mahādeva was born king Gaṇapati, (who was endowed) with the same courage, the same virtues, and the same power.

13. "The deer-marked (moon) has become bear-marked." "The blessed boar (or Vishnu) has come, because beauty (or Śrī) dwells in the lotus." "This lady has not slept with her cheeks pressed to the breast of her husband after dalliance." (Successively) experiencing curiosity, shame and grief during this morning talk of her maids, the wife of his (viz. Gaṇapati’s) enemy bends her face down and covers the two marks on her cheeks with both hands.

14. Who can boast of the courage of king Gaṇapati, at whose rise Siṁhāna lost his heart, by the attack of whose fine soldiers the Kaliṅga (king) was overthrown, and who is served by the Lāta and the Gauḍa (kings)?

15. He, who by his (the king’s) order held a province, the splendour of whose arms was famous, the foremost among generals (sanyāpāda), who, as regards eloquence (?), was the best of the smooth gems of the Tamraparṇi (river), who belonged to the renowned gōtra of the Kāsyapas, the minister of Gaṇapati, the illustrious Śāmantā-Bhūja, who, as the moon from the milk-ocean, (was produced) from the Dōchi (family), executed at Kāṇchi the edict of king Gaṇapati, (which shall last) to the end of the kalpa.

16. By presenting to the god who resides in the Ēkamra (temple), in order that wealth might be deposited (in the temple) for conducting the worship with great splendour, a village which is famed on earth by the name Kajātara, and which abounds in grain, Gaṇapati’s minister, the illustrious Śāmantā-Bhūja, the moon of the milk-ocean of the Dōchi (family), executed at Kāṇchi the edict of king Gaṇapati, (which shall last) to the end of the kalpa.

17. In the Śaka year, which was measured by the famous (?) number eleven hundred, increased by seventy-two, in the Samyuga year, in the month of Yajñistha, in the dark fortnight, on the day of Hari (Vishnu), a Tuesday, at moon (?), — Gaṇapati’s minister, the illustrious Śāmantā-Bhūja, the moon of the milk-ocean of the Dōchi (family), executed at Kāṇchi the edict of king Gaṇapati, (which shall last) to the end of the kalpa.

44 This simile implies, that the last king, Rudradēva, had four younger brothers, and that Mahādeva was the eldest of these. In the Anarākha (i. 1, 55), the pārijata tree takes the second place among the five celestial trees.

45 As suggested to me by Papit Rājabālābāha of Chikka-Ballāpura, the maid allude by the words ‘moon’ and ‘lotus’ to the face of their captive mistrees, on which a bear, the crest of king Gaṇapati, was painted. She experiences curiosity and shame, because she does not immediately catch the allusion, but takes the two first remarks of her maids in their literal sense. The third remark, which clearly refers to the painted figure on her cheeks, undecided her and reminds her of her past happiness and present misery. With the opening words of verse 13, अहकरोद्धरिन्, compare page 35 of the Pratipārāṣa: —

46 The smooth gems of the Tamraparṇi are the pearls, for which this river is celebrated. The epithet may also imply that Śāmantā-Bhūja was born on the banks of that river.

47 Literally, ‘Śiva’s hundred.’ Śiva is synonymous with Rudra, which, since there are eleven Rudras, is used as a numerical word for ‘eleven.’

48 i.e. the eleventh titthi, which is sacred to Vishnu.
CHAPTER V.

THE LANGUAGE OF THE EDICTS, AND THE LINGUISTIC HISTORY OF INDIA.

It is not sufficient to consider the language of Piyadasi as an isolated subject. His monuments form only the first link in the chain of Indian epigraphical documents. The facts which they reveal cannot fail to throw light on the period following; and our conclusions, if they are correct, cannot fail to find a more or less direct verification in later facts. It is this order of ideas which I propose to consider in this concluding chapter.

PART I.

THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE INSCRIPTIONS.

The most urgent task is to establish, as exactly as possible, the chronological classification of the monuments with which we have now to deal. I do not propose to examine once more in detail the thorny problems which the chronology of India presents for the period which extends from Ashoka to the kings of Valabhi; still less do I propose to bring forward here any original system of my own. These questions have been studied by such good judges, and have been replied to in so many different ways, that little room is left for new theories. I believe that the true solutions have been already indicated, and I intend simply to group dispersed elements together, and to connect them into a coherent whole, both by the consistency with which the principal dates fit into each other in one uninterrupted chain, and by the support lent to them by accessory considerations and coincidences.

Amongst the works which have thrown most light on a very obscure subject, Prof. Oldenberg’s essay, Ueber die Datierung der ältesten indischen Münz- und Inschriftenreihen, certainly holds the first place. It is, I believe, sufficient to combine his conclusions with certain results obtained by the labours of Messrs. Bühler, Bhagwanlal Indrajit, Bhandarkar, and Fleet, I only mention the most recent publications, to obtain a chronological series, the main points of which appear to be firmly established.

With Prof. Oldenberg, I consider that the Saka era starts from the coronation of Kaniska, and that it is in this era that the inscriptions of this king and of his Indo-Scythian successors are dated. With him, I consider that the era of the Guptas, which was also adopted by the kings of Valabhi, should be calculated, in accordance with the evidence of Alberün, from the year 319 A.D., and that no sufficient reason exists for disturbing one of the rare positive traditions which we have the good fortune to possess.

This being settled, it remains to determine the chronology of the Satraps of Surāshtra and of the Andhābrhityas. Here several synchronisms come to our help.

2 Prof. Max Müller holds the same opinion, India; What it can teach us, p. 291.
3 With regard to the era of the Guptas, I would refer the reader specially to Appendix A. of Prof. Bhandarkar’s work, Early History of the Deccan. New arguments have been put forward quite recently, which have led Dr. Bühler to the same opinion (cf. Bühler, Uber eine Inschrift des Königs Dharanastra IV von Valabhi, in the Sitzungsber. der Wiener Akademie, 1885, pp. 13 and ff. of the reprint). [Since the above was published the admirable researches of Mr. Fleet, contained in the 3rd volume of the Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum, have put an end to all debate regarding the era of the Guptas. It has not been necessary for me to modify my original text in consequence, for it maintains the accuracy of the fact, of which Mr. Fleet has proved the certainty; but I cannot deprive myself, en passant, of the pleasure of rendering a grateful tribute to the fertile labours of this skilful epigraphist.]
An inscription of Nasik, dated the 19th year of the reign of Vasishthiputra Pulumayi, and emanating from his mother, Gotami Balasiri, refers to his father and predecessor Gotamiputra Satakarni, as the ‘destroyer of the family of the Khakharatas’ (Khakharata-vanikiranavasasadakara). We also find at Nasik a parallel series of inscriptions emanating from Usavadata, son-in-law of the ‘Satrap Nahapanama, a Khakharata king,’ and even a dedication presented by a minister, Ayama, of this prince. It is in the person of Nahapanama that Gotamiputra Satakarni must have destroyed the dynasty of the Khakharatas or Khakharatas, for the same locality has preserved for us a document, by which he exercises over it an act of sovereignty. He transfers to a community of ascetics certain lands, which come from Usavadata, probably the very son-in-law of the dispossessed sovereign.

The reader can see in an ingenious article of Dr. Bühlers, that the numismatic discoveries of Panjiti Bhagwanlal Indraji, on a comparison with epigraphic data, allow us to reconstitute the following series of sovereigns in the dynasty of the Andhrabhrittas.

Gotamiputra Satakarni, who reigned at least 24 years.
Pulumayi Vasishthiputra, who reigned at least 24 years.
Madhariputra Sirisena, who reigned at least 8 years.
Vasishthiputra Chaturapana Satakarni, who reigned at least 13 years.
Siriyana Gotamiputra Satakarni, who reigned at least 16 years.

It is not certain, but it is at least probable, that the succession was immediate between the second, third, and fourth of these princes.

Rudradamae, the Satrap king, in the celebrated inscription of Girnar, tells us how he twice conquered Satakarni, the king of the Dekhan; he only spared him from total destruction by reason of their close relationship. Now, an inscription of Kaçhori has preserved the memory of a queen, daughter of a Kshatrapa king, whose name was composed of two syllables commencing with ru, and wife of the king Vasishthiputra Satakarni. Whether the Rudrakarni, father of the queen was, as appears very likely, or was not, the Rudrakarni of Girnar, it remains almost certain that the Satakarni of whom that prince was the contemporary and conqueror is one of the two last princes named in the foregoing table. Fortified by palaeographical coincidences which tend to confirm the likelihood, which in itself is very strong, of these facts, we can hold it for proved that Rudradam belonged to the same time as Vasishthiputra Satakarni, or Siriyana Satakarni.

The third synchronism, together with an indirect verification of the second, gives us a valuable means for approximately fixing the dates, not only relatively but absolutely, of these persons. In a well-known passage, Ptolemy mentions Tistanes and Sire Polemaios, as sovereigns of Ujjaini and of Paithana. These two names have been long identified, the first with that of Chashana, and the second with that of Sire Pulumayi. Now Chaishana is known by the inscriptions as grandfather of Rudradama; and it is quite easy that he should have been a contemporary of Pulumayi Vasishthiputra, grandfather or great-grandfather, or at any rate third or fourth predecessor, of the Satakarni, of whom we have just seen that Rudradama was the contemporary and the conqueror. A remark of Prof. Bhandarkar contributes a still higher degree of probability to these identifications. Ptolemy tells us that, while the northern parts of the west coast were governed by Sire Polemaios, the southern parts were under the rule of Balleocurois. Now, there has been discovered at Kolhapur a series of coins, in which the name of Vithvayakura, whose identity with Balleocurois forces itself on our notice, is associated with that of Vasishthiputra and of Gotamiputra, to whom we have just been introduced.

---

* Arch. Surv. West. Ind. IV. 168.
* Indian Antiquary, 1893, pp. 272 and ff. It will be seen from what follows that I have not been able to place myself in entire accord with the learned author.
* Arch. Surv. West. Ind. V. 78.

---
The terms in which Ptolemy speaks of these sovereigns, Tiastanes, Sri Polomaios and Baleojouros, give us naturally the impression that he speaks of princes of his own time. Without any doubt this conclusion is in no way a forced one. He could, it is true, have drawn upon previous authorities, and his information regarding such distant countries was not necessarily up to date; but, until the contrary is proved, every presumption is in favour of the most simple solution, which makes the princes reign at the same epoch as that in which he wrote the geography, or a short time before. Ptolemy is credited with having composed his book a few years after 150 A.D., and we are, therefore, entitled, a priori, to consider that Chashtana and Pulumayi Vasihiputa must have been in possession of their power between about 135 and 145. This conclusion, which is admitted by several scholars, will impose itself with yet greater force upon our attention, if it is found to accord with the chronological data, which it is possible to collect directly in India. This is exactly the case.

Prof. Oldenberg has strongly insisted upon the reasons which prevent us from fixing at a later date than the commencement of the second century the era of the Kshatrapa kings of Gujarat, that is to say of the dynasty, the founder of which was, as we gather from the inscriptions, Chashtana. The arguments on the basis of which he hesitates to make it coincide with the Saka era of 78 A.D. appear to me to be less convincing. We know of a Kshatrapa coin bearing not only the date 300, but the date 310 of the Kshatrapa era; the date 83 of the Gupta era, i.e. (319 + 83 =) 402 A.D., is the earliest one of their successors in Mâlava, the Guptas, of which we have evidence, and it is hence impossible to bring down the commencement of the Kshatrapa era to a later date than 90 A.D. As it is, on the other hand, certain that the Kshatrapas were not the originators of the era which they employed, — we shall shortly see that it was also used by Nahapana, — it seems to me that the strongest probabilities lead us to conclude, with Pandits Bhagwanial and Bhandarkar, that it was the Saka era of 78 A.D., the era of Kaniska, which they adopted.

Every one is now, I believe, agreed in considering with Messrs. Oldenberg and Bhagwanial, that Nahapana was, in Gujarat, the representative of the race of the Kshaharakas, which was conquered by Gotamiputra Sâtakaqi, and which immediately preceded this dynasty of Kshatrapa Sénas, of whom Chashtana was the first representative.

It will now be sufficient to mention the dates supplied to us by certain inscriptions; and we shall see how they adjust themselves, and how happily they coincide with the presumptions to which we have come independently.

According to the Girmar inscription, Rudradaman was on the throne in the year 72 of his era, which we suggest to be the Saka era. Coins of his son Rudrasimha bear the dates 102 to 117, and it is probable that the first-mentioned ones go back to the commencement of his reign. It is, therefore, likely that the reign of his father Rudradaman could not have commenced much before the year 150 A.D., the date of the bursting of the embankment at Girmar. Every indication points to the conclusion that the reign of his father Jayadaman was short, and Chashtana, as founder of the dynasty, could only have come into power at a mature age. There is, therefore, small room for making mistakes, if we allow for these two reigns a period of 20 or 22 years. The accession to power of the Sénas would thus be placed at about the year 128 or 130 A.D.

An inscription of Junnar proves that Nahapana was still king in the year 46 of the era which he employed: the inscriptions of his son-in-law Usavadi, which are known to us, are earlier, bearing the dates 40, 41, 42. We can thus put the destruction of his power by the

13 Cf., for example, Thomas in Burgess, Arch. Surv. West. Ind. II. p. 20.
15 Ind. Ant. 1878, p. 258 al.
17 Arch. Surv. West. Ind. IV. 103.
Andhna, at about the year 48 or 50 of his era. What is that era? If, hypothetically, we suggest the era of Kanishka, the date 125 to 128 A. D. which we get, agrees so exactly with that to which we are led on the other hand as the date of the coming to power of his conqueror, that the proof seems to be decisive. I may add that, according to a restoration which Dr. Bühler\(^\text{18}\) considers as 'almost certain,' Usavadāta, the son-in-law of Nahapāna, in one of his inscriptions calls himself a Saka. It is, therefore, probable that this family of Kshaharitas held its power, as vassal satraps, from the Turukhs of the dynasty of Kanishka; and nothing could be more natural than that they should have used the era adopted by their suzerains. After them, the family of Śenās must have simply followed their official tradition, as the Valabhi kings did in later years when they succeeded the Guptas. The name of Śalivāhana by which this era came eventually to be designated, appears to be a recollection of the similar procedure by which the sovereigns of the Dékhan, on their side, appropriated the era founded in the north by the Saka king.

Another result which follows from the above is that we now find the members of the Andhna dynasty, who more immediately interest us here, placed in their chronological position. I have mentioned their names above.

If we take 126 A. D. as the date of the victory of Gotamiputra Sātakaṇi over Nahapāna, an inscription of the conqueror\(^\text{19}\) proves, on the other hand, that this event must have occurred before the 14th year of his reign, for he sends orders dated in that year to the representative of his authority at Nāsik. Various epigraphical monuments testify that he reigned at least 24 years; and we thus get the year 126 + 11, say 137 A. D., for the end of his reign, and the coming to the throne of his successor Vāsiṭhihīputa Pulumāya. The rule of this prince having lasted at least 24 years, that of Mādhāraputra Sīraśāna at least 8, and that of Vāsiṭhihīputa Sātakaṇi at least 13, we arrive, for the conclusion of this last reign, at least at the date 137 + 24 + 8 + 13 = say 182 A. D. Rudradāman, the Kshatraka, having ceased to reign before 180 A. D., it follows that it was certainly Vāsiṭhihīputa Sātakaṇi, and not his successor, who is referred to in the inscription of Gīrnar.

We see how completely all these data agree amongst themselves. The verification which is, in my opinion, the most important, consists in the complete accord which this system establishes without any effort, with the presumptions which we are entitled to draw from the mention made by Ptolemy of Chashpāna and Pulumāya. It must be, as we have seen, about the years 185 to 145 A. D. that this mention should a priori, lead us to fix the reigns of these personages, and, that too, independently of any preconceived ideas, or of any one obtained from Indian sources. On the other hand, our deductions, founded on absolutely independent calculations refer the former to the years 130 to 140 or 145, and the second to the years 187 to 161 A. D. In the face of so striking a result it appears to me difficult to avoid recognizing how artificial and how fine-drawn must be the suppositions, by which some writers have sought to weaken the induction which the text of the geographer at once suggests to us.

On the other hand, I must express my entire agreement with Dr. Bühler in the criticism to which he submits the rash attempts which have been risked to reconstitute the chronology of the period anterior to the Andhrabhṛtyas. Their contradictions, and especially the positive data which are furnished by the monuments, show how little confidence is deserved by the lists of the Purāṇas.

The more this epoch is still enveloped in obscurity, the rarer the means of marking out its historical development, the more important is it to cling with all our power to the marks which we have been able, in my opinion, to fix with confidence. I sum them up here.

1. The Saka era of 78 A. D. is the era founded by Kanishka. His monuments and those of his successors, the last of whom are lost in the obscurity which surrounds the commencement of the Gupta dynasty in 319 A. D., are dated in that era.

\(^{18}\) Arch. Sur. West. Ind. IV. 101.

\(^{19}\) Arch. Sur. West. Ind. IV. 101.
2. It is in the same era that the inscriptions and coins,—on the one hand of Nahapāna, the Kshaharata,—on the other hand of the Kṣatrapa Sānas of Gujarāt,—are dated. The monuments, known to belong to the former, relate to the years 118 to 124 A.D., and the rule of the latter dynasty extended from about the year 130 to the end of the fourth century A.D. The great inscription of Rudradāman at Girnar dates from the third quarter of the second century of our era.

3. The reigns of the five Andhrabhṛtya kings, whose names I have given above, and the order of whose succession we are enabled to determine with the aid of various monuments, from Gōtāmiputra Sātakaṇi to Siriyani Sātakaṇi, fill the greater part of the second century of our era.

These conclusions put us in a position to date several epigraphical monuments which are certainly of decisive importance for the linguistic history of India. It is desirable that we should be able to do more, and to attain to equal certainty both with regard to the preceding period which separates the inscriptions of Aśoka from those of Kanishka, and for the subsequent one. Unfortunately the elements for analogous deductions are not forthcoming, and we are, as a general rule, reduced to indications borrowed from palaeography, to which it is prudent to accord but a limited confidence. I should add that, so far as regards the principal question with which we have to deal, this uncertainty very luckily does not appear to have very serious consequences.

There is one class of monuments, the coins, concerning which I have not much to say. M. de Salle\[^{20}\] has submitted the problems connected with them to an examination at once complete and thorough. I doubt whether the main lines of his conclusions can be seriously altered by later researches. Under any circumstances, I do not believe that the uncertainties which may remain unexplained, or the errors which may require correction, are of such an extent as to compromise the deductions which philology can draw from the legends of the coins.

It would be more essential, but it is more difficult, to fix with confidence the relative dates, and the order of all the inscriptions which belong to the same period.

By the side of those which bear the names of Kanishka, Huśuksa, and Vāsudēva, whose dates, as I admit, are certainly to be referred to the Śāka era, there are others which various indications connect more or less closely with the same series, without its being proved, or even shown to be probable, that they employ the same era. I refer especially to two characteristic inscriptions in Indo-Bactrian characters, that of Taxila\[^{21}\] dated in the 78th year, and belonging to the great king Mōga, and that of Takhthi-bahi\[^{22}\] dated the year 103, and the 28th year of the reign of a king whose name is read as Gudupharas, most probably the same as the Gondophares or Yndoperhos of coins and of legend; but if this identification is admitted, and if, on the other hand, we also allow the identification, which has been proposed, of king Mōga with the king Manas of the coins, there are, from a numismatic point of view,\[^{23}\] serious difficulties to be met in fixing the epoch from which to count this year 78, so as to calculate these two dates. All that is at any rate certain is that these monuments belong approximately to the same period as those of the Tarushka kings; and the study of the former should not be separated from that of the latter.

As regards the two inscriptions of Mathura\[^{24}\] (No. 8 and No. 9 of Dowson) which are dated in the year 135, and the year 280 respectively, I see no decisive reason against referring them to the series of the Śāka era.

---

\[^{20}\] Die Nachfolger Alexanders des Grossen in Baktien und Indien. Cf., however, also Gardner and R. Peile, Coins of the Greek and Scythic kings of Bactria and India in the British Museum.

\[^{21}\] Cf. Dowson, J. R. A. S. XX. 221 and ff.


\[^{23}\] Cf. Salle, op. cit. pp. 43, 51, 137.

\[^{24}\] Cf. Dowson, J. R. A. S., N. S. V. pp. 182 and ff.
A certain number of inscriptions, though undated, contain names which enable us to determine their age with some precision. Such are the short dedications of Dasaratha, the grandson of Asoka, and the inscription of Bharhut, engraved under the rule of the Sungas. To the same category belong some texts of a higher value, — the inscriptions of Nanaghata. They are connected with the most ancient of the royal inscriptions of Nasik, that which contains the name of king Kausha (Krishna) of the family of the Sataka. The reader may be referred to a learned essay which Dr. Bühler has devoted to these inscriptions and their date. It can be seen from what precedes, that I am not able to accept the whole of his conclusions. I consider at least that these monuments belong to the beginning of the dynasty of the Andhrabhrityas or Sataka. While I admit that it would not be safe to accept the discrepant evidence of the Puranas as a solid foundation for calculating the period which elapsed between the kings of Nanaghata and the series of sovereigns who have left us at Nasik authentic documents, we should not, at the same time, too lightly discard these confused traditions. Dr. Bühler has been perhaps led to display the more severity towards them because he disagrees with the date, in my opinion too ancient, which he attributes to Gotamiputra Sataka and his successors. There remains the evidence to be deduced from paleography. Dr. Bühler calculates that this does not allow us to presume a space of more than a century between the inscription of Nanaghata and those of Gotamiputra Sataka at Nasik. Dr. Bühler’s authority in matters of this kind is too considerable to allow me to venture to dispute his opinion, and I will only confess that, if an interval of a hundred years does not appear to him improbable between the characters of Asoka and those of Nanaghata, I can scarcely understand how it can be certain that between the engravers of Nanaghata and those of Nasik, there did not elapse 200 years or even more. The truth is that, at least for this period, we have no scale of paleographical development graduated by documents which exception cannot be taken. After all, vexations as these uncertainties are, I do not undertake to reconstitute the history of the Andhrabhrityas; so far as the aim which I have in view is concerned, it is sufficient to remember that the inscriptions of Nanaghata certainly fall in the period intermediate between Asoka and Gotamiputra Sataka, and that they are, at least, a century earlier than the latter.

As for the other monuments of the period we are compelled to content ourselves with analogous, though still more valuable conclusions. It is a fortunate circumstance that however desirable it may be in many respects to fix the exact age of each text, these conclusions are in the present case sufficient for us. There are, I believe, very few instances in which we are not in a condition to assert that such or such an inscription is or is not anterior to the line of demarcation which marks the epoch of Rudradama the Kayatrapa, and his contemporary Sataka the Andhrabhritya. To the period which extends from Asoka down to these sovereigns belong the edict of Khandaqiri and the inscriptions of Ramatth, the inscription of Kanagra, as also that of Rewa, and several epigraphs both in the caves of the west coast, as well as in the ruins of Sanchi, of Bharhut, and Amravati. Taking the word in the very wide sense which I have explained above, the dates of these texts are subject to no serious doubts.

It is a matter for regret that, for the period which follows, I mean the 250 years which extend from the commencement of the 3rd to the middle of the 5th century we are still worse provided. The absence of materials is here almost complete. We shall see, when we explain the linguistic importance of this epoch, how much this is to be regretted. We are hardly entitled to include in this period the inscription of Banavasi or those of the

29 Ind. Ant. 1880, 120.
21 Cunningham, Buddhist Stupas.
22 Cunningham, the Bharhut Stupa, and Hoernle, Ind. Ant. 1881, 113, 255 ; 1882, 25 ; Hultzsch Z. D. M. G. XL p. 70.
24 Burgess and Bhagwanal, Inscript. of the Rock-cut Temples, p. 100.
Jaggayapeta Stupa, for they so closely follow the time of Siriyanga Sitakadi that they really belong to the preceding group. Towards the end of the 4th century, the series of Gupta inscriptions opens with that of Allahabad, engraved in honour of Samudragupta, and with the dedications of Udayagiri and Sañci, contemporary with his successor Chandragupta, and dated in the years 82 and 93 of that era, say 401 and 412 A. D. They are followed by the inscriptions of Skandagupta at Girnar (138 G. E., i. e., 457 A. D.), and by others more recent. From this period the series of monuments is prolonged in fairly sufficient number of specimens.

But between the commencement of the 3rd century and the first year of the 5th, I know of no inscription which has been dated with certainty. Even those the palaeographical character of which would probably place them in this interval are of great rarity. Amongst the numerous dedications of the caves of the west, there are very few which appear to belong to it.

We must put aside the most ancient monuments attributed to the dynasty of the Gaugas, for the most experienced authorities in Southern Indian Epigraphy have declared them to be apocryphal. We are thus reduced to a few documents which emanated from the kings of Vēṇgi.

The earliest in point of date would appear to be the donation of king Vijayanandivarman, which Mr. Burnell, and agreeing with him, Mr. Fleet, refer to the 4th century. Both these gentlemen refer to the same reign a donation of the 'yuvamahārāja' Vijayabuddhavarman contained in the papers of Sir W. Elliot. It has since been published by Mr. Fleet. It seems, however, that the name, which had originally led them astray, is in reality 'Vijayakhaṇḍa-varman,' and various circumstances go against the idea of a close connexion between the author of this inscription, and that of the preceding one. It is, however, none the less one of the most ancient inscriptions of the dynasty of the Pallavas, and dates either from the end of the fourth century or the beginning of the 5th. The language in which it is couched renders it a monument of the very highest interest, and I shall subsequently deal with it again. It is either contemporary with or very little earlier than the donation of Vishnuvilāpavarman, of his brother Simhavarman, and of Ativarman, which are referred to the 5th century.

---

31 Inscription of Skandagupta at Kuhwa (142) (Prinsep, I. 250), at Indore (140) (J. A. S. B. 1874, p. 333), of the column at Bhittari, belonging to a successor of Skandagupta (Prinsep, loc. cit. p. 210), of the column of Eran, under Bṛihagupta (153) (Prinsep, p. 218); the inscriptions of Tārāmaṇa at Eran and at Gwalior. With regard to the other Gupta inscriptions I may also cite here the Jain inscriptions, dated in the year 188 of the Gupta, of which Dr. Hoernle has given a transcription and a revised translation (Ind. Ant. 1884, p. 309). — It is now enough once for all to refer to the excellent Corpus of Mr. Fleet.
32 I quote, simply as examples, the plates of Garijara Dadda (158) (Dawson, J. R. A. S. N. S. I. 184 and ff.; and Fleet, Ind. Ant. 1891, pp. 81, 115); the inscription of Umeda de. The plates of Jayabhuta (Ind. Ant. 1876, pp. 169 and ff.) appear to be earlier (429), if Dr. Büllker is correct in referring them to the era of Vikramaditya, but this conjecture appears to me to be very improbable.
33 Nos. 7 — 10 of Kusa, Arch. Surv. West Ind., (IV. 85-88) seem to me to be of slightly later date. I may mention, however, No. 1 of Kaśāri, which Dr. Büllker dates in the 4th or 5th century. The inscription is both very short and obscure, but its date has, nevertheless, in our eyes, an interest, which will become clear later on.
34 I refer to the donation of king Chēra Aryanavarman dated Śaka 169, quoted by Dr. Eggington (Ind. Ant. 1874, p. 159) and published by Mr. Fleet (Ind. Ant. 1879, p. 212), and the inscription published by Mr. Rice (Ind. Ant. 1875, p. 168), and referred by him to the year 350 of our era. We should add the plates of Merkara (Ind. Ant. 1872, p. 360) for which the figures 388, calculated in the Šaka era, give the date as 466 A. D.
36 Ind. Ant. 1874, p. 175. Mr. Poulton has published a donation of Nandivarman, which he believes to belong to the same prince (Ind. Ant. 1873, p. 167). The numerous discrepancies which exist in the genealogy, in my opinion, render this suggestion inadmissible; and, if the inscription is not apocryphal, as Mr. Fleet considers (Ind. Ant. 1830, p. 101, note), it must emanate from another king of the same name, posterior to this first Nandivarman.
37 Ind. Ant. 1880, p. 102.
But, as I have already said, from this time the harvest of monuments again becomes sufficiently ample for it to be useless to undertake enumerations which would necessarily be incomplete. I lay stress neither on the plates of the earlier Kadambas, nor on those of the first Gurjaras, Dudda, or Jayabhata. They bring us down to a period too modern to affect the questions of formation and origin which alone interest us at the present moment.

These are the known dates of the monuments which enable us to put forward precise conclusions for the chronology of the linguistic history of India. The preceding summary has therefore, been indispensable. By language, or more exactly by grammar and spelling, the epigraphical types divided themselves, in the period under consideration, into two series. The two currents continually intermingle and become confused, but we are, nevertheless, compelled to follow them separately. Of the two sections which follow, the first will be devoted to Mixed Sanskrit and to classical Sanskrit, and the second to monumental Prakrit and to the literary Prakrit. I shall commence in each case by detailing the characteristic facts which are furnished by a study of the inscriptions, and shall then examine the general questions which connect themselves with it.

WEBER’S SACRED LITERATURE OF THE JAINS.

TRANSLATED BY DR. HERBERT WEIR SMYTH.

(Continued from page 185.)

XXXVII. Third ohhēdasūtraṁ, the vavahāra. We have already seen above, pp. 447, 449, that the three texts dasī, kappa and vavahāra, according to the Āvaśya, 10, 199, are connected as one group. In the arrangement found in the Āvaśya, and in that handed down in the Nandi, vavahāra is placed in the last place after dasī and kappa. This position after the kappa is also allotted to the vavahāra [469] in the penultimate verse of the bhāṣya belonging to it, and consequently in Malayagirī’s comm., where there are two statements to this effect — in the introduction and at the conclusion of the seventh udd. The same conclusion may be drawn from the compound kalpavyavahārau in schol. on Oghaniry (see p. 449), though there may be here nothing more than a mere reference to the greater brevity of the word kalpa. In the Rataśāgara (see p. 449), however, the vavahāra stands at the head of the chhēdasūtra.

We have already seen (ibid.) that kalpa as vavahāra is attributed especially to Bhadrabahu and considered as an extract from pūrva 9, 3, 29. According to Āvaśya, 2, 5, Bhadrabahu (supposing that he is here the speaker) composed at least a niyutti on it. And we have also seen (p. 446) that the text is divided into ten uddesas in agreement with the statements in Āvaśya. 16, 199. The contents consist of general regulations in reference to the penances etc., of the clergy and of disciplinary statutes concerning right and wrong — kappa, no kappa.

Each of the uddesas closes, after the fashion of aṅgas 1–3, with ti bēmi. The text is in prose and well preserved. The Prakrit bhāṣya in ārya, is found entire in Malayagiri’s very detailed commentary, which is in reality rather a commentary on the bhāṣya than on the text itself. [467] In the commencement of the very lengthy introduction we find the relation of the text to the kalpa stated as follows: kalpāḥbhāṣyaṁ abhavat prāyaścittam āktaṁ, na tu dānaprāyaścittam dānāṁ; vyavahārāṁ tu dānaprāyaścittam abhāvac chā bhūṣyate.

13 Ind. Ant. 1877, p. 22; 1878, p. 31.
15 Inscriptions of Kāri, Bühl, Ind. Ant. 1876, p. 109; of Umētā, ibid. 1878, p. 61.
16 kāpavrāhaṁ bhāṣyaṁ muktāma vṛttaraṁ avyayān.
17 uktāṁ kalpāḥbhāṣyaṁ, idāṁ vyavahārāḥbhāṣyaṁ avyayāt. 97 pūrvaṁ kalpāḥbhāṣyaṁ bhāṣyate.
18 Or according to its own schol. also in 3 khaṭhas (udd. 1, 2; 3–6; 7–10).
19 pāṭhā (see p. 435), in 2355 gr., corresponding to 182 verses of the bhāṣya. The entire commentary embraces 2512 gr. The MS. which I have before me is dated Saṅvats 1565 A.D. 1569.
udd. 1 treats of parihārāthāṇāṁ lasting 1, 2, 3 or 4 months, — 2 of the relation of two sīhantīmaṇḍus, — 3 of teacher and scholar, — 4 of the mṛā (maryādā) sāhūṣām, — 5 of the mṛā saṃjñāṭhāṇām, — 6 of mishances (also nigāhaṭṭhāṇa), — 7 of the rājādānām avagraha, — 8 of the sāthanikāvagraha, — 9 of the āhāra, — 10 of the abhiṣvagraha.

See above, p. 445, in reference to the vavahāra as source of the gachhāvāra.

XXXVIII. Fourth chhēdaśatram, the dasā or āvārasaṇā, dasās, in fuller form dasāśrūtaskandha, in 10 uddēsas (uddesapaṇāla Āvāṣya, 16, 100), of which 1 to 9 are called dasā, the eighth is called also ajhayaṇaṁ and the tenth ajjhayaṇaṁ only. In Āvāṣy. 2, 2 the speaker declares himself to be author of a dasāṇāṁ niyuttī whose author tradition (see Jacobi, 1. c. p. 12) calls Bhadrabāhu. The great antiquity of the text is proved by the fact that not only is it cited in āṅga 3, 10 under the title Āvārasaṇā, but also the names of its ten ajh. cited there are the same as those given here. See p. 272.

Each of the first seven dasās begins after the formula: sāyānaṁ mē āṣaṇaṁ! tēpaṁ [468] bhagavayaṁ āvam akkhaṇaṁ and closes with ti bēmi. After akkhayaṁ there follows another formula, which briefly says that the contents of the following section is as “tiḥreṇin bhagavantēham pannattā,” as in up. 3 (p. 388), see Abhayadēva on āṅga 3, 11 f. 288a. The doctrines in question it refers to the predecessors of the bhagavat (see also up. 10, p. 423). In the first dasā 20 asamāhīṭhānā are treated of, in the second 31 (śabālī), in the third 33 āsyaṇaṁ, in the fourth 8 gapīsampadā, in the fifth 10 chittasamāhīṭhānā, or, according to V, attasāhā (here there is a legacy of a sermon of Mahāvīra at the time of Jīyasattu, King of Vāpyaṇa, closing with 17 ślokās), in the sixth 11 uvāsagapadīṁu, in the seventh 12 bhikkhūpadīṁu. All this deals with regulations having reference to the department of the viṇaya, and treaties of the court of life and the discipline of the laity and clergy. The method of treatment is short and compact.

The eighth section is called ajjhayaṇaṁ, but in āṅga 3, 10 as in V, pājjōśaṇākappō, exceeds the first 7 dasās in its contents and in its extent. Certainly its largest portion has been inserted here at a later period. It is formed of the work called Kalpaṇa and in fact of the entire work of this name in its three parts, according to the MSS. and the Kalpaṇa Vācyāni. Jacobi (Kalpaṇa, pp. 22, 23) has already called our attention to the fact, that in reality only the last (the third) section, [469] which is called “sāmichārī, rules for yatis,” and also paryusanaṇaṁ-kalpa — cf. the title of this book in āṅga 3 and V. — belongs in this place, and that it alone could claim, together with the remaining parts of the dasās, to be ascribed to Bhadrabāhu. The closing words ti bēmi, pavyośaṇākappadāsā aṭṭhamāṇaḥ ajjhayaṇaṁ are similar to those of the other dasās and substantiates this conclusion. The contents of this section refers to the varṣāvāsa, and treats of that which thereby is kappāi and nō k. In the introduction commencing with the legendary formula — tēpaṁ kāḷṇaṁ — it is stated how Mahāvīra acted in these cases. The following portions, each of whose sentences invariably begins with a stereotyped refrain, is at the end ascribed to Mahāvīra in special legendary form likewise introduced by tēpaṁ kāḷṇaṁ. I will refer to the other parts of the Kalpaṇa below.

The ninth dasā, also called mōhāṣṭhiṇyaṭṭhāṇaṁ, has the usual legendary beginning: tēpaṁ kāḷṇaṁ, and tells of a sermon of Mahāvīra under king Kōṣaṇa of Champā in reference to the 30 (so also āṅga 3) mōhāṭṭhāṇaṁ. The portion dealing with this sermon consists of 39 ślokās, for the most part with the refrain: mahāmōhāṁ pākuvā. The conclusion is ti bēmi.

The tenth book, Āyātīṭṭhāṇaṁ² commences with the usual formula: tēpaṁ kāḷṇaṁ, and tells in great detail³ how Śeṇa [470] Bhīmahīśaṁ, king of Rāyagīha, together with his spouse

¹ Cf. Āvāṣya, 16, 17 f.
² Ājjanamāṇaḥ ājīṭṭhāṇaṁ saṃvādinaṭṭhāṇaṁ sampravādaḥ Abhayadēva on āṅga 3, 10 (290a) in the introduction.
³ It refers to up. 1.
Chellaṇā, listened to a sermon of Mahāvīra. The sight of the princely splendour turned the thoughts of the followers of Mahāvīra to worldly things, to rebuke which Mahāvīra preaches a lengthy sermon on the excellence of his doctrine, divided into 10 §§ and beginning with the same refrain. Nor does he forget to mention the rewards of those who follow his teachings. The result of this sermon was that his audience were delighted and Mahāvīra continued to preach in Rājagṛha.

The legendary excursi of the last dasā (5, 8, 9 and 10) in reference to Mahāvīra are doubtless the cause of the introduction of the Kalpasūtra, the first part of which treats especially of the life of Mahāvīra.

The Kalpasūtra was the first Jain text which was made known, in 1848, in the very faulty translation of Rev. J. Stevenson. It is now carefully edited by H. Jacobi, 1879, to whose instructive introduction I have so often referred.

We have already observed, that of the three parts of which it is composed, the last alone can claim to belong to the dasā. The two other parts were originally not connected, each of them is divided into three portions, the first of which contains the history of Mahāvīra, the second that of his 23 predecessors, the third a list of his successors, [471] Thērāvall, to Dēviddhī-khamāsamaṇa, the nominal redactor of the 45 āgama.

This Thērāvall agrees as regards each of its first twelve parts with those statements which are found in the thērāvall of the Nandī and of the Āvaśyakāsūtra, and in the later tradition of the Jainas (rīkṣiṣmāṇḍalasūtra of the Dharmaghoṣha etc.). But from this point on there is no such harmony. The list found here is the most complete, since it embraces a large number of the lateral branches proceeding from each of the patriarchs; and contains all sorts of divergences from the other lists. Jacobi distinguishes “four or five distinct treatises” (p. 23).

It is self-evident that any connection is impossible between this Thērāvall and Bhaddabāhu, the nominal author of the Kalpasūtra — see below — who appears in the seventh place in the list of patriarchs. The Thērāvall contains eleven members more (ajja Vairā, Vajrāsvāmin, as number 16) nor did it belong originally to the Kalpasūtra. This conclusion holds good also in the case of the account of the 23 predecessors of Vira which introduces it. In this account we find some few details in reference to two of Vira’s immediate predecessors, Pāsa and Ariṭṭhanāṭē, and in reference to Usabha who is placed first in the series. The other predecessors are treated of in a very few words. The relation is retrogressive, beginning with the 23rd. We find no mention that Malli (Mali in the text of Jacobi) was a woman.

The intention of collecting everything that had reference to Jainism is manifest in the addition [448] (see Stevenson, p. 99) of these two sections in reference to the successors and predecessors of Mahāvīra, to the main part of the Kalpasūtra which treated of his life.

This main portion contains towards the close (§ 148) statements mentioning the dates 980 and 993 after Vira. According to Jacobi (p. 23) it is self-evident that these dates do not “refer to the author, but to Dēvarddhīgaṇjim, the editor of the Kalpasūtra.” Tradition places Bhadrabāhu, the nominal author of the Kalpasūtra, in the year 170 after Vira (see Jacobi, p. 114). But as far as I can see, an error or confusion has brought it about that the Kalpasūtra has been ascribed to Bhadrabāhu, as tradition, e.g. the introduction to the Kalpantavacṛṣyāṇī, states. In the well attested statements (see above, p. 449) that the Kalpavayavahāra was extracted from pūrva 9, s, by Bhadrabāhu, we must not understand by “kalpa” the Kalpasūtra, but the chhēdāsūtra 5, a conclusion that may be drawn from the statements in reference to the division of the two texts kappa and vavahāra, which is found in Āvaśy. 16, 10b. The similar statement concerning the dasa-kappa-vavahāra in the Rīkṣiṣmāṇḍalasūtra (Jacobi, p. 11) is, after a consideration of this passage of the Āvaśy., not to be referred, as Jacobi refers it, to “the

---

4 "... mā dhamme pannatē, īpam ēva niggaṇṭhatē pāvanā, sa chā aputtārā paṭipunno kēvalā... (cf. Auppāt. § 55, p. 62, ed. Leumann),"
ten 'kalpas and the Vyavahāra,' but (see p. 357, 450) to the three chhēdasūtras 3—5: the dasānī, the vavahāra and the καπτα. 5

Personally I am inclined on the strength of § 148 to hold Dēvarādhigāni as the editor, and even as the [473] "author" of the chief part of the Kalpasūtra. I will even go a step-farther and assert that in reality the Kalpasūtram, or its present essential part, has no claim to this title, which is at complete variance with its contents. It has received this name after its junction with the paryushānākalpa, the eighth chapter of the dasānī. This ancient title (see p. 468) is cited in the beginning of the sandēhavishnushadhi as a collective title of the work. See Jacobi, p. 99.

The Pañcahanamāskāra, placed "keshuchid ṣadarṣeshu" at the commencement of the text, is known to us from aṅga 3 and upāṅga 4. It is followed here as in up. 4 by the passage in its praise, which is supposed to date back to Vajra (see Knp. 811), and is designed to glorify this commencement. This passage of the pañcahanam, contains the form havai — and not ḥoi as in up. 4 — which in more modern times is regarded as the only well attested form. See p. 303, §§ 1, 2, which contain the recital so obnoxious to the Digambars (see Jacobi, p. 22) — see p. 261 — that Mahāvīra first "entered the womb of (the māhāni) Dēvanandā" before he was placed (§ 21) in that of (the khattiyaṇi) Trisālā?", are borrowed outright from aṅga 1.

Jacobi, p. 23, considers the portion containing the 14 dreams (§§ 33—46), with their long, complex compounds, as a secondary addition, since it is not in harmony with the prevailing "archaic style" of the text. I should prefer to regard the solemnity of the subject as the cause of these stylistic differences. [474] Upon such occasions the aṅgas contain numerous stylistic excrescences, which, it should be remarked, occur not infrequently in other parts of the Kalpasūtra. The differences of this kind in §§ 33—46 (or does J. extend the description of the dreams farther than 46?) may therefore, I should think, be reduced to a minimum.

The historical kernel of the recital is exceedingly small. Up to § 96 (incl.) the events before the birth of Mahāvīra alone are treated of. The following §§ to 111 discuss the birth, naming, childhood of M., and his life as gīhātīlī. It is noteworthy that there is no mention of foreign nurses, as is usual in the aṅgas and upāṅgas on such occasions, nor are the 72 kalas etc. referred to. The enumeration of the Brahminical sciences in § 10 is the usual one, which we have already met with in aṅga 5. The recital as to how Mahāvīra: māgariyam paivvaē (§ 116), and of his further development up to the time of his death (§ 132) is devoid of every particle of life. There is no trace of the many legends concerning him which we find scattered here and there in the aṅgas, etc. They have not been made use of at all; hence the whole makes but a very unsavoury impression as regards any biographical information. In § 147 the mention of the 55 ajhayaṇas of the pāvaphalarāvāyāni (see p. 271) is of interest, as also that of the 36 aṇṭṭhāvāyāraṇāni, which, according to Jacobi, p. 114, are to be referred to the uttarajhayaṇaṃ.

We have in the work entitled Kalpantavāchyaṇi, a production partly in Prākrit, partly in Sanskrit, and in the mixture of the two [475]. After a self-evident introduction in reference to the ten forms of the kalpa: ṣāchēlukka (ṣāchēlavam), uḍdesia (uḍdesika piṇḍa), sijjāyara (ṣijjārdō [sayyā] vasatsīvāni), rāyapiṇḍa (presents from the king), kiikāmmē (kṛiti), vaya (vrata), jīṭhūla (jīṣṭhāvatam), pāṭikkāmaṇē, māśaṃ (māsakalpa), pāṭjāvāsakāpē (varahān chaturmāsvāsthamānāraṇapē), in reference to the pūras, out of the ninth of which the śrīkalpa of Bhadrabāhu, "adhērīta," etc., is the Kalpāntar, in loose connection with the text of the Kalpasūtra, makes the text of the latter the point of departure for the insertion of a large number of legends and other statements in prose and verse. The frequent mention of Hēmāchandraśūri and of Mānatiṇgūsāri, Malayagiri, of the Vāmanaḥ, Sarasvatīkāṭhābharanaṃ (as vākāra-

---

5 We find, however, mention made of a ten-fold division of the kalpa, e.g. in the introduction to the Kalpantavāchyaṇi. See p. 473.
6 Wife of Usabhādatta, cf. Wilson Sel. W. 1, 293 (see Bhagav. 9, 23, Laxm.).
7 Wife of Siddhattha of the Nāya race.
and Sārasvatī’s vyakaraṇa shows that it was composed at a tolerably recent date. In general it may be said that there is a large amount of citations collected here. Of especial interest is the peculiar attempt made in the introduction to prove the great age of the Jinaśāstra from supposed Vedic passages, as the two “vaśvaveda-pichau Yajurveda.” The risabha-vatram puruṣātman adharam yajnešu nagnam paramaḥ pavitraṁ śrutadharaṁ yajnapatipradhānam pītauṇja (I) pāram indraṁ āhavē ‘tī svahā, and trāṭāram indraṁ risabhaṁ vadaṁ atitāram indraṁ am arishtānim bhav 2 subhavaṁ supārvau indraṁ āhavē tu śakra ajītanā jinéindraṁ tadbhuvāmaṁ puruṣātmā indraṁ svahā, and also Vs. 31, 18, Rik 2, 89, 3 etc. all of which is cited [476] incorrectly. The detailed enumeration of the Brahminical sciences in § 10 contains much of interest (18 purāṇas, 18 suṣṭhitas, 18 vyākaraṇas). The foreign serving-women are enumerated in § 16, essentially in the regular way: — khujjāo chilāo vāmao vaḷabhi o bhabhao pāṇiāo jāoīo pahavāo śiṁlāo chārāośiṁlāo lāśiāo lāśiāo deśālāo sinhalāo abhāio (I) pāṭālāo pakkao mārumālāo bahalāo sabhāio pārasīlo jātiyo dāṣyāo. — On § 108: bhagavatō lekhaśālaśākapārāmacāhabhāo likhyatē (in Prākrit), — on § 209 a double enumeration of the 72 kalās and of the 18 lipayas — see above p. 400 — on § 211, 64 mahāmukās.

The oldest of the commentaries to which I have had access is the Saṁdēha-varshaśaḥdhīr of Jina-prabhamuni, composed in Ayodhyā A.D. 1307; at the end there is added a commentary to a pāryaśaṅkā-laninyukti. Both texts are composed in Prākrit, and the commentary is based especially on the niśśāstra. This fact recalls chap. 8 of chhēdāsātra 4.

XXXIX. Fifth chhēdāsātra, the bhrihaṅkalpa, in 6 uddēsas. Ordinances for the clergy of both sexes (nīggaṇṭha and nīggaṇṭhi) in reference to that which is proper (kappati) and that which is not (nā kappati).

The agreement in reference to the division into 6 uddēsas shows that it is our text which (p. 446 ff.) is designated in the Āvaśyā. 16, 19 in connection with dasā and vavahara and under the name of kappā simply.

[477] We shall have to recognize it under the designation of kappā, or kalpaḥvyayana, in other passages (see pp. 449, 472) where there is mention made of the extraction of kalpavahārān from ṃrīva 2, 3, 30 by Bhadrabāhu. Its designation as bhrihaṅkalpa, or vṛṇaṅkaṅkalpa is unsuitable if we regard the diminutive size of the text (only 475 gr.). The conclusion (tī benn) of udd. 4 and 6 is worthy of note.

The old bhāṣya in Prākrit āryās, belonging to this text, is designated simply as kalpaṁbhāṣya, and is an enlargement of the “kappasam niṣjutti,” which the author of the Āvaśyā, declares that he composed (2, 7). See Kielhorn (in the Report on the Search of Sanskrit MSS. 1880-81, pp. ix. x.), in reference to an old MSS. of it (Saṁvat 1218), and to its very curious use of letters of the alphabet to denote numerical notation. The commencement differs considerably from that in a palm-leaf MS. similar to this, but much younger (Saṁvat 1334), of which the Berlin Library possess a copy made on transparent paper. The commencement of the Berlin MS. — after prefixing the first 6 §§ of the text — is namo arhamānam, kūṇā namokkaraṇā tiḥṭhayaṇāṁ tiḥṭhayaṇāṁ kappavahārāṇāṁ vakkhanāvahāṇām vakkhanāvahāṇām vakkhanāvahāṇām

XL. The sixth chhēdāsātra is called paṁchakalpa in Bühler’s list; — see p. 226. I have not had access to a text of this name, which is repeatedly mentioned (see pp. 448, 449)

8 I am unable to explain the first passage, the second is manifestly Rik 6, 47, 11 (Ts. 1, 6, 12), 6: trāṭāram indraṁ avitāraṁ indraṁ āhavē pavitraṁ śrutadharaṁ yajnešu nagnam paramaḥ pavitraṁ, āhavē pavitraṁ śrutadharaṁ nagnam paramaḥ pavitraṁ āhavē nagnam paramaḥ pavitraṁ śrutadharaṁ.
9 na ca cha Jinaśāstramvaśācharā, vēḍāśtvapi tadvachanāt, tathā hi: vēḍāśtvapi jinaśāstramvaśācharā.
10 On this see Bhagvanlal Indrajī on the ancient Nāgari Numerals in the Indian Antiquary, 6, 43 fg. (1877) and Bühler, ibid. p. 47 fg.
11 In Kielhorn’s report, p. 94, there is mention made of a paṁchakalpastrīcharūpī by Āmṛadvāchārya.
both in Ávi. and V., together with a āśjakappa. According to the Vichārāṃśītasāṁgraha, the pañčchakappa is a work of Saṅghadāssavāchaka, while the jītakalpa belongs to the Jinabhadrakaṃkṣiṣṭha[478]samaṇa.12 We find in it citations from both texts. The jītakalpa is also enumerated in the Ratnasāgara, p. 507, as the sixth chhādaanūtram. Raj. L. Mitra, however (see p. 227 above), mentions it as the last of his “five Kalpasūtras.”

In lieu of commenting upon a text of the name of pañčchakalpa I will at least remind on the jītakalpa, which is mentioned together with it, that a śāddhaśūlakalpa in 141 Prākrit-gāthās actually exists. It treats of the prāyaśchitta, which suits the character of the chhādaasūtras exactly, but is referred to a definite author, Dharmaḥśwa, scholar of Deśendramunīvara. In the anonymous commentary on it it is designated as composed upanishatkalpa(l)kalpa-vyabhāra-niśthayatijātakalpaṇusāraṇa. In the commentary reference is paid to the pravachanam as sāmāyikādibindusāraparyānta, and in v. 58 erroneous doctrines and pāshaqūd are treated of in detail. Then the gītāthās (see above, pp. 437, 450, 464), to which the text refers in v. 141, are expressly expressed as śrīniśthākādīchhādgraṇātthasūtrasāradaṇā.13 From all this we may draw the conclusion that the text is closely, [479] if not directly connected with the chhādaasūtras.

We have already mentioned in reference to the mahākappas, Ávāṣyō, 8, 55, above pp. 446, 447, that the Naadī in its anaṅgāpavīthā list recognizes the existence of a mahākappasam, a chullakappasam, and a kappiyākappiam. In the scholarīst tūd. we find the following explanation: kalpākalpapratisādakam adhyayanaḥ kalpākalpam; tathā kalpaḥ sthāvirakalpadhō, tattatretāsam rūtīm kalpāsūram, tach cha dhīdhaḥ: kṣullakakalpal mahākalpal cha, tatrai 'kam alpagraṇāthān alpāthañ, dhītīñam mahāgraṇāthān mahāḥrañ cha. There is, therefore, no doubt but that these of this class existed.14

NOTES ON THE CHINBOKS, CHINBONS, AND YINDUS OF THE CHIN FRONTIER OF BURMA.1

Geography.—The Wélaung Chins inhabit the villages on the head waters of the Myitbā river. They are bounded on the north and west by Baungghē Chins, on the south by Chinbōks, and on the east by Taunggūs of the villages round Wēpō, which is distant four days' journey.

The Chinbōks live in the hills from the Mō River down to the Sochaung.2 They are bounded on the north by Wélau ng and Baungghē Chins, on the east by the Burmāns, on the west by the Arakan Yōmās, on the south by the Yindus Chins.

The Yindus inhabit the valleys of the Salinchaung and the northern end of the Mō Valley, bounded on the south by the Chinbōks,—the other boundaries being the same as those of the Chinbōks.

The Chinbōks inhabit the southern end of the Mōchaung and stretch across the Arakan Yōmās into the valley of the Pčhaung. They are bounded on the south by the Chinbōks of the Mikbu frontier, on the east by the Burmāns, on the west by the Arakanese.

History.—The Wélaung Chins are stated to be of Baungghē origin. The Chinbōks claim a similar origin. The Yindus state that their origin is similar to that of the Taunggūs, an industrious race, who inhabit the Yō and Myitbā Valleys in Burmese territory, and who claim to have come

12 See above, pp. 427, 430, where both texts are counted in with the palamas. There are there several other texts described to Jinahhadra. The passage reads: Jinahaṃ sārahāṃ kritō jītakalpaḥ, khetrasamāsāḥ, saṅgrahapti viśeṣaṇapati cha.
13 In the scholarīst Vichārāṃśītasaṁgraha the following explanation for Jīyakappa is found in citation from the Pañcakappace: jītajāyō cha paśchhitānām jāyāryaparaṇaparānyaviruddhaḥ ā jōgā ya bhuvi yo ēsā kho kalpā u; it the word Jīyam is tūd. explained as follows: Jām bahuńīm jyānteñīm āppānām tama Jīyaṁ uhitam āchitaṁ ity anarthaṁ ināyavabhāschāripunjāḥ, jītaṁ nāma prabhūteṣaṃkṛtaḥ dhāvātāḥ, tatrattrapādānāgraṇāthāḥ 'py upachārāḥ.
14 Compare also, the title of upāga 9.
1 Notes, dated the 20th April 1890, by Lieutenant B. M. Rainey, Commandant, Chin Frontier Lorry, regarding the Chin tribes bordering on the Yō Country in the Pakōkkū District, and printed originally as a Government paper by the Chief Commissioner, Burma. [The original paper is very difficult reading, owing to want of care in composition. — 8 as an in ‘awful’ throughout.—Ed.]
2 [The word chwee in such compounds means ‘stream’ or ‘river.’—Ed.]
from Pópá Hill. The Chinbóns, further south, point out a rock, which they state is the body of a min or official, who was killed in a quarrel with his brother, when they were emigrating from Pópá, and was turned into a stone. The brother returned to Pópá. The Chinbóns claim Burman origin. Further than this the Chins appear to have no history. In appearance they resemble Burmans, though some have better features.

Languages.—The four villages on the head waters of the Myitpá speak two dialects: the village of Wésaung having a dialect of its own, differing from that of the other three.

There are three distinct dialects of the Chinbó language,—the northern, spoken from the Mò to the north bank of the Ché with slight variation; the central, spoken by the south bank of Ché and the Chauksitchaung; the southern, spoken by the Kadin and Sóchaung Chins.

The Yindaus speak a language of their own; while the Chinbóns speak a language which is identical with that spoken by the Chins, who live in the Laungshé township, and to whom they are related. There is no written language.

Government.—There appears to have been no attempt at government further than an incomplete village system. Each village has a thingyi. The title is hereditary, and does not necessarily indicate a man of influence. There is generally in each group of villages some man (or perhaps two of three), who is looked up to and respected either for being a brave sportsman or raider, or for having a knowledge of Burmese, or for some special qualification. These are the men who really lead the people.

Quarrels are wiped out with blood only. There are no laws, but certain customs, which all observe.

Religion.—There is no religion further than propitiating and consulting náts or spirits. The Chinbóks appear to be perfect slaves to their náts (spirits). To propitiate náts an animal must be slaughtered; buffaloes, bullocks, mithas, goats, pigs, fowls, and dogs are chiefly used for this purpose; the three latter being more commonly used as they are so prolific. All are afterwards eaten, if the offering was sacrificed near home; but when raiding, on a journey, passing through notoriously unhealthy jungles, &c., sacrifices are frequently made, animals being carried on purpose. For this purpose dogs are preferred, as they follow and require no carriage. Náts are consulted in a similar manner, the direction in which the blood flows, &c., being one of the signs. Eggs are also used for these purposes, being blown as we blow them for egg-collections, i.e., with a hole at each end. They are afterwards painted and stuck on a stick, as also are cocks’ feathers. Rows of these sticks are frequently seen across paths.

Raids are frequently abandoned at the last moment and after travelling long distances, if the omen is unfavourable. When náts are consulted or propitiated near home, every one gets drunk off home-brewed rice-beer. Tom-toms, music, and dancing accompany the ceremonies. Náts are sometimes humbugged by the wily Chins, an example of which will be found under the heading Marriages. They do not trouble about a future world. There are no priests.

Medicine.—Medical science and surgery are unknown. No medicines are used. When a person falls sick the náts are consulted or propitiated: consulted to ascertain if the patient will recover or not; propitiated in hopes that the patient will be spared. The principal diseases are fever, bowel-complaints, skin diseases, and wounds.

Dress, Arms, Customs, &c.—The Wésaung and Kwómin Chins more closely resemble the Baungshés than the Chinbóks; but, as I have seen but little of them, I will not attempt to describe them.

The dress of all the Chinbóks from the Mò down to the Ché is much the same everywhere, though there are slight differences. Those who inhabit the Chauksit, Kadin, and Só streams wear a sort of compromise between the dress of the Chinbóks and of the Yindaus. The dress proper of a Chinbók man (see Plate A) consists of a very small lantóoffé, as worn by natives of India when wrestling, and a piece of cloth, about three feet in length and one in breadth, which is folded and hung behind, being suspended by bits of string across the shoulders. The chief object of this cloth is apparently to have something warm to sit upon when the ground is cold. The women weave the clothes, and, when new, they are generally striped red and blue.

The dress of a woman (see Plate A) consists of a garment like a short jersey without sleeves and with an open V-shaped throat; also of a small lantó, which shows about 6 inches below the jacket. These jackets are also home-made and of similar patterns to the men's garments.

4 [These have to a certain extent been reduced to writing: vide Maung Tet Pyo's Customary Law of the Chin Tribe. Rangoon, Government Press, 1884. — Ed.]
From Lieut. Rainey’s Sketches.
In the presence of strangers the women either stand or kneel. Any other position they could not with modesty or decency assume on account of their scanty skirts.

The men tie up their hair with bits of rag,—red for choice. The hair is grown long.

In the cold weather men and women wrap blankets of Burmese or European manufacture round their shoulders.

The Yindu man (see Plate B) wears a laungyauk, similar to that worn by the Chinbôks, and also a loose blouse, without sleeves and open at the throat, which reaches down to below the knees. Except in cold weather, they take their arms out of the sleeve-holes and wind the upper part of the garment round their waists. The dress of the women (see Plate B) is similar to that of the Chinbôk women, except that the Yindu women, as well as the men, wear the blouse I have described above in addition to their other garments. The Yindus also use extra wraps and blankets in the cold weather.

The dress of the more civilized Chinbôks is exactly similar to that worn by the hundreds of emigrated Chinbôks, who live in the Laungshê township, and closely resembles the dress of the Burmans. The less civilized Chinbôks, who live on the Arakan side of the Yûnis, wear what can hardly be called even an apology for clothing. It is stated that some even use the bark of trees to hide their nakedness. The Biblical fig-leaf would be more covering than was worn by some of the villagers we met.

Ornaments.—The clothing above described is supplemented by various ornaments. To begin with, the head is often decorated with coils of beads of different colours, kawryâs, &c. Brass skewers are generally stuck into the hair, and, in the case of the Yindus, are generally beautified by tassels of goat’s hair dyed red or bunches of the teeth of the hog-deer. These skewers are used for scratching their heads, which are full of lice. Sometimes bone, ivory, bamboo, or porcupine quill skewers are worn. Feathers are universally used as head decorations by the men. Sometimes only a few, generally white cock’s feathers, are stuck into the topknot, for they wear their hair like Burmans: sometimes the whole of a cock’s tail and part of the back is worn. In the latter case the bird is skinned, and the part to be worn is dried and stretched on a bamboo frame with a bamboo skewer to stick into the hair. This arrangement is worn at the back of the head and presents a peculiarly ludicrous appearance. Green parrots’ feathers are also used. Women wear skewers in their hair, but no feathers.

Necklaces are much worn by both men and women. They are made of beads of all kinds, glass marbles with holes drilled through them, white metal bands, little bells like farret-bells, cockspurs, teeth of hog-deer, cockle shells, kawryâs, coral, and stones, according to fancy.

Earrings of one pattern only are worn by men; they are plain flat rings about two inches in diameter, supposed to be made of gold, but are probably generally of brass. They can be put on or off at pleasure by pressing the ends in opposite directions. The elasticity of the metal keeps them closed under ordinary circumstances. The holes in the ears are much pulled down by the weight of these rings. The women have large holes in their ears, in which they stuff thin strips of bamboo tightly rolled up. The only women I have seen actually wearing earrings were some Chinbôk women on the Maungshaung, who wore bits of telegraph-wire about five inches long bent into an oval-shaped ring.

Bracelets of brass wire are much worn by the men, sometimes nearly the whole of the right forearm being enveloped in rows of wire. They seldom wear them on the left arm. The women do not wear brass, but a white-metal bracelet.

Wristlets to protect the left arm from the bow-string are always worn by men. Among the Chinbôks they are made of cane wicker-work laquered over; but sometimes a strip of leather is used. These wristlets are about six inches in length and are frequently ornamented with bells. The Yindus wind a piece of string or rope round their wrists in lieu of the wristlets described above.

The Chinbôks of the Chee-haung wear long brass guards, enveloping the whole of the back of the left arm up to the elbow, which are kept in position by the wristlets. They are intended partly to protect the arm from dagger-wounds when fighting, and partly for ornament.

Arms and Accoutrements.—Among the Chinbôks and Yindus every male carries a bow (see Plate C) from the time he begins to toddle. It is made of bamboo, well seasoned by being smoked for several years over the fireplace in the hut. It takes five years’ seasoning to thoroughly mature a bow. The length of the bow of an adult is usually about four feet. It is thickest at the centre and tapers to the ends, where it is notched to hold the string. The string is made of cotton, sometimes plaited with bamboo and other fibres. When bows are not in use they are frequently unstrung.
The arrows are carried in a quiver or basket (see Plate C) on the left side. They are about a foot and a half in length (the shaft being made of bamboo about the thickness of a pencil), and are neatly tipped with feathers or bamboo shavings. The heads (see Plate C) are of several kinds. For war purposes and for killing big game iron heads are used. These again are of different shapes and various sizes, some being barbed and some lozenge-shaped. The other heads they use are hardened-wood points spliced on bone-heads for shooting fish,—these are said to be very deadly for this purpose,—and, lastly, shafts with the points sharpened for shooting birds.

The arrows with iron heads carry 150 yards and further, and are very deadly, killing bear, tiger, deer, &c., at 80 yards range. Chins do not poison their arrows, and usually keep them bright and clean. But, as they use their arrows time after time whenever they can find them again, and as wounded animals frequently escape only to die afterwards in the jungles, and as these arrows, which are frequently pulled out of the carcasses of animals in a patrid state, are used indiscriminately with those that are clean, blood-poisoning is very likely to follow an arrow wound. This has probably given rise to the idea that they poison their arrows by sticking them into dead animals.

The only other weapon which every man carries is a dagger (see Plate C) a little over a foot in length, worn in war-time in a bone scabbard on the right side. Attached to the shield or rather to the leather breast-plate (see Plate C). When engaged in peaceful pursuits it is stuck into a basket, worn on the right side, in which there is a sheath to receive it (see Plate C). The bone scabbard mentioned above is the shoulder-blade of a buffalo or bullock with a bamboo back.

These daggers are used both for fighting and for cutting up food, &c. The people make great use of them when fighting among themselves, which they frequently do when drunk. It costs nothing to stick a knife into a man, while if he were shot with an arrow and afterwards escaped, the arrow-head, which is valuable, would be lost.

Many men carry spears (see Plate C), which resemble Burman spears:—in fact, many are obtained from Burmans.

Every man wears a kind of leather armour. It consists of a strip of bent buffalo hide, about nine inches to one foot broad, reaching from the waist in front to the small of the back behind. It is worn across the left shoulder, like the saab of a military officer, the ends being tied together at the right side with a string, to which the dagger in its bone sheath is attached. In the case of the Yindus this armour is frequently made of cane basket-work thickly covered with kauris. The Chinboks also frequently adorn theirs with kauris and small bells like ferret-bells.

The arrows are carried as follows:—A neat basket, generally measuring about one foot four inches in depth, one foot eight inches in length, and eight inches in breadth, is slung on the right shoulder, hanging therefore on the left side. It is divided into compartments. Nearest the front a bamboo quiver containing the iron-headed arrows is kept in place by cane loops in the basket. This holds about twelve arrows, and has a top, sometimes of bamboo or cane-work lacquered over, and sometimes of bamboo ornamented with red beads. This top is attached by a string to the breastplate, the string being frequently adorned with small bells. The next compartment in the basket contains a somewhat smaller bamboo, which acts as a box for tobacco, tinder, steel, and flint. The tinder used generally consists of bamboo filings. The lid of this box is generally ornamented with red seeds. The rest of the basket holds a pipe, arrows without heads, and odds and ends. Outside the basket at the back is fixed a small bamboo holding a spare bowstring.

On the left [† Ed.] side a basket, measuring one foot in depth and length, and eight inches in breadth is generally worn. In this fob, &c., is carried. It has a compartment, into which the dagger fits as already described.  

The pipes smoked by Chinboks and Yindus (see Plate C) are of three kinds:—firstly, a plain bamboo pipe with a bamboo stem a foot long; secondly, a pipe with a baked bamboo bowl and bamboo stem; thirdly, a pipe on the principle of the hubble-bubble. This last consists of a gourd, in which some water is kept, and from which a bamboo tube fitted with a neat earthen bowl, projects about an inch from the upper side. The smoke is drawn into the mouth through the end of the gourd, where it taps off at its stem. The tobacco the people smoke is grown by themselves, and is very rank and offensive in smell. They are always smoking. The women smoke as well as the men.

The Chinboks for the most part carry nothing but spears. They have a few guns and a few
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From Lieut. Rainey's Sketches.
bows and arrows. They have a square leather shield, which, when on the war-path, they carry in the left hand, and with which they ward off spears, thrusts and arrows. They have no accoutrements.

Exports and Imports.—The principal exports of these Chin tribes are—

| Plantains | Sát (a small millet) |
| Tobacco | Ginger |
| Indian-corn leaves | Pork |
| (for cheroots) | Honey |
| Chillies | Beeswax |
| Turmeric | Cane mats |

The principal imports are—

| Salt | Marbles |
| Blankets | Trinkets |
| Sheets | Spears |
| Gaunghbaung | Damaunks |
| Cotton (raw) | Pauktás |
| Cotton (thread) | Iron |
| Needles | Sickles |
| Dyes | Cattle |
| Brass-wire | Goats |
| Gongs | Dogs |
| Cymbals | Pows |
| Small bells | Nyák |
| Beads | Dámbyás |

Agriculture.—The system of cultivation carried on by the different sections or tribes on the South Yô frontier is much the same everywhere, and the crops produced vary but slightly. It is all tauungya'6 cultivation. No cattle are used in ploughing. All the work is done by hand, a great deal being performed by women. The only exception to this system of agriculture is that a few villages of Chinbôns in the southern end of the Môn valley have a few buffaloes, with which they plough a few paddy-fields; but this industry does not prosper; as their more powerful neighbours carry off their cattle to sacrifice to the nás'.

The first operation in the tauungya' system is to clear the jungle off the slopes to be brought under cultivation. This work is performed by the men in the month of October with damaunks, which they buy from the Burmans. The jungle, thus cut, lies until quite dry, till it is burnt in the month of April. The ground is then cleared and, without further preparation, the grain is planted as follows:—In the right hand a sharpened or rather pointed stick is held, with which holes are drilled into the ground. Into these holes the grain is dropped with the left hand. After this

weeds have constantly to be kept down, and the work of weeding falls to the lot of the women, who also loosen the ground round the young shoots with Dámbyás, which are bought from Burmans, as soon as the crop is a few inches high.

The first crop of sát is reaped in August; other crops are reaped in November and December.

The same ground is cultivated for two years only, as in the third year the grass grows so strongly that cultivation is impossible. It is therefore left until jungle has again grown on it, when,—usually after five years,—it can again be cleared and cultivated.

threshing is performed as under:—The grain in the ear is collected in heaps near the grain-huts in the fields, and trodden out by foot on large cane matts, from which it is transferred into enormous cane baskets standing over four feet high. Some grains, such as Indian-corn, are stored loose in the ear in the grain-huts.

The principal crops are—

| (1) Tauungya' paddy. | (12) Sugarcane. |
| (2) Sát (a small millet). | (13) Plantains. |
| (3) Chaiknàn (a large-grained millet). | (14) Pineapples. |
| (4) Millet. | (15) Chillies. |
| (6) Yams. | (17) Tomatoes. |
| (7) Sweet potatoes. | (18) Pumpkins. |
| (8) Ginger. | (19) Gourds. |
| (9) Beans (of various kinds, some an inch in length). | (20) Tobacco. |
| (11) Ddl. | (22) Turmeric. |
| | (23) Onions. |
| | (24) Garlic. |

Much damage is done to the crops by bears, pigs, and deer, and also by birds. The Yindus build huts high up in trees, in which they sit at night to frighten off the bears. Various scarecrows are also used to frighten off birds.

Grains which require to be husked are treated as follows:—A log is planted in the ground protruding about three feet. The top is scooped out so as to form a deep cup, into which the grain is dropped and pounded with a club. The Chinbôns, who live in houses near the ground, have this log protruding through the floor of their houses and therefore perform this work inside the house. This work falls on the women, and very hard work it is. While cultivating, the

5 Burmese turbans.
6 dâs or knives used for household purpose.
7 Spades.
8 Preparing of putrified fish used as a condiment.
9 Trowels.
10 Temporary forest clearing.
villages are deserted, the people living in temporary huts in their fields.\textsuperscript{11}

Local Products and Industries.—The only local products, besides agricultural, are—

(1) Pottery, which is confined to a few villages only, Mying on the Mon and Myin on the Maung being the foremost in this industry:

(2) The manufacture of daggers, arrow-heads, and spear-heads confined to certain villages:

(3) The production of lac, which is abstracted from trees in most villages and used in the manufacture of accoutrements, &c:

(4) The production of salt. The largest salt-springs are on the Mò at a place called Êkun, six dain\textsuperscript{12} from Tllin, where 200 viss of salt can be produced daily, and there are other springs further up the stream. These are, however, the only springs of importance. A small quantity of salt is procured at a place on the Chêchung, three dain from Yân, a Burman village. The salt is produced by boiling down the water:

(5) Spinning, which is done by the women; all the clothes of a purely national character being made by them. The people import most of their cotton, but grow a little:

(6) The manufacture of mats, brooms, baskets, and such like articles; besides bows, arrows, and accoutrements:

(7) Hunting, as a means of filling the pot, though the people collect heads (of animals) and trophies with a thoroughly sportsman-like interest. They track their game and shoot it with bows, bringing down tiger, bear, ëmbhar, pig, &c. They frequently come to grief and get badly mauled, and many are killed by tigers and bears:

(8) Fishing, which is carefully and systematically carried out in various ways;—(a) by shooting the fish with arrows, at which the people are wonderfully skilful; (b) by catching the fish in basket traps, in the manner of the Burmans on this frontier; (c) by catching the fish with nets made locally; (d) by diverting a stream and isolating stretches of it with dams, and then poisoning the fish with the bark of a certain tree, which is stripped off, pounded, and thrown into the water prepared as above.

Forests.—The lower slopes of the Burman side of the Chin Hills contain some fine teak, especially near the mouths of the Yo, Maung, and Chê streams. Bamboos are plentiful throughout the hills. On the higher slopes are fine fir forests, oaks of various kinds, rhododendrons, and so on.

Dwarf bamboos, making excellent fodder, were constantly met with, even at heights over 7,000 feet above sea-level. There is some cutch on the lower slopes on the Burman side.

Flora and Fauna.—On the lower slopes the usual flowers and vegetation seen in Burma are met with. Higher up flowers and plants of a colder climate are seen, including orchids, ferns, roses, lawn daisies, marguerites, thistles, mosses; also a shrub with a flower like hawthorn.

The wild animals are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tiger</th>
<th>Hare</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bears</td>
<td>Porcupine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leopards</td>
<td>Otter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pigs</td>
<td>Wild cats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deer of many kinds</td>
<td>Jungle fowl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wild cattle (rain) and pyang</td>
<td>Pheasants (silver)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monkeys</td>
<td>Partridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apes (Hoolocks)</td>
<td>Many kinds of small birds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The domestic animals are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maiban</th>
<th>Dogs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pigs</td>
<td>Fowl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goats</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All are used for food and sacrifices, and for marriage gifts.

Houses.—The houses resemble those of Burmans, except that they are stronger and better built; the thatch on the roofs being often a foot thick, well put on, and firmly tied down. The floors are frequently of teak or fir planks hewn out of a single tree. The floors are raised three to six feet from the ground. Pigs, goats, dogs, and fowls live underneath and all round, and the houses, though otherwise clean, are full of fleas. The fireplaces are similar to those in Burman houses.

During the cultivating season the villages are abandoned and temporary huts are built in the fields, as well as sheds for storing grain. To prevent rats from getting into the latter they are raised six feet or more off the ground, and branches of fir, stalk-ends uppermost, are tied to the posts, because rats cannot run up them. Flat circular boards are also used for the purpose of preventing rats from running up a post, the post passing through a hole in the centre.

Engineering Works.—There are no engineering works on a large scale.

Fishing dams are constructed to isolate reaches of streams in order to catch or poison the fish, or to divert the stream.

\textsuperscript{11} [A Shâñ custom also. — Ed.]

\textsuperscript{12} dain = kò = about 2 miles.
Bridges across streams are also made on the cantilever principle. These are wonderful constructions of bamboo and very clever. Other simple bridges are also made, including swing-bridges.

Aqueducts for bringing water into the villages are also ingeniously designed. They are made of bamboos, split so as to form a gutter, along which the water runs. The bamboo gutters are supported, according to the level required, on tripods. A spot higher than the village is chosen as the source of water-supply often nearly half-a-mile distant. The Chinbôns, who have paddy-fields, irrigate them in the same way as the Burmans.

The roads are mere tracks and are not in any way constructed.

Household Furniture, Dishes, &c.—The only articles of furniture to be found in a Chin house are the fireplace and cooking pots, similar to those used by Burmans. Water is kept in ghârâs, bamboos, or gourds. They eat with their fingers off bits of matting, which take the place of plates.

Each house has a rough loom, spindle, &c., for spinning. In Chinbôns houses the grain-pounders protrude through the floor.

In all houses are found a few baskets containing grain for present use and some liquor jars.

Trophies and Decorations.—In the verandah of each Chinbô or Yinda house are the heads of every animal shot, captured, or killed by the householder. The Chinbôns also carve boards, or rather posts, about eight feet high, which they erect outside their houses. These indicate the number of head of game which the owner has killed. No man is thought much of unless he has a good show of heads and posts. The heads include tiger, bear, adambhar, saim, and various kinds of deer, monkeys, and domestic animals. Chinbôns shoot but little.

Raids.—The objects of raids are to obtain possession of slaves, cattle, money, and property of all kinds; and are never undertaken with the sole object of (human) head-hunting. They are not only directed against British-Burmans subjects, but also against those dwelling across the Yômâs, and even against another Chin tribe.

The captives taken in raids into Burma are usually held to ransom. The actual process of raiding is accompanied with much bloodshed and cruelty, but the prisoners are well treated if once they reach the village of their captors. Women are not outraged.

As captives, women, children, and pônyâs, (priests), are preferred: the two former as there is less chance of their effecting their escape than men; the latter because they can obtain such enormous ransoms for their release. Captives are at first placed in stocks, but are afterwards allowed out with a log attached to their legs, and a string to carry it by. To secure the leg to the log a hole is cut through the centre of the log. Through this hole the foot and ankle are inserted, and also a wooden pin so as to make the hole too small to allow of the foot being withdrawn. A string is attached to either end of the log, which the prisoner holds in his hand when walking, thus taking the weight off the ankle. If it is thought that prisoner is not likely to attempt to escape, the log is removed. Prisoners are obliged to work in the fields, fetch water, husk grain, &c.

Captives, if not quickly redeemed by their own people, are sold from village to village, which renders it very difficult to trace and recover them. They fetch from Rs. 80 to Rs. 300, sometimes paid in cash, but generally in cattle.

Cattle are much prized, and are driven off from the plains, whenever opportunity offers.

Iron is greatly valued for spear and arrow heads, &c. When raiding in Burma the Chins frequently tear off the tâs (summit ornaments) from pagodas for the sake of the iron they contain.

Certain villages are notorious raiders, cultivating but little and living by raiding. They are a terror to the weaker and more industrious Chin villagers, whom they greatly oppress, and who are consequently frequently driven to raid on Burman villages to recoup themselves for the heavy losses they sustain at the hands of their more powerful neighbours. This system of terrorism keeps the Chins the savages we find them. They have no incentive to become prosperous, as they are liable to lose their all, including wives and children, at any moment. They can ransom their relations, if well enough off, but the price demanded is beyond the means of most Chins.

Raids are organized as follows. The leading man or chief, who wishes to get up a raid, gets men together from his own and other villages. He gives a feast and arranges for rations on the road. All these expenses he defrays, but gets the lion's share of the captives and loot. Quarrels frequently occur, attended with bloodshed, over division of the spoil. The raids are always consulted and, if the omens are unfavourable, the raid is postponed and often abandoned altogether.
Moonlight nights are usually chosen for raids and a "surprise" is always attempted. While retreating they generally spike the path behind them with bamboo and, if pressed, they often kill their captives. On this account the Burmans frequently hesitate to follow them up.

Warfare.—The Chin system of warfare is almost identical with the system of raiding. When attacking an enemy's village, or a force encamped, they always attempt a surprise, and unless they consider themselves very strong, they content themselves with harrying a column on the line of march by creeping up and discharging arrows, generally at the rear-guard. They will also roll down boulders and rocks, if opportunity offers, upon an advancing force, and will attempt to burn the jungle through which a column is passing. They only attempt a front attack when confident of success, and then advance yelling and shouting. On the defensive they roll down rocks, spike roads, and discharge arrows from behind cover. They do not dig pits.

Chinbôk villages are not fenced in any way. Yindu villages have a thorn or bamboo fence which presents no serious obstacle.

Chinbôns stockade with what is known as "Chin stockade-work" and form most formidable abatis by felling the bamboo jungle in which their villages are generally built, sharpening the ends of the bamboos, and planting innumerable spikes. There is only one gate to a Chinbô village and it is a very narrow one, approached by a path which admits of men advancing in single file only. A few of the villages are not stockaded, but built on high poles.

Chin villages are generally built in dense jungle hollows on the sides of the hills. They can always be taken in rear and commanded, and should never be attacked from below. Approaches will always be found to be spiked, and rocks will be rolled on the advancing column.

Smoking and Washing.—Men, women, and even small children are never without their pipes and tobacco, and smoke constantly. A description has already been given of the different kinds of pipes they smoke. The tobacco used is grown by themselves and sun-dried. It is very rank.

Chins, especially the Northern Chinbôns, have the greatest dislike to water. They never wash their bodies, and very seldom touch their faces and hands, with water. Their clothes are never washed.

Food and Drink.—The food of the Chins consists of the grain and vegetables they grow, the domestic animals they keep, and the game and fish they shoot and catch. Grain and vegetables are boiled, except châkin, which is generally roasted, as is also the flesh of animals. They cook like the Burmans, but do not use oil.

Except the beer they brew, water is their only beverage. The women draw water in ghârs, gourds or bamboos.

Drunkenness.—The most remarkable custom of these people is their habit of getting drunk on every possible occasion. Every and any incident is an excuse to bring out the beer jars (see Plate C)—the arrival of a stranger or visitor, the birth of a child, a marriage, a death, a case of sickness, an offering to or consultation of wûts,—are all sufficient excuses for every one present, men, women, and even tiny children, to get drunk. They frequently keep up these debacles for days. The liquor is made of grain, boiled and fermented, and varies much in quality, depending on the grain used (rice is the best) and the length of time the liquor has been kept. Good Chin beer is a very palatable drink, much resembling cider in taste, but more like perry in appearance. The liquor is stored in jars, standing over two feet in height and filled half full with the fermenting grain. As the liquor is drawn off the jar is filled up with water.

The liquor is drunk as follows:—A hollow bamboo, the thickness of a little finger, is thrust into the jar, and pressed well down into the grain. The company sit round this and take turns in turn.

A more civilized way of drawing off the liquor is sometimes followed. A hole is made in the side of the bamboo above mentioned, the hollow top being stopped up; into this hole another bamboo is inserted sloping downwards over the side of the jar (see Plate C). The host gives a suck to start the liquor running; gourds are then filled and handed round.

Tattooing.—All women have their faces tattooed (see Plate A). The process is commenced when they are small children and gradually completed, the operations extending over several years.

The Chinbôns cover the face with nicks, lines, and dots in a uniform design, the women's breasts being also surrounded with a circle of dots. The Yindus tattoo in lines across the face, showing glimpses of the skin. The Chinbôns tattoo jet black and are the most repulsive in appearance, though often fair-skinned. The beauty of a woman is judged by the style in which the tattooing has been done. Men are not tattooed at all.
Proper Names.—Most Chin villages have Burmese names. Many have two names, one a Chin and the other a Burman name, which causes great confusion. Among themselves they usually talk of a village as So-and-so’s village, naming the Dżá (headman). Thus, a village of which the headman’s name was Nga Tin would be called Nga Tinyá (Nga Tin’s Village). The names of men resemble Burman names, but they invariably prefix Nga instead of Maung.

The women’s names are curious; they prefix Mi and Ba.

The following are examples of names:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nga Kwaì</td>
<td>Mi Ba Do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nga Shain</td>
<td>Mi Ba Laung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nga Cha</td>
<td>Mi Ba Sók</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nga Tin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sanitation.—The villages are kept cleaner than Burman villages, otherwise their sanitary arrangements are similar.

Carrying Loads.—Everything is carried slung across the forehead by a strap, usually in cane baskets about the size of a Burmese pack-bullock’s basket. Sometimes there is a second strap, which passes across the chest. Even water is carried in this manner, gourds being filled and placed in the basket, or, if ghájá are used, the ghájá is placed in the basket. A Chin makes nothing of a sixty-pound bag of dí (flour) going over the worst possible tracks.

Music and Dancing.—Musical instruments consist of gongs, cymbals, drums, and bells. There is also a curious kind of banjo made out of one piece of bamboo a little thicker than a man’s wrist and about eighteen inches long. The bamboo is used as a hollow and cut off at both ends just beyond the joint. Narrow strips of the bamboo are then slit and raised on small pegs without severing the ends; four or five strings are thus formed, which are manipulated with the fingers. The music produced is rather pleasant.

There is no tune, but time is kept on the drums. Dancing, in which both men and women take part, is generally commenced when they are all primed with liquor.

The men brandish spears and dí and shout, or rather yell. By firelight the sight is a curious and pretty one.

Oaths.—Oaths are of several kinds and are supposed to be binding. The one most feared is drinking water that has been poured over the skull of a tiger.

Another oath is partly Burmese, [? Chinese—Ed.] in origin. The terms of the oath are written on paper and burnt, while the swearing parties place the butts of their arms, spears, dí, guns, bows, arrows, &c., in a basin of water. The ashes of the paper are then mixed with the water and drunk by the parties concerned.

Another oath is drinking blood. In all oaths much liquor is drunk. It is doubtful whether oaths are of any value.

Births, Marriages, Deaths.—All these are great occasions and necessitate sacrifices to the náts, feasting, and much drinking, accompanied by music and dancing.

When a child is born the náts are consulted to ascertain if it will live or die.

Marriage among the Chinboks is a love affair, and takes place at about twenty years of age. The young man proposes and, if accepted, the consent of the girl’s parents is asked. They, if they approve of the suitor, consult the náts to see if the marriage will be a lucky one.

If the omens are favourable, one maípá at least must be given to the bride’s parents. If the bridegroom has not got the value of a maípá, he promises to pay by instalments and takes possession of the bride at once. If the girl has many necklaces, several maípá must be given. A big drink and feast follows, and sacrifices to the náts.

If, however, the omens prove unfavourable and the young couple are nevertheless anxious to be married, the náts are periodically consulted until they are favourable. This always must happen in time, if the náts are only consulted frequently enough.

The Hindu marriage customs are different. Among them the love is one-sided. The would-be bridegroom selects the lady of his fancy and goes to her father’s house with ten pairs of earrings, or their value, and demands the girl, giving the father the earrings. The girl is immediately handed over to him, whether willing or not, and whether the parents approve of the match or not. The usual drinks and ceremonies follow.

There are no divorces. If a man's wife is carried off by another man, as frequently happens, the husband kills his rival, if he can, and takes back his wife.

There is no restriction as to the number of wives allotted to one man. If a man dies, his brother must take his wife and children. In this way one man may accumulate many families.

On a death occurring all the friends assemble and drink. A woman, or other suitable sacrifice, is slain. The number of days the body is kept, and consequently the duration of the festivities, depends on the age and importance of the deceased. The body is eventually carried far into the jungle to a burial-ground on the ridge of a hill, where it is burnt. The charred bones are collected and, together with the clothes of the deceased, are placed in an earthen pot.

The pot, amongst the Chinboks and Yindus, is placed on the ground under a slab of stone supported on four upright stones. In the Chinbok and Yindu country there are large cemeteries of these stones, some of which are of enormous size and must have taken great labour to bring from the places where they abounded to the burial-ground.

The Chinboks do not use stones, but erect miniature houses, which are models of the style of architecture of the particular village to which the deceased belonged, being either raised on poles or not, as the case may be. In these houses, which form miniature villages, the pots are placed. Those Chinboks who have emigrated to and died in Burma, are cremated where they die, but their bones are carefully collected and sent in a pot to be placed in the cemetery of the village, to which they or their forefathers originally belonged.

**NOTES AND QUERIES.**

**SOCIAL CUSTOMS IN SOUTHERN INDIA.**

When a young Brahman visits or takes leave of an elderly man of his caste and sect, either in consequence of age or learning, the custom is for the younger to prostrate himself before the elder and to receive his blessing.

In poor Brahman houses, a widow is the chief cook and she performs almost all the menial work in the house. She gets up early in the morning and shuns the presence of everybody else in the house, as it is superstitiously believed that if anybody sees a widow's face on rising from his bed he will have bad luck during the day. Even her own children, if she has any, are averse to seeing her face in the morning, and she herself, knowing the evil that would arise, will not approach them. When a person starts on a journey or on any special errand, if a widow comes before him, it is an evil omen. On entering upon her widowhood, a woman takes off the hair on her head, and a portion of her waist cloth is put round her head. She usually turns very religious, takes only one meal a day, and sets aside all worldly pleasures. She is also prohibited from singing on marriage occasions.

K. Srikantaliyab.

**SUPERSTITIONS AS TO SNAKES IN MADRAS.**

Take half a measure full of native onions and make about three or four dozen small bags, put half a dozen onions into each and then tie up the bags at some small distance from each other to the rafters under the tiles, or tie up to the rafters about half a dozen peacock feathers. As snakes have a very acute sense of smell, and as the smell of these two things is very repugnant to them, they will always keep away. The above is said to be very effective in the case of cobras.

Snake charmers in Southern India have often been seen to catch cobras with their right hand, while keeping a small stick in their left hand. This stick is always besmeared with onion juice.

A pinch of tobacco snuff thrown over the head of a cobra acts as chloroform and the cobra is becumbed as it were.

It is considered a great sin to kill a cobra. When a cobra is killed the people generally burn it as they do human bodies. A man who has killed a cobra considers himself as polluted for three days or at least for forty hours, and in the second day milk is poured on the remains of the cobra. On the third day he is free from pollution.

**SUPERSTITIONS ABOUT ANIMALS IN SOUTHERN INDIA.**

The Indian screech owl or death-bird is held in great fear by the Hindus of Southern India. If this bird happens to sit on the roof of a house and screech thrice, it is said that the chief member of the house will die within one week from that date.

If bees build a nest in any part of a house, it is said that the chief member of the house will die within one month from that date.

K. Srikantaliyab.
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>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Kannarese</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>अ</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>अ</td>
<td>ज</td>
<td>ja</td>
<td>ज</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>आ</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>आ</td>
<td>जा</td>
<td>ja</td>
<td>जा</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>इ</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>इ</td>
<td>ध</td>
<td>da</td>
<td>ध</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ई</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>ई</td>
<td>ठ</td>
<td>tha</td>
<td>ठ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>उ</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>उ</td>
<td>ड</td>
<td>da</td>
<td>ड</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ऊ</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>ऊ</td>
<td>ळ</td>
<td>la</td>
<td>ळ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ऋ</td>
<td>ra</td>
<td>ऋ</td>
<td>ला</td>
<td>la</td>
<td>ला</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ए</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>ए</td>
<td>य</td>
<td>ya</td>
<td>य</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ऐ</td>
<td>ai</td>
<td>ऐ</td>
<td>रा</td>
<td>ra</td>
<td>रा</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ओ</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>ओ</td>
<td>रा</td>
<td>ra</td>
<td>रा</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>औ</td>
<td>au</td>
<td>औ</td>
<td>भा</td>
<td>ba</td>
<td>भा</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Visarga Visarga भ

Jihesamānya, or old Visarga before ी Visarga before ी

and ी and ी

Upadhmānya, or old Visarga before ी Visarga before ी

fore ी and ी

Anugraha Anugraha म

Anvadāra Anvadāra न

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 text.

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 sahādi. 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 virāmi 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 sahādi 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 ा, 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 shewn 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 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 akshara or syllable.
BHARAUT INSCRIPTIONS.

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

The remains of the Buddhist Stūpa of Bharaut were discovered in 1873 by General Sir A. Cunningham, who very judiciously saved most of them from destruction by removal to the Indian Museum, Calcutta. His richly illustrated monograph The Stūpa of Bharaut (London, 1879) contains eye-copies and tentative transcripts and translations of the Bharaut inscriptions, both of those which are now at Calcutta, and of those which remain in situ. Part of the Calcutta inscriptions have been minutely treated by Dr. Hoernle. With the kind permission of Dr. Anderson, Superintendent of the Indian Museum, I prepared mechanical copies of all those at Calcutta in 1885 and published them with German translations. The importance which the Bharaut inscriptions undoubtedly possess on account of their antiquity, now induces me to republish my German paper, with some additions and corrections, in English, and thus to make it more generally accessible.

The age of the Bharaut inscriptions is approximately fixed by the inscription No. 1, which records that the East gateway of the Stūpa was built "during the reign of the Sāgas," i.e., in the second or first century B.C., by Vātsiputra Dhanabhūti. From the manner in which he refers to the Sāgas, it may be concluded that this king was one of their tributaries. One of those inscriptions which have not been removed to Calcutta contains the name "of prince Vadhapāla (i.e., Vyaṭhpāla?) the son of king Dhanabhūti." At the beginning of another fragment, one is tempted to conjecture tisā instead of kosa, the reading of General Cunningham's eye-copy, and to translate: — "The gift of Nāgarakshitā (i.e., Nāgarakshita) the wife of king Dhanabhūti." A gift by some later Dhanabhūti is recorded in a Māthra inscription, which has been removed to Allīgāth.

