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## ILLUSTRATIONS
CURRENCY AND COINAGE AMONG THE BURMESE.

BY E. C. TEMPLE.

(Continued from Vol. XXVI, p. 329.)


The quaint, but for its time intelligent and advanced, Comparative Vocabulary of the Burmese, Malay and Thai Languages, from the Serampore Mission Press, 1810, gives us, at p. 129, a list of weights and measures, valuable for tracing the history of Indo-European words and weight denominations, and at the same time enables us to pass on to the next point for consideration: comparative Burmese and Siamese bullion weights. In this table the Burmese and Malay words are in their respective characters, but the Thai (Siamese) words are in Roman transcription. I will, therefore, transcribe the first two columns in transcription and leave the other two, Siamese and English, as they are in the original.

Comparative List of 1810.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Burmese</th>
<th>Malay</th>
<th>Siamese</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chèn</td>
<td>Tembang</td>
<td>Chang</td>
<td>(any) Weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyaungdan</td>
<td>Pàdi</td>
<td>Met-k'au-fang</td>
<td>A grain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taywî</td>
<td>Sagâû</td>
<td>Klam</td>
<td>A-rutty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lèyôwî</td>
<td>Sêkî-kâm-dar</td>
<td>P'hai</td>
<td>Half coonderin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamôûtî</td>
<td>Kóndar</td>
<td>Fûang</td>
<td>Cooaderin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamôûtî</td>
<td>Mayam—Mâs</td>
<td>Sâlûng</td>
<td>Mas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khatôchî</td>
<td>Jampal</td>
<td>Bât</td>
<td>A rupee weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tahôung</td>
<td>Tadî-Bûngkal</td>
<td>Tamlûng</td>
<td>Tial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

94 For a further explanation of Siamese weights, see later on in the text.
95 Tembang, according to Crawford (Malay Dict., 1852), is Javanese "to weigh."
96 There is a curious mistake here: pyaungdan is millet; pàdi is "paddy," rice; and met-k'au-fang is for durian, a grain of rice unhusked, vide Bowring, Vol. II, p. 230; La Louësère, E. T., Siam, p. 164; Cushing, Shan Dict., p. 310. So the book has mistaken the words "a grain" for "a grain weight." In Burmese this is, in this case, strictly sinthi, but usually yây; and in Malay it is basu.
97 These words mean respectively: 1 yêd, 4 yêp, 1 mûd, 1 mèn. 98 See Ridgeway, Origin of Currency, p. 171.
99 Sêkî is, however, one-fourth; khôndar and coonderin are valuable forms for the history of "sandara;" khôndar, according to Crawford (Malay Dict., s. v.), is the Adenasmam panaini = yêfî; see ante, Vol. XXVI, pp. 314 ff., 320.
100 The origin of "mâs." 1 In these words the è is nearly the German ë, or perhaps in most men's mouths nearest the French â. French writers represent it by â or è.
2 Lord, (the) weight (of a) këkî, or tickal.
3 Spelt tahâr and means "1 hat" or "1 king." I do not know what this is meant for, unless for the Indian coin hâm or pagoda, which was known to the Malay (vide Crawford), and so got to the informants of the writers of the Vocabulary. This view is confirmed by the current Shan word hâm for 24 rupees (or tickals), the tael being in Shan really hâm or 4 rupees (or tickals). Taking the hâm as properly 21 tickals it would equal in weight 3 1/2 rupees or very nearly the pagoda. The Siamese tael and the pagoda were mixed up in the last century, vide Stevens, Guide, p. 82.
4 Tîl or tîlû in Crawford; always tîlû in Buffet's Java, and in Maxwell's Malay Papers: tîl (evidently meant to be pronounced like "dial") for tael is a valuable transitional form; La Louësère has "taîl or tâl."
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Burmese</th>
<th>Malay</th>
<th>Siamese</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ta-bēkäs</td>
<td>Kattē</td>
<td>Chang</td>
<td>Catty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-chēntayā</td>
<td>Pīkūlī</td>
<td>Hap</td>
<td>Pecool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bhārā</td>
<td>P'hrā</td>
<td>Balhar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taingš</td>
<td>Ukuršt</td>
<td>Wāt</td>
<td>any Measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chin</td>
<td>Suqātan</td>
<td>Fliang</td>
<td>(any) Measure of capacity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To dive into the irregular tangle of Siamese weights, as presented by travellers and writers, with any hope of arriving at clear ideas, is no easy matter, but I think we may safely affirm the following comparative table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Burmese</th>
<th>Siamese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 ṭé are 1 mā</td>
<td>4 p̤ñān̤g are 1 fiang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 mā  , 1 māt</td>
<td>2 fiang   , 1 sailing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 māt , 1 kyāt</td>
<td>4 sailing , 1 bāt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 kyāt , 1 pēkā</td>
<td>80 bāt , 1 chang</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now the chang is roughly 3 lbs. 2½ oz., i.e., 59½ oz. av., and the pēkā (viss) roughly 3 lbs. 11 oz., i.e., 59 oz. av. Practically this works out the bāt and kyāt to half an oz. av., and both represent the tickal. Therefore the kyāt, māt and mā of Burma represent the bāt, sailing and fiang of Siam. Now it will be seen on reference to the concurrent Burmese tables given ante, Vol. XXVI. p. 320, that the above synonymous denominations for bullion weights refer to the quaternary Burmese scale and not to the decimal. So that here we begin to have an explanation of the concurrent Burmese systems. Namely, that the decimal scale is due to Chinese influence and the concurrent quaternary scale to Siamese influence.

Historically I should be inclined to say that the original Burmese scale was the decimal one borrowed from China, and that when the Lower Provinces were held in Siamese dominion from about 1300 A. D. to 1550 A. D., the people adapted the terms of the decimal scale to the Siamese quaternary scale, and then preserved the adaptations, precisely as they have in Lower Burma since the Wars of 1825 and 1853 and in Upper Burma since that of 1876 fitted their existing terms for weights to suit the Rupees, annas and pice of British-India. In both these last instances the two-fold senses of the terms used have continued to run concurrently:

---

6 Written tapitā, which is unusual and probably phonetic: it means "1 viss."
7 Katt is Javanese, according to Crawford, Dict., s.v.
8 A Siamese catty is two Chinese canties.
9 This means "weight one hundred," and helps to account for the teiga and peiya of Wilson above noticed, Vol. XXVI. p. 326.
10 Javanese according to Crawford, meaning "as much as a man can carry."
11 How the people got along with their muddle of weights and measures is well described by La Loubère, Siam, E. T., p. 72. See also p. 134, and Beck, Temples and Elephants, p. 134. (p. 313)
12 Usually so stated, but the word mān as a suffix often means "one" in Sthu, and this expression should therefore perhaps be correctly always given as simply pā. Aymonier, Voyage dans le Laos, Vol. I, p. 329, has "les fâi ou sous Siamois."
13 In 1313 A. D. the Chinese Government sent to Siam a set of its standard weights and measures on application; Bowring, Siam, Vol. I, p. 73. And Mr. E. H. Parker informs me that it did so to the Northern Shan States constantly, notably in 1488 A. D. To Burma it issued such standards in 1441 and 1451 A. D.
14 See Stevens, Guide, p. 90 f.; Symes, Ann., p. 285; Primep, Useful Tables, p. 34: but Crawford, Ann., p. 334, thinks it was borrowed from the Hindus, and may be right. The point is a very obscure one.
15 See Flayre, Hist. of Burma, p. 299: as to Siamese influence in Pegu, see ante, Vol. XXI. p. 333.
thus the common terms 8 mā (nyūd) = 1/2 kyāt = 8 annas, and 6 mā (chaukma) = 10 annas will no doubt live as long as 1 mā (tāmī) = 2 annas, and 3 mā (bōngmī) = 6 annas, though the former refer to the decimal and the latter to the quaternary scale.

By going into the greater weights one can further show the Siamese and Burmese to be the same. Thus, two Chinese (Penang) catties are one Siamese catty (chung), and, assuming the bāt and kyāt to be the same weight on the faith of the table just given, 100 viss (Burmese) are 125 Siamese catties = 250 Chinese (Penang) catties. Now 100 viss (Burmese) are one old Ava picul of 250 Penang catties. The comparative scale of old Burmese and Siamese weights is therefore based on the equality of the bāt and kyāt or tickal. Again, the Siamese picul (hap) equals the Chinese picul thus: 2 Chinese catties = 1 Siamese catty, but 100 Chinese catties and 50 Siamese catties = 1 Siamese picul.

As regards the lower weights, the available information is naturally too insecure for useful comparison, thus: — 32 or 24 or 20 klam (or clam) = 1 pēnūng Siamese; 4 sānū = 1 yūd and 5 yūd = 1 pē Burmese; 2 pēnūng Siamese = 1 pē Burmese. Now the klam and sānū are both grains of rice. Therefore, on the above premises, 32 grains of rice = 1 pē, and 16 grains should equal 1 pēnūng, but the scale gives more. To complicate the matter, the usually at all points reliable Crawfurd, Siam, p. 331, calls the klam the seed of the Abrus precatorius, which is a much heavier weight than the rice-seed, but he gives the local vernacular form as sāng, which when used thus by itself is Malay (usually) for a rice-seed. By turning to the cowry equivalents, the position is not improved. Crawford puts 100 cowries to the pēnūng: Bowring, Siam, Vol. II., on p. 257, puts it 300 and on p. 260, 300:6 Malcom, Travels, Vol. II. p. 150, at 400. But one may expect this sort of thing in such matters. It all depends on the date and place of the enquiry on the spot.

I feel confirmed in the speculation on the origin of the concurrent Burmese systems by the existence of precisely the same conditions further Eastwards under apparently similar circumstances. Professor Ridgeway,19 quoting M. J. Moura, Le Royaume de Cambodge, 1883, Vol. I. p. 323, affords the following table for Cambodia:

Concurrent Tables for Cambodia.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decimal Scale.</th>
<th>Quaternary Scale.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 hun are 1 chi</td>
<td>4 pey are 1 fuong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 chi &quot; tomlong</td>
<td>2 fuong &quot; 1 slong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 tomlong &quot; 1 neal</td>
<td>4 slong &quot; 1 bat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 neal &quot; hap</td>
<td>4 bat &quot; 1 tomlong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(16 tomlong) &quot; 1 neal</td>
<td>(16 tomlong) &quot; 1 neal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 neal &quot; hap</td>
<td>100 neal &quot; hap</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

16 See Wilson’s Documents of the Burmese War, Appx., p. 1xi.
17 Rule 4 of the Treaty Rules with China, dated 8th November 1857, runs: — “The weight of a pecul of 100 catties is held to be equal to 133 1/3 pounds avoidingpoids.” Herstlett’s Treaties, p. 33.
18 The following quotation from Aymonier, Voyage dans le Laos, Vol. I. p. 134 f., gives the probable explanation of the muddle: — “Non seulement le Monong Attopou paie son impôt en poudre d’or, mais, fait unique au Laos, ce métal précieux est sa seule monnaie. Cette poudre est habituellement pesée dans des petites balances à plumeau. On dit que l’unité de poids est la tical pesant 32 grains d’or gros riz rouge du paysa.”
19 At p. 244 Bowring quotes Van Dyck, 1668, 200 to 300 to the tael, which must be a mistake for 2,000 to 3,000: Mandlefeld, 1859, Travels to the Indies, p. 104, makes 200 to 250 cowries to the pēnūng: Bank, Temple & Elephants, 1854, p. 141, makes them 300: so does Colquhoun, Amongst the Siams, 1886, p. 220 n. 1: Holt-Hallett, Thousand Miles on an Elephant, 1899, p. 164, has 100 to 200 at Zims (Chiangmai, Kiangmai).
21 The spelling is Prof. Ridgeway’s in both tables.
22 Ridgeway, p. 181, says the Cambodian term for bāt is clomon. Haswell, Prijman Vocabulary, p. 42, gives chi as the Mon word for 100.
23 M. Moura has not apparently stated how many tomlong go to the neal in this scale. In Siam 20 tomlong go to the chaung.
24 I must here note, though it is not in itself surprising, that the details in French terminology of the Siamese
He says that the first is “plainly borrowed from the Chinese, whilst the other is regarded as native in origin.” The first or decimal scale is no doubt of Chinese origin, but the second or quaternary scale is the Siamese scale word for word, except as to náal (catty) for chang, though I am unable to produce evidence at present as to whether the Cambodian scale came from Siam or the Siamese scale from Cambodia, beyond Prof. Ridgeway’s statement at p. 161: — “The Siamese coins, known also to Cambodia, were the weight and money units of the ancient Cambodians, who probably weighed their precious metals.”

Sir J. Bowring, Siam, Vol. I. p. 257 ff., evidently intended to sum up the information available on the weights and measures of that country, as known up to 1857, but apparently without fully grasping the significance thereof:

First he gives a table from Jones, Siamese Grammar:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 pic</td>
<td>1 fuang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 fuang</td>
<td>1 salung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 salung</td>
<td>1 tical or bat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 tical</td>
<td>1 tambung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 tambung</td>
<td>1 chang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 chang</td>
<td>1 hab or picul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 hab</td>
<td>1 para</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

He then gives another table from McCulloch’s Dictionary, on Crawfurd’s authority:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>200 bia or cowries</td>
<td>1 phainung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 phainung</td>
<td>1 singphai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 singphai</td>
<td>1 fuang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 fuang</td>
<td>1 salung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 salung</td>
<td>1 bat or tical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 ticals</td>
<td>1 cattie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 catties</td>
<td>1 picul</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

But he notes that the “cattie” above mentioned is the Chinese and not the Siamese “cattie,” which is double of the Chinese and of which only 50 go to the picul.

and Cambodian weights do not fit at all, according to Bowring and Ridgeway; see Vol. II. p. 238 and p. 160 respectively. Thus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Han</td>
<td>0·45</td>
<td>1·375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuang</td>
<td>2·25</td>
<td>1·714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salung</td>
<td>4·5</td>
<td>2·344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bat</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9·375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Náal (chang)</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


24 If the Cambodian scale is the original one, then the historical argument as to the origin of the Burmese quaternary scale is strengthened, for the Cambodian influence in Lower Burma lasted from the 6th to the 10th Century A. D., giving way to the Siamese finally in the 13th Century: ante, Vol. XXII. p. 560 ff. See also M. Pontalis’s article L’Invasion Thaise en Indo-Chine, Toung Po, Vol. III. p. 39 ff.

26 There are so many misprints in each of Bowring’s quotations as I have been able to verify, that this seemingly impossible word should perhaps be read for some form of pét: Bock, Temples and Elephants, has pét at p. 141.

27 Misprint for tambung. The Sián word is lanes, evidently the same as tical. See Cushing, Siam Dict. p. 252.

28 Misprint for nth. The Shán word is lanes, evidently the same as nth. See Cushing, Siam Dict. p. 252.

He also gives a résumé of the information in La Loubère, 1638, from which can be extracted the following table:

- 4 payes = 1 fuan
- 2 fuan = 1 mayon
- 4 mayons = 1 tical
- 4 ticals = 1 tael
- 20 taels = 1 catty
- 50 catties = 1 pie

At p. 244 he quotes Vaneshouten, 1636, to the following effect:

- 2 fuangs = 1 mace
- 4 mace = 1 tical
- (4 ticals = 1 tael)
- 20 taels = 1 catty

His own information can be tabulated thus (p. 257):

- 1,200 cowries = 1 fuan
- 2 fuang = 1 salung
- 2 salung = 1 songsalung
- 2 songsalung = 1 tical
- 4 tical = 1 tael
- 20 tael = 1 catty

Bowring also gives a table from the French authorities as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Avoidedpois Weight</th>
<th>cwt.</th>
<th>qr.</th>
<th>lb.</th>
<th>oz.</th>
<th>dr.</th>
<th>cts.</th>
<th>grs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hün = 45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>76170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuan = 2½</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salung = 4½</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>61893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bat = 18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>47597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xang = 1,440</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>07811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catl = 720</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>03955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kab = 72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4460</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Put in another form, which will be found later on to be of great value in determining the true relation of the Siamese to other Far-Eastern scales, the above tables can be stated thus:

- 5 hün = 1 fuan
- 2 fuan = 1 salung
- 4 salung = 1 bat
- 60 bat = 1 Siamese catty (xang)
- 40 bat = 1 Chinese catty
- 100 Chinese catties = 1 hap (pical)

---


ii. Mistake for picul, based on La Loubère.

iii. Mandelab, Travels into the East Indies, 1639, E. T., p. 104, gives the scale in full, as in the text.

iv. Pages 259 f., he gives derivations, following La Loubère, for the terms, which can now be shown to be quite erroneous.

v. I. e., chang or Siamese catty.

vi. 2-75 lbs. av., according to Bock, Temples and Elephants, p. 141.

vii. Should be hab (hap).

viii. From the Cambodian tables above given we see that this is meant for the candareen or seed of the Adenanthera pavonina.
From Crawfurd himself, Siam, p. 331 f., we get the following:—

32 sagas
200 bias (cowries) " 1 phainang
2 phainang " 1 songy'hai
2 songy'hai " 1 funang
2 funang " 1 salung
4 salungs " 1 bat or tical
80 ticals " 1 cattie or 1 1/3 lb. av.
100 catties " 1 picul

In the above tables pie (?), pay, payy, p't and p'énang are the same thing; bát, tamlung (tumlong), chang (zang) and hab, hap (hab) are Siamese forms respectively for tickal, tical, catty and picul; neyam (Malay), mace (commercial), mácha (Indian) and salung (slung) (Siamese) are the same thing. Sông (som) means two or double, and can be discarded in comparisons. As regards the han it seems, while being intended for the candaecareen, to be treated in the Tariff attached to the Treaty which Sir John Bowring drew up with Siam in 1855, as if it were synonymous with "phainang." I do not find it mentioned in the other Treaties.

We may now upon the information thus collected draw up a general table in the following form for the purposes of comparison:—

| 4 p'énang are 1 ōng | 1 bat (Siamese tickal) |
| 2 ōng " 1 salung |
| 4 salung " 1 phainang |

That is the 1 bat = 32 p'énang, and since, as we have already seen, 2 p'énang = 1 phainang, Burmese, the p'énang must equal 4 ōng Burmese; so the bat = 128 ōng = 1 kyüt (Burmese tickal).

Thus also the Siamese scale can be referred to the ordinary ancient Indian scale on the assumption of a common origin.

Since gathering the above information, I have come across the statements of Malcolm on this subject, who wrote some twenty years previously to Bowring. His testimony, Travels, Vol. ii. p. 150, is as usual valuable and much to the point, confirming generally what has been just stated:— "The Siamese have coined money, but use cowries for very small change. The coins are merely a small bar of silver, turned in at the ends, so as to resemble a bullet and stamped with a small die on one side.

| 400 cowries make 1 phainang |
| 2 phainang " 1 songy'hai |
| 2 songy'hai " 1 funang |
| 2 funang " 1 salung |
| 4 salungs " 1 bat or tical |
| 4 ticals " 1 tamlong |
| 20 tamlongs " 1 chang |

The last two are nominal. They sometimes have a gold funang equal to eight ticals. The tical assayed at the mint of Calcutta, yielded about one rupee, three and a half annas.
equal to 2s. 6d. sterling, or about sixty cents of American money. For weights they use the catty and picul. The catty is double that of the Chinese, but the picul is the same."

Going back to observations made at considerably earlier dates than those above mentioned we find in Stevens' Guide, 1775, at p. 88:

1 Tekull is 12 or 13 Fanams Madras, or 1 Rupee
3 Tekulls are 1 Pagoda
4 Tekulls 1 Tale or Pagoda
20 Tales 1 Catty, or 36 Pagodas 26 Fanams

At p. 128: "Gold and Silver Weights," Stevens tells us that "These are the Tical, which weighs nearest 9 dwt. 10 grs. and (is) 9½ dwt. better than standard Silver. Great Weights. 80 Taals are 1 Catty, or 2 lb. 9 oz. 4½ drs. Avoirdupois (sic): 50 Catties 1 Pecul, or 129 lb. 0 oz. 13 d. 85 Fifty Siam Catties should be equal to 1 China Pecul of 132 lb. for all their Goods are weighed by the China Dotchin: But the King's Dotchin at Siam is never found to give more than 125 lb., though it should be 132 lb.

Coins.
2 Sampors are 1 Tuang
2 Tuangs 1 Miam
4 Miams 1 Tual

800 Cowries are 1 Tuang
4 Taals 1 Tale
20 Tales 1 Catty

Accounts are kept here in Catties, Tales, Taals, Miams, Tuangs, and Cowries. 10 Miams pass for a Tale China, and 85 Tales Siam are always reckoned as 8 China."

I have given these extracts in extenso, as instructive in the present enquiries. From the first we can see why it is that Alexander 50 years later (Travels, p. 21), and later again Malcolm (Travels, Vol. II. p. 270), say that the Burmese tical was nearly a Madras rupee. From it we also see that the merchants recognised at that time a Madras and a Siamese Pagoda, the last being the taal or tamsing. The "tual" mentioned is clearly for "tical," probably through misreading some MS. document.

But Alexander Hamilton, writing 35 years before Stevens, in his East Indies, Vol. II., Appx., p. 8, sets off the facts much better in his "Table of Weights, etc." Thus:

"Siam Weights and Coin have the same Denomination.

1 Miam is 2 Foods (fāngle)
1 Teul 4 Miams
1 Caipee 80 Teuls
1 Pecul 100 Catties or 133 lb. Avoirdupois.

The Caipee and Pecul are used in Cambodia, Cochinchina, Tonquin, China and Japan, not differing above 2 per Cent. in all those Countries."

---

48 But compare ante, p. 5.
49 I. e., scales, balance: see Yule, Hobson-Jobson, s. v., dotchin. But here is a new reading for this word: "In China . . . they having no regular Standard kept, but the usual Resort for the trial of their Dějings are the Joo houses, where they always keep what they call the true Dějing, but you will seldom find two of them agree." Stevens, Guide, p. 91.
50 I. e., sampór.
51 A misprint for Fiang.
52 Malay term, mūjang = md = meling.
53 I. e., 200 to the p‘tang.
54 This is not quite intelligible. Stevens reckoned 16 Chinese taels to the Chinese catty, (p. 91), and the Chinese catty as half the Siamese catty, therefore 32 Chinese taels = 1 Siamese catty. By Siamese reckoning 20 Siamese taels = 1 Siamese catty, therefore 85 Siamese taels = 153 Chinese taels. But the statement "10 miams pass for a tale China" is rather a neat reference to mūjang (Malay) = md (S. Indian) = mūzh (Sanskrit) = mace (commercial), for 10 mace are 1 taal Chinese.
From a document attributed to George White, the son of the celebrated Interloper, being a Report on the Trade of Siam in 1878, we find that the buying price of sapan-wood at the Royal warehouses was "2: mace: 1: fuaah p. Pec. ;" and the selling price therefrom "2: mace ordinarily." But the King "an: 7777" hee raised it to 2 Tecalls vpon notice that y: price, was advanced in China, since when 'tis fallen againe to y: form: rate of : 6: mace." Here "fuaah" is clearly for fuang.

As the Siamese and the more or less wild Hill Tribes, known to the English through the Burmese as the Shan, and to the French through another local source as the Laos, are merely sections of the same race, the Tai, it will be useful to make a survey of the Shan method of calculating bullion weights. To make clear the observations that follow, it is necessary to explain that the Shan Race is spread from the sources of the Irrawaddy within Indian and Chinese Territories over the plains between the Salween and the Cambodia Rivers to the Gulf of Siam. It includes the Khamtu of the Assam border, the Siamese, the people of Sip'song Pannâ of Cambodia, and the former ruling race Ahom, from which Assam takes its name. It includes also Tribes that are conveniently known to the English as Burmese Shan, Chinese Shan, and Siamese Shan, and clearly besides, what may be called on a perusal of French authorities, Cambodian Shan. These generalisations show, what is so important for the present purpose, the influences to which these people have been exposed, the said influences, as will be seen later on, giving a variety of colour to their ideas on currency and weights. The fundamental affinities of the Shan are historically towards the Chinese proper.

As regards the Burmese Shan, McLeod and Richardson's Journal, 1837, says that the Shan "use the same weights and measures as the Burmans, but deteriorated one-fourth or 25 per cent. by alloys." Again Cushing's Shan Dictionary gives ph (pâ), mî (nu), mat (met), and sî (sip), all with their Burmese equivalents, obviously meant for the same words and weights. Also tâh for the British-Indian rupee, obviously again for the Burmese diâp.

---

60 In Siamese Tai, to make the word mean "the free."
61 i.e., the Mekhing or Namkhaung.
63 See Colquhoun, Amongst the Shans, pp. 49, 206 ff.
64 Holt-Hallett, Thousand Miles on an Elephant, pp. 321, 331.
65 In Siamese Tai, to make the word mean "the free."
66 Soott Hnaa. The name Siam comes through the Malay form Siyom (Crawford, Malay Dict. s. v.), and the various forms of it show it to be identical with "Shan."
67 See Yule, Hobson-Jobson, s. v.
68 See Colquhoun, Amongst the Shans, pp. 49, 206 ff.
70 At p. 407 Dr. Cushing says oddly that the mî is half a ph. The fact is, of course, just the other way. He also gives us, pp. 34, "kâs, two viss in weight, two hundred rupees;" p. 552, "huan, two rupees and a half, one fourth of a viss;" and p. 552, "taung, four rupees, one twenty-fifth of a viss."
A Northern Shan from Mônô (Mùngnası) told me, through Capt. J. W. Orchard, Indian (Madras) Staff Corps, employed for a time with the Lashio Battalion, Military Police, that the Burmese denominations, with slightly different words to express them, are now almost always used by the Shân in his part of the country. He recognised the šuang, salüng, and hêt of the Siamese, as expressions used by the people on the Siamese borders. His list ran as follows:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Burmese</th>
<th>Shën</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ywê</td>
<td>makk'ik'wêyêng (^{67})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pê</td>
<td>pêlüng or pênüng (^{68})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mû</td>
<td>mülüng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mât</td>
<td>matlüng or sâmmlûng (^{69})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kyât</td>
<td>pyâliung (^{70})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pêkîbâ</td>
<td>soilüng</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another Shân from Mômoit (Mùngmit) gave me the following forms for the Burmese denominations:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Burmese</th>
<th>Shën</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pê</td>
<td>pênüng (^{71})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mû</td>
<td>múñüng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mât</td>
<td>lûkmat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kyât</td>
<td>kyânuñg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dr. Cushing comes to the rescue as to luk in lukmat, at p. 477 of his Dictionary. Luk means anything round: lukk'an is a weight used in weighing: lukpê equals six or eight (ywê) \(^{72}\) seeds of the Abrus precatorius, or 1 pê: lukmat equals 4 pê or 1 mât: lukmuû equals 2 pê or 1 mût. \(^{73}\) With this explanation we can follow further the same informant from Momeit:—

8 annas are lupèseu \(^{74}\)  
9 "     " lupèseu-païpê \(^{75}\)  
10 "    " lupèpê-šanûng \(^{76}\)  
11 "    " lupèpê-šanûng-païpê \(^{77}\)  


\(^{67}\) Makk'ik' is the seed of the Abrus precatorius, Dr. Cushing, Shan Dict. p. 379; and 'wê is anything round, p. 359; and so wêyêng may mean merely "round." Wê is also a cowry, p. 315.

\(^{68}\) Lüng and nüng mean "one," but lüng means also a round thing, and perhaps lüng and nüng in this connection mean merely "round." The concurrent forms of lüng and nüng rest on the well-known interchange of l and n when initial.

\(^{69}\) Sâm means two.

\(^{70}\) I. c., a piece.

\(^{71}\) The Shan numeral coefficient for money or coin is t'up: e. g., Shân, pênüng pênuñg = Bur. múñüng múñüng, a silver piece. The persistent nüng here confirms the idea that in such words lüng = nüng.

\(^{72}\) For the ywê I have been given the terms mûnyê and chënat. Dr. Cushing's words are (p. 82) 't'êk and pêxen for the Abrus seed and nüngsêng for the Abrus僉花 seed.

\(^{73}\) These words were given me as lupwê, lupseu, lupseu-païpê, by a Shân from the Thâmô (Sañgô) State.

\(^{74}\) As will be seen later in sukam (— salamâk) means either eight or a half.

\(^{75}\) Pê (Shân) = pieu.

\(^{76}\) Sip (Shân) = ten.

\(^{77}\) It is odd that he did not use sippênûng, 11 annas.
This man further gave me the following little table:

1 piec is pyüng (and ? chüp)\(^{28}\)  
2 " are sôngchüp  
1 anna is sîchüp, i.e., 4 chüp  
2 annas are pîyatchüp\(^{29}\) " 3 chüp  
3 " sîpôngchüp " 12 chüp  
4 " têng\(^{30}\)  

He also volunteered the information that in the hills of the same State the people called pice pêng, which is evidently the same word as his own pyüng, and counted thus:

1 pice tâpêng  
2 " nâmêng  
3 " sòngpêng  
4 " litpêng  
5 " ngâtêng  
6 " sûpêng  
7 " nutpêng  
8 " swûtêng  
9 " kutpêng  
10 " tachilpêng  

Now, all these numerals are those of the Hill Tribes, known to the Burmese as Taungûs and to themselves as Pso, to be found in the Maukma and Thaton Districts of Burm, in the Shan State of Thaton (Satung) and other Shan States, and in Cambodia.\(^{81}\) They are at the same time suspiciously near to being merely dialectic Burmese, thus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ta (tit)</td>
<td>ta(^{32})</td>
<td>ta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>'ma ('nit)</td>
<td>ni</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>bông3</td>
<td>sôn</td>
<td>sòng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>lêf</td>
<td>lit</td>
<td>lit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ngât...</td>
<td>ngat</td>
<td>ngât</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>chank</td>
<td>sû</td>
<td>sû</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>ko'nit</td>
<td>nit</td>
<td>nût</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>shit</td>
<td>sôt</td>
<td>swût</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>kêt</td>
<td>kut</td>
<td>kut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>tâ'ân</td>
<td>tachî</td>
<td>tachî</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One might go on gathering evidence of dialectic forms almost indefinitely in the Shan Hills, but the above information and what follows will shew that the further one dives into the sea

\(^{28}\) Dr. Cushing, Dict. p. 327, gives pîkán avoidly for pêal, as the word for 'piece.'

\(^{29}\) Evidently for pît.

\(^{30}\) Cf. Cushing, Shan Dict. p. 226, a bar of metal, = (?) the lat of the Siamese Sâm, see below in the text. Perhaps here for '4', Chinese and Northern Shan for '4 annas.' See Cushing, Shan Dict. p. 276, and later on in the text.

\(^{81}\) See Taw-Scin-Ko, Memo. of a Tour in Parts of the Arakan, Shweyin, and Pegu Districts, p. 44: Mouhot, Travels, p. 24. The Burma Census Report, 1881, pp. 165, 267, treats the Taungûs ethnographically as merely a branch of the Karens. So does Mr. Burgess, in p. 13 of Notes on the Languages and Dialects spoken in British Burma, an official publication, 1884: but in the same work Dr. Bennett is rather scornful as to the official ideas on the subject: p. 15, Stevenson, Bur. Dict., gives 'Shan-Taungthu; one of the Shan-Taungthu Race,' under 'Shin.'

\(^{32}\) To these the Taungûs add pêî as a coefficient, much after the manner that the Shânas add itî, nôîng or luîng to their numerals.
of dialects the more certainly do the forms become explainable. Here is a list from a Shan from Pindya near Muktih:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>bádá</td>
<td>tapé</td>
<td>1 pê</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>nádd</td>
<td>tamú</td>
<td>2 mú</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>bómðú⁶⁵</td>
<td>ñompë</td>
<td>3 pê</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>lidú</td>
<td>tamät</td>
<td>1 mlô</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ngrú</td>
<td>ngapet⁷⁴</td>
<td>5 peô</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>sudú</td>
<td>bémëmû</td>
<td>3 mú</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>nudd</td>
<td>bémëmmëtapë</td>
<td>3 mú 1 pê</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>bùwêtô⁶⁵</td>
<td>ashankë</td>
<td>a half (?) 1 pê</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>küdë</td>
<td>ashanahtapë</td>
<td>a half (?) 1 pê</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>taâl</td>
<td>chaunmû</td>
<td>6 mú</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>chaumëmëtapë</td>
<td>chaumëttapë</td>
<td>6 mú 1 pê</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>bómëmët</td>
<td>3 mlô</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>bómëmmëtapë</td>
<td>3 mlô 1 pê</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>takyëtëyëmû³⁷</td>
<td>1 rupee less by a mú</td>
<td>1 rupee less by a pê</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>takyëtëyënpë</td>
<td>1 rupee less by a pê</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One rupee was given as tabê, which is evidently the Burmese tabyët, a pice. Burmese influence is here clearly seen in the table for annas; and the dialectic forms for the numerals in the pice table give curiously connective forms between the Burmese and the Taungyà numerals.

To show how the Shan dialects meet and how they are influenced by their surroundings or reminiscences, I give here a comparative table of the parts of a rupee, as enumerated to me by illiterate Shans, respectively from Bhamo (Manmû, Chinese influence), Theinni (Northern Shan, Sênwîl), and Wuntho (Western Shan, i.e., from the late Shan State of Wunbô, West of the Irrawaddy).

A Comparative Shan Money Table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English Terms</th>
<th>Bhamo Shan</th>
<th>Theinni Shan</th>
<th>Wuntho Shan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One anna</td>
<td>yipê</td>
<td>1 pê</td>
<td>9 ywê</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two annas</td>
<td>múlûng</td>
<td>a mú</td>
<td>sonpê</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>sampê</td>
<td>3 pê</td>
<td>sâmpe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>yimêt</td>
<td>1 mût</td>
<td>yîtê</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five</td>
<td>hâpê</td>
<td>5 pê</td>
<td>têpê</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six</td>
<td>hûkêpê</td>
<td>6 pê</td>
<td>hûkêpê</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven</td>
<td>sîtpê</td>
<td>7 pê</td>
<td>sâmâmûpê</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kight</td>
<td>sôngtê</td>
<td>2 tê</td>
<td>pîtê</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nine</td>
<td>sôngtêpê</td>
<td>2 tê a pê</td>
<td>kaunpê</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten</td>
<td>sîppê</td>
<td>10 pê</td>
<td>châmmû</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleven</td>
<td>sipıpê</td>
<td>11 pê</td>
<td>sîpitpë</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⁶⁵ Kê is an odd form, but was insisted on. ⁶⁴ Also an odd form, but pê is used for ‘anna’ later on in the text. ⁶³ Dû, not tê, as one might expect. ³⁷ The above given: sâmûng according to a Shan from Thatôn (Shèrent) State. Another Shan from the same State gave me the odd form of Chinese look, nhâmûng, for ‘eight annas.’ The word is pêng in Siamese Shan according to Cushing, Dict. p. 572. ³⁸ You evidently = "less by."
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Bhamo Shan.</th>
<th>Theinny Shan.</th>
<th>Wuntho Shan.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Twelve annas</td>
<td>samtê</td>
<td>3 tê</td>
<td>hokmû</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thirteen</td>
<td>sipîsámpe</td>
<td>13 pê</td>
<td>samt'pê</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourteen</td>
<td>sipîsîpê</td>
<td>14 pê</td>
<td>sipîsîpê</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifteen</td>
<td>sipîpê</td>
<td>15 pê</td>
<td>kâpyônpê a kâyp less a pê</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rupee</td>
<td>kâyaplûng</td>
<td>a kâyp</td>
<td>kâyaplûng</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We have indeed here a general muddle of terms. Thus, the Bhamo Shan uses the Chinese numeral yi for one, and the curiously mixed term *yimât* (yi, Chinese, one, and *mât*, Burmese, a quarter), though he knows his own term *tê* = *mât*, as shown by his use of *lâm* (*tê*), 2 *tê*, and *samthê*, 3 *tê*. The Theinny Shan's use of *kanyók*, 9 *yôk*, is very remarkable, because *yôk* is a Burmese and not a Shan term, and 12 (not 9) *yôk* would be, if anything, the modern Burmese equivalent for "an anna." But the knows his term *pê* for "anna," and uses it constantly thereafter in the table. He uses the Chinese *yi*, one, in *yîjê*, and a purely Burmese term *chauknô* for "ten annas." Then the Wuntho Shan uses *kâyp*, properly "a flat piece," evidently for the "half-anna" or "double pîcê," as he makes the anna *song-kâyp*, i.e., two *kâyp*. This obliges him to borrow the Burmese coefficient for "pîcê," *byâ*, for the rupee in *byâlûng*, lit., a *byâ*. Also, having got *sîpê*, 10 *pê*, right in his own tongue, he tumbles into the purely Burmese compound expression, *chauknôpê* for "11 annas." I have no doubt whatever that by persistent cross-examination a purely Shan and more consistent table could have been extracted from these informants. But that was not the point aimed at, which was rather to let the peasants count out their money in their own way, however puzzling the results to the enquirer.

It is hardly, in the present state of available knowledge on the subject, worth while to seriously consider the Chinese Shan forms, and I give the following information collected from a man from Shweû near Bhamo (Bumô, Mânô), as an indication of a line of research worth following up. *Sîk* is a pîcê: then:

- sîkâ is 1 pîcê
- sîkûk " 2 "
- sîksi " 3 "
- sîkauk*10* " 4 " or 1 anna
- yeông*10* " 1 anna
- yeoka*10* " 2 annas
- s'auk*11* " 4 "
- wâtsâ*12* " 1 rupee

---

* See Cushing, Shan Dict. p. 270.
* See also the use of *sambyêt* for an anna, post, p. 29.
* I think we may fairly take sîk to be a pîcê, = 4 annas, in these words, as sêk, sêk (sêk, sêk) is a Shan word for 4 pê used in connection with money and gambling tokens. This leaves 4, sêk, sêk for the numerals 1, 2, 3, 4. *Sêk* at any rate is, I understand, Kâôh, and perhaps they all are. The character of the Kâôh (Kâôhô) appears to be still indeterminate both as to language and descent. See Burma Census Report, 1891, Vol. I. pp. 161, 190. Ants., Vol. XXII. p. 129 ff.
* (7) Chinese *yi*, one.
* Cushing, Shan Dict., gives p. 87, 188. Kâp*ê* and sô as "a Chinese coin." sô being Chinese and Kâp, Shan, a numeral coefficient for flat things. The Shan word for "coin" with Burmese affinity is *onsyêp*; p. 599. Pyê (pîê) is a Shan and Burmese numeral coefficient for flat things, and *onsyêp* is obsolete Burmese. For "coin," being supplanted by the Indian importation *dôp* (Shan *sêk* and *sîkê*); Stevenson, Bur. Dict., i.e. For "four annas" Cushing, Dict. p. 270, gives *tê* as the Chinese Shan term.
* Wêi is Eastern Shan for *mît*, Siamese, a tickle or rupee.
Neither the man who gave the above information, nor the men from Momeit and Pindyà, recognised the expressions, *filàng*, *salàng*, *bat*, and *chäng*.

For the Siamese Shàn, on the authority of Prof. Ridgeway, *Origin of Currency*, p. 162, we get a table:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Siamese-Shàn</th>
<th>Sense of the Shan terms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 anna</td>
<td><em>sípè</em>²⁵</td>
<td>4 pice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 annas</td>
<td><em>fàng</em></td>
<td>a <em>fùng</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><em>sàmpè</em></td>
<td>3 pet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><em>salàng</em></td>
<td>a <em>sàling</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td><em>sàmpè</em></td>
<td>5 pet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td><em>salàng-fàng</em></td>
<td>a <em>salàng</em> and a <em>fàng</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td><em>salàng-sàmpè</em></td>
<td>a <em>salàng</em> 3 pet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td><em>sàngsalàng</em></td>
<td>2 <em>salàng</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td><em>sàngsalàngpaipè</em></td>
<td>2 <em>salàng</em> and a pet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td><em>sìppè</em></td>
<td>10 pet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td><em>sìpìppè</em>²⁶</td>
<td>11 pet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td><em>sàngsalàng-fàng</em></td>
<td>2 <em>salàng-fàngs</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td><em>sàngsalàng-fàngpaipè</em></td>
<td>2 <em>salàng-fàngs</em> and a pet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td><em>sàpsìppè</em></td>
<td>14 pet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td><em>bàtònppè</em></td>
<td>a rupee less by a pet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 rupee</td>
<td><em>bàt</em></td>
<td>a <em>bàt</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For pice the same man gave the following terms:—

1 pice²⁸ *pènûng*
2 pice *sòmpè*
3 pice *sàmpè*
4 pice *slèpè* or 1 anna

²⁵ For a figure of the last, see Colquhoun, *Amongst the Shâns*, illustrations facing p. 315.
²⁷ Another Eastern Shàn trader settled at Maxmim gave me, more correctly for his tongue, *sàngpè*; i.e., 2 (Siamese) pf for one anna.
²⁸ *I. e., *sàpsìppè.*
²⁹ This man also gave 'catty' as chang.
³⁰ Cushing, *Shàn Handbook*, p. 196, gives pàiy for 'pie.'
³¹ Oddly enough in this list we have pf for 'pice' and pf (bys) for 'anna,' reversing the usual terminology.
For the Cambodian Shan, Prof. Ridgeway, *Origin of Currency*, p. 161, quotes M. Aymonier, *Notes sur Laos*, 1855, to the following effect as to money of account: —

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Cambodian</th>
<th>Shan (Siamese and Commercial)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 hun</td>
<td>1 chi</td>
<td>10 damling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 chi</td>
<td>1 bat</td>
<td>1 chang (catty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 bat</td>
<td>1 damling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 catties</td>
<td>1 picul</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here we see a mixed Cambodian decimal and Siamese quinary scale: the terms hun and chi belonging to the Cambodian decimal scale and bat, damling (i.e., tamlung or tael), chang to the Siamese quinary scale. In addition to this, these Shans use the regular Cambodian money and the Cambodian decimal scale in full.¹

It must, moreover, be remembered that for long past the British-Indian rupee and its parts in silver, the eight, four, and two anna pieces have been the chief currency in the Shan States outside of Siam proper, and the words denoting parts of the rupee are used to denote parts of the rupee, just as in Burma itself.²

Brock, *Temples and Elephants*, p. 159, says: — “Here and there one may come across one of the old native pieces of money, oval in shape, very thin, with a depression on the reverse side, which is always varnished, and a corresponding elevation on the obverse, giving the coin a shrivelled appearance. Round the margin are stamped different devices, representing the States from which the coin originated, e.g., an elephant for lakon, a horse for Chiangmai.”³ This refers to a form of the oblong ingot of silver and gold issued in Tongking and Cochin-China, described by Crawford, *Siam*, p. 517, as can be seen from p. 361, where Brock's book talks of “a few of the old Lao silver coins, called Nan-tok, worth about 6s. each,” for Crawford's silver ingots were “carefully analyzed in the Mint of Calcutta, and found to be equal in value to 156 Spanish dollars, or 6s. each.”⁴

We have, therefore, found the concurrent decimal and quaternary system observed in Burma, running side by side throughout all the wide districts occupied by the Shan Tribes: the decimal scale being obviously Chinese in origin and the quaternary scale as obviously Burmese, Siamese, or Cambodian, according to the predominating influence of these respective countries over the Shan Tribes. But whether decimal or quaternary the sense of the terms used for the denominations is the same throughout. Thus, the denominations can be stated in terms of each other as follows:

| Burmese and | Siamese, Cambodian | Cambodian | Shan (Siamese and Commercial) | Indo-European Commercial |
| Burmese-Shan. | | | | |
| pè | pè | pè | | |
| mè | fiang | | | |
| māt | saling | | | |
| kyàt | bat | | | |
| taung | tamlung | | | |
| pēkā and soík (changed) | nīlh | | | |
| | hap | | | |

¹ It will be observed that the damling here is the Siamese tael, and the chang the Chinese catty: the Shan catty being made equal to the Chinese catty by making 10 tael to the catty instead of the Siamese 20; the picul remaining constant. The mixed influence is thus shown to perfection.
² 1833: McLeod and Richardson's *Journal*, vol., p. 8.
³ 1881: Cushing, *Shan Dict.*, s. v.
⁴ 1884: Bock, *Temples and Elephants*, p. 163.
⁵ 1885: Colbyhoun, *Amongst the Shans*, pp. 94, 192, 315.
⁷ See Plate I., fig. 11, the marks of (7) a king's (hansu) on a piece of saék silver.
⁸ (7) Royal or “palace-struck.”
⁹ The larger and better known ingot is meant to equal ten of the description mentioned in the text.
¹⁰ Properly a Siamese catty is 14 viss (pēkā, soík).
And a corollary to the above observation is that, if the Siam-Burmese quaternary scale is traceable to an Indian source on the basis of a common origin, the whole further-Eastern system, from Burma through the Shan States and Cambodia, is likewise so traceable.

As regards money of account of higher denominations than the tickal or rupee, we have seen the tambung or four tickals, the chang or eighty tickals, the kip or four thousand tickals of the Siamese, and also the pokha or hundred tickals of the Burmese, which last is the equivalent of the soi of the Shans. But amongst the Shans there are evidently a number of such terms worth following up, some of which are recorded by Dr. Cushing, thus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Dr. Cushing</th>
<th>Siamese</th>
<th>Given myself by Shan.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 rupee</td>
<td>kyap, wat</td>
<td>bât</td>
<td>lupkyap, bât, chetk'è</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 rupees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ngînbau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>haung</td>
<td></td>
<td>ngâmuk'è</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>taung</td>
<td></td>
<td>ngûnîng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>kô'nalâm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>hoi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>k'an</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>pan</td>
<td></td>
<td>chên, chang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>soi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>kum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since the above remarks on Siamese weights were prepared for the press, my old correspondents, the managers of the Musée Guimet, have been good enough to send me Vol. I. of the *Voyage dans le Laos* of the Mission Étienne Aymonier, 1895. This consists chiefly of full and exceedingly intelligent diaries of journeys undertaken in 1882-3 off both banks, but principally off the right (Western) bank, of the Grand Fleuve, best known to us by its Siamese name of Mékong, the French apparently preferring the Shan name Nam Khong for it. And as M. Aymonier constantly records prices, values, rates, taxes, dues, demands, presents, offerings and such like, for all parts of the country traversed, the volume is of great value for the present purpose. The book, however, is essentially a journal of a tour, and the collection, tabulation and comparison of the facts recorded in it have involved a careful perusal and collation of the whole of its 350 pages.

Journeying through a great number of villages occupied by a variety of tribes more or less wild, M. Aymonier came across several forms of currency used under a considerable variety of terms therefor. He also employs occasionally translations into his own tongue of the vernacular words, which at first are a considerable puzzle to the English reader. I will, therefore, first consider here the terms employed and then the results of his representations of the currency and weights of the Siamese Shans.

**Translated Terms.**

1. Balance. — This is a literal translation of chang, the Siamese word for a catty, and also for balance and weight. It is used for the Siamese catty (pp. 18, 89) and as a synonym for livre siamoise (p. 127).

---

* In quoting Dr. Cushing I have rendered his words as best I can and perhaps not always as he would, for Shan writing, though intended to be phonetic, allows several sounds to the same vowel symbol. To the list here given might be added from Aymonier, *Voyage dans le Laos*, Vol. I, p. 133, nakhing or 40 rupees, i.e., 5 chang.

* For kȳat or kȳp clearly.
2. Barré. — The *barre d’argent*, or simply *barré* (p. 72) is given as the equivalent of 15 to 16 Mexican dollars (pp. 22, 133), or of about 50 to 60 francs (pp. 72, 134). At p. 132 it is described as running 160 to the picul, i.e., as being of 10 taels. It is clearly therefore the silver ingot already noted (ante, p. 14).

3. Livre. — The expressions *livre d’argent* (pp. 15, 60, etc.), *livre siamois* (p. 15), or simply *livre* (p. 133, etc.) mean usually a Siamese catty (p. 254), but sometimes a Chinese catty (p. 22). They are also, with the *livre cambodiéenne* (p. 113) and *livre indigène* (p. 61) found (p. 321) expressed in terms of the *muan* (mýng), a measure of capacity taken at 5 to the picul, i.e., at 10 catties or 20 catties, according as the Siamese or Chinese catty is mentioned. I gather that the *livre cambodiéenne* = the *livre siamois*, and that the *livre indigène* = the Chinese catty. By *livre asiatique* the writer means the representative of the Chinese catty (p. 22), weighing in Indo-China about 600 grammes.

4. Once. — By this is meant the Chinese tael, 16 to the catty or livre (p. 22). *Once indigène* (p. 51) is, I gather, the *tám-lăng* or Siamese tael (see ante, pp. 1 and 6, n. 45).

Vernacular Terms.

1. Bat. — This is only once used (p. 133), and then as a weight of gold: — "un impôt de 2 ou 3 bat d’or par village (le bat doit peser 9 grammes 177 milligrammes)." Cf. ante, pp. 1, n. 2, 2 and 6. But it turns up in a most interesting form in the course of a "Sphérimen de conte des Khmères de Korat..." qui selon toute probabilité appartient aussi aux Siamois."

It is there called (p. 285) *pad*: — "deux pad (c’est-à-dire deux ticas)." And a line or two further on we have "deux pad d’argent."

2. Cattie. — The term *cattie* or *cattie d’argent* is not mentioned until well on in the book, when it is frequently used (pp. 161, 190, 203, 228, etc.). By it or its equivalents is meant, sometimes the Chinese catty, 100 to the picul, and sometimes the Siamese, 50 to the picul (p. 223, etc.).

3. Chang. — This is only once used, and then clearly for the Siamese *châng* or catty (p. 264), but we have a curious multiple of it (p. 133) in the phrases "cinque livres *anching* d’or," and "l’impôt est de trois *anching* d’or"; au in the word anching being clearly the Shâ dialectic term *hh*, ã, ãm, ãn, = 5.

4. Chi. — This word occurs as a pure weight (p. 258, and p. 112: — "un garçon pesait à la balance 4 chi de cuivre"), and sometimes as currency (p. 136, and p. 133: — "ces inscrits laoïens furent chacun un chi et quatre hun d’or, soit 5 grammes 25 centigrammes de capitalisation annuelle"). At p. 27 it is described as "monnaie fictive," and we are there given a useful act of analogues, as it equals "1 ling sixmois, 1 ligue de cyclops amazites et 3 lingots de fer de Kompong Soui."

5. Damling or damlung. — This word is spelt at times either way, and is the Siamese *tâm-lăng*, or tael of 4 tickals (pp. 75, 212, 323, etc.). It is purely a weight, for on p. 264 we find the people paying as dues *damling* d’or and *damling* d’argent.

6. Han. — This only occurs on p. 133, where we are given: — "un chi et quatre hun d’or (soit 5 grammes 25 centigrammes)," and "sept hun (soit 2 grammes 625 milligrammes) d’or." This makes the *han* = 755 grammes. Cf. ante, pp. 3, n. 21, 5.

7. Lat. — This is defined (p. 60) as the chief small money (*monnaie divisionnaire*) of the Eastern Shâns, and as consisting of small lumps of copper (*de petits saumons [piske] de cuivre*) of various sizes and values, and is constantly mentioned as currency (pp. 51, 112, 197, etc.). There is no doubt as to variation in value, as one finds it running 16, 24, 32, 43, and 64 to the tickal (pp. 60, 89, 110 f., 189, 221, 244, 250, 264).

8. Slung or slug. — This is spelt either way and is frequently used. It is the *sâm-lăng* or quarter tickal (pp. 60, 228, etc.).
9. Thép. — This is a most interesting form and in the sense used by M. Aymonier new to me. It occurs on three pages. Page 309: — "Ils ont pour monnaies les ticaux siamois et les thép (sic) ou pièces anglaises de la Birmanie." Page 321: — "Les monnaies unifiées à Dacca sont les ticaux et les théps (sic) de Birmanie." Page 329: — "Dans ce pays de transit, les monnaies sont les ticaux de Siam, les thép (sic) ou pièces d’argent de la Birmanie anglaise à l’effigie de la reine Victoria, de la valeur de trois sïng, d’un sïng et d’un fêuong (fêuong)..." Clearly then thép means the current British money of Burma. It is a Shan numeral coefficient for money (ante, p. 9, n. 71).

10. Tical, pl. ticaux. — This has now evidently become a French word, as rupee has become an English one. It is the unit used throughout the book, and to it all the currency is referred (p. 18). By it is meant the Siamese money known universally by that name (le tical est une monnaie siamoise d’argent, p. 18).

Besides the statements thus collected, there are several others directly giving the inter-relations of the terms for currency and weights, especially at pp. 18, 22, 27, 60, 75, 132, 172, 197, 225, 249, 265, 272 and 329; and from the whole we can fairly make out the following tables for 1882-3, in complete confirmation of what has already been written in this Section.

Aymonier’s Siamese-Shan Weights.

A. — Siam-Cambodian Scale.

4 sling or chi are 1 tical
4 tical = 1 damling
20 damling = 1 cattie
50 cattie = 1 pikul

B. — Chinese Decimal Scale.

(16 tael are 1 cattie)
20 cattie = 1 moum
5 moum = 1 pikul

Also
(10 tael are 1 barre)
160 barre = 1 pikul

C. — Relative French and Shan Weights.

1 cattie is 600 grammes
1 pikul = 60 kilogrammes

At p. 329 M. Aymonier mentions that besides the British money, the théps already noted, there are current in the country he traversed "les att et les fâ ou sous siamois." The fâ is obviously the "phailung" or pê of the Siamese, and as to att, it has been above noted (ante, p. 6, n. 44) that Bock, *Temples and Elephants*, p. 141, gives it as the equivalent of the pê. But I find in the *Report* of Mr. T. H. Lyle on the *Trade of Mung Nang* for 1896 that the scale runs thus:—

2 lât are 1 ât
2 ât = 1 pê
2 pê = songpê

The *Report* in question is so much to the point as regards the present enquiry that I give it here in full:—

"The country is undoubtedly under the disadvantages which the lack of a medium of exchange entails. Money is scarce, more especially small change, and so accustomed are the inhabitants of this district to the usage of money that of the four denominations of Siamese..."


\[\text{Rangoon Gazette, 27th Sept. 1897, p. 18f.} \]
copper coin, namely, the 1/2 (half att), the att, the pai (two atts) and the songpai (four atts),
the first two only are current, the pai and songpai being refused in the native market with
cautious suspicion. The coins current in Nan are the rupee, with its factors the four and
two-anna silver pieces, and Siamese copper coins, the att and half att or lot.

For the four-anna and two-anna pieces the absence of small change has produced a fictitious
value, which is somewhat confusing to a new-comer. The rupee is recognized in Siam as
equivalent to 48 atts or decimal 75 of a tical. Under these circumstances the two-anna piece
equals six atts and the four-anna piece equals 12 atts. In Nan, however, whilst the rupee is still
recognized as equivalent to 48 atts the two-anna and four-anna piece are given a value of 7 and
14 atts respectively. Consequently, whereas in Chiangmai there are eight two-anna pieces
to the rupee, in Nan one can only obtain seven two-anna pieces, or three-and-a-half four-anna
pieces for the same coin. There is thus a loss in purchasing value of 12½ per cent. on every
rupee expended in the native market, though on the other hand any one importing and making
sole use of small coin would be the gainer to a similar extent.

This system holds good also in Phre. It appears to have arisen from the former scarcity
or absence of small change combined with the easily satisfied needs of the people, which enable
them to buy and sell their necessities in diminutive quantities.

One or two proclamations have been issued requiring the people to give eight two-anna
pieces to the rupee, and to regard the two-anna piece as of six atts value; but in spite of
penalties held out to the disobedient, the old order prevails, and any attempt to insist upon the
normal rate is met with the unanswerable argument ‘it is not the custom.’

The above Report makes clear an otherwise inexplicable statement as to British coinage
made to me by a peasant settled at Lénya to the Mergui District, who stated that he came
from Bankok, and was what the Burmese call a Yödiya (Ayuthia) Shan, i.e., a Siamese.
This man's table of British money in his own language was given thus: --

**A Siamese Version of British Coinage.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Siamese Terminology</th>
<th>Sense</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 anna</td>
<td>1 sambya†</td>
<td>3 pice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 annas</td>
<td>2 füang</td>
<td>a füang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3 kaubyä</td>
<td>9 pice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4 saling</td>
<td>a saling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5 salüngsambyä</td>
<td>a saling and 3 pice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6 salüngfüang</td>
<td>a saling and a füang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7 salüngkaubyä</td>
<td>a saling and 9 pice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8 söngsalüng</td>
<td>2 saling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9 söngsalüngsambyä</td>
<td>2 saling and 3 pice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10 söngsalüngfüang</td>
<td>2 saling and a füang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>11 söngsalüngkaubyä</td>
<td>2 saling and 9 pice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>12 salling</td>
<td>3 saling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>13 söngsalüngsambyä</td>
<td>3 saling and 3 pice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>14 söngsalüngfüang</td>
<td>3 saling and a füang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>15 söngsalüngkaubyä</td>
<td>3 saling and 9 pice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

†† Byä is properly a cowrie in Siamese; see ante, pp. 4, 6; but it is also used commonly as the Burmese numeral coefficient for copper money.
It is obvious that this man's knowledge of British coinage in Siamese territory must have been picked up in the places in which it is current, i.e., in the Siamese Shan States, where the tāt and āt are practically the only recognised native copper currency, and where the small British silver, sixpence, the two and four-anna pieces, would be known in terms of the tāt and āt. Now, if the āt run 48 to the rupee, 3 āt will make one anna, and no doubt that fact was in the man's mind, when describing the anna as being of three "byt" or "copper pieces," the term byt being borrowed from the surrounding Burmese idiom.

A correspondent of the Rangoon Gazette (22nd November 1897, p. 20) dating from rural Siam (apparently from a Shan Shan State, for he notes that rupees and British small silver are current together with Siamese money) gives the following account of a village computation of a simple sum in British currency:

"Arithmetic seems to be unknown. A man once had to add Rs. 234-14-0 to Rs. 165-2-0. He could not do it; neither could any of the 'clever' men in the village whose aid had been invoked. Finally a Baba — father Chinese, mother Siamese — turned up. He was asked and correctly did the addition. His method was interesting, and I give it. He placed two rupees on the ground to represent hundreds of the Rs. 234-14-0. Then another rupee to represent the single hundred in Rs. 165-2-0, making three rupees, representing three hundreds on the ground. He next placed nine eight-anna bits to represent the tens of the 34 and 65. Then came nine four-anna bits for the 4 and 5 of the units. He knew that 14 annas and two annas made a rupee. He therefore added a four-anna bit to the nine already placed on the ground. These he took away as representing one ten, and added an eight-anna bit to the nine already placed. This gave ten eight-anna bits representing 100 rupees. Sweeping these away, he added a rupee to the three originally referred to, and announced the result as Rs. 400 to an astonished and wonder-struck crowd. Needless to say that Check Te was from that day forward a man of some consequence in the village."

The method of addition above quoted evidently struck the writer as something strange, but the explanation is simple enough. The "Baba" had clearly been taught the use of the Chinese abacus (juwpan), and, being without the instrument, improvised one out of the British coins available on the spot.

The above problem, as worked out on the system of the Chinese abacus, can be stated as follows, in order to show to a person trained to European mathematics the process of reasoning followed by the "Baba":

Let \( a = 100 \); \( b = 10 \); \( c = 1 \); \( 16d = e \).

Add \( 2a, 3b, 4c, 14d \) to \( a, 6b, 5c, 2d \); and state the result in figures.

Then \( 2a + a = 3a; 3b + 6b = 9b; 4c + 5c = 9c; 2d + 14d = 16d = e \).

Then \( 9c + c = 10c = b; 9b + b = 10b = a; 3a + a = 4a = 400. Q.E.D. \)

A Burman (or for that matter, a modern Tibetan, an ancient inhabitant of India, or a modern Indian astrologer) would have tackled the problem thus, writing on sand, or on a sanded board, beginning with the large figures, and rubbing out and substituting as he proceeded, precisely as did the "Baba."

Problem: add Rs. 234-14 to Rs. 165-2.
Write....... 234
165

12 See present writer's article on Burmese Arithmetic, ante, Vol. XX, p. 33 ff.
\[2 + 1 = 3, \text{ therefore write } \ldots \ldots \ldots 334\]
\[3 + 6 = 9, \text{ therefore write } \ldots \ldots \ldots 394\]
\[4 + 5 = 9, \text{ therefore write } \ldots \ldots \ldots 399\]
Now because \[2 + 14 = 16 = \text{ Re. 1}, \text{ add 399 and 1.}\]
\[\text{Write} \ldots \ldots \ldots 399\]
\[9 + 1 = 10, \text{ therefore write 390}\]
\[9 + 1 = 10, \text{ therefore write 300}\]
\[3 + 1 = 4, \text{ therefore write 400. Ans. Rs. 400.}\]

I may mention here\(^{13}\) that this process is really natural mental arithmetic, and is that followed by bank clerks all over Europe, when running up accounts in books. It can with practice be gone through with extreme rapidity and accuracy. In ancient India the written process made a nearer approach to the mental than is possible with the modern system of denoting numerals, because the ancient people did not express value by position, but by signs, and so wrote as they spoke and thought, and as all Europeans still speak and think.

The same writer goes on to say, \textit{Rangoon Gazette, loc. cit.}, that:

\textbf{The Siamese do not write Rs. A. F. as we do.} The best explanation I can give of their method is by diagram —

\[\begin{array}{c}
\text{B} \\
\text{A} \\
\text{E} \\
\text{F} \\
\text{H} \\
\text{G} \\
\text{C} \\
\end{array}\]

From \textit{A} to \textit{E} * tam loongs* are placed. One tam loong = 4 rupees. At \textit{B} * changs* are placed. One chang = 20 rupees. From \textit{F} to \textit{C} rupees. At \textit{G} four-anna pieces. At \textit{D} pice. And at \textit{H} two-anna pieces. Thus:

\[\begin{array}{c}
\text{3} \\
\text{2} \\
\text{15} \\
\text{4} \\
\text{1} \\
\end{array}\]

would read: \textit{3 tam loongs, 7 changs, 15 rupees, 6 annas (4 and 2), and 3 pice, or Rs. 167-6-3.}"

These statements do not, however, work out as the writer makes them, for two reasons. Assuming that the tickal and its parts have already been superseded by the rupee and its parts, — a fact of great importance to the present enquiry —, the "tam loong" = the Siamese tael = 4 rupees, as stated, but the chang = the Siamese catty = 20 taels = therefore, 80, not 20, rupees. Secondly, in the figured diagram the parts of the rupee are wrongly stated for the total required, and for the lower ciphers 2, 4, and 3 we should read 1, 1, and 1, and for "3 pice," we should read "3 pice." \textit{E. g.,} the total according to the diagram works out to

\(^{13}\) See ante, Vol. XX. p. 55.
Rs. 538-4-914 and not to Rs. 167-6-3, as stated. The proper diagram for Rs. 167-6-3 is as follows:

```
2
|
1 1
  3
```

Now, eliminating the errors from the statement, we can perceive that it provides an exceedingly valuable form of improvised abacus for computing money. Thus, taking the rupee as the unit, we get

\[ a = \text{chang, catty} = 20b ; \]
\[ b = \text{tamlung, tael} = 4c ; \]
\[ c = \text{rupee} = 1. \]
\[ d = 4f ; \]
\[ e = 2e ; \]
\[ f = 8f ; \]
\[ g = 1 \text{ piec.} \]

Then the abacus diagram, as made out by the Siamese, runs thus, for a sum of Rs. 167-6-3:

```
a
|
|
|
```

And it would read thus:

\[ 2a = 40b = 160c = \text{Rs. 160} \]
\[ b = 4c = 4 \]
\[ 3c = 3 = 3 \]
\[ d = 1/4c = 4 \]
\[ e = 1/8c = 2 \]
\[ f = 1/8c = 3 \]

\[ \text{Rs. 167-6-3} \]

(To be continued.)

\[ \text{Thus,} \]
\[ 7 \text{ catties} ... \text{Rs. 569} \]
\[ 3 \text{ taels} ... 12 \]
\[ 15 \text{ rupees} ... 15 \]
\[ 4 \text{ four-annas} ... 1 \]
\[ \text{568} \]
\[ 2 \text{ two-annas} ... 4 \]
\[ 3 \text{ pice} ... 9 \]
\[ \text{568-4-9} \]
NOTES ON THE SPIRIT BASIS OF BELIEF AND CUSTOM.

BY SIR J. M. CAMPBELL, K.C.I.E., I.C.S.

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

I. The Features, Character, and Mode of Living of Spirits.

In Western India, most spirits are believed to have their legs turned back or crooked, their hair loose, and in some cases on end. Many are lean and ugly, and many are supposed to be green or, like English fairies, to wear green. Some are white, like Munjia, the spirit of a Brâhman lad, and a few are black, like Kâfri, the spirit of a murdered negro. Vêtâl, the chief of spirits, is green, and rides a green horse. The Konsâk female spirit Kîvâlî wears a yellow robe and bodice, and lets her hair fall loose. The water-spirit Gîra has his legs turned back, and the hair of his head is on end. In Bengal, Churâl, the spirit of a woman who has died in child-bed, is fair in front and black behind; and her feet are turned back. The Pâris have spirits whose features are half like a man's half reversed. According to Henderson, the English spirit Brownie was half spirit half man. English, mermaids, or water-spirits, were women above the waist, and below the waist fish with fins and a spreading tail.

The general character of spirits is supposed to be evil; bhîts are spirits who are almost always bent on mischief. Satara (Western India) Mârs say that all who die accidental or sudden deaths with unfurnished wishes come back and plague men and cattle. Still, all spirits are not mischievous, and some of them, like Vêtâl, Brahmâpurrush, and Chêdâ, if pleased or propitiated, are believed to be of great help to their worshippers. Vêtâl is said to shew his devotees hidden treasure, and to supply their wants.

The belief in the complete or in the partial good-will of spirits is widespread. Up to the eighteenth century the belief in a kindly helpful spirit called Brownie was common in the British Islands. About 1600, James I., in his Demonology, describes Brownie as a rough man who haunted houses without doing evil. Some, he adds, were so blinded as to think Brownie made their house all the sooner, that is, faster or more prosperous. In 1690, the traveller Martin says, in the Shetland isles every family of consequence has its Brownie. Milk and water are poured to Brownie through a holed stone. Brownie used to be seen as a tall man. Since 1640 sights of him had become rare.

In his Journey to the Western Islands, Dr. Johnson (A. D. 1773)

23 Of the character and features of German spirits Grimm says:—They have in them some admixture of the superhuman, which approximates them to gods; they have power to hurt man and to help him, at the same time they stand in awe of man, being no match for him in bodily strength. Their figure is much below the stature of man, or else mis-shapes. They almost all have the faculty of making themselves invisible. The females are of a broader and nobler cast, with attributes resembling those of goddesses and wise women; the male spirits are more distinctly marked off from gods and heroes (German Mythology, Vol. II. p. 420). English fairies are said (Kirk in Napier's Folk-Lore, p. 29; Dalzell's Darker Superstitions of Scotland, p. 330) to be astral spirits between angels and humards. In looks and ways they are like tiny men and women. They are merry, and dance decked in green. They marry, have children, and die; they can be visible or invisible at pleasure; they live in the ground and unseen; they constantly wait on men; they are fond of human children, and carry them away, and sometimes women. They milk cattle, and shoot people with flint-headed arrows, of which at the same time fairies themselves stand in awe. According to Sir Walter Scott (Demonology and Witchcraft, pp. 159, 452; Border Minstrelsy, p. 461), English Woodland spirits are kindly but mischievous; Scotch Moorland spirits are fierce; and Highland spirits are peevish and vicious. As to their appearance Reginald Scott (1556), Discovery of Witchcraft, p. 426, complains that some sixteenth century English writers are so carnally minded that if a spirit is spoken of they think of a black man with cloven feet, horns, tail, claws, and eyes as broad as a basin. The Ceylon evil spirit is black-skinned, large-eyed, and long-nosed; some of them wear colours (Journal, Ceylon Asiatie Society, 1865, p. 155). They have the worst wishes to men, and can be forced or tempted to do what any one wishes who has a charm over them (op. cit. p. 8).

29 Quoted in Hynge's Year-Book, p. 1533. Compare Dalzell (Darker Superstitions of Scotland, p. 330). Brownie is a house-spirit who did much work. Food and milk were set apart for him. The Reformation chased him up. Brownie's Gaelic name was Gruagach (Notes and Quaries, Fourth Series, Vol. VIII. p. 289).
says of the spirit called Brownie:—"Brownie was a sturdy fairy, who, if he was fed and kindly treated, would, as they said, do a great deal of work. They now pay him no wages, and are content to labour for themselves."  

Heron in his journey through part of Scotland, 1799, Vol. II. p. 227, says:—"The Brownie was a very obliging spirit who used to come into houses by night, and, for a dish of cream, performed lustily any piece of work that might remain to be done. Sometimes he would work and sometimes eat till he burst; if old clothes were laid out for him he took them in great distress, and never more returned."  

Sir Walter Scott describes the Brownie as thin, shaggy and wild, hating rewards. Scott likens the Brownie to the Roman lar who was human, roughly clothed in dog's skin, and, like Milton's lubber fiend, lived near the fire. The Welsh farmer still puts out a bowl of milk for the fairies. Trolls or drollies were found in Scotland and in Shetland. Like the Brownie the Troll worked for man. They came to houses where feasts were held, especially at Yule or Christmas time. Shakespeare describes Puck or Sweet Puck as another name for Hobgoblin. For those who called him Sweet Puck, Hobgoblin worked and brought them luck. Puck describes himself as the merry wanderer of the night who jested to the fairy king and made him smile, in a gossipy bowl and bobbing against her lips, or as a three-legged stool slipping aside from those about to sit. Coleridge (1790) describes the Devonshire Pixies or Little Pucks, a friendly race too small to be seen, as before dawn in robes of rainbow hues, sipping the furious flowers, shedding soothing witcheries over their favourite poet, sighing with the lover and dancing on the fairy grass rings. The Phynnodderre, a spirit of the Isle of Man, was believed to help peasants in cutting and gathering grass. Ariel was a kindly spirit, glad to help man, especially the weak and ill-used. The Ban-`ae or Irish woman-fairy warned Irish families, and corresponding family spirits warned Scottish families, before the death of any of its members. Another English guardian or good genius was Billy Blind or Blind man's Buff.  

As a class, Indian spirits are considered unclean in their habits, and, as they never bathe, their bodies are said to have a peculiar smell. So the Marathi proverb runs:—\textit{Jethun shuchir-bhunt pandi ahe, jethun bhunt udhi.}—Where there is cleanliness there is no spirit. On the other hand some spirits are represented as specially clean and pious. Thus Vétál is very clean in his habits, and spends much of his time in the worship of the god Shiv. The Brahmapurush bathes daily, wears clean white clothes, performs \textit{sandhya} adoration, and observes all the religious duties of a pious and orthodox Brahmā. Similarly fairies are font of neatness and cleanliness of apparel, of strict diet, and of an upright life.  

Certain spirits were believed to have connection with men. Thus the \textit{apnaar} or fairy named Urvasi was believed to have come on earth and lived for some time with an Indian king named Pururava. The story runs that while king Pururava had gone hunting he heard a woman cry, and, looking back, saw a beautiful damsel being carried off by a demon. He turned, slew the demon, and released the damsel. Out of gratitude the damsel who was a fairy agreed to live with the king, with the condition that he should never come before her undressed. She lived with him happily for a year during which a son was born to...
wish?" Through her chosen medium the mother says: "Make an embossed golden likeness of me and fasten the plate round my child's neck." Or the mother says: "Make a tiny golden image of me and set my image in the ark along with the house-gods." If the mother asks that her image should be set in the ark the people say: "We must ask the house-gods. If the house-gods do not object we will set your image in the ark." The house-gods speak through certain men only. If a medium is present, he bathes, puts on a fresh loin cloth,loosens his top knot, and sits in front of the ark. He drops incense on a fire to the right, and prays to the gods: "God, come into my body and tell me one or two things." Presently he tosses his loose hair and trembles. The house-god has passed into him. The people come and say to the house-god: "The mother has come back." The mother (that is, the man into whom the mother has entered) says: "I will do you no harm. I will do you good. Put me in the ark." The people ask the house-god's medium: "Are you willing that we should set the mother's image close to you?" If the house-god is willing the medium pants: "Yes, seat her close to me," If the house-god is unwilling the medium says: "Put the mother outside." They say to the medium: "Can we trust the mother will not harm us?" The medium replies, quivering and panting: "The mother is good; she will do you no harm." The chief house-god has ended and retires. The medium bows until his brow strikes the ground. He raises himself. A fresh shivering seizes him. He is possessed by the second of the house-gods. "Who are you?" the women ask. "Bahri," pants the medium. Bahri agrees that the mother may have a seat in the ark and retires. The medium droops till his brow smites the ground. He pulls himself straight. A fresh air comes over him. He shivers as the third guardian passes into him. The third guardian approves the mother. And so it goes till all the powers are asked and have approved. The image of the mother is set in the ark. The women ask: "What should we give the mother to eat?" The wise men say: "The same as other guardians—a cock and a coconut once a year." The mother's worship is performed year after year, so long as her child lives. With her child's life the mother's immortality ends. Her image remains in the ark; no offerings are made to it. The Germans have the same belief as Hindus. A German mother comes back to nurse the child. A hollow in the bed shews where she has lain.44

(To be continued.)

MISCELLANEA.

SOME TECHNICAL TERMS AND NAMES IN PORT BLAIR.

The Penal Settlement of Port Blair being established for the whole of British India, every one of the many languages in that vast area is represented at the Settlement as the mother-tongue of some person or other. In such circumstances it was early found to be imperative that one chief language should be established as a lingua franca. The language that naturally suggested itself for this purpose was Urdu, the language of the Camp of the Muhammadan conquerors of India, better known by its name of Hindustani. Consequently every one in Port Blair has to acquire a practical knowledge of Urdu, be he Englishman or Burman, Tamil or Afghan, Lepcha or Gond, and one result of this necessity is that this language is current in every conceivable variety of corruption. It is spoken in many forms and with very many accents, and in addition to the curiosities of language thus created, there are many words of local growth, invented to suit local wants. On the whole, therefore, the Andaman form of the old Camp Language of India is philologically worth study, even as Pigeon English is, and with more reason, because, being perhaps the easiest of all languages to acquire fairly correctly, Urdu has never degenerated into such a jargon as Pigeon English.

I propose now to give a few Port Blair words to illustrate my meaning.

The following words I have heard even in the mouths of Burmans unable to make themselves understood in Urdu:

Bijan. — This means now a barrack for convicts as distinguished from a barrack for troops or police, though various corruptions of "barrack" are also used for that purpose. It is really English in origin, and represents the word "division," the corruption having taken place on vulgar Urdu.

lines. Thus, "di" has dropped out, b has become v and the sk sound of si has become j, quite according to custom. Originally the convicts were divided into "divisions," each of which slept in a barrack. Hence the present application of the term.

Tapu. — This means a convict "station." It is really good Urdu for an "island." Originally all the convict stations were situated on small islands in Port Blair harbour. Hence its present application to any convict station, inland or on an island.

Sikshah. — This means now either the "sick list," or the Female Jail. It is the English word "section." Originally the major division of the convicts was into sections, of which No. XVII was the convalescent gang, the sick and unable to do any or full work. The women were of course all in the Female Section. Hence the present double application of the word, kept in existence no doubt in the first case owing to the likeness of "sikshah" to the familiar "sikmdn" of the Native Army Hospitals.

Waipar. — The first Jail constructed in the Settlement was on Viper Island, so named after a gunboat in the last Century. It is now dwarfed by the great Cellular Jail on Atalanta Point, so named after another old man-of-war, which is the Jail par excellence, much to be avoided in the eyes of the convicts; the other is simply waipar. Other jails are being constructed at Minnie Bay (named after another by-gone gunboat), Paharganj, and Göplakabang (Andamanese word), of which the mightiest will be that of Minnie Bay, and it will be interesting to see what popular terms will be applied to them. By the way Göplakabang is already Göbang in common parlance and script, and the name is likely to have "no derivation" in days to come.

Dhobi, a washerman, and talash, search, are pure Urdu, but they are two of the first words picked by Burmans and non-Indians, and it is curious to hear them in the midst of an otherwise purely Burmese sentence.

Péti Asiar, for "petty officer," is unquestionably referred by Native speakers to the péti, belt, they all wear and not to the English word. I have heard them spoken of simply as pétiisedd, the men who wear belts, though in ordinary Anglo-Indian slang pétiisedd, translated into "boxwallah," is the hawkw who sells articles of female attire and familiar wares; and patthiddd exists for those familiar with the language for the belt-wearer, i.e., the messenger or peon.

Many of the existing place-names about Port Blair are English, and the corruptions thereof by the convicts and their Native guards are interesting, shewing that striving after a meaning which is so prolific of verbal corruptions all over the world. E.g. —

Mount Harriet becomes Mohan Rét.
Perseverance Point, "Paras Pét.
Shore Point, "Sowar Pét.
Navy Bay, "Nabbi Bég.
Phenix Bay, "Pinik Bég.
Barwell Ghat, "Bádi Ghát.

Harriet was the name of the wife of a former Superintendent. Perseverance and Phenix were the names of Royal Ships in the last Century. Shore Point is named after Sir John Shore (Lord Teignmouth), Governor-General. General Barwell was a former Chief-Commissioner. There is also a large village called Ánikhét, a conscious pun on the name of the daughter of a former Chief-Commissioner, who was named Annie Kate. The largest steam-launch in the harbour is named "The Belle," after Belle, the daughter of a former Chief-Commissioner, which has proved an unfortunate name, for the vessel is invariably called by the Natives "Belly Jaház."

The station of Elephant Point has been translated into Hathi Tapu. The stations of Navy Bay, Dundas Point, South Point, and Phenix Bay are all also frequently called indiscriminately Chhána Bhattá, because there is now, or has been at some former time, a lime-kin at these spots. Convicts never forget a place at which there has been a lime-kin: they hate the work so. So also there is a village called Chaüldari in the Southern District after a former convict "camp" at the spot; but the station of Middle Point, a long way off in the Northern District, is also commonly known to the convicts as Chaüldari for the same reason.

Sometimes the Natives' names for places are merely corruptions of the English words, without any effort at a meaning; e.g., Ubánt for Hoptown, where Lord Mayo was murdered, and Hárdo for Haddó. Port Blair itself is always Pót Bilár and Port Mount always Pótmotí.

R. C. TEMPLE.

KULA.

One of the first vernacular words that the stranger learns in Burma is kála (written kula), a foreigner. It has always a contemptuous sense, much like the word "barbarian," and is applied properly to a native of India; and hence to any Western foreigner, when it is not likely to be resented. It is traceable to Göja (Gáuda) and meant originally an Indian Buddhist immigrant from Bengal (Gáuda, Gaur, Pal Göja). See Yule, Hobson-Jobson, s. v.
Perhaps nothing would astonish the ordinary Burman more than to learn that the term could anywhere be applied to himself precisely as he applies it to others. But such is nevertheless the case, for it is invariably so used by the Eastern Shâns (Laos) about the Mêkong (Nam Khungh); teste M. Aymonier, Voyage dans le Laos, 1895. The journey of the "Mission Aymonier" about the Mêkong, especially its right or Western bank, as far West as Korât and as far North as Nampat, was undertaken in 1882-3, and the leader's references to the Burmans as Kâlas are so distinct that I will quote all there are in his first volume,—the only one so far issued.

Page 97. — "La population [de Bassak] est laotienne avec quelques rares Khmère, Chinois, Kula (ou Burman)."

Page 98. — "Nous rencontrons des Kola [à Phou Dên Mouung] nom les Laos donnent aux Burmans."

Page 197. — "Les habitants [d'Oubon] sont tous des Phou Thais qui cultivent des rizières, pêchent et élèvent des bestiaux qu'ils vendent aux Kola ou Burman pour les expoter à Bangkok."

Page 233. — "On y fait aussi [à Dhatou Penou] un commerce de buffles que les Kola ou Birmans viennent acheter dans la région pour les emmener à Bangkok."


Page 290. — "[Le Phya de Nongkhai] avait à ce moment de gros ennui avec des Kolas ou marchands Birmans qui sont détestés dans le pays . . . Le jour même le Chau et les mandarins firent signer leur expulsion aux Kolas qui furent attaqués la nuit suivante, à coups de fusils . . . Ils allèrent réclamer au consul anglais à Bangkok, d'où ordre au Chau de Nongkhai de rendre justice aux Kolas, ou bien de faire expédier les accusés à Bangkok."

Dr. Cushing, Shan Dictionary, p. 13, gives "kâla", a foreigner; kâlâlam, a black foreigner, used generally of a native of Hindustân because most known to the Shâns; kâla, a name applied to Karena on the mountains East of Toungoo; kâlaum, a Siamese or Laos, also an appellative given to all who are under Siamese rule; infrequently karsum."

So the opprobrious term appears to be of mutual application!

R. C. Temple.

NOTES AND QUERIES.

MUSLAM TITLES OF HINDUS.

There is nothing really Musalmân in these titles. Khâb, which means simply tribal chief, was the usual title of the heads of tribes in the North-West Panjâb. Within historic periods Afgânistân was ruled by Hindu or KhâMarket tribes, and many a tribe of Râjpûts, Jâts, and even Khârists still preserve the tradition of having emigrated into the Panjâb from the neighbourhood of Ghanzi. And of these several had ancestors who are said to have borne the title of Khâb.

In later times, too, titles borne by Muhammadans originally were adopted by others — e. g., the Bâdâkh, Shâkhzâdâ, and Sûr dar of the Sikhs. In modern times Hindus gladly accepted such titles as Khâb Bahâddor, etc., when conferred on them by the British Government. ¹

The tradition of the Mân Jâta is that they once ruled in Ghanzi, and that Râjâ Bhîmpâl was the last ruler of their race there. This came on an expedition to India, and settled at Bhârîndâ (Pâthâlî territory), driving out the Bhatti Râjpûts.

¹ [The British Government frequently bestows mixed Hindo and Musalmân titles on Native Chiefs, following in this the custom of the Native Governments. The Sikh

Another Mân Jâta of the same family held the title of Khâb, his name being Bhûndar. His son, Misâ, succeeded to the title. Another ancestor, now known as Mân Shâh, had the title Shâh conferred on him by the Delhi Emperors. His real name has been lost, and he is only remembered by his title of the Mân Shâh. His descendants are called Mânshâhs, and even now those who claim descent from Bhûndar Khâb would have no objection to the revival of the title of Khân in their favour.

Surdial Singh in P. N. and Q. 1883.

NICOSAR ISLANDS — LATTER-DAY FOLK-MEDICINE.

This is a prescription by a "doctor" of the village of Kenaka in Car Nicobar, given on 14th April, 1896:

"Mix Eno's Fruit Salt in water. Add to it a little powdered camphor and turpentine. Give twice a day for colic and stomach-ache. Add a little quinine to the above in fever cases."

R. C. Temple.

Port Blair.

Port Blair.

1 and 2. The British Government constantly did so. The custom no doubt arose in the time of the free-thinking earlier Maghal rulers of Delhi. — Enj.]
CURRENCY AND COINAGE AMONG THE BURMESE.

BY R. C. TEMPLE.

(Continued from p. 31.)

4.

Chinese Weights.

So much is said in the course of this Chapter regarding Chinese influence on the weight system of Further India, that it is necessary to consider here the Chinese weights themselves.

Prof. Ridgeway, Origin of Currency, p. 158, quoting apparently Silvestro, Excursions et Reconnaissances, 1883, No. 15, p. 308 ff., but in reality taking the whole information from Wade, Tsu Erh Chi, Vol. II. p. 213, which again is condensed from Bridgman’s Chinese Chrestomathy, a book I have not seen, gives the modern indigenous table of weights thus:—

10 lín are 1 fén
10 fén " 1 ch’ien
10 ch’ien " 1 liang
16 liang " 1 chin
100 chin " 1 tan or shih

For the above vernacular terms read as follows, and the universal Far-Eastern and Archipelagic modern commercial terminology for currency is reached, thus17:

li is cash
fén " candareen
ch’ien " mace
liang " tael
chin18 " catty19
tan (shih) " picul20

The modern scale then is practically almost entirely decimal, the 16 liang to the chin being introduced apparently to satisfy general Far-Eastern convenience commercially.21 However, when and how the modern scale came to be introduced I have no means by me of satisfactorily ascertaining, but such examination of ancient Chinese weights as I am able to make shows that it cannot have been introduced very long ago, for it certainly did not exist, according to Terrien de la Couperie, at any rate up to 621 A.D.

For, in his Catalogue of Chinese Coins, he covers the period of the VIIth Century B.C. to the VIIth Century A.D. and at pp. xliii. ff. has an elaborate disquisition on weights, based chiefly on the ancient coins still in existence, because of the muddle which the native writers on the subject have made of their identifications. His pages are rather hard and difficult reading, but after an amount of trouble that might have been avoided had the presentation been clearer, I have been able to put together the following statements from pp. xliii and xliiv.:—

Ancient Chinese Weights.

A. — General Table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 chu</th>
<th>equals grs. 4:06</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 chu</td>
<td>are 1 hwa &quot; 24:37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 hwa</td>
<td>&quot; 1 che &quot; 48:75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16 Prof. Ridgeway is a little vagus in his transcriptions, e.g., we have ch’ien, p. 158 = ch’en, p. 150, and liang, p. 158 = liang, p. 150.
17 Also fén and ch’ien, Wade, Tsu Erh Chi, Vol. II. p. 213.
18 Heraliet’s Treatise, p. 27 n. See also Stevens, Guide, 1775, p. 91, who says that the “gross Weights differ, more or less about one per Cent” and that the “Dedgins,” i.e., scales, seldom agree.
19 Usually kian.
20 This seems for a long while to have been fixed at 1 lb.; see Stevens, Guide, p. 91.
21 Fixed at 1558 lbs. av. by Treaty of 1826; see Heraliet’s Treatise, p. 93. It was reckoned at that rate in the 1st Century; see Stevens, Guide, p. 91.
22 The modern tōng (tael), being about an oz., 16 liang or catty (chin, kia) = about a lb. av.
23 Terrien de la Couperie is not certain as to this word apparently, for on p. xliii. he has rendered the character for this weight as tao, and on p. xliiv. as lōa.
2 che are 1 liang equals grs. 97.5
1 liang " 1 kin " 195
4 kin " 1 yuen " 780
5 yuen " 1 liueh " 3,900
2 liueh " 1 hwan " 7,800

B. — Special Ancient Coins.
1 fun equals grs. 96
9 fun are 1 yuen " 780

C. — Literary Weights.
20 liang are 1 literary kin $ equals grs. 1,950
2 kin " 1 liueh " 3,900
2 liueh " 1 hwan " 7,800

D. — Larger Weights.
30 kin $ are 1 kuin equals grs. 58,500
4 kuin " 1 shih $ equals grs. 224,000

E. — Ancient and Modern compared.
1 modern chu is 1 ancient hwa, or 6 ancient chu, equals grs. 24.17
1 modern liang is 6 ancient liang $ equals grs. 579.84

These ancient Chinese tables are of the first importance to the present discussion, because of the following comparison that can be made:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Burmese Decimal Scale of Mū</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 ywè are 1 pè</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 pè &quot; 1 mū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2½ &amp; 2) 2 mū &quot; 1 māt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 māt &quot; 1 kyät</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ancient Chinese Scale.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 chu are 1 hwa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 hwa &quot; 1 che</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 che &quot; 1 liang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 liang &quot; 1 kin $</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Therefore 96 ywè = 1 kyät and 48 chu = 1 kin. Now the chu is four grains and equals the fen or candareen, i.e., the conventional seed of the Adenanthera pavonina, and the ywè is in this case, as we have seen ante, Vol. XXVI, p. 314, the seed of the Abrus precatorius, conventionally

20 Neumann, Translations from Chinese and Armenian, 1831, in The History of the Chinese Pirates, has under date 1809, p. 41, and also p. 124, an odd note: — "A shih or stone contains 4 hwa: a hwa 30 kin or catty, the well-known Chinese weight: a catty is equal to 1½ lb. English." The shih could not, therefore, have possibly been a stone or 14lbs. He has, however, other odd notes: e. g., p. 22 (also p. 102): — "These (tessu fe) are large vessels, with windows from 200 to 300 tons: they are called by Europeans by the Chinese name, in the Canton dialect, junks: chauen is the Mandarin pronunciation." But how about Malay and Javanese jong and ajong?

22 Lockyer, Trade in India, p. 159 ff., gives a table, dated c. 1704, for converting Canton weights into Troy weights and vice versa. His tale is 10 oz. 4 dwt. 17/28 grs. = 581.25 grs. His mace is 2 dwt. 10½ grs. = 59.12 grs. But p. 159 he says: — "you cannot well be without such a Table, thoroughly examined, in your Closet. I met with several done by other Hands; but all disagreeing, I calculated this for the Use of the Factory. . . . . . The weights are here much heavier than at Amoy; where by the Medium of four different Tables 100 oz. Troy, amount to Tale 84, 4m., 8c., 9c., which at Canton is 82½, 5m., 7c., 6c." That is, the Canton weights were then about 2 per cent. larger than the Amoy weights, which would make the Amoy Tale of that period c. 570 grs. and the mace about 57 grs. Stevens, Guide, 1775, p. 105 ff., gives a table for converting "Canton Weight or Money into English Troy Weight" and vice versa. His tale is 1 oz. 4 dwt. 3½ grs. = 579.84 grs.; his mace 2 dwt. 9¼ grs. = 579.84 grs.; his candareen is 5.708 grs.; his cash (bases on p. 129) is 0.7084 grs. This is a calculation downwards on the basis that 100 taels, Canton weight, = 120 oz. 16 dwt. English Troy weight. Both Terries de la Cooperie's and Stevens' weights must be taken as conventional literary denominations, because in 1870 the tael varied in practice from 5a. 9d. to 6a. Ed. i.e., 14 per cent., in different ports in China: Herschel's Treatise, p. 37 n., quoting Fort. Papers, China, Nos. 7 and 12, 1870.
half the *Adenanthera paxurina* seed. Therefore, if the *yueh* is half the *chu* the ancient Chinese *kin* = the *kyat* or modern tickal. That the *kyat* or *bat* or tickal is the upper standard of modern Indo-Chinese bullion weights and the *yueh* the lower standard we have seen already abundantly in the preceding sections of this Chapter, and a reference to Terrien de la Couperie's work will shew that the *kin* was likewise an upper and the *chu* the lower standard of ancient Chinese bullion weights. Given these premises the inference is irresistible that the modern Burmese Decimal Scale of *Mii* is merely the survival of the ancient Chinese universal scale, and as (ante, p. 2) the modern Burmese decimal scale of *mii* is practically identical with the scale for the whole of Indo-China, it follows that the Indo-Chinese populations have preserved, apparently without material change, the bullion weight measures of the ancient Chinese.

The further inference then is that if the whole Further-Eastern System, from Burma through the Siamese States and Cambodia, is traceable to an Indian source on the basis of a common origin, the old Chinese scale is also so traceable; though here we should, I think, modify the proposition by stating that the Indian and old Chinese scales are therefore traceable to a common origin.26

All the evidence available to me points to the overlaying of the Chinese decimal scale upon an older scale such as Terrien de la Couperie has extracted from the ancient coins and to the supposition that the decimal scale has been introduced from some outside and independent source. Thus, in attempting to connect the terms of the old and new scales, one finds that nothing is so puzzling as the tracing of Chinese terms from author to author, no two Sinologists apparently using the same system of transcription.26a But if we abandon the transcriptions and make a comparison only of the Chinese characters for ancient and modern weights used by Wade and de la Couperie, we shall find that, if we are to accept Terrien de la Couperie's statements, apparently prepared with great care and fullness of examination of the details on which they are based, the terms used in ancient and modern times have entirely changed in significance: — Thus,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Character</th>
<th>Wade's Modern Equivalents</th>
<th>T. de la Couperie's Ancient Equivalents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>分 ...</td>
<td>fên 5-7984 grs.</td>
<td>fun 96 grs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>両 ...</td>
<td>liang 579-84</td>
<td>liang 97-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>斤 ...</td>
<td>chin 9277-44</td>
<td>kin 1950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>石 ...</td>
<td>shih 927744</td>
<td>shih 234000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Terrien de la Couperie himself tells us that the old *liang* and *chu* were about a sixth of the modern *liang* and *chu*, and this table makes the old catty (*chu*, *kin*) about a sixth of the modern one. It also makes the old picul (*shih*) about a fourth of the modern one. By the old *fun* must have been meant something quite different from the modern *fên*, which, as the conventional caddareen, must represent the old *chu* of 4°6 grs.

26 Colquhoun, *Across China*, 1831, Vol. I, p. 268, makes a disquieting statement as to this. All the evidence goes to show that whatever the catty or pound might be, the picul of China and all Indo-China and the Far East was the same, but Colquhoun says, describing the famine in Yünnan after the then recent war: — "The scarcity was fearful, the price being at times 25 taels per picul (fun) of Yünnan. The fun is equal to 175 Chinese lbs." If then he means by lbs. *kin* or catties, and his statement is correct, we have the disturbing fact of a double (picul) (ton) existing in Yünnan.

26a "No. 1 Compradore" of the Indo-China Co.'s S. S. *Kutsung* gave me *six* *cents* the list from cash to picul thus: — *sam*, *fên*, *chên*, *liang*, *kin* and *shih* as the terms used in the Cantonese dialect. All these terms, except *chên*, I have found in W. Williams' *Tonic Dict. of the Canton Dialect*, 1885, at pp. 274, 45, 231, 198, 441, respectively. W. Williams gives also for "cash" at p. 238, and fun for "picul" at p. 499. I have found also that all the *Guide Books* about Canton and Hongkong, some written by men with good local colloquial knowledge, differ in the representation of the characters for "money," etc.
Again, as regards the introduction of the Chinese decimal scale, it appears in full swing in the days of Marco Polo and the mediavel travellers, as recorded in two of Yule’s great works, Marco Polo and Cathay and the Way Thither, i.e., during the Mongol sway in the XIIIth and XIVth Centuries A.D. But the money then found was almost entirely of paper, in which tale and not measure or weight is the essential point in denominations. And it is to be noticed that Marco Polo and his successors sometimes speak of money in the terras employed for enumerating the Army. This makes one inclined to hazard the conjecture that the Mongols introduced the decimal division of the coinage, basing it on the ancient decimal division of the Army, which can be seen from the following terms:—

- onbashi (on, ten)
- yüzbashi centurion (yüz, hundred)
- mng-(mng)bashi chilarch (mng, mng, thousand)
- tümnān-ğhāssi chief of a legion (tümnān, ten thousand men)

Now the notes of Marco Polo’s time (Vol. I. p. 378 ff.) were those of Kublai Khan’s first issue (1260-1287 A.D.), whose denominations were stated in terms of

1. tens of cash (tsein)
2. hundreds of cash
3. thousands of cash (strings)

Marco Polo has many local notices of the use of paper money always introduced with the formula:—“The people are idlers, burn their dead, use paper money and are subjects of the Great Khan (Kublai);” Vol. II, pp. 183, 115, 116, 133, 140, 143, 175. But see also ante, Vol. XXVI, p. 291 f., in Chapter I. of this work, section on paper money.

With reference to Yule’s specimen of a note of the Ming Dynasty in his Marco Polo, Vol. I, p. 378, I bought some years ago a number of beautiful French plates relating to China from a Parisian dealer, evidently meant to illustrate some (folio?) book, though they have never been bound into one. No. 65 is superscribed, like the rest, “Descript. mon. de la Chine,” and is a plate of coins and currency. Some French hand has dated many of these plates “1755,” but among the curious illustrations of “Monnoyes anciennes nommées Pou et Tao, Monnoyes incertaines ou étrangères dont on ignore le temps, et qui ont en cour à la Chine, Monnoyes anciennes dans la suite des temps, des Peuples à attaché des idées médies de Superstitions, et Monnoyes d’argent du Tibet (i.e., Nepalese rupees)” we find “Monnoyes de différentes Dynasties,” which are illustrations of cash, commencing with the “Dynastie des Tchéou,” and ending up “De Chou tch’i fondateur de la Dyn. regnante, Da fou Empr. Cang hi, De Yong tchéng Empr. regnant.” This gives the true date, for it refers to the Ts’ing Dynasty and to the Nia Hao or titles of reings of Shum Che, 1644-42, K’ang Hi, 1662-1722, Yang Cheng, 1723-35; see Mayer, Chinese Reader’s Manual, p. 307 f. So perhaps the plates refer to what Terrien de la Couverie has called (Cat. Chinois, p. viii.) “the great work of P. E. Souvet, Observations Mathématiques, Astronomiques, Géographiques, et Physiques, tirées des Anciennes Livres Chinois, 3 vols., 1720-33,” which I have not seen. At any rate the work is that of a complete Chinese scholar, for, in addition to the other matters, there is an illustration of the very rare, 1,000 cash note of the Ming Dynasty of the identical issue of that given by Yule, character for character and seal for seal. Every character is transcribed and translated into French.

I have here used a for the sound of us in useful.

See ante, Marco Polo, Vol. I, pp. 225 f., 231. Also ante, Vol. XI, pp. 189 ff., 193 f., where an account of the military arrangements of Chinghiz Khan, under date c. 1295 A.D. is given, based on the authority of the Frangh’é-qo-pi-ži (1340 A.D.), and Vol. IX, p. 28, and of “Aba’rel-Ghâsi (1663 A.D.). Also Redhouse, Turkish Dict. a. v.: Shaw, Sketch of the Turkish Language, a. v. See also Aâr Abbar, Blockmann’s Ed. p. 229 ff., where the divisions (nominal) of Abbar’s Army (16th Cent.) bear a remarkable likeness to the denominations of Kublai’s note currency (13th Century) as recorded in Yule’s Marco Polo, Vol. I, p. 378 f.


28 By the way, all Yule’s valuations at p. 361 f. of the paper money in Marco Polo’s time are based on the assumption that a “string” = liang = tael = 80 d., but from what Terrier de la Couverie tells us as to the liang up to 620 A.D. being a sixth of the modern liang of c. 90 d., it would follow that the liang of 1260-1800 A.D. might be anything between 184 and 364. This consideration might reduce Yule’s enormous figures as to the value of Kublai’s note currency to more manageable amounts.
And in estimating the revenues of China, Marco Polo (Vol. II. p. 171 f.) expresses it in "tomas of gold," and Friar Odoric (Cathay, Vol. I. p. 123) in "tumans of balis."

One cannot, however, lay much stress on all this, as túmda with the travellers evidently meant the abstract number 10,000, for we find Wassaf (A. D. 1300) talking of "tómān of soldiers and tómān of rāya'gātā"; and Friar Odoric of "tumans of fire-places, every tuman being ten thousand." The Friar also tells us of a man, whose revenue was "XXX tumans of tagars (bags) of rice, and each tuman is ten thousand."

Such being the evidence available, I leave this question here, and pass on to a point of much interest and value in the present argument. Ridgeway, Origin of Currency, p. 152, following Wade, Ten Erh Chi, Vol. II. p. 213, points out that the modern Chinese metric system, like that of all the Further East, the Eastern Archipelago and India, is based on the natural seeds or grains of plants, and then proceeds to talk of "ten of a kind of seed called jên (the cardamom)." Here Rumphius (1741) comes to our aid, as will be seen from his terms quoted x'ns, Vol. XXVI. p. 316 f. He there tells us that the Abrus jucundus (i.e., proriorius) seeds are mixed up in weight standards with the Corallaria purpuroa (i.e., Adenanthera pavonina) seeds, and that the latter run ten to a mace (maas) in China, and ten mace to a "tayl." He also tells us that the cardareen (condorius or condorium, as he calls it) is the seed of the Adenanthera pavonina, and that the "Chinesis concordium" of the Southern parts of China is rounder, harder, more solid and heavier than the Malayan variety. There can be no doubt, therefore, that the "kind of seed called jên" is the Adenanthera seed, and if we are to accept the modern jên as representing the ancient ch'n, then it follows that the ancient and modern Chinese weight systems, despite differences in denominations, are alike based on the Adenanthera seed.