With the exception of No. 1, the Bharaut inscriptions do not contain any historical information. They are simply labels which record the names of the donors of the pillars (stambhā) or rails (nīchā) on which they are engraved, or explain the subjects which some of the reliefs represent. The following towns from which some of the donors hailed, are incidentally mentioned: — Bhogavardhana, Bhōjakṣaṭa, B[i][m]bik[a][n][d]ikaṣaṭa, Kākāṇi, Karabākaṣṭa, Kūmbaṇḍuka (?), Mayuragiri, N[n][d][n][n]agāra, Pāṭaliputra, Purīka, Simhatapada, Sthavirākūṭa and Vaidiśa. The epithets Cākunāiyā or Chekula, Chudāthilikā and Dabhinikā appear to be likewise derived from names of localities, the Sanskrit originals of which are, however, doubtful. In General Cunningham's eye-copies of those inscriptions which were not removed to Calcutta, occur: — Karanakṣaṭa (Plate iv. No. 96), Mragiri (No. 95), Nāsika (No. 87) and Vedisa (No. 100, and Plate lv. No. 1); also Bhōjakṣaṭa, 'a resident of Bhōjakaṣṭa' (Plate lv. No. 46), Kosabeyaka, 'a female resident of Kaṇāmbī' (Plate lv. No. 53), and Selapuraka, 'a resident of Sālāpurā' (Plate lv. No. 91). Among these geographical names, Kaṇāmbī, Nāsika, Pāṭaliputra and Vaidiśa are the modern Kōsam, Nāsik, Patna and Bēnagar.

Of the Buddhist scenes which are represented in the sculptures and referred to in the inscriptions, part are still obscure, and part have been successfully identified by General Cunningham. The most interesting among these representations are the Jātakaś, or supposed previous births of the founder of the Buddhist creed. As will be seen from the subjoined table, a considerable number of them have been traced by the Rev. Subhūti, Professor Rhys Davids, and myself, in the Pali collection of Jātakas, for the publication of which we are indebted to the scholarship of Professor Fausboll.

---

1 As stated by Dr. Fleet, ante, Vol. XIV. p. 133, note 1, this appears to be the correct spelling of the name. General Cunningham uses the form Bharut.
4 Stūpa of Bharaut, Plate lv. No. 54.
5 Ibid. No. 67.


Kuṇkuṭa-jātaka.

10. Isi-miga jātaka.
15. Sāchha-jātaka.
17. Bhisaharakṣana jātaka[m].
32. Nāga-jātaka.
37. Miga-jātakaṃ.
72. Yavamahākaliyam jātakaṃ.
85. Chhadantīya jātakaṃ.
86. Vitbara-Punakya jātakaṃ.
109. Lātvā-jātaka.
156. Iṣī[im]yin jāṭa[ka].
158. Huvusa-jātaka.

Cunningham's Plate xxvii. No. 9.

xxxii. 4. 461. Dasaraṭha-jātaka.
xxliii. 5. 407. Mahakapi-jātaka.
xliv. 5. Nos. 46 and 268. Āramadāsaka-jātaka.

It appears from the above table that the titles of the single Jātakas in the Bharut inscriptions generally differ more or less from those which are adopted in the standard redaction of the Jātaka book. A very curious proof for the antiquity of the verses which are handed down to us in the Jātaka book, is afforded by the inscription No. 157, which quotes the first pāda of one of these verses. As discovered by the late Professor Childers (Pāli Dictionary, p. ix, note 3), an almost literal quotation from the Life of Buddha, which is prefixed to the Jātaka book (Vol. I. p. 92), occurs in the inscription No. 38. The announcement of the future conception of Buddha (No. 89), his descent to earth (No. 93), and the festival in honour of his hair-lock (No. 78), are referred to in the same introduction to the Jātaka, Vol. I. pp. 48, 50, and 65. The assembly (of ascetics) with matted hair (jaṭila, No. 13) is probably intended for Uruvēla-Kassapa and his followers (Vol. I. p. 82 f.). The Indraśāla cave (No. 99) corresponds to the Indrāśala cave of the Northern Buddhists, who also mention the visits of king Prāśenajī of Kosala and of the serpents' king Airavata to Buddha (Nos. 58 and 60). The visit of Ajāntāstru (No. 77) is described in the records of both Northern and Southern Buddhists.

In the inscriptions, Buddha is generally designated Bhagavat, 'the Blessed one,' and once (No. 46) Sākyamuni. Of the former Buddhas the following are named: — Viśvāsin, Viśvantī, Kakutasadhā, Kānḍagāma, Kāhiṣapa. The inscriptions also mention 'Sudharma, the hall of the gods,' 'Vaijayanta, the palace (of Indra),' the two classes of deities called Kāmavāchara and Sudhāvāsā, and give the names of four celestial nymphs (apavaras), three goddesses (dēvatā), one angel (dēvaputra), one vidyādhāra, six male and two female yakhas,

1 The chief story of the fifth book of the Pañcchatatantra is closely related to the Chatusdāvajātaka (Fausboll's No. 430). At the beginning of the Pañcchatatantra story occurs the following verse (No. 23 of the Bombay edition):

�तिक्रोधे म कृत्यस्य लोभं वै विरुद्धताः
अतिविचारितामयुक्तं च भयं कश्चर्कते

The fourth pāda of this verse is identical with that of the 5th verse of the Chatusdāvajātaka, the second half of which reads: — śeṣōhātataś ca pīnas ca kākṣāh bhāmāti matthikā.
and two serpent kings (nāgarāja). Buddhistical terms are: — chaitya, bōdhi or bōtha, bōdhīchakra and dharmachakra. The mention of donors who were versed in the Pītakas, (No. 134), in the Sārāṅga (No. 95) and in the five Nikāyas (No. 144) proves that the Buddhist canon and its subdivisions were known and studied in the second or first century B.C. Among the donors are one householder (grihapati), one trooper (aśūvārika), one sculptor (rāpakaśaka), four preachers (bhāṣaka) and twelve nuns (bhikṣuṇī). Others are characterised as members of the priesthood by the epithet ‘reverend’ (ārya or bhadanta).

**TEXTS AND TRANSLATIONS.**

**No. 1** (Cunningham's Plate liii. No. 1).

1 Suganaṃ raso raṇo Gāgl-patasa Visadevasa
2 pauṇṭeṣa Goti-patasa Āgarajusa paeṣa
3 Vāchhi-patena Dhanabhutina kāraṇa toranāṁ
4 sila-kaññaranto cha upaṃṣa,

During the reign of the Sungas, — Vatāl-patra Dhanabhuti, the son of Gaupti-patra Aṅgadāyut (and) grandson of king Gāgl-patra Visvadeva, caused (this) gateway to be made, and the stone-work arose.

**No. 2** (liii. 1 b).

Aya-Nāgadevasa dānaṁ.
The gift of the reverend Nāgadeva.

**No. 3** (liii. 2 b; Hoernle's No. 5).

Maghadeviya jataka.
The jātaka which treats of Makhādeva.

**No. 4** (liii. 3 b; Hoernle's No. 6).

Dighatapasi ise anuśasati,
Dirghatapasi instructs (his) pupils.

**No. 5** (liii. 4 b; Hoernle's No. 7).

Abode chaṭṭiyaṁ.
The chaṭṭiya on (Mount) Arbuda.

**No. 6** (liii. 5).

Sujato gahuto jataka.
The jātaka entitled “Sujāta caught.”

**No. 7** (liii. 6).

Bījala-jatara kukuṭa-jataka.
The cat jātaka, (also called) the cock jātaka.

**No. 8** (liii. 7).

Daṇḍanikamo chakama.
The enclosure (called) Daṇḍanikamagrama (?)

---

8 The text of Nos. 1 to 154 is transcribed from impressions which I prepared at Calcutta in 1885. A facsimile of No. 1 is found ante, Vol. XIV. p. 159, and facsimiles of Nos. 2 to 15, 17 to 31, 55 to 151, and 153 in the Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgen. Ges. Vol. XI. pp. 60 and 70.

9 Read toraṇaḥ (instead of तोरण). Read upaṃsa (इ उपामस instead of उपामस).

11 As suggested by Dr. Bühler, this name has to be explained by Aṅgadāyut (अंगदायुत) as being ‘shining like (the planet) Mars.’ The custom, in accordance with which each of the three kings bears a secondary name derived from the ēta ( suffice of his mother, has descended through the Andhras to the Kadambas and Chalukyas; see Dr. Fleet's Kannarese Dynasties, p. 5, note 2.

12 See Childers' Pāli Dictionary, s. v. kammanto.

13 Possibly a clerical mistake for chaṭṭiyam.

14 Gahuto (Sanskrit gṛhita) appears to mean either ‘surprised’ or ‘understood’ (by his father); see the Sujāta-jātaka, Faussboll's No. 352.

15 This is a clerical mistake for jātaka (i. e. jātakam).
THE INDIAN ANTIQUARY.

No. 9 (liii. 8).
Asađá vadhu susáne sigāla16 šāti,17
The woman Ashādhā, who has observed the jackals on the cemetery.

No. 10 (liii. 9).
Isi-migo jātaka.
The jātaka (entitled) "the antelope of the saint."

No. 11 (liii. 10; Hoernle's No. 1).
Miga-samadaka[m] chetaya.19
The chaïya which gladdens the antelopes.

No. 12 (liii. 12).
Kinara-jātakaṁ.
The Kinnara jātaka.

No. 13 (liii. 13).
Jaṭila-sabhā.
The assembly (of ascetics) with matted hair.

No. 14 (liii. 14).
Uda-jātaka.
The jātaka (which treats) of the (two) otters.

No. 15 (liii. 15; Hoernle's No. 4).
Secchha-jātaka.
The kaiksha19 jātaka.

No. 16 (liii. 16).
1 Karahakaṇa-nigamasa
2 dāna.
The gift of the city of Karahakāṇa.20

No. 17 (liii. 17).
Bhisaharaniya jātaka[m].
The jātaka (which treats) of the stealing of the lotus-fibres.

No. 18 (liii. 18; Hoernle's No. 8).
Veđuko katha dohati Naḍode pavate.
Vonuka21 milks22 katha20 on Mount Naḍōda.

No. 19 (liii. 19; Hoernle's No. 9).
Jabī Naḍode pavate.
The jambū (tree) on Mount Naḍōda.

No. 20 (liii. 20; Hoernle's No. 2).
U . . . . . Janako rāja Sivala devi.
. . . . . . King Jansaka. Queen Sivala.24

16 Read sigile (acc. plur.)?
17 šāti probably represents the Sanskrit jātras, as kēṭa in No. 58 stands for kēṭa.
18 It remains doubtful whether the vowel a in the second syllable of this word is due to a clerical omission of the sign for i, or if it is the expression of an indistinct pronunciation of the vowel i. Compare Sabhād for Subhadra in Ajātānta for Ajātānta in Nos. 52 and 77.
19 See Childers' Pāli Dictionary, s.v. seko, a resident of Karahākāṇa, occurs in the Kuḍā inscription No. 18, Arch. Survey of W. India, Vol. IV. p. 87. Karahakāṇa or Karahakāṇa is probably identical with Karahākāṇa, which is referred to in a Šahtrukkāya inscription of Saka 675 (ante, Vol. XI. p. 110), and with the modern Karhā in the Sattārā district.
20 According to No. 63, this person was a gardener. Vṛuka, 'little reed,' occurs in the Jītaka No. 43 as the name of a snake.
21 See the corresponding relief, Stūpa of Bharhut, Plate xlviii. No. 9.
22 This word may be meant for kāṭha (Pāli kāṭha, Sanskrit kāṭha), or, according to Dr. Bühler, for karaṭha or kāṭha, 'a decoction.'
23 Similar formations are Ahila and Vasula in the Kuḍā inscriptions, and Himala, Isala and Sivala in the Amarāvati inscriptions.
No. 21 (iii. 21; Hoernle’s No. 3).

Chitupâda-sila.
The Chitrâtpata rock.  

No. 22 (iii. 1 c).
Vedasà Châpadévârâ Revatimita-bhâriyâya pâthama-thabhâ bânamâ.
The first pillar (is) the gift of Châpadévârâ, the wife of Revatimitra, from Vaidisa.

No. 23 (iii. 2 c).
Bhadramitasa 22 aya-Bhutarikhitasa Khujatilukiyasa dânaâm.
The gift of the lord, the revered Bhutarakshita, from Kubjatinduka (?).

No. 24 (iii. 3 c).
Bhagavato Vaisabhuno bodhi sâlo.
The sâla (which was) the bódhi (tree) of the blessed Visvakarma.

No. 25 (iii. 4 c).
Aya-Gorakhitasa thabhâ bânamâ.
A pillar, the gift of the revered Gorakshita.

No. 26 (iii. 5 b, 6 b).
Aya-Pamthakasa thanabhâ dânaâm Chulakokâ devatâ.
A pillar, (representing) the goddess Kshudrakokâ, 27 the gift of the revered Panthaka.

No. 27 (iii. 7 b).
1 Dabhnikâyâ Mahamukhîsa dhiit Badhika-
2 ya bhichhunîyâ dânaâm.
The gift of the nun Badhâkâ, 28 the daughter of Mahâmukhî, from Dabhina (?).

No. 28 (iii. 8 b).
1 Pâtaliputâ Nâgasenâyâ Koci-
1 yâniyâ dânaâm.
The gift of Nâgasenâ, a Kociâni, 29 from Pataliputra.

No. 29 (iii. 9 b).
1 Samanâyâ bhikhunîyâ Chudâthilîkâyâ
2 dânaâm.
The gift of the nun Sramanâ 30 from Chudâthila.

No. 30 (iii. 11 b).
Bhagavato Konâgamenasa bodhi.
The bódhi (tree) of the blessed Konâgamana.

No. 31 (iii. 12 b).
Bhojakaṭâkâyâ Diganâyâ[?] bhichhunîyâ dânaâm.
The gift of the nun Dûnâgâ from Bhojakaṭâ. 32

---

25 Chitrâ utpdâ yatraṣa sâ sâl, ‘the rock where miraculous portents happen.’ The Pâli uppdâ represents both utpdâ and uppesa; compare Annâha for Anûha in No. 28.
26 tâs looks like tosa, and the fa of Bhuta like tâ.
27 i.e. the little Kâkà. Her counterpart, the big Kâkà, is mentioned on Plate iv. of the Sûtra of Bharhat, No. 98, which reads: Makâkâ devata.
28 Perhaps Bôdhî has to be restored. The name Bôdhî occurs in three Kukâ inscriptions.
29 Kociyâni, which is found again in No. 100, might be the feminine of Kociya (No. 69); compare aryu—aryâli, and kshatriya—kshatriyâli. On the Kociyas, a tribe residing near and related to the Sâkya, see Dr. Kern’s Buddhîramas, translated by Jacob, Vol. I. pp. 174 and 295. Besides, Kociyâni might correspond to the patronymic Kauplakayâni; compare Kachchhanâ = Kâyâna, and Mogallâna = Manûlakâyâna.
30 It follows from Nos. 103 and 104, that Sramanâ is here used as a proper name.
31 In the fourth syllable of Konâgamana we appear to have a case of short (Pâkkhik) s for Sanskrit s. Short s for i occurs in Pâkkhik (No. 134) for Pitkhit, and Seri (No. 149) for Siri (Siri); short o for u in Aboda (No. 5) for Arbuda; long â for â in the termination yâ (Nos. 65, 108, 129, 121, 146, 148 and 150) for yâd; and long o for â in dûna (No. 130) for dûna.—The first syllable of bodhi is injured and looks like be.
32 According to a grant of the Vâkattaka king Pravarasena II. the village of Châmârâka, the modern Channak the fileshpur district, belonged to the Bhojakatâ-râya; see Dr. Fleet’s Gupta Inscriptions, p. 236.
Nāga-jātakā.
The elephant jātakā.

No. 32 (lī. 13 b).

1 Bib[ī]k[ā]naṇikāta Budhīna gahapatino
2 dānaṃ.
The gift of the householder Buddhi (from) Bimbikāṇandikāta (?).

No. 33 (lī. 14 b).

Supāvaso Yakho.
The Yaksha Supravīśha (?)

No. 34 (lī. 15 b).

Dhamagutasā dānaṃ thabho.
A pillar, the gift of Dharmagupta.

No. 35 (lī. 16 b).

1 Bibikānaṇikāta Suladhāsa asavārikā
2 sa3 dānaṃ.
The gift of the trooper Suladha (from) Bimbikāṇandikāta.

No. 36 (lī. 17 b).

1 Pusasa thānbho dānaṃ
2 migā-jītakām.
A pillar, (representing) the antelope jātaka, the gift of Pushya.

No. 37 (lī. 18 b, 19 b).

Jētavāna Anādhapedikā deti koṭi-saṁhātena kētā.
Anāthapiṇḍika gives Jētavāna, (which) he has bought by a layer of crosres (of gold pieces).

No. 38 (lī. 20 b).

Kosa[m]ba-kuṭi.
The hall at Kauśambī.

No. 39 (lī. 21 b).

Gā[m]dhākuṭi.
The hall of perfumes.

No. 40 (lī. 22 b).

Dharmarākhitasā dānaṃ.
The gift of Dharmarākhita.

No. 41 (lī. 23).

Chakavakā Nāgarājā.
Chakravāka, the king of serpents.

No. 42 (lī. 24).

V[r]udāko Yakho[.]
The Yaksha Virudhaka.

No. 43 (lī. 25).

Gaṅgito Yakho.
The Yaksha Gaṅgita.

No. 44 (lī. 26).

Aya-Iśidinasa bhānakasa dānaṃ.
The gift of the reverend Rishīdatta, a preacher.

No. 45 (liv. 27; Heurnle's No. 17).

33 Read “vedrikāsa.”
35 See Böhtlingk and Roth's Sanskrit-Wörterbuch, s. v., and Childers' Pāli Dictionary, s. v. virūḍha.
No. 46 (liv. 28; Hoernle's No. 11).
1. Bhagavato Sakamunino
2. bodho.
The bôdha (tree) of the blessed Sâkyamuni.

No. 47 (liv. 29; Hoernle's No. 12 a).
1. Puruśhima [di]sa Sudhâ-
2. vâsâ [de]va[e][a].
In the eastern direction, the deities (called) the Sudhâvâsas.

No. 48 (liv. 30; Hoernle's No. 13 b).
1. Utaraśa disa [tini sa]-
2. vatani sisâ[ni].
In the northern direction, [three covered] heads (?).

No. 49 (liv. 31; Hoernle's No. 13).
1. Dakhinaśa disa chha Kâ-
2. māvachara-sahasni.
In the southern direction, six thousand Kâmavacharas.

No. 50 (liv. 32; Hoernle's No. 14).
1. Sâdika-saśmadañ
2. turañ devânañ.
The music of the gods, which gladdens by (i.e., which is accompanied with) acting.

No. 51 (liv. 33; Hoernle's No. 15 a).

The Apsaras Mîrakâsâ.

No. 52 (liv. 34; Hoernle's No. 15 d).
Sabhad[â] Achhar[â].
The Apsaras Subhadrâ.

No. 53 (liv. 35; Hoernle's No. 15 c).
1. Padumâvatî
2. Achhara.
The Apsaras Padmâvatî.

No. 54 (liv. 36; Hoernle's No. 15 b).
1. Alâñ-
2. busâ Achhara.
The Apsaras Alambushâ.

No. 55 (liv. 37; Hoernle's No. 18).
Kâ[â]dariki.
Kançariki.

No. 56 (liv. 38; Hoernle's No. 21).
1. Vijâpi
2. Vijâdharo.
The Vidyâdharâ Vijayin.

---

46 On tāra for tērya, see Hâmaçandra, ii. 63, and Dr. Pischel's notes thereon.
47 With saṃmada compare saṃmadaks in No. 11.
48 According to Bîhâlingk and Ritt, e. v., Bharata explains vâjaka by vâjaka-bhûda.
49 Read Mînakâ.
56 Vijâpi might be derived from Vijâyin by the double change of y to v and of v to p. Regarding the first change, see Dr. Kuhn's Pâli-Grammatik, p. 42 f. and Arch. Survey of W. India, Vol. IV. p. 99, note 1, where Bhâdratvâya (p. 106, text line 10) might be added. Instances of the second change (Kuhn, i.e. p. 45) are Jâpata for Airâdana (Nos. 55 and 60), Kapura for Kouver (No. 92), bhâgapatô for bhâgavatah (Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgen- Ges. Vol. XXXVII. p. 557, No. 82) and pârpatô for pâravata (Jâtaka No. 42).
No. 57 (liv. 39; Hoernle's No. 10 a).
Bhagavato dharmachakran.
The dharmachakra of the Blessed one.
No. 58 (liv. 40; Hoernle's No. 10 b).
1 Rājā Pasenāji
2 Kosalo.
King Prasāñjait the Kosala.
No. 59 (liv. 41; Hoernle's No. 16 b).
Erapato [Nā]garājā.
Airāvata, the king of serpents.
No. 60 (liv. 42; Hoernle's No. 16 a).
1 Erapa Nāgarājā
2 Bhagavato vadate.
Airāvata, the king of serpents, worships the Blessed one.
No. 61 (liv. 43; Hoernle's No. 20).
Bahuwathiko.
(The banyan tree) Bahuwastika.42
No. 62 (liv. 44; Hoernle's No. 19 a).
1 Bahuwathiko nigodho
2 Nañode.
The banyan tree Bahuwastika on (Mount) Nañoda.43
No. 63 (liv. 45; Hoernle's No. 19 b).
1 Sasupālo Kōdāyo
2 Veñuko a-
3 rimako.
Sisupāla the Kōdya. The gardener Vēnuka.45
No. 64 (liv. 48, 49).
1 Chekulana-Sagharmitasa thabho dānaṁ
2 bhagavato Kasapasa bodhi.
A pillar, (representing) the bākhi (tree) of the blessed Kāśyapa, the gift of Samghamitra from Chikulana.46
No. 65 (liv. 50).
Nāgaye bhichhuniye dānaṁ.
The gift of the nun Nāgā.
No. 66 (liv. 51).
Bhadānta-Valakasa bhanakasa dāna thabho.
A pillar, the gift of the reverend Valaka, a preacher.
No. 67 (liv. 52).
1 Karahakṣa
2 aya-Bhutakasa thabho dānaṁ.
A pillar, the gift of the reverend Bhutaka (from) Karahakṣa.

42 The Challosaṇya (v. 6) uses the form Ērjatha, which has been wrongly sanskritised by Ēläpata; see Dr. Kern's Buddhianus, translated by Jacob, Vol. II. p. 384, note 3. The usual form Ērjatha is derived from the Sanskrit Airjatha, a various form of Airāvata.
43 Bāhās tānāvatāt sad, 'where many elephants (are worshipping)'; see the corresponding relief on Plate xv of the Stāpa of Bharhat.
44 Compare Nos. 18, 19, and Stāpa of Bharhat, Plate liv, where two identical inscriptions (Nos. 70 and 79) appear to read:—Nañoda-pāde Chenachhako, 'at the foot of (Mount) Nañoda . . . . . .' .
45 Probably Kōdīyo must be read; see p. 229, note 29, and compare No. 58, where the name of the country or tribe (Kosalo) likewise follows the name of the king (Pasenāji).
46 See No. 18.
47 Chekulana is synonymous with Chikulaniya in No. 88.
Tikoṭiko chakamo.
The enclosure (called) Trikōṭika.47

No. 68 (liv. 54).

Bhadata-Mahilasa thabhō dāṇāṃ.
A pillar, the gift of the revered Mahila.

No. 69 (liv. 55).

Karahakāśa Samikasa dāna thabhō.
A pillar, the gift of Syāmaka from Karahakāśa.

No. 70 (liv. 56).

Bhadata-Samakasa thabhō dānaṃ.
A pillar, the gift of the revered Syāmaka.

No. 71 (liv. 57).

Yavamajahikiyaṁ jātakaṁ.
The jātaka (which treats) of the yavamahikyaṁ.48

No. 72 (liv. 58).

Sirimā devata.
The goddess Śrimati.

No. 73 (liv. 59).

Suchilomo Yakho.
The Yaksha Suchilōma.

No. 74 (liv. 60).

1 to bhikkunīyā thabhō
2 dāṇāṃ.
A pillar, the gift of the nun 

No. 75 (liv. 61).

Bhadataśa aya-Iṣṭapālaśa bhikṣikasa navakamikasa dānaṃ.
The gift of the lord, the revered Rishipālita, a preacher, who superintends the buildingoperations.49

No. 76 (liv. 62; Hoernle's No. 24).

Ajātasastra Bhagavato vandate.
Ajātasastra worships the Blessed one.

No. 77 (liv. 63; Hoernle's No. 22).

1 Sudhāsāma devasaṅghā
2 Bhagavato chūḍāmaho.

Sudharmā, the hall of the gods. The festival (in honour) of the hair-lock of the Blessed one.

No. 78 (liv. 64; Hoernle's No. 25 a).

1 Vejayaṁto pā-
2 sāde.50

Vaijayaṁta, the palace (of Indra).

No. 79 (liv. 65; Hoernle's No. 25 b).

Mahāsāmiyikāya Arahaguto devaputo vokato Bhagavato51 sāsana pāṭisambhūti.
The angel Arhadgupta,52 having descended, announces to the great assembly the (future) conception of the Blessed one.

---

47 Tūrāb kīsōyā yāṣya sa, 'triangular;' see the corresponding relief on Plate xlvii. of the Stūpas of Bharhat.
48 This is the name of a kind of chāndravajrā.
50 Probably a clerical mistake for pāsiḍa.51 Looks almost like tū. Read āsanta.
52 The name Arahaguto devaputo is also contained in a fragmentary inscription on Plate lvi. No. 3, of the Stūpa of Bharhat.
No. 81 (liv. 67, 68).
1 Moragivimha Nagilaya bhikhuniya danaṁ thabhā
dhugnyato Vipasino bodhi.
Pillara, (representing) the bōḍhi (tree) of the blessed Vipasyā, the gift of the nun Nagila from Mayūragiri.\footnote{54}

No. 82 (liv. 69).
Vedisā Phagudevasa danaṁ.
The gift of Phaligudēva from Vaidisa.

No. 83 (liv. 71).
Purikāya diyaṇakana danaṁ,
The gift of donors from Purika.\footnote{55}

No. 84 (liv. 72).
Bhagavato Kakusadhasa bodhi.
The bōḍhi (tree) of the blessed Kakutsambha.

No. 85 (liv. 73, 74).
1 Vedisā Anurādhāya danaṁ
2 Chhadamiya jātakaṁ,
The jātaka (which treats) of the Shadvanta (elephant), the gift of Anurādha from Vaidisa.

No. 86 (liv. 75 ; Hoernle’s No. 26).
Vitura-Punakiya jātakaṁ,
The jātaka (which treats) of Vidhura and Pūrṇaka.

No. 87 (liv. 76).
Bramhadevo mānavako.
The youth Brahmadēva.

No. 88 (liv. 77).
Bhadata-Kanakasa bhanakasa thabhō danaṁ Chikulaniyaṁ.
A pillar, the gift of the reverend Kanaka, a preacher, from Chikulana.

No. 89 (liv. 78).
Yakhini Sudasana.
The Yakhisī Sudarṣana.

No. 90 (lv. 80).
1 Bhadata-Budharakhitasa sa[ ]padā[na]-
2 sa danaṁ thabhō.
A pillar, the gift of the reverend Buddharaṅghita, who is versed in the sciences (?).

No. 91 (lv. 81).
Chadā Yakhii.
The Yakhśī Chandrā.

No. 92 (lv. 82).
Kepiro Yako.
The Yakhśa Kuvoṛa.

No. 93 (lv. 83).
Ajakālako Yako.
The Yakhśa Ādyakālaṇa.

\footnote{54} Regarding the formation of this name, see Elsaß, v. 3, 84, and Zeitschr. der Deutschen Morg. Ges. Vol. XXXVII p. 531, No. 5, note 2. Compare further Ghāṭila (No. 139), Mahila (No. 69), Saghila (No. 123) and Yakhila (No. 120).
\footnote{55} With Mayūragiri compare Mayūraparvata, a locality which is referred to in a quotation of the Charana-r̥yākhyāna; see Dr. Bühler’s translation of Āpastamba, p. xxxi, note, and Dr. von Schroeder’s Maitrīgīti Saṁhitā, p. xxiv.

\footnote{56} The same place is mentioned in Nos. 117 to 119. On a town of this name, which is referred to in the great epic, see Böhtlingk and Roth’s Sanskrit-Wörterbuch, s. v. At the time of theŚilīhāras, Puri was the capital of the Koskāṇ; ante, Vol. XIII. p. 134. Another Puri in Orissa is well-known by its shrine of Jagannātha; ante, Vol. XX. p. 390.
No. 94 (lv. 84).

Moragirimbha Pusya dana thabhaha.
Pillars, the gift of Pusya from Mayuragiri.

No. 95 (lv. 85).

1 Aya-Chulas Sutaantikasa Bhogavadha-
2 niyasa dana.
The gift of the reverend Kehudra, who is versed in the Sivanta, from Bhoga-vardhana.

No. 96 (lv. 86).

Moragirimbha Thupadasa dana thabhaha.
Pillars, the gift of Stupa dasa from Mayuragiri.

No. 97 (lv. 83).

1 Maharasa amtevasono aya-Sama-
2 kasa thabbho dana.
A pillar, the gift of the reverend Svanaka, the disciple of Mahara.

No. 98 (lv. 89).

Bhagavato okarnita.
The descent of the Blessed one.

No. 99 (lv. 92).

Idasala-guha.
The Indrasala cave.

No. 100 (lv. 2).

Patiliputri Kodiyaniy Sakatadevayana dana.
The gift of Sakatadeva, a Kodiyani, from Patiliputra.

No. 101 (lv. 3).

Kakaniya Somiya bhikhuniya dana.
The gift of the nun Somi from Kakandi.

No. 102 (lv. 4).

Patiliputri Mahadasenas dana.
The gift of Mahendrasana from Patiliputra.

No. 103 (lv. 5).

Chudashhlikayi Nigadevayi bhikhuniya dana.
The gift of the nun Nigadeva from Chudashhila.

No. 104 (lv. 6).

Chudashhlikaya Kajaraya dana.
The gift of Kujarata from Chudashhila.

No. 105 (lv. 7).

Dhajamagutamata Pasadevaya dana.
The gift of Pushyadva, the mother of Dharmagupta.

No. 106 (lv. 8).

[U]hikaye dana.
The gift of Ujjihika.

No. 107 (lv. 9).

[Dhaj]marakbitaya dana suchi.
A rail, the gift of Dharmacakkhit.

---

56 On Sutanta, see Vinaya Texts, Part I. p. xxx. and on the school of the Sutranta, Dr. Kern's Buddhissima, translated by Jacobi, Vol. II. p. 504.
57 The same place is repeatedly mentioned in the Saka inscriptions.
58 The first letter of this word looks like d, which is phonetically impossible.
59 Kakandi is mentioned in the Pajasanii of the Kaunararagatha; ante, Vol. XI. p. 267.
60 Read bhikhuniya.
Atimutasa dānaṁ.  
The gift of Atimukta.  
No. 108 (lv. 10).

Lañuvā-jātaka.  
The gift of Nandottara.  
No. 109 (lv. 11).

Nadntaraya dāna suchi.  
A rail, the gift of Muna.  
No. 110 (lv. 12).

[Mu]daśa dānaṁ.  
The gift of Munḍa.  
No. 111 (lv. 13).

Isānasa dāna.  
The gift of Isana.  
No. 112 (lv. 14).

Isidatasa dānaṁ.  
The gift of Rishidatta.  
No. 113 (lv. 15).

Aya-Punāvasuno suchi dānaṁ.  
A rail, the gift of the reverend Punarvasu.  
No. 114 (lv. 16).

Devarakhitaśa dānaṁ.  
The gift of Devarakshita.  
No. 115 (lv. 19).

Vedisāto Bhutarakhitasa dānaṁ.  
The gift of Bhutarakshita from Vaidita.  
No. 116 (lv. 20).

Purikāya Īdādevāya dānaṁ.  
The gift of Indradēva from Purikā.  
No. 117 (lv. 22).

Purikāya Seṭaka-māitu dānaṁ.  
The gift of the mother of Srēṣṭhaka, from Purikā.  
No. 118 (lv. 23).

Purikāya Sāṃyā dānaṁ.  
The gift of Śyāmā from Purikā.  
No. 119 (lv. 24).

Budharakhitāye dānaṁ bhāchhuniye.  
The gift of the nun Buddharakshita.  
No. 120 (lv. 25).

Bhутaye bhāchhuniye dānaṁ.  
The gift of the nun Bhutā.  
No. 121 (lv. 26).

Aya-Apikinakasa dānaṁ.  
The gift of the reverend Apikinaka.  
No. 122 (lv. 27).

Saṅghilasa dāna su-hi.  
A rail, the gift of Saṅghila.  
No. 123 (lv. 28).

41 Regarding the loss of the aspiration, see Dr. Kuhn's Pāli-Grammatik, p. 41, and compare Asudā for Ashādha (No. 9), Virudāwa for Virādhaka (No. 43), and Vīrūrā for Vīdūrā (No. 86).
42 Compare Aśāpikinaka in a Bhājā inscription; Arch. Survey of W. India, Vol. IV. p. 82, No. 3.
No. 124 (lv. 29).  
Saghharahhitasa matipituna athaya danam.
The gift of Saghharakshita for the benefit of (his) mother and father.

No. 125 (lv. 30).
Dhutasa suchi dano.  
A rail, the gift of Dhurta.

No. 126 (lv. 31).
Yakhilasa suchi dana.
A rail, the gift of Yakshila.

No. 127 (lv. 32).
Mitasa suchi dana.
A rail, the gift of Mitra.

No. 128 (lv. 33).
Isirakhitasa dana.
The gift of Bishirakshita.

No. 129 (lv. 34).
Sirimasa dana.
The gift of Srimat.

No. 130 (lv. 35).
Bhadata-Devasesamasa dana.  
The gift of the reverend Devasesa.  

No. 131 (lv. 36).
. . . . kaya bhichumia dana.
The gift of the nun . . . .

No. 132 (lv. 37).
The gift of Indradeva from Nandinagara.  

No. 133 (lv. 40).
Jethabhadrasa dana.
The gift of Jyesthabhadra.

No. 134 (lv. 41).
Aya-Jatasa Peetakino suchi dana.
A rail, the gift of the reverend Jata, who is versed in the Pitakas.

No. 135 (lv. 42).
Budharakhitasa rupakarakasa dana.
The gift of the sculptor Buddharakshita.

No. 136 (lv. 43).
Bhadata-Samikasa Therak[ai]nya dana.
The gift of the reverend Syama from Sthavarakuta.

No. 137 (lv. 44).
Sirisapada Isirakhitaya dana.
The gift of Bishirakshita (from) Sirishapada.  

63 dana is used as a masculine.
64 The o probably represents a dinned (asahrita) pronunciation of the vowel a.
65 A place of this name is mentioned in several Shachi inscriptions.
66 A village called Sirishapadaka is mentioned in two inscriptions of the Gurjara dynasty; ante, Vol. XIII, pp. 82 and 88. Similar names are Samaipada (Samaipada) in a Nasik inscription (Arch. Survey of W. India, Vol. IV, p. 111) and Vajayapada, the modern Baroda (ante, Vol. XII, p. 124, note 85).
Moragirima\textsuperscript{67} Ghaṭila-matu dānaṁ.
The gift of the mother of Ghaṭila, from Mayāragiri.
No. 138 (lvi. 45).

Samidatāya dānaṁ.
The gift of Śrāmidatta.
No. 140 (lvi. 48).

Chulanasa dānaṁ.
The gift of Chullana.\textsuperscript{68}
No. 141 (lvi. 49).

Avisanasa dānaṁ.
The gift of Aviśhanna.\textsuperscript{69}
No. 142 (lvi. 50).

[Aviśanasa dānaṁ.
The gift of Aviśhanna.
No. 143 (lvi. 51).

Saṅghamitasa bodhichakasa dānaṁ.
The gift of a bodhichakra by Saṅghamitra.
No. 144 (lvi. 52).

Buddharakhitasa Pachanakāyikasa dānaṁ.
The gift of Buddharaṅghita, who is versed in the five Nikāyas.\textsuperscript{70}
No. 145 (lvi. 53).

Isirakhitasa\textsuperscript{71} suchi dānaṁ.
A rail, the gift of Rishirakhitā.
No. 146 (lvi. 55).

Phagudevāye bhūchhuniyeye dānaṁ.
The gift of the nun Phagudēvā.
No. 147 (lvi. 56).

Koḍāya Yakhyā dānaṁ.
The gift of a Yakhyā by Koḍā.\textsuperscript{72}
No. 148 (lvi. 57).

Ghosaṅye dānaṁ.
The gift of Ghōshaṅ.
No. 149 (lvi. 59).

Seriyā putasa Bhāranidevasa dānaṁ.
The gift of Bharantidēva, the son of Śri.
No. 150 (lvi. 60).

Mitadevāye dānaṁ.
The gift of Mitradēva.
No. 151.\textsuperscript{73}

Isānasa dānaṁ.
The gift of Isānā.

\textsuperscript{67} Moragirima is either a clerical mistake for Moragirimā, or stands for the assimilated form Moragirimmā. Compare nabhīmā for nabhīdāmā, and pāpekkha for pāpekkhā in the Jātaka, Vol. I, pp. 267 and 440.

\textsuperscript{68} This word is derived from chulla (Suṣakā kahṛda). Compare Dhamanaka, Nikaṇḍaka, Paseṇḍa, Rāmāṇa, Usabhasakā and Vasalasakā in the cave inscriptions.

\textsuperscript{69} Compare Aviśaṅ in two Śākchi inscriptions.

\textsuperscript{70} See Childers' Pāli Dictionary, s. v. nikāya.

\textsuperscript{71} Isānā looks like Isāṇa.

\textsuperscript{72} Compare Koḍ in a Kāra inscription (Arch. Survey of W. India, Vol. IV, p. 91, No. 16) and Koḍa in a Sopārā inscription (Dr. Bh. Indraji’s Sopārā and Padana, p. 15). The word dānaṁ governs both a subjective and an objective genitive, as in No. 143; see Pāṇini, ii, 3, 63.

\textsuperscript{73} On the same rail as the identical inscription No. 112, but in more modern characters.
Bo[dhigu]lasa dánaṃ.  
The gift of Bódhigupta.

No. 153.  

. . . . Himavate i . . . .

No. 154.  

. . . . . . . [m]ika[sa dánaṃ].

No. 155 (xxv. 4; lv. 94).  
The játaka (which treats) of the cooking of beans (?)

No. 156 (xxvi. 7).

Iśita[i]ṃgiya jā[ta[ka].
The játaka (which treats) of Rāyaśriṇga.

No. 157 (xxvi. 8; lv. 97).
Yañ braham[ḥ]ano avayesa jātakaṃ.
The játaka (entitled) "yañ bṛdhmano avadāsī;"

No. 158 (xxvii. 11; liii. 11).

Haṃsa-jātaka.
The swan jātaka.

No. 159 (lvi. 66).
Tīrāmi tīmigita-kuchhīnha Vasuguto māghito Mahādevānā.

Vasugupta is rescued from the belly of the sea-monster (and brought) on shore by Mahādeva.

No. 160 (lvi. 19).

1. [Ba]huḥthika āśana  
The seat of the blessed Mahādeva (under the banyan tree) Bahuḥthiṣṭa.

PRAKRIT AND SANSKRIT INDEX.  

Aboda (Arbuda) 5.  
Achharā (Apsaras) 51 to 54.  
Āgaruṣu (Āṅgaruṣuṇa) 2.  
Ajākāla (Ādyā) 93.  
Ajatasa (Śatrū) 77.  
Alamāna (Alambusha) 54.  
Aṅṭevāśa (aṅṭē) 97.  
Anāhāpīḍika (Anāthapīḍika) 38.  
Anurādhā 85.  
amāna (aṅṭā) 4.  
Apikāna 122.  
Arhadgupta (Arhadgupta) 80. lvi. 3.  
arāmaka (āramika) 63.  

Asañā (Aśāñā) 9.  
āśana 160.  
asavārika (asava) 36.  
āṭha (artha) 124.  
Atimata ("mukta) 108.  
avayesa (3rd pers. sing. aor. of vaidyati) 157.  
Avisanā (Avisanā) 141, 142.  
aya (arya) 2, 23, 25, 26, 45, 67, 76, 95, 97, 114, 123, 134.  
Badhika (Bōdhika ?) 27.  
Bahuḥthika ("hastika) 61, 62, 169.  
bhadānta (bhadaṇta) 23, 66.  

74 On rail 8, Plate xxxviii. No. 3; much injured.  
75 On pillar 28, Plate xix.  
76 Nos. 155 to 160, the originals of which were not removed to Calcutta, are transcribed from General Cunningham's photographs and eye-copies in his Stūpa of Bharhut.  
77 Read Tīrāmī tīmigita-kuchhīnha Vasuguto māghito Mahādevānā.  
78 See the corresponding relief on Plate xxxiv. No. 2, of the Stūpa of Bharhut. Mahādeva probably refers to the Mahāsa or Bōdhisatva; compare No. 160.  
79 See p. 232, note 42.  
80 Arabic figures refer to the Nos. of the inscriptions, Roman figures to the Plates of the Stūpa of Bharhut.
bhadata (bhadanta) 69, 71, 76, 88, 90, 130, 136.
bhagavat 24, 30, 46, 57, 60, 64, 77, 78, 80, 81, 84, 98, 160.
bharaka (bāhāra) 58, 88.
bhānaka (bāhāra) 45, 76.
Bhāranideva (Bharaṇīdeva) 149.
bhārīya (bhāryā) 22.
bhichhuni (bhikṣuṇī) 27, 31, 65, 101, 120, 121, 131, 146.
bhikṣuṇi (bhikṣuṇī) 27, 75, 81, 103.
bhisaharanīya (from bhis-haraṇa) 17.
Bhogavājñāniya (from Bhogavāndhana) 95.
Bhojakataka (from Bhōjakata) lvi. 46.
Bhojakatakā (from Bhōjakata) 31.
Bhuta (Bhūta) 121.
Bhutaka (Bhūta) 67.
Bhutarakhita (Bhūtarakṣita) 23, 116.
Bibhīkanadikaṭa (Bimbikānandī?) 36.
bījāla (bījāla) 7.
bodha (bōdha) 46.
bodhi (bōdhi) 24, 30, 64, 81, 84.
bodhichakka (bōdhiḥchakka) 143.
Bodhīhikṣu (Bōdhiḥikṣa) 152.
Brahmadeva (Brahmadeva) 87.
bram[h]ana (brāhmaṇa) 157.
Budharakhita (Buddharakṣita) 90, 135, 144.
Budharakhita (Buddharakṣita) 120.
Buddhi (Buddhi) 33.

cha 1.
Chadā (Chandrā) 91.
chakama (cha[k]rama) 8, 68.
Chakovāka (Chakra?) 42.
Chāpadeva ("dēva") 22.
Chekulana (from Chi?) 64.
Chenachhaka (?) liv. 70, 79.
chetaya (chaitya) 11.
ch[e]tiya (chaśīya) 5.
chha (sash) 49.
Chhaddevīya (from Shuddanta) 85.
Chikhulaniya (from Chikulana) 88.
Chitpāya-silā (Chitrāṭpāta-silā) 21.
chudāmaṇa 78.
Chudaṭṭhikā (from Chudaṭṭhā) 29, 108, 104.
Chula (Kshudra) 95.
Chulakokā (Kshudrakokā) 26.
Chulana (from kshudra) 140.

Dabhinikā (from Dabhīna) 27.
Daśanikama (Daśanishkramana) 8.
dakhina (dakṣiṇa) 49.

dana (dāna) 108, 145.
dāna 2 etc.—Masc. 125.
dāyaka 83.
dēti (dādāti) 38.
deva (deva) 50.
dēvapauta (dēvaputra) 80. lvi. 3.
Devarakhita (Dēvarakṣita) 115.
devassabhā (dēvā) 78.
Devasena (Dēvasena) 130.
devata (dēvāti) 47, 73. lv. 98.
dēvata (dēvāti) 26.
devi (dēvi) 20.
dhamachaka (dharmachakra) 57.
Dhamgupta (Dharmagupta) 35.
Dhamarakha (Dharmarakṣita) 41.
[Dh][a]rakha (Dharmarakṣita) 107.
Dhaṇḍā (Dharmagupta) 105.
Dhamabhiṭā 1. lvi. 54.
dhitu (gen. of duhitī) 27.
Dhuta (Dhūtā) 125.
Dīghanaga (Dīhnāga) 31.
Dīghanapāsa (Dirghatapasvin) 4.
disa (acc. of dis) 47 to 49.
dohati (dōgadhi) 18.
dona (dāna) 130.

Erapata (Airāvata) 59, 60.

Gāgī (Gāgī) 1.
Gahapati (griha) 33.
Ga[h]uta (grihiḥ) 6.
Ga[m]hakuti (Gaudhakuti) 40.
Gangita 44.
Ghāṭīla 138.
Ghosā (Ghōṣā) 148.
Gorakhita (Gorakṣita) 25.
Goti (Gaupī) 1.

haṁsa 158.
Himavata ("vāt") 153.

Idadevā (Indrādevā) 117, 132.
Idasā-guha (Indrāśā-guha) 99.
Isāna (Isāna) 112, 151.
isi (ṛishī) 10.
Isidatta (Rishidatta) 113.
Isidhīna (Rishidatta) 45.
Isipālīta (Rishi?) 76.
Isirakhita (Rishirakṣita) 128, 145.
Isirakhita (Rishirakṣita) 137.
Isi[ś]ūga (from Rishvīṛga) 156.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jabu (jambū)</th>
<th>19.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Janaka 20.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jāta 134.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jataka (jāt) 3, 6, 7, 10, 14, 15, 17, 86, 157.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jātaka 12, 32, 37, 75, 85, 109, 155, 156, 158.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jatila 18.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jetavana (Jātā) 38.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jethabhādra (Jyēšt(h)a) 133.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kākanadi (Kākandil) 101.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kakusandha (Kakutasandha) 84.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāmāvachara 49.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaśinjarikī (Kanḍarikī) 55.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katāmaṁta (karmānta) 1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanaka 88.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karahakāya 16, 67, 70, lv. 96.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kārīta 1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasapa (Kāyapa) 64.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katha (kāṣṭha or kvaṭha?) 18.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ketā (nom. of kṛtā?) 38.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khujadikāyā (from Kubjatindukā?) 23.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinara (Kinnara) 12.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koḍa (Krūḍā) 147.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koḍāya (Koḍāya?) 63.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koḍāyā (Koḍāyā?) 28, 100.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Konagamena (Koṅgamana) 30.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kosabaya (from Kaṇasāmbē) lv. 53.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kosala (Kōsāla) 58.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kosa[m]ba-kuṭi (Kaṇasāmba-kuṭi) 39.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koṭī (koti) 38.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kucchā (kukshī) 159.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kujāra (Kuṇājarā) 104.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kukūṭa (kukūṭa) 7.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kupira (Kuvēra) 92.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>latvā (laṭvā) 109.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maghādeviya (from Makhādeva) 8.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahādeva (Mahādeva) 159.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahādeva (Mahādeva) 160.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahākoka (Mahākkoka) lv. 98.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahāmukhi (Maha) 27.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahāra 97.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mahāśāmāyikā (from mahat and sāmājīka) 80.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahāśadasena (Mahāśadasena) 102.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahila 69.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mānavaka (māṇa) 87.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>māṭāpituma (māṭāpitūmb) 124.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>matu (gen. of māṭī) 105, 138.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mātu (gen. of māṭī) 118.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migā (miṟga) 10, 11, 37.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misak[ei]a (Miśakṣā) 51.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitā (Mitra) 127.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitadevā (Mitradēvā) 150.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M[o]chita (mochita) 159.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moragiri (Mayūra) 81, 94, 96, 133. lv. 95.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Mu]da (Mūḍa) 111.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m[uchi]k[i]ya (from mudgā-pāka?) 155.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naḍoda (Naḍoda) 18, 19, 62. lv. 70, 79.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nadutara (Nandottarā) 110.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nāga 32.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nāga (Nāgā) 65.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nāgadeva (&quot;dēva&quot;) 2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nāgadevā (&quot;dēvā&quot;) 108.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nāgarājā (&quot;rājā&quot;) 42, 60.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nāgarajā (&quot;rājā&quot;) 59.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nāgarākṣitā (&quot;rakṣitā&quot;) lv. 67.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nāgasena (&quot;sena&quot;) 28.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nāgilā 81.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N[a]nagā[r]ikā (from Nandinagara) 132.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nāsika lv. 87.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ṣati (jāṭī?) 9.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>navakamika (from navakaman) 76.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nigama 16.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nigoda (nyagrodha) 62.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>okraṃtī (avakrīntī) 98.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pachanekārya (from Paṇchaniṇikāya) 144.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pada lv. 70, 79.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Padumavati (Padmāvatī) 53.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paṁthaka 26.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pāśāda (pra?) 79.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasenaji (Prasenajit) 58.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pāṭaliputa (&quot;putra&quot;) 28, 100, 102.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pathama (prathama) 22.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paṭisaṁdhi (prati?) 80.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>panta (pantra) 1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pavata (parvata) 18, 19.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peṭakin (from Piṭaka) 134.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phagadeva (Phalgrudeva) 82.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phagadevā (Phalgrudevā) 146.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purāvasu (Puruṣvasu) 114.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>puratāpam (from purastāt) 47.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purikā 83, 117 to 119.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pusa (Pushya) 37.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pusā (Pushyā) 94.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pusadeva (Pushyadevā) 105.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>para (putra) 1, 149.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
raja (rājya) 1.
ruka (ruka) 22.
Revatimā (Rēvaṭimā) 22.
rupakāraka (rupa) 135.
sabha 13.
Sabhāḍā (Subhāḍā) 52.
sādika (sātaka or sāṭikā) 50.
Saṅghamita (Saṅghamīta) 64.
Saṅgharākṣita (Saṅgharākṣita) 124.
Saṅghila (Saṅghila) 123.
sahasa (sahasa) 49.
Sakamuni (Saṅkṣaṭi) 46.
Sakata-devā (Sakata-devā) 100.
sāla (sāla) 24.
Sāmā (Sāmā) 119.
samadhāka (samādhāka) 11.
Samakā (Saṅkā) 71.
Sāmakā (Saṅkā) 97.
Samanā (Sramaṇā) 99.
Saṅghamita (Saṅkṣaṭi) 148.
Samīḍatsa (Saṃmādatsa) 139.
Samikā (Saṅkā) 70, 138.
samāmada 50.
sāntihata (sāntihata) 33.
sāsā (saśā) 30.
[sa]vata (saṅvata) 49.
sekhā (saṅkhā) 15.
Selapuraka (Selāpuraka) lr. 97.
Seri (Sri) 149.
Setka (Saṅkaṭaka) 118.
sigala (ṣigala) 9.
sīlā (śīlā) 1.
Siṅgula (Siṅgula) 129.
Sīrīma (Sīrīma) 128.
Sīrīma (Sīrīmat) 129.
Sīrisapada (Sīrisapadā) 137.
sīsa (śīsa) 4.
sīsa (śīṣa) 48.
Sīvala (Sīvala) 20.
Somā (Somā) 101.
suṣṭha (suṣṭha) 107, 110, 114, 123, 125 to 127, 134, 145.
Suchiloma (Suchiloma) 74.
Sucharasa (Saṅkarasa) 85.
Sudhāmā (Sudhamā) 78.
Sudhāvāsa (Suddhā) 47.
Suga (Suṅga) 1.
Sujata (Sujata) 6.
Sudhāsha (Sudhāsha) 36.
Supāvasa (Sūprāvāsa) 34.
sūṣanā (śūṣanā) 9.
Sūsumā (Śūṣumā) 63.
Sūtaṇṭika (Sūtraṇṭika) 95.
thābha (stambha) 22, 25, 35, 64, 66, 67, 69 to 71, 75, 81, 88, 90, 94, 96, 97.
thaṭbha (stambha) 26, 37.
Therāk[ū]ṭi (Ṭhērākūṭa) 136.
Thupadāsa (Ṭupāśa) 96.
Trīkūṭika (Trikūṭika) 68.
Tīrīṃghila (Tīrīṃghila) 159.
tīra (tīra) 159.
toraṇa (toraṇa) 1.
tura (tūra) 50.
uda (udra) 14.
[Ujjhika (Ujjhika) 106.
upāsana (ntpanna) 1.
uttara (uttara) 48.
Vāchhi (Vāchi) 1.
Vadate (vandate) 60.
Vāḍhāpila (Vāḍhā) lvi. 54.
vadh (vadhā) 9.
Vālaka 66.
vandate (vandate) 77.
Vasuguta (gupta) 159.
Vedasa (Vaidśa) 22, 82, 85, 116. Ivi. 100. Ivi. 1.
Veduca (Vēṇuca) 18, 63.
Vejarāṭa (Vejarāṇa) 79.
Vesabhu (Viśabhū) 24.
Vijāḍhara (Viḍā) 50.
Vijāpī (Viṣṭā) 56.
Vipasīn (Vipaśīna) 81.
V[i]ruḍaka (Viraḍhaka) 48.
Visadeva (Viṣadēva) 1.
Vitūra-Punākya (from Vitūra and Punākaya) 86.
vokata (avakrānta) 80.
Yakha (Yakha) 34, 43, 44, 74, 92, 93.
Yakhi (Yakhi) 91, 147.
Yakhila (Yakṣila) 126.
Yakhini (Yakṣini) 89.
yām (yat) 157.
yavamajhakīya (from yavamadhūaka) 72.
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PART II.

MIXED SANSKRIT AND CLASSICAL SANSKRIT.

It is in the monuments of the last Kesharatta, Nahapana, and in those of the first Andhrabhritiyas that we find the knot of the questions with which we are concerned. According to my opinion, these monuments are dated with certainty. Even for those who may not share my opinion, they are not one whet of less capital importance. A difference of 50 or 100 years is, in this matter, of small consequence, and, at any rate, there can be no dispute about one point, viz., that all these texts are to all intents and purposes contemporaneous.

Nevertheless, from the point of view of language, they present characteristic differences.

At Nasik, Karli, and Junnar, seven inscriptions of the reign of Nahapana have been brought to notice. Not only do they all belong to the same time, but also, with the exception of the last, they all emanate from the same person, Usavadata, son-in-law of Nahapana. Of these inscriptions, one, No. 5 at Nasik, appears at the first glance to be couched in grammatical Sanskrit, spelled according to classical rules. But, on closer examination, we observe more than one irregularity, the transgression of certain rules of Saundhi, Prakritizing methods of spelling, such as deCatvadriti, Podhiri, Podhakadhati, varsharatum, utamadad, &c. These irregularities, which are very rare at the commencement, multiply towards the end of the inscription. Another (Nasik 6 A) is, on the other hand, entirely Prakrit in its terminations; homogeny consonants are not doubled; y is retained after a consonant (keshatrapa), but assimilated where it precedes (usavada); it distinguishes three sibilants, but, by the side of sata, we read sata, and even panarasa for pañchadasa; by the side of the ordinary assimilations of Prakrit, the group kha is retained unchanged, and we find kātyaka equivalent to the Sanskrit naṣṭyaka. It is hardly otherwise with No. 7 of Nasik. It contains both kāyana and kāsana, kāraṇa beside Ushavadata, kāraṇapāṇa and kāraṇapāṇa, saha and sakha, all which does not prevent its using the vowel i in kriya.

In another inscription, No. 19 of Karli, pure Prakrit reigns supreme, except in the orthographies brhadnapa and bhūrya. The fact is the more striking because the formula employed is the exact counterpart of the Sanskrit formula of the monument first referred to. The case is the same at Nasik, in Nos. 8-9, save for the orthographies pata, keshatrapa, and kesharatita, by the side of Dukhanatita (equivalent to Daksﬁnitra). Finally, in No. 11 of Junnar, the kha gives way to kh, which, nevertheless, does not prevent them from writing amdiya and not amacha, by the side of sañi for svámi, and even of mañapa for mañapa. I cannot dispense with again referring to No. 10 of Nasik which, although we are unable to fix its date with precision, is undoubtedly contemporaneous. This time, the terminations, the genitive masculine in asya, have the appearance of Sanskrit; but we also find the genitive -varmanah, side by side with varmanaya; as a general rule the orthography is Sanskrit, but, nevertheless, we read in it gita, chaṭāvā (Chachāvi), vishudhatiya, gidabhadha. This is the exact reverse of the preceding inscriptions, which write keshatrapa, and have the genitive in asa.

This capricious and unequal mixture of classical and popular forms is a new thing. In the literature of the Northern Buddhists, it has a name. It is the "Gāthā dialect." Nowadays, that this same mode of writing has been found not only in prose religious

82 Hoernle, Ind. Ant. 1888, pp. 27 and 32.
83 Ushavadata itself could easily contain an instance of confusion between the sibilants. The y, which is almost constant, does not appear to me to lend itself to the transcription Rishabhadatta of Dr. Bühler. It is, unless I am mistaken, Utsavadata, which we should understand.
treatises, but also in lay works, and that we meet it in the texts of inscriptions, this terminology has become both inaccurate and inconvenient. I propose to substitute the term ‘Mixed Sanskrit,’ a name which will, I hope, be justified by the observations which follow.

The same caves preserve the memory of the Andhrabhrityas who were contemporary with or the immediate successors of Nahapana — Gotamiputa Satakarni and his descendants. In general (Nâsik, 11 A, 11 B, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 22; Kârli, 20, 21; Kanâhri, 4, 14, 15) the inscriptions are couched in pure Prâkrit, though not without certain inconsistencies in detail (sâvâmi beside sâuryâhi, Nâs. 11 A, 15); Pulumâdi (Nâs. 13, beside Pulumâdi, Nâs. 15, and Pulumâdi, Nâs. 12, &c.). This means that assimilation occurs everywhere, though the consonants are never written double. This does not, however, prevent us from finding at Kârli (No. 22), a donation of the reign of Vâsishthputra Pulumâdi, which has siddhapâ, according to the classical method; which, beside numerous genitivies in ãsa, writes pustasa, sâvâsakasa, vâsahasya, and, beside niśhta, hitarupasthâriyê. It thus unites in the same word forms which were already no longer found in the inscriptions of Piyadasi, and others which are still rare in the 2nd century of our era, to which epoch they belong! On the other hand, at Kanâhri (No. 11), a dedication of the reign of Vâsishthputra Satakarnî, the son-in-law of the Satrap Rudradâman, is couched in pure Sanskrit, save for one single irregularity: Satakarniya.

Are these facts, I will not say isolated, but circumscribed in a narrow region? Quite the contrary. It is sufficient for conviction to cast the eye over the monuments of the Turushka kings, Kanishka and his dynasty, monuments which are either exactly contemporary with those to which we have just referred, or of very little earlier date. The inscription of Sué Vihar is dated the 11th year of Kanishka. It may be said to be couched in Sanskrit, but in a Sanskrit seriously disfigured by spellings like bhikshusya, ahaevi(u)jë, nagodastasa, sahikakafisya(?), yathik, yathipraithanam, &c. In the 18th year of the same reign, the stone of Manikyâla, however imperfectly we may understand it, allows us clearly to recognise, side by side with the retention of the three sibilants and of groups containing an r, a number of Prâkrit forms, such as bhudosita, the termination âd, makarajasa, vêpâsia, chahrapasa, &c. Mathurâ possesses, from the year 28, a fragment of correct Sanskrit. So also for the time of HuvishKa. At Mathurâ (Growse, 2, 11; Dowson, 1, 2, 5, 7) the language of the dedications is classical; yet they present the genitive bhikshusya, and the phrase asya (or étasa) pàrvadyé. On the Wardak vase, in the year 51, appear forms so much altered as thuvamki (=stúgë), bhogad, arigadachhina, to speak only of those which are certain. The date of the inscription of Taxila is not fixed with certainty, but I do not think that any one can consider it as more modern than those to which I have just referred; and the name Chhahardâla, which I think I have identified at the end of the first line seems to assign it a place in about the same epoch, or in an epoch slightly earlier. Here, excepting the sibilants and a few groups (chhatrapa bhratara, vauhita, sarca, sahuatasa), everything is Prâkrit, the genitive in ãsa, the assimilation in aha, takshâna, prâthihsita, &c., and mixed up with very debased forms such as the locative sanâtaraayât, and the dative puyaé.

It is necessary to complete this review, by noting that it is towards the end of the period of which we are treating, towards the year 75 or 80 of the Saka era, i.e. 155 to 160 A. D., that we find the first known inscription in perfectly correct Sanskrit — the inscription of the

44 The Bashkhalii Manuscript, which has been published by Dr. Hoernle.
46 Arch. Surv. West. Ind. V. p. 78.
47 Hoernle, Ind. Ant. X. 333 and ff. Papjip Bhagwanial Indrâji has submitted this document to an independent revision (Ind. Ant. 1882, p. 129), in which he has frequently come to conclusions different from those of Dr. Hoernle. In cases of divergence, except in certain doubtful passages in which the truth appears to me to be still undiscovered, I consider that it is Dr. Hoernle who is right.
48 Dowson, J. R. A. S. XX. p. 228.
Strap king Budradâman, at Girnar. The inscription of Jasdhon, dated 127, and consequently 50 years later, emanating from the grandson of Budradâman, only returns to the mistakes of Mixed Sanskrit in a few details.

What is precisely this Mixed Sanskrit?

Various attempts have been made to explain its existence and its peculiarities. It has been held to be a dialect intermediate between the ancient period of Sanskrit and the more modern period of the Prâkrits; — a sort of jargon created by ignorance or, if it is preferred, by incomplete knowledge on the part of the people, their ambition being incommeasurable with their powers, who wished to give themselves the honour of writing in the literary language, without possessing a sufficient acquaintance with it (Burnouf); — the special dialect of bards, who appear to have taken a middle course between the popular speech and the learned language, in order to make themselves intelligible, without too great derogation, to their audience (Rajendralâla Mitra).

Neither of these explanations, taken alone and in the exact meaning which was intended by its author, can be reconciled with facts as they are known to us at the present day.

The conjecture of Burnouf was an excellent explanation, when he seemed to be dealing with only a few stanzas lost in a vast literature. We can no longer attribute to the pedantry of an editor or of a clumsy scribe a language which is employed on a vast scale, and applied to royal inscriptions, and we are unable to explain by a vulgar ignorance a mixture, which rather appears to bear witness to an extensive acquaintance with the literary language.

It is no more possible to represent, as a special poetical language, a dialect which is fluently used in the inscriptions, and which is employed in lengthy prose works and even in didactic treatises.

As for seeing in Mixed Sanskrit the direct expression of the current language at a certain period of its development, the theory hardly deserves the trouble of refutation. A dialect so void of all stability, at one moment closely resembling classical Sanskrit, and at another very different from it, a dialect which brings together, in complete confusion and in arbitrary proportions, phonetic phenomena which belong to most unequal degrees of linguistic development, could never be a faithful echo of the popular language at any epoch whatever. Mixed Sanskrit is, neither in its grammar nor in its phonetics, intermediate between Sanskrit and the Prâkrits; it constitutes an incoherent mixture of forms purely Sanskrit and of forms purely Prâkrit, which is an altogether different thing.

Mixed Sanskrit has, moreover, a history. In the chronological series of monuments which it is represented, far from shewing signs of gradually increasing phonetic decay, it continues to approach more and more nearly to classical orthography and to classical forms. In the inscriptions of Mathurâ, the remnants of Prâkrit orthography are so rare, that the general appearance as a whole is that of pure Sanskrit.

This observation comes to our assistance in answering the question which we have before us. It is not sufficient to know what Mixed Sanskrit is not. We must determine what it is.

Towards the end of the 2nd century, we find upon the monuments three dialects which, in their phonetic condition, appear to correspond to different ages of the physiological development of the language: Sanskrit, Mixed Sanskrit, and Prâkrit. All three are destined in the future to continue concurrently in literature. Here we find them used side by side, at the same time, and at the same places. It is inadmissible to suppose that they represent contemporary states of the vulgar tongue; at most, that could be represented only by the most corrupted of the three dialects, the Prâkrit. As for Mixed Sanskrit, like

---

20 Arch. Surv. West. Ind. IV. p. 136.
21 Hoernle, Ind. Aud. 1883, p. 32.
22 This gradation becomes still more evident if, as we ought to do, we take as our point of departure the inscriptions of Piyadasi at Girnar and at Kapur di Giri.
regular Sanskrit itself, it cannot be anything other than a special literary language, or, more exactly, a special literary orthography. In itself, it is no more surprising to find side by side two literary idioms like Sanskrit and Mixed Sanskrit than to find the parallel use of the various Prākrit dialects which were established for religious or poetic usage. From the facts proved for the time of Piyadasī, we are prepared to see a double orthographical current establish itself, one more near to the popular pronunciation, and the other approaching, and tending to approach more and more nearly, etymological forms. In the hundred and fifty or two hundred years which separate our edicts from the most ancient monuments of Mixed Sanskrit properly so-called, these tendencies, which we have grasped in their rudimentary state, have had time to become accentuated, and to develop in the strict logical sequence of their principles. As it appears to us in the most recent monuments, Mixed Sanskrit is so nearly the same as Sanskrit, that it seems impossible to separate the history of one dialect from that of the other. What is the relationship which unites the two?

From the time when Sanskrit first appears, we find it in a definite form. Neither in grammar nor in its orthography do we find any feeling the way, any development, any progress. It leaps ready armed from its cradle. As it was at the first day, so it has remained to the end. Mixed Sanskrit is altogether different. Uncertain in its orthographical methods, without any absolute system or stability, it appears to us, from Kapur di Giri to Mathurā, progressing, in spite of many hesitations, in spite of many minor inconsistencies, in one continuous general direction. At Kapur di Giri the language is entirely Prākrit, but several consonantal groups are preserved without assimilation. In the inscription of Dhanabhūti at Mathurā, the terminations are Prākrit, but spellings like vatiṣṭ, rājagriha approach the classical standard. At Śvē Vihar, even the terminations take the learned spelling; asya and not aṣa; only a few irregularities connect the language with Prākrit. In the caves we have seen that some inscriptions have side by side the genitive in aṣya and that in aṣa. These examples will suffice.

Besides these characteristics, two important facts, which mark their true significance, deserve mention.

In the north, the first inscriptions written in Sanskrit, or at least so nearly Sanskrit that they bear witness to its diffusion, are those of Mathurā, and date from the reign of Kanishka. Shortly after this period we find no further examples of monumental Mixed Sanskrit. In the west, the son-in-law of Rudradāman inaugurates the use of Sanskrit with the inscription of Kanhārī; from the end of the second century, the use of Mixed Sanskrit is, in the west, banished from the inscriptions. In a word, the introduction of regular Sanskrit marks the demise of Mixed Sanskrit. That is the first fact.

The second is of another nature. All texts in Mixed Sanskrit, both in the north and in the west, preserve uniformly one very characteristic peculiarity, which we have already noticed in the spelling of Piyadasī. They never write as double, identical or homogeneous consonants, which are really doubles either by origin or by assimilation. This trait only disappeared at the precise moment when Mixed Sanskrit ceased to be used. In the north, the first inscriptions which double these consonants are those of Mathurā, which are almost entirely couched in regular Sanskrit. The practice was certainly a new one, for the other inscriptions of the reign of Kanishka, even those which, as at Śvē Vihar, approach most nearly the learned orthography, do not adopt it. It is quite true that they are

62 Bharhut Stūpa, pl. LIII. 4. The transcription proposed by General Cunningham requires corrections. We should read,—

Kal ....... dhana
bhātika ... vatiṣṭ,
putraka [vādha] lama
dhanabhūtika dhūnak veditkā
torundha cha rājagriha sa
ravabhadrapūjya saka mālāpī
tiṅ (?i) saka · chatu · parishāhā
engraved in the Aramaean alphabet of the north-west, while the Indian alphabet is employed at Mathurā; but at Mathurā itself, the inscription of Dhanabhūti, although written in Indian characters, does not observe the practice of doubling any more than they do. This neglect is, therefore, not the peculiarity of one particular mode of writing; it is a general fact down to a certain epoch, which, in the north, is marked by the reign of Kanishka. On the west coast, the first inscription in which we find the notation of double consonants is No. 11 of Kapihri (Arch. Surv. V. 85). It is one of the latest of the series, and is certainly not earlier than the end of the 2nd century. The doubling of consonants, therefore, only makes its appearance at the period in which the monuments testify that correct Sanskrit was becoming taken into common use, and the parallel application, in the inscriptions of the time of Kanishka, of the ancient procedure, and of the new method, indicates that we have grasped the precise moment of the evolution.

It is not difficult to come to a conclusion.

Mixed Sanskrit is certainly not a direct copy of literary Sanskrit, attempted at an epoch when the latter had already been established in common use. The progressive march by which it gradually approximated classical forms as well as its feeling its way in matters of detail, would be, under this hypothesis, without any possible explanation. Its tendency towards an etymological and regulated orthography is everywhere visible. If it had had before its eyes a fixed, a definitive model, previously realized by writing and literary practice, it would from the first have imitated it in all its particulars. It would not have waited three centuries before doubling its consonants in writing. As it constantly tended to go as close as possible to the orthographical conditions of which the learned Sanskrit is the completed perfect type, it would have gone right up to it. From the moment at which real Sanskrit appears, Mixed Sanskrit disappears, and this most naturally; for, in face of real Sanskrit, Mixed Sanskrit is without reason for existence, its efforts would be without honour, and its shortcomings without excuse. Far, therefore, from being able to pass for an imitation of pre-existing Sanskrit, Mixed Sanskrit proves, by its very existence, that Literary Sanskrit did not exist, I mean for current use. The date on which the classical language appears in the monuments, coincides with that at which the Mixed Sanskrit ceases to be employed, and marks very exactly the epoch at which the learned language took possession of that empire which was destined never to escape it. This conclusion is further strengthened by the fact that the current of this diffusion may, at least in one direction, be traced by the monuments. Regular Sanskrit can be considered as under process of establishment in the north-west towards the end of the first century of our era. The practice immediately began to spread towards the south. In the second half of the following century, the inscription of Rudradaman presents to our notice, in Gujarat, the first incontestable monument. It was the influence of the same sovereign which caused it to extend still further, for in an inscription of his daughter it makes its first appearance in the dominions of the Andhrabhrityas. Until then these princes had only employed a Monumental Prākrit now and then affecting the appearance of Mixed Sanskrit.

Although Mixed Sanskrit is not a direct imitation of a pre-existing Sanskrit, the close connexion between the two terms is evident. But is, therefore, Mixed Sanskrit the source of Classical Sanskrit? Is it Classical Sanskrit in course of formation? By no means, any more than the converse case is true. The reasons are peremptory.

All the elements from which Sanskrit, in its classical form, has been built up, were pre-existing in the Vedic language. Its system of phonetics, which is that which gives it its special character in comparison with the popular idioms, had long been fixed and analysed for the purpose of religious recitation. In order, therefore, to fix Sanskrit, there was no room for much feeling of the way. So far as there may have been any, it was certainly not of the kind we witness in Mixed Sanskrit. In fixing classical Sanskrit, a regular course would have been followed, instead of the constant alternate progress and retrogression which we find in the mixed variety. We do not find in it side by side the two-fold reflexion, the learned and the
popular, of the same forms. So also, the classical language, being derived directly from the learned and Vedic tradition could have made no delay in noting the duplication of consonants.

It should not, however, be assumed that Literary Sanskrit must have sprung at once from the schools into public life. The necessary grammatical elaboration, even the accommodation of the alphabet to its needs, must have required a greater or less length of time, but the course of its development was certainly not the same as that which the inscriptions allow us to see in the case of Mixed Sanskrit, with its inconsistencies, and its blunders.

While Mixed Sanskrit is neither the reflected imitation nor the source of classical Sanskrit, it is, nevertheless, something of both. If Sanskrit had previously existed in common use, Mixed Sanskrit would never have existed at all; but at the same time, unless Sanskrit had been in existence to serve for its type, the existence of Mixed Sanskrit would have been equally impossible. This paradox is not difficult to solve, if we place before us the very peculiar conditions which have ruled the linguistic development of India.

Sanskrit presents itself to our notice under an aspect calculated to perplex the observer. Literary languages are usually vulgar tongues in current use, which, being applied, at a moment of high intellectual development, to works destined to endure as abiding national monuments, have been through the means of these works crystallised into a shape which becomes the norm for future writers. Not so with Sanskrit. It does not issue directly from the popular idiom. It first appears at an epoch when the vulgar and general tongue had, for centuries, arrived at a much further advanced degree of phonetic and grammatical degeneration. It represents an archaic language preserved at first by oral tradition, and subsequently retouched by the labours of learned men. It is, in a manner, a literary language in the second degree,—a profane language, grafted on a more ancient religious one; or, to state the matter more accurately, it represents the reform of an earlier literary language.

The oral preservation of the Vedic hymns down to an epoch when the language in which they were composed had long ceased to be used by the people, is a cardinal point in the linguistic history of India. A caste had kept guard over the treasure of religious songs. Their importance for ritual assured their conservation to the most minute degree; the necessity of protecting their efficacy together with their material form gave rise to rules of pronunciation. These gradually developed into a phonetic system which was refined even to subtlety, and which prepared the way for the study of grammar properly so-called. The religious bearing of the hymns inspired the zeal necessary for assuring their oral transmission; and the fear of making the privilege common to all, maintained the oral tradition even down to an epoch when it would have been easy to substitute for it preservation by the art of writing.

Whatever may have been the authority of this tradition, the knowledge of writing could not have failed to exercise a sensible action on the future of the language, and this action was the more certain, because the attention already paid to the phonetic questions had the better prepared men's intellects for the application of writing and for the comprehension of the questions of grammar.

Being given this state of things and the introduction of so new and so powerful a factor, we have now to see how affairs actually occurred, and how, on the one hand Classical Sanskrit and on the other hand Mixed Sanskrit were developed.

Sanskrit by its roots which dive deep into the language and the tradition of the Vedas, by its regularity founded on earlier phonetic studies, by its most ordinary applications, is essentially a Brahmanical language. By the manner in which it was constituted and fixed, it is a scholastic language, born and elaborated in restricted and exclusive surroundings.

This character is so marked, that the fact, that such inscriptions as those of Nāṇāghaṭ, although entirely devoted to the commemoration of liturgic ceremonies, are couched in Prākrit, would almost of itself suffice to prove that, at the period to which they must be referred, Sanskrit had not yet expanded into exterior use. At any rate, it furnishes a remarkable confirmation of the conclusions on which I am endeavouring to throw some light.
It is quite otherwise with Mixed Sanskrit. Every application of it which is known to us, whether in monuments or in literature, is, without exception, Buddhistic. The irregularities and inconsistencies of its grammar and of its orthography mark it with an evident character of spontaneity. It is not a dialect which has undergone alterations and after-touche, or which has bowed itself to those precise rules which denote the idea of a really literary language.

From this two-fold point of view, therefore, the contrast between the two dialects is as marked, as, in other respects, their analogies are striking, and such hints are of considerable value to us.

There is little appearance of the everyday use of writing in India much before the time of Aśoka. The inscriptions of Aśoka are certainly the most ancient examples of the art which have hitherto been accessible to us. At this period we know of the existence of an archaic religious language preserved by a privileged caste in memorials, which are surrounded by a traditional reverence, and which, though it has never been written, has still been the object of a certain amount of culture. The Brahmans, the exclusive depositaries, through the oral tradition, of a religious literature on which their authority was founded, have always shewn themselves little disposed to deprive themselves, by writing, of their monopoly. At that time their disposition must have been the same. On the other hand, it is natural that the habitual study of the Vedic texts and the continuance of their religious avocations should have led them to preserve, or, in a measure, to evolve for their personal use an idiom akin to that of their traditions, and very superior, in its general aspect of preservation, to the contemporary dialects of the common people. The Buddhists must, on the contrary, have been anxious to avail themselves of the art of writing to spread abroad their doctrines. The monuments of Piyadasi bear witness to this, and the vulgar tongues were the necessary instrument of this propaganda.

When people set themselves to the task of fixing, by writing, the current tongue, the religious language, and the experience gained in the efforts devoted to assuring its integrity, cannot fail to have exercised a certain amount of influence. This is exactly what we find in the orthography of the edicts. This influence continued, and gained increased power with time, and explains the continual progress with which, from Kapur di Giri to Suś Vihar, and from Suś Vihar to Mathurā, the popular orthography comes nearer and nearer to learned accuracy. At the same time, the practice of writing exercised upon the culture of the religious language a reaction which was none the less certain because it was indirect. People might refuse to write it, but it was impossible that the use of the alphabet should not have acted as a stimulus towards phonetic and grammatical studies. The attempts to fix the orthography of the vulgar tongue must have suggested and urged on the definitive fixation of the more learned language, the idea and general prototype of which must have long been dormant in the Brahmanical schools. The labour devoted to this must, in its turn, have extended its influence to the vulgar orthography. The Buddhists, as we know, were recruited from the Brahmanical, as well as from the other castes, and they were, to a certain degree, initiated into its learning. This explains how their orthography, in Mixed Sanskrit, continually tended to approach nearer and nearer that of correct Sanskrit. It followed it from afar, if not step by step, at least in its general direction. It was, without doubt, in this manner the Buddhists who unconsciously determined, partly the final constitution, and certainly the diffusion of Sanskrit. It was they who, little by little, introduced into wider circulation the habits of an orthography which was inspired by the labours and practice of the schoolmen. They followed on that track, though, it is true, with imperfections and shortcomings. By this slow and instinctive revelation, the secrets of the learned so to say, became public. All that remained for the Brahmans to do was to recover their vantage ground on the strength of their superior technical knowledge, to take the initiative again by teaching their learned language in its correctness, and to develop its public use, both official and literary. It was thus that the diffusion of Sanskrit
found itself secured. It suppressed the use of Mixed Sanskrit, after having, nevertheless, been one of its principal factors. Before, however, the latter disappeared from current use and from the monuments, it had already secured a future course for itself as a literary language. The very aspect of the Buddhist dialect “of the Gāthās,” so nearly does it approach Classical Sanskrit, proves that it was first settled at a period close to the definitive domination of the latter. In this respect, the tradition which places the arrangement of the Canon of the Northern Buddhists in the time of Kanishka, agrees very well with the conclusions to which we have been led by epigraphy. Not, indeed, that we are to assume that all the works or fragments written in Mixed Sanskrit are necessarily so ancient as that; but that the fixing of this system of orthography and the application to literary use which assured it its survival, must be referred to that epoch, which marks, together with the diffusion of classical Sanskrit into general use, the hour in which Mixed Sanskrit, when on the eve of being absorbed into it, borrowed from it the largest proportion of learned elements.

We thus see how, under the common, but on the one hand direct and on the other indirect, influence of an ancient religious language, there was produced in parallel lines, and not without reciprocal reactions, the two-fold development of Classical and of Mixed Sanskrit. Their final fusion, to the benefit of the classical language marks the hour of its definitive establishment,—of the commencement of an undisputed supremacy which yet endures.

Thus is explained the apparently paradoxical formula within which we found ourselves shut up. The endless chain is broken. Mixed Sanskrit is, to speak exactly, neither a copy nor the source of regular Sanskrit, but is something of both. Classical Sanskrit, without enjoying a public and consecrated existence at the time when the early form of Mixed Sanskrit makes its appearance, nevertheless did exist in the close circle of the schools, in a stage of formation more or less advanced. It will be understood how the Vedic language could, without being written, exercise a profound action, and how the Brāhmaṇas, in spite of their distaste for writing, were led to fix and to put into circulation that great instrument of literary production in India, Sanskrit. This profane language did not compromise the privilege belonging to their religious language, of which they still remained the jealous guardians.

MISCELLANEA.

NOTES ON THE TRADITIONAL AND MYTHICAL MEN AND BEASTS OF THE MALAGASY.

From the general appearance of the Malagasy, especially of the leading Hova tribe, and from their language, we can easily see that they are of Malay extraction. Their numerals, for instance, up to ten are identical; and it is a curious fact, that in the Malagasy language we find words from almost all of the many different dialects spoken in the Malay islands of the Archipelago. However, in their customs, folklore and religion the Malagasy have, I believe, but little in common with the Malays. I have never heard of any tradition among the natives of Madagascar as to their arrival in the island, and they are entirely unconscious of any relationship to the Malays.\(^1\)

There is, however, a tradition of the arrival of the Hova tribe in the Province of Imerina, in which are the Highlands they now occupy. These people say that their forefathers came from somewhere unknown, and drove out a race of men called the Vazimba, which, they say, is now extinct, but was a diminutive race, with the head small in proportion to the body. The phrase Vazimba loka (Vazimba-headed) is still occasionally used to express anything, such as a nail, that has an unusually small head. But whether the tribe in question is extinct is a matter of doubt. A friend, when exploring an unknown part of western Madagascar, came across people of a distinctly negro type calling themselves Vazimbas,\(^1\) and having, as aborigines, an hereditary right over the river traffic, albeit in subjection to the Beteirry tribe of the Sakalavas. They had not, however, as far as he noticed, anything peculiar in the formation of the cranium. I may add, while speak-

---

\(^1\) They are not in any way a seafaring people, except the Sakalava tribe on the west coast, and this tribe is very much more akin to the Negro type than the Malay.

\(^{2}\) Stanley, I think, mentions a tribe called Wasimbos in Central Africa. Some derive the name from the Swahili word wasimbo, an ogre or madman, others from kusimbo, in the grave.
riding in outlying districts, where a horse had never been seen, I have often put a whole village to rout, for the sudden appearance of a white man, (never perhaps seen before,) riding a songomy was enough to strike terror into the boldest. I remember quite well one poor woman stealing back after a general stampede caused by myself to save her child, when my men stopped her and quieted her fears. After confidence was restored she confessed to having thought we should want a baby or two to feed the horse with. It often took one hour or more to gain the people's confidence.

Next to the songomy is the Fanainim-pitolohi, the Hydra with seven heads. This is not an awe-inspiring reptile, as one might easily imagine; far from it, it is respected and venerated. It has its origin in man, and the spirit of the person from whom it springs is embodied in it. As a rule it springs from the entrails of the dead. Among the Betelneo tribe living to the South of the Hova Province of Imerina, it is said to be a common custom to take a portion of the entrails of a dead relation and place them near a running stream or pond, in order that a fanainim may be generated and an embodiment of the spirit effected. If such should happen the hydra proceeds to the village, and those of the inhabitants, who have lost a relative, ask it who it is, by repeating the names of the departed. Should the fanainim make its head sideways it is not the person named, but should it nod, there is a great rejoicing among the relations of the person named, and offerings are given daily to it. The appearance of the fanainim is variously described, but the most authentic account states it to be striped, and of a dull brown colour, with seven heads. When it has reached maturity horns grow on each head.

There are many curious fables about this hydra. Here is one. Once upon a time one attacked a bull, but the seven horns being broken, for it butted and did not bite as one might suppose, it was despatched by the bull. This took place near a village, and next day the fanainim had swollen to such an extent, that it was like a mountain overshadowing the houses, so that the inhabitants had to flee the place during its putrefaction. Sometimes we are told they grow so large that they can span a mountain at its base, but as soon as the tail overlaps their heads they bite off the extra piece, and, fixing the stamp in the earth, rear themselves up on it and shoot into heaven!

I am assured that the reason so few are seen with seven heads at the present day is that they are all young, and that it takes many years before they gain their full complement.
Another mythical animal is the tokan-dia, the single step. This is a large white animal with one leg in the middle of its body and one in its chest, and although only gifted with these two legs, it travels at the most extraordinary speed. It eats men, and, is, but seldom, if ever, seen now!

Then there is the most uncanny of all the fabulous beings, the kinolo. It is a supposed resurrection of the body after partial decomposition. Should a tomb—the natives always bury in large vaults in Imerina and Betsileo—be opened as soon as the bowels and skin of a corpse have become putrid, the corpse is said to run away. Its eyes become red like fire, and its nails long as talons. It loses all likeness to the living, except its human form. It is harmless from want of strength, only prowling about and stealing such food as it can lay its hands on. This is a Betsileo superstition, and it is said that some people leave their tombs open, so as to allow their relatives the chance of becoming kinolies.

Such are the chief myths among the natives of Madagascar. I have heard also of a few others of unicorns and mermen, whose distinctive feature is, curiously, their long hair, and of a hairy tribe of dwarfs that live in trees.

C. P. Cory.

NOTES AND QUERIES.

SUPERSTITIONS IN MADRAS.

It is a superstitions belief in Southern India that we should not eat at evening twilights, as it is said that the Asuras of the infernal regions wander over this world at that time, and when food is served they will come in and partake of it, leaving for us mortals only the remainder of what they have eaten.

If a person dies in the house on an unpropitious day, the house is shut up for six months continuously. After the expiration of this period, the usual ceremonies for cleansing the house must be performed, and then it becomes habitable.

Don't shave during July, August, (Adi); September, October, (Purattasi); December, January (Masyasi); February, March (Masi); Sunday, Tuesday or Saturday.

If you anoint your body with oil or bathe in hot water on Sunday you will get heart disease, on Monday health, on Tuesday death, on Wednesday gain, on Thursday loss of a child, on Friday loss of money, on Saturday increase of age.

K. SRIKANTALAYA.

EUPHEMISMS IN BENGAL.

In colloquial Bengali euphemisms are common with a view to avoiding the use of expressions of unpleasant import. Such euphemisms have generally arisen from an undercurrent of superstition that it is unlucky to use unpleasant expressions, a belief which has universally prevailed at all times. E.g., the expression 'sit' on taking leave means 'let me go,' and is never understood in its real sense of 'let me come.' The reply is invariably 'eat,' or politely 'aati,' which means 'you may go,' while their real sense is 'you may come.'

Calcutta.

GAURDA BYSACE.

ORIGIN OF ALOMPRA.

The story that Alompra (Alaungpaya) was a hunter, as stated by most European historians of Burma* is a pure myth. He belonged to a respectable well-to-do family, and to a class, which would be called the landed gentry in England.

The very fact of his being able, in a short time, to rally round himself a large following, and of his possessing the respect and confidence of his adherents, proves the unsubstantial basis of the story. For in Burma, from time immemorial, the hunter and the fisherman has always been looked down on, and treated as an outcast, beyond the pale of refined society. Had Alompra been a hunter* his assumption of leadership would not have been tolerated by his followers.

TAW SEIN KO.

cent. There were many instances of sham 'princes' amongst dacoit leaders (hla) from 1852 to 1889 against the English. One was whilom a schoolmaster of the Educational Department in Lower Burma. There is in fact much to be said both for Phayre's view and for Taw Sein Ko's. No doubt future search will settle the point.—Ed.]

[Phayre, History of Burma, loc. cit., says in effect that Alompra was originally a 'hunter captain,' who succeeded against the Talasang, claimed royal des-
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>इ</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>इ</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ई</td>
<td>e</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>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>ऊ</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ऋ</td>
<td>ri</td>
<td>ri</td>
<td>ऋ</td>
<td>ri</td>
<td>ri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ऌ</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>ऌ</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ए</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>ए</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</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>विशार्ग</td>
<td>विशार्ग</td>
<td>विशार्ग</td>
<td>विशार्ग</td>
<td>विशार्ग</td>
<td>विशार्ग</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>निहिमुख्य</td>
<td>निहिमुख्य</td>
<td>निहिमुख्य</td>
<td>निहिमुख्य</td>
<td>निहिमुख्य</td>
<td>निहिमुख्य</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>विशार्ग बहुलुक</td>
<td>विशार्ग बहुलुक</td>
<td>विशार्ग बहुलुक</td>
<td>विशार्ग बहुलुक</td>
<td>विशार्ग बहुलुक</td>
<td>विशार्ग बहुलुक</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>उपशार्ग</td>
<td>उपशार्ग</td>
<td>उपशार्ग</td>
<td>उपशार्ग</td>
<td>उपशार्ग</td>
<td>उपशार्ग</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>अनुद्रव</td>
<td>अनुद्रव</td>
<td>अनुद्रव</td>
<td>अनुद्रव</td>
<td>अनुद्रव</td>
<td>अनुद्रव</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>अनुद्रवीक</td>
<td>अनुद्रवीक</td>
<td>अनुद्रवीक</td>
<td>अनुद्रवीक</td>
<td>अनुद्रवीक</td>
<td>अनुद्रवीक</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>क</td>
<td>क</td>
<td>क</td>
<td>क</td>
<td>क</td>
<td>क</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>क्ष</td>
<td>क्ष</td>
<td>क्ष</td>
<td>क्ष</td>
<td>क्ष</td>
<td>क्ष</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ग</td>
<td>ग</td>
<td>ग</td>
<td>ग</td>
<td>ग</td>
<td>ग</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ग्ल</td>
<td>ग्ल</td>
<td>ग्ल</td>
<td>ग्ल</td>
<td>ग्ल</td>
<td>ग्ल</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ठ</td>
<td>ठ</td>
<td>ठ</td>
<td>ठ</td>
<td>ठ</td>
<td>ठ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ठ्छ</td>
<td>ठ्छ</td>
<td>ठ्छ</td>
<td>ठ्छ</td>
<td>ठ्छ</td>
<td>ठ्छ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ड</td>
<td>ड</td>
<td>ड</td>
<td>ड</td>
<td>ड</td>
<td>ड</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ड्य</td>
<td>ड्य</td>
<td>ड्य</td>
<td>ड्य</td>
<td>ड्य</td>
<td>ड्य</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 Text.

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 rūdha 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 text.

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 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.
THE MUNGIR COPPER-PLATE GRANT OF DEVAPALADÉVA.

BY PROFESSOR F. KIELHORN, C.I.E.; GÖTTINGEN.

The plate containing this inscription — so far as I know, the first Sanskrit inscription that was ever brought to the notice of European scholars — was found about 1780 by Colonel Watson at Mungir, the chief town of the Mungir District of the Bengal Province, on the south bank of the Ganges. The inscription was translated by Charles Wilkins in 1781, and his translation was published, with a few notes by Sir W. Jones and a lithographed facsimile (but without a transcript) of the original text, in 1788, in the Asiatic Researches, Vol. I. pp. 123-130 and 142. The plate having been lost, I now venture to edit the inscription from the published lithograph, which, with all its defects, is by no means valueless as may appear to be the case, at first sight.

The plate was a single one. Judging from the lithograph, it was surmounted by an ornament, fixed on the upper part, and advanced some distance on the plate so as to occasion a break in the upper lines. As in the case e.g. of the Dinájpur plate of Mahñpaladéva, this ornament in all probability contained a seal, across which were engraved the words śrī-Devapaladévaśya which in the lithograph are put at the top. The plate itself contained 52 lines of writing, 36 of which were on the front and 16 on the back of the plate. The writing was well preserved throughout. The characters clearly were of the same type as those of the Bedá pillar inscription and of the Dinájpur plate. Thus, to mention a characteristic feature of this alphabet, there can be no doubt that the letter r, preceding another consonant, was ordinarily denoted by a short line, sideways attached to the right side of the akṣara of which r forms part. By the lithographer this short line has been altogether overlooked, and accordingly the letter r is omitted in the lithograph about twenty-five times. Similarly, the peculiar way in which medial ñ, ā, ai, ō and au were written in the original plate, has often caused the engraver of the lithograph to omit the signs for the medial ñ and ā, and to put ō and ō in the place of ñ, ai, and au. The sign of the anagropa was exceptionally employed in the original in mūrttā ś the, in line 18, and ś kīchitragrāhyā, in line 40. The language is Sanskrit. Excluding the introductory dhvasthi, the inscription is in verse down to the commencement of line 24. Lines 24-46, containing the formal part of the grant, are in prose; they are followed, in lines 46-50, by four of the customary benedictory and imprecatory verses; and the inscription closes with another verse, in lines 50-52, which gives the name of the dátaka of this grant. The inscription was written and engraved with great care, and in regard to orthography I need only state here that ś throughout is denoted by the sign for r, and that instead of anuvra the guttural nasal has been employed in the word [vñ]ánu, in line 50.

In writing out my text, I have not considered it necessary to record all the very numerous minor errors and omissions of the lithograph. The only passages about which I am at all doubtful, and in which the rediscovery of the plate may prove to have gone wrong, are the words suvinayudhi, in line 5, rājaukiya-samasta-, in line 40, and kara-hirany-, in line 45. For the rest, my text will, I trust, speak for itself.

The inscription is one of the devout worshipper of Sugata, or Buddha, the Paramédvara, Paramabhaṭṭāraka and Mahārājādhirāja, the illustrious Devapaladéva, who meditated on the feet of the devout worshipper of Sugata, the Paramédvara, Paramabhaṭṭāraka and Mahārājādhirāja.

1 See Asiatic Researches, Vol. I. p. 132.
2 The statement of the late Dr. Rájshrá dá Mítra (Indo-Anyts, Vol. II. p. 219), that the translation was published without any facsimile, is of course incorrect.
3 In the lithograph it is often quite impossible to distinguish between y, m, and y, or even s. D is engraved instead of n, or m, or y, or y; dū instead of s; nd instead of u, or ndh, or nu; bh instead of s; yy instead of ch, or dy, or oy; v instead of ch, or n, or r, or rth. The signs of the original for käh and ñ are drawn quite wrongly. And the signs of anuvra and visarga, and those of the subscript ṛ, Ṛ, and ṛr, are often omitted. But it is one great advantage that the lithograph was prepared by an artist who did not understand the language of the original.
the illustrious Dharmapaladeva (lines 28-29). After the words "śrīnāsāri and a verse in honour of both Buddha and the ruling king, it gives (in lines 4-24), in thirteen verses of which a full translation will be given below, the genealogy of Dēvapaladeva. All we learn from this part of the inscription is, that Dēvapāla was the son and successor of the king Dharmapala and his wife Rāmādēvi, who was a daughter of the illustrious Parmāla of the Rāṣṭra-kātha family; and that Dharmapāla again was the son and successor of the king Gōpāla. Dēvapāla, as well as his father and grandfather, are eulogized as very powerful monarchs, who each of them are represented as having conquered almost the whole of India. I have already had occasion to state that in later inscriptions of the same dynasty Dēvapāla is described as the brother's son of Dharmapāla, and that I would identify his father-in-law Parmāla with the Rāṣṭra-kātha Gōvinda III, also called Sṛvallabha (or Sṛvabha), etc.; but I must add here that my chief reason for proposing this identification is the circumstance that we know Gōvinda III to have ruled at the beginning of the 9th century A. D., and that this would be about the time when Dharmapāla's father Gōpāla may be supposed to have lived.

The wording of the formal part of the grant (lines 24-46) is much the same as in the three other known copper-plate grants of the so-called Pāla kings. As regards the object of the grant, Dēvapaladeva, from his camp at Mudgagiri on the Ganges, informs his officials and the people concerned that he has given the village of Mēshikā, which was in the Krimilā vishaya of the Srinagara bhakti, to the bhagya Vīśakārāmā, a son of the bhagya Sṛvārākārata and son's son of the bhagya Vīśārata, of the Anupamārava gōtra and Āsvālayana śāhā; and he orders the people to make over to the donees whatever may be due to him in accordance with this donation. Among the numerous officials, enumerated in this part of the grant, two occur who are not mentioned in the other Pāla grants, the pramādī and svarahāsya (in line 32). I am unable to explain these terms, and can only state that the same officials are mentioned, under the names of pramādī (or perhaps mahāvīṣṇupramādī) and svarahāsyā, in line 11 of the Paṇḍukēsva grant of Lalitāśrūveda, published in the Proceedings, Bengal As. Soc., 1877, p. 73; and that we find pramādī in Epigraphia Indica, Vol. I. p. 83, l. 49, p. 115, l. 82; pramādī, ib. p. 73, l. 9; and mahāpramādī, ib. p. 73, l. 17.

The formal part of the grant closes (in line 46) with the date, the 21st day of the month Mārgaśira of the year 33. Lines 46-50 contain, as already stated, four of the usual benedictive and imprecatory verses. And these are followed (in lines 50-52) by another verse which will be translated below, according to which the king had appointed, as dātaka of this grant, his own son, the Yutakāja, the illustrious Rājapaladeva. The year 33 of the date must of course be referred to the king's reign, which I agree with Sir A. Cunningham in assigning to about the end of the 9th century A. D.

Of the localities mentioned in this inscription Mudgagiri and Srinagara have already by Sir Charles Wilkins been identified with the modern Mungir and Patnā respectively. The Krimilā vishaya and the village of Mēshikā I am unable to identify.

TEXT.

First Side.

1 Ōm! svasti | Siddhārthasya parā[ratha]-sasthira-
2 matāḥ saumārgam-abhayayatasa-siddhis-siddhima-a
3 nuttāram-bhagavatas-tasya prajāsu kriyāt | yas-traiḥbātuka-sat[v]ya-siddhi-padavrā-
4 atyugra-vīrya-dāyayajīvā nirvīya- m-āsāsāda surgataḥ sarvārtha-bhāmāsvarah 11 Saabhāgyan-dadbad-astulah āriyasa-sapatnā Gōpālaḥ patir-abhavadevasu-

* See above, p. 90.
* Expressed by a symbol.
* Metre, Śāśvālavālīkīti.
* Metre, Prahārshāhīp.
5. ndh̄ar̥yāḥ | dṛśastāntē | [svanayinām] | surajāṇī | yasmīn-śrāddheśyaḥ | Prithu-Sagar-āḥ (dayoj)-py-abhvān | Vījitya | yēna | jaladhēr | vāsanunā.

6. rām vimoḍītā māṛha-parighrāhā iti | savāśhparm | udvāśhpa-vilōcchanam | punar- | vvanēshu | va (ba) | dhrū [s] | mmaataṅga-jaśāḥ | Cha.[11]

7. latav-mamantē vṛṣa | yaśa | vīvambraviyar | niḥitaṁ | rājēsīḥ | pāda- | prachārā-kamamantā | antarikṣham | vahāngamamānām | suchīram | va (ba) | bhūva.


11. sṛhitavaṭān | tṛthē | dharmyāḥ | kriyāḥ | bhṛtyānām | sukham- | eva | yaśa | sakālaṇ | nuddṛtya | dushṭān | imān | lōkān | sā.

12. dhayato | mūshaṅga-janitā | siddhiḥ | paraṇe | ṣpay- | abhūt | Tāir | tair | dvigvij- | avasāna- | samayē | samprūhitānām | parā-tān-

13. kāraṇa-apalānya | kēdhā | aṣkaṇ | svān | svān | gataṇām | bhavaṃ | kṛityam | bhavantāya | yataditam | prītya | ṇrīpāṇam | abhūt | sā.


17. rākṣā | sālaḥ | Sāgīrya | pita- | aśāu | muktā- | ratnaṁ | samudra- | sūktir | iva | śrī | Dvapalādavam | prasanna- | vṛktraṇa | sutam | asūta |


25. pī-vibrāman | nīraṭiṣaya | ghana | ghanighana | ghāṭā (tā) | śyāmāyāmaṇa | vāsā- | lakṣhami- | samāravīha (bdha) | saṇtā- | jala- | samayā.

---
[9] What the lithograph actually has, is mudatinātā; but the second aksara, di, is very oddly shaped. The English translation has 'by comparison of the learned.'
[12] Read 'kēnām.'
[13] The lithograph apparently has 'yēh.'
[16] Metre, Śarādevikṛjita; and of the next verse.
[17] Read 'ūndālō.'
[21] Metre, Śarādevikṛjita; and of the next verse.
[22] In the lithograph there is no visarga, and the syllable, here read uva, looks rather like prā or vara.
[24] The lithograph apparently has sē ṭui (or bhūtu).
[25] The lithograph has nikēndēcha (or vītēndēcha).
26 نیہدہ کے مچھلی-انکہا-نارپاتی-پرھ کید ہے-اپرامےہ-ہے-اپنہ-کھارا-کھر-اکہا-دکھوا-دھاسی-دی-
27 گانتارلہ ہے مہامہ-سیمہ-سیمہ-کھارا-جمو کہ-سیمہ-نواب-مینہ-
28 سیمہ-میہا-میہا-میہا-میہا-میہا-میہا-

30 سریناگارہ-ہیک تک-کریملہ-فیس بھا-انتہا-پتی-اسیاسما (مہا) دکھای چھا-نہا-تالوپتے-
31 مکھیکرمنہ سامپاراکا؟-نیہدہ کے-میہا-
32 مانی-میہا-میہا-
33 میہا-میہا-میہا-
34 میہا-میہا-میہا-
35 میہا-میہا-میہا-
36 میہا-میہا-میہا-

37 ندراکاک-چھا-نیہدہ-پاریتیاک (م) ویدیا-ا-س
38 سیمہ-میہا-میہا-میہا-
39 میہا-میہا-میہا-میہا-
40 پار تا-سیمہ-میہا-میہا-میہا-
41 میہا-
42 میہا-
43 میہا-
44 میہا-
45 میہا-
46 میہا-

39 میہا-
42 میہا-
40 میہا-
43 میہا-
44 میہا-
45 میہا-
46 میہا-

SECOND SIDE.

37 ندراکاک-چھا-نیہدہ-پاریتیاک (م) ویدیا-ا-س
38 سیمہ-میہا-میہا-میہا-
39 میہا-میہا-میہا-میہا-
40 پار تا-سیمہ-میہا-میہا-میہا-
41 میہا-
42 میہا-
43 میہا-
44 میہا-
45 میہا-
46 میہا-

39 میہا-
42 میہا-
40 میہا-
43 میہا-
44 میہا-
45 میہا-
46 میہا-

SECOND SIDE.

37 ندراکاک-چھا-نیہدہ-پاریتیاک (م) ویدیا-ا-س
38 سیمہ-میہا-میہا-میہا-
39 میہا-میہا-میہا-میہا-
40 پار تا-سیمہ-میہا-میہا-میہا-
41 میہا-
42 میہا-
43 میہا-
44 میہا-
45 میہا-
46 میہا-

39 میہا-
42 میہا-
40 میہا-
43 میہا-
44 میہا-
45 میہا-
46 میہا-

SECOND SIDE.

37 ندراکاک-چھا-نیہدہ-پاریتیاک (م) ویدیا-ا-س
38 سیمہ-میہا-میہا-میہا-
39 میہا-میہا-میہا-میہا-
40 پار تا-سیمہ-میہا-میہا-میہا-
41 میہا-
42 میہا-
43 میہا-
44 میہا-
45 میہا-
46 میہا-

39 میہا-
42 میہا-
40 میہا-
43 میہا-
44 میہا-
45 میہا-
46 میہا-

SECOND SIDE.

37 ندراکاک-چھا-نیہدہ-پاریتیاک (م) ویدیا-ا-س
38 سیمہ-میہا-میہا-میہا-
39 میہا-میہا-میہا-میہا-
40 پار تا-سیمہ-میہا-میہا-میہا-
41 میہا-
42 میہا-
43 میہا-
44 میہا-
45 میہا-
46 میہا-

39 میہا-
42 میہا-
40 میہا-
43 میہا-
44 میہا-
45 میہا-
46 میہا-

SECOND SIDE.

37 ندراکاک-چھا-نیہدہ-پاریتیاک (م) ویدیا-ا-س
38 سیمہ-میہا-میہا-میہا-
39 میہا-میہا-میہا-میہا-
40 پار تا-سیمہ-میہا-میہا-میہا-
41 میہا-
42 میہا-
43 میہا-
44 میہا-
45 میہا-
46 میہا-

39 میہا-
42 میہا-
40 میہا-
43 میہا-
44 میہا-
45 میہا-
46 میہا-

SECOND SIDE.

37 ندراکاک-چھا-نیہدہ-پاریتیاک (م) ویدیا-ا-س
38 سیمہ-میہا-میہا-میہا-
39 میہا-میہا-میہا-میہا-
40 پار تا-سیمہ-میہا-میہا-میہا-
41 میہا-
42 میہا-
43 میہا-
44 میہا-
45 میہا-
46 میہا-

39 میہا-
42 میہا-
40 میہا-
43 میہا-
44 میہا-
45 میہا-
46 میہا-

SECOND SIDE.

37 ندراکاک-چھا-نیہدہ-پاریتیاک (م) ویدیا-ا-س
38 سیمہ-میہا-میہا-میہا-
39 میہا-میہا-میہا-میہا-
40 پار تا-سیمہ-میہا-میہا-میہا-
41 میہا-
42 میہا-
43 میہا-
44 میہا-
45 میہا-
46 میہا-

39 میہا-
42 میہا-
40 میہا-
43 میہا-
44 میہا-
45 میہا-
46 میہا-
47 bhāyā bhūyah prārthayatāttiśha Rāmaḥ | sāmānyo yañā dharma-sātunā nripāram
kītē kīte pālanayāh kramēṇaḥ | Va(hu)hubhiḥ vatsudā
48 dattā rājabhīḥ Sagara-adibhiḥ [1***] yaṣya yaṣya yaṣaḥ bhūmiḥ
tasya tasya tasya tatha
phalām | Sva-dattām para-dattām vā | yō harēta vaṣu
49 nṛharām [1***] sa viśāhāyām kṛimir-bhūtvā pitṛtibhis-saha pācyata
| [1**] Iīt
kaṃkālā-dal-āṃnv(mnu)vindu-lōllam | śrīyam-anuṣhātaya manvabhya
50 īvītaṁ = ca | sakalam idam = uddhītān-echa vu(bu)ddvā na hi purushāiḥ para-
kṛitēyō viḷōpāḥ | Śrīyō-vidhiśvā = ndbhaya-[va*]īśa
51 śuddhi-bhājaṁ rīj = śaṁkē-adhigat-ātma-guṇam guṇa-jiṣāh | ātma-ānurēpa-charitaṁ sthira-
yaavarāyāṃ śri-Rajyāpālam
52 ha dūtankām = ātma-putraṁ

TRANSLATION OF LINES 1—24 AND 50—52.

Oṁ! May it be well!

May the perfection of that venerable being, whose objects are accomplished, whose mind is steadfast in the cause of others, and who is ever treading the path of virtue, procure for his people unsurpassed perfection,—that being who, a Sugata and in all things a lord of the earth, having excelled the ways of perfection of the creatures of the three worlds by the display of his awful might, has attained unto bliss!

(Line 4.) Possessed of matchless prosperity, Gopāla was the husband of Fortune as well as the lord of the earth. While he, the type of a well-conducted (king), carried on his beneficent rule, even (kings) like Priyau and Sagara came to be believed in.

When he had conquered the earth as far as the sea, he set free his elephants, regarding them a useless train; and they with tears (of joy) saw again in the forests their kindred whose eyes became filled with tears.

When his innumerable forces were marching, the sky continually was so filled with the dust of the earth that the birds of the air could walk upon it.

(L. 8.) He paid his debt to his forefathers in heaven by begetting the illustrious Dharmapāla, who, conversant with the precepts of the Śastras, by restraining those who swerved from the right course, made the castes conform to their proper tenets.

By the elephants of this prince, who were moving about like walking mountains, the earth was so tormented that, in the guise of the dust, it took refuge in the peaceful heavens.

With ease uprooting all the wicked and subduing this world, he at the same time secured for his followers the blessings of the world to come; for (on his expeditions) they bathed according to precept at Kēḍāra (and) where the ocean is joined by the Ganges, and performed holy rites at Gokarṇa and other sacred shrines.

When he had completed the conquest of the regions, he released the princes (whom he had made captives); and they, made to forget all their distress by the various great honours shown to them, and having each returned to his own country, pondered upon his generous deeds, and

48 Read uripātāṁ. 44 Read kramēṇa. 45 Metre, Šūka (Anuṣhūba); and of the next verse.
46 Read bāhmīc-tasya. 47 Read -dattāṁ vē. 48 Read pachyastāṁ.
49 Metre, Puṣpītāgā. 50 Read -bhūvaṁ dvīyaṁ.
51 The lithograph omits this visarṇa.
52 Metre, Vaṃsātīlakā.
53 i.e., either a Buddha or, applied to the king, a follower of Buddha, a Buddhist. For, like the verse at the commencement of the Dālpur, Bhāgalpur, and Ámpādāl plates, this verse is applicable both to the founder of the Buddhist religion (Siddhārtha, Buddha, Sārvarthasiddhā) and to the king, in this case Dālpāldeva, who issued this grant.
54 Literally, 'Gopāla was a lord of the Earth who was the fellow-wife of the goddess of fortune.'
55 It appears necessary to add this particle, because, so far as I know, there is only one Kēḍāra, which is situated in the Himālaya mountains. Gokarṇa is in the North Kanara District of the Bombay Presidency; it is even now a place of pilgrimage frequent by Hindū devotees from all parts of India.
their hearts were fondly longing for him, as of mortals banished from heaven who remember their former existence.

(L. 14.) As a householder, that lord of the earth took the hand of Rāmaṇāḍēvī, the daughter of the illustrious Parābala, the ornament of the Raśtrakūta family.

By the purity of her conduct causing the people to deliberate as to whether she might be Lakṣmi incarnate, or the earth embodied in human form, or the king’s fame in visible shape, or his household goddess, she surpassed the ladies of the court by the excellent qualities with which nature had endowed her.

As the shell of the sea yields the precious pearl, so that praise-worthy husband-devoted lady bore a son with a pleasing countenance, the illustrious Dévapālādeva.

(L. 18.) Unsullied in thought, controlling his speech, and steadfast in the performance of blameless actions, he inherited the kingdom of his father free from troubles, as a Bōdhisattva attains the status of a Buddha.

In the course of conquest his elephants, roaming over their own Vindhya forest, met again with their kindred who shed plentiful tears (of joy); and, after he had crushed the power of other kings, his young chargers in Kambéja at last saw their mates, and it was a pleasure to hear them loudly neigh at each other.

He indeed has again clearly opened that road of liberality which was first made by Bali in the Kṛśa age, on which Bṛigu’s descendant walked in the Trēṭā age, and which was trodden by Karṇa, devoted to his friends, in the Dvāpara age, but which had been choked up by the Kali age, ever since the enemy of the Saka went to heaven.

He has ruled the earth, free from rivals, up to the (mountain) celebrated for Gāṅga’s descent, as far as the bridge which proclaims the fame of Rāvaṇa’s foe, as far as the ocean which is Varuṇa’s home, and as far as (that other ocean which is) Lakṣmi’s birthplace.

*(L. 50.)* The king, who knows how to appreciate excellent qualities, has made his son, the illustrious Bājypālā, who is of pure descent on both sides, who has acquired the excellent qualities of his parent and whose conduct resembles his, and who is firmly appointed as Yasa-rāja, the dātaka for this deed of merit.

---

**THE INSCRIPTIONS OF PIYADASI.**

BY E. SÉNART, MEMBRE DE L’INSTITUT DE FRANCE.

Translated by G. A. Grierson, B.C.S., and revised by the Author.

(Concluded from page 156.)

**PART III.**

**MONUMENTAL AND LITERARY PRAKRIT.**

In the period which extends from the 2nd century before our era to the 3rd century A. D., all the inscriptions which are not in Sanskrit or in Mixed Sanskrit are couched in a dialect which may be designated by the name of Monumental Prakrit.

In all the places where it is found it is essentially identical. This does not mean that the monuments present no inconsistencies between themselves. These inconsistencies and irregularities are many, and as they are also instructive, it is worth the trouble of quoting a certain number of them. They are of two kinds. On the one hand, the writing varies for the same words or for identical sounds; and, on the other, forms unequally altered,
and, consequently, belonging to different linguistic strata, are found in juxtaposition on
the same monuments or on monuments of the same date.

In the first category, the most general fact is the inconsistency with which the dental \( n \) and
the cerebral \( ñ \) are employed. Sometimes one or other is introduced indifferently into the
same word, or they are even applied in a manner contrary to every known rule; and sometimes
one or other is exclusively used. This cannot be a question of dialectic divergencies, for instances
occur in contemporary and neighbouring monuments. I quote a few examples\(^1\) Näs. 11 A;
\( ánapayati \) and \( ánata \); the same in Näs. 15. C. T. I., p. 33, No. 13: \( ñadiyā \), \( yapasya \). Näs. 22:
\( sēpāpati \). Kaññh. 15: \( ápahūdā, ápanī \). C. T. I., p. 46, No. 14: \( udēyā \); p. 55, No. 33: \( yaverā, 
\( bhada \); p. 44, No. 8: \( bhātunā, dāna \); p. 42, No. 2: \( bēja javāna \); p. 30, No. 6: \( dhēnukakata-
kēna \); p. 6, No. 5: \( bhāgīnēyīya \). Kaññh. 28: \( bēśhikāna, pānīya, sānghēya, dīnā \). Kaññh. 15:
\( ápan[a]nēna, sānghēna, &c. Näs. 12, Kaññh. 10, C. T. I., p. 38, No. 2; p. 18, No. 25, &c., use
exclusively \( ñ \); C. T. I., p. 44, No. 9; p. 9, No. 9: Amravati, No. 175, &c., use exclusively \( n \). 

Inconsistencies of orthography are manifested in an infinity of other cases. Take the
weakening of hard consonants into soft ones: \( muha, Kārīli, 22; Kaññh. 15, 28, &c.; muha 
C. T. I., p. 29, No. 4, No. 6, beside \( sukha, pamañka \) (e. g. Amrav. No. 190); \( kudukbini, Kaññh. 15, 
Näs. 9-3, C. T. I., p. 38, No. 2, &c., beside \( kusumkini \) (e. g. Kaññh. 4); \( dhēnukakata, C. T. I., p. 38, 
No. 2, beside \( dhēnukakata, C. T. I., p. 24, No. 4; p. 31, No. 7; thūba, Kāhīli. 10 (of the time of 
Vāsishthiputa Pulumājī), beside \( thupa, C. T. I., p. 24, No. 3; p. 26, No. 1. The inscription of 
Madharipata (C. T. I., p. 60, No. 2) gives \( pañtīkāpya, \) while elsewhere, as for example Amr. 8
(pp. 52-53), we find \( pañtīkāpya, \) and again elsewhere the spellings \( pañtīhāpya (Kāhīli. 15), 
pāvīdātāvā (Näs. 7, time of Nahapana), \( pañtīsiya (Kāhīli. 4) \) and \( pañtīsāvāna (Kāhīli. 16-18) \), of 
the time of Śīrāyāna Sātaka, \( pañtīdāna (Kāhīli. 5) \) in an inscription of earlier date. Of two 
monuments of Gātampata Sātaka, one (Näs. 11 A) has Sādakahī, the other Sātaka. C. T. I.,
p. 15, No. 19 has \( sādaka[y] \), while p. 4, No. 1 and p. 9, No. 9, which belong to exactly the
same date, have \( sādakēryā. \) Sometimes the alteration is still more complete such as in \( gīvamū \)
equivalent to \( guvamād ("mā") \), C. T. I., p. 15, No. 160. In several instances the suffix \( ka \) is changed
into \( ya \); C. T. I., p. 49, No. 20 presents to us, side by side, \( bhārakachakānair \) and \( bhāgadīdīnānair 
for \( lānukkakānair \); in Kārīli, we read \( mahāśaṅgīhyānair \) in a passage dating from the
24th year of Pulumājī, and which retains several genitives in \( asa, \) beside the Prākrit form in
\( asa, \) that is true that, at about the same period, the Wardak vase presents the intermediate form
mahasaṅgīhyānair; and that, at Kaññhī, Nos. 12 and 20 have, at the same epoch, the spellings
\( Sūpārayaka \) and \( Sūpāraya \) respectively.

As a general rule, it is the soft consonants of Sanskrit which thus disappear or which
leave \( y \) as the only trace behind them: \( pāyana (Näs. 7, an inscription of the time of Nahap-

dana) and \( pāuna (C. T. I., p. 47, No. 6) \) equivalent to \( pādōna; bhāyuntā, C. T. I., p. 18, No. 25;
p. 24, No. 4; p. 50, No. 22, &c.; or \( bhāhunā, C. T. I., p. 24, No. 3, beside \( bhāhunā; sīgūtā, 
C. T. I., p. 38, No. 2, beside \( sīvahkutiṁdā \), p. 9, No. 9; \( pāvavīkā, C. T. I., p. 6, No. 5, or 
pavīta, p. 5, No. 5; p. 37, No. 21, 22; Kaññh. 21, 23, &c., beside \( pavavīta; bhōja, C. T. I., p.
14, No. 17; p. 4, No. 1; p. 9, No. 9, beside \( bhūya, in an inscription emanating from the same 
family (p. 15, No. 19), \( bhūya (p. 2, No. 9), bhāgīyāi, (Kāhīli. 24, earlier than Gātampata 
Sātaka), \) and even \( mahābhūvīyā \) (C. T. I., p. 100). It is clear that, when \( y \) is introduced, it
is done in a very arbitrary fashion. It is also on several occasions omitted.

In an inscription, No. 21, of Kaññhī, beside \( bhāyuntā, thōriya, &c., we find \( pavavītikā 
\) \( pōnakārī sānā, and chārīka beside \( chīvarīka \) of the preceding numbers which are exactly 
contemporary. \( V \) and \( y \) are here subjected to the same treatment, and we, therefore, need not

---

\(^1\) I quote in general Cave Temple Inscriptions according to number and page in the collection of Messrs. Burgess
and Bhagwanlal. For Nāsik, I follow the numbers given in the Arch. Surv. IV. 56, &c. For Kaññhī, the
numbers of the order in the same collection, V. pp. 74 and 75.
be surprised at sporadic instances of orthography such as purisadatōva (Nās. 24), bhayāvavā vēliatōva and rava (C. T. I., p. 17, No. 23), beside the usual ēva, and the terminations in ēya. So, also, we find in the inscriptions of the north, side by side, rōvēvātēvā, dharmatīmaē, tadhāvātīvā, puyā h (Taxila), &c. We find kālīva (Kān. 13, 24, &c.) as well as kāliyāva and pūtumā, pūtumā, and pūtumāvī (Nās. 12, 13, 15); dhūnīna, mūnīna (Kān. 27) beside dhūnīna, mūnīna, &c.; yu and ja are used indifferently the one for the other, when it is necessary to represent an etymological j: on the Wardak vase we read puyā, beside rājā, at Taxila, rājā beside puyā, and, to confine ourselves to the cave inscriptions, Kān. 18 reads puyathā[Ju], C. T. I., p. 16, No. 20, vāniyasa, Amr. 26 B, vāniyasa; while on the other hand, beside the usual bhayā (equivalent to bhāryā), we have bhajyā, Kān. 19, bhāriyā, Nās. 11 B.

Involved, a hard consonant is sometimes substituted for a soft one. For example, nākama, beside nāγama (C. T. I., p. 60, No. 2), nākāmha (Kān. 2), nākāmika (Amr. 121), nākamkāmla (Amr. 56), in the frequently occurring mā[Ju]tāma, beside mānāmā and mānāmā; Kān. 16 reads bhāk for bhāga; Amr. 222, lōdētīva equivalent to lōkētīva, and bhāgaprā for bhāgaprā.

Although the palatal nāsā is not unknown, its use is very irregular. Kārli 20 has anī equivalent to onyā; Kān. 5, amānī, Kān. 27, pūnāṁ equivalent to pūṇāṁ and nāṁ equivalent to jōttī. The same spelling nāṁ occurs again at Amravati, e. g. in Nos. 232, 249, while, on the other hand, I have noted in two inscriptions (C. T. I., p. 53, Nos. 28 and 30) kāmānāma.

Similarly, other modes of orthography sometimes bring us nearer to, and sometimes take us further from, the learned standard. I may mention amasa[nJu]taka, Nās. 11 B; bhāmāniyā beside baśvena, C. T. I., p. 14, No. 15; these methods of writing are the more worthy of note because, long before, at Kapur di Giri, we regularly find the spelling bramaṇa. C. T. I., p. 46, No. 14, writes shasāvīsā equivalent to shadāvīsā, an absolutely sporadic instance of the use of ākā in this Prākṛiti: a similar inscription, no less Prākṛiti, writes putrāsā beside putrās, (C. T. I., p. 40, Nos. 3, 5, 6, 7).

These inconsistencies of orthography are all sporadic. That they certainly do not depend on differences of time, can easily be proved by reference to the monuments from which the examples have been drawn.

These monuments are dispersed over a very wide area. Now, between the inscriptions of Gujārat or of the caves of the Western coast, and those of Amravati at the mouth of the Krishna, those of Khandagiri in Orissa, of Sānci in Mālava or of Bharaut in Bihār, we find no trace of differences of dialect. They extend over at least four centuries, from the second century B. C. to the 3rd century A. D., without disclosing, between the most ancient and the most modern, any appreciable variation. In an area so extensive, the vulgar tongue certainly could not have failed to divide up into numerous dialects. This is a phenomenon escaped by no language. Literature bears witness to it for the following period, and no one can be tempted to imagine that the fact was then a new one. On the other hand, it is clear that a language cannot pass through four or five centuries in the mouth of the common people without decay and transformation. The earliest literary specimens which we possess of the Prākṛita, the stanzas of Hāla, and the Prākṛitas of the most ancient dramas, although in origin but a short distance from the end of the period to which we refer, reveal a phonetic alteration which was much further advanced. Let us, therefore, bring ourselves face to face with the orthographical facts which have just been pointed out.

The parallel employment of forms unequally altered, belonging to different strata of the language show that this dialect of the monuments, however near we may suppose it to the living popular language, is neither its direct expression nor its faithful imitation. It conceals under a level in part conventional, a more advanced degeneration of the current language — a degeneration of which the distortions are reflected in those more corrupted spellings which accidentally escaped the engravers.
The frequent inconsistencies of the methods of writing show that we, nevertheless, are not dealing with a language which is rigorously subject to minute rules, and fixed by studies so definitive that their authority had cut short all individual caprices. Nor can we, on the other hand, see in it the spontaneous efflorescence of local dialects freely expanding in their native diversity.

The language is, therefore, neither purely popular, nor entirely subject to rules. Taking all in all, it is to Mixed Sanskrit that the Prākrit of the inscriptions can be most exactly compared. Both, by the general use to which they were subjected, and by their relative stability, were raised above the character of simple local dialects. In each case each represented an analogous effort, — though arrested at unequal stages, — to compass a regularity, a unification, which, not being yet defined, left more or less room to hesitation and to caprice.

We have just now had to investigate the relationship which united Mixed Sanskrit and Classical Sanskrit; it is no less necessary to determine what, in the linguistic series, were the respective positions which we should assign to this Monumental Prākrit, and to the Literary Prākrits.

People are accustomed to call this dialect of the inscriptions, which I designate by the name of Monumental Prākrit, simply Prākrit, or, more often, Pāli. This name lends itself to serious misuderstandings. If all that is meant is that in its constituent elements it is very analogous to the Prākrits, of which Pāli is only a particular form, that is all-right; but, so great is the danger arising from the use of terms, which are either imperfectly defined or inaccurately employed, that people are ordinarily prepared to go much farther. They admit, as proved, or simply as self-evident, the identity between the two dialects; and such an identity in no way exists.

It is, on the contrary, a very remarkable fact, the explanation of which will have to be methodically searched for, that the literary Prākrits never appear in the epigraphic monuments: and that the Prākrit of the monuments never appears in literature.

The material elements being in each case identical and drawn from the same popular source, the points of difference deal more with the form than with essentials. They have less to do with inflexion than with orthography, but they, none the less, certainly exist. Compared with monumental Prākrit, two features above all others characterize the Prākrits of literature: on the one hand the regularity with which the orthographical rules peculiar to each are applied, and on the other, the invariable custom of writing double those homogeneous consonants whose doubling is etymologically justifiable, or which result from the assimilation of a non-homogeneous group of consonants.

The few examples given above are sufficient to show how unstable in its orthography is the Prākrit of the inscriptions. A reference to the monuments themselves will show plenty of other proofs. Sometimes a medial consonant is elided, sometimes it is retained: a hard consonant is usually maintained unchanged, but is sometimes softened: the cerebral ولوجي and the dental أحك is sometimes distinguished, and sometimes one is used alone to the exclusion of the other. The palatal endcode is by turns used or abandoned in words of identical formation. What need we say about the perpetual omissions and confusions which affect the notation of the long vowels? There is nothing like this in the Prākrit of the books. In them the value of the vowels is everywhere strictly fixed. Does this Prākrit weaken a medial hard letter to a soft one? Then it does so always. Does that elide a medial soft letter? Then it elides it in every instance. One dialect exclusively employs the dental nasal, another no less exclusively adopts the cerebral. If they use both, they do so under distinct and clearly defined circumstances. I know that in several of these peculiarities people have sought for traces of dialectic or of chronological variations, but we have seen what confusion reigns in a number of inscriptions which belong to the same region and to the same epoch. That confusion allows us to
attribute to such causes only a very secondary action. It, in any case, assigns to Monumental Prakrit a place apart, nigh to, but independent of the Prakrits of the books.

In order to be more accurate, it is indispensable to examine more closely those Prakrits of the books, — the Literary Prakrits.

It has long been recognized that the Prakrits of the grammarians and of literature are, to a greater or less extent, languages which possess an artificial and a learned character. The very commencement (v. 2) of the collection of Hala is significant:—

Ami am pūṣakevam
padhūn svuṇ a jē ṣa jānaṇī
kāmase tavatānaṇī
tuṣṇī tē kaha rā lajjanī?

It could, therefore, very well happen that people were unable to understand Prakrit poetry. A special study was required to follow it. — This is not the only piece of evidence, but the very appearance, the nature of the language, and the way in which it was used, furnish, in this respect, still more decisive arguments.

The mere fact that the plays, even those reputed to be the most ancient, employ at the same time, dialects which have reached very different stages of phonetic decay, will not allow us to admit that these dialects have been really and simply conveyed from real life into literature. The way in which they are employed and their allotment amongst the characters of the play are regulated, not according to the birth-place of the speakers (who in general are supposed to belong to the same country), but in conformity with a comparative scale which assigns each dialect, according to its degree of corruption, to each character according to his social rank. It is needless to show how arbitrary is such a state of affairs, and how it cannot have been a direct imitation of the truth. If the Mahārāṣṭrī dialect is exclusively reserved for poetic use, it is so because it has been adapted to the purpose by special manipulations, so that it no longer really and exactly represents the language of Mahārāṣṭra. On this point, opinion is, I believe, unanimous, and no one doubts that literary custom and convention are in great part responsible for the emasculation of this language, which appears unable to bear a single strong articulation, and which is resolved into a confused murmur of vowels following one after the other. Even those dialects, which, like the Sauraṇi, have not been deliberately reduced to this degree of weakness, have certainly not escaped a certain amount of retouching. Languages do not, by their organic movement, go again up the stream, down which they have been carried by the natural action of phonetic decay. If the languages spoken in India at the present day possess articulations which have disappeared in the Prakrits, the grammatical constitution of which is infinitely more archaic, the use in literature of which is anterior by twelve or fifteen centuries, it is evidently so because the orthography of these Prakrits does not absolutely represent the condition of the language at the time at which they were employed or fixed. In this respect the Prakrit grammarians themselves supply sufficient indications. It is exactly those disdained dialects, which were considered as inferior, that have had their forms least altered, and that are nearest to their etymological origin. The Paścāti preserves the medial consonants which the superior dialects elide (Hemachandra, IV, 324), and the Apabhraṣṭa retains the articulation of r after a consonant (tibid. IV. 398), which is everywhere else suppressed in the uniform level of assimilation.

The names of the dialects, too, contribute their testimony. Titles, such as Apabhraṣṭa, i.e. 'corruption,' or perhaps, 'corrupted dialect,' Paścāti, 'the dialect of demons,' are not names of definite languages, really existing in a precise region. When we found further distinguished, the Chāṇikā-Paścāti, or 'Little Paścāti,' the Ardha-Māgadhī, or 'Semi-Māgadhī,' we can scarcely doubt, a priori, that we have to do with dialects which are something quite different from simple provincial idioms. I know that my learned fellow-worker and
friend, Dr. Hoernle, has, with reference to Apabhraṃśa and Ardha-Māgadhī, put forward propositions which would make them local dialects with exact boundaries. I do not think that these theories could be positively maintained. To tell the truth, his views regarding the first would appear to have varied. Recently, in the provisional introduction to the excellent Bihārī Dictionary, he puts forward the Apabhraṃśa as the peculiar dialect of the north-west of India. We see from the preface to his edition of the Prākritalakṣaṇa of Chaṇḍa (p. xx) that this opinion is chiefly based on one fact, viz., that the edicts of Kapurī-Giri agree with the Apabhraṃśa in optionally retaining an r following another consonant. Such a basis of classification is insufficient. We have nothing in any tradition to authorise the localisation of the Apabhraṃśa in the north-west. Do not we also find the sporadic retention of this r at Girnar, at Nānāghāṭ, and in other inscriptions of the west? If the Apabhraṃśa thus combines apparently ancient forms with the most advanced instances of decay, this happens, not owing to a dialectic peculiarity, but to the habit, common to all the usual dialects, of drawing freely on the tradition of the learned language, orthography and pronunciation. The Apabhraṃśa of Hemachandra (IV. 398, cf. 414, &c.), still retains the r in composition. Would any one dare to draw chronological deductions from this fact? It employs on occasions the vowel ri (IV. 394); are we to see in this use the local survival of a sound lost for so many centuries? Dr. Hoernle was, in my opinion, much nearer the truth, when, in the introduction to his Comparative Grammar (pp. xix—xxi) he came into accord with the proposition so learnedly put forward by Prof. Pischel, who considers the Apabhraṃśa as the popular dialect, as really spoken, in opposition to the Literary Prākrit.

He considers that there are as many Apabhraṃśas as Prākritas, and I think that, in this, he has gone too far; for a great deal is still wanted to prove that each Prākrit could be viewed as regularly corresponding to a definite local dialect (as we shall see at once in the case of Ardhamāgadhī). But the main fact to be drawn from the passages which he has quoted, or to which he has referred, and from the authoritative statements of the grammarians themselves, is that the Apabhraṃśa is like a general category, into which the grammar throws pell-mell, without attempting to classify them into dialectic groups, a number of peculiarities probably borrowed from current usage and eliminated from the literary idioms. In this way we can explain how the Apabhraṃśa could appear sometimes more archaic, though usually more degenerated, than the learned Prākritas, in which the affection of orthographic uniformity, has made the proscription of tautemasas, or at least of such as were too apparent, as large as possible.

[Note by translator.—It is almost unnecessary to state that the fact of his being the translator of M. Senart's luminous arguments, in no way binds Mr. Grierson to either accepting or denying their cogency.]

3 Academy, October 1870.

4 At the same time I am unable to understand on what arguments the idea, expressed by Dr. Hoernle, that the Apabhraṃśa would appear to represent the popular language spoken by the Aryans, and the Prāśkī the same language as spoken by the aboriginal tribes, is founded. Such an arrangement looks really too systematic, nor is it sufficiently justified by the few divergences which distinguish the Prāśkī from the Apabhraṃśa. Some of these, such as the hardening of soft consonants, are found now and then at all epochs, from that of Pṇyāsā to the Prākrit of the monuments. Dr. Hoernle has himself remarked that, in the more modern grammarians, the confusion between the Prāśkī and the Apabhraṃśa is perpetual (Comp. Gram. p. xx, note). I believe, indeed, that they are only two names to distinguish two things which, if not identical, are extremely analogous. It is perhaps for this reason that Vararuci does not mention the Apabhraṃśa. It is probable that, at the period when his grammar was written, pedants had not yet pressed their taste for arbitrary differentiations so far as to distinguish between an Apabhraṃśa and a Prāśkī. It is certain that, when the distinction first comes to our notice, in the Prākritalakṣaṇa (III. 37-38), the two alleged dialects are characterised by traits, —use of the consecutive r in Apabhraṃśa, substitution of i and u for r and ṣ — which could, in no way, be held sufficient to constitute a difference of dialect. They alone suffice to show the secondary, theoretical, origin of the separation. When we are told that in Prāśkī the spelling saṣa (= sə) for Sanskrit sahas occurs, are we to believe that this debased dialect has naturally perpetuated the etymological spelling? We cannot do so, any more than we can believe that the Apabhraṃśa preserved the consecutive r. It simply takes up in tautemasas, written with a liberty tolerated by its rudeness, and the borrowing of which this rudeness itself supports, the tradition which we have already found at work at Girnar, several centuries earlier, in spellings like saṣa, &c.
Dr. Hoernle’s opinion regarding Ardhamagadhi rests, unless I am mistaken, on but a weak basis. He has endeavoured to establish from the inscriptions of Piyadasi a geographical partition of the ancient dialects, which I have already, I believe, shewn to have little foundation. We have, as a fact, no indication of the existence, at that ancient period, of a dialect intermediate between the Māgadhi and the Māhārāṣṭrī. I would add that, by its name of Arsha, the Ardhamagadhi is at once classed as a literary language. It would be a strange phenomenon that we should have to take it as denoting a real idiom,—this dialect, whose sole peculiarity is the formation of the nominative singular in े, and which, in other respects, save a few insignificant exceptions, is just the same as Māhārāṣṭrī. It bears clearly on its face the mark of its artificial origin. I shall indicate, later on, what we may conjecture as to its formation; and certainly, the first impression awakened by its name, the notion which that name gives of a scholastic idiom, is not one that will mislead us.

It is true that, beside these instructive names, other dialects received local titles which connected each with a definite tract of country. I do not even wish to insist on the fact that the principal dialect, the one which serves as the basis for the teaching of the grammarians, instead of habitually receiving its name of Māhārāṣṭrī, is called Prakrit, the Prakrit par excellence, which manifestly contrasts it, as an artificial language, with that other learned and literary language, which is Sanskrit, the Sanskrit, the Sanskrit. This detail can well have only a secondary importance, and it remains certain that several Prakrits are designated by geographical names; Māhārāṣṭrī, Sauraśeni, Māgadhi. It is natural to conclude that they are connected respectively with the countries of the Māhārāṣṭrī, of the Sauraśeni, and of Māgadhi. But to what degree, and in what sense are they connected?

That each borrows certain characteristic peculiarities from the popular dialect of the country of which it bears the name, is a thought which will at once occur to the mind. Several facts confirm it. Some of the phenomena attributed to Māgadhi by the grammarians—the formation of the nominative of a-bases in े, the substitution of ī for ṛ—are also found in the official dialect of Piyadasi, and the situation of the royal residence entitles us to consider that as approximately representing the idiom of Māgadhi. Whatever we may be led to think of the work of regularisation and of the cutting down to measure by the grammarians, it is certain that they have taken their materials for foundation, their constituent elements, from the vulgar dialects, and the names which have remained attached to the literary idioms, when they have a definite geographical meaning, deserve to be taken into serious consideration. Till the contrary is proved, they supply us with an historic basis, which we cannot abandon without committing a serious imprudence. So far as concerns the Māhārāṣṭrī, the comparisons which the inscriptions of the western coast, in the land of Māhārāṣṭrī, permit us to institute, show that no incompatibility exists between what we can identify as belonging to the popular language, and the rules of the grammatical idiom. The only thing is that we must clearly understand under what conditions these comparisons present themselves. Māhārāṣṭrī, where we find at once both a long series of monuments, and, in the verses of Hâla, an ancient, probably the most ancient, instance of the application of Prakrit to literature, is the tract most favourably circumstanced for us to form a clear idea, on actual evidence, of the manner in which the reform of the Prakrit grammarians was accomplished.

On a consideration of the Prakrit inscriptions of the West we have been convinced that, although they are necessarily based on the popular language of the locality, they do not give us a rigorously faithful picture of it. Their orthography is not strictly representative; but, without having that stability which can only be assured by a complete grammatical culture, it tends to get as near as it can to etymology, that is to say to the orthography preserved by the learned language. It takes as the typical ideals of its writing those instances in which the pronunciation has departed least from the primitive form. The parallel use of Mixed Sanskrit is there to prove that this conclusion does not arbitrarily attribute to the authors of the monumental orthography a predisposition which was not theirs.
What about the literary Mahārāṣṭrī? We know, in the first place, that the grammarians distinguish two varieties,—the ordinary Mahārāṣṭrī, which is that of Hāla and of a portion of the poetry of the plays, and the Mahārāṣṭrī of the Jainas. We can for the moment neglect the shades which distinguish these two groups; taken as a whole, they closely resemble each other, as we should expect in the case of dialects which, bearing the same name, must have sprung up in the same soil. Between this literary idiom, and that of the monuments, numerous points of difference leap to the front the moment we examine them. We must consider these differences more closely.

The literary orthography ordinarily weakens into the corresponding sonant the hard $t$; I have quoted above, from the inscriptions, the spellings mukuta, viṭaka, dhēṇukata, kuduañī, sādañī, sādagārī, padidāvana, padidhāpita, &c., by the side of the more usual writing which retains the consonant as in the standard Sanskrit. The literary language readily weakens $p$ into $b$ or $v$, and it completely elides the medial $t$; I have quoted above the sporadic spellings ihū and for thāpa (etapā), gāyana for gautama ("mt"). The grammarians teach that a soft consonant between two vowels is elided; in the monuments, we have met words like bhayāna, bhava, beside bhaveda, sascita for sascita, pavātha and pawātha for pawātha, bhōja and bhōsa for bhōjika and bhōja, pāyana and pādana for pādana, uvaraka beside īvaraka, oṣvaraka, beside the usual vchari, pāthāna for pāthāna, representing pratishthāna. The locative singular of bases in $a$ is formed in the Prakrit of literature in $ā$, and more usually in āma; if in the monuments it is almost always formed in $ā$, we, nevertheless, find examples like evābudayamahi (Karli No. 10, Arch. Surv. IV. 91); and, beside the locative tirashtumā, the spelling tiraschumā (i.e., tirashtumā) (Arch. Surv. p. 106, No. 14). So, also, bhūmāna beside bhūmanā in the same dedication. These instances prove that the termination mā was altered, in a manner more or less constant, into āma in the vulgar pronunciation.

The $y$ is constantly changed into $j$ in the regular writing, and, consequently, $yy$ into $jj$, and the group rya into rya, through an intermediate rya. Cases like niḥadhadāna, (C. T. I., p. 31), No. 7; for "dhajamā, vaṃśiyāsā, p. 16, No. 20, pyathān, Kaṅ. No. 90, vayāma, Arch. Surv. IV. p. 99, No. 4 (perhaps we might add bhōja beside bhōja), prove that in real pronunciation there was no distinction between $y$ and $j$. Elsewhere, beside learned spellings like dharjīya (C. T. I., p. 100), dharja, Kaṅ. No. 17, we meet the forms dyaika, Kaṅ. No. 19, C. T. I., p. 60, No. 2; bhaya, C. T. I., p. 43, No. 6, &c., payānadhī, Arch. Surv. p. 114, No. 22; and the sporadic spellings, bhāja, bhāya, Kaṅ. 19, 27; harajīyā, Nās. 22; hāddrajaṇīyā, Kaṅ. 27, beside pāṇiya, do not permit us to doubt that, between the grammars and the inscriptions, the difference was purely apparent, and simply graphic. I could quote other details, and, compared with the stātras I. 29; III. 129, of Hēmācandra, point out, in the monuments, the spellings dīvyāsini, Kaṅ. 28, Kuḍa 22, dīyymi, Arch. Surv. IV. 114, No. 3, &c., dā, Kaṅ. No. 3, beside bē (Mahād. 1), or vē (Junnar, 14).

These comparisons suffice to put in its true light the character of the grammatical dialect. It is founded on the same local basis as the idiom of the monuments: both represent the same language but at slightly different periods of its history: both modify its appearance by an orthography which is in part arbitrary, but dominated in each case by divergent predilections. The one, when it is inspired with learned recollections, ordinarily chooses as its standard the least altered etymological form; the other goes, so to speak, to the extreme limit of existing corruptions; it prefers to take the most advanced facts of phonetic deterioration, as the level which grammatical elaboration imposes with a more or less absolute regularity on the system which it has consecrated.

The arbitrary constructions of the school can, of course, work in more than one direction. We must expect not only to find different tendencies, but also to meet both partial instances of unfaithfulness to the regulative tendency, — and also elements and distinc-
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5 Jacobi, Kalpa Sutra, Introd. p. xvii.
tions which are purely artificial, mingled in a variable proportion with the elements which have been directly supplied by the popular speech. A comparison of the various literary Mahārāṣṭrīs, the parallel employment of which I have already mentioned, throws a striking light upon this point of view.

As Professor Jacobi (loc. cit.) points out, the Mahārāṣṭrī of Varanasi and the poets differ from that of Hēnāchandra and the Jains in two main peculiarities. The former does not use the ya-śrutī, and everywhere substitutes the cerebral y for the dental n; the latter retains the dental n at the commencement of words, and when it is doubled. It is quite natural that the origin of these divergencies has first been sought for, either in diversities of dialect, or in differences of time; but I should be surprised if anyone, with the knowledge which we are now beginning to acquire of Indian epigraphy, could persevere in this view.

So far as concerns the first point, the introduction of a y between vowels — or, according to Hēnāchandra, more exactly, between two a’s — which form an hiatus, I lay no stress on several circumstances, disagreement between the grammarians, disagreement between the rules of the grammar and the manuscript tradition, which a priori appear to indicate that this rule is susceptible of arbitrary extensions and restrictions. I content myself with calling the texts of the inscriptions as witnesses. The ordinary orthography is too ready to adopt the methods of the learned language to allow many hiatus to exist. I have, however, quoted many examples, and I could quote more; bhōṣa, bhūṣya, pāiṇa, chitora, paṭhaṇa, bhāṣa, pulumā, pūṇa; the spellings chōtīsā (Kaḥp. 5), paṭāyīsya (Kaḥp. 4), the terminations pavaṭṭkā, pūnakasāṇa, (Kaḥp. 21), bhāyā (Kaḥp. 27). It follows that from an epoch earlier than that of our literary authorities, the local pronunciation supported the existence of the hiatus in Mahārāṣṭrī, as well as in the other provinces of India. It must be assumed that, there as elsewhere, but not more than elsewhere, the hiatus implied a light utterance-break analogous to the soft breathing. If this has been denoted by means of the y, whether in all, or in special cases, the choice can be explained on the one hand by the imitation of a certain number of terminations of the learned declension, and on the other by the fact that the change in every case of an original y to j, left the sign for y available for a special function. Sometimes the inscriptions apply v for this purpose, as in pulumāvīa (Nās. 15). bhāyāvī (Kuḍa, No. 23), and the parallel employment in this last inscription of the spelling uyaraka, for uvaraka, clearly shows that neither the v in the one case nor the y in the other represented any actual pronunciation. They are merely equivalent expedients for concealing from the eyes a hiatus which the recollections of the cultivated language caused to be considered as clumsy and barbarous. It was a similar idea, and not a chimerical peculiarity of a local dialect, which has caused the employment of the ya-śrutī by one school, and which has subsequently ceased to pass into the rules of its grammars and into the usages of its books.

As for the use of the dental n and the cerebral y, the case is, if possible, still more striking. At first sight, a dialect which invariably pronounces an initial n in one way and a medial n in another, should surprise us and put us on our guard. But the question is more general, and the case is susceptible of being argued with greater precision.

I must confess that I cannot sufficiently express my surprise to see nowadays the distinction between the cerebral and the dental nasal taken as a basis of classification when dealing with the ancient Prākrits. It will be remembered how the form of the cerebral J is known to none of the inscriptions of Piyadasī which are conched in the Māgadhī orthography. The dental J is alone used. If this is a peculiarity of the dialect, it is very curious that, in the literary Māgadhī, the dental n should, on the contrary, completely disappear, and that the cerebral n alone should be admitted. At Bharhat, the ordinary inscriptions know only one J, the dental n; but there is, nevertheless, one exception, and it is characteristic. The royal inscrip-
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tion of the eastern porch, dated in the reign of the Saṅgaśa, uses concurrently both forms ṣ and ṣ; but in what way? It has pōdha, putra, putra, probably tōraṇaḥ and certainly upāna. If both forms are here known, it is quite clear that the distinction between them is not popular, but arbitrary and learned. This is proved not merely by its inconsistencies and by its irregularities, but by the application of the cerebral ṣ to terminations in which its presence is explicable in Sanskrit, but in Sanskrit only, by the proximity of an r which has disappeared in the vulgar idiom. At Girnar, at the time of the edicts of Aśoka, where the distinction between ṣ and ṣ is marked, the pedantic imitation does not go so far, — the cerebral ṣ never appearing in terminations. At Sāñchī, the state of affairs is very analogous to that which is presented at Bharhut. In all the ancient dedications the ṣ is unknown. It only makes its appearance in an inscription of the reign of Sāṅkṣa (No. 190), the introducer of Sanskrit into the epigraphy of the Andhras. At the other extremity of India, in the monuments of Ceylon, the signs ṣ and ṣ are evidently employed without distinction, and it is natural to conclude that the case was the same in the region from which that great island had borrowed its alphabet. It is a curious fact that the only inscription (No. 57 of E. Müller) in which a deliberate distinction appears to have been made — we have in it mahāsaram, bhūmāsaramabhūti, beside nāti (nāthi), śhāna, niyati — appears to be directly based on a Māgadhī dialect, and yet, in its use of ṣ and ṣ, it deviates equally both from the practice of Piyadasi, and from the rules of the literary Māgadhī.

Nowhere are things more clear than in the tract which interests us more immediately, the country of Mahārāṣṭra. I have just drawn attention to the fact that in the root-portion of words, Girnar follows Sanskrit in distinguishing between the two ṣ's. At Nāṇgāṣī, the ancient Andhras knew nothing but the dental ṣ. The cerebral ṣ reappears in the period following, we have seen above under what conditions. The confusion is continual. No fixed rule allows us to disentangle it. Neighbouring inscriptions make exclusive use, one of ṣ, the other of ṣ. The meaning of this hesitation, of this medley, is further accentuated by the parallel facts concerning the palatal ṣ. This nasal has disappeared in the literary Mahārāṣṭra, and is replaced by the cerebral or by the dental. Nevertheless, in the inscriptions, we constantly find the genitive ṣāḥi, and also forms such as hēnāika (C. T. I., p. 54, No. 32). On the other hand spellings such as kahaṇaka (C. T. I., p. 53, Nos. 28, 30) are of a nature to lead us to conclude that the τ is no longer a living letter. We have, indeed, already quoted dāna, an, an, and, hēnāika, pāṇa, nāti, ṣ, which shew that the use of the sign ṣ is only a mere pedantic affectation. It is certainly not otherwise with the signs ṣ and ṣ. In the inscriptions they represent a value which is in both cases absolutely identical; and if the grammatical reform of the literary dialects has assigned to them special rōles, it is owing to an arbitrary differentiation which has no connexion with the actual variations of the current pronunciation.

Although summary, these remarks are, unless I am mistaken, sufficient to mark the peculiar characteristics of Monumental Prākṛt, and also, more especially, of the Literary Prākṛt, and to present them under their true aspect. This is an indispensable preparation for elucidating the problem with which we are concerned. It resolves itself into two terms; when and how were the Literary Prākṛta constituted? These two points embrace all the secondary questions.

It is a trite observation that languages, in the normal course of their history, are invariably subject to a gradual decay of their phonetic elements. This is a current down which all float. None can, of itself, go up the stream by its natural movement. This has ordinarily, and very naturally, been made the basis of the relative chronology of the dialects of India. "The
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8 It is very possible that this state of affairs was in reality much more ancient. In fact, putting aside the peculiar spelling ṣāṇa (G. VIII. 1), the edicts of Girnar, along with the ordinary orthography of ṣ for ṣ, have in one passage (VIII. 4) the reading hēnāka. Inversely, while the ṣ appears nowhere in the edicts in the Māgadhī dialect, Dhālī presents an unique example in pāṇiṣṭ for pratīṣṭ, always supposing that the reading of the Corpus is exact, which I have great difficulty in believing.
preceding remarks make evident with what particular reservations we should here surround the application of this principle. In themselves, the Sanskrit forms are certainly more archaic; they are historically older than the Prákrit forms of the time of Píyudasi. Yet does not prevent Sanskrit, as a whole language, in the form in which we know it now, having only succeeded in conquering for itself an existence long after the rise of his Prákrit. So it is with the different Prákritic. The general phonetic appearance of Páli is certainly more archaic than that of Maháráṣṭría. Have we any right to conclude that therefore it actually existed, in its definitive form and orthography, before Maháráṣṭría? In no way. In short, we must carefully distinguish between the constituent elements of the dialect, considered directly, and their utilization in the shape of a particular literary dialect, adapted to a certain order of production. We cannot apply to literary idioms, in part artificial and learned, the same measure as that which we apply to purely popular languages. They, the former, can, in a sense, go up the regular stream of their linguistic development. This is the very fact which we have proved for Mixed Sanskrit. When I speak of inquiring into the age of the Literary Prákritic I mean, not to determine the epoch to which the elements, morphological and phonetic, of which they are composed, can be traced up, but to fix the moment when they were arrested, crystallized, in a definite form for literary use. For this purpose the forms which are the most altered are those which are most instructive. They can be made to prove that such a dialect cannot be earlier than such a given epoch. The better preserved forms prove nothing. They may have been either subsequently reconstructed in the light of the learned language, or preserved for a greater or less period by tradition before receiving their place and their consecration in the special dialect of which they finally formed an integral part.

The criterion, therefore, founded exclusively on the general phonetic appearance of the dialects must be resolutely put to one side, if we wish to avoid misconceptions regarding the most certain, the most characteristic features of the history which we are endeavouring to build up.

This being settled, a two-fold object of inquiry presents itself. On the one side, the relation existing between the Prákritic of the monuments and that of the books, and of the other, the relation existing between the literary Prákritic and Sanskrit.

To set to deliberately, to convert, by systematic work, popular dialects into literary dialects with forms fixed for ever, is not so simple an idea that it would suggest itself of itself, and that it should not require any explanation. Such an undertaking must evidently be regulated on a prototype, on some pre-established model. India possesses a type of this description, Sanskrit. Indeed, if we pay heed to the names, prákritic and sanskrtica are correlative terms. The actual bond which connects together the two series of facts is certainly no less close than the formal relationship of the names which designate them. Historically, the earlier term is Sanskrit. On that point there can be no possible doubt. It is the very elaboration and diffusion of Sanskrit which has served as the basis and model for the elaboration of the Prákritic. They have been regularised in imitation of it. The recollection of this origin is perpetuated in the teaching of the grammarians. They take care to establish that Prákritic has Sanskrit for its basis and for its source (Hémonch. I. 1, and Dr. Fischel's notes). It would be a mistake to attribute to the Hindús, on the strength of such a remark, the idea of a linguistic genealogy founded on comparative analysis. When Vararuci and others (cf. Lasen, Inst. Ling. Prákritic, p. 7) declare that the prákritic of Sauraseni is Sanskrit, and that of Maháráṣṭría and of Páśuacchi the Sauraseni, it is quite clear that we must not take the proposition in an historical sense. It is nothing but a manner of stating that Sauraseni, in various characteristics, approaches Sanskrit orthography more nearly than the other dialects, — that it is in a fashion midway between the learned language, and the dialects with a more altered orthography. It is not a genealogical classification, but an entirely practical one. It is something like a direct recognition of the method according to which these languages have received their grammatical fixation. This working has taken for its basis the grammar of the learned language, and for its principle the gradation of each of them on a determined level below the stage of Sanskrit.
I now come to the second object of inquiry.

Monumental Prākrit and the Literary Prākrits start from the same source. Their main difference consists in this, that they have been unequally cultivated. The latter possess a character more stable, their mode of writing is more perfect. Is this to be explained by indifference to these particulars on the side of the former? Certainly not. The part which it plays as the official language of the inscriptions, the general level which it knows how to retain above the more altered local dialects, allow us to recognize in it an idiom already refined, and with an inevitable tendency, as is universal in India, to establish itself as a fixed and regular language. How could we believe, if there already existed, in the Literary Prākrits, a parallel model of better regulated and more complete orthography, that the writers could have, when using the language for inscriptions, neglected to profit by it, and to utilize its experience?

But general considerations are not sufficient. Whatever it be worth, the demonstration, to be conclusive, must be connected with precise and characteristic phenomena. The facts relating to the graphic representation of double consonants have afforded us valuable assistance for establishing certain essential points in the comparative history of Classical and Mixed Sanskrit, and the data of the same order are no less instructive in the new ground on which we tread at present.

The Literary Prākrits observe every doubling without exception. There does not exist a single Prākrit text which departs from this rule, or a single grammarian who does not explicitly teach it, or shew by evidence that he assumes it. The strictness with which it is uniformly introduced in all the dialects shows that we have here a rule which has from the very commencement exercised its influence on the grammatical work.

This mode of writing seems, in itself, to be perfectly simple; it is only the expression of the actual pronunciation. But the matter is not so easy as that. Not only does the most ancient orthography, that of the edicts of Piyadasi, abstain from observing it, but we have seen that Mixed Sanskrit, in spite of the tendency which led it to approach historically older forms, adopted it slowly, and, as I have admitted, under the influence of Classical Sanskrit. It is no less a stranger to the Prākrit of the monuments throughout the whole period with which we are now dealing. We are entitled to affirm this as a general fact, though I shall shortly point out certain exceptions, which, far from weakening the rule tend to emphasize its correctness.

This graphic usage of the literary Prākrits, which is inseparable from their very elaboration and from their grammatical establishment, was, therefore, not borrowed by them from earlier established customs. It is not met in epigraphy, nor in the current practice which epigraphy certainly reflects. It can only have been borrowed by them, as it was borrowed by Mixed Sanskrit, from the pre-existing orthography of Classical Sanskrit. I have just shown that it was à priori more than probable that the very idea of refining the local dialects into literary tongues, and still more probably the principles under which the latter were elaborated, must have had their source in the existence, in the employment, and in the rule of profane Sanskrit. This orthographical peculiarity lends to this view a new and positive foundation in fact, and certain data borrowed from epigraphy shew it in its full light.

I have said that the Prākrit of the inscriptions does not double its consonants. It remains, in this respect, faithful to the ancient tradition. This fidelity is not variable, and does not endure to an indefinite period. From a certain epoch, we find some examples of doubling appearing sporadically. The last inscription of Vasiṣṭhiputa Pulumāyī (A. S., IV. p. 113, No. 21) has stapharanaṇaputtya. The termination asya, which is repeated in sāvasa-kasya, abulmanadithasasya, clearly shews that the engraver employed this doubling in a moment of Sanskritizing imitation. In the purely Prākrit texts of Madhariputa Sakasēna, we meet
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* Amongst the neo-Aryan languages, Siadhī, re-adopting in its case the primitive inexactness of the Hindu orthography, neglects to note these doublings; but it none the less faithfully observes them in pronunciation.
áyyakōṇa (A. S., V. p. 19, No. 14), áyyakōṇa and buddha (ibid. p. 82, No. 19). The maintenance of the long vowel before the double consonant is here to reveal a Sāṃskṛt influence, and an analogous action is altogether natural in the participle buddha, which is identical in the learned language and in the popular tradition. Doublings (even purely Pāṇini words) are more numerous in No. 27 of Kaṇhārī (d. S., p. 85) : pāṇīyā, bhādrāvijyāvyan, etta, ekka, ettō, putāna, sauvāna, lifānaṇ, iti. This inscription is, generally speaking, rather couched in Mixed Sāṃskṛt, forms like pratigrād, prat他认为, kulasa, bear witness to a more or less direct action on the part of classical orthography. Its linguistic level is, in other respects, very uneven, and side by side with these Sāṃskṛt forms, appears a genitive like dhausā. Dr. Bühlī, whose experience on this point is entitled to great respect, considers that this inscription, written in Andhra characters, contains some forms of more modern letters. It, therefore, most probably, belongs to the third century.

These facts speak clearly. It is certain that Pāṇini, as it was written on the monuments, was quite ready to accept the graphic doubling of consonants. From the moment when the diffusion of Sāṃskṛt set the example of this doubling, this tendency shows itself in various dispersed instances, welling over from Mixed Sāṃskṛt to introduce itself into Pāṇini. These instances form the evidence of the movement which was inevitably destined to carry on the Pāṇini in its course. They show also that this movement had not yet resulted in the fixation of the orthography of the Pāṇini, for, in that case we should find in the Pāṇini of the monuments, instead of rare indications, a constant practice.

Later facts prove that this is not an unfounded conjecture.

It will be remembered that after the commencement of the 3rd century, the series of epigraphical monuments is interrupted by an unfortunate lacuna. The most ancient inscriptions which come next to carry on the chain of tradition, are, so far as is at present known, a few epigraphs of the Pallavas. The earliest is an endowment of Vijayabuddhavarman. Messrs. Burnell and Fleet agree, on paleographical grounds, in attributing it to the fourth century. Of the four faces which are covered with writing, only the last is in Sāṃskṛt. In the condition in which they have come down to us, the three first do not appear to be susceptible of a continued translation, but that is not indispensable for our present purpose. Whatever may be the difficulties and uncertainties, the general fact which concerns us leaps at once prominently into notice. Words like siriviyajakāhandavamamahādźjasa, yuvamā-
vārīya, sāriviviyajahuddhatamamamasa, pādduttaro pāde show us a Pāṇini which, for the first time in the series of epigraphs, doubles its consonants like the grammatical Pāṇini. This, too, is not an accident or a caprice. The copper-plates of Himādaṇagallī, which belong to the same dynasty, and to the same time, and which have been kindly communicated to me by Mr. Burgess, use on the whole the same orthography.

The fact is of high importance. It conclusively testifies how the writing of the monuments was naturally inclined to adopt the more regular and accurate orthography used by the Literary Pāṇini. If, therefore, it had not adopted it sooner, it was because that use had not yet been established. It thus gives us a means for determining with sufficient approximation the epoch in which the final elaboration of the Pāṇini occurred.

To sum up. The reform of the Literary Pāṇini was subsequent to the diffusion of Sāṃskṛt in profane use, and cannot therefore, be earlier than the first centuries of our era. In the 4th century it had been carried out; at least, the general system had been established. This is borne witness to by the reaction which it exercised upon the Pāṇini of the monuments; all that we do not know is to what dialects it at first extended. The few examples of doubling which we find in the epigraphs of the end of the 2nd century, or of the beginning of the 3rd, would seem to mark this epoch as the period of this grammatical work.

10 Fleet, Ind. Ant. 1880, p. 100. 11 Ind. Ant. 1875, pp. 175 and 8. 12 It has since been published by Dr. Bühler in Epigraphica Indica, Part I.
Without being in a position to state with positive accuracy, we cannot be far wrong in asserting that the second and third centuries are the earliest time at which it can have been brought forward into practice. It is clear that this work cannot have been contemporaneous for all the dialects, and that, for several, it has only been carried out at a much later period.

These conclusions compel us to accept an important consequence. This consequence is that all the Pāli-Prākrit literature which we possess is, in the orthographical form in which we now have it, later than the grammatical reform of the Prākrits, and later than the 2nd or 3rd century.

I must here do away with a scruple which might arise in the reader’s mind, and suggest one explanation.

My last inductions are principally founded on the date of the doubling of consonants in writing. Am I not exaggerating the importance of an orthographical detail?

It will first be remarked that the argument drawn from doubling, if I have been right in insisting upon it on account of facts which allow us to treat it with a striking degree of accuracy, comes simply to confirm and to circumscribe, from the point of view of chronology, a proposition which a priori compelled its own acceptance. Or can any one doubt that the regularisation of the Prākrits, such as we find it both in grammatical manuals and in literary works, was not necessarily later than the final elaboration and diffusion into common life of Sanskrit, or that it was not inspired by and modelled on it? This imitation of Sanskrit performance carries us, after what has been said above, to at least the second century.

Moreover, we must take care not to minimize too much the importance of this graphic phenomenon. For several centuries, through minor modifications, a certain orthographical system was maintained in the Prākrit of the monuments, without undergoing any attack, or submitting to any compromise. All at once, we find, one day, this system modified, and modified in a regular, constant manner, in one of its most characteristic traits. The incident, from a grammatical point of view, is not so petty. By its very suddenness, by the strictness with which the new principle is applied, it indicates that a revolution of some magnitude has intervened.

This doubling may pass for a detail, but it is not an isolated one. It forms an integral part of a more general reconstruction. It is one of the most apparent manifestations, but it is far from exhausting them. The fixation of the Prākrits by the learned has also touched other points. There is no appearance or indication of its having been executed in successive stages, and, so to speak, in several acts. It can only be understood as taking place at a single blow in the first dialects which were subjected to it. It could subsequently have extended to the others by a natural process of imitation. If we prove the application of one characteristic feature of the system, we may be assured that that system in its entirety has just, for the first time, been put in practice.

A decisive fact testifies to the importance of this moment in the history of the Prākrits. It is natural that one graphic system should disappear from use on the arrival of a system, which was more complete and more consistent to itself. That is what happened to Mixed Sanskrit in the presence of Sanskrit. Now, with the 3rd century, Monumental Prākrit disappears without return. The Pallava inscriptions are in pure Pāli, and after that epoch, Sanskrit remains, alone amongst the tongues of Aryan stock, as the language of epigraphy.

The objection, therefore, appears to me to be divested of serious importance.

As for the explanation, I can be brief.

Of Prākrit of earlier date than the grammatical reform, we possess no positive documents other than epigraphic evidence. All the literary works are written according to the system established by the grammarians, and they all bear evident traces of the levelling process which followed the scholastic reform. I conclude from this that all, from the Sinhalese canon and the canon of the Jainas to the verses of Häla and to the dramas, are, in the actual form in
which we now have them, of later date than the labours of the grammarians, and consequently, than the third century.

Are we, therefore, to conclude that the dialects which the schools retouched, had never, before this epoch, been applied to literature? Such is not my opinion. We shall see, on the contrary, that the use for which several have been specialized, the archaic form which several of them have preserved, can only be explained by the existence of certain traditions, either literary or religious. People composed stanzas in Mahārāṣṭrī before the collection of Hāła was written in its present form. Long before the Sinhalese Tripīṭaka was fixed in the shape in which we now read it, there existed, amongst certain sects of Buddhists, a number of formulae, rules, and legends transmitted in a dialect in its essence closely resembling the Pāli of our books. We must, nevertheless, take care not to exaggerate the accuracy or the importance of these earlier compositions. They must have remained purely oral, or, at most, had only received a written form, which was accidental and ephemeral. A sect, Buddhist, Jain or other, which possessed, whether written, or even living in a finally established oral tradition, a definite and consecrated canon, would certainly never have consented to alter it by submitting it to a new grammatical remodelling. Moreover, this grammatical retouching must have been at first undertaken in answer to a demand, to give for the new requirements of editing and codification, the instrument which was necessary to them. The fixation and the reform of a dialect peculiar to the sect, which was used for its fundamental texts, can only be conceived as occurring at the date when they were for the first time united in a definitive collection of traditions, which had hitherto been either imperfect or dispersed. If they had been established sooner in a canonical corpus, the language of that corpus would itself have been the law. Its authority would have rendered reform both useless and impossible. This reform would, on the other hand, under the conditions in which it was produced, have been equally inexplicable, if we did not admit previous attempts at editing. Although imperfect and fragmentary, they have, in a general way, marked for each dialect the low-water mark of its phonetic development, and furnished the characteristic traits of its morphology.

It is expressly subject to this reserve that we must understand the conclusions which I have indicated. At the present moment, I am only dealing with a special class of considerations. It is unnecessary to say that there are arguments of another nature which appear to me to confirm these inductions. I here leave them aside, and only wish to point out, en passant, one interesting instance of agreement. There are reasons for believing that the stanzas of Hāła represent the most ancient specimen of Prākṛt literature. In the course of his learned and ingenious labours on this valuable collection, Prof. A. Weber has proved that the third century is the earliest date to which it is possible to refer it.

I have now replied, so far as the documents on which I depend appear to allow, to this first question; — at what epoch did the Literary Prākṛits begin to be fixed and to establish themselves? We should also like to know how and under the influence of what circumstances this blossoming forth took place.

This question has hitherto been treated as a simple problem of linguistics. Each dialect has been considered as having been, at the epoch when it received its literary form, a spoken and living idiom. Taking this principle as a foundation, a series based solely on phonetic comparisons has been converted into a chronological scale. I have protested against this confusion, and indicated why, in my opinion, we must discard a criterion which has been adopted with too ready a confidence.

The literary elaboration of the Prākṛits cannot have been earlier than the second or third century. It has been in no way proved, and, indeed, it is hardly probable, that it should

have taken place for all the Prākrits at the same time. Once given the initiatory impulse, the new comers could have followed a movement to which they were originally strangers. In each case it is a special question, less of linguistics than of literary history, which is necessarily difficult and delicate, and which demands thorough investigation for each dialect. I am not called upon to enter, nor should I have the means of entering, upon such an inquiry, even admitting — and I am very far from admitting — that each of these separate problems is at the present moment ripe for discussion. It is sufficient for me to indicate certain facts which appear as if they would throw some light on the problem as a whole.

On looking at it nearer, it resolves itself into two questions.

We must understand why some of the popular dialects were transformed into literary dialects more or less touched up by learned hands.

We must discover how and under what circumstances each received the particular form in which it has been ultimately fixed.

The previous existence of Sanskrit gives an easy reply to the first question. Learned languages have been settled in India in all parts and at all periods. The continued tradition of a religious language distinct from the current tongue, the ancient creation of a literary language fashioned on its model, a language consecrated both by its origin and by the privileged position of its authors, — all these very special conditions sufficiently explain the fact. To this must be added the influence of the social constitution. By the overruling authority which it conferred on the Brāhmaṇas, it assured to scholastic formalism, to the preferences and undertakings of the learned, an empire altogether surer and more powerful than could otherwise have been expected.

I content myself, therefore, with merely pointing out the causes, the action of which has been so evident.

The second question is more complex: why should such and such dialects and not such and such others have been the object of this literary culture? How comes it that dialects in very different degrees of degeneration could have been fixed under parallel circumstances, and, more, at an epoch long posterior to the linguistic period represented by their respective constituent elements? What influences have determined the level at which each one has been arrested?

If the existence of a learned language, like Sanskrit, is an indispensable postulate for the very existence of the Literary Prākrits, its influence was not confined to an initiatory impulse. It is manifest that the classical grammar has, in matters of detail, played the part of a regulator. The classical language fixed in all its parts, surrounded by so much authority and prestige, would present itself to learned labour as a type of perfection: its action could not fail to be powerful. It is the existence of it alone which can explain how such a partial re-organization, a partial levelling, could have taken place without throwing the whole into irremediable disorganisation. The model was there, at once a light and a restraint.

If we take these dialects in themselves and in their separate destinies, it is not difficult to discern several factors which have not only rendered possible, but which have prepared the way for, and which have inspired, their definitive constitution.

All the Prākrits have their roots diving deep into the popular language. The ethnic names which several bear, may, in one or more instances, be deceptive, but, certainly, all their essential elements are originally borrowed from the living language. This peculiarity is common to all, but all the popular dialects have not been raised to the rank of grammatical Prākrits. This learned crystallization of several of them, occurring at an epoch when Sanskrit was coming into common use and had put in the hands of all an excellent literary instrument, must have had special reason for its motive in each particular case. Several such reasons, literary or religious, local or scholastic, will readily suggest themselves.
If the definitive fixation of the Prākrits, and, as a consequence, the drawing up into their present form of the works which have come down to us, cannot have been appreciably earlier than the third century, it is very plain that neither these languages, nor these works could have one day sprung from nothing. They must have had antecedents. There certainly existed, in a more or less rudimentary condition, long before this epoch, a popular and profane literature, hardly or not at all written, but nevertheless living. We find positive traces of it in the inscriptions. I need not refer, in the inscription of Siripulamāyī (Nā. No. 14), to the well-known allusions to the Epic legend. The religious sects could have, nay, must have, from the age of their foundation, preserved teachings and relations, and, at the same time, a more or less altered tradition of the language which had at first served for their propagation. It is from these sources that the arbiters of the literary renovation were able to draw the characteristic elements of the idioms to which they gave a definitive form. In several respects the situation of the Prākritis is altogether analogous to that of Sanskrit as I understand it, and as I have sketched it above.

If Mahārāṣṭrī has become, in preference to every other dialect, the language of song-poetry, it is because it was in Mahārāṣṭrā more than elsewhere, that there had spontaneously developed a poetry which served as a model for more learned attempts. The Jainas, while using the Mahārāṣṭrī, have introduced into it the termination ś of nominatives masculine. The name Māgadhī preserved for their dialect well shews that this innovation is, as it were, a last echo of the recollections which they had kept of this country of Magadha, with which more than one historic tie connected them. It is evidently an analogous recollection which is expressed in the application of the same name, Māgadhī, to the language of the Sinhalese Tripiṭaka. A few rare Māgadhisms can hardly pass for a mark of origin. Several traces of Māgadhisms, however, appear in the most ancient inscriptions of Ceylon, which seem to testify that, as we might expect, it was a kind of Māgadhī which was employed in the propaganda of Piyadasī. The Sinhalese canon pretends to descend directly from it; in reality, an altogether different influence rules the language in which it is couched,—an influence probably emanating from the west of India. The Mixed Sanskrit of the Buddhists of the North-West is the Prākrit orthography which was the most closely allied to Literary Sanskrit, and it was it which, in all likelihood, was the soonest fixed in a lasting tradition. It is very possible that Pāli owes something of its archaic character to this leaning towards etymological orthography of which Western India has furnished as with multiple proofs. The tradition of it must have been, to a certain degree, preserved by the sect to which we are to attribute the drawing up of the southern Tripiṭaka.

From this point of view there is one fact which seems to me to be sufficiently striking to deserve being mentioned here. Three provincial Prākritis hold the place of honour in the grammars, the Mahārāṣṭrī, the Māgadhī, and the Saurasēṇī. It would give quite a false idea of the Prākrit grammarians to imagine that they claimed, under these three names, to include all the principal families of the popular dialects. Their only aim was always practical utility, and we shall be in no danger of wronging them if we affirm that they never conceived the idea of a general and methodical classification of all the Prākrit dialects. It is upon special conditions, local or historical, that the importance of these three dialects must be founded. Now, we learn from their origins, as indicated by their names, that they exactly correspond to the homes of the three systems of writing which the monuments allow us to descry in periods earlier than the grammatical one; the Mahārāṣṭrī to the Monumental Prākrit of the West coast; the Māgadhī to the official orthography of Piyadasī, and the Saurasēṇī, the one which possesses the most archaic aspect, to the Sanskritizing Prākrit of Mathurā and the North-West. It seems that the more or less obscured recollections, the more or less interrupted perpetuation, of a tradition, founded on early attempts at writing, set in movement in these three homes, and at least facilitated the creation of literary dialects.

Whatever may be the value of this conjecture, one conclusion is certain. It is only in
the circumstance of an earlier tradition, local, religious or literary, kept up by means and under conditions which may have varied, that the grammatical reform, from which sprang the grammatical Prākrits in the form in which we know them, can have been possible. I am here content with pointing out the fact in its general aspect. I have not set myself to approach the thorny questions of literary history which surround the peculiar origin of each of these dialects. I have at least wished to shew, while laying before the reader the proposition to which the facts of philology appear to me irresistibly to drive us, that as a whole it presents none of those insurmountable difficulties which a mind pre-possessed by different theories might expect. In concluding, I wish to remark that this necessary allowance of a previous tradition, is an important corrective to what might seem too positive in my statements regarding the final redaction of the Pāli or Prākrit books. This reserve is indispensable. As for laying down the limits in each particular case, for accurately distinguishing between what is the work of the last editors, and what the inheritance of earlier tradition, such a task would be infinite. Perhaps we shall never be in a position to accomplish it in its entirety.

PART IV.

CONCLUSION.

The above observations have led me to touch on most of the more general problems which the linguistic history of ancient India presents. I cannot conclude without summing up the principal conclusions to which I have been conducted. They are, in several respects, in conflict with generally received ideas; but we must consider that, hitherto, the examination of these questions is, as is admitted by all, far from having ended in categorical results. Our knowledge on this subject is still too incomplete, too floating, to allow a little novelty to excite surprise or to justify distress. I have dealt with a single order of considerations, with arguments based on epigraphy and philology, the only ones which were called forth by the principal subject of this work. I consider that these arguments furnish my views with a sufficiently solid basis; and I have every confidence that proofs of other kinds will come to add themselves to mine, and to gradually confirm them. I shall not be charged, I think, with having disdained these other sources of information. I well know all their value. Even if it be not true, as I think it is, that the series of facts to which I have confined myself is the one most likely to lead us to decisive results, the other considerations would hardly come within the limits which have been laid down for me.

The principal literary dialects of ancient India are three in number; the Vedic language, Classical Sanskrit, and the group of Prākrits. To these we must add that idiom which was in a way intermediate between Sanskrit and Prākrit, for which I have proposed the name of Mixed Sanskrit.

1. So far as concerns the religious language of the Vēdas, the inscriptions of Piyadasi indirectly testify that it was, at the commencement of the 3rd century before our era, the object of a certain amount of culture, and that this culture was purely oral. That is a point which has been discussed in the preceding chapter.

2. As for Classical Sanskrit, its elaboration in the Brahmanical world, essentially based on the Vedic language, and on the school-language which might have formed, so to say, its prolongation, but enlivened by the first applications of writing to the popular dialects, should be placed about the 3rd century B.C., and the time following. Its public or official employment only commenced to spread abroad at the end of the first or at the commencement of the second century. No work of the classical literature can well be of earlier date than this epoch.

3. Mixed Sanskrit is only a manner of writing Prākrit, consisting in going as near as possible to the orthography and the etymological forms known to the religious language.

14 I may refer the reader to the recent preface put by Prof. M. Müller at the commencement of his Sanskrit Grammar for beginners, p. v., and also to the preface of Prof. Whitney's Sanskrit Grammar.
Its use, born spontaneously with the first attempts at writing, continually developed, from the edicts of Kapur dī Giri to the epigraphs of Mathurā. Used specially by the Buddhists, it stimulated the Brāhmaṇs to the codification and diffusion of a more consequent, more refined language, profane Sanskrit. The coming into use of Literary Sanskrit marks its disappearance. It had, in the meantime, owing to its diffusion in the reign of Kanishka, assured its own survival, as a semi-literary dialect, in certain Buddhistic schools.

4. There remain the Prākrits. Popular in their origin, they have, in the form in which they have been employed, and which has come down to us, undergone a process of fixation, and of orthographical and grammatical reform. It is Sanskrit, and the exactly analogous process of learned labour to which Sanskrit owes its own existence, that inspired and guided this process. It cannot have taken place before the end of the 2nd century, and towards the end of the 4th we may suppose it a completed operation. None of the grammars which teach the literary Prākrit, and none of the books couched in one or other of these dialects, can, under its existing form, be of earlier date than this period. At the same time, it must be clearly understood that, far from excluding the existence of literary attempts and of a more ancient tradition, this theory supposes them as an indispensable preparation. It only excludes the idea of works having received a definitive form, of a canonically arrested tradition, the existence of which would have rendered all grammatical reform both superfluous and impossible.

It is needless to say that the correctness of the dates which I have just now mentioned depends, to a very high degree, on the correctness of the dates which we attributed to the inscriptions. The chronological series of the monuments appears to me to be well established, and if we suppose that some corrections in it are necessary, I do not imagine that they can be found to be of sufficient extent to modify the main lines which I have sketched out.

Everything, in this system, depends on, and follows, one natural and well-connected movement. The same tendencies, which we see at work in the earliest times, continue their action to the end. Throughout evolutions, each of which pre-supposes and engenders the next, the main motors remain identical. The continuation of the linguistic history during the period which we have surveyed, is the logical development of the tendencies which are revealed by the most ancient monuments. In this sense, this last chapter is closely connected with the direct object of our studies, the Inscriptions of Piyadasi.

FINIS.

THE DATES OF THE VAGHELA KINGS OF GUJARAT.

BY G. BÜHLER, PH.D., LL.D., C.I.E.

In my review of Dr. Bhandarkar’s most valuable Report on the Search for Sanskrit MSS., 1883-84, (ante, Vol. XVIII., p. 184ff.), I expressed strong doubts as to the correctness of the Vāghēla dates, given in his new historical Fragment, p. 12, and by the Dharmasāgara in his Pravachanaparikēṣā, op. cit, p. 150. But I was unable to furnish strict historical proof that Dr. Bhandarkar’s two authorities post-date the accession of Vjaladēva and of two of his successors by two years. Lately Rāo Sāheb D. P. Khakar, who has already furnished numerous valuable contributions to the history and archaeology of Kaich, has kindly sent me an eye-copy of a mutilated inscription, which settles the question. It is inscribed on a Pālia at Khōkhā in Kaich, of which Rāo Sāheb Khakar gives the following account:—

"The Pālia has a figure of a cow, feeding probably on Indian corn (maize) and suckling her calf. This Pālia is stated to have been in the Fort of Bhdrēshwar. But a Thādējā daughter of the village of Khōkhā, near Angār, having married in Bhdrēshwar, she thought that the cow might be worshipped in the Mahādēva temple in her father’s village, and so she sent it there, where the inscription was all buried, and the cow was worshipped. When I learnt of it in Sam. 1909, I got with great difficulty the buried portion of the Pālia excavated,
and found that the portion of it on which the object of the inscription was written, had been broken and lost, and after a year’s inquiry I got no trace of it.”

The fragment of the inscription, which appears to be written in the ordinary Devanāgarī characters of the thirteenth century, runs as follows:—

1. Oṁ  || Saṁvat 1332 varṣaḥ Mārga sudi 11 Saṁv = adya-eśha sri-
2. [ma*]d-Anahillapātakā samasta-rājāvali[yā*]-samalaśkrita-mahārā-
3. jāhūrāja-paramesvara-paramabhatāsaka-prō-[prau]dha-pratāma(pa)-Nārā-
4. ya[nā]vatāra-lakṣhmi-svayaṁ vara-mahārāja-śrī-Sārāṅgadāva-ka-
5. lyāṇa-vijaya-rājya śrī-śrī-kaṇāda(dau) mahāmātya-śrī-Śrī-

The document belongs, therefore, to the reign of the Vaghāla king Sārāṅgadāva and mentions a minister, called Kānha, i.e., Krishna. Its date Saṁvat, i.e., Vikrama-Saṁvat 1332, Mārga sudi 11 Saṁvau corresponds, according to Dr. Schram’s Tables with Saturday, Dec. 1, 1275 A.D. The year was an expired year, both according to the northern and the southern mode of calculation. The conflicting statements contained, the one in the Vīhāraśāhni and Mr. Bhātt Dāji’s Paṭṭāvali, and the other in Dr. Bhāgārkar’s fragment and the Pravachanaparikshā, are:

Visaladāva ruled (I). V.S. 1300-1318; (II). V.S. 1302-1320.
Arjunadāva ruled until (I). V.S. 1331; (II). V.S. 1333.
Sārāṅgadāva— (I). V.S. 1553; (II). V.S. 1553.

The date of Rāo Shēb Khaṅkar’s new inscription proves that the Fragment and the Pravachanaparikshā place Sārāṅga’s accession too late and do not deserve to be credited.

FOLKTALES OF HINDUSTAN.

BY WILLIAM CROOKE, C.S.

No. 2.—The Parrot Prince and his Princess. 1

Once upon a time there were two parrot kingdoms at Dohlī and Hansālī Vīhār. The king of the former had a son and the king of the latter an only daughter. The subjects of both the kingdoms advised that the prince should take a wife and the princess a husband. So they both left their respective kingdoms in search of a partner. It so chanced that one night on their journey they alighted on the same tree, and the parrot prince hearing the leaves rattle inquired who was there. Each told the other who they were: and they were thinking of marrying together, when the prince said, “All women are faithless.” “So are all men,” said the princess. Thus they went on disputing and they finally agreed to refer the matter to the arbitration of the king of the country in which they happened to be.

So they both attended the king’s court, and he said, “Produce your proofs.”

Then the parrot princess said,—“Once upon a time seven sons of a king went out hunting and came upon a grand house in a jungle. Now this was the house of a demon (dād), and the owner was away, leaving his six daughters and their handmaid in charge of his palace. The seven girls made friends with the seven princes, and they lived together for some time in the greatest happiness. Now the youngest prince had taken the handmaid as his partner, and one night he heard her say in her sleep, “What a misfortune has come on the wretched mother of these poor princes!” Next night she said the same words. So, when eating time came, the youngest prince refused to eat, unless the girl told him what she meant. After

1 These letters cannot be correct.
2 According to Professor Jacob’s new Tables, published in the Epigraphica Indica, the eleventh tithe ended on Saturday about 44 chalikas after mean sunrise (Laṅkī).
3 A folktales told by Daṇga Kharwar; the Kharwar is an aboriginal tribe in South Mirzapur.
some hesitation she said — "The six girls, whom your brothers have taken to live with you, are the daughters of a demon, and he eats men. When he comes back he will devour all the six princes." "Is there any way of escape?" asked the prince. "Well!" she answered, "If you get hold of the horses of the demon and cross the ocean at a single jump you can escape. To-morrow make a pretence of going out to hunt and do this. They did so, and just as they were jumping across the ocean the demon rushed up and seized hold of the hind legs of the horse, on which the youngest prince was mounted. Then the handmaid called out to her lover "Take your sword and cut off the hind legs of the horse and you will escape." The young prince did so, and the demon was left behind, and they crossed the ocean in safety. When they got over, the daughters of the demon asked, "How did you manage to escape our father?" "By doing as the maid, who was with me, told me to do," replied the Prince, who could not keep the secret. Then the demon's daughters fell on the maid and tore her to pieces.

"By this," said the parrot princess, "you may learn that a man is never to be trusted."

"Now, what have you to say?" asked the king of the parrot prince.

"Well," he replied, "there was once a Rājā, who married a Rānī, and was bringing her home in a litter. By chance he got separated from his followers, and as they were going along the Rānī was suddenly taken sick and died. The Rājā took her corpse out of the litter and laid it on a river bank. Seeing this dreadful sight the bearers all ran away. The Rājā sat down by the corpse, and began to sing Rāma nāmī. The God Mahādev, who generally lives in solitary places, came up and asked the Rājā why he was lamenting. He told Mahādev of the misfortune that had fallen on him. "If I bring the Rānī to life, will you surrender half your life?" asked Mahādev. "I agree," said the Rājā. So Mahādev poured a little water on the Rānī out of his jar (kamandal) and the Rānī came to life again. Mahādev went away and the Rājā and Rānī lay down to rest. While the Rājā slept a merchant (mahājan) came up with a horse laden with gold mohārīs, and the faithless Rānī abandoned the Rājā, who had saved her life, and ran away with the merchant."

"By this," said the parrot princess, "you may learn that all women are faithless."

Then the Rājā, who was trying the cause gave his decision — "Men as well as women," said he, "have their faults and the best thing you can do is to get married."

And so they were married and ruled their two parrot kingdoms for many a year in happiness.

NOTES AND QUERIES.

SUPERSTITIONS ABOUT ANIMALS IN MADRAS.

It is considered one of the greatest sins that a man can commit to kill a cow or taste its flesh, and it is also laid down that to eat curds, ghit, and honey together is an equal sin.

When cattle cross your path it is considered a sin to pass through them. You must wait till the way is cleared and then go on.

When flying-foxes are flying about during the day, it is a sure sign of a shower of rain immediately.

About the Garudan or Royal Eagle or White Kite there is a tradition among the Hindus of Southern India, that the bird serves as the vahana (vehicle) of Vishnu, and on Sundays he is supposed to ride on it in the morning. Hence the Brahmans especially anxiously look out for it on Sunday mornings, in order to pay their respects to Vishnu, through his sacred bird. On seeing it the ordinary Brāhma recites the following slōkam, which he supposed to be Sanskrit:—

Kunamkita varnam Yoga
Kundendru tavaayiga Vismvavaha namasthukhyam
Paahirdja ithi namaha
Some of the Brahmins believe that if a person sees this bird dying in the sky on a Sunday morning, at any time before breakfast, he will attain fulfilment of all his enterprises during the ensuing week.

Among the lower castes of the Hindus the ceremonies have a different aspect. Their priests buy a small quantity of flesh from the bāndār and bring it home. With this they make it a point to feed the bird, and wait outside their houses for it to fly over them. When they see one they throw up bits of the meat, inviting the bird to take them. When the bits are all taken they pay obeisance to the bird and take leave. After this they bathe and take their meals, considering themselves to have received the benediction of Viṣṇu.

K. SRIKANTALAYAR.

MALABAR COAST.

Unlucky Actions.

1. Never let any one tread on the nails of your fingers or toes, lest he become your enemy.

2. Never pour water into a chuvam pouch at night.

3. Never take off the inner coating of the areca-nut at night.

4. Never look at the fox or jackal in the morning; but note the proverb: — "Did you wake this morning with a fox in your face?"

N. SANKUNNI WARIYAR.

MALABAR COAST.

Lucky Actions.

1. Always throw the outer rind of the areca-nut into the street, so that people walk over it.

2. Turn to the right when getting up in the morning from your bed.

N. SANKUNNI WARIYAR.

SPIRIT HAUNTS IN MADRAS.