The mixing up of the Abrus and Adenanthera seeds has already been explained, ante, Vol. XXVI. p. 317 ff., and is to be seen in the following quotation from a Collection of Dutch Voyages, 1703, p. 199. The quotation also shows that the Chinese were then known to use the Adenanthera seed as a weight standard. "They (mixed metal Cash) were not then (1590) current in China itself, where the People pay nothing in Money, but with little bits of Silver, which they weigh against Conduris, or small red Beans, which have a black Spot on one side." 37

---

21 As a contribution to the study of Marco Polo's narrative I may here make the following remarks. Yule sagaciously infers that by "tomas of gold" Polo referred to "tomas of tiao (ten ounces) notes," and that the "tīn" note was the equivalent of an ounce of gold, as the ounce was understood at that time. But Polo estimates the tomda in sāyjī, and the sājī (Venetian) was one-sixth of an ounce (Venetian), Yule, Marco Polo, Vol. II. p. 273; Cathay, Vol. II. p. 307. The sājī was therefore equal to 1/42 of a D. and to 72 grs., while according to Tertius de la Cooperie up to 890 A. D. the tīnō (ounce) was equal to say one-sixth of the modern tīnō or Chinese ounce, and was in fact about 97 grs. May we not argue, therefore, that all Marco Polo was trying to convey by the expression sājī was an idea of the tīnō of his time, to which the sājī might then have been the nearest equivalent in European money that his hearers were likely to understand? Grant this and we can again cut all the calculations as to the real sense of Marco Polo's figures down to a sixth of the sums hitherto accepted as equivalents, and thus bring them within reasonable limits, and go a step further towards relieving him of the (?) undeserved sobriquet of Marco Milione.

22 So far as I can judge the balas was a tījī note (of ten ounces), but it is a very difficult word: see Yule, Marco Polo, Vol. II. p. 102; Cathay, Vol. I. pp. 115 f., 123, 240; Vol. II. pp. 259, 294, 481.

23 Marco Polo, Vol. II. p. 100; Cathay, Vol. I. pp. 123, 183, Johnson's Persian Dict., 1922, calls tāmsā a Persian word and says: "A myriad, 10,000. A sum of money equal to 10,000 Arabian silver drachmas, which are about one-thousand less than those of the Greeks; also a sum equal to 15 dollars and a half ($10,000 cash). Districts into which a kingdom is divided, each being supposed to furnish 10,000 fighting men when the city of Samarkand, for example, therefore, is put down for 7,000 tomda, it implies that she holds 70,000 men ready to bear arms on the requisition of her sovereign. A large division of a tribe." This description seems to fairly cover the general usage of the word. It is called tōmān and tōmdān in Stevens, Guide, pp. 134, 139.

24 Rumphius' vernacular Chinese synonyms are tsiu-fajō, tsjofajjī, sōngri, tshomjī, tshongjī, which I suppose represent characters for some such word as changjī or changjī.

25 This may account for the jên being reckoned at about 5 grs., while the Adenanthera seed is reckoned at about 4 grs.

26 This, of course, is wrong. At p. 221, op. cit., the Conduris is correctly described, and it is noted that it is called Sājī in Java.
Turning now to the countries south of China proper, and confining the research to the modern money and weights, we find from Ridgeway, pp. 158 ff., who has followed Mag. Taberdier, 1838, Mag. Palleux, 1854, M. Moura, 1883, and M. Aymonier, 1885, the following illuminating tables as regards Chinese influence on modern Cambodian ideas of currency:

Cambodian Denominations.

1. Bullion.
   60 dong (sapec, cash) are 1 tien (mace)
   10 tien = 1 string (tael)
   10 strings = 1 nén (bar of bullion)

2. Account.
   10 ll (cash) are 1 hun (candareen)
   10 hun = 1 chi (mace)
   10 chi = 1 denh (tael)
   10 denh = 1 nén (ting) 38

3. Weight Avoirdupois.
   10 hun (candareen) are 1 chi (mace)
   10 chi = 1 tomlong (tamlung, tael)
   16 tomlong = 1 blue 14 (catty)
   100Neal = 1 hap (pical, tan, shih)

---

38 The text gives 500 sapecs to the tael, a fact which appears to be accounted for later on in the text under the quotations as to Tongking money in the last century. Cf. Aymonier, Voyage dans le Laos, Vol. I, pp. 23, 27. Yule's ingenious suggestion for the word sapec (Hobson-Jobson, s. v.), sapec, sapec, sapuy, caypy, is that it is Malay sa + p'ku, a string of p'ku (p'jes) or cash. Cf. Stevens, Guide, note, Vol. XXXV. p. 385, who writes the word sette and petty. Yule's conjecture is practically set at rest by the following valuable quotation from Mandelstam, Voyages and Travels into the East Indies, E. T., 1699, p. 117, under date 1692: "By them (the Chinese) likewise comes the money hithe (Java), which in the Malay language is called Cox, in Java, Pity, and is current, not only at Bantam, and all the Isle of Java, but through all the neighbouring Islands. 'Tis a little thin plate made of Lead, and the Skum of Brass, so brittle, that letting fall a string of Coxes, you shall break at least ten or twelve. They are made in the Town of Chiuchin in China, and they belong to Wanty (b for Wanly), King of China, for them, who lived about the year 1590, and finding that the Coxes made by his predecessor Huyien, King of China, went not off, by reason the Chinese had so filled the adjacent Islands with them, he contrived this brittle money, which his Successor Humendou put forth, as it is now corrupted. It hath a four-square hole through it, at which they string them on a Straw: a string of two hundred Coxes, called Sate, is worth about three farthings sterling, and five Sates tied together make a Sopecoon. The Java's, when this money came first amongst them, were so cheated with the Novelty, that they would give six bags of Pepper for ten Sopecoons, thirteen whereof amount to but a Crown. But they have had leisure enough to see their error; for in a short time, the Island was so filled with this stuff, that they were compelled absolutely to prohibit all trading, which so disarmed this money, that at present two Sacks of Pepper will scarce come for one hundred thousand Coxes."

We seem here to have both the rise of the sapec and its depreciation fully accounted for. Huyien, Wanty, and Hamendou, "Kings of China," are, I fancy, the Ming Emperors, whose Nien Hao, or Reign Titles, are Lung K'ing, 1567-73, Wai Li, 1573-1600, and Tai Ch'ang, 1620-1. See Mayers, Chinese Reader's Manual, p. 378. But in Mandelstam's day, during the disruption caused by the fall of the Ming and the rise of the Te'ing Dynasty (1628-44), there must have been some confusion as to who was "King of China." Wan Li's long reign would, of course, make his name well remembered.

Since recording the above information, I have found the same story in different, and perhaps more interesting, detail in a Collection of Dutch Voyages, 1703, inserted (but ? interpolated) during an account of the First Voyage, 1595-7, p. 150 ff. Sate there becomes sata (and at p. 197, but sata at p. 137) and sopecoon becomes sapecoon (? by a misprint), but pity has its correct form pity. I am also able to finally confirm Yule's derivation from Moor's Notices of the Indian Archipelago, 1837, p. 94, in an article entitled "Short Account of the Island of Bali" from the Singapore Chronicle, June, 1830:

"The money current on Bali consists solely of Chinese pice with a hole in the centre, which have been introduced into Bali from time immemorial. They value them at half a cent and 600 of them may be obtained for a silver dollar. They, however, put them up in hundreds and thousands: 200 are called satah, and are equal to one rupee copper, and 1,000 are called sapecs, valued at five rupees."

In Vol. II. of Balfour's Java, p. 641., are described ancient Javan coins and Plate 87 gives several dated by natives from 881 to 1688 A. D. These are all evidently piteh, and in view of the information now given are worth examining. They form part only of a large collection made.

38 The Chinese denominations for ten taels.

Also 105 and 112Neal = 1 pical; and according to Crawfurd (Stata, p. 616), 112, 140 and 150 cattles go to the pical of various commodities.
For Laos, i. e., the Shan Country under Cambodian and Chinese political influence, we see Chinese fiduciary influence clearly in the following tables for "Laos" generally: —

10 hun (candareen) are 1 chi (mace)
10 chi        " 1 Bát (tickal)
4 bát        " 1 damling (tamłąng, tael)
10 damling   " 1 chang (catty)
100 chang    " 1 hàp (piciul)

And in the following statement regarding "the South-West of the Country (Laos), Bassak, and Attopoou": —

10 strings of cash (mace) are 1 denh (tael)
10 denh        " 1 nén (bar of bullion)

For Annam we have a most interesting table of weights in terms of the tael, there called luông and in translations a "nail" of bullion, while the nén, i. e., the bar of bullion, weighing ten taels, nails, or luông, becomes in translations a "loaf" of bullion.

**Annamese Table.**

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{1}{4} \text{ luông} & \quad \text{equals} \quad \frac{1}{4} \text{ tael (i. e., a tickal)} \\
\frac{1}{2} \text{ } & \quad \frac{1}{4} \text{ tael (liang)} \\
1 \text{ } & \quad 1 \text{ } \\
\frac{1}{4} \text{ nén} & \quad 5 \\
1 \text{ } & \quad 10 \text{ } (\text{ting})
\end{align*}
\]

For Tongking in the last Century, there are the statements of Stevens, *Guide*, 1775, p. 129: — "Touquin Weights. These are by the Chinese Dotchin (scale). . . . . Copper Cash are the only Coins here: 500 great, and 1000 small, Cash, are accounted one [Marados]. The Price of Silver is always variable here, on Account of its rising and falling according to the Quantity brought in. By this the Chinese make considerable Advantage. In the Year 1739 they allowed 23 1/4 Marados for 1 Bar or 10 Tale Silver, and in 1748, but 21 Marados. All the Mexico and Pillar Dollars are run into Bar Silver without any Distinction. These Bars should weigh ten Tale each . . . . Accounts are kept here in Tales, Mace and Candareens: all which are regulated by the Price of the Marados and Copper Cash."

For Cochín-China generally Crawford, *Siam*, p. 516 ff., gives us information based on an Edict of 1818 A. D., which confirms that herein gathered as to the Further East. He tells us that all the silver coin (aspes), as well as the gold and silver ingots are struck at Cuchao, the Capital of Touquin, and from his other statements can be put together the following tables, curiously combining the vernacular and general commercial terminology already ascertained: —

**Cochín-Chinese Denominations.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ballion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(\frac{1}{4}) ingot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\frac{3}{4}) &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 &quot; (luông, dinh)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 large ingot (nén, bar)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

42 By "string" in books is apparently intended sometimes a string of 100 cash (mace), and sometimes a string of 1,000 cash (tael).

44 This marado is clearly meant for the weight in bullion of the dollar, or about two tickals, or half a tael.

Now Stevens, *Guide*, 1775, p. 89, tells us that at Madras the "Goa Pardo" and the "new Mexico Dollar" were each of the same value and that the "new Pillar Dollar" was of but very little more, and so we may fairly gather that the "marado" was some local form of the Portuguese silver parado; vide Tule, Hoben-Johnson, Suppl., s. v.

44 Spanish, see Claines, *Colonial Currency*, p. 321 f.

44 I. e., as nearly as local metallurgy would permit.
Account.

60 sapeks (cash) are 1 mas (mace)
10 mas " 1 kwan or quot (tael of account)
2 kwan 8 mas " 1 ingot (tael of weight)

For the Archipelago there is a valuable contribution to medieval currency in Groeneveldt's "Notes on the Malay Archipelago and Malacca" in Indo-China, 2nd Series, Vol. I. p. 177 ff. Speaking of Java, the Ying-yai Sheng-lan (1416 A.D.) is quoted as follows: — "In their trading transactions the Chinese copper cash of different Dynasties are current. . . . Their weights are as follows: a cati (kin) has twenty taels (liang), a tael sixteen ch'ien and a kobang four kobangs; a kobang is equal to 2-1875 fen, Chinese official weight, the ch'ien is 8-75 fen, their tael is 14 Chinese taels and their cati has 28 Chinese taels, all in official weight of China." Such is the text and there is a footnote (1875): — "We have not been able to ascertain the official weights and measures of the Dynasty during which the above article was written, but we have been told by a very reliable native scholar, that the present Dynasty has made no change in this respect. Taking, therefore, the Institutions of the present Dynasty (Ta-Ch'ing Hwui-tien) as our guide we arrive at about the following values:

A Javanese cati equals 1-12 kilogr.
A " tael " 0-056 "
A " ch'ien " 0-00035 "
A kobang " 0-000075 "

For cati, tael, and ch'ien the author gives the Chinese names."'

I do not understand why the author quoted has not translated ch'ien by mace, when he has translated kin by cati, and liang by tael, for it clearly was the mace. In the first place it was 1/3 of a tael, and a reference to the previous and succeeding sections of this Chapter will show that that was a mace in the Archipelago and Indo-China. In the next place it was equal to "4 kobangs," i.e., a mace, vide Stevens, Guide, 1775, p. 87: — "4 Copangs Acheen are 1 Mace (an imaginary Coin)," and Stevens further states, loc. cit., that the Japanese kobang (222 grs. gold and also silver) was also current among the Malays and was known to be a different thing from the Malay kupong: — "They (at Malacca) have no particular Coins of their own: some few Dutch Schillings and Stivers are to be seen: the Rest are Gold as Coopangs, stamped, is 10 Dutch Dollars or 8 Spanish." And p. 88: — "1 Japan Gold Coopang, stamped, is current for 50 Rix Dollars, unstamped is do. for 8 do."

This notice, however, plunges us into the Malayan currencies, but I will not pursue the subject further here, as it will be discussed in the next section of this Chapter, except to point out that the currency noted, though expressed in Chinese terms, is not of the decimal Chinese scale but belongs to the general Malayo-Indo-Chinese system; — the notice is in fact merely a Chinaman's way of stating the currency he found in those parts.

Faraway on the other borders of the Chinese Empire, I have come across a curious reference to its influence on currency and weights. In Shaw's Vocabulary of the Language of Eastern Asia...
Tehristan, J. A. S. B., Pt. I., Extra Number, 1878, p. 69 f., it is recorded that "tangah is a money of account used in Turkestan, consisting of 25 small copper 'cash' of Chinese make with square holes through them, called da-khán, each of which is worth two pul, imaginary coin. The value of the tangah varies constantly in the bazar, according to the number of tangahs that may be given for a kurr, a Chinese silver ingot weighing about 2 lbs., and worth about 170 Rupees. Sometimes the number reaches 1100 and sometimes falls as low as 800. The Khosan tangah consists of 50 copper shucked, which are slightly smaller than the Yarkand dakhán. Consequently a Khosan tangah is worth nearly twice as much as a Yarkand or Kashgar one." But at p. 59 we find "pul" a copper coin, the 50th part of a tangah, which 5 pence about; also money in general." This information is a little uncertain, but we have a clear reference of Turki to Chinese standards.

It is often difficult to determine the language or dialect that travellers across the Asiatic Continent are using, when detailing their monetary transactions en route, prices, and so on. Usually their attempts at describing the currency results in a jumble of terms, due, no doubt, to their interpreters' notions of making them understand it. Witness the following statement of Littledale, Journey Across Tibet in the Geographical Journal, 1896, Vol. VII. p. 456: — "Theoretically the Chinese monetary system is very convenient: 10 fen = 1 miscal, and 10 miscal = 1 seer; but unfortunately all payments are made in tangahs, sixteen of which go to a seer in Kashgar and only eight in Khotan, so confusion results." Here fen is Chinese: miscal is Arabic and now Asiatic Muhammadan: seer is Indian. Apparently what is intended is that 10 fen (candareen) = 1 ch'en (mace): 10 ch'en = 1 liang (tael), which would make the Turki sér to be a very different weight from the Indian sér.

Mr. Littledale, following the example of many another traveller, sometimes uses (pp. 456, 468) the terms of English money to express his statements of prices and sometimes those of Indian money (pp. 463, 473). But on p. 473 he says: — "I wrote, proposing to give to their temples fifty silver yamboos (1 yambo = £8 or £9) if they would allow us to pass through Lhassa and go to Sikkim." As regards the term yamboos we get an explanation from Dr. Sven Hedin's horrible Journey through the Takla-Makan Desert, Chinese Turkistan, in op. cit., 1896, Vol. VIII. p. 365: — "He brought back all my money (Chinese jambor and Kashgarian tengels)."

The yamboos or jambor would appear then to be an ingot of silver about half the value of a kurr, and the remarks of these travellers justify Shaw both as to facts and to the influence of Chinese currency in those parts.

5.

Malay Weights.

We have just seen (ante, p. 33) from a Chinese account of the XVth Century A. D., that the Malay ponderary table of that period can be stated as follows: —

4 kobangs = 1 mace
16 mace = 1 tael
20 tael = 1 catty

22 I. e., the tangah is the quarter mace.
21 Say c. 2 catties (kin) or 30 taels (liang).
23 Apparently there is a confusion here between the pul of account and the pul (shisa, shisa) a copper coin of Western origin.
24 The word appears to be Tibetan (= silver piece): Terrien de la Courperie, Catalogue of Chinese Coins, p. xx
This is identical with the Siamese, i.e., Continental Indo-Chinese, quaternary scale, thus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XVth Cent. Malay.</th>
<th>Siamese Quaternary.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 song'pè are 1 füang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 füang = 1 saling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 kobang are 1 mace</td>
<td>4 songpè = 1 saling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 saling = 1 tickal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 tickal = 1 tael</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 mace are 1 tael</td>
<td>16 saling = 1 tael</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 tael = 1 catty</td>
<td>20 tael = 1 catty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The kobang therefore represents 2 pè or half a füang.

The above table applies to Java, and that there was no difference in denominations in Acheen (Sumatra) up to c. 1833, or perhaps up to 1858, can be gathered from Thomas’ Ed. of Princeps’ Useful Tables, p. 115, which gives: “Tale of 16 mace or 64 copangas.” But his table goes on to say “Catty = 100 tales or 20 buncals (bängkal),” and he gives the weight of the catty at 2 lbs. 1 oz. 14¼ drs. av. or nearly double the Chinese catty of 1½ lbs. av., i. e., this modern Acheen catty is practically the Siamese catty. The calculation also greatly reduces the weight of the tael below that of the Chinese tael (c. 580 grs.) and makes it only 143.2 grs.

These statements lead to the consideration that among a people chiefly occupying a very large Archipelago a great variety in the actual weights of the standard denominations may be looked for.¹⁴

Such indeed is to be found among the Malay populations, making a study of their system somewhat puzzling and difficult. Thus, from the work just quoted, loc. cit., we can gather the following table of the weights of the tael at various points in the Malay Archipelago about 1833:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acheen</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>Sumatra</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>grs. 148.2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ambon</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>Moluccas</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>455.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banjarmasin</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>Borneo</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>614.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bantam</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>Java</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>1,055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bengkulu</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>Sumatra</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macassa</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>Celebes</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natal</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>Sumatra</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palimbang</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>Sumatra</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>949.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While for Cachao (Tongking) is given 590.7 grs. and for China 579.84 grs. (the usual standard).¹⁵ The catty is, in the Archipelago, no steadier, thus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acheen</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>Sumatra</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>lbs. 2 oz. 1 drs. 14¼</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Banda</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>Moluccas</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>6, 1, 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banjarmasin</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>Borneo</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>1, 5, 5½</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


¹⁵ There is more method in all this variety than would at first appear. The existing Singapore bängkal, or tael of weight is 582 grs. and equals, of set purpose, 2 standard dollars of 416 grs. each. Similarly all these tael weights except that of Acheen, which is the only indigenous one, and that of Natal, which follows the modern Chinese, refer to the standard dollars of c. 416 grs. in some fixed proportion; e. g., the Banjarmasin, Macassar, and Bengkulu weight equals 1½ dollar; the Ambon weight equals 1¼ dollar; the Bantam weight equals 2½ dollars; and the Palimbong weight equals 2½ dollars.
While for what may be termed the Continental Malay and other States we find the catty stated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Java</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>lbs.</th>
<th>1 oz.</th>
<th>2 drs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Malacca</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>2 oz.</td>
<td>0 drs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penang</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siam</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batavia</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bencoolen</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macassar</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natal</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5½</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is clear then that in order to arrive at any definite idea of the rise of the modern Malay bullion weight system, we must trust rather to the denominations themselves than to the actual weights they now represent in various places for various articles of commerce.

What the denominations were in Prinsep's time can be partly seen from the following table compiled on the information given loc. cit.:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>kobang</th>
<th>mace</th>
<th>tael</th>
<th>buncal</th>
<th>catty</th>
<th>pecul</th>
<th>bahar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acheen</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amboyna</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banda</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banjarmassin</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bantam</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bencoolen</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cachao (Tongking)</td>
<td>(100 cash)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macassar</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malacca</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>(20)</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palimbong</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penang</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siam</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As, in books, weights are sometimes stated in vernacular terms, sometimes in the international commercial terms, and sometimes in a mixture of both, it is necessary before proceeding further to give a comparative statement of the vernacular and commercial terms.\[56\]

---

56 This table must be read "kobang 4 × mace 16 × tael 5 × buncal 20 × catty 200 (× pecul 0) = 1 bahar; and so on.

57 In this case 20 buncals = 1 catty of 2 lbs. and over; i.e., the Siamese catty; so that 10 bengal would equal a Chinese catty.

It is possible that my rendering of Malay terms may give rise to criticism. All I have to say is that the authorities on the subject never agree, — old or new, — owing to the great variety of dialects and the absence apparently of any standard dialect. I have before me the Malay Vocabulary, 1810, Raffles, 1814, Crawford, 1852, Swettenham, 1851, Maxwell, 1852. Swettenham and the Malay Vocabulary give the vernacular, and even in that do not agree. The careful Crawford varies in orthography in the two halves of his Dictionary. Sir Frank Swettenham and Sir William Maxwell, the two contemporary authors, differ as often as not in the words required here to be accurately represented.


### Standard Terms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Malay Vernacular</th>
<th>International Commercial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pitis, pichis</td>
<td>cash(^{29})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sagä</td>
<td>ratty, rati, also candareen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kündarli, kündarli</td>
<td>candareen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kupong, kúpang</td>
<td>cobang,(^{26}) copang, kobang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mayam, mäs</td>
<td>mace, mas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>táhil, táil</td>
<td>tael, tale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bungkal</td>
<td>bunedal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>katf</td>
<td>catty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pikül</td>
<td>pecul, pecal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bahir, bhārā</td>
<td>bahar, bar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>koyan</td>
<td>coyan, quoyane, quoin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Having collected evidence from the XVth Century A. D., and in the XIXth Century between 1833 and 1858, and having arrived at an idea of the relation of commercial to vernacular terms, I may now proceed to the evidence available to me for the periods between these dates and up to the present time.

Yule, *Hobson-Jobson*, s. v., candareen, quotes *A. Nunes*, 1554, p. 39, to the following effect for Malacca:

- 5 cumdurns are 1 cupong
- 4 cupong = 1 maz
- 4 maz = 1 paual\(^{21}\)
- 4 paual = 1 tael
- 20 tael = 1 cate\(^{22}\)

Capt. T. Davis in *Purusha*, Vol. I, p. 123, 1599, is quoted by Yule, *Hobson-Jobson*, s. v., tael, to the following effect:

- 400 cashes are 1 cowpan
- 4 cowpans = 1 mas
- 4 masses = 1 perdaw\(^{23}\)
- 4 perdaws = 1 taypl

---

\(^{29}\) Clearly so from Stevens, *Guide*, p. 57. — "Their Money (Acheen) is in Mace and Cash: The Mace is a Gold-Coin, about the size of a Twopenny-Piece but thinner, weighing about nine Grains; the Cash is a small Piece of Lead, 2500 of which usually pass for a Mace, but that often varies, 7 or 800 in a Mace." Lockyer has (Trade, p. 43) 1400 and 1600 "Leaden Cash (i. e., pitis) per Mace" in 1711, and 1500 as "the Number allowed in Accounts." Alex. Hamilton, *East Indies*, Vol. II, p. 199, talks of "Leaden Money called Cash" at Acheen, 1200 to 1600 to the "Mace or Massie." Lastly Mandelslo, *Travels*, 1639, p. 117, has: — "By them (the Chinese) likewise comes the money hither (Java) which in the Malayan Language is called Cas and in Javan Fity."


\(^{21}\) Whatever this word may be etymologically it is the Siamese tickal here in practice, which by the way is recognized in Crawfurd's *Malay Dict.*, 1833, s. v. tickal, as "a silver coin or weight of Siam, weighing 22½ grs. English." But see later on in the text.

\(^{22}\) Oddly enough, s. v. mace, Yule gives quite a different rendering, using maces, cupongs and cup\(s\)o.

\(^{23}\) Perdaw: see Yule, *Hobson-Jobson*, Suppl. 1, s. v.
To a Collection of Voyages undertaken by the Dutch East India Company, 1708, there is an Appendix (p. 245 ff.) to the First Voyage, 1695-7, "Of the Weights, Measures and Coyne of the East Indies." From the statements in this Appendix can be worked out the following table:

**A. — Malayan Weights.**

22 Tayels⁴⁴ are 1 Cate⁴⁵
200 Cates " 1 Bahar⁴⁶

**B. — Chinese, i. e., Commercial Weights.**

10 Conduris (candareens) are 1 Mase
10 Mase⁴⁷ " 1 Tayel
16 Tayels " 1 Cate
100 Chinese Cates⁴⁸ " 1 Picol
3 Picols " 1 Bahar

Out of Lockyer's statements in *Trade in India*, 1711, p. 42, can be gathered the following as a table for Acheen:

**A.**

4 copong are 1 mace
16 mace " 1 tale

**B.**

5 tale are 1 buncalli
20 buncalls " 1 catty Mallay
200 catty Mallay " 1 bahar = 3 Pecull China

And for Malacca, p. 70:

16 mace are 1 buncalli
20 buncalls " 1 catty
do catties " 1 pecull (137½ lbs.)⁴⁹
3 peculls " 1 bahar

From Alexander Hamilton, Appx. to Vol. II. pp. 8 ff. of his *East Indies*, 1739, we can make out the following statements:

For Acheen weights:

20 tankaals make 1 catty

For Acheen coins:

1200-1600 cash make 1 mace
16 mace " 1 tayel

For Johore coins:

4 compang make 1 macie (guld)

For Java and Malacca, Avoirdupois weights:

40 pecull make 1 quoin (koyan)

---

⁴⁴ *L. i.,* for metals and fine goods: 29 taels per catty for coarse goods, and 14 taels at Malacca.
⁴⁵ See pp. 147, 157: corn, p. 190 (by a misprint).
⁴⁷ In Bentam, 8 mace to a tale.
⁴⁸ "And 66½ Malay catties?"
⁴⁹ Lockyer always takes the "common China Pecull" at 132 lbs.
From Stevens, *Guide*, 1775, we get a variety of statements, and for Aceh the following table can be made out from p. 370:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Conversion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 copang</td>
<td>1 mace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 mace</td>
<td>1 tael (of Aceh)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 tael</td>
<td>1 buncal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 buncal</td>
<td>1 catty (Chinese)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 catties</td>
<td>1 pical (135 lbs. av.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 pecul</td>
<td>1 balar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For Malacca we are given for avoirdupois weights, p. 127:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Conversion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16 tales</td>
<td>1 catty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 catties</td>
<td>1 pecul (135 lbs. av.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 pecul</td>
<td>1 balar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

And for gold weights:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Conversion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16 minnas</td>
<td>1 buncal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 buncals</td>
<td>1 catty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the *Burma-Malaya Vocabulary*, 1810, p. 129, we can extract the following tables:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Conversion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16 sagá</td>
<td>1 kündarl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 kündarl</td>
<td>1 máyam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 máyam</td>
<td>1 jampal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 jampal</td>
<td>1 bingkal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 bingkal</td>
<td>1 kati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 kati</td>
<td>1 pikul</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After stating in a footnote that "the bingkal and máyam differ in some degree from the words inserted as their synonyms," viz., tâel and má, it goes on to say:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Conversion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 más are 1 tâel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 tâel</td>
<td>1 catty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

17 Stevens is here as puzzling and delightful with his Anglo-Indians as ever. Thus we have "A Dutch Dollar is 3 Tangués or Scillinges. A Tangués is 6 Silver or 3 double Keys or Cash." The tangués is a form of our old friend the tanki, vide p. 127: "Goa Cents: 80 Lcesters (8 lester) Coas (ruis) are 1 Tangué, 5 Tangués are 1 Parle or Xeraphin." The "double Key" is a curious instance of "Hoeboen-Johson," though noted by Yule. It is the Dutch dubbel of 2 stuivers (silver) known to Oriental merchants as doubledy in various spellings; Stevens, *Guide*, p. 127: Lockyer, *Trade*, p. 69: Chalmers, *Colonial Currency*, p. 333 f.; Raffles, Java, Vol. II., Appx., p. clxxi.

18 The true Standard of a Buncal is 80 Mace or 5 Tale; although in trade, merchants make their Buncal heavier or lighter, as they please. . . . . . N.B. — As the Buncal is bigger or less, so must the Catty be." — Op. cit., loc. cit.

19 Stated at 15 lbs. At p. 123, we have the same statement, and then find Stevens practically copying Lockyer, *Trade in India*, 1711, p. 43, and saying: "14 Catty, Chinese Weight, is commonly reckoned 1 Malay Bahar, which makes 3 Chinese Pecul equal to 1 Malay Bahar; in which there is a Loss to the Buyer of 2 Catties, the latter being but 398 lbs. Care must be taken of this, it being an Imposition." Care by the merchant, that is; and to the student a warning that commercial swindling has at times to do with the reports as to bullion weights by travellers.

20 Stated also to be 200 "Catty of Aceh" and then called "one Bohar Malay or 3 Pecul China." Also 240 catties at Salangore (p. 120), where Stevens tells us: "The Malaccan Bahar of 300 Catties is sometimes used in selling; and it is therefore necessary in Bargains to mention what Bahar you agree for."

21 Here, I suspect, used in its proper sense of "rice-seed."


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Conversion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 penjurs = 1 piah</td>
<td>= weight 1 máyam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 piah</td>
<td>= 1 jampal = weight 4 máyam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 jampal</td>
<td>= 1 real</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23 Or tâel, as it is written in English characters, but tâl in the vernacular.
The statements in Marsden, Sumatra, 1811, p. 171, aff ord the following table: —

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24 saga timbangan</td>
<td>1 mab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12½ saga puku</td>
<td>do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 mas</td>
<td>1 tail (= here bangkal)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Milburn, Oriental Commerce, 1819, Vol. II. p. 329, as quoted by Yule, Hobson-Jobson, s. v. mace, gives a very complete table for Aceh: —

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 copangs</td>
<td>1 mace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 mace</td>
<td>1 mayam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 mayam</td>
<td>1 tale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 tales</td>
<td>1 bancal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 bancals</td>
<td>1 catty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 catties</td>
<td>1 balar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Raffles, Java, 1814, Vol. II., Appx. p. clxv., gives us: —

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100 Chinese kati</td>
<td>1 pikul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 pikul</td>
<td>1 koyan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Crawford, Indian Archipelago, 1820, Vol. I. p. 271, has: —

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 bangkal (here tael)</td>
<td>1 kati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 kati</td>
<td>1 pikul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 pikul</td>
<td>1 koyan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Newbold, Account of Johore (J. A. S. B. 1839) and in Moor, Indian Archipelago, Appx., p. 70), there is information which explains much that has gone before in this Section, and indeed in this Chapter. “After the adherent first particles of the sand have been removed, it (gold dust) is weighed into quantities, generally of one tael each,” which are carefully folded up in small pieces of cloth. These packets constitute the Bunkals of commerce. . . . The Bunkals are, as in Sumatra, frequently used as currency instead of coin. The weights . . . are as follows: —

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 small saga (saga kechil)</td>
<td>1 large saga (saga besar)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 saga besar</td>
<td>1 mainam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 mainam</td>
<td>4 tael or bunkal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 taels</td>
<td>1 catty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17 In Ridgeway, Origin of Currency, p. 172.
18 Adenanthera pavonina.
19 The confusion here is between the genuine Acehian scales; — 4 kupong, 1 mace, 10 mace 1 tael, 5 tael 1 bangkal, 20 bangkal 1 catty, . . . . and the Sino-Malayan scales; — 16 mace 1 tael, 20 tael 1 catty. Milburn has in fact stated two separate concurrent scales as parts of one, coming to grief over the fact that mainam (mace) is used in each though not to mean the same intrinsic weight.
20 Also 27 and 28 pikuls.
21 Also 25, 27, 28 and 40; but it is the commercial piece of 132½ lbs. av.
22 It is rather late in the day to point out that cash, candra, mace, tael, catty and pikul are not Chinese words, nor even of Chinese origin, and represent nothing that is indigenous to China. They are Indo-European commercial terms, partly of Indian and partly of Malay origin, adapted by traders and merchants to all the local weights they found it necessary to use and to reduce to common denominators for convenience of traffic. They are as purely international conventional terms in China as in the Malay Archipelago and elsewhere. In the days of Crawford, Marsden and contemporary and previous writers, it was no doubt thought that at any rate the most prominent standards, tael and catty, were Chinese; and the reason for my so strongly stating the facts in this note now is that I perceive that Ridgeway, Origin of Currency, 1893, accepts the former view and bases an argument on it at pp. 170 ff.
23 Crawford, Malay Dict., 1834, describes bangkal as “the same with tāhil.” Raffles, Java, 1814, Vol. I. p. 204, speaks of bangkal or tabah in referring to remittances of gold bullion from Borneo.
24 Abrus precatorius.
25 Adenanthera pavonina.
Newbold adds "at Malacca 10 saga bear or 4 kupangs are equal to 1 maiam."

The existing tables are thus stated in the *Singapore and Straits Directory*, 1883, p. 34:

**A. — Bullion Weights.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 saga</td>
<td>1 mayam grs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 mayam</td>
<td>1 bongkal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 bongkal</td>
<td>1 kati</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B. — Commercial Weights.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16 tahil</td>
<td>1 kati lbs. av.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 kati</td>
<td>1 pikul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 pikul</td>
<td>1 bhar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 pikul</td>
<td>1 koyan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We have already seen, in this section of this work, in the table called from the First Dutch Voyage to the East Indies, 1596-7, that those early traders gathered from the Malacca they met with a Chinese table of commercial weights as known to the Malays identical with that still in use. We have also seen, from Stevens' Table of 1775 and the Malay Vocabulary, footnote to its Table of 1810, notices of what may be called the Chinese scale in use in the Indian Archipelago, while Chinese influence crops up in the commercial scale just quoted as in use in the Straits Settlements in 1883. So it will be of value here to trace further Chinese influence on commercial measures in the Archipelago generally.

In Yule's *Hobson-Jobson*, s. v. candareen, is given the general Chinese-Malay scale thus, from Fryer, *East Indies*, for say 1873 as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 cash</td>
<td>1 Quandreck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Quandreck</td>
<td>1 Mass (in silver)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Mass</td>
<td>1 Teen (? Taie)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Taies</td>
<td>1 Cattie</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again from a paper by J. Hunt on the Sulo* Archipelago in Moor's *Indian Archipelago*, Appx., p. 45, under date c. 1814, we are told that "the China weights are in universal use here; the catty is regulated at 28 Spanish dollars, but they have particular names for the subdivisions." We can also get from this source so essentially a Chinese table as this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 mahuks</td>
<td>1 chuchak = 1 candareen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 chuchaks</td>
<td>1 amas = 1 mace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 amas</td>
<td>1 tael</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 taels</td>
<td>1 catty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 catties</td>
<td>1 babut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 babuts</td>
<td>1 laxa = 50 catties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 laxes</td>
<td>1 pikul = (100 catties)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Side by side with this there is given a table for capacities, which is Malay altogether:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>Equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Half a cocomatl-shell</td>
<td>1 panchang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 panchangs</td>
<td>1 gantong = 4 catties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 gantongs</td>
<td>1 raga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2½ ragas</td>
<td>1 pikul</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

100 Therefore the *saga* = 3.25 grs., and so represents the local candareen.
101 The influence so far may be, and probably be generally called, Chinese, but strictly, I think, it is the general Far-Eastern commercial influence on China merchants that has brought about the 16 taels to the catty, rather than the other way round.
102 See, Sol., Sol., Sula, see Crawford, *Malay Dict., s. v.*
103 *I. e., cahs.*
104 *I. e., mala = mace.*
To clinch this point and clear it up at the same time, in the *Straits Settlements Directory* for 1883, *loc. cit.*, the weights for opium are given in terms of the Sino-Cambodian (ante, pp. 14 ff., 34 ff.) scale thus:

10 Tee = 1 Hoon
10 Hoon = 1 Chee
10 Chee = 1 Tahil

Lasty, there is a fine specimen of mixed influence, Spanish, Malay, Chinese and Commercial, in the statements for Manilla for 1775 by Stevens, *Guide*, p. 127, which run thus:

**Manilla Weights.**

16 Ounces are 1 lb. by which all sorts of Goods are weighed
10 " " 1 Tale of Gold Weight
11 " " 1 Tale of Silk and other Things
9 " " 1 Punto of Gold and Silver Thread
22 " " 1 Catty
1 " " 1 Mexico Dollar in Weight
1 Manilla Pound makes 1 lb. 0.03 dec. Avoirdupoise
8 Ounces are a Mark of Silver

The existing British Colonial denominations for money, which differ radically in Penang from Singapore and Malacca (*vide* Swettenham, *Vocabulary*, Vol. II., Appx. on Currency, Weights and Measures), is a mixture of foreign adopted terms, modern newly-coined vernacular terms, and the real vernacular terms, — all applied to the dollar and its parts, — and of course is of no help to the present argument, thus:

**Singapore and Malacca.**

4 duit (½ cent) are 1 sen (1 cent)
2½ sen = 1 wang (2½ cents)
10 wang = 1 suk (25 cents)
4 suku = 1 ringgit (1 dollar)

**Penang and Province Wellesley.**

10 duit (cent) are 1 kupang (10 cents)
12½ duit = 1 tali (12½ cents)
2 tali = 1 suk (25 cents)
4 suku = 1 ringgit (dollar)

We have now followed the Malay and Far Eastern Commercial ponderary terminology from a mention of it by a Chinese author of the XVth Century step by step to the present day through all parts of the Archipelago and its surroundings occupied by the Malays. We have followed it also through the renderings of it by English, French, Dutch, Portugese and Spanish writers and observers, and despite the mistakes they are likely to have made and no doubt have made, and the naturally great variety caused by the conditions in the actual vernacular terms and their senses, it seems to me to be clear that the main points have remained the same throughout. These main points are just those that have been observed already in this Chapter in regard to the Far-Eastern Continental nations; *viz.*, (i) that the Malayan and Far Eastern Commercial Scales as such can be clearly separated from the concurrent modern Chinese Decimal Scale; (ii) that the Malayan Scale is virtually the same as the Far-Eastern Continental Scale; (iii) that the Indian and Far-Eastern Scales,

---

1 Swettenham, *Vocabulary*, 1881, Vol. II., Appx. on Currency, etc., only gives hau, chi, tahil.
2 Spanish.
3 Chinese, i.e., 10 ounces silver = 1 tael of gold; i.e., gold is to silver as 10 to 1.
4 Malay.
5 Commercial.
including the Malayan, are all derived from one original source; (iv) that all the Scales can be stated in terms generally of each other, thus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ancient Chinese</th>
<th>Siamese-Cambodian</th>
<th>Burmese</th>
<th>Indian</th>
<th>Malayan</th>
<th>Commercial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>chu</td>
<td>hùn</td>
<td>ywê</td>
<td>raktikã</td>
<td>kündari (sagã)</td>
<td>candareen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hwa</td>
<td>pê</td>
<td>pê</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(paye)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>che</td>
<td>fùang</td>
<td>mû</td>
<td></td>
<td>kupong</td>
<td>(copang)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liang</td>
<td>salûng</td>
<td>mât</td>
<td>mâsha</td>
<td>mâyam</td>
<td>mace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kin</td>
<td>bât</td>
<td>kyât</td>
<td>kârâhã</td>
<td>tãhil, tãi</td>
<td>tickal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yâen</td>
<td>tamlûng^4</td>
<td>bô()^4</td>
<td>pala</td>
<td>bûngkal^3</td>
<td>tael^3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hwan</td>
<td>châng</td>
<td>pêkbû^4</td>
<td>visê^4</td>
<td>katî...</td>
<td>catty (viss)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hap</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pikûl...</td>
<td>pical</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We have seen already how it is that the Far-Eastern Continental System may be traced to an Indian source, and it will now be seen that the Malayan System is traceable in precisely the same way on its own account. The tracing of the connection between the Far-Eastern Continental Scale and the ancient Indian ordinary Scale was effected by shewing that the number of conventional standard seeds in the Burmese bô(l) was identical with that in the Indian pala, and that the bô(l) equalled the pala both in practice and by etymology.

The indigenous Malay scale is that of kupong, mâyam, tãhil, bûngkal, or kündari (sagã), kupong, mâyam, bûngkal, and we have seen how it was that the commercial tael (or tãhil) and the bûngkal became mixed up in certain cases. The kupong in the Acheen scales took the place of the kündari elsewhere and the kündari has always been the conventional standard seed of the Malays, being equal to the double raktikã of the ancient Indian jewellers, which ran 320 to the pala and was equal to the seed of the Adenanthera pavonina, and this the kündari itself actually was.

Now throughout the mad muddle of the Malay scales above given it will be found, on close examination and separation from the concurrent and confusing Malayan versions of the Chinese Decimal Scale, that there is a clear and distinct method in the madness thereof. Confining ourselves strictly to the indigenous Malay scales, we find the Acheen scales of Lockyer, 1711, Steven's, 1775, Milbarn, 1813, Prinsep, 1833, to be the same throughout, thus:

**Acheen Scale.**

- 4 kupong are 1 mâyam
- 16 mâyam = 1 tãhil
- 5 tãhil = 1 bûngkal

\[ \therefore 320 \text{ kupong} = 1 \text{ bûngkal} \]

^100 This extended to Japan; vide Appx. on Japan Trade to Raffles, Java, Vol. II. p. xvi.: "In the beginning the returns from Japan consisted of silver and copper; and the former, being coined, was received according to current value in that country, where the coins and weights go by the same names as in China, viz. kati, tâhil, mca, and kandarins. Ten mcs were worth a tâhil and 16 tâhil a kati." For the true relative positions of the intermediate denominations, see later on in the text.

^1 The kârâhã, through the kâ, kâs, i.e., cash, has become degraded to a varying and indefinite amount below the candareen.

^2 The tamlûng represents the Shan taulû, 4 tickals, and so does the bûngkal, while the bô(l) represents 5 tickals.

^3 Tael represents both the tãhil and the bûngkal, and strictly nowadays the bûngkal of weight and the tãhil.

^4 Pêkbû and visê are strictly a little more than the chêng and kâs: about one fourth. Copang in the sense used in the table is confined to Malayan countries and is there only partially used.
For Malacca Nunes gives us in 1554:

**Malacca Scale.**

- 5 kündarı = 1 kupong
- 4 kupong = 1 máyam
- 4 máyam = 1 paoal
- 4 paoal = 1 tael (bungkal)

\[ \therefore \text{320 kündarı = 1 bungkal} \]

Now we have seen (*ante*, Vol. XXVI. p. 318) that the ancient Indian ordinary scale ran thus:

- 5 raktikás = 1 masha
- 16 māshas = 1 kārsha
- 4 kārshas = 1 pala

\[ \therefore \text{320 raktikás = 1 pala} \]

These raktikás are double raktikás, i.e., kündarı in general Malay parlance and the kupongs of the Chinese scales.

The common basis of the ancient Indian and the old Malayan scales is thus even clearer than is that of the Burman and ancient Indian scales, and I do not think that I could more clearly express the inter-relation and common origin of the Indian, Further-Indian and Malayan Scales than by presenting them, on the above facts and those gathered in the previous Sections of this Chapter, in the following form:

**Scale of 320 Standard Seeds.**

(*Adenanthera pavonina* or double *Abrus precatorius*).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indian</th>
<th>Burmese</th>
<th>Siamese-Cambodian</th>
<th>Malayan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>raktikás</td>
<td>ywêj</td>
<td>hũn</td>
<td>kündarı</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 pē</td>
<td>5 pē</td>
<td>5 kupong</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 mū</td>
<td>2 füang</td>
<td>4 máyam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 māt</td>
<td>2 salüng</td>
<td>4 tāhil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 kyāt</td>
<td>4 bāt</td>
<td>4 bungkal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 bō(l)</td>
<td>4 tamlüng</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table shews the upper and lower denominations to be the same in all the scales, but the intermediate denominations to vary considerably. By shewing the scale in the following manner the nominal relative place of each denomination becomes at once apparent:

- India: raktikás
- Burma: ywêj
- Si-am-Cambodia: hũn 1 seed
- Malay: kündarı
- Burma: pē

---

* Is it possible that paoal is a reminiscence of pala and bō(l)?
* Read this table thus: raktikás 5 × māshas 16 × kārshas 4 = 1 pala = 320 seeds.
* See the French table given *ante*, p. 5: the hũn is undoubtedly the sandareen = *Adenanthera* seed: vide *ante*, p. 5, note 33.
India ... ... māsha
Siam-Cambodia ... pe
Malay ... ... kupon
Burma ... ... mū ... ... " 8
Siam-Cambodia ... fäng ... ... " 10
Burma ... ... mát ... ... " 16
Siam-Cambodia ... sālīng ... ... " 20
Malay ... ... māyam ... ... " 64
Burma ... ... kyāt ... ... " 80
India ... ... kārsha
Siam-Cambodia ... bāt ... ... "
Malay ... ... tāhil
India ... ... pala
Burma ... ... bō(l)
Siam-Cambodia ... tāmliūng
Malay ... ... būngkal

As I have shown the ancient Chinese scale concurrently on p. 46 with the other Far Eastern scales, it will be of use here to note the places its denominations would take if included in the above table. The chu would be 1 seed and therefore rank with the kōndari, etc. The huo would be 6 seeds and would rank between the mū and kupon, etc. The che, 12 seeds, would rank between the fāng and the māt. The liāng at 24 seeds and its double the kin at 48 seeds would rank between the kyāt and the māyam (and sālīng). Similarly the yuen would come before the bō(l), etc., with 192 seeds.

There is, however, a point in the Malay scales, which requires reconciliation with the above facts. The Singapore existing scale (ante, p. 44)⁴⁰ is stated to be: —

12 sāgā are 1 māyam
16 māyam " 1 būngkal
12 būngkal " 1 kāt

By this, clearly only 192 standard seeds go to the būngkal instead of 320. But assuming the kāt to be constant, 12 of these būngkals = 20 old būngkals, 20 būngkals (or taels) being the old recognised division of the kāt. Therefore, on this assumption, 1 modern būngkal would equal 1½ old būngkal, and 1½ of 192 is 320. Therefore also, the existing 192 seeds represent the old 320 seeds. However, this is not what I apprehend has actually taken place, which is rather that the modern scale has been reduced to about three-fifths of the old scale. Thus, by the old scale, taking the standard seeds at 41 g., as the modern does, we get 1,387 g. as the actual weight of the old būngkal against 832 of the present one.¹¹ There is nothing surprising in such a local reduction in standards, and I put forward the above argument to shew the part played by continuity of thought and custom in the reduction of the būngkal from the rate of 320 to the precise rate of 192 standard seeds. The commercial object of the reduction would seem to have been to make the būngkal equal the weight of two Spanish dollars (i.e., twice 416 g.), instead of the weight of three or three and a third. The resultant standard of 192 seeds in place of the old 320 was found to be a convenient proportion.

⁴⁰ See also Svettenham, Vocabulary, 1882, Vol. II., Appx. on Currency, etc.
¹¹ The old Burmese bō(l) (and also the old Malay būngkal and Siamese tāmliūng) must have weighed nearly 320 seeds of c. 4 g. each = 1,380 g., because that gives a kyū or tickal of 229 g., and the actual weight of the standard tickal (tkū and kyū) was 2254 g.
As regards the Johole scale for 1836, given above at p. 43, as recorded by Newbold, I will re-state it here for clearness' sake:

**Johole Scale.**

2 sagā kāchil (*Abrus p.*) are 1 sagā bāsar.\(^2\) (*Adenanthera p.*)
8 sagā bāsar
15 māyam

This makes 120 būngkal = 480 bāsar, which last is said, however, to be equal to the tael and is shown as 20 to the kuti; so the subdivisions, if correctly reported, must have been some local eccentricity.

(To be continued.)

---

**A LEGEND OF THE JAINA STUPA AT MATHURA.**

BY G. BÜHLER, PH.D., LL.D., C.I.E.

One of the most interesting pieces in Dr. Führer's splendid collection of *Jaina inscriptions from the Kankali Tila at Mathura* is that dated in the year 79, as the characters prove, of the Kushana kings, which records the consecration of one, or perhaps of two statues, at the *Stūpa built by the gods* (*kishavijāapi*), in accordance with the request of the preacher Vṛddhachalapatin.\(^3\) Taken together with the discovery of the remains of a Stūpa, it furnished an irrefragable proof that the Jainas, as their sacred books assert, in early times really erected Stūpas in honour of their prophets, which fact, as has been shown of late by M. Sylvain Lévi,\(^4\) even their rivals, the Buddhists, admit for the time of Kanishka. The inscription also proved the great antiquity of the Jaina faith at Mathura, which town their tradition declares to be one of the centres of their faith. For the epithet of the Stūpa 'built by the gods' makes it evident that in the year 79 of the Kushana reign its real origin had been forgotten and a myth did duty for historical truth. Whatever the precise initial date of the era, used by Kanishka, Huvishka and Vasudeva-Vāsishtha, may be, this year cannot fall later than about the middle of the second century B.C. At that time the legend had been formed and the Stūpa must have been erected several centuries earlier.

The exact shape of the myth regarding its origin, of course, cannot be ascertained from the inscription and hitherto no allusion to it or to the Stūpa has been made known from Jaina works. But recently, on going over *Jinasprabha's* *Tīrthakalpa*, called also *Rājaprabhā*, I have met with a full account of the *Stūpa built by the gods* at Mathura, which gives us at least the story, as it was told between A.D. 1326/18 and 1331. The author of the *Tīrthakalpa* him-

---

\(^2\) Malay kāchil, kāchil means small; bāsar, bear means great.
\(^3\) Extract from a paper in the *Sitzungsberichte* of the Imp. Academy of Vienna.
self furnishes us with the dates, on which several pieces of his compilation were composed. The earliest date stands at the end of the Sātuṇāyakaśa, with which the work begins:

**Arthaśāstra.**

**Samvatya.**

"On the seventh day of the month of Mādya (Tapas), in the dark half, in the year of illustrious Vikrama, measured by the varṇa (4) the eight and the Viśvēdēvas (13, or V. S. 1384) this portion of the poem was completed." The latest occurs at the end of the whole, fol. 120 b, 17:

**Arthaśāstra.**

"In the year of the illustrious king Vikrama measured by the nandās (9), the elephants (8), the śakīs (3) and the moon (1, or V. S. 1389), in the second (half) of the month of Bhadrāpada, on the tenth day, a Wednesday. While the illustrious Hammira Mahamāda (Mochammed Tughlak, A. D. 1325-1351) brilliantly shone as king of the earth, this book was completed in the town of the Yōgin (Delhi)."

The Tīrthākalpa, which is written partly in faulty Sanskrit and partly in Jain Mahārāṣṭri with many Gujaraticisms, gives descriptions of all the great sanctuaries of the sect, known to the author, and has been compiled, as he himself repeatedly indicates, from earlier works and from the traditions of those who know the past (purāvīdaṃ). None of its numerous legends are therefore inventions of Jainaprabha. It also contains various, evidently accurate, statements regarding the history of his own time and possesses some value for the ancient geography of India, on which account the late Dr. Bhagvānālāl Indrājī recommended its study to me. What it says regarding the Mathurā Stupa "built by the gods," is as follows:—

1. "Adoring the seventh and the twenty-third Jina lords, the reuge of the world, I will declare the Mathurākalpa, which gives luck to good men." 2. "When the teaching of Supārśvanātha prevailed, there were two lion-like ascetics, devoid of worldly attachment, called Dharmāruchi and Dharmaghośa."

"And these men who performed austeritys for one, two and three months by (partaking of every) six, eighth, tenth or twelfth meal) or by fasting for half a month, and who awakened good people, once wandered to the town of Mathurā. At that time Mathurā, that is loved by the water of the neighbouring Yamnā, extended over twelve yojanas, as adorned with an excellent rampart, was resplendent with white temples of the gods, oblong and round wells, tanks, mansions of the Jinas and markets, and contained a multitude of (Veda-)reciting Brahmanas, belonging to various chūṭvīdīya. There the excellent ascetics remained during the four months of the rains fasting in a garden filled with various trees, flowers, fruits and

---

8 The MS., which I have used, is Dr. Peterson's No. 1256 of the Bombay Collection of 1887-88. It reads in this verse erroneously, in the first line अर्थशास्त्रं व्रतम्, and in the second कस्यर्थम्.
9 Dr. Peterson, Fourth Report, p. xxxvii., gives by a slip of the pen Sātuṇāvat 1327 instead of A. D. 1329 as the date of the Apāpobhikṣakaśa, and states that Jīnaprabha's known dates range from S. 1349-1389. The MS. consulted has for the Apāpobhikṣakaśa the date V. S. 1389.
10 The wording of the text is here ungrammatical, because the correct expression नाचपपोषकस्तवस्यान्तः did not suit the metre.
11 According to Dr. Schram, who has kindly calculated the date, it corresponds to August 28, 1331, when the tenth Tithi of the dark half of Bhadrāpada ended at 23 h. 52 m.
12 His account of the conquest of Gujarāt by Ullā Khān (Ulgh Kh.) younger brother of Allīvadīpa (Allīsādīn Khāj), which occurs in the Saṃpūrṇakalpa, has been separately published.
13 "Corporations of Brahmans including adherents of all the four Vedas," which usually were formed and endowed with writs on the foundation of Indian towns.
creepers, and called Bhūtaramaṇa after obtaining permission to take possession. By their study, performance of austerities, quietism and other virtues they gained the favour of the guardian goddess of the garden, Kubērā. Thereupon she appeared at night and said, 'Worshipful sirs, I am exceedingly pleased by your virtues; choose therefore a boon.' They answered, 'We are devoid of worldly attachment and do not ask for anything.' Then they preached the law to her and made her a lay-hearer. Once on the night of the eighth day of the bright half of Kārttika, the excellent ascetics bade farewell to Kubērā as to their hostess[11] in this way, 'O lay-woman, be firm in correct conduct and diligent in honouring and worshipping the Jinas! Having kept the four-monthly retreat, we shall wander during the present combination of the stars to another place in order to perform the concluding ceremony.' She said, full of regret, 'Worshipful sirs, why do you not always remain in this garden?' The saints replied, 'The abode of monks, birds, bee-swarms and herds of cows is not fixèd, nor is that of the autumnal clouds.' Thereupon she remarked, 'If it is so, then tell me of some religious work that I can accomplish it; not without result is the intercourse with the gods.' The saints spoke, 'If thou art very eager, take us together with the congregation to Mount Meru and let us worship the Chaitya.' She answered, 'I am ready to make you two worship the gods there. But if the congregation of Mathurā is made to go, the heretical gods will perhaps raise obstacles on the way.' The saints replied, 'We have seen Mount Meru through the power of the sacred books. If thou hast not power to take the congregation, then it is no use that we two should go there.' Then the goddess became ashamed and said, 'If it is so, I will cause to be built a Meru-temple,[12] adorned with statues, you can worship there together with the congregation.' When the saints agreed, the goddess during the night caused to be erected a Stūpa, fashioned of gold, inlaid with precious stones, surrounded by many deities, adorned with arches, flags and garlands, carrying three parasols on its summit and beautified with three bands.[13] On each band were in all the four directions images of five-coloured precious stones and the image of the glorious lord Supārśva had been set up as the chief one. When the people arose in the morning, they saw the Stūpa and began to quarrel. Some said, 'This is divine Svayaṃbhū who has the serpent Vasuki for his emblem.' Others asserted, 'This is Nārāyaṇa, extended on the (serpent) Śesha, his couch.' Thus there was a disagreement with respect to Brahma, the lord Nara, the Sun, the Moon and other (deities). The Buddhist said, 'This is a Stūpa, but (the image represents) the lord of the Buddhās.' Then impartial people spoke, 'Don't quarrel. This (monument) has been made by a god; hence even he will solve the doubt. Let each of you paint his god on a piece of cloth and come together with his congregation. Whose god it may be—e'en his cloth (picture)—alone will remain, the god will make the cloths of the others disappear.' But the Jaina congregation painted a cloth (picture) of the lord Supārśva. Then all the sectarians painted cloth (pictures), each of his god worshipped them with their congregations and stood singing on the night of the ninth (day). At midnight arose a mighty wind, carrying along leaves, gravel and stones. It destroyed all the cloth (pictures) and took them away. Before its roar, which sounded like that at the destruction of the world, the people fled in all directions. Alone the cloth (picture) of Supārśva remained. The people were astonished (and said), 'This is the divine Arhat.' That cloth (picture) became resplendent in the whole town. A cloth (picture) procession was instituted. Then the ablutions (of the Stūpa) began. To the Jaina laymen, who quarrelled about the first ablution, the old men said, 'He whose name, (written) on (one of many) name-marked balls, first comes into the hand of a virgin, shall perform the first ablution, be he poor or rich.' This decision was given on the night of the tenth (of Kārttika). Then on the night of the eleventh, holding vessels in their hands, they washed (the Stūpa) with milk, sour milk, ghī, saffron, sandal and so forth out of thousands of vessels. The gods remaining hidden, took

---

[11] This translation has been suggested to me by Prof. Jacob.
part in the ablutions. Even to-day they come in the same way to the procession. When all by turns had performed the ablutions, they placed (on the Stûpa) flowers, incense, cloth, great banners and ornaments. To the saints they gave clothes, Ghû, sugar and so forth. On the twelfth (night) garlands were put up. Thus those excellent ascetics gladdened the whole god-honoured congregation, and, having kept the four-monthly retreat, having performed the concluding ceremony elsewhere and having made the sacred lore resplendent, gradually shaking off (the effects of) their Karman, reached perfection. A “field of perfection” arose there. Then the goddess, who was sorrowful on account of the separation from the two ascetics and remained always strongly attached to the Jinas, enjoyed a life of half a Pulyapama, afterwards fell (from her station), was born again as a human being and reached the highest abode. Each goddess, who arises in her place, is called Kûbrâ. Protected by her, the Stûpa remained for a long time open (to the view), until the Lord Pârvâ was born. At that period the king of Mathurâ, being under the sway of greed, called the people up and spoke, “Take away this Stûpa, made of gold and precious stones, and throw it into my treasury.” Thereupon, when the people struck (the Stûpa) with steel pickaxes in order to take it away, the pickaxes did not take effect. The blows hit the limbs of those who struck. Then the king, who did not believe (that), even himself gave a blow. The pickaxe flew up and split the king’s head. Thereupon the goddess appeared and said angrily, “Fie, ye sinners, what have you begun there? You will die just like the king.” Then they, being afraid, asked the goddess for forgiveness, bringing censers in their hands. The goddess said, “If you will worship the dwelling of the Jina, then you will be freed from the tribulation. If any one will worship an image of a Jina or a Jina temple, his house will stand for a long time; else it will fall.” Every ear the cloth (picture) of the Jina must be carried about and “the sixth (day) of the pickaxes” must be kept. He who becomes king here, must dine after having set up images of a Jina; otherwise he will not live. The people began to carry out exactly all the orders of the goddess.

“Once the lord Pârvâ, wandering about as a Kêvalin, reached Mathurâ. At the solemn visit (to the Stûpa, sambaraṇa) he preached the law and made known the future experience of the evil period (dúsma). Then, after the worshipful one had wandered elsewhere, Kûbrâ called the congregation and spoke as follows, “The approaching evil time has been described by the lord. The people and the king will be eaten up with greed; and I shall become negligent and have not long to live. Hence I shall not be able to protect always this Stûpa, which is open (to the view). At the order of the congregation I will therefore cover it with bricks. But you must build outside a stone temple. Every other goddess that will come in my place will perform the worship inside.” Then the congregation, considering (the plan) excellent, gave their consent and the goddess did thus.”

“Afterwards, thirteen hundred years after the lord Vîna had reached perfection, Bappabhattisâri was born. He also restored this sanctuary, caused the Jina Pârvâ to be worshipped, and had made groves, wells and store-rooms in order to ensure the constant worship. Thinking that the bricks, placed by the congregation, were being displaced, he began to put into order the Stûpa which was surrounded with stones. The goddess stopped him in a dream, saying to him, “You must not open this.” So by the order of the goddess it was not opened. Well-made, surrounded by well-fashioned stones it is even to-day protected by the gods. Resplendent is this home of the Jina, which is connected with many thousands of images, chapels ............... a charming gandhakûśi as well as with (statues of) Chilaṇâ, Ambâ and other (goddesses), (of the) Kâlêtrâpalas and so forth.”

14 Jînaprabhasa, I suppose, means, that Mathurâ became a place where men could obtain Siddhâ.
15 I omit the next following sentence of the text, which I take to be an interpolation, as it interrupts the speech of the goddess.
16 This seems to have been a festival, kept at Mathurâ in memory of the king’s wicked attempt against the Stûpa.
In the course of some further remarks on various miracles or remarkable events, which happened at Mathurā, the Stūpa is mentioned yet twice. The first note says that Jinābhadra-śramānam, performing austerities at the Stūpa, built by the gods, pleased its guardian deity and restored the Mahānīśitha Stūra, which had been broken and mutilated, because the leaves of its Mām, had been eaten by white ants. The second passage briefly recapitulates the history of the monument, adding that Āmarāja, Bapabhaṭṭī’s patron, in reality made the restoration which above is attributed to that ascetic.

Like many other Jaina stories, Jinābhadra’s legend of the Mathurā Stūpa has so unreal and phantastic an appearance that, but for the note in the inscription, most Saṃskritists would not hesitate to declare it to be a late or ‘comparatively late’ invention of the Yatis without any substantial basis. If we possessed the Tīrthakalpa alone, it most probably would be doubted, if not denied, that Mathurā ever possessed an ancient Stūpa dedicated to a Jina. In the face of the inscription this is, of course, impossible and it must be admitted that a Jaina Stūpa really existed in Mathurā as well as that a myth regarding its divine origin was current at least about twelve hundred years before Jinābhadra’s time. The case of the Mathurikalpa, therefore, furnishes another illustration for the correctness of the principle, proved of late years by various other discoveries, that it is dangerous to treat the Jaina tradition with absolute contempt. We see here that even a phantastic legend has a basis of real facts. A good deal of caution in the use of negative criticism seems therefore advisable.

It is, however, a very different question, if we may assume that the myth of the divine origin of the Stūpa, known to Vṛddhahastin and his contemporaries, was exactly identical with Jinābhadra’s tale. This, I think, is improbable at least in one point. The statement of the Tīrthakalpa that the original golden Stūpa bore on the mukhāda, or bands, various images, made of precious stones, the mukpadavan or chief image being that of Supārśva to whom the whole structure was dedicated, can hardly be so ancient. This description does not fit the ancient Jaina Stūpas, which on the few sculptures,17 hitherto found, look very much like those of the Baudhānas, and like these are not adorned with statues. But it would suit the miniature Stūpas of the Baudhānas, which were manufactured in great numbers for devotional purposes and worshipped in the houses of the laymen. The inscriptions on the monuments of this kind, which I have seen in the London Museums and in private collections, mostly show characters of the eighth, ninth and tenth centuries, but, as far as I know, never ancient ones. The use of such Stūpas, which may have also occurred among the Jaines, is therefore probably not so old as the inscription of Vṛddhahastin, and it is difficult to believe that their description could have stood in the legend of his time. The old legend perhaps may have spoken of a golden relic casket, possibly in the shape of a Stūpa, which the gods or the goddess Kubera (who hitherto has not been traced in other Jaina works) brought to Mathurā and which was first kept exposed to the view and later deposited in a brick Stūpa and finally encased in stone. The event may have been fixed in the time of Supārśva, as the Mathuri inscriptions furnish abundant proof that the legend of the twenty-four Tīrthāṅkaras did exist during the rule of the Kushana kings. The Stūpa may also have been dedicated to Supārśva. The Nigīlava Edict has proved that the Baudhānas erected Stūpas to their mythical Buddhas even before the time of Asoka, and there is no reason for denying that their rivals may have done so likewise. This point possibly be settled by a thorough examination of the sculptures, found by Dr. Führer. With respect to the alleged restoration by Bapabhaṭṭī or by Amaraṣa at Bapabhaṭṭī’s request, it may be noted that Jinābhadra’s date for Bapabhaṭṭī’s birth, A. V. 1300, slightly differs from the more usual one, Vikrama Saṅvat 800,18 and agrees better with that given in the Paṭāvāla for his death, A. V. 1365 or V. S. 895. The inscriptions in no way confirm Bapabhaṭṭī’s and Amaraṣa’s traditional dates or the restoration ascribed to them. The Kankali Tila has yielded only two documents later than the Kushana

---

17 See the Plates, mentioned in note 13 to this article.
18 Indian Antiquary, Vol. XI. p. 223.
period, one from the reign of Kumāragupta, dated Guptasaṅvat 113 or A. D. 431/2, and one dated V. S. 1080.

If the note about the restoration of the Mahāvīśhāthā Sūtra by the ancient Jinabhādrā is meant to assert that he re-wrote the work with the help of old fragments, there may be some truth in it. For the present Mahāvīśhāthā is a very curious book, for which no commentary exists and on which even some Jaina scholars look with suspicion.19

FOLKLORE IN SALSETT.

BY GEO. F. D'PENHA.

No. 20.—The Crane and the Princess.

Once upon a time there lived a woman in very indigent circumstances. Every morning she would go into the neighbouring forest to gather firewood. After reserving a small quantity of the firewood for her own use, she would carry the remainder to the bāzār and sell it for the highest price, and on this she lived. One day, when in the forest collecting firewood, she felt tired, and sat down on a large stony flat. Having seated herself, she thought she would chew pān sōyārī. So she pulled out her bag of betel-leaves and nuts and proceeded to eat it, when she found that her bag contained no chūnā. She was at a loss to know what to do, but looking about, she saw something that appeared like chūnā, and thinking it would answer the purpose of chūnā, she took it, and, applying it to the betel-leaves, chewed her pān sōyārī. Having thus felt refreshed, she gathered more firewood, and soon returned home.

Now it happened that what the woman ate as a substitute for chūnā turned out to be the dung of a baglā (crane). The consequence of this was that the woman became pregnant. One month passed, two months passed, three months passed, and so on till nine months, at the end of which she gave birth to a male crane. The bird soon began to hop and fly about, and thus would find his own food, so that the woman, the mother of the crane, had only to follow her old occupation and maintain herself as before, and in this way passed many years.

One day the crane happened to fly to a tank, on the banks of which he saw the daughter of the king of that country, she having come there with her bāthkīa (maid-servants) to bathe. The crane, at the very first sight of the princess, fell desperately in love with her. Going home, he said to his mother that she must go and negotiate with the king on his marriage with the princess. Thought the woman to herself—"How can such a thing happen? In the first instance, my child is only a bird, and to propose a marriage between a bird and a princess is simply preposterous. Again, had my child at least been a human creature, I might have presented myself before the king with some pretension. Even then, we are as poor as can be, and it would be hopeless to attempt such a task."

Thus thinking, the woman told her son, for so we must call the crane, that it would be useless to go to the king. Indeed, she said, she would not have the audacity to make such a proposal even to an ordinary person, and therefore much less to a king. But the son was very importunate, and at last insisted on the mother to go to the palace.

At last the mother did go to the palace, and with fear and trembling stood before the king. The king, who had known her for years, thinking she had, perhaps, come to beg for alms, at first spoke to her mildly:

"Why have you come here, my good woman? Do you come to ask for any help, or has any one done you harm, let me hear your complaint and I shall see you redressed."

19 See A. Weber, Indische Studien, Vol. XVI. p. 456 ff. [It is right to add that Dr. Bühler, my personal friend for many years and the greatest friend and supporter that the Indian Antiquary ever possessed, had no opportunity of seeing this last article through the Press.—Ed.]
Upon this, the woman, still shaking with fear, but being partly encouraged by the kind speech of the king, with the greatest reluctance and with a faltering voice, informed the king of the object of her visit. No sooner the king heard what the woman had to say, his rage knew no bounds, and he thundered like a tiger:—

"How could you ever dream of making such an audacious and extremely stupid proposal? Get out of my presence at once, or in a minute you shall be no more a live person."

The poor woman ran away as fast as her legs would carry her before even the king had finished his words, and going home she told her son what kind of reception she had met with at the hands of the king, and with what result. The son, on his part, seemed to be even more offended at the refusal of the king than himself at the proposal of the woman, and thus gave vent to his feelings:—

"The king has rejected my proposal, has he? And, that is not all, he has insulted my mother, and driven her out of the palace, has he? I shall make him rue the moment in which he treated her thus brutally, and I shall see that he gives up his daughter in marriage to me!"

So saying, he went and covered up with his wings the only tank in the country, from which all, without exception, drew their water-supply. Now, when the women of the place came to fetch water, the crane would not allow any one to take water on any account. Thereupon, all the people went in a body to the king, and informed him of what had happened; and, as they had learnt what had transpired between the king and the mother of the crane, they suggested to the king that he should get one of the maid-servants richly dressed and given away in marriage to the crane, and thus avert their misfortune. The king fell in with the suggestion of his subjects, and immediately issued orders that one of the maid-servants of the princess be dressed in the clothes of the princess, and, wearing also her ornaments, go to the tank, and, offering herself in marriage, ask the crane to allow the people to take water without further hindrance. The order must be obeyed. So one of the maid-servants, having dressed herself and put on fine ornaments, went to the tank, and thus spoke (sang) to the crane:—

"Sóra, sóra, Baglóji, raitéchá pānī kain gá,
Hótain támchi laññchí ráñi kain gá.
Let go, oh let go, Mr. Crane, the water of the subjects,
I will become your queen by marriage."

To which the crane replied (singing):—

"Thiñ tó káin rāñchí bāśkín kain gá,
Nahíin sóriñ raitéchá pānī kain gá.
You are only a maid-servant of the rāñi (princess),
I will not let go the water of the subjects."

Seeing that she was detected and that she could not prevail upon the crane to release the water-supply, the maid-servant went and reported the matter to the king. The king, thereupon ordered that another maid-servant, dressed better than the first, and wearing more ornaments, should go and offer herself as the princess in marriage to the crane in return for a free water-supply. So another maid-servant, without loss of time, dressed in very fine clothes and profusely decorated with ornaments, went and presented herself before the crane, and thus spoke (sang) to the crane:—

"Sóra, sóra, Baglóji, raitéchá pānī kain gá,
Hótain támchi laññchí ráñi kain gá.
Let go, oh let go, Mr. Crane, the water of the subjects,
I will become your queen by marriage."
But the crane knew only too well that the person speaking to him was only a maid-servant, and would not give in. He, therefore, thus spoke (sang) to her:

"Tūnā kē kāhī rājāchā kātā kūnā gū,  
Nahā kē kāhī rājāchā pānī kunā gū.  
You are only a maid-servant of the rājā (princess),  
I will not let go the water of the subjects."

The second maid-servant, too, found that she could not deceive the crane, nor prevail upon him to let go the water of the tank, and so went and reported the matter to the king. The king now sent a third maid-servant, dressed and adorned still better than the first and second, but she also met with the same failure. In this way, seven maid-servants were sent, one after another, the last having been dressed in the princess' own best clothes and covered with all her jewellery, hoping to deceive the crane, but to no purpose.

At last the king saw no other alternative but to send the princess. But, although an extremely beautiful person, she was made to assume the ugliest appearance possible. She was clothed in rags, divested of her ornaments, and with dirty hands and feet and face, the princess was sent to the tank. When she came in the presence of the crane, she thus spoke (sang) to him:

"Sāga, sāga, Pāgāja, rājāchā pānī kūnā gū,  
Nāhā kē kāhī lāgnā jūnā kūnā gū.  
Let go, oh let go, Mr. Crane, the water of the subjects,  
I will become your queen by marriage."

The princess had scarcely uttered these words, when the crane, recognising her in spite of her assumed ugly appearance, at once flew off, and thus left the tank free for the people to take their water from. The princess returned to the palace and communicated to the king the result of her errand. Of course, it was decided that the princess must be married to the crane, and so an early day was fixed for the celebration of the wedding.

(To be continued.)

NOTES AND QUERIES.

HORNS AT TEMPLES.
A good deal could be said on the subject of horns on temples, so I will make my remarks as brief as possible.

In the valley of the Chandrabhāg (the River Chenāb), on almost every shrine dedicated to Dēvi are found some splendid horns. The reason of their being there is this. In the winter months, when snow is down to about 6,000 ft., the animals, who usually live at 12,000 ft., come down to look for grass. The villagers, seeing them, rush out and drive them into a snow-drift, and knock the poor beasts on the head. A sacrifice is made at once, and the village temple smeared with the blood. When the heads have been cut off the horns are placed upside down on the peep-roof of the temple. By this means the hill people save their sheep and goats, gālā or mār, much to the detriment of sport in the uplands of India, as they eat the carcasses of the slain animals instead of those of their own flocks.

MARMOT in P. N. and Q. 1883.

BIRTH CUSTOMS—MUSALMANS.

Some time before the birth takes place the woman gives up her household duties if her means permit, but the poorer women do not do so. At this period, too, they are not particular as to food, eating whatever they can get hold of. When the delivery takes place no male can approach the mother, only a woman or midwife can attend her. On the birth of a male child the nurse congratulates the near relatives present, and barbers, etc., are sent to congratulate the distant relatives. Among the well-to-do classes all the domestic servants are rewarded by the master of the house. Those that have a first child very late in life make presents also to the various hangers-on (īdās). In large cities and towns a public entertainment is given, including the relations and friends. On such occasions the parties invited do not make presents.

GULAB SINGH in P. N. and Q. 1883.

In Prinsep's *Useful Tables*, Thomas Ed., p. 110, there occurs a notable passage: — "As with the coins, so with the weights, Southern India retained most of the names and terms properly Hindu, *pāla, tālā, vistā, bhāra, khāri (*khārdi*?), bhā.*" Just so, and as the old trade between South India and Indo-China is beyond all doubt, it is of value here to make some examination of South-Indian weights.

This subject is no less thorny than those which have preceded it in this Chapter. Indeed, so surrounded is it with difficulty and uncertainty that the local experts who wrote the article *nīray* in Vol. III. of the *Madras Manual of Administration* dared not go beyond such cautious statements as "the following is an attempt at Native avoirdupois standards," "average Troy tables," and "approximate actual values." I note also that the tables given under this article in Vol. III. do not quite coincide with those given by (other) local experts in Vol. I. p. 616 ff., and Vol. II. p. 505 ff., nor with those given in Vol. III. itself under the names for the denominations.

It is from the article *nīray* in Vol. III., however, that I have extracted for the present purposes the following tables of the "average weights" at present recognised in Southern India.

### A. — General Southern Indian Denominations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Troy</th>
<th>Average Avoirdupois</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arahi Indian Equivalents</strong></td>
<td><strong>Musalmān</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mustard seed</td>
<td>zarā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>barley corn</td>
<td>6 jau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rice in husk</td>
<td>2 dhān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abrus seed</td>
<td>4 gumchī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>black gram</td>
<td>8 māsha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 misqāl</td>
<td>180 grs. Troy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table shews that the Avoirdupois and Troy denominations meet at the *pāla* of 1,443 grs., and that the modern Muhammadan denominations are merely an effort to give a Musalmān form to indigenous denominations without interfering with the established South-Indian standards. It also works out the guṇja, gumchī or abrus seed to an average of 1,876 grs. Troy: *in South India 96 to the tōla.*

---

12 *Nīray* is for the Tamil *nīrai*, weight. Invaluable as the Article is, I may warn the enquirer that the transliteration adopted is such as will oblige him to go direct to Natives, or to look up every vernacular word in some work of reference, or to wander all over this huge third volume, in search of the true term thereof. *Expera erexa.*

14 Read "sarā 8 = jau; 2 = dhān; 2 = jau; 2 = dhān; " and so on.

15 As per statements in the Article quoted.
### B. — South-Indian Modern Troy Weights.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anglo-Indian Equivalents</th>
<th>Tamil</th>
<th>Telugu</th>
<th>Canarese</th>
<th>Malayalam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>rice grains</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abrus seeds</td>
<td>kunrīsamī</td>
<td>gurigīja</td>
<td>4 higa</td>
<td>kunnikūrn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adenanthera seeds</td>
<td>2 mānjādi</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 maṇjādi</td>
<td>2 maṭchāti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fanam weight</td>
<td>2 pāṇatakkam</td>
<td>4 chinnamu</td>
<td>2 haṇa</td>
<td>2 pāṇatākkam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pagoda weight</td>
<td>9 waragāniḍai</td>
<td>9 warahāyettu</td>
<td>9 warahātuka</td>
<td>30ľ urūrpiyattukam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dubb, rupee wt</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 dabbu</td>
<td>16 taṅka</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The standards of weight given in the article are the pagoda = 54 grs. Troy, and the tōla = 180 grs. Troy. This works out the above table thus in English Troy weight:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anglo-Indian Equivalents</th>
<th>Tamil, Telugu, and Canarese Districts</th>
<th>Malayalam, Districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abrus seed</td>
<td>equala</td>
<td>grs. 1&quot;5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adenanthera seed</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fanam</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pagoda</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tōla</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dubb</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tanka</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>3,456</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### C. — South-Indian Modern Avoirdupois Weights.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anglo-Indian Equivalents</th>
<th>Tamil</th>
<th>Telugu</th>
<th>Canarese</th>
<th>Malayalam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>fanam weight</td>
<td>paṇatakkam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pagoda weight</td>
<td>9 (10) waragāniḍai</td>
<td>warahāyettu</td>
<td>tōla</td>
<td>urūrpiyattukam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rupee weight</td>
<td>10 palam</td>
<td>10 palamu</td>
<td></td>
<td>10 palam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pollam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40 riṭlu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rättel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 rättal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viss</td>
<td>40 vissai</td>
<td>40 visamumu</td>
<td>6 ḍhāḍē</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manud</td>
<td>8 manugu</td>
<td>8 manugu</td>
<td>4 māra</td>
<td>25 tulam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>candy, bahar</td>
<td>20 kaṇḍi</td>
<td>20 bharā</td>
<td>20 bharā</td>
<td>20 bharā</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As in the case of the Troy weights, the South-Indian Muhammadans have done no more than use the indigenous Avoirdupois system, as will be seen from the average South-Indian table of Muhammadan Avoirdupois weights given in the same article:

| 3 tolā | 1 palam |
| 8 palam | 1 kachā sēr |
| 5 kachā sēr | 1 paṅchaśr |
| 2 paṅchaśr | 1 dharā |
| 4 dharā | 1 maṅ |
| 20 maṅ | 1 kāṇḍil |

To show how difficult it is to get clear ideas on this subject, and in what different ways its facts can be stated, I take from Vol. I. p. 616, of the same work, the following comparative statement:

**The Five Principal Tables of Weights in South India.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Telugu Districts</th>
<th>Tamil Districts</th>
<th>(2) Ordinary Native Traders</th>
<th>(3) Recognised by Government</th>
<th>(4) European and Native Merchants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>chinnum...</td>
<td>fanam...</td>
<td>............</td>
<td>............</td>
<td>............</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 pagoda wt...</td>
<td>9 pagoda...</td>
<td>pagoda wt...</td>
<td>............</td>
<td>............</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 dub...</td>
<td>............</td>
<td>............</td>
<td>............</td>
<td>............</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>½ tolā...</td>
<td>10 pollum...</td>
<td>8 cutcha seer...</td>
<td>............</td>
<td>............</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 cutcha seer...</td>
<td>8 cutcha seer...</td>
<td>5 vis...</td>
<td>8 maund...</td>
<td>20 candy...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>............</td>
<td>............</td>
<td>8 maund...</td>
<td>8 Madras md...</td>
<td>20 candy...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The attempt to express such (vernacular) words on English principles, and, instead of that, of employing a method of strict transliteration from the exact letters of the original combined with the use of the Continental, and especially the Italian, powers of the Roman Alphabet, to which accents and other signs are applied, is a standing objective proof of the wisdom of Sir William Jones in 1784, when he proclaimed his system of transliteration, and of the ultimate wisdom of the Government of India in following it, so far as practicable, now many years ago. When will Madras officials learn that the movement for transliteration has been in progress for more than 100 years?

26 The Malabar *palam* works out to 1,880 grs., being 100 to the maund of 25 lbs., while the Tamil and Telugu palamas are 320 to the maund.
27 The Bombay maund is 28 lbs.; Prinsep, *Useful Tables*, p. 117.
28 There are long discursive statements of South-Indian Muhammadan weights in Herklot's *Quoos-o-Islam*, 2nd Ed., 1838, Appx., p. r. ff., but it is quite impossible to work tables out of them.
29 I.e., 40 tolā to the paṅchaśr or vis, and 8 vis to the maund, 20 maunds to the kāṇḍil; cf. the South-Indian Tables above.
30 Also 10.
31 I.e., 30 chinnum.
32 I.e., 40 pollums.
33 I.e., 24 rupées.
34 I.e., of 25 lbs.
35 Synonym: haurum.
THE INDIAN ANTIQUARY.  

(5) Imperial Weights of the Government of India.

90 tolah are 1 seeer
40 seeer " 1 Imperial maund (82.5 lbs. av.)

From a note I have taken from Thomas’ Chronicles of the Pathan Kings, p. 221 ff.36 I work out the following comparative tables for old North Indian weights37:

A. — Old North Indian Scales.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Silver</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>raktikā</td>
<td>raktikā</td>
<td>raktikā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 māsha</td>
<td>5 māsha</td>
<td>5 māsha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 dharara</td>
<td>16 suvarṇa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 pala50</td>
<td>4 pala</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>——</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>——</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

And from Thomas, loc. cit., and Gladwin’s Ayen Akbarer, Vol. II. p. 153, I work out the following:

B. — North Indian Muhammadan Scales.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>rati</td>
<td>rati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 māsha</td>
<td>6 māsha (dām)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 tāṅk (tāṅk)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 tōla</td>
<td>16 tōla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>——</td>
<td>——</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thomas’ note to Prinsep’s Useful Tables, p. 21 ff., following Colonel Anderson, gives the table below for general Indian Muhammadan weights:

C. — General Indian Muhammadan Weights.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Troy</th>
<th>Avoirdupois.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>rati</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 māsha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 tāṅk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 tōla</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1½ dām</td>
<td>dām</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>——</td>
<td>30 sēr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>——</td>
<td>40 mān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96 rati to the tōla</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

36 I have cause to regret just now that, as is the case with many other books, some kind friend has forgotten to return the book to my library.
50 Also pariṣṭara.
51 Also kanḍa and tōka.
52 Also sālamāna.
53 For Kashmir.
The above tables show that, in terms of the ratti, 3½ tóla = 1 pala, which is what the modern South Indian average scale states to be approximately the case. We have then here, as it seems to me, a reasonable explanation of the descent of the modern Muhammadan South Indian scale from that of North India, and from the tables already given in this Section it can be seen that the main points of the Muhammadan and Hindu scales of South India are identical at candy, maund, viss and pollum (to use the Anglo-Indian forms). One can then also say that the whole modern South Indian scale is related to the North Indian through the scale of ratti, tóla and sér, rather than through the scale of raktiká, máshá and pala.

I think one can hardly doubt that there were for centuries two separate concurrent scales in North India, pretty much as I gather was also formerly the case in China,²² i. e., the recognised or literary and the popular. Thus, after giving a long series of scales from all sorts of books, working out generally to the scale of raktiká, másha and pala (320 raktikás to the pala) Colebrooke, Essays, Vol. II, p. 531, states significantly: "To these I do not add the másha of 8 raktikás, because it has been explained as (? being) measured by eight silver ratti weights, each twice as heavy as the seed. Yet as a practical denomination it must be noticed. Eight such ratti make one másha, but twelve máshas compose one tóla. This tóla is nowhere suggested by the Hindu legislators." That is, the scale of ratti, tóla and sér (96 ratis to the tóla) is not the old literary recognised scale, yet it is unquestionably the scale that the Muhammadan conquerors picked up, and is essentially that adopted by South India and modern India generally. One may safely argue that the Muhammadan conquerors would in the ordinary course of things be more likely to pick up and adopt a popular scale, than an orthodox and literary one, for their weights and measures, and I apprehend that this is what they did.⁴³ Hence my designation of the scale of 320 raktikás to the pala as the literary scale and of the scale of 96 ratis to the tóla as the popular scale, at any rate in the XVth and XVIth Centuries A. D., whence the modern coinsages date.

With regard to the popular scale Colebrooke states, p. 536: "The Vrihat-rájamártranda specifies measures which do not appear to have been noticed in other Sanskrit writings:"

| 24 tólikas = 1 sér (? sétaka) |
| 2 sérns = 1 prabh (? prabhu) |

It is mentioned in the Ayin-i-Akbari that the sér formerly contained 18 dánas in some parts of Hindustán and 22 in others, but that it consisted of 28 at the commencement of the reign of Akbar, and was fixed at 5 tóns or 20 máshas, or, as stated in one place, 20 máshas 7 rattis. The ancient sér noticed in the Ayin-i-Akbari therefore coincided nearly with the sér stated in the Rájamártranda. The double sér is still (1799) used in some places, but called by the same name (paúcha-sérni) as the weight of five sérns employed in others.”

Prinsep, after tracing (Useful Tables, p. 17) the Hindu system of South India at the time of the Muhammadan invasion, through North India, to the Greco-Bactrian coinage, the kshpans and ḫyphos of 120 grs., seems to find (p. 18) in the Líléeali table signs of its recognition in Sanskrit writings, on the faith of Colebrooke’s Essays (see Vol. II, p. 532, Ed. 1873):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Líléeali</th>
<th>Ikkeri Hán.</th>
<th>British Pagoda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>paša</td>
<td>pašam</td>
<td>kāsa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 dharia</td>
<td>16 hán</td>
<td>8 fanam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 nishka (pala)</td>
<td>42 pagoda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

²² See ante, p. 29 ff.
²³ Cf. Lane-Poole, Cat. Indian Coins, B. M., Mogul Emperors, 1892, p. lxxvi. “I. e., rás.
The pagoda having varied as much as 16, 14, 28, 42 fanams, and the āpa being the weight of the ānāma.

Now Banerji's (1893) Ed. of Celebrooke's Lilāvatī (p. 1) affords the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>vardakā (cowry)</th>
<th>20 kākiñ</th>
<th>4 paṇa</th>
<th>16 dhrāma</th>
<th>16 nishka</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The text given runs as follows:

vardakānāṁ dasakadelvayāṁ yastā kākiñ ānāma-paṇa-hatrasah

tē shōdaśadṛamaṁ ihāvagayō dravnaistathā shōdaśabhisṭaṁ nishkah=

And although Celebrooke, Essays, loc. cit., says:—“The tale of shells, compared to weight of silver, may be taken on the authority of the Lilāvatī,” and then gives a table, the terminology of the table varies so much from the text of the Lilāvatī which he apparently used, that one wonders where it came from:—E. g.,

kapardaka (cowry) | 20 kākiñ | 4 paṇa, kārābapaṇa, karahika (= puraṇa of shells) | 16 bhrāma (of silver) | 16 nishka (of silver)

However that may be, Banerji’s Ed. of the Lilāvatī is careful, v. 2, to call the scale just given “money by tale” and to give Troy weights in three scales, thus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>yava</th>
<th>guṇja</th>
<th>valla</th>
<th>dharaṇa</th>
<th>gadyānakā</th>
<th>14 dhataka</th>
<th>16 karha (svarna)</th>
<th>4 pala</th>
<th>320</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The texts run as follow, vv. 3 and 4:

tulō yavābhyaṁ kathitātra guṇjā vallāstrigunjāḥ dharaṇaṁ saṁ to 'āhatan

gadyānakastaddvayāṁ indrātulyāṁ vallāstaṁaṭhākō dhatakaṁ pradīṣṭaṁ= 3

daśardhagunjāṁ pravadantī māshaṁ māshaḥvāyāṁ śōdaśabhisṭaṁ karañam

karhaścaturbhisṭaṁ palaṁ tulūjāṁ karhaṁ svarnaṁ svarnaṁ

samīḥam= 4

Now these four statements of the Lilāvatī are of the first value to the present argument. In the first place we get from them a direct reference of the popular scale of money to the ānāma, besides the concurrent Troy scales, popular and literary.

After v. 8 Banerji says there is a spurious verse inserted in the text of the Lilāvatī, giving taṅka

14 sēra

40 māṣa.

48 The existing Sūrat scale (Gazetteer, p. 268) is 3 ratī = 1kā, 18 kā = guṇdaṁ, 2 guṇdaṁ = kāla. I feel sure that I am right in taking the scale in the text as of 96 ratīs to the tōla.
the takka being \( \frac{1}{4} \) gamma and the maza being a (Auv., that is) weight "in use among the Turks and Muggals" for a weight of coin and like articles." This gives us the rate of 36 gujia (ratas) to the uppermost Troy weight, which we find to be so constant in modern Madras scales. Interpolation or not, it is an interesting statement to find in Sanskrit.

The Lilavati is of course a modern work of the XIIth Century, A. D., but it is contemporaneous with the first Muhammadan invasions, and its value therefore lies in its giving the Hindu views of bullion weights at the time of the early Indian Muhammadans, and consequently what the Muhammadans were likely to have found the scales to be amongst the people when they entered.

The whole argument, therefore, so far comes to this that there were concurrently of old in India an indigenous — or shall we say a very ancient? — scale, running 320 raktikas to the palia, and another scale, traceable to the influence of the Greek invasion over part of North India and Western Asia, running 90 ratas to the tale: that it was this last scale which the Muhammadan conquerors of the Xlth Century and onwards took up, superimposing on it some of the ponderary notions that they brought with them: and that it is the combined Greco-Indo-Muhammadan scale which has now, in infinite varieties of detail, spread itself all over modern India, becoming crystallised in one form of it (the North Indian) in the authorised general scale of the Imperial British Government; in other forms of it in the authorised scales of the Madras and Bombay Governments.

It will now be of interest to trace in some degree at least the story of the weights onwards from the Muhammadan invasion. In regard to this, the farther one goes back the more do the terms for money and bullion weights become synonymous, and at no time up to the present day have they become completely separated. And so, in tracing out the history of the terms for weights, I have included those for money, but I have given them separately, because, where money is mentioned, the question of alloy always influences the rates at which one denomination is compared with another. E.g., the number of fanams to a pagoda is a conventional proportion in a statement of Troy weights: but the number of fanams to a pagoda will vary with the alloy in any particular sort of fanam or pagoda in a statement of current money.

Taking the Provinces or Divisions of India round the Coasts, as known to the traders and Europeans before the growth of the British Empire, the general tables may be given as follow for Gujarat, Bombay, Malabar, Madras and Bengal: —

A. — Gujarat.

### (a) Money.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1838</th>
<th>1771</th>
<th>1775</th>
<th>1776</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kanun (cowry)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pie</td>
<td>peckas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

47 Turks, Mughals, Oriental foreigners from the West. 48 There is a sketch of the history of South Indian coinage in the Madras Man. Adms., Vol. I. p. 91. There is also a good note on the subject in Rise, Moore, and Coors, Vol. I., Appx., p. 1 f. 49 36 almonds = 1 peysa; also are mentioned "brass and copper money called tahques." 50 5 pissa = 1 rupee. 51 I, e., of gold.
### (b) Troy Weights.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1638</th>
<th>1711</th>
<th>1736</th>
<th>c. 1833</th>
<th>1877</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ropia (a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 massa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1½ theil (b) (silver)</td>
<td>32 tola</td>
<td>32 tola</td>
<td>12 tola</td>
<td>2 tola</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 theil (b) (gold)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### (c) Avoirdupois Weights.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1638</th>
<th>1711</th>
<th>1736 (a)</th>
<th>c. 1833</th>
<th>1877</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pcses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 ceer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 maon (30) lbs.</td>
<td>40 maund (37\frac{1}{2}) lbs.</td>
<td>40 man (37\frac{1}{2}) lbs.</td>
<td>40 man</td>
<td>20 candy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### B. Bombay \(a\)

#### (a) Money.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1675</th>
<th>1739</th>
<th>1775</th>
<th>1775</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rayie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 pice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 lare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 xeraphin</td>
<td></td>
<td>400 rupee</td>
<td>16 rupee</td>
<td>15 gold rupee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(a\) See also A. Hamilton, East Indies, Vol. II, Appx., p. 5.
\(a\) Stevens says that the weights here gave rise to much dispute.
\(a\) Also 11 and 13 ropia = 1 theil silver.
\(a\) Probably for tole (tola), which he mixed up with the more familiar theil (tanka). But Mandelstã seems here to have got mixed in a way very unusual with him: ropia and massa have become reversed.
\(a\) Also 20 pice.
\(a\) I. e., gold is to silver as 10 to 1: cf. Prinsep, Usefu Tables, p. 5.
\(a\) 1739. A. Hamilton, East Indies, Vol. II, Appx., p. 5, 20 to 32 pice to 1 ear, 40 ear 1 maund, 20 maunds. 1 candy.
\(a\) Also 37, 42, 44, 48, 49, 40, 42, 45. Really all weights between 37 and 46 lbs.
\(a\) Included in Malabar by Stevens, p. 129. 10 pice = 1 lare; 24 pice = 1 xeraphin (silver pagoda),
\(a\) 11 quarters = 1 pagoda (gold), p. 129.
(b) Troy Weights.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1775</th>
<th>1775</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ganze 66</td>
<td>6 gns. (rupee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2½ vall</td>
<td>2½ vall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 tola (rupee)</td>
<td>40 tola</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(c) Avordupois Weights.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1789</th>
<th>1775</th>
<th>c. 1833</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sear</td>
<td>30 seer</td>
<td>tānk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 mannd</td>
<td>40 man (23 lbs.)</td>
<td>40 man (23 lbs.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 candy</td>
<td>20 candy</td>
<td>20 khāng</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. — Malabar.

(a) Money.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1510</th>
<th>1520</th>
<th>1584</th>
<th>1688</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>copayqua (sapêque)</td>
<td>2 reis</td>
<td>20 damma</td>
<td>6 tanga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 rey</td>
<td>2 bazaruco</td>
<td>20 damma</td>
<td>15 vintín</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90 pardao</td>
<td>5 serphim</td>
<td>5 pardaw</td>
<td>2 ducat</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

66 No doubt for jem, barleycorn.
67 This term is explained at p. 312 of Venkateswami Row's *Tanjore*, 1883, in the course of a rather interesting note on weights and measures: — "The theoretical unit of weight is the seed of the *oburu pereiras* (tile), called in Tamil *baramam* and in Hindustani *ganj*, and of these seeds 32 are supposed to be equal to the ponderary value of a pagoda." Guzis is, therefore, *guja*.
68 2 vintén = 1 bargayum.
69 e. i., vintén.
70 7 and 8 tanga = 1 pagoda.
71 Also 4 and 5. 10 and 11 togha = 1 ducat.
72 Also 5.
73 3 testones = 1 pardao.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. 1600</th>
<th>C. 1600</th>
<th>1638</th>
<th>1776</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basarucos</td>
<td>Basarucos</td>
<td>Basaruggestions</td>
<td>Re</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 and 15 vintin</td>
<td>105 fana</td>
<td>9 peise (peyse)</td>
<td>2 bazaraco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 and 4 tanga (larin)</td>
<td>18 lari</td>
<td>4 laree</td>
<td>2 pecka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 pardao xeraffin</td>
<td>20 pardao xeraffin</td>
<td>10 pagoda</td>
<td>3 xeraphim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 sichino (venetian)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1775
Stevens, Guide, p. 129.

Vintin
44 tangu (? gold)
4 parn
2 gold rupee

(b) Troy Weights.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1443</th>
<th>1504-5</th>
<th>C. 1833</th>
<th>1883</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jital (copper)</td>
<td>Cas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 târ (silver)</td>
<td>16 tare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 fanam (gold)</td>
<td>16 fanam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 partâb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 varâla (1 misqâl)</td>
<td>20 pardao</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9 palâm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(c) Avoirdupois Weights.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. 1340</th>
<th>1638</th>
<th>C. 1833</th>
<th>1883</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Misqâl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rupee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 rith (sir)</td>
<td>Ceere</td>
<td>Sîr</td>
<td>10 pollum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 mann</td>
<td>40 maon</td>
<td>40 tulâm (23/4 lbs.)</td>
<td>4 pound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 candy</td>
<td></td>
<td>25 tulâm (maund)</td>
<td>20 candy (maurum)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

74 Also 108.  
75 I. e., of Pondicherry.  
76 The rihl being 1 lb. av.; this proves what the sir then was.
ON THE SOUTH-INDIAN RECESSION OF THE MAHABHARATA.

BY M. WINTERNITZ, Ph.D.

That the South-Indian MSS. of the Mahabharata represent a distinct recession of the great Hindu epic has first been pointed out by A. C. Burnell in his Aindra School of Sanskrit Grammarians (1875), pp. 75-80, and again in his Classified Index to the Sanskrit MSS. in the Palace at Tanjore (1880), p. 180 sq. He has shown that especially the longer books, I.-XV., in the Devanāgarī editions on the one hand and in the Grantha and Malayālam MSS. on the other "differ to as great an extent as the two chief recensions of the Rāmdyana."

NOTE.

1. Also 40 and 42.
The general result of a collation of the two recensions of the Adiparvan is according to Dr. Burnell "that the Nāgarī recension has about ten per cent. more slokas than the South-Indian recension; these slokas generally form passages wanting in the last. Of the rest of the text, a considerable portion (numerous vv. II. apart) is the same in both; the rest of the text presents slokas found in the Devanāgarī recension, but with many vv. II., and in a totally different order. The short chapters agree generally in both recensions." Dr. Burnell also states that the South-Indian recension of the Mahābhārata is divided into 24 books, the Adiparvan being divided into the Adī, Astika, and Sambhava Parvams, the Salya into Salya and Gudā, the Sanhitika into Sanhitika, Aishāka, and Viśoka, and the Sāntiparvan into the Rājadharman and Mokṣadharmar Parvams. The single books, again, differ considerably in the number of their chapters.

The Tanjore library is extremely rich in Mahābhārata MSS. — Dr. Burnell counted about 336 MSS. of the whole or parts of the poem — and it is very much to be regretted that all these treasures should be well nigh inaccessible to European scholars. An edition of the Mahābhārata has been printed at Madras, in Telugu characters, which in a very few cases seems to represent the South-Indian recension, though on the whole it is based on the Calcutta edition and gives the text of Nilakaṇṭha. I am indebted to Prof. Ludwig for some interesting communications about this edition. He has collated several thousand stanzas of the Madras edition with those of Calcutta and Bombay, and has come to the conclusion that the Madras text is essentially the same as that of the Calcutta edition. Even misprints in the latter edition have found their way into the Madras edition. Yet, as Prof. Ludwig points out, we find occasionally better readings in the Madras edition, than in the Devanāgarī editions. Dr. Liders has pointed out to me a few passages in the Madras edition where it agrees with the text of our South-Indian MSS., though in other places it follows the Calcutta edition as closely as possible. The edition will be scarcely of any use for a critical restoration of the text of the Mahābhārata.

Another Telugu edition is mentioned in the Catalogue of the Library of the India Office, Vol. II. Part I. p. 122 sqq., but as it contains Nilakaṇṭha's commentary it can hardly be expected to represent the South-Indian recension to any great extent. There are also a number of South-Indian Mahābhārata MSS. in the India Office Library which, however, have not yet been examined. As far as I am able to see from the published catalogues, the number of South-Indian MSS. in the Continental libraries can be but small, and even in the Tanjore Library the number of Devanāgarī MSS. is much larger than that of South-Indian MSS. proper.

Under these circumstances it is all the more satisfactory to know that the Royal Asiatic Society in London possesses a number of highly valuable Grantha and Malayālam MSS., containing a considerable portion of the South-Indian recension of the Mahābhārata.

I have examined these MSS. for my catalogue of Sanskrit MSS. in the Royal Asiatic Society collections which I am preparing, and I venture to think that a few remarks on the South-Indian recension of the Mahābhārata, as represented by these MSS., may be welcome to scholars interested in Mahābhārata criticism — which, after all, will never lead to satisfactory results, as long as it is not based on sound text criticism.

The MSS. in question all belong to the Whish Collection, acquired by Mr. C. M. Whish in the early part of the present century.

1 Prof. Jacobi who has also examined the Madras edition kindly informs me that he has come to the same conclusions as Prof. Ludwig. Prof. Jacobi has moreover made a concordance of the three editions from which it appears that the Madras edition agrees, almost everywhere, with the numbers of verses and chapters found in the Calcutta edition. Exem the Introduction to the Sabhā Parvan (Vol. I. p. 276) it is evident that the Editor of the Madras edition looked upon Nilakaṇṭha as his chief authority.

2 Some of these MSS. are now being examined by Dr. Liders.

3 A rough list of these MSS. will be found in the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society for 1890, Vol. XXII. p. 865 sqq. My catalogue will, I hope, be finished in the course of this year.
Portions of the Adiparvan are found in the Whish MSS. Nos. 65 and 158.

The Grantha MS. Whish No. 65 contains the Paulomaparvan (in 8 Adhyāyas) and the Āsīkāmaparvan (in 40 Adhyāyas), these 48 Adhyāyas corresponding to Adhyāyas 1-59 of the Nāgārī editions.

The difference in the number of Adhyāyas is partly due to the fact that two Adhyāyas are sometimes contracted into one, but partly also to omissions in the South-Indian MS.

In order to give some idea of the value of the South-Indian recension — as far as one single MS. can be said to represent a whole recension — for an eventual critical restoration of the text of the Mahābhārata, I have given below a few extracts from this MS. The passages which differ from the Devanāgarī recension have been underlined, and the corresponding passages given opposite each line. The full text given in the left hand column is a fair specimen of what the South-Indian recension is like, while the varieta lectionis given in the right hand column will shew at a glance the relation of the two recensions to each other.

The first extract contains the beginning of the Mahābhārata, verses 1-150 of the first Adhyāya.

A.

Adiparvan.

South-Indian MS.

Devanāgarī edition (Bombay).

1

Nārāyaṇa naman nāmādhyāya nāmātmaḥ.

Deest.

2

वेर्या सतर्कत्रियै ततो अवशषिरिेत्त्

रूसः ४००.

3

वर्णानां ब्रह्मवेदक्ष्याधिकर्षिततः.

वेर्या पराशरमासिनाः.

4

भोगाणव्र दुनिस्तत्रसंबोधितं वर्णान् वेदां भोगाणव्रादि महापुराणस्य वर्णसाधनाम्.

वेर्या वर्णानां वेदां भोगाणव्रादि महापुराणस्य वर्णसाधनाम्.

Deest.

5

लोकः सोमीति: "नैनिया" कवितामाने deest.

5

रूसः ४००.

6

समासाने मानसां: विहारवादः पवस्त्रान्तः.

समासाने मानसां: विहारवादः पवस्त्रान्तः.

7

कालः कल्याणवादे दुर्घटादृश्यो गमन.

कालः कल्याणवादे दुर्घटादृश्यो गमन.

8

सूत:.

* In all the extracts given in this paper, I have retained the orthography of the South-Indian MSS. No attempt at correction has been made, except occasionally (see the foot-notes).

* I have used the Bombay edition with Nilakanṭha’s commentary, published śake 1799.

* Read विहारवादः.

Read रूसः ४००.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>South-Indian MS.</th>
<th>Devanagari edition (Bombay).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>जनमेवादस्य राजपूतनःपरीः महामात्रः।</td>
<td>पारिः</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>समीपे पारियंतेः सम्वरे पराक्रितिः च।</td>
<td>सम्बिधिः:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>कुञ्जप्रीत्यभानस्यक्ष्यविनयः कथा:।</td>
<td>वै</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>कथितास्यपि विविधवः वैशालीपानेः च।</td>
<td>सम्बिधिः:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>शृद्धान्ताः विविधाःस्य सम्बिधिः।</td>
<td>कुञ्जनः पारियाः च</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>बुध्युः संस्थिरक्रमः सीताब्ध्यायाःसाच।</td>
<td>कुञ्जनः पारियाः च</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>समतहः क्षामः पुण्ये खण्डालं भनिने।</td>
<td>कुञ्जनः पारियाः च</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>गतवर्णाः तन्यं जुडः वस्मायम् चन्द्।</td>
<td>कुञ्जनः पारियाः च</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पाण्डवाः कुञ्जनाः जुडः बस्मायम् महीनिः।</td>
<td>कुञ्जनः पारियाः च</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>विपुलायस्यस्मात्सहस्री समवायिः।</td>
<td>कुञ्जनः पारियाः च</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>आधुनिकमस्य एव प्राचीनोऽहिः व नेन भंति।</td>
<td>कुञ्जनः पारियाः च</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>अन्यायं महामात्रसुवर्णायाःवक्तयोः।</td>
<td>कुञ्जनः पारियाः च</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>कुञ्जनः पारियाः च।</td>
<td>कुञ्जनः पारियाः च</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>नवनिर्माणोऽहिः किमह्यंनुः।</td>
<td>कुञ्जनः पारियाः च</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पुराणाः भिन्नः कथा या सम्बिद भिन्नः।</td>
<td>कुञ्जनः पारियाः च</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>इति कृष्णदेवस्यद्याभियुक्ताः महामात्रः।</td>
<td>कुञ्जनः पारियाः च</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>श्रीमालेक्ष्मान्तः कथा।</td>
<td>कुञ्जनः पारियाः च</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>नवपोष्योऽहिः कथा।</td>
<td>कुञ्जनः पारियाः च</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>सुरास्यस्यभास्यः चुः वर्णं वदनीतुः।</td>
<td>कुञ्जनः पारियाः च</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>सदाश्ववर्णायाः विविधाः।</td>
<td>कुञ्जनः पारियाः च</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>सुकृतायमायुः ब्रह्मवेश्यः वेद्ययंस्य च।</td>
<td>कुञ्जनः पारियाः च</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>भारतेवं तितास्य पुष्पायाः प्रभायाः सिद्धिः।</td>
<td>कुञ्जनः पारियाः च</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>संस्कृतायाः प्राचीना।</td>
<td>कुञ्जनः पारियाः च</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>महामात्रायाः।</td>
<td>कुञ्जनः पारियाः च</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>जननेवायाः श्रीमालेक्ष्मान्तः।</td>
<td>कुञ्जनः पारियाः च</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>यथायाः सुभितः पुराणः न ततुरुः।</td>
<td>कुञ्जनः पारियाः च</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>वैष्णवेन्द्रस्य वास्मात्स्य वास्मात्स्य मन्त्रम्।</td>
<td>कुञ्जनः पारियाः च</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>संस्कृतायाः अब्राह्मायाः।</td>
<td>कुञ्जनः पारियाः च</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>हृदिन्त्रायाः मन्त्रम्।</td>
<td>कुञ्जनः पारियाः च</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

पुण्यं महायांसुन्तमन

भवायेन परस्याये:लक्षम्या पुराणाः

संयुक्तः पुण्याः

स्तीतिः पुण्याः पुराणाः

अतोऽहिः पुण्याः

अन्यायं महामात्रायुः वेद्ययंस्य च।

संस्कृतायाः प्राचीनाः।

कुञ्जनः पारियाः च।
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>South-Indian MS.</th>
<th>Devanagari edition (Bombay):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>पुण्येश हिमवतः पते मजुरे गिरिभासते।</td>
<td>Deest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>विशीतां देहनभागेषु प्रेरितांमुखित।</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>युग्मितस्मिन्नी वस्तुदानन्तराणम् नवस्य प्रसिद्ध।</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>भरतसतिराशसः प्रेमप्रभुपाचारः संधी स्थित।</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>प्रविश्व गोरे जमेन संग्रहवस्मयम्।</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>निधिमोक्षिणानां सर्वसतममत् हृत्।</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ब्रह्मचूर्णः मुद्रेः प्रजाना वेदान्तवरदृश्।</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>तु युग्मितिस्मिन्निमयमेव हृदयः प्रविशते।</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>वामसवन्धुभवित्वो विश्वासमानं।</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>अत भवस्मृत्यम वर्षस्तरस्तरानां गतं।</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>अभावस्त्रायां रूपम् वर्णं ब्रजन्त्रसनकं।</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>यहन्निग्रीतिमार्थी जसे जगुरक्: प्रवाहि।</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>वै तु भवस्मृत्यम मयानं वर्षस्तरस्तराः।</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>प्रविश्वः प्रविश्माय गोरेः संवर्धिन्यं।</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ततः प्रजाना पलवः प्रवर्तविविभागः।</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पुष्यपार्श्वम् प्रविश्माय गोरेः संवर्धिन्यं।</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>प्रविश्वः प्रविश्माय गोरेः संवर्धिन्यं।</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>प्रविश्वः प्रविश्माय गोरेः संवर्धिन्यं।</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>प्रविश्वः प्रविश्माय गोरेः संवर्धिन्यं।</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>प्रविश्वः प्रविश्माय गोरेः संवर्धिन्यं।</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>प्रविश्वः प्रविश्माय गोरेः संवर्धिन्यं।</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>प्रविश्वः प्रविश्माय गोरेः संवर्धिन्यं।</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>प्रविश्वः प्रविश्माय गोरेः संवर्धिन्यं।</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>प्रविश्वः प्रविश्माय गोरेः संवर्धिन्यं।</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>प्रविश्वः प्रविश्माय गोरेः संवर्धिन्यं।</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11 Read ब्रह्मचूर्णः।
12 Read योगितिस्मः।
13 Read "या"।
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>South-Indian MS.</th>
<th>Devanāgarī edition (Bombay).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>मृत्युपानानि सर्वाणि सहस्त्रं विचारितक व दर्शनार्थम्</td>
<td>वेश गोग: सहस्त्रानि च वर्णमकारं स्वरूपः</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>धनोपाकानां विवधानां संयुक्तस्तुनाश्यः</td>
<td>सदृशः सम्बन्धः</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>नीलारसरस्वतेषु सिद्धात्यश्च सब्देशः</td>
<td>Deest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>इष्टासाहाययायं क्रियायेक युक्ताणि च</td>
<td>वेयावहः</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>इति भवानुभवस्य न एव राजमन्वम्यां</td>
<td>Deest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>संयुक्तस्तुनाश्यः तत्त्व ज्ञातं विस्तारं</td>
<td>&quot;समाहाराम्&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>विन्ययाम्बाकानाम् श्रवणश्रवणं पपशोपीत</td>
<td>विनिमयः</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>इति सि विवधं लोकः महाविष्णु सदृशः</td>
<td>उपादाय</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>मन्नासहित्यं केन्द्रानां तथादारः सतापे</td>
<td>भीमानानुभवम्</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>संयुक्तस्तुनाश्यः विवधानां श्रवणश्रवणम्</td>
<td>भीमानानुभवम्</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>विनिमयं सारस्तातांसंपर्यायं मन्नासहित्यं:</td>
<td>व्याख्या केन्द्रति मन्नासहित्यं:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>भवानुभवस्य: केन्द्रति मन्नासहित्यं:</td>
<td>तथा सतापे स्तुनायः अत्यं हेतु स्तुनायः</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>इति भवानुभवस्य: पुष्पः सारस्तातांसंपर्यायं</td>
<td>विनिमयः</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पोरासाहाययायं सर्वाणि सहस्त्रं विचारितक</td>
<td>व्याख्या केन्द्रति मन्नासहित्यं:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>मानुषोपमंकारं सतापे स्तुनायः</td>
<td>भीमानानुभवम्</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>कृपेवती विनिमयं कृपेवती विनिमयं</td>
<td>पुष्पमानुभवम्</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>बीमानानुभवम्:</td>
<td>व्याख्या केन्द्रति मन्नासहित्यं:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>इति भवानुभवस्य: पुष्पः सारस्तातांसंपर्यायं</td>
<td>पुष्पमानुभवम्</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>जगानं सर्वाणि सहस्त्रं विचारितक</td>
<td>व्याख्या केन्द्रति मन्नासहित्यं:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>तवद्वारायं देवेन नाथे क परां गति:</td>
<td>उपादाय</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>अभवित नाथे सप्तम मन्नासहित्यं:</td>
<td>भीमानानुभवम्</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>जमिनमेवै प्रसूतयं वायुंस्य संसवः</td>
<td>भीमानानुभवम्</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>बशास विनिमयानि वेयावहायं मन्नासहित्यं:</td>
<td>भीमानानुभवम्</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>स वस्त्रावस्थायाः सतापे स्तुनायः</td>
<td>कम्पनास्वरुपं व्याख्या केन्द्रति मन्नासहित्यं:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>कम्पनास्वरुपं व्याख्या केन्द्रति मन्नासहित्यं:</td>
<td>कम्पनास्वरुपं व्याख्या केन्द्रति मन्नासहित्यं:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>कल्याणं: मन्नासहित्यं: कल्याणं: मन्नासहित्यं:</td>
<td>कल्याणं: मन्नासहित्यं: कल्याणं: मन्नासहित्यं:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>वाल्लास्वरुपं मन्नासहित्यं: मन्नासहित्यं:</td>
<td>वाल्लास्वरुपं मन्नासहित्यं: मन्नासहित्यं:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>वाल्लास्वरुपं मन्नासहित्यं: मन्नासहित्यं:</td>
<td>वाल्लास्वरुपं मन्नासहित्यं: मन्नासहित्यं:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>वाल्लास्वरुपं मन्नासहित्यं: मन्नासहित्यं:</td>
<td>वाल्लास्वरुपं मन्नासहित्यं: मन्नासहित्यं:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>उपादाय</td>
<td>उपादाय</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>तेषु जातेः सारस्तातांसंपर्यायं</td>
<td>भीमानानुभवम्</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>जगानं सर्वाणि सहस्त्रं विचारितक</td>
<td>भीमानानुभवम्</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>भोको स्तुनायः च पुष्पमानुभवम्</td>
<td>भीमानानुभवम्</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>भि</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ततोऽध्यायः</td>
<td>तत्तथायः दुःखः</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>वस्त्रावस्थायं स्तुनायः</td>
<td>&quot;सन्तो लोकानं कृर्मानवोच्चताः&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>वानीः</td>
<td>&quot;म्यो&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>विभिन्नस्य तथा</td>
<td>तत्वात्त्विकतयः</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>प्राप्ततः</td>
<td>सर्वदिनयाम्:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>सर्वदिनयाम्:</td>
<td>सर्वदिनयाम्:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>सर्वदिनयाम्:</td>
<td>सर्वदिनयाम्:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
South-Indian MS.

परिहारस्वातान्त्रको वास्तविक रितीमा तत्त्व.
भेदताल गूढ़ता मानना दर्शित है।

Deest.

६९

कुलमनुष्यों को निवास भाषा परम्परा है।
प्रथम वर्षाकाल में व्याख्यात भाषाही भस्मय होता है।

६१

लगायतपिंडित्व वेदांग विलासभीमता है।
इतिहासियों तथा विचारण प्रकृति वत्त।
मूल भाषा निविद्या विचित्र कालांतर है।
जयमात्र भाषा स्वाभाविक भाषाओं है।

६२

विवेक च धर्मस्व साधनाः हि तत्त्वाः।
此项上看, looking up.

६४

प्रथम भाषाचं पूष्पाच्चार्यमानस्यां।
प्रथम भाषाचं भाषाचं गुड़ह।
पदार्थविज्ञान भाषाचं गुड़ह।
स्थलों वधुवी गुरुगः प्रत्ययांपूर्वक।

६६

यथेऽत्साहसितः च तत्त्वाः पश्चिमस्व।
यथाश्चार्याः पश्चिमस्व प्रत्ययांपूर्वक।
क्षमामूलवाच्याः पूर्वां पश्चिमस्व।

६७

इत्यत्साहसितः जनम विज्ञानस्य विचाराः।
तीर्थाः पूर्वां पूर्वां पदार्थविज्ञान भाषाचं।
नरेण्यविज्ञान वनां सागरस्व च।

६८

पुराणाः द्वियमानं कृत्यां विज्ञानोऽवधारणा च।
वाचाकाराः विनिवेशाः लोकानांमें लक्ष्यः।
बालाध्य सर्वां गुहामन्त्र प्रथम स्नानस्व।

६९

Deest.

७०

व्रताः।
तत्साहितां चतुर्वित्वाः त्रैविष्णुविवादाः।
मदवेदमात्र लोकमात्र रहस्यमयावर्तमात्र।
जनमंडलः सख्यां में विनाशावर्तमात्र।

७१

स्वभाव च कालांतरस्य तत्त्वाः काल निविद्याः।
अथ व्याख्या विचारोऽन स्वभाव विचारोऽन।
विचारोऽन गृहस्वत्त्व इत्यादि।

७२

Deest.

७३
South-Indian MS.

Devandgari edition (Bombay).
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Deost.

Sahajaannalottos Dhruvapratyayannambha Bhijam.
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I do not propose to enter into a full discussion of all the various readings found in the above extract, but will only draw the attention of scholars to the most striking points.

The MS. is quite consistent in writing Romaharshaqa for Lomaharshaqa, Naimüa for Naimśa, and almost consistent in giving the name Sīta instead of Sāuti.

The most important divergence between the two recensions begins with verse 55, and the most characteristic fact is the omission of the story of Gaṇēśa who undertakes to write down the Mahābhārata. The order of the verses 55-109 differs entirely in the two recensions, but this different arrangement in the South-Indian recension is by no means necessitated by the omission of the story of Gaṇēśa. If the author of the South-Indian version had simply wished to shorten the narrative by omitting this story, he might have achieved his end with much less trouble. Nor is it probable that the author or compiler of this version had any scruples about the mention of writing in the story, and on this account omitted every allusion to Gaṇēśa's acting as a scribe for Vyāsā. In order to enable the reader to decide, in this special case, which of the two versions is preferable, and whether it is more likely that the legend of Gaṇēśa is an interpolation in the Northern recension, or that it has been omitted by the compiler of the Southern recension though he knew it to be part of the Mahābhārata — I give below, in parallel columns, a short sketch of the contents of verses 55-111, (a) according to the Bombay edition, and (b) according to our Grantha MS.

(a) Dravadya (Bombay) edition.

54. (1) Vyāsā, the son of Satyavatī and Parāśara, composed the Mahābhārata.

55-56a. (2) Having composed it, he considered how he might teach it to his disciples.

56-60b. (3) Brahman, knowing the thoughts of Vyāsā, appears and is received by Vyāsā with due respect.

61. (4) Vyāsā addresses Brahman, telling him that he has composed that great poem.

62-70a. (5) Giving a list of all the subjects treated of in this poem,

70a. (6) and winding up with the words: 'However, no writer (lekakā) of this work is found on earth.'

71-73b. (7) Brahman replies praising Vyāsā as a great poet and sage,

73c. (8) and finally advising him to think (with an inward prayer) of Gaṇēśa for the purpose of writing down the poem.

74a. (9) Then Brahman returns to his abode.

(b) South-Indian MS.

1. Vyāsā, the son of Satyavatī and Parāśara, composed the Mahābhārata.

2. Vyāsā, by Niyoga, becomes the father of the Kauravas.

3. His sons having grown up, etc., Vyāsā proclaimed the Mahābhārata, teaching Vaiśampāyana and reciting the poem during intervals of the sacrifice.


5. This Bhārata contains 100,000 verses, including the Upākhyānas.

6. Vyāsā made the Bhārata of 24,000 verses, without the Upākhyānas.

7. Afterwards the Rishi composed another epitone in 150 (?) verses of this most excellent of stories.

8. And he considered how he might teach it to his disciples.

9. Brahman, knowing the thoughts of Vyāsā, appears and is received by Vyāsā with due respect.

12 So also Romapāda for Lomapāda in the Vasapareṇa.
(a) Devanāgari (Bombay) edition.*

743-80. (10) Vyāsa directs his devotional thoughts to Gāṇeśa, who as soon as thought of, appears, and writes down the Mahābhārata which Vyāsa dictates to him.

81. (11) I (Saúti?) know 8800 verses, so does Sūka, Sañjaya may know them or not.

82. (12) The hidden meaning of the Mahābhārata no one is able to penetrate.

83a. (13) Even omniscient Gāṇeśa took a moment to consider.

83b. (14) Vyāsa also composed many other verses.

84-87. (15) The Mahābhārata extolled as the best of poems.

88-92. (16) The Mahābhārata is a tree, of which the Parvans are seed, root, etc.

93. (17) Sūti says: ‘I will now speak of the branches, flowers, fruits, etc., of that tree.’

94-96a. (18) Vyāsa, by Nyóga, becomes the father of the Kauravas.

96b-99a. (19) His sons having grown up, etc., Vyāsa proclaimed the Mahābhārata, teaching Vaiśampāyana and reciting the poem during intervals of the sacrifice.


101b-102. (21) This (first) Bhārata contains 100,000 verses, including the Upākhyaṇas.

102b-103a. (22) Vyāsa made the Bhārata of 24,000 verses, without the Upākhyaṇas.

103b. (23) Afterwards the Rishi composed another epitome in 150 verses.

(b) South-Indian MS.

10. (10) Vyāsa addresses Brahmān, telling him that he has composed that great poem, 16

11. (11) giving a list of all the subjects treated of in this poem.

12. (12) Brahmāna replies praising Vyāsa as a great poet and sage,

13. (13) extolling the Mahābhārata as the best of poems,

14. (14) and describing the Mahābhārata as a tree of which the Parvans are seed, root, etc.

15. (15) Then Brahmāna returns to his abode.

16. (16) Sūti says: ‘I will now speak of the branches, flowers, fruits, etc., of that tree.’

17. (17) The Anukramanikādyaya and Parvasaṅgraha (?)

18. (18) This it was what Vyāsa first taught to his son Sūka, then to other fit pupils.

19. (19) Nārada recited it to the Devas, Asita Devala to the Pitris, Sūka to the Gandharvas, Yaksas and Rakshas, Vaiśampāyana to Janamejaya.

20. (20) Duryodhana and Yudhishṭhira represented as trees.

---

* The two lines 60b and 61a are clearly omitted by a scribe's carelessness, the omission being easily accounted for by अर्णेवतिः in line 60a and अर्णेविः in 61a.
(a) Devarāja (Bombay) edition.
104a. (24) consisting of Anukramaṇikādhikāya and Parvasaṇagraha (?).
104b-105a. (25) This Vyāsa first taught to his son Suka, then to other fit pupils.
105b-107a. (26) Then he composed another Stūkita for the gods, another for the Pitris, one for the Gandharvas, besides the one for men.
107b-109a. (27) Nārada recited them to the Devas, Asita Deva to the Pitris, Suka to the Gandharvas, Yaksas, and Rakshas, Vaiśampāyana to men.
109b. (28) I (Sautri ?) recited 100,000 slokas.
110-111. (29) Duryodhana and Yudhishṭhira represented as trees.

(b) South-Indian MS.

It will be admitted at once that neither of the two versions sketched above is quite satisfactory.

In both versions Vyāsa considers how he might teach the Mahābhārata to his disciples, whereupon the god Brahman appears. The Northern recension here introduces Ganeśa who, on Brahman’s suggestion, is charged with writing down the Mahābhārata. But we are not told that this copy made by Ganeśa was ever used by Vyāsa as a means of instructing his disciples. On the contrary, it is pretty clear from vv. 80-83 that the legend of Ganeśa was chiefly invented in order to enhance the vastness of the Mahābhārata, and the profundity of its teaching, and to show the skill of Vyāsa in dictating the poem without a stop. The statement in v. 81 about Santi, Suka, and Sañjaya knowing 8,000 verses comes in quite abruptly and contradicts the statements of v. 103. Even more abrupt is the transition from v. 93 to vv. 94 seqq. Santi says that he is going to speak about the flowering and the production of fruit of the tree called Mahābhārata. Then follows the story of Vyāsa’s Niyoga, his instructing Vaiśampāyana, and reciting the poem at Janaśeṣa’s sacrifice (vv. 965-99a). It is just possible, though not probable, that the summary in vv. 99-101 was intended to be the description of the ‘flowering and production of fruit’ of the Mahābhārata tree. But it seems to me more probable that vv. 110 seqq., if not 112 seqq., should follow immediately after v. 93.

In the South-Indian recension, the allusion to Vyāsa’s Niyoga (vv. 965 seqq.) follows, more properly, after v. 94. But we meet with the same difficulty in the Southern, as in the Northern recension, when Vyāsa begins to consider as to the best method of teaching the Mahābhārata, and Brahman appears. It is by no means clear how Vyāsa derives any help from the god in his perplexity, unless it be by Brahman’s describing the Mahābhārata as a tree, of which the eighteen Parvan are root, branches, etc.

There is, in the Southern version too, a hiatus after the words of Sūta or Sautri, “I will speak of the branches, flowers, fruits, etc., of that tree (vīś, the Mahābhārata),” but this hiatus is, at any rate, not so great as in the Northern recension.

I am puzzled by the two lines:

अनुक्रमिकाद्वितीय त्रिनिष्ठा नवमीत्रो द्वारा नन्दा भास्कर्यां
रवि हैनावनः पूर्णे नामस्यात्मकस्तत्त्वात् ॥
The neuter द्व is seems odd. But I prefer the Southern recension, when it omits vv. 105b-107a. This story of Vyása's having composed special Sāṁhitās for the gods, the Pītris, and the Gandharvas is probably an after-thought suggested by vv. 107b, 108a, relating merely that Nārada recited the Mahābhārata to the gods, Asita Deva to the Pītris, and Suka to the Gandharvas, Yakshas, and Rakshas.

There is nothing in the Southern recension that would justify us in assuming that its compiler knew the legend of Gaṇeśa. Even the editor of the Telugu edition of the Mahābhārata gives the legend in brackets. If, in addition to this evidence, we remember that Kṛṣṇa, in his Bhāratamālaṇjārī, does not allude to the legend of Gaṇeśa, we are, I believe, justified in suspecting this legend of a more recent origin than the rest of the introductory story of the Mahābhārata.

It is true that the legend of Gaṇeśa acting as a scribe for Vyása must have been known to Rājaśekhara, ca. 900 A.D. For in his Prachandaṇḍīdisavatā Nāṭaka this poet introduces Vyása speaking to Vālmīki about the progress of his great work, and telling him how he had succeeded in outwitting the god Gaṇeśa and compelling him to act as his scribe. I give the passage according to the edition of the work in the Kāvyamālā. (p. 5). Vyása says:—

"भवनिविम के सिद्धार्थसमाधय गुणनिशिष्य देव:।
ग स वसति भारतसंभवाय बुधशारसिमेन नेलकोप!।"

This is, no doubt, the same legend as that told in the Mahābhārata (I. 1, 74-80), although there is no mention of Brahman, who according to the Mahābhārata advised Vyása to address himself to Gaṇeśa, in the drama of Rājaśekhara, who only says that Vyása obtained Gaṇeśa's help by means of austerities (tapasvā). On the other hand, the words of Vyása om ity astu in the Prachandaṇḍīdisavatā look almost like a reminiscence of the phrase (used however of Gaṇeśa) om ity uktvā in the Mahābhārata, I. 1, 79.

But if Rājaśekhara knew the legend of Gaṇeśa—even if there should, be a slight verbal agreement between the two narratives—does this prove that he knew it from the Mahābhārata? Such a legend must have been current for a long time before it was inserted in the Mahābhārata. Rājaśekhara may have known it as an independent Itihāsa, or he may have taken it from some Purāṇic source. It must be remembered that the story occurs not in the body of Rājaśekhara's work, which is mainly an epitome of certain Purāṇas of the Mahābhārata, but in an introductory scene—shewing us Vālmīki, the renowned poet of the Bāmbhāyaṇa, and Vyása, the author of the Mahābhārata, engaged in a pleasant conversation—which is entirely

37 I am indebted to Dr. Bühler for drawing my attention to this fact. [Since this was written, Indian studies have suffered the severest loss that could have befallen them, by the untimely death of my revered Guru. It was at his request that I wrote some notes on the Gaṇeśa legend in the Mahābhārata for the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society—see April number 1898, pp. 350-84—to which (as he wrote to me in his last letter) he intended to add a 'āṭaka' of his own in the next following number of the Journal. The Gaṇeśa legend discussed above had a peculiar interest for the departed scholar on account of its bearing on the history of writing in India, and I ought to state that it was his opinion that Rājaśekhara knew the Gaṇeśa legend from the Devanāgarī version of the Mahābhārata, as found in our editions. To the omission of the story in Kṛṣṇendrā's Bhāratamālaṇjārī he attached little importance. "There are (he wrote to me) even more characteristic features of the Mahābhārata which are omitted by Kṛṣṇendra—omissions which can easily be explained by his desire "to measure the elephant with the closed fist.""

No doubt in the world that the āṭaka to my notes on Gaṇeśa which the departed intended to give, would have been far more valuable than anything I have said on the subject. Also, the history of the Mahābhārata is one of the many points in the history of Indian literature on which Bühler's vast scholarship was useful to shed new and unexpected light—and in this respect also the loss of our great Guru who was the most enthusiastic student as well as the truest lover of India, is simply irreparable.]
Rājāśekhara's own invention. And in this scene he might well have inserted the legend of Gaṇeśa, in order to enhance the greatness of Vyāsa and his work. It is not necessary that he found it in his version of the Mahābhārata.

For the present, at any rate, I should prefer to say that the legend of Gaṇeśa was known already about 600 A.D., but that even in Keshmendra's time—about 150 years later—it was not yet a part of the Mahābhārata. It seems to me highly improbable that Keshmendra should have omitted such a characteristic story, if he had found it in his Mahābhārata, especially as he could easily have condensed the whole story into one or two stanzas. We shall see below that this is not the only instance in which Keshmendra agrees with the South-Indian recension of the Mahābhārata.

From a mythological point of view our passage is also of some importance. For it is remarkable that our legend is the only legend of Gaṇeśa found in the epic literature. I am not aware that Gaṇeśa is even mentioned in any other passage either of the Rāmāyana or of the Mahābhārata, and it may well be doubted whether he has any claim to a place in the Epic Pantheon. He is certainly not a Vedic deity in any sense of the word. He is not mentioned in the Smṛitis, not even in Manus.18 In the Yaśñavalkya-Smrīti we meet with him (it seems) for the first time. Here the worship of Gaṇeśa has been ingrafted on an older Vindyaśakti. The Vindyaśakas are a class of evil spirits (who are the cause of evil dreams) for whose propitiation a Vindyaśakāḍā is prescribed in the Mānavagrīhyasūtra. As the late Dr. von Brücke has shown, Yaśñavalkya's description of the Gānpati-homa is based on the Vindyaśakti of the Mānavagrīhyasūtra.19 But originally the Vindyaśakas—who are also mentioned in the side of Rākshasas, Piṣṭakas and Bhūtas—have nothing in common with Gaṇeśa, except the name Vindyaśaka which happens to be one of the common designations of the elephant-headed god. An actual worship of Gaṇeśa occurs only in such late Smṛitis as the Kātyayana-Smrīti (I. 11, 14) where Gaṇeśa is worshipped together with the Mothers.

But in the older literature we look in vain for any of the legends connected with Gaṇeśa's birth, or his elephant head, or his one tooth, or his rat, such as we find them in the Purāṇas. On the other hand, I have not been able to find our Gaṇeśa legend in any of the Paurānic treatises devoted to Gaṇeśa.20 But that a deity who has become so popular in later times should occur in the epic literature only in one passage, makes this one passage very suspicious. It seems, therefore, also on mythological grounds, that in this instance the South-Indian recension has preserved a less interpolated text of the Mahābhārata than that found in our editions.

Of course, it does not follow by any means that the Southern recension represents the original Mahābhārata.

(To be continued.)

18 That the gaṇapāthiyā yājñik, who according to Manu III. 164 is excluded from a śraddhā śraddhā is (as the commentators will have it) a performer of the Vindyaśaka or Gaṇeśa-homa to me utterly improbable. The most probable explanation seems that suggested by Dr. Bühler in the note to his translation of Manu (S. B. E. Vol. XXV. p. 100) that refer to the Gaṇapāthiyas of Baudhāyana Dharma. IV. 8. 1.
19 See Yaśñavalkya-Smrīti, I. 271-294; Mānavagrīhyasūtra, II. 14; Brücke in the Zeitschrift der deutschen Morgenländ. Gesellschaft, Vol. 36, pp. 426-432; Stenacher, Yaśñavalkya, p. IX; Jolly, Recht und Sitte (Bühler's Grundrisse, II. 8), p. 26. The Mānavagrīhyasūtra mentions four Vindyaśakas whose names are given. Yaśñavalkya has only one Vindyaśaka whom he identifies with Gaṇapati.
20 Mahābhārata, XII. 284, 411; Harivṃśa, 134 (16697).
21 I have not been able to trace it in the Gānela-Khaṇḍa of the Purānic-cintāmaṇi, nor in the Gānela-Ugāṇḍa, nor in the Gānela-Khaṇḍa of the Skanda-pūrṇa. For the latter I could only compare an Index of the work found in the Bodleian MS. Mill 79. But my acquaintance with these works is too superficial to allow me to say definitely that the legend does not occur in them.
FOLKLORE IN SALSETTE.

BY GEO. F. D'PENHA.

(Concluded from p. 58.)

In due course, the wedding-day came, and the marriage took place with all possible éclat. The relations and friends of the king were feasted for several days. The bridegroom, the crane, hopped about the palace and the large compound and in the adjoining garden, causing much amusement to all. During meals, too, he would stretch his long neck and pick what he would desire from the table.

After thus spending some time at the king's palace, the crane one day expressed, to his father-in-law, his desire to go home with his bride. The king could not object to this, and so his son-in-law, after bidding everyone adieu, took his royal bride home.

Now in the nights, after supper, while the princess lay down to sleep, the crane would keep hopping about. As soon as he observed that his wife had fallen asleep, he would remove his crane-skin, and assuming the form of a man, would take his place at the side of the princess. A few days passed this way. At last the princess began to entertain some doubts about her husband, the crane. To find out the realities about him, she one night went to bed, but kept awake, snoring all the while to make believe that she was fast asleep. Her husband, little thinking of the dodge, having no cause to suspect her action, divested himself of his crane-skin, and, as usual, lay down beside the wife. The princess thus found out that her husband was not really a crane as he appeared to be, but a human being like herself, and, therefore, she had no reason to regret her marriage, although he was very poor, for her father could give her what she might want, being the king's only child.

The princess's next thought was how to make her husband remain in his human form, and she hit upon the following stratagem. She pretended that she had a strong fever, and that she was feeling very cold. She asked her mother-in-law, therefore, to keep a good fire under her cot, to keep her warm during the night, as she said. The mother-in-law, too, did not suspect what was really in her daughter-in-law's mind, and, thinking what she stated might be true, kept a brisk fire burning under the cot of the princess. Night soon came, and supper over, the princess not eating anything that night on the pretence that she had no taste nor any appetite for food, they all retired to bed. That night, too, the princess kept awake, pretending to be asleep. Her husband, the crane, after a good while, thinking his wife was asleep, removed his crane-skin, and, assuming the form of a man, lay down beside the princess, and was soon fast asleep. The princess left the bed without making the slightest noise, and, getting hold of the crane-covering of her husband, threw it on the fire, which soon reduced it to ashes. Having done this the princess again lay down quietly and went to sleep. When, at the usual time, the husband woke up, he searched in vain for his covering, but, looking at the fire under the bed, he soon discovered the trick which his wife had played upon him. He questioned the princess, who frankly confessed what she had done, and craved forgiveness, which he granted with all his heart.

The news of the metamorphosis of the crane soon spread in the country, and reached the ears of the king, who came and saw for himself that it was only too true, and learnt from the princess what she had observed for several nights, and how she had brought about the transformation.

As they were very poor, the king invited them all to live with him, and on his death his son-in-law succeeded him to the throne. They then lived happily to a good old age, loved and respected by all.
NOTES AND QUERIES.

MARCH, 1893.

MORE IDIOMS FROM PORT BLAIR.

1. Total. — In common use among the convicts, who are constantly being counted for all sorts of reasons. Petty Officers are told off to count them in batches, and as each finishes his batch he brings up his “total.” Total karnā, to compare the totals.

2. Dipātmak for Department: means the Forest Department, that being the first separate department created at Port Blair. Dipātmak Sahib, Forest Officer. Dipātmakwālā, a convict told off to work in the Forest Department.

3. Shēr Sahib: shēr shortened from ‘over-seer’ from its likeness to the common Indian word shēr, a tiger. An overseer of convicts.

4. Singal, for signal = a semagram. There is an elaborate system of semaphore signals at Port Blair worked by the Military Police.

5. Tikat, tikatāv, a ticket of leave, also its holder. Tikatwālā, a man with a ticket of leave: a self-supporter. Tikat is also used for the wooden “neck-ticket” worn by labouring convicts.

6. Parmāsh, promotion. — This is in common use amongst the Military Police, and also amongst the convicts, who are constantly being transferred from class to class on “promotion.”

7. Kilās class. — The convicts are arranged in classes.

8. Sikpān, sick-man, used for a convict when in hospital: hence for any human being in the “sick-list” hence again for any Government animal on the “sick-list,” e.g., an elephant, pony, bullock.

9. Bol = rail, originally a railing, now any kind of hedge or fence.

10. Rāshān, ration. — The labouring convicts are all rationed. Rāshān-mā, ration mate; i.e., the convicts told off to help the cooks to keep and distribute the rations.

11. Chunā-bhāttā, i.e., a lime kiln, used for any place where one has once been set up. The name sticks, however much the use of the place may change in the course of time. Half a dozen spots are already so named.

12. Chaudhārī for shulderī, a native tent. — This is the name of two separate places in the Penal Settlement, because at one time convicts were encamped at each for a while.

13. Dūdh-lain, lit., the Milk-lines, i.e., a place where milk-cattle have once been kept. Two or more places are so named.

14. Namūnagār, lit., Pattern-house. — The name of a village, a convict-station and some quarries, because a sample (namūna) house (ghar) for convicts, according to which men on ticket-of-leave must build their huts, was here set up by the Government.

15. Hāthi-Ghāt, Anglicize, Elephant Point, so called, because some Government elephants were once kept there.

16. Nimak-bhāttā, salt-pana. — More than one place is so called because of a former salt manufactory on the spot from sea-water.

R. C. TEMPLE.

DAGON AND KIAKCIACK.

Here is a quaint and valuable contribution from Alexander Hamilton, New Account of the East Indies, 1739, Vol. II. p. 29, towards the history of this difficult word, which has been already discussed, ante, Vol. XXII. p. 27 f. After explaining how Shāh Shuja’ of Bengal was killed and plundered by the ruler of Arakan, he goes on to say: — “So much Treasure never had been seen in Arackan before, but to whom it should belong caused some Disturbance. The King thought that all belonged to him, those that fought claimed a Share, and the Princes of the Blood wanted some fine large Diamonds for their Ladies, but the Tribe of Levi found a way to make up the Difference, and persuaded the King and the other Pretenders, to dedicate it to the God Dagun, who was the titular God of the Kingdom, and to deposit it in his Temple, which all agreed to; now whether this be the same Dagon of Ashdod, mentioned on the first Book and fifth Chapter of Samuel, I do not certainly know, but Dagun has a large Temple in Arackan, that I have heard of, and another in Pegu that I have seen.”

At p. 56, there is given one of those useless illustrations of the period of “A prospect of the Temple of Kiakeck or Dagun.”

Again at p. 58 f., we are told that “there are two large Temples near Syrian, so like one another in Structure, that they seem to be built by one Model. One stands about six Miles to the Southward, called Kiackick, or, God of Gods Temple. In it is an Image of twenty Yards long, lying in a sleeping Posture, and, by their Tradition, has lien in that Posture 6000 Years.... The other stands in a low Plain, North of Syrian, about the same Distance called Dagun.... Assoon as Kiackick dissolves the Being and Frame of the World, Dagun or Dagon will gather up the Fragments and make a new one.”

Hamilton in the above curious narration, has, of course, mistaken the building for the object of its dedication, but so far as the word Dagun is concerned, we may arrive at its pronunciation from the spelling Dagunn.
The impossible-looking word Kisakiack, with its variant spellings, is nothing but the Talaing kyaik, any object of worship or veneration, a pagoda, equals the Burmese and Siamese phra and phaya. Secante, Vol. XXII p. 334 ff., and Hsaww’s Talaing Vocabulary, pp. xiii, 84, 40. There is, moreover, the well-known Kyaik-kauk Pagoda, that described by Hamilton, near Syrian; which, probably accounts for the repudiated forms Kisakiack and Kiekeck used by him.

R. C. Temple.

BOOK-NOTICE.

THE SIKSHASAMUCHAYA.¹

A word of congratulation must be offered to the Imperial Academy of Sciences of St. Petersburg, for its successful inauguration of the new series of Buddhist Texts, entitled the Bibliotheca Buddhica, and to Prof. Bendall for having the honour of leading it off with the first number of his edition of the Sikshasamuchaya. Philology owes much to the Academy for what it has done for Sanskrit. The monumental Dictionary of Boehtlingk and Roth issued from its doors, and is a familiar example of its more recent achievements in this department of research. But in publishing it, the Academy has only carried on traditions which dated from the first volume of its Transactions for the year 1728. Amongst the learned men who were the original members of the Academy was the celebrated Bayer, whose letters to Lacroze form the most interesting portion of the Theaevus Epitomls. It was Bayer who had the honour of being the first European scholar to decipher a Buddhist inscription in the Pali language, and to bring a knowledge of the Sanskrit alphabet to the West. These were first described by him in the Transactions of the Academy for 1728 and 1729. Before that time the only speciments of Indian alphabets which appear to have reached Europe had been published in 1715 in a collection of translations of the Lord’s Prayer contained in Chamberlayne’s Sylloge. This was an unsatisfactory work, and contained some extraordinary blunders, so that the Academy may fairly claim to be the official who introduced Oriental Philology into the western world, to have taken the promising child into its hospitable arms, and to have nursed it till it was fit to go abroad into foreign countries. Nor did its care stop here. A hundred and thirty years later, when the child had become a youth (learning ever has a long childhood), it endowed it with the great lexicon for a capital which has lasted so many years, and which is still bearing liberal interest. Now, in his full-grown manhood, she has not abandoning her loving interest in her protectée, and, under the general direction of Prof. d’Oldenburg, is forwarding his interests with this projected series of the Bibliotheca Buddhica.

¹ Sikshasamuchaya, A Compendium of Buddhist Teaching, compiled by Sattidiva, chiefly from earlier manuscripts. The inscription read by Bayer was the now familiar Oh nevi podun kus, and his knowledge of Sanskrit, such as it was, was obtained chiefly from Tibetan sources. So, also, it is from Central Asia that Sanskrit learning in St. Petersburg has on more than one other occasion received its inspirations. Witness, for instance, the Kharaśthi Manuscript exhibited by Prof. C’Oldenburg at the last Oriental Congress; and so it is but appropriate that the Imperial Academy should be the body to step forward and to offer to supply a want which has long been felt by Buddhist scholars. Buddhist works of the Southern school we have in plenty, but the examples of works of the Northern, Mahāyāna, school which have been printed are few in number, and with the exception of one or two well-known volumes, are almost confined to the publications of the lately founded, Indian, Buddhist Text Society. In addition to the Sikshasamuchaya, we may now shortly expect in the same series, the Rājatapila-paripricchhī, edited by M. Finot, the Daśabhūmikā, edited by M. de Blonay, the Abhidharma-kosa-vyakhya, edited from Chinese sources by Prof. S. Lêvi, and the Suvrata-prathās, edited by M. Finot. The first of these is in the press, and the others are under preparation.

The present edition contains the first third of the work edited by Prof. Bendall. It has the disadvantage of being based on a single MS., an ancient one, now forming a portion of the Wright collection in Cambridge. Mr. Bendall, however, has been able to supplement this by a comparison with a Tibetan version in the Hodgson collections of the India Office, and the result is a text which, considering the difficulties under which the Editor laboured, is remarkably free from doubtful passages. The work is an important one, and is, as the Title-page informs us, a compendium of Buddhist teaching of the Mahāyāna school. Mr. Bendall reserves remarks regarding the text and its contents for the completion of its publication, and for a translation which he has under preparation. All scholars will await them with interest.

Geo. A. Grierson.

Mahāyāna-sūtra, edited by C. Bendall, M.A., Fasciculus I., St. Petersburg, 1897.
CURRENCY AND COINAGE AMONG THE BURMESE.

BY R. C. TEMPLE.

(Continued from p. 67.)

E. — Bengal.

(a) Money.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1590</th>
<th>1638</th>
<th>1739</th>
<th>1775</th>
<th>1775</th>
<th>1835</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>jëtal ...</td>
<td>couries ...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>pie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 dám (paisá) ...</td>
<td>payse ...</td>
<td>30 paun ...</td>
<td>pice ...</td>
<td>4 fanam ...</td>
<td>2 double pice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>pice ...</td>
<td>1½ viz ...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 rupee (silver)</td>
<td>30 roopa ...</td>
<td>16 rupee ...</td>
<td>16 rupee ...</td>
<td>16 rupee ...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 mohar (gold)</td>
<td>2 crown ...</td>
<td>32 to 36 rupee ...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) Troy Weights.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1833</th>
<th>c. 1833</th>
<th>c. 1833</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bengal Regulation.</td>
<td>Prinsep, Useful Tables, p. 93 f.</td>
<td>Prinsep, Useful Tables, p. 96 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>punko ...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 dhan ...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 rupee ...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 masha ...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 tola ...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(c) Avoirdupois Weight.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1833</th>
<th>c. 1833</th>
<th>1897</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bengal Regulation.</td>
<td>Prinsep, Useful Tables, pp. 96, 112</td>
<td>Calcutta Bazaar Weights.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tola ...</td>
<td>tólā ...</td>
<td>sicki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 chittack ...</td>
<td>5 chhaták ...</td>
<td>5 kancha (1¼ tola)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 sér ...</td>
<td>16 sér ...</td>
<td>4 chittack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 pansēri (ylsā) ...</td>
<td>4 powah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 maund ...</td>
<td>4 seer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 khāndī (mānt) ...</td>
<td>5 pāssere</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[82] Stevens, or his printer, oddly enough (p. 129) mixes up "Calicut and Calcutta" under Bengal, an indication perhaps of the relative value of Bengal as a possession on those days.
[83] Also 10 anna = 1 janna.
[84] Also called sole.
[85] Also rupées = 1 pagoda.
[86] The "Bengal Factory maund," 1787, was 19¾% higher than the modern British Indian maund ; 3 factory maunds being made to equal 2 cwt. to save calculations in remittances to England : p. 104.
I will now proceed to note the evidence I have as regards particular Factories along the West Coast of India, premising that information regarding the main Factories of Surat, Bombay, Madras and Calcutta has been already given under the major heads of Gujarat, Bombay, Madras, and Bengal. I take the selected Factories or places from North to South thus: — Aurangabadar, abandoned in 1775, in Sindh; Goa, Carwar, Calicut and Tellicherry, Cochin, all on the Malabar Coast; and Ayengo and Onor further South in Travancore.

F. — Aurangabadar.

(a) Money.

No evidence available.

(b) Troy Weights.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1775</th>
<th>c. 1833</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stevens, Guide, p. 67</td>
<td>Prinsep, Useful Tables, p. 115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| moon | ratl |
| 24 ruttee | 6 masba |
| 12 tola | 12 tolá |

(c) Avoirdupois Weights.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1739</th>
<th>1775</th>
<th>c. 1833</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stevens, Guide, p. 67</td>
<td>Stevens, Guide, p. 67</td>
<td>Prinsep, Useful Tables, p. 115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| pice | 4 anna | 64 sér |
| 16 puca seer | 40 man (74½ lbs.) | 40 man (74½ lbs.) |

G. — Goa.

(a) Money.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1639</th>
<th>1675</th>
<th>1711</th>
<th>1739</th>
<th>1775</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| reis | basrook | ray | buaderock | leader²⁷ rees |
| 1½ basarque | 12 rees | 15 vintin | 15 vintin | 15 vintin |
| 8 vintin | 5 tango | 80 tango (silver) | 5 tango | 80 tango |
| 5 tangbe | 5 tango | 80 tango (silver) | 5 tango | 80 tango |
| 5 & 5 sera (silver) | 5 zepain | 5 pardao zaphin | 5 pardao zepain | 5 pardao zepain |
| 3 pagoda | 12 cruzado (gold) | 1½ rupee | 5 St. Thomae | 5 St. Thomae |

²⁷ Prinsep probably meant Shëhbandar, as Aurangabadar was dissolved in 1775, the year in which Stevens published his book; see Hughes, Hist. of Sindh, p. 767.
²⁸ "Weights used at Sindy."
(b) Troy Weight.
No evidence available.

(c) Avoirdupois Weight.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1711</th>
<th>1739</th>
<th>1775</th>
<th>c. 1833</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1873</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rotola (1 lb.) ...</td>
<td>rattle ...</td>
<td>rotulla ...</td>
<td>rattle ...</td>
<td>......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 arobe (avoine) ...</td>
<td>24 maund ...</td>
<td>24 maund ...</td>
<td>24 maund ...</td>
<td>aroba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 kintal ...</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>4 quintal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3½ bahar ...</td>
<td>20 candy ...</td>
<td>20 candi ...</td>
<td>20 candy ...</td>
<td>......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 1833</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prinsep, Useful Tables, p. 116.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maund ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 candy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

H. — Carwar.

(a) Money.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1711</th>
<th>1775</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>budgrook ...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>budgrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 pice ...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>3 pice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4½ juttal ...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>6 settle (jetta)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1½ fanam ...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>1½ fanam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 pagodi ...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>20 pagoda</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) Troy Weights.
No evidence available.

(c) Avoirdupois Weights.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1711</th>
<th>1775</th>
<th>c. 1833</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ser ...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>maund (26 lb.) ...</td>
<td>sér</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 maund ...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>20 candy ...</td>
<td>42 man (26 lb.) ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 candy ...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

3 I. e., a man of 32 lbs.
22 All these maunds are 24 lb.
32 220 lbs. Av.
44 I. e., 3 m. A.
### I. — Calicut and Tellicherry

#### (a) Money

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1711</th>
<th>1711</th>
<th>1739</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>———</td>
<td>tare (silver)</td>
<td>———</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fanham (gold)</td>
<td>16 fanham (gold)</td>
<td>10 fanam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5½ rupees</td>
<td>4½ rupee</td>
<td>4½ rupee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 ducat</td>
<td>———</td>
<td>———</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### (b) Troy Weights

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1775</th>
<th>1776</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>vis</td>
<td>tarr or vis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 fanam</td>
<td>16 fanam (gallees)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 &amp; 4½ rupee</td>
<td>5 rupee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### (c) Avoirdupois Weights

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1711</th>
<th>1775</th>
<th>c. 1833</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>———</td>
<td>———</td>
<td>rupees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pollam</td>
<td>———</td>
<td>20 ser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 maund (38 lbs.)</td>
<td>100 maund (30 lbs.)</td>
<td>64 &amp; 68 man^#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 candy</td>
<td>20 candy</td>
<td>———</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### J. — Cochin

#### (a) Money

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1711</th>
<th>1775</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>fanham (gold)</td>
<td>fanam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 rupee</td>
<td>9 pagoda</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

^# 3 rupees equal 7 chequen.
^$ 3½ pollam = serife.
^52 Probably pollam.
^55 32½ to 34½ lbs.
(b) Troy Weights.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1775</th>
<th>c. 1833</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>fanam</td>
<td>sēr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 9½ chequin weight | 42½ man (27½ lbs.)
| 10 rupee | 100 |

(c) Avoirdupois Weight.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1711</th>
<th>1775</th>
<th>c. 1833</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pollam</td>
<td>mannd (27½ lbs.)</td>
<td>sēr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 maund (28 lbs.)</td>
<td>20 candy</td>
<td>42½ man (27½ lbs.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

K. — Anjengo and Onor.

(a) Money.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1775</th>
<th>1775</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>vis</td>
<td>budgrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 fanam (gallion)</td>
<td>4 pice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5, 7 and 6 rupee</td>
<td>12 fanam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 pagoda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) Troy Weight.

No evidence available.

(c) Avoirdupois Weight.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1775</th>
<th>c. 1833</th>
<th>c. 1833</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stevens, Guide, p. 123.</td>
<td>Prinsep, Useful Tables, p. 115, for Anjengo.</td>
<td>Prinsep, Useful Tables, p. 120, for Onor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maund (28 lbs.)</td>
<td>telong (tulām)</td>
<td>sēr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 candy</td>
<td>1½ man (28 lbs.)</td>
<td>40 to 44 man (25 lbs.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20 khāḍi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

100 Nominal 25 lbs.
The tables just given appear at the first glance to contain merely a hopeless muddle of facts, but the more closely they are studied in the light of the facts elicited from the *Lilavati*, the *Āims Adbhut*; and the Muhammadan Indian coinage, and of the existing Indian scales, the more clearly do they appear to me to prove that the existing Indian scales are the direct descendants of that popular Indian scale of 96 ratis to the tōla already described: and that, too, despite the queer diction of travellers and traders, and the various dates and places at which they recorded their observations for three and four centuries and more. The existing scales are, moreover, substantially what they were in the days of the early Muhammadan conquerors.

These tables therefore confirm the conclusion that the general South-Indian scale must be referred to the popular scale of 96 ratis to the tōla and not to what I have called the old Indian literary scale of 320 raktikās to the pala. But, as may be seen from the preceding sections of this Chapter, it is this very literary scale of 320 raktikās to the pala that became extended to the Far East.

Now, however conventional and unreal the literary scale may have become by the X11th Century A.D., it must have been real enough at some time previously, and no doubt it spread to the Far East whilst it was a practical method of computation:—say, at some period long anterior to the X11th Century. The general inference from this argument is that the Far Eastern scales, as we find them now, have been adopted from India at a time when the old literary scale of 320 raktikās to the pala was still in practical use, which time was anterior to the adoption in India of the popular scale of 96 ratis to the tōla.

How old the Indian popular scale is, or when the Indian literary scale spread Eastwards, I do not pretend to discuss here, but I would point out that the ancient Chinese scale, as opposed to the existing decimal scale, seems to bear some reference to the popular scale. Thus, taking the *ratī* to be half the candareen and the candareen to be the old Chinese *chu*, we get:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indian Popular scale.</th>
<th>Lilavati Popular scale.</th>
<th>Ancient Chinese scale.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ratī ... ... ...</td>
<td>guṇja (ratī) ...</td>
<td>chu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 māsha ... ...</td>
<td>3 valla ...</td>
<td>6 hwa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... ...</td>
<td>8 dharaṇa ...</td>
<td>2 che</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 tāṅka ... ...</td>
<td>2 guḍayānaka ...</td>
<td>2 liang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 tōla ... ...</td>
<td>(2 tōla, see ante, p. 62)</td>
<td>2 kin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>48 ( = 96 ratī)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Taking the tōla to have been actually 174-180 gms., the *kin* c. 195 gms., and the *tickal* c. 225 gms. Troy, we get at the actual relative values which the upper Troy denominations assumed; and this places the ancient *kin* between the modern tōla and *tickal*. So far as I can gather, in modern India the old general upper Troy denomination has become assimilated to the tōla and in Indo-China to the *tickal*.

There is also a curious coinage in Ñēpāl, which has long had a great vogue far into Central Asia, through Tibetan trade, the weights of which should apparently, and, in view of what will be later on explained as to the Manipūr coinage and Troy scales, almost certainly.

1 *Ante*, p. 36, and the argument in the Section on Chinese weights.
be referred to the scale of 96 rattis to the tōla. Prinsep, *Useful Tables*, p. 32, gives the weights of it thus:

**Nepalese Troy Weight and Coinage.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5 dāms = 1 paisā</th>
<th>5 paisā = 1 ānī</th>
<th>4 ānī = 1 sūkā</th>
<th>2 sūkā = 1 mohar</th>
<th>2 mohar = 1 takkā (= tōla or rupee weight of 174 grs.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

400 dāms to the tōla

The whole scale is directly and purely Indian, and should more than possibly be referred to the coins represented by the gold and silver *jalda* of Akbar, which were respectively worth 400 and 40 dāms (gold being then to silver as 10 to 1, or nearly so), and weighing practically the same amount, i.e., about a tōla. The gold *jalda*, - *la’l-i-jaldā*, or at least one form of it—was in weight or value equal to two round mohars.

To the scale of 96 rattis to the tōla should also be referred, I think, the isolated Burmese denomination *viss* (pēkbā, spelt pissa) and its Talaing and Shan equivalents, *p’č’* (w’sā) and *soi*, both without doubt representing the word *viss* etymologically as well. The South-Indian *viss* (visār), as the eighth part of the South-Indian maund of 25 lbs., has practically always been 3'125 lbs., or thereabouts, and the weight of 100 tickals, being 3'652 lbs., or thereabouts, has been given its name by the Peguans and Burmese traders.

Besides the *viss*, no Far Eastern commercial weight can be traced in the Vernaculars to South India, so far as present information goes, with the doubtful exception of the *candareen*. The Malay equivalent is *kūndari* or *kandari* and the Tamil is *kunraniṇi* (vulgarily *kunriniṇi*), but it would require a good deal of proving to settle which (if either) came from the other.

That the modern commercial terms, mace and tael, can be traced as far as a Malay origin there can be no doubt, but the further clear reference of them to *māra* and *tōla*, to my mind, demands still further research to carry conviction.

As regards the ultimate reference of the commercial term *cash* to *kārsha*, or better to *kārshāpana*, there is the evidence collected by Yule, *Hobson-Jobson*, s. v. And so long as one is content to remain in the realm of conjecture, with a view to research in definite directions, the following probabilities may be put forward:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kārshāpana</td>
<td>māt</td>
<td>mās</td>
<td></td>
<td>cash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>māsha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>mace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>karsha</td>
<td>kyāt</td>
<td>tāhil, tāil</td>
<td></td>
<td>tēk, h’k, b’kō</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tōla</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tickal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taka</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pollam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pala</td>
<td>bō(l)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>w’sā, p’sā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>visa</td>
<td>pēkbā</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>viss</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

3 The scales given in Wright’s *Nepal*, p. 277, do not seem to be correct. At any rate they do not work out.


* South-Indian *kān*.  
* Shān, *soi*.  

4 *kān.*
ON THE SOUTH-INDIAN RECESSION OF THE MAHABHARATA.

BY M. WINTERNITZ, Ph.D.

(Continued from p. 81.)

I now proceed to give some more extracts from our Grantha MS. I am obliged to omit, for the present, the highly interesting first Anukramaṇaśāstra or Table of Contents, but I give the end of the first Adhyāya, the Pārasaṅghadhyāya and the second Table of Contents for the first three Pārvas, and the end of the second Adhyāya.

B.

Adiparvan,

1, 252-275.

South-Indian MS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sūtra:</th>
<th>Devasthānaḥ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>गृहस्थानं</td>
<td>गृहस्थानं</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>विवधानसम्बन्धस्य विवधानसम्बन्धस्य</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>विवधानसम्बन्धस्य विवधानसम्बन्धस्य</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>देवस्य देवस्य</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>विवधानसम्बन्धस्य विवधानसम्बन्धस्य</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>विवधानसम्बन्धस्य विवधानसम्बन्धस्य</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>विवधानसम्बन्धस्य विवधानसम्बन्धस्य</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>विवधानसम्बन्धस्य विवधानसम्बन्धस्य</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>विवधानसम्बन्धस्य विवधानसम्बन्धस्य</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>विवधानसम्बन्धस्य विवधानसम्बन्धस्य</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>विवधानसम्बन्धस्य विवधानसम्बन्धस्य</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>विवधानसम्बन्धस्य विवधानसम्बन्धस्य</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Devanāgarī Edition (Bombay).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sūtra:</th>
<th>Devasthānaḥ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>गृहस्थानं</td>
<td>गृहस्थानं</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>विवधानसम्बन्धस्य विवधानसम्बन्धस्य</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>विवधानसम्बन्धस्य विवधानसम्बन्धस्य</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>विवधानसम्बन्धस्य विवधानसम्बन्धस्य</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>विवधानसम्बन्धस्य विवधानसम्बन्धस्य</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>विवधानसम्बन्धस्य विवधानसम्बन्धस्य</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>विवधानसम्बन्धस्य विवधानसम्बन्धस्य</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>विवधानसम्बन्धस्य विवधानसम्बन्धस्य</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>विवधानसम्बन्धस्य विवधानसम्बन्धस्य</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>विवधानसम्बन्धस्य विवधानसम्बन्धस्य</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>विवधानसम्बन्धस्य विवधानसम्बन्धस्य</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>विवधानसम्बन्धस्य विवधानसम्बन्धस्य</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Read कीस्थवस्तेः.**
The verses in which the etymology of *Mahābhārata* is given seem to be better in the South-Indian recension, for the two lines 272, 273 are quite superfluous. It is interesting to see that our MS. supports the reading भारतशास्त्र in v. 274, which is also found in Kumārila's *Tantravārttika* where this line is quoted. The appropriateness of this reading has been proved by Dr. Bühler.24

C.

**Adiparvan.**

2, 33-205.

---

24 See *Indian Studies*. By G. Bühler and J. Kirate. **No. II., Contributions to the History of the Mahābhārata.**

*Wien, 1892, p. 9 seq*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>South-Indian MS.</th>
<th>Devanagari Edition (Bombay).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>स्वरकृषीम् स्वरकृषी मदुःस्ततमः।</td>
<td>कार्तिकः</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>अलस्य पाठनमेव प्रविधः परम।</td>
<td>संगमः</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>नारसिकानन्दः पुरी किन्नरस्वामी वाराणसी।</td>
<td>कटकः</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पद्मकान्तः वैद्यं वैद्यमन्नामिः।</td>
<td>परशुरामणी</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>कृष्णकृष्ण धनुर्दारः।</td>
<td>हिन्दियोः</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>भृगुकुलः।</td>
<td>'दुः' तत्</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>तत।।</td>
<td>द्या हरनारायणा।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>नृत्यः।</td>
<td>'तेधः' तत्-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>अर्जुनस्य ।।</td>
<td>'तिन्न' तत्-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>सुन्दरहरिन्या।</td>
<td>'छड़ा' हरनारायणा।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>श्रीरामकान्तः।</td>
<td>'तिन्न' करतः</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>सनंद्रत्वम्।</td>
<td>'पिंचः' करतः</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>विष्णुवर्तकः।</td>
<td>'पिंचः' परतः</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>श्रीरामकान्तः।</td>
<td>'तिन्न' करतः</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ध्रुवः।</td>
<td>'तिन्न' करतः</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>आर्यः।</td>
<td>'तिन्न' करतः</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>देवः।</td>
<td>'तिन्न' करतः</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>सनंद्रत्वम्।</td>
<td>'तिन्न' करतः</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>विष्णुवर्तकः।</td>
<td>'तिन्न' करतः</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>श्रीरामकान्तः।</td>
<td>'तिन्न' करतः</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'तिन्न' करतः।</td>
<td>'तिन्न' करतः</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>तत।।</td>
<td>'तिन्न' करतः</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>नरोपायायुष्यम।</td>
<td>'धर्मकं कहोरायं।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>तिन्नकुलबुधः।</td>
<td>'समाध्या के पंचकनामेन्यां।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>मुरारनीकः।</td>
<td>'नोक्रियोऽवर्ध्यो' तत्रे च।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ब्रजकृष्णानः।</td>
<td>'महाराज्या नामनामिः प्रसिद्धं च।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पाण्डवान् बखच्चरा च।।</td>
<td>'समाध्या के पंचकनामेन्यां।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'पाण्डवान् प्रविश्या तन्मायते।</td>
<td>'समाध्या के पंचकनामेन्यां।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South-Indian MS.</td>
<td>Devarāgī Edition (Bombay).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>वासुकिपथमः परे विद्यासांभवेय ।</td>
<td>61a नातलेरियुपवर्तकां पारित वादवाय ।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deest.</td>
<td>हयतीन्द्रविषुपर्वेन्निस पारित वादवीर ।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61b साविकीर्यां सर्वोदयवर्तकां पारित वादवाय ।</td>
<td>62a सत्यरेरियुपवर्तकां पारित वादवाय ।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62b श्रीराम्युपवर्तकां पारित वादवाय ।</td>
<td>63a सत्यरेरियुपवर्तकां पारित वादवाय ।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63b उद्भोधम् रेत्याविवेचनं सर्वोदयवर्तकां पारित वादवाय ।</td>
<td>64a वासुकिपथमः परे विद्यासांभवेय ।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deest.</td>
<td>64b सत्यरेरियुपवर्तकां पारित वादवाय ।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65a सत्यरेरियुपवर्तकां पारित वादवाय ।</td>
<td>65b सत्यरेरियुपवर्तकां पारित वादवाय ।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65c सत्यरेरियुपवर्तकां पारित वादवाय ।</td>
<td>65d सत्यरेरियुपवर्तकां पारित वादवाय ।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65e सत्यरेरियुपवर्तकां पारित वादवाय ।</td>
<td>65f सत्यरेरियुपवर्तकां पारित वादवाय ।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65g सत्यरेरियुपवर्तकां पारित वादवाय ।</td>
<td>65h सत्यरेरियुपवर्तकां पारित वादवाय ।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65i सत्यरेरियुपवर्तकां पारित वादवाय ।</td>
<td>66a सत्यरेरियुपवर्तकां पारित वादवाय ।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66b सत्यरेरियुपवर्तकां पारित वादवाय ।</td>
<td>66c सत्यरेरियुपवर्तकां पारित वादवाय ।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66d सत्यरेरियुपवर्तकां पारित वादवाय ।</td>
<td>66e सत्यरेरियुपवर्तकां पारित वादवाय ।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66f सत्यरेरियुपवर्तकां पारित वादवाय ।</td>
<td>66g सत्यरेरियुपवर्तकां पारित वादवाय ।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66h सत्यरेरियुपवर्तकां पारित वादवाय ।</td>
<td>66i सत्यरेरियुपवर्तकां पारित वादवाय ।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66j सत्यरेरियुपवर्तकां पारित वादवाय ।</td>
<td>66k सत्यरेरियुपवर्तकां पारित वादवाय ।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66l सत्यरेरियुपवर्तकां पारित वादवाय ।</td>
<td>66m सत्यरेरियुपवर्तकां पारित वादवाय ।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66n सत्यरेरियुपवर्तकां पारित वादवाय ।</td>
<td>66o सत्यरेरियुपवर्तकां पारित वादवाय ।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66p सत्यरेरियुपवर्तकां पारित वादवाय ।</td>
<td>66q सत्यरेरियुपवर्तकां पारित वादवाय ।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66r सत्यरेरियुपवर्तकां पारित वादवाय ।</td>
<td>66s सत्यरेरियुपवर्तकां पारित वादवाय ।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66t सत्यरेरियुपवर्तकां पारित वादवाय ।</td>
<td>66u सत्यरेरियुपवर्तकां पारित वादवाय ।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66v सत्यरेरियुपवर्तकां पारित वादवाय ।</td>
<td>66w सत्यरेरियुपवर्तकां पारित वादवाय ।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66x सत्यरेरियुपवर्तकां पारित वादवाय ।</td>
<td>66y सत्यरेरियुपवर्तकां पारित वादवाय ।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66z सत्यरेरियुपवर्तकां पारित वादवाय ।</td>
<td>66a सत्यरेरियुपवर्तकां पारित वादवाय ।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66b सत्यरेरियुपवर्तकां पारित वादवाय ।</td>
<td>66c सत्यरेरियुपवर्तकां पारित वादवाय ।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66d सत्यरेरियुपवर्तकां पारित वादवाय ।</td>
<td>66e सत्यरेरियुपवर्तकां पारित वादवाय ।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66f सत्यरेरियुपवर्तकां पारित वादवाय ।</td>
<td>66g सत्यरेरियुपवर्तकां पारित वादवाय ।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66h सत्यरेरियुपवर्तकां पारित वादवाय ।</td>
<td>66i सत्यरेरियुपवर्तकां पारित वादवाय ।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66j सत्यरेरियुपवर्तकां पारित वादवाय ।</td>
<td>66k सत्यरेरियुपवर्तकां पारित वादवाय ।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66l सत्यरेरियुपवर्तकां पारित वादवाय ।</td>
<td>66m सत्यरेरियुपवर्तकां पारित वादवाय ।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66n सत्यरेरियुपवर्तकां पारित वादवाय ।</td>
<td>66o सत्यरेरियुपवर्तकां पारित वादवाय ।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66p सत्यरेरियुपवर्तकां पारित वादवाय ।</td>
<td>66q सत्यरेरियुपवर्तकां पारित वादवाय ।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66r सत्यरेरियुपवर्तकां पारित वादवाय ।</td>
<td>66s सत्यरेरियुपवर्तकां पारित वादवाय ।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66t सत्यरेरियुपवर्तकां पारित वादवाय ।</td>
<td>66u सत्यरेरियुपवर्तकां पारित वादवाय ।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66v सत्यरेरियुपवर्तकां पारित वादवाय ।</td>
<td>66w सत्यरेरियुपवर्तकां पारित वादवाय ।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66x सत्यरेरियुपवर्तकां पारित वादवाय ।</td>
<td>66y सत्यरेरियुपवर्तकां पारित वादवाय ।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66z सत्यरेरियुपवर्तकां पारित वादवाय ।</td>
<td>66a सत्यरेरियुपवर्तकां पारित वादवाय ।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66b सत्यरेरियुपवर्तकां पारित वादवाय ।</td>
<td>66c सत्यरेरियुपवर्तकां पारित वादवाय ।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66d सत्यरेरियुपवर्तकां पारित वादवाय ।</td>
<td>66e सत्यरेरियुपवर्तकां पारित वादवाय ।</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
South-Indian MS.

वाणा तवत्तवत्ता य नसो मुनिवरवरस य ||
Deest.

''

विदुरस च वाक्ष्यं सुगरस्वमानित्या ||
Deest.

104a

पाण्डवानां च चतुर्विद्वाय वर्षवः ||
Deest.

105a

पंडितसप्तस्च दौष्टिरित्वेष्व परक्षितस्य ||
Deest.

106a

अहातान्त्रिको प्राणं काढयो वासी ग्राहणवेदनाम ||

108a

बद्धवर्ष विपन्नकूद मार्गाभानाजू विस्मयः ||
Deest.

108b

111a

अंगारगुरिचित्रसम्म गंगाकुसुमस्य णतस्य ||
Deest.

112a

भाघिरसहितस्वरूपपदालामी भवेः ||
सापरस्य वासिद्धयो चापालसायवासंस्य छ ||

Deest.

112b

113a

परेन्द्रान्तपातासनमववाहानसुमुख्ये ||
पाणाकृतिचरवेद्यो हिमस्थो नुरस्य च ||
प्रेमस्य वेदितस्य विवाहानामस्य न ||

117a

116a

117b

118a

विदुरस च संमारीतमेवं केदारस्य च ||
सापरस्य महामहापत्तस्य सन्तो राज्यादायासंस्य ||
नारस्य च वाक्ष्यं प्राप्तस्य विनान मवास्यां ||
सुलोकवशीला तुष्प्रमादं वैदिकस्यः ||
Deest.

118b

119a

119b

120a

पाण्डव वनवास्य वनश्य अह संसमः ||
युप्तिपक्षयो चापालसायवासंच च ||
Deest.

122a

123a

हारकार्यं हस्ते सा कार्यानिर्गोचा ||
प्राप्तस्यस्यमुत्तमैव मात्रायं विनास्तिना ||
हर्ष्य शुभो शंभादर्शी वनश्य वे कामकाल्यनः ||
Deest.

125a

125b

126a
Deest.

South-Indian MS.

\[ 1266 \]

Deest.

\[ 128a \]

Deest.

\[ 128b \]

Deest.

\[ 128c \]

Deest.

\[ 129a \]

Deest.

\[ 129b \]

Deest.

\[ 130a \]

Deest.

\[ 130b \]

Deest.

\[ 131a \]

Deest.

\[ 131b \]

Deest.

\[ 132 \]

Deest.

\[ 133 \]

Deest.

\[ 134a \]

Deest.

\[ 135a \]

Deest.

\[ 135b \]

Deest.

\[ 136a \]

Deest.

\[ 136b \]

Deest.

\[ 137 \]

Deest.

\[ 138a \]

Deest.

\[ 139a \]

Deest.

\[ 139b \]

Deest.

\[ 140a \]

Deest.

\[ 140b \]

Deest.

\[ 141a \]

Deest.

\[ 141b \]

Deest.

\[ 142 \]

Deest.

\[ 143 \]

Deest.

\[ 145a \]

Deest.

\[ 147a \]

Deest.

\[ 148a \]

Deest.

\[ 148b \]

Deest.

\[ 149a \]
South Indian MS.

Devandgari Edition (Bombay).

1498 शायोप्तर्भेन्दृत वानां दृष्टिनेतमस्तान थ।
1500 दिनीस्वव वाधावश नमिषणं वसुः अगोः।
1506 कुञ्जिनामामामाभाव पञ्चामानाः थ वशस्त।
151a कुञ्जिना दक्षिणामुखः दुर्प्रथितं निर्वितांश थान।
1516 रुक्मि पार्श्वायुष्मानं हरसेव किरीति।
152a परिवृतिः न पाद्यायतः राजस्वः तास्मिः।
1526 आप्सरस्नां न कुञ्जिनादायः प्रकृतिः।
153a तथो सोवंप्रायावश्वः क्रियासह नारिः।
1536 सुन्दराया: सनुपायाः: कुञ्जिनि हन्तः हृदाः।
154a नवन द्रोपदेशाभासं पुष्पवधनिः प्रेय थह।
1546 प्रवेशः पाण्डवाभासं रथेऽक्षेत्रं स्त।
155a भरमाज्या चावेन संवातः कुञ्जिनाः सह।
1556 संवातः तथा राजा भोसः प्रकृतिः।
156a सनृमाण्यः पाण्डुः भृगवादामस्तान थव।
1566 प्रत्सब्याय निवाया सनं राजाः महाविनः।
157a राजां नारायणेऽव वाच्यं प्रत्येकं स्त।

"नामस्वास्तास्तवस्य स व।"
159a महेंद्रकाव्यपासेन्द्राय थ विदिवः।
1596 वन पिल्ला समुपाया भृगराजस्व दुष्टी।

"व्यस्यां नलोः" ॥
1524 तथातद्यास्तास्तवस्य नवायाविनः।
1526 लोकस्याय बायावशं अनंतायाविनः।

"वै लोकः" ॥
154a सनृमाण्यः पाण्डुः भृगवादामस्तान थव।
1546 सनृमाण्यः पाण्डुः भृगवादामस्तान थव।
155a पुत्रस्वामिन्यार्चा न महासः महाविनः।
1566 वथ वरदं गुणमाण्याय वायायाविनः।
1566 नारायणेऽव वाच्यं प्रत्येकं स्त।

"चरित्रयावः" ॥
1596 प्रमाणार्चार्चार्यः पाण्डुः वृष्णिनिष्ठ सायानः।
1716 मन्दराभासायावशायानं राजां जैवः ग्रामविनः।

repeated, occurred already above after 1635.

सुमानिकायाः जी सामिनि।
It will be seen that in the Parvasamgraha the Grantha MS. has a number of omissions. But no great importance can be attached to these, as some of them, e.g., the omission of the Arjundhigama (III. 12-37), of the Nalopakhyana, of the Savitri and Rama Upakhyanas, and of the Karna and Salya Parvans, are clearly accidental, and merely the fault of the scribe. The number of Parvans according to the Parvasamgraha in the Devanagari editions is 122, while our MS. gives only 96. Brockhaus²⁶ has tried in vain to make out that the list really contains only 100 Parvans conforming to the name Suta-parvasamgraha. But this is really of no importance whatever. It matters little whether Natula (62) and Odalavachrita (63) are counted as separate Parvans, as in the Parvasamgraha, or as parts of the Bhagavatyana (61), as in the printed editions. It is, however, of importance to find, e.g., an Aindrayyana (45) which is not in the editions, or to see that the Parvasamgraha mentions the Pativrata-mahatmya (48) before the Ramopakhyana (49), while in the editions the Ramopakhyana comes first. It is on account of such discrepancies between the Parvasamgraha and the actual state of things that I give below, in parallel columns, (a) the List of Parvans according to the Nagari editions, (b) the List of Parvans according to the Grantha MS. I have marked with asterisks the Parvans which are omitted in the List of the Grantha MS.

List of Parvans according to the Parvasamgraha.

(a) in the Northern Recension.

1. Anukramanikā.
2. Parvasamgraha.
3. Paushya.
4. Pauloma.
5. Astika.

(b) in the Grantha MS.

1. Sarvānukramaṇa.
2. Parvasamgraha.
3. Paushya.
4. Pauloma.
5. Astika.

²⁶ Read ⁴⁸:
²⁷ Read ⁵⁰:
²⁸ Read ⁶⁰:
(a) in the Northern Recension.

6. Ádvimámávatárana.
7. Sambhava.
9. Haidimbavadvaha (or Haidimba).
11. Chaitraratha.
12. Svayamvara.
13. Vaivíhika.
15. Rájyalábha.
17. Subhadráharasa.
19. Khágadvadáha, including the Mayadarána.

20. Sábhá.
22. Jarásandhavadvaha.
23. Digvijaya.
25. Arghábhíharasa.
27. Dyúta.
28. Anudýuta.
29. Áranyaka.
31. Arjunaúbhígamana.
32. Káraíta (Ísvarárjunayar yuddham).
33. Indralókábhígamana.
34. Nálapákhyána.
35. Tírtháyatrá.
37. Yakshayuddha.
38. Nívataksavachair yuddham.
39. Ájagara.
40. Márkañjeyasamsasyá.
41. Draupadi-Satyabhámayoh saúvadáha.
42. Ghoshayatrá.
43. Mrígasvapnodbhaavá.
44. Vríhidraunika.
45. Aíndradvnya.
46. Draupadiharasa.
47. Jayadhráthimókhaśa.
48. Sávítír (Pativrátamáhátya).
49. Ránapákhyañá.
50. Kuúdáláharasa.
51. Áranyeya.
52. Vairáta, consisting of
   *Pángdvánám praveśaḥ, and
   *Samasyaśa pálañá.
53. Kíchakánám vadhaḥ.

(b) in the 'Grantha MS.'

6. Ádvimámávatárana.
7. Sambhava.
11. Chaitraratha.
12. Svayamvara.
13. Vaivíhika.
15. Rájyalábha.
17. Subhadráharasa.
19. Khágadvadáha, including the Mayadarána.
20. Sábhá.
22. Jarásandhavadvaha.
23. Digvijaya.
25. Arghábhíharasa.
27. Dyúta.
28. Anudýuta.
29. Áranyaka.
31. Káraíta (Ísvarárjunayar yuddham).
32. Indralókábhígamana.
33. Tírtháyatrá.
34. Jatásuravadáha.
35. Yakshayuddha.
36. Ájagara.
37. Márkañjeyasamsasyá.
38. Draupadi-Satyabhámayoh saúvadáha.
40. Práyopaveśana.
41. Vríhidropaka.
42. Draupadíharasa.
43. Kuúdáláharasa.
44. Áranyeya.
45. Vairáta.
46. Kíchaka.
47. Gográhaña.
49. Udýoga.
50. Saújayayána.
51. Prajágaral (Dhítaráshtrasya chintaya).
52. Sánapusutá (guhyam adháyátmadarsánam).
53. Yánasandhi.
(a) in the Northern Recension.

54. Gogrāhaṇa.
55. Abhīmanyn-Vairāṭl-Vaiwāhika.
56. Udyoga.
57. Saṅjñayāna.
58. Prajāgarah (Dhṛtarāṣṭrasa chintayā).
59. Śāntasujāta (guhayam adhyātmadarsanam).
60. Yānasandhi.
61. Bhagavadyāna.
62. Mātalyya.
63. Gālavacharita.
64. Sāvitra.
65. Vāmadeva.
66. Vaipūyapākyāna.
68. Shodāsaṭājika.
69. Šahapraṣveṣaḥ Śrīṣrasya.
70. Vidulāputrasādana.
71. Sainyāniyāna.
72. Svetopakhyāna (or Viśvopakhyāna).
73. Vivāda (Karṣasya).
74. Niryāna (Kura-Pṛṇḍava-senayoh).
75. Rathātirathasaṅkhyā.
76. Ulukadūtāgaman.
77. Ambopākhyāna.
78. Bhīṣhamābhisechana.
79. Jambūkhaḍyāvinirmāṇa.
80. Bhūmi (Dvīpaviṣṭārakirtana).
81. Bhagavadgītā.
82. Bhīṣhmvadha.
83. Drogbhīṣechechana.
84. Saṁśaptakavadha.
85. Abhimanyuvadha.
86. Pratijñā.
87. Jayadrathavrhadha.
88. Ghatotkachavadha.
89. Drogpavadha.
90. Mokho Nārāyaṇāstraśya.

(b) in the Grantha MS.

54. Bhagavadyāṇa.
55. Vivāda (Karṣasya).
56. Senāpatyabhisechana.
57. Sveta.
58. Bhīṣhamābhisechana.
59. Niryāṇa (Kura-Pṛṇḍava-senayoh).
60. Rathātirathasaṅkhyā.
61. Ulukadūtāgaman.
62. Ambopākhyāna.
63. Jambūkhaḍyāvinirmāṇa.
64. Bhūmi (Dvīpaviṣṭārakirtana).
65. Bhagavadgītā.
66. Bhīṣhmvadha.
67. Drogbhīṣechechana.
68. Saṁśaptakavadha.
69. Abhimanyuvadha.
70. Pratijñā.
71. Jayadrathavrhadha.
72. Ghatotkachavadha.
73. Drogpavadha.
74. Mokho Nārāyaṇāstraśya.
75. Aishika.
76. Jalapradānika.
77. Stre.
78. Śraddha.
79. Ābhisechana.
80. Chārvakānigraha.
81. Gṛihapramādha.
82. Sāntī (Rājadharmanukirtana).
83. Apaddharma.
84. Mokshadharma.
85. Ānusāsanika.
86. Svargārohaṇika.
87. Aśvamedhika.
88. Anugtā.
89. Āśramavāsa.
90. Putradhāna.
91. Nāradagaman.
92. Mausala.
93. Mahāprasthānaka.
94. Svargārohaṇaka.
95. Harivaṇāsā.
96. Bhāvishyat.
NOTES ON THE SPIRIT BASIS OF BELIEF AND CUSTOM.

BY SIR J. M. CAMPBELL, K.C.I.E., L.C.S.

(Continued from p. 23.)

2. Spirit Haunts.

Or spirit haunts or abodes of spirits seem to be most popular—funeral places, borders, cross roads, stones, and trees. The remaining spirit resorts are caverns, deserts and waste places, empty houses, groves, hills, hearths, house roofs, looking-glasses, river-banks and sea-shores, unclean places, and water or pot-holes in river-rocks.

Funeral Places.—In all religious thought the hovering ghosts of the dead make the funeral ground a place where the flesh creeps. So Mahadev and Yetli live in the funeral ground, and so when a Hindu exorcist or witch has to win the favour of Yetli or any other spirit he goes at night to a burial or burning ground. In Bengal, there is a Smashani Kali or Graveyard Mother. The Hindus believe that spirits haunt funeral places, cross roads and tamarind and acacia trees; the Persians hold that spirits cluster at the ‘Tower of Silence,’ and the Andaman Islanders believe that the place of burial is for months haunted by the spirits of the dead. The Chinese think that epidemics are caused by spirits issuing from tombs. The people of Madagascar hold that ghosts haunt tombs, and the people of Guinea that every place is haunted where death happened, and among the West Coast Africans the spirit stays where the body is buried.

63 Balfour’s ‘Encyclopaedia,’ Vol. V. p. 592.
Boundaries. — In the Bombay Dekhan, spirits live on boundaries, people are buried near boundaries, and boundary fights used to be common. At a Dekhan Khalsi's wedding, when the boy crosses the boundary of the girl's village, a lemon is cut, waved round his head, and thrown away, and his eyes are touched with cold water; and among the Ukhlas of Poona, when the bridegroom returns to his village with the bride, they stop him at the border of the bridegroom's village, break a coconut, mix the pieces with rice and curds, and scatter them as offerings to evil spirits. The siment pijam, or boundary worship, is performed at all high-caste Hindu weddings in Bombay. In Dharwar, at the festival of the goddess Dayanava, a naked Mândhra scatter a buffalo's blood and pieces of flesh round the village boundary for the spirits that live there. The Khonds offered their human sacrifices on the boundaries. So the souls of the Carebs gather on the sea-shore, and in Mexico, the skin of the thigh of the woman that was offered to the goddess Ciaawatt was taken to the borders. In Scotland, in 1690, a famous sorcery case, the witches dug a grave above high-tide mark and at the boundary of the king's and the bishop's land. In the Highlands, suicides were buried at borders.

Roads, especially Cross-Roads. — Among the Pitâne Prabhus of Poona, at their wedding, when the wedding procession comes to a place where three roads meet, coconuts are broken as offerings for spirits, and among the Bijapur Dhors, when the wedding procession comes to cross roads, a coconut is broken, and half of it is thrown past the bride and half past the bridegroom for the spirits. The Gonds bury the ashes of the dead near a road. The natives of the Antilles thought that the dead walked the high roads. The Romans buried near road-sides, and laid fruit, violets, cakes and salt for the dead in the middle of the road. In Middle-Age Europe, walking spirits or Ambulons sat by the way-side and ill-used travellers. In ancient Germany, the partings of roads were believed to be the meeting places of spirits and witches, and still in Germany, a plaster from a sore—that is, a plaster containing the spirit of the disease—is left on a road, as there the spirit will be at home, and will not come back, and in rural England, a pebble that has rested on a wart is for the same reason left on the road. The troops of spirits that live and move along the roads gather in crowds at the cross-roads. In the Bombay Dekhan, people lay fowls, rice, eggs, and coconuts at cross-roads, or tivâts, for spirits to eat. The Santhals and apparently the Brahmans of Bengal think the place where roads cross to be a spirit resort. Some early tribes in India (as the Khonds) sacrifice a cock where four roads meet. In China, at the street corners or cross-roads are hungry ghosts who have to be fed with money when a funeral passes or else they will trouble the soul of the dead. Dr. Livingstone says that the people of Angola, in South-West Africa, are fond of bringing the spirits of the dead to cross-roads. In Guinea, people troubled by a spirit offered a cock where four roads met. In Mexico, the favourite haunt of the spirits of women who died in child-birth was where roads crossed. Some American tribes burn torches of black wax and resinous wood, and offered fowls and blood from their own bodies at cross-roads. Others adorned cross-roads with images and shrines, where the traveller rubbed his legs with a handful of grass, spat on the grass, and placed it on the altar. The Romans called the crossing of roads Trivia and Compita, and set a statue of

73 Macpherson's Khonds, pp. 67, 68.
74 Bancroft, Vol. III. p. 357.
75 Mitchell's Highland Superstitions, p. 34.
77 Taylor's Primitive Culture, Vol. II. p. 416.
81 Dalton's Descriptive Ethnology of Bengal, p. 213.
85 Information from Mr. Tirmalrâo.
86 Taylor's Primitive Culture, Vol. II. p. 111.
89 Dalton's Descriptive Ethnology of Bengal, p. 253.
90 Wright's Celt, Roman and Saxon, p. 322.
91 Burton's Anatomy of Melancholy, p. 126.
92 Taylor's Primitive Culture, Vol. II. p. 49.
93 Information from Gens Râmoshi.
94 Leslie's Early Races of Scotland, Vol. II. p. 423.
95 Dr. Livingstone's Travels in South Africa, p. 144.
a guardian, or Lâr, with a dog at his feet. When Rome became Christian, statues of the Virgin and saints took the place of the Lares. In the middle of the eleventh century the crossing of four roads was still considered a great spirit resort in Italy. In England, in the eleventh century, women were censured by the Church for drawing their children through the air where four roads met. In Ireland, in 1324, cocks were offered at the meeting of four roads. In the Tyrrol, spirits are still seen, and the Sardinians still burn bonfires at cross-roads. In Worcestershire (1867), a child with whooping cough was taken to a finger post or place where cross-roads meet, put on a donkey's back, and made to ride round the post nine times. The child was cured. To cure wars touch them with stones, pat the stones in a bag, and the bag where four roads meet. The wide-spread sanctity attached to cross-roads as a meeting place of spirits suggests that this may be the origin of the high place which the cross takes in so many religions. Shiv has his trident, and the Buddhists and Jains have their svastik, or lucky cross. Unira, the goddess of the Tarls or Dheda minstrels of Gujarat, has an iron trident. The Kumbhâra of Kâthākâr, on the sixth day after a birth, make a cross on the door of the lying-in room, and make the child bow to it. The Singhols of the north-east frontier use a St. Andrew's cross, and the Lepcha women of West Bután and East Nipal cover their woollen clothes with crosses. The Jews are said to have marked the brow with a cross, or T, as a sign of safety. The last letter in Hebrew was Tau, cross-shaped. The Egyptian amulets were marked with a cross. The triple Tau is a Masonic emblem, and the cross with a circle on the top was an Egyptian symbol of eternal life. The Egyptians used to hang a cross as a talisman round the neck of the sick, sometimes shaped as T. The Chinese put iron tridents on tops of houses to keep off evil spirits, and place them on the taffrails of ships to ward off evil. The Hottentots (1800-1700) go into caves and say prayers, raise their eyes to heaven, and make crosses on the other the mark of the cross on the forehead. The cross was a common symbol in America. A cross is worn round the neck of all Russians night and day. It is also hung in the cradles of babes. The Russian priest crosses the child over its brow, lips, and breasts. Among the Roman Catholics, at the beginning of the Confirmation, the Bishop signs himself with the cross; and at Baptism the priest makes a sign of the cross, and says: — "Satan, fly; behold the God, great and mighty, draweth near." Stone. — In all parts of Western India, the commonest house for a spirit is a stone. The village gods and many of the local gods, who have been Brahmanised into Mahâdevs, are undressed natural stones. Veâlî and his circle of guards is a common sight near many Dekhan villages, all of natural stones. A big rock at a road crossing, on the crest of a pass, near a river ford, is painted and set apart as the house either of a local deity or of one of the greater gods. Family spirits that prove troublesome have a stone, plain or carved into an imago, set for them either in the house or out of doors, and by bright painting and regular offerings are coaxed to stay at home, and not trouble the living. Steps are also generally taken to localise the spirits to which old battle and sati stones belong. Among Marathas it is not uncommon to make a tomb for the ashes of the dead in which he may stay harmless and at rest. So, too, when images of stone or of metal or of clay are made for any of the gods, a

2 Op. cit...
5 Dyer's Folk-Lore, p. 193.
6 From MS., notes.
8 Mackay's Freemasonry, p. 14.
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18 Dalton's Descriptive Ethnology of Bengal, p. 13.
19 Eckieil, i. 4.
20 Moore's Fragments, p. 229.
22 Hahn's Tauni Geam, p. 40.
service is performed to induce the spirit of the god to come into the image — sometimes permanently, sometimes for a season. If the god is to use the image only for a season, as is the case with the yearly images of Ganpati, at the end of the sacred season the god is asked to leave the image. The image is carried to the bank of a river or pond, or to the shore of the sea, and thrown into deep water, so that the spirit may not find his way back to the house, and require further attention from his worshippers. The upper classes have the higher idea, that by the way of the divine water the spirit passes into the one soul. In support of the view that the stone is the house of the spirit, the Maris, a wild class of Gonds, raise head-stones for the soul of the dead to live in. The Kharris of East Bengal throw the ashes into the river, but near their houses raise tall rough stones, to which they make daily offerings. So the Kerantis of Nepul-Butan make square tombs with an upright slab, and the Kasias raise tall pillars. The Khyans of the same part, when a tree is struck by lightning, look round for a stone in which the lightning is likely to have taken its abode, and hand it to a priest to worship. The Shanars of Timnevelly have two rude stones to which they sacrifice, and then throw them away, and the Bedadans of Madras have a stone in their houses which keeps off evil demons. Out of India the Taranian tribes of North Asia worship stones, because spirits live in them. They believe that spirits dwell in objects in the same way as spirits live in the human body. The Tartars raise a funeral mound, and on the top set an upright stone which they cut into a statue, so that the spirit may feel at home in a body-shaped house. The Society and the Fiji Islanders worship stones; the Melanesians have stones in their houses associated with (that is where live) the spirits of the dead. The New Zealanders and the Polynesians hold that images or logs of wood get their sacredness from being the abodes of spirit. In America, the Lalish Indians of Aegon (?) brought back souls in little stones, and many medicine-men cure diseases by picking out of the sick small pieces of stone into which some wizard had put a spirit and conveyed the stone into the victim's body. The Dacotas pick a stone, paint it red, and call it grandfather. The Mexicans set a stone between the lips of the dead to receive his soul. The Phoenicians had stones or bodies inhabited by a living principle. The old Greeks worshipped formless stones. A pillar was set on the top of Patroclus' funeral mound. The Roman-British (A.D. 100-400) cut a pillar in two, hollowed one-half, and put an urn in it, and again set up the pillar. In Norway, during the eighteenth century, the people kept round stones in their houses, washed them on Thursdays, smeared them with butter, put them before the fire, and at certain times laid them in ale to bring good luck. In England and Scotland, earth-fast stones continued till lately to be considered favourite spirit places. They cured sprains and bruises, and dissipated swellings. Witches knew spells which could send a spirit into a stone or looking-glass. Standing stones were possessed by the spirit of the stone. Rocking stones in Iceland and Scotland were inhabited by a spirit. In the Highlands of Scotland, the goddess Cailleach VerX

22 Dalton's Descriptive Ethnology of Bengal, p. 288. It seems probable that the meaning of the flat stone so common among all burying nations was at first to lay the spirit of the dead; and the meaning of the common head-stone or pillar was at first to give the spirit a house.

23 The use of undressed stones as the dwelling of spirits by people who were acquainted with the working of tools may, perhaps, as among the Jews, have been caused by the belief that iron frightened spirits, and that no spirit would live in a stone over which an iron tool had been lifted.
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lived in a great rock. In England, a country cure for warts is to press a pebble against the wart, and leave the pebble on the high road. Heine in one of his pagan passages adopts the early style: — "Kaiser Friederic, the old Barbarossa, is not dead. He and his court have gone to the hill of Kyffhäuser, and will come again to cheer the German people. I cried: — "Come, Barbarossa, come!'; but he came not, and I could only embrace the rock in which he dwells." It is not easy to explain why the stone should have been chosen as a spirit's dwelling. That stones were found to contain fire, may have helped the idea, and that heated stones were so useful in curing sickness, in cooking, and in many other ways, may have strengthened the belief. Perhaps, the earliest idea was that, as the life of the millet was in the millet seed, and the life of the mango tree was in the mango stone, a human spirit could live in a rock or pebble. The belief, that the soul or part of the soul of a man lives in his bones, seems closely connected with the belief in the stone as a spirit house. Probably it was held as an early belief, that the bones should be kept so that if the spirit comes back, and worries, he may have a place to go to. In West India, the wizard searches for the forearm bone of a woman who has died in child-bed, because her spirit lives in it with great power. For the same reason the hand and arm are engraved on a sati stone. The belief, that the spirit remained in the bones, is at the root of Buddhist and other relic worship. When sick the Andaman Islanders wear round the parts in pain chaplets and belts of the bones of their deceased relations. In Australia, three men sleep on a grave, and get a piece of bone, the spirit of the dead. This they can put into another man. Some Central African tribes wear necklaces of teeth. In America, the belief was widespread that the soul of man lived in his bones. So in Ezekiel's vision there was life in the dry bones. So among the Romans teeth were favourite charms, and are common charms among the present Hindus. A child with a wolf-tooth round his neck does not start in his sleep; a horse with a wolf-tooth round his neck never tires. In Scotland (1860), a cup made out of a suicide's skull was believed to cure epilepsy, and in England (1869), a collier's wife asked a sexton for a bit of a skull that she might grind it to powder, and give it to her daughter as a cure for fits.

According to widespread European beliefs Hrobogin lives in a mill and the devil goes under a millstone to carry out evil designs. The origin of these beliefs would seem the worship shewn, as among Hindus, to the quern or hand grind-stone as the home of a bread-winner or guardian.

Among stones bored stones have a specially sacred character. In India, the most famous example is the shâligrân or sacred pebble from the Gandaki River. This is said to be holy, because Vishnu pierced it in the form of a worm. Another famous bored stone is a stone or rock with a cleft in it through which the penitent and the conscience-stricken forced their way. Such was the stone at Malabar Point, in Bombay, through whose cleft Shivâji (1660), Kanoji Angria (1713), and Raghunâth Peishâwa (1780) are all said to have passed. With the Indian shâligrân and the small bored stones which are so highly valued in North America, may be compared the adder's stone, which was held in high honour among the Scotch, and was believed to

---
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47 Tylor's Primitive Culture, Vol. II. p. 149.
51 Mitchell's Highland Superstitions, p. 25.
54 Stanley's Dark Continent, Vol. II. p. 287.
55 Pliny's Natural History, Book xxviii., Chap. 19.
have been pierced by adder’s stings. A bored stone in Scotland (1591) kept off the pains of child-bed. In England, about 1700, bored stones were hung at the bed to keep off nightmare, and they may still be seen (1860); there ought to be flints with a natural hole in them at stable doors to keep witches from riding horses. With the cleft stone at Malabar Point may be compared the cleft or passage at the church of the Holy Sepulchre at Jerusalem through which pilgrims used to crush, and the Shargar stone in the Auld Wife’s Lift in Scotland and similar stones in Ireland under which people used to crawl. The special value of the bored stone may perhaps not mean more than that the hole is an open door into the spirit house, and will, therefore, be a favourite dwelling. The flint with the natural hole hung in front of the English stable suggests that the fire-spirit, dreadful to witches, lives in the stone. The cleft stone in Malabar Point is explained by Brahmans as a symbol of a second birth. The character of the three chief men who are said to have passed through the cleft, suggests that the object was to get rid of blood-guiltiness, or rather of the evil spirits to which the blood-guiltiness had given an opening, and that in passing through the cleft these evil spirits were dragged down through the body and out by the heel in one of the usual ways of getting rid of spirits. So at the church at Jerusalem the object of squeezing through the rock seems to have been the hope that the spirit of Christ would drive out evil spirits. The view seems to agree with Colonel Leslie’s statement of the objects with which the clefts in stones in England and Scotland were passed through. The objects were to cure existing maladies, to ward against incantations, and to free from sin. In England (ninth and tenth centuries), the rite was to draw children through a hole in the earth, or through a small tunnel, or through a hole where four roads met. A child suffering from hernia (seventeenth century England) was cured by passing it through an ash-tree cleft. In Moray, in Scotland, in 1700, children passed through circles of woodbine clinging to an oak. On Midsummer’s Eve, in the Canary Islands, naked infants were passed through a part-split rush to cure hernia. In Oxford (1600), a cheese was cut and hollowed out, and a child made to pass through it on Christmas day. In Cornwall, in 1749, people with pains in the back and limbs passed through a hole, and young children were drawn through to cure them of rickets. A third case of bored stones is a slab with a round hole in it which forms one of the sides of the kistvaens, or chest-tombs, which have been found in the Dekhan, in Circassia, and in Cornwall. Colonel Leslie’s explanation, that the hole was left for the spirit to pass out, seems likely to be correct.