Evil spirits seek always for their abode that portion of a tank or a river where someone has been drowned and lost his life, or the following trees:

1. Ficus Religiosa, pipal, (Arausu in Tamil);
2. Asadirachta indica, Nim, (Yembu in Tamil);
3. Tamarind (Puliyam in Tamil).

Hence virgins, or pregnant women, and children, are usually warned not to approach these places at any time during the day or night.

K. SRIKANTALAYAR.

Ootacamund.

BOOK-NOTICE.


The Buddha-Gaya Mahabodhi Society, or the Bud-Gaya1 Society, for it is a little difficult to make out its title clearly from the publication before us was, we find, established at Colombo on May 31st, 1891, under the auspices of Colonel H. S. Olcott. This is good and also bad. Good because the Colonel has already shown that he can control a Society and a Journal which can live, and bad because he has also shown that his views of the Buddhist Religion are as bold as they are delightfully visionary. The complete and unconscious misapprehension of every aspect of the subject he affects to have deeply studied is indeed the most charming part of the addresses he delivers. He is always poetical and nearly always wrong in every view to which he gives expression. He is "chief adviser" of the new Society, and in the first number of its Journal are many echoes of his ideas. There is the same magnificient disregard of actual facts, and the same enchanting inaccuracy as to details in historical references on every page, that have always distinguished the writers on Theosophy. Here is a fine sample:

"It is only a baseless tradition that Buddhism was destroyed by the Aryans. As yet no evidence has been forthcoming to show that the vandalism was done by them. But, on the contrary, there are facts and historical data to prove conclusively that the catastrophe was accomplished by the Muhammedan(sic) invaders of India. The temples of Viṣṇu, Śiva and other devatas (sic) did not escape the fire and sword of the devastating Moslem. The destruction of Buddhist dates from the time of the invasion of India by Muḥammad (sic) of Ghazni."

Could anything be more delightful than this? Just before the above passage we are told "that Buddhism was destroyed seven centuries ago in

1 It is to be hoped that 'Bud-Gaya' will be dropped as hopelessly wrong etymologically.
India is beyond doubt." Muhammad (speaking under Col. Oloott's correction we understand that the conqueror's name was, however, Mahmud) of Ghazni we thought lived nearer nine centuries than seven centuries ago. But then, two centuries of time are as nothing in the retrospect of a poet! And we are glad to hear, because it is news, that it was the wicked 'Muhammedan' (we follow the 'chiefly advised' writer in making 'Muhammedan' the correct adjective form of 'Muhammad') who carried through the destruction of Buddhism in India from start to finish. A little lower down we learn how it was done:—

"From the tenth to the twelfth centuries a systematic vandalism of sacred shrines was carried on by the devastating hordes of Arabs under Muhammadan generals."

The armies of the Ghurids and Ghori generals were, of course, all Arabs! We are learning quickly indeed; — but there is yet more to learn — much more than was ever dreamt of in our philosophy:—

"From the twelfth to the sixteenth century indigenous literature was not only not allowed to be cultivated, but every method was adopted to stamp out a national growth."

O shades of Akbar and Jahangir and Dara Shikoh! O Chand Bardai! O Kabir! O Guré Namak! O Tulsi Dasa! O ye Medieval Reformers; what say ye to this?

However, the 'Muhammedan' is evidently a red rag to the writers in the Journal of the Mahabodhi Society, and it may be that their personal feelings have warped their sense of historical accuracy.

The Journal is severe on those who differ from its views. "Scientists and superficial critics, failing to grasp the philosophy, and merely for the sake of notoriety, condemn Buddhism as atheistic." Granted for the sake of argument. Let us hear what the scientific and deep critic has to teach us — for we confess to being with the scientists in this matter: — "The cherished gods of the Aryans, the mild Vishnu, the protecting Brahma, and the guarding Indra (the differentiation between 'protecting' and 'guarding' is distictly good), besides most of the devas and devatis have not been relegated into the land of myths. They have a niche in the pantheon of gods in the Buddhist system."

"The pantheon of gods in the Buddhist system" exhibits a truly scientific appreciation of the Buddhist philosophy no doubt, but we shall remain 'scientists' nevertheless.

Passing by the muddling together of 'devas and devatis', as exhibited in the extracts already quoted, we have to note a peculiarity in the Journal, which is typical of the theosophic variety of the scientific man. Outer sciolists, who lay claim to some knowledge of Indian languages, have a habit, when transliterating, of discursively marking certain letters to show their form in the original. The scientific theosophist always tries to do the same, and the result is invariably startling. We have fine specimens before us now, e.g., Vaishnav, Magadha (the country), Kusinagar, Priyadarsi (this is most excellent, for it has the advantage of being neither Pali nor Sanskrit), and so on. And then again, if you write Siwa and Saiva (p. 3), why write Sri and Sankaracharya.

If the Mahabodhi Society's views of things ancient are astonishing, its ideas on contemporary movements are equally so:—

"The intellect of the educated has reached its ultimate development, and it is possible to go back to the dualistic stage of religion, when scientific monism is gaining ground among the highest intellects of Europe and America. This scientific monism is the Advaita Philosophy of ancient India. This scientific and realistic monism in all its comprehensiveness was promulgated by Gautama Buddha twenty-five centuries ago."

This is well conceived, but the following is better from the pen of the 'chiefly advising' Colonel himself:—

"Western dogmatism cannot stand before it (the Arya Dharma of Sakya Muni, miscalled 'Buddhism'). Western men of light and learning welcome it, the weary-eyed begin to hail it with enthusiasm. The two chief reviving agencies, the two channels through which it is flowing, are a book and a Society. — the 'Light of Asia' and the Theosophical Society. Ten years hence Buddhism will have gained an unshakable foothold throughout Christendom."

This is enough for us! When Western men of light and learning accept the Light of Asia as a true exposition of Buddhism the Christian will deserve to go down before the Buddhist.

We have thus dwelt on the errors in the Journal of the Mahabodhi Society at length, because we fully sympathize with the general aims of the Society, which are apparently to protect the remains at Buddh-Gaya from further neglect, to secure the funds of the temple from further misappropriation, and to ensure the preservation of Buddhist literature. The sooner therefore the conductors of the Journal of the Society cease to publish downright nonsense the sooner will they secure respect towards themselves, and general sympathy with their laudable objects.
THE inscription, which I now publish, is on the southern wall of the Bhaktavatsalasvāmin temple at Tirukkalukkunram in the Chingleput District, Madras Presidency. It was copied by me on the spot, but I have not been able to make out a correct reading of the whole of the inscription, as it is much faded and in some parts illegible. It is in Tamil characters of the Eleventh Century A.D. The first part of it is a eulogy on the reigning king, and is in verse in High Tamil; the latter part is in ordinary prose and records the purchase of a piece of land by the temple authorities. The original text of the poetical portion appears to have been composed by a writer well versed in classical Tamil. It has been engraved, however, either very carelessly or by ignorant hands; even common words have been misspelt, and no distinguishing mark has been made to denote the end or commencement of each line of the verse portion. The language being High Tamil, and the characters somewhat indistinct, the deciphering of this part of the inscription would have been impossible, if I had not fortunately had with me copies of inscriptions, which I had taken from other temples in the Tamil country. Three of these, which I detail below, have been of much use to me in reading this text.

INSCRIPTION No. 1.

An inscription on the northern side of the Vimāna of the temple dedicated to Pāṇḍava dōta-Purumal at Kaṇchipuram, which commences with the first 25 lines of the present text, and continues as follows:

Text.

Nan mañi államum tiruppayattalakalam pōla viramum tiyakamum vilāika pármicha mēvālar vānapāka vīra chimm马拉hanattu puvaananjutudaiyāloduṃ virirantarulīya Kōrajākāseravarmarāna Udaivyār sri-Kulottunga-Chōjadēvakku yāṅdu aṇcāvatu . . . . . .

Translation.

In the fifth year of the lord sri-Kulottunga-Chōjadēva, alias Kō-Rājakāserivarman, (here enter the translation of the first 25 lines) whose valour and munificence shone like the necklace of faultless gems and the garland of flowers on his shapely shoulders; who deigned to sit on the throne of heroes with the goddess Earth, while his enemies bowed down to the ground before him.

INSCRIPTION No. 2.

An inscription in very clear characters, on the western wall of the Saiva temple at Kilpāluruvūr in the Trichinopoly District, which begins with the same words as in the present text up to the end of the 62nd line, and continues as follows:

Text.

Neṭitorum nilaika ḍaḍḍaruḷi tiṟal koḷ vīra simhasana vēḍduḷi poṇkūḷiyaramum tiruppayattalakalam pōla viramum tiyakamum vilāika pármichai mēvālar vānapāka vīra simhasanattu avaiṣuṇjutudaiyāloduṃ virirantarulīyā Kōrajākāseravarmarāna Tirupuvanachakkara-vartikakal sri-Kulottunga-Chōjadēvakku yāṅdu irupatāvatu . . . . . .

Translation.

In the twentieth year of the emperor of the three worlds, sri-Kulottunga-Chōjadēva, alias Kō-Rājakāserivarman, (here enter the translation of the first 62 lines) who erected on all the public paths boundary-marks (of his territories) and obtained the throne of mighty heroes; whose valour and munificence shone like the resplendent necklace and the garland of flowers on his sacred shoulders; who was pleased to sit on the throne of heroes with the goddess Earth, while his enemies bowed down to the ground before him.

1 [The spelling of vernacular words in the English portion of this paper has been altered in accordance with the system followed in this Journal. The Tamil texts have been left intact, as no facsimiles were to hand.—Ed.]
INSCRIPTION No. 3.

An inscription on the eastern wall of the Śaiva temple at Tiruvudaimurūdu in the Tanjore District, which begins with the first 66 lines of the text and proceeds as follows:—

Text.

Chivanidattamayena Tinschintamaṇi puvanamūntūdaiyālōdum kaṅkāvīrpiruntena mañ kaiyār tillatam Īlīcaivallapi iṟṟaḷakamudaiyāl vāiyumalartintitirūppa āvūm tirumālakattuppiriyātena tirumakal tikaḷiennen Tiyaṟkavallē taremā ulukudaiyāḷirupa * * * puvanamūntūdaiyālōdum vīrpiruntarāḷya Kōvirajākēsariyammarāṇa Chakkavarattikēl sri-Kulottunga-Chōjadēvaṟkkē yāṇu 26vatu nāl nāṟṟēḻupattirāṇḍinil . . . . . .

Translation.

On the 172nd day of the 26th year of the emperor sri-Kulottunga-Chōjadēva, alias Kō-Rājakēsariyvarman, (here enter the translation of the first 66 lines) who, worshipped by the whole world, was pleased to sit in state with Tinschintamaṇi, the mistress of the whole world, like Siva with Umā, and with Īlīcaivallē, the mistress of the fourteen worlds, the most beauteous amongst women, like Gaṅga with Umā, and with Tyāgaravallē, the charitable mistress of the world, like Lakṣmi who is ever inseparable from Vishṇu, and with the goddess Earth.

Comparing the above three inscriptions with that which is the subject of this paper, and which is dated "in the 42nd year of the emperor sri-Kulottunga-Chōjadēva," it will be seen that it is beyond doubt that all the four refer to the same sovereign, because his name is given as Kulottunga-Chōja in all of them, and the events of his reign mentioned in the earlier inscriptions are repeated in the very same words in the later. Considering the facts that these inscriptions are found in places very distant from each other, and that the same verses have been used for describing the reigning king, it would appear that it was the custom during this period to adopt a prescribed form of preamble in drawing up any important deed; and as that form was in verse, it is most probable that it was composed by a poet of the king's court and circulated under royal sanction. This is borne out by epigraphical records of other Chōja kings; for instance, the inscriptions of Rājarāja-Chōja begin with the words "Tirumakal pōla perunilachchelviyum"; those of Vikrama-Chōja commence "Pūmilai milantu pommālai tikaḻa"; those of Rājendra-Chōja open with the verse "Tiru manni vajara iranilamaṅstantiyum."

The four inscriptions of Kulottunga noticed in this paper furnish a short history of his life. While he was Yuvarāja, he first distinguished himself by storming Chakkarkottam. He surprised the enemy there and captured a number of elephants, but left no permanent trace of his conquest. Then he had to fight against the kings of Kunta, that is the Western Chālukyas. About this time the Chōja country came to be without a king, and he marched southwards, and by right of inheritance ascended the throne of the Chōjas. Before the end of the fifth year after his accession he vanquished the Southern or Pāṇḍya king, who was either taken prisoner, or killed in battle; for the inscriptions state that his head lay, pecked by eagles, outside the Chōja capital. Vikkilaṅ, who is doubtless the Western Chālukya Vikramaditya VI., then invaded the Chōja territory, but had to retreat before the superior forces of the Chōjas, and was hotly pursued from Naṅgali in the Mysore province to Maṅalūr on the banks of the Tūṅabhadra, where he crossed the river and sought safety within his own dominions. An expedition towards the west was next conducted by Kulottunga in person, and Koṅgūmaṇḍalam was subjugated. Two expeditions were also sent to Singhabalām, apparently with no great results. Then he wished to conquer the Pāṇḍimaṇḍalam, and equipped a large army. After the death of the Pāṇḍya king above alluded to, his kingdom evidently became dismembered, and five Pāṇḍya princes, who were in power, fled in disguise before the Chōja's forces, and sought refuge in

* These were most probably the two Chōja invasions mentioned in the Mahārajas (chap. lviii.) as having occurred during the early part of the reign of Vijayabāhu.
inaccessible jungles. The whole of the Paṇḍya country as far as Cape Comorin and Kōṭṭāru was annexed to the Chōla empire. Then the pearl fisheries in the Gulf of Mannar and the wild elephants on the Western Ghāats became the property of Kūḷōṭṭuṅga before the close of the 20th year of his reign. It was, I believe, after this important event that he proclaimed himself “emperor of the three worlds;” for in the inscription No. 1 his name is given as “Uḷaiyār āṟṟu Kūḷōṭṭuṅga-Chōḷa-dēvā,” whereas in No. 2 it is “Tribhuvanacakravartigal āṟṟu Kūḷōṭṭuṅga-Chōḷa-dēvā.” Within six years afterwards the Kaliṅgaṃañḍalam was conquered; but from the 26th to the 42nd year the empire seems to have enjoyed peace, no mention being made of any wars in subsequent inscriptions. Three of Kūḷōṭṭuṅga’s queens are named in the inscription No. 3, viz., Dīvīchintāmaṇī, Elḷusaivalabhi and Tyaga-vallī; but only the last two are mentioned in the text, which forms the subject of this paper.

No era or astronomical day is given in the inscriptions to enable us to ascertain the period of the king’s reign; but from the leading events mentioned in them, it is certain that he is identical with the Kūḷōṭṭuṅga-Chōḷa of the Kaliṅgattu Parami. The poem speaks of his early exploits at Chakkarakkkōṭam (canto x, stanza 23), the anarchy in the Chōla country (x, 26), his accession to the Chōla kingdom (x, 32), the defeat of the five Paṇḍya princes (xi, 69), the battles on the banks of the Tuṅga-bhadā (iv, 7) and at Maṇālur (xiii, 93), the conquest of the Kaliṅga-ṃañḍalam (xii, 68), and the queen Tyaga-vallī (x, 55). All these particulars occur in the inscription also. I have in my article on the Kaliṅgattu Parami identified the Kūḷōṭṭuṅga-Chōḷa of that poem with the first Eastern Chāḷukya king of the same name. And as it appears from inscriptions in the Telugu country that he bore the name of Rājendrā-Chōḷa before he ascended to the Chōla kingdom, there is no doubt that he is also that “Rājiga, the lord of Vēṅgli,” who, according to the Vīkramadēvakāvcharita, took possession of the throne of Kāṅchī on the death of the Chōla king. From the Chellōr grant we learn that Kūḷōṭṭuṅga’s third son, Vira-Chōḷa-dēvā, was installed as viceroy of Vēṅgli in A.D. 1078, and that before him, Kūḷōṭṭuṅga’s second son, Rājarāja II., held charge of Vēṅgli for one year, and his uncle, Vijaya-vittiy, for fifteen years. It follows, therefore, that Kūḷōṭṭuṅga succeeded to the crown of Vēṅgli in A.D. 1063. But there is no record to show when he ascended the Chōla throne. From Tamil inscriptions I find that a Chōla king named Vira-Rājendrādēvā, alias Kō-Paraṅkṣarivarman, claims to have bestowed the Vēṅgimaṇḍalam on Vijaya-vittiy, who had bowed at his feet, conquered Kaḷāram for another king who had besought his assistance, forced Sōmēsvara to give up the Kannaradēsam and drove him out of that country, and reduced Iraiṣṭa-pāḍi for Vīkramāditya, who had sought refuge at his feet.” The kings alluded to appear to be Vījaya-vittiy VII., viceroy of Vēṅgli (A.D. 1063—1077), the Western Chāḷukya Sōmēsvara II. (A.D. 1069–1076), and Vīkramāditya VI. (A.D. 1076–1127). That Vijaya-vittiy was in danger of being deprived of his power by the Chōlas, is also evident from one of the Gaiga grants, in which it is stated that, “when Vijaya-vittiy, beginning to grow old, left the country of Vēṅgli, as if he were the sun leaving the sky, and was about to sink in the great ocean of the Chōlas,” Rājarāja of Kaliṅgasagara (A.D. 1071–1078) “caused him to enjoy prosperity for a long time in the western region.” The above records seem to indicate that Vira-Rājendrā, alias Kō-Paraṅkṣarivarman, was the immediate predecessor of Kūḷōṭṭuṅga on the Chōla throne, was contemporary with the Western Chāḷukya Sōmēsvara II., and helped his younger brother, Vīkramāditya in wrestling from him a portion of the Chāḷukya dominions; also that Kūḷōṭṭuṅga did not take possession of the Chōla kingdom till about A.D. 1071. This is confirmed by the Vīkramadēvakāvcharita, which states that “the lord of Vēṅgli” seized the Chōla sovereignty some time after the death of Sōmēsvara I. which occurred in A.D. 1069, and before Sōmēsvara II. was taken prisoner by Vīkramāditya VI. in A.D. 1076. If Kūḷōṭṭuṅga had reckoned his regnal years from the day of his accession to the throne of Vēṅgli, the date of the following inscription, which is in the 42nd year of his reign, would fall in A.D. 1105.

* Dr. Bühler’s edition, chap. vi, verse 26.  
* See Dr. Fleet’s article on the Eastern Chāḷukya Chronology, ante, Vol. XX. p. 276.
The concluding portion of the inscription, which is in prose, records a deed of sale, executed by the Brāhmaṇ proprietors of a village named Vānavaṇnamahādevīchaturvēdīmaṇḍalam in Kumijinādu in Āmūrkōṭtām in Jayakōṇḍaḥōjlamandalam. The property sold was a portion of the village, which was intended to be used as garden land for the Matha of Naminandi Adigal attached to the Śaiva temple at Tirukkaḷukkuṭtām. Naminandi is the name of one of the 63 devotees of Siva, an account of whose lives is given in the Tamil Periyaprāṇam, and the Matha was probably founded by him or by his descendants in his memory. The fact that the proprietors of the village met together in a Mahāsaṭhā or great assembly, and executed this deed of sale, is evidence of the ancient system of land tenure peculiar to the Dravidian people, under which the residents of each village were the common proprietors of all those parts of the village, which were not appropriated to any individual. Two taxes are mentioned, the peruvaram (great share) and ēławurei (expenditure tax). The first is the king’s share, which is generally one-sixth of the produce; the second appears to be a local cess, levied to meet expenses incurred in the repair to tanks &c. in the village.

TEXT.

Svasti Śrī!
Puḷaḷ chōḷēṭa puṇṭari aḷaḷ chōḷēṭa paviyil
Ponnēmi aḷavum tannēmi nadappa
Vēḷiḷēku chayu mākaḷai īḷakōpparuvattu
Chakkaraṇkkōddattu vikkiramattojilāl

(5) Putta māṣam puṇṭartu mata varai iddam
Vaiyir ākarattu vāri ayil munai
Kutagā arachar taltam iriyā
Vēḷ urai kalittu tōl vali kāddi
Pārppari nadattu krttiryai nīṛuttī

(10) Vada tichai vāki chōḍi ten tichai
Tāmaru kamara pūmakāl potumaiyum
Ponnī ēḷayiūm nannilappāvai
Tanmaiyum tavira vanai punitarū
Tiru māṣi makudam urmaiyaḷ chōḍi

(15) Tanning irapidum tada mudiyāka
Tōnalē rēntar chōḍa munnai
Mana vāru peruka Kali yāru varappā
Cheikōl tichai tōram chella veṣkudai
Irēnīlē vijākām ōkaṇum tanatū

(20) Tiru nīḷal veqqlāl tikaḷa
Oru tani mēruvul puli vilaiyāda
Āḷ kadal tēvāntatarttu pāḷalai
Tirai vidu kuṇcharam murai nāpāi nirpa
Vēḷiḷēku Tōnsvan karautalai paruṭtalai

(25) Tidattan ponnakaṇ puṇṭatidai kidappā
* * * * * * *
Choolētir kōḍirappatū tankai
Villetir kōḍā Vēkkīḷan kallattar
Naṅkittē todāṅki Mapatūr naduvin

(30) Tunkappattīraī puḷu turttu ṣēkaṇum
Padda veṭkajērum kodda tan mānunam
Kōṛiḷa viramum * * *
Ēṅna mālaikaḷum mutuku nēllippa
Iḷnta naṅkaiḷum āṛuṇatōḍa

* * [Compare śil-vıṛi peru-vıṛi, 'the small tax (and) the large tax,' in Dr. Hultsch’s South-Indian Inscriptions, Vol. I. p. 87, text line 6.]
(35) விள்ளவாக கோதாகலம் தலை விரிதலமாரா
குடன்டுக் கண்டு கண்டு விளங்கும்

(40) சீயர்பாரும் வாச நோக்கு
மாணிக்காய் குணதுக் கடுட்ட கோடை
பேர்கரி பிறந்து கோக்கும் நூற்றாண்டு
சின்னாயம் என்பும் பரி இருந்து
பொருள்சூடு காயக்குக் இவுரியும் புகுத்து

(45) பாண்டிமண்டலாம் கோல் திருவல்லத்தடப்பு
வேர்போன் தலாகாளம் போரு குளாகாளம்
மாளிகா வரையம் உக்கின்஦ய வந்து
செம் கடல் தென்கு படற்குள் முல்
தந்தனியீர்கள் நாடு மாறசார்கள்

(50) பாஞ்சாவர் ஆவரம் பொருட்ப் பொர்க்கல்லு
அசி சோசி நெற்றோடி
அரசன் புக்கா குரிதட்டுத்தடப்பு
கார்போ தம்மாம் வானாசராகக்
உண்மைச்சுரம் குறிக்காரண

(55) விசாயத் தம்பம் தோசம் தீம் நிருத்தி
முட்டிச் சிர்ப்பும் முற்மிர் போட்டியில்
மாட்டோ வேர்கோ புதும் மாய்ய சாய்யமும்
காண்போம் காயக்கு மாற்றினூட
தலைக்காட்டு குதம்மாலி நாடு மாறசார்கள்

(60) எல்லாம் தணி விசும் பெரா

குருங்கள் குலையம் கூட்டர் பும்பா
உச்சம் தோட்டம் நிலையக்காட்டு மாறுமன
கல்லாம்பாணாகத் காப்படுத்தும்

(65) திரை கோளாரம் திருப்பயாய்க்காளயம் போள்
வில்லம் தியாகம் விளங்காக்காரோ
சிறியாவுரோமில் தியாகவனில்
அவ்வணும் முதற்தோணால் இருப்பா, அவுண்டன
காஞ்சு விரித்துண்டு மாக்கையர் தில்தொம

(70) எல்லாவுலாயில் எல்லாகம் உடயண்
வாஜரம் பொண்ணிடுறுப்பழ
லிசுலவணி முன்முதாங்கலோடு

8 I give below the different readings in the preambles of the four inscriptions of Kuṭṭamanka-Cholâdeva which I have examined. A stands for the inscription at Kâlêchelperam, B for that at Kîlppajuvûr, C for Tiruvûjilamandârûr and D for Tirukkallakknâram.

Line 2. A has sadait for nadappa.
Line 5. A has vakaḻiṟṟu for maṭavai. B and C have maṭavai for maṭavai.
Line 12. A has ponnanidaiyam for ponnaidaiyum.
Line 13. A and D have taviru for tavira vantu.
Line 16. A has ponni for munnai.
Line 29. B has tirunulit remukata for tirunulal.
Line 33. A has kolaṅcēr kaiṟṟu for kuṇcharam. B has kolaṅcērpiraiṟṟu for kuṇcharam. C has kolaṅcērī kaiṟṟu for kuṇcharam.
Line 42. B & C have kaiṟṟu for kaiṟṟu.
Line 57. B has tecca for chayga.
Line 59. B has tecca for elai.
Lines 63 & 64. D has ayppulaṭalaṅkâlam koṭkumandalam for maripunal koliṅka mandalam.
Vrachimāchanaṭṭu viṣṇurantauriyā Chakkaraṁvattikan sri-Kulottuṇka-Chōlajāva-
kkunu yādu 4-vatu Jayaṅkondachōlaṁandalaṭṭu Āmūrkōddattu Kumiṅnāddu Vān-
vanmahādēvichaturvādamāṅkalattu maṅkāchāpiyōm nilavilai āvaṇakēiḷaiyētuttu, Kalattar-
Kumijñaddu Ulakantaa-Chōlapuramana Chembian-Tirukkalakkukunattu udaiyar-
tirukka,ukkuṇrāmudaiya Mahīdēvar kōvīl Chānti Chandesvarādevarkku nāikail mada pura-
māka viṭṭukkudutta nilavāvatu: eikājīr mēlīmīndā Kērāipākkam kādukej veddi kaddai-
parit tu tiruttikkoṭivātaka kudutta nilattukku kēlpēkkēlai Urōmattalai uṟavum, tempēr-
kkēlai Tāḷsiyēddellai uṟavum, mēlpērkkēlai Vikāmbattalai uṟavum, vadāpurkkēlai Taṅdu-
raillai uṟavum, innāṅkēllai kūkkudatta nīr-nilalum tunchei nilānum mēnōkkina maramanu-
kēl nōkkinkaṟum ivēr madaivijākkatiṟukku Nāminanti Adikā Madattukku madap-
purumāka nākai īppai iippicchi viṭṭukkudutta vilāyāka nāukai kaikkoḍu achaī nērgicche putum kaivilai ara viṭṭu poruḷaṟakkai koḍu vīlā āvaṇsam cheytu kuduttum. Manā saapai om īnlil-
tukku vanta chilāvu vari peruvāram epērppaṭtutum nāukai iṟukkakkadavōmākamum. Īppai-
iippicchi viṭṭukkuduttum. Chāppakku chāmānta tāruma varā Eduvamāvan Ādittan Pasappal-
paddanum, Mappirāraka Kumāruṟuvaṅkkikipamālittanum, Urapputtuṭtāḷipaddanum, Padma-
purattu Śrī Ranganāṭipaddanum, Apppadūr Chākkaraṁrāṇaṟaṇpadanum, Kāvicharikillai-
Tantiknavittanum, Kērāichēkkē Tākkiramavittanum, ivvānaivarum chantrērittā varaikku-
mm chilēkkai paṇipakuduttum. Mahāsabhāīm. Ippadikku ivai Vānvasvanmahādēvı-
udaiyan Chēlvan Kūmarān ejuttu Āmūrkōddattu.

TRANSLATION.

Health and Wealth! In the 42nd year of the emperor sri-Kulottuṅka-Chōlajēva,
who, in his youth, first embraced the goddess of victory by his heroic deeds at Chakkara-
kōṭṭam, so that his empire on this earth, which is girt by the glorious ocean, may extend up
the golden mountain (Mēru); who, by his prowess, captured a multitude of rutting
elephants, and routed the forces of the kings of Kūntala at the point of his lance; who
leading his troops of horse and unsheathing his sword, displayed the power of his arm and
established his fame by his victories in the northern countries, and, coming southwards, espoused
the goddess of the honeyed lotus flower (Lakṣmi), and Poppī (Kāviri), and the good lady
Earth, who was without a consort, and by right of inheritance assumed the sacred and illustrious
diadem (of the Chēsas); whose pair of feet served as a broad crown to the ancient kings of
this earth; who wielded his sceptre with such justice in all directions (in his dominions) that
the rules of the ancient Manu prevailed and the river Kēl (evi) was dried up; whose white
umbrella shone like the moon over all the wide world; whose tiger (banner) played (in the
breeze) on Mēru, without a rival; the elephants given in tribute to whom, by the kings of
remote islands in the deep oceans, stood in many a row; outside whose golden town, the black
head of the Tēppavaṇ (Southern or Pāṇḍya king) lay pecked by eagles; *
who drove from Nangilī of rocky roads Viṅkilaṇa, that never bent his bow except on a foe who
had failed in paying him due respect, and forced him to enter the Tūṅgabhadra at Mānāṭar,
abandoning his elephants which lay wounded on all sides, and bringing disgrace on his fair
fame and boasted valour; who, with his army, commencing his march towards the west, on
an auspicious day, caused the mountains to bend their backs, the rivers to forsake their beds,
and the Viṅgāva seas to be stirred and agitated *
and seized the great goddess of victory, bevy of bright-eyed women, and whole columns of
fierce elephants, which the enemy were unable to save, and the Koṅgumāṇḍalam; whose fame
was augmented by two campaigns in Siṅghalī; who, desirous of conquering the Pāṇḍirāṅda-
lam, directed his vast armies, which, with hosts of generals, squadrons of fleet horses and battle-
elephants, resembled the northern sea rushing to join the southern ocean, and when the five
Pāṇḍyas fled in terror from the battle-field and sought refuge in the jungles, cleared those
jungles and converted them into villages and made them (the Pāṇḍyas) lead the life of woodmen
in a dreary wilderness, and planted pillars of victory on every side; who took possession of the

* [Read mēl-pūṭapai.]
pearl fisheries, and Pōdiyam, where flourished the three kinds of Tamil (literature), and the mid Sahya hills (Western Ghāțas), where huge wild elephants are captured, and Kapṭi (Cape Comorin), and fixed the limits of the Southern (Pāṇḍya) land; who sent to the upper world all the kings of the western hilly country * * * and, scattering his enemies, erected on all the public paths boundary-marks (of his territories) including Kōṭṭāru; who conquered the Kalinagamandalam of embanked floods; whose valour and munificence shone like the gorgeous necklace and the garland of flowers on his shapely shoulders; who, worshipped by the whole world, deigned to sit on the throne of heroes with Tyāgavallī, the mistress of the whole world, like Siva with Umā, and with Eśitaivallī, the mistress of the seven worlds, the most beauteous amongst women, like Gaṅgā with Umā, and with the goddess Earth,—the deed in writing of a sale of land by the great assembly of Vānaṇavamahādevī-
chaturvedimandalam in Kumilinādu in Āmūrkōṭṭam in Jayākondachōlamandalam. The land that we have sold and given, to be used as a garden for a Matha, to Chantiṭi Chāṇḍēvaradeva of the temple of our lord Mahādeva of Tirukkalikkupram in Sembiyap-Tirukkalikkupram, otherwise known as Ulagalanda-Chōḷapram, in Kajattar-Kumilinādu, is as follows: Of the land which we have given in Kraippakkam [?] [a western hamlet] of our village, to be improved by cutting down the jungle and by removing the stumps of trees, the eastern boundary is Urāmattu [?], the southern boundary is Tājāvēṭtu [?], the western boundary is Vīgāmbam [?], the northern boundary is Tāḍurāi [?]. Within these four limits, the wet land and dry land, the trees overgrown and the wells underground, we have sold to be used as a garden land for the Nāminandi-Aṭigal-Matha in the madai-vilāgam of this town, exempt from taxes, and we have received as the price aksai nellī kāṭu ten. We have sold (the land and all our rights thereto) completely, and, having received the whole of the price, we have executed this deed of sale. We, the great assembly are bound to pay the peruvāram, the ilavāvarai, and all other taxes that may be imposed on this land. Exempt from all taxes we have given it. The representatives of this assembly are: 12

............ We all have had this deed of sale engraved, so that it may last as long as the sun and moon exist. We, the great assembly. This is the writing of Vānaṇavamahādevī-
udāiyān Selvān Kumāraṇ of Āmūrkōṭṭam.

THE ORDER OF SUCCESSION IN THE ALOMPRA DYNASTY OF BURMA.

BY MAJOR B. C. TEMPLE.

In Vol. XX, pp. 422-423, ante, reference was made to a statement that the rule of succession in the Manipur state was, that all the brothers of the reigning king succeeded by seniority before his sons; failing brothers the king's sons succeeded in turn. The line of succession would therefore run thus:—The living brothers in order of seniority, then the sons of the last brother in order of seniority. The tree of succession might in fact be as follows:—

A (1)
Reigning king

B (2)  C (3)  D (4)  E  F
Eldest son  Second son  Third son  Fourth son  Fifth son. (died young)  (died young)

G (5)  H (6)  I

10 [Read Adidita p.]

11 [Should the two preceding words be a misreading of kāṭu 10?]

12 [The names of these people are omitted in the translation, as their spelling is very uncertain. Each of them has either the attribute bhūṣja or kramavād.]
The points to note in the succession are: — (1) the father must, if possible, actually have been king; (2) brothers must succeed before sons. The next heir by analogy, failing brothers and sons, would be the eldest surviving son of the king before the deceased. E.g., in the above tree, if king M had no sons or brothers, then the sons of king L would succeed in turn.

This custom is evidently widely spread over India and Burma, for (loc. cit. and ante, Vol. XV. p. 273) it has been already shown in this Journal that a part of the Valabhi succession ran thus:

\[
\text{Bhāṭārka (1)}
\]

\[
\text{Dharaśena I (2)} \quad \text{Drūpasimha (3)} \quad \text{Dhruvasena I (4)} \quad \text{Dharupaṭṭha (5)}
\]

\[
\text{Guhasena (6)}
\]

The Genealogies of the Eastern and Western Chalukya Dynasties (ante, Vol. XX. p. 283, also p. 422, and Fleet’s Dynasties of the Kannarese Districts, pp. 18-19) give the succession of brothers before sons in several instances; notably in the years between 633 and 663 A.D., and between 696 and 709 A.D. and between Saka 230 and 964.

The Genealogy of the Māḷer-Kōṭhī State (ante, Vol. XVIII. pp. 328—330) gives part of the succession thus:

\[
\text{Shēr Muhammad (1)}
\]

\[
\text{Ghulām Hussain (2)} \quad \text{Jamāl (3)}
\]

\[
\text{Bhīkan (4)} \quad \text{Bāhādur (5)} \quad \text{'Umr (6)} \quad \text{Asadullāh (7)} \quad \text{'Atāullāh (8)}
\]

\[
\text{Wazīr (9)}
\]

Properly speaking ‘Atāullāh’s son should have succeeded, and when Wazīr’s line failed a successor was found in Ibrāhīm ‘Ali, (the present ruler), the great-grandson of ‘Atāullāh.

Throughout the Shāh States (ante, pp. 119–120) the rule of succession is brothers before sons in order of seniority.

There are three disturbing elements in the rule, however, which must always be taken into consideration in its application: — (1) where the ruler has a multiplicity of wives, there must always be a difficulty in determining seniority; (2) in most Oriental States might is right and that heir succeeds, who is, for any reason, the most powerful; and (3) the temptation, seldom withstood, to the de facto ruler to oust his brothers in favour of his sons. As a rule, it may be said that every brother and every son looks upon himself as the possible heir, and the actual succession frequently falls to him, who finally succeeds in the struggle for the throne on the king’s death.

I give below the Genealogy of the Alompra (Alsungpaya) Dynasty of Burma, as illustrating the persistency of this peculiar law of succession and also the vicissitudes to which it is liable in practical application.
THE ALOMPRA DYNASTY OF BURMA (1753—1885 A.D.)

(1) Alaungp'ayá (1753—1760).
(2) Naunghdójá (1760—1763).
(3) S'ínbyúyín A son, died (1763—1776).
(4) Maun* (1776—1781).
(5) Amyin (young, no title granted. (1781—1791).
(6) Pak'anji (1791—1806).
(7) The Eshémin. (1806—1819).
(8) Minbá.
(9) Minbá.
(10) Minbá.

With reference to the above table the following remarks are applicable in the present connection. It is commonly said in Burmese Yàcawins (Kjëjewwàkàs), or Histories, that the reason why Alaungp'ayá's sons succeeded him in turn is, that he expressed a dying wish to that effect. I believe, however, that, whether he did so or not, the dynasty really followed what was felt to be the ancient and appropriate rule, and that the succession was accepted by the Court and people as the customary one.

Alaungp'ayá left seven sons, one of whom died as a child before the time came to give him a title, but all the rest grew to manhood and to be political forces in the country. He was succeeded by his eldest son, Naunghdójá, in the regular course, and then by his second son, S'ínbyúyín. The disturbing elements in the rule of succession then began to work. S'ínbyúyín nominated Siígùsá, one of his sons, as his successor, and the succession was secured to him by a palace intrigue.

This caused a rebellion on the part of the next heir by right of succession, viz., the Amyin Minbá, who was killed in the course of it, and so put out of the way. Maung Maung, the son of Naunghdójá, afterwards raised a sudden palace revolt and deposed Siígùsá. This did not fall

---

1 The word Minbá means 'king's son,' i.e., 'prince.' Reading between the lines of Sangermano, pp. 301 of the 1885 reprint, it would seem that the Minbá of the earlier Alompra kings held much the position of the Ætheling of the early English; i.e., he was a local chief of the blood royal.
2 The Paungdá of Sangermano, see pp. 350 of the 1885 reprint.
3 Sangermano, p. 50 (1885 reprint) repeats the story.
4 Much after our own fashion, Burmese Queens, Princes and Princesses were given titles, generally after estates that were handed over to them for sustenance, a practice which, however, ceased with the ascension of King Minbá in 1882, who inaugurated the system of paying salaries to the members of his family. His ministers and officials. The rank of the title-holder was indicated by a word suffixed to the name of the place. Sometimes several titles were held by the same person, as with us. The titles of royal children were conferred generally on their reaching an age to be of political importance. Thus, mìbàyá = queen, minbá-prince, mi-pàm = princess, and the titles ran thus: Lëmbá Mìbáyá, Amyin Minbá, Sënpàwàg Minbá. Titles were occasionally not connected with places, as S'ínbyúyín, the Lady of the White Elephant. Kings on accession retained their princely title in the same way, generally from places, as Pàrawàw, Paung, Minbá and Pëhò. Sometimes, however, their titles were descriptive, as S'ínbyúyín, the Lord of the White Elephant. Kings had generally several titles, e.g., Pàrawàw is equally well-known as Kônghàwung and Shëwò, both-place names, which is confusing. Confusion is further made worse confounded by the private names of these royal personages having come down to history; e.g., Minbá is still also known as Maung Lwin. Maung Maung, the fifth king of the Dynasty, had apparently no title (unless we grant Sangermano's name of Paungdá was a title), and was killed before he could give himself one to go down to history. The private name of the Myinnaung Minbá, drowned by order of Bòdòp'ayá in 1147 B. E. (1783 A. D.), was Maung Pë Shin.
in with the Court and general views at all, and, after a seven days' reign, he was put to death by the Court in favour of the rightful heir, Bódöpayá, who, to settle himself on the throne, put an end to Siôngsá.

Bódöpayá, like his brother Sûnyûyin, was a powerful ruler, and acted precisely in the same manner. That is, he nominated his son Eûshêmin (Yuvaráya), against the rights of his two surviving brothers, the Pak'ñuy Minbá, and the Myinzaing Minbá. The former wisely acquiesced in the arrangement and died a peaceful death. But the latter rebelled and was killed.

Bódöpayá reigned for a long while and his son died before him, and the succession went to his elder grandson, Bâjiddá, who, in course of time, was deposed by his brother Dârawádi (otherwise equally well-known as Kôngbaung and Shwëbá Min). Dârawádi became insane and the country was governed by a regent, the Pagán Minbá, who was the king's rightful heir, being his eldest son by his chief wife. Two years later the regent became King Pagán. After a while that strong and powerful prince, his brother Mindón, deposed him, and proved to be the best ruler that Burma had had for many a decade. The acknowledged heir to Mindón was his remaining brother, the Eûshêmin, who was killed by his nephews, the Myingan and Myingondaing Princes, in order to keep the succession to themselves, a very serious attempt being made on Mindón's life at the same time.

The succession to Mindón consequently devolved upon one of his sons, as the Eûshêmin's family was by rule and custom ousted from it. Another of the disturbing elements in the application of the rule of succession now became apparent. Who was to be considered Mindón's eldest son and rightful heir? He had a great number of wives and concubines, the wives were of superior and inferior rank, and he had sons of all ages likely to survive him. As a matter of fact every son looked upon himself as the possible heir, only the Myingan and Myingondaing Princes being out of the way, as outlaws after the murder of their uncle and their attempt to seize their father's throne. Also, it being practically impossible to decide rival claims as to seniority, Mindón settled on that prince as Eûshêmin, who had done him the best service; viz., the Mâkk'âya Prince who had accompanied him on his expedition to dethrone Pagán.

However, on Mindón's death, Dibó, a junior and inferior son, was placed on the throne, owing to the intrigues of a princess, Sûp'ayållá, and her mother, the Sûnbyûmáyin, one of

1 This Eûshêmin was generally known to Europeans as the "War Prince"; and though the dignity of "Heir Apparent (Eûshêmin)" was customarily conferred on him by his brother in recognition of his distinguished services in the rebellion which raised the latter to the throne, it is to be observed that in doing so Mindón followed the rule of succession.

2 This king's name is that known as Thibaw, Thobaw an. Thebaw, corrupted to Thobald by the British soldiers at the time of the annexation of Upper Burma in 1855-56. "Thebald and Sophia" were the King and Queen of Burma according to the British Soldier, (see next note). Thibaw, (Dibó) is one of the principal Shan States tributary to the Burmesse King; its ruler, the Dibó Sôbwá, being quite as well known to the English in Burma as the king himself. It is curious to note that his predecessor, Mindón, took his title from a valley in the Pacyin Dô District in British Territory. This was due to the fact that when Mindón was a prince, the country that afterwards became the British Province of Pegu and consists now of the Irrawaddy and Pegu Divisions of Lower Burma, was still under the rule of the Burmesse King.

3 Both Sûp'ayållá (corrupted by the way into Sophia by the British soldier in Mandalay, like the Persian Soyba of the XVIth and XVIIIth Centuries out of Safavi) and Sûnyûyin are titles. Sûnbyûmáyin, as already explained, means 'the Lady of the White Elephant.' Sûp'ayá means a 'princess of the line': a woman whose father was a de facto king and whose mother was herself a Sûp'ayá, i.e., not a woman whose descent was otherwise than directly royal on both sides. Lât means 'the middle of three.' So the title indicates that the bearer had an elder and a younger sister. She was in fact the daughter of Mindón by a royal half-sister, and she married Dibó, his half-brother. Sûp'ayållá and her elder sister, Sûp'ayfi, were installed as co-queens on Dibó's coronation, but the younger sister was strong enough to oust the elder from her conjugal rights. Subsequently Sûp'ayållá, the youngest sister, became junior queen to Sûp'ayållá. It is a general belief among Europeans in Burma, that Dibó's mother was not "royal" in any sense. This is a mistake. Her title was Laungshê Môlîyá, and she was of Dibó's royal descent, though not a Sûp'ayá, as above described. Her mother was a daughter of the Eûshêmin of Bódöpayá (see ante, p. 299) by the daughter of the then Dibó Sôbwá. Hence she was first cousin to her husband Mindón. Hence also no doubt the choice of title for her son.
Mindon's superior queens. The efforts of these ladies, the younger of whom became subsequently famous as the chief queen of Dibó, were successful in consequence of the aid of two Ministers, the Kãnpât Minj and the Kînûn Minj, given for political reasons, which need not be here recounted, because of the recent date of the events following on the death of Mindon in 1878. The superior claimants to the throne, viz., the Dûnê, Mêk'k'ayâ and Nyaungdâi Princes, together with many others, were put to death, but the Myingun and Myingondâi Princes escaped slaughter, as they were in exile.

At the time of his deposition, in 1885, Dibó's heirs were his half-brothers, the Myingun Prince in exile, (the Myingondâi Prince having died in exile in 1884), and the Kôln and Pyinma Princes. The lives of the two last had been spared on account of their youth and political insignificance. To the present day the Myingun Prince, still exiled from the country, considers himself the heir to the Burmese throne by established right of succession.

As an ancient authority for the rule may be cited, the following passage from Faubol's Jâdaka (Vol. I. pages 127—133). 8


"In times past Brahmadatta was king of Bârâṇs in the country of Kâsî. At that time the Bôdhisattâ was incarnated in the womb of his chief queen, and on the naming-day was named Mahîmânâskukmâra. When the young prince could walk and run about, another son was born to the king, and was named Chandaṇukmâra. When the second child could walk and run about, the Bôdhisattâ's mother died. The king installed another wife as chief queen. She became his darling and delight. Owing to the bond of love subsisting between the king and the queen, a son was born and was named Suriyâskukmâra. On the birth of this son the king was delighted and said: 'My dear, I shall grant a boon to thy son.' The queen accepted the boon and bided her time to announce its nature. When her son had come of age, she said thus to the king: 'A boon was granted by my Lord to my son at the time of his birth; bestow the crown upon him.' The king replied: "'My two sons are as brilliant as two masses of fire; it is impossible for me to accede to thy prayer.' Though thus refused the queen renewed her request over and over again, and the king thinking: 'This queen might, perhaps, harbour evil designs against my sons,' sent for them and addressed them thus: 'My dear sons, when Suriyâskukmâra was born, I granted him a boon. Now his mother asks for the kingdom; but I do not wish to give it to him. Womankind is wicked, and the queen might

8 I am indebted to Mr. Taw Sein Ko for pointing out this passage. This story is the sixth in Rhys Davids' Bâdhiṭ Birth-Stories, Vol. I. pp 180-184, and is entitled Dvâdhamma-Jâdaka.
harbour evil designs against you. Retreat therefore to the forest, and on my death return and assume the reins of government in the city of your fathers.' Weeping and crying, the king kissed his sons on the forehead and sent them away. He (Mahimaraka) converted the Yakkha, and lived under his protection. One day, looking up at the stars, the prince became aware of the death of his father, and taking the Yakkha with him, went to Baranasi and assumed possession of the kingdom. He bestowed the dignity of Upaśraja on Chandakumāra and that of Sānapati on Suriyakumāra."

No doubt a large number of interesting instances exist in the history of India and the surrounding countries, both of the rule quoted in this article and its application, the collection of which would prove of great use to the proper understanding of Oriental dynastic succession, and in determining approximately, where dates are wanting, the probable duration in years of a line consisting of a given number of Oriental rulers. For it must be borne in mind that, when a rule of such a description as that alluded to in this paper may be presumed to have existed, the number of the kings belonging to a certain family that actually ruled by no means coincides with the number of generations in that family.

In connection with the subject of this paper I wish to draw attention to the genealogies of the early English and Scottish Kings, as possibly showing a feeling, if not a custom, similar to that pointed out above. The similarity in the order of succession is at least remarkable, even if it turn out to be due to a different set of causes.

As I understand the matter, these kings were elected by the people out of the grown men, capable of leading, who belonged to the royal family. But what we are now concerned with is the actual succession, to which this custom gave rise. Let us take first the successors of Egbert, the first general king or overlord of the English tribes.

(1) Egbert
802-839.

(2) Æthelwulf
839-858.

(3) Æthelbald
858-860.

(4) Æthelberht
860-866.

(5) Æthelred
866-871.

(6) Ælfred
871-901.

(7) Eadward the Elder
901-924.

(8) Æthelstan
924-940.

(7) Eadmund
940-946.

(10) Eadred
946-955.

(11) Eadwig
955-959.

(12) Edgar
959-975.

(13) Eadward the Martyr
975-979.

(14) Æthelred the Unready
979-1016.

(15) Eadmund Ironside
1016.

(16) Eadward the Confessor*
1042-1066.

* Cnut and his sons having intervened from 1016 to 1042.
Now between Eadmund Ironside and Eadward the Confessor there intervened Cnut the Dane and his successors. Cnut had married Emma, the widow of Æthelred and mother of Eadward, and by her and a former wife had two sons, who succeeded in turn according to seniority, thus:

(1) Cnut
1016-1035.

(2) Harold
1035-1039.

(3) Harthacnut
1039-1042.

Turning to the Scottish kings, we find the genealogy to run thus:

(1) Duncan I.
ob. 1057.

(2) Malcolm III. Canmore
1057-1093.

(3) Donald Bane
1073-1098.10

(4) Edgar
1098-1107.

(5) Alexander I.
1107-1124.

(6) David I.
1124-1153.

(7) Malcolm IV.
1153-1165.

(8) William the Lion
1165-1214.

The practical result then of the English custom of popular election was the succession of brothers before sons, and it will be observed that the succession was carried out in every case cited, for generation after generation, almost exactly in the manner in which it would naturally fall under a rule, such as that enunciated at the commencement of this paper. The interest of these phenomena is in the question:—Were these elections governed by a feeling that the appropriate order of succession is that the brothers of the reigning king should succeed before his sons?

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

[Vol. XVII. p. 1].

In Bühler's list there follow:—

E. Nandisūtram and F. Anuyogadvarasūtram, without any name to connect them. In Rājendrā Lalā Mitra, Notices of Sikh. MSS. 3, 6 (Calcutta 1874) and in the Ratnasāgara, p. 508 (Calcutta 1880) both texts are mentioned in conjunction, but at the close of the Siddhānta after the mūlasūtras. In the Ratnas, the Anuyogadv. precedes. On the other hand we have already seen (p. 427 f.g.) that, at the time of the three Sāmāyāris, and indeed at that of the Vichārāmritasūkhyātra, both texts were placed in a much earlier place of the Siddh., at the head of the painma group, though in the Vidyaprāpā at least, their connection with this group is represented as uncertain (see 4296).

In bearing the stamp of individuality and having a systematic arrangement, both texts have a claim to a free and independent position. This shows that their author attempted to give an encyclopedic, but systematic, review of everything that appeared necessary to him as a means

---

10 Duncan II. connected by birth, usurped for a year, 1004-1006.
of information in reference to the sources and forms of a correct knowledge and understanding of the sacred texts. In this way [2] he could present his readers with a hermeneutical introduction. These two works are admirably adapted to the use of any one who, having completed a collection or redaction of them, then seeks for light concerning the nature of sacred knowledge itself. The statement of the scholiast on the Nandi has no little internal probability in asserting that Dévavātika, i.e. Dévardīddhigani himself, was their author. Furthermore, the list of teachers in the commencement of the Nandi and also in the commencement of mūlas. 2, as we shall soon see, breaks off with Dāsagani, whom the scholiast states to be the teacher of Dévavātika, author of the Nandi. There is, however, no external support for this conclusion which is not borne out by any information to be derived from the contents. In fact, the contrary view seems to result from these sources of our knowledge; see p. 17 ff. The Anuyōgadv. contains all manner of statements, which would synchronize with the date of Dévardīddhigani, 950 Vīra, i.e. fifth, or sixth century A.D. But I possess no information which would lead me to connect the composition of the Anuyōgadv. especially with him; and the difference in the terminology militates against the probability of both texts being the production of one and the same author; see pp. 9, 11, 21. That the Nandi is anterior to the Anuyōgadv. is made probable by some passages of the latter work, which appear to have been extracted from the Nandi. But the fact that the Anuyōgadv. is mentioned in the asaṅgagapavīśa list in the Nandi (see p. 12), makes for the opposite conclusion.

We find references to the Nandi in the remarks of the redactor scattered here and there in the aṅgas and upaṅgas; and especial attention is directed to the statement of the contents of the 12 aṅgas found in the N. This statement is found in greater detail in part 2 of aṅga 4. Hence the fact that in these references of the redactor, the Nandi and not aṅga 4 is cited. We do not read jāhī samavāyī, but jāhī Nandī; see 284, 352 (accord. to Leumann, also Bhag. 25, 2, Rājapr. p. 248) : — which must be regarded as a proof that the Nandi was the authority on which these references were based. The treatment of the subject in aṅga 4 is, then, merely an appropriation to itself and extension of the contents of this part of the Nandi. Other arguments, notably that many of the readings in the Nandi are older in special cases (see 349, 363) incline us to the same conclusion.

If now the nominal redactor of the entire Siddhānta or at least of the aṅgas and upaṅgas, Dévardīddhigani, was also author of the Nandi, it becomes at once apparent why he referred to his own work in reference to so special a subject as the statement of the contents of the 12 aṅgas; and the account in aṅga 4 is to be regarded as an insertion made after D.'s time. See p. 19.

I find in the Siddhānta no remarks of a redactor in reference to the Anuyōgadvāras, though Leumann thinks to have discovered one (Bhag. 5, 4). In the text of Āvaśy. 10, 1 the Anuyōgadvāras is mentioned together with, or rather after, the Nandi as a preliminary stage of advancement for the study of the sutta. [Both texts are in fact thought to introduce the study of each sutta that has been treated by a Niruykti. L.]

Both sūtras are composed in prose, though occasionally [4] gāthās are inserted; that is to say if we except the 50 verses in the commencement of the Nandi. These gāthās, in which the Nom. Sg1. Masc. 1 Decl. always ends in a and not in e, are manifestly the genuine productions of their authors. In the prose part, the preservation of the nom. in e shows that there is an attempt to reproduce the language and form of the sacred texts. The Nandi embraces only 719 granthas, the Anuyōgadv. about twice as many.

XLI. The Nandi, Nandī, or the Nandisūtras. The three sāmāyārī texts understood by nandī, or nandikādīhārani (Āv.), nandirayapavihi (Vi.), an introductory ceremony, in long or

---

1 "A glossary of the above-named sūtras and a description of five Jūnakas" is the somewhat peculiar description of the contents of the Nandisūtra by Kāshinī (p. 227).
2 See also Būdha Dādī in the Journal Bombay Branch K. As. S. 9, 151.
3 Jacob, Kalpa, p. 15, note 2.
short form as the case may be, for the sāvayakachchāṇi (śrāvakaśrītyāṇi), especially for the didactic exposition or the recitation of the aṅgas, etc. It is almost probable that by this the recitation of our text is referred to. We read in Āvī: taḥ guru namokkārātigupuṣvaṃ nāṃdīṇa kājṭhāṇaḥ, sā chē 'yaśa: nāṃśa paṃchvaiḥaḥ... and then follows the real commencement of the Nandi. See below. This is, however, soon interrupted, and the citation passes to that variant textual form which is found in Annyāgadv. Another change then occurs, and finally that enumeration of the sacred texts is reached which is found later on in the Nandi. We have, therefore, here no immediate citation from the text of the Nandi but a relation based essentially on the same foundation but in its form independent, a relation whose designation by the same word is based upon the appellative signification of this expression. We may compare the [5] similar use of the word nāṃdi in Skt. for those introductory strophes of a drama which are designed to bring good fortune. Cf. also nāmīka as the name of a door-post, and nāndīpaṭa, a cover of a spring (P. W.). Haribhadra on Āvāy. 9, 1 has the following: — śādimaika galāraṇaḥ nāṃdi vyākhyāti, and in the commencement of his commentary, ibid.: — nō-aṃgatā bhāvamāṅgarāṃ nāṃdi, tātra nāmikānāṃ nāṃdi, nāmikānāṃ dassayē 'tya va bhavyāḥ prācina iti nāṃdi. The signification of the title of our text is really: an introduction designed to bring good fortune. This title can refer either to the entire contents of the work such as I have above sketched, or, and this seems preferable, to the 50 verses which form the beginning.4 In vv. 1—19 Vīra is praised, in vv. 20, 21 there is an enumeration of the 24 Jinas, in vv. 22, 23 a list of his immediate scholars, the 11 so-called gaṇadhāras, and finally, from v. 24 on, a thērāvall beginning with Suhama (1) and Jambū (2), and embracing in all thirty members; it closes in the third generation after Nagajūna (5) with Dāsagami (9), who, according to the anonymous scholiast (on v. 27) was the teacher of Dēvavāchaka, the author.5

As we have already seen on page 471, this thērāvall varies, from the ninth member on, from the statements in the list contained in the Kalpaśūtra. [6] The reason for this is apparent from a consideration of the remarks of the scholiast (avāchūri) on v. 27: Suhastinaś śāhavāliksāhā śālkaṇḍa utkraṇāt na ta(a)ya īkha 'dhikāraḥ, tasyāṁ Naṇḍikārā-Dēvavāchaka-gurvanupattāḥ. From this it is clear that the author of the avāchūri considers Dēvavāchaka to be the author of the Nandi, and that this account does not emenate, like that of the śālkaṇḍa, from Suhastin (1b). The evidence proves that it is rather to be referred to his immediate predecessor, or brother,6 Mahāgiri (9), whose intellectual descent it makes known.

In reference to each of its members there exists great uncertainty, according to the scholiast, who says of verses 31, 32: kṣēpaṇaṛavād vṛṣṭau na 'ktaḥ, and remarks on vv. 33, 34: ētadgātādvyātārtha āvāyaśadikātā likhitā 'sti, avachūṛāv api nā 'sti, vv. 41, 42 is: vṛṣṭav āpavākyāśātavāt prakṣhiptam, and of Gōvindāchārya he says, on v. 43: śīshyakramāmābhāvād vṛṣṭau na 'ktaḥ, āvāyaśadikātā likhitāḥ.

4 These recur, as has already been mentioned, in the commencement of the Āvāy. nīja in identically the same form.
5 Cf. the name of the nāndīmukkāḥ pitaras or of the nāndīkārdham. In the case of the latter was there any recitation of a list of ancestors?
6 śāhavāliksārā in Klett, Indic Anuṣṭ. 11, 231b, or ubhāv api bhṛtarāna in Dharmaghoṣha's Gurvanvāli itself. Suhastin is characterized as the laṅgurabhṛtarā Mahāgiri, also in the paṭāvall of the Kharataragacha, Klett, 246b. Klett in accordance with other traditions (cf. Kalpaśūtra) refers both to different gotras: and Mahāgiri to Elāpatyagotra (so here v. 27, Elavachassottra), Suhastin to Vāsidhā. Have they different mothers?
7 On this cf. Jacob in Journ. Germ. Or. Soc. 34, 323, 3, especially in reference to verses 27, 33, 36, 37, and Leumann's remarks, ibid. 37, 277 ff. In v. 27 we must read in Jacob: Bahulasā sarvāvayaḥ (vavayanfr vavayaḥ) vaiśrūḍh instead of bahulasā Sārivaraya vaiśrūḍh (see Klett, 1 c. 251b); in the scholiast we read ima Mahāgirār dha śāhavāliksāhāḥ: Vahū Vanalisaḥ (cf. Kalkas, Thūrīvā 6 e) eha: tatō Mahāgirār anuśāṣanā Mahālasya yamalabhṛṣṭāvād nādiśvayaṇaṁ, prāvīcchāniśvayaṇaṁ prābhāśvayaṇaṁ, Vahulasā saṃkātyā eva 'tya arthāh.
8 śāhavāliksādī in 21 v. 23 becomes then śāhavāliksādī in 30. But even verse 33, in which śāhavāliksādī is mentioned, is doubtful: see above.
That this list actually reaches as far as the author or his teacher is rendered the more probable by the fact that in the last verse of the list (v. 50) the nāṇasa parūvaṇaṁ is stated to be the purpose of the account which is to follow — and this purpose reproduces correctly the contents of N. Next follow two secondary insertions, first a gāthā,[8] which cites 14 examples or titles of stories in reference to capable and incapable scholars (the avachārī contains a more detailed account) and secondly a short polemical notice of the three kinds of parisē, parshad, vīś.: — jāññi, ajjāññi and duvviādjīhā — each of which is illustrated by a gāthā.

At this point the investigation of the jñānas begins, in which a principal part is played by the enumeration of the different categories and sub-categories of both the principal classes into which the jñānas is divided[12] — the pachchakkhaṇāṇam and the parokkhaṇāṇam. The latter contains much that is interesting. It in turn is twofold, ābhinnivōhiyaḥ[16] ("bodhika") and susaṛuṭa. In the account of one of the two groups into which the ābhinnivōhiya parokkhaṇāṇam is divided, are inserted eight gāthās, which contain the titles of stories which belong in this connection, and which are intended to serve as examples. The avachārī goes into detail on this point.

The sanandaparakkham is divided into 14 groups among which Nos. 5, 6, 13, 14 are of special importance: — The samasaṇam 5, sanyakartam, is explained as jaññi Imath ariññatthīhi bhagavānūtthānāṁ uppānnaṁ sāsanaṁ sāsanaḥ sūtra. In this group are included the Bhāvaviveka, ōvīra, and the list gives one name more in mentioning Dēvarīḍī himself after Dēsagāri.

Vallissahaśiyathā Harīlagotama Śvātim. Nominally author of up. 4, see p. 392.

This episthe explained by Āryagotra is found also in Nos. 15 — 17, 19 — 22.

Ke 'pi Mahāgīri Āryagotra it nāṁśīvatām śūh, No. 17 then falls ent.

According to the scholast the dasapuṇvīpāḥ (see Hum. v. 34) Āryaśālaśīs tachhiya Durvalikāpūpamā ča navapuṇvīpāḥ, reach from Mahāgīri to Vajra. See page 343.

Bāhbhādīvāyaṃ, Vrahmagīpākaśatihālakhesaṭhe Sāhim Sāhādhārīyaḥ.

Cf. the Nāgājanahās in the Scholast on nāga 2, 2, 3, and see p. 265.

Nāmaṃ pañcavāhā: ābhinnivōhiyānaṁ sau ahaṃ padaśīvā kāvadā. Or duṇvīra: pachchakkhaṇam and parokkhaṇam, and the latter is then: ābhinnivōhiyaparokkhaṇāṇaṁ ča sanandaparakkhaṇaṁ ča; the ābhī is sanandasmīnaṁ ča dhammāniyam ca; both are frank, and the latter is divided into: uppaṭṭiyā, yēpā, kammī, āpāṭhāṃ kudālī (see p. 140).

66 Where it is characterized as nāmaśāhāvī bhāvanāyaṃ and as sanandhīm mīchādīṭṭhiṁ sāsanaṁ dhammāvīpaṭippāṇīḥ; cf. the 29th had pāvamasam Āvāya., Ind. Stud. 16, pp. 115, 116. I denote the four MSS. to which I have had access as A B C R. The citations from Nāda are by Leumann.
The enumeration of the names in S. contains a different grammatical construction, i. e. the names are in the genitive.

The avashchari gives explanations (occasionally in detail) of at least some of the names. A large number of the names in, however, passed over in silence. [Explanations may however be found at the end of the Vyavahāra-dhātu, as the corresponding part of the sutra mentions most of the names.—L.]

These numbers represent the arrangement which I have observed here in essential agreement with Bühler’s list in the enumeration of the parts of the Śiddhānta.

The texts which are no longer found as separate texts in the Śiddhānta, are printed in italics. On kappiyāk, (cf. kappakappiam p. 9 n. 39), chullak. and mahāk., see the scholiast’s remarks, p. 479 above.
From this we may draw the conclusion that the 59 titles, according to the opinion of the author of the Nandí, represent merely a portion of the 84,000 paññásas (our MS. has 184,000 in the text!), which belonged to the first thirthankara Rishabhásvarín and to the 22 Jñávaras following him; but that at the time of Vardhamánasvarín their number was reduced to 14,000. Or according to another view, each of the 24 thirthankars had just so many thousand...
painnas, or pratyëkabuddhas\(^44\) [\(^16\)] as he possessed scholars endowed with the correct fourfold knowledge. Estimating these exaggerated figures at their true value, let us consider the 59 titles.\(^8^5\) Of the texts now enumerated as parts of the Siddhânta the titles of the four painnas 25, 27, 23, 34, of the sixth chhêdâsûtra 49 and of two of the mûla-sûtras, 41 and 46 are omitted. Of these the four painnas are to be regarded as modern productions and later than the N; the titles of the sixth chhêdâsûtra 49 and of the fourth mûla-sûtra 46 are not certain; and, finally, the title of the fourth mûla-sûtra 41, âśâyâsaka, has been already mentioned. See on p. 11. The remaining 27 titles of texts of the present Siddhânta not belonging to the âṅgas (\(^3\) fg.) are one and all contained in the above list, though in a different order of arrangement and without any statement in reference to the names of their groups. Some, however, belong together as groups — the first four and the last five upâṅgas (Nos. 5—8 and 55—59) and the five chhêdâ-
sûtras (Nos. 31—35). Besides these the list contains 32\(^8^6\) additional names which are not directly represented by texts in the existing Siddhânta. Among these there are five for which corresponding sections in the S. can be shown, thus: — 10 pâmâyappamâyam, 17 pûrisî-
manûlalânî, 18 mûmâsâlappârêso, 38 divasâgara-pattalî [\(^17\) têyagârânasanga]. In the Siddhânta there are references to 12 others; thus for 4, 36 (and 38), 40—49; 8 others are mentioned elsewhere 9, 21, 51, [\(^60\)—\(^64\)]; and finally there is a whole list of titles (12 or 13), which cannot be attested from any source whatsoever, thus 2, 3, 19, 22, 23, 24 \(^{a,\ b}\), including marapâvâsîthî — 27, 50, 52, 53). It is of special interest that we find statements concerning a whole series of texts held to belong to the kâlisa-sûam in old kârîkâ verses. The source of these statements is not further attested. These texts were a special object of riper study at the time of the composition of these verses. Of Nos. 40—49, 51 (50—53 ?), 60—64 it is said that they were designed for the eleventh to the eighteenth year of study: 40—44 for the eleventh, 45—49 for the twelfth, 51 (50—53 ?) for the thirteenth, 60—64 for the fourteenth to the eighteenth year; the nineteenth year forming the conclusion with the study of the dîthivâda. Cf. my remarks on pp. 225, 344, 345.

This list at least opens up to us a wide perspective for the literature existing at the time of the composition of N. It is certainly very remarkable that N is itself cited in this list (as No. 11). Is this the only work of the author inserted by him in the list? Or did he avail himself of this capital opportunity to procure a resting place for other of his productions? If in reality Dêvârdâdîrâgha, the nominal rector of the Siddhânta, is to be regarded as the author of N, then the discrepancy between this list and the existing Siddhi, is especially remarkable.\(^[18]\) Did all these differences arise after his time? And is the division into the groups uvaṅga, painna, etc., or the names uvaṅga, painna themselves, etc., to be ascribed to a period subsequent to his? In the case of the painna this is evidently very probable.

Next follows the âṅgapavîththam 23, the thirteenth group of the suaañnaparokkham, which strictly belongs before the suaanâgapaviâtham. It is called duvâlalasaviham and then the 12 âṅgas, ayâro to dîthivâm (âṅga 5 as vîvâhappannatî) are enumerated in order. This in turn is followed by the detailed statement of contents and extent of the 12 âṅgas, which (see p. 284 ff.) recurs in identical form but in greater detail in âṅga 4. This entire statement has been given on p. 297. We have already seen (pp. 284 ff. 349, 352, 361, 383, and 3) that its appearance in âṅga 4 was secondary, and that here we frequently meet with the older readings. When in the insertions in the âṅgas made by the redactor (even in âṅga 4) any reference is paid to his enumeration,

\(^{44}\) pratyêkabuddhâ api tâvante eva, ayah; — atmi 'kê vyêchakukhata; ēkaikayâ 'pî têrthahkritas tirêche parimânaprakaraññi, tathkhriyam aparimânaprakaraññi, k khôlami pratyêkabuddhahriyage eva prakaraññi, dhaññhika aparimâna-pratyêkabuddha-parimânaprakaraññayam pratidhânavat. This explanation of êkê is designed to effect a perfectly comprehensible limitation, but cannot be brought in agreement with the context. The title pratyêkabuddha is of great interest. It occurs also in the âṅgas, see pp. 263, 334. Similar statements to the above are found in the scholastic on the first painna. See p. 435. In the Vîchâramitrasaṅgraha is quoted the following interesting citation from the pthas of a kalpañkha: settha guññharaññiyam tabêva pattêyabuddharâliyam cha | suyâkavanã rájanah abhimna dasapuvrîpi rájana ||

\(^{8^5}\) Or 60 and 65, see p. 15, note 1.

\(^{8^6}\) Or 33 and 38.
the citation is from the Nandi and not from aṣāga 4. The Nandi and not aṣāga 4 is therefore indisputably the source whence these citations are drawn. But whether or no the account here is really to be regarded as the source whence came the account in aṣāga 4, appears to me to be still in dubia. This assumption is rendered improbable by the fact there are very great differences in these accounts, not to mention that that of aṣāga 4 is much more detailed. If, however, we regard the account in the N. as the source, then that in aṣāga 4 is secondary and enlarged after it had effected a lodgment in that aṣāga. [19] But on the other hand it is a perfectly legitimate conclusion that the account in N. and in aṣāga 4 were drawn from a common source now no longer extant. Finally, it must be stated that the entire section in N. almost gives me the impression of being a secondary insertion. The fact that it too contains the most wonderful statements, called into existence by the effort of pure fancy (cf. especially the statements concerning aṣāga 9 and aṣāga 12), cannot readily be reconciled with that tradition which regards the Nandi as the work of Dēvardhīgaṇi, the nominal redactor of the whole Siddhānta. Dēvardhīgaṇi would have expressed himself in a more sober, definite way, and would not have given rein to such monstrous figments of the imagination. We must not, however, suppress the fact that the Pākṣikasūtram takes no notice of this detailed statement of contents and extent27 of the 12 aṣāgas, but limits itself merely to the enumeration of the twelve names.88

Then, too, the general observations in reference to the duvālasaṅgāna gaṇipilagāna, which are joined on to the account of each of the twelve aṣāgas, are found here in just the same form as in aṣāga 4; cf. pp. 368, 369. The five kārikās form the conclusion. They contain statements in reference to the correct [20] attainment of the suṣunānā; the last one reads: suttatāh khalu paṭhamo, bho nijjutti(m)-niśad bhajitā; taśā nirvāvasā, esa vihā hūi aṣāga || 5 || According to Leumann, the reference in Bhag. 25, 3 cites this verse as the conclusion of this entire account (jāva suttatāh . . . aṣāga). The nijjutti is also mentioned.

Next follow some statements which are not noticed by the author of the avadhūrī, from which we may conclude that they were inserted at a later period, though they may in reality be of great age. They comprise a section in prose in reference to the aṣānā, anujā, and a renewed repetition of the titles of the 12 aṣāgas and a reference to Usabhāṣa, as the original source of the aṣānā. See p. 13.

The commentary, which I have before me (avadhūrī), the work of an anonymous author, is very short. The Calcutta edition contains the commentary of Malayagiri, according to Leumann. We have already seen that a Nandivṛtā is frequently cited — see pp. 353, 354 (Vichārāṃṣītapasangraha), 360 (Abhayadeva), — the citations from it being partly in Prākṛti (gāthā), partly in Sanskrit. In the scholiwm on the Gaṇadharasārdhasāśa (see pp. 371, 458) Sarvararājgaṇi ascribes the Sandivṛtī to the old Haribhadra, who is said to have died 76 years after Dēvardhīgaṇi. The author of the Vichārāṃṣītapasangraha appears to ascribe such a Sandivṛtī to Umasvāmivāchaka who was about 50 years older (see pp. 371, 372). He says (fol. 3r of the Berlin MS.) tathā cha “ha bhagavān Umasvāmivāchakāḥ: samyagdarsanajana-chārānī mokshamārga iti Nandivṛttau, vācbhāsabhāsa cha pūrvvagataḥrutadharē rādhā, yathā: pūrvvagataḥ sūtram anyoḥ cha vināyakā vācbhāsaḥ iti vācbhāsāḥ, Nandivṛttaḥ: [21] vādi ya . . . (see p. 355c). Such statements as these in reference to commentary are of great an age are of great importance as regards the age of the Nandi.

XLII. The Anuyogadvarasūtram is an encyclopedic review of everything worth knowing,89 composed in anūgas, questions and answers. It is composed in prose though there is

---

87 I call attention here to the mention of the name Bhādābhūu an aṣāga 12, pp. 360, 367. It is noteworthy that he appears in the same gradation (though last in order) as the names Daśāra, Baladēva, Vānadēva, Harivāsa, and consequently as a mythological personage.

88 This is introduced in just the same manner as the previous one. See pp. 16, 13: — samadhī tāvān khamaseṣa-navāna jāhā iha duvālasaṅgāna gaṇipilagāna taḥ jahā . . , and concludes in the same way: surēbhākā pi śammi duvālasaṅgā ganiṣṭājā bhaṣavantā naṃtē . . .

89 An account of the method of defining and explaining the Sastras, Kanh.
a frequent admixture of gāthās. There are no subdivisions though a systemic arrangement prevails throughout.

As in the Nandi, the nāṇa is especially treated of here. The text commences forthwith with an enumeration of the same five forms of the nāṇa, which we find also in N. abhinībhīya, suya, ḍhi, maṇapayyava, kēvala. The second form, the suyaṇāṇa, śrutajānana, is the one par excellence which is discussed further on in the Anuy. The subdivisions of the suyaṇ are indicated by means of the same names which we find in N, though the gradations are somewhat different; see p. 11. It is divided into āṅgavāpi and into āṅgabhāraṇa, the latter into kāliyaḥ and ukkāliyaḥ; the latter of which again into āvassayam and āvassayavairittam.

Here in the Anuy, the āvassayam alone is discussed. The author states that he desires to explain his work according to the following four points of view, though the real reason for this statement is not clear: āvassayam nikkhivissā, suyaṇ (śṛutaṇ) aṣṭhaṁ, kehaḥ, kehaḥ ajjhayapanaṇaṁ aṣṭhaṁ. After a kārīka inserted here the author proceeds to a discussion of the āvassayam per se, [22] which is chaśvivahā, viz.: — nāṇaṁ, āṭhaṇaṁ, dāvāṁ, bhāvaṁ, respectively, the latter two being distinguished from the others as āgamaḥ and nō-āgamaḥ. At the end the synonyms (ēṣaṁ kūru nāṇaṁ nāṇaṁ nāṇaṁ nāṇaṁ nāṇaṁ) are stated as follows: — āvassayam, āvassakaraṇaṁ, duvanīggaṁ, visohi yaṁ ājñhayapaḥ kākakṣayaggaḥ nāṅaḥ ārāhaḥ maggō maṇaṇantā sāvaṇa ya āvassakāyayyaṁ āvāśa jāmbaḥ a śāntah nāṅaṁ āvāshyaḥ. This designation as ājñhayapaḥ kākakṣayagga points unequivocally to a definite text, divided into 6 adhyayanas. By the 6 adhyayanas we may understand the six kinds of āvassayam enumerated in the Nandi, above p. 11, and occurring below (see pp. 23, 24). These names as well as all the other synonyms of āvassayam belong to the domain of ethical, ritualistic or disciplinary matters. Our text, however, touches upon these subjects only occasionally.

Next to the enumeration of the synonyms of the āvassayam come the suyaṇ and the kāṇāṇa, two of the four sections. To these we find that the same groups and sub-groups are ascribed to the āvassayam; and an enumeration of the synonyms of each forms the conclusion. The verse containing the synonyms of the suyaṇ is as follows: — [23] sayaṇaṃ suttamānaḥ siddhāntaḥ sahaṇaḥ aṇā yaśaṇa uṣaśe ṣaḥ vāṇaṇa āgamaḥ a ēṣaṁ kūru pāravā yuttāḥ a, that containing the synonyms of kāṇāṇa: — gupakā ṣaḥ nīkā kāṇāṇaḥ vajjaḥ tāṭeva riṣaḥ a puniṣṭaṁ niṃ atmaḥ a niṃ a. The first names for “sacred text” refer then to the contents, the second to the extent. In one subdivision of kāṇāṇa, the nō-āgamaḥ bhāvakhaṇḍeḥ, the following explanation is found (see kīma taṃ no-ā): — ēśenaḥ cēva saṃāyika-māyaṇaḥ chhaṇam ājñhayapanam saḥ kaḥ saṃāyikam samaggaḥ āvassayapanam bhāvakhaṇḍeḥ labhate, sā taṃ nō-āgamaḥ bhāvakhaṇḍeḥ. By this is meant in all probability the connection of the totality of all the above cited six adhyayanas of the āvāṣyaka, saṃāyika, etc.

The last of these four sections designed to explain the āvassayam, refers ex professo to the ājñhayapanam, and begins with an enumeration of these six ājñhayas. A kārīka is first introduced.

60 There is unfortunately no enumeration of the āṅgabhāraṇa texts in Anu.
61 Viṣeṣa I, 871 f. I call attention to the following from the scholiast: — saṃāyikāḥ abādābhīyanaḥ keñjapakṛtaḥ āvāṣyapalayaṁ, tathā abhijñābhāyanaḥ, samagā pāyayaṁ, yaḥ, mokshārābhāyanaḥ hētuttvaḥ ārāhaṇaḥ, tathā mokshapurapāptaḥ āvāṣyapalayaṁ, tathā abhijñābhīyanaḥ, etc.
62 Between ēmaḥ ajaṇaḥ vāyaṇaḥ yaḥ. This word is often used, however, throws the metre out of order; ukkā vāyaṇaṁ vāyaṇaṃ scholiast; instead of itti, uṣṭaṇvayaṁ, etc. is often su, ṣrutā, etc., which, however, does not suit the metre.
63 Saṃāyikamālaṁ (沉默); ēmaḥ ēva prastutāsāvyapakṣapakṣaḥ saṃāyikāḥ, samapāṇaḥ abādābhīyanaḥ samuddayaḥ, samudavyayaḥ samudavyayaḥ samudavyayaḥ, samudavyayaḥ samudavyayaḥ, saṃāyaḥ, saṃāyaḥ, etc., tathā nāṃ sa ṣrutāsakāṇḍaḥ sa bhāvakhaṇḍaḥ iti labhāt
64 Āvassayayaḥ pariṇāmaḥ evaṁ abādābhīyanaḥ, saṃāyikāḥ, saṃāyikāḥ, saṃāyikāḥ, etc., tathā vāyaṇaṁ vāyaṇaṁ vāyaṇaṁ vāyaṇaṁ vāyaṇaṁ vāyaṇaṁ, tathā nāṃ saḥ evaṁ abādābhīyanaḥ, etc.
which may have found its way from here to pañña 1 [24] — (see p. 433a), — though both places may have drawn this verse from a common source. This verse states in brief compass the contents of each of the six ajjh. Then follow again the six names as in the Nandī. Next the first one, the sāmāyām, is designated expressly as the one which is treated of in the An. To it are allotted four aṅguṇadārās, sections for questions related to the subject-matter. These sections are uvakkamā, nikkhēvā, aṅguṇamā, nayē, and under this division the rest of the text is divided, the uvakkamā taking the lion’s share. In a MS. which I have before me, ms. or, fol. 762, = A, which contains 56 fol., the uvakk. embraces fol. 5a to 53a. That which proceeded was on fol. 1b to 5a; nikkhēva is on three leaves, to 56b; aṅguṇamā is despatched in ten lines on 56b and naē in six.

On p. 23 I called attention to the lack of harmony between the names of the six āvasāyaka groups and the actual contents of our text which purports to discuss them. This lack of harmony, which is increased by the table of contents adduced for each one in particular, is so great, that I have in vain attempted a solution of the mystery as to how our text can have the face to assert that it discusses the first of these, the sāmāyām, or the sāvajjajōgavirati.86 A genuine discussion is hardly touched upon, the real subject-matter being special topics pertaining to [25] matters of dogma and speculation, or to general matters of cosmological, anthropological, linguistic or literary interest.

Aside from this lack of harmony, another fact is in itself likely to excite the hostility of surprise: the word sāmēya is used as the title of the first āvasāyaka, but in reference to the aṅgas we had learned to employ in quite a different signification, viz.: — as the title of aṅga 1, whose contents it is true, might be characterized as sāvajjajōgavirati. The double use of one and the same word to designate two different termini technici is truly a matter to be wondered at. See 243 fg., 342 fg.

The contents of the sections uvakkama, etc., is very varied and in part extremely interesting; and the form, in which it is encased so to speak, is highly remarkable. The statements are heterogeneously arranged, and the connecting thread being purely external, there is no logical procession. Everything is divided according to the fashion prevailing in the Sūddhānta, into groups, species, sub-species, etc. The uvakkama e.g. is divided into aṅguṇavavv (in A on fol. 5a to 16a), nāmah (to 27a), pāmāyama (to 31a), vattavayā (to 51a), athāhāyāia (ib.), samavāyāia (to 53a). And the aṅguṇavavv is in turn divided into nāmahāṅguṇavavv, ṭhavāṅguṇ, davāṅguṇ, khettāṅguṇ, kālaṅguṇ, ukkitaṅguṇ, gaṅgaṅguṇ, saṁsthāṅguṇ, saṁmāyāriṅguṇ, bhāvāṅguṇavavv.

Without paying any greater attention to the stereotyped expressions of the text [26] than is necessary to mark the different passages where the statement in question occurs, I give here, according to the arrangement of the text, some of the most important data contained in it and at the end, a résumé of the results of interest for the history of literature. It may be prefaced that the nom. sing. masc. I decl. ends now in o, now in e, and that in the verses, the nominative and case forms in general are frequently represented by the theme. In the case of feminine nouns thematic ã ā are shortened.

A species of davașvavasaya (A 29) is divided into loyam, kuppavaya, and loottaraya. The first is referred to the usages of the processe, who appear in the usual enumeration that we have met with in the aṅgas: jë imā rāli-sara-salavara-kōdaṃya, maundaṃya-ibha-ṣetti-ṣekāvai-saithavahapabhi.87 The kuppavaya describes in the following enumeration

86 In the athāhāyāia section of the uvakkama in one MS. the contents of all the six ajjhayaṇa are seemingly ascribed to the sāmāyam alone. The actual facts of the case are different, see p. 37a.
86 On talavara, see p. 58 fg. 818; kōdama from kuṇama, the older form of kuṇama, see Ind. Streifen 1, 304.
87 Pānhādapdach. p. 41; yasa pravāra śāman aparām grāmanagardikā na 'sti yat sarvataracchinnājanāndyāvāśaḥṣāpaṃ maḍanabam ucyotā tasāya 'dhipatā maṛjanakāh.
the character of those sectors which do not share the same beliefs: — jē imē98 charag-chhriya-
chammakhānīiya-bhichchhānījaga-paṇḍuraṇaṇa-Gōyama-govvaiya- ghīthhamma-dhammaciṃh-
jaga-aviruddha-viruddha-vuddhasāvagabhiphayaṇa-pasamajjataṁ, and states that these: "Indassā
va Khaṇḍassā va Rūddassā va Śivasva va Vēṣasama va dēvasva va nāgassa vā jakkhassā vā bhāyāsa
va Mūgumīdassā va Ayyāveva koṭṭakiriya eva99 uvaḷeṇa-sammayanāya."varisaka-
dhāvapupphagamdhāmallīyaṇaṃ dāvavassasyāyaṇaṃ karoti. The lōguttarīya is finally referred
to the merely external Jaina-yogin: jē imē samapagupaṇmukkā-jōgi chakkaṇaṇaṇaṃ pada
iva uddāmā gāyā iva niruṃkṣaṃ gaṇṭhā maṭṭhā tuṇpāṭhā100 paṇḍurapaṇḍurapāṇa1 diṇāpana
apāṇāt (anājaya) sucohchandaṇa viharīyaṇaṃ ubhyāyā-kālān āvassassyāna uvaṭṭhanati.

[28] In the bhāvavassayaṇa (intellectual exercise) we read in the passage attributing a
similar division to the lōyiyaṃ: puṇvāpiṇhē Bhārahma, averanē Rāmāyaṇa;2 and as regards the
kuppavayaṇyam, it is said of the same sects as above (charaganārya) etc. that they ija-11jāi-ma
hēma-jaya- notified as the bhāvavassayaṇa lōyiyaṃ. The dāvavassaya is characterized as paṭayya-poṭṭhayaliyayaṇa and as anājaya, vōndayaṇa, kīdayaṇa, vōlavaṇa.

The works of the Brahminical literature cited by me ad Bhag. 2, 243 are quoted in the
same list as above (see above, p. 9), where the same list is adduced from the Ānavis, though in great
somewhat different.

98 dēliti(f)rhakālī sānto yē bhēthīya charantī tē charakā; rathayaṇitichararaṇagānta chhirikā; bharag-
parīdāhāra charmakhānīkā; yē bhēthām ēva bhunjatē na tu svarajgihītaṃ gōdūghīdīkaṃ tē bhīkṣāha,
Sugata-āsanānātha ity anyā; pāṇhīyaṃ bhaṃsūbhūsīṭaṅgāra; viharīyaṇapataṃdogītaghīkārīyaṃaya
varahakāmālokīdīharciyaḥvārpabhākāvyataḥ (2) kāpanbhikṣhūdhīhipo Gautamaḥ (cf. Kapāhū, Kapāda !)
goharyūnāśkriye gōvratīkā, tē hi "vayaṃ api kālā tīryakāh vasmāna" iti bhārvānā bhāyāmānā gobhīr
niruṃkahārīkāhi saha niruṃkahārti sāmīhīna ti sāmīhīnaṃ ti sāmīhīnaṃ ti bhunjāmānā bhūtai
va triṇapad-
trīvakaripadākāhārti bhunjatē, tēd uktaṃ; gāvā saṃsāmatē vānrapavvāsināchārīyaṃ ya padākārintī
bhunjaitī jahā
gāvā tīrīhāvassānā vībhavānta iti; gīhasthāhārīva ēva śīrvīkī iti; gīhasthāhārīva ēva śīrvīkī iti,
tēha ti tadaunāṃkīna
vācaṇa; gīhārānavasamō dharmān na bhūtō na bhāvivāyati tē tēlāyantī yē dērīhā,
kiśvā bhūtanī añātī ity itī; Yānaṇvāyakaprabhumitrīṣhapraśārībhārmanasūnītī chintayantī
iti; dharmachāṅkāya; dhēvātā-śukhīdāta-
mōttīpiti-tīrayākirtīdāvīrahāvānamo duṇiyakīkā; puṇyapapātikākāmabhupagamapa-
trīya-kāvyāvānī viruddhīh), saraṇaghāsīhīhi saha viruddhasrīṣṭitē; prathāmamaṃ ēva "dūtyāthikaraṇē
samuttanavatvāt; pūyo viruddhīkālī dhēkhasrīṣṭatē sahī viruddhīsī ṭāpasaṇā; śīravākā bhūtakhaṇā;
anyā tē dūthānuṣṭava ity ēkaṃ ēva padām pāmāraṇāvāraṇaṃ eva bhūtakhaṇā (Buddha is therefore not referred to
here ! (see Bhag. 2, 214); anī AC 8, dūtho ruddha, BC 8 alone having vuddha); bhūtanīyaṃ vṛttaṇa, tadā ti sāmīhīna
iti ti bhunjāmānā; — on Gōyama, see Asap. § 73. See chap. 15 in Varahamīhīra’s Brahmaśāstrī (puṇva-
rajyāgādhīya), or Laghūd. 9, 19, Ind. Stud. 2, 239, where also viruddhasēraka.
99 Makruṅgha Baladāvyah; ārya prāṇāyināipūrī Durgā; sat ‘va mahāmātīyāḥ tatkutukāpatīn koṭṭakiriya; atro
pachārākhāṇādābhādāna tad-kyataṇaṃ apya ucyatē; the same arrangement of the gods, except Mukuṇa, occurs
also in the Bhagavat 3, 1, 60; see my treatise 3, 121, 439.

100 See p. 101 on Śaṭa 400 Bhuv.
1 Accounting to all appearances this speaks against the connection of the text with the Śvetāntara, and refers it
to the Digvignarasas (cf. Bhag. 2, 187, 312, where I have partially misunderstood the passage).
2 See Bhag. 2, 243, my treatise on the Rāmāyaṇa, p. 34; lōkē hi Bharaṭa-Rāmāyaṇayο vāhanaṃ śravapaṇa
vā purvaprāhānīya vēvā rējēhan.
3 līya yāgaṇa, athāva dēśībhīkṣhāya iti (itē līyaṃ B) mātā (t), tēvā mānakṣāvīdhaḥ ... undurakka tē
dēśībhūtana mānuṣa mukhaṃ, rukkaṃ viruddhasāvādikaranaṃ, dēśātāprūtā prīṣhahāgamakāranaṃ. — B
has also itēdēhaṇī in the text; this is manifestly caused by a misunderstanding of the ligatures shv, and
jj. See Vol. XVI. Ind. Stud. 22; itē, mātā is to be referred either to root yaj or to ārdā.
4 pat(t)rakṣiṇī talāṭāyādīsūrīhamsī, tāsamāntaśānpanṭaṃ tu pustakā, taṇ̥ā ca patrakṣiṇī ca pustakā
da, tēva likhitā; athāva pūtāna vastraṇa (see T. E. Vol. 16, p. 135) pat(t)rakṣiṇī ca tēva likhitā ... anājaya
hamsagābhābī; hamsa paṇsāṅga, gatha ta sannāvānīkāsūkā ... tadātuṇānaṃ sūtraṃ anājaya ucyatē:
āḍīśādaḥ avbāchānrapāṣāpanaṃ paddahā; vōndayaṇa (bo B, po A) karpasa-m-kē, Ind. Stud. XVI. 111; vōndayaṇa
vāmānpalana māṇijā tuṇā tuṇā vōndayaṇa; phalāṇa phalāṇa karpasaśāyakarōpdhaṃ; kātī jāṭān kātuṣaṃ avvānā; is avvālō; paṭṭa paṭṭaṇītraṃ (detailed citation from the ūryāvāryayākhya), Malā
Malaye vārpayāṇaṃ vōndayaṇa; anī, Gōyama vāryayākhya, kimikā; lōmāḥbhī jāṭān vōlavaṇa ... is avvālō; unī
arāṇīkā, uṭṭhī anāhikā, miśrābhūnā, kuṭakā (kō) uṇdūruṇādhānām, kītī sūraṇīdhaṃ pad uññhāri
the direct statement to reference to the relations of these stuffs, consisting of down, cotton, silk (from Malaya and
China), hair (wool, skin), plants (hemp, flax) to the ārthana. Their use as paper, etc. for MSS. is here referred
to as in the case of patyaya.
[29] In the enumeration of the names from āyāra to diṭṭhivāsā (āṅgā 5 as vivahapannatti) the duvālasamgaṇa gaṇipidaṇam takes the place of the lūttariyam, etc.

In the case of the khettanupuṇi, the groups of the ascetē (Rayasappabhā to Tamatamappabhā), tiriyalō (Jaṁbuddivī to Sayambhuramanē), uṇḍhuḷō (Sōhāmmē to Īśpabhārā) are enumerated, and in the case of the kālāpaṇa, the graduations of the divisions of time from sāmē to savvaddhā. As we learn from a second discussion of the subject in a passage later on (see pp. 34, 37), we have to deal here with a progression by 84's and not by 10's. Cf. Bhagav. 1, 427, above, pp. 268, 411, 412. In the case of the ukkittāgaṇa we find an enumeration of the 24 Jinas.

Under nāmaṇ we find all manner of linguistic, grammatical and other statements. Immediate dependence upon Sanskrit literature is here very clear; thus e.g. as examples of monosyllables are cited the following four—hṝṭi śr̥̄ṅg dīl̥ str̥ (sic) in the Sanskrit form, manifestly because they (cf. Pīṇa-ga’s chhandas i, 12 Ind. Stud. VIII, 217, 218) are used in Sanskrit grammar as customary (mūrdhvabhikṣaka) examples. The same fondness for Sanskrit may be observed in the metrical rules concerning gender, statements in reference to the finals of nouns, (k, t, ū, o and a, i, u, u), saṁhī (śāma, lova, pagadi i.e. prakṛti, and vikāra) and the five classes of words. For some of the names of these classes (e.g. nāmikā, naipātikā, akhyātikā, anupasargikā, mīrīm) and the examples of others, the Sanskrit is used. The sacred author makes, ludicrously enough, [30] a wilful error of a slight character. He cites, besides, other examples of saṁhī; vadhā ūhattē vadhūhātē, but Sanskrit has no nominative or rather no form vadhū. The nomin is vadhū.