Trees. — The belief that spirits live in the stems of, or in beams or images of wood, seems not to differ from the belief that spirits live in stones. In the Konkan, orthodox Brahmans daily, before taking their meals, worship the spirit, called Vastra, which lives in the principal pillar of the house. In Nask, some classes of Marathas set up memorial pillars of wood instead of stone, and Colonel Dalton (Descriptive Ethnology of Bengal, p. 115) notices that the Khyans of the north-east frontier put a carved log or post at the tomb. In the Konkan, the medium or bhagat, who becomes possessed, is called jhad, or tree, apparently because he is a favourite dwelling of the spirits. In the Dekhan, it is believed that the spirit of a pregnant woman lives in a tamarind tree, and, according to the Poona Kumbh, the favourite spirit haunts are large trees, lonely places, empty houses, and old wells. The Santhala believe that human spirits live in the bela tree, and the Abors or Padams of East Bengal think that spirits in trees kidnap children. The Mysore spirits are fond of lodging in trees and burial grounds. That human souls live in trees is a belief of the Dayaks of Borneo. Among the Malays spirits frequent trees and bring diseases. In Tasmania and in Guineas, spirits live in hollow trees. The Hyperboreans

6 Scott’s Border Minstrelsy, p. 402.
66 Leslie’s Early Races of Scotland, p. 306.
68 Information from Mr. Ramsay.
69 Information from Mr. P. B. Joshi.
72 Information from Mr. Kelkar.
73 Dalton’s Descriptive Ethnology of Bengal, p. 25.
74 Tylor’s Primitive Culture, Vol. II. p. 226.
76 Tylor’s Primitive Culture, Vol. II. p. 11.
of North America believe that those who die a natural death dwell for ages in the branches of all trees. The Greeks and Romans believed in spirits living in trees. The Greek dryads and hamadryads have their life linked to a tree; as their tree withers and dies they fall away and cease to be. Any injury to a bough or twig is felt as a wound, and a wholesale hewing down puts an end to them at once. A cry of anguish escapes them when the cruel axe comes near. The Middle-Age Europeans believed that human spirits went into hollow trees. The Swedes still pour milk and beer over the roots of trees. An Austrian märchen tells of the stately sir in which there sits a fae waited on by dwarfs, rewarding the innocents and plaguing the guilty; and a Servian song of a maiden in the pine whose bark the boy split with a gold and silver horn. On St. Thomas's day Franconian damsels go to a tree and knock thrice and listen for rasp to say what sort of husband they are to get. In England, it was believed that spirits lived in trees. So Prospero threatens to peg Ariel in the knotty entrails of an oak, and subsequently we find Ariel imprisoned in the rift of a cloven pine.

Of the less important spirit haunts the following may be noted:

Caverns. — Caverns are spirit haunts. So the Khonds' spirits live under ground, and the West Africans in passing a hollow rock or a cave put tobacco in the crack, and pray: — Demon, who livest here, behold our tobacco, keep us safe, give us good trade, and a safe home-coming. Among the South Africans there is a belief that souls live in caverns, and a similar belief is prevalent among the people of Tasmania and the Negroes of Guinea. The Friesian white nymphs or white wives lived in caves and took people away. The Mexican dead go into caverns, and in Ireland, Lough Derby has a cavern, the entrance to St. Paul's Purgatory.

Deserts and Waste Places. — Spirits gather at waste places or in deserts. So in the Kûnkan, during an eclipse, sorcerers and conjurors practise their spells in waste places or on the sea-shore. The Shanars say that spirits live mostly in trees, in wastes and shades. The Samoans, Coast Negroes, and New Caledonians believe that spirits haunt wastes. Spirits live in deserts, and so Christ went three days' journey into the wilderness to be tempted of the devil. The lives of the desert-dwelling Christian monks in Egypt are full of assaults and temptations either from Satan or from his servants. The people of South Guinea in times of peril gather at the skirts of a forest or on a hill-top and call piteously on the spirits of their ancestors. The Zamáro evil spirit, according to the Záparo Indians of South America, haunts the wood. In South Scotland, to please the genius loci, or spirit of the place, a piece of ground is sometimes left untilled as the Gudeman's field or Clonties Croft. The evil spirit in the south of Scotland has still the power of worrying good Christians in waste places. A minister riding home from a meeting of Presbytery was thrown. A scornful weird laugh was rewarded with: — “Satan, ye may laugh, but when I fall I can get up again; when ye fall ye never rise!” The spirit (hearing this) groaned.

26 Scott's Border Minstrelies, p. 445.
27 K. Raghuinithe's Pâhâe Prahbas.
29 Mrs. Jamieson (Sacred and Legendary Art, Vol. II, p. 750) points out that these devil tales need not be either inventions or impostures. Like Luther's struggles at Wartburg they may be due to diseased, repressed, or unwholesome feelings. Half way between the Egyptian monk and Luther, during the second half of the eleventh century (A.D. 1056-1166), at Byzantium Michael Pedinus (7) discourses on demons and their cloud-like changeable bodies, who, unhappy in hell, came into men, causing possession and madness. (Lexis's European Rationalism, Vol. I, p. 56.)
31 Henderson's Folk-Lore, p. 273.
Empty Houses. — There is a strong belief among Hindus that empty or forsaken houses or forts are favorite abodes of spirits, and cases are not uncommon in which houses have been abandoned or left unoccupied because they are haunted by spirits. So among the Poona Lingiyats, during the progress of the wedding procession, cocoanuts are broken at street crossings and empty houses to scare fiends. According to the Poona Kunbis the favourite spirit haunts are large trees, lonely places, empty houses, and old wells. The Sandwich Islanders think that spirits hover over old houses.

Groves. — The belief is common in India that the spirits of the dead live in sacred groves as well as in single trees. In the Dekhan and also in the Kōnkan, the sacred groves are believed to be the haunts of the sylvan spirits, or vanadavātās, who are, for the most part, supposed to be guardians. Once a year it is usual in Kānara and other primitive parts to please the spirits of the wood by presenting them with a blood-offering. The whole village goes at night into the grove with music and much noise. The headman kills a goat or several cocks in front of the shrine of the head spirit of the wood, and smears the stone with blood. The people remain all night in the wood. The Orasins of Chhotal Udepur worship Darha, the spirit of the wood, and Sarna Buri, the lady of the grove. The Mandas have a similar spirit of the grove whom they call Jhar Era. The Nagas make miniature houses for the dead in sacred groves. Near Upsala, in Sweden, there were holy groves, every tree and leaf of which was deemed most sacred. These groves were full of the bodies of men and animals that had been sacrificed.

Hills. — All over western India a hill or rising ground is one of the commonest sites for a temple. The Karubarus of Bijāpur worship a hill called Birappa. Gujarāt Musulmans believe that the king of Gias lives on Mount Caucaus. So the Khonds offer a victim to their ancestors on a hill, praying to live as their ancestors lived. The Khyns bury the rich on holy mountains, build a hut near, and keep a man to drive off malignrant spirits. The Kirantis, Mundas, and Kāsias burn their dead on hill-tops. The Kols sacrificed on a great hill or Marang Burn. Shiv and Pārvati and all their troops and ghosts have their head-quarters on hill tops. In Madagascar, the spirits of the dead are believed to go to lofty mountains. Among the Dyaks in Borneo, spirits hover about the hills. The Americans worship a high spirit-haunted rock. In Iceland, spirits are said to gather on high rocks. In Scandinavia, the dwarfs lived in the hills, and in Scotland, spirits and fairies gather on hill-tops. In Scotland, a suicide used to be buried on a hill-top, and the Scotch masons used to meet on hill-tops on St. John's Day. British bards commonly speak of the spirits of mountains.

Hearth. — The Kōnkan Hindu cow-dungs his house on the 12th or 13th day after a death to drive away spirits — bhut-bit. The Negros of the Gold Coast, in West Africa, said spirits keep in the house till they are driven out. The Roman Lares or good ancestors lived in the hearth.

House-Roofs. — The Hindus of Sind believe that a spirit lives in the roof of the house, and gives the house-people seizures. The dead Prabhū sits ten days on the eaves. Spirits haunt house-roofs, and so Pārās mark their tiles with yellow and red to scare fiends. The Burmans believe that spirits live in house-roofs. So for the comfort of the house-spirits the

---

8 Bombay Gazetteer.
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23 Shibree's Madagascar, p. 312.
25 Scott's Border Minstrelsy, p. 441.
tops of all the posts in the house are covered with a hood of cotton cloth wherein the spirits live.\textsuperscript{28} The house-spirit \textit{Elin-Saung Nāi} lives in a cotton night-cap or hood in the top of a pillar.\textsuperscript{29} Compare the Greek Mistor:—
\begin{align*}
\text{δύσκωμενοι πράκτοροι τε σκοτιών} \\
\text{δευτολίμοι, ἐν ὀνείρι τοῖς ὑσίοις} \\
\text{ἐν ὄρφων μάνισσα. Σαροὶ ἄκτιζεν.}
\end{align*}

They (Argives) having regard to the divine avenging observer hard to war with;—what house could stand (bear) him defiling on the roof. Grievedly he sits there.

"\textit{πλασταρ} became a general term for an unclean spirit, or evil genius."\textsuperscript{30}

Looking-glass. — The looking-glass seems to be a spirit haunt. So the Hindus deem it unlucky to see one's face in a looking-glass at night, and in Sweden, if a girl looks in a glass after dark it is believed she will lose favour in the eyes of men.\textsuperscript{32} The idea is that the \textit{gexi} in the glass possesses the girl, and makes her ill-favoured. The Burman white witches use a looking-glass in restoring the soul of a child which its dead mother has taken away.\textsuperscript{33} In England, looking-glasses are covered when a death happen.\textsuperscript{34} In Yorkshire, if you walk three times against the sun at midnight and in the dark, and look into a glass you will see the devil.\textsuperscript{35} It was an English belief that a death would take place in the house in which a mirror is broken.\textsuperscript{36}

(To be continued.)

NOTES AND QUERIES.

A POPULAR LEGEND ABOUT VALMIKI.

In the beginning Wālmik went to Ghazni Fort and did penance there. A barren Mughal woman came to visit him and asked him for a son, and promised that if one were given her she would dedicate him to his service. In short, by the intercession of Wālmik she gave birth in due time to a son, and called him Lāl Beg. When he grew up she took him and dedicated him to Wālmik, according to her promise.

Wālmik afterwards took him to Benares (Kāśi). The 96 karōya (960 millions) of \textit{dēvadās} (goddlings that inhabit Benares) had turned the sweepers (\textit{chandāl}) out of the home of the \textit{dēvadās}, and placed them in Chandālgarh, which is 7 kos from Benares and across the Ganges.

When Wālmik was in Benares he saw that in the mornings when the sweepers came from Chandālgarh to sweep the city, they used to sound drums (\textit{ḍhāl bajātā}) before entering it, and that the inhabitants, who were really \textit{dēvadās}, used to hide themselves in their houses to avoid seeing them. When they finished sweeping they again sounded drums, and then the people came out of their houses and went on with their business.

When Wālmik saw this he would not hide himself, and asked the people why they avoided seeing the sweepers. The people answered:—

\begin{quote}
"because they are sweepers, it is unlawful for us to look upon them."
\end{quote}

Wālmik out of pity gave up his life for them (\textit{chädā chhāyā dätā}). When he died blood and matter oozed from his body, so that no Hindu could touch it. So one of the inhabitants of Benares went to Chandālgarh to call a sweeper, and saw them all there. The sweepers came into Benares and threw the body of Wālmik into the Ganges. But the Hindus found the body lying in the same condition in another house, and called the sweepers again. Again the sweepers throw the body into the Ganges and went home. A third time the body was found in a house in Benares and the people were astonished, and calling the sweepers, saw all their faces.

Afterwards Wālmik appeared in a dream to an inhabitant of Benares, and told him that as long as the people refused to see the sweepers his body would not leave the city. Ever since then the people have not hidden themselves from the sweepers. The sweepers took the body from the city for the last time, and Wālmik told them to take it to Chandālgarh. And it is said that when the body reached Chandālgarh all the mat huts of the sweepers turned into houses of gold. This was in the Golden Age (Satyug).

R. C. TEMPLE in P. N. and Q. 1888.
CURRENCY AND COINAGE AMONG THE BURMESE.

BY R. C. TEMPLE.

(Continued from p. 91.)

7.

Pāli and Old Burmese Weights.

Seeing how important a part the pala of the Sanskrit, which is the phala of the Pāli, writers plays in all the arguments relating to the bullion weights of India and Further India, I have made every endeavour to trace, in the sources of information at my command, the old Burmese views of the weight which that term really represented, and it is much to my regret that I have after all still to leave the point more largely to conjecture than I could wish. Information more or less exact should apparently be forthcoming, as there is a very large number of inscriptions in the country, but it may be said that they are only now beginning to be brought to the notice of students, and a few only have been edited with any attempt at adequate treatment.

I have before me the large volume of inscriptions from Pagan, Pinya6 (old Ava), and Ava, printed by the Burma Government from the papers of the late Dr. Forchhammer, containing 156 inscriptions from Pagan, 17 from Pinya, and 9 from Ava. I have also the two still larger volumes, printed at my own instigation by the same Government, - always so ready to assist research of this kind, - of the wonderful collection of copies on stone of the chief inscriptions in Burma at the Mahāmuni Shrine near Amarapura (and Mandalay), attributed to King Boddiphaya7 and containing 596 inscriptions.8 But both sets of records are still in the Burmese character and inedit, and the work of picking out such information as is required for the present purpose from such a mass would be far too great a task to undertake, so long as it remains in its present condition.9

Besides these there are many inscriptions from Arakan and Pagan recorded more or less fully in Forchhammer's Reports on the Antiquities of Arakan and on the Kyaikto Temple at Pagan, and in the same writer's Notes on the Early History and Geography of British Burma; (1) Shwedagon Pagoda, (2) First Buddhist Mission to Suvaññabhūmi.

6 The Railway from Rangoon to Mandalay passes right through these most interesting ruins: a fact not generally known.
7 I understand the importance of the Monastic Orders, who wished to have recorded all the gifts of land made to them at various times.
8 The present writer was also successful in inducing the trustees of the Mahāmuni Shrine to preserve the original stones, from which the copies had been made. Their idea was that as wise copies on stone had been made of the old worn stones, the originals had become valueless, and so they were thrown away in a corner; and it is only through the innate carelessness of the Burmans that they have been preserved from absolute destruction.
9 As no description of these works has ever been given to the public, I may as well note here, for the benefit of enquirers, that the first contains 450 large quarto pages, a fairly full table of contents and a careful list of errata, and also that each inscription has prefixed to it a note on the position of the inscription and its date, the giver and the gift, and sometimes the tenor of the inscription.

The inscriptions from Pagan are as follow:

Shwedagon Pagoda ... 22 | Wetyl-In Quarter ... 11
Ngetpyiittaung Quarter ... 11 | North East Quarter ... 8
East Quarter ... 19 | South East Quarter ... 7
City (Shwedgyi) ... 26 | South Quarter ... 2
Myin Pagan ... 8 | Daypissaya (Shripchéchayá) ... 2
Lélaungga ... 37 | Pëmsti ... 7
Chaukpalá ... 5 | Total ... 155

Those from Pinya near Ava are:

Pinya Myoing (Old Town) ... 7
Do. do. do. South ... 6
Do. do. do. North ... 6
Total ... 17

Those from Ava itself, from the Palace Monastery, number 9: which gives a gross total of inscriptions in the volume of 182.

To these I may add a note on my own, ante, Vol. XXI. p. 32, on a curious English inscription on a large bell on the platform of the Kyaukloan Pajoda at Maulmain,21 because it gives a statement of a weight: — "He who destroyed to this bell they must be in the great hell and unable to coming out. This bell is made by Koonah Lingahyah (Gnalañ-kāra) the Priest and weight 600 viss. No one body design to destroy this bell Maulmain, March 30th, 1865."

Crawfurd's inscriptions are part renderings by the well-known Burmese scholar Judson, of two of the Mahānuní collection of stones, of which he says there were (Nov. 30, 1826), according to his counting, 260; and he seems to clearly infer that the stones he saw set up in

The two volumes of the second work are printed in the same form as the first with a slight change. They contain 509 and 467 pp., but are paginated consecutively in 962 pp. The inscriptions are arranged therein geographically, according to the modern English divisions of the country. Thus:

I. — Upper Burma,
   A. — Northern Division.
      Mandalay District ... 26 | Shwèbō District ... 35
      Kyauktwin District ... 1  Total ... 62
   B. — Central Division.
      Sagaing District ... 218 | Lower Chindwin District ... 39
      Total ... 257
   C. — Southern Division.
      Pakokku District ... 41 | Mibō District ... 18
      Magwe District ... 5  Bayet District ... 19
      Total ... 70
   D. — Eastern Division.
      Mynagō District ... 153 | Kyauktō District ... 98
      Miktō District ... 12  Yaneñin District ... 2
      Total ... 165
   E. — Unattached Villages.
   Total ... 6
   South ... 4 | North ... 1
   Total ... 12
   Total for Upper Burma ... 599

II. — Lower Burma,
   A. — Pago (Pagu) Division.
      Pyinyo (Prome) District ... 1
   B. — Ezrawadi Division.
   Hnōgō District ... 2
   C. — Tamiñyó (Tenasserim) Division.
      Taung-ñú District ... 3
      Total ... 6
   Total for all Burma ... 596

The places that have contributed the largest number to this collection of inscriptions are Shwèbō, 35; Sagaing 77; Ava, 35; Pinyō, 32; Amyin, 64; Pakokkō, 23; Talōkmyō, 36; Pāgūn and neighbourhood, 129.

There is a table of contents and a list of errata prefixed to each volume, and to each inscription is prefixed such information as its serial number by place, Sub-division, District and Division: its designation, collector, original position, date, giver, gift.

10 In 1838 I procured an authentic copy of the important Rijnaguchōsō inscription at the Kaungmudō Pagoda, dated c. 1650 A.D., and the Burma Government started printing it for me, but I do not know what the final result was, as I soon afterwards left the country. I have still a rubbing and hand copy of the Kaddgūrō inscription of Mōdon Min, 1838 A.D., at Shwèbō. Malcolm, Travels, Vol. I. p. 127, says that the pagoda is dated 1626, A.D.

11 Kyakshārāna according to Stevenson, Bur. Dict. p. 406; spelt Krākhmarkand. At p. 406 f. there is a valuable list of pagodas in this work.

12 A notice of this bell and its inscription is to be found in Scott, The Burman, Vol. I. p. 243 ff.; Winter, Six Months in Burmese, 1885, p. 25.
the galleries were the originals and not the existing copies, which supports what I have also heard, that the copies were made later than Bódopāya's time (1731-1819). But the truth about such things is always difficult to get at in Burma. The first inscription is dated 1432 A. D., and contains no mention of any weights, but the second, dated 1454 A. D., talks in the translations of "4,600 ticals of pure silver — 100 ticals of gold — a silver salver weighing 300 ticals."

Yule's inscription is a part rendering, on the authority of Burney, of that at the curious and famous Kaung-mudó Pagoda, about 15 miles from Sagaing, in which no mention is made of weights.14

Those of the British Burma Gazetteer and Mr. Hesketh-Biggs relate, in free and part translation by Mr. Hough, the missionary, and Moun Hla Oung, a well-known official, the inscriptions on the great bells on the platform of the Shwedagon Pagoda at Rangoon. The first is on the "Great Bell" or Mahāgāndha (Mahāgānta), generally attributed to King Bódopāya and said to be dated 1781 A. D.15 The second is on the still greater bell called the Mahātīrātāgāndha, the great three-toned bell, of King Parawalī, dated 1841-3,16 which is said in the translation of the inscription thereon, to "weigh 25,94,049 ticals of pure brass."

By 1855, however, Yule, in his book, p. 167, states that the Mahāgāndha Inscriptions were 200 or 300 in number (far under the mark, it will now be seen), and, on the authority of Phayre, that they are "not originals nor exact copies of originals."

I have obtained access to Burney's original MSS. and here is his interesting note on his visit to this Pagoda:— "Aug. 27, 1830. Capt. Pemberton and I accompanied the Mya-wadl Wongsdee this day to inspect the great Pagoda of Kaungmudó, which bears the Pali name of Ramasuniscola [Rajamargol̄a, also Chōlamapi and Rājakagnamapi, ante, Vol. XXII. p. 346]. At this time of the year, the whole country being inundated, our war-boats were able by a short route from Ava to go close up to the Pagoda. In the enclosure, within which the Pagoda stands, are several smaller buildings and in one of which we saw the inscription, said to have been engraved in the year 1821, A. D. 1859, in the reign of King Nyebalat (the Nébalat or Nga Htaap Dhamó) of Phaya, Hist. of Burma, p. 346, of the Taung-yá Dynasty, reigning from Ava. The inscription is cut on a beautiful block of marble, about 10 feet high, 5 broad and 1 foot thick, and is covered on both sides with Burmese characters, made square, not round like the common Burmese writing. Moun Za (Atwinun) told us that the difference between the two descriptions of character was precisely the same as that between our printed letters and handwriting. The greater part of the inscription consists of religious and moral maxims, but I could distinctly trace the passage, which refers to the division of the Burmese Empire, a copy of which has been given me. This was the portion of the inscription published by Yule. Had Burney and the Burmese Ministers of the day only known it, there was much more precise information of the kind they wanted of a then quite recent date in Sipyuyin's Inscription at Bódalung, dated 1774 A. D. (ante, Vol. XXII. p. 4).

Hesketh-Biggs, p. 59: British Burma Gazetteer, Vol. III, p. 694; Winter, Six Months in British Burma, 1858, p. 10 f.; but see later on as to the actual gaver and date.

Mahā Tisahārāgāndha, three-toned, in Hesketh-Biggs, p. 46: obviously for Pāli Mahā-tri-saddha-gānta = Sakkrit Mahā-trī-lābha-gaṇṭa, great three-toned bell. At p. 42 of Mr. Hesketh-Biggs' book Moun Hla Oung calls the bell Netha Yisadha Ganda — at least he is so printed. This must stand for the Pāli Niṣayā-saddha-gaṇṭa, the bell of the voice of refuge.

As there seem to be disputes as to the date of this bell I give here each date in the inscription relating to King Dārāwadl and his doings at Rangoon, as given in Moun Hla Oung's translation, worked out to the English Calendar, according to Moyle's Almanac of Corresponding English and Burmese Dates from A. D. 1822 to A. D. 1895 (Fourth Ed.). From general history one knows that Dārāwadl, here called "Sripuravāraśīya-Lākshāpati-Vijayamahādarmāriśīya, the Third Founder of Amarapura," came to the throne in 1837 A. D. (ante, Vol. XXI. p. 327 ff.) but the date on the inscription is precise, as the corresponding date A. B. is given as 2580 = 1836 A. D. The corresponding date A. B. is twice given for 1206 B. E. as 2381 = 1841 A. D., and the general accuracy of the dates in the inscription will be seen from the following statements:

A. — 6th waxing Cādā, 1198 = Wednesday, 26th April, 1838, King Dārāwadl took possession of his father's heritage.

B. — Sunday, 7th waxing Twāñalin, 1203 = Monday, 5th September 1841, he came by water in the royal yacht to Rāmanfil, the three countries of the Talaingó, i.e., to Rangoon. The dates do not tally, but the 7th waxing Twāñalin, 1203, was a Sunday and corresponds with Sunday, 22nd August 1841:

C. — 3rd waxing Tasaunæm, 1503 = Sunday, 21st October, 1841, he constructed a citadel and girt the Shwedagon Pagoda.

D. — 10th waxing Dadinjut, 1503 = Friday, 24th September, 1841, he made a mould of this great bell.

E. — Sunday, 5th waxing Tabōdew, 1504 = Sunday, 19th February, 1842, he finished the casting.
No doubt, the word translated "tikals" in the inscriptions of 1484 and 1843 is kyáit.

In the Buddhist Gayâ inscriptions there is no mention of any weights.

So far, then, these inscriptions bring us no nearer to the point of our enquiry as to the true Burmese notions on the subject of the weight of the pala or phala. Nor will Forchhammer's work help us.

The Burman of the present day still believes as did his ancestors time out of mind. He still spends his earnings or savings in building or repairing pagodas and sacred buildings of all sorts, inscribing on them the fact, with a statement of what his works of merit have cost him. In this way the currency of the British supremacy in these parts will doubtless go down to a far posterity.

Thus the repair of the original Mahâmuni Pagoda in Arakan (not to be confounded with its counterpart near Amarapûra) in 1865-7 by a Shân is described in his inscription as follows: 18 "In the course of the work it was found that the sum of Rs. 460, which he had brought with him, would not suffice. In this dilemma he appealed to the Wundank (Magistrate) and begged of him to receive his wife and children as surety (in pawn) for Rs. 400. But the Wundank would not agree to the proposal. 19 He, however, most liberally advanced the Rs. 400 to meet the expenses. With all this aid however it was found that the extra money received could only suffice to repair the base, but not the roof of the image-house. 20 Arrangements were made to collect subscriptions from the whole of Dhaññavatil (Arakan) in order to bring the work to a successful close. The following are the names of the subscribers: Wundank Maung Kalâwâ with the title of Dâkyîzi; Dâyakâ Sûndun Rs. 5; Tazazin Thâdun 2 (and so on)—altogether Rs. 145."

Similarly one "Mâ Myâtû, the beloved wife of Zayântagâ Maung Chindaung of Môlêk Village in the Akyab District spent more than Rs. 15,000 in gilding the chêtî on the summit of the Urittaung Hill, as a work of merit done for the good of her deceased husband," i.e., according to her inscription dated in "the year B. E. 40," i.e., B. E. 1240 = A. D. 1879. 21

In an inscription, dated 1848 A. D., at the Andó Pagoda at Sandoway, it is said that "a tî, whose opening measured 2½ cubits and which had 12 tiers was constructed by Maung Lô Nôkâ, who was paid Rs. 100 for its workmanship." The same inscription says that the feast on the occasion cost Rs. 350. 22

In Scott's The Burman, Vol. I. p. 247 ff., there is a translation of the inscription on bell "No. 15,319 in the Indian Section of the South Kensington Museum," from which we see that it is dated 1209 B. E. = 1847 A. D., and "The exact weight of the bell in current reckoning is 2,500 kyâits weight." 23 In addition to this the giver, a Yêwun (Maritime Provincial Governor) of Pâgân Min (1846-52), says "I gave a tagundaeing, 24 the price of which, with all incidental expenses, was Rs. 500: 25 that was the alms exactly."

And lastly there are the two inscriptions in Vol. XXII. of the Indian Antiquary so well edited by the capable hand of Mr. Taw Sein Ko, viz., the Pôodaung Inscription of Sunbyâyin, dated 1774 A. D., and the Kalyâm Inscriptions of Dhammachôtî, dated 1476 A. D.

In the first there is no mention of weights at all, but in the second, which is throughout in Pâli, there are several; this inscription, or rather set of inscriptions, being in fact the only one to throw any light on the present subject.

19 That official would hardly have dared to accept under British rule, but the Shân acted according to the notions of his life-long surroundings on the subject of slavery for debt.
20 Forchhammer usually means by this expression the Burmese ðÎng, Pâlî sînû, strictly a hall of ordination.
23 2,500 kyâits = 210 viss = 912.5 lbs. Av. = rather less than half a ton.
24 Tagundaeing is a streamer offered in worship; tagundaeing is a post set up near a pagoda to hang the streamer on.
25 Ent I suspect that the translation should be here "500 tickals (kyâits)."
First, we read on the obverse face of the second stone (ante, Vol. XXII. p. 40) that Dhammachāthi gave the Holy Tooth Relic at Kandy in Ceylon:

1. A stone alms-bowl — having for its cover a pyramidal covering made of gold, weighing 50 phalas.
2. An alms-bowl with a stand and cover complete made of gold, weighing 30 phalas.
3. A duodecagonal betel-box made of gold, weighing 30 phalas.
4. A gold reliq-receptacle, weighing 33 phalas.

Further on (p. 41) we read: — "The following articles were prepared for presentation to King Bhūvanakabāhu, King of Sihaladīpa:"

5. Two sapphires valued at 200 phalas of silver.
6. Two rubies valued at 430 phalas.

Again (p. 41): — "200 phalas of gold" were given to the emissaries for the purpose of providing the 22 thāras and their disciples with the "four requisites," should any mishap, such as scarcity of food, arise.

Clearly, then, the phala was a Troy weight at that period in the estimation of the Burmese monks.

Later on, again, on the reverse face of the same stone (p. 45) we read about the gift of Dhammachāthi to the Shwedagon Pagoda at Rangoon of "a large bell made of brass weighing 3,000 tulas." Here we have an Avordupois weight.

Lastly, the return gift (p. 45) of the Sihañese King "included a religious gift in the shape of an image of the Holy Tooth Relic, embellished with a topaz and a diamond, valued at 100 phalas."

The difficulty of course is to get at direct evidence of the weight of the phala and tula of that period. The only evidence from Burmese documents that I have come across so far, though it indicates the sources from which such information should be forthcoming, is Taw Sein Ko's Ed. of the Mahājānaka Jātaka, 1892, p. 92, where occurs the following passage:

"And lastly he soliloquized on the gold salver out of which he ate — badhānī satabalān kamasāka, meaning, "This my gold salver, from which I eat my soft and solid food, is made of pure gold, and it weighs 100 phās and so on."

Now, this edition of the Mahājānaka Jātaka is taken from the Burmese translation thereof by U Aowththa (Obhāsī), the head of the Minbu Monasteries in 1785, and to the above passage that learned monk appended a note, thus rendered by Taw Sein Ko: — "The phā is of four different kinds: it may weigh 5, 25, 50 or 100 tickalās. Of these four, the second weight, viz., 25 might be adopted, judging from the term of life extending to 10,000 years, allotted to the persons of the story."

We have here, at any rate, the views of a Burmese authority of the last Century on the phā, i.e., the bō (l) or phala, and its value.

At p. 116 we come across this salver again: — "There you exchanged your costly garments and your golden salver weighing 100 phās for this poor ascetic garb and this poor earthenware alms-bowl."

26 Value about £3.190, according to the calculations made later on.
27 There misprinted 500.
28 Bignaclet, Guadama, Ed. 1810, Vol. II. pp. 167-76, gives an abstract of this Jātaka under the name of Dnannakha, but unfortunately says nothing in it about the salver.
29 The Burmese monk had even Indian authority for such a statement, vide Colebrooke's Essays, Vol. II. p. 531, who says "a salver, synonymous with pala, consists of five suvarnas. According to some authorities, it is also a denomination for the quantity of 1,100 suvarnas." Colebrooke also says, loc. cit., "108 suvarnas or tulas of gold constitute an urukhāsana, pala or dinara."
At p. 158 there is a chance note by Taw Sein Ko himself, which curiously confirms all that has been written by myself (ante, Vol. XXVI. p. 325 ff.) on the subject of the derivation of bö(l). In giving a description of the Burmese notions of the classical svayabheera (pān-gōntamoyd, garland-placing ceremony) in the form of stringing and unstringing the mighty bow (lēdinbow, bow-stretching ceremony), he says: — “Difference of opinion exists as to the right interpretation of the expression, bö(l) achod tatauraung tin’naing’ō’ō lōb. Bō(l)30 is evidently the Burmanised form of the Pāli bala, strength, an army: achor means the sum total. Thus the phrase would mean, a bow (lō) that can be strung and unstrung (tin’naing’ō’ō) by the collective strength (bō(l) achor) of 1,000 warriors. This is one version of the interpretation. The other is that bö(l) should be read pō, a five tickal weight, and that the meaning should be: — a bow that can support without breaking the weight of 2,500 tickals at either end (bō(l) achor tatauraung). The former rendering should be adopted, bearing in mind that Oriental writers take a delight in the use of hyperbole.”

I think that one may now without hesitation assert positively that bö(l), with the alternative spelling pō, is the Sanskrit pala, Pāli, phala; and that as a matter of practical calculation it represented of old in Burma a five tickal weight. On this assumption we can proceed to reduce statements in phalas, and perhaps tulas, to European weight denominations and values with some hope of approximate success.

In this way the value of the four gifts of golden articles sent by Dhammaceti to Bhavavakabāhu can be stated as follows, assuming that 1 phala = 5 tickals: 100 tickals = 1 viss:

1 viss = 3.66 lbs. Av.: 1 lb. of gold = £60.31

Then:

1. 30 phalas = 150 tickals = 2.5 viss = 9.125 lbs. Av. = £549.5.
2. 30 phalas = 150 tickals = 2.5 viss = 9.125 lbs. Av. = £549.5.
3. Same as No. 2 = £323.5.
4. 33 phalas = same as Nos. 2 and 3 + 1 10th = £328.5 + 32.85 = £361.35.

As to the gifts valued in silver, perhaps the best way to reckon their value will be to assume that silver was to gold as about one to ten at that time, and to proceed to reckon as for gold dividing the result by ten, thus:

1. 200 phalas of silver = 20 phalas of gold = 100 tickals = 1 viss = 3.65 lbs. Av. = £219.
2. 430 phalas of silver = 43 phalas of gold = 215 tickals = 2.15 viss = 7.75 lbs. Av. = £465.

So that the value of the gifts would be £2,251.85, and if it is to be accepted that the purchasing power of gold in the XVth Century, A. D., was several times greater than its present purchasing power, the value of the presents was sufficiently large.

It is interesting here to work out the value of the gifts stated in the contemporary (1454 A. D.) Burmese Inscription at the Mahāmuni Shrine near Amarapura, translated by Judson and quoted above. The values are all stated in tickals. Thus:

1. 4,600 tickals of pure silver = 460 tickals of gold = 4.6 viss = 16.79 lbs. Av. = £1,007.4.
2. 100 tickals of gold = 1 viss = 3.65 lbs. Av. = £219.
3. 300 tickals of silver = 30 tickals of gold = 3.65 × 30/100 lbs. Av. = 1.095 lbs. Av. = £65.7.

30 This last assumption I have arrived at thus: — 144 lbs. Av. = 175 lbs. Troy, therefore, for rough calculation, 1 lb. Av. = 1 lb. Troy, and vice versa, 1 lb. Troy = 1/2 lb. Av. Gold by value is about £4 to the ounce Troy, therefore £48 to the lb. Troy, therefore the value of 1 lb. Av. of gold = 1/2 of £24 = £60. The existing £ runs 2844 to 28 lbs. Troy, so that 1 lb. Troy = £40 14s. 6d. As the quality of the metal in the inscriptions is never mentioned, the calculations in the text are not enough.
These old gifts compare with the modern ones quoted as being recorded on stone by Forchhammer, thus:

(1) 1848 A. D. Exchange taken at Rs. 9 to the £ —
   (a) Rs. 100 = £11.
   (b) Rs. 350 = £39.

(2) 1866-7 A. D. Exchange taken at Rs. 10 to the £ —
   (a) Rs. 460 = £46.
   (b) Rs. 460 = £40.
   (c) Rs. 145 = £14.5.

(3) 1879 A. D. Exchange taken at Rs. 12 to the £ —
   Rs. 15,000 = £1,250.

The calculation of the po or bō(1) of the Mahājanaka Jātaka may be regarded from two points of view: — first, that of the monkish translator, and secondly, that of the Pāli original of the story.

According to the monk's quaint conjectures, which would also, from Taw Sein Kō's remarks, appear to coincide with the orthodox Burmese view, the po, bō(1), phala, at the time of the Jātaka, equaled 25 tickals. Then, 100 phalas of gold = 2,500 tickals = 25 viss = 90'25 lbs. Av., as the weight of the gold salver. No wonder the good old monk felt bound to justify his computation by an allusion to a belief held by his Buddhist readers to be true, because contained in Scripture. Had he taken the weight of the po at its contemporaneous current computation of 5 tickals, the gold salver would even then have weighed 18'05 lbs. Av., value £1,110. Quite enough both for weight and value.

The story being a Jātaka, one has to go back to ancient computations of the phala to get at a notion of the idea that was in the mind of the originator of the story, when he talked of a golden salver weighing 100 phalas.

Taking the rati at the average double rati of ancient commerce of about 4 grs. Troy and the phala as 320 ratis, we get an average phala of 1,280 grs. = 24 oz. Troy. Then, for such a calculation as the present, 100 phalas = 266 oz. Troy = 22'16 lbs. Troy = 17'73 lbs. Av. And if we accept Colebrooke's estimate of about 4'4 grs. for the double rati, which makes, by the way, the persistent South-Indian pala (pulam) of 1,440 grs., then the phala = 3 oz. Troy. Then also 100 phalas = 300 oz. Troy = 25 lbs. Troy = 20 lbs. Av. So that the salver was probably imagined by those who first told and heard the story as weighing what would be now described as a weight of between 17 and 20 lbs. Av., or to put it in modern Indian phrase as between 8 and 10 pakka ās, or in modern Burmese phrase as between 5 and 6 viss.

Now 100 phalas make 1 tūlā, and so we get a statement of the ancient tūlā as being of 20 lbs. Av., or ¼ of the modern average South-Indian maund. However that may be, for arriving at an idea of the weight of King Dhammāçāli's bell at the Shwedagon Pagoda, the best plan that suggests itself to me, as a result of the study of South-Indian weights given ante, pp. 57 ff., is to assume that the Pāli scholars of Burma in at any rate the 15th century A. D. and onwards have meant by the tula what is now known as the Madras maund of 25 lbs. Av. Just as the Burmans and Talaing unquestionably borrowed the South-Indian viss in an approximately correct form, so did they also, I think, borrow the next higher Avoirdupois denomination, the South-Indian tūlā, man or maund. And that these synonymous terms have meant continuously a weight of 25 lbs. Av. or thereabouts in, before and after the 15th century A. D. there can be no doubt.
Assuming the tula then to equal 25 lbs. Av., the weight of Dhammachāṭi's bell of 3,000 tulas would be 75,000 lbs. Av. or 33 1/2 tons. If we give the tula a weight of 20 lbs. or less, then the weight of the bell would be 26 3/4 tons or less.

The weights of the Mahātībāddagāndā of King Partwadi at Rangoon and of U Kunalingya's bell at Maulman are, of course, stated in modern terms, and weigh, according to the inscriptions thereon, — the first, a few lbs. over 43 tons, and the second, about one ton.

The traditional weight of the Mahagandā at Rangoon is 25,555 viss, which amounts to about 41 1/2 cts. tons, or a little less than the Mahātībāddagāndā; but, in the course of an interesting correspondence in the Rangoon Gazette on the subject, a writer says, in a letter, dated 27th May, 1896, that part of the inscription on the bell runs as follows: — "Year of the establishment of religion 2322, era (Burmese) 1140, 11th day of the waxing moon of Tabotwai (Tabodwe, about February) after the third watch, the position of the stars being propitious, with metal weighing 15,555 petthā (viss)." Now 2322 A.D. and 1140 B.E. both represent 1778 A.D., and assuming that the above transcript is right, it must have been Sinhdgā (1776-81), who gave the bell, and not Bōdāpāyā (1781-1819), as is generally stated on the strength of Mr. Hough's rendering of the inscription; and its weight must be about 25 1/2 tons.

The above variations in statement arise from two causes: — positive variations in the statements themselves and differences in the mode of computation. For the instruction of students I now collect in one view the information so far available in the subjoined table.

The Various Computations of the Weights of the Greater Burmese Bells.

I. — The Myingun Bell.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Viss</th>
<th>Ibs.</th>
<th>Tons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Op. cit., loc. cit.</td>
<td></td>
<td>500,000 (over)</td>
<td>219-64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 1852</td>
<td>Bigandet, Gaudama, Ed. 1880, Vol. I. p. 74 f. n.</td>
<td></td>
<td>200,000 (over)</td>
<td>89-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1855</td>
<td>Yule, Avar. p. 1713</td>
<td></td>
<td>555,515</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>Popular view</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>Malcom based on Burney</td>
<td></td>
<td>204,575</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1883</td>
<td>Phayre, Burma, p. 219</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23 Hesketh-Biggs, Shwedagon Pagoda, p. 55.
24 25,555 viss against 25,916 viss.
25 The remarks now made should be taken, where they differ, to supersede those made ante, Vol. XXVI. p. 210, on the same subject. The difference arises in the taking the tula at 145 oz. Troy (see Monier-Williams, Sanskrit Dict., s. v., tula), based on Colebrooke's remarks, loc. cit., on the ancient Sanskrit weights, and on the assumption that the tula was 2.25 lbs. This works out the tula to about 12 lbs. Troy = 94 lbs. Av., instead of what I now think that Dhammachāṭi's engravers meant by the term tula, viz., the then current tula of about 25 lbs. Av.
26 Near the Siyō Pagoda, ante, Vol. XXII. p. 546. Cox, c. 1794, Burman Empire, p. 165 fl., describes this Pagoda, but not the bell, which was doubtless not then in existence.
27 Malcom says over 330,000 lbs., but the above statement is the correct one.
28 By computation of the metal in the bell. This, however, is as uncertain as any other statement about it. A comparison of the weights I have quoted will show them to differ very greatly as to dimensions.
29 Copied by Strettell, Ficus Elastica, p. 68 n.
30 This is merely a popular exaggeration.
II. — Mahâgândâ Bell, Bangoon.\(^{46}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Viss.</th>
<th>lbs.</th>
<th>Tons.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1778)</td>
<td>Inscription ...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>15,555</td>
<td>..................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1853</td>
<td>Laurie, Bemce, Ed. 1855, p. 126</td>
<td>4,915-06</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>8-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895</td>
<td>Hesketh-Biggs, p. 55, popular statement.</td>
<td>25,555</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III. — Mahâtibâddagândâ Bell, Bangoon.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Viss.</th>
<th>lbs.</th>
<th>Tons.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1843)</td>
<td>Inscription(^{41})</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>25,940-5</td>
<td>94,687</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV. — Dhammâchâti’s Bell, Bangoon.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Viss.</th>
<th>lbs.</th>
<th>Tons.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1476)</td>
<td>Inscription, 1st comp.(^{42})</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>..................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1476)</td>
<td>Do, 2nd do.(^{43})</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>..................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895</td>
<td>Taw Sein Ko, ante, Vol. XXIV, p. 332.</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>181(^{44})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scott, who has a peculiar knack of picking up scraps of information of the greatest interest about the Burmese, tells us in The Burman, Vol. I. p. 250, of a small bell in the South Kensington Museum, bearing the following inscription:

“... In the month of Tabo’dwê, on the fifth of the waning moon, in the year 1204, on a Sunday, at about four in the afternoon, this bell was cast and moulded of pure copper. Its weight is 594,049 kyâts. There are four lions on the hanging apparatus. Its height is nine fingers’ breadth, the diameter is five inches, the circumference fifteen, the thickness twenty-four. It is called the Mahâtee Thadda Gandâ. The man who had this royal bell moulded was the Burman king Tharrwaddy, Kông Bounng Min.”

Here we have, almost certainly, preserved for us a memorial model of the Mahâtibâddagândâ of King Pàrawâdlî (i.e., Kông-baung). If we may read 2,594,049 for the 594,049 kyâts of the text, we get within one kyat of the statement on the original bell, as above given, because 25,940-5 viss = 2,594,050 kyâts or tickals. Also Sunday, the 5th waning Tabo’dwê, 1204 (B. E.) is the date on the original bell. One would like to know if it has been the custom to make such memorial models of the great bells. At any rate the South Kensington Museum specimen is exceedingly interesting.

(To be continued.)

---

\(^{46}\) Mentioned by Alexander, Travels, p. 45; Tract, Two Years in Ava, p. 34. But no weight is given in either case.

\(^{41}\) Hesketh-Biggs says 26,000 viss or 42 tons; p. 43.


\(^{43}\) Ante, p. 117.

\(^{44}\) This figure is arrived at by taking the tuld to be 40 viss, instead of, as I now think, a little less than 8 viss. I do not know the authority for the computation, and it seems to be clearly wrong. At 8 viss to the tuld the weight would be 97-2 tons.
ON THE SOUTH-INDIAN RECEPTION OF THE MAHABHARATA.

BY M. WINTERNITZ, Ph.D.

(Continued from p. 104.)

The discrepancies between the two recensions in the Parvasanāgraha are not so considerable as those in the Anukramaṇi.

In the Anukramaṇi (both in the Northern and in the Southern recensions) the whole of the Mahābhārata is divided into the usual eighteen Parvanas, as we find them in the Devanāgarī editions. It is strange that neither the Northern nor the Southern MSS. of the actual Mahābhārata seem to bear out this division into 18 Parvanas. We find, e.g., 20 or 21 Parvanas in the complete Devanāgarī MSS. of the Berlin and Oxford libraries. Of the Southern MSS. Dr. Burnell states that they divide the poem into 24 Parvanas, which is not quite borne out by our Grantha MS. which, in the colophons, describes the Pauloma and Āstika Parvanas as subdivisions of the Ādi-Parvan, so that we should have

\begin{align*}
(1) \text{Ādi Parvan:} & \\
\quad (a) \text{Pauloma} & \text{Ādi Parvan in the Nāgarī editions,} \\
\quad (b) \text{Āstika} & \\
(2) \text{Sambhava Parvan}
\end{align*}

while Burnell gives the three first Parvanas as:

\begin{align*}
(1) \text{Ādi Parvan} & \\
(2) \text{Āstika Parvan} & \text{Ādi Parvan in the Nāgarī editions.} \\
(3) \text{Sambhava Parvan}
\end{align*}

A curious list of eighteen Parvanas is that given in the passage (I. 1, 83-92) where the Mahābhārata is compared to a tree, of which the Saṅgrahādhyāya is the seed. The titles of the Parvanas are given here as follows:

\begin{align*}
(1) \text{Pauloma,} \\
(2) \text{Āstika,} \\
(3) \text{Sambhava,} \\
(4) \text{Sabhā,} \\
(5) \text{Āranyā,} \\
(6) \text{Āraṇī,} \\
(7) \text{Virāṭa,} \\
(8) \text{Udyoga,} \\
(9) \text{Bhishma,} \\
(10) \text{Droga,} \\
(11) \text{Karga,} \\
(12) \text{Salya,} \\
(13) \text{Sri,} \\
(14) \text{Aishika,} \\
(15) \text{Sāntī,} \\
(16) \text{Āśvamedha,} \\
(17) \text{Āśramaśīka,} \\
(18) \text{Mausala.}
\end{align*}

All this seems to show that eighteen was a traditional number for the larger divisions of the Mahābhārata, but that this number was made up in very different ways by different sects at the different periods in the long history of the Mahābhārata text.

---

See A. Holtzmann, Das Mahābhārata, III. 18 seqq.
The account given of the contents of the single Parvan in the Anukramaṇi is of considerable importance for Mahābhārata criticism. For it is always worth something, if an episode about the genuineness of which doubts are entertained, can be proved to have been known to the compiler of this Anukramaṇi.

It is, therefore, important to see that the South-Indian recension gives a considerably shorter list of contents than the Nāgarī editions. How much importance can be attached to the omissions in our MS., we shall not be able to decide, until many more MSS. from different parts of India have been collated.

It is, however, interesting to see that the allusion to the Sakuntalā episode (in vv. 95b and 96) is missing in the Grantha MS. For as we shall see below, the same episode is omitted in a Malayalam MS. of the Sambhavā Parvan of the Mahābhārata.

Another important omission is that of vv. 109-110 alluding to the birth of Draupadi and Dhristadyumna, and to Vyāsa’s meeting with the Pāṇḍavas, when he tells them to proceed to Pañchāla for Draupadi’s Śayamvara.

But there are numerous omissions, especially in the summary of the Vana Parvan, which at present can hardly be accounted for, and even the arrangement of the episodes in the Grantha MS. differs to a very great extent from that in the editions. I will only give a few examples, in order to show the great discrepancies between the two versions. The asterisks show the passages which are omitted in the Grantha MS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. 2, 166 sqq. in the Devadāsi (Bombay) edition.</th>
<th>Corresponding passage in the Grantha MS.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Story of Kaṇa being deprived of his ear-rings.</td>
<td>1. Story of Agastya, the Asura Vātāpi, and Lopāmudrā.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*2. Eulogy of Gaya.</td>
<td>2. Story of the hawk and the pigeon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Story of Agastya, the Asura Vātāpi, and Lopāmudrā.</td>
<td>3. Sivi, examined by Indra and Agni and Dharma.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Story of Rāṇa, the son of Jamadagni, and death of Kārtavirya and the Haihayas.</td>
<td>4. Story of Rāyaśırīga (sic).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Story of Sukanyā, Chyavana, and the Āśvinis.</td>
<td>7. Bhīmasena in Gandhamadana, at Draupadi’s request.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Story of the hawk and the pigeon.</td>
<td>10. Story of Sukanyā, Chyavana, and the Āśvinis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Sivi, examined by Indra and Agni and Dharma.</td>
<td>11. Story of Jantu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Departure of the Pāṇḍavas for Gandhamadana.</td>
<td>15. Battle with the Nīvātakavachas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td>Etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I. 2. 166 sqqq.
in the Devanāgarī (Bombay) edition.

*17. Bhima’s meeting with Hannūmat.
18. Bhima’s bath in the tank and destruction of the flowers.
20. Destruction of the Asura Jata by Bhima.
*21. Meeting of the Pāṇḍavas with Vṛishaparvan.
*22. Their going to the hermitage of Ārṣṣṭi-shepa.
*23. Incitement of Bhima by Draupadi.
24. Ascent of Kailāsa, and battle with the Yakṣas.

Etc.

It seems to me that the state of the text in the Grantha MS. is in many respects less satisfactory than that offered by the Devanāgarī editions. The text is certainly corrupt in the stanzas giving the number of Adhyāyas and Slokas. The number of Adhyāyas for the Adि Parvan is given as 297 in the Devanāgarī editions, and as 218 in the Grantha MS. But our MS. agrees with the editions in giving 8,884 as the number of Slokas. For the Subhā Parvan the number of Adhyāyas is given as 75 in the editions, as 72 in our MS. The number of Slokas is said to be 2,511. The number 4,511 in the Grantha MS. is certainly a mistake. As regards the Vana Parvan, it is very surprising that the Grantha MS. exactly agrees with the editions in giving the number of Adhyāyas as 296, and the number of Slokas as 11,664.

It would take up too much space if I were to give the whole of the Anukramani; I have therefore content myself with giving in Extract D the end of this List which is the end of the second Adhyāya.

On the whole, the text of this important chapter in the South-Indian recension leaves the impression that the Southern MSS., though not likely to contain a more original or a better text than the editions, are certainly indispensable for any future critical edition of the Mahābhārata.

D.

Adiparvan,
2, 370-396.

South-Indian MS.

370a

Deetes.

370a प्राये गैरणे ग्वष्णोर्दशाः कथनः पराराः
371a अधिनुह्य तन्हुः वासात्मकाः कथाः विना
371c तस्मात्त्विचार्य जात्वा ज्ञानिः स्वमे महामनाः
372a अत्यं पति व तस्मात्वा परिपरिताः समन्वितम्
372b विष्णुः पद्माः संस्कृत वामाः विद्याः नुष्ठा
372c वेदस्य रक्षकं प्रयोगः व्याख्या सदैवः
372d विष्णुः रक्षकं प्रयोगः व्याख्या सदैवः
373a निग्रीवाः द्वाराणाः वृष्णी त्वेन वेदताः
374a निग्रीवाः द्वाराणाः वृष्णी त्वेन वेदताः
374c अनुसूचितं प्रयोगं वेदयास्त्राः च मधुवः
375a आश्वास्त्विचार्याः कथाः वेदमात्रा संस्कृतम्
375b विष्णुर्मन्त्रित्वं त्वेन वेदमात्रा संस्कृतम्
376a विष्णुः पुष्तिः स्वमे संस्कृतम् च वेदः
376b एवतादेशस्य पदे प्रयोगः व्याख्या विनितम्

377a अत्यं आदिपति तत्त्वं विनाय कथाः
377b प्राये गैरणे ग्वष्णोर्दशाः कथनः पराराः

Praṇavaḥ Sanmātāḥ: Pṛthivibinduḥ.
The third Adhyāya in our MS. corresponds to the third Adhyāya of the Ādiparvan (Paūshyaparvan) in the Nāgarī editions. The end of the chapter is given below in Extract E.

The fourth Adhyāya in our MS. comprises the 4th and 5th Adhyāyas of the Nāgarī editions. The omission of Agni's speech at the end of the Adhyāya — see Extract F — can hardly be due to anything but the scribe's negligence.

The fifth Adhyāya (Agniśīda) corresponds to the 6th Adhyāya, and the sixth Adhyāya (Agniśpratūḍa) to the 7th Adhyāya in the Nāgarī editions. The superficial line

परं स पुनःसिद्धग्नि देवसम्प्रज्ञ: पुरा।

making a śloka of three lines in the editions (I. 7, 28) is not found in our MS.

The seventh Adhyāya in our MS. corresponds to the 8th Adhyāya in the Nāgarī editions. The end is given in Extract G.

The eighth Adhyāya in our MS. comprises Adhyāyas 9-12 of the Nāgarī editions, and finishes the Paūṣama-Parvan. The end of this Parvan and the first Adhyāya of the Āśīta-Parvan (= I. 13, 1-6a in B. edition) are given in Extract H.

The second Adhyāya of the Āśīta-Parvan corresponds to I. 13, 6b-15, 11 (end of the 15th Adhyāya) in the Nāgarī editions. The end of this Adhyāya is given below in Extract I.

If we compare I. 14, 7b and I. 15, 3a and remember that I. 14, 6 is a śloka of three lines in the edition, we can hardly doubt that the Granthā MS. which omits I. 14, 6b and 7 gives a more original text. It is certainly remarkable that we find so frequently ślokas of three lines in the Northern recension, where the South-Indian MS. has only two lines. Yet we find sometimes ślokas of three lines also in the latter, which proves that the authors of the South Indian recension did not remove the superficial lines intentionally.

Adhyāyas 3-6 of the Āśīta-Parvan correspond to Adhyāyas 16-19 in the Nāgarī editions. The end of the 3rd Adhyāya is given in Extract J.

The seventh Adhyāya corresponds to Adhyāya 20 in the Nāgarī editions, and (as may be seen from Extract K below) differs considerably from the Northern recension.

The eighth Adhyāya corresponds to Adhyāya 21 of the Northern recension, concluding with the last verse of Adhyāya 22, while the rest of this Adhyāya (which is mainly a repetition of Adhyāya 21) does not exist in our MS. The end of the eighth Adhyāya will be found in Extract L.

These two Adhyāyas (7 and 8) of the Āśīta-Parvan are of considerable importance. They relate the story of Kādrī and Vinatā who wager about the colour of the horse Uchchhāṣravas, a story the roots of which reach down into the depth of ancient mythology, and which has an important bearing on the relation between the Vedic and the epic literature. That there is some confusion in the text of this story as found in the Nāgarī editions, has been pointed out long ago.31

A brief summary of the contents of chapters 20-22 will show at once the unsatisfactory state of the text in the Northern recension.

Adhyāya 20: Seeing the horse Uchchhāṣravas, Kādrī and Vinatā wager about the colour of the horse's tail. Kādrī orders her thousand sons, the Snakes, to transform themselves into black hair and cover the horse's tail so that it might appear black. The snakes refuse to do her bidding. She curses them to be burnt at Janamejaya's sacrifice. The 'Grandfather' (Brahmaṇ) heard this cruel curse, but seeing how the snakes had multiplied exceedingly, and being anxious for the welfare of creatures, he together with all the gods approved of the curse uttered by Kādrī. After some general reflections on the dangerousness of snakes, and the

31 See Holtzmann, Das Mahābhārata, I p. 17 sq.
fate of the wicked, the Creator (devāḥ śriṅkīrti) calls Kāśyapa (Prājñāpati) and tells him not to grudge about the destruction of the snakes, his children, and finally bestows upon him (Kāśyapa) the power of destroying snake poison.

Adhyāya 21: Kādrī and Vināti go to view the horse Uchchaišvānas, and on their way see the ocean. Description of the ocean.

Adhyāya 22: The snakes, after a debate, decide to comply with Kādrī's wish, and cause the horse's tail to appear black. Then follows (vs. 4-12) what amounts to a repetition, or rather a shorter version, of the preceding Adhyāya.

In the Suparśvakhyāna which, like other Vedic texts (Sut. Br. III. 6, 2, 3 sqq.; Taitt. Saik. VI. 4, 6, 1 sqq.), relates the story of the wager of Kādrī and Vināti, no reference is made to the part played by the snakes in connection with this wager. Professor Oldenberg, in his most interesting essay on the Suparśvakhyāna,22 suggests that originally this legend had nothing to do with the Snake sacrifice (stṛpasattra). This, he thinks, is proved by the awkwardness with which the story of the Mahābhārata tries to overcome the difficulty that though Kādrī wins the wager with the help of the snakes yet the snakes perish in consequence of their disobedience, cursed by Kādrī. This may be so. Partly, however, the awkwardness of the story in the Mahābhārata is due merely to the state of the text in the Devanāgarī editions. The South-Indian recension gives a much more satisfactory text.

Even if we had only the Northern recension, the genuineness of I. 20, 12-16ś relating the conversation between the Creator (Brahman) and Prājñāpati-Kāśyapa might be doubted. But seeing the Southern text, there cannot be the least doubt that the two lines

वेगोऽवसेवकायस्य प्रभवान प्रजायां प्रसिद्धिः

प्रजायाभिंसि (?) तिवयाः काश्यपाय श्रावणम् ॥

belong together. Observe that in the editions śloka 16 has three lines, and that vv. 11 and 12 are very loosely connected. The context, according to the Southern recension, is as follows:—

On hearing the cruel curse pronounced by Kādrī against the Snakes, Brahman the 'Grandfather' approves of it, being aware that the snakes had multiplied exceedingly, and being anxious for the welfare of creatures. For, to be sure, it was on account of the violent poisonousness of snakes and for the benefit of creatures, that he bestowed on Kāśyapa the art of destroying snake poison.

Kāśyapa is probably the physician Kāśyapa who wanted to cure King Parīkṣit from the snake-bite (Mbhār. I. 42 sq.). He is mentioned here very aptly, in order to shew how anxious Brahman was to protect men from the poisonous snakes. In the Northern recension (or at any rate, in the text known to us from the Devanāgarī editions) Kāśyapa was substituted for Brahman, and the insipid conversation between Brahman and Prājñāpati came to be inserted.

The South-Indian version continues: After the Snakes had thus been cursed by Kādrī, Kārkotaka greatly distressed on account of that curse propitiates his mother by promising to transform himself into black hair and make the horse's tail appear black.

This is, at any rate, more plausible than the version found in the Devanāgarī editions. The latter tells us (I. 22, 1-3) that all the snakes comply with Kādrī's wish, and yet the snakes perish at Janamejaya's sacrifice. While the South-Indian recension makes only one Nāga (or perhaps one party of Nāgas) comply with the wishes of Kādrī, which agrees well with the fact that finally some of the snakes are spared from the general destruction at the snake-sacrifice (I. 58).

That Adhyāya 22 which is mainly a repetition of the 21st Adhyāya is omitted in the South-Indian recension, also proves that — at any rate, in this particular episode — the South-Indian recension has preserved a better text than that found in the Devanāgarī editions.

The ninth Adhyāya of the Āstikaparvan corresponds to I. 23 of the editions, but is much shorter, vv. 2, 6, 76, 86, 12-14 being omitted, as well as the second portion of the hymn to Gāruḍa. The end of this Adhyāya is given in Extract M below. It is, of course, possible that verses may have been omitted in the South-Indian recension for the sake of shortening the text, but it seems to me far more probable that given a hymn in praise of Gāruḍa, a reciter or editor thought it meritorious to add some verses of his own, or from another source, in praise of the same divine being. Both editors and copyists of the Mahābhārata seem to have readily admitted into their text anything they approved of, if only it was found in some MS., or on the principle of bringing all excellent things together (yamapasaahdhirinayana). In a critical edition of the Mahābhārata, we should probably have to omit or to mark as spurious any passages occurring only in one of the two recensions, provided that they can be safely omitted without disturbing the context.

The tenth Adhyāya of the Āstikaparvan corresponds to Adhyāyas 24 and 25 of the Northern recension. But the first two slokas of the 24th Adhyāya, and all from 42 to the end of the Adhyāya, as well as the first sloka of Adhyāya 25 are omitted. The omission includes the legend of the enmity between Rāhu and the Sun, and the appointment of Aruṇa as the Sun's charioteer. The Adhyāya begins:

अर्थ सूत्रः ॥

तत: कामरम्: पश्चि मार्विकाय भावनः:।

अभन्धर्म: पुष्पार्को लिङ्गमूलः।

मानुलिकमनामग्नेऽपि परन्तोण्मिन्धे।।

यथा शासनोतिरं धारणेन पवित्रकाव्य।

अरुनवमुख्यवतः सर्गानां दुर्गमान्यः।।

The rest of the chapter corresponds to I. 25, 3-17. It cannot be a mere accident that the story of the Sun's wrath on account of the enmity of Rāhu, and Aruṇa's appointment as charioteer to the Sun is also omitted by Kṣemendra in his Bṛhatasamānyatī. And if we compare the three lines I. 24, 3-4a,

तत: कामरम्: पश्चि मार्विकाय विषयम्।

अरुनवमुख्यवतः सर्गानां दुर्गमान्यः।।

with I. 25, 1,

तत: कामरम्: पश्चि मार्विकाय भावनः।।

मानुलिकमनामग्नेऽपि परन्तोण्मिन्धे।।

we see clearly how the whole passage from I. 24, 45-19 was interpolated, and I. 25, 1 had to be added in order to take up the thread which had been interrupted by the interpolation. Observe also the omission of the line I. 6, 23b (below, extract J) containing an allusion to Aruṇa's charioteership. That the legend is omitted in Kṣemendra's work goes far to prove that the passage was interpolated after Kṣemendra's time, i.e., after A. D. 1050, and if the story could be proved to occur in all MSS., representing the Northern recension, we should be justified in concluding that the branching off of the Southern recension took place after the time of Kṣemendra.

The eleventh Adhyāya corresponds to I. 26 of the Devanāgarī edition, but is again shorter. The twelfth Adhyāya corresponds to I. 27-28. Omitted are I. 27, 2-3a; 7a; 8b; 9a; and I. 28, 4b-9a; 11b; 12b; 13a; 14a; 16a. The end of the 11th and beginning of the 12th Adhyāya will be found in Extract N.


33 See Bühler, I. 114 sq. (Kṛṣṇa-dāl), and Prof. Kiæte in 'Contributions to the History of the Mahābhārata' (No. II. of Indian Studies, by G. Bühler and J. Kiæte), p. 36.

34 Dr. Bühler in 'Contributions,' p. 3 sq.
Adhyāyas 13-34 of the Āstikyāparvan in our MS. correspond to Adhyāyas 29-50 in the Devanagari editions; Adhyāya 33 corresponds to I. 51-52; Adhyāya 36 to I. 53; Adhyāya 37 to I. 54-55; Adhyāyas 38-39 to I. 56-57; and Adhyāya 40 to I. 58-59.

The end of Adhyāya 40, which is the end of the Graṇtha MS. Whish No. 65, will be found in Extract O below. In the editions, Adhyāya 59 is the beginning of the Antavasāvatāparvan. The title of this Parvan does not occur in the South-Indian recension, but the Āstikyāparvan ends here, and is followed immediately by the Sambhava-Parvan, the first Adhyāya of which corresponds to Adhyāya 60 in the Devanagari editions.

I now give, in parallel columns, the rest of the extracts from MS. Whish No. 65, with the corresponding passages of the Northern recension.

### End of the third Adhyāya in Graṇtha MS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>एतेन्देवयाः सुपंचिन्तकम् कुञ्जीप ह।</td>
<td>There was a great anxiety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>उत्सवपदिधिया शीतोश्चिनिनिविधिया कथा।</td>
<td>The festival was attended by various types of people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>अपराधवत नवता राजा माणवसम्बुद्धलित।</td>
<td>The king was denounced by the people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>उद्यमशीव साक्षिद्वेद रत्नमोहिन्त्व प्रार्थित।</td>
<td>The efforts of the people were supported by the king.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>वेद्यत्र श राजास्वेद्रो दुर्योधनासुधोपनप्याय।</td>
<td>In the battle, the king was supported by the people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>विनिः द्विः मुखांगकाश्च नरभूतानि।</td>
<td>The king was hailed as the lord of the people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>इत्यदि भैरवभार्ते भक्तशक्तिरत्नो विहन्ति नि-नि-नि।</td>
<td>The king was praised by the people.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### End of the third Adhyāya in B. edition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>अन्नवस्य</td>
<td>There was a great anxiety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>अन्नवत</td>
<td>The people were scarce.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ततोष्ट प्राप्तिः</td>
<td>The king was appointed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ततोष्ट प्राप्तिः</td>
<td>The king was appointed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>शारीरविन्यासम्</td>
<td>The body was decorated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>अन्नवस्य</td>
<td>The people were scarce.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### End of the 4th and beginning of the 5th Adhyāya in Graṇtha MS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>नत्तेतस्य च तुर्गस्य राजस्य</td>
<td>The king was present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>नत्तेतस्य च तुर्गस्य राजस्य</td>
<td>The king was present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>नत्तेतस्य च तुर्गस्य राजस्य</td>
<td>The king was present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>नत्तेतस्य च तुर्गस्य राजस्य</td>
<td>The king was present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>नत्तेतस्य च तुर्गस्य राजस्य</td>
<td>The king was present.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### End of the 5th and beginning of the 6th Adhyāya in B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>अन्नवस्य</td>
<td>The people were scarce.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>अन्नवस्य</td>
<td>The people were scarce.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>अन्नवस्य</td>
<td>The people were scarce.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>अन्नवस्य</td>
<td>The people were scarce.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>अन्नवस्य</td>
<td>The people were scarce.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

31 It is, however, remarkable, that in the Pāravasāvyūha (see above, extract C. I. 2, 42) the Ādiviśeśākāra is mentioned in both recensions.
32 Read मृगीसीधर्मविचारः.
G.

Adiparvan,
8, 25.

Grantha MS.

Devanāgarī edition (Bombay).

H.

Āliparvan,
12, 4-13 6a.

Grantha MS.

Devanāgarī edition (Bombay).

***Read "सौं स्वः".*
THE SOUTH-INDIAN RECENSION OF THE MAHABHARATA.

1. Adiparvan,
   14, 6-15, 11.

Grantha MS.

I. Devandhari edition (Bombay).

6a ब्रजसिद्धनाथ नाथरूढ़िया नाथारूढ़िया

6b नाथसिद्धनाथ नाथारूढ़िया नाथारूढ़िया

7a तारासिद्धनाथ तारासिद्धनाथ

7b तारासिद्धनाथ तारासिद्धनाथ

8a तारासिद्धनाथ तारासिद्धनाथ

8b तारासिद्धनाथ तारासिद्धनाथ

9a तारासिद्धनाथ तारासिद्धनाथ

9b तारासिद्धनाथ तारासिद्धनाथ

10a तारासिद्धनाथ तारासिद्धनाथ

10b तारासिद्धनाथ तारासिद्धनाथ

11a तारासिद्धनाथ तारासिद्धनाथ

11b तारासिद्धनाथ तारासिद्धनाथ

J. Adiparvan,
   16, 22-25.

Grantha MS.

Devandhari (Bombay) edition.

18 ब्रजसिद्धनाथ नाथारूढ़िया नाथारूढ़िया

18a ब्रजसिद्धनाथ नाथारूढ़िया नाथारूढ़िया

19a तारासिद्धनाथ तारासिद्धनाथ

19b तारासिद्धनाथ तारासिद्धनाथ

20a तारासिद्धनाथ तारासिद्धनाथ

20b तारासिद्धनाथ तारासिद्धनाथ

21a तारासिद्धनाथ तारासिद्धनाथ

21b तारासिद्धनाथ तारासिद्धनाथ

22a तारासिद्धनाथ तारासिद्धनाथ

22b तारासिद्धनाथ तारासिद्धनाथ

23a तारासिद्धनाथ तारासिद्धनाथ

23b तारासिद्धनाथ तारासिद्धनाथ

24a तारासिद्धनाथ तारासिद्धनाथ

24b तारासिद्धनाथ तारासिद्धनाथ

25a तारासिद्धनाथ तारासिद्धनाथ

25b तारासिद्धनाथ तारासिद्धनाथ

सार टूटाये।

सार टूटाये।
A fragment of the *Sambhava-Parvan* is found in MS. Whish No. 158. This is a tiny palm-leaf MS. written in Malayalam (Tulu) characters, and containing fragments of a work (or works) on ritual, and at the end twelve chapters of the *Sambhava-Parvan*.

This *Parvan*, as stated above, begins with the second *Adhyāya* of the *Ādiyāvatārāya-parvan* in our editions, just where the *Aṭṭha-Parvan* ends in MS. Whish No. 65. The first three *Adhyāyas* correspond (with numerous various readings) to I. 60-82 of the *Mahābhārata* in the Devanāgarī editions. But the *fourth Adhyāya* is not found in the Northern recension. It contains a genealogy of Pura corresponding to that found in I. 95, 6-87 of our editions. It begins:

```
[II]
पूर्वेऽवसान्त भवेऽरतानविनिविदकरमाः [II]
प्रतिविपन्नो नामाः ते नामाः मात्र न निःसृपु।
विद्वतितिस्मातः विद्वततात्वज्ञानो नाम: [II]
मनोरथो इतः गुरु। पुरूष: ॥
पुरुषस्य भक्तिः गृहस्थः
महास्वयं वेदविद्वानं भवेऽरताः निःसृपुः।
उत्साहस्य शुद्धाः प्रवेशः वेदविद्वानं शुद्धाः शाक्यभाषा नाम [II]
सत्यार्थो विद्वानं नाम: [II]
```

The passage referring to Sakuntalā and the birth of Bharata (I. 95, 27-32) runs as follows in our chapter:

```
[II]
अनुभवो भविः [II]
सत्यसत्यसन्तुतु ॥*अनुभवाराज्यात् [II]
लक्ष्मणवासां कामिनिः सत्यसन्तु ॥
इति मनुष्येऽरताः ्हुस्ताताः ्हुरुपाः नवन: जनव: जनान: जनान: [II]
लक्ष्मणस्य लक्ष्मणस्य शुभस्य सत्यसन्तु ॥
वेदविद्वान शुभस्य शुभस्य सत्यसन्तु ॥ [II]
यह भाद्रम भाद्रम शुभस्य सत्यसन्तु [II]
नरसात् लक्ष्मण श्रीमाणाः सत्यसन्तु शुभस्य नाम: [II]
```

The chapter ends, as follows:

```
परितिर्थु लक्ष्मण सत्यसन्तु शुभस्य नाम: अनुभवाराज्यात् [II]
जनमेवान्तु लक्ष्मण कामेऽवस्य शुभस्य सत्यसन्तु शुभस्य नाम: अनुभवाराज्यात् [II]
यह भाद्रम भाद्रम शुभस्य सत्यसन्तु [II]
```

---

42 The colophons treat this as a separate *Parvan*. 43 इति श्रीवर्षाद्रान्तः सभापरिवर्णः प्रम्िचितः। 44 Read श्रीवर्षाद्रान्तः सभापरिवर्णः प्रम्िचितः। 45 Read तात्त्विकः सभापरिवर्णः। 46 Read सत्यसन्तु ॥ 47 Read तात्त्विकः सभापरिवर्णः। 48 Read तात्त्विकः सभापरिवर्णः। 49 Read तात्त्विकः सभापरिवर्णः। 50 Read तात्त्विकः सभापरिवर्णः। 51 Read तात्त्विकः सभापरिवर्णः। 52 Read तात्त्विकः सभापरिवर्णः। 53 Read तात्त्विकः सभापरिवर्णः। 54 Read तात्त्विकः सभापरिवर्णः। 55 तात्त्विकः सभापरिवर्णः। 56 तात्त्विकः सभापरिवर्णः। 57 तात्त्विकः सभापरिवर्णः। 58 तात्त्विकः सभापरिवर्णः। 59 तात्त्विकः सभापरिवर्णः। 60 तात्त्विकः सभापरिवर्णः। 61 तात्त्विकः सभापरिवर्णः।
The next following Adhyāya 5-9 correspond to I. 63-57 of the Nāgari editions. But the Sakuntalā episode told in Adhyāya 68-74 of our editions is not found in our fragment. Instead of it we find the 10th Adhyāya which contains a genealogy of Bharata, beginning with Pūruṇu, and ending with the brief statement that Dvīṣanta had two sons, viz., Janamejaya by Laksmana, and Bharata by Sakuntalā. I give here the text of this chapter:

अजनेयः[I]
पुर्षेऽवस्ते पश्चिममेवं वर्ण [I]
आनुरवस्ते के बालोऽर्थीरवस्ते इति[I]
विष्णुनगरी शर्मेषु भावनेषु जनमेषु जातेन[I]
व कूस्त तथा शर्मया भारती द्विजस्मि[I]

वेदी[I]
पुरुषौपरंततुषु वोयस्स्व पिता नुवः [I]
द्वित्तेः द्वित्तेः द्वित्तेः रवं द्वित्तेः द्वित्तेः[I]
प्रवृत्तिः द्वित्तेः द्वित्तेः द्वित्तेः द्वित्तेः[I]
ज्ञानवेत्ता द्वित्तेः द्वित्तेः द्वित्तेः द्वित्तेः[I]
पुरुषस्मि सामर्थस्मि राजा राजावेत्ता तथा[I]
सुमुखावस्ते वर्धी सोवस्तावस्ते अवस्तावस्ते[I]
सुलभावस्ते वर्धी सोवस्तावस्ते अवस्तावस्ते[I]
सुलभावस्ते वर्धी सोवस्तावस्ते अवस्तावस्ते[I]
सुलभावस्ते वर्धी सोवस्तावस्ते अवस्तावस्ते[I]
सुलभावस्ते वर्धी सोवस्तावस्ते अवस्तावस्ते[I]

राजाधृतपयते पुरुषेऽवस्ते इत्यादि[I]
वेदी ज्ञानस्मि ज्ञानस्मि ज्ञानस्मि स्मि[I]
हक्कर्वस्ते भारतेऽवस्ते इति[I]
तथा ज्ञानस्मि ज्ञानस्मि ज्ञानस्मि ज्ञानस्मि[I]
शजस्मि पुरुषस्मि ज्ञानस्मि ज्ञानस्मि ज्ञानस्मि[I]

सुपुरुषावस्ते वर्धी सोवस्तावस्ते अवस्तावस्ते[I]
सुलभावस्ते वर्धी सोवस्तावस्ते अवस्तावस्ते[I]
सुलभावस्ते वर्धी सोवस्तावस्ते अवस्तावस्ते[I]
सुलभावस्ते वर्धी सोवस्तावस्ते अवस्तावस्ते[I]
सुलभावस्ते वर्धी सोवस्तावस्ते अवस्तावस्ते[I]

वेदी ज्ञानस्मि ज्ञानस्मि ज्ञानस्मि ज्ञानस्मि[I]
हक्कर्वस्ते भारतेऽवस्ते इति[I]
तथा ज्ञानस्मि ज्ञानस्मि ज्ञानस्मि ज्ञानस्मि[I]
शजस्मि पुरुषस्मि ज्ञानस्मि ज्ञानस्मि ज्ञानस्मि[I]

67 Read वास्तेः.
68 Sic. Only the akṣara ब्रह्मण is not quite clear. The editions have स्वारमर्गः ब्रह्मणः in the corresponding passage I. 94 5.
69 Read द्वाराधिता.
70 Read द्वाराधिता.
71 Read पुरुषोऽवस्तेः. The forms in पुरुषोऽवस्तेः found in I. 94 10 sq. of the editions are more plausible. It is also possible to read युधिष्ठिर in our ms. The mistake, if mistake it be, युधिष्ठिर for युधिष्ठिर would point to a Nāgarī original. In Malayalam pō and ṣu are hardly distinguishable, but ṣu and ṣu are never confused.
72 May be read अष्टि or अस्मि.
The 11th Adhyāya which follows immediately corresponds to I. 75 of the editions, and the fragment breaks off in the middle of the 12th Adhyāya (= I. 76, 29 in the editions).

The omission of the Sakuntalā episode is very remarkable. It is possible, no doubt, that the story was copied in a separate book by the same scribe who wrote this MS., and therefore omitted by him here. But in that case he would have made some remark to that effect. It is more probable that the Sakuntalā episode, if it occurs at all, will be found in a later Adhyāya of the Sambhava Purāṇa in the South-Indian recension. Whether this is the case, might be easily ascertained, if other and more perfect copies of this Purāṇa could be procured from India.

It would, of course, be too rash to draw any definite conclusions from this omission in our fragment. It is, however, worth while pointing out that the name of the King in our MS. is not Dushyanta or Dushshanta, but Dushshanta.54 It is true, we find several times the spelling Dushvanta and Dushvanti. But व for व is a mistake easily to be accounted for in Malayalam, as well as in Grantha. For व is व, but generally written so that the top of the lower ओ is hardly discernible, and comes very near to व which is व. Dushshanta would be the regular representative of the old Vedic forms Dushhanta and Dushshanti, as found in the Aitareya and Satapatha Brāhmaṇas—a fact which points to a greater antiquity of the South-Indian recension.

One thing is certain. The Sakuntalā episode in the form in which we find it in our editions is of very doubtful antiquity. While the story itself is told with very few details, the beginning—the description of the forest, of the King’s hunting expedition, and of the hermitages—is spun out in lengthy Kārya style. We are scarcely told why Sakuntalā is at first not recognised by the King, and the account given of her final recognition is very insipid. We hear nothing of the ring, nor of the Rishi’s curse which causes the catastrophe in Kālidāsa’s drama, as well as in the Sakuntalopakhyāna of the Padma-Purāṇa. On the other hand, the speech of Sakuntalā is made a repository of all sorts of Dharmasūtra maxims relating to the duties of parents towards children. Thus it is that although the Sakuntalā episode is related in the Mahābhārata in five chapters, two of which are of considerable length, yet the story itself seems fragmentary and incomplete. And it seems to me all but certain that Kālidāsa must have known another version of the story on which his famous drama is based. It is quite possible that the two śiccas māna māla indicum, etc. (see I. 74, 109 seq.; I. 96, 29 seq.) were all that the old Mahābhārata had about the Sakuntalā episode, leaving it to the rhapsodist to tell the Ākhyāna according to his pleasure. But however that may be, there is certainly much scope for criticism as regards the Sakuntalā episode, and as it is one of the most important episodes for the history of Sanskrit literature in the whole of the Mahābhārata, it would be highly desirable to examine more MSS. of the Sambhava-Purāṇa. Could not such MSS. be procured from India?

The Whish collection, unfortunately, contains no more MSS. of the Adipurāṇa.

(To be continued.)

54 May be read also दुश्वति.
55 Read दुपश्चि.
56 The form Dushshanta occurs also in the Malayalam MS. of the Śaṁśa Purāṇa (Adhyāya 8) where it is confirmed by the reading of a Telugu MS. Kshemendra, too, seems to have preserved the old form Dushhanta. The Kāryamālā edition of the Bhāṣa,malaṣṭara identifies Dushyanta, but Prof. Kirk found Dushkinta in his MS., which he rightly explains as a mistake for Dushhanta, i.e., Dushhanta. See Contributions, i.e., p. 41.
Rivers and Sea-shores. — All classes of Hindus in the Kēkān and in the Dakhan believe that spirits haunt banks of rivers and channels and sea-shores. Compare: Parāṣurāma in Kārakṣetra up 108 durgas on the sea-shore and in the Khonds' wedding procession, if they cross the stream, they have a new set of rites on the further bank. When the king of Melinda, in East Africa (1569), came on the water to meet the Portuguese Captain Cabral, he rode over the carcass of a disembowelled sheep, uttering certain words of incantations in a loud voice. The negroes of the Gold Coast believe that spirits haunt the banks of rivers.

Unclean Places. — It is the general Hindu belief that evil spirits abound in unclean places — a belief which is doubtlessly based on the experience of the disease-breeding power of dirt. The Marāhl proverb is, where is cleanliness there is neither spirit nor fire. This belief explains the puzzling inconsistency of Hindus of all classes, from Brāhmans to Mārais, that the house and the house-door and a little in front is scrupulously clean, while the yard may be a dung-heap or privy. As long as the house is clean the bhūt cannot come in; let him live in the privy; he cannot do much harm there. It seems probable that the origin of the English saying from the New Testament — cleanliness is next to godliness — was the belief that the main object both of godliness and cleanliness was to scare fiends.

Water or Pot-holes. — In the Kēkān, water-spirits live in the round holes found in river-beds rocks. River beds are favorite spirit-haunts, and so in Poona, every year, when the rivers swell, all villagers come together, take with them a green sīrī or waist-cloth, and chālī or bodice cloth, flowers, fruits, frankincense, and betel-nuts and leaves and throw them in the river. In Mehānasī, holes in water-rocks are sacred to spirits. In Scotland, pot-holes are called fairies' cups.


Cases of spirit-possession in India, like fits in England, are occasionally feigned. In most cases they are not feigned. Laymen, as a rule, have no more power to bring on one of these nervous seizures than they have to bring on a fit of ague or of madness. Professional mediums and spirit-scarers can bring on a fit, but have no control over the fit when it comes. Spirits-seizures may be brought under the two heads of Voluntary and Involuntary Seizures. Voluntary seizures are of two kinds — the attacks which the professional medium, called sādī or tree, brings on when he wishes to be inspired by his familiar spirit, and the attacks which mourners bring on when they sit playing in a circle till the spirit of the dead enters into one of them. An account of the measures taken to induce the spirit of the dead to enter the body of one of the mourners is given under “Funeral Rites,” and an account of the means employed by the exorcist to induce his familiar spirit to enter his body is given below under the head of “Exorcists.” Involuntary possession, or spirit-seizure, happens chiefly to women and children, but also sometimes to men. These attacks may be either ordinary diseases — fevers or rheumatism in the severe or paroxysmal stage; or the possession may be one of the nervous seizures, swoons, fainting fits, or slight forms of mania to which women are more liable than men.

Cases are recorded which show that fits and spirit-seizures are sometimes feigned. At the same time there appears no reason to doubt that, as a rule, these seizures, whether voluntary or involuntary, are not feigned. Colonel Dalton says of the Kasarī, the possession is in most cases perfectly honest. Every instance appears to prove its reality. This seems to
apply to most cases of possession both in India and in other countries. In the majority of cases the nervous seizure is neither controlled, brought on, or desired by the patient.  

In most parts of the Bombay Presidency, and especially in the Kōkān, the common symptoms of spirit-possession are that the patient cries incessantly, weeps, speaks at random, bites his fingers, sways his body to and fro, lets his hair fall loose, spits blood, refuses food for several days, and day by day grows paler and leaner. To some extent in the Dekhan and Gujarat, and to a large extent in the Kōkān, all people are at all times liable to spirit-attacks. Cases of spirit-seizures are most common among women, less among children, and least among men. All women are liable to spirit-seizures. They are specially liable during their monthly sickness, in pregnancy, and in child-bed, and barren women at all times. Infants are most liable to be attacked by spirits on the fifth and sixth days after birth. The part most subject to spirit-possession in the Bombay Presidency is the Kōkān. In the hilly parts of the Thānā District, especially in the Jawāhar State, cases of spirit-possession are of every day occurrence. In the Kōkān, the belief in the frequency of spirit-attacks is very strong among the lower classes of Marāthias, Vādvals, Kunbās, Mānagellas, Thākurs, and Kolis. The belief in spirit-seizures is perhaps strongest among the Thākurs and Kolis; nearly ninety per cent. of a Koli’s ailments are attributed to spirit-attacks. Among middle and higher class Hindus the belief in spirit-seizure is not so strong, and among the Brāhmaṇs it is still weaker. Although the percentage of attacks among the Brāhmaṇs and other higher classes is smaller than among the lower classes, when attacks occur the same methods are followed by the higher as by the lower classes. The only difference is, that Brāhmaṇs do not make offerings of fowls, goats, or liquor, or, if they do, it is done secretly through a Kunbi or Marāthā. The Kōkān, Lingāyats profess not to believe in spirit-seizures, and say that so long as they wear the līgā and ḍhamsa, or cow-dung ashes, spirits dare not attack them. So also the Gujarāt Bharadvās are, as a class, said to be free from the fear of spirit-seizures.

One great reason why spirits are able to enter into human beings is fear. Fear, says Burton, is the great cause why spectres are seen. A predisposed state of mind occasions fear, and most cases of spirit-possession appear to be due to this state of mind. Thus in the Kōkān, there is a belief that the spirit of a husband’s first wife invariably comes to trouble his second wife, and this belief is so strongly rooted in the minds of Hindu women of the middle and lower classes, that whenever a woman, whose husband’s first wife is dead, sickens, her sickness is attributed to spirit-possession. Captain Mackintosh says, if a Mahādev Koli widow-bride sickens, or her husband sickens, it is considered the work of her former husband. Among the Somavāṃśi Kastri or Chaukals of Allībāg there is a strong belief, that when a woman marries another husband, her first husband becomes a ghost and troubles her. This fear is so thoroughly rooted in their minds, that whenever a woman of this caste sickens, she attributes her sickness to the ghost of her former husband, called purushavāra, and consults an exorcist as to how she can get rid of him. The exorcist gives her some charmed rice, flowers, and basil leaves, and tells her to enclose them in a small copper-box, and to wear the box round her neck. Sometimes the exorcist gives a charmed coca nut which he tells her to worship daily, and in some cases he tells the woman to make a copper or silver image of the dead, and worship it every day.  

---

46 Of feigned cases no doubt many instances occur in India, and instances are not uncommon in England. Scott (Demonology and Witchcraft, pp. 334 and 335) records one case in 1697 of a girl who was proved to have feigned possession, and in 1704 of a vagabond who affected fits. He notices (Demonology and Witchcraft, p. 335) that a son of Lord Torphichen, when a boy, feigned fits. He was sent to sea, and tried fits in the navy, but the discipline was too severe. In time he became a good sailor and defended his vessel with great bravery against Angria and his pirates in 1730. The St. James’s Gazette of the 23rd February 1833 records the case of a man who made a living in the London streets by feigning fits.


48 Information from Mr. Janardan Gopal.


Spirits are said to go in and out of the body like bees in a hive. But there seem to be the following chief spirit-entries:—the top of the head, the hair, the mouth, the hands, the feet, the nose, the eyes, and the ears. That the above parts of the body are believed to be spirit-entries will be made clear from the following rites performed and the words spoken by the chief mourner at the time of performing the varsha śrāddha, or the commemorative rites of the dead:—“The chief mourner after taking water in his right hand says: ‘I do touch the different parts of my body in order that they may be purified,’ and then throws the water on the ground. Then touching his eyes with water he says: ‘I bow to the sages Gautama and Bharadva Já; let them protect my eyes;’ touching his ears with water he says: ‘Let the sages Viśvāmitra and Káśyápa protect my ears;’ touching his head he says: ‘Let the sacred cow gáyátari and fire protect my head;’ touching his chin he says: ‘Let the god Bhárapati protect my chin (mouth);’ touching his neck he says: ‘Let the gods Usník and Śūn protect my neck;’ touching his navel he says: ‘Let the gods Indra and Tríshúna protect my navel;’ touching his knees he says: ‘Let the god Marat protect my knees;’ touching his feet he says: ‘Let the god Viśnu protect my feet;’ and, lastly, he says: ‘Let all the gods protect my body.’”

The Head. — Spirits go in and out of the body through the hole in the top of the skull. So among the Śevú Bráhmans of Kánara, when their chief teacher, or Rája Sánya Já, dies, the new teacher strikes a coccoanut on the crown of the dead teacher’s head, and makes an opening in the skull in which a śáliagná stone is laid.50 So in Dhársyá, when an abbot, or suána Já, dies, the crown of his head is broken with a coccoanut, and his body is stuffed with salt and powdered mustard.51 Among the Pátáne Prabhús of Poona, after setting fire to the pyre, when the skull bursts, a coccoanut is thrown at the head. Among the Roman Catholics of Thána at the time of Baptism, the priest anoints the top of the child’s head with Holy Oil, and thrice pours water over it.52 Among the Dhársyá Lingáyáts the priest blesses a child by laying his right hand on the child’s head.53 At a Lingáyáta funeral a Jangam sets his right foot on the dead person’s head.54 When a Medár, or basket-maker, of Dhársyá dies, a Lingáyáta priest comes and places his foot on the corpse’s head.55 At a Gond wedding an old man knocks the heads of the bride and bridgroom together.56 When a Whállá, or Mysore Mahár, touches a man of pure caste, the man has to wash his head.57 In Malábár, when any one is defiled, it is custom to wash the head, not the hands.58 The most meritorious of deaths among the Hindus is to hold the breath with such force that the soul is driven out through the crown of the head.59 The soul enters the body through the crack in the crown.60 In his bathing ceremony, the Bráhmán repeatedly throws water on the crown of his head.61 The top and middle of the head is the window of life, the passage of the soul. In that place is the flower of one thousand leaves. This is the residence of the glorious divinity. She wears smelling herbs and flowers.62 The Bení-Isrà’lí priest blesses the bride and bridgroom by laying his hand on their heads.63 The high priest of the Jews, on whose head anointing oil has been poured, shall not uncover his

50 Bombay Gazetteer, Vol. XV. p. 150. It is believed that sanyásin, whose spirits pass through the crown of the head, go straight to heaven. The Hindus believe that a human being, by the practice of self-denial and austerities, can attain the power of centering his soul in the crown of his head, and of dying at will, when the soul leaves the body through a minute opening called Bráhma randhara. They further believe that a man who reaches this state becomes insensible to all bodily sufferings, and, though seemingly dead, is capable of living for a time without food or drink or without breathing. Bombay Gazetteer, Vol. XV. p. 156.
51 Information from Mr. Tirmalró. 52 Information from Mr. Tirmalró.
53 Information from Mr. Tirmalró.
54 Information from Mr. Tirmalró.
56 Dubois, Vol. II. p. 273.
61 Information from Mr. Tirmalró. 62 Information from Mr. Tirmalró.
63 Bishop’s Aboriginal Tribes of the Central Province, Vol. I. p. iii.
head or rend his clothes. The Ainós, an early tribe of North Japan, before drinking, throw liquor on their heads. Among the Tabaksal the priest lays his hand on the child whose father is dead, and blows into him the dead soul. It comes to life in the next child. At a Mexican birth the crown of the child's head is touched with water. When Numa Pomplini was made king of Rome (B.C. 714) the augur placed his right hand on the king's head and invoked the protection of Jupiter on Rome and on the king. The cross was originally worn by the Christians on the forehead. The laying of hands on the heads by the elders is to wish good, that is, to scare evil. Compare Odin, when he sent people to war, laying his hands on their heads and blessing them. After confession in a Russian church, the penitent prostrates and the priest lays his hand on the penitent's head. A Russian woman should not leave her head uncovered. Married women in Russia always wear a cap at dinner. Spirits enter through the head, and so in the scape-goat the priest lays his hands on the head of the goat, and the sins of the people pass into it. So Aaron put both hands on the scape-goat's head. In England (1620), as a cure for sadness, the devil's disease, it is not amiss to bore the skull with an instrument to let out the fuming vapours. (To be continued.)

NOTES AND QUERIES.

PANJABI NICKNAMES.

I venture to think that a dissertation on, or examples of the nicknames of the Panjáb would be extremely interesting. The Panjáb is a jocular person, and is therefore ready at nicknaming. Many European officials, most native officials, and nearly all villagers, have to suffer under the burden of a nickname, whether they will or no. Some nicknames are merely descriptions of physical or mental peculiarities, such as Ram Singh Lāmād—the long (tall) Ram Singh; Bhrā, the auburn one; Mustamāl Ganji, Mrs. Scalhead; Gungl, the dumb one; Gadhā Singh or Bālā Singh, the silly one.

Again, a tall man with a large head and a penchant for posterostrously large turbans, received the nickname of Kumbh Karan. Any one who at the Dásahrā festival has seen this hero's effigy at the Rām Līlā sacred drama, will appreciate the wit of this name.

Another case is that of a native who, going out to shoot a tiger, and promptly and, I think, very sensibly running away, received the title of Shermār, or the tiger-slayer. Very many more instances might, I think, be cited.

M. Millett in P. N. and Q. 1883.

A NOTE ON MUSALMAN TOMBS.

There is no distinction between the tombs of men and women in the Jhūlam District, Panjáb, excepting among the Awān villages of the Tālūngān tahsīl, in the west of it.

All the graves there have a vertical slab at either end. A woman's grave can be at once distinguished by the presence of a third slab in the centre, smaller than the head and foot stones. Men's graves have no central vertical slab.

J. Parsons in P. N. and Q. 1883.

PICTURES ON MUSALMAN TOMBS.

At the village of Khāngāh Dōgrā (Gujā̄nawālā District) are the tombs of certain Musalman saints. These tombs are ornamented with pictures of birds and other animals, though such representations are contrary to the Muhammadan religion. The village is composed mainly of Muhammadans, though there are four Hindu families. I was told that none of the inhabitants ever slept in beds, but on the ground, out of respect to the memory of the saints who practised similar austerities.

R. W. Travers in P. N. and Q. 1883.

[An examination of the Census Tables of 1881 will show that such names as Perū, Lambā, Bhrā, Gānj, Gungl, Gadhā, and Pījī Singh, are by no means necessarily nicknames, though they undoubtedly are so in some cases. Real nicknames in the Panjāb would, however, form a very interesting subject of study, and it is hoped that more notes on it will be forthcoming in these pages. — Eds.]
CURRENCY AND COINAGE AMONG THE BURMESE.

BY R. C. TEMPLE.

(Continued from p. 121.)

8.

BURMESE STANDARD WEIGHTS.

The Burmese Kings, after a very ancient and well-known fashion in Oriental countries, have long issued "standard weights" cast by an interesting variety of the cire perdue process. The subject is still very obscure and requires far more enquiry than I have been able to bestow on it, and all I can do now is to present to the student the information available to me. The accompanying Plate, due to the courtesy of the authorities of the British Museum, shows all the forms given to the weights that have come my way.

The ordinary forms to be found in the Burmese bazars are those of the hinā (hansa), and the standard weights are consequently usually known as the Hinā Weights (figs. 3, 4, 6, 10, 11 and 12 of the Plate). But it will be seen that other figures have been used:—Elephant (p'ia, fig. 2); Bull (n̄eñ̄, figs. 5, 8, and 9); Monkey (n̄yañ̄, fig. 7); Lion (mythical, chin̄, fig. 1); Lion (mythical, id, fig. 12).

The references to the subject in writers on Burma and the Far East seem to be few and superficial. Indeed, all that I have found are those that follow:


c. 1795. — Money scales and weights are all fabricated at the capital, where they are stamped, and afterwards circulated throughout the Empire; the use of any others is prohibited." — Symes, Ava, p. 326.

1826. — "Every shopkeeper has a small box, containing scales to weigh bullion given in payment for commodities; the weights are modelled after the figure of griffins, cows, etc." — Alexander, Travels, p. 21.

1826. — "Weights (in Tavai and Mergui). These are the same that are used throughout the Burmese Empire, which are made at Ava and distributed to the provinces. They change their shapes on the accession of a new king. The present weights are called Tawår, or Lion weights, as they represent that animal according to the Burmese conception of it. Those of the last reign are termed Hanaa-ulle, being made in the shape of the Hansa or goose. The weight of both kinds is the same." — Wilson, Documents of the Burmese War, Appx., p. lxi.

1829. — "The representations of the different Burmese weights are uniform and well regulated. They consist of masses of brass, of which the handle, or apex, represents the fabulous bird which is the standard of the empire." — Crawford, Ava, p. 384.


1845. — "The Government of Ava send from the capital, sets of standard weights (ch'è) for the use of the provinces. The present are called Tawår, being surrounded by the figure of a tû, the mythical Lion of Buddhism, and the present cognisance of Burma. The former were styled

43 Ridgeway, Origin of Currency, pp. 128 f., 270 ff.
44 The present writer has presented to the Oxford Museum a complete set of articles explaining the entire process of casting, from the die to the finished weight. The wax cores for the process were made by being run into deeply sunk iron dies of skilful workmanship. The process is a very old one in the Far East for the manufacture of money, Terrier de la Couprie, Cat. Chines Coins, p. xxviii, note.
45 All presented to the British Museum.
46 Pharey, Int. Num. Or., Vol. III. p. 31, says that the tû is "supposed to be a compound of horse and deer."
hinśā-alē, from having been surmounted by the figure of a hinśā, the famous hansa or Brahmin duck, the cognisance of the Kingdom of Pegu." — Latter, Grammar, p. 171.

1882. — "The standard weights are usually formed with a figure of a sacred kantha on them, or sometimes with the animal representing the royal birthday." — Shway Yoe (Scott), The Burman, Vol. II, p. 299.

1884. — "The old native weights, which are still in use here and there for small quantities, are made of brass in the form of the hoong or sacred goose (henga in Burmese) or of an elephant." — Bock, Temples and Elephants, p. 159. But among a collection of Herr Bock's weights seen by the present writer were to be found counterparts of figs. 4, 5, 7 and 13.

From the above references it will be seen that stamped standard weights (vide figs. 3, 11, 12 and 13) were issued officially and took the form of various animals, chiefly sacred or mythological.

But the statements go farther and tell us that the weights were issued by each king in succession, in forms appropriate to each, based apparently on the animal ruling over the royal birthday. This is, however, extremely doubtful. Witness the statements themselves. E.g., Wilson says that the tō-alē (fig. 12) was current in 1825, and Latter says that it was still current in 1844. But Bajjō was King in 1825 and Dārwādī in 1845. So that the tō-alē lasted through two reigns at any rate. Again, Wilson says that the hinśā-alē (figs. 3, 4, 6, 10, 11, 13) was current in the reign previous to that in 1826, i.e., in Bōdōp'ayā's and Scott notices its currency in 1832 under Dībō (Thibaw). It certainly was current in 1886-7 to my own knowledge, and I may say that the set given to the Oxford Museum were cast for me in 1888 at Mandalay.

My own information by word of mouth was much that above recorded. That is, I was told that of the weights figured the following were the periods of issue:—

No. 2. — The S'mu-alē, temp. Alaungp'ayā (Alompra, 1753-60).
Nos. 3, 4, 11. — The Hinśā-alē, temp. Mindon Min (1852-73) and Thibaw (1878-85).
No. 6. — The Hinśā-alē, temp. Nanndōjī (1760-3).
No. 10. — The Hinśā-alē, temp. Kongbaung-p'ayā or Shwēbō Min (Dārwādī, 1836-46).

But on my attempting, with the late Sir A. W. Franks, to identify the collection at the British Museum by means of my information, it became evident that the accuracy of the traditional ideas regarding their historical value was open to the gravest doubt. A careful criticism of the statements of the writers about them also forces one to the same conclusion. My impression is that every now and then the reigning king was advised by those around him to alter the form of the standard weight and did so.

As to Scott's story about the form of the weights depending on the king's birthday, I have been told the same thing repeatedly myself; but I found that the statement would

49 I think we ought to assume that "the old native weights" of Bock were merely stray Burmese weights that had got into the Shin villages he visited.
50 I was also told that these weights had originally the denominations marked on them. It may have been so, but I have never seen any so marked.
51 Popularly known to Europeans in Upper Burma at the time of the conquest as "peacock" weights.
52 The zīwśā was described to me as a variety of hinśā; but I see that Stevenson, Bur. Dict., s. v., calls it the tryanto excellens, the little swift that makes the well-known edible bird's-nests of the Andamans and the Malay Peninsula.
not bear examination. The Burmese have the usual Oriental notions about the guardians of each day, which are popularly stated as follows: 32—

Sunday, galôn (kołôn, garuda).
Monday, chāt (kyāt, tiger).
Tuesday, chinśč (mythical, lion).
Wednesday, stin (elephant).
Thursday, pūz (guinea-pig).
Friday, chat (rat).
Saturday, tū or uagā (mythical, lion or serpent, udā). 34

But so far as my notes go King Mindon Min was born on a Tuesday, chinśč ruling, 35 and Thibaw was born on a Saturday, tū ruling. Now, as they both adopted the chinśč as their weight form, it seems obvious that they could not have been guided in their choice by the ruling spirits of their respective birthdays.

Another view of the origin of the standard weight forms is stated in the quotations above given, viz., that they represented the national cognisance, but this again, though it has the support of Latter, op. cit. loc. cit., Phayre, Coins of Arakan, etc., Int. Num. Or., Vol. III. p. 31, and Stevenson, Bur. Dict., s. v., is to my mind open to doubt. E. g., they all say that the hauk is the cognisance of the Pegvian Kingdom, and one has strong doubts as to any King of Burma Proper ever having allowed a Pegvian national cognisance to become the cognisance of Burma also. I observe, too, that Latter says in 1846, temp. King Parawadil, that the Burmese national cognisance was the tū. It may have been so then, but at Mandalay it was certainly not so under Kings Mindon and Thibaw, 1852-85. At that period, beyond any doubt, the royal cognisance was two-fold, the peacock and the hare, to emphasize the mythical claim of the Alompra Dynasty to both solar and lunar (Indian) descent. All over the palace, especially on either side of the throne itself, 36 — everywhere in fact where it could be intruded, — it was to be seen; and it was on the coins also, as will be perceived later on. 37

9.

Minor Tongues.

It will have become obvious to those who have followed the argument so far, that the further one dives into the dialects of the Far East and the closer is one's acquaintance with

32 The whole question of naming children, ruling animals of the days of the week, etc., is very well explained in Scott's The Burman, Vol. I., opening Chapter. The custom is distinctly Indian, see my Proper Names of the Punjabis, Ch. VII.
33 A man's birthday guardian animal can be tested by the shape of the candles he offers at the Pagodas. A complete set of these, moulds and all, have been given by the present writer to the Oxford Museum. There is one for every day of the week in the conventional image of the ruling animal and the custom is to present candles in the form of one's birthday guardian. See Scott, The Burman, Vol. I. p. 6.
34 Though both are nowadays generally called "lions," the chinśč, the ordinary guardian of the road to a pagoda or other sacred place, is, in my belief, the remote descendant of the Assyrian winged lion, and the tū of the Assyrian winged bull. The Burmans do not seem to know the lion at all, for when a young lion and lioness were purchased for the Zoological Gardens at Rangoon in 1899 the Burmese visitors declined to believe that they were anything but European dogs!
35 Until a mischievous hand destroyed one of the emblems in 1888.
36 It was adopted by the Upper Burma Volunteer Rifles for their buttons, which caused the ribald to say, most untruly, however, that they were as proud as peacocks and as timid as hares. To give an idea of the ordinary Burman's view of the symbols, I may say that when a Burman convict was told to carve two door panels for Government House, Port Blair, being left to himself for the design, he carved a peacock on one and a hare on the other, precisely as he would have done in the same circumstances for the King of Burma. That was his idea as to what was appropriate to the dwelling of the highest personage in the land.
the modes of speech and the habits of thought of the many minor peoples inhabiting those regions the clearer becomes the sense of the expressions for currency in use among those who speak the greater and more civilised tongues. I, therefore, make no excuse for prolonging the present discussion so as to include the main groups of languages spoken in and about Burma, so far as the limited information at my disposal permits.

It is also not practicable to grasp the notions of currency held by a people without knowledge of their numerals and modes of reckoning, and the following pages will therefore include an enquiry into this point to the extent possible to me. Again, as the terms for the metals used for currency are always more or less closely connected with those for the currency itself, I have collected and recorded these wherever I have been able to do so.

For the present purpose the Minor Tongues spoken in Burma are divided into five groups, viz., the Karen, the Talaing, the Manipur, the Kachin-Naga, the Chin-Lushai. I have placed the Karen Language apart because of its Eastern (beyond Burma) affinities, and have included the Talaing among the Minor Tongues, because that is its present, though not its historical, position. As to the remaining tongues, my own inclination is to group them together in one great Hill Language, appearing to Europeans in a great variety of dialects, universally made out, to my ideas, to be much more numerous than they really are and to possess much greater divergences than is really the case, owing to an inadequate comprehension of them and to their presentation to students by imperfectly trained local observers. However, in order to comply with the ordinary grouping of them, I have divided them into Kachin-Naga and Chin-Lushai, difficult though it has been to maintain the distinction. Manipur, an essentially Naga tongue, I have placed apart, because of the complicated and interesting attempts of a people new to civilisation to adopt the method of reckoning and currency of the better educated peoples they have copied.

As a rule the languages above noted are now preserved in the Roman character, with such modifications as have seemed good to those who have recorded them, but there are two notable exceptions, the Karen and the Talaing.

The Karen language is written nowadays in a modified form of the Burmese character invented by the missionaries working among that people, but, so far as my information goes, no transliteration or transcription thereof into Roman characters exists. This has obliged me to find out for myself how to read the books in the missionary character, and to give a somewhat detailed and lengthy account of it in the following pages. The Talaing Language was, centuries ago, reduced to writing by the Talaings themselves in the same form of Alphabet as that adopted by the Burmese, and of the difficult script so evolved no adequate transcription even now exists, I have had therefore to explain my method of transcription at some length in this case also.

With these preliminary explanations I will proceed at once to a discussion of the Karens' language and their notions regarding pecuniary and ponderary matters.

A. — Karen.

The authorities at my disposal for the study of Karen are:

3. Anglo-Karen Vocabulary, Bennett, 1875.
6. Notes on the Languages and Dialects spoken in British Burma, official pamphlet, 1884.
(8) Census Report, Burma, Edinburgh, 1891.

(3) A Sgau Karen, born at Gybingank, Tharrawaddy District, able to read and write his own language freely and having a good knowledge of Burmese.

To use the ordinary transcriptions of the names, there are two clearly defined dialects of Karen. Sgau and Pwo, to which may be added Bghai. Another way of stating this fact is to say that the Karen Languages may be defined as those of the Burmese Karens, the Talaii Karens, and the Red Karens. The marked difference seems to be, however, between Sgau and Pwo, and even that appears to be giving way before the predominant Sgau.

My direct teacher has come to such signal grief in life that I will not mention his personality beyond saying that his dialect must be Sgau, because, though he does not recognise the terms Sgau and Pwo, while he knows all about Bghai, he calls himself a Burmese Karen, as distinguished from a Talaii Karen, whose language he says he cannot speak. When asked to which of the Bghai Karen Tribes enumerated at p. 111, of Wade's Dictionary of Sgau Karen he belonged, he remarked that he was a Pghâkanyâ which means, however, in Sgau, a Karen generally: see Sgau Dist. pp. 9, 1015.

Dr. Bennett explains (Notes, p. 13 f.) how, about 1834 and later, the Karen "Alphabet" came into existence as the result of the efforts of missionaries to write in a practical manner the hitherto unwritten and much differing dialects of Sgau and Pwo, and how they finally adopted the Burmese Alphabet with variations and additions to suit each. What was done as regards Pwo I do not know, and all the information in the authorities available to me is clearly Sgau.

Now the reason I have had to go so carefully into the question of the Karen Language for my present purpose is, that so far as I know, the sounds attached to the missionary-invented characters are nowhere laid down in such a way as to enable the enquirer to arrive at authoritative transcriptions or transliterations of the Karen words for money, weight, etc. The nearest approach to such information I have found is in Dr. Bennett's statements (p. 19 of the Notes):—"The great fact is the Burman characters are used in writing Karen, but not Burmese sounds . . . . There is hardly ever the sound in Karen the same as in Burmese. It is essentially a Burmese character but with Karen sounds . . . . The real sounds cannot be written with English letters."

Among those consulted by the Government for the Notes was Mr. P. H. Martyr, whose general authority on such subjects all who know will acknowledge, and he wrote (p. 17) in 1882:—"The Karen Alphabet is, therefore, the Burmese Alphabet with variations and additions, marks and strokes to denote sounds not found in the Burmese language have been added. The Burmese letters have not been changed in any way, but some of the sounds of the letters have been changed . . . . The two principal dialects Pwo and Sgau have been reduced to writing, and strange to say that, although they are both formed with Burmese characters, distinct additional marks and strokes have been introduced to denote the same sounds."

Thus far my authorities, which are not very encouraging; and so I have in the end been

---

8 Information in this volume procured chiefly from Dr. Mason.
9 Census Report, p. 165. Dr. Bennett, in 1882, said (Notes on Dialects, p. 14):—"A Sgau Karen has been known to read Pwo after a few hours' study, and the Pwo can easily read the Sgau, notwithstanding there is a great difference in the definition of many words."

0 Mason, Nat. Fed. Burma, 1856, gives a great number of Pwo Karen words, but there is nowhere any transcription described, and the character is a very strange one.
1 See also p. 13.
compelled to trust to my unhappy Karen teacher. From him I gather that the consonants adopted from the Burmese characters are as follows:—

| Gutturals  | k, k' | gh | ḥ | ng |
| Palatals   | s, s' | sh | tš | ny |
| Denticals  | t, t' | d, | n |
| Labials    | p, p' | b, | m |
| Linguals   | y, l  | w |
| Sibilants  | l, s  |   |
| Aspirates  | h, h' |   |

The ligatures are special and are taken partly from the Talaing Alphabet; e.g., c, and z, y: and partly from the Burmese Alphabet; e.g., c, r, v, o, w, j, gh (ो). Thus:—

Ω ky, ơ kr, ṣ j kl, ǂ kw, ṣ bh, ṭ by.

As in all Alphabets of Indian origin, short a is inherent in all consonants, and both Burmese and improvised symbols are adopted to express modifications of this inherent vowel, but, so far as the Burmese symbols are concerned, with uses so differing from the original that they must be given here.

Thus Ω ka is modified to suit the Sgan Karen gamut of sounds in the following manner:—

Karen: ká, kí, kó, kū, kā, kē, kė, kō, kō
Burmese: ká, kă, kā, kō, kō, kā, kē, kē, kō

The special vowel sounds above are kō, something like German ò, nearest French ou, not far from "aw" in English. Ká near French u, but not it. Kē as in Burmese, near English "fair" or French "mer." Kō as in English "fall."

In addition to these direct vowels the missionary alphabet-makers have attempted to reproduce the tones of Karen by four symbols ཭ ཧ ས ས, and the staccato accent by the symbol ས, borrowing the Burmese heavy accent (which by the way is the Talaing staccato accent) for the purpose, because, the Burmese staccato accent had already been borrowed to represent the direct vowel ò. Karens, of course, hear the tones and foreigners usually cannot, and hence Mr. Martyr's remark about several characters being introduced to represent the same sounds. In transcriptions for foreigners into Roman characters I should not propose to notice the characters for tones, though I transcribe the staccato ས by kā; but I distinctly think that the missionaries were right in introducing them, when concocting a character in which Karens were to read their own language. Any one who has floundered as often and as long as the present writer over the Shán Dictionary, in which, of course, Dr. Cushing had to follow the methods of a character long ago concocted by the literary Shans to express their own language, would understand the importance to a native Karen of being able to denote his tones by characters.

*As I have adopted ' to distinguish aspirated consonants; and letters, where not explained, are pronounced as usual, or as nearly as may be for practical purposes.

*Gh = Arabic ĝ, often sounded as a surd after an aspirated consonant: ḫ = ḡ.

*The symbol for sh is adopted from the Burmese ligature ʃ, hr = sh in pronunciation.

*With English appreciation of denticals.

*English surd th = Arabic th: symbol taken from the Burmese ฏ = ṭ in pronunciation.

*The symbol ṭ is of all Oriental tongues; ἠ, ἱ, ἱ, etc.: Its position in this Alphabet is adopted from Shán, as also is that of ḡ.

*Written ơ, borrowed from Talaing: a special letter for a very softly breathed ḡ, sounded like ṭ before ḡ and ơ.

*As in Burmese, ḡ = ṭ in pronunciation.

*The use of these ligatures is usually quite different from that in Burmese or Talaing.

*The symbol ʊ is the stopped or staccato accent in Burmese.
Having thus explained how I came by the transcription of Karen herein adopted, I will proceed at once to the main subject in hand.

The Karen ponderary scale can be made out thus from the Syau Dictionary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>704</td>
<td>wê</td>
<td>ywêjî (4 gra.) 72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>667 ; 1, 111</td>
<td>2 bghê</td>
<td>pê</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>585</td>
<td>2 s'ghê 23</td>
<td>mû</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1286</td>
<td>2 bî</td>
<td>mât</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>651</td>
<td>2 pô 24</td>
<td>(half tickal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>664</td>
<td>2 bât</td>
<td>kyêt (tickal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>690 ; 1, 180</td>
<td>10 rwê</td>
<td>(10 rupees, tickal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>655</td>
<td>10 pô</td>
<td>(100 rupees), pêkbô (viss)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>670</td>
<td>10 mô</td>
<td>(1,000 rupees, ten viss) 76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The wê is clearly then the *Adenanthera* seed or candoor. The word for the *Abrus* plant in Syau Karen is given by Mason, *Natural Productions of Burma*, 1850, p. 196, as *bâlêghô* and for the *Adenanthera* tree as *bâlêghôp'adô* (*p'adô* = great). In the Syau Dictionary *bâlêghô* is defined as a "tree of the genus *Adenanthera*" (p. 1370). The Karen scale is most interesting in its use of pô for the half tickal, thus making the Troy weights each the half of the next higher denomination; and in its ingenious decimal division of the Avoirdupois scale, 77 growing out of the Troy scale.

I have given the words for weights above in their unattached forms. They do not however appear to be so used, but always in conjunction with a numeral; e.g., they are to be found in the Dictionary as tawî, tabâkhê, and so on; all s.v. ta, the prefix for "one." Tô is a weight in a scale (p. 763), and so is a scale, balance (p. 514) but the word for balance does not appear to be used also for the standard weight, as is usual in the East; i.e., for the weight which turns the scale. Unless one may take the synonyms (p. 1180) karô, shrow, sîpô (pô, num. coeff. for viss, p. 1007) to indicate the standard Avoirdupois weight (ruô, pô) that turns the scale (sô). 78 That the Karens have a clear comprehension of a standard weight for turning the scale is to be seen from the term *tobô* on p. 1213 (ô to descend, p. 1215, and *toô*, the force or impetus of gravity, p. 677), which means "to be of a definite weight," clearly by turning the balance.

My informant’s statement of the Karen terms for British money shows the usual mixture of the ideas of bullion weights with each denominations, but in simple form. Oddly enough he did not know any word for "pie" nor did he recognise a pie when shown one, but we get the word from the *Syau Dictionary* (p. 212) where it is kô; and also from a sentence in the *Anglo-Karen Dictionary*, s.v. pice, which is of value here:

bô kô mè tô ta-bô

three pice are copper one-piece

I.e., three pie make one piece.

72 My teacher gave me ywêjî; pê is seed in Karen, and ywêjî is Burmese. I should say that he picked up the name from his Burmese neighbours.

73 Pronounced sôô.

74 Page 767 gives synonyms tawî, tabâkhê, obviously for tabô, tickal.

75 Be seems also to be used as a numeral co-efficient; e.g., pêbî, Anglo-Karen Verbal, s.v., "silver coin, rupee,"

76 Curiously described in the Dict. as "ten bikethâ: ‘bikethâ’ being an attempt at the Burmese word pêkbô; "

"bikê" as in the well known slang word for bicycle.

77 The Karen decimal numeration series is, like that of most Far Eastern nations, remarkable: Thus sô, ten, and then *kayô*, 10 x 10, hundred: *katô*, 100 x 10, thousand: *kôlê*, 1,000 x 10, ten thousand: *kôlô*, 10,000 x 10, hundred-thousand: *kôlôkê*, 100,000 x 10, million: *kê*, 1,000,000 x 10, ten million: *kêô*, 10,000,000 x 10, hundred-million. Each of these words is a unit, preceded by the prefix ta, s.v. sôô, takayôt, and so on. *Dict.*, p. 605.

78 See also Dict., p. 513, s.v., *sêbô.*
This shows that the Karens have adopted wholesale the British system of enumerating copper coinage. That they actually do so I gather from my informant, who, on being asked to write down how he enumerated pice, proceeded straight on from one to thirty pice, thus:

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c}
\text{one pice} & \text{tōtabō} & (tā, one) \\
\text{two pice} & \text{tōkābō} & (kā, three) \\
\text{three pice} & \text{tōbōbō} & (bō, three) \\
\end{array}
\]

and so on.

This shows that bō is really a numeral coefficient for “copper coin,” as one also gathers to be the case from the Anglo-Karen Dictionary, which gives tōtabō for “one copper coin.”

For silver, i.e., the rupee and its parts, he gave the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Karen</th>
<th>Sense of the Terms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>one anna</td>
<td>tabghē</td>
<td>1 bghē</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>two annas</td>
<td>tāsghē</td>
<td>1 s'ghē</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>three</td>
<td>bōbghē</td>
<td>3 bghē</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>four</td>
<td>ta bē</td>
<td>1 Đi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>five</td>
<td>yēbghē</td>
<td>5 bghē</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>six</td>
<td>kōbghē</td>
<td>6 bghē</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seven</td>
<td>nēbghē</td>
<td>7 bghē</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eight</td>
<td>tāpō</td>
<td>1 pō</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nine</td>
<td>kōbghē</td>
<td>9 bghē</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ten</td>
<td>bāghē</td>
<td>bghē a ten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eleven</td>
<td>s'ītābghē</td>
<td>11 bghē</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>twelve</td>
<td>s'īkābghē</td>
<td>12 bghē</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thirteen</td>
<td>s'ībōbghē</td>
<td>13 bghē</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fourteen</td>
<td>s'īwēbghē</td>
<td>14 bghē</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fifteen</td>
<td>s'īyēbghē</td>
<td>15 bghē</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rupee</td>
<td>tabā</td>
<td>1 bā</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Syau Dictionary discloses a confusion of mind among the Karens as to metals, not altogether surprising in tribes situated as they have been. Thus, we have, p. 495, 56, money of gold or silver, but clearly usually of silver: p. 760, tō, brass and copper, also silver and superior brass: p. 1014, pghākbō, tin, lead, pewter, and spelter generally: p. 1224, lwētōbō. “precious kind of copper,” lwētā, “precious kind of iron;” here lwē is a precious stone, tō is iron (p. 793), and bō is yellow (p. 1105).

I may mention that my teacher only recognized lwētā as iron and tōbō as brass. Distinctions between brass, copper and spelter seem to be tōbō, as above, yellow tō, and tōkābō, golden tō (p. 115) for brass: tōghē, red tō (p. 39) for copper: tōwē, white tō (p. 1224) for spelter.

I have no means of locating the qualities of Karen (terms for) silver to any scale, but that there are qualities vaguely understood there can be little doubt. Witness the words bōsē (p. 499), touchstone; sēpō, silver refiner, and pghākbō, silver assayer (p. 1015); pēsā

79 Anglo-Karen Vocab, has tāpghē for “copper coin,” pghē being “tin.”
80 K. g. Anglo-Karen Vocab, gives the words for “silver” as those for “money,” “cash;” p. 27. See also Anglo-Karen Dict. p. 391.
81 Pghē and pghēkō (wō, white) in Anglo-Karen Vocab. See also Anglo-Karen Dict., s. v.
82 My Karen teacher gave me sē as lead, spelling it eō; the Dict, p. 1014, gives pghē as lead or tin.
83 See also Anglo-Karen Vocab. p. 25, and Anglo-Karen Dict., s. v.
84 So also Anglo-Karen Dict., s. v.
(Burmese however) silver assayer, appraiser (p. 1060). Besides these, I have unearthed the following terms:

For “pure” silver:


- Page 299. - Kōlpōkō (money; white-pure-silver-white: pp. 299, 1001, 495, 1225).

For alloyed silver:

- Page 298. - Kō, lit., white.
- Page 298. - Kōlpōkō, silver money.
- Page 496. - Pō, pōkōlpō, silver paid in advance (pō, payment in advance, p. 398).

For money:

- Page 495. - Sēnkī (sā, silver, tū, gold).
- Page 496. - Sēnāmghā, sēnāmghū-sēkamghā, sēkamghū-sēkamghā, silver chips, small silver change.
- Page 496. - Sēnā, Burmese lump silver (nā, texture, substance, p. 595).
- Page 496. - Sēnāpō, Siamese stamped silver, “piano-convex pieces of specific value,” as the Dictionary quaintly puts it (ū, measured, p. 887, pō, round).
- Page 496. - Sēnāpō, Siamese small silver (ū, bits, p. 1162, pō, small parts, p. 1083).

As regards gold the Dictionary has most curious information: - Thus, tū is gold (p. 812): red gold is called male gold (tūpō, p. 1061) and pale yellow gold is called female gold (tūmā, p. 1145). Red gold is considered the purer. This, of course, is, within limits, a mistake, though it is shared by the Burmese and others: the redness of gold being caused by the less valuable copper, and not by the more valuable silver alloy of pale Oriental gold.

There are given on p. 813 a series of terms for “pure” (i.e., I gather, “good quality, acceptable”) gold: thus:

- Tūmā (nā, pure, p. 500, tī, water, p. 797).
- Tūmāpō (nā, water, p. 927).
- Tūpō (tī, perfect, p. 731).
- Tūpōkānd.
- Tūpō (tī, water, p. 927).
- Tū (ī).

Other words for gold given loc. cit. have, as I understand, the meanings attached below:

- Lump gold ... Tūpō (tū, convex, p. 839).
- " " ... Tūpōkō (tū, burnt, p. 1204).
- Alloyed gold ... Tūmē (mē, fire, p. 1188).
- Impure gold, bullion. Tūmpē (mē, scum, froth, p. 1283).
- Gold-dust ... Tūkānd, tūkānd-tūkānd (kānd, dust, p. 99).
- " " ... Tūkā (ī, bits, p. 235).

85 See, good, passable, marketable.
86 Sī means money, but fundamentally barter.
87 Of. Shānāmā, water, also fineness of metals.
88 Also native silver bullion.
89 The will-o’-the-whisp, ignis fatuus, is, according to the Karen, an animal of gold tinsel, which lays golden eggs: see tū and tūmāpō, p. 812 f.
B.—Talaing.

It is a pity that a language with such a past literature and so many ancient documents in stone as the Talaing, also commonly known as the Mon and Peguan, must be treated as a minor and practically unwritten language, but I have no alternative. The Burmese conquest of the Talaing Country in the middle of the last Century and many other causes have operated to thrust back this once important and highly civilised tongue, until it can now only survive in rude dialectic forms among remote villages. These causes have also no doubt brought about the fact that the missionaries among the Talaings have almost as little to tell us as those among the Karens have much. The works and information at my disposal are:—

(1) Haswell, Grammatical Notes and Vocabulary of the Peguan Language, 1874.
(2) Stevens, English-Peguan Vocabulary, 1896, based on Haswell.
(4) Comparative Grammar of the Languages of Further India, Forbes, 1881.
(5) Notes on the transliteration of the Burmese Alphabet, Appx. on the vocal and consonantal sounds of the Peguan or Talaing Language, R. C. Temple, 1876, in which I followed Haswell, official publication.
(6) Burma Census Report, Eales, 1891.
(7) Various illiterate or slightly literate Talaing peasants.

The Talaings long ago converted the same form of Alphabet as that adopted by the Burmese and Shans to their own use; a form which is very little suited to the requirements of their language. This Alphabet, being rich in consonantal and poor in vocal representation, has been made to do duty by modifications to express a language of exactly the opposite kind, very rich in vocal and poor in consonantal sounds, and the result has been to bring into existence two difficult and puzzling series of modifications: one of the uses of the letters themselves, and the other of the additions to them. It is no doubt not an easy thing to learn to read Talaing.

So far as the books and information available to me permit, I would describe the Talaing language and writing as follows:—

Gutturals ... k, k' ng
Palaits ... ch, ch' s, ts ny
Dentals ... t, t' n
Labial ... p, p' b, m
Linguals ... y, r, r' w
Sibilants ... s
Aspirates ... h, a

Sonants corresponding to the surds are not heard in pronunciation, but are fully represented in the written character. The use of the sonants is to express modifications of the sounds of the following vowel symbols: e, g, the inherent vowel in surds is e, in sonants it is e. That is, the symbols k and k' represent ka and k'a: but the symbols y and g' represent ke and k'e. So k + a is ka, but g' + e is kea. This habit divides the Alphabet into surds and sonants, and for this purpose s, h, and special symbols, I, b, and y are surds, and y, r, l, w, and special symbol b' are sonants.

99 Said by Mr. Stevens, page v., to be "the only white man of the Century in Burma, who ever mastered the Mon Language."
91 Information chiefly from Dr. Mason.
92 This contains, p. 99 ff., a neat comparison of Mon with the Cambodian and Annamese Languages.
93 I use ' to express aspiration. The symbol for ng = gn when initial.
94 Same symbols used for ch, s; ch', ts.
95 With English appreciation of dentals.
96 Special symbols for surd l.
97 H' (b') is also used to represent surd l, and hw (w) is pronounced for a surd.
In this way there are two inherent vowels, a and e, and two sets of open vowel modifications thereof. Thus:

Surd Modifications of Open Vowels.

kā kā̂ kī kī̂ kū kū̂ kōa kōâ kāu kāû kō̂ kāi kīe kōe kōê

Sonant Modifications of Open Vowels.

ke kē kē̂ ku kū̂ ke kōa kōâ kāu kom kō̂

But, as in Burmese and all the cognate tongues, final consonants also modify preceding vowels, and we thus get a double set of modifications, which renders the reading of Talaiing very difficult.

On considering the effect of the final consonants there will be found to be an ordinary and a special modification of both surds and sonants with each vowel. Thus:

Ordinary Modifications with Final Consonants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>With initial surds.</th>
<th>With initial sonants.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>open...</td>
<td>kā̂ kē̂ kāu kō̂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>closed...</td>
<td>kōt kāt kōt̂ kāt̂</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Special Modifications with Final Consonants.

A. — Surds being initial.

(c) With final k.

open... kā̂ kē̂ kāu kō̂
closed by k kā̂̂ kē̂̂ kāu kō̂̂

(d) With final ng.

open... kā̂ kē̂ kāu kō̂
closed by ng... kā̂ng kāû ng kā̂ng, kā̂ng kāû

(c) With final w.

open... kā̂ kē̂ kāu kō̂
closed by w... kō̂ kā̂ kō̂

(d) With final a (deep guttural sound).

open... kā̂ kē̂ kāu kō̂
closed by a... kō̂ kā̂

B. — Sonants being initial.

(c) With final k.

open... kā̂ kē̂ kāu kō̂
closed by k... kā̂k kē̂̂ kāk kē̂̂

(δ) With final ng.

open... kā̂ kē̂ kāu kō̂
closed by ng... kā̂ng kāû ng kā̂ng, kā̂ng kāû

Besides all this, there are irregularities, recognized and dialectic, and the use of open vowels following sonants to express, in dissyllables and compound words, short inherent a, or a slightly sounded inherent vowel, thus:

written kata: pronounced kētā;

" gata; " kē'a, or katā.

This inherent a, or slightly sounded inherent vowel, is also expressed by ten sets of ligatures!

88 The mark " is used to show that vowels are long, and the mark " that they are pronounced so. The English reader will comprehend the difference at once by considering to himself the difference between part and guard, fruit, and prune, meet and mead, soak and rogue, ought and fraud, make and made, and so on.

89 This a as in or has a sharp accent sound.

90 This is written with the Burmese ə, but never as an open vowel, though it is sounded as an open d.

1 See Haswell, p. xii.
I think that any one who has followed me through this description of the Talaing's mode of writing his language will admit that it must be difficult to read. 2

Now, I very much regret to say that I have been unable to use the information thus put together for any other purpose than an attempt to adequately represent in transcription the contents of the Vocabularies at my disposal. The information verbally given me for the present purpose is so dialectic, that I have thought it best to give the Talaing metrological terms as I heard them, without adopting the scheme of sounds laid down even by so experienced a scholar as Mr. Haswell.

The parts of the rupee are parts of the former tickal, and the peasantry do not seem to distinguish by language between the coins and the bullion weights that the coins represent. The parts of the tickal follow the Burmese terms, thus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Burmese</th>
<th>Talaing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pê</td>
<td>pôs, bôs, pûs, bûô</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mù</td>
<td>mûs, mûn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>màt</td>
<td>meh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kyât</td>
<td>h'kl, t'kl, t'kô</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pêkbû (viss)</td>
<td>w'sî, p'sû</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The tickal is the weight that turns the scale; e. g., tâ-k'î is a balance; nûm-tâ-k'î is the weight (nûm) of a tickal; lâ, apparently of the balance. 6

The silver money scale, i.e., for the rupee and its parts, my general information states to be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Talaing</th>
<th>Sense</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 anna</td>
<td>mûpôsa</td>
<td>mûpôsa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 annas</td>
<td>mûmû</td>
<td>mûmû</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>pûpôsa</td>
<td>pûpôsa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>mûmû</td>
<td>mûmû</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>pûbû</td>
<td>pûbû</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>h'k'ôbû</td>
<td>h'k'ôbû</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>h'pûpôsa</td>
<td>h'pûpôsa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>h'pûpôsa</td>
<td>h'pûpôsa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>h'k'ôbû</td>
<td>h'k'ôbû</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>h'k'ôbû</td>
<td>h'k'ôbû</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>h'k'ôbû</td>
<td>h'k'ôbû</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>h'k'ôbû</td>
<td>h'k'ôbû</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>h'k'ôbû</td>
<td>h'k'ôbû</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>h'k'ôbû</td>
<td>h'k'ôbû</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>h'k'ôbû</td>
<td>h'k'ôbû</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 rupee</td>
<td>h'k'ôbû</td>
<td>h'k'ôbû</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. See Stevens, pp. 91, 118.
2. This h is a deep guttural, given as h by Haswell, and spelt t or d.
3. This word is clearly the Indian viss or viis.
4. See Stevens, pp. 7, 12, 6. viss, balance and scales.
5. I may mention that a Talaing Karon, i.e., a Pegu Karon, furnished the following words to me: — tâ-k'î, tickal; mûs-arc, brass; pû, iron; sâm, silver. These are purely Talaing. Cf. Haswell, p. xiii.
6. A Talaing from Kôlâhî, Ambirer District, prefixed sâm, silver, where the reckoning represented a silver coin: e.g., Bô, sâm-k'î. Sâm-pû, sâm-platec: 4 annas, sâm-mûmû: 2 annas, sâm-mûmû.
7. Also kôpôvâ: = 8 bôa.
8. Also Kôhamb Và: = 8 bôa.
9. For these numbers, which agree fairly with Haswell's list, one man gave me k'âm, 8; h'sût, 9; t'sêm, 10 and te uns. One is mûs, but mû in composition, as mûpôs, mûmû, mûmû, mûh'Ô, mûpôs (a viss, but synonym mûs-sû). Pôs, three, is also pôs (see or pô in Haswell, p. 21). Bô, two, is also bôa and pôa.
My informants recognised the Burmese word *ywa*, *Abrus* or *Adenanthera* seed, but called it *sāphā* and *mēbōn*, i.e., zinc *bōa* (*sāt*, zinc; Stevens, p. 128, has *sāt*), or seed *bōa* (*me*, seed), meaning thereby (?) zinc money or seed money.

The word for a *cooper coon* is *tōi*, or *tūi*, and the numerical coefficient is *kṭāi*, the pice being enumerated precisely as in Burmese and the neighbouring idioms, as copper + number + coefficient, e.g., one pice is *tōi-mōa-kṭāi* = copper-one-piece.

My informants were also not likely to know much about the metals, and what has been gathered is very little.


Silver: — *sōn*, Haswell, pp. 128, 133: *sōn*.


Copper: — *tōi*, Haswell, p. 116: *p'rut-k'ākt*, and *k'rut-k'ākt*, i.e., red brass.


(To be continued.)

NOTES ON THE SPIRIT BASIS OF BELIEF AND CUSTOM.

BY SIR JAMES CAMPBELL, K.C.I.E., I.C.S.

(Continued from p. 140.)

The Hair. — The hair seems to have been considered an inlet for spirits, because it leads to the opening in the skull. Hair is also curiously affected by fear, and stands on end when a vision or ghost is seen. In a dry climate it crackles and becomes full of electricity. These may have been among the reasons why the hair plays so noticeable a part in early beliefs and rites. Because spirits enter through the hair, in the Kōkan the medium lets his hair fall loose, in order that his familiar spirit may enter into his body. It is believed by the Hindus that, if the medium forgets to untie the knot of his head hair, he will not be able to become possessed.75 In the Dakhan, when a knowing man is called, he seizes the patient by the hair. A pregnant Chitpāna woman should not let her hair hang loose, or she may be attacked by spirits.76 The Liṅgāyats of Dhārwar say that they cut the hair of girls under five, as, if their hair is long, it might touch a woman in her monthly sickness, which they believe would give the child certain diseases.77 The Sṛivaśīvara Brāhmaṇs shave the moustache, because they hold that, if water touches the moustache in passing into the mouth, it becomes the same as liquor.78 At their *sadā haṭrī soma*, or the hair-cutting ceremony among the Liṅgāyats, the priest holds two betel-leaves in the form of a pair of scissors, and with them touches the longest hair on the child's head.79 Among the Bijāpūr Bedars, when a woman, who has been cast out for eating or committing adultery with a man of low caste, is let back into caste, her head is shaved, and her tongue burned with a burning *rus* twig.80 When a Bijāpūr-Bedar man is guilty of adultery with a kinswoman of the same *gōra*, or family-stock, his head and face are shaved, and he is

11 *kṭāi* is spelt *kṭāk*, in Stevens, p. 77.
12 *k'ākt* is lead according to one informant.
13 Information from Mr. P. B. Joshi.
14 Dhārwar Gāttcteer, p. 111.
15 K. Baghunāth's *Pānās Prabba*.
17 Bombay Gazetteer, Vol. XXIII. p. 94.
made to drink liquor. Mourners among all high-caste Hindus shave the head except the top knot. So among the Kānara Sāṃvī, when a death happens, the chief mourner shaves his face and head, except the top-knot. The Belgaum Marathas shave the face after a death, and wrapping a piece of gold with the shaved hair burn it in the funeral pyre. Among higher class Hindus, after shaving, a man or a woman is considered unclean, and will not eat or touch anything. This is, perhaps, because they are specially liable to be attacked by spirits as the hair is about, and a spirit may settle in it, and soin the person. So it was important to take care of the parings of nails and hair-clippings. Originally the idea seems to have been that spirits would pass through them into the owner; afterwards it was thought that the magician should work with them. So the ancient Persians drew a circle round parings of nails and hair-clippings, and poured earth on them. Among the Kois of Bastar the white or harmless wizards let their hair grow, and become inspired by performing a quick dance. In South India, Liṅgāṇaḥ sometimes carry a liṅg in the hair, and a man who has been troubled by an evil spirit lets his hair and nails grow for a year, and then offers them to a goddess. The Köl women, like the old Greek women, when they wish to become possessed, walk up a hill with their hair loose. The dying Beni-Irāʾill is shaved, except the face. Spirits enter through the hair. So the Pāra ḍ corpse-bearers have to wash their hair in human urine. The Pārhs believe that spirits gather wherever hair and nails are left. They believe that there is a great danger, unless the hair and nails are buried with prayers, that evil spirits will feast on them and work sorcery with them. Young men offered their hair at the temple of Syria. The Burmans wash their head only once a month, because the Barma, and especially the people of Pegu, believe that frequent washing destroys and irritates the genius who dwells in the head and protects men. The young Burmans, on entering into a monastery, get their locks cut off. Japanese children have little patches of hair left tied with strings of ribbon. Some Papuans of New Guinea turn their black wool or frizzle light red by rubbing it with burnt coral or wood ashes. The hair-dress of early tribes is perhaps spiritual. The Waggoos of East Africa twist their wool into countless strings, which they braid with bābātī fibre, and at the end tie little brass balls and coloured beads. The Mandingos of Africa cut the child’s hair and spit into its face. Zulu women leave a small tuft on the crown of the head. Among the North American Indians many tribes cut their hair after a death. The mention that the Dakotas after cutting the hair rub the head with white earth, suggests that the object was to keep off spirits. On the other hand, in some cases, the cutting off the hair was a sacrifice; so in North America, the Nebraska Indians bound locks of women’s hair with the body. Other North American tribes wore their hair matted and dishevelled. Among the North American Indians several tribes also keep a lock of hair as the ghost of the dead. In this case the hair is kept as a memorial. In the Sandwich Islands, in 1799, to stop a volcano, the king cut his holy hair and threw it into a river. The Peruvians pulled a hair out of the eye-brows in worshipping. The Greek bride offered a lock to Aphrodite. Till B.C. 300 the Romans never cut the hair. Among the Romans there was (A.D. 100) a

---

87 Shway Yo’e The Burman, Vol. II. p. 92.
88 St John’s Nipon, p. 194.
90 Gardiner’s “Zula Country,” p. 100.
95 Black’s “Ethnol. Oddities,” p. 78.
99 Earl’s “Papuans,” p. 5.
100 Taylor’s “Primitive Culture,” Vol. II. p. 431.

1 Among the tribes who cut their hair short are the Dakota (p. 161), Inuit (p. 157), Californians (p. 151), and the Pima (p. 99). — First Rep. Ethn. Com. Amer. 1880.
7 Fliny’s “Natural History,” Book vii., Chap. 59.
belief that an unborn child gives its mother much trouble and pain when its hair begins to bud forth. The hair of Russian priests is cut cross-wise in four places when he is ordained. In Scotland, when horses are taken out of the stable by witches, and ridden at night, next morning their manes and tails are dishevelled and tangled. In North England, there was a belief that, when a child is suffering from whooping cough, its head should be shaved, and the birds take the hair and the cough. So mix your hair with an ass's or dog's food, and you will pass him your scarlat fever. Sir W. Scott, in his Lays of the Last Minstrel, Vol. II. p. 17, says:

"Yet somewhat was he chilled with dread,
And his hair did bristle upon his head."

Spirits enter into the body through the hair, and bring on sickness. So in England, there was a belief or saying: — "You can be cursed of ague by winding some hair round a pin and driving it into an aspen stem." The king (of England?) after anointing should have his hair combed with an ivory or gold comb if the hair is not smooth. In England, a nurse sometimes cuts some hair of a child's head who is sick with measles and whooping cough. She puts the hair between bread and butter, and leaves it for a dog to eat. The dog eats it, and gets the measles. In Ireland, the hair is cut off a person's head who is sick of scarlet fever, and is put down an ass's mouth. It is considered fatal in England if human hair is taken and worked by a bird into its nest. Two girls sit up silent, each takes as many hairs out of her head as she is years old, and having put them in a cloth with the herb called true-love, she burns each hair separately, and says: — "I offer this my sacrifice to him most precious in my eyes. I charge thee now come forth to me that I this minute may thee see." The shape appears, and walks round the room.

The Mouth. — On three occasions there is a special risk that spirits will pass into the body through the mouth — in eating, in sneezing, and in yawning. Perhaps because spirits enter through the mouth while eating, the higher class Hindus before beginning to eat make a circle of water round their dish, and sip a little water, repeating some verses. So orthodox Lingayats do not like to take their meals in an open place, lest they may be affected by the Evil Eye. Sometimes pious Hindu women during the four months of the dakshinayan, — that is, from mid-June to the middle of September when the doors of heaven are closed and the influence of spirits is great, — make a vow of observing silence at meals. In Kanara, a Roman Catholic Baptism, the priest breathes three times into the child's mouth to drive away evil spirits, and to make room for the Holy Ghost. In South India, (some) Brâhmans eat in silence. Burton (1621 A.D.) notices two cases — one of a nun, who ate a lettuce without saying grace or making the sign of the cross, and was instantly possessed, and the other of a wench who was possessed by eating an unhallowed pomegranate. The Greek and Roman offerings of meat and drink before or after meat, and the English leaving part of a dish for Lady Manners, were due, perhaps, to the belief that spirits enter at food-time through the mouth; and so the Roman Catholic practice of making the sign of the cross before eating and the Protestant rule of grace before meat, may be attributed to the same belief.

Sneezing. — The convulsion of sneezing is generally thought to be caused by a spirit. According to one belief it is caused by a spirit going out, and according to another belief by a spirit coming in. Among Kólikán Hindus, when a man sneezes, it is customary to say shatam.
jic, or live long or a hundred years. If a man sneezes while he is standing on the threshold it is considered very dangerous, and water is poured on his head. In Dharwar, if A sneezes once when B is beginning some work, B stops for a time, and then begins afresh; if A sneezes twice together, B goes on with his work without stopping; if A sneezes on B's back, B's back is slightly pinched; and if A sneezes during a meal, some one of the party calls on him to name his birth-place. The Siamese wish a long life to the person sneezing, for they believe that one of the judges of hell keeps a register wherein the duration of men's lives is written, and that when he opens this register, and looks upon any particular leaf, all those whose names happen to be entered in such leaf never fail to sneeze immediately. When the king of Mesopotamia sneezes, acclamations are made in all parts of his dominions. At Dahomey if the king sneezes, all courtiers turn the back, and slap the thigh, and all women of the court touch the ground with their forehead. In Madagascar, if a child sneezes, the mother says: "God bless you." In Florida (1542), if the chief sneezed, the people said: "May the sun guard you; may the sun be with you; may the sun shine on you." Aristotle has a problem why sneezing from noon to midnight was good, but from midnight to noon unlucky. St. Austin says that the ancients were wont to go to bed again if they sneezed while they put on their shoe. Among the Romans and other Europeans, when a man sneezed, there was a custom of saying "God bless you," or otherwise to wish him well. To the inquiry why people say "God bless you" when any one sneezes, the British Apollo, Vol. II. No. 10 (fol., London, 1769), answers: "Violent sneezing was once an epidemic and mortal distemper from whence the custom specified took its rise." In Langley's abridgment of Polydore Virgil, vol. 130, it is said there was a terrible plague whereby many as they sneezed died suddenly, whereof it grew into a custom that they that were present when any man sneezed should say "God help you." The early Christian Church denounced omens from sneezing. In Germany, if a professor sneezes, the students cry good health.

Yawning. — The general belief about yawning is that a spirit jumps down the yawner's throat. So when a Hindu yawns, he snaps his fingers and thumb, apparently the remnant of the elaborate old Pārās plan of driving out a spirit, and repeats God's name. In South India, when a Brahman yawns, to drive away demons and giants, he cracks his fingers to the right and left. The Persians applied yawning to spirit-possession, and the Mussalmān thought Satan leapt into the open mouth.

The Hand. — Spirits were believed to enter the body by the hands. The Pārās believe that unclean spirits enter through the nails. They think the dhrūkḥa nānus, or spirit of corruption, passes from the corpse into the nails, and so Pārās bearers always draw bags or fingerless gloves over their hands. The Hindus attach much importance to the hand and forearm. The hand and forearm are in Gujārat and the Bombay Dakhan carved on satī stones — that is, stones raised in memory of a widow who has been sacrificed, — and the forearm of a woman who has died in child-bed is a most precious possession both to Hindu and to Mexican seersers. In the Kōtikan, sometimes the medium takes hold of the little finger to see whether it is a jāhā or some other bādī that has taken possession of a man, and among the Dakhan Rāmōs when an exorcist is called, he squeezes the patient's finger. The hand is a sign of blessing. Compare the Sati's hand and the hand on the wedded Musalmān's back. The Poonā Uchias or pocket-sliters.
strew sand on the spot where the dead breathed his last. They cover the spot with a basket, and next morning lift the basket. They trust to find the mark of a palm. The palm shows the dead is pleased, and from the palm virtue goes out over the whole family. The Poona Thakurs, a wild tribe, on the fifth day after the birth of a child, dip a hand in red powder and water, and mark it on the wall in the lying-in room, and worship the mark. When the Belgaum Bhoi or fisher agrees to break his family ties, to renounce the pleasures of the world, to obey the teacher or guru, and to follow him wherever he goes, the guru lays his hand on the Bhoi's head and says: "Rise; from this day you are my disciple." The Bijapur Liingayats at the festival called Nandi-kada along with the Nandi's horn carry a hand which they call Vyasanta, or the hand of Vyasa the Puran writer. All Brahmans, while performing their sandhya or prayer, pass the thumb over the other fingers, and repeat a verse. In his evening prayer a Brahman, after praying the goddess Gayatri to enter him, cracks his fingers ten times, and shuts all the openings into the body, so that Gayatri cannot get out. The origin of the special respect which is paid to the hand may be that the wrist contains the pulse, an important sign of life, or, according to the early view, one of the chief spirits which lodge in the body of man. Hindus generally feel the pulse and draw blood from the forearm. Among the Jews the right hand was an emblem of fellowship. Abraham says: "I have lifted my right hand." Egyptians, hands and fingers were dedicated to the gods who healed the sick. Among the Ainos of Japan, when one who has been away comes back, his friends take his hands and rub them. Among the Niam-Niam of Africa there is a fashion of grasping right hands in such a way that the two middle fingers crumble. The Romans usually joined right hands in sign of a bargain; so did the Parthians and Persians. The hand of justice was a part of the regalia of the Holy Roman Empire. Among the Roman Catholics, in the service of the Mass, after the priest has elevated the Host, he never disjoins his fingers and thumbs, except when he is to take the Host, till after washing his fingers. The laying on of hands at a Roman Catholic Baptism implies possession by God, and in an adult Baptism the laying on of hands drives out the devil. In the solemn plighting of troth in the Roman Catholic marriage the bride and bridegroom join their right hands. In Middle Age Europe, the thumb was held sacred and worshipped as thumbboin polluit. Licking or biting thumbs was a sign of challenge, promise, or agreement among the English and Scotch. In a fit of convulsion or shortness of breath hold your left thumb with your right hand. It may be suggested that the idea that spirits enter by the hands explains the old English practice of giving presents of gloves at marriages and at funerals. So Mr. Cornelius Bee was buried on the 4th of January, 1671, without sermon, without wine; only gloves and rosemary. The custom of giving gloves at weddings was prevalent in England. Hutchinson, in his History of Northumberland, says: "Children to avoid danger are taught to double the thumb within the hand. This was much practised whilst the terror of witchcraft remained." It was also the custom to fold the thumbs of dead persons within the hands to prevent the power of evil spirits over the deceased. In some parts of England, it is believed that the clergymans touch cures rheumatism, and in North-West England, a child's right hand is not washed that it may gather riches.
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The Foot. — The foot is a great spirit-enter. So in the Mahabharata, in the tale of Nala and Damayanti, it is stated that one day Nala washed his hands and lips with purifying water, but forgot to wash his feet, and so the evil spirit Kaali entered his body. Among the higher class Hindus of Bombay, when the bridegroom comes to the bride's house, the father-in-law washes his feet. No Hindu will take his meals without washing his hands and feet; and among the higher class Hindus, when a man goes to a house of mourning, or where a death has taken place, on his return home he does not enter his house until he has washed his hands and feet. If he enters the house without washing his feet, it is considered unlucky, and he is blamed by the elderly members of his house for coming in with bhurula pāl or (spirit) laden feet. In Dhārwar, rheumatism is cured by a person who was born feet first, by rubbing the place that pains with his feet. Among the Lingayats in the Bombay Karnataka, and among the Saivas and Vaishnavas in Bombay Kānara, the religious teacher or guru washes his feet in water, and the disciples drink the water, and are purified, — that is, are freed from evil spirits. Among the Dhārwar Lingayats, when a child is born, a Lingayat priest is called, his feet are washed in water, and the water is called dālīvalodah, or feet-dust water. The water is rubbed over the bodies of those present, and a few drops of it are sprinkled on the walls to purify the house. When a Dhārwar Lingayat dies, the chief priest lays his right foot on the head of the body, and the mathapati, or Lingayat headdress, lays flowers and red powder on the priest's feet. When the dead is buried, the priest stands on the grave, a coconut is broken at his feet, flowers and red powder are laid on them, and the party return home. Among the Jadars of Belgaum the Lingayat priest lays his foot on the head of the deceased. In Kānara, the Śena vi gur has his followers water to drink in which his feet have been washed. Before the body of a Medar, or Kānara bamboo-worker, is carried to the burial ground, a Lingayat priest sets his right foot on the head of the corpse. The priest's foot is worshipped by the relations of the dead, and washed, and the water is poured into the corpse's mouth. The Hāvīg Brāhmaṇas of Kānara drink the water in which their guide has washed his feet. The Kānara Musalmāns tie the great toes of the dead tightly together. In Kāthiawar, men take an oath by putting the hand on Siva's foot. The Jogis of Kāthiawar brand the right front toe before burial. Spirits enter by the foot-route, and so in Kāthiawar, in their pregnancy ceremony, Rajput women walk on cloth. It is apparently to keep out spirits that, among the Mundas and Oraons of South-West Bengal, the bridegroom treads on the bride's feet during the marriage ceremony. The Gond bridegroom sets his foot on the bride's feet, and a chicken is killed, and the body laid under the girl's feet. The Kur fathers-in-law wash the feet of the young couple. The Bhāyas of Bengal place the toes of a new king on their ears and head. In worshipping a Brāhmaṇa woman in Bengal, women paint the edges of her feet. Śidrās in Bengal carry a cup filled with water, and ask Brāhmaṇas to put their toes in, and they drink the water. In magic the sorcerer orders the spirit in the name of the teacher's feet. With the Hindus one of the first duties of hospitality is to give the guest pādya or water to wash his feet. In the Padma Purāṇa, the great king of Līlīja falls on his face before an ascetic, washes his feet, drinks some of the water, and puts more on his head. The Parāś rule, that one should never walk barefoot, is, perhaps, due to the
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supposition that the foot is a spirit-entry. The great toe of Pyrrhus, the Persian king, cured spleen, and was kept in a temple. Among the Beni-Irāil the feet of the bride and bridgroom are washed by the girl's sister at her house. Burmese women are careful to cover the feet while praying. The Burmese king never walks when he is out of doors. The emperor of Japan never touches ground with his feet out of doors. Before the revolution of 1868 the emperor of Japan used never to leave his palace or be seen. If he walked, as he rarely did, mats were laid to keep him from touching the earth. The Samoan bride and her party walk on path-way of cloth. The knees and ankle-joints of Mota children are often tied round with a piece of string or bark. In the Kongo country, when the chief drinks, his big toes are pulled. The big toe is worshipped in Egba, in Africa. In East Africa, the Wataitas believe that strangers passing through their fields with shoes on bring witchery on the crops. It seems to be a widespread belief that the stains of battle or any blood-stains give the spirit of the dead an inlet through which he can enter and haunt the body of the person who killed them. Among the Basutos of South Africa warriors returning from battle must wash to cleanse the blood-stains, or the shades of their victims will disturb their sleep. They wash in a stream and have holy water sprinkled over them from a cow's tail. So Hector cannot pray till he has washed off the blood, and Aeneas may not touch the household gods till he has bathed in the running stream. According to Pliny, a maiden's toe cures a man in falling sickness. To cure fever rub the soles with blood. In an old-fashioned Russian adoption ceremony the adopting father puts his foot on his adopted son's neck. The Celts in West Europe (B.C. 200 to A.D. 600) used for coronations stones with feet carved on them. In a Roman Catholic Baptism the priest goes outside of the Church to meet the person, because he is still the slave of sin, and cannot be allowed into the House of God, that is, because with him evil spirits would come in. At the coronation feast of Elizabeth, wife of Henry VII, two lords sat at her feet under the table.

The Ear.—The ear is a spirit-entry, and so perhaps the Hindus pierce the ears of their children, and put in gold or pearl ornaments to keep off spirits. It is deemed unlucky not to bore the ear of an infant, and orthodox Brahmins consider it wrong and polluting to touch a child whose ears are not bored after they have bathed and before they have taken their morning meals. Among several classes of Goas in Belgaum, ear-boring is one of the chief ceremonies. The Divris, a Marathi-speaking class of drumming beggars in Belgaum, bore their children's ears at twelve, and the teacher or guru puts in the holes a pair of light silver rings. Among the Belgaum Mudliars even the poorest must wear an ornament in the ear. Among the half Marathi Rajputs of Belgaum women bore ten holes in each ear in which they wear gold rings stuck with pearls. Among the Roman Catholics of Kannara, at Baptism, the priest touches a child's nostrils and ears with spittle. Among the Dhuru Prabhu of Poona, when the boy reaches the bride's house, his brother comes out and pierces his ears, and in return is given a turban, and among the Kōnkī Kolla of Poona, when the bridgroom reaches the bride's marriage porch he is met by her brother, who pierces the bride.
The ear cleansing or tān-paukaṇāt. The priest breathes some words into the child’s ear, and the ear is clean — that is, the evil spirits are driven out of it. So among the Dakhan Mhrs, when a child is to be initiated, the gurrū takes it on his knee, breathes into both its ears, and mutters some mystic words into the right ear. When performing religious ceremonies, if a Brahman sneezes, or spits, he must touch his right ear. According to the rule of Sūtras after sneezing, spitting, blowing the nose, sleeping, dressing and crying, a man should touch his right ear before he spits water. This was probably to keep spirits from getting in by the ear. The Brahmins state the object was to remove impurity (that is, to scare evil spirits), the reason they assign being that water or the Ganges, the Vedas, the sun, the moon and the air live in a Brahman’s right ear. When a Beni-Isrā’īl child is brought in after taking it out of doors for the first time it is laid on a sheet with seven or nine pinches of gram round it and two pieces of cocoon-kernel. Several children come up, take the babe by the ear, and say: “Come and eat rice-cakes,” and pick up some of the boiled gram, and as they run out, they are struck on the back by a knotted handkerchief. Among the Beni-Isrā’īlīs, when the bridegroom enters the girl’s house her brother squeezes his right ear. Aaron’s right ear was marked with blood; so was his right thumb and his right great toe. Ear-boring is an important ceremony in a Burman girl’s life. They put jewels, amber and glass ornaments in the ear. The Polynesian’s bore the lobe of the ear to wear ornaments. The Papuans of North Guinea pierce the ear, and insert ornaments of tobacco rolled in a Pandan leaf. The men of the Arra Islands in the west of New Guinea drill four or five holes in their ears, and fill them with pieces of brass wire, and the women make many holes and draw through them copper or tin wire, and sometimes a sea plant which is also used as an armlet. Boring large holes in the ear is a great point of honour with the Philippine Islanders. The Nubian men wear one ear-ring of silver or copper in the right ear. The Waggoes of East Africa enlarge ear lobes to a monstrous extent, and put in rings. In England, a pig used to be cured of lameness by making a hole in its ear.

The Nose. — Spirits enter through the nose, and so when a medium in the Koshkān wishes to get his familiar spirit to enter his body he invariably sniffs a flower. Most Hindu women bore their left nostrils, and put gold and pearl rings in them. Sometimes, when a male infant dies soon after birth, or suffers from sickness, Hindu women make a vow to a goddess, that if their son lives, or does not suffer from sickness, they will bore his nose and put in a nose-ring. The Mādhrā Brahman women of Dhāwār bore their nostrils and wear one or other of the following ornaments, viz., mukhrās, a gem-studded gold nose-ring; bulak, a gem-studded crescent worn in the central cartilage of the nose; mughālīs, a thick pin worn in the left nostril; and aroandans, a gem-studded gold crescent worn in the right nostril. Dhāwār Rājput women wear a nose-ring about six inches in diameter, part of the ring passes through a hole in the left nostril, and part is lifted up and tied by a string to the hair above the forehead. At a Baptism among the Kānāra Roman Catholics the priest touches the child’s nostrils and ears with spittle, and then he orders the evil spirit to leave the child, and rubs a
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little oil at the middle of the collar bone and at the end of the spine. All Brāhmaṇas in their sandhyā or daily prayer press their nose with their fingers and hold the breath. So in his daily prayer an ascetic holds his nostril with one hand, and puts the other on his head. The Hindus require that if a person kills insects he must repeat a verse and squeeze his nose. A man, who can draw breath from the lower part of the body and raise it to the head, can never sicken, is free from hunger and death, and is above the gods. Among the Australians the nose is almost always bored, and a long bone thrust through it. Dying their nose is quite a ceremony with the aborigines of Central Australia, and once a year hundreds of them gather together in order to bore the noses of the younger men. The Papuans of New Guinea pierce the central cartilage of the nose and put in a piece of stick, bone, or hog's tusk.

5. Spirit Seasons.

The months of the daksīṇāyan or southing sun, that is, the declining sun, are considered unlucky by the Hindus, and during these months no thread-girding or marriage ceremonies are performed. The gates of heaven are closed, and Vishnu, the guardian deity, is believed to sleep for four months; consequently the influence of spirits is greater during the southing than during the northing sun. Pūrṇapācha, or the departed ancestor’s fortnight, when the spirits of all the dead come on earth, also falls in the daksīṇāyan or southing months. All Tuesdays, Saturdays, Sundays, new-moon and full-moon days, and the nine days of the month of Ashwin (October-November), called the Navarātra or nine nights are times on which spirits are specially numerous and aggressive. Other occasions on which spirits are likely to attack, are on great social events, as birth, thread-girding, marriage, coming of age, pregnancy and death; also during eating, meeting and bargaining, and in all times of prosperity.

Eating. — Dinner is a spirit-time, and so all Brāhmaṇas before taking their meals sprinkle a circle of water round their dishes, put five pinches of food to the right of their dish, and sip water. The several rites observed before a Brāhmaṇa caste feast is begun seem to find their explanation in the belief that at the time of eating there is special risk of spirit attacks. Round each dish lines of quartz or red powder are drawn, and incense sticks, fixed in small pieces of plantain, are kept burning. The host goes round to each guest, pours a spoonful of the holy water into his right hand, rubs his brow with sandal or saffron paste, and lays a basil leaf or a flower in his hand. Then, while the family priest repeats verses, the host sprinkles water on the guests and dishes, and taking a little water and sandal-paste in a ladle throws it on the ground. The family priest calls aloud the name of the family god, and the host and guests join in the shout “Har, Har, Māhādev.” At the end of the dinner betelnuts and leaves, and copper or silver coins, are handed to the guests, scented oils and powders are rubbed on their arms, and garlands of flowers and nosegays are placed in their hands. As the priest-guests leave, they throw grains of rice over the host’s head. In Bombay, when a horse takes his food on a new-moon night, the horse-keeper lays a cloth over his withers. The Telugu Brāhmaṇas of Poona repeat the name of Govind before they begin dinner. The Poona Sāvīs at the beginning of dinner shout out “Har, Har, Māhādev,” and when half finished chant verses. Dakhan Mhārs never eat without first saying the word kṛishārpaṇ, or dedicated to the god Krishna. Among the Kavatāṣṭa Kunbis one of the guru’s or teacher’s chief rules is that the disciples should not eat while a dead neighbour is unburred, or go on eating after the light is put out. The Kulichārī Hatgars, a class of Brāhmaṇic hand-loom weavers in Belgaum, dine in silk or freshly washed cotton, offer some of the food to the gods, lay out some pinches, and make a circle
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of water round the plate.\textsuperscript{22} Karnāṭak Vaiśyas take three sips of holy water, and make fresh sect marks before eating.\textsuperscript{23} In Bengal, no Brāhmaṇ will eat unless he weals his sacred thread, and no Vaiśya without putting on a fulaśi necklace.\textsuperscript{24} The Jeun Kurnars of Coorg pronounce Kālī's name over their food.\textsuperscript{25} The Paleyas, a wild Coorg class, call on their gods Galiga, Khorti, and Kalwiti when eating.\textsuperscript{26} In Mecca, after dinner, rosewater is sprinkled on the boards of guests, and aloeswood is burnt before them.\textsuperscript{27} The Persians say a prayer before eating, and observe inviolable silence during the repast.\textsuperscript{28} In China, besides pouring out wine, the feast is begun by a drink; so also among the Persians.\textsuperscript{29} Dr. Livingstone says the Balondas of South Africa returned to a thicket when porridge was cooked, and all stood up and clapped their hands.\textsuperscript{30} The Musalmāns of Morocco begin their meals in God's name, and end with a wash and thanks to God.\textsuperscript{31} The New Caledonian women never drink facing a medicine man (wizard), but always turn their backs towards him.\textsuperscript{32} That the Romans shared the experience that dinner was a spirit-time, is shown by their crowning their heads with chaplets of bay and laurel, and fastening a rose over the table.\textsuperscript{33} Burton\textsuperscript{44} (1621 A.D.) notices two cases — one of a nun who ate a lettuce without saying grace or making the sign of the cross, and was instantly possessed; and another by eating an unhallowed pomegranate. The Greek and Roman offerings of meat and drink before or after meat, and the English leaving part of a dish for Lady Manners were due perhaps to the belief that spirits enter at food-time. So also the Roman Catholic practice of making the sign of the cross before eating, and the Protestant rule of grace before meat may be attributed to the same belief.\textsuperscript{55}

**Times of Meeting and Bargain.** — Spirits are likely to attack at the time of bargaining. So the Bombay Baniās, at the time of making a bargain, conceal their hands under a cloth, and the Dakhan Chitāpāvan at a wedding closes the bargain with the musicians by giving each a betel-nut.\textsuperscript{66} Among the Chitāpāvan, when the betrothal ceremony is over, the fathers of the bride and bridegroom tie to the hems of each other's garments five betel-nuts and five pieces of turmeric, and at a Chitāpāvan wedding, when the girl is formally given, the father of the girl pours over the hand of the boy a ladleful of water.\textsuperscript{67} Among the Karnāṭak Madhava Brāhmaṇs when the bride's father finally agrees to give his daughter to the bridegroom, he ties turmeric roots, betel-nuts and rice into a corner of the bridegroom's shoulder cloth.\textsuperscript{68} The Afghans swear to a contract over a stone.\textsuperscript{69} In making a covenant the Jews cut a beast in two, and make the parties pass between the parts.\textsuperscript{70} In Lancashire, when you buy cattle, you should always get back a little coin for luck.\textsuperscript{71} The Hindus repeat the names of their gods when they meet one another. Thus, the Gujarāt Hindus say: "Jai Gopāl, or victory to Gopāl," and the Dakhan Hindus say: "Rām, Rām, or victory to Rām." The original object of this may, perhaps, be to scare spirits. The Aborigines of the Andamans salute by lifting up their leg and slapping the thigh.\textsuperscript{72}

**Auspicious Events.** — On all occasions of joy and mirth, as birth, marriage, coming of age, and pregnancy, the influence of spirits is great, — that is, men are more likely to be attacked on such occasions than at other times. The fifth and sixth nights after a birth are held in dread by all Hindus.\textsuperscript{73} Spirits are likely to attack at the time of a wedding: so among
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the Ratnagiri Marathas at their wedding, when the lucky moment comes, the priest shouts
"take care," the guests clap hands, and when the people outside hear the clapping they fire
guns. The reason why they fire guns is to keep off Kali. If they did not frighten Kali he
would seize the bride and bridegroom or their fathers and mothers. Whoever Kali seizes
falls senseless or in a fit. The Mangellas, Punjagis and Vadvals of Thapp have a strong
belief that at the lucky moment the bride and bridegroom or their parents are likely to be
attacked by spirits, and especially among the Mangellas frequent cases occur in which the
bridegroom or his father or mother get possessed, or fall in a fit just when the lucky moment
comes. To this day the Swedish bridegroom has a great fear of the trolls and spirits which
inhabit Sweden. As an antidote he sews into his clothes strong-smelling herbs, such as garlic,
cloves, and rosemary, and the young women carry boughs of these, and deck themselves with
loads of jewellery, gold bells and gretots as large as apples. Coming of age and pregnancy
are also times at which spirits attack men. At her coming of age the Chitpavan girl is treated
with special care. She is seated in a wooden frame with lamps on either side, is
decorated with flowers and ornaments, and is feasted with rich dishes. A Chitpavan girl who
is pregnant is not allowed to let her hair fall loose, or to go out of doors, or to sit under a
tree, or to ride on a horse or an elephant. The Hottentots make their boys men at a feast,
where oxen and sheep are slaughtered. Among the New Caledonians a girl's first monthly
sickness is much feared; when the first periodical sickness comes on, the girls are fed by their
mothers or nearest female relations, and on no account will they touch their food with their
own hands. They are at this time also careful not to touch their heads, and keep a small
stick to scratch their heads with. They remain outside the lodge all the time they are in this
state, in a hut made for the purpose. During all this period they wear a skull-cap made of
skin; this is never taken off until their first monthly sickness ceases; they also wear a strip of
black paint, about one inch wide, across their eyes, and hang a fringe of shells and bones.
Their reason for hanging fringes before their eyes is to hinder any bad medicine man harming
them during this critical period. In building or entering a new house or church there is a
danger of spirits attacking the enterer; so the Hindis perform a ceremony, called vasā
śādāti or quieting of the spirit Vāstu, before coming to live in a newly built house. The first
person who enters a new church in Germany becomes the property of the devil. So they send
in a pig or a dog.

Among Hindus, at the beginning of any work, Ganpati, the lord of the ganas or troops is
invoked, and some propitiatory rites are performed. All beginnings are special spirit-times.
So Hindus take care to wear new clothes on a lucky day, and when they wear a new cloth
they apply a little red powder to its edges, and sometimes offer a few threads from the clothes
to their family god. In Bulgaum, where a Chitpavan gets a new waist cloth before he puts it
on he rubs turmeric and red powder on the corners. He then folds it, and lays it before the
house gods, praying them to give him a better one next year. He finally lays it across a
horse's back before he puts it on. Dhūravā Mādha Brahmanas, especially the women, will
not take a new robe as a present unless the giver marks it with red powder. In Scotland,
when a child wears new clothes for the first time, other children or the elders of the house pinch
him, giving him what is called a tailor's nip. "A nip for new, a bite for blue" is a Durham
rhyme for wearing new clothes. Originally, at the time of wearing a new coat, a glass of
liquor was given, and if the wearer refused, a button was cut off. On the Scottish borders
people never put on a new coat without putting money in the right pocket.
New-moon and Full-moon days. — Spirits are believed to be more numerous and dangerous on new-moon and full-moon days than at other times. This belief is general among Hindu physicians from their experience that men suffering from special diseases have a great fear that their sickness will increase on the days of new and full moon. On all new-moon days Brähmans offer water and sesame seed to their ancestors; and those who are very pious, called agnikotis or fire-sacrificers, kindle a sacred fire on all new-moon and full-moon days. Dhárāwás Radders on all, except the December new-moon, offer fried cakes to the goddess Lakshamāva, and throw cakes to the four quarters of heaven. In Southern India, on all new-moon days, Brähmans offer sesame seed and water to their dead father, grandfather, and great-grandfather. On those new-moon and full-moon days on which an eclipse takes place the influence of spirits is said to be exceedingly high; on these days Hindus dip their household gods in water that they may not be defiled, and lay sacred grass blades or basil leaves on their own clothes and food. When the eclipse is over, all bathe, and change their sacred thread, and any cooked food that may be in the house is thrown away. On eclipse-days many exorcists and wizards stand in water and repeat or study the mantras or incantations which give them power over spirits, and all new candidates for the study of exorcism, sorcery or witchcraft are initiated on eclipse days. The washermen of Mysore on the new-moon a shapeless stone, and occasionally feast in honour of deceased ancestors. Among the Musalmāns, on the new-moon which comes after the new year, the blood of a goat is sprinkled on the sides of their doors. Fryer (p. 94) says (in 1673) on a new-moon night the Musalmān widows of Surat used to go to the grave to repeat a doleful dirge, and bestowed a sacramental wafer, and asked their prayers for the dead. No young Musalmān girl will go out either on a new-moon or on a Thursday evening.

The Musalmāns of the Maldive Islands rejoice when they see the new moon, and offer him incense, and fire guns. At the sight of the new moon the Hottentots crowd together, make merry all night, dance, jump, and sing. According to Pliny, monkeys and marmosets are sad and heavy in the wave of the moon, but adore and joy at the new moon, testifying their delight by hopping and dancing. The Peravians had a yearly water-sprinkling on the first day of the September moon.

Besides new-moon and full-moon days the other Hindu special spirit-days are Tuesdays, Saturdays and Sundays, the day on which the sun enters the sign of Capricorn, nine days in the month of Āṣvin (October-November), and the pitripaksha or ancestor’s fortnight in the month of Bhādrapada or September. Hindu children are not allowed to go out at noon or in the evening on a Tuesday, lest they may be attacked by spirits who go on circuit at that time. New year’s day and the days at the end of the year are also days on which spirits are numerous. So all Hindus in the Koṅkān, on new year’s day, rub their bodies with oil and sesameum, bathe, and then eat sugar and nut leaves. Among the Halvaki Vakkals of Kānara, on the (April) new year’s day or yugade, commemorative rites for all the spirits of the dead are performed. On the five extra days of the Persian year spirits come back to earth. Among the Egyptians there were three unlucky or black days which were dangerous to man. Among the Chinese the beginning and end of the year together form a great spirit season. On the last day of the year, which is the day of the (dead) head of the house, the Chinese burn incense before their family tablets, and before dawn go to a temple, burn incense,
and then visit friends and drink rice liquor. In the temple they make offerings of flesh, fowls and fruit, and make a troublesome noise with Chinese drums and fire-works. Illuminations begin on the first of the year, and on the thirteenth is a great feast of lanterns. On new-year's day the Chinese remain awake to keep spirits from coming. In Scotland, the month of May is unlucky; so it was in Rome. In Northumberland, the first man who came in after the old year was dead brought a shovel of coal or whisky. In England, in 1450, the twenty-eighth of every month was held unlucky. In Saxon England, the last Monday of April, the beginning of August, and the first Monday of December were unlucky. It is unlucky to marry on Friday according to Christian tradition because Christ was crucified on Friday. The time of death is a great spirit-time. In Coorg it is believed that demon-spirits, called Kuli, carry off ancestral spirits at the hour of death. If people think that a demon has carried off an ancestor, they go to a medium who has power over the demon, and beg him to force the demon-spirit to let the ancestral ghost free. The people of the house sit round the medium, who throws a handful of rice on them, and the ancestral spirit lights on the back of one of them, who falls into a swoon and is carried into the house. When the possessed person recovers, the spirit is supposed to have gained its right place in one of the family. If mourners come from a distance to redeem the soul of the dead, they do not fall in a swoon, but the moment the spirit gets on the back of one of them all hurry home without looking back till the spirit and his carrier are safe in the family. The belief that death makes the house unclean by turning it into an abode of bodiless spirits remains in England slightly Christianised. In Northumberland, the wrath of God rests on the death-visited house till the clergyman has come. Formerly the clergyman blessed a house after a death. Times of prosperity or triumph are special spirit-times. The Hindu on any accession of fortune must perform mind-rites or śrāddhas to his ancestors. Among the Hottentots the triumphing warrior is met by girls who sing, the priest cuts marks on his chest, and he is given a new name. Among the Romans the triumphing hero was crowned with laurels, and close behind him Conscience in the form of a slave whispered "thou too art mortal."*

(Folklore in Southern India.

By Pandit S. M. Natesa Sastri, B.A., M.F.I.S.

No. 45. The Story of Kēkāvā.

A Variant of the Inexhaustible Day.

In the declining days of the Dvāparayuga there lived, in a certain village near the Kollimalai Mountains, a poor Brahman family, consisting of a husband and wife and half a dozen children. Most of the inhabitants of the village were more or less poor, and the poorest of all were the family just mentioned. Almost every day the father would go out begging and return with enough rice for a thin gruel. The hungry children had their portions first, and whatever remained was shared between the parents. None of these children was able to help the family in any way, as the eldest was a boy of only thirteen years of age. For what after all could a Brahman boy of thirteen do in the way of helping his family? For the caste rules at the end of the Dvāparayuga were very strict. He could not dig nor bear a burden nor do any labour which could bring one or two jānams as wages. The only assistance he could

4 Henderson's Folk-Lore, p. 31.
5 Dyer's Couns., p. 109.
7 Henderson's Folk-Lore, p. 53.
8 Hahn's Tami Goan, p. 23.
14 From MS notes.
render was to accompany his father with a begging bowl, and this he sometimes did. Thus the family had very hard days to struggle with, and at last the pangs of hunger had become so great that the mistress of the family took her lord apart one day and spoke to him thus with her eyes swimming in tears:

"O Kēśāva, how long are we to endure this misery? Day after day and month after month, I have been most anxiously looking forward for a mitigation of our sufferings. But the great God has not yet been pleased. Surely we must have been the greatest of sinners in our previous births, and we must now try our best to alleviate our hardships by some penance. I will try my best to collect whatever may come in the shape of alms and maintain the children while my lord should go to some unfrequented spot in a remote jungle in the Kōllimajāi mountains and there propitiate the deity in such a way that our poverty will be removed from us in this birth. We must live above want for at least a few days before we die."

"Agreed," said Kēśāva, and on that very day he started for the Kōllimajāi mountains. He chose an unfrequented spot. Tigers and bears were howling round about him, but he did not consider them more dangerous than hunger. He sat down, motionless as the stump of a tree, with closed eyes. Birds warbled sweet notes round about him and beasts of prey howled, but he heeded nothing. His whole attention was in the contemplation of God. For months he remained in the same posture. His eyes once closed were never opened. He became absorbed in contemplation, and whether he suffered from hunger or thirst he never knew. Creepers sprouted up round about him, and encircled his neck, and birds built their nests on his hair. Thus passed ten months.

On the first day of the eleventh month a certain person in the garb of a mendicant stood before Kēśāva and asked him to open his eyes. Kēśāva obeyed and saw a most holy person standing in the shape of a sanyāsin before him. He felt himself to be in the same state of health as when he had sat down for penance, but he knew not how long ago. The mendicant ordered Kēśāva to relate his story. "My lord," said Kēśāva, "I am a pauper with half a dozen children. They are all dying of hunger. Give me enough to feed them on and to live above want. That is all my prayer."

"Undoubtedly, your request will be granted," said the great God, for it was no other than the Almighty himself who had come down in the shape of a sanyāsin. Having thus spoken, he placed on Kēśāva's head a bag of rice and ordered him to go home. He then disappeared. Kēśāva was greatly pleased at the dawn of divine favour on him, and, though weak, he had strength enough for the journey. He was very intelligent, and understood at once that the sanyāsin before him was the great God himself.

So Kēśāva returned home with joy and reached his house at evening. He called aloud to his wife by name, and asked her to help him in taking the bag down from his head. She did so, but when he lifted up his head there was another rice-bag on it! That too was soon brought down. And as soon as it was taken down, there appeared a third bag. A fourth, fifth, sixth, bag appeared in succession, and were taken down, and then the matter grew hopeless. Bags began to appear ad infinitum, and poor Kēśāva had no time to be relieved of his burden or to go in to refresh himself. He was thoroughly exhausted, and asked his wife to go in and give him something to eat, while he remained outside with his burden.

Of course, there was no rice at home, but his wife took a small quantity from one of the bags, and ground it into flour in a hand-mill. She collected the flour, but, though the whole quantity was collected into a small heap, more still kept lying round the mill! She now divided the secret and cooked what she had already collected into a cake in all haste, and returned to her lord with it and a little water to drink.

Kēśāva was standing with both his hands uplifted holding up the bag. So his wife broke a portion of the cake and thrust the bit into his mouth. She also gave him a spoonful of
water to help him to chew it. With all the difficulty of a heavy burden on his head Kêśava managed to chew the bit of cake and thus swallowed his first nourishment for ten months. As soon as the first mouthful was gulped down, what was his wonder to feel a similar bit of cake still in his mouth. He showed it to his wife and she at once became alarmed. She gave him, however, another spoonful of water. Soon the second bit also was chewed and swallowed down. But again a similar bit appeared. His suspicions were now confirmed. Without end bit after bit of the same size as the first appeared in his mouth. He became exhausted after swallowing a dozen and fell down dead on the ground with the bag still sticking to his head, like a tree cut at the root.

The sorrow of the poor wife can be better imagined than described. The hundred bags of rice already lowered down from Kêśava's head were lying in piles. She had given him only a bit of a single cake, and that had multiplied itself into a dozen and killed her lord. There he was lying — a corpse with the horrible bag still sticking to his head.

The villagers had of course assembled and seen everything that had transpired. To a certain extent they understood it and looked upon the death of Kêśava as a great calamity. But the dead body had to be cremated. So they made arrangements and prepared a bier of green leaves, and set on it the body which had the bag still sticking to its head. Four stout men bore it to the cremation ground. The funeral pile was ready and the burden was set down. But there was at once a similar burden on their shoulders. They threw it down and again a similar burden appeared. They were bewildered and soon there were one hundred dead bodies of Kêśava lying on the ground, and still there appeared to be no hope at all of the matter coming to an end. They cursed themselves for having thus got themselves involved in Kêśava's affairs. The whole village was horror-struck.

It was at this moment that a sânyâsî suddenly made his appearance on the cremation ground. He approached the astonished villagers, and enquired of them the cause of their misery, and they related the whole story.

"Very well, my friends! Can you point out the original body of Kêśava which you brought here from his house?" said the mendicant.

The villagers tried their best, but could not succeed, for one body was so like the other. They pleaded their inability. The mendicant then poured a pot full of water on all the dead bodies, when they all disappeared, and the original Kêśava rose up with the bag still on his head. The astonished villagers now regarded the mendicant as a God sent to help them, if not the very God himself, and followed him with Kêśava and his bag to Kêśava's house. There they found Kêśava's wife just recovering from her swoon, and on hearing the story of her lord's return, she fell down on the feet of the mendicant and begged of him to grant her her lord without the bag on his head.

"I shall do more than that for you, madam!" said the sânyâsî. He threw a handful of water on Kêśava's head, and the bag dropped down.

The mendicant next demanded the original bag that was brought from the Kêlîlimajâi mountains to be pointed out to him. Here, too, there was the same inability and failure. So the mendicant poured a vessel full of water on all the bags, and they all disappeared, leaving only one behind, which was the original bag.

"Let this single bag be emptied in your granary, and the contents of your granary will never decrease. The quantity that you take out will at once be replenished and there, and thus you will live above want."

Saying thus the sânyâsî vanished, and the whole village understood that it was all the work of God. They praised Kêśava for his devotion and good luck, and ever after Kêśava lived a happy man with his wife and children, and beyond want.
NOTES AND QUERIES.

BURNING IN EFFFIGY.

Lately three convicts in Fort Blair from Northern India had a dispute with a fourth, and were caught trying to wreak vengeance on him as follows:—

They made a figure of straw, to which they gave his name, and abused and beat it with shoes. Finally, they took it to a latrine where they made water on it, and were about to burn it, when the authorities came upon the scene and necessarily interfered.

R. C. TEMPLE.

A NOTION AS TO THE PLAGUE IN BOMBAY.

This is what I recently heard from the mouth of an old woman from Bándrá, a village some ten miles from Bombay.

"It is believed that disease says it will go in advance, but so also say the wind and the rain. And thus a constant struggle between the three has always gone on. At length it happened that disease got the better of the other two, and it (to wit: the Plague) came in advance, and played sad havoc throughout the Bombay Presidency. This dire disease had been hardly got rid of, when another followed, namely, cholera, which also carried away people by hundreds. The conflict now only remained between the wind and the rain, both of which wanted to be in advance of the other. The monsoons began early, but as quickly as clouds gathered and it was about to rain, the wind came howling and pressed the clouds onwards, so that the falling of the rain was checked; at least it did not fall in such quantities as it otherwise would have fallen. At times the rain prevailed over the wind, in which case there was a good downpour, with good results to man and beast."

Geo. F. D'Penha.

CORRUPTION OF CHRISTIAN NAMES.

There is a Christian prisoner at Port Blair returned as "Venturasamy alias Chowtan, son of Samuel." Chowtan stands for Sývastán = Sebastían. The ch in Chowtan arises from the well known difficulty that Dravidians have in distinguishing between ch and s.

R. C. Temple.

NOTES ON SOUTHERN INDIA.

The purpose of Herr Schmidt's visit to the Madras Presidency seems to have been to obtain anthropological measurements of the wilder hill tribes still found there, and, generally speaking, to study the characteristics of the different races and classes of people that inhabit the South of India. The measurements are probably reserved for an anthropological journal, but he gives a good many interesting facts about the uncivilised hill peoples.

In some instances he could note a gradual amelioration of condition and a slight rise in the scale of civilisation compared with a century or so ago. For instance, the Kamars of the Tinnevelly District no longer abandon a whole village when a death takes place and form a new settlement at a distance from the old one; nor do they build their straw huts in trees to be out of the reach of tigers and wild elephants, as they did at a very recent date. Like many other degraded races, their muscular system is weak, and, curiously enough, for a jungle people, they seem to be very poor shots with a bow and arrow.

Almost their only industry is basket-making, at which they are proficient. Other necessaries, such as knives, arrow-heads, pottery, and woven stuffs are obtained from Muhammadan pedlars.

At Cochin on the west coast, the Black Jews are so despised by their white co-religionists that regular marriages never take place between them. Yet concubinage between white males and black Jews is far from uncommon, with the result that every gradation of colour from lightest to the darkest is to be found among the Hebrew population.

The Malsers of the Anamala Hills — a short, slight-bodied, brown, forest people — are not, as we might imagine, hunters, but live on roots, chance carcasses, and fish, which they catch in their hands, as they have no nets. They always marry within the village. About a hundred years ago they used to burn their dead, but now this is only done with old people, and the young are buried with the head to the south.

When a Badaga of the Eastern Nilgiri Hills is on the point of death, a small piece of money is placed in the dying man's mouth. He ought to swallow it if possible; but if too weak to do so, it is wrapped up in a piece of cloth and tied to his arm. When dead his body is laid on a pile of wood with his ornaments and implements. Next morning a dance, lasting till midday, is performed by men in front of the pile; the sins of the deceased are then transferred to a calf and the pyre is ignited. On the following day the ashes are thrown into a stream, and the larger bones are covered with large stones.

Geo. F. D'Penha.

1 [This is a characteristic also of all the Andamanese Tribes. — En.]
CURRENCY AND COINAGE AMONG THE BURMESE.

BY R. C. TEMPLE.

(Continued from p. 133.)

C.—Manipur.

The connection between Manipūr and Burma is of old standing, and many groups of Manipūr families are to be found established all over Upper Burma. It is on this account that I have made such enquiries as I could into the interesting, if complicated, puerile, pecuniary, and account notions of the inhabitants of the Manipūr State; an enquiry which is also otherwise of interest, as the conditions therein described are rapidly passing away and will probably have disappeared by the time the present youthful meditated ruler of the State reaches his majority and is emancipated from the leading-strings of his British superintendents. And if, as I think, the Manipūr money system explains the divisions of Akbar's jālīlar, the enquiry becomes of general importance.

My sources of original information as to this language are more limited than one would wish, and consist of:


3. An educated Manipuri.


The Manipūr Language can, however, hardly be said to have been more than superficially studied by any writer whose work I have seen, and so I have felt myself to be at liberty to represent the words thereof in the forms that they appeared to assume to me, irrespective of the statements of others.

---

14 As described in the Ain Akbari and explained in the previous Section of this Chapter.

15 The Census Report, Burma, Vol. I. p. 150, calls the Pūṇās Maipirī Brahmins, following the usual notion on the subject in Burma, and the Kabās captures deported by Shynbyāyin in 1764 A.D.: the Pūṇās being immigrants of an earlier date. However this may be, it is so happened that I saw a good deal of both Pūṇās (Skrt., not ancient, pūṇa, Pali, puṇna, pure) and Kabās while in Mandalay in 1857-58, and to a certain extent won their confidence, visiting their temples, and being admitted to their ceremonies, which are so much to them and were then, at any rate, so carefully hidden from the outer world. I should say, from what I then saw and heard, that the Maipirīs in Burma are divided into Pūṇās, or higher caste Maipirīs, and Kabās, or lower caste or "so caste" Maipirīs. I know that the Pūṇās are not by any means all Brahmins, nor do they at all claim to be of that caste. The majority are among themselves called Sutrīs (Chaturī, i.e., Chhatrīs), and there are other caste distinctions among them. In Manipūr itself the usual caste distinctions are recognised. The Kabā weavers, much Burmanised, of Eastern Mandalay, also recognise differences in caste status amongst themselves, and, beyond their common origin of habitation, had but little connection with the proud and exclusive Pūṇās. Mr. Eales remarks in the Census Report that the reported difference in dialect between Pūṇā and Kabā is more fanciful than real, and is due to the greater Burmanisation of the one class over the other. In this I think he is right. I have no accounts of the Maipirī ceremonies given me by the people, written in the Bengali character, and they are practically the same for both classes. But Mr. Eales seems to think that the Burmanisation has been greatest among the Pūṇās. My experience was just the other way. The Pūṇā, I found, stuck to his race and language: was proud and exclusive and kept his blood pure. The Kabā, on the other hand, was free in his marriage relations and anxious to be absorbed into the prevailing Burmese population: many, to my knowledge, professing Buddhism, as opposed to their own ancestral modified Hinduism, with that object.

The Burmese word Pūṇā is generally translated Brahman, and is perhaps usually understood in that sense vaguely by the Burmese population. In Stevenson's Burmese Dictionary we have Pūṇām, Pūṇa and Pōṇa, translated quaintly "a Brahman." But I do not think that outside of Burma the counterparts of the word have ever signified a Brahman. It has meant "pure, holy, righteous, a performer of the enjoined ceremonies," and was no doubt applied in Burma of old to the soothsayers and performers of ceremonies, who were real or supposed to be Brahmanas, probably the latter.

The very interesting term Kabā, Cassay in many old books, requires an essay to itself for elucidation.
As to the peculiarities appearing in my pages: the palatals ch, j, sh, s, ts, z, seem to be not clearly distinguished by Native speakers. E. g., the same man will say Saurjit, Chaunrij and Chaourz indifferently. So also will he say sal, shai and sal, the é being distinctly palatal; sendhab and sendhib; toby and jip. Similarly the liquids r, l, and n are not easily distinguishable: c. g., lopd and ripó equal "rupee." l and n are mixed up in pronunciation in the manner not at all uncommon in India and Further India. I have not noticed that any one has remarked the existence of sandhi in Manipur, but that it does exist in an irregular form I have little doubt. E. g., sendhab = sal + táb; semmari = sál + maní. So sámá = sál + amá, but on the other hand we have sánt and sahám = sál + ami and sál + akám. And many of the puzzling and unexplained inflectional forms given in the long list of sentences in Primrose's Grammar seem to me to be only explicable on the assumption that sandhi exists in the language. 16

With these preliminary remarks I will plunge into the very troubled waters of Manipur account-keeping.

In Manipur itself there is only one recognised indigenous coin or form of currency, known as sél to Europeans and as makható to the Natives, which is a very small rudimentary bell-metal, i. e., a mixture of brass and tin, usually stamped with the word sér. It will, in the explanations following, be called by its established European name.

I have already shown (ante, Vol. XXVI, p. 290) how the method of calculating the sél is based on the assumption that 400 sél = 5,000 cowries = 1 rupee, about 5,000 cowries to the rupee being of old the ratio of account exchange in these parts. The interesting point for the present purpose is to trace out how it came about that 400 sél were made to equal a rupee and to represent 5,000 cowries.

The standard scale for reckoning cowries is as follows (Prinsep, Useful Tables, p. 2):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4 cowries (kauris)</th>
<th>are 1 gándá</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 gándis</td>
<td>1 pán</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 pán</td>
<td>1 ágá (anna)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

400 cowries to the anna

It will have already been seen that Akbar adopted 400 dánís as the final division of his upper standard money of account, the gold jálála, which corresponded in weight to his upper standard Troy weight, the tóla. It will also have been seen, that the Nepalese

16 Sandhi seems to be heard and seen sometimes in the larger numerals, e. g.,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10 is kud, a score : then</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 is kihád = kud + tóla = a score and ten.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 is siphú, i. e., 2 score :</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 is hámphú, i. e., 3 score : then</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 is hámphudrá (spelt hámphudá), i. e., 3 score and ten:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 is maríphú, i. e., 4 score : then</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90 is maríphudrá, i. e., 4 score and ten.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The philology of Manipuri is no doubt interesting. E. g., there is a clear connection with many surrounding Nága words and with Burmese. It has, for instance, the Burmese accent __; and npá, fish, is spelt in precisely the same way in both tongues. I also found archaisms in it, now lost in Burmese; e. g., the Burmese, pínj, a monk, the pómgy (hard g) and pómny, pójças, of the Anglo-Indian, is spelt bómjá, and is in Manipuri pronounced pómj. I know one official, who, seeing the word spilt pómjáy officially, always called it pómgy; u as in fun, g hard. Just as the engineers on the Myit-ná Bridge, a large work, always called it Mingy; ng as in sing.

17 So written, but the pronunciation is much nearer sel (a palatal).


Bell-metal (sél) is composed of brass and tin.
have adopted the scale of 400 dāmus to their upper standard money of account, the takkā, which is the rupee and which weighs a tōla.

Now it can be shown that there is no doubt about the origin of the Manipuri scale of 400 sōl to the rupee of account being directly due to the system of reckoning 400 cowries to the anna, and the sōl of Manipūr being the dām of Akbar's time and of modern Nepal.

In the first place the sōl are reckoned for account purposes by fours, that is, by the equivalents of gaṇḍa, in precisely the same way as are cowries. The only difference is that one sōl = 12½ cowries, and therefore

- 4 sōl are 50 cowries
- 8 " " 100 "
- 12 " " 150 "
- 80 " " 1,000 "
- 400 " " 5,000 "

Now four sōl are known by the name of "fifty," and multiples of four sōl up to 400 sōl are known by name as multiples of 50; thus, the name for 8 sōl is simply "one hundred:" for 12 sōl "one hundred and fifty:" for 80 sōl "one thousand." A rupee, i.e., 400 sōl, is in reckoning known as "five thousand." This system of naming is not used for the intermediate denominations; i.e., 2 sōl are not called "twenty-five:" nor are 3 sōl called "37½:" nor are 6 sōl called "75." Such denominations have a system of terminology resting on altogether a different basis. It is therefore clear that the sōl are counted by fours, each four being in accounts equal to 50 cowries and called by that name.

The actual nomenclature is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial No. of quartettes</th>
<th>No. of sōl</th>
<th>Name.</th>
<th>Sense of name.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>yāngkhai²⁰ and yāngkhai-amā²¹</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>sāmā²²</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>sāmā yāngkhai</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>sani²³</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>sani yāngkhai</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>sahūm</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>sahūm yāngkhai</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>sāmari</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>sāmari yāngkhai</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

²⁰ To reckon by gaṇḍa is to reckon by fours. Beames' Ed. of Elliot's Glossary, Vol. II. p. 315; Grierson, Bihar Peasant Life, p. 420; Thomas, Pathan Kings, p. 220.
²¹ In the vernacular enumeration given by Primrose, Grammar, p. 36, all these terms are preceded by the word sa: e.g., sa yāngkhai, sa emām: but I did not gather that this is really the custom, except when it is necessary to prevent obvious ambiguity.
²² sāmā, sa, cha, chā is the prefix for 100: cf. Malay sa.
²³ Called by Primrose chau in Roman characters, but chaī in Bengali characters: p. 30.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial No. of quartettes</th>
<th>No. of sêl.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Sense of name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>sâmangå…</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>sâmangå yângkhai</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>sâtaruk</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>sâtaruk yângkhai</td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>sâtarêt</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>sâtarêt yângkhai</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>sânipân²⁴</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>sânipân yângkhai</td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>sâmâpan</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>sâmâpan yângkhai</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>lishing²⁵ and lishing-amâ</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>lishing-ani</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>lishing-ahûm</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>lishing-mari</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>lishing-mangâ²⁶</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following comparison can now be made to clinch the argument as to how the scale of sêl took its particular form:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reckoning by cowries.</th>
<th>Reckoning by sêl.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 kaurla are 1 gañdå</td>
<td>4 sêl are 1 yângkhai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 gañdå , 1 pañ</td>
<td>20 yângkhai , 1 lishing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 pañ , 1 áyã</td>
<td>5 lishing , 1 lipa²⁷</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As I have already pointed out (ante, Vol. XXVI, p. 290), when the revenue of Silhet was paid in cowries, about 5,000 cowries were reckoned to the rupee. The actual reckoning in accounts was 5,120 cowries to the rupee. This came about by the use of another popular scale. In the Lîldvati, as has been explained in the previous Section,

- 20 cowries are 1 kâkiñf
- 4 kâkiñf , 1 pañ
- 16 pañ , 1 dramma

\[1,280\]

²⁵ Spelt lishing and so transcribed by Primrose, p. 30.
²⁶ These terms mean really 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 lishing.
²⁷ Written lîpa. This is the recognised term for a rupee in Manipūr: vide Primrose, Grammar, pp. 332.

It must not be understood that a Manipūr would so express his scale if questioned.
This scale is preserved in modern times thus:—

4 cowries = 1 gauḍā
20 gauḍā = 1 paq
16 paq = 1 kahawas

= 1,280

Now both the kahawas and the dramma of the Līlāvati are quarter rīlas, i. e., they are the equivalents in cowries to the quarter rupee, and therefore by this scale the rupee would be equal to 1,280 \( \times \frac{4}{3} = 5,120 \) cowries.

Both Elliot and Beames\(^{23}\) have long ago explained that the gauḍā of account and the gauḍā of practice have never coincided; nor, as a matter of fact, have any other account and bullion denominations nominally the equivalents of each other. It is so with the sēl. Sēl, in practice as coins, have had no fixed exchange with rupees, but the exchange has varied with the quantities of silver coin in the market from time to time. Thus in 1873 Dr. Brown, Manipur, p. 89, tells us that sēl ran 423 to the rupee,\(^{24}\) the usual variation lying between 420 and 450 to the rupee. The nomenclature of the intermediate denominations of the quartettes of sēl also shows that at one time,—it is not so now, as will be explained later on,—there must have been the same divergence between practice and account as regards sēl as there is as regards gauḍās of cowries. That is, the sēl of account was one half the coined sēl, a fact which affects the mode of enumeration throughout, thus:—In account "one sēl" is called makhā tubą,\(^{25}\) i. e., "a half"; "two sēls" are called sēlamā, i. e., "sēl one"; "three sēls" are called sēlamā makhāi, i. e., "sēl one and a half," and so on through all the minor denominations of each quartette. The full scale of enumeration is a combination of the names of the quartettes of fifties and of the just explained habit of counting the sēl of account as half the coined sēl, thus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Manipuri</th>
<th>Sense of the Manipuri</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 sēl</td>
<td>makhāi sēl</td>
<td>1 half</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 sēl</td>
<td>sēlah sēl and pān āmā</td>
<td>1 sēl and 1 pān āmā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 sēl</td>
<td>sēlamā makhāi</td>
<td>1 sēl and a half</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 sēl</td>
<td>yāngkāi sēl</td>
<td>fifty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 sēl</td>
<td>yāngkāi makhāi</td>
<td>fifty and a half</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 sēl</td>
<td>sēlah sēl</td>
<td>3 sēl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 sēl</td>
<td>sēlah sēl makhāi</td>
<td>3 sēl and a half</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{23}\) Beames' Ed. of Elliot's Glossary, Vol. II. p. 515.


\(^{25}\) That is, the British rupee. Brown says that Burmese (peacock) rupees were also current, but I was assured that it was considered a sin to pass Burmese rupees in Manipur.

\(^{26}\) Makhāi sēl, according to Primrose, p. 90 n., but the expression would be, I gather, incorrect.

\(^{27}\) Also simply makhāi. If it be necessary to prefix sēl to makhāi for the sake of clearness, the term becomes sēl makhāi.

\(^{28}\) The words sēlamā, sēlah sēl, and pān āmā (sēl + makhāi) are treated as one word, i. e., as separate terms in the language.

\(^{29}\) Also simply pān āmā. Kēk is a term for the quarter gauḍā of India, = one in the scale of quartettes, whence possibly pān āmā. Beames' Ed. of Elliot, Glossary, Vol. II. p. 316.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Manipuri</th>
<th>Sense of the Manipuri</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 sēl</td>
<td>sāmā</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>sāmā makhāi</td>
<td>100 and a half</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>senmangā</td>
<td>5 sēl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>senmangā makhāi</td>
<td>5 sēl and a half</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>sāmā yāngkhāi</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>sāmā-yāngkhāi makhāi</td>
<td>150 and a half</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>sani sendābā</td>
<td>200 less a sēl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>sani makhāi-tābā</td>
<td>200 less a half</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>sani</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>sani makhāi</td>
<td>200 and a half</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>sani phai gak</td>
<td>200 and a phai gak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>sani-phai gak makhāi</td>
<td>200 and a phai gak and a half</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>sani yāngkhāi</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>sani-yāng khāi makhāi</td>
<td>250 and a half</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>sāhūm sendābā</td>
<td>300 less a sēl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>sāhūm makhāi-tābā</td>
<td>300 less a half</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>sāhūm</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>sāhūm makhāi</td>
<td>300 and a half</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>sāhūm phai gak</td>
<td>300 and a phai gak</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

And so on up to 32, 40, 48, 56, 64, 72, and 80 sēl, each octave, or double quintette, following the system of nomenclature seen in the octave 16-24.

According to this method of reckoning, the coined parts of the British rupee in silver would show in accounts as follows:

**The Rupee in Manipuri Accounts.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Value in sēl</th>
<th>Manipuri</th>
<th>Sense of the Manipuri</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rupee</td>
<td>400 sēl</td>
<td>lishing mangā</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-anna piece</td>
<td>200 sēl</td>
<td>lishing ani sāmangā</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-anna piece</td>
<td>100 sēl</td>
<td>lishing amā sani yāngkhāi</td>
<td>1,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-anna piece</td>
<td>50 sēl</td>
<td>sātārūk phai gak</td>
<td>600 and a phai gak</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25 Also sātārūk sīmād.
26 The phai gak being 25 cowries, the expression = 625. Its form arises out of the scale just given, by which 50 sēl = 12 quintettes, i.e., 48 + 2 (phai gak) sēl.
And in fact these coins do so show in accounts.

It will be readily understood that such a system of reckoning and such a complicated nomenclature could survive into everyday use in practical life among an essentially uneducated people, only if the real meaning of the terms used be not present in the minds of those who use them. This is the actual fact, and the above enquiry is therefore only useful for the purpose of grasping the meaning and origin of the phenomena of the system.