In mentioning a subspecies of chhanāmā (shan) the twelve aṅgas are again enumerated in detail (āṅgā 5 again as vivahapannatti), and the navapuvadhara jāus choddasapuvadhara mentioned (see Bhag. 2, 19). Under the head of all manner of aśerial and heavenly phenomena the eclipses of the moon and sun are referred to.

Under the head of sattanāmē we find a very thoroughgoing account of the seven svara’s interwoven with all sorts of gāthās; under aṭṭhanāmē a similar account of the eight cases (vibhatti), under navanāmē of the nine poetical (kuvva-)rasas. Each of the latter is illustrated by a corresponding gāthā. See Ind. Stud. XVI, 154-58.

The following countries are enumerated under the head of a subspecies of dasanāmē, the khetanāmājāga: Māgaha, Malavā, Sōraṣṭhā, Āravānē, Kuñaka, Kāśā. If the first two of these names recall [31] the pre-eminent position occupied by Magadha and Mālava at one time in India—see Ind. Straflī, 1, 300, 34, the two following names refer par excellence to Jainism. That the list is limited to these six names, whereas in āṅgā 5 it embraced 16 and 25; in upānga 4, is a feature of significance which is probably based upon genuine knowledge of the facts. The list in āṅgā 5 and in upānga 4 has no secular a foundation than that of a stereotyped literary tradition.

In another of these subdivisions, the thavanāpamanē, which contains a discussion of the seven kinds of formation of names, we find an enumeration of the 28 nakkhattras, still begin-

---

* Thus saṁhī: āgamaṇaḥ... padmāṇi payhīsā, lōvīṇaḥ... tē atra tē 'tra, patē atra paṭa 'tra, payatī... agra ētāu, pārē ēma, dālē ētē, mālē ētī, vikrētāṇa... dāmaṣaya agraṇa dāmaṣyaṁ, sā āgata aṅkata, dādens iha ha dāhdaśa, naḍha haḥ naḥ dāhdaśa, māṇḍhu uḍaśa māṇḍhdaśa, vadhā (I) ūhāṭe vadhūhātē—then, after mentioning the five classes of words, the examples to illustrate them are given in Sanskrit: atra itī nāmaṁkaḥ, khalv itī naip, dhāvati 'ty akhye, para 'ty uṇ, nasṣaya iti niṃrah.

* abbha ya abharukkha saṁhī gaṇadahavanagav ya ukka vayā dikṣābhā vijjī guṇijā naṅgāya jāva, jākkhaliṭa (yakṣastakakā, naḥḥāyamāṇaṇaṇiṣṭhaḥ) dhūma viḥā naḥāḥ (dūmākā mahākā) naṅgāya (raja-udghāṭaḥ, rajāvālī dīśaḥ) chandāvāraśā sūrvarāśa chandāparivāra śrūpa paṭheṣṭaḥṣāya paṣṭā, indā, dhāṇya, uḍāmaḥ (muṣṭāya, indrāhaṁkaraḥ) kharhāya (mukhāṣṭvaḥ, ahamahāntiḥ) vikūrva (vāpikṣāya ahasaḥ naḥvasa jvālabhīma-gasāta ṣāḍaṃ) amūhī (amoghaḥ sūryabhūtāḥ adhaḥ kahādhipa upalabāyamāṇaṇaṇaṇiṣṭhaḥ) kharhāya (vāpikṣāya ahasaḥ naḥvasa jvālabhīma-gasāta ṣāḍaṃ).

* See my treatise on the Pratijñādīśaṁ, pp. 109, 110.

ing with krittikā, though with their secondary titles (pussa, jethā, mūla, savana, dhanīthā, bhaddavāya). Cf. Ind. Stud. X 225, 16, 225, 418. The patronymic formation of eight different names, one for each born under a definite nakshatra, is here specially treated of and also the names in: dīnā, dhamma, samma, (śarman), dēva, dāsa, sēna, rakkhī,9 thus e.g., kattia, kattiddhama, kattisamma etc. Furthermore the patronymics from the names of each of their 28 divinities;10 thus aggi, aggidi, aggidihamma etc. All this proves εὑρετεία that this kind of names was very popular at the date of the composition of the text itself, or rather at the date of its sources.

This is for the latter a [32] factor of synchronistical importance (see p. 40) since these nakshatra names appear to have been exceedingly popular at the period of the grihyasātras, and even of Pānini. See my treatise on the nakshatra 2, 317 fg. As examples of patronymic kula-names Ikkhāgā (Aikshvāka), Nayē (the kuṇām of Mahāvīra) and Kūravē are cited. The following appear as pāṇḍu in the same connection: samaś pāṇḍuśaingē, bhikkī kāvalī, tvāsē and parīvāśā, s. Bhag. 2, 315. The scholiast explains bhikkī by Bhuddharāsanārika and on the other hand asserts that there is a five-fold division of samaśa: niggāntha-Sakka (Sīkāya)-tāvasa-gērāya ājīvā with which Abhayadēva too is acquainted (see p. 281). He connects the pāṇḍurānya with the naiyāyika. (But cf. above, p. 26.)

Under the head of bhavapamaṇa, as a species of pāṃśubhāmaṇa, the composition of words is first treated of. There are seven forms of this, the examples of the first form being given (see pp. 29, 30 in Sanskrit, 39: — 1. dādu, examples: daṭṭhē cha osihum cha damatoshhau, stanau cha udaram cha stāndaram, .. vastrapārna, .. asvamahishau, .. ahinakula, 2. bahunvihi, 3. kammadhārava, 4. digu, 5. tappuri, 6. avavyēhava, and — 7. ākāsē, the plural as a collection of several units (there is no dual). The eight-fold taddhitas follow the compounds: kaman 1 siippa 2 sīlō 3 sanjōya 4 samidva 5 a sanjōhē 6 iissarā 7 vachchēga 8 ya taddhitanaṇa tu athavahitām.

It is peculiar that among these examples there are almost as many of primary as of secondary formation and in fact [33] even compounds.11 The commentary explains this peculiarity, which is to be ascribed to actual ignorance (cf. the wilful blunder, p. 30) as follows: — iha taddhitasadbūna taddhitapratihētahūtuḥ ṛṭhe grihītā, tātu yatrā 'pi tūnne āhṛtuvē ity-ādau taddhitapratayā adhāyētatē tatrā 'pi taddhitabhātārtha āyānātavāri taddhitātva (perhaps merely taddhitātva) siddhām bhavatī.

It is especially interesting that here sanjōha, sanjōthā are explained by the scholiast as grāntharachanā, so that the examples cited in the text are to be regarded as titles of literary compositions: — Tarāṅgavati, Malayavati, Satēnusatīthi (attā) and Bīmudū are such names! dhātē is said by the text to be the third group of bhavapamaṇa. It is explained in Sanskrit in the following most singular fashion: — bhu sattāyān parasambhāhi, odha vṛiddhau, spardha sanharshē, gāthā pratishthālsapayā grāntthē cha, bādhī āldanē, sēttēmā dhātē. This is nothing more than the title of Pānini's chālupātha; see Westergaard Rādices, p. 344. The fourth group, niruttē, enumerate in Sanskrit a large number of very peculiar etymologies: mahīyēn śētē mahīshē, bhramati cha rānti cha bhramarāh, [34] mūhar mahūr lasati mussels, kapiriva lañvatē thach (v. l. are ghatti, bēti, sheti) cha karīti (patati cha is added by BC) kapitthēm, chid iti karīti khalīn cha bhavati chikkallān, ardhhavarkāṅśa12 ulīkah, khasya mālā mekhālā.

9 The names in "bhūtī, cf. Ḫālda, Aggi, Vāyu," are omitted strangely enough.
10 ahi bādhya appears here as vīvaddhi (!), cf. vīvaddhi in nāga 3 (p. 265); both are forms which are much more corrupted than the abhivaddhi ("vṛddhā") of the Sṛṣṭrapajnopati, see Ind. Stud. 10, 295.
11 On 1 tapahārē etc., — on 2 vātē, tānē, vātavē etc., — on 3 samātē, māhātē, — on 4 rāma samāraśā, — on 5 gīrīsā samvērī nagham gīrīsaraṇaṁ, Bādē s. n. Bāsāmī, — on 6 Tārāṅgavālikā (in BR iliavkātā khērē), Malayavatī vai BR)khērē, sattē (attē BR)nasuttikārē, bhīmikārē (cf. dharmani bhīmaśīrī, p. 457), — on 7 kārē stāvērē mājāhē .. — on 8 arāhantīmāyā, chakkavatīmāyā, Bāladeshmāyā, Vāśādēvamāyā.
12 ardhhavarkā . . . omitted in R.
Under the head of pamaṇa, that is divided into dāvā, khetta, kāla and bhāva, the measures of space, length of liquids, time and dry measures are treated of in extenso. There are frequent citations of lengthy passages of antique colouring, which deal in the form of a dialogue with the instruction of Goyama (by Mahāvira) on this point. A very minute doctrine of atoms is also found here, see Bhavav. 2, 29. The enumeration of the measures of time is similar to that in the kalasūpavali, above page 29, the progression by 84’s beginning three gradations after the quinquennial yuga. In the discussion on paliōvamā (palyōpama) we find inserted a lengthy passage from the Pannavāpa (thiipasa) in reference to the duration of the continuance of creatures in their different gradations. This insertion is given in full in some MSS., in others the beginning and conclusion above are given, it being stated that it is a citation from the Pann. Not much farther on a question is introduced in the following fashion which does not seem original—tathā pān chōdā (chōdakā, prēca kā, prīchahakā) pannavāyama (ācārya) evam vaṣāya, and then follow questions and answers in the usual way introduced by atthi paṇa... and haṁta aththi. Later on [35] comes the dialogue between Goyama (and Mahāvira), clad in old form which is probably caused by citations.

Under the head of gunappamāna, the first group of the bhāvappam, the ṃaṅgupam. is said to be four-fold: pachchakkhā, aqmā, uvaṁā, and āgamā. The last is divided into lāyā and lūttarī. To the lāyā is ascribed everything that is annaṁśhāḥ michchhadīthāḥ śhācchāndabuddhīmatvagaviyām: tām jahā: Bhārshaṁ Rāmāyapaṁ jāva (BCR, evaṁ A) chattārī a vēda saṁgaṁvaṁga. Here we have a reference to an earlier enumeration. See above, pp. 9, 28. We find that jam imām arshaṁśhiṁ bhagavatāṁśhiṁ savadārāṁśiṁ paṁsaṁ duvala. saṁgaṁ gaṇpiṣayaṁ, tām: ayārā jāva diṭṭhiṁva is considered to be lūttarī. There are, however, other divisions of the lūttarī, thus, those into suttā, āthā and ātuṁva, or into āthā, āpānārā and paraṁparā original doctrine, doctrine that has been directly received, and traditional doctrine (see p. 216). The charitāngamappamāna is said to be five-fold, sāmkacar, chhādōvatṭhaṇaḥcār, (AC, merely cītha BA etc), and the sāmācār. two-fold: itariā and arakāśī; s. Anapo. pp. 38, 41, and Leumann in the Gloss. According to Leumann’s communication this division goes back as far as Bhavav. 8, 2, 25, 7. Is this the reason of the name of the chhādūsūtaṇa? Under nayapamāna three diṭṭhiṁvaṇa, examples, are discussed in detail; in these an “avamollāṭhā nāgamā” is carried on from the general to the particular, or to the visuddharaṭa etc., and finally an advance made to the visuddhā. In this section Pājālaputta appears as the residence of the person who is questioned (Dvěddattā, Skr., not ‘dinnā’, [38] and as situated in the dhiśaṇḍha of the Bhārsha khetra. Under the head of paramāpamānaṁ (yā) the kāliṇapamāna, is contrasted with the diṭṭhiṁvaṇa. The point treated of is their mutual division into, and enumeration of

14 Where uddhaṁva is to be translated by adhavaṇa, saṇha, usamaṇa by ālakhanaḍalakṣipīkā, uccalbhikhaṇa: saṇha can also be for sūkha; see Hem. 1, 18, where, however, we have abhā bhūmā. Ct. 2,75? Hāla. 732.

15 While correcting the proof Leumann informs me of its occurrence in the Nandī, Nas. p. 335. It is also found in the Śrī, niḥi, see p. 69.

16 I notice in passing that the example given on Hem. 2, 150, i.e. Mahura viva Pājaliutta pāṭhā is in agreement with the examples in question found in the Mahābhāṣya. See Ind. 13, 390. Is this a case of direct borrowing? See above p. 33. Mathūrā does not play any great part among the Jains, but see the special statements in the beginning of the Vīcharāṁvitasāhasyāḥ in reference to a Māthuri vīcharana (Skandābhayaḥ abhimāṇa).

17 Likewise in Avāśy. 8, 40 (below p. 61); i.e. quite another terminology than that in N. (p. 11) and in the beginning of the An. itself (p. 21), where kāliya is a subdivision of anāgaparīthā, or angābhira.

18 Veda, vēka, perhaps a group of verses? niṣṭhu an explanatory section? anugādha a paragam tara paryāvraḥ paryāvraḥ dharmā iti yāvaṁ, tatrāpū saṁkhyaḥ paryavasānukāyaḥ (the meaning of paryavara here as a preliminary stage of akhaṇa is obscure; per se it is doubleless denotes the different groups of the alphabet), sā cha kālikāraṇaḥ sasattaparyāvāṃśaḥ draṣṭātraḥ, ekalakṣaṇaḥ iṣya skāraḥkakārasaya tadānudhyāyaḥ cha jñāna-śatamah prakhyātām anātāparyāvāṃśaḥ: evam anyatra niḥ bhavannā kāyaḥ: navarāṇaḥ (samākhyaḥ) saṁkhyaḥ saṁghāṭaḥ; sā ṣaṁghāṭiḥ saṁsāraḥ (praṣiddhāttāḥ və saṁkhyaḥ padātī: gāthāḥchathurśaṁśaḥpāṇi saṁkhyaḥ pāṭhāḥ; saṁkhyaḥ vṛṣṭhaḥ; nihākapraṇiṣṭhāṇaḥā-yuktānukarśitaḥkāraṇaḥ śrī vaśyaḥvaśyaḥ. — The division into granthas, or at least this name for the division is not mentioned here. It is really identical with allāpa.
pâyavâ, akkhara, saṅghâya, pada, pâda, gâhâ, sîlôga, vedha, nijjutti, aṣṇuṇâdāra, and from here on the enumeration of the uddâsaṅga, ajhayaña, suukkhaṁdhâ, aṅga in the kâlisuṇa, and of the pâhuda pâhûḍi, pâhûḍapâhûḍi, vattha in the diṭhivâs.

According to the fourth āṅga and Nandi (see p. 354 f. 81), the latter method of division does not belong to the entire diṭhivâs, but merely to the puvvas contained in it; [37] and the evidence of occasional citations made from the puvvas (and found in other works) prove that they were actually so divided. See ibid.

vattavvayâ is then divided into sasamayav (svâ), parasamayav. and sasamayaparasamayav. The scholiast cites as an example of the second a passage from āṅga 2; the source of the one for the third is not stated. Thus the nêgamavaṇavârā, but the nijjusa, explained by piṇ-jucâ ("āru)! āra. the orthodox believer, recognizes only the first two vatt. and of these two the first alone as entitled to authoritiveness.

The athâhâgâra section consists merely of the gathâ: saâvajjajôga, which states the contents (attha) of each of the 6 ajhayaças of the āvâsaya. See p. 24.

Under the head of samâyâra, samavatâra we find for the third time an enumeration of periods of time from ávâlaya to savvaddhâ. See pp. 29, 34. In the second dâra, nikkhêva, the author returns to the sâmâm and describes in several verses the nature of the samaña [38] who possesses the sâmâm. Two of these verses recur in the sâmâyajjhay. of the Ávâs. nijj. 8, 106, 110. See pp. 67, 68. The last section of the nikkhêva, the suttâlavayapiñippanna, is not given in full by the author "for brevity’s sake,” lâghavâttham, since its contents is, he says, contained in the third dâra, the aṣṇagama, which follows thereupon.

This deals particularly with the suttângama and the nijjuti-aṣṇag, which latter is divided into nikkhêvânijj, uvagghâyanijj and suttaphâsinijj (sâtasparâsika) — see p. 36. Of the gathâs cited in it one in part recur in Ávâs. nijj. 9, 66.

Under the head of suttaphâsia, the correct pronunciation of the suttas is treated of. According to the scholiast there are 32 dôsas and 8 (or 6) guṇas, which he discusses at length. The six different means of making oneself certain of the correct understanding of the text are also mentioned; they are: — samihita-form of the text, pada-form, sense of the words, division of the words into component parts, consideration (of objections) and determination (rejection of the objections): saûnîyâ ya payaṁ chêva payasthâ payaviggahô châlañâ ya pasiddhi ya châvviham viiddhi lakkañâm.

[39] The fourth dâram, nê, consists of 6 gathas, of which the first four treat of the seven different forms of nayâ, i.e. method of conception, exegesis; they are: — nêgamâ, saṅgâbha,

---

18 The latter passage reads: dagam âvasanitâ râ ârâpâ vâ pavâlyâ idam darpisam âpanâ avandûkka vimochohaštît tyât; on this the scholiast says: grihasatâbh, ârâyâ vâ tâpasâdaya va pravajitâ cha sûkhyâdaya; idam samâlânân matam âpanâ Mûritâ pavaddûkhâbhûyo vimochohastra ity evam yâd Sûkhyâdaya prati- pâdayastra itd evam parasamayavaktayata, yadâ tu Jainâs tâdâ avasamayavaktayat, tatarä cha "sau avasamayapa rasamayavaktyayata" chyatâ.

19 It reads: sê kîm tâth a sth' rô jô jasâ ajhayaçassa attbh' rô In B, instead of tâth we have sâmâyavana attth'm, and this is doubtless merely an example of how the verse is to be understood: saâvajjajgavigam aâst'bh, ukkisitañâ châhrikhatthastra attbh' etc.; i.e. according to the scholiast: “arthâlikhkkhô dhyyâyan” adâyadâd Árâhâya savvadâsah svatthastra.

20 Is threefold: châinâpphannā nânâni suttâlavayani; châinâ is fourfold: ajhayaçan, ajñhè (akshâpa), kà (tyabh), jivanâ (kharâpâ), nâm cas which are also: sâmâyavanâ kartvâyâ nisârthây esârthâyâ sâmâyâni. See Bhavag. 2, 103.

21 He has probably lost his breath! The following sections are treated in a very fragmentary fashion.

22 kîm kâvibhâva kasa kahaâ kahân kahân kîcmâhâ (kacchâ?!) hauâ kâliâ! kaît saâtractâm vaisrãlsah bhavâ, "gârâs-pheasampi-nivritthâ! sâmâm is to be supplied according to the scholiast. The verse recalls the gusvâ cuv' cuv! contre, simis, pârdjakât, teestes applied in German schools to the analysis of proverbs, etc.

23 The scholiast is here very prolix, though the text is very compact and brief.

24 See on this Harî. on Ávâs. 10, 1 etc.; in an avâchátri on the oñhaniryuktì we read: sakhalitapadoch-čâmaññâ samihiti; padâvibhâgâ padhiti; padâmak arthah padhêthâ; padâvignâhstvâ samihitabhâjî padhiti; châlânâ pûrva-pâkhaññâññâ; pratyayavattânâ nêkâmpañśa svapakhaññâ apâjan.
vahārāḥ, uṣasāḥ saddē, samabhūdāḥ, ēvaṁbhūtē. The scholiast says that they are named thus in reference to their connection with the sāṃyikādhyayananam as the background of the entire work. Verse 5 gives a general definition of the word nāya. Verse 6 makes known the fact that the śūna, sādhu, must hear all its forms with their manifold methods of representation, be purified by this means, and thus remain constant in his (correct) course of action. This concluding verse 6 thus refers directly to the sāṃyikam, even if it does not mention it by name. It was quite necessary that here at the close some regard be had for the sāṃāya; the remaining part of the work refers to it but little.

I have collected on Bhag. 1, 373, fr. some of the data regarding its age that can be extracted from the contests of the Anuyogadva. To the arguments that have been mentioned others may be added. In the forefront is the direct connection of the work with the grammatical Sanskrit literature, especially the citation of the beginning of Pāṇini’s Bhātupātha. Next the information of a definite nature concerning the other literatures, Brahmica, etc., of that period. The nine kavravasas point to a highly developed system of rhetoric, and the gathas cited therein demonstrate the existence of a rich Prākrit poetry after the fashion of the verses in Hāla’s sapasatatakam. The names cited in the formation of taddhitas are perhaps to be regarded as titles of dramas (cf. niṣadākṣi at the end of the loya works) or [40] of romances. See p. 380. Bādaretam (but not Mahābh.) and Rāmāyaṇam are mentioned three times in conjunction and undoubtedly were held in high esteem at that period. See my treatise on the Rām. p. 34. The contrast instilled between kāliṃ saṃ and diṭṭhīvāsa is of importance to Jain literature. At the date of this work and at that of the Nandi, see above, p. 11, there existed a work, consisting of six ajhayaṇas, on the six śavayakas, the first of which is said to form the foundation of the Anuy., though no evidence can be drawn from the Anuy, itself to prove this assertion. Another fact that savours of antiquity is the special emphasis laid on the formation of the names of persons by means of the names of the nakshatras or of their divinities. The first nakshatra names appear in the old kritika series, though no longer in their ancient form; and the names of the divinities are very much corrupted. The significance of the names Chāṇi, Sīraṭha and Mahāyāṇa, and those of the different pāsaṇas, or of each of the divinities honoured by them, must not be overlooked.

There is a commentary by Hōmachandrasūri, scholar of Abhayadevasūri.27

[41] The conclusion is formed by

G. — The four mūlasūtras.

I have as yet not been able to make out the significance of this title,28 which has come to light only in quite modern times in connection with these texts. In the second mūlaśūtra the expression mūlaśūtragāthā (see p. 54) occurs (see scholiast on Āraśya, nijj. 11, n.) though it is there probably used in contrast to the gāthā of the nijjuti; so that mūlaśūtra would mean nothing more than sūtra (see tād. on 11, 39), i. e. the original to which the nijjuti belongs.

The three texts bearing the same mūlaśūtra which I have before me (the fourth I do not possess) have in reality no sūtra form at all, but are almost entirely in metre; mūlaś. 1 and 3 in the ancient style (see p. 233, 239), especially in ślokas; the nijj. on 2 is in gāthās.

They make the impression of being analogous to parisēthas rather than sūtras. The mūlas., which is No. 2 in Bühler’s list, has not been preserved in its sūtra form at all, only its

26 As a matter of fact such names are not often found in the Siddhānta. The following examples, however, belong here: — śākā, Aggadatta, Śūnadhata, Pāsamaṭṭa, Thagutta, Sīlabadda; cf. also Rāvalnakahatta (above p. 7). It is surprising that the form in “bhūḥ is omitted, a form which is specially attested as occurring in Mahāvira’s time. Cf. also Pusakabhūti, Śīva”. See Mahībh. on Paś. 9, 1, 107 (Ind. Stud. 4, 311) on the common name of Agniḥbhūti.

27 Other predecessors are Muniśundaśarāṭi, Virādāvī and Jayasikhaḥ; the gaccha is śrī Harshapurīya, the kulam that of śrī Praśnapāthana. The well-known Hōmachandra is, therefore, not referred to, and the above-mentioned Abhayadeva is doubtless not the navagītrītikārī. Cf. pp. 273-7.

28 Does it perhaps refer to the 5 mūlagunas (Āraśya, 20, 6-9).
nijjutti being extant. The title of the fourth múlas, expressly declares it to be a nijj.; and since both the others have essentially the same form, it is not an improbable conjecture to regard these too as nijjuttis to a sūtram of like name. On the other hand, however, special nijjuttis on each are cited by the scholiast, and these nijj. appear to be still extant. Of this kind are probably the two texts which the author of the Ávasya. [42] nijj. 2, s declares that he composed on dasakālāṁ and uttarajjīvā.

The prose portions found here have in places the old introductory formula: sūyam mé śāsanā...; and the concluding formula of each of the ajjā. (and addes.) of múlas. 1 and 3: tibemī gives us an impression of their antiquity. Furthermore, the titles of all the 36 chapters of the first múlas. are enumerated in the fourth aṅga, § 36 - hence this múlas. with essentially the same contents must have existed at the date of aṅga 4. It appears to be cited also in the Kalpasūtra. In N. (above p. 11 fg.) we find only the three titles of the múlasūtras I have before me; the name of the fourth is omitted, and the title of the second plays there, as in the Anuyogadv. (above pp. 11, 22 fg.), a very prominent part.

A very ancient author is quoted for the third múlasūtra; and a single chapter (14) of the Áv. nijj. is ascribed to a definite author, although the author of the Áv. nijj. himself says, in the beginning of chap. 2, that he is author of a large number of nijjuttis on the most different parts of the Siddhānta, especially on several chādasūtras, and, as already mentioned, on múlas. 1 and 3. The Ávasya. nijj. contains, therefore, a large amount of authoritative data in reference to the date of its composition.

The contents of all three texts belongs to the sphere of the vinayapāthaka. The Nom. Sg. Masc. of the 1 Decl. ends generally in o, but chiefly in e in the few prose sections; but both forms are found together occasionally, and in fact even in the same verse.

[43] The extent of múlas. 1 is stated to be 2065 gr., that of 2 or its nijj. 2550, that of 3, 700 gr. The author of the commentary on 2 is said to have died Vīra 1055.

XLIII. First múlasūtra, the uttarajjhaṇyam, in 36 ajjhyanas. The names of these ajjah, which are cited (see page 280) in aṅga 4, § 36, are identical with those in the MSS, with but a few exceptions. By the chadhās (cha apuṭhāvārāṇāṁ, mentioned in the Kalpasūtra. § 147, we must understand the Utaraṅga. according to the scholiast (Kalpaṭāta). See Jacobi, p. 114. The correctness of this number (36) is corroborated by the concluding verse of the work itself. Haribhadra, on Ávasya, 8, 54, explains the isibhāsātā, mentioned there by uttarajjhaṇyādhi, and ibid. 2, 5 both isibhāsā and uttarajjhaṇā appear in conjunction in the text. The scholiast on Nandī explains (see p. 13 n.) the name uttarā by the sarvēbhāṁ adhyayānāṁ pradhānāṅgavāṁ which belongs to this work. The author of the Ávasyakanījī, states (2, 5) that he is also author of a nijj. on the Uttarajjīvā.

With the exception of chap. 29 and the beginning of 2 and 16 which three chapters commence with the formula: — sūyam mé śāsanā teṣāṁ bhagavāya evam akkhāyaṁ (or t. bh. Mahāvīrēśvarī Kāśvālī et al.), the text is composed in metre and principally ślokās, though there is an admixture of gathās, śrisattbh, etc. The contents consist of direct ordinances in reference to a correct course of life, especially of the clergy, [44] and of recitals and parables illustrative of this life. Much of the contents makes upon us the impression of great antiquity and recalls similar Buddhistic texts and especially aṅga 2.

On this múlas. we have a very detailed commentary, śishyāhita, by Śāntisūrya (Śāntīṣṭhārya) in which frequent reference is paid to a nijjutti belonging to the text. [41] See pp. 41, 43.

28 So also the anya in the Vihārapāṇi; see pp. 499, 490.
29 The metre is often very much out of order, as in almost all metrical parts of the Siddhānta.
31 In a palm-leaf MS., dating itself 1307 (A. D. 1541) the 3 appears to me to be for an original 5; in which case the date would be 1507 (A. D. 1541). According to Jacobi, p. 9, the commentary of Dēvēndrārga, which was composed Satīvā. 1179 (A. D. 1323), is based upon that of Śāntisūrya.
1. vinyasyauryajñhāyānaṁ, 48 vv. begins: saṃjñogavippamukkass aṣṭāmānā bhiṣkhuṇāṁ vinayaṁ pāṭkariṣṭaṁ viṇapuro viṇupuṣṭaṁ suṇghaṁ mē. The word buddha appears to be here and frequently elsewhere in the work, an honorific title of the teacher’s (vv. 7, 8); cf. p. 287 (aṅga 2).

2. parīṣadvajjaṁ, 46 vv. with a prose beginning, which enumerates how the 22 parīṣadas has: saṃānānā bhaṭavāya Naḥāvānā kaśāvānā pāṭvāya. In the metrical portion the first person is used: parīṣadānā pavibhāttitā kaśāvānā pāṭvāya taṁ bhe udāharīṣīśiṁ ṛṇapuro viṇupuṣṭaṁ suṇghanāṁ mē. 11

3. chaśrīṇjanī, "gīyauṁ in S,23 chaś(rost)gījanī ṇ V, 20 vv.; of the mūnauhvatādi. In the commentary on v. 9 we find particular statements in reference to the seven schisms.

4. saṃakṣiptaṁ, pamanāppamānaṁ rā V, 13 vv. Of pramādāpramāda (cf. No. 10 in the anaṅgapavīṭha list of N., above p. 11), and of the apramāda, maraṇakāle pī.

[45] 5. akāmamaraṇaṇaṁ, 19 vv.; of the pāṇḍitamarāṇaṁ.

6. kuhdāga-niyamaṇhājanī (cf. chap. 20), saranaviyopīl S, 18 vv. Of the vidyākaraṇaṁ-vikalpa of the virata. Its appellation in S is very different though the name there suits the present contents very well.

7. "laijaiṁ (so also V; of ējāka); urā(b)bhiyauṁ S and unabhhi also here in C, in an enumeration of the chapters which is added to the close of this MS. only: 30 vv.; urabhṛdīdravāntiānāṁ, resp. rasagṛddhiṁtyāuṁ.


10. dūmapatthauṁ, dūmapatatthāṁ, 37 vv.; apramādārtham upamādvārēgaṇī naśāsanāṁ. Instruction addressed to Gāyāma. It closes thus: — buddhasa nissīma bhāsiyaṁ i sukhaṁ attapahāpaśoṁyauṁ rāgāṁ dōsaṁ cha chhiṁdiyaṁ i siddhiṁyauṁ gē Gōyama tī běmī 11. 37 11

11. bahussuyapījauṁ ("puvauṁ ṇ), bahussutatīpūjauṁ, 32 vv. — In v. 1 the refrain of l. 1. 2, 1: pāṭkariṣṭaṁ, ṛṇapuro viṇupuṣṭaṁ mē.

12. Harikīṣaijauṁ (Harīsauṁ V), 47 vv. Of the tapāsasamārdhi of Hāriṣabala. The stories belonging here and also to the following chapters are related in detail in the commentary.


14. Usārījauṁ, Iṣhacārīyanā, 55 vv.; of the nirnīdānātāgupā; pūre purāṇī Isagāra nāmē (i. e. not as Ind. St. 2, ss).


16. bāṃbhaĉeṃrasaṃbhūṭhiṣṇau, bāṃbhaguttī C, samāḥbhīṭḥau S. First an enumeration of the ten bhāmbhācchresas of the bhikkhu in prose, then 17 silūgas. Of the brāhmaṇaḥcaryagupti.

17. pāvasamaṇiṇjauṁ, pāpasramaṇiṇjauṁ, 21 vv. Of the pāpasramaṇaṣavarpāṇā, and of the pāpasavarnaṇā. Verses 3 to 19 close with the refrain: pāvasamaṇi tī vuchehaī.

18. Saṃjaḷījanā, Saṃjjāyauṁ,34 54 vv. Of the bhogaṛddhiṁtyau. Kūṇpillē nāyārāyā u dinambalapavāhuṛaṇāmā nāma mācaṁvinā (māgaṛvām) uvāçgja 11

19. Miyāuputiyaṇau, Miyājījauṁ V, Miyacharīta (or Miyācharīta) S, 97 vv. Of the niḥprati-karitaū, and of Miyāputa, son of king Balabuddha and of Miyā; Suggivī nāyayā.
There once lived a man with his wife and three sons, and when the sons came to be of a suitable age, the parents got them married. The wives of the two elder sons, having also attained puberty, came and lived with their husbands, but the wife of the third son, who was himself very young, being still too small, of course remained at her father's house.

Several years passed and the father died. The two elder brothers took to their father's profession, cultivation, and the youngest, not being old enough to do any manual work, was told by his brothers to take the cattle out for grazing and such-like light work.

Now it happened that his wife, being now twelve years old, had attained puberty, and was in the habit of going to a well to draw water, where she used to see a shepherd, and, calling out to him, would sing:

"Aiśa na re, tik na re māhījā maṃgāvālā dādā re,
Aurā māhā, aurā re nīśā ṣāg māhī jāvandāṃ bhārtirdā re;---
Tiṭi na re ṛambhā na khāṭī kēlī saśi re,
Kēl saśi na nīnārā rasā ālī re.
Bagīṭi re, bagīṭi pāchā sadā tiṭi na re, vāṭṭā re,4
Nāhīn te na lāvālā dūrīahā na pāṭṭā re."

Listen, O listen, brother shepherd,
These words of mine; this message tell to my beloved husband:
Your wife has grown up like a plantain-tree,
Like a plantain-tree, and like a lime she is full of juice.
She will wait, she will wait for you for five days,
Otherwise she will marry another.'

For three or four days she said the same thing to the shepherd, and the shepherd used to deliver her message to her husband, whom he happened to meet on the pasture ground. Three days had passed, and on the fourth the cowherd asked his mother to let him go and fetch his wife. It happened also that his two elder brothers had gone to another country to trade. So his mother said to him:—"Wait, my son, till your brothers come back, and then you can go with them and fetch your wife home."

The cowherd, however, would not listen to his mother's advice, for who could tell when his brothers would return, and he knew that if he did not go soon, in one day more his wife would take to herself another husband. So on the fifth day, instead of resting and taking his cattle to graze as usual, he would not leave his bed. His mother saw him still asleep; so she sang:

"Uṣṭā na re, ut māhījā jāvandā grūnāvālā rē,
Tiṭi na re dhāranā na gūrāna gōṭṭā gōṭṭā bāndali rē."
Rise, O rise, my beloved cowherd,
Your cattle are still tied up in every stall.

Then the cowherd, who was awake, thus sang to his mother:

"Sṛdhauṛ gē, sṛdh aṭā, dāvī lāvāvīh vanātā gē."
Unfasten, O unfasten, and let them loose in the forest.

1 [This quaint version of the "Taming of the Shrew" belongs to the "singing" class of tales very common in the Paśjāb, and there always associated, so far as I know, with the Basālī Cycle. This tale then is very important as evidence of what I have long suspected, that the incidents of the Basālī Cycle are common to all Northern India. Thus we now know that a "singing" tale of a type identical with those of that Cycle is current among the Salssett Christians without ascription to any particular hero. — Ed.]
2 Ṛambhā is one that is an adept in singing.
3 lit., victorious.
4 lit., I will see, will see for five days your road.
His mother unfastened the cattle from the stalls and drove them towards the forest, but she and her sisters-in-law wondered what was the matter with him. They asked each other if any one of them had said or done anything to annoy him, but all pleaded ignorance. And his mother, thinking perhaps he was sick, called out her eldest daughter-in-law, and sang:

"Áká na gë, áká na máńje mhojë na sínë gë,
Lâvâ na gë, lâvâ na sínë gavštându chávia gë;
Kârávia gë, kârá na sínë vakhândchia sánë gë,
Parâtvia gë, parâtv sínë džhôndiâ sándiâ gë,
Pâsvia gë, pâsv na sínë tâjë jásvanâ dîrâ gë."

Listen, O listen, my eldest daughter-in-law,
Put, O put, daughter-in-law, keys to the drawers;
Take out, O take out, daughter-in-law, ingredients for medicine,
Grind, O grind them, daughter-in-law, on the stone mortar,
Give to drink, O give to drink, daughter-in-law, to your beloved brother-in-law.

When the cowherd heard what his mother had said to his sister-in-law, he sang in answer:

"Dâkatê gë, dâketë die tâmchë mhojë na sînëchau pôsța gë."

Is aching, is aching, mother, your eldest daughter-in-law’s stomach?

By this he meant, of course, to tell his mother that he had no need of the medicine, which she had told her daughter-in-law to give him, but that his sister-in-law herself wanted it. His mother, however, did not understand the drift of what he said, and thinking perhaps that he did not like to take the medicine out of his eldest sister-in-law’s hand, she called out to her second daughter-in-law, and thus sang to her:

"Áká na gë, áká na máńje madojë na sínë gë,
Lâvâ na gë, lâvâ na sínë gavštându chávia gë;
Kârávia gë, kârá na sínë vakhândchia sánë gë,
Parâtvia gë, parâtv sínë džhôndiâ sándiâ gë,
Pâsvia gë, pâsv na sínë tâjë jásvanâ dîrâ gë."

Listen, O listen, my second daughter-in-law,
Put, O put, daughter-in-law, keys to the drawers;
Take out, O take out, daughter-in-law, ingredients for medicine,
Grind, O grind them, daughter-in-law, on the stone mortar,
Give to drink, O give to drink, daughter-in-law, to your beloved brother-in-law.

When his mother had done singing to her second daughter-in-law to give the boy medicine-the cowherd, still in bed, thus sang to his mother:

"Dâkatê gë, dâketë die tâmchë madojë sînëchau pôsța gë."

Is aching, is aching, mother, your second daughter-in-law’s stomach?

His mother now thought that he would not take any medicine even from his second sister, in-law, and so she said nothing. A little while afterwards the cowherd arose, and dressing himself very shabbily, took a horse from the stable, and took the road to his wife’s house; though he had never seen his wife, much less her house. He thought, however, that the shepherd, who used to bring her message to him, would guide him there, and so he went on and on. On his way he came upon his sister’s house, when his sister, seeing him dressed so shabbily, asked him what was the matter with him and where he was going. He told her how for two or three days successively he had received a message from his wife, and that he was going to fetch her home.

* Lit., Middle; but second is meant.
"But," said she, "how will you find out your wife's house? And how will you know her? You have never seen her before!"

"I will go," he answered, "and wait for the shepherd, who will surely guide me."

His sister then said to him:—"Don't do so. Take these few stones with you. When your wife comes to the well and sings to the shepherd, you will know her; and when she has filled her pitcher and is about to lift it up on her head, throw one of these stones at the pitcher, which will then charm, so that she will be unable to carry it!"

The cowherd took the stones, and riding his horse went away. As he went along he came upon the well and there saw a young woman drawing water, and suspecting that it must be his wife he waited there. Soon afterwards he saw the shepherd driving his sheep to the pasture-ground. When the woman saw the shepherd, she sang:

"Āikā na ré, āk na ré máńjá māndēvāla dādā ré,
Aurā máńjá, aurā ré nīrap sāng máńjā jāswāntā bharīdē ré:
'Tūjē na ré rambā na shāhī ēlē saśi ré,
Kēl saśi na mīranā rādā ākē ré,
Bagātē ré, bagātē pāchā dīśē tūjē na ré vāṭṭū ré,
Nākēn tē na lāvīlā dīskāsā na pāṭṭū ré.'"

Listen, O listen, brother shepherd,
These words of mine; this message tell to my beloved husband:

"Your wife has grown up like a plantain-tree,
Like a plantain-tree, and like a lime she is full of juice.
She will wait, she will wait for you for five days,
Otherwise she will marry another.'"

The shepherd listened to her, and promising to deliver her message, went away again, as he had not seen the cowherd. The cowherd now made sure that the young woman was his wife, and waited till she had filled her pitcher, and when she was about to carry it, he hit it with one of the stones given him by his sister. As soon as the stone struck the pitcher, his wife was unable to lift it up. She tried all her strength, but to no avail; the pitcher was as if fixed in the ground. She looked about to see if there was any one about the place, whom she might call to help her, and saw the cowherd on horse-back, and as she, too, had not seen him before, she did not recognise him as her husband. She therefore thus sang to him:

"Eśi na ré, ēh na ré máńjá gāośēvalā dādā ré."
Come, O come, my brother groom.

But the cowherd answered:

"Pālā Háti lāvin na gé tājhē sāhīlādānā gé,
Amī ēōrā Háti lāvin na gé ghāgarālā gé."
One hand I will place upon your breasts,
And with the other I will lift up the pitcher.

Upon this the wife sang to herself, addressing her mother:

"Sādāchān kānān na ēō, sādāchān na pīnān gé,
Sādāchān ghāgar na ēō, sādāchān na chāmīlān gé,
Ākā[n] māńjā kārū kōnīrī khālān gé?"
My usual food, mother, and my usual drink,
My usual pitcher, mother, and my usual pad,
Where is my strength gone to-day?

* Lēi, who has eaten my strength to-day?
She made another attempt to lift up the pitcher, but in vain; so she again beckoned to the supposed groom to come and help her, singing:

"Déhí na ré, éh na ré mányjá ghorévdú dáddá ré.
Come, O come, my brother groom.

But the cowherd sang as before:

"Fáltá käá lágún na gé táyá khóbalánán gě,
Añt dúrrá käá lágún na gé gágvarúd gě."
One hand I will place upon your breasts,
And with the other I will lift up the pitcher.

The poor woman had now no alternative, but to allow him to place one hand on her breasts. So he came, and having first placed one hand on her breasts, he only touched the pitcher with the other, and she was enabled to carry it as she would a feather. Taking up her pitcher she went to her house, our hero following her. His wife, however, did not like this; so she shut the door against him. And then he sang:

"Úgará gě, úgar rambhá darbájáchá khílá gě.
Añlái na, añlái t̄úd jásvantú bhartárú gě."
Open, O open, wife, the bolts of the door.
Is come, is come, your beloved husband.

But the wife thinking he was only a groom, who had followed her with evil intentions, paid no heed to what he said, and hurled at him abuse in the following strain:

"Mánjé na ré jásvantú gónúndíachá kútarú náhín sássáil."
You are not worthy of being my beloved cowherd’s dog.

But our hero paid no attention to the abuse, and repeated his entreaties to his wife:

"Úgará gě, úgar rambhá darbájáchá khílá gě.
Añlái na, añlái t̄úd jásvantú bhartárú gě."
Open, O open, wife, the bolts of the door.
Is come, is come, your beloved husband.

The girl, however, would not open the door, and continued to abuse him, singing:

"Mánjé na ré jásvantú gónúndíachá d̄ékar náhín sássáil."
You are not worthy of being my beloved cowherd’s pig.

Still the cowherd did not mind his wife’s abuse, but sang:

"Úgará gě, úgar rambhá darbájáchá khílá gě.
Añlái na, añlái t̄úd jásvantú bhartárú gě."
Open, O open, wife, the bolts of the door.
Is come, is come, your beloved husband.

But still the girl could not be persuaded to believe that the youth was really her husband, and therefore sang:

"Mánjé na ré jásvantú gónúndíachá máñvar náhín sássáil."
You are not worthy of being my beloved cowherd’s cat.

For the third time the cowherd bore the abuse patiently, and for the third time he entreated her to open the door for him, singing:

"Úgará gě, úgar rambhá darbájáchá khílá gě.
Añlái na, añlái t̄úd jásvantú bhartárú gě."
Open, O open, wife, the bolts of the door.
Is come, is come your beloved husband.
Thus they kept on for some time, one begging for the opening of the door, and the other abusing him instead, till the girl's parents, who had gone out, came in and recognising their son-in-law, took him into the house, introducing him to their daughter as her husband, and entertaining him as a son-in-law.

The day passed and in the evening, as there was no spare sleeping-room for them, the wife asked her sister-in-law to spare her room for them for the night, singing:

"Diaca na gê, diaca kôniad tûmchâ kâmbarâ gê.
Diaca na gê kusniad tômchâ kâmbarâ gê."  
Give, O give, sister-in-law, your room.
Give, O sister-in-law, your room.

Her sister-in-law willingly gave up her room to them for the night, and having taken their supper they went to bed. On the following morning, while she was still in bed, the cowherd's wife sang to her mother:

"Nâhîn na gê, nâhîn âî kômala mâyânchâ na môgarân gê! 
Nâhîn na gê, nâhîn âî pûsâl môlînchâ hûsîla gê! 
Nâhîn na gê, nâhîn âî vânkharî mâyîchî na sîna gê!"
Not faded, not faded, mother, the jessamine from my hair!
Nor rubbed off, nor rubbed off, mother, the lamp-black from my eyes!
Nor dishevelled, nor dishevelled, mother, my hair!

To which her mother sang in reply:

"Tô tê na gê, tô tê dûhî âîlî lângalâ bhûgalâ gê.
Tô tê hî dûhî lâjêchâ na kômbarâ gê."
He has come, he has come, daughter, knocked up and tired.
He is, daughter, a shy cook.

They then arose and another day passed, and in the evening, the cowherd's wife asked her aunt to spare her room for them for the night. She sang:

"Diaca na gê, diaca kôlî tûmchâ kâmbarâ gê.
Diaca na gê kusul tômchâ kâmbarâ gê."  
Give, O give, aunt, your room.
Give, O aunt, your room.

Her aunt also gave up her room with the greatest pleasure, and when the night had come they took their supper and went to bed. Next morning, when she awoke, the cowherd's wife sang to her mother:

"Nâhîn na gê, nâhîn âî kômala mâyânchâ na môgarân gê! 
Nâhîn na gê, nâhîn âî pûsâl môlînchâ hûsîla gê! 
Nâhîn na gê, nâhîn âî vânkharî mâyîchî na sîna gê!"
Not faded, not faded, mother, the jessamine from my hair!
Nor rubbed off, nor rubbed off, mother, the lamp-black from my eyes!
Nor dishevelled, nor dishevelled, mother, my hair!

And her mother again sang to her:

"Tô tê na gê, tô tê dûhî âîlî lângalâ bhûgalâ gê.
Tô tê hî dûhî lâjêchâ na kômbarâ gê."
He has come, he has come, daughter, knocked up and tired.
He is, daughter, a shy cook.

When they awoke the following morning, the cowherd told his father- and mother-in-law that he wished to go home, and to take his wife with him. They had, of course, no objection,
and the mother made her daughter dress for the journey. While she was combing the girl's hair and putting on her a new rich sāṟī and other things, her daughter sang:

"Kalā na gē, kalā diē sāṟī ani gharia gē?
Tō tē hāi na vāṭṭānhī vāṭsāri gē."
Why, why, mother, these sāṟīs and other clothes?
He is only a passer-by!

But her mother, who knew better, paid no heed to her daughter's words, and when she was ready, she ordered a palanquin for her; but the girl would not sit in it, and had therefore to follow her husband on foot. Half way she complained that she was tired, upon which her husband taunted her:

"Nāhīn na gē, nāhīn diē kōmalān māṭhīonchān na mōgarah gē!
Nāhīn na gē, nāhīn diē pūṣald āṭālānchā kāsdītā gē!
Nāhīn na gē, nāhīn diē vāṭhāna kāṭi māṭhīchā na vini gē!"
Not faded, not faded, mother, the jessamine from my hair!
Nor rubbed off, nor rubbed off, mother, the lamp-black from my eyes!
Nor dishevelled, nor dishevelled, mother, my hair!

And again with the words:

"Kalā na gē, kalā diē sāṟī ani gharia gē?
Tō tē hāi na vāṭṭānhī vāṭsāri gē."
Why, why, mother, these sāṟīs and other clothes?
He is only a passer-by!

When she was thus taunted she followed him quietly till they reached his sister's house. There he told her to get a large vessel with seven holes, and ordered her to fill it up with water. But how could such a vessel be filled? As fast as she poured water in it, it ran out through the holes! But she was made to bring water, till she was brought to submission and admitted him as her husband.

They then went to their house, and lived happily together to a good old age.

NOTES ON THE NATIONAL CUSTOMS OF THE KARENNS.

The Karenns, or the Red Karens, call themselves Kayā. Their classical appellation is Kirātā. They inhabit the tract of country, lying between the parallels of 18° to 20° North latitude and 97° to 99° East longitude, with an area of about 7,200 square miles. They are a strong and hardy race, fierce and desperate fighters, and take a special delight in raiding into the neighbouring territories, kidnapping men, women, and children, and driving off cattle.

A raid, made on a village is either through the existence of some chwē, or on account of the favourable omens shown by a fowl's bones at the installation of a Chief.

The word chwē means an affair awaiting settlement, and is, in fact, a casus belli. The nearest English word, which would express its meaning, is 'feud.' Its literal meaning in Burmese is 'debt.' Among the Karenns any wrong done against their persons, or property, or any insult done to their tutelary gods is a chwē, and it must be expiated either by blood or presents. A chwē is not wiped off by the death of the original offender; his children and his children's children are held responsible for his wrongful acts. It is the persistence of this custom of 'feud' that causes the Kachins, Karenns, Chins, and other wild tribes of Burma to have no union among themselves, in spite of their community of language, beliefs, and traditions, and splits them up into various classes at feud with one another.

A Chief among the Karenns attains his position not by hereditary right, but on account of certain sacred characteristics. He must abstain from rice and liquor. His mother, while eunecte, must have eschewed these things and lived solely on yams and potatoes. She must not have eaten any meat, nor drunk the water out of the common wells; and in order to be duly
qualified for a Chiefship her son must continue these habits. Such a child is taken good care of, and in due time installed as a Chief in the following manner. A hò, — a low, rambling rectangular bamboo structure — is built and the candidate for the Chiefship is placed in it. Each villager brings one bunch of plantains, one mār, and at least a quarter of a tical weight of silver as offerings. The amount of the silver offering, however, varies from a quarter of a tical to a full tical, according to the resources of the village. The villagers also bring fowls, whose bones are to be used in reading omens. They then proceed to pass a merry time the whole night long, drinking kaung, their national beverage, and dancing round the hò. The fowls are killed and the leg bones are carefully scraped clean, and certain small holes in them are examined with a piece of straw or bamboo. If the holes on the right leg bone are situated higher up than the corresponding ones on the left, the omen is considered to be auspicious. By this method of divination, which is quite a science among the Red Karens, the future of the candidate for a Chiefship is settled. The questions usually asked are whether the newly installed Chief will be one of might and power, whether the villages will prosper under his rule, and whether the people now assembled will be able to undertake forays successfully and with a minimum of loss to their side.

Every man is judge in his own case in Karenni, and the exacting of an indemnity in consequence of a chwè, which is an affair of honour, rests with himself. It is only in important differences and disputes that the Chief exercises his prerogative by stepping in as an arbitrator or peacemaker.

Divination by means of the bones of a fowl plays an important part in Karenni politics. All organized raids are determined in this way, and sometimes the subjects of a Chief disobey his orders, when the bones consulted predict unfavourable events.

The Karennis pay no regular revenue to their Chiefs. All that they are called on to pay is a silver offering, as described above, on certain days, as the anniversary day of the Chief’s installation, or some festival day. Such silver pieces are hoarded in the hollow of the central post in the hò.

The Karennis, like all other wild tribes, are noted for their fidelity to their oaths. There are different forms of oath-taking: (1) killing buffaloes, eating their flesh, and preserving their horns, one being kept as a memento by each party participating in the ceremony; (2) drinking water, in which a drop of human blood from a puncture in the arm has been infused; (3) eating a jack-fruit; and (4) exchanging spears. The first three forms are used when an interchange of fraternity takes place. The fourth signifies that a reciprocal guarantee is given that no harm shall be done to the recipients. Sometimes, after deciding a knotty case between parties, who have a chwè against each other, a Karenni Chief gives his spear to one of the litigants in order to shield him from private vengeance.

T. S. K.

NOTES AND
MISCELLANEOUS SUPERSTITIONS AS TO
ANIMALS IN MADEAS.

If one happens to see a jackal on first rising from bed, there will be success in every enterprise undertaken during that day. It is a common custom among the Hindus of Madras, when a man meets with exceptional success, to ask him, “Did you see the jackal’s face early this morning?”

QuERIES.

If a horse neighs, or an ass brays, or a clock chimes, or a bell is rung, or a dog twitches his ears, or a gun is fired, just when one is contemplating the performance of anything, there will certainly be success in the enterprise or attainment of the object.

K. SRIKANTALIYAR.

Ootacamund.

BOOK-NOTICES.


1 [ś = sx, in ‘awful’—Ed.]

2 Such a ceremony was performed by Kyetpogyi.

Leipzig.—Otto Harrassowitz. Imperial Quarto. 1891.

The new series of Archaeological Survey Reports well begun by Messrs. Führer and E. Smith’s handsome volume on the Sharqī Architecture of Jaunpur is worthily continued by the work which is the subject of this notice.

(Chetpòjì, Chief of Western Karend, and Mr. O’Riley, Deputy Commissioner, Toungoo, in 1897.)
The book is printed in large quarto size on good paper, and the binding and typography are much superior to the work ordinarily turned out by official presses in India.

Some mistakes and slips of the pen have escaped correction; for example, the name of the well-known Bhar tribe is perversely printed Bhar, with the long vowel, throughout the book. I am familiar with the Bhar country, and am quite certain that the vowel is invariably short. In the spelling of Indian words Dr. Führer has allowed himself to fall into the sin of pedantry. "Jungle" is now as good English as "verandah," or "mango," and it is absurd to print the word as "jangal." I do not understand what principle the word sayid or sayid (💰), is spelt Sa'id, a form which is incorrect, both for transliteration and pronunciation.

So much for small slips and defects: They do not seriously impair the value of the book, and need not be further dwelt on. While commenting on the external features of Dr. Führer's book, I must not forget to mention that it is furnished with admirable indices. Careful readers should not overlook the important "Addenda et Corrigenda" at pp. 331—334.

The Classified Lists of the Monumental Antiquities and Inscriptions in the North-Western Provinces and Oudh contained in this volume have been prepared in compliance with orders issued by the Government of India in 1885. The system of classification adopted is designed as a guide to assist Government in deciding questions concerning the conservation and repair of ancient monuments. "The object of this volume," observes the compiler, "is not only to produce complete lists, so far as known, of the antiquities and epigraphs in each district for the use of the Archeological Survey, but to furnish general information for the guidance of the many residents in these Provinces, with the view of enabling them, if their tastes so incline, to interest themselves in the character and history of the remains in their vicinity."

The work may be regarded as an abstract of Sir A. Cunningham's Reports, topographically arranged, and brought up to date.

I now proceed to notice some passages of special interest.

Page 38.—The local name of the rock at Kālāt in the Dehra Dōn District is Chitraśālā "inscribed or pictured stone," and not Chhatrasālā.

trastā, or "canopied stone," as stated by Sir A. Cunningham.

Page 23.—An old fort, in Tahsil Sahaswan, 20 miles north-west from Badāon, has the remarkable name of Koṭ Salābāh (Śalābāha).

Page 35.—In Pargana Bilār of the Muradabad District "there is considerable opportunity for antiquarian researches, as nearly every second village has an old mound, or dīh, to the west of it."

Page 36.—To the south-west of the village of 'Āṣampur, in Tahsil Hasanpur of the same district, "is a kāhār, which is the site of ancient buildings. It is reported that there was here the school of Fāqīr Ḥāfiz, brother of Abūl Fazl, the great historian of Akbar's time. The ruins of an arched doorway are still standing. The earth of this mound is carried off by people, who come from long distances, in order to give it to students to eat, as it is supposed to have very beneficial influence on the brain and memory."

Page 42.—The ruins at Māṭī (Māṭipūra) in Tahsil Pawāyan of the Shahjahānpur District are extensive and apparently would repay examination.

Pages 53—58.—These pages contain a good summary account of the buildings at Agra. Dr. Führer thinks that the Palace of Jahāngir in the Fort was probably built by Akbar, late in his reign, to serve as a residence for the heirs-apparent and his family. He does not accept Sir A. Cunningham's suggestion that the building was erected by Ibrahim Lodi.

Pages 105—107.—It is to be hoped that a full and connected account of the discoveries at Mathurā will some day be published. Pending such publication the notes here given are of interest: "The Kānkālī Tīlā lies at the side of the Agra and Delhi road, much nearer the city than the Jamālpur mound. On the summit stands the fragment of a carved pillar venerated at the present day, the supposed image of the goddess Kānkālī."

In the hill itself were found buried two colossal statues of Buddha, each 74 feet high. Here also was found the large figure of an elephant standing on the capital of a pillar with an inscription of the Indo-Scythian king Huvischka.

During the extensive excavations, carried on by Dr. Burges in January 1888, and by Dr.

1 [It would be quite a different word, and would ordinarily represent $\text{ε\phi\nu}$.—Ed.]

2 [It should be noted that, in correcting General Cunningham's version of the name, Dr. Führer twice confounds Stl. 'stone' with Stl. 'virtue.']
Führer in January 1889, a large number of very interesting Jaina relics have been unearthed, namely:—a four-faced lion-capital of the Indo-Scythian period; a massive door-jamb, the three faces of which are divided into panels of equal size, containing scenes of domestic life represented under temple façades of the Mausoleum pattern; several beautifully wrought panels, bearing inscriptions in the Maurya alphabet; twelve large statues of Digamba Tirthankaras, bearing inscriptions dated in the regnal years of the Indo-Scythian kings Kanishka Huvishka, and Vasudeva; and two colossal statues of Padmaprabhanātha, dated Sañvat 1036, or A. D. 978, and Sañvat 1134, or A. D. 1083, being donor gifts of the Śvēmbarā community of Mahurās.

Probably, on this mound stood the Upagupta monastery mentioned by Hiuen Tsang, which General Cunningham identifies with the Yaśa Vihāra inside the Katra. The railway from Mathurā to Bīḍābān has been cut through the lower terrace of the Katra in January 1889, and during the excavations several Buddhist sculptures have been discovered, as well as a mutilated inscription of the Maughrāi king Mahākītya, and a beautifully written slab, dated Sañvat 1207, but partly damaged in the middle.

These inscriptions have been edited by Dr. Bühler for the Epigraphia Indica.

Page 139.—Concerning Ḫita, in the Allahabad district, the ancient Pratihārā-purāṇa, the residence of Purvāvas, the first prince of the lunar dynasty, the compiler remarks: "The only remains now existing are the ruined forts of Samudragupta and Hamsagupta. Fifteen years ago twenty-four gold coins of Kumāragupta were unearthed here. Does this mean that the names of Samudragupta and Hamsagupta are still remembered by the people? If so, the facts is curious: Who was Hamsagupta?"

Page 222.—Dr. Führer here recapitulates the arguments already published in his Jampur volume, which convinces him that Bhīnā Dīh in the Basīt district cannot be Kapilavastu, the birth-place of Buddha, as Mr. Carleyes and Sir A. Cunningham confidently believed it to be. Dr. Führer successfully attacks some of Mr. Carleye's fancies, but I do not think that his criticism justifies the conclusion that it is "evident that Bhīnā Dīh is not the ancient site of Kapilavastu." Some of Mr. Carleye's reasons for concluding it to be a site that is undoubtedly invalid, but Bhīnā Dīh occupies approximately the position indicated by the Chinese travellers, and I do not see why it should not yet be proved to be Kapilavastu. But it must be admitted that satisfactory proof has not yet been given.

Page 299.—By an odd blunder Kumāragupta Mahendra is described as the son of Skanda-gupta.

Page 271.—"It is interesting to note that in 1876 several rectangular Chinese silver coins were found close to the river Gangas in a āḍh at 'Alauḍūdpur, about six miles west of Bāng-garhā," in the Unāo District of Oudh.

Page 274.—The ancient village of Sañchānākōṭ or Sujānākōṭ, on the right bank of the river Sātī in the Unāo District, is identified by Dr. Führer with the Sha-chi of Fa-hian. Sir A. Cunningham held that both the Sha-chi of Fa-hian and the Visakha of Hiuen Tsang are represented by the existing town of Ayudhya, or Ajodhya, and that both are identical with Sākṣātam. Dr. Führer holds that Ayudhya = Sākṣāt = Visakha, but that Sañchānākōṭ = Sha-chi.

Pages 306-313.—The account given in these pages of Sākṣāt-Mahārāja in the Gôndâ District, the site of the famous city of Brâvaṇa, is the best yet published. But, remarks Dr. Führer, "notwithstanding, the excavations made by General Cunningham in 1892 and 1894, and by Dr. Roay, C.S., in 1895, as yet very little is known of the ruins covered with dense jungle, inside the old city, which must contain relics which would do much to elucidate some of the most interesting periods of Indian history. There can be no doubt whatever that, a thoroughly and properly conducted excavation would be of great success, and yield many Buddhist and Jain relics; but it is ought to be gone about in a scientific method."

Page 321.—Dr. Führer shows good reasons for believing that the well-known fort at Dalmān on the Ganges, the most 'picturesque' object in Oudh, was not originally a fort at all, but "consists really of two Buddhist stupas.

Page 282.—The 'Obya-ṭo' of Hiuen Tsang has been identified with so many old sites in Oudh, that I hope Dr. Führer is correct in asserting that on topographical grounds and from a calculation of distances it may safely be identified with Jagatpur in the Rāj Barī District.

19th April 1892.

V. A. Smith.

* There seems to be some mistake here; 1888-978- = 56, and 1134-1088 = 46. The passages in the text are quoted as amended by the list of Corrigenda.
SYSTEM OF TRANSLITERATION.

The system of transliteration followed in this Journal of 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>ā</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>ए</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>आ</td>
<td>āa</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>ओ</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>इ</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>ऒ</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ई</td>
<td>iī</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>ओ०</td>
<td>ōo</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>उ</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>उ०</td>
<td>ōu</td>
<td>u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ऊ</td>
<td>u०</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>ऊ०</td>
<td>ōu०</td>
<td>u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ऋ</td>
<td>ri</td>
<td>ri</td>
<td>ऋ०</td>
<td>ōri०</td>
<td>ri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ऊँ</td>
<td>rī</td>
<td>rī</td>
<td>ऋ००</td>
<td>ōri००</td>
<td>rī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ऌ</td>
<td>rī०</td>
<td>rī</td>
<td>ऋ०००</td>
<td>ōri०००</td>
<td>rī०</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ए</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>ए०</td>
<td>ōe०</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ऐ</td>
<td>eī</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>ऐ०००</td>
<td>ōe०००</td>
<td>e०००</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ओ</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>ओ०००</td>
<td>ōo०००</td>
<td>o०००</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>औ</td>
<td>ōu०००</td>
<td>ōu०००</td>
<td>औ००००</td>
<td>ōou००००</td>
<td>ōu०००</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>वैशार्गा</td>
<td>Vaiśārāga</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>वैशार्गा</td>
<td>Vaiśārāga</td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>जिह्वाद्विया, or old जिह्वाद्विया</td>
<td>जिह्वाद्विया</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>जिह्वाद्विया</td>
<td>जिह्वाद्विया</td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>वैशार्गा बैरा जिह्वाद्विया</td>
<td>वैशार्गा बैरा जिह्वाद्विया</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>वैशार्गा बैरा जिह्वाद्विया</td>
<td>वैशार्गा बैरा जिह्वाद्विया</td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>आनुस्वर</td>
<td>Anuvāra</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>आनुस्वर</td>
<td>Anuvāra</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>आनुस्वरिक</td>
<td>Anuvāra</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>आनुस्वरिक</td>
<td>Anuvāra</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>क</td>
<td>ka</td>
<td>ka</td>
<td>ख</td>
<td>kh</td>
<td>kh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ग</td>
<td>ga</td>
<td>ga</td>
<td>घ</td>
<td>gh</td>
<td>gh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ष</td>
<td>ḷ</td>
<td>ḷ</td>
<td>ष</td>
<td>ḷ</td>
<td>ḷ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ष</td>
<td>ḷ</td>
<td>ḷ</td>
<td>ष</td>
<td>ḷ</td>
<td>ḷ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ष</td>
<td>ḷ</td>
<td>ḷ</td>
<td>ष</td>
<td>ḷ</td>
<td>ḷ</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 eupheic rules of saññadi. 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 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 svāma 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 saññadi 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 avagraḥa, or sign which indicates the elision of an initial s, 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 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.
SOUTH-INDIAN COPPER COINS.

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

As far as I can ascertain, the majority of the coins which form the subject of this paper, are now published for the first time. Others (Nos. 6, 7, 9, 11, 12, 14, 24, 27, 30) were included, because the previously published readings of their legends were more or less capable of improvement. Most of the coins form part of those which were selected from the collection of the late Mr. T. M. Scott, of Madura, for the Government Central Museum, Madras, by me and Mr. C. Rajagopala Chari. The abbreviations are the same as ante, Vol. XX. p. 301, with the following additions:

Atkins = The Coins and Tokens of the Possessions and Colonies of the British Empire, by James Atkins; London, 1889.

Thurston = History of the Coinage of the Territories of the East India Company in the Indian Peninsula, and Catalogue of the Coins in the Madras Museum, by Edgar Thurston; Madras, 1890.


Tafnell = Hints to Coin-Collectors in Southern India, by Captain R. H. C. Tafnell, M. S. C.; Madras, 1889.

Mr. B. Santappah, Curator of the Mysore Government Museum at Bangalore, has again obliged me by preparing the plaster casts, from which the accompanying Plates were copied.

I. VIJAYANAGARA COINS.

No. 1. Harihara. M.

Obv. A bull, facing the right; in front of it, a sword. On a specimen belonging to Mr. Tracy, a four-pointed star is visible over the back of the bull.

Rev. { नाप्रप्त } Pratāpa-Harihara.

The legend is surmounted by symbols of the moon and the sun. This coin is a variety of the coin No. 3, ante, Vol. XX. p. 302.

No. 2. Mallikārjunārāya. MH.

Obv. An elephant, facing the left; above it, the Kanarese syllable Nī.

Rev. { मलिक } Mali-

{ kājunārā } kājunarā-

yarn.²

No. 3. Ditto. M.

Same type as No. 2, but the elephant on the obverse faces the right.

This and the preceding coin closely resemble Sir W. Elliot's No. 92, on which see ante, Vol. XX. p. 304. Mallikārjuna was a son and successor of Dévarāya II, whose latest date is Saka-Saṅvat 1371 expired, the cyclic year Sukla. An inscription of Mallikārjunādēva, the son of Dévarāya, on the left of the entrance into the first prākāra of the Aruḷḷa-Parumāl temple at Little Kānchi is dated in Saka-Saṅvat 1387 expired, the cyclic year Pārthiva. He appears to have been succeeded by his brother Virūpakṣhādēva, whose inscription on the South

---

1 Read Harihara.
2 Read Mallikārjunārd infection.
wall of the *Abhirikka-maṇḍapa* in the same temple is dated in Saka-Saṅvat 1392 expired, the cyclic year *Vikrīti*. The two Tamil dates are as follows:

A. Inscription of Mallikārjuna.


“While Mallikārjuna-mahārāya, the son of the glorious Virapratapā-Dēvarāya-mahārāya, was pleased to rule the earth, — on the day of (the nakṣatra) Kṛṣṭīka, which corresponded to Sunday, the full-moon *tīthi* of the first fortnight of the month of Vṛṣiṣṭika in the *Pārthiwa* year, which was current after the *Saka* year 1387.”

B. Inscription of Virūpāksha.


“While the glorious Virūpakṣhadēva-mahārāya, the son of the glorious Dēvarāya-mahārāya, was pleased to rule the earth,— at the auspicious time of *Ardhādaya* on the day of (the nakṣatra) Sravaṇa, which corresponded to Sunday, the new-moon *tīthi* of the second fortnight of the month of Makara in the *Vikrīti* year, which was current after the *Saka* year 1392.”

No. 4. Sadākivāraṇya. MH.

Obv. God and goddess, seated.

Rev. {Śrī-Sadā}

This copper coin corresponds to the pagoda figured by Sir W. Elliot, No. 100; see ante, Vol. XX. p. 306, No. 32.

No. 5. Ditto. M.

Obv. A kneeling figure of Gātu, which faces the left.

Rev. Same as No. 4.

The obverse of this coin is an imitation of the copper issues of Kṛṣṇapālaṇya, ante, Vol. XX. p. 306, No. 28.

No. 6. Tirumularāya. H.

Obv. A boar, facing the right; above it, a sword and the sun.

Rev. {Śrī-Tī}

This coin is figured by Sir W. Elliot in the Madras Journal, New Series, Vol. IV. Plate 1. No. 11. The execution of the Kanarese legend is so barbarous, that the reading would remain doubtful, unless a similar Nāgari legend did occur on the coins figured *ibid.* Nos. 12 to 17, which have nearly the same obverse as the coin under notice. A correct transcript of the legend on the reverse of these coins was given ante, Vol. XX. p. 307.

* See also Mr. Sewell’s Lists of Antiquities, Vol. II. p. 345.

* Read Virūpakṣha.
II. CHOLA COIN.

No. 7. M.

(Elliot, No. 152).

The obverse and reverse are identical. In the centre is a seated tiger,—the emblem of the Chōla king,—facing the right, with two fishes,—symbols of the Pāṇḍya king,—in front, and a bow,—the emblem of the Čēra king,—behind. The whole group is flanked by two lamps and surmounted by a parasol and two chariots. Underneath is the legend:

Obv. and Rev. | Gaṅgaikondā-Chōla[1].

This coin is republished, because Mr. Thomas has misread it (Elliot, p. 132, note 1). The name or surname Gaṅgaikondā-Chōla, "the Chōla (king) who conquered the Gaṅgā," survives to the present day in Gaṅgaikondā-Sōlapuram, the name of a ruined city in the Uḍaiyapālaiyam tāḻukā of the Trichinopoly district. The earliest reference to this city is in a Taṇṭaḻvur inscription of the 19th year of the reign of Parakǎṭsarivarman, alias Rājendra-Chōla[2]. As this king claims to have conquered the Gaṅgā, it is not unreasonable to suppose that he bore the surname Gaṅgaikondā-Chōla (I.), and that both the foundation of the city and the issue of the coin are due to him. A proof for the correctness of this supposition may perhaps be derived from the unpublished inscriptions on the walls of the ruined Brāhmagirī temple at Gaṅgaikondā-Sōlapuram. This temple is called Gaṅgaikondā-Chōla[3] in four Pāṇḍya inscriptions, while a mutilated inscription of Kulōṭtunga-Chōla[4] I. refers to a temple named Rājendra-Sōla-Iṣvara. If, —what is very probable,—this temple has been taken as identical with the first, it would follow that the founder of the Iṣvara (Siva) temple at Gaṅgaikondā-Sōlapuram bore the two names Gaṅgaikondā-Chōla and Rājendra-Chōla. Further, the surname Gaṅgaikondā-Chōla is applied to the maternal grandfather of Kulōṭtunga I. in the Kaliṅgattu-Paraṇī (x. 5). Though the same poem (x. 3) gives the real name of Kulōṭtunga's grandfather as Rājarāja, there is no doubt that, as Dr. Fleet (ante, Vol. XX. p. 279 f.) points out, this is a mistake or an inaccurate expression for Rājendra-Chōla, who, as we know from the Chellur grant, was the father of Ammaṅgadeva, the mother of Kulōṭtunga I. A coin which resembles the one under notice, but bears the Nāgarī legend Sīrī-Rājendra[5] (Elliot, No. 158), may be attributed to Parakǎṭsarivarman, alias Rājendra[6].

An unpublished inscription of this coin at Maṇiṅgaiḷam in the Chingleput district mentions a Gaṅgaikondā-Chōla (II.) who was the uncle of, and received the title Irnmaṇi-Chōla from, the reigning king. Subsequent to the time of Rājendra-Chōla, the next mention of Gaṅgaikondā-Sōlapuram is in an unpublished inscription of Parakǎṭsarivarman, alias Vīra-Rājendra[7], at Karuvūr in the Coimbatore district. This inscription also refers to a son of the king, whose name was Gaṅgaikondā-Chōla (III.), and on whom the title Chōla-Pāṇḍya[8] and the sovereignty over the Pāṇḍya country were conferred by his father. According to the Kaliṅgattu-Paraṇī[9], Gaṅgāpurī, i.e. Gaṅgaikondā-Sōlapuram, continued to be the royal residence in the time of Kulōṭtunga-Chōla[10] I. (A.D. 1063 to 1112). In Bilhaṇa's Vīramadakīṭhavacariya (iv. 21, and rv. 21) the city is mentioned under the name Gaṅgaikondāpurī[11], which the Western Chōla king Vīramadakīṭhavacariya V.[12] is said to have taken twice.

III. MUDRA COINS.

No. 8. M.H.

Obv. Two fishes.

"The round coin (?) of the glorious Avantpasekhara (i.e. the ornament of princes)."

No. 9. MH.
(Elliot, No. 189).

Obv. A standing figure, facing the right.

Rev.  
{Tamil}  
{Sōgā-
   ĳu ko-
   āṇāṁ.}

"He who conquered the Chōla country."[11] The correct reading and explanation of this legend is due to my First Assistant, Mr. Venkayya.

No. 10. MH.

Obv. Same as No. 9.

Rev. Two fishes; between them, the Tamil legend:

El-
ī-</p>

(ta-
aiy-
āṇā).

No. 11. MH.

(Elliot, Nos. 137 and 160).

Obv. Same as Nos. 9 and 10.

Rev. Two fishes, surrounded by the Tamil legend Ellāntalaiyā.

No. 12. MH.

(Elliot, No. 136).

Obv. Same as Nos. 9 to 11, with the addition of the Tamil syllable Su on the right side.

Rev. A fish between two lamps, surrounded by the same legend as on No. 11.

No. 13. MH.

Obv. Same as Nos. 9 to 11.

Rev.  
{Tamil}  
{El-
   ī-
   ū-
   āṇā}

The legends of Nos. 11 to 13 appear to be abbreviations of the longer legend of No. 10, which on some specimens is further shortened into Ellāntalai. Mr. Tracy, p. 2 of pointed out that Sir W. Elliot's reading Samarakūthala is impossible, and suggested Eiλdunayādun instead. But the syllable which he reads rai, is clearly tāi on all the coins. The preceding syllable might be ka, ga or ta, da; the sense requires the second alternative. The last syllable is distinctly āṇā on No. 10. Ellāntalaiyā means "he who is the chief of the world" and appears to be the Tamil original of the Sanskrit epithets viśvottarakahalakrit, sarvottaraka-

1173 (ante, p. 122). This supposition is further strengthened by the fact that, on the obverse of some copies of the coins Nos. 10 to 13 (e.g. on No. 12 of Plate i), we find the Tamil syllable $Su$, which appears to be an abbreviation of $Sundara-Pāṇḍiyarāja$. Compare $Dē$ for $Dēvarāja$; ante, Vol. XX. p. 303, No. 12.

No. 14. Viśvanātha. M.

(Tracy, No. 9).

Obv. Same as No. 13.

Rev. A sceptre between two fishes, surmounted by a crescent and surrounded by the Tamil-Grantha legend:

[1.] Vi- [5.] ū
[2.] śva- [4.] da-
[3.] nā-

Mr. Tracy, p. 6, took the final Tamil $S$ for a Grantha $s$, and the Grantha group $īva$ for a Tamil $ea$.

No. 15. Ditto. M.

Obv. A sceptre between two fishes.

Rev. A crescent; below it, the Tamil-Grantha legend:

Viśva-

nāda-

ṛ-

No. 16. Ditto. M.

Obv. A sceptre between two fishes; above them, the Tamil legend:

Pāṇ-

ḍiyarāja.

Rev. The same legend as on No. 15.

Nos. 14 to 16 belong to Viśvanātha, the first Nāyaka of Madura (A.D. 1559 to 1563). No. 16 shows that he wanted to be considered as the rightful successor of the Pāṇḍya dynasty.

No. 17. MH.

Obv. A standing figure.

Rev. $\text{ṣo}v$ Veṅka-

tapa.

This is a variety of No. 37, ante, Vol. XX. p. 308.

No. 18. H.

Obv. Three standing figures.

Rev. $\text{ṣo}v$ Veṅka-
[ta]panā-
[yaka].

No. 19. MH.

Obv. A kneeling figure, which faces the right.

Rev. Vi-

ravha-

dra.

(Grantha.)
No. 20. MH.

Obv. A kneeling figure of Ganaḍa, which faces the right.

Rev. \[\text{Sri-A.}\] \[\text{nauna.}\]

It is not known to which of the rulers of Madura the names VirabhadrA and Ananta on the reverse of Nos. 19 and 20 refer. But the style of the kneeling figure on the obverse connects the Grantha coin No. 19 with the Tamil coins of Bhuvanaikavira (Elliot's No. 138) and Samarasinghala, and the Kanarese coin No. 20 with the Nagar coins of Kṛishṇarāya and Sādāīvarāya (No. 5, above).

No. 21. H.

Obv. A lion, facing the right.

Rev. \[\text{Mñā-}
\text{(Tamil.)} \{\text{tchi.}\]

Mñākṣaṇī is the name of the goddess of Madura. According to Mr. Sewall's Lists of Antiquities, Vol. II. p. 203, queen Mñākṣaṇī of the Nāyaka dynasty ruled from A.D. 1731 to 1736. The reverse of the coin may refer to the goddess, or to the queen, or to both at the same time.

No. 22. MH.

Obv. Same as No. 21.

Rev. \[\text{Madu-}
\text{(Tamil.)} \{\text{rai.}\]

No. 23. MH.

Obv. Madhurā.

Rev. Same as No. 22.

The obverse of No. 22 connects this coin with No. 21. The bilingual coin No. 23 agrees with No. 22 in the reverse, which bears the Tamil name of the city of Madura, while its Telugu equivalent occupies the obverse.

IV. BRITISH EAST INDIA COMPANY COINS.

No. 24. MH.

(Tufnell, No. 49; Thurston, Plate xii, No. 1).

Obv. \[\text{Srl.}\]

Rev. \[\text{Kum-}
\text{(Tamil.)} \{\text{pípí.}\]

No. 25. MH.

Obv. An eight-pointed star.

Rev. Same as No. 24.

The reverse of Nos. 24 and 25 is an early attempt to transliterate the word "Company" in the vernacular character. The auspicious monosyllable Srl (Fortune) appears to be inserted on the obverse of No. 24 from similar motives as the word Sūrvāga on Nos. 26 to 29.

No. 26. H.

Obv. An orb, surmounted by a cross.

Rev \[\text{Srl-}
\text{raúāga.}\]

13 On some specimens of this and the next coins, the second line of the legend reads \text{rāñgā} instead of \text{raúāga} through a mistake of the engraver of the die. See Nos. 26 b and 28 of Plate ii.
No. 27. H.—A.D. 1678 (?).

(Atkiss, p. 140, No. 34.)

Obv. Same as No. 26, but the figure 78 inscribed in the lower portion of the orb.

Rev. Same as No. 26, with the addition of a double line between the two lines of the legend.

Mr. Atkiss attributes this coin to the Bombay Presidency; but the Southern characters on the reverse prove it to be a Madras issue.

No. 28. H.—A.D. 1698.

Obv. \{18\} in a circle.

Rev. Same as No. 27.

No. 29. H.—A.D. 1765.

(Thurston, Plate xii. No. 3 ?).

Obv. Same as No. 26, but the figures 17 and 05 inscribed in the upper and lower half of the orb.

Rev. Same as Nos. 27 and 28.

The word Srivaesha, which appears on the reverse of Nos. 26 to 29, is, as a neuter, the name of a celebrated shrine of Vishnu near Trichinopoly, but is also used in the masculine gender as an epithet of the god Vishnu himself. This reverse was probably selected by the Company with the view of making their coin popular with the native public, and of matching the image of Vishnu, which was engraved on all the Madras pagodas.

V.—FRENCH COIN OF KARIKAL.

No. 30. H.

(Tufnell, No. 48).

Obv. \{Pudu\-chchê-ri\}.

(Tamil.)

Rev. \{Kâ-\-raik-\-kül\}.

(Tamil.)

Puduchchéri and Kâraikkal are the original Tamil forms of the names of the French settlements Pondicherry and Karikal.

WEBER'S SACRED LITERATURE OF THE JAINS.

TRANSLATED BY DR. HERBERT WEIR SMYTH.

(Continued from page 311.)

20. mahâniyamthijja\(î\) (cf. chap. 6), mahâniyirgranthiy\(î\)\(û\); anâhavavy\(î\) S; 60 vv. Of the anâthin\(î\)va\(î\); Sê\(î\)ô\(î\) Magahâhivô v. 2. The title found in S agrees with the contents (as was the case with 6 and 7).

21. samuddapâlija\(î\) ("lejja\(î\) V), samudrapâlija\(î\), 24 vv. Of the vivikta\(î\)charya. Begins: Chaîî\(î\) Pâli\(î\) nã\(î\)ma t saî\(î\) \\ãî vî\(î\)m \(î\) Mahâvîrassã bhagava\(î\) bhû \(î\) so u mahappa\(î\) 111111

\(î\) No. 59 a of Plate ii shows the first and second lines of the obverse, and the second and third lines of the reverse; No. 30 b exhibits the second and third lines of the obverse, and the first and second lines of the reverse.
22. rahaněmijjaṁ, 49 vv. Of the aṇorāthanemivach charaṇaṁ; utpānnavārōtāsikāṇaḥ 'pi dhṛtṛḥ kārya. Begins: [47] Sūryaparənmanī nayāre i āsi rāyā mahiḫhīṭe i Vausdeva 'ti nāmaṁ i rāyalakṣhaṇasāhaṇe i 1.1 tassā bhujaṇu duvē āsi i ṇīḷītī Dēva taḥā i tāsiṇi dēpaṇāḥ pi do putṭā i ṛṭīkā ṛṣaṁ Kāśīva i 2.1.1.1. Samudrāvīṣe nāmaṁ i 1.1.1 i tassā bhujaṇa Śīvā nāma i tāsi putte mahāyaśe i bhagavāya Arīṣṭhanēmi tti i lōganāhē damiṣaṛe i 4.11... 


24. samiṭi, samiṭi S, pavayaṇaṃyaraṇac (I) C; 27 vv. Of the pravacanamāṭrisvāraṇam, i.e. the 5 samiti and 3 loka, which are together also called āṭha samiṭi: iriṇā-bhiṣeṣa'saṣa dāṣa uccahāre samiṭi iya i maṇiṛgatē vayaṃgaratē kāyaṃgaratē ya-aṭhaṃsa i 2.11. These are regarded as the mothers as regards the dvulaṇaṃgaṇa Jīpakhāyaṇa pavayaṇa. See Ind. Streifes, 1, 133, 209, 207, in reference to the ethical three-fold division into maṇḍ, vaya, kāya.


26. sāmāyārā, dassaś C, 53 vv. Only he who is in possession of the brahmaṇaḥ (chap. 25) is a yati, tōna chā vaśyaṁ sāmāchāri vidiḥaḥ. This is ten-fold.44 [48] avasīyaḥ, nīśaḥ,45 āpuchänaḥ, paṭīpuchänaḥ, cchedhaṇaḥ, ichchākarō, mihchākarō, taḥkārō, abhūṭhīhaṃ, uvasāṇaḥ. The similar enumeration in Ávāya, nijj, 7, 12, where there is, however, a different arrangement (the same as in aṅga 3, 10, and Bhag. 25. 2: according to L): — ichchākaro, mihchā, taḥkāro (6—3), āvać... cchedhaṇa (1—5), niṃmaḥa (instead of 9), uvasāṇa (10). — Hari-bhadra on Ávāya, nijj, 6, 88, says56 that there are three kinds of sāmāchāri ṣ, the ghaṣasāmāchāri, represented by the ghaṣanīrakto, on the 20th prāhṛita (ghaṣapā) of the 8. vastu (āchārīhī) dārānaḥ pārāva 9, the daśāvīhasāmāchāri, for which our chapter and Áv. nijj. 7 is authoritative and 3. the padāvīhasāmāchāri, which too is represented by chēḍasūtra-lakṣaṇanāma navamātā pāravā ēva nirvṛtyā, or by kalpavṛśaḥ.57 Begins: sāmāyārīṁ pavakkhāmi savyadāvākhānuṁ i jan charitinda nīgamaṇē i tāmaṃ sāmasāgaṇaḥ i 4.11.

27. khaluṃkijjaṁ, khulou V, 15 vv. Of the āṣatāta; the āṣatāta is the antecedent condition for the sāmāchāriḥ. It begins: thēre gaṇahāre Gagāra (Gṛgṛgha) mnū āsi viśāraē āinnē gaṇiḥbhāvanam samāmāḥ paṭiṣṭhāḥ i 11. The name comes from v. 3: khaluṃkē jō a jōti, khaluṃkē gatiṛśaḥ (n. Hēm. 1263) yō yōyājati.

28. mukkhamaggaś, sivamaṇggaś C, 36 vv. Of the mokṣhamārgaḥ. Begins: mukkhamaggaśaḥ cauchwāḥ i snuṭhā jaṇaḥbhiṣayam...

31. charanavihā, 31 vv.; charanavidihi.

32. eśāyaṁ kṣaṇiṁ, 111 vv.; pramāṇāsthāṇaṁ. Begins: asczahaṁtakāllasam samalayaṁ savaṁ ṣaṅkhass u jō pāmākāhā mē padippunnakittā | suṇēha ēgantahāyaṁ hiyathāṁ.

33. khammayaṇāṁ, karmaprakṛitiḥ, 25 vv. Begins: attha kammāṁ (cf. Bhag. 2, 39) vucchāmi | āṇupuṇvīṁ jahakkamaṁ jōṁ hādhuḥ ayaṁ jīvē | saṁsārē pariṣṭattā | nānassā "varajjijāṁ | dasaṇaṇaṁ sahānaṁ taṁ ēvajjijāṁ | tabāh mūhāṁ | ankarmaṁ tabēva ya ya | nāmakaṇyaṁ cha gāyaṁ cha | aṁtariyaṁ tabēva ya. Closes: dēsāṁ saṁvarē chēva | khavatē ya jāē (yatēta) bhē tē bēmi || The nāgām e. g. is (see N. Anuyā. Āvaśy. Anupap. p. 41) five-fold: suyaṁ, abhinibbhiyaṁ, dhīmaṁ, maṇḍanaṁ, kēvalāṁ.


35. saṇḍgāmaggāṁ, "gīgī S, "gīgī V, 21 vv.; hiṃśaparivarjanadāyāḥ bhikkhuṇāḥ. Begins: suṇāha mē ēgamaṇa maṇḍaṁ Savvannaṇḍāyā | jāṁ āyaraṇo bhikkhuḥ | dokkhaṇa 'istakaro bhārē || Closes: nimmaṁ niraḥaukaṁ viyaṃgō aṣapavē | saṃpattō kēvalaṁ nāgaṁ saśayaṁ parinivvūha tē bēmi || 31 ||


At the end in some MSS. of the text and in the scholiast there are added some variant verses of the niryuktikāra in praise of the work: jē kira bhavaśiddha | paritasaṁsārā a jē bhavaṁ tē kira padhaṁ ēt. | chahattāsaṁ uttarajjihār ||

XLIV. Second mūlasatra, āvaśyakanstrān. By āvaśyaka, as we have often seen in the case of ānīna, Nandī and Anuyogavī, are meant six observances which are obligatory upon the Jain, be he layman or clerical. That the regulations in reference to these observations had an established text as early as the date of N and An., is clear from the fact that they appear in the Nandī as the first group of the ānaṇagapavitiṣa texts (see above p. 11); and in the Anuyogavī the word ajjhayamchañkakavagga is expressly given as its synonym. See p. 22. We have also seen [51] that the Anuyogavārasutra claims to contain a discussion of the first of these ē āvaśyakas (the sāṁyāma), but that this claim is antagonistic to that limitation of the sāmaṁ to the sāvajjājgaviralaṇī which frequently secures the Anuy. By this limitation an ethical character is ascribed to the work, the contents of which is, furthermore, at variance with the claim mode by the Anuy.

The āvaśyakasātra is a work which deals with all the six āvaśyakas in the order, which is followed in the Nandī and Anuyogavī, and discusses the sāmaṁ actually, not merely nominally as the Anuyogavī does. Unfortunately we possess, not the text of the āvaśyaka, but merely the commentary, called ishyasita, of an Haribhadra, which is as detailed as that on mūlas.

---

32. See p. 424 on this arrangement.

33. At the close he is called a pupil of Jinaśattra from the Vidyādharakula, or an adherent of Sītābharāchhāya Jinaśattra, samāṭha cē, 'ṣāṇā ishyahita nāma "vāsyakāṭī, kriyā sitābharāchhāya Jinaśattraudānāścānī' Vidyaḍhakulaḷītālākāhāya Jinaśattraśiśikhyasya dharmatō jōī (yākki) mahattārasamśāntaṁ parīkṣā (ph) cē Śīrāyaḥ Haribhadraśa. The Gpaddresshāsaṭhata is here referred to (cf. v. 23 fr.) and the great Haribhadra (7 Vīra 1055); see pp. 371, 373, 405 ff. In Peterson's Detailed Report (1883) we find cited (pp. 6 — 9) under No. 12 a vṛtti of a Śīrāyaḥ Śīrāyaḥ, scholar of Śīrāyaḥ, composed saṁvat 1396.
I. Of this commentary there is but one MS., which, though written regularly enough, is very incorrect and fails in every way to afford the reader any means of taking a survey of its contents by the computation of the verses, etc. It labours under the defect of such manuscript commentaries in citing the text with the pratikas only and not in full, with the exception of fol. 73 to 153 and some other special passages. The text is divided according to the commentary into 57 the six ajjhayaas, with which we are already acquainted:—1. the sāmāyō, the sāvajjājōgavirāti, which extends to fol. 196, 2. the chaúvasāthava or praise of the 24 Jinas, extending to 204, 3. vaññadāya as or honor paid to the teachers, reaching to 221, 4. pañikamarpan, confession and renunciation (to 298), 5. kāussa, ejection to (315), and 6. pachchakkhaṇṇa, acceptance of the twelve vratas (to 342).

By sāmāyō much more than the sāvajjājōgavirāti is meant. It is etymologically explained by sāmā as jānadasarṣanachāriṣṭāyaṣṭāyaṣṭāyaṣṭāyaṣṭāyaṣṭāyaṣṭāyaṣṭāyaṣṭāyaṣṭāyaṣṭāyaṣṭāyaṣṭāyaṣṭāyaṣṭāyaṣṭāyaṣṭāyaṣṭāyaṣṭāyaṣṭāyaṣṭāyaṣṭāyaṣṭāyaṣṭāyaṣṭāyaṣṭāyaṣṭāyaṣṭāyaṣṭāyaṣṭāyaṣṭāyaṣṭāyaṣṭāyaṣṭāyaṣṭāyaṣṭāyaṣṭāyaṣṭāyaṣṭāyaṣṭāyaṣṭāyaṣṭāyaṣṭāyaṣṭāyaṣṭāyaṣṭāyaṣṭāyaṣṭāyaṣṭāyaṣṭāyaṣṭāyaṣṭāyaṣṭāyaṣṭāyaṣṭāyaṣṭāyaṣṭāyaṣṭāyaṣṭāyaṣṭāyaṣṭāyaṣṭāyaṣṭāyaṣṭāyaṣṭāyaṣṭāyaṣṭāyaṣṭāyaṣṭāyaṣṭāyaṣṭāyaṣṭāyaṣṭāyaṣṭāyaṣṭāyaṣṭāyaṣṭāyaṣṭāyaṣṭāyaṣṭāyaṣṭāyaṣṭāyaṣṭāyaṣṭāyaṣṭāyaṣṭाया, which is frequently mentioned in the text. These legends have doubtless been borrowed from one of his predecessors whose commentary was composed in Prakrit. The remarks of this predecessor, cited elsewhere either directly as those of the Bhāṣyakāra (see on Nijj. 10, 47), or without further comment or mention of his name, he has incorporated into his own commentary. This too was here and there composed in Prakrit. Occasional reference is made to a mālāṣṭkā (see on Nijj. 19, 122), which in turn appears to have been the foundation of the Bhāṣyakāra.

[53] Even if we do not possess the text of the shādvāyaṣakṣātra with its six ajjhayaas which was commented upon by Haribhadra, our loss is to a great degree compensated by a metrical Nijj. This is even called aṣvāyaṣakṣātra at the close in the MSS., and is probably the only Avasay text which is extant. At least Haribhadra regarded it as an integral portion of his text. He has incorporated it, with but a few omissions, into his commentary, and commented upon it verse for verse. He cites its author not merely as Niryukti, kāra, (e.g. on chap. 16, 17) as Saṅgrohaṇikāra, as Mālābhāṣyakrit (e.g. g. 113), or even merely as Bhāṣyakāra (e.g. g. on 2, 70, 149, e. g. just as the author of the above mentioned commentary in Prakrit prose) but also occasionally as graivaṇkāra, kāra (see for example Nijj. 8, 44, 10, 26), and even as sūtrakāra, kāra (g. Nijj. 1, 76, 16, 36). The verses of the Nijj. are occasionally called sūtras by him. From a consideration of these facts we are led to the conclusion that the sole difference between the text commented on by Har. and the Nijj. lies in the different division — the text being divided into 6, the Nijj. into 20 ajjhayaas. See below. The fact that Har. does not cite at all some sections of the Nijj. (for example the Thāravāl at the very start) may, however, be held to militate against the above conclusion. His text too contains besides the Nijj. several other parts, chiefly in prose [54] (which he calls sūtras or words of the sūtrakāra (see Nijj. 13, 51), e.g. especially a pratikramśatrasātram given in extenso. He furthermore occasionally contrasts the sūtragathā with the gāthās of the Niryukti. See on Niry. 11. 38, 41.