To the Manipuri, when reckoning money and setting down accounts the terms for his coinage present themselves to his mind merely as abstract words for enumerating it in the quaternary scale: thus:

1 sel is simply a makhai
2 sel are simply a phaigak or selam
4 sel are simply a yangkhai

This can be shown to be the case by the use of the terms

makhai-amā for 1 sel, lit., 1 makhai
phaigak-amā for 2 sel, lit., 1 phaigak
yangkhai-amā for 4 sel, lit., 1 yangkhai

In this way the Manipuri reckons thus:

2 makhai are 1 phaigak\(^{37}\) or half-quarter
2 phaigak are 1 yangkhai or quarter

In the same mental attitude the Manipuri continues his reckoning up to 20 quartertes, which make a lishing, thus:

2 yangkhai are sāmā
4 " sani
6 " sahum
8 " sāmari

And so on by the terms for "hundreds." In precisely the same way five lishing make a līpa, or rupee.

This abstract way of looking at the words used is also visible in the terms for the intermediate denominations for the odd parts of the quartertes, thus:

3 sel are phaigak makhai, i. e., a phaigak\(^{37}\) and a makhai, or a half quarter tet and a sel.

5 sel are yangkhai makhai, i. e., a yangkhai and a makhai, or a quarter tet and a sel.

The above terminology applies to the sel as a money of account.

For reckoning the sel as a coin the terminology is much simpler and more straightforward. Thus, the term for the coined sel being makhai, sel in the form of coin are simply counted as any other article would be, and in this way the terms for the British-Indian silver coins are simplified down to the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>British-Indian silver coins in terms of coined sel.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>English</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rupee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-anna piece</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-anna piece</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-anna piece</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{37}\) It being understood that selamā and phaigak are purely synonyms: merely convertible terms.
It will be observed that the meaning of all the terms used is thus duplicated, but in practical speech confusion would hardly ever arise. In case it should the full terms used are makhāi sāmari, makhāi sani, makhāi sāma, makhāi yāngkhai, respectively, meaning 400, 200, 100, and 50 sēl (coined).

We now arrive at a point that is so puzzling to those who converse with Manipuris on money matters. The British-Indian silver pieces have long been current throughout the State and have names of their own irrespective of those given them in reference to their place in accounts and to the number of coined sēl each contains; thus:

| Names for the British-Indian silver pieces. |
| English | Manipur | Sanskrit |
| Rupee | lupāmā | 1 rupee |
| 8-anna piece | makhāi28 | half |
| 4-anna piece | sīki29 | quarter |
| 2-anna piece | ānā | anna40 |

It is for the above reasons that there are in common use three names for each denomination of British-Indian silver money, thus:

| Concurrent Manipur Terms for British-Indian Silver Coins. |
| English | Manipur Equivalents |
| Rupee | for the coins | in cash | in accounts |
| 8-annas | makhāi and lupā-makhāi | sāmari and makhāi-sāmari | lishing mangā |
| 4-annas | sīki and lupā-sīki | sāmā and makhāi-sāma | lishing-ani sāmangā |
| 2-annas | ānā | yānkhai and makhāi-yānkhai | sātaruk phingak |

Copper money, British-Indian or other, has never, until quite lately been in use in Manipur, and Brown, Manipur, p. 89, relates that an attempt to introduce piece in 1866 absolutely failed, as the bōkār women41 refused to have anything to say to it. The consequence has been that it does not clearly appear in the Manipuri language until British-Indian copper coins (except the pie) were generally introduced after the mediatisation of the State in

28 In full lupā-makhāi, half rupees.
29 In full lupā-sīki, quarter rupees. In conformity to the likings of all Orientals for fractional expressions, sīki-mangā or five sīki, is used for "a rupee and a quarter."
30 This is due to there being no copper coin in the country. The people had no idea of the British-Indian anna and adopted the term to express the lowest denomination of silver coin. Since the troubles of 1891 the British-Indian copper money has been known generally and the term ñānd has come to mean one anna, as well as two annas, by a still further complication explained below.
41 Women are the hucksters of the country to even a greater extent than in Burma.
consequence of the troubles of 1891. Now, however, though the people were, when I enquired, still confused about the matter, the terms are:

**British-Indian Copper Money.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Manipuri</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pice, quarter-anna piece</td>
<td>paishá, paishámá</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>half-anna piece</td>
<td>paishá-ani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one anna, four-pice</td>
<td>paishá-mari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pie</td>
<td>támíre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is known that the anna, i.e., four pice, equals 25 sél (coined), and that therefore the half-anna, pice and pie are, as the people express it, a "a little more" respectively than the 12, 6, and 2 sél. It is for this reason that in their account nomenclature only a term for "anna" appears, that being sahún-maháli.43

Since 1891 annas have been enumerated seriatim, as is customary in British-India, thus:

- one anna ... ánná-má
- two annas ... ánná-ani
- three annas ... ánná-ahum
- four annas ... ánná-mari

And so on. But it will be observed that some confusion is thus caused by the use of the same term for the British-Indian anna and for the British-Indian two-anna piece, as above explained. This will no doubt soon disappear, the latter sense of the word ánná becoming of necessity forgotten before long.

That the enumeration of the annas on the British-Indian plan was adopted by the Manipúris when dealing with Europeans before 1891 is proved by a sentence in Primrose's Grammar, p. 85, 1887, which runs thus:

Aingon-da rápá-ama-dagi áná ani támí-piré
Us (me)-to rupee-one-from annas two back-gave
Gave me back a rupee less two annas, i.e., fourteen annas.

The Manipúris cannot make bell-metal and resort to old pots and pans, broken pieces of images and utensils, procured from British-India, Assam (the Dékhan of the Manipúris), and Burma; to old pieces dug up in their own country, and even to old sél of former coinages. They consider the best metal to be that from old Assamese implements and utensils. The minting of sél is well described by Brown, *Manipur*, p. 89: "The metal is first cast in little pellets; these are softened by fire and placed on an anvil; one blow of the hammer flattens the pellet into an irregularly round figure; a punch with the word sél cut on it (in Bengali characters) is then driven on it by another blow, which completes the operation."

The minting of sél goes back to at least the middle of the last Century, perhaps to the days of Rágúrama,44 1714-54 A. D., when they were much larger than the present ones, described as four or five times as large, the old sél being square in form.45 Those of Rágúrama is still the popular Indian word for the British-Indian pí (pie).

43 The half anna could in no case appear in the account scale, as the term available would be that for 12½ sél, which is already appropriated by the term for 13 sél: *vide* scale, ante, p. 174.
44 The Gharbi Nawá of History.
45 In imitation of the neighbouring Assamese and Arakanese coinages.
Kartā (the Jai Singh of the Chronicles, 1764-98 A. D.) were twice the size of the present coin. They did not always have the word ārī on them. E. g., those of Rājā Kartā were marked with ārī and also with ma, i. e., the Bengali form of the letter m, for “Maipūr?”, as also were those of his sons Saurjit, Mārjit and Gambhīr Singh, of whom so much is to be found in Wilson’s Document of the Burmese War, 1827. Rājā Nero (Nar Singh, 1834-50) marked his sēl with rā, i. e., the Bengali form of the letter r. Since then the mark has been ārī.

It is as well to note that Maipūral sēl have more than once been largely forged by Kachhārī and Bengali traders.

Although it is clear from the Maipūral system of account keeping that cowries (līkhol) must once, and that not long ago, have been the currency of the country, there seems to be no tradition even of the fact nowadays, 47 and I could hear of no tradition as to when sēl were introduced. Not even the Nāga Tribes in the State use cowries — indeed the Nāgas, like the Kachhārīs and some Shāhs about Burmā, only recognise silver as currency, the ānd, or two-anna piece, being the lowest denomination. I note, however, that Brown, p. 40, states that “the price of a wife (among the Tongkhul or Lukupā Nāgas) to those well off is one mēthnā (a buffalo); others pay in cowries or Maipūral sēl about the value of ten rupees.”

Brown relates, p. 89, a tradition that Saurjit “about 1815 coined silver of a square form of the same value and weight as the British rupee.” It may be so, but I have never confirmed the statement. It is not a likely one, because the brothers Saurjit, Mārjit and Gambhīr Singh spent between 30 and 40 years in establishing and disestablishing each other on the throne, and none of them seem, about 1815, to have had anything approaching so firm a seat on it as to have time to trouble about the coinage.

The Maipūral have no indigenous avoirdupois scale, using nowadays the British-Indian scale when necessary. The reason is that, until of late, the custom was to buy unwrought iron, brass and metals by measurement and not by weight, and wrought metal articles by the bargain. Like all the Further Eastern nationalities they have scales of capacity, buying and selling grain by basket measurement. 48

For their Troy weights the Maipūral have borrowed the modern Indian scale of 90 ratts to the tōla, explained in the last Section of this Chapter; thus:

Maipūral Troy Scale.

| 2 tōla  | 1 sānāng (abrus seed) |
| 12 sānāng | 1 senmakhāmā  |
| 2 senmakhāmā | 1 sēlamā  |
| 2 sēlamā  | 1 sēlani or mohar-makhā (½ tōla) |
| 2 sēlani  | 1 senmāri or mohar (tōla)  |

90 seeds to the tōla.

(To be continued.)

47 For the history given in the text cf. Brown, p. 58 f.
48 Traditions die out very fast in such places. Even the educated in Maipūr regard the Burmese War of 1825-6 as having occurred in the dim past, — much more than a hundred years ago! The days of Pamhalā (1714-54) are spoken of as a very long time ago.
49 Lukup, Maipūr, a cap: Primrose, p. 18; Brown, p. 37.
50 The Scottish word for “jag” is jāg = Bengali jāg ( job), Hindī jau, Skr. gau. Cf. Skr. gaurāj, Maipūral jābrāj and jābrāj, the bear apparent, a title of which so much was heard during the troubles in 1891. The Pāli form of this last word, upārāj, gave rise to the amusing “Hobson-Jobson,” in the “Upper Regio” of Pegu, once an important personage to shipmasters and travellers, noticed indeed in Yule, but not so fully as it might have been. 51 Spelt sēlmakhāmā and sēl-māri.
52 It must be understood that a Maipūrāl would not thus describe his table, because senmakhāmā means one half sēl: sēlamā means one sēl: sēlani means two sēl: senmāri means four sēl.
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IRREGULAR VERBS.

179. Here follow the Irregular verbs, according to Mp. It should be noted that several of them are quite regular. Some of them do not agree with Elmslie's Vocabulary, or with Np., in their vocalization. [In the original, the various forms are given in the Persian character, without transliteration. As this does not show the pronunciation, I have endeavoured to remedy the defect by transliterating. Many of the forms given by Mp. are incorrect. In cases in which the forms are clearly wrong, I have corrected them. It is no use repeating erroneous forms. I am responsible for all footnotes to this list. — G. A. G.]

Irregular verbs (according to Mp.).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ãqâñun</td>
<td>to knead, mix flour</td>
<td>ãqâ</td>
<td>ãqâri</td>
<td>ãqâmut</td>
<td>ãqâñun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>âñun</td>
<td>to be</td>
<td>âsi</td>
<td>èsmut</td>
<td>ès</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ãsmâñun</td>
<td>to try, to tempt</td>
<td>ãsmâv</td>
<td>ãsmâvî</td>
<td>ãsmâvmut</td>
<td>ãsmâvun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[atnun</td>
<td>to enter</td>
<td>ats</td>
<td>ati</td>
<td>tâmut</td>
<td>tâv ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[aun</td>
<td>to laugh</td>
<td>as</td>
<td>âsi</td>
<td>osmut</td>
<td>onun (os)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aun</td>
<td>to tremble</td>
<td>al</td>
<td>âli</td>
<td>alyânmut</td>
<td>alyân</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ânun</td>
<td>to bring</td>
<td>ân</td>
<td>âni</td>
<td>onâm</td>
<td>onn (on)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bûznun</td>
<td>to roast, fry</td>
<td>bûz</td>
<td>bûzi</td>
<td>bûsmut</td>
<td>bûznun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bûzn</td>
<td>to set</td>
<td>beh</td>
<td>behi</td>
<td>byâthmut</td>
<td>byâk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bhun</td>
<td>to ask</td>
<td>prâsh</td>
<td>prâshi</td>
<td>prâshmut</td>
<td>prâshun (prâsh)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pradun</td>
<td>to drip</td>
<td>prad</td>
<td>pradi</td>
<td>pradyâm</td>
<td>pradyâv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prazalun</td>
<td>to shine</td>
<td>prazal</td>
<td>prazali</td>
<td>prazalyâm</td>
<td>prazalyôv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parzâun</td>
<td>to recognize</td>
<td>parzãn</td>
<td>parzani</td>
<td>parzâm</td>
<td>parzâm (parzâm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parznun</td>
<td>to be born</td>
<td>par</td>
<td>prasi</td>
<td>pyâm</td>
<td>pyáv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parun</td>
<td>to read</td>
<td>par</td>
<td>pari</td>
<td>porâm</td>
<td>porun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pushqrun</td>
<td>to entrust</td>
<td>pushár</td>
<td>pushhàri</td>
<td>pushhàmut</td>
<td>pushqrun (pushár)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peun</td>
<td>to fall</td>
<td>peh</td>
<td>peyi</td>
<td>pyâm</td>
<td>pyâw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tachhun</td>
<td>to pare</td>
<td>tachh</td>
<td>tachhi</td>
<td>tochh</td>
<td>tochhun (tochh)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trávun</td>
<td>to leave</td>
<td>tráv</td>
<td>trávi</td>
<td>tróvmut</td>
<td>tróvun (tróv)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tulun</td>
<td>to bear</td>
<td>tul</td>
<td>tuli</td>
<td>tulumut, f. tujmut</td>
<td>-tulun (tul)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tülün</td>
<td>to lift up</td>
<td>tül</td>
<td>tuli</td>
<td>tülmut</td>
<td>tül</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thávun</td>
<td>to possess</td>
<td>tháv</td>
<td>thávi</td>
<td>thóvmut</td>
<td>thóvun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cheun</td>
<td>to drink</td>
<td>cheh</td>
<td>cheyi</td>
<td>chyaunmut</td>
<td>chyaun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chürun</td>
<td>to squeeze out</td>
<td>chür</td>
<td>chiri</td>
<td>chýrmut</td>
<td>chyurun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chhakun</td>
<td>to scatter</td>
<td>chhak</td>
<td>chhaki</td>
<td>chhokmut</td>
<td>chhokun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chhalun</td>
<td>to wash</td>
<td>chhal</td>
<td>chhali</td>
<td>chholmut</td>
<td>chholun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tsápun</td>
<td>to gnaw</td>
<td>tsáp</td>
<td>tsáyi</td>
<td>tsópmut</td>
<td>tsópun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teárun</td>
<td>to pick up</td>
<td>teár</td>
<td>teári</td>
<td>teórmut</td>
<td>teórun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tešáun</td>
<td>to cut</td>
<td>tešá</td>
<td>tešái</td>
<td>teósmut</td>
<td>teósun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tsolun</td>
<td>to flee</td>
<td>tsol</td>
<td>tsolái</td>
<td>tsólmut</td>
<td>tsol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tešáun</td>
<td>to taste</td>
<td>tešá</td>
<td>tešáí</td>
<td>tešámut</td>
<td>tešáun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teštun</td>
<td>to crush</td>
<td>tešt</td>
<td>teští</td>
<td>teštúmut</td>
<td>teštúun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teásun</td>
<td>to burn</td>
<td>teás</td>
<td>teási</td>
<td>teásmut</td>
<td>teás</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teívun</td>
<td>to give</td>
<td>teív</td>
<td>teíväi</td>
<td>teívmut</td>
<td>teívun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dúnun</td>
<td>to sweep</td>
<td>dúv</td>
<td>dúvi</td>
<td>dúvmut</td>
<td>dúvun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rachhun</td>
<td>to protect</td>
<td>rachh</td>
<td>rachhi</td>
<td>rochhmut</td>
<td>rochhun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ranun</td>
<td>to cook</td>
<td>ran</td>
<td>raní</td>
<td>runmut</td>
<td>runun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rósun</td>
<td>to remain</td>
<td>róx</td>
<td>rbái</td>
<td>rúdmut</td>
<td>rúd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zánun</td>
<td>to know</td>
<td>zán</td>
<td>záni</td>
<td>rónmut</td>
<td>rón</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zeun25</td>
<td>to be born</td>
<td>zeh</td>
<td>zéyi</td>
<td>rámut</td>
<td>ráo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suvun</td>
<td>to sew</td>
<td>suv</td>
<td>suvi</td>
<td>suwmut</td>
<td>suvun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shongun</td>
<td>to sleep</td>
<td>shong</td>
<td>shongi</td>
<td>shongmut</td>
<td>shong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>férun</td>
<td>to wander</td>
<td>fér</td>
<td>féri</td>
<td>fyármut</td>
<td>fyár</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20 1 sg. cheung.  
21 Elmale, Wade, cheamut.  
22 Wade, cheam.  
23 Elmale, team.  
24 1 sg. ding.  
25 Pres. Part. nevud. The forms of this verb are taken from the Kalmúna-taddāmṭta. The original has Imperat.  
26 2 sg. zie, Fut. 3 sg. zīet; 27 Elmale.
28 Elmale.  
29 1 sg. seme.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>फेऀन (phatun)</td>
<td>to split</td>
<td>फ़ही</td>
<td>फ़ही</td>
<td>फ़ोमुत</td>
<td>फ़ोः</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>फेईन (phatun)</td>
<td>to break</td>
<td>फ़हुँ</td>
<td>फ़हुँ</td>
<td>फ़ोमुत</td>
<td>फ़ुँ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>फ़ैलन (phollun)</td>
<td>to bloom</td>
<td>फ़ोली</td>
<td>फ़ोली</td>
<td>फ़ोलमुत</td>
<td>फ़ोः</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>फ़िडन (phidun)</td>
<td>to strain, filter</td>
<td>फ़िडन</td>
<td>फ़िडन</td>
<td>फ़िडनमुत</td>
<td>फ़िडन</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>काडन (kodun)</td>
<td>to drag out</td>
<td>काड़</td>
<td>काड़</td>
<td>कोमुत</td>
<td>कोः</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>करून (karun)</td>
<td>to make</td>
<td>कार</td>
<td>कार</td>
<td>कोमुत</td>
<td>कोः</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>कशन (kashun)</td>
<td>to itch</td>
<td>काश</td>
<td>काश</td>
<td>कोमुत</td>
<td>कोः</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>क़न (khanun)</td>
<td>to dig</td>
<td>क्हान</td>
<td>क्हान</td>
<td>क्हानमुत</td>
<td>क्हान</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>कम (kham)</td>
<td>to eat</td>
<td>क्हे</td>
<td>क्हे</td>
<td>क्हानमुत</td>
<td>क्हान</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>गाटन (gatun)</td>
<td>to go</td>
<td>गात़</td>
<td>गात़ि</td>
<td>गोमुत</td>
<td>गोः</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>गालन (galun)</td>
<td>to melt</td>
<td>गाल</td>
<td>गाल</td>
<td>गोमुत</td>
<td>गोः</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>गान्सन (ganznun)</td>
<td>to count</td>
<td>गांञ़र</td>
<td>गांञ़र</td>
<td>गांञ़रमुत</td>
<td>गांञ़र</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>गैंदन (gindun)</td>
<td>to sport</td>
<td>गैंद</td>
<td>गैंदि</td>
<td>गौदमुत</td>
<td>गौः</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>गांदन (gandun)</td>
<td>to bind</td>
<td>गांद</td>
<td>गांदि</td>
<td>गोमुत</td>
<td>गोः</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>गाखन (gakhun)</td>
<td>to grind</td>
<td>गाख</td>
<td>गाखि</td>
<td>गोमुत</td>
<td>गोः</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>लैयन (layun)</td>
<td>to strike</td>
<td>लैय</td>
<td>लैयि</td>
<td>लौमुत</td>
<td>लोः</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>लाबन (labun)</td>
<td>to take</td>
<td>लाब</td>
<td>लाबि</td>
<td>लोमुत</td>
<td>लोः</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>लावन (laun)</td>
<td>to live</td>
<td>लाव</td>
<td>लावि</td>
<td>लावमुत</td>
<td>लोः</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>लिकन (likun)</td>
<td>to write</td>
<td>लिक</td>
<td>लिकि</td>
<td>लिकमुत</td>
<td>लोः</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>लामन (lamun)</td>
<td>to pull</td>
<td>लाम</td>
<td>लामि</td>
<td>लाममुत</td>
<td>लोः</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>लेवन (levun)</td>
<td>to lick</td>
<td>लेव</td>
<td>लेवि</td>
<td>लेवमुत</td>
<td>लोः</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>लोनु (lunu)</td>
<td>to reap</td>
<td>लोँ</td>
<td>लोँि</td>
<td>लोँमुत</td>
<td>लोः</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>लयन (layun)</td>
<td>to be worth</td>
<td>लैय</td>
<td>लैयि</td>
<td>लैयमुत</td>
<td>लोः</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>मारन (ma-run)</td>
<td>to slay</td>
<td>मार</td>
<td>मारि</td>
<td>मारमुत</td>
<td>मारियोः</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>मानन (manun)</td>
<td>to esteem</td>
<td>मान</td>
<td>मानि</td>
<td>मानमुत</td>
<td>मानियोः</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>मटन (matun)</td>
<td>to be foolish</td>
<td>माट</td>
<td>माटि</td>
<td>माटमुत</td>
<td>माटि्योः</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[\text{Note:} \quad \text{The Kasmiri-schêntëla given phidun.} \]

\[\text{1 sg. khemə.} \]

\[\text{20 Elmalie, lō.} \]

\[\text{21 Elmalie, lō.} \]

\[\text{22 Wada, kēχμुत, kēχ.} \]

\[\text{23 Elmalie, lō.} \]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mathun</td>
<td>to rub</td>
<td>math</td>
<td>mathi</td>
<td>mathmut</td>
<td></td>
<td>mathun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mutarun</td>
<td>to open</td>
<td>mutar</td>
<td>mutari</td>
<td>mutormut23</td>
<td>mutarum23</td>
<td>mird</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marun</td>
<td>to die</td>
<td>mar</td>
<td>nari</td>
<td>mudnut or</td>
<td>m ún</td>
<td>m úd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m lánávun</td>
<td>to mix</td>
<td>m lánáv</td>
<td>m lánávi</td>
<td>m lánávmut</td>
<td>m lánávun</td>
<td>m lánávun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mongun</td>
<td>to ask</td>
<td>mong</td>
<td>mangi</td>
<td>mongmut</td>
<td>mongun</td>
<td>mongun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>natun</td>
<td>to tremble</td>
<td>nat</td>
<td>nati</td>
<td>natwamut</td>
<td>nätov</td>
<td>nätov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>námun</td>
<td>to bow</td>
<td>nám</td>
<td>nami</td>
<td>námwamut</td>
<td>námvo</td>
<td>námvo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>térnun</td>
<td>to go out</td>
<td>tér</td>
<td>térí</td>
<td>drámut</td>
<td>dráv</td>
<td>dráv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tinnun</td>
<td>to take</td>
<td>tikh</td>
<td>niyí24</td>
<td>niyamut25</td>
<td>niyón</td>
<td>niyón</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w otharun</td>
<td>to spread</td>
<td>w othar</td>
<td>w othari</td>
<td>w othormut</td>
<td>w othorun</td>
<td>w othorun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w othun</td>
<td>to stand up</td>
<td>w oth</td>
<td>w othi</td>
<td>w othmut</td>
<td>w oth</td>
<td>w oth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w ethun</td>
<td>to be fat</td>
<td>w eth</td>
<td>w ethi</td>
<td>w ethomut</td>
<td>w ethov</td>
<td>w ethov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vetsun</td>
<td>to be contained</td>
<td>vets</td>
<td>vetsi</td>
<td>vyúsumut</td>
<td>vyúta</td>
<td>vyúta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wadun</td>
<td>to weep</td>
<td>wad</td>
<td>wadi</td>
<td>wodmut</td>
<td>wodun</td>
<td>wodun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wudun</td>
<td>to fly</td>
<td>wud</td>
<td>wudi</td>
<td>wudýomut</td>
<td>wudýov</td>
<td>wudýov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>warun</td>
<td>to descend</td>
<td>war</td>
<td>wasi</td>
<td>wothmut 38</td>
<td>woth38</td>
<td>woth38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ważun</td>
<td>to speak</td>
<td>wän</td>
<td>wani</td>
<td>wómmut</td>
<td>wónun</td>
<td>wónun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wownun</td>
<td>to plant, sow</td>
<td>wown</td>
<td>wovi</td>
<td>wórmut</td>
<td>wónun</td>
<td>wónun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wónun</td>
<td>to weave</td>
<td>wón</td>
<td>wóní</td>
<td>wónmut</td>
<td>wónun</td>
<td>wónun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hárun</td>
<td>to let fall</td>
<td>hár</td>
<td>hárí</td>
<td>hórmut</td>
<td>hórún</td>
<td>hórún</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hárun</td>
<td>to show</td>
<td>háv</td>
<td>háwi</td>
<td>hóvmut</td>
<td>hóvun</td>
<td>hóvun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hekkun</td>
<td>to teach</td>
<td>hekk</td>
<td>hekhi</td>
<td>hyúchmut</td>
<td>hyúchun</td>
<td>hyúchun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hekun</td>
<td>to be able</td>
<td>hek</td>
<td>heki</td>
<td>hyúkmut</td>
<td>hyukun</td>
<td>hyukun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hokhun</td>
<td>to be dry</td>
<td>hokh</td>
<td>hokhi</td>
<td>hokhmut</td>
<td>kokh</td>
<td>kokh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>husun</td>
<td>to swell</td>
<td>hun</td>
<td>huní</td>
<td>hunýomut</td>
<td>hunýov</td>
<td>hunýov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hewn</td>
<td>to take</td>
<td>heh</td>
<td>heyí27</td>
<td>hyótmut</td>
<td>hyótun</td>
<td>hyótun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yishun</td>
<td>to wish</td>
<td>yish</td>
<td>yishi</td>
<td>yishmut</td>
<td>yishun</td>
<td>yishun</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23 Emalve, mutaur. 24 1 sg. niyov. 25 Wade, niumut. 26 Emalve, wáth. 27 1 sg. f. hemp. 28 1 sg. yim. |
APPENDIX I.

190. Examples of Aorists and Pluperfects:

1. atewa, to enter; aor. 3 pl. f. team.
2. omay, to bring; aor. 3 sg. m. to me on, by me; 3 sg. m. thee; 3 sg. m. toh me on, by you; tima on, by them; ouk, by them; 3 sg. f. an to me on, by us; 3 pl. m. tima on, by them; aik, quik, by them.
3. adaraw, to wet (causal from adar, wet); aor. 3 sg. m. adaraw, by him.
4. bygaraw (causal of bygar, to divide); aor. 3 pl. m. bygaraw, by them.
5. backun, to be saved; 3 pl. m. bachy.
6. bacharaw (causal of No. 5), to save, to help; aor. 3 pl. m. bacharaw, by him.
7. bakhun, to give; aor. 3 sg. m. to me bakhun, by me to thee; bakhun, by him to him; tima bakhun, by him to them (in which tam precedes, but is separated by a it, and); 3 sg. f. tam bakhun, by him.
8. baden, to alter oneself; plup. 3 sg. f. baden.
9. badun, to become great, to increase; plup. 3 sg. m. badu; 3 pl. m. badu.
10. bulun, to become well; plup. 3 sg. m. bulu; 3 pl. m. bulu.
11. balgraw (causal of the preceding), to make well, to heal; aor. 3 pl. m. tam balgraw, by him; tam balgraw, by him.
12. banun, to be, happen; aor. 3 pl. m. banun.
13. bekin, to sit; aor. 3 sg. m. beku; 3 pl. m. beku.

* All collected by the author in the course of reading.
(14) bihanavun (causal of the preceding), to put down; aor. 3 sg. m. bihanavuk, by them.

(15) bōrum, to hear; aor. 3 sg. m. bōrun, by him; (neut.) tami bōz, by him; tohi bōz, by you; 3 sg. fem. tami bōz, by him; 3 pl. fem. tami bōz, by him.

(16) protshun, to ask (the person asked is put in the dative. It is hence construed impersonally); aor. 3 sg. neut. tami timan,
    (it was asked) by him to them, he asked them; timav tas, by them to him, they asked him;
    tami protshuk, by him to them, he asked them;
    tami protshunaks, by him to him, he asked him;
    tami protshun, by him to him, he asked him;
    protshunaks, by him to them, he asked them.

(17) protshanavun (causal of the preceding), to make to ask (the person asked in the dative); aor. 3 sg. neut. protshunaves, by him to him, he made him ask.

(18) parun, to read; aor. 3 sg. neut. tohi porow (it was read by you),
    you have read; negatively and interrogatively, tohi porow-nā.

(19) prazalun, to shine; plnp. 3 sg. m. prazalyo.

(20) parzandunavun (causal of the preceding), parzundun, to recognize, to test; aor. 3 sg. mas. tami parzandunē.

(21) pakun, to go, to wander (with dī pata, to follow; with dī bōnāth, to pass by; with būrīn pakan to wander further); aor. 3 sg. m. pakun, 3 sg. fem. pāch; 1 pl. m. pak; 2 pl. m. pāch; 3 pl. m. pāch; 3 pl. fem. pāch.

(22) pēnu, to fall; aor. 3 sg. m. pī, pī pīv (pronounce pēo) [the correct form is pīvaur]; 3 sg. f. pī pēy; 3 pl. m. pī pēy.

[125] Emslie, õyôr pakun, to wander.]
(23) पहुँचन् to burst, to be rent; aor. 3 sg. m. पहुँचन् phut.

(24) पहुँचन् (causal of पहुँचन्) to break, tr. 3 pl. f. पहुँचन्, by him.

(25) पहुँचन् (पहुँचन्) to turn oneself; to turn back; to wander; with 

कुन (governing dative), to turn towards someone; with बुध, to turn away from someone (dat.); with पुत्र, to return; सूक्र, to be spread abroad (dat.), aor. 3 sg. i. पहुँचन् phir, पहुँचन् phir.

(26) तरुप, to go across, to cross; with याप, याप, to go across, to pass over; नवि क्याति, in a ship.

(27) तरुप to leave, discard; send forth; let go; make over; with बुध, to let down; with नाप, नाप, to thrust out; with रुद्ध, to cause to rain, to send rain; with वन, to make room; aor. 1 sg. m. तरुप तृषुव sāvati, by thee; 3 sg. m. तरुप तृषुव, तृषुव, by him; तृषुव, by as; तरुप, तृषुव, तृषुव, by him; तृषुव कुंड, by them; तृषुव कुंड, by you; 3 sg. f. तृषुव, तृषुव, by her; 3 pl. m. तृषुव, तृषुव, by you.

(28) तलन् to lift up, bear; with तोड, to raise (the eyes); aor. 3 sg. m. में तलन्, by me; 3 sg. f. तलन्, by him; तुक, तुक, by them; 

3 pl. masc. तलन्, by you; तुक, तुक, by them; तुक, तुक, by you; तुक, तुक, by them.

(29) ढारुन्, to set, to put, to place; to possess, to have; with नाथ (voice), to call, name (dative of person); with तल ठुरित (dubrit, to hide), to conceal under something; aor. 3 sg. m. ढारुन्, ढारुन्, by him; ढारुन्, by them; 3 sg. f. ढारुन्, by me; ढारुन्, by her or him; ढारुन्, ढारुन्, by him; 3 pl. m. ढारुन्, ढारुन्, ढारुन्, by thee.

(30) ठारु, to be terrified [hurried]; plup. II. 3 sg. m. ठारु thārūr.

(31) ठारुन्, to be standing, to abate (of wind); plup. II. 3 sg. m. ठारु thārūr, by him; 3 sg. f. thārūr, by thee.

[From तौरे we should expect aorist masc. to be always तौरे thou, and never तौरे thou. The singular masculine form with a instead of e is certainly wrong.]
(32) *chāvun* (causal of *chēvn* cheun, to drink), to give to drink; 1 sg. m. *chāvun* bo, by you; 2 sg. m. *chōvun* bo, by us; 3 sg. m. *chōvun*, by him.

(33) *chhalun*, to wash; aor. 3 pl. m. *chhalin*, by him.

(34) *chakum*, to scatter; aor. 1 sg. (impersonal) *chakum*, by me; *chokum*, by thee.

(35) *teāken*, to collect; aor. 3 pl. f. *teākem*, by them.

(36) *teāken*, to taste; aor. 3 sg. m. *teākem* teakem, by him [should be *teākh*].

(37) *teafun*, to cut; to pluck, gather; aor. 3 sg. m. *teafun*, by him.

(38) *teafun*, to flee (dative of person from); aor. 3 sg. m. *teaful*, 3 pl. m. *tequl*, with suffix *s*.

(39) *tehunun*, to throw; with *nāli*, on the neck, to dress, to put round somebody's (dative) neck; with *trāvun* trāvun, to abandon, to throw away, to pour out, to let go; with *kākun* kākun, to drag, to drive out, to expel, to tear out, to persecute; with *nād* speech, to call, to name; with *marī* marī, to kill; with *khat* khat, to eat, to eat up; aor. 3 sg. masc. *tehunun*, by you to me; *tehunun*, by them; *tehunun*, by them; *tehunun*, by them; *tehunun*, by them.

(40) *dōburvun* (causal of *dōburvun* doburun, to bury), to get buried; aor. 3 sg. f. *dōburvuk*, by them.

(41) *dōpun*, to say, speak (dative of person addressed); aor. 3 sg. (impersonal) *dōpun*, by him; *tum* dopun, by him; *timav* dopun, by them to him; *timav* dopun, by them to him; *dōpuh*, by them to him; *dōphak*, by them to them; *dōphak*, by them to them; *dōphak*, by them to them.
(42) دین dīn, to give; to permit, allow (with infinitive); with ُن vag, voice, to call (dat. of person); with كُلک kūlt, to vex (dat. of person); with خبر khabar, news, to notify; with ُنā badal, to requite; with ُنān burglarly, to break into a house (place broken into in the dative); with حساب hisāb, to give an account; with تعليم ta'lim, to instruct; with حشر hishr, to compare (with ُسūr); aor. 3 sg. masc. دیوتus, by him; تامی dīt, by him; مه me dītum, by me; دیوتوا dītwaq, by you; تاک tokh dītwaq, by you to me; دیوت, by them; تامی dīt, by him to thee; دیوت, by him to him; تامی dīt, by them to him; 3 pl. m. دیوت dīt, by them; 3 sg. f. دیوت dīt, by them; دیت dīt, by them; دیت dīt, by them; 3 sg. plap. II. (impersonal) دیوت دیت dītū (دیوت timun), it had been given to them: causal دیوت dītūn.

(43) راف راف raftun, to grasp, seize, lay hold of; metaphorically, to grasp, understand; with علَم alām, a root, to take root [Matt. xiii. 6]; aor. 3 sg. مول rošoq, by you; مول rošoq, by you; راft raft, by him; راft, by him, by them; راft, by them; 3 pl. مول rošik, by them; 3 pl. راft raft, by them.

(44) راف راف raftun (casual of the preceding), to cause to seize; aor. 3 sg. مول rošoq, by me; مول rošoq, by me; راft rošoq, by him; راft rošoq, by him.

(45) راف راف raftun, to remain, to stop oneself, to be remaining anywhere, to dwell; with علَم alām, to stand still; with موت mūt, to wait for some one; with دعāja, to remain, to be established; with خبر jamc, to be of good courage; with دیوار dāwār, to be on one's guard; aor. 3 sg. مول روب ra'das (مولد ra'd); 3 sg. راft nom, ra'd: 3 pl. مول روب ra'da dii.

(46) زن sānun, to perceive, to know, to understand; to observe, suppose; with حیر hāqir, to consider mean, to despise; with پنās, to consider one-

[Dītūk in paradigm, which is correct.]
self to be such and such; with  ne-keib, to consider as nothing, to
despair; aor. 3 sg. (impersonal) timam zon, by them; zonuk,
by them; zonut, by thee.

(47) zitharoun (from *zithar*, long), to extend; aor. 3 sg. m.

(48) zeun, to be born, arise; aor. 3 sg. m. zon, zev.

(49) zonun, to win; aor. 3 pl. fem. zene, by him.

(50) sapanun, to be, happen; with qabil, to be accepted; with
khariib, to be ruined; with durr, to go to a distance; with jam', to
assemble together; with rauda, to set out; with dukh, to
enter; aor. 3 sg. m. sapon: 3 sg. f. sapun' (sapun)
3 pl. m. sapun.

(51) samun, to meet, assemble; aor. 3 sg. m. + suff. k, samuk (to
them); plup. II, 3 pl. m. samy'ay; 3 pl. f. samy'ay.

(52) sambadun, to repair, add on; aor. 3 pl. f. sambadak, by them.

(53) suran, to send, send away, dismiss; aor. 3 sg. m. sira: 3 sg.

(54) shongun, to sleep; aor. 3 pl. m. shungi; 3 pl. f. shonge.

(55) formadun, to order; to say (applied respectfully, of a great person
speaking); aor. 3 sg. (impersonal) formad, by him; formadun,
by him; formadug, by him, you.

(56) ka'dun, to drag out, tear out, cast out (with thunun), send forth;
with mulaq, to root out (funditus evertere); aor. 5 sg. m. kand, by
him; kadek, by them: 3 pl. m. ka'di, by us.

(57) konun, to sell; aor. 3 sg. m. konun, by him.

Apanun is used for forming intransitive and reflexive compound verbs, just as karun is used for transitive.

[form used is samy']
karun, to make (compounded with many Arabic and Persian nouns; e.g.,
qaid, to imprison); aor. 3 sg. masc. kor, by him; korut, by thee;
korun, by me; korun, by him; korun, by you; koruk, by them;
korunak, by him to them; korun, by him to him; korun, by him to
them; korun, by her to him; tohi korun, by you he; 
kornase, by him to him; korun, by him to you; aor. 3 pl. m. 
timav kor, they by them; kor, they by them; korit, by thee;
kryun, by them; kryun, by them; kryun, by them to him.
karanduvu (causal of the foregoing), to cause to make; aor. 3 sg. m.
karanudavu, by thee; 3 sg. f. karanuvat, by thee.
khurun (causal of khasun, No. 61), to cause to ascend, to lift up,
to draw up, to fetch; aor. 3 sg. m. khuruk, by them.
kus, to ascend, mount; to rise (of the sun); to survive anything
(e.g., a disease); aor. 3 sg. m. kehe (kehe); 3 pl. m. kehe [3 sg. f. kehe; plup. II, 3 sg. m. kehe, kehe]. (Double
causal kharanduvu.)
khusun, to fear; aor. 1 sg. m. khustus, 3 sg. m. 
khusun. 3 pl. m. khustu. (kehe); 3 pl. m. kehe.
kherun, to eat; with kherun, to be vexed; with gase, grass,
to graze; aor. 3 sg. m. kehe, by him or them; kehe, by them;
3 sg. f. kehe, by him.
khyavun, to cause to eat; with khyavun, to vex any one; aor.
2 sg. masc. khyovuk, thou by us.
gandun, to bind; aor. 3 sg. f. ganan, by him.
lagnun, to plough, to thrust against, to put against; with atha, a hand,
to apply the hand, handle, touch; with nali, the bosom and neck, to put
on, wear (clothes); with masuri, to labour, to hire, employ on hire; aor.
3 sg. m. lagnu (lagnu) lagnu, by him, by them;
lagnu, by him to her; lagnu, by him to thee: 1 pl. m. 
get, we were hired.

46 [The original has 'kor throughout the pl. which is an evident slip.]
47 [The Kaimira-febbahyia gives khyav (khyav).]
(67) lâyun, to strike (with dative); with پتک, to lean upon; with تهپار, to give a blow; aor. 3 sg. m. ذريت, lâyun, by him; ذريت, lâyuy, by him to thee; ذريت, lâyhas, by them to him; ذريت, lôyuk, by them; 3 pl. m. ذريت(ن) lôyhas, by them to him.

(68) lâbun, to take, receive; to find; aor. 3 sg. m. لبت, lûbûl, by thee; لبت, lôbûs, by you; 3 sg. f. لبت, lôbûq, by them.

(69) lâdun, to build; to load; to fill up; with گودي, qaid, to put in prison; with مطع, salibi, to crucify; aor. 3 sg. m. ثمُ, tami lôdû, by him; ثمُ, lôdûn, by him.

(70) logun, to be, become; to appear, arise; to begin (with infinitive feminine); to be fit; to be bound (dat.); with گودي, qaid, to be imprisoned; with بکح, hunger, to be hungry (dative of subject); with گودي, khoum, to be vexed; aor. 3 sg. m. لگُ (کِن log'); 3 sg. logus, to him; 3 sg. f. لگ لاج, log, to him; 3 pl. m. لگ, log'; 3 pl. f. لگ, log.

(71) mûrun, to slay (causal of مرن, marun, to die); aor. 3 sg. m. مورُ (کِن mûrû), he, by you; مورُ, mûruk, by them; 3 pl. m. ما mûrik, by them.

(72) mûranûn (double-causal of the preceding), to get slain; aor. 3 pl. m. مارَنون, by him.

(73) مَن, mûnu, to accept, approve, esteem; to consider, hold; to comply with; with گى, khoum, to obey; believe in; to hearken to anyone; aor. 3 pl. (impersonal) مَن, mûnu, to him.

(74) mûtyrun, to open; to unloose, loosen; aor. 3 sg. f. [causal] mûtyrów, by him.

(75) مرِن, marun, to die; aor. 3 sg. m. مرود, mûdû (کِن mûd); 3 sg. fem. مُي, moye: 3 pl. m. مرود, mûdî.

[Wade gives, aor. 3 sg. مود (should be مرود, mûd); plup. II., 3 sg. مِرود (should be مرود, mûd); perfect part. pass. مرود (should be مرود, mûd);] mûdmût (should be مرود, mûd.)]

(76) mokalun, to be or become free; plup. II., 3 sg. m. مَکْلاون, mokalûw, by him.

(77) مَکْلاون (causal of the preceding), to set free, help, rescue; to finish, conclude (with part. absol.); with نيش, to secure (against anyone); aor. 3 pl. f. مَکْلاون, tami mokalûw.
(78) मून्नं mungun, to ask (acc. of thing, dat. of pers.); aor. 3 sg. m. मून्नं mungun, by him; 3 sg. f. मून्नं mungun, by him.

(79) मूल्लं milewan, to add, to mix; to meet; to become one with anyone (sát, with); aor. 3 sg. f. मूल्लं milewan, by him.

(80) मूल्लं milewán, to meet, obtain; to go to meet (dat.); with न्हः nāh, to have lost, to loose; with सि sī, to meet; to compare oneself; to reconcile; मूल्लं milewan, to add to anything; aor. [3 sg. m. मूल्लं milewan] 3 sg. f. मूल्लं milewan; 3 pl. m. मूल्लं milewan.

(81) नात्सुा natsus, to dance; aor. 3 sg. (impersonal) नात्सुा natsus.

(82) नात्सुा natsus (causal of नात्सुा natsus), to cause to take; aor. 1 sg. m. (bo), 1—by you.

(83) नारुं nāru, to go out, to come out (also used with न्हः nāh); with inf. fem. of purpose; aor. 2 sg. m. नारुं nāru; 3 sg. m. नारुं nāru; 3 sg. f. नारुं nāru; नारुं nāru; 3 pl. m. नारुं nāru; 3 pl. f. नारुं nāru; नारुं nāru; with suff. नारुं nāru; नारुं nāru; (where we should expect नारुं nāru).

(84) निउं niun, to take, bring, carry; with दौर dūr, to run; कृं मिन दिन दिन kuru niun dīn, to traffic; with भें मिन दिनपेशिस to inherit; with भें तह स to steal; with लाज्ना lāja, to rob; with लिलित lili, to carry off; with याकर्षण yakṣarṣaṇ, to take to oneself, to take to one side; with पुन्नस sūt, to take with oneself; aor. 2 sg. m. निउं niun, 3 sg. f. निउं niun, 3 pl. m. निउं niun, by us; 3 sg. m. निउं niun, by him; 3 pl. m. निउं niun, by him.

(85) वाड़ूं wādū, to arrive, enter (with निउं niun, into), to reach a (place), to attain to one's object; to completely finish; with गयां garyā, to come home; with वृद्ध वर्त वृद्ध वर्त वृद्ध वर्त, to carry across; aor. 3 sg. m. वृद्ध वर्त वृद्ध वर्त वृद्ध वर्त, 3 pl. m. वृद्ध वर्त वृद्ध वर्त वृद्ध वर्त.

(86) वादन wāyun, to blow, play (a musical instrument), to make to go; with शानवदा, to draw a sword; with नाय क nāyi, to play the flute; aor. 3 sg. (impersonal) नाय क nāyi, by us.

[Note: Wade has nish, etc. For niun the Kalmia.in.ār. gives निउं niun.]

[Elsmale has, as we should expect, वाड़ूं. Wādū is certainly wrong.]
wothun, to rise up, stand up; to ascend; to disappear (of an illness), also
with nāth thod; aor. 3 sg. m. ṭā wothū (ḥā wothū); 3 sg. f. ṭā wothū;
3 pl. m. ṭā wothū; 3 pl. f. ṭā wothū.

watharān (causal of ṭā watharūn), to spread out; aor. 3 sg. f.
timāu watharō, by them; 3 pl. f. ṭā watharāvak, by them.

wučkhā, to see; with nāth wath, to expect, wait for (some one); with
ku, to look towards (some body); aor. 2 sg. masc. kučkhā, by
us; 3 sg. m. kučkhā (kučkhā), kučkhā, kučkhā, kučkhā, by
him, by them, by us; ṭā kučkhā, by him; 3 sg. f. ṭā kučkhā; 3 pl. m.
kučkhā (kučkhā), by him; kučkhā, kučkhā, kučkhā, by
him, by them; 3 pl. f. kučkhā, kučkhā, kučkhā, by
them.

wučnu, to weep; aor. 3 sg. imperson. ṭā wodnu, by him.

wučranān, to awaken (causal ṭā wučran, to be awake); aor. 3 sg. m.
wučranbuk, by him.

wučnu, to wrap up, cover, to wrap oneself up in something (acc.); aor.
3 sg. f. kučnu, kučnu, by him.

wučnu, to speak, say; to name; aor. 3 sg. unperma, kučnu, by
him, (her), them, kučnu, kučnu, by him; kučnu, kučnu, kučnu, by
him, by them; kučnu, kučnu, kučnu, by him; kučnu, kučnu, kučnu,
by him to him; kučnu, kučnu, kučnu, kučnu, by him to them; kučnu, kučnu,
kučnu, kučnu, by him to them; kučnu, kučnu, kučnu, kučnu,
kučnu, kučnu, by him to them; kučnu, kučnu, kučnu, kučnu,
kučnu, kučnu, by him to them; kučnu, kučnu, kučnu, kučnu,
kučnu, kučnu, by him to them; 3 sg. f. kučnu, kučnu, kučnu;
3 pl. f. kučnu, kučnu, kučnu, kučnu, by him.

wučnu, to sow; aor. 3 sg. m. ṭā wučnu, wučnu, wučnu, by
me, kučnu, kučnu, kučnu, by thee; 3 sg. f. wučnu, kučnu, kučnu,
by him.

hačnu, to show; with kučnu, ḍā ḍā, to swear; aor. 3 pl. m. ṭā hāčnu,
by him, kučnu, kučnu, kučnu, by him; 3 pl. f. kučnu, kučnu, kučnu, by
us.

hečkinsān (causal of ṭā hečkin, to learn), to teach; aor. 3 sg.
(impera.) kučnu hečkinsān, kučnu hečkinsān, by
them; 3 pl. m. kučnu hečkinsān, kučnu hečkinsān, by
him, to you; kučnu, kučnu, kučnu, by him.

[Should be kučnu, hečkinsān.]
(97)  
hekn, to be able (complement in participle absolute); aor. 3 sg. f.  

hekh, by him.

(96)  
hekhu, to become dry; aor. 3 sg. m.  

hekhu.

(99)  
hem, to take; (with inf.) to begin,  

with  noli, to buy; with  

myuth, to kiss;  hinu daw, to be guilty; with  

sau, to take with one; with  

hiss, to settle accounts with anyone; with  

khabar, to obtain news about a thing, to inform oneself; aor. 3 sg. imper.

(100)  
yotshu, to wish (complement in infin.); aor. 3 m.  

tum yotshu.

by him (her);  yotshu, by him (her);  tymu yotshu, by them;  

yotshu, by you to me;  hetsan, as to thee; 3 pl. m.  

hetsun, by him.

 MISCELLANEA.

MR. SHANKAR BALKRISHNA DIKSHIT.

Many readers of this Journal will hear with great regret of the recent death, prematurely, from fever, of Mr. Shankar Balkrishna Dikshit, of the Bombay Educational Department, who was for some years a contributor to this Journal and also did other valuable work.

Mr. Dikshit's speciality was mathematics and astronomy; and he came to the front at just the time when his knowledge could prove most useful. I was fortunate enough to make his acquaintance at the end of 1886, when I was engaged in the preparation of my volume of Gupta Inscriptions. He saw one or other of my preliminary notes, and introduced himself to me because he was interested in the subject and found himself able to settle exactly and finally the vexed question of certain dates in the Gupta era. And, at my request, he proceeded to write two articles, which were first published in this Journal and were also given as Appendices II. and III. to my volume. The first of them (Ind. Ant. Vol. XVI, 1887, p. 115) explained the process by which, with Prof. Kero Lakshan mantra's Tables, we may calculate correctly the week-day and the full Christian date for any given Hindu tithi or lunar day. The second of them (Ind. Ant. Vol. XVII, 1888, pp 1, 312) dealt with the elucidation of the system of the twelve-year cycle of Jupiter. In connection with the latter subject, he further made all the calculations — (some of them, I believe, extremely intricate and laborious) — for determining the years of the cycle that are cited in some of the Early Gupta records. And by his invaluable assistance he thus made complete the work that I then had in hand. Without his help, I must have left the long-disputed question of the

---

[The translator has made some corrections above. The Past Part. masc. of this verb is usually transliterated hyut, but hyut more nearly represents the sound.]
epoch of the Gupta era still open, within the limits of one year before and after the true date, to doubt and argument. With it, I was able to present my case in a complete and satisfactory form, and to prove for the first time what had often been maintained but had never been proved before, viz. that the Early Gupta kings rose to power, not in the first or second century A.D., but in the fourth century, and that, the given unqualified years being applied as current years, the exact epoch of the era used by them was A.D. 319-20 and the first current year of the era was A.D. 320-21.

As regards the matter dealt with in the first of Mr. Dikshit's papers, — it was not altogether a new one. To mention the most well-known names, — Warren (1825), Prinsep (1831), Kero Lahkman Chhatre (1869), Cowasjee Patell (1866), and Cunningham (1883), had worked at it. But the processes adopted by Prinsep, Cowasjee Patell, and Cunningham, gave results which were only approximate, — which might be correct or might not, — and were therefore of no real use for historical purposes requiring absolute and unquestionable accuracy. Warren's Tables could be made to yield accurate results: but the process was cumbrous; and the book was not free from mistakes which might easily vitiate any particular calculation. And Kero Lahkman Chhatre's Tables, which give the required accurate results by an easy process, are in the Marathi language, and had not attracted European attention. It is curious that the last-mentioned work should have remained unknown to, or at any rate unused by, Cowasjee Patell, who had, in it, the means at hand for producing, in at least one particular branch of his subject, much better work than his predecessors had accomplished and that he himself turned out. But so it was. And it is to Mr. Dikshit that we are indebted for bringing it to notice, and for practically placing in our hands, for the first time, the means of dealing properly with the question that arises most frequently in the verification of the dates of ancient Hindu records. Mr. Dikshit, indeed, was not absolutely the first in the field; for, Dr. Schram, of Vienna, published his Hilfe-tafeln für Chronologie in 1883, and dealt, among other details, with that particular one. Also, Prof. Jacobi, of Kiel and Bonn, who began to publish soon after Mr. Dikshit, had evidently taken the matter up at an appreciably earlier time, and had begun to work at it before an impetus to that line of inquiry was given by Mr. Dikshit. But to Mr. Dikshit belongs the credit of first bringing the matter to the notice of English readers, and of making the real start in a most interesting and important line of study, absolutely necessary to all who wish to deal properly with the ancient records of India. And the value of the subject, and of the impetus to the inquiry into it that was given by Mr. Dikshit, may be estimated from the time and trouble that have been devoted to the elucidation of it by writers who have followed him in order of publication. Since the time when he began to write, we have become indebted to Dr. Jacobi for "Methods and Tables for verifying Hindu Dates, Tithis, Eclipses, Nakshatras, etc." (Ind. Ant. Vol. XVII., 1888, p. 145); to Prof. Kielhorn, for "the Sixty-Year Cycle of Jupiter" (Ind. Ant. Vol. XVIII., 1889, pp. 186, 390), as well as for special articles on some of the various Hindu eras; to Dr. Schram for "Tables for the Approximate Conversion of Hindu Dates" (Ind. Ant. Vol. XVIII., 1889, p. 290), in which he has placed before English readers those of his Tables which treat of the Hindu lunar year; to Dr. Jacobi, again, for "the Computation of Hindu Dates in Inscriptions, etc." (Ep. Ind. Vol. I, 1892, p. 802), and for: "Tables for calculating Hindu Dates in True Local Time" (Ep. Ind. Vol. II, 1894, p. 487); and to Prof. Kielhorn, again, for a paper illustrating, with certain improvements, the use of "Warren's Rules for finding Jupiter's Place" (Ind. Ant. Vol. XXV., 1896, p. 233).

As well as the two papers already referred to, Mr. Dikshit contributed to this Journal a Table for the Abdaṇa, Tithi-Suddh, and Tithi-Kāndra (Vol. XVII., 1888, p. 268), which presented in a more convenient form, with some improvements by himself, the primary quantities that have to be taken in working with Kero Lahkman Chhatre's Tables; articles on "the Original Shrya-Siddhánta" (Vol. XIX., 1890, p. 45), and on "the Rōmaka Siddhántas" (ibid. p. 139), and some notes in connection with "the Pañcandikā" (ibid. p. 469); an examination of some Errors in Warren's Kalasanakalita" (Vol. XX., 1891, p. 33); a note on "the Date of Sundara-Pandya-Jayavarman" (Vol. XXII., 1893, p. 219); and a note on "the Age of the Satapatha-Brāhmaṇa" (Vol. XXIV., 1895, p. 245). These writings represent great application and hard work, as well as much learning. And still more clearly have those qualities been displayed by...
Mr. Dikshit's share in a work produced jointly by himself and Mr. Sewell, viz. the "Indian Calendar," with an Appendix by Dr. Schram on Eclipses of the Sun in India, published in 1896, which provides the materials for verifying the most customary details of all Hindû and Muhammadan dates from A.D. 300 onwards. The completion of this book realised an ambition which Mr. Dikshit had entertained before the time when he began to co-operate with Mr. Sewell. The book is open, of course, to criticism and improvement in respect of various details, and has been criticised in respect of some of them. But it is a most useful and up-to-date work. It has been everywhere very favourably received. And there is only one serious fault in it, fortunately easily capable of correction in a second edition, by omission; namely, that, in addition to providing for correct and unquestionable results, it also includes, and by placing them before the exact method even gives prominence to, some special means of making those approximate calculations of Hindû dates which, if accepted as yielding results, are so untrustworthy and useless,—with the dangerous advice that, if a result obtained by an approximate process is not in exact accordance with the given details of the date, and if those details include the week-day, then the result may be altered to suit the given details. These special means ofmakingapproximatecalculationsaretwo-fold: one is a system that was introduced into a previous work by Mr. W.S. Krishna Naidu; the other is a method invented by Mr. T. Lakshmin Naidu. Now, we are told in the very first words of the Preface that "this Volume is designed for the use, not only of those engaged in the decipherment of Indian inscriptions and the compilation of Indian history, but also of Judicial Courts and Government Offices in India." Approximate calculations must often be made, as a preliminary step, by the historian who is trying for exact results,—especially in cases in which there is a doubt as to the exact year in which the correct result is to be looked for. But it will very soon be found that the approximate calculations in such cases can be made,—either by using other methods, or by writing down from the "Indian Calendar" the first few quantities that are to be used for exact calculations, or even more readily still by a brief mental process,—much more easily and quickly than by either of the special means which Messrs. Sewell and Dikshit have put forward for them; and, after even the shortest practice, no one who has an exact result in view will ever take the trouble to use, for his preliminary approximate calculations, the means thus specially provided.

For any such work, therefore, those means are not needed at all. And, in the other direction, it is a really dangerous matter that Indian Judges and Civil Officers should have the temptation to use such processes and accept such untrustworthy results. It will not be often that parties before a Court can engage Counsel competent to lay such questions properly before the Court. And it may happen, at any time, that, by means of these approximate processes, the agency of a Court of Justice may be used to send an innocent man to rigorous imprisonment for a forgery or to hang him for a murder of which he is guiltless, or to enable some miscreant to secure, by a forged will or other document, property to which he has no just claim. I find it difficult to understand how Mr. Dikshit, with his habits of careful and painstaking accuracy, came to lend the authority of his name for such a use of processes of this nature.

In addition to the work that he did on his own account for publication under his own name, Mr. Dikshit was always ready, and was ever willing to find time, to examine a difficult date for anyone else, to elucidate any matter of doubt in his special line of work, and to render any other assistance that lay in his power. And great and varied was the help that I myself received from him, before the time when I became able to use the Tables freely and make calculations for myself. It was a real pleasure to invoke his aid; because he always had in view, not the finding of fault with work done by others, from a desire to write for the exaltation of himself, but a genuine wish to remove difficulties and impart knowledge. During the last few years of my service in India, and since then, I was not so much in communication with him as previously, partly because higher official position and increased work and responsibilities prevented me from engaging much in antiquarian researches beyond completing a contribution that I had promised for the "Bombay Gazetter," and partly because, since my return to England, I have not until lately been engaged in matters in which he could help. But certain questions have accumulated from time to time in connection with topics dealt with in the "Indian Calendar," and with other matters, in respect of which I had the intention of consulting him eventually. And it was, therefore, with more than ordinary sorrow that I received the unexpected news of his death. The loss of him will be greatly felt. It is a real misfortune that he should have passed away without revising his work in the "Indian Calendar." And it will, I fear, be very difficult to find anyone to take his place, to complete his published work in those details in which it is capable of
expansion or improvement, and to give from the
Native point of view the practical assistance that
even the best European scholar must need more
or less in the special subjects with which he was
so well acquainted.

J. F. Fleet.

London, 8th July, 1898.

SOME REMARKS ON THE SVASTIKA.

The svastika is called by the Jains sāthis,
who give it the first place among the eight chief
auspicious marks of their faith. It would be
well to repeat here, in view of what follows, the
Jain's version of this symbol as given by Pandit
Bhagwanlal Indraji, who was told by a learned
yati that the Jains believe it to be the figure of 'Siddha'. They believe that, according to a
man's karma, he is subject to one of the following
four conditions in the next life,—he either
becomes a god or dēva, or goes to hell (nāraka),
or is born again as a man, or is born as a lower
animal. But a Siddha, in his next life attains to
nirischna and is therefore beyond the pale of these
four conditions. "The svastika represents such a
Siddha in the following way. The point or bindu
in the centre from which the four paths branch
out is jiva or life, and the four paths symbolise
the four conditions of life. But as a Siddha is
free from all these, the end of each line is turned
to show that the four states are closed for him."

The Buddhist doctrines mostly resemble those
of the Jains, and it is just possible that the former
might have held the svastika in the same light
as the latter. In the Nasik inscription No. 10 of
Ushavāda, the symbol is placed immediately
after the word 'siddham,' a juxtaposition which
corroborates the above Jain interpretation. We
find the svastika either at the beginning or
end or at both ends of an inscription and it might
mean svasti or siddham.

The Hindus revere this mark as auspicious and
draw it on many religious occasions. At the Nava-
rātra (i.e., the first ten days of the month of Asvin)
it is drawn on the wall behind the family gods.
It is also drawn on walls with numerous figures by
women at the Gaurī festivals, when the image of
Gauri is placed on a pedestal and decorated with
flowers, pictures and paintings. At marriages
and thread placing ceremonies it is drawn on
clothes, pots and fruit. It is also marked out on
the wall where the marriage or upnāyana time
is written and made with water by means of
a pot called ghūtapātra. It appears again on the
feet of the bride and bridegroom. At the first
tonsaure or chāuti of boys it is drawn with
kātam on their shaved heads. It is drawn on
the head of a boy at his thread placing
(upnāyana) ceremony. It is drawn on the right
thigh of a bridgroom in one of the marriage
ceremonies. During the chādur māya, i.e., four
months of a year, some women vow to draw
thirteen svastikas daily, and at the end of the term
give dakhindā (alms) to Brāhmans. The svastika
is also drawn on horoscopes, purses, account
books and treasury boxes by the Hindus and Jains alike.
It is tattooed by women on the arms. In the morning
svastikas are drawn in great many varieties
by women in the open yard opposite a door,
after the ground is sprinkled with cow-dung and
water. On the Sumukurta, i.e., the day fixed for
a marriage ceremony, the people of Gujarāt and
Kach在接受 the floor a red circle with a
svastika in it, which is called ghauṛūt-svastika.
This symbol is also drawn on ground, smeared
with cow-dung, on which the family god
Kuldevata is placed.

Y. S. Vavikar.

NOTES AND QUERIES.

Bao.

Here is an additional quotation regarding this
curious word, noted ante, Vol. XXII. p. 165.

1788. — "Par une coutume barbarique, lorsqu'on
bâtit une Pagode, les premières personnes qui
passent sont jettées dans les fondemens. Cette
horrible cérémonie est cependant assez ordinaire,
parce que ces peuples croient presque toutes
leurs richesses à la construction de pareils édifices,
ce qui est parmi eux une œuvre très-meritoire, de
même que fonder des Bao, ou de contribuer aux
funérailles de leurs Tupains, qu'ils brûlent avec

In a footnote to the same page Sonnerat says,
by way of explaining bao, that it is "espece de
couvent."

I may add that the earlier part of the para-
graph above quoted is, as far as I know, a libel,
though a very old idea.

R. C. Temple.
My sources of information for the Kachin Language are:

1. Grammar of the Kachin Language, Hanson, 1896.
2. Handbook of the Kachin or Chingpaw Language, Hertz, 1895, official publication.
6. A Kachin peasant from the hills of the Myitkyina District.

Kachin is the Burmese appellation for a number of more or less closely connected tribes, inhabiting the hills within and without the Chinese (Yunnan) and Assamese borders of Upper Burma, and speaking a difficult, unwritten language in a bewildering variety of dialects. The Assamese appellation is Singpho, based on their own name for themselves, which is also variously represented as Chingpaw, Chinghpaw, Jinghpaw, and Singpaw (Chingp'o), and meaning roughly a Highlander.

By common consent the language of the Kachin Tribes is connected generally with that of the Naga Tribes, and is now usually known as belonging to the Kachin-Naga Group.

The books available to me on Kachin itself are slight, but they are all written in a systematic, capable manner. It seems, moreover, that a definite system of representing the language on paper has been officially arrived at, but as it would only cause confusion to use it in these pages, I have felt myself to be at liberty to represent the language on the lines I have followed in representing the Far-Eastern Languages generally, instead of adopting bodily the system of the Burmese Government.

In this way I would specially treat only the following points in writing Kachin, ignoring the tones for the present purpose. The frequently used, but scarcely heard, inherent vowel, like that represented in Talaing by the use of sonant syllables, will be written ´: e.g., Thong, two; m'sum, three. The sound nearly approaching that of ə in German, or cur in English, will be written ə. There is a distinct initial j, as in German, which will be so written, and kh will represent the harsh surd guttural heard in the Arabic IZER. K, t, p, when initial are sounded as ɡk, dt, bp, but this habit need not be represented on paper, as it merely means that the Kachins have an explosive way of talking, just as some "slight" stammerers have in speaking the European languages.

In devising words to represent the only coined currency they know, the Kachins have followed the plan so systematically adopted by the minor peoples inhabiting Burma and so often explained in these pages. Up till quite lately they were aware only of British rupees and their silver parts. Piece and copper money they seem hardly to have grasped as yet, and the old annas in the rupee still seem to be a great puzzle to them. All these points are brought out clearly in the Kachin money table, so far as I have been able to make head or tail of it. The Myitkyina Kachin, though quite positive as to his words, differs so much from the writers of the books, who by the way fairly agree together, that I will give the book words and his words separately.

83 Appr. A contains an excellent monograph by Mr. E. C. S. George on the Kachins of the Bhamo District.
84 Kakhyn and Kakhyn in many books of a generation back.
85 Mr. Hanum, Kachin Grammar, p. 6, remarks on the uncertainty of pronunciation in the dialects.
### Book Money Table of the Kachins (Silver).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Kachin</th>
<th>Sense of the Kachin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Han. 95</td>
<td>1 anna</td>
<td>pê-mî</td>
<td>1 pî²⁷</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Han. 95, S. 21</td>
<td>2 annas</td>
<td>mû-mî</td>
<td>1 mû²⁷</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>t'î-mî, tî-mî</td>
<td>1 t'i, 1 tî²⁸</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>mû-m'sâm, tî-mû</td>
<td>3 mû, tî and mû</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>tî-l'kông</td>
<td>2 tî</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>tî-l'kông-mû</td>
<td>2 tî and mû</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>tî-m'sum</td>
<td>3 tî</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 21, Han. 95, Her. 42</td>
<td>1 rupee</td>
<td>làp-mî</td>
<td>1 piece²⁹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Han. 95</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>gyâp-mî</td>
<td>1 piece³⁰</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Her. 42</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>dingâ³¹</td>
<td>coin (lakhâ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 14, 16</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>kumprô</td>
<td>silver piece</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 21</td>
<td>2½ rupees</td>
<td>hông-mî</td>
<td>1 hông³²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Han. 95</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>rông-mî</td>
<td>1 rông</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>k'ûn-mî</td>
<td>1 k'ûn³³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>gak'ûn</td>
<td>a k'ûn of halves (ga)³⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>pûn-mî</td>
<td>1 pûn³⁵</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Han. 95, S. 95, Her. 42, 47</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>joi-mî, soi-mî</td>
<td>1 viss³⁶</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Book Money Table of the Kachins (Copper).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Kachin</th>
<th>Sense of the Kachin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Han. 95</td>
<td>1 pie</td>
<td>kà-mî</td>
<td>1 kà²⁷</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1 pîce</td>
<td>p'ai-sû</td>
<td>pîce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>p'ai-sû-lîp-mîlî</td>
<td>pîce pieces 4⁶⁸</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

²⁷ Burmese and Shân.
²⁸ Shân tî'; tî'; ante, p. 11, and Shân Dict., p. 279.
²⁹ Shân bû markers; ante, p. 9, and Shân Dict., p. 477.
³⁰ Burmese.
³¹ Shân; ante, p. 15, and Shân Dict., p. 252.
³² Practically, half a viss.
³³ Shân; ante, p. 15, and Shân Dict., p. 571.
³⁴ Shân; ante, p. 15, and Shân Dict., p. 588.
³⁵ Shân, soi.
³⁶ Means Abrus seed; see below in the Myitkyina Kachins' terms.
³⁷ Note that the Kachins place their numeral coefficients like the Chinese, and not like the Burmans and Shâns; i.e., before and not after the numeral.
The Myitkyinä Kachin's Money Table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Kachin</th>
<th>Sense of the Kachin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 anna</td>
<td>nl-sāp</td>
<td>2 pieces (?) half-annas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 annas</td>
<td>mūsí</td>
<td>a mú</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>kyi-sum-kyāp</td>
<td>copper 3 pieces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>tsi</td>
<td>a ti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ngōlum</td>
<td>5 lum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>tèn-nūl-pu-n'sān</td>
<td>1 ti and ? 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>tŚ-l'kōng-mū</td>
<td>2 ti and mú</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>tŚ-l'kōng-mū</td>
<td>2 ti and mú</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>tŚ-m'sum</td>
<td>3 ti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>tŚ-m'sum-mū</td>
<td>3 ti and mú</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 rupee</td>
<td>kyāp-mī</td>
<td>1 piece</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1½</td>
<td>ngōnchān</td>
<td>silver?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1¾</td>
<td>làp-mī-tŚ-l'kōng</td>
<td>1 rupee and 2 ti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1¼</td>
<td>làp-mī-tŚ-m'sum</td>
<td>1 rupee and 3 ti</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the above tables and information the following points become clear. The Kachins really divide their rupee by the silver pieces (2 and 4 annas), which they find current, on the principle of the surrounding system of Troy weight, being still hazy and uncertain as to the use of the newly introduced copper money, and practically unable to express or comprehend the intermediate British divisions of the rupee into annas, which last denomination is a money of account. Thus:

2 pā = 1 mú
2 mú = 1 ti
4 ti = 1 kyāp or làp
2½ làp = 1 hōng or rõng
4 rõng = 1 k'ān
5 k'ān = 1 gak'ān
2 gak'ān = 1 joi

As regards Kachin bullion weights, my information is chiefly gathered from Mr. Hanson (p. 95) and Mr. Symington (p. 20).

9 For kyāp. Thus, chāp, chūp, săp = jēp, gūp = kyāp.
10 Kp = Bar, copper; sum, Kachin three: kyāp, Shān, piece.
11 Lum: see Kachin Troy Table, either for lemin or dūm.
12 Burmese mulā: sŚ = zī, a seed.
13 Burmese sŚ, zī.
14 It will be seen that this man is consistently confused as to the "odd annas" in a rupee, and he collapsed altogether when asked to go beyond "six annas."
15 This is clearly a wrong form: tŚ-l'kōng being sufficient.
16 He gave these words on being shown five, six and seven four-anna pieces.
17 Shān, silver.
Kachin Troy Weights.

M'lem = Abrus seed. Lem-mi = 1 lem.

2 lem = 1 dum
2 dum = 1 pë
2 pë = 1 mû

Kachin Avoridupois Weights.

gak'an = half a viss
joi = 1 viss

The viss, joi, is the weight that turns the scale, as can be seen in the phrase, joi cheng e, "it balances, it weighs;" cheng, a weight, being borrowed from Burmese-Shán, while joi is used for the scales as well as for the standard weight, a viss.

The Myitkyina Kachin recognised the Abrus seed as kâchêng, i.e., kâ-weight, which seems to indicate that the true meaning of the term kâ-mi, given by Mr. Hanson for "one pie," is "one Abrus seed." But he had, nevertheless, no true idea of Troy weight, though he seemed to show some glimmering of it in his term for piece, say-chêng-hyâp (or hyâp), copper-weight-piece.

I have already remarked that the Kachin books available are slight, and there is not much to be obtained from them as to the metals, while the Myitkyina Kachin differed greatly from them in his terminology.

Thus: — silver is in the books kump'rô, kumprô, gump'rô. According to the Myitkyina Kachin it is kump'rông. Gold is in the books jà, ajà, and gold-dust is jàmun, jàyûn. Brass and copper are in the books m'grî, but the Myitkyina Kachin gives them as kyûl and hyûch respectively. Iron in the books p'rà, p'riv, but the Myitkyina Kachin called it sam't'kông, a term which he also used for tin, while in the books tin is p'riv-p'rà, i.e., white iron. In the books lead is chá, actû, m'jî, cháu, and zinc is p'riv-p'rô, but according to the Myitkyina Kachin this last is sam't'kông.

I will now proceed to compare the Singpho terms for currency and the metals, so far as I am able, with those of the Kachins, though there is some difficulty as to this, as Mr. Needham in his works does not pay much attention to money or barter, and what information he has given to be extracted piecemeal from his Grammars.

The ordinary Singpho word for money is as usual that for silver, kump'rông, which will be at once recognised; but at p. 13 is to be found dalà aimà, one rupee. Here we have apparently reference to a numeral coefficient dâr for money in Kuki-Lushai, seen again seemingly in Chin (Lai) dâr, brass, Kachâri (Bôgi) darbi, gold, and in Ao-Nâga târîbi, silver. The Mîri numeral coefficient for rupee is dâr.

---

98 Also chî, Hertz, p. 47.
99 Prô means white and undoubtedly kump'rô means "white kum," kum being, I take it, a root for "metal" or for "the metal par excellence." For there is in the "Nàga" Languages a persistent set of roots, këng, râng, yêng, with the sense of "the metal," meaning sometimes gold, sometimes silver, sometimes iron, and sometimes several metals indifferently. E.g., Kachin, kump'rô, kumprô; Singpho, kump'rông; Mîri, mārkëng, këng; silver: — Kachin, sam't'kông (also iron); Manipûrî, ñîson; tin: — Lhota, ràng, ñrang, rûmpûk; Hill Tipperâ (Lushîi), râng; Empo, rûnhrông, yêng, këng; Angami, xàdê; silver: — Kûki-Llushîi, rûmpûkî; Hill Tipperâ, rûnhrông; gold: — Ao, rûngûn; lead: — Ao, mîrrông (also in) iron: — Ao, yongmîn; brass: — Ao, yongmîn; copper: — Lhota, yêngchêk; brass, copper, tin, iron.
101 Lôf was also given me by one man, and may be dialectic.
97 Symington, pp. 95, 98.
98 See also Needham, p. 197.
The words for the metals generally in Kachin and Singpho seem to be identical, thus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Silver</th>
<th>Gold</th>
<th>Brass</th>
<th>Iron</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kachin</td>
<td>kump'rò, kamp'rong...</td>
<td>jà...</td>
<td>m'grì...</td>
<td>p'rì...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singpho</td>
<td>kump'rong...</td>
<td>jà...</td>
<td>magì...</td>
<td>m'p'rì...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I notice also that the word for weight in Singpho is *chen* (p. 117), and that the Kachin word *gà-dà, (gà) half*, has its counterpart in the Singpho *n'kau* or *kau-mà* (one-half). But it is in the numerals that the identity of Kachin and Singpho comes out, so far as the present enquiry is concerned.

### Comparative Table of Kachin and Singpho Numerals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Kachin</th>
<th>Singpho</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>l'ngai, ngai</td>
<td>ai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suffixed</td>
<td>mì, mà</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>l'kông, l'kwang'</td>
<td>n'k'ong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suffixed</td>
<td>nì</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>m'sum, m'sôm</td>
<td>masûm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>m'ìl</td>
<td>mall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>m'ngà</td>
<td>mangà</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>krù, krap, kruk</td>
<td>k'rù</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>s'niit</td>
<td>sinìt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>m'tsât, m'sât</td>
<td>masat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>j'k'ù, s'k'ù, ch'kù, ch'kon</td>
<td>chakù</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>shì, alf</td>
<td>al, tas, alù</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>shì'ngai, sel'ngai</td>
<td>alf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>k'un</td>
<td>k'un</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>k'unl'ngai</td>
<td>k'un-ai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>sumshì, sùmsì</td>
<td>dumàl</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

84 See Needham, pp. 87, 97, 100.
85 The great difference, so far as I can judge, between the Singpho and Kachin dialects, which would tend to make them mutually unintelligible, is that the accent in Kachin is on the last syllable, whereas in Singpho it is on the first: e.g., *m'grì* in Kachin would, in practice, have a very different sound to *ms'pì* in Singpho, and they would not be to the ear at all identical words.
86 Needham, pp. 75, 98.
87 According to the Moykyinà Kachin, the "teens" run thus: — *sa-l'ngai, sa-l'kông, sa-l'k'mù, sa-l'm'all*, and so on to *sa-l'k'lu*, 19.
Ordinarily, therefore, I gather that a Singphô would count his rupees thus: — dalá-má, dalá-n'k'ông, dalá-masim. But that the Singphôs use the generic term kump'róng also, may be seen from the expressions kump'róng lachá, 100 rupees; kump'róng k'wun, 20 rupees, in Needham's Grammar, pp. 76, 78. Similarly a Kachin would ordinarily count his rupees by the coefficient term ló (gyap), thus: — ló-má, ló-ni, ló-n'm'sum. Or he might count them by borrowing the Burmese word diáged, a coin (Hertz, p. 38, Symington, p. 66), thus: — diáged-má, diáged-ni, diáged-m'sum. But he might also count them by using the generic term kump'ró, wide Symington's expressions kump'ró-l'sá, Rs. 100; kump'ró-l'sá-m'ngá-shi, Rs. 150 (pp. 14, 16). It is therefore clear that a Kachin would at once understand a Singphô in a bargain, though it must not be assumed that a Singphô, with his surroundings, would have any idea of the Kachin's method of dividing his rupees, that style of calculation belonging to the Burmeso-Shán side of the ranges dividing Burma from India, and being utterly foreign to any Indian people.

It may help to explain the numerals of these tribes to note here how the Myitkyiná Kachin was induced to deliver up his terms, for an attempt to extract them out of him direct failed altogether. A number of pebbles were collected and he was told to count them one by one. He accordingly took up the pebbles one by one and enumerated them on his fingers, turning one finger down at each enumeration, and when he had reached five he pushed the pebbles aside. He then proceeded to count five more in the same way and pushed them aside, and then said, pointing to the two little heaps: — l'kông m'ngá sá, “two fives (are) ten.”

---

88 The Myitkyiná Kachin collapsed at 100, being unable to understand numerals beyond this point.
89 1,000 seems to be the end of the Singphô numeral denominations, but the Kachin denominations follow that of the Burma Tribes generally: — thus,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Kachin</th>
<th>Singphô</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>m'ldáh, m'ldá</td>
<td>m’ldáh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>l’sá, l’sá</td>
<td>lachá, latsá</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>n’ištá, n’ištá</td>
<td>n’k’ôngchá</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>chingmi, singmi</td>
<td>hing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>mummi</td>
<td>hingťá</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>senmi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>wánmi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000,000</td>
<td>rími</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Symington, p. 61, is a little confused (probably his teachers were), and gives chiing, mún and sing as the equivalents for a lákh, 100,000.

90 The Kachins have a word for cowry, tó'ká (Symington, p. 35), but the Singphô's probably have not.
91 I have found this plan by far the most effective with such semi-savages. The heavy, puzzled look disappears at once from their faces, intelligence takes its place, and then slowly and painfully the numbers come out one by one. But I warn the enquirer that much patience and a trained ear are necessary to a successful result. The educated, literary Manipúr official, quoted in the section on Manipúr Weights, enumerated on his fingers, evidently from sheer habit.
He proceeded onwards in precisely the same way up to twenty and then said, pointing to the four heaps: — m'li m'ngd b'un, "four fives (are) twenty." So on to k'ruk m'ngd sōme, "six fives (are) thirty." Then by coaxing he went on to k'un m'ngd l'tā "(a) score (of) fives (are a) hundred." After this he subsided, having reached his tether as regards enumeration, and was apparently unable to recognise the book words given for a thousand and onwards.

My sources of information on the Nāga Languages most nearly connected geographically with the Singphō are:

2. Outline Grammar of the Ao Naga Language, Mrs. Clark, 1893, official publication, Assam.
6. A Nāga from Sibṣāgar and two Nāgas from Manipūr.

To take the Lhota-Nāga Language first, I find the money table to run as below, but it has an unstable appearance. In fact, instability seems to be a main, though distracting, feature of the Language. E. g., Mr. Witter remarks, p. 8 f., on the instability of both the vowel and consonantal sounds, and the instability of the words themselves: can be ascertained by trying to make out the sentences given with the Grammar and by noting the variety of form given in the various parts of Mr. Witter’s book for the words of currency and money. The probability is that the dialect differs on every hill side on which it is spoken, and that the speakers use it very much as the speakers of highly developed written languages use slang, i. e., they are quite indifferent as to form, provided their meaning is understood, trusting rather to inference than to convention for the correct conveyance of their meaning.

### Lhota-Nāga Silver-money Table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 anna</td>
<td>... pūsā mez'i, rāngmyō mezii</td>
<td>4 pice, 4 red coins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 annas</td>
<td>... mōiyā matsaṅgā</td>
<td>... 1 mōiyā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... ...</td>
<td>rāŋgterū ēhm</td>
<td>... coin small white</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 annas</td>
<td>... mōiyā enni</td>
<td>... 2 mōiyā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 &quot;</td>
<td>... mōiyā et'am</td>
<td>... 3 mōiyā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 &quot;</td>
<td>... rāmpīāk pūko</td>
<td>... half rupee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... ...</td>
<td>rāngmyō tizā</td>
<td>... 8 red coins</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

92 A reprint sent me by the late Prof. Avery, based on notes supplied in 1884 by Mr. Clark, the husband of the authoress of the Ao Nāga Grammar above quoted.
93 Witter, pp. 88, 89.
94 This looks as if the word rāngmyō were used indiscriminately for pice and anna, which is as likely as not.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Lhota-Naga</th>
<th>Sense of Vernacular</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>adhōli\textsuperscript{66}</td>
<td>(adhōli, half rupee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 annas</td>
<td>mőiyā mūngo</td>
<td>5 mőiyā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>mőiyā tirōk</td>
<td>6 mőiyā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>mőiyā ting</td>
<td>7 mőiyā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 rupee</td>
<td>ōrāng matsaṅga</td>
<td>1 rupee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rōmaṅk matsaṅga</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pīṅkā, ēpīṅkā\textsuperscript{66}</td>
<td>rupee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1\frac{1}{2} rupee</td>
<td>pīṅkā sū pōko</td>
<td>rupee plus half</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What the expressions for the odd annas are I am not sure, but, from the general indications given, they are probably expressed either by ōrāng + numeral (e. g., ōrāng mūngo, 3 annas, ōrāng mūngo, 5 annas), or by the use of sū pōko, “plus a half” (e. g., mőiyā sū pōko, mőiyā and a half = 3 annas; mőiyā enni sū pōko, 2 mőiyā and a half = 5 annas).

**Lhota-Naga Copper-money Table.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Lhota-Naga</th>
<th>Sense of Vernacular</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 pie</td>
<td>ōrāngyō terāvō</td>
<td>smaller than red coin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 pice</td>
<td>ōrāngyō matsaṅga</td>
<td>1 red coin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pōisā matsaṅga</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 pice</td>
<td>pōisā\textsuperscript{68} enni</td>
<td>2 red coins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>pōisā et'ām</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>(anna)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The metals are badly expressed by the Lhota Nāgas, owing, no doubt, to their small acquaintance with them. Thus, the word for silver is given as ōrāng, but no word is given for gold at all, and one word, yōngchāk, does duty for brass, copper, tin and iron, i. e., really for any metal not silver or money, while p'yōnte is used for lead.

The words given for weight and the scales have an apparent connection with that for cowry, which is odd and unusual. E. g., weight is efū (p. 158); balance is efū (p. 90); cowry is f'ūfo (p. 143). There are words to express the actual balancing of articles weighed against each other in ek'āing and kūt (p. 168), the first having a most suspiciously borrowed appearance.

Three words are translated “counterfeit money” by Mr. Witter, viz., ōrāngtāp, ōrāng-n'tāpō, ōrāngyōnō; a fact which it rather surprises one to find in the language of such a tribe, but they

\textsuperscript{66} Witter, p. 70. It is clearly the Lhota adhōli; see Beames’ ed. of Elliot, Glossary, Vol. II. p. 2.
\textsuperscript{68} Witter, p. 81. Also at p. 126 there is given ūtrēn, which also means wages.
\textsuperscript{67} Witter, p. 81.
\textsuperscript{68} Rārngyō is throughout a synonym for pōisā.
can be compared with the kumpro lamp of the Kachin Vocabulary of Mr. Symington, p. 65, translated "to mint, coin."

The Luota Nàga numerals (p. 26 ff.) present no particular difficulties, but there are some peculiarities valuable for comparison with other Nàga tongues and for counting out money.

| 1  | ek'á³⁹ | 11 | taró sû⁴ ek'á  |
| 2  | enun, ònul⁶⁹ | 20 | mekwü, mekwü, mekû³  |
| 3  | et'am | 30 | t'amdró²  |
| 4  | mezû⁴ | 40 | zûro²  |
| 5  | mûngû | 50 | òngyâ  |
| 6  | tûk | 60 | rôkro²  |
| 7  | tûng, ts'ang | 70 | ek'á ts'ang, ek'á tûng  |
| 8  | tûzû | 80 | ek'á tûzû  |
| 9  | tôkû¹ | 90 | ek'á tôkû  |
| 10 | taró², taró, tató³ | 100 | ek'á taró, n'zo, n'zû, n'zo²⁶  |
|    |    | 1,000 | t'angâ⁷  |

The usual way of expressing the intermediate numbers is that shown above in the case of 11: i.e., taró sû (or st) mezû is ten plus four or fourteen, mekwü sû mezû is twenty plus four or twenty-four: but 16 to 19, 26 to 29, etc., are alternatively expressed thus: —

| 16 | mezûsû mekwü m'pen | by-four 20 short  |
| 17 | et'amnû mekwü m'pâm | by-three 20 short  |
| 18 | enunmû mekwü m'pen | by-two 20 short  |
| 19 | ek'amû mekwü m'pâm | by-one 20 short  |

The tendency in reckoning is to carry the mind on to the next coming ten and to subtract from it.

Passing on to Ao Nàga, one finds that Mrs. Clark has not paid much attention to recording currency, and except incidentally there is no mention of money matters in her book. It must be remembered also, in reading what follows, that instability of form is as characteristic of Ao Nàga words as of those of any other Nàga tongue.

The word sen is used for money (pp. 61, 65, 69, 75, 140) borrowed one fancies from the sel (sen) of the neighbouring Manipuri State, especially as it turns up in the expression for small money, tânak sen⁸ (pp. 57, 106).¹⁰ A rupee is ordinarily tânak.

---

³⁹ This is only used in enumerating. When used with other words, "one" is represented by the suffixed numeral coefficients matàngi, n'teangû, for things, and n'êkû, n'khyû, for mankind. Fundamentally the term ek'á would seem to signify "a ten" in decimal notation: cf. the terms for 70, 80, 90, 100.
⁶⁹ Also ek'dâ tâlo m'pâm = by-one ten short = one less ten.
¹² The terms taró, t'amdró, zûro, rôkro, evidently mean 1, 3, 4, 5 tens.
¹⁰ Witter, p. 154.
¹⁰ Mrs. Clark does not distinguish between long and short vowels, and these have to be guessed at, but her ñ is always broad, and I have given it, therefore, as à.
¹⁰ It is also seen in the expressions for "debt," p. 102: — sen-tû, sen-dû, sen-ûpo, in which dû and ûpo mean "borrow" (pp. 54, 98) and sen means "money."
and also topāh (pp. 54, 57, 64, 66, 156). For pice the Indian form pōśa is found in a phrase on p. 65:

\[ \text{tānūr} \text{ ḫoṭi } \text{pōśa} \text{ ṛngu } \text{āri } \text{ādāh } \text{rāṣṭāgā ṛyur} \]

boy-the what pice gets that all keeps

The boy keeps all the pice he gets.

In the Vocabulary, however, is to be found the (?) Assamese form sorotia, made to do duty for “pice” on p. 147 and for “anna” (4 pice) on p. 90. It is quite likely that these Nāgas use the same term for both.

The word for cowry is given as zabā (p. 107).

Money is counted apparently in a straightforward way. Thus we find:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>pp.</th>
<th>ṭātsak kā</th>
<th>ṭātsak ānā</th>
<th>ṭātsak āsam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>57, 64</td>
<td>one rupee</td>
<td>two rupees</td>
<td>three rupees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The words for the metals partake of the regular Nāga forms, iron being the metal par excellence, as the same word, in, does duty for both iron and metal (pp. 132, 133).

Gold is hon (Assamese), p. 124. Silver is tārhi (pp. 70, 160). Iron is in, and merāng (p. 132), and with iron lead seems in some measure to be confounded, as one guesses from the term rāṅgīn (i.e., rāṅg-metal), but there is a synonym (p. 135) tāsin given for lead. Brass, yongmen (p. 99), is undoubtedly mixed up with copper, yongmenin, i.e., yongmen-metal (p. 106).

The Ao Nāga numerals have a puzzling, and curiously, but not uniquely, developed method of carrying the mind, after the first ten, on to the coming ten for numbers beyond five, as shown below: otherwise these numerals are much those of the Nāga and the allied tongues generally. Thus:

| Ao-Naga Numerals |
|------------------|-------------------|
| 1... | kā | 6... | trōk |
| 2... | ānā | 7... | tenet |
| 3... | āsam | 8... | ti |
| 4... | pezō | 9... | takō |
| 5... | pungā | 10... | ter |
| 11... | terikā | ... | ten and one |
| 12... | teriānā | ... | ten and two |
| 13... | teriāsam | ... | ten and three |
| 14... | teripezō | ... | ten and four |
| 15... | teripungā | ... | ten and five |
| 16... | metsō-mabēn-trōk | ... | twenty-not-brought-six |
| 17... | metsō-mabēn-tenet | ... | twenty-not-brought-seven |

11 Tātsak, I gather, means “wage-measure” see Ao Grammar, s. vt. measure and wages.
12 I gather that Mrs. Clark’s final short a, which she writes t, is the German o, or near it, and I rather suspect that she writes the sound sometimes as or, following the English sound of that combination of letters.
13 Should be, I take it, properly written terōk. 14 Should apparently be properly written metsō.
### Currency and Coinage Among the Burmese

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Burmese Name</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>metsō-māben-tf</td>
<td>twenty-not-brought-eight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>metsō-māben-takō</td>
<td>twenty-not-brought-nine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>metsō</td>
<td>(? a score)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>metsarikā</td>
<td>twenty and one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>metsariānā</td>
<td>twenty and two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>metsariāsam</td>
<td>twenty and three</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>metsaripezō</td>
<td>twenty and four</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>metsaripungā</td>
<td>twenty and five</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>semar-15-māben-trōk</td>
<td>30-not-brought-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>semar-māben-tenet</td>
<td>30-not-brought-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>semar-māben-tl</td>
<td>30-not-brought-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>semar-māben-takō</td>
<td>30-not-brought-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>semar</td>
<td>30 and 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>semarikā</td>
<td>30 and 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>lir-15-māben-trōk</td>
<td>40-not-brought-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>lir</td>
<td>40 and 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>tenem-māben-trōk</td>
<td>50-not-brought-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>tenem</td>
<td>50 and 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>tenemikā</td>
<td>50 and 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>rōkar-15-māben-trōk</td>
<td>60-not-brought-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>rōkar</td>
<td>60 and 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>tenemsermetsō-māben-trōk</td>
<td>50-and-20 not-brought-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>tenemsermetsō</td>
<td>50-and-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>tenemsermetsarikā</td>
<td>50-and-20 and 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>liranaś-māben-trōk</td>
<td>twice-40 not-brought-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>liranaś</td>
<td>twice-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>liranaśarikā</td>
<td>twice-40 and 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>telangtakō-māben-trōk</td>
<td>9-(before)-100 not-brought-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>telangtakō</td>
<td>9-(before)-100 (lit., 100-9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>telangtakōserkā</td>
<td>9-(before)-100 and 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10 The final r in semar, lir, rōkar, is evidently the ro of Lhota, and signifies "a ten." Probably the final ө in metsō signifies the same thing.

12 I take this curious expression to mean "the 9 before 100."
The Ao Nágas do not weigh the metals, so far as I can make out, probably measuring them; but they have a neat set of measures of capacity, on which they have based a sort of avoirdupois weight for their great requirement, fermented rice for making yi (rice-beer).

**Ao-Naga Measures of Capacity.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Approximate actual weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kentzô molok</td>
<td>egg basket</td>
<td>value of an egg in paddy</td>
<td>1 1/2 sêrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 yi molok</td>
<td>beer basket</td>
<td>value in paddy of standard measure of rice made ready for brewing yi (rice-beer).</td>
<td>2 1/2 sêrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 puâ</td>
<td>Indian quarter sêr...</td>
<td>........................................</td>
<td>5 sêrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (and 2) imzi</td>
<td>village</td>
<td>village standard</td>
<td>20 (and 10) sêrs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The real standard, i.e., the weight that does not vary, is, however, the puâ, for the Bengali pasêk, magnified from the quarter sêr, which it really is, to the five-sêr weight (pasêk), probably because five sêrs of paddy are equivalent in value to one quarter sêr of some article that these people still commonly buy, or have in the past habitually bought, with paddy (unhusked rice).

Another common measure, evolved as above, is the nabû molok, wage basket, 2 1/2 to the puâ, and hence equal to about two sêrs which represents a day’s wages in paddy.

**Ao-Naga Avoirdupois Weights.**

2 tsamâ-s’oong are 1 s’oongś = 1 1/2 sêrs
1 s’oongś ... ... ... ... = 2 1/2 sêrs

Some villages have a weight called puâkoptâ (? short puâ), intermediate between the s’oongś and the tsamâ-s’oong (p. 49).

The word for scales is s’oongś, and the term tsamâ-s’oong seems to mean half-a-s’oong, or half the weight that turns the scale. The word sérêt is also given (p. 157) as a synonym for scales, and the expression sérêt-lung (lit., scale-stone) is given for “scale-weights.” But I gather from a sentence on p. 71 that sérêt is really borrowed from the Indian word sér and means that weight or its equivalent, thus:——

shizeng sérêt-kâ nômacnâ
potatoes sér-one insufficient
(translated) “the potatoes are a seer short weight.”

---

17 Mrs. Clark very properly remarks (p. 45) that the above mode of reckoning puzzles children and makes them carry forward the wrong figures in addition. So much is this the case, that in "the schools an effort is being made to discard the above irregularities and count regularly thus: tert-trêk, sixteen; melâr trêk, twenty-six; and so on." One does not wonder at it. In computing money the system must be a very difficult one to work.

18 (Clark, p. 49). Compare this with the Manipuri double scale; — one for rice and the other for paddy; Primrose, Grammar, p. 24.

19 Clark, p. 49.
One has to search the sentences given in McCabe's Angami Grammar for the views of the Angâms as to currency. From these can be gathered the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Sentence</th>
<th>Equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>p. 36</td>
<td>pice ... ... ... ... paisá</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pp. 26, 40</td>
<td>2 annas ... ... ... moyá</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 40</td>
<td>8 annas ... ... ... duli</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 37 ff.</td>
<td>rupee ... ... ... raká</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If we may accept that duli = adhâli (Lhota-Nâga) = adhâtâ (Indian), and that raká = a form of the general Nâga word râng, then the above table agrees with what may be called the normal Nâga forms. "Small money" is kepetse (p. 54).

The word for metal (p. 73) is given as t'ejô, but I gather, or rather guess, that jiño is metal and that the t' = iron. Then for gold we have no word at all, but silver is raká-jô (p. 85); lead is mûsîtâ-jô (misc., Manipûr : p. 71); copper is presa-jô (p'ri, Kachin-Singpho, iron : p. 56); while iron is t'esa21 (p. 70) and tin rîshî and zhâsî, where zhe, zhû probably equal ji. Brass is (p. 52) merêni or meseni, but I perceive that merêni (p. 60) also = "ear-ring," and perhaps the metal takes its name from the ornament.

At p. 26 we have moyá and moyá po (one moyá) for "two annas," and on p. 40 moyá sê (three moyá) for "six annas." Rupees turn up at several points in the book; e.g.,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Sentence</th>
<th>Equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>p. 26</td>
<td>raká po ... ... ... one rupee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 39</td>
<td>raká sê ... ... ... three rupees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 37</td>
<td>raká pangu ... ... ... five rupees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 38</td>
<td>raká t'et'â ... ... ... eight rupees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At p. 40 we have duli, eight annas, and at p. 39 raká kennâ di duli, rupees two and a duli, for Rs. 2-8-0. On this evidence, I should say that the Angâmi Nâgas count their money quite straightforwardly in rupees, two-anna pieces, and half rupees. Thus their scale would be:

4 moyá are 1 duli
2 duli = 1 raká

The Angâmi Nâgas reckon on the same principles as do the Ao Nâgas. Thus:

**Angâmi Nâga Numerals.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Numeral</th>
<th>Equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>po ... ... 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>sê ... ... 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>pangu ... ... 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>t'ênh ... ... 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>tekwû ... ... 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>ker-o-pokrô ... 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>ker-o-kennâ ... 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>ker-o-sê ... ... 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>ker-o-dâ ... ... 14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

20 Cf. Kachin and Singpho, ji, gold.
21 ñ = French j.
22 The r in ker and sê no doubt means "a ten." Cf. Ao numerals.
## Angami Measures of Capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>muta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>muta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>muta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>muta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>muta</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mr. Needham's Hindi Grammar, though referring directly to the Shaiyang Chau, is practically as used by the whole Mzira. About the latter, I have only an account from a native. I take it for granted that the Mzir used them to do from Mr. Clark's statements, etc., base them on a day's wage in rice. Thus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In their measures, which are only of capacity, the Angami Mzira actually do what one may expect the Angami Mzira to do from Mr. Clark's statements, etc., base them on a day's wage in rice.
coefficient \( pîr \); pice, borrowing the Assamese or Indian word, \( \text{pôisú} \) or \( \text{pású} \), with numeral coefficient \( pîr \) added. Money is generically spoken of as \( \text{márcáng} \) or \( \text{márkô} \) (pp. 27, 44, 108, 136).

The words for the metals, except iron, are absent from the Vocabulary, save as materials for bracelets. Thus, iron is \( \text{yûkdn} \) (pp. 107, 132; cf. \( \text{Maipûlû yût} \), Primrose, p. 17).

The words for bracelets are — of brass, \( \text{kâpûn} \) (p. 117); of silver, \( \text{kîngô} \) (p. 117; cf. the rupee, \( \text{márcáng} \)); and of a metal called lead, but (?) really bell-metal, \( \text{pûjûn} \), in which the Nâga word for metal, \( rûng \), comes out again.

The Miri numerals are extremely simple, and this tribe’s ideas of counting are distinctively Indo-Chinese:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Miri-Abor Numerals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1      átêrkô (^{26})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2      ánylkô</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4      âplkô</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6      âkêngkô, ákîkô</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8      plîyîkô, páûnyîkô (^{27})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10     éngîkô</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11     éngîkô lâng átêrkô</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20     éng-ánylkô</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21     éng-ánylkô lâng átêrkô</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30     éng-áûmkô</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90     éng-kônângkô</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100    lîngîkô (^{28})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Numeral coefficients are widely used and precede the numerals, as in Chinese and Nâga generally; e.g., \( \text{bâr} \), num. coeff. for rupee; \( pîr \), num. coeff. for small silver (2 and 4-anna pieces) and pice \(^{29}\) then:

\[
\begin{array}{c|c}
\text{Rs.} & \text{bâr-kô, á-bâr-kô} \\
\text{2} & \text{bâr-nyîkô, bâr-nyîl, á-bâr-nyîkô} \\
\text{3} & \text{bâr-ûmkô, bâr-ûm, á-bâr-ûmkô} \\
\text{2-anna-bit} 1 & \text{pîr-kô (á-pîr-kô)} \\
\text{2} & \text{pîr-nyîkô, pîr-nyîl (á-pîr-nyîkô)} \\
\text{3} & \text{pîr-ûmkô, pîr-ûm (á-pîr-ûmkô)} \\
\end{array}
\]

\(^{26}\) \( kô \) is evidently a suffix meaning "one," and the idea of the numerals is "a one," "a two," "a three," and so on. The movable prefix \( á- \) of the first six numerals seems to imply a fixed quantity, "only" (p. 20); so that the expressions \( á-á-kô, á-nyîkô \) signify really "only one," "only two." \( Kô \) turns up again on p. 27 of Mr. Needham’s interesting pamphlet, \( \text{A Few Digs} \) (Teleng), \( \text{Mîjû} (M') \) and \( \text{Tibetan Words}, 1886, \text{Government Publicatio} \), Assam, in the "teema" of the \( \text{Mîjûs} \) : thus 11, \( ñjû-ûnâ-kômîkô, ñjû, 10 \) and 1, and so on to 19.

\(^{27}\) Twice four.

\(^{28}\) But at p. 101 \( \text{lîngî mûrkhî \( \circ \\) is translated "500 rupees;" here \( á-\) bâr means "only," and so, perhaps, \( ñjû-\) or \( ñjû-\) means an large number — 100 and beyond.

\(^{29}\) I gather that there is a word only for the two-anna piece, as in the case of the other Nâga tongues.
But there is an odd exception to the rule in omitting the numeral coefficients with 7, 8 and 9: thus, pui, num. coeff. for round things: then:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>āpui puikō</th>
<th>āpui painyil</th>
<th>āpui paikeŋ</th>
<th>āpui pui-čing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 egg</td>
<td>2 eggs</td>
<td>6 eggs</td>
<td>10 eggs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

But āpui kńit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>āpui pinya</th>
<th>āpui kōnāŋ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 eggs</td>
<td>9 eggs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

So far as the instances given are concerned, the Miris count their money chiefly by means of the coefficients. Thus:

- pp. 36, 58 ... Re. 1 ... ... ... ā-bār-kō
- p. 93 ... ... Rs. 4 ... ... ... bār-pkō
- p. 92 ... ... 10 ... ... ... bār-čingkō

But on p. 20 the full expressions are to be found:

- Rs. 4 ... ... mūrkōng bār-pkō
- 5 ... ... mūrkōng bār-ngākō

I have now taken those who have been good enough to follow me through all the unfortunately, but unavoidably, incomplete evidence available to me as to the Kachin-Nāga Group of tongues, and it will be seen that the numerals and the words for the metals compare as shown below. I have added Manipūrī to the comparison, as being a link between the Kachin-Nāga and the Chin-Lushai Groups, though I do not wish it to be thereby inferred that the two groups of tongues should not really be described as members of a larger general group of languages, embracing all the modes of speech adopted by the populations occupying the hills between India and Burma and the hills of the North and North-East frontiers of India and of the North frontier of Burma. 30

**Comparative Table of the Kachin-Nāga Numerals.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kachin</th>
<th>Singphō</th>
<th>Lhota</th>
<th>Ao</th>
<th>Angāmī</th>
<th>Miri-Abor.</th>
<th>Manipūrī</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 l'ngai</td>
<td>ai</td>
<td>ek'ā</td>
<td>kā</td>
<td>po</td>
<td>ātērkō</td>
<td>amā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suf. m</td>
<td>mā</td>
<td>matsaŋgā</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>kō</td>
<td>mā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 l'kōng</td>
<td>n'k'ōng</td>
<td>enni, ēnl</td>
<td>ānā</td>
<td>kēnnā</td>
<td>ānylkō</td>
<td>ani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suf. ni</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ni</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 m'sum</td>
<td>masum</td>
<td>et'ām</td>
<td>āsam</td>
<td>sē</td>
<td>āumkō</td>
<td>ahum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 m'li</td>
<td>mal</td>
<td>mezū</td>
<td>pezō</td>
<td>ē</td>
<td>āplkō</td>
<td>mari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 m'ngā</td>
<td>mangā</td>
<td>mūngo</td>
<td>pungū</td>
<td>pāngū</td>
<td>āngākō</td>
<td>mangā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 krū</td>
<td>k'rá</td>
<td>tirōk</td>
<td>trōk</td>
<td>surū</td>
<td>ākēngkō</td>
<td>taruk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31 Also n'ngai.
32 Also mē.
33 Also m'som.
34 Also krup, īrūk.
35 Also ākēngkō.
It is not my purpose here to prove the connection of the above words, but I have no hesitation in saying that they afford most interesting mutual evidence of a common origin.

### Comparative Table of the Kachin-Naga Terms for the Metals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metal</th>
<th>Kachin</th>
<th>Singpho</th>
<th>Lhota</th>
<th>Ao</th>
<th>Angamul</th>
<th>Miri-Abor</th>
<th>Manipuri</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>gold</td>
<td>jà</td>
<td>jà</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>hon</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>sana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>silver</td>
<td>kump'ró</td>
<td>k'umprong</td>
<td>òrng</td>
<td>tāribi</td>
<td>rakajó</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>? kongé</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>copper</td>
<td>m'gri</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>yongchāk</td>
<td>yongmenin</td>
<td>presajó</td>
<td>....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brass</td>
<td>m'gri</td>
<td>magi</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>yongchāk</td>
<td>yongmen</td>
<td>merēn63</td>
<td>....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tin</td>
<td>p'rlp'ró</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spelter</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iron</td>
<td>p'rl, p'śi</td>
<td>m'prf</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>yongchāk</td>
<td>in, meràng</td>
<td>tezhe</td>
<td>....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lead</td>
<td>chū, m'jū</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zinc</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>....</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

57 Also tej'ăng.
58 Also t'ai.
59 Also ek'd'ing.
60 Also n'zo, n'zi, n'zoa.
61 Also sing-mi.
62 See ante, p. 200. The Mvkyin Kachin gave quite a different series of words.
63 Also m's't.
64 Also t'ai.
65 Also kek'ū, kek'ū.
66 Also t'ai.
67 Also nōklang.
68 Also m'zēt.
69 Also k'k'ū, ch'k'ū.
Of course, in such a matter as the nomenclature of the metals, savage tribes will borrow largely from those around them, and such a table as the above is valuable chiefly for tracing such influences.

I have had two opportunities of personally examining Nāgas as to their vocabulary. One man came from the Naga Hills District, and called himself a Sibsāgar Nāga, obviously for the benefit of the Englishman, but I could not get a better description of himself out of him. His vocabulary showed him to belong to what are called the Mithan and Tablang Nāgas in Dalton’s Ethnology of Bengal, p. 71, and I here give the information gleaned from this man for what it may be worth.

He named the metals as follows: — gold, saktōt; silver, shakānwa; brass, kāpūnā; lead, nābūwa; tin, swapwā; iron, yān. His money was named thus: — rupee, tākā (Indian, takā); 8-anna-piece, hōtōl (Indian, adhēlā); 4-anna-piece, yēki (cf. Shān, ante, p. 12); 2-anna-piece, asāt; pice, pāiśā, pōiśā, e.g., one anna, pōiśā-ālī, i.e., pice four. For rupee (the coin) he had a synonym me v. nākā, tākā, which has a distinct Far-Eastern look, and he recognised the Abrus seed at once as gālāhā.

He clearly calculated money, like the other Nāgas, by the silver coins, and his table ran thus: —

2 asāt are 1 yēki
2 yēki ′ 1 hōtōl
2 hōtōl ′ 1 tākā

But his chief method of dividing the rupee was by the yēki or four-anna-piece. Thus, he at once named the following fractions, on the coins being put down for him to name: —

Re. 1 ¼ ... yēki agā ... five yēki
Re. 1 ½ ... yēki agōk ... six yēki
Re. 1 ¾ ... yēki amīt ... seven yēki

His numeration was interesting, thus: —

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>... chāng</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>... enni</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>... arēn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>... alī</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>... agā</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>... agōk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>... amīt</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>... asāt</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>... akū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>... bōn</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>... bōn-bā-chāng</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>... bōn-enni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>... hān</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>... hāhan</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>... panit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>... pāpūn</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>... pārēm</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>... pamit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>... pāsāt</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>... pākū</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>... pāgā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>enni-pagā</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>pāhā</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two other men whom I examined I can only describe as Maipūrī Nāgas, for they certainly came from the hills of Maipūr, and belonged to the same tribe and village, though what their precise tribe was I could not discover.\(^2\)

These men also divided the rupee by its silver coined parts, but with a curious nomenclature, thus: —

2-anna bit ...mulē (mā weight, Burmese)
4-anna bit ...sāki (Indian)
8-anna bit ...s'ān-pēh (half rupee, s'ān)
rupee ... s'ān (= also silver)

\(^2\) I rather gather that it requires a considerable practical experience of the Nāgas to make out the tribe of any individual with certainty.
For the intermediate annas they used the Burmese form *p'aisáh* of the Indian *paisá*, calling the anna *p'aisáh* m'hai, four pice, and reckoning thus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>anna</th>
<th><em>p'aisáh</em> m'hai</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>pice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>annas</td>
<td>mülé</td>
<td>a mâ weight</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>mülé-all <em>p'aisáh</em>-m'hai</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>sû 4 pice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>sîki</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>sîki-all <em>p'aisáh</em>-m'hai</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>sîki 4 pice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>mülé asèh</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>mâ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

And so on, multiplying out the mülé and sîki for the even annas, adding *p'aisáh* m'hai for the odd annas, and using *s'nd pôh* for eight annas. This method shows a little more systematic thought than is usual with the wild tribes.

One rupee was called *s'nd kai*, and, on being shown the coins, they at once called Re. 1½ *s'nd-kai* *s'nd-pôh*, *i.e.*, one rupee (and) one half, and Re. 1¼ *sîki-m'ngú*, *i.e.*, five sîki, which is correct and again shows active reasoning powers.


Their numerals were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>ál</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>án'hai</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>áseh</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>m’tai</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>m'ngú</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>churú</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>ánèh</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>áchet</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>ákau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>kirão</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>kirão’áll</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>kir-áhão</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>kir-áchet</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>kirão’m’tai</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>kirão’m’ngú</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>kir-áchurú</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>kir-ánèh</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>kir-áchet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>kir-ákau</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>m’kai</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>m’kai-áll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>shirão</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td>rái’m’tai</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td>rái’m’ngú</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td>rái-chirú</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td>rái-ánèh</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td>rái-áchet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td>rái-akúh</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>kihai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(To be continued.)
which certain vowels undergo in Declension and Conjugation, with a few examples. The following pages, therefore, do not owe much to this MS.

182. The other authorities, in the Roman character, mentioned by me in §§ 1 and ff., are extremely incomplete as regards nouns, and treat them very superficially.52 It thus happens that the solution of many difficulties can only be arrived at by the study of the existing texts, and these, it must be confessed, do not always sufficiently assist us, in ascertaining satisfactorily the correct forms of words. For example, in Np. the vowel points are often omitted, or written without adherence to any fixed rule. Thus, a and i are not often interchanged: e. g., d̄hahi, beside d̄haki; and again j and o is sometimes written for j. a (o), thus j or j, a mother, and so many others.53 So also in the texts written in the Devanagari character there is a similar want of system in writing words and forms. E. g., तरण and तारण, मिर, but मेर, which are good examples of the difficulty of fixing the pronunciation.54

I regret, therefore, that the following pages cannot be affirmed to rest in every point on a secure basis; but they may serve to assist further studies in Kāśmirī.55

I. — Gender.

183. The gender of substantives and adjectives is either masculine or feminine. In the case of pronouns, it may also be neuter. When masculine nouns are changed to feminines we find the same changes of final consonants, which we observed in the case of verbs (see § 158).56

184. [We thus get the following changes.]57 They only occur either in the formation of feminines from masculines, or in the declension of feminine nouns.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Final</th>
<th>Changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>j</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j</td>
<td>j</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>j</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>ch (only in declension)58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>chh (only in declension)58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>th</td>
<td>chh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kh</td>
<td>chh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>ch</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

52 The MS. marked b by me must be excepted. Even in this, however, the Personal Pronouns are not given, and the numerals only as far as 48. [Another exception must be made in Mr. Wade's excellent little grammar, which was not known to the author.]

53 The fact is that in Kāśmirī the vowel scale is by no means fixed. In different parts of the country, and by different people, and by the same person at different times, words are pronounced in different ways. There is as yet no standard. This is exemplified by the difficulties experienced in representing many of the sounds in the Persian and in the Devanagari alphabet. — Trans.

54 [The translator has endeavoured to illustrate what he believes to be the most usual pronunciation in each case, by the system of transliteration adopted by him: see §§ 5 and ff.]

55 Mr. Wade's grammar and Iśvara-kaula's Kaśmirī-śāhāmānī (a native grammar edited by the translator for the A. S. R.) have enabled the translator to control Dr. Burkhard's results, and, in a few cases, to silently correct slips of the pen, or statements resting on incorrect authorities.

56 We, thus, find in Luke, xx1, 24, from d̄la lā namād, trodden under foot, pl. f. d̄la lā namājā.

57 [The reader is referred to §§ 158 and ff. The corrections there made are also made here. The author was under the impression that the rules for nouns differed from those for verbs, but this is not the case, and corrections have been made in the text accordingly.]

58 In these cases, the change is not observed in the nominative feminine.
Final န th becomes သ th

Radical.                                               Becomes.

_ a                                                      _ o
_ a                                                     _ o
_ a, _ 3, _ 3, _ 3
_ a                                                     _ o
_ a                                                     _ 3
_ 3, _ 3, _ 3
_ 3, _ 3, _ 3
_ 3, _ 3, _ 3

A final န 3 3 becomes ဗ 3.

Some words form the feminine, by adding a final ဗ 3.

Examples of these changes are given below.

A. — Substantives.

1. Gender.

186. Few general rules can be given for distinguishing the genders of nouns. It can sometimes be ascertained from the meaning, derivation, or termination of the word. In many cases, however, authorities contradict each other.

Thus, ဗ ဗ, a thing, and ဗ ဗ, commencement, are, according to El., feminine, but are masculine in Np.: ဗ ဗ, a fish, is, on the other hand, masculine in El., and feminine in Np. and elsewhere.

58 E. g., ဗ ဗ, mother; ဗ ဗ, sibnait (Arabic fem.), report; ဗ ဗ, za ndzé, zinday (Persian fem.), life; ဗ ဗ, nabiyah (Arabic), prophetess. A large portion of the vocabulary consists of substantives borrowed from Arabic or Persian.

59 [Ed. transliterates ဗ ဗ. Wade gives ဗ ဗ and makes it fem.]
Feminine substantives are formed from masculine ones, in the following ways:

1. Through the abovementioned changes of vowels and consonants.

**Examples:**

**(a) Vowel Changes.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Masculine</th>
<th>Feminine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[० a]</td>
<td>[० a]</td>
<td>khar, an ass</td>
<td>khar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[० á]</td>
<td>[० á]</td>
<td>See below.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[० or ० u]</td>
<td>[० or ० a]</td>
<td>gagur, a rat</td>
<td>gagur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>kohur, a cock</td>
<td>kohur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>kōtur, a pigeon</td>
<td>kōtur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[० o]</td>
<td>[० a]</td>
<td>zor, a deaf man</td>
<td>zor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>paf, a plank</td>
<td>paf, a small plank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[० u]</td>
<td>[० u]</td>
<td>patau-lōv, a fox</td>
<td>patau-lōv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dyōr, a rich man</td>
<td>dyōr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[० yu]</td>
<td>[० i]</td>
<td>See adjectives.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[० i, y, etc.]</td>
<td>[० i]</td>
<td>See adjectives.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final [० ०]</td>
<td>[० i]</td>
<td>tōla, a parrot</td>
<td>tōla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>gur, a horse</td>
<td>gur, a horse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ḍōḍa-gūr, a milk-seller</td>
<td>ḍōḍa-gūr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

61 Several additional examples, given by translator.

62 Luke, xiii. 34, ḍōḍa kohur [so also Wade, § 10].

63 Pronounced gur. In Devanagari गृ: gur. So also uḍa-gūr is pronounced ḍōḍa-gūr (Devanagari उदगुर).
(b) Consonantal Changes.
(See also below.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ٍ‍</td>
<td>ٍ‍</td>
<td>ناَدِر، a barber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ِ‍</td>
<td>ِ‍</td>
<td>ناَدِر</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ُ‍</td>
<td>ُ‍</td>
<td>پُدِ، a chicken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ُ‍</td>
<td>ُ‍</td>
<td>پُدِ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ُ‍</td>
<td>ُ‍</td>
<td>هُر، a dog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ُ‍</td>
<td>ُ‍</td>
<td>هُر</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(c) Changes of both Consonants and Vowels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vowel Change</th>
<th>Consonant Change</th>
<th>Masculine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ة]</td>
<td>[ة]</td>
<td>فَمِ، a pear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ة]</td>
<td>[ة]</td>
<td>كُرَّ، a potter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ة]</td>
<td>[ة]</td>
<td>سَلِ، a jackal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ة]</td>
<td>[ة]</td>
<td>غَنِ، a pimp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ة]</td>
<td>[ة]</td>
<td>غَنِ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ة]</td>
<td>[ة]</td>
<td>وَدِ، a man of low caste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ة]</td>
<td>[ة]</td>
<td>جَلِ، a goat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ة]</td>
<td>[ة]</td>
<td>نَه‍، a shepherd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ة]</td>
<td>[ة]</td>
<td>نَه‍</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ة]</td>
<td>[ة]</td>
<td>بُتُ، a drake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ة]</td>
<td>[ة]</td>
<td>بُتُ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ة]</td>
<td>[ة]</td>
<td>خَبِ، a bear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ة]</td>
<td>[ة]</td>
<td>خَبِ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ة]</td>
<td>[ة]</td>
<td>نَجِ، a cripple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ة]</td>
<td>[ة]</td>
<td>نَجِ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ة]</td>
<td>[ة]</td>
<td>سُدِ، sign of genitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ة]</td>
<td>[ة]</td>
<td>سُدِ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ة]</td>
<td>[ة]</td>
<td>تُرِ، a gaoler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ة]</td>
<td>[ة]</td>
<td>تُرِ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ة]</td>
<td>[ة]</td>
<td>مُلِ، a father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ة]</td>
<td>[ة]</td>
<td>مُلِ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ة]</td>
<td>[ة]</td>
<td>وُلِ، a ring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ة]</td>
<td>[ة]</td>
<td>وُلِ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ة]</td>
<td>[ة]</td>
<td>كُونِ، one-eyed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ة]</td>
<td>[ة]</td>
<td>كُونِ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Consonantal changes not exemplified above, will be found under the head of adjectives.]
(2) By the addition of the syllable ु aū [ू] or ० eō a...

- माम mām, a mother's brother
- बु ण baṇ, a Brāhman
- हुंस, a boatman
- कृ ह khar, an ass
- होस, a host, an elephant
- वृंश, a camel
- कृ त kās, a crow
- अण aṇ, a gander
- सूर sōr, a boar
- सो ण sōṇ, a shop-keeper
- पायर, a water-carrier
- वृव, a weaver

and so on.

(3) In the case of animals, often merely by the addition of यादā māda; e. g.

- खुर māda, a she-ass;

(4) In more or less irregular ways, e. g.,

- महान्यु, a man
- भो, brother
- राजा, king
- मदन्यु, a lover, friend
- सुह, a tiger
- वर, a snake
- जव, an ox
- क्षुर, a sparrow
- गुलाम, a servant

- याप मāda, a she-ass;
A man’s wife is generally denoted by the addition of bātī, or is frequently formed according to rule 2 [the latter is less respectful]. Thus,—

chān, a carpenter ... chhāna-bātī, a carpenter’s wife
kāndr, a baker ... kāndr-bātī [or kāndreṇ]
khar, a blacksmith ... khara-bātī
krāl, a potter ... krāla-bātī
manr, a lapidary ... manr-bātī [or manrreṇ]
pādshah, a king ... pādshah-bātī (≡ mālik), the king’s wife, the queen
grāst, a cultivator ... grāst-bātī
nāvid, a barber ... nāvid-bātī
wāsā, a cook ... wāsā-bātī, a she-cook, or a cook’s wife

I also find (Luke, i., 36):—

ashnā, the cousin ... ashnā-bātī

(To be continued.)

NOTES ON THE SPIRIT BASIS OF BELIEF AND CUSTOM.

BY SIR J. M. CAMPBELL, K.C.I.E., I.O.S.

(Continued from p. 165.)


The general effects of spirit-possession are sickness or disease, barrenness, loss of favour or affection, loss in business, and general misfortune. When a person is seized by a spirit, the usual symptoms are that he cries incessantly, weeps, speaks at random, bites his fingers, sways his body to and fro, lets his hair fall loose, spits blood, refuses food for days, and day by day grows paler and leaner. In some cases of spirit-possession, where the result is barrenness or other form of ill-luck, no bodily signs are visible. In the Konkān as well as in the Dakhan, the following diseases have been generally attributed to spirit-possession, Monomania, Melancholia, Hypochondriasia, Mania, Dementia, Catalepsy, Hysteria, Epilepsy, Convulsions, Delirium, Malaria, Fainting, Long-continued disease, Cholera and other epidemics, and Sudden Illness. Spirit-possession brings sickness and misfortune. So the Kotegars, low class Dhāwrār beggars, if sick or unlucky, go to a Liṅgāyat priest, who gives them an enchanted lemon and some ashes. They eat the lemon, rub on the ashes, and are well. The Pingla Joshis of Bija—

---

12 The effects and symptoms mentioned above are in the case of involuntary spirit-possession.
14 Information from Mr. V. B. Ghollay, Assistant Surgeon, Poonā.
15 Information from Mr. Tirmalrūṇā.
pur, if they are troubled with sickness, think it is caused by an angry ancestral spirit entering the body, and to please the ghost they set his image among the house gods, and worship it. Gujarât Musâlmâns believe that when a young grown-up girl gets an attack of hysteria it is because she has a jinn, or spirit-lover, who has possessed her. Spirit-possession causes sulkiness. Among Gujarât Musâlmâns, if a woman is sulky or in a fit, the husband says: "Don't speak; the devil is on her." In Mysore, epilepsy is believed to be the effect of spirit-seizure: Buchanan says — one night hearing a great noise, next morning I made enquiries, and found that one of the cattle-drivers had been possessed by a devil or jinâx, and had been senseless and foaming at the mouth. The whole people, Musâlmâns and Hindus, met, and in the hope of frightening the devil made all the noise they could. But they could not get him to leave, till a Brahman threw ashes on the man and said prayers. In fact, it was epilepsy brought on by intoxication. Among the Shanârs of Tinnevelly, if a man feels the beginning of an auge fit, or the dizziness of a bilious headache, he thinks himself possessed. The Kirghiz of Central Asia hold that a woman in child-bed suffering from an involuntary muscular contraction, is the effect of possession. An Arab in delirium is possessed: so the Samoans, Tongans, Sumatrans, all think that madness is possession. In Syria, madness is thought to be inspiration. Among the Jews madness was originally thought to be ghost-possession. The Chinese believe that diseases are caused by the unfriendly spirits of dead ancestors, who, having no posterity to offer sacrifices, and yet having the same need of food, possess or prey on the living. The Hottentots believe that all disease comes from Gauma, their devil-guardian, and his servant. Barrenness is caused by spirit-possession, and so Hottentot girls who have just come of age run naked in the first thunderstorm that they may be fruitful. In Africa, the effects, or rather symptoms, of spirit-possession are hysteria, lethargy, insensibility to pain, and madness; these symptoms are believed to be the work of Baders or wizards. In the Kongo, in West Africa, epilepsy is possession, and the possessor is the ancestral spirit. The Abyssinians hold that women are oftener possessed than men. The Umpsas think death can hardly occur naturally. The Coast negroes think neither death nor disease is natural. American Indians think that death is caused by witchcraft. The belief in spirit-possession and in the spirit theory of disease is still common in rural England. Fits, the falling sickness, ague, cramp and warts are all believed to be caused by a spirit entering the patient's body. These diseases are cured, that is, the spirit who causes the disease is scared, by a charm. In the charm the disease is addressed as a spirit or being. In ague the charm runs: "Ague, farewell till we meet in hell." Cramp is addressed: "Cramp, be thou faultless, as our Lady was sinless when she bore Jesus." In Lancashire, the people think casting out the ague is the same as casting out the devil, for it is the devil in the sick man that makes him shiver and shake. Warts are cured by rubbing them with a green elder stick and burying the stick till it rots. In certain parts of England fits and his cough are still believed to be possessions, and are cured by charms. Unmarried country girls in England, when they have no lover, perform many curious rites. The object of the rites is apparently to get rid of a fairy lover who the girl thinks has possessed her, and, to keep her for himself, has thrown over her some spell which makes her unloved in men's eyes. For this reason she performs various rites to get rid of the fairy lover. In Yorkshire, on St. Agnes' Eve, girls keep a fast, and eat a small cake, flour, salt and water, without speaking.
7. How Spirits are kept off.

In many parts of the Bombay Presidency it is believed that persons who die on an unlucky day, people who die a violent or unnatural death, and people who die with a wish unfulfilled, as an unmarried person, or a woman in child-bed, or who die leaving their chief interest behind them, as a woman who leaves a babe, or a miser who leaves his hoard, do not rest, but come back to trouble the living. To prevent ghosts of this kind from coming back and troubling the family, special funeral rites are performed. Figures of men of dough or of sacred grass are laid on the body and burned, and, in the case of a woman, all or some of her ornaments or clothes are given to a Brahman woman. Among the Ratnagiri Marathas and Kunbis a woman who dies in child-birth has sometimes the tendons of her heels cut. Among the Sowvanidh Khairals of Aliabad there is a strong belief that when a woman marries a second time, her first husband’s ghost comes and troubles her. To prevent him troubling her, she wears round her neck a charmed silver or copper amulet, or a silver or copper image of the dead husband. In Gujarat, men and women wear round the neck a round or oblong silver plate with the face of the deceased member of the family who has been haunting them roughly embossed on it. In the Dakhan, to prevent the ghost of a woman who has died in child-birth coming back, water and râli grains are strewn along the path when the corpse is carried to the burning or burying ground. As soon as the body has passed out nails or a horse-shoe are beaten into the threshold of the house, and in some cases a small nail or a needle is driven into the crown of the head of the deceased.

To drive spirits from the bodies of persons whom they have seized, several home cures are resorted to. In the Konkâ, when a person is believed to be possessed by a spirit, a fire is kindled, and on the fire some hair, marjum lobâs or dung-resin, and a little hog-dung or horse hair are dropped, and the head of the sufferer is held over the flames for a few minutes. Cuts with a light cane are given across the shoulders, and pieces of garlic are sometimes squeezed into the ears and nostrils of the possessed. When all home cures fail to drive out, the spirit, prayers for help are offered to guardian spirits or to house and village gods. Vows are made to the house gods, and the patient is taken to the temple of Mâruti, or some other village god; there he is made to fall prostrate before the idol, ashes from the incense pot kept burning before the god and a little red lead and oil taken from the feet of the god are applied to the forehead of the sufferer, and he is brought home. When the guardians fail to drive out the spirit, in some cases even before consulting the guardians, an exorcist, or bhegat, is called in.

(To be continued.)

MISCELLANEA.

KOBANG, THE MALAY COIN AND WEIGHT.

The commercial term kobang is liable to lead to confusion in the minds of students, because of its application to two very different objects, viz., the Japanese gold coin or piece of money known as kobang or ko-ban, weighing 232 grs. of gold, and the Malay money of low denomination, 10 cents, known as kupong and also loosely as kobang. Both the Japanese and the aborigines kobang have been current side by side in the Straits Settlements for centuries. Yule incidentally mentions the Malay kobang in Hobson-Jobson, but he gives no explanation of it, nor has he devoted an article to it. The following quotations are a contribution to its history. The word itself seems to mean a piece or slice, and to have been originally a numeral coefficient, as are so many modern expressions for money, coin, weights and measures in languages using numeral coefficients. See Maxwell, Malay Manual, p. 71, who, as a numeral coefficient, calls the word kopong.

1419. "In their trading transactions (Java) the Chinese copper cash of different Dynasties are current . . . . Their weights are as follows: a cattî (kîn) has twenty taels (tian), a tael sixteen ch'ien and a ch'ien four kobangs; a kobang is equal to 2-1375 fen, the Chinese official weight.
the ch'ien is 8.75 fen, their tael is 1.4 Chinese taels, and their cash has twenty-eight Chinese taels, all in official weight of China." — The Ying-yai Sheng-ian, quoted in Groteveldt, Notes on the Malay Archipelago and Malacca, in Indo-China, 2nd Series, Vol. I. p. 177 ff.

1654. — "The weight with which they weigh (at Malacca) gold, musk, seed-pearl, coral, calabumbo, . . . consists of . . . one paush 4 mazes, one maz 4 cupoö, one cupoö 5 cumundrys." — A. Nunes, p. 39, in Yule, Hobson-Jobson, s. v. mace. Under candareen, Yule quotes the same passage in a different rendering, calling cupoö, cupoö by the Anglicised form cuppong.


1711. — "A Quarter of a Mace is called a Pollam or Copong, Imaginary." — Lockyer, Trade in India, p. 42.

1776. — "4 Copang Acheen are 1 Mace, an Imaginary Coin." — Stevens, Guide to East Indian Trade, p. 87.

1805. — "The Memorandum of 1805 by Lieutenant-Governor Farquhar (J. Ind. Arch. Vol. V. p. 418) speaks of 'doublekies or capong,' the doublekies being the Dutch coin of 2 stuyvers, or 10 doits." — Chalmers, Colonial Currency, p. 382 n.

1811. — "And (at Achin) kepping or copper cash, of which 400 go to the dollar." — Marden, Hist. of Sumatra, p. 171.

1812. — "Keping, a copper coin, of which 400 are equal to a Spanish dollar." — Marden, Malay Diet., s. v.

1813. — "4 copangs = 1 mace." — Milburn, Oriental Commerce, in Yule, Hobson-Jobson, s. v. mace.

1814. — "This tax is either paid in a small Chinese coin, called képong, or in kind." — Raffles, Java, Vol. II., Appx., p. cxii.

1825. — "Accounts are kept (in Penang) in Spanish dollars, capong, and piece, 10 piece making a capong, and 10 copangs one Spanish dollar." — Kelly, Cambis, in Chalmers, Colonial Currency, p. 382.


1836. — "This gold coin (Japan copang) is not to be confused with the copper coins of 1 and 2 capangs coined for Malacca in 1836 by the East India Company." — Chalmers, Colonial Currency, p. 388 n.

1836. — "At Malacca 10 Saga besar or 4 Kupangs are equal to one maiam." — Newbold's account of Johole, in Moor, Indian Arch., Appx., p. 70 n.

1852. — "Kupong (Dutch cuppon)." A copper money, estimated at 10 doits, or the decima of a Spanish dollar." — Crawford, Malay Diet., s. v.

1881. — "10 duit (cent) = 1 ktpang, (10 cents), in Penang and Province Wellesley." — Swettenham, Malay Vocabulary, Vol. I., Appx. on Currency, etc.

1883. — "Local terms are also used to denote fractions of the dollar, as in Penang, kupang (= centes)." — Maxwell, Malay Manual, p. 142 f.

1883. — "These are Malay words. The wong was the Netherlands Indian stijver, = 4 duit, and the wong bhara was the European stijver, = 5 duit. Twenty-two years ago, when I was magistrate at Malacca, I often heard the expression wong bhara used to signify 2½ cents of a dollar, though there was no corresponding coin. This is similar to the use of the Kupang in Penang." — Chalmers, Colonial Currency, p. 388 n., in a letter from Sir W. Maxwell.

R. C. TEMPLE.

NOTES AND QUERIES.

MUSALMAN TITLES FOR HINDUS.

The use of Musalmán titles by Hindus is not uncommon in all parts of India which have been subject to Musalmán rulers. In Bengal a well-known family of Brâhmans bears the title of Khân. Bâjê Mahendrá Lâl Khân, of Mîdânpur, is one of them. So also the titles of Majnu’dâr (now corrupted into Majoomdar), Sirkâr, Mustaﬁr, are borne by the descendants of persons who held those offices under the Moghul sovereigns. The reverse practice of Muhammadans bearing Hindu names is also common in Northern Bengal, where we meet such names as Shâkh Gobind Dîs, Shâkh Gîfâl, Kâlêt Shêh. These are descendants of converts to Islam from Hindùism, who retain the Hindu names of their ancestors.

JOHN BEARES in P. N. and Q. 1883.

* This can hardly infer that the Dutch introduced the word into Malay, because we hear it presumably in use in 1416 and certainly 1554, the first Dutch voyage to India being dated 1596-7.
SCYTHO-BACTRIAN COINS IN THE BRITISH COLLECTION OF CENTRAL ASIAN ANTIQUITIES.

BY A. RUDOLF HOERNLE, C.LE., Pr.D. (TUBINGEN).

THE British Collection of Central Asian Antiquities, which has gradually been forming within the last five years, and a Report on which I am now preparing for the Government of India, includes a not inconsiderable number of very interesting coins. Some of these belong to the Scytho-Bactrian, others to the Indo-Chinese classes. In this paper I propose to describe the coins of the former class. With two exceptions they were all procured, in October 1897, through Captain Stuart H. Godfrey, Assistant Resident in Kashmir, by purchase from a merchant named Miyan Ghulam Rasul. They are said to have come from Samarkand, Tashkend and other places in Western Turkestan. The two exceptions are from Eastern (or Chinese) Turkestan, and were procured by Mr. George Macartney, who resides in Kashgar as Special Assistant for Chinese Affairs to the Resident in Kashmir. They were obtained from one of the sand-buried sites to the North of Khotan.

The substance of this paper will form part of my forthcoming Report, which will be accompanied with photographic plates showing the coins here described.

The total of the Scytho-Bactrian coins is thirty-six. Among them there are Imitations of Bactrian coins, twenty-six coins of Hyrkedos, one coin of Azes, and two of uncertain inscription.

(a) Imitations of Bactrian Coins.

There are seven of these; all silver Tetradrachms. They imitate the coins of Euthydemus and Heliocles. The former reigned in Bactria about 210-190 B.C.; the latter, who appears to have belonged to a rival family, about 160-120 B.C. during the reign of the former, Saka tribes occupied the Nor. harr provinees of the Bactrian empire between the Oxus and Yaxartes. During the reign of the latter, the Sakas, being driven out by Kusahan (or Yue-chi) tribes, occupied Bactria south of the Oxus. Their chiefants imitated the coins of their contemporary Bactrian rulers. These coins can be easily recognized by their degradation, both in point of design and of weight.

The best of the seven coins are two in imitation of Heliocles, of his well-known type: Bust of King on obverse, and Standing Zeus on reverse, as in the British Museum Catalogue, plate vii, fig. 2. One, which weighs 231 grains (full weight 264), measures $1\frac{1}{2}$, and is fairly good in design (with ringlet for omikron), though much worn, may possibly be a genuine coin of Heliocles. It has the monogram of Brit. Mus. Cat., No. 4 (p. 21). The other weighs only 219 grains (size $1\frac{1}{2}$), and, as the semi-barbarous reverse shows, is clearly a Saka imitation: but the curiosity of it is, that while it has an imitated Heliocles reverse, it has retained an apparently genuine obverse of Eukratides (c. 190-160 B.C.), who was the predecessor, and perhaps father, of Heliocles. The imitated Heliocles reverse is very fairly done, it has the full Greek legend, but with a dot for omikron, and a rather rude figure of Zeus. Its monogram is Β. Both this and the first-mentioned coin must be early imitations, and may be referred to about 150 B.C.

The remaining five coins are imitations of Euthydemus, of his well-known type with Head of King on obverse, and Sitting Heracles on reverse, with club resting on his knee. One of them, which is the heaviest, weighing 170 grains and measuring $1\frac{1}{2}$, has the king’s portrait as shown in Brit. Mus. Cat., pl. ii, figs. 1-4. It had also an entirely Greek legend, which, however, is almost totally obliterated. The other four coins, which only weigh from 155 to 144 grains, show the king’s face as portrayed in Brit. Mus. Cat., pl. i, fig. 11 (also Ariana.

1 See the outlines of Bactrian history in the Introduction to the British Museum Catalogue, pp. xviii. ff.
Antiqua, pl. i, figs. 2-4, and Rapson’s Indian Coins, pl. 18, in the Indo-Aryan Encyclopedia). Both types of face, however, are very fairly imitated. One of the four coins, which weighs 144 grains (size 14”), had an entirely Greek legend, now badly effaced; but sufficient traces remain to show that it had the name of Heliodores struck over that of Euthydemos. The two names were not struck accurately in the same line, consequently M (of Euthydemos) is still seen slightly projecting over the line of Heliodores, of which latter name H is fully, and A partially recognizable; as shown in the woodcut. The other three coins are bilingual, having the king’s name in native Bactrian letters, while the title in Greek characters is seen in its usual place to the right, or behind the back, of the Sitting Heracles. Of the Greek title BAZIAME only the three letters ΣΙ Ε or ΣΙ Ν (i.e., with inverted Λ) together with traces of Λ before and Ε after them are clearly legible. Coins of this description, that is, with the title to the right and the name in Bactrian letters to the left of Heracles, appear to have been found previously. Two such coins, from the collection of General Fox (if I understand the account correctly), are described by Mr. Thomas in his edition of Prinsep’s Indian Antiquities, Vol. I, p. 32. But, so far as I know, none of them has ever been figured. Similar coins, but with the Greek and Bactrian legends transposed, that is, the title in Bactrian and the name (Euthydemos) in Greek, have been published. One, in rather good preservation, has been figured by Sir A. Cunningham in the Numismatic Chronicle, Vol. IX (1859), pl. xiii, (also Rapson’s Indian Coins, pl. i, 19). Another series of similar coins has the whole legend in Bactrian characters, see Numismatic Chronicle, Vol. IX, pl. xiii, 6; also Ariana Antiqua, pl. i, 9, 10; Indian Antiquities, pl. ii, 5. It is probable that, as Sir A. Cunningham says (Num. Chron., Vol. IX, p. 307), the oldest imitations are those with Greek legends only, next come those with mixed legends of rude Greek and Bactrian letters, the latest are those with Bactrian characters only. In the second class, I suppose, those coins which preserve the Greek fashion of arranging the legends, and show the title on the right in Greek, and the name on the left in Bactrian, may be considered to be older than those which show the mixed legends in the opposite position, i.e., the name in Greek on the left, and a Bactrian legend on the right, the latter legend also being a name. Accordingly the bilingual coins of the present series may be referred to about 130 B.C. It would also seem, if Dr. Gardner’s theory of the change of standard is correct (see Brit. Mus. Cat., Introd., pp. lxvii, lxviii), that these coins are didrachms of the Persian standard (full weight 160-170 grains), such as began to be minted in Heliodores’ reign.

Seeing that the Bactrian legend on our coins takes the place of the Greek name, it seems reasonable to assume that, like the latter, it runs parallel to the Greek title and must be read from the outside of the coin. This assumption is certainly supported by the general appearance of the characters, which, after the Semitic fashion, must be read from the right to the left. They are shown in the subjoined woodcut.

No. 1. Weight 155 grs.
No. 2. Weight 148 grs.
No. 3. Weight 145 grs.

The third, fourth and fifth letters of No. 1 legend have a distinct resemblance to the Kharosthi letters ja, a and ka; and at first I was disposed to take the second letter as a crude Kharosthi ra, and to read the whole as a matilization of (a)raja Akai (Ashkelon). But the remaining signs do not suggest Kharosthi letters. The fifth letter of Nos. 2 and 3 suggests the Kharosthi e; but on the whole the three legends suggest themselves as identical; for the first three letters in all are clearly the same; so are most probably the sixth and seventh; and the
fifth letter of Nos. 2 and 3 may be only a badly drawn form of the corresponding letter in No. 1. The only apparent difference between the three legends is the absence of the fourth letter of No. 1 from Nos. 2 and 3. I am not able to decipher the legend; but considering the juxtaposition with the other coins of Euthydemus and Eukratides which bear the name of Helioctes, I would like to suggest that the Bactrian legend might also contain that name. The Alphabet current in Bactria must have been one of the very early modifications of the Aramean, similar to the ancient Pahlavi and Kharosthi. The first and fifth letters are very like the Pahlavi h and the Kharosthi k respectively. The second letter resembles the Kharosthi l. The third and fourth letters resemble the Pahlavi aleph and vav respectively, and together might have been used to express the vowel a. In Nos. 2 and 3 the fourth character is omitted; and the third might also be taken to represent the Aramean 'ayin and to express the vowel o. Anyhow, the initial four or five characters may be easily interpreted to represent h-l-o-k, the initial portion of the name Helioctes. It is more difficult to fit in the remainder, unless we may assume that the name was pronounced with r instead of l, as in its Indian form Helitakeya. In that case the sixth letter is r, in its form closely resembling the corresponding Pahlavi and Kharosthi character. The seventh letter appears to be mutilated, and there may have been an eighth; but I do not know what the genitive inflection of the local Bactrian or Scythian dialect may have been in these days. Thus the characters may represent the letters h-l-o-k-r, which would well enough make up the name of Helioctes.

(6) Coins of Hyrkodes.

There are twenty-six coins of Hyrkodes, about 110 B.C., silver obols; mostly of the two well-known types, with Head of King on obv., and either a standing figure (17 specimens), or Head of Horse (7 spec.) on reverse, as shown in Brit. Mus. Cat., pl. xxiv, 10 (10 spec.); ibidem, pl. xxiv, 11 (7 spec.); and ibid., pl. xxiv, 12 (7 spec.). But there are two obols, one being a new variety of the well-known type, the other an entirely new type. The new variety shows the reverse standing figure holding a spear in his left hand, while the usual variety shows the spear in his right hand. Weight 13 grs.; size 0.5". The new type shows the usual Head of King on the obverse, but the reverse has a standing figure to the right, apparently Nike standing on a scroll (cloud ?) with traces of a Greek legend. The King's head is distinctive for this coin. Size 0.5625". Weight 17 grs.

(6) Coin of Aaxes.

There is one coin of Aaxes, c. 80 B.C., silver; nearly the entire legends of both sides clipped away; of the well-known type with mounted King on obverse, and Zeus holding Nike on reverse; apparently in every respect (incl. of monograms) the same as Brit. Mus. Cat., No. 32, p. 75. Weight 36 grs., size 0.5625".

(6) Uncertain Coins.

There are two copper coins, from the neighbourhood of Khotan; apparently Indo-Bactrian, but too much worn to permit of identification. One is a small round coin, measuring \(^{1}\) inch, weighing 18-5 grs., showing on one side traces of a bull's head facing (?), within an irregular square, enclosed within a marginal circle of dots, without any legend: the other side is entirely indistinguishable. The only, hitherto known, Bactrian coins with a bull's head facing, so far as I know, are two square copper coins of Menander, in Brit. Mus. Cat., No. 66, p. 49, and No. 4, p. 169 (pl. xii, 5, and xxxi, 10). The other is a small, apparently square coin, measuring \(^{1}\) inch, weighing 11 grs., showing on one side traces of a conventional stupa (?) surrounded by an illegible legend: the other side is quite indistinguishable. The only, hitherto known, coin with a stupa, I believe, is a square copper one of Agathocles, in Brit. Mus. Cat., No. 15, p. 12 (pl. iv, 10).
ESSAYS ON KASMIRI GRAMMAR.
BY THE LATE KARL FREDERICK BURKHARDT.
Translated and edited, with notes and additions,
by Geo. A. Grierson, Ph.D., C.I.E., I.C.S.
(Continued from p. 221.)

II.—DECLENSION.
The Oblique Base.

188. The declension of a noun depends on what is called its oblique base; that is to say, the form of the noun to which the case-terminations (ə, ə, ə, ə) are added. The oblique form ends either in -a or -i. In some cases it ends in -i in the singular, and in -a in the plural. Thus, naukar is the oblique base of naukar, the servant (dat. sg. naukara-s); kuli is the oblique base of kul, the tree (dat. sg. kuli-s); kori is the oblique base of kor, the girl (dat. sg. kori-s); kathi (singular) and katha (plural) are the oblique bases of kath, the word (dat. sg. kathi-s; dat. pl. katha-n).

189. There are thus three main forms of declension, an a declension, an i declension, and a mixed a and i declension. As, however, the declension of feminines of the i declensions differs somewhat from that of masculines of the same declension, we may adopt the hitherto customary division of nouns into four declensions—

[Vis., Declension I. an a declension
  II. "i" (masculine)
  III. "i" (feminine)
  IV. a mixed i and a declension.]

All nouns following the first two declensions are masculine, and those following the third and fourth are feminine.

Number.

190. Kasmiri has two numbers, a singular and a plural. As in other Indo-Aryan Vernaculars, there is no dual.

Case.

191. There are eight cases, viz., Nominative, Vocative, Accusative, Instrumental, Dative, Ablative, Genitive, Locative. The first three may be called direct cases, and the remainder oblique cases. [The last three are made with the aid of post-positions, and are not true cases.]

192. Nominative.—This is the form in which nouns are quoted.

193. Vocative.—In the 1st, 3rd, and 4th declensions this case is formed by lengthening the -a or -i of the oblique base. In the 2nd declension, the -i of the oblique base is changed to y, and 1 - ə is added. Thus: (I.) naukar, obl. base naukar, voc. naukara, voc.

[The author gives a different order. The translator has retained the order customary amongst Indian grammarians.]
In the plural, the termination -au is added, before which the -a of the oblique form is omitted, and the -i becomes y; thus, thus, *naukaraud, buliyau, kóri, yau, gádiu.

The Vocative is usually preceded by the interjection ىُ اَیُ، O! ٩٨

194. Accusative. — This is the same as the Nominative in all four declensions.

195. Instrumental. — In the singular of the first declension, the termination -in is added to the oblique base: in that of the 3rd and 4th declensions, -h is added; and in that of the second declension, the form is that of the oblique base [but the i is shortened to i]. The plural ends in -au. E. g., *naukara-n, kóri, gádi, *naukaraud, buliyau, kóri, gádiu. This case is principally used as the case of the agent with transitive verbs in the past tense, see § 88.

196. Dative. — In the singular, this case takes -s in the 1st and 2nd declensions, and -h in the 3rd and 4th. [In the plural it takes -in in all declensions.] This case often stands as a direct object instead of the Accusative, and does so regularly instead of the personal suffixes; e. g., "*bo balárdwa-k tim (I will heal them), or *bo timan balárdwa (timan being the dat. of the pronoun of the 3rd pers. pl.);" it is therefore that "nabitán chhuk qatt kárdin tā tim yim te nisch ãy sôra saangán chhulák kárdin, thon kilst the prophets, and stonest them that are sent unto thee" (Luke xiii, 34). Very instructive is Luke, xv. 8, which is that "késa záñata jhúk, késa záñata zaná jhúk chhuná, késa dâlán, késa chhéntá dâlán, késa chhulák dâlán."

What woman doth not light a candle, and sweep the house, in which the suffix of the dative even stands after the interrogative verb. We also, however, find the dative instead of the accusative with a verbal suffix following, when it precedes a relative sentence; e. g., "myánen dushmaná, yimau na yotsh si bo kara iman peñ pádásháhat, yuri antú-x, those mine enemies which would not that I should reign over them, bring hither.

---

98 In Np. we always find ىُ اَیُ instead of اَیُ, ۔, and اَیُ instead of اَیُ. E. g., *kóri, *kúli (so also in adjectives, e. g., Luke, xii. 32, *kóri, kúli; *káli, *kúli; O little flock! [The real fact is that there are numerous forms of the Vocative case, all differing slightly in meaning. They are all given in the Haimara-jâddurâra.]

99 In Np. the Vocative is sometimes (principally in the case of foreign words) the same as the Nominative; e. g., *dy khudáu, *dy narú, *dy ustá, O master; *dy aurú, O woman; *dy shirá, O man.
197. **Ablative.** — This case is usually the same as the Instrumental, but in the case of singular nouns, of the first and second declensions, meaning animate beings, it is the same as the Dative. In the plural it is always the same as the Instrumental. In the 3rd and 4th Declensions it is the same as the Instrumental. Thus (3rd Declension) Dat. and Abl. कोरि (kori), pl. कोरयु (koryau), (4th Declension) Dat. and Abl. गाड़ी (gadi), pl. गाड़यु (gadyau). In the 1st and 2nd Declensions the Dat. sing. ends in स. Thus, in the case of animate beings in the singular number, we have (1st Declension) Dat. and Abl. चोर (choris) and (2nd Declension) गुरस (gurs). The Instrumental case singular in the first declension singular ends in लान (lan), and the Ablative singular of inanimate objects is formed by dropping the final ल. Thus, गारा (gara), a house, Instr. sing.: गोर (gor) garan, Abl. sing.: गोर (gor) gara. The Instrumental singular of the 2nd Declension ends in ल. In the Ablative, the ल is fully pronounced; and a pleonastic ल is added as in the first declension. Thus, कुल (kul), a tree; Instr. sing.: कुल (kul); Abl. sing. कुलिक (kulik) or कुल (kul). The ल added is merely a graphic device and is not pronounced. The Instrumental plural of both declensions ends in लाउ (lau), and the Ablative plural of all nouns is the same as the Instrumental plural, thus, ताशार (tashara), गौर (guar), गूर (gyar), कूलिया (kuliyā). The Ablative appears chiefly in composition with prepositions which denote separation or distance; e. g., बागा एडारा (baga andara), from the garden; नाथे मश्किना ता माध्रिना ता जानाहटा ता शम्बली पथा (nathē mashkina ṭa mādhriṇa ṭa jānāhāṭa ṭa šambalī patha), from the east and from the west and from the north and from the south.

198. **Genitive.** — This is properly speaking the Dative,⁶⁸ compounded with the declinable words सोंद (send), हौंद (hund), सूंस (shun), अंग्जा (angja) meaning 'belonging,' to all of which govern the dative case. Regarding the use of these expressions see §§ 206 and ff. below. In the 1st and 2nd declensions the termination स of the dative is elided before सोंद (send), so that we get नाकोरा सोंद (the ल is merely graphic).⁷¹ In the 3rd and 4th declensions we have कोरि हौंद (kori hund), गाड़ी हौंद (gadī hund).

---

⁶⁷ [The translator has altered this portion of the original to bring it into accord with the actual facts of the language. The author makes it out to be invariably derived from the Dative. As a matter of fact it is usually the same as the Instrumental.]

⁶⁸ Hence every attribute of a genitive, including every genitive dependent on a genitive, and every noun in apposition to a genitive, must be in the dative, see below, § 209.

⁶⁹ [The author throughout writes हौन, and there has hitherto been great uncertainty as to which was the correct form. It is now agreed that हौन is the correct form, and the translator has accordingly corrected it so throughout.]

⁷⁰ Probably the Skr. सत, being.

⁷¹ Instead of ल, I now and then find ल, e. g., लिल (dil), for दोल (dil).
The genitive can also be expressed in the following manners:

(1) The substantive is turned into an adjective, by the addition of the following syllables:
   1. (a) שׁעָנ (fem. שׁעַנ, pl. שׁעֲנָ), to proper names: e.g., מִרְצָע שָׁה (Mizra Shāh), of מִרְצָע שָׁה (Mirza Shāh), פִּילְשָׁה (Philēsheh), Uriah's wife; הָדָּה (Hadā), Philēsheh's daughter.
   2. (b) שֵׁעַ (fem. שֵׁעֲ, pl. שֵׁעֲ, fem. שֵׁעֲ, a chye), to [masculine] substantives [expressing inanimate things in the singular], including nouns of action, and infinitives used substantively: e.g., בֵּנהֶנֶנֶנֶנ (bānehen), heavenly, i.e., of heaven; נַטְאַנֶנ (natean), to gewan, the noise of dancing and singing; הָנָעָנָה (hunah), before the cock's crow, i.e., before the cock crows [This example breaks the rule of inanimate objects]; סֵפִּיּוֹ (Spifi), the power of knowing the mysteries of the kingdom (Luke, viii. 10) [Here padshahat is treated as a masculine noun]; הָיָאַט (hayēt), the hope of everlasting life; חָנָק (hānak), the hope of taking. [If the masculine ends in שֵׁעַ, then the feminine ends in שֵׁעַ, the masc. plur. in שֵׁעַ, and the fem. plur. in שֵׁעַ,]

When there are several adjectives in שֵׁעַ, united together by שֵׁעַ, and the syllable שֵׁעַ is usually affixed only to the last; e.g., זָמָה (Zamā), the lord of the heaven and the earth (cf., however, נַטְאַנֶנ, etc., above).

(c) שָׁעַ (fem. שָׁעַ, or, if the masculine ends in שָׁעַ, ש; pl. שָׁעַ, שָׁעַ, שָׁעַ, שָׁעַ, שָׁעַ), only mentioned in Mp. [Wade also describes it. The suffix means 'made of.' Examples—גָּחִי, a house of wood; חָכִי, a stick of wood; חָכִי, sandals of wood; חָכִי, windows of wood. Examples all taken from Wade.]
THE SIEGE OF AHMADNAGAR AND HEROIC DEFENCE OF THE FORT BY CHAND BIBI — A NARRATIVE OF AN EYE-WITNESS.

BY MAJOR J. S. KING,
Indian Staff Corps (retired).

Prefatory Remarks.

The great siege of Ahmadnagar by the Mughals and the heroic defence of the fort by the famous Chand Bibi forms one of the most interesting and romantic chapters in Indian history, but hitherto — as far as I am aware — no account by an eye-witness of the siege has ever been published. Up to the present Firishtah has been our only informant, for those who succeeded him, recognizing him as the greatest authority of the day on Dakhon history, have simply copied him. But Firishtah, with most of the other foreigners who escaped the massacre in the reign of Isma'il Nişām-Shāh, was compelled to leave Ahmadnagar, and he then went to reside in Bijāpur. This was six or seven years before the siege, and he does not appear ever to have revisited Ahmadnagar.

The Burhān-i Ma'āsir, from which I have translated the present account, is a very rare Persian MS. by 'All H. 'Aṣir-ul-Tābātah. I have only been able to hear of three copies of the work, viz., one in the India Office Library, No. 127 — from which this translation is made — one in the library of King's College, Cambridge, No. 65, and one in the British Museum Library, Add. 9996-9998, and the latter seems to me to be a modern copy made directly from the Cambridge MS. before it found its way to the College Library. The first part deals with the history of the Bahmani dynasty, and the
THE SIEGE OF AHMADNAGAR.

remainder is a history of the Nişām-Shāhī dynasty of Ahmadnagar. The last section of the work, which begins with a fresh Bismillāh, is an account of the invasion of the Dakhan and siege of Ahmadnagar by the Mughals in 1595-6 and concludes with the departure of the Mughal army on the 18th March, 1596, and the submission of Ikhtīs Khān and other Abyssinian amīrs, to Chând Bibī. The author tells us in the beginning of the account that he was an eye-witness of most of the events which he records.

Chând Bibī (or Chând Sultānāh as she was afterwards called), the heroine of this narrative, was daughter of Ḥusain Nişām-Shāh, third king of Ahmadnagar, who died in 1565. She was married to 'All ʿAdil-Shāh I., fifth king of Bijāpur, at the same time that his sister, Bibī Haidūrīah, was married to Chând Bibī's brother, Prince Murtaza Ḥusain. Chând Bibī's husband was assassinated by a slave under discoverable circumstances on Monday, the 24th of the month Šafar, A. H. 988, at the eighth hour of the night, corresponding to 2 a.m. on the 11th April, 1580, and as she is said to have been about twenty-five years of age at the time of her husband's death, she must have been about forty at the time of the siege.

The narrative opens at the period when Ibrāhīm Nişām-Shāh — eighth king of the dynasty — after a reign of only four months, having been slain in action against Ibrāhīm ʿAdil-Shāh II. of Bijāpur, was succeeded by his son, Prince Bahādur, but the latter being then only three years old, his grand-aunt, Chând Bibī, assumed the Regency.

Advance of the Mughal army into the kingdom of the Dakhan, and their return without attaining their object.

To the wise critics who are possessed of penetration and vision and the offspring of the laboratory of creation it is manifest and clear that when the Lord of the glorious and exalted dominion opens the door of prosperity in the face of felicity, He firmly plants the hand of protection on the solid mountain of confidence. In whatever direction the face of hope turns, a two-horsed object comes to meet it. A clear proof of this saying is the coming of the Mughal army into the Dakhan, and after the siege of Ahmadnagar and slaughter and exertions without limit or measure, their not seeing the face of victory and triumph — owing to the assistance of the Most High God and the sincerity of the intentions of Her Highness Chând Bibī Sultānāh, daughter of Shāh Ḥusain Nişām Shāh. (May God the Most High extend their glorious shadows till the separation of the two worlds!)

The sweetly-speaking parrot² of the relation of the orators of the assembly of speech, who with the polo-stick of the pen has carried off the ball of eloquence from his competitors, and with his own eyes has witnessed most of the strange events [here recorded], thus displays these precious pearls in the sight of the eloquent observers.

After the martyrdom of Prince Ibrāhīm Nişām-Shāh, Miyañ Manjū withdrew his footsteps from the road of obedience and devotion, and nominated for the sovereignty of the kingdom of the Dakhan an infant named Ahmad Shāh, and sent Prince Bahādur Shāh bīn Nişām-Shāh to the fort of Chāvandh,² which is celebrated above all the forts of Dakhan for its strength and inaccessibility. Not content even with this, he posted a number of doorkeepers round the royal harum of Her Highness the Bikhīs of the age [Chând Bibī] in order to prevent the servants of the court going to and fro, and not to allow anyone to go near her: moreover he contemplated putting her to death. And when the Ḥabshi amīrs having refused to obey Miyañ Manjū, laid siege to the fortress of Ahmadnagar, and the besieged were reduced to extremities, Miyañ Manjū through helplessness and necessity sent a letter to Prince Shāh Mūrād — who had always entertained the idea of conquering the Dakhan, and had thought of marching in that direction — and incited His Highness to conquer these paradise-like dominions. Previous to that a letter from King Akbar, also concerning the conquest of the Dakhan, had reached the Prince and all the amīrs of the frontier. At this time, when from the letter of

---

2. Of course the author here alludes to himself.

---
Miyān Manjū he obtained information of the dissension among the Niqām-Shāhī amīrs, considering it a good opportunity, he marched towards the Dakhan with the army of Gujarāt and Mālāwī.

When Rā'īs 'All Khān, ḫākim of Burhānpur, heard of the approach of that great army — being altogether hopeless of assistance from the army of the Dakhan — according to orders which had reached him from His Majesty King Akbar on the subject of alliance and co-operation with the Prince and the leaders of the army, he proceeded to join that army, and visited the Khān Khānān, on whose promise he placed most reliance; and with him waited on the Prince, and with the desire of collecting forces, returned to the Dakhan dominions by way of Sultānpur.

As Sa'ādat Khān [alone?] of all the servants of Burhān Niqām-Shāh, after the terrible death of His Majesty Ibrāhīm Shāh, outwardly used to show affability towards the malevolent traitor, Miyān Manjū, the latter sent that ḥāqān towards the districts of Kolābā and Nāsīk, which were under the Niqām-Shāhī government. Now that the numerous Mughal force was passing in that direction, Sa'ādat Khān, seeing the panicity of allies and the great numbers of the enemies, deemed it unadvisable to attempt opposition; so turning away from the route of that numerous and desolating army he went into the Dakhan without opposing the advance of the Mughal army.

Miyān Manjū, who had been freed from the siege of the Habshīs, repented having asked for the Mughal army; consequently he resolved to flee from them. Concerning this he took counsel with the nobles of the State; and as he very much doubted and feared the adherents of Chānd Bībī, he showed them much affability, in order by fraud and deceit to prevent their attaching themselves to Her Highness. On pretence of opposing the Mughal army he marched out of the fortress of Ahmadnagar, but delayed three days within sight of the fortress, awaiting the assembly of the Dakhan army and the arrival at the head of it of Miyaūn Hasān, who with a number of amīrs, had been sent to suppress the sedition of Ikhlās Khān and the other Habshī amīrs. The news of the approach of the Mughal army being circulated, Miyān Manjū took counsel with the amīrs and leaders of the army regarding some agreement and plan of campaign. Most of the amīrs persistently urged flight, except the ambassadors of the kings of the Dakhan, and in like manner Mujāhid-ud-Dīn Šamsīr Khān Ḥabshi, who through the infinite royal favours of His Majesty Murtaza Niqām-Shāh had become learned, and after being advanced by slow degrees from the obstacle of servitude to the rank of amīr, had withdrawn himself from the affairs of governorship and the military profession, and in retirement and solitude had employed himself in the acquisition of religious knowledge. Now when Miyān Manjū was reduced to extremities, he summoned this learned man to arrange a council with Ikhlās Khān and the other Ḥabshīs, and requested their advice regarding war with the Mughal army. Mujāhid-ud-Dīn Šamsīr Khān Ḥabshi opposed Miyān Manjū’s intention of flight, and said: — "To fly from the enemy’s army without contemplating battle and using sword and spear, and leaving the plain of the dominions and all the subjects to be trampled on by the enemy’s army, does not commend itself to men possessed of sincerity and faith."

Miyān Manjū replied: — "The enemy’s force is double that of the Dakhan; and in battle it is probable that a thousand kinds of troubles and afflictions — perhaps a fatal misfortune — may happen, and all the elephants and artillery and the foundations of sovereignty and power, may fall into the enemy’s hands; for the sages have said: — ‘He is a wise man who avoids fighting one stronger than himself,’ and the obligations of vigilance and caution are, as far as possible, not to resort to war."

Attack not a force greater than your own,
For one cannot strike one’s finger on a lance.

It is absurd for a few drops of rain to claim an equality with the infinite ocean, or for the insignificant motes to imagine themselves equal to the sun-beams! The best plan is to take refuge with His Majesty Ibrāhīm ʿĀdil-Shāh, and fly to his court; and from the servants of that court and from His Majesty ʿUthīm Šamsīr to seek assistance, and with this strength to oppose the enemy’s army."
Mujahid-ul-Din Shamshir Khan replied:—"If you will look on, wait in this same place; hand over the command of this force to me, and leave me to fight the enemy: by the aid of the Lord of earth and heaven I will make a night attack on the enemy's army, and gain a victory which will throw into oblivion the story of the seven-fold slaughter. It, with the divine assistance victory be on the side of the nobles of this State, well and good! Otherwise we can scatter our forces, and like devoted servants, continually attacking the flanks of the enemy's army, we shall throw on the dust of destruction each one whom we find. We can block up their lines of communication, till we reduce that crowd to distress. Want of water and forage, like a pair of compasses, will describe a circle outside which none of the enemy's army will be able to set foot. Perhaps by this stratagem the enemy, being reduced to straits, may return without acquiring a name and reputation."

Since Miyān Manjū did not feel secure from Shamshir Khan; on the pretence that the army would not unanimously consent to obey the latter, he rejected his advice; but in order to curry favour with Shamshir Khan he promised him to the rank of Amir-ul-Umara and commander of the forces in the province of Ahmadnagar; he appointed him to keep the districts in subjection and protect the subjects till the dispersed army from the various quarters of the dominions should assemble under the shadow of his victorious standard, and obey his commands and prohibitions. He wrote a fārmān concerning this, and adorned the person of that khan with the robe of honour of Amir-ul-Umara and administrator of the country. The office of Kotwāl of the fortress of Ahmadnagar he conferred on Angār Khan, who was one of his friends and coadjutors, and charged him to repel some of the nobles and inhabitants of the country.

Then Ahmad Shah, on Friday, the 20th Rabi 'II, A. H. 1004 [13th December, A. D. 1595], with all the cash and odd valuables which were at hand in the treasury, and about three hundred unrivalled elephants, all the artillery, all the paraphernalia of sovereignty and pomp, and about 8,000 cavalry who had elected to join him, proceeded towards the district of Bhīj.4

A number of nobles, such as Afsal Khan (who was distinguished above all his compiers in the service of the kings of the Dakhan, and whose sincerity and good will had commended him to Her Highness Chānd Bibi, and who had enrolled himself among her followers); Maulānā Shams-ul-Din Muḥammad Lārī, ambassador of His Majesty Ibrāhīm ‘Ādil-Shāh; Maulānā Ḥujj Isfahānī, ambassador of His Majesty Muḥammad Kuli Kutch-Shāh; Ḥabīb Khan, who at that period was promoted to the office of waṣīr; Mubīr-ul-Za’im Raqīwal Māshādī, and a number of other foreigners, amongst whom was the writer of this history, drew the foot of safety into the skirt of retirement from office, and being unwilling to join Miyān Manjū, considered the service of the court preferable to the companionship of that synod of the lords of devotion.

Miyān Manjū being apprehensive at their remaining behind, sent a person to Sa’dar Khan, governor of the city and Burhānābād in order that he should seize and bring to his camp the whole of the foreigners, whether they would or not, and the artillery and rocket apparatus belonging to the government; consequently he caused Sa’dar Khan, Ḥabīb Khan, Asad Khan and several of the foreigners to march nolens volens and brought them to the army of Miyān Manjū; and a number of the grandees sitting in their houses shut the doors in the faces of the people and joined the army of Miyān Manjū.

When Her Highness Chānd Bibi obtained information of the flight of the mischief-makers of the country and inverters of the State, she used her utmost endeavours in arranging the affairs of religion and the State, and devoted her attention to putting in order the bases of sovereignty and discovering a remedy for the state of disorder which had found its way to the feet of the royal throne.

4 Mirzā Bāf’-ul-Din Shirkī says that Miyān Manjū carried off Ahmad Shāh to Bījāpur, where the latter was well treated; being given a fine house to live in and the revenue of ten villages assigned for his support; but in the month of Muḥarram, A. H. 1018 (March-April, A. D. 1609) having attempted to raise a rebellion, he was sent with his wife and family as a prisoner to the fort of Murtazābād.
[Muhammad Khan] from the first showed rectitude and judgment, and always walked on the straight road of obedience and submission to the royal mandates and prohibitions; he used to oppose Miyan Manju in the days of his preeminence and despotism, and in conjunction with Aqal Khan used to make praiseworthy arrangements for repelling the enemies of the State. Now when Miyan Manju vacated the capital and took to flight, Her Highness Chund Bibi sent a person to Aqal Khan and Muhammad Khan, and persuaded these two khans to put down Ansar Khan. When most of the nobles and grandees of the country had remained behind from the army of Miyan Manju, Ansar Khan, lord of the fortress of Ahmadnagar, being apprehensive of this circumstance, he, according to the injunctions of Miyan Manju, endeavoured to drive away that body; and as he feared more than all Muhammad Khan, who was the head and chief of all the Dakhans, he considered it most important to get rid of this nobleman; so on Monday the 23rd Rabii II. he, with a number of his own brothers and coadjutors, arranged the preliminaries of the assassination of Muhammad Khan, and sent a person to summon him to kahfa of high degree, saying that his presence was urgently required for the arrangement of some of the important affairs of the country and State.

The following is what the writer of this history heard from Muhammad Khan. Placing his reliance on the goodness of the Creator of mankind, Muhammad Khan, with a few of his sons and relatives proceeded to the fortress and his interview with the unfortunate Ansar Khan. When he visited that wanderer in the desert of error, Ansar Khan, on presence that he wished to consult him in private, first took the Khan into his own house, whereas he had previously brought into that house a great number of soldiers, and had arranged with them that when Muhammad Khan should enter the house and he (Ansar Khan) should give the signal, they should hasten to kill him. The kahfa, with two of his sons and one of his relatives, thoughtless of the stratagem of their enemies, entered the house of the malevolent Ansar Khan. But Multan Khan, Saiyid Hasan, Ahmad Shah and Shir Khan — although they were allies of Ansar Khan — had secretly entered into an agreement with the attendants of Chund Bibi to kill Ansar Khan. Being aware of the design of Ansar Khan, they seized the door of the house, and did not allow any of Ansar Khan’s people to go inside. Ansar Khan, prepared for the attainment of his object, in the midst of the conversation signed to his brother to make haste to kill Muhammad Khan; his brother drawing his sword sought to overcome him, but the sons of Muhammad Khan becoming aware of the stratagem of their enemies, drew their swords and engaged the brothers and helpers of Ansar Khan. At this time Ansar himself tried to kill Muhammad Khan. Abul-Kasim made Ansar Khan his shield, and the sword of the brother reached the breast of the unjust Ansar Khan and penetrated his body. Muhammad Khan also stretching out his hand, with the strength of his manly arm snatched the sword from the hand of Ansar Khan’s brother, and struck him such a blow on the breast that point of the sword went out through the nape of his neck. So with the one sword those two malevolent and depraved men were overthrown, and the time of their excuses and deception came to an end. The glorious sons of the man of good disposition [Muhammad Khan], although they had received wounds, yet by the aid of the favour of God, they vanquished the brothers and coadjutors of Ansar Khan, and so removed the wicked ones of the country from over the heads of the well-wishers, and freed the kingdom from the impurity of the existence of those sinners against religion and State; and made manifest to mankind the mystery of “Whoso diggeth a pit shall fall therein.”

When Muhammad Khan and his sons were free from the designs of Ansar Khan and his assistants, the soldiers of Ansar Khan, who from outside the house had endeavoured to rush in, but owing to the opposition of Multan Khan, Ahmad Shah, Saiyid Hasan and ‘Ali Shir Khan, were unable to effect an entrance, when the head of their leader was cut off they withdrew from hostility and placed their feet in the circle of obedience and submission.

Muhammad Khan, after the killing of Ansar Khan, hastened to wait on Her Highness Chund Bibi, and gave her an account of the occurrence. She gave orders that the heads of those evil-doers, which had been pigeon-houses of vicious thoughts, and in the upper story of whose brains the owl

3 Omission in text. q. v.
of negligence had built the nest of pride — as an example to other corrupters of the State, should be placed on the point of spears and taken round the beiṣra, and that the joyful news of this victory should be noised abroad through all parts of the kingdom, far and near. The servants of Her Highness did all she ordered; and for the sake of the peace of mind of great and little, she herself, in her most pure person, ascended sun-like to the summit of one of the towers of the fortress.

(To be continued.)

NOTES ON THE SPIRIT BASIS OF BELIEF AND CUSTOM.

BY SIR J. M. CAMPBELL, K.C.I.E., I.C.S.

(Continued from p. 223.)

Exorcists. — Exorcists, or spirit-scarers, are known in the Dakhan and Konkâni by various names as bhagats or devotees, devamis or divine sages, jaunris or conjurers, maitris or enchanters, and puṇḍhākharis or men of (five) letters. They belong to all classes of Hindus and Musalmâns, but they are generally recruited from the lower classes. They have two divisions — professional and non-professional. Non-professional exorcists are generally persons who become possessed by a guardian spirit, or dev: a few of them learn the art of exorcism from a guru or teacher. Most professional exorcists have had a regular training from a guru or teacher. The first study is begun on a lunar or on a solar eclipse day. On such a day the teacher after bathing and without wiping his body or his head-hair, puts on dry clothes and goes to the village temple to Mâruti. The candidate having done likewise also goes to the temple. The candidate then spreads a white cloth before the god, and on one side of the cloth makes a heap of rice and on another a heap of udād, sprinkles red lead on the heaps, and breaks a coconut in front of the idol.

77 In the Dakhan as well as in the Konkâni, there are many persons who are said to be naturally endowed with a power over spirits. The pensioned mahâtâla of Ingapuri, in Náik, is at present (1835) believed to have a power over spirits. In Náik, on the high bank at the top of Ojâ's steps, is a monastery of Bâgâvâna, who about seventy-five years ago was famous for his power of curing diseases and controlling spirits and elements. One of the Adi Shâhí kings of Bijâpur was supposed to have a power over spirits and diseases. At Bijâpur he built a house with strong walls and a round stone roof. The house had no windows and no doors. He left a little hole, and by his power over them he drove in all diseases — cholera, small-pox, and fever — and shut the hole. After this the people were free from disease. When the English took Bijâpur, an officer saw this building without a window or a door. He asked the people what was the use of this strong house with neither a door nor a window. The people said, cholera and small-pox and fever are shut in the house, and no one should open it. The English officer thought that this showed there was money in the house, and that the king had told the people this story, so that no man might touch his treasure. The officer broke down the walls, and the house inside was empty. Terrible cholera and small-pox spread over the land, and, especially in Pâhrâgâ, many soldiers and many officers died. (Information from Abdul Râth.)

In the village of Mângaon, in Shâvantâlî, lives a Konkana thâ Brahman whose son wandered to all the holy places in India. At Banâres, Dattâtraya appeared to the young Brahman in a dream, and said he would come into him at any village in which he chose to live. The young Brahman got an image of the god, went back to Mângaon, built a temple, and set up the image. This happened in 1822. On his return it was found that the young Brahman, or the god Dattâtraya who lived in him, had great power to scare evil spirits. When a person suffering from an evil spirit is brought to the temple, the patient generally goes in a distracted way, wandering round the temple and coming before the young Brahman, who is about 25 years of age, tells who he is (the spirit in him) is — a Kali, a Kali, or a Ch [...] The Brahman, who sits at his ease and shows no sign of being possessed by Dattâtraya, asks the spirit if he will go. The spirit says: "I will if I get liquor or flesh." The Brahman says: "No; take this plain man and go." The Brahman says: "I will not go; I have hosts of spirits besides myself. What is a plain man to us all?" The Brahman grinds down a lump of sugar and gives it him. The possessed runs some distance from the temple. The Brahman gets up, and puts his arm round the pillar, and the spirit in the sick man says: "Oh! Dattâtraya. I am wrong; let me go, let me go." The Brahman eats almost nothing, and asks for nothing. Great numbers of women and sick go to him to be cured.

58 Phasello calabunai.
The teacher teaches him the mantras or incantations, which he commits to memory. An ochre-coloured flag is tied to a staff in front of the temple, and the teacher and the candidate return to their homes. After this, on the first new moon which falls on a Saturday, the teacher and the candidate go together out of the village to a place previously marked out by them on the boundary of the village. A servant accompanies them, who takes in a bag of usūd, or Phaseolus radiatus, oil, seven earthen lamps, lemons, cocoanuts, and red powder. After coming to the spot the teacher and the candidate bathe, and then the teacher goes to the temple of Māruti, and sits praying to the god for the safety of the candidate. The candidate, who has been instructed what is to be done, starts for the boundary of the next village accompanied by the servant. On reaching the village boundary he picks up seven pebbles, sets them in a line on the road, and after lighting a lamp near them he worships them with flowers, red powder, and Phaseolus radiatus. Incense is burnt, and a cocoanut is broken near the pebbles, which represent Vēṭāl and his lieutenants, and a second cocoanut is broken for the village Māruti. When this is over, the candidate goes to a river, well, or other watering place, bathes, and without wiping his body or putting on dry clothes proceeds to the boundary or vesā of the next village. There he repeats the same process as before, and then goes to the boundary of a third village. In this manner he goes to seven villages, in each performing the same ceremonies. All this while he keeps on repeating incantations. After finishing his worship at the seventh village the candidate returns to his village, and going to the temple of Māruti sees his teacher, and tells him what he has done. In this manner having worshipped and propitiated the Vēṭāls of seven villages he becomes a dēvṛāti or exorcist.

After he has gained the power of exorcism he has to observe certain rules. On every eclipse day he must go to a sea-shore or a river-bank, bathe in cold water, and while standing in the water repeat incantations a number of times. After his daily bath he must neither wring his head-hair nor wipe his body dry. While he is taking his meals he should leave off eating if he hears a woman in her monthly sickness speak, or if a lamp is extinguished. The Mohamadan methods of studying exorcism are different from those of the Hindus. One of them is as follows: — The candidate begins his study under the guidance of his teacher or usūd on the last day of the lunar month, provided it falls on a Tuesday or Sunday. The initiation takes place in a room the walls and floors of which have been plastered with mud, and here and there daubed with sandal paste. On the floor a white sheet is spread, and the candidate, after washing his hands and feet and putting on a new waist cloth or pair of trousers, sits on the sheet. He lights one or two incense sticks, and makes offerings of a white cloth and meat to one of the principal Mūsāmān spirits as Barhena, Hatila, Mehebut, and Sulemān. This process is repeated for from fourteen to forty days.

As the course of magical study which a Hindu exorcist is required to follow differs in many points from the Mūsāmān training, so the plans and procedure adopted by Hindu exorcists to scare spirits differ much from those adopted by Mūsāmāns. The commoner forms of exorcism practised by Hindus are: — (1) Lemons are held over the flames of incense, and charmed by repeating incantations over them. They are then kept under the pillow of the possessed person. (2) A small circular copper or silver box is made, and in it are put some charmed ashes, a medical herb, and a paper on which the names of Hindu gods and the name and the mother’s name of the possessed and some mystic words are written, and its mouth is closed. The box, called taita, is then tied round the neck if the patient be a female, and round the arm if the patient be a male. (3) The exorcist charms some ashes, and rubs them on the forehead of the person possessed. (4) A fowl or chicken of such colour as the exorcist may require, and of the variety which has its feathers turned upwards, is waved round the possessed person, and is thrown away. In some cases a goat or sheep is waved round the face of the patient, taken to a spot mentioned by the exorcist, and there slaughtered. The flesh of the animal is cooked, a portion of it with some cooked rice is left on the spot as an offering to the spirit, and the rest is eaten by the exorcist. (5) Cooked rice and flesh, curds, eggs, cocoanuts,
flowers and red powder are put in a bamboo basket, waved round the sufferer, and the basket is carried to a place where four roads meet. (6) The exorcist takes a few grains of *udīd*, charms them by repeating incantations, and throwing them on the body of the sufferer makes the spirit that has seized the patient depart. (7) When the spirit that has seized a person is an angelic spirit, as an Āśrā, Sathvāti, or Navlāti, a cotton thread, dyed red and yellow, called a *uddāpūti*, is charmed, fumigated with incense, and tied round the arm of the sufferer. (8) Some exorcists by the power of their charms cause the spirit to come out of the body of the possessed, and to enter a bottle which, when the spirit has entered it, they close with a cork; the bottle is then buried cork down in a lonely place. (9) Some exorcists draw a figure, and write a mysterious formula on a leaf of the *bhūrj*, or Indian birch tree. The leaf is then dissolved in water, and the water is given to the possessed to drink. (10) In some cases the exorcist takes the possessed person to a large tree; there he pronounces some mystic spells, and thereby forces the devil into the tree, and by driving a nail into the tree fixes the devil therein. (11) When a person is seized by a Brāhmaṇ's spirit, some Brāhmaṇs are fed and presented with money, and when a person is seized by the archfiend Vēṭāl, the exorcist tells the patient to worship Vēṭāl's stone, and to make him offerings of boiled rice, curds, lime, a cane, betel-nuts and leaves, coconuts, a garland of *ruśūr* flowers and camphor and incense. Among the practices followed by Musalmān exorcists are:—(1) The exorcist takes a small circular copper or silver box, and after writing the names of the sufferer and of his mother and the name of Allah or some mysterious figures on a piece of paper he encloses the paper in the box, and ties the box round the neck or arm of the sufferer. (2) The exorcist writes some lines from the *Kūrā* or some mysterious figures, or names of great saints or potent good genii on a paper, which is then made into a circular wick and burned, and the head of the sufferer is held over the flames of the burning paper. (3) A cotton thread, dyed yellow or red, called *uddāpūti*, is charmed, fumigated over burning incense, and tied round the arm or neck of the sufferer. (4) Some passages are read from the *Kūrā*; when the reading is over, the reader blows his breath on the possessed person, and the devil flees. (5) The name of Allah or figures which are known to possess certain virtues are written on a paper, or on tree bark or on a brass or porcelain plate, or on the blade of a knife; the article on which the name is written is then washed in rose-water, and the water is given to the possessed person to drink.

The Hindu methods of exorcising spirits are believed to be specially fitted for scaring the spirits of deceased Hindus, and the Musalmān methods for scaring the spirits of deceased Musalmāns. At the same time as a Hindu exorcist can drive away a Musalmān ghosī and as a Musalmān exorcist can drive away a Hindu ghost, both methods are practically considered equally effective. The following details show the procedure adopted by Hindu exorcists in the Konkan, that is, on the mainland near the city of Bombay.

Gangā, the wife of Rāma, a Kunbī of Bassein, in Thānā, on the way home from the fields in the evening, is attacked by a spirit. On reaching home she begins to cry, lets her hair fall loose, bites her fingers, spits, and wanders in her speech. Her husband and relations guess that she is possessed. They put *tulsi* or sweet basil juice into her nostrils, burn hair, frankincense, and sulphur under her nose, and break pieces of garlic root near her ears. Still the spirit does not leave her. On the contrary, Gangā grows more and more excited. Next day Rāma calls in Gōvind, an amateur spirit-scarrer, by caste a Vīḍval and a gardener by calling. Gōvind, accompanied by two of his sāthas or comrades, comes at about six in the evening, when the power of spirits is at its highest. On entering Rāma's hut he washes his face, hands and feet, and sits on a low wooden stool set in the verandah in a square made by lines of red powder. He is given a pot filled with water, a cocaanut, plantains, rice, betel-nuts and leaves, incense, camphor, ashes, flowers, and a garland of *ruśūr* blooms, which he lays in a row before him. He then sets upon the rice a betel-nut and betel-leaves, or, if he has brought with him the

---

29 *Phaseolus radiatus*.  
40 *Calotropis gigantea*.  
41 *Calotropis gigantea*.  

---
image of the god or goddess whose devotee he is, he sets on the rice the image of his patron god, and presents the image or the betel-nut with flowers, red powder, a cocoanut and frankincense, and bows before it. He next tucks behind him the middle part of his waist cloth or dhātā, puts the garland of red flowers round his neck, and, with his hands folded, either kneels or stands in thought for a few minutes. His comrades, standing behind, beat drums, clash cymbals, and sing the praises of Vēṭāl, or of some other spirit-god. While they play, the body of the spirit-scarer begins to sway to and fro, and inspired by Vēṭāl he suddenly rises, takes a long thin cane, which he generally brings with him, in his right hand, and gives himself several cuts with the cane across the back to shew the people that Vēṭāl has entered his body, as the cane does him no harm. All the while he keeps uttering a sound like ū hu. He then kneels, and swaying his body backwards and forwards sets the pot of burning frank-incense before him, and kindling a piece of camphor holds it on the palm of his hand, and shews it to the spectators, who pass their hands through the fumes and touch their eyes with their hands. Gangā is brought and made to sit before the spirit-scarer. He strikes her three or four times with the cane, and calls on the spirit to say who he or she is, what is his or her name, why he or she has attacked Gangā, and how he or she will leave her. Then Gangā, speaking in the spirit’s name, says: — “My name is Hēḍāli; I entered Gangā when she went to drink at the river, and I will leave her if a cock is killed, and a yellow robe and bodice are laid for me under the big pīpal-tree in Rāmā’s garden.” Govind, the spirit-scarer, then calls on Hēḍāli to leave Gangā, and gives Gangā some cuts with the cane. Then Hēḍāli agrees to go, and in some cases, as a sign that he has left, she tells the people to set a pot full of water on the doorstep. If the pot is upset, it is believed that the spirit has left. The spirit-scarer then takes one, four, or eight lemons, sticks pins in them, and buries them in front of the house to keep the spirit from coming back. Next day or on the same night Rāmā lays a yellow robe and bodice, or kills a fowl or a goat under the big pīpal-tree. For a day or two Gangā appears to be doing well, but on the third day she is seized with the same fit as before. Rāmā calls in another spirit-scarer, Jānu, a Kōll by caste, who is a professional exorcist. He is given a pot filled with water, and some rice or udā. Gangā is brought and made to sit before him. He waves a handful of rice three times round her face, and puts the rice in the pot. He takes a few grains from the pot, and laying them on the palm of his hand examines them closely, and lays them on a low wooden stool. A second time he takes a handful of rice, waves it round Gangā’s face, and again examines the grain. He does this some six or seven times, and then says: — “Gangā is attacked by two spirits, and not by one, as the former bhagāt stated. The two spirits are Hēḍāli and Bāpṇēy. You propitiated Hēḍāli by giving her a robe and bodice: what have you done to please Bāpṇēy? On Tuesday evening lay near the Mahār’s well some cooked rice, curds and red powder, and the blood of a goat. If you do this, Bāpṇēy will leave.” Rāmā adopts Jānu’s advice, and Gangā is cured.

The procedure followed in the Bombay Dakhan does not differ from that followed in the Konkan.

In the town of Umēṭā, on the river Mahi, in Bombay Gujarāt, Jōdā Rāwaliā, an exorcist with a great local name, held a performance on the evening of the 16th December, 1888. The details are: — An open space, about twelve feet square, is enclosed both above and at the sides with cloth. In the north-west corner is a step or altar about four inches high and three feet long by two feet broad covered with red cloth. On this altar or platform in a grass platter are two white china bowls, a white egg cup, a red turban, a black pint bottle, a glass tumbler, and two or three lemons. In front is a knife stuck point down in the ground, a box with a garland of yellow karan flowers and a row of small earthen oil cups each with a little lighted wick. Close beside the altar sits the chief performer, Jōdā, and about two yards on his right are the musicians, two drummers and a cymbal clasher, Wāghīrs by caste, and close to the musicians, Baghu, the village patēl. The
rest of the space is filled with spectators, men, women and girls, looking in through the cloth screens which are hung all round. The musicians begin drumming and clashing, the leading drummer singing a plaintive air. After a time Jōdā grows uneasy. He begins to shake. He is sitting with his arms stretched out along his knees. "Ho! Ho!" Jōdā pants, "Kōdiār Mātā," meaning "I Kōdiār Mātā," that is, Mother Itch, "have come into Jōdā," "It is well., Bhai," says the drummer, and starts a fresh air in Kōdiār's praise, while Jōdā shakes and tosses his head, smelling the fumes of a small incense pot placed between his knees. "Ho! Ho!" pants Jōdā, rubbing his eye against his hand, while the music stops. "On the Umeṭhā Hill," he gasps in a weak voice, "no hindrance is to be caused to man or cattle." "Very good, lady!" chimes in the patēl and the chief drummer. The music strikes a fresh air, Jōdā shouts: "May it be well," adding with a husky gash or whisper, "Kalāk Mātā. " "All will be well," says the patēl. Jōdā keeps on shaking with his elbows planted on his raised knees. "Ho! Ho! Ho!" he pants, "may it be well." He adds in a low voice: "Machari Mātā," the Mahī River, "may all be well," answers the patēl with deep respect. The drums rear and cymbals clash in praise of the Mahī while Jōdā goes on shaking. He rests for a time, the music keeping moderate strength. "Ho! Ho!" he says, as the spirit breeze strikes him afresh. "May it be well. Ha ! Ha ! Shikōṭār," he whispers, as the drums cease. The music opens a fresh plaintive wail in honour of Shikōṭār, the Small-pox Mother. Jōdā goes on shaking. A fiercer fit strikes him. The musicians beat and clash their noisiest. "Ho! Ho!" sighs Jōdā as the music drops, "Lālī and Phālī." The music starts afresh, Jōdā shaking, "Ho! Ho! Mērall," he shouts aloud, the music freshens and the drummers sing in honour of Mērall or Muck Mother. Jōdā moves his hand, and the singing ceases. He pants: "If any man is troubled with a bhūṭ or evil spirit, I will drive the bhūṭ away. You should not call me Mērall. The drummer breaks into a fresh song. "Ho! Ho!" Jōdā shivers, "may it be well." The music drops, and the whisper comes: "Harkā Bāi, Lady Madness." The music starts again. At a motion of Jōdā's hand it ceases. Jōdā pants and shakes, whispering: "If ever a dog is mad and the man bitten remembers me he will get no harm." The music starts afresh, the drummer singing in honor of Harkā Bāi. Jōdā goes on shaking and rubbing his eyes. By degrees the shaking grows less violent, and he sits quite for a little. The music keeps on. Presently a fresh spasm strikes Jōdā. He shivers once more, and the music strikes up fiercer than ever. "Ho! Ho!" he gasps as the music stops. "May it be well, Bhati Khātri," he adds in the usual stage whisper. "May it be well," chimes the patēl. Jōdā drops fresh incense in the pan, and again starts shivering with special fierceness. "Ah! Ah! Ho!" he pants, "may it be well. I am Mata's guard, Kal Bhairava is my name," "Right, Your Highness," says the patēl, "may it be well." Jōdā shakes sharply. He motions to a boy to pour water into a tumbler and drop in sugar. This sugared water is poured into an egg cup and Jōdā drinks. He again trembles violently. "Ho! Ho!" he shouts, "may it be well. Lady Kōdiār," he adds with the usual shudder. He moves his hand and the music is quiet. "See that any one who is in trouble or in fever let me know. I will put him right." Jōdā goes on shaking and the drummer sings Kōdiār's praise. One of the lights which was set on a flat maize cake goes out. Jōdā stops shaking and takes the cake and divides it among the musicians. Jōdā sits quietly and puts on his cap. He says: "Let any one who is in trouble and wants help come." He sits quietly, and the drumming and cymballing going on. Jōdā fans the incense pan.

A boy, a Rāvalā Sidrhol, who has been ill for about three months, comes, and Jōdā sets the boy in front of himself. He takes a lighted wick and passes it round the boy’s body and sets it on the boy's head. He bends over the lighted wick, grasps it in his lips, and puts it out in his mouth. The boy sits quietly. The drummers and cymbal-clashers pour forth a torrent of noise. The boy remains quiet and Jōdā sits looking at him. Jōdā shouts to the disease spirit: "Come into this boy's body or I will kill you." The boy begins to shake. The drums and cymbals grow louder. Jōdā keeps his eye fixed on the boy. The boy shakes violently. "Who are you?" asks the drummer. "Dākan," that is, a witch, shivers the boy.
The music again grows louder. Jódá brings out a heavy iron chain. "I will beat you with this chain," he says. "Where have you come from?" "From a well," gasps the boy. "What well?" "This well here." "When did you catch the boy?" "I seized him as he was going out in the morning." The music starts again with a fresh chant. The boy is racked by the Dákán, tossing his head and jerking his shoulders with furious violence. Jódá is quiet, looking hard at the boy. The chief drummer says to the boy: "Will you eat?" "I won't eat," says the Dákán. "Why won't you eat?" asks the drummer. The singing begins afresh, and the boy is struck by another spirit. "It is the Musalman woman who was drowned in the well," says Jódá. The boy keeps tossing and jerking. Jódá moves about, looking after the lights. A tile is brought and two sweet balls are laid in it. Jódá rises, picks up a lighted wick and passes it round the boy's back and waist and sets it on his head. Jódá leans down, closes his lips round the wick and puts out the light in his mouth. He repeats this three times. He then picks up a lemon, lays it on the boy's head, and gashes the lemon with a knife. He sets a lighted wick in the cleft of the lemon, bends down and takes the flame in his mouth, squeezing the lemon with his teeth. He pours sharbat into a bowl, passes the bowl round the boy's head, and drinks the sharbat. "How do you feel?" he asks the boy. The boy is silent. Jódá pours fresh sharbat into the bowl, waves the bowl round the boy's hands and drinks the sharbat. Jódá draws the chain up to the boy's spine. He lifts first his left then his right leg over the boy's head and makes the boy place his hands on his own spine. He gives the tile with the sweet balls to be taken away, and goes about, putting the oil saucers to right. A woman brings in a child about three years old and gives it to Jódá. This is Jódá's own child and is not sick. Jódá takes off his cap and sets it on the child's head, and plays with the child, dressing him in a small red coat. The music plays a moderate accompaniment. All this time the sick Ráwáliā boy is sitting quietly. Jódá gives him sugar in a bowl, and the boy eats the sugar.

Jódá tells the drummer to sing the praise of Mother Mahi Sun. After the chant to Mahi is begun, a big man, Vishnu, a dhópī or washerman, who has been seated near Jódá, begins to shake. His neighbour takes off the shaker's turban. Vishnu sets his elbows on his knees and is fiercely racked. "Ho! Ho!" he gasps, and, as the music stops, adds: -

"Mahi Mother. May all be well." The music begins again and Vishnu has a fresh seizure. "Ho! Ho!" he gasps. "Narsingh. May it be well." The music starts the praise of Narsingh, and Vishnu is stricken with a fresh air. "Ho! Ho!" He pants. "Harakhaj Jhámpadī," that is Mother Mania of the Gate." Vishnu goes on shaking, the music and singing keep on at a moderate strength. All this time Jódá has been resting, playing with his child. Vishnu is again seized. "Ho! Ho! Maha Shikótár," that is, Shikótár of the tombs. The drummer starts a plaintive air in Shikótár's honour. Vishnu goes on shaking and jerking, but with less violence and quickness than Jódá. Vishnu holds his hands to his face, and leans against the wall tired. One of his neighbours replaces Vishnu's turban on his head.

The singing goes on, Jódá keeping quiet. The spirit next falls on Náma, a land-owner, a Rabári or camel-breeders by caste. He takes off his turban and tosses his head heavily. "It is well," he shouts, "Kodiār Mátá." He tosses his head, catching the tips of his hair in his fingers. "So long as I stay in Umáthá," he gasps and jerks, "no man, no animal will take any harm." A boy, Ráwáliā, comes in and sits in front of Jódá. Náma has a fresh seizure, rolling his head heavily. "Márali," he gasps. The Ráwáliā boy is quiet, sitting with his knees drawn up and his elbows on his knees. He shakes slightly, Náma has a fresh fit, and the drumming and clashing wick louder. He rolls his head heavily. "Ho! Ho!" he pants. "Máta Rópáni," Mother Silver. The drummer takes it up. Rópáni Mátá has come, and he sings her praise. A woman of the Kött or Dhbréal caste brings in a boy about seven or eight, reduced almost to a skeleton, with a white shoulder cloth drawn over his shoulder, and a cloth tied round his upper right arm. He is her only child. He has been sick for ten days. Jódá hands back his own child to its mother. Náma is quiet and sits with his face wrapped in a cloth.
The Rāwāli boy is seized and shakes violently, holding out his arms. "Ho! Ho!" he gasps, "Shikotar." He lays his arms along his knees and shakes with great force. The drummers raise Shikotar's wailing chant. "Ho! Ho!" gasps the Rāwali boy, holding up his hands. "Who are you?" asks Jōdā. "Chāran Māṭā," the Bard Mother, shivers the boy, and the musicians break into Chāran's praise. The boy leans his head on his hands and goes on shaking. He is again stricken; the drumming and clashing grow louder. "Ho! Ho! Narsingh," sobs the boy. "Narsingh," repeats the drummer and breaks into Narsingh's praise. The Rāwali boy is quiet for a time, and once more is racked. "Ho! Ho!" he gasps, "Mērail," and the drummer raises Mērail's hymn. This boy is not sick. He has come to take a vow for his mother who is dangerously ill.

Jōdā gets up, takes a lighted wick and passes it up and down the thin Dharēli boy's spine and waves the light round him. "I will give you food," he says to the spirit in the boy. "Don't harm the child. Come." Jōdā sits down and looks hard at the boy. He comes nearer, sits down, raises his knees, and crosses his arms over his knees, and leans his chin on his arms, staring fiercely at the boy. He pulls off the white sheet that wrapped the boy. The boy sits quiet, his hands folded in front of him. Jōdā, seated about a yard off, looks hard at the boy. Jōdā rises and trims the lamps, and again sitting close to the boy looks hard in his face. "Come," he says to the spirit, "in the boy; I will give you food. If you don't come you won't get any food." The boy is still quiet. Jōdā sets a lighted wick on the boy's head, leans down, gulps it at and quenches the wick in his mouth. This he does three times. Jōdā takes a lemon, sets it on the boy's head, gashes the lemon with a knife and sticks a burning wick in the cleft. He leans down, catches the wick in his lips, and puts the light out in his mouth. Jōdā asks the boy if he has any pain. The boy points to his right side. Jōdā lays him down, cuts a lemon in two, presses the half lemon on the boy's side over his liver, and himself sucks the lemon. Jōdā lifts the boy up, who has a severe fit of coughing. Jōdā passes his hand up and down the boy's spine, and then raises his leg over the boy's head. Jōdā lays his right hand on the boy's head, and holding a cup of sharbat in his left hand, passes it round the boy's head and drinks the sharbat. Jōdā bends his head close to the boy's and passes his hand back and forwards between the two heads. The mother of the boy gives Jōdā a piece which he lays on the altar. The boy is set on one side.

Jōdā looks after the lamps, and the drumming and clashing go on steadily. Jōdā sits down, takes off his cap, and begins a shaking. "Ho! Ho!" he gasps, and the music stops. "It will be well," he pants. "May it be well," says the drummer. "Who is your honour?" "Kodiār Māṭā," whispers Jōdā. "May it be well," answers the drummer, and raises Kodiār's hymn, a melancholy wailing measure. Jōdā is again stricken. "Ho! Ho! Ho! Ah, brothers!" he gasps. "Has any one come to ask me about the fire in the Brāhma)n's house?" "No one has come," says the drummer. "A fire happened once before in that house," gasps Jōdā. "If the owner comes I will show him how the fire happens. In this house is a Chandī or female spirit and a Jinn or Musalmān spirit. It was the same in his house before." He raises his hand to his face and rubs his eyes. He goes on in a jerky husky voice:—"A Gōrji went to the house to drive out the spirits. The Gōrji did no good. I will bring this Badwī or medium of mine (that is Jōdā). He will set it all right." The music strikes up a strong chant. A fresh shiver passes through Jōdā. He raises his palms to his face and rubs them over his eyes. He stretches out his hands. "Ho! Ho! Ho!" he gasps. "Brothers, a son of a Kothār Baniā was going to a village and a spirit seized him." "Ho! Ho! Mērail." He shouts, and shakes fiercely. "I take what is due to me if I have a mind to take it. If not I will not take it. Ho! Ho!" he gasps, "Shikotar." Almost at once a fresh fit seizes him. "Ho! Ho! Mērail." "May it be well," says the drummers, and raise Mērail's hymn. Jōdā gives some grains of wheat to one of the drummers who sprinkles them on the ground. Jōdā is fiercely shaken. "Ho! Ho! May it be well!" The music stops again begins. Jōdā grows quiet, but is soon once more driven. "Ho! Ho! Lālūl Phūlāl!" The music strikes up once more, but Jōdā gradually calms and sits still. The mother of the thin Dharēli boy comes in, and Jōdā says to her you have fulfilled your vow, lady, and cuts off the cloth that was bound round the sick boy's upper arm.
Among Gujarāt Musalmāns when a house mother finds any of her family sick or troubled by bad dreams, she orders a chicken, preferably a black chicken, and passes it seven or eleven times over the body of the sufferer. The person who wavers the chicken over the patient carries it away without looking back, and gives it to a fakīr or religious beggar. If no one is willing to take the chicken it is carried out of the town and let loose.43

(To be continued.)

DISCURSIVE REMARKS ON THE AUGUSTAN AGE OF TELUGU LITERATURE.

By G. R. Subramiah Pantulu.

Mr. Campbell, in his Telugu Grammar, thus describes the Telugu Language and the area over which it is spoken:

"The language is commonly, but improperly, termed by Europeans the Gentoo. It is the Andhra of Sanskrit authors, and, in the country where it is spoken, is known by the name of Teelina, Telinya, Telugu or Tenugu.

"This language is the vernacular dialect of the Hindus, inhabiting that part of the Indian Peninsula which, extending from the Dutch Settlement of Pulicat on the coast of Coromandel, inland to the vicinity of Bangalore, stretches northwards along the coast as far as Chincaco, and in the interior to the source of the Tapti; bounded on the east by the Bay of Bengal, and on the west by an irregular line, passing through the western districts belonging to the Sudder of the Deccan, and cutting off the most eastern provinces of the new State of Mysore; a tract including the five Northern Circars of Ganjam, Vizagapatam, Rajahmundry, Masulipatam and Guntur; the greater portion of the Nizam's extensive territories, districts of Cuddapah and Bellary ceded by him to the British; the eastern provinces of Mysore; and the northern portion of the Carnatic: nor is this language unknown in the southern parts of India, for the descendants of those Telugu families which were deported by the kings of Vidyângara to control their southern conquests, or which occasionally emigrated from Telingâna to avoid famine or oppression, are scattered all over the Dravida and Carnatic provinces, and ever retaining the language of their fore-fathers, have diffused a knowledge of it throughout the Peninsula.

"The Telugu language, as has already been shown, is not a mere derivative from Sanskrit, but has an independent origin and is of independent cultivation. The radicals, according to Mr. Ellis (Dism. p. 19), are the same as in the cognate dialects of Tamil, Kannarese, etc., and it differs from them only in the affixes used in the formation of the words from the roots. Although, however, it is not the offspring of Sanskrit, it is very extensively blended with that language in the states known as Tatsama or Tadbhava, the words in the former being the very same, taking only the Telugu inflexions, and those of the latter being mediatelately or immediately derived from Sanskrit. The rest of the language, exclusive of other foreign terms, is the pure native language of the land, and is capable of expressing every mental and bodily operation, every possible relation and existing thing, and with the exception of some religious and technical terms, no word of Sanskrit origin is necessary to the Telugu."