With this the following fact is in agreement:—several times in the MSS. of the Nijj. there are inserted in the text short remarks in Sanskrit which refer to the proper sūtram. This sūtram has, however, not been admitted into the text, e.g. Nijj. 10, 12, 170. In one case, chap. 20, this sūtra portion (in prose) has actually been incorporated into the Nijj.

42 342 foll. Each page has 17 lines of 58—63 aksh. each.
43 318—9, 3.
44 Cf., however, the Avasakṣātrasākaṇḍha in Kielhorn's Report, 1881, p. 92, and the shādvāyaṣakṣātra in Bühl's paper in the Journal of the Vienna Acad. 1881, p. 574.
45 E. g. thātā chēḥ 'padeśikān gāthāsātra sāma Niryukti-kāra: sāma' (2, 18).
46 In other passages, however, he says that the verse even of the Nijj. are sūtras! See p. 53, note 2.
It is, furthermore, noteworthy that in the Nijjuttí, too, Haribhadra distinguishes different constituent parts and different authors (see p. 53). He refers its verses at one time to the nityukti (kāra), mūlabhāṣyakāra, and at another to the saṅgrahāniṃkāra, or even sūtrākṛt. He thus brings these verses into direct contrast with each other and subjects them to different treatment, by citing some, perhaps those of more recent date, in full, [55] either word for word or without commentary; while the remainder he cites as a rule merely by their pratikās and then explains, first by a gamanikā, or aksharagamā, i.e. a translation of each word, and finally by expository remarks called out by the nature of the subject.

Haribhadra too appears to have found a special defect existing in his sūtra text. Between chapters 8 and 9 of the Nijj, we ought to find the sūtrasparśāni nijjuttí according to his statement; but: nō 'chayā, yasmād asati sütre (?) kasyā 'sāv iti. Haribhadra devotes a long discussion to sūtras in general, which recurs Nijj. 10, 2, 18, 11, 7 (sūtra and nityukti), 12, 17, 13, 8.

Using due caution in reference to an explanation of the mutual relation which exists in our text between Sutta and Nijjuttí, and in reference to the form of the text of the Āvāyakam which existed in the time of Haribhadra, I subjoin a review of the 20 ajjhayaṇas of the existing Nijj. The two MSS. which I possess (the second I call B) show many divergences from one another, some of which are explainable on the score of inexact computation of the verses. Other MSS. contain much greater variations. The passages cited in Jacobi, Kañepas. p. 100 (104) as 2, 16, and p. 101 as 2, 30, are e.g. here 3, 23 (23), 30 (30). Very great divergences come to light in the two MSS. in Peterson’s [56] Detailed Report (1885), pp. 124 and 127. These MSS. are numbered Nos. 273 (= P) and 306 (= Π, with a break in the beginning; and chapters 1, 2 and 6 are lost). The text is composed exclusively in gāthās. One of its special peculiarities is formed by the frequent dāṇḍgāthās, i.e. verses which state briefly the contents of what follows, principally by the enumeration of the catch-words or titles of paragraphs. Unfortunately the use or denotation of these verses is not regular; for which the benefit to be derived from this otherwise excellent method of division is materially reduced. The Nom. Sgl. Masc. 1. Decl. ends, with but very few exceptions, in ā.

It must be prefaced that Haribhadra treats chap. 1—10 under ajjhayaṇa 1, 11—12 under ajjh. 2 and 3 respectively, 13—18 under ajjh. 4, and the last two chapters under ajjh. 5 and 6 respectively. This is done, however, without specially marking off the conclusions of the chapters of the Nijj. Only the conclusions of the six ajjhayaṇas are distinguished from the others.

1. pechhā, piṭhikā, 131 vv. (in P the thirāvall has nominally 125 and pechhā 81 gāthās!) It begins with the same Thirāvall (50 vv.) that occurs in the beginning of the Nandi, and treats, from v. 51 on, of the different kinds of nāpa (cf. Nandi and Anuṣṭhānav.). Haribhadra does not explain the Thirāvall at all and begins his commentary (fol. 3) at v. 51: abhinibhāhānāgaṇi, suana-sāgaṇi, cēva abhināgaṇi, cha ta na maṇḍapajvāna-sāgaṇi, kēvala-sāgaṇi cha pañcho-sāgaṇaṇi 51 11.

43 4, 5, 3, iyāna nityukti-gāthā, tē tu mūlabhāṣya-akṣara-gāthā: bhūmasēva (4, 3—6).
44 The sūtrākṛta appears here as later than the saṅgrahāniṃkāra, fol. 200a:—tēn abhibhitam aha saṅgrahāniṃkāra; ambē (Nijj. 35, 40) gāthā, aśi (40) gāthā; iśānu gāthā Türkiye sūtrakriya-nityukti-gāthābhūta eva prakāśārubhībhuvāryāpyāyata (sūtrakṛta ... vyāhyāyata or sūtrakriya nīryā ... vyāhyāyata would be better); dhāraṇī pañcāṃ sāgām ti ... then follows the text of Nijj. 16, 50—56 in full but without commentary. Here it is to be noticed that one of the MSS. of the Nijj. in my possession omits these 15 verses from the text. See p. 59 in regard to the assumption that the Nijj is the work of several authors.
45 An occasional reference to other methods of treating the subject is found, e. g. 2, 61, iti samākārthāḥ, vyāhyāyos tu vidyāśrayavahadāvagabhāvanyāh. Or on 10, 19, iti gāthāsthākārthāḥ, bhāvyādhas tu bhāvyagāthābhyām vyāhyāyāḥ, tē cha sā'yāḥ (in Prākṛta, but not from the Nijj.)
46 Chapter 8 forms an exception, though at the end at least it says: samāpāt chē 'yam upādāntaniṃkār iti, but in such a way that it is not mentioned as the "eighth chapter"; nor is the statement made that it is concluded.
[57] 2. padhamā varacharī, 173 (179 P, 179 B) v., treat., from v. 69 on, of the circumstances of the lives, etc., of the 24 Jinas, especially of Usabha, the first of their number. In the introduction it is of extreme interest to notice the statements of the author in reference to his own literary activity. It is as follows:

titthayarē bhagavaṁti | añuttarapurakkanē amanānāt | tiṇnē sugaṅgāgaṅā | siddhipahapāśē
vaśādē II 1 II

vaṁdāmi mahābhāgaṁ | mahāmuniṁ | mahāyasaṁ Mahāvīraṁ | amaranarāyanaṁ | titthayaram imaṁta titthasa | II 2 II ikkaṁsa vi gaṅgarê | parvāyā śavayaṁ pavaṇaṁ pavaṇaṁ vaṁdāmi | sarvam gaṅgaravādaṁ | vāyagavādaṁ pavaṇaṁ cha | II 3 II te vaṁdiñga śirasā | atthaṁ

hutassa | 49 | ējiṁ kauṭiyasa | suṁaṁsa pavaṇaṁ | II 4 II bhagavaṁ | niyuttins | 50 | kītaṁs | iśvaṁgasaṁ dasaṁ | I liasa | taha uṭṭaraṁjha-ma-yārā | 51 | saṅggaṁ niyuttins | buccchhāmi taha dasaṁ | cha | II 5 II kappasa | ya niyuttins | varāhāraṁ vavaramanaṁ | sūtraṁpannta | buccchhāmi iśvaṁgasaṁ | 52 | cha | II 6 II

česīṁ niyuttins | buccchhāmi ahaṁ jinaṁ | jaṅgāsaṁ | āharaṇāvaṁkāra | payasvavana iśām samāsaṁ | II 7 II

sāmātāni niyuttins | buccchhāmi uvāsām gurujasenaṁ | āyasaṁparanāmaṇaṁ | āyasaṁ āgopyvvaṁ | II 8 II

niyuttī tō atthā | jaṅgāddiva teṅa ṣō呗 niyuttī | taha vi aī buccchhāvi | viśvaṁ samāsaṁ suttapaṁvā | II 9 II

There is no doubt that we have here the beginning of a work, [58] and that chapter 1 (which is itself called pīṭhikā, support, complement) did not yet precede these verses at the period of their origin. From vv. 5 and 8 we learn that the author does not intend to write an introduction merely for this second chapter, but that his work is designed for all the aṅgasya and especially the sāmāya. The separate statements of his account show that he intended to carry his investigations into the first two aṅgas too, the fifth upāga, three chhaḍasātras, two more mūlasātras, and, if Haribhadra's explanation of isībāsaṁ is correct, to paṁna 7 fgg.

If we compare these statements with those in the commentary of Rishimandalaśutra in Jacobi, Kalpas, p. 13, in reference to the ten niyuktis composed by Bhadrabāhu, it is manifest that they are identical (instead of kalākṣaya in the passage in Jacobi we must read kalpakasya), and that Bhadrabāhu must be regarded as the one who in our passage speaks in the first person. This conclusion, however, is not supported by the Thēravālī in chap. 1, which, as we have seen, p. 7, is much later than Bhadrabāhu. Nevertheless, we have just above formed the opinion that this contradiction is immaterial, since this pīṭhikā is to be regarded as not extant at the time of the composition of chap. 2. [59] The greater is, however, the contradiction which is disclosed by other parts of the text, notably the first verse of the uṣṇaṁniyuktī cited as 6, ff., and chapter 8, etc. The statements made there refer to a period much later than that of Bhadrabāhu, the old bearer of this name, and who is assumed to be the last chaṭṭaṁsaña († Viśa 170). All these statements must either be regarded as alien to the original text, or the

49 arthapithuvama.
50 sūtraṁthaiṁ parasparam niyuktaṁ niyuktiṁ; — kim adekṣaya āṅkaṁ niyuktaṁ? nō, kim tachi? śrutāvade
skhaṁ śavātāśālaṁ ity uta eva "ha: āvase; — niyukti is perhaps an intentional variation of srukti.
51 samudraśārdham aṅgaṁ vṛttidaraśā, yathā Bihamasē Śeṇa iti, uttarāśaṁ ity uttarādhyayaṁ

52 dveṁdṛṣṭaṁ varadhāṇāṁ.
53 They are placed thus in a palmleaf MS., No. 23, in Peterson's Det. Report (1883) (only 1, 3 bhinibhibhas... see p. 56, proceded) at the beginning of a text entitled "niyuktyāh," which contains at least several, if not all, of the above 10 niy.
54 dasaṁvāya is undoubtedly referred to under dasaṁvāya. See the same denotation in v. 1 of the four gāthās added there at the close. For the abbreviation see note 3 on p. 37 in reference to uttarāśaṁ.
55 This is, however, extremely doubtful as regards the existing paṁna called dveṁdṛṣṭaṁ. See pp. 442,

person in question may be one of the later bearers of the name of Bhadrabāhu, to whom these ten Niryuktis might be referred. The further course of the account would then determine to what and to how late a period this Bhadrār, belonged. All this is, however, on the supposition that we should have to assume that all the other chapters of the Nijjuti were the work of but one hand! In this connection the distinction is of significance which Haribhadra — see above pp. 54, 55 — draws in reference to the separate constituent parts of the Nijj. The fourteenth chapter is expressly stated by him to have been composed by another author, viz. Jinaabhādā. See my remarks on pp. 61, 62 in reference to the incorporation of the ōhanijjuti. The result is that chap. 14 and several other chapters (9, 11, 12, 20) exist in a detached form in the MSS., without any connection with ōv. nijj. At any rate the statements made in the text remain of extreme interest since they show the interconnection of the ten niryuktis mentioned in the text, and their relation to one author. A good part of these niry appears to be still extant. [60] As regards the MS. of the niryuktayaḥ, mentioned above p. 58², we must confess that Peterson's account does not make it clear in which of the above ten texts it is contained. On the achāranirūkta see p. 258, Peterson, Palm-leaf 62, Kielhorn's Report (1881) p. 10; on a sūyaḍaṇanjī, see Pet. Palm-leaf, 69, a dasavālianjī, tā, 167. We have also citations from the nijj, in up. 5 and mūlas. 1.

What follows is very interesting:—

attāhā bhāṣā arahāḥ | suttaṃ gāṭhāṃ gāṇahārā niṇṇapaḥ | sāsasassā (pañcaḥ) hi aṭṭhāṭṭha | tād suttaṃ pavattai || 13 ||

sāmāśā-m-āśaḥ | suṇāyaḥ jāva bīndusāriḥ | tassā vi sāro charanapaḥ | sāro charanassa niṇṇapaḥ || 14 ||

Here the contents of the doctrine is referred back to Arāhan, but the composition of its textual form is ascribed to the gāṇahārā. See pp. 216, 345, above p. 35 and p. 80. The word sāmāśā, which we have found in v. 8 used as the title of the first āvāsyaka, is now used in its other signification, i.e. as the title of aṅga 1; for bīndusāra is the title of the first pūrva book in the diṭṭhivā, aṅga 12. See above pp. 243, 244.

3. bīa varacarāḥ, 349 (also P, 359 B) vv., of like contents.²⁶ It begins Vīrama Ariṭṭhānāmīniḥ Pāṇinī Mallinī cha Vassupuṣjāni cha | śā muttāpa Jīvē asvaśāśā asā rāyaḥ || ... Despite its seeming exactness, its statements give the impression of being apocryphal. Verses 287 (297) fg. treat of Siddhatthā and Tīsāḷī,²⁷ the fourteen dreams of Tīs., etc.

[61] 4. uvasaggā, 69 (70 P) vv., treat essentially of Vīrama.²⁸ The statements made here in chapter 4 take almost no notice at all of the facts in reference to the life of Vīra that are found here and there in the aṅgas; nor does the Kalpasūtra (see p. 474) devote a greater amount of attention to this subject.

5. samavasāraṇam, 69 (64 P) vv., as above.

6. gāṇaharavādā, 88 (33 P, 90 B) vv. (is wanting in P); the history of the 11 pupils of Vīra: Indabhūtā 1, Aagṛbhūtā 2, Vābhpā 3, Viṭṭṭa 4, Suhomba 5, Mādiṣā 6, Mōriṇaṇa 7, Akāmpī 8, Ayalabhāyā 9, Mājja 10, Pabhāsa 11 (see Hēmacch. vv. 31, 32); tidhāṅaṇa cha Suhombāḥ, nivābhācā gāṇahārā sēśā (v. 5). The contents is as above, and almost no reference is paid to the account in the aṅgas. It concludes with the statement (above p. 48): sāmabhū tivihiḥ: obhā dasahā padavibhāgē || 88 ||; in B there follows, as if belonging to this chapter, as v. 89 the beginning verse of the ēghaniryukti, and thenupon the statement itthā 'intārā ēhanijjuti bhāṣyavāvā. In A v. 89 appears as v. 1 at the beginning of chap. 7 and then follows in partial Sanskrit: attāhaṁ²⁹ ghaniruktī vaktavyā; after this verse 1 of chap. 7 according to the new computation. There is probably an interpolation here. Since chap. 7 treats

²⁶ Jina 5 is called Pānimbhā (v. 33), Jina 8 Sasippaha (v. 34). Jina 19 Malli appears as a man. (Mallisa v. 30).
²⁷ On Devānādī see v. 279 (289); but Usahhadatta is not mentioned. We read Sūmaṭbhidhiṇā in the scholion.
²⁸ Gāsala v. 10 fg.
²⁹ attha instead of stha.
of the second of the three sāmāchāris enumerated in 6, 86, and the first receives no mention, it was necessary to remedy this defect. The third sāmāchāri is, according to the statement of the scholiast here and elsewhere, pp. 357, 449, represented by the two chhēdāśitraś: kalpa and vyavahāra. It is very probable that the interpolation is not merely one of secondary origin, but an interpolation inserted by the author himself. [68] If this is so, he deemed the ēhanijjuttī which he had before him (perhaps his own production) to be the best expression of the first form of the 3 sāmāchāris, and consequently, not taking the trouble to compose a new one, incorporated62 brevi manu this ēhanijjī (cf. above p. 59), or rather referred to it merely by the citation of its introductory verse. A complete incorporation brought with it no little difficulty, because of the extent of the text in question.61 The economy of the whole work would have lost considerably if the entire text had been inserted. The text which we possess under this name and of which the first verse alone is cited here, consists of 1180 Prākrit gathās.63 I shall refer to it later on, and call attention to the present to what I have said on p. 357n: — that the first verse cited here from it, in that it mentions the dasapuṇvi, excludes any possibility of that Bhāradvājhusvāmin, whom tradition calls the author of the ēghanirukti, having been the first bearer of this name, who is stated to have been the last chauddāpasuṇvi. The same, of course, holds good a fortiori of the author of our text, in which this verse is quoted.

7. dasavīhāsamāyāri, 64 (Pς, 65 B) vv. ; cf. uttarajbī. 26; the enumeration here in chapter 7 is as follows (see above p. 48): ichchhā, michchhā, tahakkārā, āvasiśa niśihi; āpucchhaṇā ya [53] paṭipucchhā cīhānañjāya ya nīmañjāya II; II uvasaṃpaṇyā ya kāle sāmāyāri bhavē dasaṇihā u II cēhīs tu payāmaṇ paṭtēa parśuvaṇa bhojchhaṇa II; II

8. uvagghāyanijjuttī, 211 (214 B, 216 P, 210 π) vv. In vv. 40-50 glorification of Ajja-Vayarā (plur. maj.), Vaṣā, Vajravāmin, who extracted the ēgāsagama vijjā from the mahāpānā (see p. 251) and made ample use of the latter. In his time there still existed (p. 247) apuṭakā kāliānuḍaśa, apṛthaktaṇā kalikānuyogasya, but after him (tēpā "rēṣa, tata āntah, Harihi), i.e. perhaps through him there came into existence puhattāṃ kāliśaṇa dīṭhivāc, a, pṛthakvanā kāliśarute dīśivād ca (v. 40). Tumbāvaṇa, Ujñājī, Dasapura, nāyana Kusumaṇām (Pāṭaliputra) appear in regular order as exercising an important influence upon his life. In vv. 50-53 glorification of his successor Rakkhiṇjā (plur. maj.), Rakkhiñkhamapa, i.e. of Ārya Rakshatvasāmin, son of Sūmadāva and Ruddaśaṃ, (elder) brother of Phaggurakkhia and pupil of Tāsāliputta. These two names: Vajravāmin and Āryarakshita (cf. Hēmāchandra's parisēṭp. chaps. 12, 13), especially as they are regarded here as persons deserving of great honor, bring us to a period much later than the old Bhāradvājhusvāmin. According to the statements of the modern Thāravāḷī (see Klatt, 1. c. pp. 246b, 247a, 252a, his death is placed Vīra, 170, but that of Vajra, 400 years later, Vīra 534.65 We will find below that [64] there is mentioned here another still date later by several years. Hēm. v. 34 too says that Vajra is the last "dālapuṛvin," one who still has knowledge of 10 of the 14 pūrvas, and in general that he is regarded as deserving great honour as regards the transmission of the sacred texts. See the account of Dharmaghosha on the Kupakshakasaṅk. Kup. p. 21 (811). The two-fold division into kāliśaṇa and dīṭhivā (also in the Aṃuyogadv. above, pp. 36, 40), dating back as far as Vajra according to v. 40, is in contrast to a no less peculiar division into four parts, referred back in v. 54 fg. to Ārya Rakshita: kāliśaṇaḥ ca isibhisāyānam taśa a śrūpan-

61 In the Vidhiprapaḥ (in v. 7 des jōgaviśinaḥ) the ēhanijjutti is said to be "ōṇām, avatṛpaḥ into the ēvāsvayaṃ.
62 Hārīta. says: skāpentam ēghanirukti vṛhchā, sā ca prapaṇiḥśtatvāt (perhaps on account of its falseness) na vīvṛtyat; and likewise at the end: idānā padaviśinamāṃcāhāryām pratiṣṭhāvā, sā ca kalpaśvanābhārāpā bhavatiśtarā vṛṣṭīṇām arāya; ity uktāḥ sāmāchāryaṃ prakramakalpaḥ.
63 The ēghanirukti, which in Pς is actually incorporated with the text, has but 58 (or 79 π) verses. See below, p. 82.
64 But according to the Gacendrasaṅkhaśāstra, v. 29, it was taken from the suṁmahāpāṇasupuṇvin; see p. 479.
65 In v. 36 there was mention of 700 (1) or 500 nayās, ēhānā (v. 37) dīṭhivā ērapuṇvaṇa suṁmahāpāṇanā; each of the 7 etc. nayās — see p. 350 ff. and p. 39 — sātaviḥāb. See also Kupakshak. p. 21 (811).
[65] In this text we notice that the different sections are frequently joined together without any break; and such is the case here. In vv. 56 to 96 we find very detailed statements in reference to the seven ninhagas, nihnavas, schisms. After an enumeration (v. 56) of the names there follows a list of their founders, the place of their origin (v. 59), the date of their foundation (vv. 60, 61), and then a more exact list of all in regular order, though in a most brief and hence obscure fashion, the catch-words alone being cited. The kathānākas etc. added in the scholiast, help us but little to clear up this obscurity. The first two schisms occurred during the life of Vīra, the first (v. 62, 63), the Bāhuyana, bhrptor, under Jāmili in Śavatthī in the fourteenth year after he obtained knowledge (Jīṇā upadīsā atavasa, the second (v. 64, 65), the Jīvaśāla, under Rāmātūrasa (chaudācāpuru) in Uṣnagarīn in the sixteenth year thereafter. The third schism (v. 66, 67), the Ayavatīka, avyaktika, under Āsāla, in Śābī (Śvētāvīkā), in the 214th year after the end of Vīra’s death (śiddhiṃ gayassa Virasa). They were “brought back to the right faith” (Jaci, Kalpas. p. 9) by the Muria (Māruya) Balabhadra in Rāyaṅa. The fourth schism (v. 68, 69), the Śāmuchchēha or chchēha under Āsamitā (Śva) in Mānighora (Mithila) is placed in the year 220 after Vīra. The fifth (v. 70, 71), [66] the Dākśirīna, under Gaṅga in Ullamaṭa (U, Ullaga B, Ullage, skoliast, Ullūkā in Sk.) in the year 228. The sixth, the Tērāsīa, tairāsika, under Chhalugia in Aṅtaraṅgā, in the year 544, is treated of at greater length (vv. 72—87), though in a very obscure fashion. We have already seen (p. 331) that āṅga 12, according to the account of āṅga 4 and Nandī, devoted considerable attention to these schisms. Finally, the théravāli of the Kalpāśīma (§ 6) contains several statements in reference to the Tērāsīya sākhā and its founder Chhalū Dīkṣāgottā. The latter it calls the scholar of Mahāgiri, who, as in the théravāli of the Nandī, is called the ninth successor of Vīra. But this is not in harmony with the above-mentioned date (544 after Vīra), since it is equivalent to an allotment of 60 years to each patriarchate. There is then here, as in the case of the name of the founder of the fourth schism — see 351—381 — a considerable discrepancy in the accounts. The seventh schism, the Asādhi (v. 88—91), under Gaṭhāmāhāla in Dāsapura is referred to the year 584 and brought into connection with Ayya Rakṣheśa, Pūsāmita and with the ninth puṣya (p. 355). The first of these statements harmonizes with the other information concerning Rakṣheśa which we possess. See p. 63, Klatt p. 2470. The name Pūsāmita is frequently met with. According to Mūrughā’s Visāvatārati (see Bühler, ante, 2, sec. and Jacobi, Kalpas. p. 7), there reigned a Pūsāmita, successor of the Muria (the Pushyamitra of the Mahābhāṣya, etc.), in the years 323—353 after Vīra. Neither can he be the one referred to here, nor the Pūsāmita who was

66 The terminology in the Nandī — see above p. 11 — is quite different. There the kāliya, sāka, together with the ukāliya, as a subdivision of the anāgāpavṛtiṣṭha texts, is opposed to the duvālānmṛga gap, the ishākāla, together with the așpir, are regarded as parts of the kāliya. In reference to the use of the word in Ānun, see above, p. 36 n. 2.

67 upalakāṃśaḥ kāliyaśrutam chaṛaṇakarmaṇaṇuyogāḥ, rśibhibhāṣṭhitām dharmakārthānuṣṭhāya iti ganeṣān; sarvasa cha dhāśṭrāścāsi chaturūṭhā bhavati anūyogāḥ, dravyanuyogā iti, tatra ishābhāṣṭhitām dharmakārthānuṣṭhāyā iti uktam, tatra ca mahākārpaṇaḥ rśibhibhāṣṭhitam tvi (tattvāt), dhāśṭrāścāsi udāśrīṣyā mokṣaṃ pratipātātītāt, dharmakārthānuṣṭhāyā (tvi vṛcch ca?) pramanage iti naśa daśābhādaśkrachākṛdhāyāḥ "ha jan ca . . . " (v. 55). See p. 238.

68 See above, pp. 275, 381 on aśga 3 and upaśga 1. Further information is found in the second chhēdāstra (see p. 463) and in the scholiast on uttarājī. § 9.

69 Abhayadaśa on up. 1 mentions Pushyamitra instead of Āsāmita. See p. 381. Is this merely a lapsus calami?
the founder of the Pūsamittijāṃ kulaṃ of Chāraṇaṅga in § 7 of the thēravāḷ of the Kalpas, which emanated from Sirigutta, the pupil of the tenth [67] patriarch Suanthi. The name Pūsamitta occurs here too in chap. 17 (16), 19 (see p. 74a), as that of a contemporary of king Muṇimagha and of Ayya Passabhū. Abbhayadēva on up. 1 mentions him as the founder of the fourth schism. See p. 659.

In addition to these seven schisms there was an eighth (vv. 92—95), that of the Dōdia, Pauṭika, according to Haribh., under Sivabāhi in Rahavārapura (Ratha) in the year 609. According to the account in Dharmaghoṇa's scholiast on his Knāpakshakanā, the Digambaras are referred to; see Kup. p. 6 (796) where I have attempted to show that the name Dōdia has the same meaning (naked) as digambara. The animosity against the Bōtikas is as keen as can possibly be imagined. In the 22nd chapter of the Vichārāṁritasāṅgraha, the remaining 7 niṅvasas are said, according to Malayagiri's commentary on the Avāṣy, to be dēsvaṅvādīno dravyaśāntena 'bhedīno, but the Bōtika: sarvaśaṅvādīno dravyaśāntatā 'pi bhīnasā. Similarly Haribh. on v. 92 (dēsavā and prabhūtavā); see also Jacob, Kalpas, p. 15. In the kālasattārī, v. 40, they appear as khaṇḍapaṃ saṃsārdya; also in Kup. 1. 27. 71. 2. 2; ibid. 1, 2, 2; or as khavasya, i.e. khaṇḍapaṃsaka. See below, p. 75.

In contradistinction to these heterodox opinions (michhadithi) we have the praises of the sāmaṁsāṁ sung in v. 102 fg. We find it called70 (v. 108) as an "ajjhaṣyaṁ" as opposed to the "remaining (five) ajjhaṣyas;" and the two verses closing with the refrain ii kavallhāśiṁ [68] are cited in reference to it. These verses recur in the Anuyogadārāsaṭṭha (see above, pp. 37, 38) as I have shewn on Bhagav. 2, 186. After the conclusion of the upodhātāniruytika, we find in the scholiast (see above p. 55) the following statement: atra sūtrasparśaniruytika (see p. 38) avasaraḥ, si cha prāptāvāsā 'pi nō, 'chuvā, yasāṁ sati sūtra kaṣāyā 'sāv iti; to which is joined an elaborate deduction in reference to sutta and niruytika.

9. namukkāramāṇjuttika, 139 (Pn. 144 B) vv. Towards the end we find the verse ēsō paṁca (132), glorifying the paṁchanamukkāra, a verse we have already met with in upaṅga 4; see p. 303. In the last pada we have here the reading havai måṅgalaṃ; see Kup. p. 21 (811) fg. where this form of the verse is referred directly back to ēri-Vajrāśīmāna. See p. 38a. 2 on v. 69. A detached copy is found in Peterson, Palm-leaves No. 77.

10. sāmaṁsāṁjuttika, 100 (v. 111 P, 112 B) vv. Begins: naṇḍi-aṇuyogadāraṇi vihivad uvaṃghāhām cha kiṁna kāṁ paṁchanamāṅgalanām āraṁbhā āhaṃ suttassa 12 11. The knowledge of the naṇḍi and of the aṇuyogad.71 is here regarded as a preliminary condition for the understanding of the sūtra. This citation is both per se of interest (see p. 9), and also because from it we can prove that the Avāṣyaḥ texts quoted in these two works are to be distinguished from our āv. nijj. — though this was tolerably self-evident after the remarks on p. 53 ff. The text continues:

ahāvā (I): kayapāṁchanamukkāra karī sāmaṁsāṁ ti sō bhīhiō tā sāmaṁsāṁ eva ya jaṁ sō sēṣaṁ nō bucbuhaṁ [59] 12 11 sūtraṁ (atrā 'ūtarā sūtraṁ vācyān B). On this Har., (see between 8 and 9): atrā 'ūtarā sūtrasparśaniruytiktā uchvatā, svasthāvatvād, āha cha niruytikāraḥ: akkhaḷiya (v. 3) ti,72 gāhā. We have here then a very incomplete quotation of the text, see above p. 55. — In v. 30—38 there are special statements in reference to the 11 karaṇas, the fourth of which is here called thīvīlyyaṇaṃ. See p. 414. In v. 40 we find a division of the sāna into baddhaṁ and abaddhaḥ. The former is explained by duvāṣīyaṇaṃ and called niśhāmā and anisāhā (see pp. 453, 553); the niśhāmā is explained as pachhāmā, and the following added in illustration: — niśhāmā nāma jahā 'jhāyāṇaṁ (v. 41). In verse 42 we

70 ajjhaṣayaṁ pi a ti vihānaṁ | suttā atthā tad-ubhāhā chēva | seśaṃ vī a dhāyaṉaḥ (chaturvīśatāṁvādaṁ) hōi ēva nijjātā udāśānirīśaṅkā nīraktyānparvāyaśānā.
71 naṇḍi ca anuyogadāraṇi cha Haribh.
72 akkhaḷišamān hi vākbuddhākṣakā daripakā | suttatāmaṇānamāṇjuttīgathītāvaṁhā mō hōi | sa chob tatrā 'vahītanānaḥ saṃhāraḥ saṃhāti (a fine Brhaminal reminiscence) ||
    padānā, saṃhāti, padārtha, padavīgraha, chaśiśa, pratyavānyanām (see above p. 38) are here referred to.
find a citation from pūrva 2 — see above p. 354 — in immediate conjunction with the foregoing.

11. chañuviratthā, 62 (61 BP) vv., second ajhayaṇa in Haribh. Stands alone in Peterson’s Palm-leaf 77c.

12. vamdaṇanijjutti, 191 (189 B, 190 P) vv., equivalent to the third ajh. of Har. Stands alone in Peterson’s Palm-leaf No. 774. From v. 36 on there is a dialogue between guru and chōṭa, chōḍaka, see above p. 34. After v. 176 we read in the text: atra sūtraṁ, and Har. quotes a text which begins with the words ichhāmi khamasamaṇa vañṇidhinā.

13. padikkamaṇanijjutti, 54 (b2 PB, 61 n) vv. Chap. 13—18, which correspond to the fourth ajh. of Haribh, presuppose a [70] pratikramaṇastraṇī given by him in full in sections. These chapters form a species of running commentary to each of the sections of the pratik. Chap. 14, 15 take up one section each, chap. 17 two, chap. 13, 16 contain the explanation of several sections. The sections explained in chap. 13 read: — padikkamaṇa ēgavihā āsā̄mjamē . . . p. dōhiṁ bāndhaṇēhiṁ, p. tīṁ daṇḍēhiṁ, p. chañhuṁ jhāṇēhiṁ. The entire following chapter is a dhammadajjhaṇa of 69 vv. which precedes these sections commented upon in chapter 13.

14. jhānasayam, dhyānaśatakam, 106 vv. The last verse (106) which is omitted by Haribhāda, mentions only 105 vv., and states that Jīṣabhadda is the author of this centon: paṁchuttārēga, gāṅā-sāgga jhānasayagangā samuddītiḥ! Jīṣabhaddhakhamasaṇeṇi kammaśeṣakāram jaināḥ 111. It had originally, as at present (see Peterson’s Palm-leaf 774 161c), a quite independent position and was later on inserted here. This is clear from the fact that the beginning contains a special salutation, which is usual only in the case of independent texts: Virgin sukkajāhaṇa-giraṇḍakhammaṇidhaṇaṁ paṇmīṇaṁ jāṁsāraṁ saranaṇaṁ, jhānasajjhaṇaṁ pavakkhāṁ 111 Haribh. cites this dhyānaśatakam just as he usually cites his [71] kathākaka: ayaṁ dhyānasamāsārthaṁ, vyāsārtas tu dhyānaśatakāṁ avasaśyāṁ, tach chē dām dhyānaśatakam asya māhārathyaś vasunāḥ śaśrāntaratvāt! (this is plain; we should have expected i the ōtvach cha) prārāṁbhēva śava viṅgāvāṅa-yakāpāśātāya maṅgalarthāṁ ishtadēvatānantakāram āhā: Virān . . . The explanation concludes (omitting verse 106) with the words: — samāptaṁ dhyānaśatakam, and the commentator proceeds with his explanation of the pratikramaṇastraṇī: padikkamaṇa paścchāṁi kriyāśaṁ, again having recourse thereby to the pārśṭabhaṇyaṇiṇiyuttī.

15. pārśṭhabhaṇia, 151 (152 P, 153 B) vv. Begins: pārśṭhabhaṇiaśavijjanī (bucchāmi dhra- purisapannatattāṁ) jāṁ nūnā suvihā pavayanasamānaṁ uvalabhāḥti 111. This chapter, too, gives me the impression of having originally enjoyed a separate existence. Nevertheless it is closely connected with chapter 18, since they both share this form of introduction. It is also noticeable that the same verse recurs with tolerable similarity in 20, 9; from which we may conclude that chapters 16, 18, 20 were composed by one author. Haribh. in this chapter omits or leaves a large number of verses unexplained; and begins with v. 79. His commentary is partially composed in Prākṛti, probably taken from the old bhāṣya (see p. 52). After the conclusion: — parīṣṭhāpanīni samāśaṁ, he proceeds to cite and explain the sūtraṁ: padikkamaṇa chañhāṁ jīvaṇikāśīṁ. In 2 there is an additional chapter āsā, with 13 vv., inserted between the conclusion and explanation.

16. padikkamanasanghavāṇī, pratikramaṇasanghrahāṇī, 133 (80 P 2 B) vv. The verses, which are not found in [72] B, are cited in full by Haribh. as a part of his commentary. 76

---

75 It begins ichhāmi padikkamanā . . . it is in prose and different from the ērādha- or śrāvaka-pratikramaṇa- sūtra, whose 50 gāthis, divided into 5 adhikāras, were commented in Suvāṭ 1486 (A. D. 1440) by Ratnaśekhaṇa from the Taṅgagachha (No. 53 in Klāśi). In Peterson’s Palm-leaf MSS. there are two other similar texts, a pratikramaṇastraṇī 809a, 80c (where it is called atichārapratī) and a pratikramaṇa 154a (see p. 125b), which is different from the first.

76 He appears in Ratnaśekhaṇa as the author of a viśeṣhāvānīya. See preceding note.

77 Or possibly thereby does not contain the verses: A 16-38, 32-43, 50-64, 68-80.

78 On one occasion he calls these verses (vv. 50—64) nibhyagāthās of the śatākṛit (1), by which the śatākṛit (1), is said to explain the two preceding verses (68, 69) of the saṃghaṇīkāra. See above p. 342.
The verses which A B have in common, are cited by him here, not as verses of the niryaṇṭikṛit, but as a part of the saṁgrahaṇikalā. In these chapters we find explanations and enumerations of the contents of sections 6—31 of the pratikramaṇaśūtram. Each group of verses is explained under its proper section. Chapters 14 and 15, however, belong to but one section. The following is treated of: 6 jītvanikā, 7 bhayāșṭhāna (v. 14), 8 mayaśṭhāna (v. 14), 9 bāmbha-cīrāgyutī (v. 15), the 10-fold samaṇadhamma (v. 16), 11 uvāsagapādīgā (v. 17), 12 bhikkhu-pādīgā (v. 31), 13 kirīyaśṭhāna (v. 44), 14 bhūyangāma (v. 45), 15 paramāṭhama (v. 48, 49), 16 prahāśñāsa (vv. 55, 66), the 17-fold saṁjana (v. 67), the 18-fold abhimba (v. 81), 19 nāyajyāṣṭhāna (vv. 83, 84), 20 asamāhitāṣṭa (vv. 84—86), 21 sabāla (śabāla v. 87), 22 parśaha (v. 90), 23 ṣuttagāḍajyāṣṭhāna (v. 102), 24 dēva (v. 103), 26 bhāvāya (v. 104), 26 dāsā-kappavahārinā uddēsaṣṭakā (v. 109), the 27-fold anagāracharitā (v. 110), the 28-fold āyārapakappa (v. 112), 29 pāvastupassāmaṇa (v. 115), 30 mōhanīyaśṭhāna (v. 117) and 31 siddhāśīna (v. 132). We find herein enumerations of the 23 chapters of aṅga 2 (in two groups, one of 16, the other of 7; see above p. 260), of the 19 chapters of the first part of aṅga 6, of the 26 chapters of the three chhēḍaśūtras 3—5, and of the 28 chapters of aṅga 1.

17. jōgasanāganāsaśyānyā, āśātānā; 64 vv., in A counted continuously in conjunction with chapter 16, i.e. as vv. 134—197. In P, B, however, it is divided into two chapters: jōgasanāganā of 60, and asyānya of 5 (4 π) vv. It contains the vouchers for and examples (udāharaṇagāthā) of the 32 jōgasanāganās (to v. 193) and 33 asyānyās,27 āśātānas (v. 194—197), which are mentioned in both sections of the pratikramaṇasūtram. The pratikramaṇaśūtraṇ (paccanā samāptā) ended here according to Haribh. But with the words sāmipratāmaṁ sutroktā ēva trayastriṇaṁ vyākhyāyanto... Haribh. comes back to the explanation of v. 197. These verses contain principally matters of legendary and historical purport, and consist chiefly of proper names and of some catch-words. Haribhadra cites very detailed kathānakas on them composed in Prākrit, from which the meaning of the verses is to be extracted (svabuddhāva vasiṣṭha); but he does not enter upon the explanation of the text of each of the verses, or even of the kathānakas cited by him. It is very interesting that Thūlabhadda is here brought into connection with the (ninth, Haribh.) Nanda, and with the Saṇḍa-laanda Vararuci (v. 144, cf. the statements in Hāmaṭa's parīśisṭaparvan 8, 3 fg.). The same may be said of the mention of Sālavāvāhaṇa in Pañjīṭhù (v. 164; Vikramāditya is, however, not noticed), and of the identification, in all essentials, of all these and similar [74] names28 with the names of king Dummha of Pañcāla, of Nānīt of Vidēha, Naggal of Gaṇḍhāra (v. 172), and with the Pañcavāraṇa (v. 161)! As far as the legends admit of being comprehended (which is no easy matter, if we take into consideration the enigmatical character of the text and the corrupt condition of the MS. of the commentary), they are in only partial agreement with our information in respect to these persons obtained from Brahminical sources. The information they convey, is quite independent of any other source, and is probably the result of their arbitrary desire for change. It is of interest that the gathā (v. 158), cited pp. 158, 159, which is quite in keeping with the character of the verses of Ḫila, is here inserted in the legend of two prostitutes (Maṇhasuṇḍarī and Maṅgasūrī).

18. asajjhaīyanijjutti, asvādhyāyika, 111 (P, 110 B) vv. Begina,30 asajjhaīyanijjuttaṁ bhūchchhāmā dhūraparipannattaaṁ i jai nāpā suvihā pahayapaśāraṁ uvalbhāhānti || i asajjhaīyan i duvihaṁ āyasamuttham āha parasaṁputtham āha i jai tattha parasaṁputthāṁ taṁ paṁ-

17 On vv. 87—88 we read here: āsān vṛkhyaḥ... ayaṁ ca samāśārthah, vyākhyātaḥ tu daśākhyād-graṇṭhaḥ ānasaṁāyam (它可以是) asamāhitāḥ dhānānākhyaḥ sabalavardham abhāhitam, saṁgrahaṇikātras tu evam tathā parivartaḥ (v. 97). The fourth chhēḍaśūtram (or its second book, see p. 408) is meant by the daśākhyā graṇṭha mentioned here.

18 Explained by śāh (!) samyagdarśanāvyāvatālakṣaṇapāṇaṁ, tasyaś āśātanāḥ khaścikṣitaṁ āśātanāṁ... as if the word was śāyasyānaḥ (or śāyaśānā).29

27 As for example Vijaya in Bharuchcha v. 189, Maṇḍhība, Ajja Puseabhū, Pāsamitta in Sambavādhaṇa v. 190.

28 Verse 5 is omitted by Haribh.
19. kaussagani, 172 vv., fifth ajjh. in Har.

20. pachchakkhañani, corresponds to the sixth ajjh. in Haribh., and consists of three parts: — 1. A metrical section in 22 (26 B) vv., with an enumeration of the 5 mālañgas. 81

2. A prose portion treating of the 12 vratas (5 annuva, 3 guṇava, 4 sikhāpadva). Haribhadra calls its sections sūtram; this is doubtless to be regarded as a bit of the sūtram, which is presupposed in the other chapters, but not directly admitted into the text of the Nįj. 3. A metrical conclusion of 74 (70 B) vv., which closes with the same two verses as chapter 10. There are 194 vv. verses in all given in P, but in n only 90. It stands alone in Peterson's Palm-leaf 77c (without statement as to the number of verses) and 86c (94 vv.). — The prose part (nominative in d) is directed with great vigor against the amaunañyas (anyasthāhika) and against the parapāsabhasaṅhas, or the parapāsañjasanañvas. According to Haribhadra, the Brahminical sects 82 Bhārati and Vōtika (Digambara, see above p. 67) are treated of under annaṇa. The 363 doctrines attacked in annaṇa 2 are referred to under parapāsanaṇa. See p. 259. 83

According to H. there is no mention here of the seven schisms. 76 He mentions also a legend (in Prakrit) of Cuka and Charhagutta in Pādaḷiputta. Cf. Hāmač, pariś. chap. 8 and 9.

Besides the Niṇjutti I possess a fragment of a second metrical treatment of the śāvyaka, which is, however, confined to vānāna and pachchakkāna. The former is divided into two sections, chaityavānādana and guru. 84 The text is only partially based upon the Niṇjutti. There is an avachūri (chūrṇi) to it from the commentary of a Sūmasunuḍara (from the Chandragachina). This avachūri can be traced back to a Jñānasāgara.

[77] XLV. The third mulañstram, dasavālañasukkhañādha, dasavañkārika, or merely: dasāñkha, dasāñkālika. It consists of ten ajjhayaagas, which are composed in ślokas, with the exception of a few prose sections. There are furthermore two chapters called chūli (and hence

81 pāpañca nadañca adatta mulañca pariṣṭhā cēva. || 8 || sāvayañhammassa vihitān kāhooti dhihpurisapamattāni | jain charīna sāviihi gīna vi sāhāna pānavi || 2 || On this verse see p. 71 on chap. 15.
82 anyasthāhikarigatiṣyati vā chaityāni arhatpratimaśaṅhaṇi, yathā Bhuntaraparigṛhiṣṭāni Vīśhahadre-Mahā kālāni, Vōtika-parigṛhiṣṭāni vā.
83 Dr. Lummel called my attention to the fact that a letter of Schiefer zu me dated Dec. 1837 — see Ind. Stud., 4, 335 — contains the following statement extracted from the introduction of a Tibetan work edited by Wencilow: “there are 363 different schisms in the religion of India.” Since I found nothing of the kind in the introduction of Taranātha, which was doubtless referred to here, I had recourse to Wencilow himself. On the 8th of October 1883, I received from him the following kind reply: — “I cannot inform you definitely in which of my works 363 Indian schools are mentioned, if at all; but it is certain that this number is frequently mentioned in Tibetan works.” In Dājñja Vatukā's Siddhanta, which I have at present before me, I find the following: “In the sūtras are mentioned 96 darsana papantika[?], 14 dijaktra mulañci[?], 61 injurious darsana, 28 which do not permit salvation, and 20 which are ruinous.” In Bhām's work Tarkadvāla all the darsanas are enumerated in 110 species, "viz..." According to my hasty count there are more than 120 names, probably because the same school is mentioned twice, e. g. in Sakkrit and Thibetans. And at the end, after mention of all 110 (—130) species, we read: — in all 363 darsana. As regards the names of these darsanas, it is too difficult for me to translate them into Russian and a fortiori into German, though, should you desire it, I will attempt it as best I may be able.” I did not consider it necessary to have recourse again to Wencilow's kindness, since, for the purpose in view, his communication was amply sufficient. It is clear from the above, compared with p. 253, that it will be difficult to expect complete agreement in detail; nevertheless the fact that the number of 363 darsanas is common to the Jain and the Thibetan Buddhists, is of great value.
84 Thus in Āv. ni.ij, 2, 4, and in the Vidhiṣṭapā.
secondary of similar contents. These are in gāthās. After them follow four gāthās, in which Sūjā-māhāvīra, according to the old thēravāl (Nandi, Kalpas) the fourth patriarch after Mahāvīra, is stated to be the author; but his son Aja-Maṇḍāya and his pupil Jasabhadda are mentioned in connection with him. This is indeed a claim of great antiquity for the author!

The contents refers to the viṇaya, and is clothed in a very ancient dress. That this is the case is proved by the case of a chapter: ti bāmi (also in the case of the two chūlās !) and by the introduction: susaṁ mā āsuva in the prose sections (with the exception of that in chūla 1.). The dasavēliam, (see p. 11) is mentioned in the Nandi as being in the forefront of the ukkāliya group of the anahgapāvīṭha texts; its position here, however, almost at the end, does not agree with the prominent place ascribed to it by N. It appears elsewhere as the last or smallest of the āgama (if I understand the words correctly; the preceding leaf is wanting in the Berlin MS. — see p. 214) in Hāmaoḥ. [78] in the pārīsāhtap. 9, 99, and in the commentary on Nāmi-chandra’s pravacanaśāra, v. 1445, where Īpi-pūrṇaḥ, the last of the 204 sūris which Nāmi-chandra accepts, is designated as dasavākālikāndturasūtraśraddhāra ‘pi chaturdassāparvārdhāra iva śakra-pūjyaḥ. The author of the āsāyā, nijj. asarta (2,5) that he composed a nijjutti on it. A MS. of a nijjutti which recognizes the chūliya is found in Peterson’s Palm-leaf 167. Is it the work referred to? The word veśaṃ is said here to mean about the same as vaikālikaṃ, “belonging to the evening” (vīkālī ‘parāhāp). 88

1. dumapaphphā, drumaṭushpikā, 5 vv. Comparison of the dharmas with a flowering tree. Cf. āgā 2, 3, 1. uttarajj. chap. 10.
2. sūmaṇapavrvara, sūmannapavṛvīkā, 11 vv. Of firmness, dhirīt.
3. kududjīyāna, kududjīkāhāra, 15 vv.; sā dhirītur āchārē vīdāhāra.
4. oahyjvāpiyajjī, 89 adhājnāvinhākyābhyaḥ, 8. c. doubtless ‘nīkyajjīḥ; see above, pp. 71, 72. In two chapters, the first of which, in prose, begins susaṁ mē... and treats of the 6 grades of the four elements (earth, water, light, air), plants (vanaspātika) and insects (taśa) and of the 5 mahāvānas to be observed in reference to them. To these five a sixth, the rābhōśaḥ vērāmāṣa (command against eating at night), is added. Chapter 2, in 29 vv., treats of the six forms of activity (walking, standing, sitting, lying, eating, speaking) necessary for these 6 mahāvānas.
5. piṃḍāsaṇa, in 2 uddēsāsaks, with 100 and 50 vv., bhikṣhāsādhi, of the collection of the necessities of life and rules of life; see āgā 1, 2, 1. To this is joined, [79] according to the Viddhiprapā, the piṃḍāniyajjī (vinās. 4); 8th pūṭi tāpyā (vīmāna 7 of the jāgāvīnaḥ).
6. dharmārthavakāmajjhaṣaṇaḥ, also mahāchārārakāthākhaṇaḥ; in 69 vv. — This trivarga (tīvṛga also in the Abhidhānapaddikā) which plays so important a rolē in epic literature (Mbhār., Rāmāya. Maṇu) is not known to the Vēda. Among the Jains and Buddhists, by whom dharma and artha are often brought into connection, though in quite a different signification (artha sense, explanation), the trivarga does not claim any place whatsoever. It is probable that we must connect it with the three guṇas: sattva, rajas and tamas. But in that case artha would respond to rajas, kāma to tamas, though kāma suits rajas much better. Has the Platonic trinity kalā, ṣākṣa, ṣākṣa, which is Cicero’s horastum, utele, dule, wandered to India?
7. vakkasuddhi, vākṣyāuddhi, 57 vv.
8. āyārampihi, āchārāpanipidhi, 64 vv.

88 This is evident from the title dasavēliam itself. At the time that the four gāthās were added at the end, these two chūlās had not yet been affixed, since the text in v. 1 is called, as one might expect from its title, merely dasaṣṭiprīFanam.
89 According to v. 37 of the kūlaśattari it was composed in the year 98 Vīra.
87 These three names recur in the same connection in the thēravā of the Kalpas. Jasabhadda is also in the Nandi the fifth successor of Vīra.
86 In āgā 2 the word means vaiddrikāṃ; in pāṇini 5 the meaning is not clear.
88 dharmapannatti vā, in the Viddhiprapā.
9. vinayasaṃāhī, "samādhi, in 4 addākas, of which the first three in metre, in 17, 23 and 15 vv., treat of the correct vinaya, especially in reference to the guru. The fourth is in prose with the introduction suamā mē... and establishes four fixed categories of the correct vinaya.

10. sa bhikkhu-ajjhayasaṃa, in 21 vv. All the verses end, as in Uttarajjha, chap. 16, with the refrain sa bhikkhu, and consequently enumerate the requirements made of a correct bh., who desires to live in accordance with the regulations contained in the preceding 9 chapters.

11. raivakka chuḷā paḍhamā, rativāka, in two sections. The first in prose, without the introduction suamā [80] mē..., enumerates 18 thānas which the bhikkhu must take and fulfill in order gradually to acquire mukkha. These second, in 18 vv., partly with the refrain: sa paṭchhā paritappā, emphasizes especially the obstacles to this quest and serves sīdṭōd thīrkarāṇāya.

12. chuḷā 2 without any special title (also in the Vidhiprapā merely chuḷiyā) in 16 vv., describes the correct course of action of the man of firmness.

The conclusion is formed by the 4 gāthās in reference to Sijjaṅbhava, which have already been referred to. These gāthās are probably of later date. The work is called in v. 1 dasaṅkāliam (as in Āv. nijj. 2, 4 in the Vidhiprapā) and also dasaṇjhayasaṃa; so that verse 1 at least dates from a period in which the two chuḷās had not been added (see p. 774)

The text is frequently doubtful in the two Berlin MSS. The commentary calls itself an avadānūri of the vṛhadvṛtti of Hariṅhadraśrī. Another avadānūri, in bāṣhā, is the work of a Rajahāṇāpāṭhyāya. A laghuvaṃti too is ascribed to Hariṅhadra. See p. 458.

FOLKTALES OF HINDUSTAN.

BY WILLIAM CROOKE, C.S.

No. 3.—How Eve rescued the Prince.

There was once a king, who dearly loved his queen, and she too loved him exceedingly. One day the king went to hunt, and met in the jungle a most beautiful woman. He fell in love with her and brought her home; soon she got his heart in her power, and one day she said: "I will live with you only on this condition, that you get rid of your first queen." The king was grieved, but he was in her power, and he searched for a cause to discard the queen: but she was so good that he could find no fault in her.

One evening he challenged her to play chess and said, "This shall be the stake. If before the game is finished a jackal howls, I will take my new queen and leave my kingdom: but if a donkey brays, then you must go away." This was agreed on; before the game was over the jackal howled. The king said, "Lady, you have won. To-morrow I will make over my kingdom to you and depart." At this her heart was nearly broken, and, not wishing to distress her husband, she replied: "Oh, king, it was a donkey that brayed. I will leave early to-morrow." The king said, "No, it was a jackal that howled." On this they began to argue, and the king said, "Let us ask the sentry whether it was a jackal or a donkey."

So the queen went to the sentry and said:—"Was it the cry of a jackal or a donkey you heard just now?" "Mistress," he replied, "it was the howl of a jackal." The queen replied: "The king and I have sworn an oath about this. If you say it was a jackal, the king must leave his kingdom. How can I defend it against our enemies? Then all you people will be killed and your children will die of hunger. You must say it was a donkey that brayed." The sentry agreed, and the queen came back to the king and said: "The sentry says it was a donkey

90 Ratnaśēkhara (in Pratikramaṇastra) cites this vṛtti frequently; likewise the Vidyārājītanāśaṅga quotes e.g. the following verse from it (or from the nijj.): titthayasthāpān khalu asthō, suttam tu gaṇāhaṁ-tsthāpān (see p. 60) [asthō ya saṁjñai suttan tamābā yaśa balavaṇī]

1. A folktales recorded by E. David, a Native Christian of Mīrāpur, from the lips of Mahtābā, a cook-woman, and literally translated.
that brayed." "You lie," said the king, "I will go and ask him myself." When the king asked the sentry he made the same answer. So the king came back and said to the queen:—
"You must leave this to-morrow morning."

Next morning the queen went off in her litter and at last reached a jungle. Through excess of grief she had not slept a wink the whole night, and was so tired that she fell asleep in the litter. Then the bearers, seeing night coming and in dread of the wild animals, quietly put the litter on the ground and ran away. When the queen awoke, finding herself alone and hearing the roaring of the wild beasts, she trembled and closed the doors of the litter. As night advanced tigers, bears and wolves roared all round her, and she lay inside trembling with fear.

When morning broke all the beasts of the forest went back to their dens, and she got up and prayed to God to appoint her some place where she could live in quiet, and get bread and water for her support. The Lord heard her prayers, and when she got out of the litter she saw a house inside a dense thicket. Going there she found that it had only a single door, which was locked. Looking about she saw the key hanging on a peg. When she opened the door, she went in and found a lot of property lying scattered about. So she locked the door thinking the house may belong to some demon (déd), and if he sees me he will kill me."

When evening came a faqir, to whom the house belonged, arrived and found the door locked. He knocked and said: "Open the door. Who has dared to shut up my house?" The queen made no answer, and did not open the door. When he got tired of knocking, the faqir said: "Whether you are a jinn, or a pari, or a déd, or a human being, open the door, and I won't hurt you." Then the queen told him the whole story and said: "Promise that we shall live as father and daughter; then I will open the door." So the faqir made the promise and said: "I will give you half of all I get by begging." The queen then opened the door, the faqir went in, and they lived there for some time happily.

Now when the queen left home she was with child, and after some time gave birth to a son, who was very beautiful. When the boy was three or four years old, one day the queen took him to bathe on the sea shore. As she was bathing him a merchant's ship appeared, and when the merchant saw the queen, he desired to take her with him. But she refused. Then the merchant secretly showed the boy some sweetmeats and the boy ran up to him. The merchant seized him and put him into the ship, and loosed it from the shore. Seeing this the queen wept violently and impressed him to give back her son. The merchant said: "I will restore him only on condition that you come with me." When the queen saw that he would not restore the child and was taking him off, through affection for the boy she agreed to go; but when the merchant desired to take her to wife she refused. The merchant thought that if he killed the child she would marry him, so after going some distance he stopped the ship, and with a pretence of great affection took the boy with him and pitched him into a well. When he returned to the ship the queen asked where her child was; he said: "I don't know. I took him a short way with me, but he turned back to you, and now I can wait here no longer." The queen was sure he had killed her son, and began to weep and bewail.

Now the fairies lived in the well into which the little prince had been thrown. They took him up in their arms and carried him quietly to their house. For two or three days the boy was quite happy, but then he began to cry and wanted to go back to his mother. But the fairies warned him,—"Don't go there, for the merchant will kill you." But he would not mind them. Then the fairies gave him two sticks, one white and the other black, and said: "When you smell the black stick you will become white as a leper, and when again you smell the white one you will get all right. So when you see your mother's ship, smell the black stick. If you don't, the merchant will take your life."

The moment the young prince got out of the well he ran in the direction where the ship had gone. The merchant from a distance saw him through his telescope (!) and recognised him. Then he got off the ship, took a sword and cut off his head, and then went on board again.
When night fell the prince was so lovely that light streamed from his face. By chance that night Father Adam and Eve (Buddha Adam, Hawa) were flying towards that jungle. Eve looked down, and when she saw the light that came from his face, she said to Adam: "What light is this? Let us go and see." Adam replied: "This is the world, and it is sometimes light and sometimes dark; come along." Eve said: "No! I must see this light." So they both flew down, and when she saw the boy, Eve took great pity on him, and cutting her finger let a couple of drops of blood fall on his head and trunk; then the boy came to life again. Then Eve said to him: "Smell the black stick; if you don't perhaps the merchant will see you again and kill you." So the boy smelled the stick and became white as a leper and went off in search of his mother.

So at last he reached the land where his mother was, and the king of that land had a great love of hearing stories. Begging his way along the boy reached the king's palace, and the people said to him: "Boy, do you know any tales? If you can tell him a story the king will be much pleased and give you a reward." The boy said, "Yes! I do know a story; if the king hears it he will be delighted." The people gave him something to eat and entertained him kindly till the evening; and when it was night the king sat in his place and beside him sat the merchant; the king's wife, and the merchant's wife, and the boy's mother and several wives of the lords sat behind seven screens, and the boy was brought forward.

So he began to tell his mother's story and his own — how his mother was married, and how his father had turned her away, and how his mother bore sorrow in the jungle and how she came to the fag, and how he was born, and how the merchant deceived his mother and threw him into the well, and how he got out of it, and how the merchant had killed him, and how he came to life, and how he changed his form by smelling the stick.

And as he went on telling the story his mother's heart became the more affected, and at last she said: "Bravo! Boy! you have well said! Raise one of the screens." And by the time the boy had finished the tale all the seven screens had been raised. At last the prince said:— "I am the boy," and his mother said: "Smell the other stick." He did so and came to his own shape, and his mother fell on his neck and wept, and said: "I never hoped to see you again." Then the king rose from his place and embraced them both; for, of course, he was the prince's father; and he turned out his wicked queen, and had the merchant executed, and he and his queen lived happily ever after.

MISCELLANEA.

TWO FURTHER PANDYA DATES.

No. 1.

In continuation of a note which appeared in the April part of this Journal (ante, p. 121.) I subjoin another date, which deserves to be calculated by an expert. For an impression of the record which contains the date, I am indebted to the kindness of Mr. R. Sewell, F. R. S. The original is stated to be inscribed on the second gopura of the Siva temple at Tirukkaikkukaram, "the sacred hill of the kites," or Pakshithamba, in the Chingleput district.

1 Svasti Samanta-jagad-Adhara Samaikulatilaka Madhurapuri-Madhaba Kurala-vinahani‘ramma]ana Lankadvipa-luṣṭhanādvitya-


3 maiyam perra Punarpósattā nāl.
   "In the 9th year (of the reign) of the emperor of the three worlds, the glorious Sundara-Pandyadeva, etc.—on the day of the nakṣatra Punarasu, which corresponded to Tues.

4 Read pratishṭhāpaka.
5 The translation of the Sanskrit biradās is omitted, as they are the same as ante, p. 121.
day, the fifth tithi of the first fortnight of the month of Bishabhaka."

The above inscription must belong to the same reign as the Jambukavāsara inscription of Sālikāvarman, alias Sundara-Pāṇḍyadeva, because the same ṛddas are applied to the king in both. A third date of a king Sundara-Pāṇḍyadeva who bore the surname Jātāvarman, appears to be contained in an inscription at Vikkitiramangalam in the Madura district. But I am unable to vouch for the correctness of the published transcript, as I have no impressions at hand.

No. 2.

The following date occurs at the beginning of an inscription on the East wall of the second prākāra of the Rājanītham temple at Sāñkraprī, near Trichinopoly.

1 .......................... Śri-kā-Māyavānmar-āga Tiribuvanachakravatē[iga] Sānādu vaḷanji aruliyē Śri-Sundara-Pāṇḍiyade-
var[kē]kāru yēnu oṃbavādu

2 Māsha-nāyagrī aparapakhati tṛitiyai-
yum Veḷḷi-kiṇaṁamayum pēga Viṣākhatu nāį.

NOTES AND QUERIES.

'No' as a word of ill-omen in Bengal.

Mr. K. Srīkandaliṣṭā, ante, p. 93, mentions that 'No' is a word of ill-omen among the Kōṭaṅtis in Southern India. In certain circumstances it is equally so in Bengal. No one will admit that there is no rice in the house, for fear of offending Aṇnapūrṇa, the goddess of the Corn and also of the Kitchen. The fact of the rice having run short is intimated by saying with significance 'the rice has increased' (bāḍomā). Aṇnapūrṇa is represented by the rice in the house, and in her hands the rice-ladle should never fail to supply all guests, however numerous. In this way she is peculiarly the symbol of Hindu hospitality.


This work of Sir A. Cunningham is the first book which deals systematically with the coins of Ancient Northern India as a whole, and is thus assured of a warm welcome from all Indian coin collectors and numismatists. The richness of the author's cabinet and his unrivalled experience necessarily bestow on the book a distinctive value which could not be given to a work on the same subject by any other writer.

BOOK NOTICE.

The preface and the first forty-one pages of the treatise deal with metrology, the origin of coinage, and the Indian alphabets. In this part of his book the author reiterates many of the opinions on matters in dispute which he has frequently expressed in his other publications. Some of the positions maintained by him are open to attack, but for the present I pass these by, and proceed to consider the seventy-seven pages which describe the coins of ancient India.

The well-known coins of the Satraps of Surāšṭra and of the Gupta dynasty are not discussed by the author, as they have recently been
fully described in the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* by the late Pandit Bhagwanlal, Mr. E. J. Rapson, and the writer of this notice. In a second volume Sir A. Cunningham hopes to deal with the coins of Medieval India from A. D. 600 down to the Muhammadan conquest, including the coinages of (1) the Rajas of Kusmir, (2) the Sháhs of Gandhíra, (3) the Kalachuris of Chéli, (4) the Chandellas of Mahóla, (5) the Tómars of Delhi, (6) the Chauhans of Ajmir, (7) the later coins of the Sisáiyas of Mewár, and (8) those of the Pandíras of Kângrá.

This is an extensive programme, and all numismatists will anxiously expect the promised volume.

The early punch-marked and cast coins form the first group described in the volume under review, but the section expressly dealing with them is not exhaustive, many punch-marked and cast coins being dealt with in other parts of the book. It is a great pity that Sir A. Cunningham did not prepare an index; for, small though his treatise is, it is full of matter, and an attentive reader finds it very troublesome to be compelled to note for himself all the cross references which require to be made.

Notes of time, marking more or less closely the date of punch-marked coins, are rare. The author records two of interest. On the authority of the late Sir E. C. Bayley he observes that a few such worn specimens of the punch-marked class were found in company with hemidrachmas of Antimachus II, Philoxenus, Lysias, Antialkidas, and Menander.

The second note of time is afforded by the fact that three worn silver punch-marked coins, weighing respectively 34, 35, and 42 grains were found "in the deposit at the foot of the Vajráśan, or throne of Buddha, in the temple of Mahábodhi at Buddha Gayá. As this deposit was made about A.D. 150, during the reign of the Indoscythian king Huvishka, we learn that punch-marked coins were still in circulation at that time." This inference nobody will dispute, and coins of the kind may have continued to circulate much later in some parts of the country. The issues of Gupta silver coins did not begin before A.D. 400, and it is probable that the silver punch-marked coins remained in circulation up to that date in Northern India, and possibly even later. But I cannot accept the argument by which Sir A. Cunningham tries to fix the Buddha Gayá coins to a date of about B.C. 450. His words are:—"The three coins weigh 111 grains, giving an average of only 37 grains. But, as the general average of upwards of 800 of these coins from all parts of India is upwards of 47 grains, I am willing to accept a loss of 19 grains [settled, from 56, the assumed normal full weight] in about 600 years circulation, or, roughly, from B.C. 450 to A.D. 150, as very exceptional. These three coins show a loss of upwards of 3 grains per century, while the average loss of these punch-marked coins was not more than one grain and a half in a century. It must be remembered that they were all hardened with copper alloy."

The assumption that the normal wear and tear of such pieces was a grain and a half in a century, seems to me rather arbitrary. It would be difficult to quote an example of any class of coins remaining in circulation for 600 years; and small silver coins would be completely worn away long before the expiration of six centuries.

British rupees forty or fifty years old are often withdrawn because they have lost more than two per cent in half a century, or, say, from five to six per cent of weight in a century, and I can see no reason why the rate of loss in the case of punch-marked coins should be assumed to be less. Three grains out of fifty-six is approximately six per cent, and that might be taken as the minimum possible rate of loss for the small thin punch-marked coins, which would wear much quicker than English made rupees. Every one knows that four-anna pieces wear out very quickly, and could not be kept in circulation for a single century. It seems to me that B.C. 200 is a much more likely date than B.C. 450 for the Buddha Gayá coins, and even that may be too early. I can find no reason for the belief of Sir A. Cunningham (page 43) that some of the punch-marked coins may be as old as B.C. 1000. I agree, however, with him that there is nothing to indicate foreign influence on coins of this class, and that the evidence clearly points to their being an Indian invention.

The conjecture that some of the punched symbols may have been private marks of ancient money changers, is plausible.

The punch-marked copper coins (page 59), are much rarer than the silver ones, and at least one-half of those that Sir A. Cunningham has seen, "are simple forgeries of the silver coins, which betray themselves by their weight (that of the fifty grain [sic] kdraka), and sometimes by the silver still adhering to them." Similar forgeries or imitations exist in the Gupta series, and in many other ancient coinages.

On page 60, in the account of the cast coins, two slips of the pen have escaped correction.
The word “bulls” should be “balls,” and the statement that “No. 23 . . . . is of six different sizes, weighing respectively 107, 76, 26, and 11 grains,” requires amendment.

The account of the coins of Taxtila, illustrated by two entire plates, is valuable. A series of rare inscribed coins found only at that place (now Shâh kâ dârî in the Bâwlpindi District) bears the legend nēgama (or, in one instance, nīgama) in Indian characters of the Anōka period. On some coins the word is written nēkama in Gandharian (i.e., Arian, or Kharoṣṭhī) letters. Sir A. Cunningham wishes to interpret this word as the name of a coin, comparing it with the Greek νέκαμα, but this suggestion does not seem to be correct.

The word nēgam (i.e., naigamahd) occurs in the Bhistiprolu Stêpa inscription lately discovered by Mr. Rea in the Kistna (Krishnâ) District, Madras, and is interpreted by Dr. Bühler (Academy for 28th May 1892, page 522) to mean “members of a guild.” That inscription appears to belong to the age of Anōka, or a time very little later, and the word nēgama, (nīgama, or nēkama) on the coins, which seem to date from the same period, should, in the absence of good reason to the contrary, be interpreted in the same way. The word nēgama (including the variant spellings) on the coins is associated with an unmistakable figure of a steeleyard balance, and also with the words dējaka, râlinata, and antârânaka, of which the meaning seems to be at present unknown. Sir A. Cunningham’s etymological speculations concerning these legends do not command assent.

The very rare coins bearing the legend Odumbara or Odumbarma, which have been found only in the Kâṅgar District, have already been noticed in the Archaeological Reports (Vol. V, p. 154, and XIV, p. 118). Only two silver pieces are known, and the number of copper specimens is variously stated by the author in the same paragraph as five and seven. The silver pieces give the name of Râjâ Dhrā Ghôsha in Pâli and Kharoṣṭhī characters. One of these coins is in the Lahore Museum, and was found in company with Kuninda coins and hemidrachms of Apollokadotus, who reigned about B.C. 100.

The coins of Amōghabhūti, king of Kuninda, have been frequently published, but only five specimens of the Śiva type are known. The name Kuninda was first correctly read by Sir A. Cunningham many years ago. The late Mr. Thomas committed himself, at one time to very rash speculations about the interpretation of the legend of these coins.

The local coins of the ancient city Kōsambo, near Allâhâbâd, appear to comprise the issues of at least four princes, namely, Bâhasata Mitra, Aśvâ Ghôsha, Jētha Mitra, and Dhanâ Dêva. The connection of the first named ruler with Kōsambo is proved by the occurrence of an inscription of his in the neighbourhood. The coin legends do not include the name of the town, and I presume that the proof of the connection between Kōsambo and the other three rulers named rests chiefly on unpublished evidence as to the find spots of their coins. Coins of Dhanâ Dêva are recorded to have been found at Ayêddha (Arch. Reports, Vol. I. p. 319). His coins are stated to be very numerous.

Plate vi. is devoted to the illustration of coins ascribed to the Yauḍhēya tribe, now represented by the Jô̄hiyas along the Satlaj River and in the Salt Range. The coins numbered 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 13, of the Plate include the name Yauḍhēya in their legends. I cannot perceive any reason for ascribing the single die coin No. 1 with common Buddhist symbols to the Yauḍhēyas, and the same remark applies to the broken coin No. 5, but the ascription of the remaining pieces (with the doubtful exception of No. 14), is satisfactorily established. The small copper coins, in two sizes, Nos. 2, 3, and 4, have on the obverse a humped bull to right, approaching a Bûdi tree with railling, with the legend Yauḍhēya (or-nt), and on the reverse an elephant walking to right, with Buddhist symbols. This class of small copper coins is believed to date from about the first century B.C. I would name it the Bull and Elephant Type. Figures 6, 7, and 8 represent large copper coins, with a mean weight of 172 grains, which form a totally distinct class, copied from the Indo-Scythian money, and apparently later in date than A.D. 300. The obverse shows an armed figure standing to front, with spear in right hand, and left hand on hip, cock in field to right. Legend in old Nâgârî characters: Yauḍhēya ganâya jaya. In one instance the word dei, and, in another, the word tri follows jaya. The reverse is occupied by a standing male figure and sundry symbols.

This type may be called the Javelin Type, which name has been generally accepted for the corresponding class of Gupta coins. The legend shows that these coins are those of the Yauḍhēya tribe or clan.

Figure 9 represents a silver coin, apparently the only one known in that metal, which belongs to a third completely distinct type. The author remarks that this piece and certain related copper coins (Nos. 10, 11, 12, 13) “are, perhaps, of a
They seem to me to be considerably later in date, and not earlier than A. D. 500.

They are characterized by the rude six-headed male figure on the obverse, which is probably intended for Kārttikāya, son of Siva, and god of war, and may be conveniently named the Kārttikāya Type. The legend on the silver piece is Bhāgavata Śudāma Brāhmaṇa Yaudhāya, and that on some of the copper coins is Bhāgavata Śudāma Brāhmaṇa Dāruṣāya.

The obverse device of Figure 14 is simply a snake, with the legend Bhudā Varma, and the ascription of this piece to the Yaudhāyas does not appear to be certain.

The Yaudhāyas coins deserve further investigation and illustration.

If space permitted, Sir A. Cunningham’s description of the Coins of Pañchāla (Northern Kōhikhind), Mathura, and Ayodhya should receive a long discussion; but it is impossible to treat the subject adequately in a review. The coins of the Mitra dynasty, characterized by the incuse square obverse, generally ascribed to the Sunga kings, are regarded by the author as the issues of a local dynasty, inasmuch “as they are very rarely found beyond the limits of the North Pañchāla, which would not be the case, did they belong to the paramount dynasty of Sungas.” The princes with the cognomen of Mitra who issued these coins, are Dhruvra Mitra, Sūrya Mitra, Phalguni Mitra, Bhānu Mitra, Bhūmi Mitra, Agni Mitra, Jaya Mitra, Indra Mitra, and Vishnu Mitra;—a very remarkable series of names. The names of Bhadra Ghōsha and Viśva Pāla also occur.

The well-known Horse and Bull coins of Satya Mitra, Sūrya Mitra, and Viṣayya Mitra, as well as the closely related coins of Sānga (Mitra) are classed by Sir A. Cunningham as Ayodhya issues. But I am by no means certain that the same Sūrya Mitra did not issue both the Incuse Square and the Horse and Bull coins. It is certainly a mistake to say that the Incuse Square coins are “very rarely found beyond the limits of the North Pañchāla.” I have myself three coins of Indra Mitra found in Oudh, and Mr. J. Hooper, B.C.S., has many other coins of the same class, obtained chiefly in the neighbourhood of Ayodhya. Coins of this class are also found in Basti and the other districts adjoining Oudh, where the Horse and Bull coins likewise occur. Certain princes, with the cognomen Mitra, namely Gō Mitra and Brahma Mitra issued coins which are classed by Sir A. Cunningham as Mathurā issues. These various Mitra coins require, and would, I think, repay detailed study and investigation.

The Mathurā coins of the Satraps Hāgama and Hāgāna (page 87) are now, I believe, published for the first time.

The chapters dealing with the coins of Ujain and Ėran are very interesting, but the greater part of their contents has already been published in the Archaeological Survey Reports, and I must refrain from discussing them. The coin from Ėran figured as No. 18 in Plate xi. is, however, too remarkable to be passed over. It “is a thick rude piece of copper, weighing 171 grains. It bears the name of Dharma Pālasini, written reversedly (scilicet, from right to left) in large Asoka characters of early date.” This legend may be older than the inscriptions of Asoka.

Sir A. Cunningham includes in his work a brief account of the Andhra coins on the ground that the Andhra kings claim in their inscriptions to have extended their sway far to the north of the Narbāda River, and may thus be reckoned among the dynasties of Northern India, with which the book is concerned. Sir A. Cunningham adopts Dr. Bühler’s results (ante, Vol. XII. p. 272), as regards the succession and chronology of the Andhra monarchs.

The coins, which are generally made of lead, fall into two main classes, the Western, from the neighbourhood of Kōhāpur, and the Southern, from the neighbourhood of Amarāvatī on the Krishna (Kistna) River. The Western coins are mostly characterized by the obverse device of a bow, with arrow fixed. The Southern coins have for leading obverse device a horse, elephant, stūpa (chaitya), lion, or two-masted ship; and for reverse device the cross and balls, characteristic of the coinage of Ujain. Sir A. Cunningham observes that “one specimen has an elephant,” but I possess nine small leaden coins from the Krishṇā District, given me by Dr. Hultsch, all of which seem to bear the elephant obverse device. They are very rude coins.

Three of the kings also coined in copper, using the Bow and Arrow device, and one silver coin struck by Yājña Sātakarṇi, resembling the Satrap coinage of Surāshṭra, was found in the stūpa of Sopāra.

The concluding section of the book is devoted to a brief discussion of the coinage of Nāpāl. Sir A. Cunningham accepts “with perfect confidence” the determination of the chronology by Dr. Bühler, whose results are very different from those at which Dr. Fleet arrived. Dr. Fleet thought that the Sūryavarami Lichchhāvi dynasty
raled simultaneously with the Thâkuri dynasty, whereas Dr. Bühl er, interpreting differently the dates of certain inscriptions, holds that the Lichehavli dynasty ended after A. D. 644, and was succeeded about A. D. 660 by the Thâkuri dynasty, founded by Thâkur Anûśvarman.

The coins, which are all copper, ranging in weight from 95 to 250 grains, bear the names of Mânâkâ, Guâkâ, Vaîravâ, Anûśvarman, Jîhûngûpta, and Pàṣûpata. Three of these coins had long ago been published by Princep and Sir A. Cunningham, and several of the types were published by Dr. Hoernle and myself for the first time in 1887 (Proc. A. S. Bengal), amended readings being given in the same periodical for the following year. The coins then described were from a find presented to me by Dr. Gûmâlette, and are now divided between the Asiatic Society of Bengal, Dr. Hoernle, and myself. Colonel Warren's coins, some of which are figured and described by Sir A. Cunningham, have been recently acquired by the British Museum. The approximate date, A. D. 640, of Anûśvarman's coins is certain, but the dates and order of the other coins are far from being settled. In fact the Nêpái coinage requires to be worked out in a separate monograph before it can be satisfactorily treated in brief. In describing the coins of Mânâkâ and Guâkâ, Sir A. Cunningham transposes the terms oververse and reverse. There can be no doubt that the side occupied by the seated goddess is, as in the Gupta coinage, properly denominated the reverse.

No one can be more grateful than I am to Sir A. Cunningham for giving to numismatic students the first intelligible guide-book to the numerous groups of miscellaneous early Indian coins, or can appreciate better the knowledge and learning displayed in the small book under review. But it is a reviewer's business to criticize, and I may be pardoned for pointing out some defects. M. Ed. Drönin, when criticizing my work on the Gupta coinage, complained with justice that the autotype figures in the plates are often unsatisfactory. The same criticism applies with much greater force to the plates in this work, the coins figured being frequently much worn copper pieces, of which the photographs are necessarily very indistinct. In many instances the more expensive and troublesome process of engraving from drawings would have given far better results.

This review has run to such a length that it is impossible to discuss the introductory sections of the book; but a few dubious statements may be noted. Modern scholars do not generally accept the date "from 600 to 543 B. C." for the lifetime of Buddha (page 3). On page 20 the statement is repeated in the form that "Buddha's death is placed in the middle of the sixth century B. C."

The observations on the derivation of the term jînandikâ in pages 24-25 will hardly command general acceptance. The date 84 (page 37) for the Haštâdja inscription appears to be incorrect. I think it may safely be asserted that the date is either 274 or 284, as read by Dr. Bühl er, and originally by Sir A. Cunningham.

On page 49 the small gold coins of Southern India, known by the name of hânî, are said to average 52 grains, the weight being adjusted to that of the kâlañjîu seed, which is "over 50 grains." On page 51 the hânîs are said to have been "intended for half dinâdras of the Roman standard"; and, on the same page, "the original gold karâha of 57 6 grains, which has now dwindled down to 52 and 53 grains," and ten of the older hânîs are said to give an average of 56 grains. These statements, which are not altogether consistent, appear to require revision. I do not see how the weight of the hânî can be derived from that of the kâlañjîu seed of "over 50 grains," a purely indigenous measure, and also be copied from the Roman dinâdr standard.

The citation of the legend of the purchase of the Jêtavana garden to prove the antiquity of "square Indian coins" (page 53) suggests the criticism, first, that Sir A. Cunningham much antedates Buddha, secondly, that the representations in the sculptures prove nothing as to the facts in the time of Buddha, but only indicate what seemed to the sculptor a suitable way for representing a payment, and, thirdly, that early square gold coins are not known to exist. The legend illustrated by the sculpture refers to gold coins.

I am glad to see that Sir A. Cunningham has ceased to use the values 175 grain and 140 grains for the rati and iśavarna respectively, and now uses the much more correct values 148 and 144. The values 1248 and 1546 which I have employed in my publications, are perhaps more strictly correct, but 148 and 144 are sufficiently accurate, and form a very convenient basis for a table of weights.

On page 53 the words "eight ratis, or 140 grains," should be read "eighty ratis, or 144 grains." On the same page it is stated that the Jêtavana story "will be found in the appendix," but there is no appendix.

Cheltenham,
22 June 1892.

V. A. SMITH.
THE THIRD INSTALMENT OF THE BOWER MANUSCRIPT.

BY PROFESSOR A. F. RUDOLF HOERNLE.

In the present paper I publish that portion of the Bower Manuscript, which contains the short treatise, referred to ante, p. 129, on conjuration or the use of magic spells.

This portion consists of four leaves. In shape they are exactly like those previously published; but they are of a somewhat smaller size, measuring only 9 by 2 inches. There is also an appreciable difference in their material; it is not so brittle as in the other parts of the manuscript, but feels tough and supple. A different preparation of the bark would seem to have been used for these leaves. A specimen, being the reverse of the third leaf, is published in the lower part of Plate III., issued with the Proceedings of the Asiatic Society of Bengal for November 1891.

The treatise, to which the four leaves belong, is referred to in my paper "On the Date of the Bower Manuscript" (ante, p. 29) as "the third portion C." I have there ascribed the writing of this portion, which is in a large and somewhat slovenly hand, to a scribe distinct from those that wrote the portions published in my first and second instalments. On closer examination, however, and further consideration, I do not feel now quite so sure on this point. It is just possible that the portions published in my second and in the present instalments may be the products of the same scribe, the second portion being written by him in a careful calligraphic hand, but the third in a hurried and rather slovenly manner.

The test letter here is the palatal ɪ, which, both in the second and third portions, has the form of a straight-lined square with a circular loop at the lower left-hand corner, while in the first portion it is a square with a rounded top and a minute forked tail in the place of the loop. In the third portion, in keeping with its more slovenly character, the loop is sometimes left more or less open, and the top-line of the square more or less indented. In fact this indentation is seen in most letters that have a top-line; it is well known, e.g., in the aksara ṛā of samyādmāma in the 5th line (fl. IIIb). On the figured page, unfortunately, the palatal ɪ occurs only once, in yasavinaḥ, in the 4th line (fl. IIIa), where the ɪ shows the open loop, but a straight top. This distinction in the shape of the ɪ is quite sufficient to show that the writing of the second and third portions belongs to one and the same class, as distinguished from the first portion. That it belongs not only to the same class but to the same scribe is shown by another significant circumstance connected with the same palatal letter ɪ. Occasionally this letter assumes, in the third portion, a very cursive form, in which the loop is connected with the top-stroke, so that the whole letter can be drawn with no more than two strokes of the pen, thus ɪ (e.g., in śāntayā śIIIb, yasavitrasya IIIb). Now in one or two places in the second instalment a few letters are inserted between the lines of calligraphic writing, to supply blundered omissions. These inserted letters are written not calligraphically, like the rest of the writing, but in a hurried, slovenly hand, strikingly resembling the hand of the third portion. In one of these interpolations, as sahityā in fl. IIIb (ante, p. 139), the letter ɪ occurs and is there drawn in precisely the same very current form which is peculiar to the third portion. This fact seems clearly to prove, that, if not the writer, at all events the reviser, of the second portion was identical with the writer of the third portion. But there is no reason why the writer of the second portion should have been a different person from its reviser. It is at least equally probable that the same person, who at first wrote his manuscript in a calligraphic hand, afterwards made the corrections in a more hurried and cursive hand, — as, the same in which he wrote another manuscript (i.e., the third portion).

When it is observed that both the second and third portions have this in common, that they never use the transitional or modern forms of ɪ, but exclusively the old tripartite form,— it further tends to make probable the identity of the scribes of those two portions. Add to this,

1 Also in the Journal Asiatic Society of Bengal, Vol. LX., Part I., pp. 80, 81.
that the writing of the third portion also agrees with that of the second in the matter of the book attached to the bottom of the main perpendicular (see ante, p. 129).

The leaves are again of varying thickness. The first has three, the third has six, and the second and fourth have each four layers.

This portion of the Manuscript is complete. It commences at the top of the obverse of the first leaf and concludes with the second line on the reverse of the fourth leaf, the remainder of which is left blank. The treatise which it contains relates a Buddhist tradition: how on the occasion of a novice, named Śvātī, being bitten by a cobra, Buddha, who was then living in Anathapindīḍa's garden in Jñātavana near Śrāvasti, gave a curative spell (śānti-śauṭayāna) against snake-bite to his disciple Ānanda for the purpose of saving Śvātī. The introduction, which is written in prose, extends as far as the middle of the last line on the obverse of the second leaf. It first relates the occasion on which the spell was given, and next enumerates all the dangers or diseases against which the spell may be put in practice. Then follows the great spell, which is composed partly in verse (śāṭka), partly in prose. The intelligible portions are in verse, while the unintelligible jargon, consisting mostly of alliterating or rhyming words, is in prose. The spell ends in the fifth line on the obverse of the fourth leaf. It is called the Mahāmāyūrī, and described as a vidyārāja, or "queen of the magical art." Mahāmāyūrī, I notice, is said in the abridged Petersburg Dictionary to be "the proper name of one of the five talismanic and one of the five tutelary goddesses of the Buddhists." The present treatise shows it to be the name of a spell. From the fact of the mention, before the commencement of the spell (fl. I b), of the ligature to be placed on the bitten part, I conclude that the saying of the spell was intended to accompany the operation of tying the ligature. See further remarks on this subject in Appendix III to this paper.

The spell is followed by the conclusion, which is again in prose. This consists of a series of salutations addressed to Buddha and Buddhism, under various synonyms, and of good wishes addressed to a certain "Yaśāmitra" (for Yaśāmitra). This would seem to be the name of either the composer of the treatise, or of the person on whose behalf it was composed. Sir Monier Williams' Sanskrit Dictionary, I find, gives it as "the name of a Buddhist author," but in the abridged Petersburg Dictionary it is only noted as the name of various persons in Jain tradition.

A fragment of this portion of the Manuscript, — that on the obverse of the third leaf — was published by me in the April, 1891, Proceedings of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, pp. 60, 61. It was also published, about the same time, and independently of me, by Professor Bühler in the Vienna Oriental Journal, Vol. V., pp. 106, 108, and in the Academy of the 16th August 1891, pp. 138, 139. His reading and translation were reviewed by Mr. R. Morris in the Academy of the 29th August 1891, pp. 178, 179, and by Dr. A. Stein in the Vienna Oriental Journal, Vol. V., pp. 343—345. Mr. Morris, in his review, has given valuable identifications of some of those Nāgarājas, whose names occur on fl. IIIa. In Appendix I to this paper I have added such further information, as I have been able to gather from the literature of the Northern Buddhists available to me, on all those whose names occur in the second part of the spell. But perhaps Mr. Morris and other Buddhist scholars, whose acquaintance with that literature is more intimate than mine, may feel disposed to supplement this information, which, I need hardly say, will be gratefully acknowledged by me in the edition I am preparing for the Government of India.

Professor Bühler, who interprets the term gōla (fl. IIIa)2; see also IIb) as the same as Gāḍāvarī, the well-known river in the Dekhan, accordingly considers it probable that the snake-charm was composed in Southern India. I cannot agree with this opinion; I have given my reasons, in a note to the translation, showing that gōla cannot be a proper name, but must be a common noun, meaning 'district.' Nothing, therefore, can be extracted from this word to indicate the locality of the composition of the spell. Dr. Stein, on the other hand, suggests that

2 See post, Appendix III. The term corresponds to the German Heilspruch.
the charm was probably composed in Kāśmīr, because most of the names, occurring on fl. IIIa, are those of well-known Nāgas or Sacred Springs of that country. It will be interesting to learn, now that I have published the whole of the mantra, whether any more, and how many, of the names in the list occur in the Nīlamatha. The fact that the manuscript was undoubtedly written in Kanāri, or in an adjoining country, naturally raises a presumption that the charm contained in it may have been composed in the same locality. On the other hand, there is the circumstance that the names of the Nāga kings, mentioned in the spell, are, as Mr. Morris has shown, the common property of the whole of Northern Buddhism, and probably also of the Southern.

Professor Bühhler suggests that the mantra is "a charm which is intended to force the Nāgas or snake-deities to send rain." The portion of it contained on fol. IIIa certainly supports this interpretation; and Mr. Morris quotes a similar list of names of Nāgas from a Chinese "rain-asking-sūtra." I was disposed to hold the same opinion at first, but gave it up when I came to read the whole of the manuscript. The introduction shows unmistakably that the mantra is intended to be a charm against snake-bite, for Ananda was to pronounce it over Śvāti in order to cure him of the bite of a cobra; and this is also clearly implied in the final words "from all poisons," in the concluding sentences. Its real character of a snake-charm is also clearly shown by its identity with the snake-charm in the Jātaka book, of which I give an account in Appendix II. At the same time the charm would seem to be intended to be a protection against all sorts of ills and troubles. I take this to be the meaning of the long list of evils given in the introduction as well as in the conclusion. Still there is clearly a prayer for rain expressed in the two first lines of fol. IIIa. For the presence of this prayer in a snake-charm I can give no satisfactory explanation; though the prayer was, no doubt, suggested by the fact that the Nāgas are also looked upon as water-deities, residing in springs or lakes.

As a curiosity I may note, that the word jañgamā, occurring at the end of verse 15, on fl. IVa, appears to be a gloss of the scribe, added to explain the meaning of the word trāga. Trāga properly means 'fear' or 'fearful,' but it is sometimes used erroneously in the place of tresa, which means 'movable,' as opposed to etdavāra, 'immovable,' or 'stationary.' The object of adding the gloss would seem to have been to prevent a misunderstanding of the meaning of tresa, which, however, was obvious enough in the context. That the word is not a genuine part of the text, but a mere gloss, is shown by its being extraneous to the metre of both verses 13 and 16.

Of two curious parallels which I have discovered, (one in the Jātaka book, the other in old Indian medical books), I have given a full account in the Appendices II. and III. respectively. The credit of the discovery in the Jātaka book, however, is really due to Professor Bühhler, who first pointed out the occurrence, in the Khandhakavattā Jātaka, of the name Chabhyāputra, and who would, of course, have noticed the more extended agreement, if he had had the full text of our spell before him at the time when he wrote his paper.

The state of the text and the character of the composition in this part of the manuscript are similar to those in the other parts which I have published. There is a considerable number of clerical blunders and omissions. To mention some of the most obvious of different kinds: we have nāma ityād for namā stū myāgī, fl. IVa; dañara śārāva for dañara śārāva or dañaraśārāva; fl. Ia; etād-yavēcha for etād-yañavēcha, fl. IIa; etād-yavēcha for etād-yavēcha, fl. Ia; sālam for sīlām, fl. IIa; sālam for sālam, fl. Ia. Sometimes anusvāras are inserted where they should not be, e.g., in sañgamāma-anabhāvanti for sañgamāma-anabhāvanti, fl. IIIa; in other places they are omitted where they should stand, e.g., in rakṣā kāraḥ for rakṣā kāraḥ, fl. IIa. In several

---

3 See also the note on No. 32, Sākhṭa, in Appendix I.
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places the vowels \( \hat{e} \) and \( \hat{a} \) are written where one would expect \( e \) and \( a \) respectively; e.g., mahārāstraḥ for mahārāstraḥ, fl. IIb\(^1\); upasārgopāyāḥ for upasārgopāyāḥ, fl. IVb\(^1\). Occasionally the scribe has made corrections; thus in fl. IIIa\(^4\) he had originally written māndopanāth, but corrected it to māndopanāth by inserting na between the lines; again in fl. la\(^6\) he seems originally to have written vāhayanāṃ, which he partially rubbed out and over-wrote with vāhayanāṃam.

Grammatical anomalies are equally numerous. I may instance the following:

I. — In Orthography: confusion of letters: s for sh in dūrvāṇu for dūrśuḥ, fl. la\(^4\); ū for ri in niṣīrīta for niṣīrīta, fl. IIIb\(^2\); ri for ri in Dhvitarāṣṭrāḥu for Dhvitarāṣṭrāḥu, fl. IIIa\(^2\); riśhikēśhu for riśhikēśhu, fl. IIIb\(^3\), prithīvī for prithīvī, fl. IIIb\(^5\); ū for i in Mahākādi for Mahākāti, fl. IIIb\(^3\); ū for u in varāyamāṇaḥ for varāyamāṇaḥ, fl. Ia\(^6\); ū for u in inīrōhi for inīrōhi, fl. IIIb\(^2\). Final t is omitted in chaturthakāṭ for chaturthakāṭ, fl. IIa\(^3\), jvarā for jvarā, fl. IIIa\(^3\), áchar for áchar, fl. IVa\(^1\).

Insertion of connecting consonants: m in Vāśuśuṇa-m-āpi fl. IIIa\(^4\), perhaps pari-m-āpanāya, fl. IIa\(^4\). Insertion of a separating vowel, i, in śīrīsā for śīrīsā, fl. Ia\(^1\). Doubling of a consonant: dh before y, in niśīrya, fl. Ia\(^2\). Sandhi neglected in taruṇāḥ achara, fl. Ia\(^3\), pariśvarāyamāṇaḥ dvārkāśṭh, fl. Ia\(^3\), bhōntu anāmāya, fl. IVa\(^3\), etc. False sandhi: dévī samātābhā, fl. IIIa\(^2\) (for dévā sa), Kōlākā Panḍiliy-cha, fl. IIIb\(^1\) (for Kōlaḥ pa), Bhogavān Śrīnandana-kā, fl. IIIb\(^1\) (for Bhogavān Śrīnā), ducchāhāya, fl. IIa\(^3\) (for ducchāhāya).

Omission of visarga: before s: fl. Ia\(^4\) Ananda Sūtār, fl. IIIb\(^2\) Kumbhāra Śīkhalōmā; before k: fl. IIIb karmnaya kṛukhā; before p: fl. Ia\(^3\) bhākṣa prāvāsā; in pāvā: fl. IIIa mahābhākṣa, etc. Some among the above given instances might have been also classed as examples of anomalous grammar.

II. — In Grammar: (a) Declension: nom. sing., fl. IIIa\(^2\) dévō, fl. Ia\(^3\) bhākṣa; instr. plur., fl. IIIa\(^8\) śīrīśhi, tuḥ; abl. sing., fl. IIb grahaḥ, fl. IIIa chaturthakāṭ, fl. IIIa jvarā; abl. plur., fl. IVa\(^1\) upāyāh (possibly a clerical error); loc. sing., fl. Ia ekam, fl. IIb gōlāya, śīlāya, fl. IIIb pariśvēlāya.

(b) Conjugation: 3. plur. pres., fl. IVa\(^1\) bhōntu; 3. sing. opt., fl. IVa\(^1\) áchar; 2. sing. imp., fl. IIb and IIb kārti; 2. sing. aor., fl. IVa\(^1\) hūni; par. pres., fl. Ia\(^6\) vāhayanāṃam. Most of these anomalies are more or less pure Prākritisms; so is also the spelling of śīlāya with ś (for Skr. śīlā), also of dvēdāya fl. IIa\(^2\) and dvēdāvāra fl. IIIa\(^4\). With regard to the forms pariśvēlāya, gōlāya, śīlāya, they may be either taken as anomalous locative forms of feminine nouns in a, and this is supported by the fact that gōlā certainly occurs as a feminine noun on fl. IIIa\(^2\) in the genitive singular gōlāyāḥ. Or they may be taken as dative of masculine nouns in a, used anomalously in the place of locatives, and for this makes the fact that śīlā (Skr. śīlā) is usually a masculine noun.

(c) In Syntax: exchange of cases: instr. for loc., fl. Ia Śrīvāstya (for Śrīvāstyaḥ), fl. Ia samayōna: instr. and loc. used promiscuously, fl. IIIa\(^3\) Vīrūpākṣēnā, but Maṇind. False Concord: nom. and acc., fl. Ia\(^5\) Śvetār-bhūkṣa (for Śvetār bhūkṣa, perhaps a clerical error); sing. and plur., fl. Ia\(^5\) sa ravaṃti (for ravaṃti), fl. IVa\(^1\) sukkhō bhōntu (for sukhā, perhaps a clerical error).

(d) Composition: fl. Ia\(^1\) kṣīta-karma (for kṣītaḥ), fl. IIa mahāki-rōga (for mahihi), fl. IIa\(^5\) ārdā-kūla (for āru), fl. IVa\(^1\) Yāsa-mitra (for Yāsa), fl. IIIa nāgā-rājan (for nāga-rāja, but also in Sanskrit); perhaps fl. IIa\(^4\) pari-m-āpanāya (for pari-āpanāya).

III. — In Prosody: false quantity, fl. IIIb\(^1\) mana, fl. IIIa\(^4\) cha, see also fl. IIIb\(^2\), IIIb\(^2\), IIIb\(^2\), IVa\(^1\). One syllable in excess, see fl. IIIa\(^2\), IIIa\(^2\), IIIa\(^2\), IIIb\(^2\), IIIb\(^2\); two syllables in excess, see fl. IIIa\(^2\); one syllable short, see fl. III. b4; two syllables short, see fl. IIIb\(^5\) (probably a clerical error).

* The scribe had originally written vāhayanāṃam.
IV.—In Vocabulary: new words or new meanings;

*avadhāta,* 'injury,' 'destruction,' fl. IIa².
*dālana,* 'exhausted,' fl. Ia².
*Yagātmiki,* a Nāga, fl. IIIb³.
*Ślayātra,* a Nāga, fl. IIIb⁴ (usually Ēḷyātra).
*Okiráṇa* 'destruction,' fl. 2a¹ (for avakiráṇa).
*Kaekhaṇa,* a kind of sorcery, fl. 2a¹.
*Karma,* a Nāga, fl. IIIb².
*Kātī, probably Prākrit for Kārttiśī, fl. IIb¹.
*krīya,* 'witchcraft,' fl. IIa¹ (usually krītyā).
*Kāloka,* a Nāga, fl. IIIb⁴.
*gupta,* 'protection,' fl. IIIa (for gupṭī).
*golā,* 'district,' fl. IIb⁴, IIIa².
*Chāhārasa,* a Nāga, fl. IIIb⁴ (Pāli Chabhaṭṭa).
*Dādāpaṇḍa,* a Nāga, fl. IIIa².
*dūṣṇa,* 'destroying,' 'antidote' (for dūṣaṇa).
*dustāraka,* 'the evil eye,' fl. IIIb⁶ (opp. sūtāra).
*nirāra,* 'inhabiting,' fl. IIIb⁶ (only nirāra 'dwelling-place' noted in dictionary).
*Nārī śaṇa,* a Nāga, fl. IIIb² (Śkr. Vaiśravaṇa).
*parīṭha,* 'protection,' fl. IIIa² (Pāli parīṭha, from ṣrī + ṭra).
*puriṭha* (or puriṭha ?), 'circumference,' fl. IIIa².
*Pithla,* a Nāga, fl. IIIb⁴.
*Paṇṭāra,* a Nāga, fl. IIIb².
*mahākṣιरāgra,* a kind of skin disease, fl. IIa².
*mahādata,* 'the time after midnight,' 'midnight,' fl. IIIa¹ (perhaps an error: 'mahādataa').
*Rishāka,* a Nāga, fl. IIIb².
*Lambaga,* a Nāga, fl. IIIb⁴.
*Vatṣaputra,* a Nāga, III² fl. (Petersburg Dict., Vātṣaputra).
*Vāmaka,* a Nāga, fl. IIIb⁶.
*vahita,* 'enunciated,' 'put forth,' fl. IVa⁶.
*Vīṇaśi,* a kind of goddess, fl. III³.
*Sakṣamukha,* a Nāga, fl. IIIb³.
*Nāhiṣṭireka,* a Nāga, fl. IIIb².
*Srāṇasira,* a Nāga, fl. IIIb¹.
*Nāhiṣṭiraka,* a Nāga, fl. IIIa (comp. Sañhāra in Petersburg Dict.).
*Sākṣatka,* a Nāga, fl. IIIb².
*Sāma,* a Nāga, fl. IIIb⁴.
*Sākṣita,* a Nāga, fl. IIIb³ (on the Bharat Śūpa).

One more point should be noted. For the purpose of interpunctuation a small hook, very much resembling the modern comma is used. In the portion of the manuscript, published in my second instalment, a small stroke or 'dash' is employed. In the Nāgarī transcript, I have represented the hook by a dash, for clearness sake; but in the Roman transliteration I have used commas. In the concluding salutations, the visarga seems to be occasionally employed as a mark of interpunctuation, alternating with the usual comma, and resembling the modern semi-colon; thus after Budhārāya fl. IVa², after Mūkṣyāya fl. IVa². After vakhaṇa in fl. IVa² the visarga is employed in addition to the usual mark of a double stroke, to indicate the 'full stop.' I have seen the visarga occasionally used in this way in modern Hindi manuscripts, as noted in my Gaudian Grammar.

In the following transcript, transliteration and translation I have followed the same system as in my previous instalments; see ante, pp. 134, 135.
Third Leaf: Reverse.

1. नाशिलगा—कालोक्ष अपलादच संग्यांभानलरक: सभ्यस्य मन्विन्य गुणवर्तको विश्वां पति कर्मोक्षतः
2. नाशिलगा—कालोक्ष अपलादच संग्यांभानलरक: सभ्यस्य मन्विन्य गुणवर्तको विश्वां पति कर्मोक्षतः
3. कोलतेः अनन्तर धर्मसंसार परंतु नगरो नागरिकं विचारः—समकालक मुखर वृत्तिको विचारः—वनस्पतिको विचारः
4. कोलतेः अनन्तर धर्मसंसार परंतु नगरो नागरिकं विचारः—समकालक मुखर वृत्तिको विचारः—वनस्पतिको विचारः
5. निर्देशन्तिकाल विश्वास: विश्वसंसारयो जस्म नगरो नागरिकं अनन्तर धर्मसंसार परंतु नगरो नागरिकं विचारः
6. निर्देशन्तिकाल विश्वास: विश्वसंसारयो जस्म नगरो नागरिकं अनन्तर धर्मसंसार परंतु नगरो नागरिकं विचारः

Fourth Leaf: Obverse.

1. शङ्के में नागरी मन्विन्य गुणवर्तको विश्वां पति कर्मोक्षतः
2. शङ्के में नागरी मन्विन्य गुणवर्तको विश्वां पति कर्मोक्षतः
3. सार्वेक्षण में नागरी मन्विन्य गुणवर्तको विश्वां पति कर्मोक्षतः
4. सार्वेक्षण में नागरी मन्विन्य गुणवर्तको विश्वां पति कर्मोक्षतः
5. सार्वेक्षण में नागरी मन्विन्य गुणवर्तको विश्वां पति कर्मोक्षतः
6. सार्वेक्षण में नागरी मन्विन्य गुणवर्तको विश्वां पति कर्मोक्षतः

Fourth Leaf: Reverse.

1. शङ्के में नागरी मन्विन्य गुणवर्तको विश्वां पति कर्मोक्षतः
2. शङ्के में नागरी मन्विन्य गुणवर्तको विश्वां पति कर्मोक्षतः
3. शङ्के में नागरी मन्विन्य गुणवर्तको विश्वां पति कर्मोक्षतः
4. शङ्के में नागरी मन्विन्य गुणवर्तको विश्वां पति कर्मोक्षतः
5. शङ्के में नागरी मन्विन्य गुणवर्तको विश्वां पति कर्मोक्षतः
6. शङ्के में नागरी मन्विन्य गुणवर्तको विश्वां पति कर्मोक्षतः

II. Transliteration.
3 svastayananā daṇḍa-par[ih]āraṁ visha-dushpaṇām visha-nāṣanām śimā-bandhaṁ
dharaṇī-bandhaṁ cha karobi, Dēva-grahātō, Nāga-gra-
hātō, Asura-gra[hātō], Maruta-grahātō, Garuḍa-grahātō, Gaudharva-grahātō, Kiniara-
grahātō, Mahēra-grahātō
5 Yaksma-grahātō, Rākshasa-grahātō, Pṛēt-grahātō, Piśāca-grahātō, Bhūta-grahātō,
Kunbhāḍa-grahātō, Pūtana-grahātō
6 Kaṭa-pūtana-grahātō, Skanda-grahātō, Unmāda-grahātō, ch-Chhāyā15-grahātō, Apasmāra-
grahātō, ḍe(t)āraka18-g[ṛ]ah(āt)ō

Second Leaf: Obverse.

1 kṛtya-karmama kavkhōrd17-ōkirna, Vēṭāda-chichecha-preśhaka-durmbhukta-duchchhar-
dā[ś]ta, duchehh(āy)[āj], (ōpra) . . . . .
2 vadhītätō jvarād-čākōika-dvētīyaka-traityakācī-čhūtrāthakā saptāhikād-ārdha-māsikā
māśikād18āiva sakar(a)(u)(ānu)(ōh)[rōttikā]
3 niṇyā-jvarād-vishama-jvarād-(bh)ūta-jvarāin-māṇusha-jvarād-a-māṇusha-jvarā, vātika-pai-
tītkā-śiśhikā-sannipātikā-sarvā-jvarā
dēricōrt19-parīm-āpanaya ardha-āvahhēdālān, ardha-kāmān, makshi-rōgān nūsā-rōgān
4 makra-śūlān, daṁta-śūlān; hṛidaya-śūlān, pārśva-śūlān; pūṣṭhā-śūlān, udara-
śūlān, ganḍa-śūlān; vasti-śūlān ērū-śūlān
5 jaṅghā-śūlān, hasta-śūlān pāda-śūlān, anga-pratyaṅga-śūlān ch-āpanaya, rātra-
svasti diva svasti svasti madhīya-dīnē

Second Leaf: Reverse.

1 sthitē, [ū] svasti sarvā-mahōtrītraṁ21 sarvva-buddhā kurvvaṁtu, mama22 II Iḍi, viḍi, hiviḍi, niḍe, adē, yadē,
2 dṛigadē, Hari-vēguḍi, Pāṃku-piśāchini, ārōhānī, ārōhānī, ēlē, mēlē, tillē, kīlē,24
3 tīmī, dumiṃe, itī, mitī, vishtaṛdhē, vimalē, hūhu, hūhu, āśva-mukhi Kāṭṭi, Mahihēdē25 Prakīrṇā-
4 kēśī, kulu, kulu, vaspahu, kōlu, kōlu, Dhōsā-dūmbā, Dō-dūmbā, dūma, dūmba, gōlāyā, śēlāyā, hiśu,
5 hili, hili, mili, tili, tili, chulus, chulu, mula, mula, mula, mula, mula, mula, mula, mula, mula,
6 hūhu, babā, babā, babā, babā, jala, jala, jala, jala, jala, jala, jala, jala, jala, jala,
(d)[u] (ma) . . . . . . .

Third Leaf: Obverse.

2 kta26 mē, Gōlāyā parivēlāya varshata dēvō samaṁtēna,27 II Izi Kisi svahā28 II Maitri mē Dhūtārāṁśṭreṣhu maitri Nairā-

18 Or perhaps chhayā, with short a; the akshara is indistinct; the Prasātati seems to read chhayā; see App. I.
19 Perhaps read derṣṭāra.
20 Perhaps intended for ṛkēśvāda; see App. III.
21 Read śēlān. 22 Read mahāṭāraṁ.
23 From rūṭina to mūma is a śālaka, but the 4th pāda has one syllable in excess. Between manasa and the two
24 strokes of interpunuation, there appears to have been originally a longish scroll which is now nearly washed out.
25 Cf. Sūkṣma-grahātō.
26 Or perhaps bhīl or tillē. The first akshara is blurred.
27 For Mahādētī.
28 The akshara kta is written on the margin, outside the line; and the exact relation in which it stands to the
29 text is doubtful. The full word may have been prayākṣa.
30 From gōlāyā to samadetēn there are two pādas of a śālaka, but the second of them has one syllable in excess.
31 Read roḍāh. The first 4-stroke is not "abnormally short," but is entirely wanting. I have noticed the faulty
32 form snāḥ also in modern Tibetan Buddhist scripts.
24

Third Leaf: Reverse.


Fourth Leaf: Obverse.

1 dēshu mē mātrī mātrī bahu-padēshu cha, [1] mā mē a-pādāk(0) hi(0)māni mē (0)mē hi[0]i niṣ[1] [d] [v] [paḍakāl] [11 13 III] mē cha mē cha no-padēshu mē mātrī ye nāgā jala-nīrātaḥ [11 14 II] Sarvva-bhūtēshu mē m(ai)tri [1] (y) [t] (a) [s] [v] [a] . . . . . . . . [1]
4 va tathā-sāva parīpāranaṃ [17 II] Namō Buddhāyā,48 namō stu bhūdyē, namō Vīmuktaṃ, namō vīmuktāṃ, namō stu Sāntāyā, na-
5 mō stu śāntaye, namō stu Muktāyā: namō ktyē,49 yē Brahmaṃā50 vāhita-pipā dharmā-nētēṃ namās-tē cha Yāsamitraṣa

Fourth Leaf: Reverse.

2 sarvva-vyādhibhāyā sarvva-grahābhāyā sarvva-visēbhāyā rakṣaṃtu :[1]
TRANSLATION.

Thus it has been related to me: Once upon a time the Blessed One was staying in Jethavana, the garden of Anathapindika in Sravasti. At that time there lived in Jethavana, the garden of Anathapindika in Sravasti, a mendicant, called Svatti, (who was) new, fresh (and) young, (and) had but lately joined the Order, and but recently submitted to this (i.e., the Buddhist) Doctrine and Discipline.

While he was chopping fire-wood for the dry hot bath of the congregation, he was bitten in the great toe of his right foot by a large black snake (i.e., cobra), which had crept out from another side among the logs of deodar-wood. He fell exhausted to the ground, foamed at his mouth, rolled his eyes, and tore his flesh. The venerable Ananda seeing the mendicant Svatti as he lay in an unconscious state, utterly and thoroughly exhausted, foaming at his mouth and rolling his eyes, inquired of the master:

"First Leaf: Reverse.

"O Blessed One, how can I effect this man's recovery?" When he said this, the Blessed one spoke thus to the venerable Ananda: "Go then, O Ananda, (and) in the name of the Tathagata save the mendicant Svatti with the following spell, the most excellent of the magic art! Grant him guard, defence, assistance, protection, a charm for recovery, preservation from danger, counteraction of the poison, destruction of the poison, and apply a ligature to the wound, a ligature to the vein! Deliver him from seizure by a Deva, from seizure by a Naga, from seizure by an Asura, from seizure by a Maruta, from seizure by a Garuda, from seizure by a Ganantha, from seizure by a Kinara, from seizure by a Mahendra, from seizure by a Yaksha, from seizure by a Rakshasa, from seizure by a Praha, from seizure by a Pieta, from seizure by a Bhuta, from seizure by a Kambhaya, from seizure by a Putana, from seizure by a Katakapantha, from seizure by a Skanda, from seizure by mania, from seizure by night-mare, from seizure by epilepsy, from seizure by the evil eye.

Second Leaf: Obverse.

from the exercise of witchcraft, from destruction by kakkhara, from injury by Vatals that attend at burning-places, bad food, bad vomiting, bad night-mare, from fever, such as comes on every day or every second day or every third day or every fourth day or every seventh day, or every half-month, or every month, or even only once for a moment, from continued fever, from remittent fever, from fever such as spirits or such as men or such as non-human beings are subject to, from fever such as arises from dirtage of the air or of the bile or of the phlegm or of all three combined, in short, from every kind of fever down to

Patti-kaksha I take to be the same as patti-kaksha which is said to be a species of pine, the Deodar; but perhaps it may here mean 'rotten logs of wood.' The Pali version (see App. II) has patti-rakka, Skr. patti-vraksha; this is said in the Perganburg Dictionary to be Colomosinae indica, but that would hardly yield fire-wood.

There are here slight traces visible of the letters t, th, and th and subscribed c. With these and the known number of missing aksharas, I propose to fill up the lacuna, as given in the transliterated text.


Simā is properly the line of junction of lips of the wound or puncture.

I do not know dātāra; it should be the name of some mysterious evil; it may be a prakritised form of daṭāraka or daṭāraka, but these words themselves are unknown. I am disposed to consider it a mishearing for daṭāraka; the letters σ and o have considerable likeness; there is probably a similar mishearing in fl. Ita bura or bu-gara... whatever the full word may have been (da-bhru-prama). Daṭāraka might be the 'evil eye,' opp. sutāra, or 'good eye.'

I take chīchaka to be a Prakritised form of Skr. chītya.

The M.S. puts a comma after kira as well as after daṭāraka; but as these nouns are in the crust base, while the context requires the ablative case, it would seem that they are all in composition with the ablative vidhita (vidhita), abl. sing. of avidhita. Otarsa stands for avakṣasana, lit. 'sweping off'; the Charaka has avakṣā-sa for 'sweepings'; it is a synonym of avadhita; or it may be derived from root kṛt (kṛnā) 'to kill.' On kakkhara see Appendix III, 'kṛtya I take to stand for kṛtya; but it might be 'demons who dig out corpses,' see Hiuen Tsang (Vol. I., p. 136, note 119).
headache.\textsuperscript{59} Remove (from him) also hemierania, indigestion, fly-like diseases of the skin,\textsuperscript{60} diseases of the nose, diseases of the mouth, diseases of the throat, diseases of the heart, pains in the ear, pains in the teeth, pains in the heart, pains in the side, pains in the back, pains in the belly, pains in the cheek, pains in the bladder, pains in the thigh, pains in the legs, pains in the hands, pains in the feet, pains in any limb, whether large or small.

Health\textsuperscript{61} at night; health in the day; health while midday lasts;

\textit{Second Leaf: Reverse.}

health all the time after midnight\textsuperscript{62}; may all the Buddhas grant (it) to me! Iṣi, viṣṭi, hiviri! Niṣī, aḍī, yadī, dṛigadī! Oh ye Vṛgūḍa of the sun-rays, ye dust-Piśāchins that ascend and descend\textsuperscript{63} Elī, mēlī, tiḷī, kiḷī, tiḷī, mēlī! Timi, dumī! Itti, mitti! In a well fixed, spotless place! Huhu, huhu! O thou horse-faced-one Kāṭi,\textsuperscript{64} Mahākāli, with dishevelled hair! Kulū, kulū, vasaghul, kōlu, kōlu! Dhōsā dūmbā, Dō-dūmbā,\textsuperscript{65} duma, dūmbā! In the district,\textsuperscript{66} on the mountain! Hān, hān, hi. Miī, mī, tī, tī! Chulū, chulī, mūlu, mūlu, mūlu, mūlu, mūlu, mūlu! Huhu, huhu, huhu, huhu! Babā, babā, babā, babā! Jāla, jāla, jāla! Duma . . . .

\textit{Third Leaf: Overse.}

(May) the goddesses of rumbling, thundering, raising, crashing, falling, ripening, captivating, wailing, delighting, adorning (grant me prosperity)\textsuperscript{67}. May the deva send rain all round over the borders of my district! Ilī Kisi! Svāhā!

\textsuperscript{59} I do not quite understand the construction of this passage. There is no verb to govern jvarē and the other ablative, except apana, which also belongs to sūtṛtīlā. The construction of pari also is puzzling; it seems here to mean "from-to," i.e., "remove all diseases from the fowlers down to the headache." Moreover pari seems to be compounded with sūtṛtīlā (like upari), and the whole compound declined in the accusative case sūtṛtīlāparin, instead of sūtṛtīlāpari. But m might also be a mere connecting consonant—Sūtṛtīlā is a curiously blundered compound, for sūtṛ is a prākritized form of Skr. śūtṛ, and the compound should be sūtṛtīlā. Perhaps sūtṛtīlā is a mere clerical error for sūtṛtīlā.

\textsuperscript{60} Matētī-ṛya is not noticed in any dictionary accessible to me. But as mahākāli is a synonym of maïka, I take maḥākāla to be the same disease as maïka.

\textsuperscript{61} Here the Mahākāla or great spell' commences.

\textsuperscript{62} The text has mahī-dārum "the night of the festival;" but the context rather suggests mahā-dārum "midnight;" or "the time after midnight." The vowels ù and ā are occasionally confused in this part of the MS., compare sūtṛtīlāpari for sūtṛtīlā in I b (note 56), sukī for sukā in IV a.

\textsuperscript{63} On the Bhūma-piśāchins or "the female Piśāchins of the dust" see Childers' Pāli Dictionary, s. v. Piśācha. They are one of the four kinds of Piśāchins. The phrase reminds one of the particles of dust that dance up and down in the rays of the sun. Vṛgūḍa I take to be a vernacular (Pāli or Prakrit) form of the Skr. vṛgūḍa, which is given in the smaller Petersburg Dictionary as an epithet of the Apsaras. Hari I take to be the sun or "the rays of the sun."

\textsuperscript{64} Kāṭi I take to be a vernacular form of Skr. Kāṭtikā, the spouse or Śakti of Kāṭtikāyā (Skanda or Śiva), the same as Mahākāli.

\textsuperscript{65} Dōsā-dūmbā and Dō-dūmbā are probably also vernacular appellatives; but I cannot identify them in Sanskrit.

\textsuperscript{66} Gōlā occurs again on fol. III a gōlīgh parivṛtthana 'on the circumference of the district.' In Hēmācandra's Grammar, II, 174, it is noted as a vernacular form of the river name Gōḍārāri; and in this sense it is taken by Prof. Bühler in the Vienna Oriental Journal, V, p. 165 and 107, footnote, who refers it to the well-known Gōḍārāri of the Dekhan. Dr. Stein, however, points out, ibidem, p. 334, that there is also a small river, Gōḍārāri in Kaśmir, "which enjoys considerable sanctity and is still at the present time visited by pilgrims." If Gōlā should have to be interpreted here as a river name, the Kaśmir Gōḍārāri has undoubtedly a better claim to consideration, as the character of the letters in which the MS. is written shows that it cannot have been produced in South India. But Dr. Stein adds that he has "not yet in Kaśmir texts come across the shortened form of Gōlā for Gōḍārāri;" and it seems to me most improbable that the word can be here a river name. It is placed by the side of the word dōsā (or dōka), which is clearly the Sanskrit dōsa, 'mountain,' and is not the proper name of any particular mountain. Similarly gōlā (or gōla) should be a mere common noun, and, accordingly, I take it in the sense 'circle,' 'district.' This meaning also fits in better in the other phrase gōlīgh parivṛtthana, for parivṛtthana properly means 'circumference,' which can hardly be applied to a river. I prefer, therefore, adhering to my original translation in Proceedings, As. Soc. Beng., for 1891, p. 91. I may add that in the Abridged Petersburg Dictionary gōlā is noted with the meaning of 'disc,' 'circle,' and that the word is still used in the Indian Vernaculars in the sense of 'circle,' 'district.'

\textsuperscript{67} I agree with Mr. Morris that we have here no 'mantra for an oblation' (Prof. Bühler), and that the list of words does not contain the names of 'various plants,' but "epithets of Śiva's female counterpart Durgā."
(Verse 1) I hold friendship with Diśitarāśītra and his race, and friendship with Nairāvāpa and his race. With Virūpāksa and his race I hold friendship, and with Kṛśna and Guṇūtama and their races. (Verse 2) With Maṇi, the king of Nāgas, I hold friendship, also with Vāsuki, and with the Nāgas Daṇḍapīda and Pūrṇabhadrā and their races at all times. (Verse 3) With the Nāgas Nanda and Upananda, the beautiful (and) glorious, who with their supernatural power assist even in the war of the devas with the Asuras, (Verse 4) with Anavatapta, Varuṇa and Śaṃbhuraka I hold friendship; likewise with Takṣa, Ananta, and Vāsamukha. (Verse 5) With Aparajita I hold friendship, and friendship with Chhibbāsata, likewise with Mahāmanasvin always and

Third Leaf : Reverse.

with Manasvin. (Verse 6) Also Kālaka, Apallala, Bhūgavanta, Śrāvaṇacīva, Daddhimukha, Maṇi, and Paṇḍarika, the lord of the quarters. (Verse 7) Karkṛtaka, Sākhaṇḍapa, and both Kambala and Āśvatara : with these kings of Nāgas also I hold friendship perpetually : (Verse 8) and (with) Kumbhira (and) Sākṣeṭaka, and likewise (with) Sīchilōma. With Ugūtama and Kāla I hold friendship and with Rishiha and his race. (Verse 9) Likewise with Puruṣa and Karṇa I hold friendship and with Śakṣatamukha, and with Kālaka, Suṣanda (and) Vatsipatra at all times. (Verse 10) With Ekapata I hold friendship, and friendship with Laṃbura, and (with) Pithkha, the great Nāga and Muchilinda, the famous. (Verse 11) The Nāgas that live on land, likewise those that inhabit the water, and those that live on high, dwelling on Mēru's summit; (Verse 12) those with one head and those with two heads, — with them I hold friendship perpetually. With the footless I hold friendship; I hold friendship with the two-footed; (Verse 13) with the four-footed.

Fourth Leaf : Obverse.

I hold friendship, and friendship with the many-footed. The footless shall not do harm to me, nor shall the two-footed; (Verse 14) (the four-footed shall do no harm to me), nor shall the many-footed. With all Nāgas that inhabit the water I hold friendship; (Verse 15) with all living beings that live and shall live I hold friendship; with all beings, whether movable or immovable, I hold friendship. (Verse 16) May all beings enjoy happiness, may all enjoy health; may all experience pleasures, and may no one practise sin. (Verse 17) In the exercise of a friendly spirit I give a remedy countering the poison, (I) grant safety and assistance and protection.

Reverence be to the Buddha! Reverence be to the Truth! Reverence be to the Emancipated one, reverence be to the Emancipation! Reverence be to the Peaceful one, reverence be...
to the Peace! Reverence be to the Deliverer, reverence be to the Deliverance! The principles of evil and good which have been declared by the Brahma (i.e., the Buddha), to them be reverence, and may they safeguard Yasômitra’s welfare! Svaähà.78 May they save (him) from all fears, all troubles, all temptations and allurements, all fevers, all diseases, all seizures, all poisons!

APPENDIX I.

The Nágárajás.

I append a list of the Nágárajás, Nágas, Désis, and the other supernatural beings invoked in the foregoing spell. To this I add such references and information as I have been able to gather. Of the Tibetan Dictionary, called the Mahávyutpatti the Asiatic Society of Bengal possesses a Manuscript translation, prepared by Csoma de Körös. This is referred to in my notes as V.y. Dr. Waddell, to whom we owe some valuable papers published in the Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, has given me several lists of Nága names, extracted from Tibetan Nága Dhárañí or rain-charms. These are referred to as W.D. In either case, I preserve the spelling of the respective informants. The Abridged Petersburg Sánskritic Dictionary is quoted as P. D. Ty. Childers’ Páli Dictionary as Páli Dy., the Mahábhárata as M. Bh., and Hinen Tsang from Beal’s Buddhist Records of the Western World. The Chinese Sátra, = Ch. S., is the Varáha Varáha Sátra quoted by Mr. Morris in the Academy.


There are altogether 48; among them Nos. 8, 10 and 11 are expressly called Nágas, and Nos. 6 and 22-32, Nágárajás; No. 47 is called a Mahámaná. The nature of the others is not specified, but they are, no doubt, all intended to be some species of Nágá. The Výutpatti gives a list of 79 Nágárajás, and 55 common Nágás. Among the former occur Nos. 7, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 23, 29, 30, 31, 32, 37, 45, altogether 13, and four others (Nos. 21, 27, 40, 44) that are uncertain. Among the latter occur No. 22, and probably Nos. 2 and 19. The Mahábhárata, Adiparvan, Chap. XXXV, (F. Ch. Roy’s transl., p. 113) has a list of 78 Nágás. Among these occur our Nos. 1, 6 (or 27), 9, 15, 26, 29, 30, 31, 32, 39, 45 and perhaps Nos. 2, 30, 36, altogether 14.

No. 1. Dhrítaráshtra is not mentioned by the Vý, among any of the Nágás, but as the first in the list of Gandharvas; nor is he accounted a Nágá by the Tibetan Lamas; but in the M. Bh., Ch. S., the P. Dy., and by Morris he is stated to be a Nágárajá.

No. 2. Náirávára. At first I doubtfully suggested that this might be the same as Airávána. This view was supported by Professors Bühler, Leumann, and Stein, who took the initial a to be a connecting consonant (see Vienna Oriental Journal, Vol. V., p. 345). Nevertheless I now feel certain that Mr. Morris is correct in identifying Náirávána with Váirávána (see Academy, Aug. 29, 1891, p. 179). In the first place, the use of a as a connecting consonant is very unusual; in fact, I do not recollect ever having met with a well-authenticated instance. Next, as Mr. Morris points out, Dhrítaráshtra and Vírúpáksha are respectively the regents of the East and West, and accordingly one expects Váirávána, the regent of the North, in the place of Náirávána. Vírúhja, the regent of the South, is omitted, because he was not regarded as a snake-king, while all the three others were accounted Nágárajás. The four Lókapálas have their position at the entrance, e.g., of a temple; and the Nágárajás among them may be expected to be invoked in the commencement of a spell. There is also sufficient suggestiveness in the similarity of the two names. Lastly, what seems to me decisive is that

78 Svaähà in such connections practically corresponds to our ‘Amen.’
Airavata is actually invoked in the concluding part of the list, under the form of Ēḷāpatra; see the note below on the latter name. It cannot be supposed that the same Nāgarāja would be invoked twice. I cannot account for the curious transformation of Vaiśravāna into Nāirāvṛta. It may be owing to a mere want of attention in the scribe, who confused Vaiśravāna with Airavata. The M. Bh., l. c., however, enumerates both Airavata and Ēḷāpatra.

No. 3, Virūpāksha. In the Vy, he is not named among the Nāgas or Nāgarājas, nor indeed among any of the special classes of spiritual beings. The only place where he is named is in the general class of "the gods inhabiting this world." Among these "gods," No. 31 is Lōkapāla, No. 32 Vaiśravāna, No. 33 Dīrgharāṣṭra, No. 34 Virūdhaka, No. 35 Virūpāksha; and from among these No. 32 is again enumerated at the head of the Yakshas, No. 33 at the head of the Gandharvas, No. 34 at the head of the Kumbhaśas; but No. 35 is not referred to any special class. These four, Nos. 32-35, as is well known, are considered to be the four "Guardians of the World" (Lōkapāla). As such, "their frescoes are found in the verandah of every Lamaic temple or gompa; but none of them, not even Virūpāksha, is considered a Nāga, by any Lama" (Wd.). But among other Buddhists, Virūpāksha would seem to have been placed at the head of the Nāgas; see P. Dy. and Mr. Morris' note; and in the Khandhavatā Jātaka (Vol. I, p. 145) he is mentioned as one of the Nāgarājas. In any case, these facts would disprove any connection of our MS. with the Lamaism of Tibet. The list of names of the Lōkapālas, compared with the three first names in our list, is rather suggestive of Nairāvṛta being a misspelling for or confusion with Vaiśravāna.

No. 4, Kṛṣṇa and No. 5 Gautamaka "are mentioned in the Divyāvadāna as two snake kings" (Morris), also in the Khandavatā Jātaka (Vol. I, p. 145). P. Dy. has Gautamaka.

Nos. 6 and 27 Maṇi. This name occurs twice. Whether by mistake, or as two different Nāgas? The M. Bh., l. c., and P. Dy. give Maṇi.

No. 7, Vaiśuki. Vy. spells Vaiśuki; Wd. gives Vasuga in one Dharmā and Bāsuki in another. Also in Ch. S.

No. 8, Daṇḍapāda is not mentioned anywhere.

No. 9, Pārṇabhadra occurs in the M. Bh. He is also known to the Jainas. The P. Dy. has him.

Nos. 10 and 11, Nanda and Upananda. "These Nāgarājas assisted the Dēvas in a struggle with the Asuras" (Morris). That struggle is narrated in the Kāśyapa Jātaka (Jat. 1, p. 203, 204), where it is stated generally that the Uragas or Nāgas helped to guard Śakra's residence, but neither Nanda nor Upananda are named. The reference in our spell would seem to refer to an occasion where these two Nāgas distinguished themselves above the others. In the Vy., Nanda is enumerated by himself as the 15th of the Nāgarājaś, and again Nandāpananda is mentioned as the 90th among them. It is not clear in the latter place whether one or two Nāgas are meant. In our spell clearly two individuals are intended. The Ch. S. and P. Dy. give both. In Wd. lists there is an Upanta and an Unanta. See also (Himun Triang, Vol. II, p. 166, note 77).

No. 12, Anavatapta is the Nāgarāja of the Sarik-kul lake in the Himalayas, the source of the Ganges. Indus, Oxus and Zarafshan (Himun Triang, Vol. I, p. 11, 12). He is No. 13 in Vy. Also in the Lalita Vistara, p. 249, 14. (P. Dy.), and in Ch. S.

No. 13, Varuṇa. In Vy. he is No. 9. Also in P. Dy. and Ch. S.

No. 14, Śaṅhārāka. The P. Dy. gives Śaṅhāra as the name of an Asura. Mr. Morris suggests a misreading for Śaṅgara = Śāgara, which is very improbable.

No. 15, Takṣhaka. Vy. No. 8, M. Bh., l. c., No. 4, also in P. Dy. and Ch. S.


No. 17, Vaiśravāna, not found anywhere else.

No. 18, Aparājita in the M. Bh., l. c., also in P. Dy.

No. 19, Chhibbasuta, as Prof. Bühler first pointed out, is mentioned in the Khandavatā Jātaka (Vol. I, p. 145) under the form Chhabbyā-putta. See Appendix II.
Nos. 20, and 21, Mahāmanasvin and Manasvin. The latter in Ch. S. and in P. Dy. The Vṛg. has Manaṣti (sic) as No. 37.

No. 22, Kālaka. The Vṛg. gives Kālaka as the 17th of the common Nāgas, and a Kālikō as the 31st of the Nāgarājas. The P. Dy. has it as the name of a Rākṣasa and an Asura.

No. 23, Aparāśeva is mentioned by (Hiuen Tsang, Vol. I, p. 122, 123, 126, note) as the Nāga of the spring which forms the source of the Swat river in Udyāna. He was prevailed upon by Buddha to desist from annually inundating the country. He is No. 45 in Vṛg. In P. Dy. it is the name of a Rākṣasa.

No. 24, Bhāgavan, according to P. Dy., occurs in the Suparnādhīyā, p. 9, 1.

No. 25, Sūmāpā, is probably the Nāgarāja whose story is told by (Hiuen Tsang, Vol. I, p. 63, 64). He was originally a Sūmāpā, or Buddhist novice, but became the Nāga king of a lake on the summit of a snowy mountain in the Hindu Kush. The Vṛg. has a Śramaṇa as the 19th in the list of common Nāgas.

No. 26, Dadhimukha, in the M. Bh., l. c., also according to the P. Dy., in the Hariṇāśa (Calcutta ed.), v. 9503.

No. 28, Pāṇḍarika, not mentioned elsewhere. The Vṛg., however, has a Padma, as the 4th of the Nāgarājas.

No. 29, Karkotaka is No. 2 of the Nāgarājas in Vṛg. and No. 5 in the M. Bh., l. c. Wd. gives Karikotaye in one Dharmaś and Karkoṣa in another. The P. Dy. has it.

No. 30, Saṅkhapāda. The Vṛg. has Saṅkhapāla as the first of the Nāgarājas; there is also a Saṅkho as No. 22. Wd. gives “Saṅgkapāla” in all Dharas. It can hardly be doubted that all these are intended for the same name. The M. Bh., l. c., has Saṅkhapajña.

Nos. 31 and 32, Kambala and Aśvataha are enumerated in the Vṛg. under one No. 65, though stated to be two separate Nāgarājas. They are Nos. 34, 35 in the M. Bh., l. c. The Pāli Dy. has Kambala.

No. 33, Sākṣatka is not found elsewhere. It might be a name, but an epithet of No. 34 Kumbhira, meaning “a native of the town of Sākṣeta” (= Ayodhya in Oudh), and if all these names are those of sacred springs, we should here have the name of a spring in the centre of North India. It is just possible that the name may be Sākṣetaka; but the apparent anuvāra is attached to the foot of the letter in the line above sākṣetaka, and is, in all probability, part of that letter.

No. 34, Kumbhira is, in Hiuen Tsang, Vol. II, p. 49, the name of several Nāgas of pools near Benares. In the P. Dy. it is the name of a Yaksha.

No. 35, Suchā is, in various inscriptions on the Bharaut Stūpa as the name of a Yaksha (see ante Vol. XXI, p. 223).

No. 36, Ugaṇa. Wd. gives Ugale. The M. Bh., l. c., has Ugraka. See note 70.

No. 37, Kāla is the 24th Nāgarāja in Vṛg. He stood before Buddha and sang his praises just before his contest with Māra (Nīdāna Kathā, p. 97, in Bhys Davids’ Buddhist Birth Stories). Also in P. Dy. and Pāli Dy. (v. v. Nāgo).

No. 38, Rishika; not found elsewhere.

No. 39, Pūrṇa is No. 9 in the M. Bh., l. c. The P. Dy. quotes a Nāga Pūrṇaṇa from the Hariṇāśa (Calcutta ed.), v. 9502.

Nos. 40-43, Karṇaṇa, Sakaṭaṇa, Kālaka, Sunanda are not found elsewhere. The Vṛg., however, gives Kulika, as the name of the 3rd Nāgarāja.

No. 44, Vatsiputra, also spelled Vatsiputra, and quoted by the P. Dy., as the name of a Nāga, from the Kārṇaṇa Vṛg. 2, 13.

No. 45, Elapatra, also spelled Ėlāpatra. With the latter spelling it occurs as the name of the 43rd Nāgarāja in Vṛg., and as No. 11 in the M. Bh., l. c., also in Ch. S. and P. Dy. Another spelling is Ėrāpata (in Skr. Airāvata) or Ėrāpatha, with the conjunct t simplified into t or th
(as in ētha for atra). The former (with i) occurs in Nos. 59 and 60 of the inscriptions on the Bharaut Stūpa (see ante, Vol. X., p. 258 and Vol. XXI, p. 232). The other (with th) is the commoner one, and occurs in the Khandhavatta Jātaka (Vol. I, p. 145); see also Pāli Dv., s. v. Nāgo. A third spelling is Nilāpana or Ārāvāna, of which the former is given by Mr. Morris from Ch. S., while the other corresponds to the Sanskrit form Airāvata. There was a Nāgarāja of this name both near Takshaśāla and Banāras, see Huen Ts'ian, Vol. I., p. LXVIII. and p. 137.

No. 46. Lambara may be the Nāgarāja of the lake on the crest of the mountain of "Lan-po-lu," in Udyāna, whose story is given by (Huen Ts'ian, Vol. I, p. 128 ff). Vṛ. gives Lambukā as the name of the 12th Nāgarāja (also in the P. Dy.)

No. 47. Pithila, not found elsewhere.


II.—Black Nāgas. Dr. Waddell informs me that the Nāgas invoked in Tibetan rain-charms are of three kinds: white, black, and angry. The names of the black and the angry Nāgas are mostly such unintelligible words, as Hili, Mili, Jala, &c. Many of these occur in our spell. I believe they are really mere unintelligible jargon, interspersed here and there with a real name, such as Pārśu-pāśāchini, or a real word, such as gōlāyā. It was only pedantic subtlety that made them into names of Nāgas. In the Khramantana-nāma Dharami occur the following names of black Nāgas: Lāmi Lāmi, Hili Hili, Taśśī Taśśī, Jala Jala, Pata Pata, Brara Brara Kuti Kuti (Wd.). In another Dharami are found the following angry Nāgas: Mili, Hili, Jala Pata, Brara, Kuti, Taśśī, Hula, Hula, Sīti, Kura, Egata, Arāre, Mahayāna, Patini, Apare Shabate, Ture. Of these Hili, Jala, Mili also occur in our spell; and Taśśī, Brara, Hula, Kura, Arāre may be respectively compared with our Chulu, Baba, Huhu, Kula or Kōin, Jāč. A few unintelligible names are also given in the Vyutpatti among those of the Nāgarājas: thus its No. 36 Ėdō, No. 51 Halaďo, No. 52 Ulukā, No. 71 Dramadro. With these may be compared our Ėlē, Huhu, Duma or Dumbing, Dōmmuṃ.

Dr. Waddell gives me from the Klu-l-sde or 'classes of Nāgas' in the Mdo-mang or 'collection of sūtras' the following list of Nāga kings and Nāgas:


III.—Dvīvā or Nāgūs. Of the 10 names mentioned on fl. III. I have only noticed one which is similar in Dr. Waddell's list. It is Patini, which appears, however, as the name of an angry Nāga, in a Dharami of the latter Nāgas. The Vyutpatti gives no list of names of Dvīvā or Nāgūs.

IV.—Grahas or Saivas. Twenty-one are enumerated in our MS.: 1, Dēva, 2, Nāga, 3, Asura, 4, Maruta, 5, Garuḍa, 6, Gandharva, 7, Kinnara, 8, Mahoraga, 9, Yaksha, 10, Rābhira, 11, Prēti, 12, Piśača, 13, Bhūta, 14, Kumbhāṇḍa, 15, Piṭanes, 16, Kaṭapāṭanes, 17, Skanda, 18, Unmida, 19, Chhīyā, 20, Apsara, 21, Dūtrāka. Nearly the same list is given in the Vyutpatti: the nine first mentioned, together with No. 14 Kumbhāṇḍa constitute its entire 156th chapter of names of supernatural beings, viz., 1, Dēva, 2, Nāga, 3, Yaksha, 4,
Gandharva, 5, Asura, 6, Daitya (instead of our Maruta), 7, Garuda, 8, Kinnara, 9, Mahóraga, 10, Kumbháṅḍa. The remainder, with the exception of Dastāraka, are mentioned in the 200th chapter on the Yídaga or 'evil spirits,' in nearly the same order: Préta, Kumbháṅḍa (here again enumerated), Píśící, Bhútà, Pátana, Kaśapápatana, Unmáda, Skanda, Apasmára, Chháya, Rakṣhása. Skanda is here explained to mean an evil spirit that "makes dry or causes consumption," and Chháya (spelled thus), one that "causes deflament," in the Śūrutila (Uttaratantra, chapter 27), however, Skanda is said to be the Grahāhīpati, or 'Chief of the Grahas' which affect children. In the Śūrutila and the Vangaśa (p. 910), skanda-graha is explained as 'convulsions'; (pátañgulaya, ranakantam, and saurabdhah hara-charaṇaiva śrityaya), &c. Chháya is generally said to mean 'nightmare.' Unmáda 'mania' and apasmára 'epilepsy' are treated in the Charaka and other medical books as ordinary diseases. After the grahas the spell proceeds to mention ordinary ills or diseases.

APPENDIX II.

The Khandavatta Játaka.

There is such a remarkable agreement of portions of this Játaka with the story of our MS. that a translation of the substance of it may be welcome for comparison.16

The commentary of the Játaka narrates the occasion of giving it thus:

The Master related this Játaka concerning a certain monk, while he was staying in Játavana. That monk was chopping wood at the door of the rising-room (jantághara-duérá), when he was bitten in a toe (padángulīya) by a snake which came from out a Páti tree (pátirūkh-aṇārā); and he died then and there. The fact of his death became known in the whole monastery. In the religious assembly the monks began to discuss the occurrence among themselves. The Master on entering asked them what they were talking about; and when he was told what it was, he said to the monks: 'If that monk had cultivated the friendship of the four snake-kings and their races, the snake would not have bitten him; for Buddha in a former ascetic existence cultivated the friendship of the four snake-kings and their races, and thus, so far as these snake-kings were concerned, he was not exposed to the risk of a re-birth (through being bitten to death by a snake).'

He then proceeded to relate the following legend:

In the past, when Brahmāda was king of Banáras, the Bódhisattva was born in the family of a Káśi Bráhman; but when he came of age, he retired from the world and made for himself a hermitage in a bend of the Ganges in the interior of the Himalayas, where, in the company of other Rishis, he devoted himself to a life of meditation. That place was infested by snakes of various sorts, and in consequence the death of a Rishi was a thing of frequent occurrence. The ascetics represented this state of things to the Bódhisattva. He advised them that they should cultivate the friendship of the four Snake-kings and their races, then no snake would bite them; and for this purpose he taught them the following gátā (śloka) verses:

1. Viráppakkháhí mē mettan mettah Érāpathéhi mē
   Chhabbyāppatahí mē mettañ Kuháh-Gótamakéhi cha 11
2. Apádañka mē mettañ mettah dipádoñkhi mē
   chhápaschedéhi mē metnañ mettañ bahúpaddéhi mē 11
3. Mā māh apádoñkhi hīsí māh māh hīsí dipádoñkhi
   mā māh chaippadoñkhi hīsí māh māh hīsí bahúpaddé 11
4. Sábbe sattah sábbe páññá sábbe bhéjñá cā kávalá
   sábbe bhádráyí passantu má kṣíñ-chi pájón ágamá 11

16 There appears to be a similar passage in the Chulavanga V, 6 (see Ját., Introd., p. LII. and Academy, 29th August 1891, p. 178), but that book has not been accessible to me here (Darjeeling).

17 This and the other passages are explained in the Páli commentary to include the races (kusa) of the respective Snake-kings. The Tibetan Vyuñjpati gives Dhritaraṣṭra as the first, or at the head, of the race of (eleven) Gandhārras, and places Suññhāpaśa as the first, or at the head, of the Nágajas. See Appendix I.
i.e. "With the race of Virūpāksha I keep friendship, and friendship with the race of Ėrāpatha; with the race of Chhābbhiputtra I keep friendship, and with the race of Kṛishna and Gōtama. (2) With the footless I keep friendship, and friendship with the two-footed; with the four-footed I keep friendship, and friendship with the many-footed. (3) Let not the footless harm me, nor harm me the two-footed; let not the four-footed harm me, nor harm me the many-footed. (4) All that exist, all that live, all that will live hereafter, one and all, may they experience the good things, may none of them fall into sin."

Buddha explained to them that the first verse they would establish friendship with the four Nāgarājas and their races, and by the second, with snakes and fishes, men and birds, elephants, horses and all other quadrupeds, scorpions, centipedes and other multi-pedes, and thus they would become proof against being bitten or injured by any of them. The third would serve them as a request, by reason of that friendship, to be saved from all danger from those different classes of beings. The fourth would show their feeling of goodwill to all creatures.

He then proceeded to explain how all safety (parītā) was ultimately to be ascribed to the transcendent power of the three gems, Buddha, Dharma and Sangha, and concluded by teaching them the following hymn:

"My safety is secured, my protection is secured!
Let all creatures leave me in peace!
So I will praise the Blessed One;
I will praise all that through him are saved!"

In this manner the company of Rishis found protection; and thenceforward, by the virtue of the charm taught by the Boddhisattva, the snakes left them in peace. The Boddhisattva himself in due time went to heaven.

The incident related in the Jātaka book is clearly the same as that narrated in our Manuscript. But what is there given in the form of a Jātaka, an incident from a former existence of Buddha, is here related as an Avadāna, an incident from his last existence. There the monk (Śvāti) is represented as dead, and the spell as having been given on a long-past occasion. Here Śvāti is represented as only being near death, and as going to be saved by the spell given on that very occasion. The spell, moreover, is here given in a very expanded form. To the first verse of the spell in the Jātaka correspond ten verses (1–10) in our MS.; to the second and third verses there, correspond five verses (11–15) here, while the fourth verse there, corresponds to the sixteenth verse here.

Some portions of the spell in our Manuscript look very much like direct translations from the Pāli. Our verses 12a, 13, 14a and 16 are Sanskrit versions of verses 2, 3, 4 in the Jātaka. Verse 13a has actually preserved, in bhumī, a fragment of the original Pāli. But the different wording of verse 16a would seem to show that the Sanskrit version in our Manuscript is based on a Pāli recension different from that contained in the Southern Buddhist Jātaka book.

Other Pāli fragments are scattered, here and there, through the whole of our Sanskrit version; thus we have karīki on fl. Ib3 and teki on fl. IIIb6. This would seem to indicate that the Northern Buddhism possessed an original Pāli recension co-extensive with the Sanskrit recension in our Manuscript.

To my mind, the transformation of the story from a Jātaka to an Avadāna form, as well as its expansion in the latter form, is an evidence of the story in this form being of a later age than that in the Jātaka book. This in itself is an evidence of the genuineness and the antiquity of the story in the Jātaka form as preserved by the Southern Buddhists of Ceylon.

APPENDIX III.

The Mahāmāyūrī Spell.

I was at first disposed to suggest that this spell may have received its name Mahā-māyūrī from the fact, that some part of the peafowl (māyūra) was used along with it. As a matter of
fact the quills of its tail-feathers, or its feet, burned and powdered, and its bile, form the ingredients of several medicines and antidotes prescribed in the older Indian medical works. Thus a powder containing burned quills (sikkhi-nādān dagdānum) occurs in the larger medical treatise of the Bower MS. on fl. I 62. A very similar powder or tincture is given in the Charaka, p. 726 (mayāra-nādān dagdānum), in the Sūrūta, p. 850 (barhi-paira-prasutām bhāsma, i.e., ashes of peacock-feathers'), in the Vangaśeṇa, p. 288 (barhi-pādān dagdānum i.e. 'burned peacock's feet'), and in the Chakradatta, p. 277 (sikkhi-puchchhaka-bhūti, i.e., 'ashes of peacock's tail-feathers'). This, however, is not prescribed as an antidote; but an antidote against snake-poison, containing the powdered quills of the tail-feathers of the peacock (sikkhi-barka) is given in the Charaka, p. 764. This powder is to be mixed with clarified butter and set fire to; and with it one's house, bed, and clothes are to be fumigated. Again in Charaka, p. 774, the broth (rasa) and tail-feathers (prāshata) of the peafowl, in Charaka, p. 770 its bile (sikkhi-pitta), and in Charaka, p. 773, its eggs (barhi-dāya) are prescribed to be taken, with other things, as an antidote against snake-poison, and in Charaka, p. 776, the peafowl is, therefore, directed to be kept on one's premises. Similar prescriptions occur in the Sūrūta; see, e.g., p. 632, 650, and in the Vangaśeṇa, p. 935 (mayāra-pitta, i.e., bile of a peacock). I cannot find any such prescriptions in the Aṣṭādīga Hṛidāya.

But while searching for these references, I came across a much more curious circumstance. The Charaka describes an antidote against the poison of snakes as well as poisons generally, which exhibits some striking features resembling those of the spell in our manuscript. It is given on pages 762—764. It is called the Mahā-gandha-ḥasti (lit. 'the great scent-elephant'), and is described as very powerful. This antidote consists of 60 drugs which are to be made up with the bile of cows (pittāna gavām) into pills (gudikā) for internal, or into a liniment (pralēpa) for external use. Used internally, the patient will quickly recover from poisoning; if applied externally, a person will be proof against poison, he may handle snakes or eat poison without any risk. It may also be smeared on various musical instruments and these sounded, or on umbrellas or flags, and these exhibited; in that case, they will act as a protection against infantile seizures (hūla-grāha), khākhāgra, every kind of seizure (sarva-grāha), fire-arms (agni-śatra), kings (nṛpa) and robbers (chauḍ). In short there will be prosperity, whenever this antidote is present. During the process of grinding its ingredients, the following spell (māṇtra) should be pronounced:—

"To my mother success and glory! success and glory to my father! To me success, to my son success, may I be successful! Reverence to the Perfect (Purusā-śūśha) Viṣṇu, the Creator (vīṣṇekarman), the Eternal Kṛishṇa who upholds and redeems the world! may his wonderful control be at once seen over Viṣṇu-kapiti, so that I may not witness the discomfort of Viśnu-da, nor the marriage of my mother, nor the drying up of the ocean. May this antidote be made efficacious by means of this true spell! Hili, Mili! With this all-healing powder protect me! Svāhā!"

What appears to be intended for the same antidote is given in the Sūrūta, p. 641, 642, under the name Mahā-sugandhī ('the great sweet-scented one'), but it is made to consist of 85 ingredients. It is given as one of those antidotes, which are "to be sounded with drums" (dundubhi-evāsīya). On p. 629 the Sūrūta says, that drums (dundubhi) which are smeared with an antidote, are to be sounded in the presence of the patient (see also p. 633). There is this difference, however, that the Sūrūta prescribes no particular spell to be said during the preparation of the Mahā-sugandhī antidote.


19 Prāshata means the "part-coloured part," and is in that place of the Charaka applied to the skin of the antelope (śaśa), the feathers of the peacock, quill and partridge (śaśa, ha, tāttīr), and the bistles of the porcupine (śeṭa).

20 In the Bengali edition, it is in Vol. III., pp. 406, 408.

21 For this the Bengali recension reads rākhašāni 'Rākhašāni,' and for Viṣṇu it reads māṇtra 'spells.'

22 The Bengali recension reads viṣa-kshayi,' wonderful in its destruction of poison.'
Further, the Ashāṅga Hirdaya gives an antidote under the name of Chandrōdaya ('moonrise'), which it praises as a most excellent protection against poisons of every kind, as well as against Vetālas, seizures, witch-craft, pūpma ('disaster'), plague, disease, famine, and war. It is made up of 28 drugs mixed in honey, and is to be applied to the patient by a pure virgin, while the physician is to pronounce the following spell during the process of preparing and applying it:—

"Reverence to the Purusha-sīhā! reverence to Nārāyaṇa! So may I not witness the discomfort of Kṛīṣṇa in the strife! May through this true spell my antidote be made efficacious! Hului, Hului! Protect me from all poisons, O Gaurī, Gāndhārī, Chanaḍāll, Mātān! Svāhā!"

It appears that according to the Charaka and Sūruta, spells (mantra) are to be used along with important operations in cases of poisoning. But the Sūruta, on p. 626, prescribes this expressly at the time of the application of the ligature to the bitten part. That operation is called the arṣha-baṇḍhana or dhamanti-baṇḍha (Charakadatta, p. 689). It is the first thing to be done, and is afterwards followed by the administration of antidotes. In the preparation or administration of the latter, the use of a spell was not prescribed. Out of a very large number of antidotes, the Mahā-paṇḍhahaṇa and the Chandrōdaya are the only two to which spells are annexed, which circumstance would show that they were exceptions, being considered antidotes of magical efficacy.

Now there are three points to be noted. In the first place, the spell in our Manuscript is clearly intended to be a spell to be used at the time of tying the ligature. This is shown by the direction: śūrd-baṇḍhana dharṣaṇi-baṇḍhana karāṇ, 'apply a ligature to the wound and to the vein,' followed by the spell. I do not now, therefore, think it probable, that the spell had its name of Mahā-māyūrī from any ingredient in an antidote used along with the spell. An additional reason is that there is no indication in the spell and its story of the use of any antidote.

In the second place: there is a considerable resemblance in the enumeration of evils which the spell is supposed to counteract, as given in our Manuscript and in the Charaka and the Ashāṅga Hirdaya. This is shown in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bower MS.</th>
<th>Charaka</th>
<th>Ashāṅga</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Darbhukta, &amp;c.</td>
<td>&amp;c.</td>
<td>&amp;c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. tōga (various).</td>
<td>&amp;c.</td>
<td>&amp;c.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Charaka and Ashāṅga add a few other ills, such as war, oppression and robbery, but these are covered by the second list of evils at the end of our spell. It seems to me impossible to avoid the impression that there is some connection between the three versions.

In the third place: there is a curious verbal coincidence between the word kārkhōḍa in the Charaka and kavkhōra in our MS. The abridged Petersburg Dictionary gives a various reading kārkkhōḍa. The word appears to have been unintelligible in later times; for the Ashāṅga Hirdaya substitutes pūpma, and the Bengāl edition of the Charaka, rakshōmī. It is, so far as I know, only known to occur in one other place; viz., in the Rājatarangini, V. 239 (in Dr. Stein's new edition). There it is related that the treasurer of king Gopāla Varman, in order to conceal his delinquencies, caused a person Rāmdēva, who was a proficient in kārkhōḍa, to compass the death of the king by his sorcery (abhichāra). This story shows, that by
khārkhōda a deadly kind of charm was understood. While preparing the present instalment, however, I have received another ancient manuscript; and in this I have been lucky enough to discover the same word in two places. The manuscript was dug out of a ruined house, near the town of Kugiar, not far from the Yarkand frontier. It is written on Daphne paper, and contains apparently six or seven separate treatises. These are written in two entirely different types of characters. One portion is written in the well-known North-Indian Gupta characters, very closely resembling those in the Bower MS.; but the other portion is written in the Central-Asian type of characters, a specimen of which has lately been published by Mr. S. D. Oldenburg in the Records of the Oriental Transactions of the Imperial Russian Archaeological Society, Vol. VII. 81-82. These latter have a close resemblance to the so-called “Wartu” characters, which are said to have been brought into Tibet early in the seventh century A.D. from Liyul or Khoten.

One of the treatises of this second portion, in the Central-Asian characters, contains the story of a charm, apparently given by Buddha to a Senāpati. In it the word, which is here spelled kakkhōrāda or kakkhōrdā, occurs twice. Unfortunately the manuscript is much mutilated; but the better preserved of the two passages runs thus: . . . dandōna parimuchchīshyati . . . ēvameśva parimuchchī[chchh]i[shchh] . . . śastra[śu] kramati na vihā n-aṁghi n-āvī-viśa84 na kakkhōrāda na Vaiśāla na . . . . (m[a][kabha]laṁ karīti, i.e., “he will be delivered from danger by . . . . even so he will be delivered . . . . no weapon hurts (him), no poison, no fire, no snake-poison, no kakkhōrāda, no Vaiśāla, no . . . . . has any overpowering effect.” The other passage has . . . . kiritā kakkhōrāda-putanis[ḥ] . . . . [parimuchchīshchh]yati, i.e., “he will be delivered from witchcraft (or demons who dig out corpses), kakkhōrāda and Pūtanas (=Vaiśālas).” The spelling slightly differs; the first passage spells the word with a short a, the second with a long a. The dental d (not cerebral ṭ), and the position of r in the second syllable (not in the first) would now seem to be the correct spelling. The variation in the spelling of the initial letter (k or kh) is possible; a similar instance is kakhata and khakhata ‘hard,’ both given in the Petersberg Dictionary. The spelling kavkhōrāda in the Bowr Manuscript I take to be a clerical error for kakkhōrāda; the r is not well made.

There is another curious verbal coincidence in the word sānti-evastây-anam ‘mystic spell for recovery,’ which is used both in our Manuscript and the Ashtāṅga Hridaya. The latter applies this term to the Chandrōdaya spell, which I have above quoted as parallel to our Mahāmgyūrī spell.

WEBER’S SACRED LITERATURE OF THE JAINS.
TRANSLATED BY DR. HERBERT WEIR SMYTH.
(Concluded from page 156.)

XLVI. Fourth múlasūtra, pīṇḍāniruykti. There is no text of this name in Berlin. We find MSS. of it mentioned in Kielhorn (Report 1881) pp. 9, 26—29, 95, and Peterson’s Palm-leaf 166.89 According to what I have cited on page 79 from the Vidihiprapā, [81] the pīṇḍān is connected with the fifth chapter of the third múlasūtra. It is surprising that a nīryuktī text should appear as a part of the Siddha, (see above p. 41). It deserves to be noticed that the pīṇḍān is not mentioned in the anāgapaṭavyathā list of the Nandī (see p. 11 ff). In the list of Raj. L. Mitra and Kāśināth Kunté pīṇḍāniruykti appears as the name of their fourth chhēdasūtrasa; Kāśināth says that its contents is “on the cause of hunger and the nature and kind of food to be taken.” A pīṇḍāniruyktīrītī is ascribed to the old Haribhadra (see p. 458). Kielhorn, l. c., cites a vṛttī of Vṛṣnaya, (see above pp. 44, 51). According to his account its extent is 61 leaves, or four or five lines on a page, each line 50 aksh. and in all about 900 ślokas.

83 This appears to be the correct Tibetan tradition, as Baba S. C. Dās now informs me. They were not brought from Magadhā. See Journal, As. Soc. Bengal, Vol. LVII. Part I, p. 41.
84 Ṭīṭ is a serpent’s fang; in the abridged Petersberg Dictionary, s.v.
85 It begins according to Peterson—as follows—piṇḍa uggamaṁ upāyapṛṣṭaṁ saṁjñapapappamāpyaṁ, and concludes: niṣjarāphalā ajñathāṁ vischijutsassas.
It remains for us to give a brief account of some of the texts quoted as parts of the Siddhânta in the Ratnasâgara, and by Rîjendra Lalâ Mitra, and Kâśinâth Kendt—see pp. 226, 227—which do not appear in Bühler’s list.

In the first place in reference to the jîtkalpa22 cited in the Ratnasâgara as the sixth chhêdasûtra and in reference to the gachhâyâra called ibid. the eighth pînim. Cf. pages 478 and 445.23

[22] The third variation in the Ratnasâgara from Bühler’s list which we find there has reference to the fourth mûlasûtram whose place is taken by the oghanirîyuktî24 and in fact as No. 3.

We have already seen (p. 61) from Av. Nijj. 6, 59, that a text of this name ought strictly to be cited there as a constituent part of the text of the Áv. Nijj. in P. it is actually cited as such and from the scholia on it and on Uttarajj. 26, above p. 48, that tradition regards it as an excerpt made from Bhadrabrahmasûra’s from pûrva 9, 3, 20. This is confirmed by the introduction of the avachûrî to the oghan. We have also seen (p. 357) that this composition cannot be referred to the old Bhadrabrahma († 170 Vira), since in the introductory verse cited in the Áv. 6, 89 the dasapuvi, dasarpurvin are honored besides the arîhânta and the chaúddasapuvi.

It is quite surprising that this verse also refers especially to the ikkâraasângasattadhîrâ; a fact diametrically opposed to the tradition just mentioned, that regards a part of aûga 12 as the source of the oghan. Further on in our present oghan, we find a direct reference in v. 14 to aûga 12; sâmâyârih bhû naçayajhayanâum (aûga 6?) dîtshâvâ, dû løiyakappussi aqûkkamâ kâraga chaúhdh 11. It is, however, sub judice whether or not this verse belonged to the original text. That this was quite a different text from that which the present oghan, as an independent work, presents, is proved by the fact that the two Ávâsaya-MSS. P. and which [33] cite it as integral part of the Ávâsaya, nijj. and allot to it but 58 (P.) or 79 (ê) verses (cf. above p. 62). The oghanijj. which exists in detached form embraces, according to its last verse, 1,160 gâthâs.25

The contents is stated in vv. 4, 5 to be as follows:

vaya (vrata) 5 samagnadhama 10 sañjama 17 veyâvachchañ 18 cha bâmabhagti 9 nãnaññiyi 3 tava 12 kõhanagrai 4 charaçañ éyau 11

pûndavisôbî 9 samuñ bhâvâ 12 padina 12 ya ñûdayairôhô 5 padilêchañ 25 guntî 3 abhaggrai 4 cheva karañm tu 11 11

The contents consequently refers to a right name of living; charoñalañarkñmikâ is the designation of the oghanirîyukt in the introduction of the avachûrî on it, and it calls itself at the end (vv. 1156-57) sâmâyâri (see above p. 43).

The beginning of the avachûrî29 contains several accounts in reference to the connection of the text with the Ávâsaya, and sâmâyikâdhyayanâ.29 These accounts are very obscure because

23 I add that a Jîtkalpasûtra is mentioned by Kisthorn, L. c. p. 51 and a jîtkalpachurî on p. 17; also in Peterson’s Palm-leaf 101, where the beginning and the conclusion are given, the total contents being 262 (162?) gâthâs. It begins xîhîsârâyûm yavrajînavahavâraavangapapapadîbhyajagam kumarîkrah aśravîkrah aśirvîn navîma nâmavirah [1] yochchhâs paçunghapariparhâpaparagarsam,—close; gûña 2 jîtkalpasûtram sambûtama.
24 Fifth chhêdasûtra in the list of Baj. L. M. and Kash., who says that the contents is ”on the duties of Sadhus.”
25 The MS. shews but 1,158 and the text belonging to the avachûrî has but 1,182 vv.
26 In the palm-leaf MS. 165 of Peterson these words run: ekkarasasihî aññihî alêhaññihî (ñ) aññihî sañghâyi; the number of verses is stated to the 1,156 (ñ).
27 A text of this name by Jinavallabhaçâ appears in the account of Kisthorn, p. 30 (with commentary) 95 and in the list of Peterson’s Palm-leaf 165. 1046-1773.
28 Composed by Jînakasûra samrâta 1439, and belonging to the vûtî of Drochâcharya.
29 Prakrânti “yam ávâsahânîvogas, tatra sâmâyikâdhyayanâ anuvartata, tasya châtâvry anuângâvârâni (cf. p. 246); upakramo nhikheṣo “anugamam nañañ; ñâasa ñâasa ñâasa,” niruktyanugamam sûtrâñugamam cha; ñâasa tridhâ: nihkheṣo “padgathâ-sûtrasâkha-sûtrasûtrasûtrasûtrasûtras,” some “ûtarpushyamansârgam anugamam tv” “tyâyaññ dráñgrâthábhîyam anugamam...” uddësa “nîññi” (see p. 871) ity-âdi...
we do not possess any of the immediate sources whence they are taken. [84] \textit{A propos of v. 1}
several interesting statements are made concerning the relations of the dasapūrvin to the
dhātarudāsapūrvin (trivadāsapūrvināḥ are said to have never existed). The dasapūrvin are said to be
upakārakāḥ, upāngādi(ānām C)-saṅgavrahaṇyuparachāneśa (śūna hētenā C).

I have found no other trace of the dēvarvijyā, see p. 471 cited in the Ratnasāgara as the
sixth paññam. The jyōtisakuraṇam which is the ninth paññam in the Ratnasāgara is at
least mentioned in the pañña list in Avī, see p. 471.

As regards the texts enumerated by Rājendra Lāla Mitra and Kāśināth Kunte, I refer to
pages 392 and 11 for the mahāpaṇamavāyu mentioned by K. K. as the sixth upāgam.

In both the above authorities we find the second muṣalāṭram called viśesāhavāṣayakāṣṭraḥ;
and a text of this name exists according to Kielhorn's Report, pp. 36 to 38. In the beginning of
Ratnasākhura's commentary on the śrāddhaṇapratīktanuṣṭāṇa it is cited as a work of a Jina-
bhadra (see above p. 70): yad iṣukhiśri Jinaḥbhadra gaṇapīkṣasamaṇaṃ saṃmukhāḥ śrī viśesāhavāṣayākē
(then two gāthās in Prāṣya). According to Khatt 247 and Kielhorn, p. 37 Jinaḥbhadra is merely
author of a commentary on this work. A tīkā by Kotyāchārya is cited by Kielhorn, the MS.
dating saṃvat 1138 (A. D. 1082). According to Khatt Kotyāchārya is another appellation of
Silākūka, whose commentary on niśga 1, see p. 29 dates A. D. 876. Kielhorn mentions [85] an
anonymous commentary on the text itself, which bears the much sought for name śiṣhyālītā (see
pp. 44, 51, 81). This MS., too, is very old saṃvat 119—(?) i. e. dates at least from A. D. 1134.
The viśesāhavāṣayakam is often cited in the Vichārāṇītaśaṅgīnī. According to Kāśināth
Kunte it contains "a detailed explanation of what is written in the Avyāyaka Sūtra."

The fourth muṣalāṭram in the list of Rājendra Lāla Mitra, by name pākshikāṣṭrayam, contains
(with some independent additions) the same enumeration of the uṇghādira texts, etc.,
which is found in the Nandi. See p. 10 ff. According to an introduction consisting of
4 gāthās it deals in prose especially with the 5 mahāvavyas to which as the sixth the rāhūbhāyanā
vēruṇām is joined. See p. 78. Then follows a metrical discussion of the same subject in
41 (13, 7 and 23) āryā. Thereupon (cē śaḥ khalu mahāvavyayānāhāraṇā kāya, iḥkāmo suṣa-
kkitaṣayām kūmi) reverential salutations (nāma) for the khamāmaṇa by which partly imaḥ
vaiṣṇavī chinnavī akṣaraṃ bhagaṃbhataṃ, partly: imaḥ vaiṣṇavī amaṅgābhāraṇaṃ kūliṇaḥ, or
ukkāliṇaḥ, bhagaṃbhataṃ, and partly: imaḥ vaiṣṇavī duṇvālasaṃgataṃ goṇipagasaṃ. According
to Kāśināth Kunte the work gives "an account of all what is to be done by the Sādhūs in
every fortnight." Perhaps the name is derived from the fact that it is to be recited every
fortnight.

[86] The work stated to be the third member in the group of Kalpaśūtras, and which has
the specific title Kalpaśūtram is, according to the statements in Kaś, the text which claims
this title kar′ ṛṣiṣva. It appears as the dasāḥ section of the fourth chhēdaśūtra.

The first three members of the group of "Chhēdaśūtras" in Rāj, L. M. cf. p. 227: - the
bṛhaṭ, laghu- and madhyama-vācchā of the mahānāma, are stated by Kāśināth to "test of
the penances to be performed by the Sādhus in a detailed, abridged and middling manner
respectively."
I have not found any other mention of this work.

The sixth member of the same group paryuṣhaṇākalpa, contains, according to Kāśināth:
"directions as to the manner of observing fasts and hearing the Kalpa Śūtra from the twelfth
day of Bhādōṇ (Bhādrapadu) Badi (dark fortnight) to the 4th or 5th day of Bhādōṇ Sudi
(lunar, i. e. light, fortnight)." Is this the paryuṣhaṇākalpanājīviti in 66 āryā belonging to the
third part of “Kalpasūtra” (Jacobi, pp. 86–93)? This paryushan was commented on (see p. 478) by Jinaprabha at the end of his saimāniḥvīsnaḥśudhī.

See p. 82 on asghanīyukti and pp. 427, 429 on maranaśamadhi.

I give in conclusion a list of the texts which are either found in the Siddhānta itself (1–29), or are mentioned elsewhere (30 fg.) as belonging to the Siddhānta, but which at present are no longer extant, at least as independent texts.

[87] 1. divasāgarapannatī, aṅga 3, 5, 6, 6, see pp. 266, 389, also in the pāñcina list in Avī. see pp. 427, 429 (where there is but one saimāniḥvīsnaḥśudhī on it).

2. kammasāgadasāru, ten ajjhanas, aṅga 3, 4, see p. 270; cf. Nos. 7, 10.

3. baṃdhadasāru, ten ajjh, aṅga 3, 10, see p. 273.

4. dōgiddudasāru, ten ajjh, ibid.

5. dīhadasāru, ten ajjh, ibid. (cf. np. 8–12).

6. saṃkhītrivādasāru, ibid., ten ajjh. viz.:—1. khandiyā vimāṇapavibhāti, 2. mahāliyā vim., 3. sāmghaḥchāliyā, 4. vaggachāliyā, 5. vivāhaḥchāliyā, 6. Arūṇāvāsā, 7. Varaṇāvāsā (Dhaśa), 8. Garulāvāsā, 9. Vēśāṅkharāvāsā, 10. Vēśamanāvāsā. All these titles recur in essentially the same order in the Nandi among the aṇāṇgāpaviṭṭha texts, group kāliya; see pp. 18, 14. In the kārikās quoted on pp. 223, 224 we find the statement that 1–5 belong to the fifth, and 6–10 to the twelfth year of study.

7. kammasāgajjhanas, aṅga 4, 4, see p. 280; cf. Nos. 2, 10.

8. isibhāsiyā dēvalgatiḥyabhaṃbāyiyā, 44 ajjh., aṅga 4, 4; the isibhāsiyā in also in the Nandi in the list of aṇāṇgāpaviṭṭha texts; see pp. 250, 252, 273, 412, 414, 442, above pp. 13, 57, 58; on rṣibhāsita see also p. 446 n. 2.

9. dēvalgaciḥyabhaṃbāyiyā, see just above and also p. 280.


11. mahākappāṁ, Āvāsā. 8, 55, as first chhānasuttam, see pp. 440, 449; in the Nandi among the aṇāṇgāpaviṭṭha texts, see p. 11 (mahākappāsaya).

12. kappiyākappiṁ, N among the aṇāṇgāp., p. 11.

13. chulakappāsaya, ibid., p. 11.

14. mahāpamāvāṇá, ibid., pp. 11, 54; see p. 392.

15. pasmāppamāyaṁ, ibid., p. 11.

16. pārismahāsañalam, ibid., p. 12.

17. maṃḍalappavesā, ibid.

18. vijjaḥarāpanaviṣiṣṭchhaḥśudhī, ibid.

19. jhāpanviḥbhatti, ibid., and in the Vidyāprapā among the paśyāra, see p. 426.

20. maraṇapaviḥbhatti, in N among the aṇāṇgāp., p. 12.

21. ayavisoḥī, ibid.

22. vijarāyasūm, ibid.

23. saṃkhārasaḥsuddhaḥ, ibid.

24. viharakkoppö, ibid.

25. charaṇapīhit, ibid.

---

5 We possess several texts on kammasāgāṇa; thus 167 Prākrit-gāthās by Jīpavallabha in Peterson’s Palm-leaf 42 f.; also 168 ditto by Garge ibid. Nos. 52, 81h,—and, without the name of the authors, Nos. 85h, 106, 161d. There is a bālāvabodhi on it by Matichandra, see Kielhorn p. 98.

The āyaṇadāśaka mentioned there are identical with chhāṇaśūtra 4.

8 The apuṣṭhavāgarpaṣaṁ in 36 ajjh. mentioned ibid. are doubtless identical with mūlaśūtra 3. see p. 43.
27. utṭhānasūnam, ib.; utṭhānasūnyayā chaũrō in the kārikās quoted p. 224 as the subject of the study of the thirteenth year.
29. nāgaśaripiyāvaliyā, ib.
30. āsīvisabhāvaṇād in the Pākhikaśūtra and the three sāmāchāri texts, ib.; in the kārikās cited p. 214 as designed for the fourteenth year.

[89] 31. cīṭtiṁvisabhāvaṇād, ib., for the fifteenth year.
32. chāraṇabhaṇṇād (chāraṇasamaṇabha), ib., sixteenth year.
33. mahāśaṇḍi(laṣuṁṇa)bhāvaṇād, ib., seven year.
34. tēganisaggā, ib., eight year. According to Vīdhīprāpī title of the fifteenth book in aṅgī 5, see p. 36.
35. maraṇānavīhī, in Vīdhīprāpī among the ānaṁgap, see p. 12.
36. rāhāraṇḍāga, in the paṁna list in Āvī, see p. 427.
37. nāgāvijī, ib.
38. jōisakaramaṇaṁ, ib., and in the paṁna list of the Ratnasaṅgara, see p. 437; cf. p. 84.
39. maraṇasamaḥ, in the paṁna list in Āvī and in Rāj. L. M., see p. 427; p. 86.
40. titṭhāgālī, in the paṁna list in Āvī, see p. 427.
41. narayavibhā ṭi, ib.
42. dēvavijijyā, in the paṁna list of the Ratnasaṅgara, see p. 431; cf. p. 84.

Corresponding to the number of the 46 āgamas which exist or are recognized as parts of the Siddhānta, we have 42 texts which are at present not extant. If we add paṅchakalpa and the two special vāchaṇās of the mahāmśila, and if we count singly the ten titles comprised in No. 6 (as is always the case in aṅgī 3 and elsewhere) — then the number of the texts no longer extant [90] is eight greater than the number of those in existence. It must, however, be confessed that the ten pieces collected in No. 6 are very brief in compass, since they are each counted as one aṣṭha-pāṇa; and the same may be the case as regards others of the texts now no longer extant. Nevertheless in the Siddhānta there are short texts and among the āgamas there is one and that is not small (aṅgī 4) which has but a single aṣṭha.

If we take into consideration the conclusions which we were obliged to adopt in regard to the loss of the mahāparinnā chapter in aṅgī 1, in regard to the changes which aṅgas 5, 7-11, up. 8-12 are proved to have undergone, and in regard to the total loss of aṅgī 12 etc., etc. — it is at once evident that great uncertainty reigns in this department of Indian literature, despite its seemingly firm articulation. The beginning of our knowledge is here contemporary with the beginning of our doubts. One fact is of cardinal importance: — Nos. 6, 27, 30-34 of the above list existed at the date of the kārikās cited on p. 224, and formed an integral part of the sacred study. The portion of the extant Siddhānta that is mentioned in p. 224 besides these is but trifling in comparison. The ultimate significance of this last assertion cannot, however, be seen at the present day. Cf. p. 225.

In conclusion, I desire to extend my most hearty thanks to Dr. E. Leumann for the generous assistance he has rendered in reading the proof of this treatise. This assistance comprises very numerous corrections made on the basis of MSS. and printed material which were not accessible to me. I have also used to great advantage Kielhorn's Report and especially Peterson's Detailed Report.

* The siddhāpāṇadapainman ib. belongs to aṅgī 12, see pp. 355, 361.
† In Kielhorn's report p. 54 there is mention made of a paṅchakalpaśucharāṇi by Āmaraḍēvācārya. See p. 477.
FOLKLORE IN SALSETTE.

BY GEO. FR. D'PENHA.

No. 13.—The Ill-treated Daughter-in-law.

There once lived an old woman with her son and his wife, and after a few years of married life the wife became pregnant. The old woman's son, about this time, fitted out a ship to go to another country, but before going he asked his mother to take care of his wife as she was pregnant, and said: — "Mātā sókrā hōit tē mējē tārvāvar sōnīcātā pāṇiāh parēl; anī sókrā hōit tē rūpiācātā pāṇiāh parēl; If a son be born to me a shower of gold will fall on my ship, but if a daughter then there will be a shower of silver."

Then bidding farewell to his wife and mother he went away. After a few months had passed the wife felt her time of delivery approaching, and so she asked her mother-in-law if she might take her cot into the sleeping-room (kāmbrā), but the old woman objected, saying: — "Kāmbrā hái tē dēvānā dharmāchād; The sleeping-room belongs to the gods and religious rites."

Then the daughter-in-law asked if she might place it in the hall (sāl), and the mother-in-law again objected, saying: — "Sāl hái tē úttā baisācchān;" The hall is meant for people to sit in.

Upon this the daughter-in-law asked if she might place her cot in the verandah (bānīsā), and for the third time the old woman objected, saying: — "Ónātā hái tē étīāh zātimācchā;" The verandah is meant for passers-by to rest themselves.

The poor daughter-in-law saw that there was no place in the house to be spared for her confinement, and at length resorted to a jungle, and there, under a mango-tree, was delivered of a boy. She left the child under the tree and went home, occasionally going back to give suck to the child. On the day the boy was born a shower of gold fell on his father's ship, upon which he distributed sugar to the crew and returned home. His mother, however, told him tales against his wife, and shewed him an orōntā (spice-grinding-stone), saying she had given birth to that stone! The husband's anger was roused against his wife, but he saw that he could do nothing and kept quiet.

A few more years passed and the wife was again pregnant. This time also her husband proceeded on a voyage. He again asked his mother to take care of his wife, which, of course she promised to do; and saying: — "Mātā sókrā hōit tē mējē tārvāvar sōnīcātā pāṇiāh parēl; anī sókrā hōit tē rūpiācātā pāṇiāh parēl; If a son be born to me there will fall on my ship a shower of gold, but if a daughter is born there will be a shower of silver," he went away.

Some months after, when the time of her labour commenced, the wife again asked her mother-in-law if she might use the sleeping-room, but she met with the same objection as before: — "Kāmbrā hái tē dēvānā dharmāchād; The sleeping-room belongs to the gods and religious rites."

She then asked for the use of the hall, but again came the objection: — "Sāl hái tē úttā baisācchān; The hall is meant for people to sit in."

Then the use of the verandah was asked for, and again the old woman said: — "Ónātā hái tē étīāh zātimācchā; The verandah is meant for such as come and go."

The poor woman, for the second time, was refused a place for her confinement, and again went into the jungle and was delivered under a hāsā tree (teak-nut tree), where she left the child and went home, occasionally going back to the tree to suckle it. For the second time there fell a shower of gold on her husband's ship, and, again distributing sugar to the crew, he returned home with great joy, but only to be disappointed, for the old woman again told him a lot of

1 Literally, 'the hall is for rising and sitting.' 2 Literally, 'the verandah is for such as come and go.'
tales, and produced a bôvârtâ (Goa broom), saying that his wife had given birth to it! The husband was very much incensed against his wife, but cooled his ire, and had patience with her.

When a few more years had passed his wife again became pregnant, and for the third time her husband went on a voyage, leaving his wife to the care of his mother, who promised all care and to take every precaution that would ensure a successful delivery. Before he went away, he said:— "Mâľâ sûhrâ hûl tê mâyî târââcar sûaâchâ pûnîû parât; ani sûhrâ hûl tê rápiâchâ pûnîû parât; Should a son be born to me there will fall on my ship a shower of gold, but if a daughter, a shower of silver."

Now in due time the wife felt her time approaching, and, therefore, asked her mother-in-law if she might use the sleeping apartment, but she only got the same old answer:— "Kâmbrâ hât tê dûvaâ dharmûchâ; The sleeping-room is assigned to the gods and religious rites."

So also when she asked for a place in the hall, she was told:— "Sâl hût tê âttû baisâvchâ; The hall is meant for people to sit in."

She now pleaded for the verandah, but was put off by the same answer:— "Ôñûtâ hût tê âttû zùûnchâ; The verandah is meant for passers-by."

The poor woman saw no alternative, but had again to resort to the jungle, and was delivered this time of a daughter, under a tamarind tree (chîchî). After her delivery she left the child there and went home, occasionally going back to suckle it. Her husband witnessed a heavy shower of silver, and, after again distributing sugar to the crew, returned home; but only to be disappointed for the third time, for he was now shewn a mûvâll (date-palm broom).

Now, this time the old woman told him so many tales that he was mad with rage. She told him to get rid of his wife, and said she would get him married to another. Her son believed every word that was told him, and having chastised his wife most brutally, went and hanged her on an or tree (Ficus religiosa), and left her there a long time. Fortunately for her, however, there passed that way some gônîâs (cow-herds) who felt deeply for her, and thought within themselves:— "Bîshkarûn kû gônîs kélî kûn sâmâ; pûnî dûn sôrvîh tîd; What offence the poor woman may have committed, who can say? But we will, nevertheless, set her free."

So they set her free, and went their way to graze their cattle. She now went and fetched together her children. The two boys were pretty well advanced in years, and the girl had made wonderful progress in her growth. So they built a hut, and lived in it.

The old woman, in the meanwhile, made arrangements for getting her son married to another girl, and on the appointed day our hero was dressed up ready to go to the Church. But his former wife, who came to know that her husband was about to go to Church to be married to some one else, called to her children and taught them to say:—

Âmbiû bûrchiû ámbayû dûdû, kâsû bûrchiû kâsûyû dûdû, chîchîû bûrchiû sâlûp bûyû, lût tôpûdû ámbûchû bûp, brûvûr tâûlëû ámbûchû úi, dharam kûr gô hauûnûnû úpû; Brother Mango from under the mango tree; Brother Catchu-nût from under the catchu-nût tree; Sister Sâlûp from under the tamarind tree; the man with the red hat is our father; our mother is hanging on the banian tree; give alms, oh tale-telling grandmother!"

When they were able to repeat this by heart, she told them to go and say it near their father’s house. The children went and standing before the house repeated what their mother had taught them. Their father, who had never seen them before, was taken by their faces, and, as he did not understand what they had said, he told them to repeat it again, upon which they said:—

Âmbiû bûrchiû ámbayû dûdû, kâsû bûrchiû kâsûyû dûdû, chîchîû bûrchiû sâlûp bûyû, lût tôpûdû ámbûchû bûp, brûvûr tâûlëû ámbûchû úi, dharam kûr gô hauûnûnû úpû; Brother Mango from under
the mango tree; Brother Catchu-nut from under the catchu-nut tree; Sister Salop from under the tamarind tree; the man with the red hat is our father; our mother is hanging on the banian tree; give alms, oh tale-telling grandmother!"

Their father called to his mother and told her to give them some öřé. She came out, but, suspecting who the children were, refused to give them anything. Their father, however, himself went to the cook-house, and fetched some öřé and gave them to the children. He then made them repeat what they said over and over again several times. At last he thought there must be some meaning attached to what they said, and asked them where they had learnt it. The children told him that their mother had taught them. Upon this he told them to call their mother (his own wife), and when she came in his presence, he asked her whose children they were that were standing before them, and she said: "These children are yours and mine."

When she said this, he told her to explain what it all meant. She then told him all: — How she had been prevented from being delivered in the house on the plea that "kámbrá hái 's śõ dësāh bharmācchā, the sleeping-room belongs to the gods and religious rites: sāl hái te. ñatá bai'sānchā; the hall is meant for sitting in: ñatá hái tō čitān sa'tānchā, the verandah belongs to passers-by; and how she had resorted to the jungle, where she was delivered first of a boy under a mango tree, a second time of another boy under a catchu-nut tree, and the third time of a girl under a tamarind tree; and how each time she was wont to go home leaving the children there, occasionally going to them to give them milk; and how his mother, whenever he came home, shewed him first an öröṯā (spice-grinding-stone), secondly a bōvātrā (Goa broom), and thirdly a mōvāli (date-palm broom); and how, not content with these tricks, she had told him a great many tales. Upon this he embraced his wife and children, and asked her why she did not tell him all this long ago, even at the risk of her life. Then in a rage he took hold of his mother, cut her into three pieces, and hung the pieces up on three roads.

After this he lived happily with his wife and children.

TIBETAN FOLKLORE.

1.—Cats.

The Cat is treated by Tibetans with the most marked attention and forbearance. Even when it spills milk, breaks or destroys any valuable object or kills some pet bird, it is never whipped or beaten in any way; but merely chid, and gently driven away by the voice: — while were a dog or child to commit these offences they would be soundly thrashed.

Such very mild and considerate treatment might lead one to suppose that the cat is esteemed holy. But such is not the case. It is indeed regarded as a useful animal to the extent that it contributes to the preservation of sacred pictures, robes, books, and sacrificial food and the like, by killing the rats and mice which consume and destroy these. But otherwise the cat is considered to be the most sinful being on earth, on account of its constant desire for taking life, even when gorged with food, and its torture of its victims. Its mild treatment is due to the belief that whoever causes the death of a cat, whether accidentally or otherwise, will have the sins of the cat transferred to his shoulders. And so great is the burden of its sins that even were one str. (2 lbs.) of butter for each hair on the cat’s body offered in feeding the temple lamps before Buddha’s image, the crime would not be expiated. Hence everyone is most careful to avoid incurring this calamity. And when a cat dies its body is carried outside the village and deposited, if possible, at a place where two paths cross.

L. A. WADDELL.

3 The process of making these öřé (singular öř) is similar to making pōl (see ante, p. 143). But while pōl are made in the shape of ordinary hand-bread, öřé are made by putting lumps of wheaten dough, thicker than that used for pōl, into boiling oil. Öřé are generally made on occasions of weddings and feasts.

4 [This story is valuable as shewing where the second part of the extraordinary story of Bāpākād (ante, p. 142 ff.) comes from. — Ed.]

MISCELLANEA.
NOTES ON AN ARCHÆOLOGICAL TOUR THROUGH RAMANNADESA
(THE TALAING COUNTRY OF BURMA).

BY TAW SEIN-KO.

UNDE RInstructions from the Government of Burma, I left Rangoon for Moulmein on the 5th December, 1891. As it was my intention to explore the whole of the country, which constituted the ancient Talaing kingdom of Ramannaśa, with special reference to the elucidation of the history of the places mentioned in the Kalyāna Inscriptions, I went down to Amherst by boat and returned to Moulmein by land, and the notes now published are those that I was enabled to make by the way.

The Mun or Talaing language is still spoken in the villages between Amherst and Moulmein, and is still taught in the monastic schools there; but, owing to there being no Government grants-in-aid given for the encouragement of its study, it is not taught in the lay schools. The Talaing language has a unique literature of its own; numbers of inscriptions are recorded in it; and certain questions relating to the ethnography, history, antiquities, and languages of the peoples inhabiting Burma are awaiting solution, because the Talaing literature is still a terra incognita. Considering that the study of the insignificant dialects of the Karen language, which has no indigenous literature, and whose alphabet was invented by Doctor Wade, an American Missionary, in 1832, receives considerable encouragement, it would be well if the Education Department could see its way to recognize Talaing in the curriculum of studies for indigenous schools in those parts of the Tavoy, Amherst, Shwegyin, and Pegu districts, where it is still spoken and studied. This measure would, no doubt, be pleasing to the Talangis, and would be a token of gracious, although late, recognition of the services rendered by their fellow-countrymen to the British in the first and second Burmese Wars.

About 20 miles from Amherst is Wàgarû, originally founded by King Wàgarû near the close of the 18th Century, A.D. The site of the old city is now completely covered with jungle; but traces of its walls and moat still exist. It is said that its walls were of laterite, and that images of the same material existed in its vicinity. But I saw neither the walls nor the images; apparently the laterite walls have served as road-metal for the contractors of the Public Works Department, and the images are hidden by jungle. I am not sure whether any excavations carried out at Wàgarû would bring to light any inscriptions or objects of archæological interest.

On the 11th December, Pagàt was visited. There are caves of great historical interest in its neighbourhood. Pagàt is the birth-place of Wàgarû, who restored the Talaing monarchy after Ramannaśa had been subject to Burmese rule for over two centuries, and is full of historical associations. It was here that Dãlãhan, the ‘Hereward the Wake’ of the Talaings, utilized the strategic position of the place, and for long defied the Burmese forces of (Añang)ãya’s son and immediate successor, Naungbioy,³ The caves are natural openings in hills of submarine limestone rock. Some of them are over 1,000 feet in height and have precipitous sides. It is reported that large boxes of Talaing palm-leaf manuscripts, which were originally hidden by patriotic Talaings to escape destruction from the ruthless hands of the Burmese conquerors, are decaying in the sequestered parts of these caves.

¹ [I fully endorse this plea for the preservation of the Talaing language. It is rapidly disappearing before Burmese, and it is pitiable to note the absolute ignorance of many Talaings of their distinctive language. But historically it is quite as valuable as Burmese, if not more so. It is not desirable, speaking practically, to revive Talaing, but academically its preservation would be invaluable and a chair in the Rangoon College might well be devoted to Talaing and its epigraphy and literature.—Ed.]

³ In Italian sense.

³ In Portuguese sense.

⁴ Subsequently, I learnt from a priest of the Mahāyāna monastery at Kado, that complete sets of Talaing manuscripts are being preserved in the Royal Libraries at Bangkok. It would be a good thing to obtain a set for the Burma Free Library at Rangoon. Perhaps the British Consul could be moved to prefer a request to
There are now few persons, who can read and understand these manuscripts: but, whenever they shall have been interpreted by a trained scholar, they will throw a flood of light on Talaing history, and on the history of learned, religious, and commercial relations between Rāmāśānādeśa, Ceylon, and Southern India. They will also solve certain questions connected with Pāli and Sanskrit philology and literature.

Owing to want of time only two caves, namely, the Kōgun and Pāgāt, could be visited. The former presents a splendid sight. Its precipitous side facing the Kōgun village is completely covered by painted terra-cotta tablets arranged symmetrically in the form of terraces and spires. Inside the cave are lying images of various sizes in different stages of decay and ruin. They are found to be made of the following substances: lead, brass, wood, stone, brick, and lacquerware. The majority of them bespeak their antiquity, as they differ from modern ones in the following particulars:—the head is surmounted by a spiral truncated cone representing the Buddhist nimbus; the bristles of the hair are represented; the ears do not touch the shoulders; the forehead is prominent, but remarkably narrow; the eyebrows, eyes, and lips are the most prominent features of the face; the body is short and stout and the head is disproportionately big; the limbs are full and large; the sole of the right foot is not displayed.

No history is known to exist about the caves of this neighbourhood; nor is there any person, layman or priest, who can relate anything historically true about them. But, judging from the fact that Rāmāśānādeśa was subject to Cambodian rule from the 6th to the 10th century A. D., and again to Siamese rule in the 14th century, it may be safely inferred that most of the images are of Cambodian or Siamese origin. The general architectural effect of the cave, and the resemblance of these images to those of Siam, favour this view. A closer examination in detail, however, might reveal the fact that some of the images were dedicated to Brahmanical worship, which was favoured by the ancient Kings of Cambodia, that others are of Sinhalese or Dravidian origin, and that there is some relationship, historical, religious, and architectural, between the caves in the Amherst district and the cave temples of Cambodia and India. I brought away three small wooden images with legends, now illegible, but conjectured to be in the Siamese characters inscribed on their pedestals. (See plate.)

The Pāgāt Cave was next visited. It contains nothing of interest. It is now the home of bats, whose dung yields an annual revenue of Rs. 600. It would appear that the contents of this cave have been made away with in order to make room for the more valuable dung!

Near this cave is a monastery, now occupied by a priest from Upper Burma. Since the annexation of that province to the British Crown, numbers of Buddhist priests from it have settled down in this district. Owing to their reputed learning and their conversational powers, they are highly esteemed and are abundantly supplied with the necessaries of life. The Talaing priests are, as a rule, somewhat lax in their observance of strict precepts: e. g., they are possessed of boats and landed estates, drive about in bullock-carts, drink tea in the evenings, and smoke cigars in public! Such conduct is now being followed by the priests from Upper Burma, who appear to be imbued with the truth of the proverb: "At Rome, do as Rome does." The burden of supporting the priests, who do very little in return for their maintenance, and who idle away most of their time, because the educational work is better and more efficiently done by the lay schools, is in the Talaing Country indeed a heavy one. On an average about 100 houses support a kyawng, and every village that has any pretence to piety must have a kyawng of its own. The standard of material comfort of the villagers, this effect to His Siamese Majesty. The late Dr. Forshammer succeeded in procuring a number of ancient Talaing manuscripts from the caves in the neighbourhood of Pāgāt. I understand some of them, if not all, are now lying in the Bernard Free Library. [The Chief Commissioner, Burma, has addressed the British Consul at Bangkok on the subject.—End.]
INSCRIBED WOODEN IMAGES FROM THE KOSUN CAVE.
who maintain the kyawng, may be a low one, but the poneyi in charge of the kyawng is fed on the fat of the land.

On the 14th December, I visited Kōkarēk, which is inhabited by Burmans, Talaings, Shāns, Karens, and Taungūs. The Taungūs are an interesting people. They have a literature of their own, and I obtained a copy of a poetical work called Suttanippan (Suttamībbāna or Nībbānamutta). The language of the Taungūs contains words bodily borrowed from the languages of the peoples by whom they are surrounded. The Taungūs resemble their congeners, the Karens, in physical appearance; their build is thick-set, and they have full, round, and heavy features. At Kōkarēk the Taungū language is purer than at Thatôn, although there have been many inter-marriages between the Taungūs and the Shāns.

The meaning of the word 'Taungū' is Highlander, in contradistinction to the people of the lowlands. A similar distinction obtains in Cambodia, the ancient Kingdom of the Khmers. The latter M. Mouhot describes thus: — "Having a great taste for music, and being gifted with ears excessively fine, with them originated the tam-tam, so prized among the neighbouring nations; and by uniting its sounds to those of a large drum, they obtain music tolerably harmonious. The art of writing is unknown to them; and as they necessarily lead a wandering life, they seem to have lost nearly all traditions of the past. The only information I could extract from their oldest chief was, that far beyond the chain of mountains which crosses the country from north to south, are other people of the high country (such is the name they give themselves; that of savage wounds them greatly), that they have many relations there, and they even cite names of villages or hamlets as far as the provinces occupied by the Annamite invaders. Their practice is to bury their dead." The above description would, with slight modifications and with the exception of the part relating to their ignorance of the art of writing, answer very well for that of the Taungūs.

The Taungūs call themselves Phāō, i.e., ancient fathers, and have a tradition that large numbers of them emigrated years ago from their original seat of Thatôn to a State of the same name in the Shān country. Since then they have borrowed largely from Shān literature: in fact, their books, most of which have been translated from Shān, contain a large admixture of Shān words.

The Taungū alphabet appears to have a closer affinity to that of the Talaings or the Burmans than to that of the Shāns, as it recognises the medial letters, which are absent in Shān. The one peculiarity deserving of notice in the pronunciation of the letters is the Indian sound accorded to the letters of the palatal class, e.g., is pronounced ch and not s, as the Tibetans, Burmans, and Talaings pronounce. This is a remarkable fact showing the probability of the Taungūs having received their alphabet direct from Indian colonists.

---

5 "My authority for this is the following extract of a note from a gentleman of the American Mission to Lieutenant Newmarsh—"

"The Taungthoos have a written language and books, and kyawngs and priests. I have seen their books, and on the fall of Sebastopol I printed the Governor-General's proclamation for Lieutenant Burn in Taungthoo, but I confess it was the first and only thing that was ever printed in Taungthoo."—Yule's Mission to Ava, Appendix M., page 383.

6 [This is now in the British Museum. Dr. Cushing informs me that Taungū MSS. are frequently to be met with in Shān monasteries, and that the commonest text of all is the Suttanippans.—Ed.]

7 Vide Mouhot's Travels in the Central Parts of Indo-China, Cambodia, and Laos, page 24.

8 Savages to the East of Cambodia, called by the Cambodians their elder brothers.

9 [Dr. Cushing informs me that the Taungū language is closely related to that of the Fghē Karen and that a Taungū can easily learn to make himself intelligible to a Fghē Karen in a short time.—Ed.]

10 [It may some day help much in determining the original sound of many Burmese words, which, no doubt have, in historical times, changed their sounds.—Ed.]
who maintain the kyaung, may be a low one, but the pöngyi in charge of the kyaung is fed on the fat of the land.

On the 14th December, I visited Kôkärêk, which is inhabited by Burmans, Talaiings, Shâns, Karens, and Taungûsas. The Taungûsas are an interesting people. They have a literature of their own, and I obtained a copy of a poetical work called Suttanippa (Suttanibbâna or Nibbânasutta). The language of the Taungûsas contains words bodily borrowed from the languages of the peoples by whom they are surrounded. The Taungûsas resemble their congener, the Karens, in physical appearance; their build is thick-set, and they have full, round, and heavy features. At Kôkärêk the Taungû language is purer than at Thatôn, although there have been many inter-marriages between the Taungûsas and the Shâns.

The meaning of the word 'Taungû' is Highlander, in contradistinction to the people of the lowlands. A similar distinction obtains in Cambodia, the ancient Kingdom of the Khmers. The latter M. Mouhot describes thus: — "Having a great taste for music, and being gifted with ears excessively fine, with them originated the tam-tam, so prized among the neighbouring nations; and by uniting its sounds to those of a large drum, they obtain music tolerably harmonious. The art of writing is unknown to them; and as they necessarily lead a wandering life, they seem to have lost nearly all traditions of the past. The only information I could extract from their oldest chief was, that far beyond the chain of mountains which crosses the country from north to south, are other people of the high country (such is the name they give themselves; that of savage wounds them greatly), that they have many relations there, and they even cite names of villages or hamlets as far as the provinces occupied by the Annamite invaders. Their practice is to bury their dead." The above description would, with slight modifications and with the exception of the part relating to their ignorance of the art of writing, answer very well for that of the Taungûsas.

The Taungûsas call themselves Pâô, i.e., ancient fathers, and have a tradition that large numbers of them emigrated years ago from their original seat of Thatôn to a State of the same name in the Shân country. Since then they have borrowed largely from Shân literature; in fact, their books, most of which have been translated from Shân, contain a large admixture of Shân words.

The Taungû alphabet appears to have a closer affinity to that of the Talaiings or the Burmans than to that of the Shâns, as it recognises the medial letters, which are absent in Shân. The one peculiarity deserving of notice in the pronunciation of the letters is the Indian sound accorded to the letters of the palatal class, e.g., ວ is pronounced چ and not ș, as the Tibetans, Burmans, and Talaiings pronounce. This is a remarkable fact showing the probability of the Taungûsas having received their alphabet direct from Indian colonists.

---

5 "My authority for this is the following extract of a note from a gentleman of the American Mission to Lieutenant Newmarch: —

6 "They have a written language and books, and kyouns and priests. I have seen their books, and on the fall of Sebastopol I printed the Governor-General's proclamation for Lieutenant Burn in Toungthoo, but I confess it was the first and only thing that was ever printed in Toungthoo." — Yule's Mission to Ava, Appendix M., page 833.

8 [This is now in the British Museum. Dr. Cushing informs me that Taungû MSS. are frequently to be met with in Shân monasteries, and that the commonest text of all is the Suttanippa.— Ed.]

9 Vide Mouhot's Travels in the Central Parts of Indo-China, Cambodia, and Laos, page 24.

10 Savages to the East of Cambodia, called by the Cambodians their elder brothers.

11 Dr. Cushing informs me that the Taungû Language is closely related to that of the Pghô Karens and that a Taungû can easily learn to make himself intelligible to a Pghô Karen in a short time.— Ed.

12 [It may some day help much in determining the original sound of many Burmese words, which, no doubt have, in historical times, changed their sounds.— Ed.]
The Taungšu language, as evidenced by the comparative vocabulary shown below, has closer affinity to Burmese than to Shân or Talaing:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Taungšu</th>
<th>Burmese</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ta-pá₁¹</td>
<td>Ta, tit</td>
<td>One.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ni-pá</td>
<td>Hna, hnit</td>
<td>Two.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Són-pá</td>
<td>бон₂ ¹⁴</td>
<td>Three.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lit-pá</td>
<td>Lê₂</td>
<td>Four.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngat-pá</td>
<td>Ngá₂</td>
<td>Five.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sú-pá</td>
<td>Chank</td>
<td>Six.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niu-pá</td>
<td>Khunhít</td>
<td>Seven.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Söt-pá</td>
<td>Shit</td>
<td>Eight.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kut-pá</td>
<td>Kô₂</td>
<td>Nine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tachi₂ ¹²</td>
<td>Tasi₁⁵</td>
<td>Ten.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mí₂ ¹³</td>
<td>Né</td>
<td>Sun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Là</td>
<td>Là</td>
<td>Moon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Châ</td>
<td>Kyê₁⁶</td>
<td>Star.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phâ</td>
<td>Phâ</td>
<td>Father.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mê₂</td>
<td>Mî</td>
<td>Mother.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lô</td>
<td>Lô</td>
<td>Man.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the 28th, I started for Thatôn and reached it on the same day. Datôn, as the name spelt Thatôn, Thahtun, and Thatone, is pronounced, has been identified by Burmese and Talaing writers as the Suvannabhumi of the Buddhist books, and the Aurea Regio of Ptolemy and others. It is bounded on the east by the Dînganék Range, which is about 12 miles long, and trends from north to south. On the west is an immense rice plain, which is about 15 miles in breadth, and beyond that is the sea. In the rainy season the plain is covered by water and navigation over it by boat is possible.

According to a Talaing tradition, Thatôn was founded by Siharájá, a contemporary of Gantama Buddha. In choosing the site of the new city he consulted his foster-father, the Rishi of Zingyaik, and was advised to select a spot where gold was found, and to which a large population would be attracted in a short time. The spot where the Jubilee Memorial Fountain, erected in 1888, is now playing, is still pointed out as the site of the palace of Siharájá and Manuhá, the first and last kings of Thatôn. Close by is the gold-bearing stream of the Shwegyang Sàn, which is perennial and issues from the Dînganék (Singanika) Hill. Gold is still worked by isolated individuals at the beginning and close of the rainy season, but the quantities obtained are not commensurate with the amount of labour involved.

There are five Talaing inscriptions at Thatôn; four in the enclosure of the Shwèzâyân Pagoda, and the remaining one under a banyan tree at Nyaungwaing. Their paleography indicates that their age is about 400 years.

Three brick buildings near the Shwèzâyân Pagoda are known as the libraries, whence Anôráštâ, King of Pağân, is said to have removed the “five elephant-loads of Buddhist scriptures” in 1057 A.D.

₁¹ Pá denotes an individual unit. Its cognate form, pronounced with the heavy tone, is employed as a numeral co-efficient in Burmese.

₁² Ch in Taungšu is interchangeable with s in Burmese.

₁³ This word means fire in Burmese; but the primitive conception of the sun as the source of heat may have possibly existed.

₁⁴ The sign ₂ denotes that the syllable to which it is affixed should be pronounced with the heavy tone.

₁⁵ ² as at in ‘pair.’

₁⁶ Ky = ch in Burmese as often as not.
Terra cotta tablets, inserted in niches in the Pāgyāp'āyā (pagoda) within the same enclosure are of considerable interest. Most of them have been destroyed, and the meaning of the representations is not accurately understood. But they appear to indicate that the people, whoever they were, who constructed these tablets, undoubtedly professed Brahmanism or Hinduism, and that they had attained to some degree of civilization. Siva with his trident is the predominant figure; conveyances are drawn by single ponies, and women wear their hair in big knots at the back of the head. The features of the persons represented are of Mongolian cast, and resemble those of the Karesns and Taungūs of the present day.\[17\]

The Pāgyāp'āyā, in common with other sacred edifices built by the Talaings, is constructed of hewn laterite; and the existence of several tanks in its vicinity indicates the source whence this building material was obtained.

There are three sculptures in bas-relief on stone, representing Vaishnava symbols, lying in the enclosure of the Assistant Commissioner's Court-house. These have been removed to the Phayre Museum at Rangoon.\[18\]

Nāt (loc. spirit) worship is still, as in other parts of Burma, one of the prevailing forms of belief at Thatōn. I visited the temple of the Nāt called Pho-pho=Grandfather. Tradition, which is, in this case, primē facie palpably false, says that, when this Nāt was a human being, he was charged by Pūna and Utta, the Buddhist missionaries who visited Ramaññadaśa in the third century B.C., to safeguard Thatōn against the attacks of the hillā or ogres. The image of Pho-pho represents an old man of about 60 years of age, sitting cross-legged, with a white fillet round the head, and a moustache and pointed beard. The forehead is broad and the face bears an intelligent expression. The upper portion of the body is nude, and the lower is dressed in a chāk paśi, or loin-cloth, of the zigzag pattern so much prized by the people of Burma. The right hand rests on the right knee, and the left is in the act of counting the beads of a rosary. The height of the figure is about five feet. In the apartment on the left of Pho-pho is an image representing a benign-looking wun, or governor, in full official dress. Facing the second image in a separate apartment is the representation of a wild, fierce-looking bō, or military officer, in uniform. The fourth apartment on the left of the bō is dedicated to a female nāt, who is presumably the wife of Pho-pho. But there is no image representing her. It is a noteworthy fact that, as it would be if in India and Ceylon, this temple is held in veneration by various nationalities professing different creeds. The images of the nāts are in a good state of preservation, as they are in the custody of a merchant, who gains a comfortable livelihood thereby. An annual festival, which is largely attended, is held in their honour. These nāts are to my mind clearly an embodiment of hero-worship, representing some benevolent and sympathetic Burmese governor and his relatives, who left behind them a kindly memory.\[19\]

On the 31st December, I visited the Kōkōnantūn Hill, which is about eight miles to the west of Bilin. On the top of the hill are two images representing the Buddhist missionaries, Pūna and Utta, in a recumbent posture and with their hands clasped towards a stone vessel placed between them. The vessel is reputed to contain a hair of Gautama Buddha. Around Pūna and Utta are the figures of gahāndas, or Buddhist saints, with full, round, and heavy features. The heads of these figures are broad and prominent, but retreating; the nose is big and long; and the mouth large. At the four corners of the platform on the top of the hill, are figures of a strange monster, half man, half beast, called, by a false Palicism, Manussatha.

---

17 A description of these tablets is given at pages 716 and 717 of the British Burma Gazetteer, Vol. II. [I do not personally quite agree with the statements in the text and will endeavour to show, in a paper now preparing for publication in this Journal, that all the Thatōn sculptures are quite compatible with the Buddhist cult.—Ed.]

18 [Though of most interesting Indian character, it is probably yet premature to state their precise nature.—Ed.]

19 [I may note that, when I was in Thatōn, I was told that they represent a Portuguese governor and his staff, and that they are consulted before entering on any kind of project. If they smile the project will succeed.—Ed.]
There is no such Pali word, but the term has been coined to designate a monster with one human head and two lion's bodies. The 'origin' of the manussiha is thus recorded in the Kalyāni Inscriptions:

"The town (Golamattikanagara= the modern Ayethm in the Shwygon district) was situated on the sea-shore; and there was a rakṣhaśa, who lived in the sea, and was in the habit of always seizing and devouring every child that was born in the king's palace. On the very night of the arrival of the two thēras, the chief queen of the king gave birth to a child. The rakṣhaśa, knowing that a child had been born in the king's palace, came towards the town, surrounded by 500 other rakṣhaśas, with the object of devouring it. When the people saw the rakṣhaśa, they were stricken with terror, and raised a loud cry. The two thēras, perceiving that the rakṣhaśa and her attendants had assumed the exceedingly frightful appearance of lions, each with one head and two bodies, created (by means of their supernatural power) monsters of similar appearance, but twice the number of those accompanying the rakṣhaśa, and these monsters chased the rakṣhaśas and obstructed their further progress. When the piśāchas saw twice their own number of monsters created by the supernatural power of the two thēras, they cried out: 'Now we shall become their prey, and being stricken with terror, fled towards the sea.'"

Fergusson, in his *History of Indian and Eastern Architecture* (page 622), makes the following pertinent remarks on the origin of this monster: "This illustration (of the Shwèdagon Pagoda at Rangoon) is also valuable as showing the last lineal descendant of these great human-headed winged lions that once adorned the portals of the palaces at Ninevah; but after nearly 3,000 years of wandering and ill-treatment have degenerated into these wretched carvatures of their former selves."

In an image-house at the foot of the hill is a brass bell on which the old Talaing inscription has been effaced, and a modern Burmese one engraved. It is, perhaps, hopeless to recover a copy of the ancient inscription.

On the 1st January 1892, I visited the Tissaung Pagoda at Zökthok village, which is about 6 miles to the north of Bilin. The basement of the pagoda is constructed of blocks of laterite, each about 2 feet by 1 ½ feet by 1 foot in dimension. Some of the images, as well as the receptacles for offerings, &c., placed around it are of the same material, and bear traces of ornamentation. In the neighbourhood are sculptures in relief engraved on large laterite blocks, which are so arranged as to form panels on the face of a wall or rampart of earth 450 feet long and 12 feet high. They are known as the sindat-myindat (elephants and horses of war); but the representations are those of elephants and tigers, or lions, alternately with those of nats interspersed between them.

The Kēlāba (Kēlāsa) Pagoda — the Kēlāsabhāpabbataçātīya of the Kalyāni Inscriptions — was visited on the 2nd January. It is situated on a steep hill about 2,000 feet high, and appears to have been renovated. It derives its sanctity from the tradition that, like the Kyaiktīyo and Kōkōnāyōn Pagodas, it contains one of the three hairs given by Gautama Buddha to the Rishi Kēlāsa. Near the pagoda are two stone inscriptions cut by King Dhammashēti. They are in the Talaing character. The engraved portion of one has been entirely destroyed and only the socket remains standing, while half of the other has been broken. Only one manussiha, facing seawards, is found on the pagoda platform. Numbers of square bricks with a representation of a lotus flower impressed upon them are lying about the place.

---

20 [The very remarkable resemblance of the chinś of Burma (out of which, no doubt, grew the manussiha) to the winged lion of Ninevah, down to the beard, has often impressed me. It also has that of the tō of Burma to the winged bull. An intermediary form of the chinś is perhaps to be seen in the two lions conchant (= chinś) from the Amārāvatī Tope in the British Museum.—Ep.]

21 [They probably were intended to represent a military expedition. See below, note 29.—Ep.]

22 [The syllable bhā in this word is remarkable, and occurs, apparently as a local peculiarity, in other Paliisms of the Talaing. E.g., Tikumbhāchāti = the modern Paliized name of the Shwèdagon Pagoda.—Ep.]
The Kâllâsa Hill abounds in plants used in Burmese medicine. The plant, called maukaùâ, is employed as an antidote against snake-poison, and another, called kâvâguungswa, is used in curing hydrophobia.

On the same day, the village of Ayéthômâ, which is four miles off, was visited. It is the ancient Taikkula and the Gólamattikanagara of the Kâlyân Inscriptions. Dr. Forchhammer in his Notes on the Early History and Geography of British Burma, II. page 7, says: "Though the seashore is now about twelve miles to the west, this place was still an important seaport in the 16th and 17th centuries; it is marked on the map of Professor Lassen as Taikkala, but erroneously placed a few miles north of Tavoy. Cables, ropes, and other vestiges of sea-going vessels are still frequently dug up about Taikkula."[26]

As to Gólamattikanagara (for Gôla read Skr. Gaûda), if the evidence afforded by the Kâlyân Inscriptions can be relied on, the settlement in Suvannabhûmi was apparently colonized from Bengal during one of the struggles for supremacy between Buddhism and Brahmanism and possibly Jainism also.[27] At the conclusion of the third Buddhist Council it was remembered by the mother-country, and missionaries were sent to it in order to re-establish community of faith.

There used to be a Talânga inscription near Ayéthômâ, but it was removed to the Phayre Museum at Rangoon about eight years ago. Traces of a wall and moat still exist, and fragments of pottery and of glazed tiles are found in the neighbourhood.

Pegu was reached on the night of the 3rd January. Extensive ruins are extant on the east and west face of the town. The ruins at Zainggâning, on the west side, comprise those of Kâlyânismâ, Mahâchettî, Yâbêmyô, Kyaikpiu,[28] and Shwêgûgyi. There are ten inscriptions at Kâlyânismâ, one at Yâbêmyô and twenty-two at Shwêgûgyi. Between Kâlyânismâ and Mahâchettî an enormous image of Gautama Buddha in a recumbent posture, measuring about 181 feet in length. Treasure-hunters have been hard at work among these ruins, and I am told that their acts of vandalism are censured by both the pâṇûgyîs and the native officials, who expect a share in the "finds." Most of the stone inscriptions have been broken by treasure-hunters, or by pagoda slaves, who were anxious to obliterate the record of their origin. In some cases, the names of persons dedicated as pagoda slaves have been carefully chiselled out.[29]

Pegu is the Thobaid of Râmaññâsê, as Pâgan is of Burma Proper, and its ruins have great claim to a detailed archaeological survey. The Kâlyânismâ is the most interesting of all. (See plate No. 1.) It is an ancient Hall of Ordination, to which Buddhist priests from all parts of Burma, and even from Ceylon and Siam, used to flock to receive their upasampadâ ordination. Close by are ten stone-slabs covered with inscriptions on both sides. All of them are more or less broken, but the fragments, which are lying scattered about are

---

26 Of late, the sea has been encroaching on the land. At the time of my visit, the sites of many villages, which derived their wealth and prosperity from the rice trade, were under water.

27 The subject of the identification of this place with the Takôla of Ptolemy and the Kalâ of Arabian Geographers is discussed, op. cit., at pages 12–16, and at pages 198 and 199 of Mr. Crindel's Ancient Asia described by Ptolemy.

28 The Kâlyân Inscriptions (1476 A. D.), obverse of first stone, say, "this town is called to this day Gólamattikanagara, because it contains many mud and wattle houses resembling those of the Gôla people."

29 Four colossal images of Buddha sitting cross-legged, back to back, and facing the cardinal points. The height of each image is about 90 feet; the thumb measures 3 feet, the arm from the inner elbow joint to the tip of the middle finger 20 feet, the distance from knee to knee 62 feet. The images represent the four Buddhas, who have appeared in this Kalpa, namely, Kakusandha, Kopâgarâma, Kasapa, and Gautama. Similar images are found at Pâgan, the prototype being probably those of Angkor Thôm. [These peculiar images are clearly Cambodian, and form a tower of the ordinary Cambodian type. Terra cotta tablets, much mutilated unfortunately, found in the neighbourhood clearly represent Cambodian figures, such as are common in Pâm-Pênh.—Ed.]

27 [A common and unfortunate practice all over Burma.—Ed.]}
capable of restoration. Their average dimensions are about 12 feet high, 4 feet 2 inches wide, and 1 foot and 3 inches thick. They were set up by King Dhamma Chatti after he had founded the Kalyâp Sin in 1470 A.D. The language of the inscriptions is partly Pali and partly Talasing. (See plate No. 2.) Numerous copies of the Pali portion on palm-leaf are extant, and from two of them I have prepared a text transcribed in the Roman character. The great value of the Kalyâp Sin Inscriptions rests on the detailed information they give of the manner in which simâs (Bengal) should be consecrated in order to secure their validity, of the intercourse of Pegu and Burma with Ceylon and Southern India in the 15th century A.D., and of the Burmese view of the apostolic succession of the Buddhist priesthood.

The Mahâchâti Pagoda is a huge pile of brick and laterite, built by Hânâbâwadi Sînbyûyin about the middle of the 15th century A.D. Only the square basement now remains, measuring about 320 feet wide at the base, and about 170 feet high.

Nothing definite is known about the ruins of Yabûmyô, Kyaikpan, and Shwêgâgyi. In the neighbourhood of the last-named Pagoda, glazed terra cotta tablets exhibiting, in relief, figures of human beings and animals were found lying scattered about. A number of such tablets have been collected in Mr. Jackson's garden near the Kalyâp Sin. All these should be acquired by Government and sent to the Phaye Museum at Rangoon. They appear to have been manufactured by colonists from India.

The religious buildings at Pegu suffered greatly at the hands of the Portuguese adventurer, Philip de Brito y Nicole, alias Maung Zingâ, who held his Court at Syriam at the beginning of the 17th century, and also at the hands of Alompra's soldiers, who, being incensed at the acts of sacrilege committed by the Talaing during their ephemeral conquest of Burma Proper, wreaked their vengeance when their turn came. It is said that Maung Zingâ, who was originally a ship-boy, and was stationed at Syriam to watch events and to represent his master, the King of Arakan, entertained ambitious designs of holding Pegu as a dependency of the Crown of Portugal and of converting the Peguans to Christianity. For the attainment of this object, he allied himself with Byinnâ Dali, the Governor of Martaban, who was tributary to Siam, and opened communications with the Viceroy of Goa. He failed in his object and met with his death, because he had alienated the sympathy of the people by breaking down their religious buildings and shipping off to Goa the treasures obtained therefrom in "five ships." In the plaintive words of the Pamaing or history of the Shwômô Pagoda: "Maung Zingâ was a heretic, who, for ten years, searched for pagodas to destroy them. Religion perished in Râmânâ, and good works were no longer performed."

The Shwôgâ Pagoda is in a good state of preservation. Its basement consists of a gallery containing 64 images of Buddha, each 4 feet 8 inches high, which were apparently constructed by Siamese architects. It is octagonal in shape, and is a remarkable structure. On each side is an entrance, 6 feet high by 3 feet 2 inches wide, and 7 feet 2 inches long; these entrances lead to an interior gallery, 5 feet 2 inches wide and 7 feet 3 inches high; the entire gallery, passing round the central portion, measures 246 feet.

Close to the Maximinshaung, is the Shwônâbâ Pagoda. It contains an image sculptured in relief on a tablet of sandstone measuring 5 feet by 4 feet. The image has an Indian cast of features, and is fabled to be shackled with fetters owing to its having once fled from Pegu. It is said that this image, as well as a similar one of the same name on the eastern face of the

28 [To be published later in this Journal. With help from the Government, generously accorded, I am making an effort to restore these invaluable documents to their original condition and to preserve them from further injury. — Ed.]

29 [Through Mr. Jackson's kindness and as a result of a visit by myself to the spot, over 100 of these tablets have been secured for the Phaye Museum. Four are in the Pitt-Rivers Museum at Oxford and two in the British Museum. They represent the march, battle and defeat of a foreign (ogre) army. Those found at the other spot mentioned in this article, represent what I take to be Cambodian figures of nobles, and perhaps, ancient Siam as also. A few are inscribed in the Kyaukâ (Kieuza) character. Personally, I should doubt their Indian origin — Ed.]
No. 1. THE KALYANI SIMA AT PEGU.

No. 2. THE STONES ON WHICH THE KALYANI INSCRIPTIONS ARE CUT.
city, were brought away from Taikkula. The resemblance between them and the figure of Avalokiteshvara is very striking, and suggests the idea that they have probably been modified from an Indian original to suit new surroundings.

Near this image was picked up a small terra cotta tablet bearing a Sanskrit legend which, with other old images lying about the place, was apparently obtained by ransacking the relic-chambers of ancient pagodas. This tablet, now in the British Museum, is of peculiar interest. Some years ago half dozen similar tablets were presented to that museum, which were found at Buddha Gayâ; and the probable history of the specimen found at Pegu is that it was brought from Gayâ as part of the collection of relics procured by the Mission sent thither by king Dhammachêtâ in the latter half of the 15th Century, A.D., and deposited in the relic-chamber of some pagoda erected after their return. The legend is said to be the formula of the "three refuges." The general character of the tablet, independently of the inscription on it, is distinctly Indian.21

The eastern face of Pegu was visited on the 5th January. The Shwêmôdô Pagoda, said to contain two hairs of Gautama Buddha enshrined by Mahâsâla and Chûlasâla, sons of Piñjakamahasëthi of Zaungtâ, was being re-gilt under the supervision of its trustees. The Pagoda was last repaired by Bêdb'ayâ, about a hundred years ago, and a broken inscription recording this meritorious act is lying on the Pagoda platform. There is also an ancient brass bell said to have been presented by Byinnyâ Dalâ after his conquest of Avâ in 1752 A.D.22

Like the Shwêdağôn Pagoda at Rangoon, the Shwêmôdô is a Buddhist shrine of great sanctity. Successive kings of Burma and Pegu lavished their treasures on it in repairing and enlarging it. When originally built, it was only 75 feet high, but as it now stands, it is about 288 feet high, and about 1,350 feet in circumference at the base.

A little to the north-east of the Shwêmôdô is a small hill, fabled to have been the resting-place of two hamsa birds, when the region about Pegu was under the sea. At the foot of this hill are two octagonal pillars of fine granite. The length of one is about 11 feet and that of the other is about 5. They bear no inscriptions, but a tradition is current that they were erected by kulé, i.e., foreign or Indian, merchants, who subsequently claimed the country as their own by virtue of pre-occupation, and that they were driven out by a Talang prince. However, the true history of the pillars appears to be that, like a similar granite pillar in the ancient town of Tenasserim (Taninâyâ) in the Mergui District, they were erected when Râmaunuâdësa was subject to Siamese rule, to mark the centre of the ancient city of Haånâvatt, and that most probably human beings were buried alive below the pillars, in the belief that the spirits of the deceased would keep an unremitting watch over the city.

A good panoramic view of Pegu and its suburbs is obtained from the Shwêungyô Pagoda, which is situated at the south-east corner of the city walls. At about 700 yards from the southern face is Jëtûvatti, the encampment of Alompra, who beleaguered Pegu in 1757 A.D. Within the walls are visible the sites of the palaces of the great kings of Haånâvatt, such as

20 Plate LV. of The Cave Temples of India, by Fergheson and Burgess.
21 [The legend of the Pegu specimen is by itself mostly illegible, but a nearly identical specimen from Gayâ at the British Museum the inscription is legible enough. It probably is some well-known formula, but it is not that of the "three refuges." There must either have been some reciprocity in the production of these votive tablets between Gayâ and other places whence pilgrims came, or the pilgrims must have induced the local artists to copy inscriptions on their particular gifts in their own various tongues, because among the British Museum specimens is one which has what appear to be imitations of the Kyûðâ characters of Burma, much resembling those on the Tenasserim medals figured by Phayre in the International Numismata Orientalia, Vol. I, Plates III. and IV., and another has illegible imitation characters on it of some tongue unknown to the artist who made it. Sir Alexander Cunningham has figured some of these tablets, which, he calls seals, in his new book, Mahâbodhî, Plate XXIV. These are apparently from his own collection of finds at Buddha Gayâ, and there are other good samples at the South Kensington Museum, Indian Section, which are wrongly labelled there for the most part.—Ed.]
22 It is said that the Shwêdagôn was raised to its present height in the last century by the Burmese in order to overtop the Shwêmôdô of the Talanga.
Hanbawadi Sinbyuyin known to European writers as Branginoco,23 Yazdarit,24 and Dhammacheti. Traces of a double wall and moat are also seen, the walls being in good condition.

I have now traversed through the whole of the ancient Talain Kingdom of Ramaññadêsa proper. The stone inscriptions are the chief of many objects of archaeological value and should, if practicable, for the purpose of preservation, be removed to the Phayre Museum at Rangoon. In the case, however, of inscriptions, whose size and weight render their removal to Rangoon unadvisable, they should be collected at some convenient and central place and arrangements should be made to protect them from the weather. If they remain in situ they are liable to become defaced or weather-worn. Manuscripts of historical interest are extremely scarce; the architectural structures have in too many cases been renovated in the modern style; and the religious buildings worthy of conservation are being looked after by the people. No true stâpas or topees, like those of India, were met with, and the enquiries instituted failed to elicit any information regarding the existence of any records, lithic or otherwise, in the Asoka character. The absence of any records in this character, both in Ramaññadêsa and at Pagan, whether it is supposed the Burmese conquerors removed their spoils of war, throws considerable doubt on the authenticity of the account relating to the mission of Sôna and Uttara at the conclusion of the Third Council, as stated in the Mahavamsa and other Buddhist books. The question, however, may be considered to be an open one, until the information afforded by Talain, Cambodian, and Siamese records, shall have helped its solution.

23 ["Branginoco" represents the title Bayin Naung, perhaps then pronounced Bhurin Nông. It is spelt Bhura NÔN.—Ed.]
24 [This word Yazdari is spelt Râjâdâra and seems to clearly equal Râjâdikâra. I may as well note that Rāj-da-bati, Narâ-da-bati, Sêna-da-bati, and similar titles in books about Burma are simply the familiar Râjâdhipati, Narâdhipati, Sênadhipati, etc., in disguise. The Di-ba-bi title, which has puzzled so many writers, is really always the latter part of some title, which includes the term adhipati, 'ruler, regent, king,' and means that the holder called himself 'overlord of ———,' whatever the first part of the word might mean.—Ed.]
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Chālākya, Western ................................................ 167, 168
Chauḍapama, the seventh upāyas of the Jains ................. 20
Chandra, a hill at Sravaṇa-Beloe ; mentioned by the ancient name of Kaṭavapra .......... 168
Chandra, a son, according to the Rājākiti, of Akṣa's son Kumbhā .......................... 157; — a disciple who is allotted by tradition to Bhadrabāhu I, 156, 157; — his real name was Guptārta .......................... 159
charm against evils in general 350 ff. — against snake-bite 350 ff. — throwing a stone at a pitcher makes it heavy .......................... 314
Chasgāna, grandfather of Rudrādāman, 204; date of, is circ. 135-145 A.D. ............. 205
chhādakāram, the first, described 180 ff.; the second, described 181 ff.; the third, described 210 f.; the fourth, described 211 ff.; the fifth, described 214; the sixth, described .................................. 214 f.
chhādakauras of the Jains described 178 ff. — are of considerable antiquity 179, 180; correspond to the Buddhist vinaya 179; contain rules of conduct for the clergy 179; traditions regarding the, quoted 179; commentaries on the .................................. 180
chief, installation of, among the Kārens ........................ 318
chiefs among the Kārens is of a sacred character ................. 317 f.
Chin (see Baunggā, Chinnōn, Chinnōk, Hākā, Kadin, Kānōh, Kōwōān, Saygillaing, Siyin, Soochang, Tashōn, Tlangtiang, Wēhauang, Yinsu and Yūkwa).
Chinnōk Chins, border on the Wēlāume Chins 215; geographical distribution of the 215; claim descent from the Baunggā Chins 215; a note on their language .................. 190
Chinnōn Chins, geographical distribution of the 215, border on the Yinsu Chins 215; claim Burmes descent .................................. 216
Chins, population estimated 192 f. — human proper names among the 223; — limitation of the capacity of the, to denote time 191; — dress of the 216 ff. — dwelling of the 220; — agriculture of the 192, 219 — are keen sportmen 221 — polity of the, described 216; raids among the 221 f.; chiefship among the 192 — dialects of the, noted 216; petty dialects among the 123 — the religion of the, noticed 191; are spirit worshippers 191, devoted spirit worshippers 216 — oaths among 223; customary law of the 191 f., 216 and note — birth customs 223; marriage customs 228; funeral ceremonies of the 191;
INDEX.

cow, to kill a, a sin in Madras 278:— to eat products of a, a sin in Madras 278
crow, superstitions as to the, in Madras 168
cures: water restores to life 186:— throwing a baby at the dead restores to life 186:—
for snake poison 383:— for hydrophobia 383
customs, social, in Southern India 224:— in Madras 193
cycle, years, instances of the use of them 
Pārthiva 321, Anvyāta 122, 197, Vikriti 322

Dāhābān, the Tālān Gūnān 377
Dalmān, a note on the fort of 329
Dāmōdara (Early Kudāmī): his rock-cut inscription at Kōnār, edited 233
dānu, the, of the Jains described 211 ff.
dates:— degree of the sun specified in 49:— recorded in days of the Kālīyugā car in MSS. 49 f.:— luni-solar used in MSS. 49:— solar used in MSS. 49:— from inscriptions and MSS. discussed 47 ff.:— of the Vāgālā Kīngs of Gujarāt 276 ff.
day, the 127th day of a regnal year mentioned in a recorded date 282
days, civil, of the fortnight, or month, denoted by tudi or sati and hodi or vāti and vāti and mentioned in recorded dates:
dark fortnight:—
eighth 51
bright fortnight:
fifth 51
eleventh 277
fortnight not specified:
twenty-first 254
days, lunar, i.e., tithis, mentioned in recorded dates:
dark fortnight:
third 344
fourth 50
sixth 51
eleventh 121, 197
thirteenth 122
bright fortnight:
third 49
fifth 344
thirteenth 48
days, lunar, mentioned in MSS.:
bright fortnight, eighth 52
fortnight unknown, seventh 50
days, solar, mentioned in recorded dates:
ninth 97
days of the week, names of them as used in recorded dates:
Āditya (Sunday) 322
Budha (Wednesday) 51, 121
Guru (Thursday) 51
Indu (Monday) 48

death customs 223:— drunkenness among the 222:— tattooing among the 222
Chinas, Hākā Tribe, were probably one race with the Lushnis not long since 127:
Maccab′s book on the Hākā dialect of the 123 ff.
chinsa of Burma is the Assyrian winged lion, degraded 332
Chālika-Pāṇiāḥa Prākrit discussed 261 ff.
chāy = causa belii among the Kavemāśis 317
is an hereditary vendetta 317
Cinderella, variant tale of 187 ff.
coins, a catalogue of the, in the Lahore Museum noted 194 ff.:— punch-marked, an Indian invention 345:— cast, 345 ff.:— lead, in India, noted 347:— of ancient India, Cunningham's, reviewed 344 ff.:— South Indian 321 ff.:— of Nepal noted 345:— French of Karikal 327:— of Amōghabhaṭi noted 346:— of Avanipāṣekha of Madura 346:— of British East India Company 326 ff.:— of the Cholas 323:— of Dhama Pālāsinī noted 347:— of Harīvara of Vijayanagara 321:— of Kōsambi noted 346:— of Madura 323 ff.:— of Mallikārjumāṇyā of Vijayanagara 321:— of the Mūtras noted 347:— of Odumbara noted 348:— of Sadāśī-varāya of Vijayanagara 322:— of Taxila noted 346:— of Tirumalārāya of Vijayanagara 322:— of Vijayanagara 321:— of Visvanāthā of Madura noted 325 ff.:— of the Yaudhēyaṇa noted 347
companions of hero in folktales, minister 185, demon 188, monkey 188
conjugation in the inscriptions at Gīrān 7 f.
conjugation in Ancient India 349 ff.
consonants, weakening of hard, into soft 259:— substitution of hard for soft, in the Prākṛits 260:— ancient Indian alphabets did double identical or homogenous 175:— doubling of, importance of, as a criterion by which to judge of Prākṛt 271:— doubling of, the main point of difference between monumental and literary Prākṛt 269 f.:— the inscriptions of Piyadasī do not observe the rule of doubling homogenous 146:— simple, changes in, in the inscriptions at Giḥra 3; changes in, in the inscription at Kapur di Giri 9, in the remaining edicts 88 f.:— suppressed, in the inscriptions at Gīrān 3, in the inscriptions at Kapur di Giri 9 f., in the remaining edicts 89 f.:— added, in the inscriptions at Gīrān 3, in the inscriptions at Kapur di Giri, 9 f., in the remaining edicts 89 f.:— compound, in the inscriptions at Gīrān 3 f., in the inscriptions at Kapur di Giri 10 f., in the remaining edicts 89 ff.:— peculiarities in all the edicts except at Gīrān and Kapur di Giri 88.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jiva (Thursday)</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nāyāragu (Sunday)</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ravi (Saturday)</td>
<td>45, 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San (Friday)</td>
<td>122, 277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śiva (Tuesday)</td>
<td>343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śoma (Monday)</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Su (Sukra) (Friday)</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sukra (Friday)</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veṣa (Thursday)</td>
<td>344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vri (Vṛiṣṇi) (Thursday)</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vṛiṣṇi (Thursday)</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Days, lucky for shaving in Madras</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Days, Jain names for, of the calendar</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death customs, in Madras</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Among the Shāks</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Among the Chins</td>
<td>191, 223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death, temporary</td>
<td>342 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recovery from</td>
<td>186, 189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death-bird in South India</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declension of consonantal bases in the inscriptions at Girnar 5</td>
<td>342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of Dravidian bases in the inscriptions at Girnar 5</td>
<td>342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of the remaining edicts</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of vocative bases in the inscriptions at Girnar 5</td>
<td>342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of Dravidian</td>
<td>342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of pronouns in the inscriptions at Girnar 5</td>
<td>342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of the remaining edicts</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of numerals in the inscriptions at Girnar 5</td>
<td>342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of the remaining edicts</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of the sun specified in dates</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devamandin, the author of the Jainācārāṇya-kāraka</td>
<td>156 note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devagiri = Daulatabad</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devapala = his copper-plate grant found at Mungir 253</td>
<td>253, 254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devi = Nagi</td>
<td>364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhammacāchāvat of Pecon, his great inscriptions</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At the Kalyanishāstra near Pecon</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhaurāditya = probably Samudra Gupta</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of Vijayapura</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhrīṣṭiśekhar, a Jain teacher</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialects, literary, of ancient India were Vedic, classical Sanskrit, mixed Sanskrit, literary Prākrits</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dī-badhi, the Burmese title, explained</td>
<td>386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diksha, use of, in ancient India as a means of</td>
<td>132 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divination</td>
<td>132 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Still in use in India and adjacent countries</td>
<td>132 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancient antiquities in connection with, explained</td>
<td>133 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digambaras, their migrations were South to</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Arabia</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. D. 60</td>
<td>132-173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of the Śvetambaras in the time of</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divided into four divisions in the time of Māhāmuni</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The gachchha of the Digambaras, merely side branches of the main line</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are two distinct traditions as to political succession among the 57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points of difference in the traditions as to the pontifical succession, discussed</td>
<td>57 ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Details of the differences in names and dates of the pontifical succession among the 62-63</td>
<td>57 ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patravals of the</td>
<td>57 ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinachintimaṇi, wife of Kāṭottonga-Chāṇa</td>
<td>352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disease, Shāk notions as to the origin and cause of</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disguise in folktales, effected by a skin</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divination — by means of shooting an arrow at random</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In ancient India</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By dice</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Among the Jainas</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By fowl's bones among the Kariyas</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorce among the Shāks</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eating, superstition</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eclipse, customs in Madras</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eggs used for divination</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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human being 164;—odour of mortals
harms 165;—a tale of ................................ 186 f.
Fāiz 2 Fāzūr, relics of .................................. 319
Funamit-pito-loha, a mythical animal of the
Malagasy .................................................. 251
Fate, belief in, among native Christians, exhibited 47 note— In folktales, unavoidable................................ 46 f.
feather (see hair); burnt, magic property of, to aid in distress ........................................... 166
feuds among the Karenels, Kachins, Chins, etc. ................................................................. 317
first fruits, offering of the, amongst the Shans 1:0
flute, magic, a story of a ................................ 165 f.
folklore in Hindustān 185 ff., 277 ff., 341 ff.; of the Kōmatīs 93 ff.; of the Malagasy 250; in Salsotta 23 ff., 45 ff., 312 ff., 374 ff.; in Tibet 376; in Western India ................................ 160 ff.
forbidden things in folktales—touching a fairy's (human) skin ........................................ 104 ff.
fortunetellers, Hindu lunar; see amalāna 47, 48
fortune-seeking, by hero in folktales ................. 161

Gachechas, the, of the Digambaras merely side-branches of the main line ....................... 59
Gadāg in the Dhrāvād District, an extract from an inscription at ........................................... 167
gambling in folktales ..................................... 341
Gāparatī of Kānghā—Kakatya king of
Orugalla (Worangal) 122; was the 5th
Kakatya king of Worangal 196; was nephew of Budradēva of Worangal 187; his descendants 199; conquered by Sundara-Pāṇīya 121; his contemporaries 198; his Kānghāpara inscription is dated 28th June 1299 and he died in 1257 A.D. 122; the Ekāmaranātha inscription of ........................................... 197 ff.
Gangaikōnda-Chola = Rājōndra-Chola ........ 323
Gaugaikōnda-Sōlapūra, a ruined town, note on ................................................................. 323
Gurud the royal eagle, the white kite in Madras ................................................................... 278
Gāthā dialect = Mixed Sanskrit .......................... 213 f.
Gauda = Bengal ........................................... 197
Gautama, the Jain Paramarshi .......................... 188
Gautami River = Gōḍāvari ............................... 199
gender in the inscriptions at Gīnārī 5; at Kapir du Giri 11 f., in the remaining edicts ................. 101
glazed bricks at Pégau 384;—at Thaton ....... 331
gōlt, the term in the Bower MS. discussed...... 350 f.
Gōla = Gauḍa ............................................. 333
Gōsamattikanagara is Ayeṭhēma in Lower Burma .............................................................. 382
Gondophares = Yndopheres = Guduphara 207
Gōtāmiputra Sākutāṇi the Andhrabūrīya .......................... 204

Gōvardhana, a Jain teacher ................................ 158
graha = a seizure, the varieties of .................. 364 f.
graham, in the Bower MS.; remarks on 131 f., 350 f.;—questions of dialect in the inscriptions of Piyadasī discussed 171 ff.; notes on some general points of, in the inscriptions of Piyadasī 150, 146 ff.; and differences of dialects in the inscriptions of Piyadasī are less decided than might be expected 155;—written, Pr̄akrit, cannot be earlier than 2nd—4th centuries A.D. 278;—Magadha dialect of Asōka, term explained ......................................................... 173
Guduphara = Gondophares = Yndopheres 207
Gupta, Samudra, = probably Dharmāditya 46
Gupta Alphabet, list of inscriptions in the N.-E. 43; list of inscriptions in the N.-W. 41; list of inscriptions in the N.-W. Post. 42
Gupta era, commencement of the ................................ 205 and note
Guptaśīvī, disciple of Bhadrabahu II. 158;
— he is mentioned in certain inscriptions as Chandragupta .............................................. 156

hair (see feather); cock's feathers used for
divination 216;—burnt, magic property of, to aid in distress ............................................... 166
Hākā Chins, geographical distribution of the
190;—dialect of 123 ff.; compared with Lushai and cognate dialects 124 ff.; the most nearly related language to it is Lushai 125; its place in the Tibeto-Burmese languages ......................................................... 126
Hambawadi Sītāgyīn, king of Pégau, his great pagoda 384; his various titles .......................... 385
Hanumadadhala, the Skr. name of Anumandā 36 f.
Haribhadra, commentator on the second
mūlasātram .............................................. 307
Haribhāra of Vijayanagara, a coin of .................. 321
Hashtnagar, a note on the date of a Greek
Buddhist inscription at .................................. 166 f.
Hāmechandrasūri, commentator on the
Anuyogādiviśvāsāstram ................................ 309
Hengtān Ar'mān Nāt, a spirit of the Chins 194
hero, in folktales, cuts off his own head 46;
seeks fortune, in folktales 101; his companion, minister 185, demon, 188, monkey 189
Hidamba is in the neighbourhood of Worangal ................................................................. 194
Hīramān, the parrot, a tale of .......................... 183
honey, to eat, a sin in Madras .......................... 275
horse, superstitions as to the, in Madras 138; image of, an offering .................................... 25
Hova, a Malagasy tribe, its Malay origin 250;—folklore of, not Malay 250;—a tradition of the origin of ................................................... 25

[Further entries continue on the page.
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ill-luck — unpleasant expressions are unlucky in Bengal ................. 232
image, chained, at the Shwenâ jade Pagoda in Pegu ..................... 383 f.
Indrâvardhin, the author of the Viśvârî, a note on him and his date ........ 84
inheritance, Shân law of 119, 130; Shân law of royal 120; of adopted sons among the Shân .......... 118
inscriptions (see Piyâdisi) — dates from, discussed 47 ff.; — the first in Sanskrit is dated 155-160 A. D., 244; of the 3rd to 5th century A. D., absence of material for determining dates of 208 f.; notes on the dates of South-Indian in the 3rd to 5th centuries A. D. 209 f.; list of, in the N. E. Gupta Alphabet 43; list of the, in the N. W. Gupta Alphabet 41; list of, in the N. W. Post-Gupta Alphabet 42 — at Bharaut, date of, discussed 225, date of, proved by that of Vâtsala-patra Dhamabhâti in the reign of the Sungsas 225, vocabulary of the 229; — note of a Cambodian 47 f.; of the Chôjas noted 263; three Chôjas, noted 282; in English at Maulmain 32; — a note on the Earildur inscription of Dürmûlitya 44, 45; — at Girnâr, details of the grammar of the 2 ff.; Girnâr of Rudradâm, the first in Sanskrit 244 f.; — Gruez-Buddhist, at Hashtmagar, a note on the date of 167 f.; — Jambudâvâvara inscription of Jhâvanvarman noted 344; Jambudâvâvara inscriptions of Pratâparâdu 200 f.; — of Jaâghan 250-251 A. D. contains mixed Sanskrit 245; — Kapurâ Giri, detail of the grammar of the 8 ff.; — the Kâñçhipura inscription of Gânapati noted 122; two Kâñçhipura inscriptions of Kâñçha-Gâpâla-dáva 122; Kâñchâ inscription of Mallikâ-râjudâva noted 321 f.; Kâñchâ inscription of Virâgâsahâdâva noted 321 f.; — Buddhist at Khânâgirî, Râmâk, Kângâ, Râwa, Western Caves, Sânchâ, Bharthra, Amrâvatî, date of 285; — Kîljamâvar inscription of Kulötûnga-Chôja 281; — two, at Mathura dated year 135 and year 290 are in the Saka era 297; — noted copper-plate grant of Mahâpaâla 88; of Nahâpâla, seven in number 213; those of Nahâpâla and the Andhrâ-prâjyâs contemporaneous 213, are in mixed Sanskrit 241; differences between the language of those of Nahâpâla and the Andhrâ-prâjyâs 243 f.; the Nahâghât are a century earlier than Gotamiputra Sâkârâma 298; copperplate of Nâmâyâpâlî noted 98; of the Pândyas noted 323; — unpublished Râgunaâthâ of Sundara-Pândyâ noted 324 f.; — Srîrangam inscription of Sundara-Pândyâ 121 f., corresponds to Saka 1182 expired 122; — Râgunaâthâ of Sundara-Pândyâ noted 314; — Takhtibâli inscription of Gudupharas, date of 297; — Taxila inscription of Mêgâ, date of 297; — Tañjâvur inscription of Kâñchâ-Chôja noted 323; — Tirukkanukkaram inscription of Kulötûnga-Chôja 281 f.; — Tirankanukkaram inscription of Sundara-Pândyâ quoted 343 f.; — Tirupparankkaram inscription of Mâravarman noted 344; — Tiruppâvarman inscription of Sundara-Pândyâ quoted 344; — Tiruvândâvarur inscription of Kulötûnga-Chôja 282; of the Purâshikas are in mixed Sanskrit 244; — unpublished Vikâramângalâm of Sundara-Pândyâ noted 344; — Pegu of Dhammâchâti, noted 382; Kâñchâ of Dhammâchâti, allusions to 377; — Talaing, five at Tithân, 380; at Aytâbâma 383; at Yâhâmyâ 385; at Shâvângi 383; at Kâñchâisima 383 f.; general noted ........
inscriptions at Bharaut, inscriptions, on copper, edited: 283
Dêvâbâlâyâ .......................... 283
Jaiyâlityâ of Vijayapura .................................. 163
Vârghâbâlâyâ ................................................. 9
....
signatures, on stone, edited: — Bharaut ............ 25
Dâmôdara (Early Kadamba) .................................. 19
Gânapatra (at Kâñchâisima temple) .............. 19
Kulötûnga-Chôja (at Kâñchâisima) .... 2
Sârangâdâ (Vârghâla) ......................................... 2
jackals, superstitions as to, in Madras .......................... 115
Jainândra-saïkârâma, the, the names of the author of it .......... 156
Jainas (see Digambaras) — community undivided until the days of Dharrâdâhu 39; the great separation took place about 152-170 A. V. 60; the traditional migration of the, from Ujjain 158, 160; schisms among the, detailed 335 ff.; — astronomy of the, discussed 14 ff.; — sacred literature of the, 14 ff., 160 ff., 177 ff., 210 ff., 253 ff., 357 ff., 35
Jaipur, the final residence of the Digambara Pontiffs: — Jambu, a Jain teacher ................................. 1
Jainbuddhaupâra, the sixth upâra of the Jains, ................. 17 f.
Jambudvipa, a Jain description of .................................. 18 f.
Jîtakas, scenes from the, represented at Bharaut ........ 225 ff.
Jîtâvarman = Sundara-Pândyâ ................................ 121, 311
INDEX.

Jayānāman, a Jain teacher .................................. 158
Jayāditya of Vijayapura, his copper-plate grant found at Gorakhpur ........................................ 169 ff.
Nāvāti, a suburb of Pega .................................. 385
Jnāprabhāmuni, the author of the Saundākya-viśnusahasadīr .................................................. 214
Juendrabuddhi, another name of Deva- nandini ................................................................. 156 ff.

k and t, confusion of, in the Hākā Chin language ................................................................. 128
k', a prefix to verbal roots in Chin, explained ................................................................. 135
Kādāmsa, a tribe of the Shān States ................................................................. 116
Kādāmsas, the Early ................................................. 93
Kādāmsa China, their language ................................................................. 216
Kākatiya kings of Worangal, their genealogy ................................................................. 197
Kākuntāsanda, the Buddha, mentioned in the Bharat inscriptions .................................. 228
Kāla princes, legendary accounts of the ................................................................. 21 ff.
Kēla, a king, defeated by Gaṇapati of Kāchipūra ....................................................... 167
Kēla, the real name of .......................... 319
Kēla's inscriptions at Pega, allusion to ................................................................. 377
Kēla, an account of 333; inscriptions at, noted ................................................................. 383
Kēla-chipūra was included in the dominions of the Kākatiya kings .................................. 197
Kāho Chins occupy the country to S. of Manipūr ................................................................. 190
Kānchīsika founded the Saka era 206, he and his successors used the Saka era ...................................................... 78
Kāntōn = Kāho ....................................................... 190
Kāraṇa — quoted Taṭitila ........................................... 48 ff.
Kāraṇas, their customs ................................................................. 317 ff.
Kāre, in the Shān States 116; customs of the Red, 317 ff.; language, noted ................................................................. 377
Kāriy, real name is Kārīkāl .............................................. 327
Kāsāya the Buddha mentioned in the Bharat inscriptions ............................................. 226
Kāsāyanā, ancient name of the Chandragiri hill at Srvana-Belgođa .............................................. 158
Kāsāmbhi = Kēsa mentioned in the Bharat inscriptions ............................................. 225
Kēśa = Keśa Karna ............................................................. 317
Kēśa Pagoda visited .......................... 382; is the Kēsa-śahār-pabdattachetiya of the Kālākāli inscriptions .......................... 382
Kuṇḍaviccālā Jitūka described ................................................................. 396 ff.

king = local magnate in folktales .......... 45 note
Kīsāyaditya, a mythical animal of the Malagasy ................................................................. 252
Kīrīta = Keśa Karna ............................................................. 317
Kite, superstitions as to the, in Madras ................................................................. 273
Kogam, caves at, described ................................................................. 378
Kokārak, a visit to ................................................................. 379
Kōkānīnāyōn Hill, visited ................................................................. 381 ff.
Kūnati, folk-etymology of the name 93 — a folk-tale of the case ........................................ 393 ff.
Kōkāgamāna the Buddha, mentioned in the Bharat inscriptions .................................. 228
Kōorang = Tharīwadi, King of Burma ................................................................. 290
Kōorangamāna, conquered by Kulōttaga-Chōla ................................................................. 282
Kōorang, a village in the Belgaum District; the rock-cut inscription of Dāmōdara (Early Kōdamba), edited ................................................................. 93
Ko-Rājākṣērarvarman = Kulōttaga-Chōla ................................................................. 281, 282
Kōring Nāt, a spirit of the Chins ................................................................. 191
Kō Saṅhāna in Sāhabān ................................................................. 319
Kritikārya, a Jain teacher, 188; elsewhere the name is Kalātattārya ...................................................... 168 ff.
Kulōttaga-Chōla, his life 282 ff.; acceded 1071 A.D., 283; inscriptions of him ................................................................. 281 ff.
Kuntala (= Western Chālukya) fight with the kings of, by Kulōttaga-Chōla ................................................................. 282
Kwōnān Chins, their dress ................................................................. 216
Kyaikpum, near Pega, ruins at, notes on ................................................................. 383 ff.

luck, good, to go to see a sacred image with the eyes closed 96; in seeing the deity first of all things at a fixed festival 96 — bad, a disgrace ................................................................. 161
Lās, a tribe in the Shān States ................................................. 116
Lāja = Gujarât ................................................................. 197
Līfe-index, instance of 187 ff.; — is a jewel, 187
Lōhārya, a Jain teacher ................................................................. 168
Lunar astronomy of the Jains ................................................................. 16
Lunar Race, the, included the Western Chālukyas ................................................................. 163
Lushais were probably one race with the Hākā Chins not long since 197; their language most nearly related to Hākā Chins ................................................................. 125

m, the letter, is a test letter in ancient Indian Alphabets ................................................................. 30
Mādhāliputraparism, the Andhārāḥṣhrtya ................................................................. 294
Māgadhī Prakrit discussed 264 ff.; — as the dialect of Aśoka, term explained 178; was the official dialect of Aśoka's Court ................................................................. 174 ff.
Māghanandini, the Digambarins divided into four divisions in his time ................................................................. 59
Māhāčetṭhi, an ancient Pagoda at Pega, noted on ................................................................. 383 ff.
Māhādeva, father of Gaṇapati of Kāchipūra ................................................................. 197
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mahāmāyārī, the great spell in the Bower MS.</td>
<td>350, 356 ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahānīshāram, the name of the second Chhēma dasastra 181; various mentions of it</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mahādānādērā</td>
<td>97, 258, 254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahārāṣṭrī Prakrit discussed 244 f.; its relation to the popular tongue</td>
<td>255 ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahāvāla, a copper-plate grant of, noted</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malayagiri, his commentary on the Saiviyapamattika 20; his commentary on the Chasidapamattika</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malika-jarika, story of Princess</td>
<td>160 ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mallikārjunaśraya of Viṣṇupadaṅga</td>
<td>321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manodhāra, the described</td>
<td>381 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māyaśrīman = Sundara-Pandya</td>
<td>344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marco Polo, possible identification of Sender Bandi</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marriage in folktales; fairy with a human being</td>
<td>164; postponement of 188; — invitations to a, in Madras 193; — customs among the Chins 223; of the Parsis 113 ff.; the Shāns, mere cohabitation in the increase 119, the forbidden degrees of consanguinity 119, proposals for marriage 118, burial ceremony of unmarried persons 118; — songs of the Parsis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mātrā, ruins of</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maung Maung, King of Burma, son of Naungdōji</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maung Zingā = Philip de Brito</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>metamorphosis in folktales, fairy into a female monkey</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>metempsychosis among the Malagasy — men into serpents 251; resurrection after partial decomposition</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minākshī, goddess of Madura</td>
<td>362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minōn, King of Burma, son of Pagōn Min</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minād = prince</td>
<td>289 note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mixed Sanskrit, described 244 f.; a Buddhistic language 247; is a manner of writing Prakrit 276; is a special literary orthography 245; — Rājendrālāla Mitra on, criticism of 245; — Burnouf on, criticism of 245; — origin of 246 ff.; nature of 245; — characteristic peculiarity of 246; development of 246; period of 244 f.; — disappeared on the introduction of Sanskrit 246; its relationship to Sanskrit 246; months, Jain names for the 16; Jain notions on the calendar 16, on the lunar 16; — lunar, zodiacal sign quoted instead of</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>months, Hindu lunar, names of the, mentioned in recorded dates:</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amūjī (Āsvina)</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaitra</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaitra (MS.)</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jyēṛātha</td>
<td>57, 122, 147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kartikā</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mārga</td>
<td>256, 277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mārgastrārah (MS.)</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phālguna (MS.)</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaiśākha</td>
<td>47, 48, 114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>months, Hindu solar, names of the, mentioned in recorded dates:</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makara</td>
<td>329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mithuna</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mēṣa (MS.)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mōsa</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāshabhā</td>
<td>121, 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simha</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vṛśāchāra</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mudgagiri = Mungri</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mudhānubodhakaravakhya, a notice of an edition of</td>
<td>62 ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mudhānubodhakaravakhya is a handbook of Sanskrit Grammar</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>māhārāṣṭra, Jain names for the</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mālāśāstra, the first described 310 f., 327 ff.; the second described 327 f.; the third described 329 f.; the fourth described 389 ff.</td>
<td>309 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mālāśāstras of the Jains discussed</td>
<td>309 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mummadamba, the mother of Pratāpuruddha 198 ff.</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mūn, language = Talaing</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mungir = Mudgagiri</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mūrja, a king overthrown by Taila II</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>murder, compensation for, among the Shāns.</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māve Nāt, a spirit of the Chins</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a, dental, in monumental Prākrit</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ā, palatal, irregular use of, in monumental Prākrit</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ñ, cerebral, in monumental Prākrit</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nāgarjas, a discussion on the 361 f., identification of the</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nāgas, the Black, a note on</td>
<td>364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nāgis, a note on the</td>
<td>364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naḥapāna, the Khāharāja king destroyed by Gōtaśrīputa Sātakāni</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nakhatras, Jain notions on the connection of the moon with the 16 f.; Jain tutelary deities of the</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nakhatras, names of the, mentioned in recorded dates:</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anurādhā</td>
<td>48, 121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Āśvinī</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kara (Hasta)</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kṛitiṇā</td>
<td>321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punarvasu</td>
<td>343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāhuka</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śravaṇa</td>
<td>392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simha</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uttarā-Bhadrapadā</td>
<td>48, 122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uttarāśī Ḍāhā</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaiśākha</td>
<td>344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Names, male, for queens 199 and note:— proper, of persons, among the Chins</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naming customs among the Shâns 117:— of the Burmese and Shâns borrowed direct from India</td>
<td>117 note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nanâ-Śângâ, another name of the Balât-kâra-Gana</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nâbudhatram, a notice of the 294 f.; a detailed description of 294 ff.; commentaries on</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nâsika = Nâsik, mentioned in the Bharaut inscriptions</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nât = spirit in Burma 191:— worship of, noted</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naungûji, King of Burma, son of Alompra</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nayapâla, mention of</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nâyâdâlîkâs, the eighth to the twelfth upâdâgas of the Jains 20 ff.; contain legendary accounts of the Kâlâ Princes, sons of the Anga king Šenûya of Champa</td>
<td>21 ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nâsikâhâyana, the first chhâdâsstra</td>
<td>180 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nâtâdara, a note on the Deccan College MS. of the</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North, the, an unlucky direction in Madras</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numeral-coefficients, use of, in the Lushai language</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numerals, declension of, in the inscription at Gîrîrâ. 6, at Kapur di Gîrî 13, in the remaining edicts 104—denoted by letters of the Alphabet, in Jain MSS.</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ñâcchâs, among the China 229:— among the Kârâranas</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ñccham, leaping the, in folktales</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ñcchus,/&amp; mortals destructive to fairies</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ödipus, variant of the tale of, in India</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offerings to godlings in Bengal 28:— a list of</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omens in Madras 318:— bad, in Madras 168; in Malabar 278; in South India 214; for a journey in Madras 193:— good, in Malabar 278; for a journey in Madras 193; of rain, flying foxes seen in the day time 278: words of ill omen, &quot;no&quot; 93:— on birth of son 374:— jackal's howl 341</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ñenkey's tray</td>
<td>341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orangâlala = Worangal</td>
<td>197 note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthography of the Bower MS. 950:— of the inscriptions of Piyaçasî discussed 171 ff. observed historical influences 155; shows a tendency towards a learned 146, 149; is not strictly phonetic 149, 155; Semitic influence on, noted 175:— of the monumental Prâkritis</td>
<td>254 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orangâlla = Worangal</td>
<td>197 note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owls, a bird of bad omen in South India</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'yu't'o of Huien Tsang identified</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pd = male in the Tibeto-Burme languages</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pañcâ Min, King of Burma, son of Thirâwâdi</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pâgât, caves at, described</td>
<td>377 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pândhara and Pândhapândhara, divisions of the Sâriyâpannati</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pânsâmam, the first described 108 f.; the second described 110; the third described 110; the fourth described 111; the fifth described 111; the sixth described 112; the seventh described 112; the eighth described 112; the ninth described 113; the tenth described</td>
<td>177 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pânuas, scattered pieces relating to the Sûdhaîâ texts of the Jains</td>
<td>106 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pâsaîçhi Prâkrît discussed</td>
<td>261 ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palace, subterranean, tale of a</td>
<td>186 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pâlas, genealogy of the</td>
<td>38 f. 254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palaungs, a tribe of the Shân States</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pâli, date of</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pâmâna year of the Jains, the</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pânechanamoskîdâra, the, discussed</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pañchala, a king overthrown by Tailà II</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pândîmanâlagam conquered by Kulottunga-Chôla</td>
<td>285 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pândyâya, the Southern, conquered by Kulottunga-Chôla</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panthays in the Shân States</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parabala of the Râsthakûta family = Gâvinda III</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paral, a sacred pagoda near Trîchîr</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paramakhattâraka</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paramêçvara</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paramêçvara-Paramakhattâraka</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pâroha = Paral</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parrots, kingdoms of the</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pârsâs, marriage customs of 113 ff., nuptial songs of</td>
<td>113 ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pâtaliputra = Pâtnâ, mentioned in the Bharaut inscriptions</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pâtnâ = Srînagura</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pâtâcâlas of the Digâmaras, detailed description of three 38-88:— a notice of three.</td>
<td>57 ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paungâsad, a title of Maung Maung, King of Burma</td>
<td>289 note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pënu, antiquities of, described</td>
<td>383 ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penance in fairs</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phâo, a name for the Taungës</td>
<td>379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phûphî, the great mât at Thatôn, account of</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilgrimage, an object of, to be cured of dumbness 96, to attain literary perfection</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Piyaçasî, inscriptions of 243 ff., 258 ff.; chronology of 203 ff.; Semitic influence in the orthography of, noted 175; their linguistic value summed up 174:— language of, discussed 166, 85 ff., 145 ff., 171 ff., 203 ff.; divide themselves into two types by lan.
INDEX.

guage 210, into two dialectic groups 171 f.; do not faithfully represent the dialect of the country in which they have been engraved 172 f.; do not pretend to invariably represent in their integrity the sounds of the spoken language 146, 149, 155; sub-dialects discernible in 172: Sanskrit not a fixed language at their date 175: grammar of, discussed at Girthár 6 ff., at Kapur di Giri 8 ff., of remaining edicts 85 ff.: notes on some general grammatical points 146 ff., 155: detail of the conjugations at Girthár 7 ff., at Kapur di Giri 11 ff.; detail of the grammatical inflexions at Girthár 5 ff., Kapur di Giri 13 ff.: detail of the phonetics at Girthár 2 ff., at Kapur di Giri 8 ff., of remaining edicts 85 ff.
Poi (see Baungshó) 190
polygamy among the Shán 119
Pondicherry, real name is Puduchcheri 227
Prabhāchandra, a Jain Aśādr̥ya, of about the seventh century A. D., who died at Sravāṇa-Belgola 158 to 160
Prakṣānanda, his probable date 23
Prakr̥t, shews signs of culture in the time of Piyaḍasi 177: monumental and literary discussed 258 ff.: literary, date of use of, discussed 267 ff., 270, fixed between the 2nd and 4th centuries A. D. 278; is an artificial dialect 261, not understood by the people 261 ff.: is not a faithful representation of the popular tongue 264; origin of 373 f.; characteristics of 261; its relation to monumental, discussed 268 ff.; never appears on monuments 261: monumental, period of 25; is one dialect 260; is not a faithful representation of the popular tongue 260 ff.; is not subject to rigorous rules 261; characteristics of 258 f.; its relation to literary, discussed 269 ff.; never appears in literature 261
Pratīpradra was the 7th of the Kākaṭiya dynasty 189; his descent from Gaṇapati of Kāichiṣvara 198
Pratīpradṛṣṭa, see preceding word.
Pravachana of Dharmasagara, wrong as to Vāghā dates 277
princes among the Chins 191
prince = local magnate in folktales 46 note
princess = wife of local magnate in folktales 46 note
Prōjarāja = Prōla, a Kākaṭiya king of Worangal 197; ancestor of Gaṇapati of Kāichiṣvara 97; constructed the Jagati-kēsari-tājika tank 197
Prōla (see Prōjarāja).
pronouns, declension of, in the inscriptions at Girthár 6 f., at Kapur di Giri 12 f., in the remaining edicts 103
Prāśīṭhula, a Jain teacher 158
Pūjyapāda, another name of Devamāndhir 156 n.
Pulunāyati Vāśīṇiputra, the Andhrāvirya 204; date of, is circ. 130-135 A. D. 205
punishment in the Bower MS. 351
punishments in folktales — mutilation after death 376
Puyavābhana, purification rite in Madras 138
purification rites in Madras 139
quantity, grammatical, not shewn in the inscriptions at Girthár 2: changes of, in the inscriptions at Kapur di Giri, 2, in the remaining edicts 85
queen = wife of local magnate in folktales 46 note
queens, male names for 199 and note
R, only one sign to represent, in the Piyaḍasi inscriptions 175
Rājarāja-Chōla, inscription of, quoted 282
Rājendra-Chōla, a name for Kulottunga-Chōla 283; inscription of, quoted 282
Rājiga of Vengi = Kulottunga-Chōla 283
Rāmaṇādēśa, is now the Talaṅ king country of Burma 377; was the ancient Talaṅ kingdom 377; antiquities of, summed up 386
Raṇṇadēvi, wife of Dēvāpal, daughter of the Rāṣṭhrakútā Parabala 254
Rāṣṭhrakútā of Mālkheś; they were overthrown by Taila II. in A. D. 973-74 ...167, 168
Raṭṭas, = Rāṣṭhrakútā 168
regnal years, use of, in recorded dates 121, 122, 284, 282, 286, 343, 344
r̥, the vowel, not known at time of the Piyaḍasi inscriptions 176
Rōng Nāt, a spirit of the Chins 191
Rudra = Mahārāja-Rudra = Rudrāmbh, daughter of Gaṇapati of Kāichiṣvara 199
Radradāman of the Girthā inscription lived temp. Vāśīṇiputra Sātakaṇi 294; and temp. Sīrīpāṇa Sātakaṇi 204; commenced to reign circ. 150 A. D. 199
Rudradēva, ancestor of Gaṇapati of Kāichiṣvara 197; was a Kākaṭiya king of Worangal 197
Rudrāmbh = Rudra = Mahārāja-Rudra 199; was the 5th of the Kākaṭiya dynasty 199
ś, palatal, a test letter in the Bower MS. 49 f.; or at the date of the Piyaḍasi inscriptions 176
sacrifices among the Chins 191, 216
Sagyaśmang Chins, geographical distribution of the 190
Sāhēṭ-Māhēṭ, a note on 320
INDEX.

Saka era (see era), commencement of 203: — its use in Cambodia 47 ff., in Java........... 48
Sākyamuni = Buddha in the Bharut inscriptions ............................................. 226
Salsette, folk lore in ............................................. 45 ff.
Sāmantā-Bhūja Dēchi, governor of Kāñchi, endows the Ekānāranātha temple ............. 197
Sāndeśakhavānarahādīr, a commentary on the fourth chadvātra ............................................................. 214
sāvatārṇī, zodiacal sign, mentioned in a recorded date instead of the lunar month... 49
sāvatārṇī, names of, mentioned in recorded dates:
  Chāpa (or Dhanu) ............................................. 48
  Mēṣa ............................................. 48
  Sinha ............................................. 49
  Tāvura ............................................. 47
sāvatārṇī, names of, mentioned in MSS. dates:
  Chattra ............................................. 49
  Karkata ............................................. 49
  Mēṣha ............................................. 49, 50
Samudra Gupta = probably Dharmāditya.................................................. 45
sāndhi in the inscriptions at Giriāk 5, at Capur dī Gi 11, in the remaining edicts .... 90
Sanskrit (see mixed Sanskrit): — origin of 246 ff.; is a Brāhmanical language 247: — not a fixed language at the date of the inscriptions of Piyadasi 175: — not yet a written language in the time of Piyadasi 177: — in its ultimate form did not exist in the time of Piyadasi 177: — proof of the date of introduction of 247: — first inscription in, is dated 155-160 A.D. 244: — classical first used in 2nd century A.D. 275, elaborated after 3rd century B.C. 275: — additions to the vocabulary of, as evidenced in the Bower MS. ............................................. 131 f., 351
Sanskrit, inscribed tablet from Pegu 385; is Genl. Cunningham’s “Buddhist seal” .... 385
Śāntichandra’s, the commentator of the Jain-buddhakāya-sūtra .................................. 19
Śāradā alphabet, a note on the ............................................. 31 note
Śāravatī-Gachha of the Digambaras, merely a side-branch of the main line ........... 59
Saurāsāni Prākrit discussed ............................................. 314 f.
sculptures, supposed Vaishnavas, from Thaton 381
Śēnas, the accession to power of the, was circ. 128-130 A.D. .................................. 59
Śēniya, king of Champa, legendary account of his sons ............................................. 21 ff.
serpents, superstitions as to, in Madras 224: — among the Malagasy are embodied spirits 251, seven-headed 251: — jewel in the
mouth of 186: — charm against snake-bite 350 ff.
Sēva, Yādava king = Rāmaschandra of Devagiri 200: — defeated by Prataparudra... 199
Sēva, Country = Sēva = Simara in Nāsk District 199, also Devagiri ........................ 199
sēk, the letter, is a test letter in ancient Indian Alphabets ...................................... 30
Sha-chi of Fa-Hian identified ............................................. 320
Shaṅ States, tribes of, the, enumerated 116: — tribal divisions of the 71: — a legend of the 120, 121: — customs of the 116 ff.; naming customs of the 117 f.; war customs of the 120: — the cosmogony of the 121: — their ideas as to the origin and cause of disease 119: — their law of inheritance 119, 120: — instances of cannibalism among the .................. 120
Shaśvāta = Ayappan ............................................. 96
shrew, taming of a, an Indian folk tale ............................................. 317
Śhūlavāgyyā Pagoda at Pegu, note on ............................................. 385
Śwhēḥē Min = Thārāwōdi, King of Burma ............................................. 290
Śhwēśūgalé Pagoda described ............................................. 384
Śhwēśūgalé near Pegu, notes on the ruins at 383 ff.; inscriptions at ........................ 383 ff.
Śhwēmōdō Pagoda described ............................................. 385
Śhwēnāmba Pagoda described ............................................. 384 ff.
Śiamese rule in Burma, traces of ............................................. 378
śibulants not distinguished in the inscriptions of Piyadasi ...................................... 176
Śiddhānta, a list of texts in the Jain ............................................. 372 ff.
Śiddhāntalāsa, note on the ............................................. 28
Śiddhāntamuktesalā, a notice of the ............................................. 23
Śiddhārthā, a Jain teacher ............................................. 158
Śīharājā of Thāfōn, account of ............................................. 380
Śīnha, = probably the Yādava king Śināha II. of Devagiri 198: — defeated by Gana-pati of Kāñchi-pura ............................................. 197
Śīnbyumāin, mother of Śūpâyulat ............................................. 290 ff.
Śīnbyumāin, King of Burma, son of Alompra ............................................. 289
Śīnghālam (= Ceylon) invaded by Kūltunga-Chōla ............................................. 282
Śīnghāla, King of Burma, son of Śīnbyumāin ............................................. 289
Śīr Ploemaios of Tolemy = Pulumaiy Vaiṣāṅṣiputa ............................................. 204
Śīryāsa Gotānepūta Sātakāni the Andhra-bhritya ............................................. 204
Śiyin Chins, geographical distribution of the ............................................. 190
sleep, aspect of, in Madras ............................................. 193
sleeping beauty, variant of the tale of ............................................. 186 ff.
snake (see serpent).
sneezing, a bad omen in Madras ............................................. 168
Śōchung Chins, their language ............................................. 216
solar astronomy of the Jainas ............................................. 15 ff.
INDEX.

Sômâ, wife of Gânâpati of Kâñchîpura...... 199
Sômâsundara, commentator on the first 'payyanam'...... 110
Sômavânśa, the, included the Western Châlukyas...... 168
Someśvara II., Western Châlukya...... 260
son, only, in folktales 23; youngest, the, in folktales, his doings...... 312 ff.
Sûnas and Uttara, the Buddhist missionaries, images of, at Kôkêmânyûn Hill 381; story of, doubtful...... 386
Sôngomby, a mythical animal of the Malagasy...... 251
sons, three, in folktales 312: seven, in folktales...... 160
Sophia, nickname of Sûp'âyâlât...... 270 note
spells in Ancient India...... 319 ff.
spirit = fairy 165....... loses "virtue" by touching a human being 165: haunts of, in Madras 279: Chin notions of 216; of a tree, among the China 191; of the forest, among the China 191: worship of, in Madagascar...... 251
Sûrâvaṣa-Belgojâ; remarks on the real purport of an inscription here, which has been supposed to mention the Sûra-Kâvalin...... 156
Sûrâgarâ = Pañâ...... 264
stone, turning into, in folktales...... 189
substituted person in folktales: wife 341 f.; children...... 374 ff.
subterranean palace, a story of a...... 161 ff.
succession, rule of royal, brothers before sons...... 287 ff.: practical application of 288: obtained in the Eastern and Western Châlukya dynasties 288; in the Valabhi Line 288; in the Mâler-Kôhlâ State 293; in Manipur 297; in the Shan States 288; in ancient England 282 ff.: authority for, from the Jîtakas...... 291
sudden action, a bad omen in Madras...... 168: noises unlucky in Madras...... 318
Sukulava, a Malagasy tribe...... 250
Sundar Bandî = Sundara-Pândya...... 122
Sundar, a note on kings and prince in S. India bearing that name...... 193
Sundara-Pândya, materials for calculating the date of 121 f.; his date settled by an inscription at Sûrâgarâ 121; his ascension falls between Saka 1162 and 1180, 122; Saka 1182 expired is the only year corresponding to his inscription 122: = Jâthârvan 122; (Jâthârvan) distinct from Sundara-Pândya (Marâvarman) 314: = Marco Polo’s Sender Bandî...... 122
Sûp’âyâlât = royal princess...... 290 note
Sûp’âyâlât, Queen of Burma, wife of Thibô...... 290 f.
Sûrâshîra, chronology of the kings of...... 203 f.
Sûryapannâti, a most important work on Jain astronomy...... 14
Sûryapannâti Bhagavati, is the fifth upa-gam of the Jains...... 14
Sûryaprajñâpti = Sûryapannâti, q. v...... 14
Sulanipan, a Taungâ M.S. work, åscessed. 379
Svâtâmbara, separated from the Digambaras in the time of Bhadrâbûhu...... 59
t and t, confusion of, in Hákâ Chin...... 128
tables, glazed, see glazed bricks.
Tabu, limits to cohabitation among the Shâns 119: forbidden occupation to husbands of lying-in women among the Shâns 117: forbidden articles of food to lying-in women among the Shâns 117: forbidden things to women during a war expedition among the Shâns...... 130
Tai family of Shân Tribes, the...... 116, 117
Talè = Chinese Shâns...... 117
Talikulâ is Ayêtâna...... 333
Taila II. (Western Chûlukya) established the dynasty, by overthrowing the Râshtrakûta in A.D. 973-74...... 167
Taileng = Taituâ...... 117
Taimauk’âm, a division of the Northern Shâns...... 117
Tainâ = Northern Shâns...... 117
Taituâ = Southern Shâns...... 117
Taiyâng, the Sh propriété of the 377; ancient kingdom of...... 277: language 377: its epigraphic and historical value 377; MSS. at Pâkāt...... 277 f.
Tashôn Chins, the geographical distribution of the 190; geographical boundaries of the 190; polity of the 190; names of their chiefs 190: speak nearly the same language as the Baungshê Chins...... 190 f.
Tatsu, in the inscriptions of Piya’sasi...... 217 f.
tattooing among the Chins...... 222
Tângôs, a Burmese tribe 265; origin of the...... 215 f.; border on the Welaung Chins...... 215
Tângôs, notes on the 379 ff.; their language 379; their alphabet, its value historically...... 379
Telunga = Andhra = Trikalinga = Trilinga...... 188
terminations, verbal, in the inscriptions at Gômrîr 7 f., at Kapur â Giri 13: verbal conjugation of, in the remaining edicts...... 165 f.
Thagyâmə at Thaûn, a note on the glazed tablets on the...... 381
Tharawâdi, King of Burma, grandson of Bodôp’âyâ...... 290
Thûn, a visit to 380; is the Suvâraśābûmi of the Buddhist books 380; is the Aurea Regio of Ptolemy...... 380
Thebaw, Thebaw = Thibò ........................................ 290 note
Theobald, nickname of Thibò ........................................ 290 note
thêrawat, the, of the dâna, discussed ........................................ 212
Thibaw = Thibò ........................................ 290 note
Thibò, King of Burma, son of Mindôn ........................................ 290 f.
Tisastanes of Ptolemy = Chashtmana, grandson of Radradaman ........................................ 264
thithi = method of quoting in M.S. ........................................ 57
titles, Burmese, explained ........................................ 289 note
Tirakalukkugram inscription of Kulöttunga-Chôja is dated 1105 A.D. ........................................ 283
Tizung Pagoda, the, visited ........................................ 382
Tantlang Chins, geographical distribution of the ........................................ 190
tô, the, of Burma is the Assyrian winged bull, degraded ........................................ 382
tokan-dia, a mythical animal of the Malagasy ........................................ 282
tones, a note on, in Tibeto-Burman languages ........................................ 128
Trîbhuvanamalla, a bûrûda of Betmarkha ........................................ 197
tricks in folktales ........................................ 24 ff.
Trîkalinga = Anûrathe = Telugâta = Trîlinga ........................................ 198
Trîlinga, origin of the name ........................................ 198
Tyôgavalli, wife of Kulöttunga-Chôja ........................................ 282

Ujjain, the traditional migration of the Jains from ........................................ 158, 160
apasâyanaam, the custom of investiture with the sacred thread in Madras ........................................ 193
unlucky words in Bengal, "no" ........................................ 344

v, omission of, in the Prâkritas ........................................ 259 f.
Vâgâñâcha kings of Gujârata, chronology of ........................................ 276 f.; genealogy of some of the ........................................ 277
Vaśiśâ = Bèsâmar mentioned in the Burmese inscriptions ........................................ 225
vâsikandarî, a division of Jambhâdhvanaparâsâta ........................................ 17
Vâsithdhâpâ Chatarapana Sâtabandha = the Andhâbhùarya ........................................ 204
Vazimba, a Malagasy tribe ........................................ 250; veneration ........................................ 251; for the graves of the ........................................ 251
Vêdias, language of, was a cultured language, 3rd century B.C. ........................................ 275
vendetta among the Chins ........................................ 218
Vêngi, Kâjirigâ, lord of, = Kulöttunga-Chôja ........................................ 283
Vidhûsûta, day of the week in M.S. = Wednesday ........................................ 49
Vîgârahapâla, a copper-plate grant of ........................................ 97 f.
Vîjâyâditya VII., viceroy of Vêngi ........................................ 283
Vîjâyapura of Jîvâditya's inscription — not yet identified ........................................ 170
Vikilla = Vikramâditya VI. of the Western Châlukya dynasty ........................................ 282
Vikrama-Chôja, inscription of, quoted ........................................ 282
Vîkrama-Prabandha, note on the ........................................ 83
Vikramâditya IV. (Western Châlukya) ........................................ 168
Vikramâditya VI. (Western Châlukya) ........................................ 283
his war with Kulöttunga-Chôja ........................................ 283
Vijâvâyakura, lived temp. Vâsithdhâpâra Sâtabandha ........................................ 204
Vinâya, a Buddha mentioned in the Bharaut inscriptions ........................................ 226
Vira-Kâjirigâ-Gopâla = Kâjirigâ-Gopâladèva of the Kâññi inscriptions ........................................ 122: = Madhu-vântaka = Kottappâ-Chôja 122; is conquered by Sundara-Pândya ........................................ 121
Vira Kâjirigadèva = Kulöttunga-Chôja ........................................ 283
Vîsâkha, a Jain teacher ........................................ 158
Vishapadêva, a Jain teacher ........................................ 158
Visâvabhû, a Buddha mentioned in the Bharaut inscriptions ........................................ 226
Vîszitramagram Sanskrit Series, a notice of the vowels, the inscriptions of Vîszitram in Indo-Buddhist characters, do not distinguish between long and short:— changes in the quality of, in the inscriptions at Gîrân 2, at Kapur di Gîrî 8, in the remaining edicts 86;— additional, in the inscriptions at Gîrân 2, at Kapur di Gîrî 8, in the remaining edicts 86;— suppressed, in the inscriptions at Gîrân 2, at Kapur di Gîrî 8, in the remaining edicts 86;— shortened, in the inscriptions at Gîrân 2, in the remaining edicts 86;— lengthened, in the 12th inscription at Gîrân 2, in the remaining edicts 85 f.;— contracted, in the inscriptions at Gîrân 2, at Kapur di Gîrî 9, in the remaining edicts 86 f.;— nasalized, in the inscriptions at Gîrân 2, at Kapur di Gîrî 9;— long not marked in the N.-W. Alphabet of India 175;— use of modified, in the Mongoloid Hill tribes ........................................ 125
ved, bird or fowl, spread of the root in the Tibeto-Burman language ........................................ 125
Wâgârd, a note on the remains at 377; on 'King Wâgârd' ........................................ 377
war-prince, the, of Burma ........................................ 290 f. note
Wâs, a tribe in the Shân States ........................................ 116
Welaung Chins are of Baungkâlî Chin origin ........................................ 215; geographical distribution of ........................................ 215
widows, right to remarriage among the Shâns 119; wise women in folktales ........................................ 157 f.; women, variant of the tricks of ........................................ 180 f., 278
y, omission of, in the Prâkritas 259:— in the Prâkrit represents Sanskrit soft s consonants 259
ya, notes on the aksharas of the letter 39 f.:— is a test letter in ancient Indian alphabets 32 f.;— the ancient form of, not known after 600 A.D. 33:— the form of, shows the Bower Manuscript was written between 350 and 500 A.D. ........................................ 34 ff., 37.
| Yabemye near Pegu, notes on the ruins at | Yadopheres = Gondophares = Gudupharas: 207 |
| 383 f.; inscriptions at | \( \text{yōgas, names of, mentioned in recorded dates:} \) |
| ........................................ 383 | \begin{align*} |
| Yázādarit, the title explained | \text{Subba} & 49 \\
| ........................................ 386 | \text{Vyatipāta} & 48 f. |
| year, Jain ideas on the 17;— the Jain of | \( \text{Yēkwa Chins, geographical distribution of} \) |
| Saturn 17;— the lakṣhaṇa, of the Jains | \begin{align*} |
| 17;— the pamāṇa, of the Jains 17;— | \text{the} & 190 |
| the Jain nakṣatra, of 327, \( \frac{51}{67} \) \( \text{nuṣṭhāna} \) 17;— | \text{yuvārīja, Burmese form ia einkhēnin} & 290 |
| the Jain lunar, of 354, \( \frac{12}{67} \) \( \text{nuṣṭhāna} \) 17;— | \begin{align*} |
| name of a, quoted in MS., Ḥemalambha ... | \text{Zainganaing, a suburb of Pegu, antiquities of,} |
| 57 | described .................................. 383 f. |
| \( \text{Yindu Chins; geographical distribution of} \) | \( \text{Zinḡ, Maung, = Philip de Brito} \) .................. 384 |
| 215; border on the Chinbok Chins 215; claim descent from th Taunḡgas.................. 215 |
ERRATA IN VOL. XXI.

p. 157, line 26, for and "built, read and built."

p. 347, lines 43 and 52, for "Horse and Bull Coins"

"27, for there," read "there."

read "Cock and Bull Coins."