Mr. Lingam Lakshmaji Pundit, in his lecture on The Disillusion, p. 7, says as Theorem I.:

"If any of the few fundamentals or elements of a language, namely, the numerals, the pronouns, the case endings, and the verb endings are demonstrated to be derived from another language, it follows that that language is derived from the other language, and that the people speaking the parent and derived languages were originally one and the same." A similar idea is maintained by Prof. Whitney in his Language and Study of Languages, p. 195. But Mr. Lakshmaji essays to controvert the opinion of Mr. Ellis by saying at p. 26 of the same lecture:

"Although the Telugu language is widespread and the people speaking it, if we include the Telugu population of the Nizam's dominions, outnumber the Tamilians, its original area is more circumscribed, as we learn from the following Telugu distich from an Andhrabhakshabhi:

43 Information from Mr. Fakullah Faridi,
bhāṣaṇam:—“The Andra country lies within the three Linga temples, Sripurva, Kalēsvara, and Drākṣarāma, which make the three lingas. The word Trilīṅga having become a Tadbhava, the country has come to be known as Telugu Dēṣam, which, afterwards, others called Telugu dēṣam, and the language thereof consists of five elements.”

Nannaya Bhāṭṭa, in his Āndhra Bhāṣāṭhānām, has taught us:—

“Adhyapakritih prakritischādyā
Eśā tāyôr bhaivyad vikrithi
Kāvalatayānusurpatyubh chēyam
Yathā tathā bhāṣā"!

The primitive language, (meaning the Primitive Aryan speech) and the therefrom derived Prākṛta language are primitive, this (the Telugu) language is their variation; this language entirely follows the other two languages in every respect.”

Abhinavadaṇḍi, the author of the more ancient Telugu Bhāṣābhāṣaṇam, has, as one of the opening stanzas:—

“Tallī Sanskritam-bellā bhāshalakunu
Dāni valana gonta gānabādiyē |
Gonta dāna galigin-anantyan-ēkamai
Tenugu bhāshananga vinutikekkē ī!

Sanskrit is the parent of languages, some, i.e., the Prākṛta languages have come from it; something has come from the Prākṛta languages; all joined together has come to be known as the Telugu language.”

Thus we see that the belief among the Indian literati has always been that Sanskrit is the parent of all languages, nor is there anything, in their opinion, which can be adduced to shake this belief, as every linguistic analysis will only serve to strengthen rather than weaken it.

The works of highest repute in Telugu are translations from Sanskrit, and the oldest works extant are not of higher antiquity than the end of the twelfth century, whilst its Augustan era, the reign of Krishṇa-deva Raya of Vijayānagar, dates from the beginning of the sixteenth. The first attempts to reduce the uses of the language to rule, appear to have been made late in the thirteenth century when Nannaya Bhāṭṭa, a Brāhmaṇ of considerable learning, and the translator of the first two books of the Mahābhārata, compiled a Telugu grammar in Sanskrit. Mr. Campbell, in the preface to his Grammar, states that the most ancient grammarians of whom mention is made in the native books, is the sage Kauṭyā, who appears to have been to the people of Andhra or Telengana, what Agastya was to those farther south, their initiator into the mysteries of Hinduism. His works, and those of other writers of antiquity, are not now to be found, and all the treatises on Telugu grammar at present exist consist of Sanskrit commentaries on the series of Apotheosis of Nannaya Bhāṭṭa. The age of this last, although conjectured by Mr. Campbell to be remote, can be ascertained by documents of which he was not in possession, viz., inscriptions recording grants made by his patron, Vishnuvardhana of Raḷaṇāghandri, to be, as above stated, the close of the thirteenth century. Mr. Campbell admits

1 According to tradition the Telugu translation of the Mahābhārata was made by Nannayabhaṭṭa during the time of the Chalukya King Raḷaṇāghanda. An inscription at Śukhrūnām near Chitradura refers to the Telugu translation of the Mahābhārata during the reign of the Eastern Chalukya King Raḷaṇāghanda I. (A. D. 1022 to 1083), the son of Vimalāditya (see Dr. Halsted's Annual Report for 1895-96, p. 6, paragraph 21). According to tradition Nannayabhaṭṭa received help in his translation of the Mahābhārata from a certain Nārâyana. In the Nandamapāḍḍi grant of the Eastern Chalukya King Raḷaṇāghanda I, dated in his 32nd year (A. D. 1083), a certain Nārâyana figures as the doner, while the Sanskrit verses of the inscription were composed by Nanniyabhaṭṭa. Of the former it is said that on account of his skill in composing poetry in the Sanskritic Kārṣṭikā, Paśāṭikā, and Andhra languages, he was renowned as Kaviśinghaṅkha and that because, by his clever verses, he put to shame would-be poets, he was rightly called Kaviśāṅkhaṅkha (Epigraphia Indica, Vol. IV. p. 302). As it is unlikely that, during the time of the Eastern Chalukya King Raḷaṇāghanda I, there was more than one pair of poets bearing the names Nārâyana and Nanniyabhaṭṭa, we may, at least provisionally, identify the Telugu translation of the Mahābhārata and his coadjutor in the work with the composer and the doner, respectively, of the Nandamapāḍḍi grant. Thus we get the middle of the eleventh Century A. D. for the time of Nannayabhaṭṭa, the Telugu translator of the Mahābhārata. — V. Yenkayya]
that the Brāhmans were the first who cultivated the Telugu language, and brought it under fixed rules, and consequently recognises the prior introduction of Brahmanical literature.

The greater part of Telugu literature consists of translations, and we have the Mahābhārata, the Vīsēṣu, Varuha, and other Purāṇas, besides Purāṇic stories in the Māhātmyas, and a number of poems and tales, rendered from Sanskrit into Telugu. At the same time, translations or appropriations from Sanskrit form a smaller portion of Telugu than of Tamil literature, and we have in the former a number of sectarian legends, chiefly of modern origin, as the Acts of the Āḷwārs and Jaigaṇams, or the Vaiṣṇava and Saiva saints of peculiar schisms, originating as late as the twelfth century with Rāmānuja and Basava. As in Tamil, there are many local charitras, historical and biographical compositions, containing, amid much exaggeration and fiction, materials for history; of which an important peculiarity is the insertion of the biographical or genealogical account of the patron of the author in the commencement of most of the works, sometimes in great minuteness of detail. Telugu literature comprises also a large collection of poems and tales, some of which are original, but it is a curious circumstance that no nāṭakas or dramatic compositions of an ancient date appear to exist in Telugu.

Telugu, like Tamil, includes a high and a low dialect, the former of which is used in writing, the latter in conversation and official business. The language of composition is so different, observes Mr. Campbell, from the colloquial dialect, that even to the learned the use of the commentaries is indispensable for the correct understanding of many of the best Telugu works. The Telugu poets are divided, according to the age in which they flourished, into poets of the olden times, poets of the Middle Ages, and poets of modern days.

There is not a book in the whole of Telugu literature which equals the Telugu recension of the Mahābhārata in elegance of diction, although some of the later poets have followed the style. Nāchana, Sōmana, Pillalamari, Piṇnavrābhadrana, and others, though they have not followed the footsteps of the triple writers of the Mahābhārata (Nammaya Bhāṭṭa, Tikkana, and Errāpragada) in point of style, drew their thoughts, their figures of rhetoric, etc., to a large extent, from them.

The Telugu writings have always been greatly indebted to Sanskrit, but it should not be understood that the old poets flooded their compositions with a large influx of Sanskrit words, because there is very little trace of the Telugu language, properly so called, in the writings of the poets of a later date. A good many of the poets, also, have sacrificed nobility of thought to elegance of language, so that some have come to be read merely for their ornate style. Bāmmara Pōṭanana combined both, and was blindly followed by some of the poets of the Middle Ages, in whom originality is sadly wanting. They followed very closely the lines chalked out by their immediate pioneer, Peddanna, who by the way deserves careful study and praise, merely polishing his descriptions and finely retouching the descriptions of the older poets. Even Peddanna has drawn his descriptions from other sources. One is able to state the plot of any of the Prabandhas at random, without going through it. Take, for instance, the Vasucharitra of Rāmarājahbhāṣaṇa. One could tell the whole story of it in a single sentence, but the whole book is flooded with beautiful descriptions. The description of the moon occupies thirty stanzas, that of the sun takes up forty more, while that of love "trotting hard" takes up full two dvānas. The plot is very meagre, and surfeit of description brings on boredom. Natural descriptions are always good, but there is a limit to allegory and hyperbole, which weary the reader, if carried too far. Take, for instance, the descriptions in the Telugu Mahābhārata and compare them, side by side, with those in the works of the poets of the Middle Ages. A poet may easily be pardoned for reasoning ill, but he cannot be pardoned for observing ill,—for creating portraits that bear no resemblance to the originals, for exhibiting as copies monstrous combinations of things which never were and
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3 [It is very doubtful if Dravidian scholars, who have studied both Tamil and Telugu literature, will endorse the view of the writer of this article. — V. V.]
never could be found together. What would be thought of a painter who mixed August and January in one landscape, or introduced a frozen river into a harvest scene? Natural description is, I think, wanting in these poets. With them

"Beauty is Nature's coin, must not be hoarded,
But must be current; and the good thereof
Consists in mutual and partaken bliss,
Unsavoury in the enjoyment of itself."

Such false beauty cannot take the place of real beauty, and even if it appears to be genuine it cannot last long.

It has been said that the Augustan era of Telugu literature belongs to the time of Krishna-dévārāya. The question, then, that naturally suggests itself to us is, who was Krishna-dévārāya? When and where did he flourish?

The State over which he wielded sway was Vijayanagara, the foundation of which is very generally admitted to have arisen out of the subversion of the Hindu governments of the Kākatiya and Velāḷa Rājas by the incursions of the Muhammadans at the beginning of the fourteenth century, and traditions are tolerably well agreed, says Wilson in his Catalogue of the Mackenzie Collections, p. 83, as to the individuals to whom it is ascribed, viz., Harihara and Bukkaraṇya, and the celebrated scholar Mādhava, entitled Vidyāranya, the forest of learning. Accounts, however, vary considerably as to the circumstances which connected these persons with the event, or the share they bore in it.

One tradition ascribes the origin of Vijayanagara to Mādhava, who, having by his devotion obtained the favor of Bhuvaneśvarī, was directed by her to the discovery of a treasure with which he built the city of Vidyānagara or Vijayanagara, and reigned over it himself; leaving it to the Kurva or Kurna Family. Another statement describes him as founding the city, and establishing the principality for Bukka, a shepherd who had waited on him and supported him in his devotions. A third account states that Harihara and Bukka, two fugitives from Worangal, after it was taken by the Muhammadans, encountered the sage in the woods, and were elevated by him to the sovereignty over a city which he built for them. A fourth statement, whilst it confirms the latter part of the story, makes the two brothers officers of the Muhammadan conqueror of Worangal, who were sent by their master, after the capture of the city, against the Velāḷa Rāja. They were defeated and their army dispersed, and they fled into the woods, where they found Vidyāranya. His treasures enabled them to collect another army with which they obtained a victory over the Velāḷa Rāja, but instead of rendering him the servant of their superior, they set up for themselves, by the advice and with the help of the anchorite. There is good reason to believe that none of these traditions is entirely correct, although they preserve, perhaps, some of the events that actually occurred. Vidyāranya or Mādhava was a learned and laborious writer, and in various works particularises himself as minister of Saṅgama, the son of Kampa, a prince whose power extended to the southern, eastern and western seas. He also terms Bukka and Harihara the sons of Saṅgama, and the same relationship is confirmed by an inscription published in the Asiatic Researches, Vol. IX., and by other inscriptions also. The political importance of Saṅgama is, no doubt, exaggerated, but it is clear that Bukka and Harihara were not the mere adventurers they were traditionally said to have been. They were descended from a series of petty princes or landholders, possibly feudatories of the Velāḷa Rājas, or even of Pratāp Rudra, who took advantage of a period of public commotion to lay the foundation of a new State. Besides, experience and talent, Mādhava may have brought pecuniary aid to the undertaking. His title, Vidyāranya, and the scope of his writings show that he was a disciple of Saṅkarāchārya, and in all probability he was connected with the Srīṅgerī Establishment, the members of which, alarmed
by the increasing numbers of the Jaṅgams and Jains, and the approach of the Muhammadans, may have contributed their wealth and influence to the aggrandisement of the sons of Sangama.

However this may be, beyond question the city of Vijayanagara was founded by Bukka and Harihara, on the southern bank of the Tungabhadra, about the middle of the fourteenth century. Sewell mentions that Fergusson gives the year 1118 A. D. as the date of the foundation of an earlier city by Vijayarāyaṇa, as a dependency of the Mysore Rāja. But Fergusson gives this only as a tradition, and adduces no proof in support of it. There are no complete buildings extant of a date earlier than the fourteenth century, although, fragments do exist, which Mr. Alexander Rea believes to belong to the twelfth or thirteenth century. The fragments, which are in some of the existing temples, may have belonged to this supposed earlier city, or, they may have been removed from some of the ancient temples existing in other parts of the district, and placed where we now find them. Traditionally Bukka is given as the first prince and Harihara as the second (Kelsall's Bellary Manual, p. 169).

The date most commonly given for the foundation of Vijayanagara is Saka 1528 or A.D. 1336; but this is, perhaps, a few years too soon, says Wilson in his Cat. of Mys. Coll. p. 84. The same date, however, is given in a copper-plate grant as the first year of Harihara's reign (Sewell's Lists, Vol. II p. 11, No. 75). If this is accepted and he was preceded by Bukka I, the date must be placed earlier, instead of later, than is usually stated. Harihara is usually placed as the first reigning sovereign, succeeded by Bukka; but then who is the first Bukka, asks Mr. Rea, placed on the lists? It is true that no grants are recognized as having been made by him, and, if he founded the city, it is improbable that during his short reign he would have risen to sufficient power to make any, or at least any important one; this may account for their absence. That the Vijayanagara Dynasty was in existence before 1336 A.D. is supported by a reference to the following statement of Sewell (Lists, Vol. II, p. 161):— "In 1327, the Muzzulman viceroy of the Dekkan rebelled, and the emperor sent an expedition against him. He fled to Kampil, close to Vijayanagar, whence the king's troops were compelled to retreat, the Vijayanagar king being too strong for them." If this account be correct and the date can be depended upon, it would show that the Vijayanagara State had at that time reached a considerable degree of power; and so far would support the traditional date.

The Mādhava, alias Vidyārāyaṇa, above mentioned was a man of great parts. Of all those who succeeded to the mēla of Saṅkarāchārya, either before or after Mādhava, there is not one to compare with him in learning. He was born in a village called Pampā on the banks of the Tungabhadra. He was the family guru of Bukkariya and a Telugu Brāhmaṇa of the Bhāradvāja Gotra. His father was Māyaṇa, and his brother, Sāyana, and some of the works he has written go by their names. He composed excellent and exhaustive commentaries on all the four Vēdas, but for which the Vēdas would have been a sealed book to all Sanskrit scholars.

Here I must observe that I am not unaware of the fact that the Sanskritists of Europe are inclined to ignore the immensity of their obligations to Vidyārāyaṇa, and even to go to the length of asserting that his commentaries on the Vēdas can only give expression to one-sided views, seeing that he was a Hindu, and that he was nurtured in Oriental prejudices. To me it rather seems that if anybody can come forward as the expositor of the Vēdas, he can only be a Brāhmaṇa of the type of Vidyārāyaṇa, who was versed in Sanskrit lore, deeply learned in the Vēddāngas, well acquainted with the nature, origin, and significance of the archaic forms in which the Vēdas so greatly abound, who attained a mastery over the subleties of accent known as svarapakṣāṇi, who was eminently gifted with a capacity for the perception of the subtle and the indefinite, which is the peculiar property of the Hindus, and who was thoroughly conversant with the Hindu mode of thought and writing. In my humble opinion no Sanskritist of Europe can elucidate the Vēdas more clearly and rightly than Vidyārāyaṇa, for the simple reason that though the former may devote his whole lifetime to the study of the Sanskrit language and literature, he may not acquire that encyclopaedic learning which alone will enable him to comprehend the Vēdas in their true light. Such being the case, any endeavour on the part of
the Sanskrit scholar of Europe to give to the Védas a more lucid or a more liberal interpretation than was given to them by Vidyáraṇya would be regarded by the Hindus as a mere attempt to draw the oceanic water in a sieve.

Besides the commentaries on the Védas, Vidyáraṇya has written a commentary on ten of the principal Upáishtáksa known as Upáishtákamálpiká; an admirable treatise on grammar known as Madhavacárttiri, equal in length to a work of 40,000 lines in the Anuñabhù metre; a kánya entitled Sañkararajya, being a biography of Sañkarachárya, the famous expounder of Védánta philosophy; treatises on the Védánta philosophy known as Jivamuktiveká, Pañchadánsprakára and Anubhuti vriklika; an epitome of several religious philosophies known as Sarvadarṣaansamgraha, brought to the notice of Western scholars, though but meagerly, by Mr. Cowell; Páragarámanávāya, a commentary on Páragarámanávâhuy; Kálanátha-khuyya, a treatise on the divisions of time; Páramí-ná and Utrarí-máhad in metre, explaining the Páramí-ná and Utrarí-máhá; and the Uttrarí-máhad of Váyás, known respectively as Jaiminiyáanáyámysaládávistara and Váyásakáñuyámysaládávistara; a commentary on Yáśa's Níruktá, a treatise on vriklika; commentaries on śrutásūtras of Apsánta and Bódháyána; a treatise on medicine entitled Madhuvánumáhuy; Vaidikásabdprakára; a work containing short notes on difficult Védic words; śrutásūkrika; a metrical treatise of 20,000 lines explaining the application of particular yásas to particular rites as laid down in the śrutásūtras of Apsánta and Bódháyána; a commentary on śrutásuk-comb; and many others not known.

Of these the Kálapāñjakána foretold the fate of the Vijayanagara kings, which Mádhava was able to perceive clairvoyantly. Some people, who move in Western grooves of thought, are of opinion that this book must have been written after the decline of the kingdom of Vijayanagara, and for the sake of courtesy must have been ascribed to Vidyáraṇya. But those who believe in Vidyáraṇya and in the wonderful work he did would never be led to suspect, much less to disbelieve, the authorship of Kálapáñjakána. My own belief is that the controversy about the real and apparent authorship of ancient works is of later origin.

It must be noted, however, in this connection that some of the above works bear the author's own name, Mádhava, while the rest bear the name of his brother Sáyana. This is, however, explained by the fact that, as they were written by Vidyáraṇya after he became a saññayásin, he did not like the idea of their bearing his own name, and he therefore ascribed them to his brother. The work entitled Váyásakarnáyámysaládávistara, though generally known as the work of his guru, Viḍyáraṇya, was really the production of Vidyáraṇya, who wrote it in honor of his guru.

It is said that Mádhaváchárya alias Vidyáraṇya breathed his last at the ripe age of ninety years. From a copper-plate inscription we learn that he was the wazir of Bukkárya in 1363 A. D. In some of his works he thus describes his descent:

Yaṣya Bódháyanam sathram Sákhya yaṣya cha Yájushtí
Bháradvájakulam yaṣya sarvaśússha hi Mádhaváḥ
Srimala yaṣya janani saktirīt-Máyaśab pitā
Sáyaṇa Bhúganáthaścha manabuddhi sahodara

The Muhammadan historians of Southern India speak of the princes of Vijayanagara (Anegonodd) as possessed of power long anterior to the Muhammadan invasions of Southern India, and Farišta asserts that the government of the country had been exercised by the ancestors of Khímarapáraṇa for seven centuries. For all historical purposes, however, the origin of this State, as a substantial principality, may be admitted to have occurred at the period above specified, although by no means in the manner ascribed in the tradition.

(To be continued.)
KING SINGHANA OF DEVAGIRI.

The following legend was told of Singhana of Devagiri (1210-1237 A.D.), the conqueror of Panahal, Kolhapur, Malwa and Gujrat by an old man of the Deshpandé family of Mayani in the Satara Collectorate.

"The temple of Siva (Sangameswar), situated at the junction of the two brooks at Mayani, was built by King Singhana (Singhana). He also built the fort of Bhishangad, and his capital was near the hill Singhanakadi. The traces of that capital are still visible. He fought with Bhujia of Panahal, and defeated him in battle. He annexed the provinces of Panahal to his kingdom. He also built the temple of Sambha (Mahádeva) in Tálhá Mán, and peopleed there at the foot of a hill a town called Singhanpur. He went daily to the temple of Séguréswar (Siva) at Devarashí in Tálhá Khánpúr (District Satara). One day, while there, he bathed in the holy water, and thereby the spots of white leprosy disappeared from his skin. He held the place in sacred adoration ever afterwards, and assigned to the temple five adjacent villages — Dhalhíri, Dabyari, etc. It is said that this king used to build one hundred temples of Siva daily."

On comparing the above account with the life of Singhana, as given in the Early History of the Deccan by Dr. Bhadarkar, it appears to be confirmed that Singhana fought with Bhujia of Panahal, and that after defeating him he annexed Panahal to his own kingdom.

The territory of Panahal appears then to have consisted of the provinces of Panahal, Miraj, Hukeri and Raitág. The sound of the Deshpandéship of the whole territory dates from that time, is vested in a family, which claims that the grant was made to them by Raja Bhujia of Panahal.

The legend further states that the capital of Singhana was near the foot of the hill known as Singhanakadi. This is hardly likely, as Devagiri was then the dynastic capital and had been so for the three preceding kings. But it does seem probable that Singhana may have sent Bichana, his general, together with his army, to subdue Panahal, while he remained behind encamped near the foot of the Singhanakadi hill, the very name of which bears testimony to the fact of Singhana having had his camp here. Panahal is forty miles distant, and the hill appears to have been then the borders of the Panahal and Devagiri territories. There are still to be found distinct traces of an encampment near this hill.

Besides the subjugation of Bhujia, Bichana humbled the Rattas of the Southern Marlah country, the Kadambas of Gun, the Guttas (Guptas), and Hoysalas.

From the dates given in history, it appears that the work of subjugation was carried on simultaneously in the Dakhan as well as in Gujrat. Kholwad and his son, Rám, were the generals who fought for their master in Gujrat, while Bichana carried on the warfare in the south. The campaign of Gujrat terminated in the year A.D. 1238, the year which saw the termination of that in the south, and as Singhana ascended the throne in A.D. 1210, it is possible that the campaigns lasted for about 25 years. From this it can be argued that the camp at Singhanakadi existed for at least two decades, and was finally turned into a town. Instances of this kind are not rare. The town of Shalahpur (in the Satara Collectorate) was at first a mere camp of Azimahal, son of Aurangzeb, while he was in the south. Some of the military camps of the English near Native capitals have been turned into towns, and are still in existence, though they have long ceased to be such camps.

The fort of Bhishangad is situated near Singhankadi, and the legend assigns its erection to Singhana. This fort lies between the rivers Nanaí and Yéralá, and it is quite possible that the army of Singhana received its supply of water from these rivers. Singhana may very well have remained with his family in this fort, while his generals and men were engaged in the conquest of the Dakhan. The place is one of peculiar safety. It is also said that Visrâj had built Bhishangad. This story is not inconsistent with the view that it was originally built by Singhana and merely repaired by Visrâj some 500 years later.

The village of Singhanpur is situated at the foot of a hill in Tálhá Mán in the Satara District, and some people thereof say that it was founded by King Singhana, whereas others say that it was founded by King Hingana. But Hingana is merely corrupt form of Singhana.

In this village there is an old temple to Siva, the structure of which, as well as the pictures engraved on its walls, resemble those of the temple of Sangameswar at Mayani. At this temple

---

1 From the Vividha-Dyana-Vidar, August, 1893.
a large fair is held in Chaitra, and the Hindus and Lingayats of the adjoining provinces go in large numbers to make obeisance there. Bājārjir, son of Śiraj, made some grants to the temple in the name of some of the very numerous Lingayats living there. There is a large tank here, covering an area of about 49 acres. It is said to have been built by Māloji, the grandfather of Śiraj.

Singhāna, though styled a Vaiṣṇavamālābha (born in the Vaiṣṇav family), was a great devotee of Śiva. The temple of Bāngāmārāvar at Māyāni, and that of Sambhū (Mahādev) in Tālākā Mānu were built by him. Some peculiar stones have been found near Māyāni, Sainānapur and Panālā, on which a Saiva Linga with a man on either side of it is engraved on the upper part, and on the lower is shown as a row of cavalry and infantry either marching or fighting with each other. A number of these stones are to be seen placed near the walls of the greater temples; and their presence seems to have given rise to the legend of the 100 temples built by Singhāna every day. Besides the larger temples there are many small ones to Śiva built on the banks of the river Teralas, which are of peculiar structure, with or without pinacles. Singhāna, like many others, may have made a vow to prepare one or a hundred or a thousand Saiva-Lingas daily. They make them of mud and sink them in wells or rivers, after worshipping and offering them prayers. Ahilyā Bāī Holkar, the writer hears, gave some grants to Brāhmaṇa of sacred places on condition of their making a certain number of Saiva-Lingas daily.

Dēvarāshtē is a village at a distance of about six or seven miles from Singhamahādi, where King Singhāna is said to have gone for bathing and worshipping Bāngāmārāvar. The people of this village, however, know nothing about him, and merely say that a king who was afflicted with some skin disease was cured by the favour of Bāngāmārāvar. His grant of the villages Dāmilā, Dāmilā, Tūpē, etc. (for milk, curd, ghee, etc.) for the provision of materials of worship at this shrine of courses proves this part of the legend. These villages are still in existence, and bear the names given them by the donor.

The legend on the whole has much truth in it, and will prove, I believe, a valuable addition to the particulars of the life of Singhāna, the most warlike and renowned prince who ever occupied the throne of Dēvarāgi. If further searches be made into the legends of that part of the Satrā District, I have no doubt that some more particulars, which will throw a flood of light on its ancient history, will be forthcoming.

Y. S. YAYIKAR

NOTES AND QUERIES.

Quotations.

As to their Money in the Indies, at Goa, and upon the Coast of Malabar, they count by Pardao's Xerafins a silver Coin, but of bad Alloy. It is coined at Goa, and hath St. Sebastian on one side, and a bunch of Arrows on the other; it is worth 3 Testons, or 300 Reys of Portuguese Money.

They also tell Money by Tangas, which are not properly Money in specie, but like Dutch Guilders; as a Pardao Xeraffin for example, is worth 4 Tangas good Money, and five of bad Alloy, for they tell Money by good and bad Alloy.

They also tell Money by Vintins, four Vintins of good Alloy, and five Vintins of bad Alloy makes one Tangas. The Basarūco's, are the worst Alloy, being made of the worst Pewter; 16 good Basarūco's or 10 bad ones, make one Vintin, and 1 Vintins are worth two Portuguese Reys, and 375 Basarūco's make a Pardao Xeraffin.

They counterfeit very often those Pardao Xeraffins, though they are most current Coin in the Indies. To prevent your being imposed upon, you find in every corner of the Streets certain
Indian Christians, who stand there purposely, and visit your money for little, or nothing: they are so skilful at it, that in being and handling the money, they know the value of it; and without rubbing it with the Touchstone, they will distinguish a false piece amongst a thousand. The Dutch, with all their skill could not do it, for they knew them by the sound only.

The Counterfeit pieces are coined in the Continent by the Heathen Indians, so that no body receives money, not so much as a half Pardo's, without examining it to a Xaraffe, which is the name of those who view the money; who for a small Sallary are obliged to make all good that they pass: they also change money, and furnish you with what Species you want, and live very handsomely upon that trade.

There is also in the Indies, a sort of money called Fanos, twenty of which make a Pardo's; and another sort called Larrin, which comes from Persia, where it is coined in the City of Lar. It is long like thick double Silver wire, of pure and fine Silver without Allay: a Larrin is worth 1/105 or 1/106 Basarico's according as the Change goes.

Besides that, there is another sort of coin called Pagodes; there are two or three sorts of these, which are always worth about eight Tangas: It is coined in Narsinga, Bissnagar, and other places by the Heathen Indians, who stamp on one side of it the figure of an Idol, like that of the Devil sitting upon a Seat, and on the other side, a King in a Triumphant Chariot drawn by an Elephant.

The Sichtni or Ducats of Venice, which are transported into the Indies by Ormus, and the other Ducats coined in Turkey, are commonly worth two Pardo's Xeraffins.

The St. Thomas's, a piece of money so called, because St. Thomas is engraved on one side of it, and a long Cross on the other side, are always worth above seven Tangas, and sometimes eight.

Of all the money that is coined in Spain, only the Reals of eight are only current in India; commonly when the Ships arrive, they are worth 436 Portuguese Reys; then they rise when they transport them to China, but they are never lower.

When you buy or sell anything in India, you must always agree beforehand, in what Species and Coin you will be paid, whether in Pardo's Xeraffins, or Pardo's de Reales, or Pardo's de Gold; as in some places in Italy, there is a difference between Scudo d'Ore, and Scudo di Moneta.

But if you buy or sell Pearls, precious Stones, Gold, Silver, and Horaces, it is enough to name the number of Pardo's you have agreed upon; for everybody knows there are Pardo's worth six Tangas: but for all other Merchandizes, if you specify nothing, and speak in general of so many Pardo's, they are understood to be Pardo's worth five Tangas.

The Merchants pay Sometimes in Pardo's of Larrin, and then five Larrins are worth but one Pardo.

SEBUNDY.

The following valuable quotation settles two points, ante, Vol. XXV. p. 257. Sebundy were known in Oudh in the last century and were employed in collecting revenue.

1782. — "The Sebundy is a separate establishment from the two above mentioned (cavalry and infantry forces), being a charge of generally about 4 per cent. upon the collections of the different Aunils, for a duty executed by a set of peons, not military disciplined men, who are stationed upon the crops and fields all over the country for their protection. These from the nature and present state of this Government appear to me absolutely and indispensably necessary for the collections, and can neither be embodied nor formed into any regular fixed establishment, but the new year will afford an opportunity of reducing their numbers, and of bringing this part of the plan into greater perfection." — Nathaniel Middleton, letter to Warren Hastings, 25th March, 1782, from Lucknow, in Forrest's Indian State Papers, Vol. III. p. 268.

R. C. Temple.

PÁDA MÚLA PÁDA MÚLika.

Guided by the context, I have translated the Sanskrit word pádamúla, which occurs in line 20 of the Pañjukēśvar plate of Lalitaśāra (ante, Vol. XXV. p. 180) and in line 51 of the Kālīmānur plate of Dharmāśāla (Ep. Ind. Vol. IV. p. 250), by 'an attendant' or 'attendants.' I now find that in Pali the derivative pādamūlikā frequently occurs in exactly the same sense. Thus we have pādamūlikā, by itself, in the Jātaka, Vol. I. p. 431, l. 11; Vol. II. p. 325, l. 13; Vol. III. p. 417, l. 3; Vol. VI. p. 461, l. 10; pādamūlikā-purid, ibid. Vol. I. p. 122, l. 4; d внārika-pādamūlikā-dādaya, ibid. Vol. I. p. 439, l. 3; rājas-pādamūlikā, ibid. Vol. II. p. 87, l. 17, and Vol. V. p. 128, l. 18, etc.

Göttingen,

F. Kielhohn.
CURRENCY AND COINAGE AMONG THE BURMESE.

BY E. G. TEMPLE.

(Continued from p. 215.)

E. — Chin-Lushai Group.

My sources of information for the Chin Language are:

1. Practical Handbook of the Language of the Lais (Baungsé Dialect), Newland, 1897.
4. The Khyeng People of the Sandoway District, Fryer, 1875.
6. Statistical and Historical Account of the Thayetmyo District, Browne, 1873.
8. An intelligent Siyin Chin.

Chin is the generic appellation used by the Burmese for the Tribes inhabiting the hill-country between Burma and the Provinces of Assam and Bengal, and the general language of the tribes so named is closely connected with that of the Lushais on the Western slopes of the same hills, and therefore more or less so with the general Naga Language, already described. Chin-Lushai being now the usual definition of the group, I have adopted the term in these pages.

As is the case with the Kachin and Naga Languages generally, instability of form is characteristic of the Chin Language also. "The language varies somewhat from place to place, particularly in the matter of the vowels, which are seldom clearly pronounced. Indeed, distinct articulation is not by any means affected by the Chins." This fact should always be present in the mind when perusing the following pages. It should also be remembered that y and s are interchangeable in the mouths of Chins from different villages.

By far the fullest and most laborious, and in many respects the most valuable, work on the Chin Language is that of Surgeon-Major Newland on the Language of the Lais, Lai being the native term for the large and important tribe better known by its Burmese appellation of Baungsé, or by its alternative territorial title of Háká. Unfortunately Dr. Newland is not a practised grammarian or philologist, and his presentation of the language is, therefore, a considerable trouble to the student, who has indeed to work out his own idea thereof from the various statements given him in the book. Captain MacNabb treats of the same dialect in his Handbook, and unluckily with the same defect. But with a little patience and study of peculiarities one can make out the tables given below for the numerals. To these I have added the numerals given me by the Siyin Chin above noted, as, so far as I can ascertain, the dialect of the Siyin Tribe is quite nearly related to that of their neighbours, the Hákás.

---

60 Reprint from J. A. S. E., Pt. I., 1875.
61 Page 152 ff. contains a long and interesting note by Mr. Bernard Houghton on the Chin Language.
62 Khyeng in most books of the generation now passing away.
63 Mr. Houghton in the Burma Census Report, 1891, p. 102. See also Newland, p. 1, and MacNabb, introduction.
64 From Newland's various remarks Kandi or ngiri clearly exists extensively in Chin, a fact which will no doubt puzzle the ordinary learner of that language until it is explained to them. The explosive, hesitating nature of many Chins' speech can also be gathered from Capt. MacNabb's book.
65 I do not wish in the above remarks to underrate the labours of these two officials. Men are not sent to the Frontier because they are philologists, but to perform different, and for the time at any rate, far more valuable work than that of the philologist. The student cannot, in fact, be too grateful for the jottings of hard-worked and sorely tried frontier officials, who must always make them under all sorts of difficulties and in the midst of engage and pressing duties. Even if the official happens to be a "scientific" enthusiast, the drudgery and worry of taking notes on top of the anxieties and in the midst of the difficulties inseparable from the position are sufficiently deterrent to many men, and it is really "very good" of any man so placed to take the trouble at all.
## Chin Numerals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lai (Hékà, Baunggàh Chin)</th>
<th>Styin Chin.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>pôkât³⁴</td>
<td>pakât³⁴ (pahât, p. 46).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>pônî</td>
<td>pa'nî</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>pôbûm</td>
<td>pâbûm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>pôll</td>
<td>pâl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>pôṇgà</td>
<td>pângà</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>pôrûk</td>
<td>pârûk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>pôsêrî</td>
<td>pâsêrî</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>pôryêb</td>
<td>pâryêb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>pôkôwâ</td>
<td>pâkôwâ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>pôrâ</td>
<td>pârâ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>pô'lekât⁶⁵</td>
<td>'lékât</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>pôkûl</td>
<td>ñânkàl, ñânkûl⁶⁸</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>pôkûl-lêkî-pôkât</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>saumbûm⁶⁹</td>
<td>sômtûm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>sauîl</td>
<td>sômîl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>saumûgà</td>
<td>sômûngà</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>saumûk</td>
<td>sômûk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>saumûsêrî</td>
<td>sômûsêrî</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>saumûryêb</td>
<td>sômûryêb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>saumûkûâ</td>
<td>sômûkûâ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>chwêkât, Shawnâg êkîsî</td>
<td>zakât</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>ñâungkât, zara²⁷</td>
<td>ñâungkât</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>ñâungûrâ²²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Analysis:

- **Notes:**
  - The Chin numerals are used to denote quantities.
  - Notations are broken into columns for clarity.
  - One distinct numeral is noted as 100, indicating a significant cultural or practical value.
  - The entries suggest a hierarchical structure typical of numeral systems, with base values likely of 10 and 100.

---

**Transliteration and Coefficients:**

- The transcription uses standard symbols for numerical representation.
- Coefficients are integrated into the numeral system, showcasing a method of expansion and scale.

**Cultural Insight:**

- This notation is indicative of traditional numerical systems, often used in documentation and record-keeping.
- The use of symbols and specific coefficients suggests a structured approach to number representation, possibly for trade, documentation, or daily record keeping.

---

**Historical Context:**

- The integration of such a system into broader historical and cultural narratives provides insight into the development and spread of numerical systems across different regions.
- It reflects the importance of numbers in daily life, commerce, and administrative processes.

---

**Further Reading:**

- For a deeper understanding of historical numerals and their significance, exploring sources such as historical texts, anthropological studies, and indigenous cultural histories can offer additional insights.
The little works of Mr. Houghton and Col. Fryer are on a footing very different from that of the works above mentioned. Mr. Houghton's brief, but vitally laborious, notes are the results of the observations of a practised and highly-trained scholar and those of Col. Fryer the work of a writer who knew what he was about from a philological point of view. Both works are, however, slight. But they tell us enough to show that the dialect of the Southern China differs considerably, though not essentially, from that of their brethren much further North. Witness the numerals quoted by Mr. Houghton and Col. Fryer:—

**Southern Chin Numerals.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mr. Houghton (p. 19 f.)</th>
<th>Col. Fryer (p. 14)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>hò (hát)²³</td>
<td>hot (n'hat)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>'ni</td>
<td>'ni (pan-'ni)²³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>t’un (t’un)</td>
<td>t’un (t’um)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>m’il (‘il)</td>
<td>m’il (‘il)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>‘ngō</td>
<td>‘ngō (‘ngan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>sok</td>
<td>sop (sank)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>‘st</td>
<td>she (s’ē)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>‘èt</td>
<td>shaŋ, shaŋ (sât)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>ko</td>
<td>go (ko)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>‘nga (ha)</td>
<td>bā, ‘nga (bā)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>‘ngahō</td>
<td>hā-ne-puñhot²⁸</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>go (kūr)</td>
<td>gōi (kūr)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>goh</td>
<td>goi-ne-puñhot²³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>t’unkit (quip)²⁷ (p. 90)</td>
<td>t’umgip (t’ungip)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>t’unkit-hō</td>
<td>t’umgip-puñhot²³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>m’likit</td>
<td>m’ilgip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>haukkit</td>
<td>‘ngōgip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>‘sokkit</td>
<td>sopgip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>‘alkit</td>
<td>shegip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>‘aokkit</td>
<td>shaŋgip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>kokyit</td>
<td>gogip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>p’yābō</td>
<td>piāhoot (klā-hē)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
<td>piālōn-ne-puñhot²³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td></td>
<td>piā-gōi-ne-puñhot²⁷</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>tātōng (Burmese)</td>
<td>piā’nga (ten hundred)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,001</td>
<td></td>
<td>piā’ngālōn-ne-puñhot²⁹</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

²³ Much as I would have liked to have adopted Mr. Houghton's transcriptions as they stand, I have felt obliged to change them to those adopted in this work for the sake of clearness.
²⁷ Pan is a coefficient.
²³² Fourteen is not a coefficient, and these numerals run thus: — 10 with 1, 20 with 1, 30 with 1.
²⁷² These are clearly "a ten," and the numerals run 2, 4, 5, etc., tens.
²³² These expressions mean: — 100 beyond with 1, ten hundred beyond with 1.
²³² This I take it, means "a hundred (and a score with one)."
Colonel Frere drops a remark on p. 14, which goes far towards explaining the varying words used for "a ten" in the Nàga and connected tongues in enumerating 30, 40, etc., to 90. He says gùp signifies "a clap of the hands," and so t-shùgùp means "three claps;" mìgùp, "four claps," and so on. One can see how this comes about: — the numerals are counted on the fingers up to ten and then the hands are clapped, "one ten." This explanation also accounts for the term for fifty being an insolated one in nearly all the dialects; because when the enumerators come to "five claps," i.e., to a handful of tens, he would naturally mark the fact in his mind by a special term and proceed again with what is to him the laborious and important process of counting on to a hundred.

Only one of the books available to me, Dr. Newland's, gives any direct statement as to the Chin's notions of coin and currency, but he also gives the reason why the other books are practically silent on the point, for he says (Intro., p. 4) that the Chinese use the Burmese words for money, having none of their own for the purpose.

His table for the Lais runs as follows:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Lao Coin</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 rupee</td>
<td>tañkà pokàt</td>
<td>pp. 31, 42, 66, 82, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 half-rupee</td>
<td>ngàµà pokàt</td>
<td>pp. 31, 42, 519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 4-anna bit</td>
<td>bà'màb màbët</td>
<td>pp. 32, 42, 614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2-anna bit</td>
<td>mëuch chëkët</td>
<td>pp. 32, 42, 502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 pice</td>
<td>païsë pokàt</td>
<td>pp. 31, 42, 635, 657</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is all Burmese pronounced and used Chin fashion, the Burmese words being respectively ñìyà (spelt ñìyàt; ngàµà, ñàñšt, mëuch, païsë (Indian). Pò, màb, chët in the above expressions are all numeral coefficients, andàt means one. In the Burmese ñàñšt the te = one, and the Chin expression shows how the Lais have borrowed the Burmese word for "one màt" bodily without understanding its full import, which is interesting.

Tañkà, which is an Indian word, and its derivatives in the Far East, as I have already shown at length, mean "coin" pure and simple, and the word is so used by the Chinese. Thus we have shëk-tañkà (Bur. shëk-ïnìyà), gold coin = the British sovereign; ngùn-tañkà, silver coin = the British rupee; ñàng-à-tañkà, copper coin = the British-Indian pice; suppo-tañkà, lead coin = counterfeit money (p. 650). Tañkà is also used for "money."

The Lai word for silver, ngùn, which by the way is good Shàn, is, as usual, employed for a rupee, singly on p. 258 and also with tañkà (ngùn-tañkà) on p. 651. On pp. 161, 225 ngùn is used generally for money, while on pp. 225, 673 we have a curious expression asëk-ëk, tìt, "the purchaser," for "money."

Captain MacNab supports the above statements by giving tañkà for rupee on pp. 5, 48, and for money on pp. 14, 45; while he has tañkà-pokàt (pp. 11, 34) for "one rupee," and tañkà-tañkàl (p. 21) for Rs. 20, ñàns being a numeral coefficient (p. 104, pà, pàm, vùn, pù)."
Turning to the Southern Chins, Col. Fryer nowhere mentions money, and Mr. Houghton only does so incidentally, using the word for silver, "hén," for rupees (p. 44) and also for money (p. 46). From his pages the method of counting rupees can be gathered thus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Re.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>hén ló-hó</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>hén ló-ńgo</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>hén ló-ńgā</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>hén ló-haukkyit</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here "ló" (lo) is the numeral coefficient for coin, pp. 20, 44.

It may be assumed, therefore, that the Chins count their money in a straightforward way, by the British coins they use. But that they also use the numeral coefficients for the purposes can be seen from a sentence in Newland, p. 36:

"sdulak-kā pő-ruk²⁸ kän mēk-lāt the whole for six I pay will"

Translated: I will pay Rs. 6 for the whole lot.

The words for the metals compare as follow in my authorities:

Chin Terms for the Metals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metal</th>
<th>Newland</th>
<th>MacNabb</th>
<th>Houghton</th>
<th>Fryer</th>
<th>The Siyin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>gold</td>
<td>shwē²⁸ (B)²⁹</td>
<td>shwē, shwi (B)</td>
<td>hā²⁻</td>
<td>kām (S)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>silver</td>
<td>ngān²⁶ (S)</td>
<td>né (B)</td>
<td>hēm</td>
<td>ngān (S)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>copper</td>
<td>bāngsā (S)</td>
<td>kēsən</td>
<td>hāxan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brass</td>
<td>dār</td>
<td>dār</td>
<td>kātyā²⁸ (B)</td>
<td>hākyēng</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tin</td>
<td>sāngpy²⁶ (B)</td>
<td>sāngpy²⁶ (B)</td>
<td>dānl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iron</td>
<td>ngeen</td>
<td>nār</td>
<td>nē¹</td>
<td>nē²</td>
<td>tō³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lead</td>
<td>kwen</td>
<td>kwen</td>
<td>kē²³ (B)</td>
<td>hāk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zinc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>chīltōng</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Chins, or at least some of them, must have some notions of Troy weight, as may be seen from statements in Newland. Thus at p. 557 n. he says, after explaining that the Chins measure and do not weigh their goods, "silk yarn is sold by weight, one rupee's weight being akṣē-kāt (âkṣē-kāt, "one rupee-weight"), each kēp consisting of so many smaller skeins or bāk-kāts. Beeswax is sold in pieces, each about a viss in weight; these pieces being called chwèt or shwè-kāt," lit., one hundred. Here we seem to have distinct rudiments of Troy weight, copied from the Burmese and Shāns, thus:

- akṣē-kāt: weight of one rupee (tickal or tāl)
- chwět (= shwē-kāt): weight of one hundred rupees

²⁸ Pō, num. coeff., for rupees.
²⁹ Shwē ngāng, ngōm, ngāng, pure gold, pure silver. Cf. u. 81 above, tangē ngōngi, genuine rupees.
³⁰ B stands for Burmese, and S for Shān.
³¹ Maungbōha, gold kept hereditarily: p. 75.
³³ Also any white metal which is not silver.
³⁴ Tō, Northern Chin.
³⁵ From the expression (p. 67) for bullet, kē-mēng (kēmōng, pp. 60, 116, a lump, hard thing).
³⁶ One cannot help thinking, however, that the word is really bō, the kāt being added for "one."
Again, Dr. Newland gives ἀγάς-ἀρ (lit., silver weights) for "Burmese brass weights" for weighing bullion and the finer articles of trade (pp. 299, 522). For scales Dr. Newland gives skueba, and for weight,64 ἱλι, which is 侵害 in Capt. MacNabb's book, p. 8. Mr. Houghton has ὀλίν (Burmese), pp. 52, 130.

To the instances already given (ante, Vol. XXVI. p. 285) of articles of value being used for barter, Dr. Newland (p. 216 n.) addsuce a good one in the use for the purpose by the Lais of the mé-fahr, or pine torch, which is to them the substitute for the lamp and of great and constant value.

Of their aptitude for trade, so far as they understand it, he says (p. 438 n.): "All grain is measured in baskets. These, however, vary in size all over the hills, no two villages having baskets of the same capacity. The Hāks have taken care to have their baskets much larger than those of any of the other tribes. To show what acute eyes to business they have, it may be explained that, when purchasing grain from the villages, or when getting in their tribute, their own large baskets are used: on the other hand, if selling to them, the smaller baskets of outsiders are then taken as the standard." This habit of having varying in-coming and out-going measures has been already noticed (ante, p. 8, n. 58) among far-Eastern peoples, and is, of course, a primitive attempt at "cover" for incidental charges, risk and wastage; fair enough, where the difference is small, but constantly used by the strong, as in this case, in order to take an undue advantage of the weak.

For the Lushai and connected languages my sources of information are as follow:

1. Short Account of the Kuki-Lushai Tribes, with Outline Grammar, Soppitt, 1887; official publication, Assam.
2. Short Account of the Kachaka Nga (Empoo) Tribe, Soppitt, 1885; official publication, Assam.
4. Outline Grammar of the Kachāri (Bēr, Bōō) Language, 1854, Endle; official publication, Assam.
5. Four Lushais from the Chittagong Hill Tracts.
6. A Tipperā from Hill Tipperā (Narā Rām by name).
7. A Gāro from Rōnnēring.

Mr. Soppitt divides the race generally known to the Bengalis as the Ḳūkis65 into four main tribes, - Ḳāngkō'lis, Ḳānsūs, Lushais, and Fois,66 speaking varieties of one main tongue, which will be seen from these pages to be much that of the China with many Nga affinities. His Grammar refers chiefly to the dialect of the Ḳāngkō'lis with comparative notes on those of the Ķānsūs and Lushais. Two of the Lushais whom I examined myself gave me words practically the same as those given to Mr. Soppitt, but the third man, though coming from the same part of the hills, evidently spoke a different dialect, almost certainly Maring. See Brown's Manipur, pp. 15, 43 ff. This tribe is not yet properly affiliated to either Nga or Kūk-Lushai, but it is closely enough allied to the latter for me to call it Eastern Lushai for the present purpose.

For the purpose of comparison with the Chin dialects I here give the Ḳūk-Lushai numerals.

64 Avoirdupois, I take it, c. a., for heavy articles.
65 The "Cookies" of the earlier travellers and European residents in Bengal.
66 Here is an interesting confirmation by independent officers working on the Burmese and Assamese sides of the Chin country of the identity of, at any rate, some of the Chin and Lushai Tribes. Mr. D. Ross, Burma, ante, Vol. XXI. p. 196, says: "The Baungshis (Lai China) are known as Foi to the tribes on the Bengal border. They are called Foi by the Tashùns (China)." Whilst Mr. Soppitt, Assam, includes the Fois as among one of the four chief divisions of the Kūkis.
### Kuki-Lushai Numerals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soppitt, p. 33</th>
<th>Soppitt, p. 81</th>
<th>Soppitt, p. 87</th>
<th>The Eastern Lushai (Maring)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rāngk'öl</strong></td>
<td><strong>Jānān</strong></td>
<td><strong>Lushai</strong></td>
<td><strong>Rāngk'öl</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>enkāt</td>
<td>kāt</td>
<td>pēkāt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>suff. kāt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ennī</td>
<td>ni</td>
<td>pānī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>suff. nī</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>entūm</td>
<td>tum</td>
<td>pātūm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>suff. tum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>mūlī</td>
<td>lī</td>
<td>pālī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ringāh</td>
<td>ngā</td>
<td>pongā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>garūk</td>
<td>vūp</td>
<td>pārūk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>sārī, sāīt</td>
<td>sagī</td>
<td>pāsār</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>garīt, gārīt</td>
<td>gūt</td>
<td>pārīt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>gūk</td>
<td>gū</td>
<td>pākwā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>shōm, shom-kāt</td>
<td>shōm</td>
<td>sōm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>shom-kāt-lē-kāt</td>
<td></td>
<td>pirmit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>shomnī, shomennī</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>shomnī-lē-enkāt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>shomtūm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>shomnīl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>shomringāh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>shomgarūk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>shomārī</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>shomgarī</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>shomgūk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>rajākāt, réjākāt</td>
<td>lākāt</td>
<td>jākāt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>shangkāt</td>
<td>shāngkāt</td>
<td>t'āung (Barmese)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To gather how the Lùshais reckon the money they come across one has to search Mr. Soppitt's pages. The word for rupee, or money, is that for silver, shām or shōm, and dār, a word with strong Nūga affinities, is the numerical coefficient for rupees; and it would seem that in reckoning they either use (a) the term plus coefficient plus numeral, or (b) the coefficient alone with the numeral, or (c) when there is no ambiguity simply the numeral. Thus, we find:

(a) p. 67  ...  Rs. 5  ...  shōm dār-ringāh
(b) p. 60  ...  Rs. 2  ...  dār-uf
(c) p. 60  ...  Rs. 4  ...  dār-mill
(d) p. 66  ...  Rs. 5  ...  dār-ringāh
(e) p. 67  ...  Rs. 20  ...  dār-shōm
(f) p. 56  ...  Rs. 20  ...  dār-shōm-mill
(g) pp. 66, 68  ...  Rs. 25  ...  shōmeni dār-ringāh
(h) p. 68  ...  Rs. 40  ...  dār-shōm-mill
(i) p. 60  ...  Rs. 35  ...  shōmeni
(j) p. 60  ...  Rs. 20  ...  shōmeni

Mr. Soppitt also gives sīkī for the four-anna bit, borrowed from Bengali.

My own notes, however, tell a very different tale from the simple one above quoted, and one more in accord with the painfully elaborate methods of calculating, which one knows to be customary with the savage or semi-civilized peoples of the Far East. Whether right or wrong, my notes are the result of an infinity of patience.

The first point to observe is the nomenclature of the coined divisions of the rupee given me by the men, above-mentioned as speaking different dialects, whom I may now call for the present purpose the Eastern and Western Lùshais; meaning by the Eastern Lùshai the man (? Maring) whose speech was nearest Chin and by the Western Lùshais the men whose speech was nearest to that of Mr. Soppitt's Kikli-Lùshais. These men named the silver coins thus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Eastern Lùshai</th>
<th>Western Lùshai</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2-anma piece</td>
<td>parc ānā 12</td>
<td>duśnā 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-anma piece</td>
<td>sīlāp, siplāp</td>
<td>sīkī 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>half rupee</td>
<td>t'ngāsī</td>
<td>hādall 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rupee</td>
<td>tāngā</td>
<td>tāngā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one rupee</td>
<td>p'łāp 15</td>
<td>tāngā-kāt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1½ rupees</td>
<td>p'łāp t'ngāsī 17</td>
<td>tāngā-lē-sīkī 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1¼ rupees</td>
<td>p'łāp-enkōi 17</td>
<td>tāngā-lē-hādall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1½ rupees</td>
<td>p'łāp-sōma</td>
<td>tāngā-lē-hādall-sīk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10 Pages 53, 57, 73, 75 for shām; pp. 66, 68 for shōm = money; p. 77 for shōm = silver.
11 This is the usual Far Eastern way of employing the numeral coefficient; the next instance is unusual.
12 I. e., two annas.
13 Indian, donāl, "a 2-anma bit."
14 Both Indian. Hādall = māh/mī, a half rupee.
15 The coin being placed before them to name.
16 We may perhaps take lāp (= lākā) = one, and p' (= pō, po, etc.) as the numeral coefficient for rupee, but the expression has an interesting Kachin look about it, vide ante, p. 190.
17 There is confusion here, as both words mean Re. 1½; sōkōi = a half; cf. Chin kōi in Houghton, p. 112.
18 Lād = with.
Then comes the crux,—the nomenclature of the intermediate divisions of the rupee, the uncoined odd annas of account,—where so much depends on the individual intelligence of the examinee. Here the Eastern Lushai counted straight ahead,—2, 3, 5, 6 annas and so on (poré, sōm, tangd, tarikh—anā), varying his nomenclature only when he came to four annas and eight annas, which he called by the names for the coins, siplā and tāgāt. He used, however, pa-anā for "one anna," just as he used pīlāp for "one rupee," and a notable term awat-anā for "10 annas," where one would have expected hi-anā.

But one of the Western Lushais gave a list, which was very puzzling,—probably he was puzzled himself,—and I give it here with the explanation, just as it was given me.

### Divisions of the Rupee.

#### The Western Lushai's Terms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Lushai</th>
<th>Sense of the Lushai</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 anna</td>
<td>dārtāngā pali</td>
<td>copper-coins four¹⁹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 annas</td>
<td>duānā</td>
<td>2-anna piece (douānī, Indian)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>sōm-lē-panī</td>
<td>12 (pice)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>sīkī</td>
<td>quarter (of a rupee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>sōm-lē-pak'ngā</td>
<td>15 (pice)²⁰</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>sōmnī</td>
<td>20 (pice)²¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>sōmnī-pail</td>
<td>24 (pice)²²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>hādalī</td>
<td>half rupee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>hādalī-lē-pail</td>
<td>half with 4 (pice)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>hādalī-lē-paryāt</td>
<td>half with 8 (pice)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>hādalī-lē-paryāt-pail</td>
<td>half with 8 and 4 (pice)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>sōm-lē-panī</td>
<td>12 (annas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>sōm-lē-patūm</td>
<td>13 (annas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>sōm-lē-pail</td>
<td>14 (annas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>sōm-lē-pak'ngā</td>
<td>15 (annas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rupee</td>
<td>taṅgā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The working of this, in reality intelligent, savage's mind comes out clearly in the above table. His "anna" was to him a concrete thing, viz., a quartette of (coined) pice, and he painfully tried to multiply out his quartettes, making mistakes in the effort before long, until he came to the half rupee, or hādalī. Here he gained breathing time, until again the multiplication became too much for him, which caused him to boldly enumerate the annas direct at 12 annas and onward. He thus used the same expression for "12 annas" as he had already

---

¹⁹ I. e., four pice.
²⁰ Should be 15 pice, sōm-lē-parēk.
²¹ Should be 24 pice, sōmnī-pail.
²² Should be 28 pice, sōmnī-paryāt.
used for (12 pice) "3 annas," in a manner with which my readers will be now familiar. The probabilities are that the more practised traders of this community enumerate thus:

5 annas ... siki-lē-paīt
9 annas ... hadali-lē-paīt
18 annas ... hadali-siki-lē-paīt
and so on.

I may mention that the Eastern Lushai called pice kri-paītā, kri being used by him for both brass and copper, according to a well-known Far-Eastern root. Also both men recognised the Abrus seed as min'ti (East) and sentel (West).

The Lushai terms for the metals compare as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Mr. Soppitt</th>
<th>Eastern Lushai</th>
<th>Western Lushai</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>gold</td>
<td>rāngmājāk (p. 74)</td>
<td>kō</td>
<td>rāngmājāk (p. 74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>silver</td>
<td>shum (p. 97)</td>
<td>tāi</td>
<td>sūm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brass, copper</td>
<td></td>
<td>kīt</td>
<td>dār, hār</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tin</td>
<td></td>
<td>dātsā</td>
<td>rāngwā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iron</td>
<td>tir (p. 75)</td>
<td>lōhwā (Indian)</td>
<td>tir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lead</td>
<td></td>
<td>kēmā (p. 74)</td>
<td>swān</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The fourth Lushai, whom I had an opportunity of examining, was a Zo (or Dzo, as the books have it), the tribe most closely related of all to the Chin, and I have kept his numerals to the last, so as to serve as an argument for clinching the inter-relationship of Chin and Lushai.

Zo Lushai Numerals.

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>p'kat</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>p'nit</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>p'll</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>p'ngā</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>p'sārt</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>p'rīk</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>t'schom</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>t'schom-lē-p'kat</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

His terms for the metals were also extremely interesting. Gold, s'na for the Indian sōnā, which has become the term for silver among the Manipuri Nagas, ante, p. 214: silver, tānkā, i.e., the term for the rupee has become that for the metal it is made of: iron, i.e.: lead, hār, used for brass among the Lushais, as we have just seen.

32 Capt. Lewin's list in Anderson's Hill Tipper gold is shōna (Bengali); silver is tānkāhān; iron is tīr.
33 Also shōnā (Bengali).
34 K'ī is Burmese.
35 See Newland, p. 1; Houghton, p. 4.
36 The t, s, and c all distinctly sounded, with a hesitation between the t and s.
37 So on to 19.
38 So on to 90.
39 Reversing the Indian process of thought, where the coin, "rupee," is named after the metal it is made of.
From Mr. Soppitt’s account of the Kachchā Nāgas of North Kachār one seems to find in their tongue a typically unstable language linking with both the Chin-Lushai and the Nāga Groups. Witness his numerals:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kachchā Nāga Numerals.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 kat</td>
<td>2 ganá</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 mādai</td>
<td>5 mingéo, mingao³³⁷</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 sená</td>
<td>8 dasát, děsát²²³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 gáëo</td>
<td>11 gáëo-kát</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 eñkai-kát³⁵³</td>
<td>30 shimëo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 ringjëo, ringao³⁷²</td>
<td>60 riág-súrk³³³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 riág-dasát</td>
<td>90 riág-súgìt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 shàng</td>
<td>100 hai</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mr. Soppitt gives (pp. 38, 42, 44) the Kachchā Nāga word for both silver and money as râng-gâng, râng-kânt, but I gather that the word is really râng, gâng (kânt) being its numeral coefficient. Gold he calls (p. 43) jëcchàk, and iron (p. 44) jëgé.

Taking râng = silver, money, rupee, and gâng, kânt³⁵⁵ as its numeral coefficient, we find that these Nāgas reckon money much as do their neighbours. E.g.,

(a) by rupee plus coefficient:
   p. 31 ... Rs. 2 ... râng gâng-ganá
   p. 33 ... Rs. 25 ... râng gâng-eñkai-mingao
   p. 38 ... Rs. 40 ... râng gâng-r'dai

(b) by numeral coefficient only:
   p. 9 ... Re. 1 ... gâng-kânt
   p. 32 ... Rs. 4 or 5 ... kânt-mādai-mingao
   p. 9 ... Rs. 61 ... riág-súrk gâng-kânt

It is also clear that they must have the same method as their neighbours for reckoning the parts of the rupee, as on p. 10 we find:

hâgi = 4 annas
bpl = 8 annas
hâgi-gâjûm = 12 annas, lit., “4-anna-bits three”

Mr. Soppitt gives no words for the weights, which is unfortunate as the Kachchā Nāgas must have definite ideas on the subject, as may be seen from a remark on p. 10, that, in relation to weights, badday = a quarter, gajàt = a half, baddâng-gâjûm = three quarters.

Mr. Anderson’s Hill Tipperā Notes are very slight, my own attempts with a Tipperā one Nārsī Rām, from Hill Tipperā, being more productive of words for the present purpose.

²⁵ See p. 8.
²⁶ Page 42.
²⁷ Page 47.
²⁸ Eñkai-kát-Me is the full expression and means “twenty-full-(and)-one-single.”
²⁹ Page 38.
³⁰ Jëgé is clearly “a ten,” and the numerals equal 6, 7, 8, and 9 tens. Shimëto, 30, seems to be formed in the same way, r’o being ten. So also radai, 40, seems to equal 4 tens, and ringao, 50, to equal 5 tens.
³¹ Kânt is the numeral coefficient for flat things in Kachchā. Endle, p. 13.
From the information to hand, however, we here, as in the Kachari (Bōdi) Language, seem, without leaving the class, to be getting away from immediate relationship with the Chin-Lushai Group proper. Thus the Hill Tipperā numerals run as follows:

**Hill Tipperā Numerals.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>kāicha</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>kaich'ā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>remoi</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>k'ânōi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>kat'ām</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>k'at'ān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>buroi</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>baroi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>bā</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>bā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>dau, dok</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>dau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>sūl</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>sanē</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>chā, charā</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>sā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>chukū</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>sakū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>chē</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>sē</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>...</td>
<td>sēsā⁴⁰</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>k'al</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>kō</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>...</td>
<td>kō-pe-si⁴¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td>...</td>
<td>kurunōi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td>...</td>
<td>kurun'chi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td>...</td>
<td>kurutā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td>...</td>
<td>kurutāši</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td>...</td>
<td>kurubaroi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td>...</td>
<td>kurubaroichī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>...</td>
<td>razāhā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>...</td>
<td>sāyā</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⁴⁰ All his "teens" were regular, except 15, which was said.
⁴¹ Probably for "twenty with ten." The remaining numerals seem to be formed by scores (kurū; Chin, kūr; Naga, kū, kal; all go doubt through the Assamese, k'ūrī, a score) thus, kurū-nōi, 2 score = 40; kurun(ō)i-chī, 2 score and 10 = 50; kurū-sā, 3 score = 60; kurutāš, 3 score and 10 = 70; kuru-baroi, 4 score = 80; kurubaroichī, 4 score and 10 = 90. Cf. the Manipur custom as given above, p. 170, n. 16.
Mr. Anderson makes no mention of money in his Vocabulary, but I squeezed a certain amount of information out of Narsi Râm on the subject. Thus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rupee, râng</th>
<th>one rupee</th>
<th>k'wâ-â³</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>half rupee</td>
<td>màsà, m'sà</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>quarter rupee</td>
<td>sagí</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Shown the coins, he enumerated the fractional parts of the rupee thus:

| Re. 1¼ | k'wâ-â ánà baroi | rupee one annas 4 |
| Re. 1½ | k'wâ-â m'sâ | rupee one (and) half |
| Re. 1¾ | k'wâ sagí lê-t'ân | rupee (and) quarter by three |

He enumerated his annas, however, in a complete and straightforward manner from 1 to 15, using the suffixed forms for 1, 2, and 3, thus:

| one anna | ánà hâ |
| three annas | ánà t'ân |

and so on, even using ánà sà, eight annas, as a synonym for m'sâ for the half rupee.

The words given for the metals compare as under:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mr. Anderson</th>
<th>Narsi Râm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>gold</td>
<td>rângchâo</td>
<td>rângsà</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>silver</td>
<td>râng</td>
<td>rúpai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>copper</td>
<td></td>
<td>poicha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brass</td>
<td></td>
<td>petóh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tin</td>
<td></td>
<td>sôkôpî³⁵⁴⁶</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iron</td>
<td>shor, char</td>
<td>sô</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lead</td>
<td></td>
<td>sî-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the above words in Narsi Râm’s list, rúpai, petóh, sîsà are directly Indian, and so is the interesting word poicha for copper, i. e., metal. Lastly, Narsi Râm at once recognised the Abrus seed, which he named byéwá.

For Kachâri there is Mr. Endle’s excellent and only too brief Outline Grammar, showing the connections and the wide spread of this tongue under its best known title of Bôdô (Bôrô)³⁶

---

³³ Silver, according to Mr. Anderson.
³⁴ Equal to three quarters. With this saqì cf. Kachcha Nîga hâgî, 4 annas, and hâgî-gûjûn (three hâgî) 12 annas.
³⁶ It may be as well to note here the various names, more or less well-known and familiar, under which Kachâri of sorts appear in books:
(1) Bôrô, Bôbô, Bora, Bojo, Bôrà, Bodo.
(2) Mêch Mês.
(3) Hciar: Hâjông, Lâlang.
(4) Dôm, Dûlômî.
(5) Ghow: îpperà, Mikir (f).

See Endle, Preface, 1 v. f.
its connection with the general language of the North-East Frontier Hills comes out in the words noted in these pages for numerals and currency, proving it to be highly instructive for the present purpose, despite the essentially Indian character of its surroundings.

The Kachārī indigenous numerals only run as far as ten, thus, as given by Mr. Endle: —

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kachārī Indigenous Numerals.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When counting directly beyond ten, the Indian numerals are used, as may be seen from a sentence on p. 66: —

dān-fāi-ān pandra bā ēk'urī t'āk'ā mangan
month-each-in fifteen or one-score rupee get
(translated) get fifteen or twenty rupees a month.

But the Kachārīs have borrowed the Indian scale of quartettes (gaṇdas), so popular for reckoning cowries, and this enables them to count as far as 43 in their own numerals. Here we have that link in Kachārī with the Western tongues and habits, which explains so much that is puzzling in the curious Manipūr method of reckoning sēl and already discussed; while we have also in Kachārī an all-important link with the Eastern tongues and habits in the full use of numeral coefficients, employed Chinese and Nāga (not Burmese and Shān) fashion.

Borrowing the Assamese word jak'ā (= gaṇḍā), which they have turned into zak'āi (z'kāi on p. 42), the Kachārīs express 15 by zak'ai-tām-(coeff.)-tām, i.e., three quartettes and three. Forty-two they express by zak'ai-zō-(coeff.)-nō, i.e., ten quartettes and two. The

---

47 S and ść in Kachārī and Gāro often equal zh, ch', j', j' in the surrounding tongues.
48 The Gāro is essentially a mere dialect of Kachārī or Bodo.
49 Page 60. Indian k'ē, a score. We can now trace the wanderings in the Hills of this well-known term from k'é, through Assamese k'ē, to
(1) Tipperā, kār ; Chin, bār, krut.
(2) Chin, Manipūr, kōl ; Kachashīngphā, k'ōml.
(3) Chin, kōl ; Tipperā, k'ōl.
(4) Chin, Tipperā, kō, go, gēl.
(5) Lhōtā and Angāmī Nāga, (me)kō, kwa, kōl ; Chin, kōl ; Kachsha Nāga, (en)kōl.
50 Vide ante, p. 271.
51 Page 12.
numeral coefficient for rupee is 'tai, a round thing, and so Rs. 15 would be in this enumeration sak'ai-t'am-t'ai-t'am, and Rs. 42 would be sak'ai-zó-t'ai-né.

The Kachári also reckon, like their Indian neighbours, in rupees, annas, and pice, i.e., in their vernacular, in tākā (tākā), faísă (poisā) and āndă. For tākā the numeral coefficient is 'tai, and for faísă it is gat, while there is no coefficient for āndă. This much can be gathered from the following statements scattered about Mr. Endle's book:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>pp. 36, 43 f.</th>
<th>Rupee</th>
<th>'tākā, 'tākā</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>p. 60</td>
<td>Rs. 1</td>
<td>'tākā t'aisé</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 58</td>
<td>Rs. 2</td>
<td>'tānöl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 42</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>'t'ait'am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>'t'aini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 39, 40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>'t'ainzó</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 66</td>
<td>2 pice</td>
<td>poisā gatnē</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 42</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>faísă gathā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. vi.</td>
<td>6 annas</td>
<td>ānā rō, ānā-rō</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 60</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>ānā-zō</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The only word that Mr. Endle gives for the metals is that for gold, which is darbi, a word of distinctly Eastern (Nāga) affinities. He gives nothing indigenous for the weights, but several obvious corruptions of such familiar Indian terms as man, sér, etc., are to be found scattered up and down his pages.

Mr. Endle did not go beyond ten in the Gāro numerals given by him, apparently because of the limit of his indigenous Kachāri numerals, but the Gāro I examined carried his on to 100 and 1,000, thus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gāro Numerals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1... mang'sā 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4... mang'brī 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7... mang's'ni 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10... mang'chik'ing and mang'chik'ing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30... kōlach'ni 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60... sotdök 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90... sotchikū 100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 'mang' prefixed to the numerals of the first ten appears in two lists in Dalton's Ethnology of Bengal (p. 93) of the numerals of the Bodos (Kachāriis) and the Mēchs as man.

---

82 The Kachāri Nāga use gāng = , in Kachāri, numeral coefficient for flat things.
83 Also duplicated, khetkhet.
84 kūng may be compared with the terminal syllable bā, kāng, kāng already noticed among the Nāga Languages.
85 Evidently "one score."
86 Also duplicated, chichik'ing.
87 So on to 19, using chi + numeral or chik + numeral at will.
88 Evidently a score and ten.
89 Set, clearly "ten."
80 Should be 100, being literally "ten tens"; its use for 1,000 is notable.
and man, both prefixed. As will have been already seen, the Mècha and the Bodos are essentially the same people. Though not mentioned by Mr. Endle, man, man, man is clearly a coefficient, as it will be seen to disappear in the counting of money. Thus, the Gāro I examined called an anna gondā, i. e., gondā, or a quartette (of pice), a fact of great interest in the present connection, and proceeded to reckon his annas entirely as gondās of pice. Thus:

1 anna... ... gondā-sā 2 annas ... gondā-g'ni
3 annas... ... gondā-g'tām 4 annas... ... gondā-bri
and so on to 15 annas.

His numeral coefficient for rupee was kāp, and he counted his rupees kāpsā, kāps'ni, kāps'āw, and so on. Similarly he counted his pice, using the Indian word pośā, straightforwardly, pośā p'āk, pośā-s'ā, pośā-s'ām. Like the Zō Lāshais, he mixed up his silver with his rupees, calling both tāshā. For brass he used the Indian word for lead, šisā.

(To be continued.)

THE SIEGE OF AHMADNAGAR AND HEROIC DEFENCE OF THE FORT BY CHAND BIBI — A NARRATIVE OF AN EYE-WITNESS.

BY MAJOR J. S. KING.

Indian Staff Corps (retired).

Continued from p. 237.)

Mujāhid-ud-Dīn Shamsīr Khān, who, having undertaken the defence of the city and country, was engaged in collecting a force and making preparations to repel the vindictive enemy (some explanation of which we have already given); and when he heard of the death of Ansār Khān, and of his Highness Chand Bibi having ascended the tower of the fortress, he hastened to attend at court with all his glorious sons; and in like manner Aīṣal Khān and Mīr Muhammad Zamān, more than all, were distinguished by the happiness of attendance at the foot of the throne of sovereignty. After that, all the inhabitants and great men of the city, small and great, going to the foot of the throne, assembled under the shadow of Her Highness' favour.

At this juncture a body of troops from the north side of the city came into view, and arrived in the vicinity of the namās-gāh. A number of them rushed to the summit of the namās-gāh, and some proceeded to the city. Since no one imagined the near arrival of the Mughal army, some people thought this was Sa'ādat Khān's force, and some imagined it was the army of the Ḥabshīs. Shamsīr Khān, in order to ascertain the circumstances of that force, sent a person among them, and he brought back the news that this was the force of the Khān-Khānān and the advanced guard of the Mughal army. The garrison of the fortress and the nobles when they became aware of the arrival of the Mughal army, fired some guns towards them and dispersed those who had come on the plain of the chabītra. Then with all their might they engaged themselves in strengthening and protecting the fortress and getting ready the warlike apparatus. When the day had come to an end, the Khān-Khānān's force did not remain in the vicinity of the fortress, but hastened back to the Khān-Khānān, who had encamped near the garden of the old kāriā; and that night till the appearance of the true dawn they remained cautious and watchful.

Her Highness Chand Bibi cast the rays of attention and favour on the state of the well-wishers and nobles of the country; especially Muhammad Khān, whom she treated with much affability and kindness; and as a reward for his virtuous efforts and honourable services, she conferred on him the rank of wāhil and amīr-ul-wawārā and the office of udā'ī; and the reins of the control of all

* One of the subterraneous water-leads, of which there were fifteen in all — vida Bombay Gazetteer, Vol. XVII. p. 670.
mankind and the defence and strengthening of the fortress she placed in the powerful grasp of that faithful khan; ordering him to exercise due vigilance and caution. To Mujahid-ud-Din Shamshir Khan she entrusted the protection of the helpless people and vassals outside the fortress, and the fighting the enemies of the State. A number of brave men and well-wishers of the State, such as Mir Muhammad Zamân, and all the warlike ones she ordered to co-operate with him.

The next day was Tuesday, the 24th Rabi' II. (17th December, 1595). The Khan-Khânân with a number of the officers of his army set about the protection of the city and Burhanâbâd,7 and conciliating and looking after the affairs of the inhabitants and vassals, who are a sacred trust from the Creator of mankind; and issued a proclamation of security of property and life. A number of the helpless and poor, who through want of ability to migrate, had remained in their dwellings, trusting in the good news of the promise of security, took refuge in the neighbourhood of the fortress and all the fortified villages.

On this day Mir Muhammad Zamân being appointed to summon Jalâl-ud-Din Haidar, brought to the foot of the throne that sâyîd of high origin, with his glorious sons; in like manner Rukn-âs-Sultanat Afsal Khan being appointed to summon the ambassadors of the kings of the Dakhan, and they brought these two pillars of religion and the State to the foot of the throne.

On this same day a battle took place between the forces of Mujâhid-ud-Din Shamshir Khan and a body of the Mujahals, who with the foot of daring were traversing the open space of the Kâlâ Chautarah plain. Mir Muhammad Zamân, showing valour and manliness worthy of a sâyîd, charged the warriors of the Mughal army and broke their ranks. Since in the beginning of the fight the flag of victory of the nobles was exalted, the people of the fortress undoubtedly gained strength and became hopeful of victory. At first they had been terrified, but afterwards they fought heroically.

At the close of the same day [17th December] the army of Shâh Murâd, with the great amîrs and khâners, such as Mirzâ Shâh Rukh, Wâli of Badakhshan; Shâhâbâz Khân; Shâh-i Muhammad Khân; Sâyîd Mumtâz and all the amîrs and leaders of the army, with an immense and formidable force, arrived in the neighbourhood of the city.8 The dust of their force blackened the mirror of the heavens, and the clang of their drums and trumpets made an earthquake in the earth and a tumult in the sky. They encamped in the vicinity of the old kârâ, which is called the Bâgh-i-Dihist [Garden of Paradise].9 From the thronging of the many forces the area of that spacious ground appeared narrower than a seal-ring or the eye of a needle.

Account of the pillaging and plundering of the city and country, which caused disgust in the minds of high and low, and was one of the causes of the failure to take the fortress.

This was one of the causes of the failure to conquer this paradise-like country; and until the news of this injustice and insecurity reached Prince Shâh Murâd and the Khan-Khânân, and they proceeded to put a stop to this tyranny and oppression, and punished a number as a warning to the others, no one in the city and its environs had any goods or houses left. Moreover, the foundations of buildings had been destroyed, so that no one could distinguish his own house from that of a stranger. But since it appeared as if the divine intention was to prohibit the conquest and the plans of the amîrs of Akbar Shah's army, that which occurred tended to undermine their power and dignity and supremacy, while it tended to increase the greenness and freshness of the young plant of the hopes of the fathers of the State. In truth, this was the first rupture which reached the foundations of the enemies' good fortune.

7 A town about three miles north-east of Ahmadnagar fort, founded by Burhan Niga-Shâh II.  
8 Another writer — Mirzâ Râfî'-ud-Din Shâhâbâz gives the names of the principal amîrs accompanying Prince Murâd as follow:—“Khân-Khânân, Shâhâbâz Kamâtî, Mirzâ Rustâm — grand-son of Bahram Mirzâ, the brother of Shah Tahmâsp, Muhammad Shâhâbâz Khân, Mirzâ 'Ali Akbar Pâhîshâh and Shâh Khâwjah, with two hundred other great amîrs.”  
9 Or Bâgh-i Haqîc Dihist, about four miles to the north-west of the fort. For description, see Bombay Gazetteer, Vol. XVII. p. 704.
By the disaster of that sacking and plundering not a sign of cultivation or prosperity remained. The roads of communication with the various quarters of the country became closed, so that for the space of three months not a human being from the enemy's country could bring any news to them; till famine and scarcity in their army reached such a pitch, that during that space of time, no one among either nobles or plebeians saw the face of ghee, rice and most of the necessaries of life. In the end, this same scarcity and plundering became the cause of the return of that hostile army, as will shortly, with God's assistance, be related.

(To be continued.)

NOTES ON THE SPIRIT BASIS OF BELIEF AND CUSTOM.

BY SIR J. M. CAMPBELL, K.C.I.E., L.C.S.

(Continued from p. 244.)

The following details show the methods adopted by exorcists to drive out spirits in North Kanara:— Lakshmī, the wife of Anandrāv Yārdī, a Śenī Brāhmaṇ of Śūpā in Kanara, while working in her house at noon (in 1881), was attacked by a family spirit. She began to cry incessantly, let her hair fall loose, and tore her clothes. From these signs her husband and other relations guessed that she was possessed. They put sulphur and hair on the fire under her nostrils, but she did not speak. They then put a cloth over her face, and pouring water on it called upon the spirit to speak, and say who he or she was. On this Lakshmī speaking in the name of the spirit said:— "My name is Alvantin, I am Anandrāv's first wife, and I seized this woman because she wears my ornaments and clothes, and sleeps in my room." After this statement, Lakshmī became more and more excited. So Anandrāv sent for Parsu Gūḍa, a spirit-scancer by profession and by caste a Kunbi. Parsu came about six in the evening. On coming in he sat on the ground in the verandah. A low wooden stool and a handful of rice were given to him. Repeating some incantations he emptied the rice on the stool, and taking one-fourth part he arranged it in three heaps before him. Turning his finger round the heaps, and repeating incantations, he took one grain from the heap and broke it on the edge of the stool. This he repeated three times, and then said that Lakshmī was attacked by the ghost of her husband's first wife, and that Anandrāv should make a vow to his family gods to scare the spirit. Anandrāv did as he was advised. Still the spirit did not leave Lakshmī. So on the next day Anandrāv sent for Mangēśabhatṭa, another spirit-scancer. Mangēśabhatṭa accompanied by a man of the kind called pāyālu, or born-feet-first, came at eight at night, and sat on a low wooden stool. Mangēśabhatṭa took out a glass, applied black powder to it, and gave the glass and a lamp to the pāyālu to look into the glass. He then threw a cloth over the pāyālu, and taking a handful of rice and repeating incantations began to throw grains of rice on the pāyālu. After a few minutes the pāyālu told Mangēśabhatṭa that he saw in the glass a jungle where a man came, prepared, and lighted lamps. He also saw the village gods, the family god and goddess, and the spirit Alvantin. On hearing this the exorcist told Anandrāv that his wife was attacked by the spirit Alvantin. The exorcist then made a promise to Anandrāv's family god, that after two months Anandrāv would go to visit the god Mangēśa at Mangēśa in Goa, and prayed that during the two months the god should prevent the spirit troubling Lakshmī. After the lapse of two months Anandrāv with his wife went to Mangēśa in Goa. There he poured water over the īḍa of the god Mangēśa daily for several hours, and his wife walked a thousand times round the temple every day. In this way they lived at Mangēśa for about two years. One night Anandrāv was told by the god Mangēśa in a dream that his wife was well. So Anandrāv feasted some Brāhmaṇs in the name of the god, and returned home with his wife, who was cured.

In Bengal, among the Kurs and Munis or, if any one is sick, or if an epidemic has come on the cattle, or if some family has been haunted by a spirit, the people meet together, and go to the house of their medium, called baigā or bhagat, with music and dancing. The people dance
and play, and call on the spirit, until one or more of them begins to roll their eyes and twitch their muscles. Then one or two others, generally old women, are seized. The attack comes on like a fit of ague. It lasts for a quarter of an hour, during which the patient writhes and trembles and leaps from the ground as if shot. He is then unconscious. After a few minutes spasms set in the hands and knees, the hair falls loose, the body is convulsed, the head violently shaken, and there is a gurgling noise in the throat. Then the patient hops about with a stick, the head jerking sharply. No one in his senses could stand so much exertion for a minute. The baigai is asked to cast out the spirit. If the spirit is the great Ganjam, it is asked politely to withdraw; if not, it is driven out with threats and promises. When all is over, the patient is rubbed with butter. On the north-east frontier of Bengal Buddhist priests exercise in cases of sickness, or of devil or witch-possession. When the Santals are troubled by a spirit, or.Whit, they go to the medium. The medium fasts for a time. Then a drum is beaten before him, and his head presently shakes, and his body writhes in hair-tossing spasms. The spirit that was troubling them has passed into the medium. He shouts out some phrases, seizes some victims that are placed ready, cuts their heads off, and pours out the blood.

In the Central Provinces, the Pardans and Gonds get possessed. Among the Naikad Gonds the gods Waghoba and Morari, who are ancestral gods, enter into the ministrant, and say whether they are pleased. The Karens have a priest or vie, who goes into convulsions, and gives an oracle.

The Panzes of Malabar make their living by exorcism and charms. They speak with spirits, who enter them, and make them do awful things. When any leading man is ill they are generally called in numbers. They paint their bodies, put on crowns of paper and cloth, light lamps, and beat drums, and blow trumpets and horns. They dance sword in hand, jump on each other's backs, make bonfires, stick one another with knives, and push one another bare-foot in the fire. The women shout and sing. This goes on for two or three days. They make rings of earth and lines of red ochre and white clay, strew them with rice and flowers, and put lights round them until the devil enters into one of them, and tells what the patient is suffering from, and what must be done to cure him. They tell the patient, and he gives them presents, and gets well. The Buntars, a high class of South Kânara cultivators, have exorcists called Nucarus like the Kuniars of Malabar. Buchanan mentions a class of men called Kanis or Wallars, — that is, low-caste men who drove out spirits. Some of them did so from the knowledge of the stars, and others rattled an iron instrument, and sang till their voice went, and they seemed drunk, and were considered inspired. They could tell whether the spirit belonged to the family, and, could be driven out. A family spirit, they said, was most difficult to dislodge; a strange spirit could be easily driven out. All held this belief, except Brahmas and Musalmans. In Coorg, the great sorcerers are Tantri Brahmas from Malabar whose goddess is Bhagavati. Every year certain candidates present themselves for the service of the goddess, and the (chief) Brahmass chooses one who is likely to make a good medium, and he becomes possessed by the goddess. When he sees a suitable man the Brahman says a text, sprinkles holy ashes on his face, and immediately the person begins to shake and dance as one possessed. In Coorg, exorcists relieve ancestral spirits from the clutches of a demon-spirit. When an ancestral spirit is released, the man, whose ancestor's spirit it is, rushes home from the exorcist's lodging without looking back, or else the house spirit which rides on his back is scared.

In Coorg, the Kaniyas are consulted when a man or a bullock sickens. They examine their books and shells, which they use as dice, and find out who sent the sickness. The Kois of Bastar slay fowls and smear the sick man's

---

44 Dalton's Descriptive Ethnology of Bengal, p. 233.
47 Hi silicon's Aboriginal Tribes of the Central Provinces, App. II. and VII.
48 Hi silicon's Aboriginal Tribes of the Central Provinces, p. 25.
49 Dalton's Descriptive Ethnology of Bengal, p. 117; Tylor's Primitive Culture, Vol. II. p. 131.
50 Stanley's Baross, p. 142.
face with the blood. They have black and white wizards. The white wizards foretell. Among Parsis, if a spirit comes into a man, the priest drives him down right through the body out by the left foot.

When the Shamanite magician of Siberia performs his superstitious rites, he puts on a garment trimmed with bits of iron, rattles and bells; he cries horribly, beats a sort of drum, agitates himself, and shakes the metallic appendages of his robe, and at the same time the bystanders increase the din by striking with their fists upon iron kettles. When the exorcist by his horrible contortions and yells, by cutting himself with knives, whirling, and swooning has succeeded in assuming the appearance of something preternatural, the assembled multitude believe that the demon they worship has taken possession of the priest. When he is enchanted he makes a sign that the spirit has left him, and then imparts to the people the intimation that he has received.

In the outlying parts of Burma, when the sick cannot be cured, a witch-doctor is called, a rope is tied round the sick man’s neck, and jerked, and the spirit is asked why is has entered the man. If an answer is given, and the spirit agrees to pass into some article the object named is placed on the road. If the spirit does not go out, the man is beaten with a bamboo; the louder he shrieks the better. If this fails, a woman of the house becomes the spirit’s wife, is dressed fantastically, goes into a shed, music is played, and she dances into an ecstasy. She has the spirit in her, and says where the offerings should be put.

In Burma there are many experts who control evil spirits. A woman who dances at feasts, natt melchanna, is consulted as to where the dead are.

In Ceylon, if a person is possessed, a bower of plantain trees is made near the house. In the evening, the patient is seated on an upturned mortar facing south. Close to his feet are placed chickens, coconuts, rice and limes. The warden, that is, veidya or doctor, comes helped by petty conjurers, who beat drums, leap and dance. At Gala-kep-pu dewale a village eleven miles from Kandy on the way to Colombo is the temple of Wahalsdev. This is the great place for exorcising evil spirits from possessed women. Women are known to be possessed when they dance, sing and shout without cause, tremble and shake and have long frightening fits. Sometimes they run away from their house, use foul language, and bite their flesh and tear their hair. The ordinary demon priest or kettadhiya gives relief. In cases where he fails he says the patient should go to Gala-kep-pu. Within two or three miles of the temple the influence or demon in a possessed woman becomes active and she moves on in a hurried desperate manner. No one can stop her. At the temple she falls in a corner speechless or in a swoon. In the temple a space is curtained off where the god is. The priest tells the god the woman’s story, the woman all the time shaking and shouting. The priest says: — “Demon, will you leave the woman?” Generally, the demon answers: — “I will not.” Then the priest beats the woman with a cane. The demon says: — “I will leave her.” The woman grows quiet and returns home. Of thirty or forty women so cured none have ever again become possessed.

Among the Chinese the chief Taoist priest, who belongs to a family who have been popes one thousand years, is a great exorcist, and has control over spirits that enter and disease women. When a man is possessed by a spirit in China, a Taoist priest is called in. He fires crackers, crashes gongs, and blows a conch. Rich pork, eel, and other food is offered to the spirit. The exorcist then sprinkles tea in a circle, and burns red candles on a table covered with yellow silk. Exorcists are common in China. When an exorcist is called to see a case of possession he makes an altar in the house, sets out offerings of pork, fowl and rice, and calls
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88 Dr. Caldwell’s Descriptive Grammar, App. p. 582. 49 Shway Yoe’s The Burmans, Vol. II. p. 356.
90 Journal Ceylon Royal Asiatic Society, 1865-66, pp. 41-43.
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upon the spirit that has entered the sick person's body, to leave the body and eat the offerings. If the spirit does not leave the sufferer, the priest threatens that he will ask the gods to banish the spirit to hell.\(^{66}\) In China, if a man is sick with devils, the exorcist makes a paper image of a man called Tai Sun. In front of the paper image an altar is made, and on the altar are laid eggs, pork, fruits, cakes, and paper-money. Candles and incense sticks are lighted. The spirit goes into the Tai Sun, who is carried into the street, and burned or put in a boat to drift to sea.\(^{67}\) When a house is haunted, the Chinese call a Taoist priest. The priest wears a red robe, blue stockings, and a black cap, and holds in his hand a sword made of the wood of peach or date tree which has been struck with lightning. A strap of red cloth is twisted round the hilt, and on the blade is a mystic scroll written in ink. He lays the sword over the altar with burning tapers and incense sticks. He prepares a mystic scroll, burns it, and gathers the ashes in a cup of water. He holds the sword in his right, and the cup in his left hand. Then he walks several paces, and calls on the gods to give him power to turn out evil spirits. He shouts:—"Leave this house like lightning." He takes a branch of willow, dips it in the cup, and sprinkles the four corners of the house. He takes up the sword and the cup, fills the cup with water, and splashes the water on the east walls. He calls aloud:—"Kill the green spirits, or let them be driven away." He does this at each of the four corners and in the middle. The attendants beat gongs and drums with an appalling din, and the priest shouts:—"Evil spirit, retire, vanish." Then he goes to the door, and makes cuts with his sword through the air.\(^{68}\)

In a case recorded by the late Sir William Maxwell from Perak in the Malay Peninsula, the patient was a girl in child-bed, who after the birth of her child became delirious. A Malay exorcist, Che Johan, was called in and seated near the patient on a tiger's skin. He was naked to the waist, had a couple of cords bound across his back and breast, had strings tied round his waist, and held bunches of leaves in his hands. Close to Che Johan sat a woman who beat a one-end drum and chanted shrilly to the tiger-spirit or hanter báhn, to which class Che Johan's familiar belonged. As the woman chanted, Che Johan sat rigid, then smelling the bunches of leaves he began to nod, struck the bunches together, and fell forward burying his face in the leaves, sniffing like a wild animal on all fours, growling, roaring, worrying. He again sat up and struck his chest and shoulders with the leaves. He was now possessed by the tiger-spirit. He spoke in a feigned voice and was addressed as Bujang Gelap or Dragon spirit. He scattered rice round him, growled, muttered and danced, went to the patient's bedside and hissed, "Heijn, O spirit." He sprinkled the girl and her couch with rice and a fluid. He was again convulsed and crept under his mat and lay quiet for fifteen minutes. He then sat up and yawned, and still speaking in a feigned voice said:—"A dunt langsuyar, a white woman is in the girl." He again sprinkled grain, put some in the girl's mouth, danced, and beat himself with leaves. At last he was tired, and gave up. Then an old man, whose familiar was a water-spirit, tried, and did no good. A revolving mosque was made, and as the demons would not yield to force, the attempt was made to tempt them out of the girl. Offerings of the fat, the sweet, the sour, and the pungent were made. A hen was put in the mosque, and the two exorcists, with wavings, music and chants, joined in moving the spirits from the child to the mosque. Each exorcist with a handful of leaves dipped in the liquor called tepung tawdr guided the spirits to the mosque. The mosque escorted by the exorcists was carried to the river and started down the stream with charms and chants. This was done again next night, and a day later the girl died.\(^{69}\)

The Papuans believe in evil spirits and ghosts. Evil spirits in a coast man are driven out by an inland man into a hole in the earth.\(^{70}\) In Madagascar, when a person is sick, the people call a diviner. Pieces of white wood, painted black and red, are laid on the roof of
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\(^{69}\) Maxwell in Straits Journal, December 1883, p. 232.
\(^{70}\) Ingle's Australian Cousins, p. 32.
the house, and a forked branch of a tree is set near the door. Twice a day they dance. House charms and a dollar are placed on a wooden rice-mortal. A cloth is spread on the mortar, and the sick, dressed in a foolscap with leaves and flowers and a tassel, is seated on the cloth. Drums and bamboo are beaten, and the village men make a circle, and go round clapping hands, while women sing. When a woman of rank dances, a person behind the sick beats an old spade with a hatchet. 71 Exorcism is generally common among the Washaheis of East Africa. The exorcist, or Mganga, drums, sings, and dances, and in the animal excitement the patient is cured. 72 Mediums are common in South Central Africa. Cameron mentions an old chief's wife who was a medium, and held communion with her dead husband. 73 The East African diviners cure fevers and boils. Most of the diviners or white magicians are women. 74 Exorcism is practiced among the Bongos of the White Nile. The exorcist gives answers by ventriloquism. 75 In West Africa, the Fangos dance round the sick, beating the tambourine. They deck the body with red and white bands. The sorcerer mounts guard over the sick man's hut with a drawn sword in his hand. The disease-spirit passes into a hen, and the hen is chased away. If any one catches her he catches the disease. 76 The Californian Indians spend their time in getting sorceresses to break the spells of evil spirits. 77

In Europe and Western Asia, spirit-possession played a very prominent part in the early days of Christianity. People who were liable to possession had a separate place in the churches. 58 The spirits were cast out by reading the Bible and praying. 79 The Northmen had male and female diviners with familiar spirits. 80 The Skandinavians had hoary-headed prophetesses in long white linen robes, who cured wounds. 81 The early Christian Church claimed the power of exorcising demons. This was the only one of the early miracles to which Protestants laid claim. 42 The Bulgarian exorcist still puts a vampire in a bottle. 83 Roman Catholic priests still exorcise spirits, but few Protestants now claim to have this power. The English Dissenters claimed it in the seventeenth century. 84 Sorcerers were called tamans in Ireland, and had the power of restoring stolen goods. Vallancey, in his Collectanea de Rebus Hiberniciis, No. XIII, p. 10, says:— "A farmer's wife in the county of Waterford lost a parcel of linen. She travelled three days' journey to a taman in the county of Tipperary. The taman consulted his book, and assured her she would recover the goods. The robbery was proclaimed at the chapel, a reward offered, and the linen recovered. It was not the money, but the taman that recovered it." 85 In Scotland, in 1700, spirits were sent by exorcists to the Red Sea. 86 In the eighteenth century, in Scotland, Papish priests had power over devils, and could cure madness. The Presbyterian clergy had no such power. 87 It was formerly thought in England that a spirit could be laid in solid oak, in the pomel of a sword, in a barrel of beer, or in a cask of wine. 88 In York, till 1819, sorcerers or wise men were common. 89 Some of the cases which were tried as witchcraft in Scotland, in the seventeenth century, seem to find an explanation in spirit-scarers' practices in Western India. The accused sorcerer was said to have made a hole in the house wall; to have passed a cock three times through the hole; to have laid the cock under the sick woman's arm; and then to have burned the cock in a fire. Indian practices explain these rites. The sorcerer's object in passing the cock through the hole in the house wall was to free it from any existing impurity or spirit. He laid the cock under the woman's arm that the disease might pass from the woman into the cock, and he threw the cock into the fire that the disease spirit might be driven away. 90 The magic
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87 Scott's Demonology and Witchcraft, p. 235.
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and sorcery which caused so great a scare in Europe between the fourteenth and eighteenth centuries was partly white magic,—that is, magic practised with the view of curing diseases; and partly black magic,—that is magic practised with the view of causing harm. The basis of both was partly old rites and spirit-worship belonging to pre-Christian times, and partly a knowledge of healing or poisonous herbs and drugs. Many of the cures were caused by simple means without any power from spirits. According to Burton (1620) many an old wife does more good with a few known and common garden herbs than our bombast physicians with their prodigious, far-fetched, conjectural medicines. So also in Pliny the quaint cures which he ascribes to magicians differ little from the cures he cites as worked by the common people. As a rule, Pliny professes to believe in neither, though he occasionally admits there must be some reason why every one should believe in the cures. He also abuses doctors for being too fond of new drugs, and praises the diligence and curiosity of the men of old, who searched the secret of things. As Pliny scoffed at spirits, he did not attempt to explain the grounds of the different cures. Many of the cures he cites are difficult to explain. The bulk of them seem to take their rise in the state of mind which believes all disease to be the work of spirits, and which knows that certain strong-smelling or pungent drugs recover people from swoon and other typical spirit-seizures.

It is interesting to note how far the priests of the different religions have claimed the power of casting out spirits. Brähmans seem not to claim the power, or, at least, except the lower class Brähmans, do not practice the art. So also the pure Liṅgāyats of the Bombay Karnāṭak do not believe in exorcism. On the other hand exorcism was one of the most important functions of the old Buddhist priest, and it is still the chief employment of the Jain Gorji. In Europe, the early Christian Church had a special staff of exorcists. In the Middle Ages, the Roman Catholic priests practised exorcism. The power was at first claimed by the Reformed Churches. The clergy of the Established Church of England after the sixteenth century seldom exercised it, although Dissenting ministers continued to exorcise till the eighteenth century. In England, Roman Catholic priests are the only clergy who still claim the power, and nervous seizures and similar diseases are now almost always treated by physicians as bodily maladies.

(To be continued.)

DISCOURSIVE REMARKS ON THE AUGUSTAN AGE OF TELUGU LITERATURE

BY G. R. SUBRAMIYAM PANTULU.

(Continued from p. 240.)

Bukkrai afterwards betog Harīharanātha by Kāmakaḥīḍēvī, who reigned from 1379 to 1401 A. D. His son by Malladēvī, Vīra Prāṇḍharāya by name, reigned till 1412, and his son Vijayabhūpati till 1418, and his son Dēvārya from 1422 to 1447. These facts we are able to gather from inscriptions, but we are at a loss to know when exactly they were born, when they ascended the throne, and when they breathed their last. They were constantly at war with the Muhammadans from the time of Bukka, who gained a victory over the Muhammadans for the first time in 1364 A. D. His son Harīhara utterly routed them in 1380, and drove them off from Goa. This Harīhara gave enormous tracts of land to various Hindu temples. In the latter part of his reign, Sālva Guṇḍa was his minister, and he was the father of Sālva Nṛṣimhāraja, the person to whom the Jainini-Bhārata was dedicated. This Guṇḍa, who combined in himself both the offices of minister and commander, gained an extensive tract of country. His son Sālva Nṛṣimhāraja occupied the whole of the Carnatic, as Dēvārya died heirless, or for
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some other reason. This Nṛsiṃha had an elder brother Timmāraja by name who was, I think, the father of Īśvararāja, and the same as Śāluva Timma, the writer of the Paramāyopāvita. Śāluva Nṛsiṃha has made a good many grants of land. He made a grant of land to the temple at Vailam, ten miles to the west of Wandewash, rendered famous in the early annals of the French in South India, in S. S. 1391, i.e., 1469 A.D. It was during his reign that a grant of land was made by another to the Saiva temple of Yavur in North-Arcot District in Saka 1393, i.e., 1471 A.D. From the preface to the Varāhṇapradaya we learn that Īśvararāya, son of Timmāraja, was his captain-general of the forces, and succeeded to the throne after the demise of Nṛsiṃha. We learn from inscriptions that he reigned from 1487 to 1509 A.D. Some are of opinion that he reigned till 1505, when the reins of government were transferred to his son, Viranṛsiṃha. This version may be true. As the father and the son bore the same name, it is highly probable that those who deciphered the inscriptions have unconsciously made a mistake, and have identified the son with the father.

From 1509 dates the reign of Krishnadēvarāya. It is plain from some of the works dedicated to him that his brother guided the helm of the state previous to his assuming the reins of government. There is no question that Nṛsiṃha was of a different family from the preceding Rājas of Vijayanagara, and became irregularly possessed of the throne. He is admitted to have been a Telinga, and the son of Īśvararāya, the petty sovereign of Karnūl and Arvīri, a tract of country on the Tungabhadra to the east of it, near its junction with the Krishnā. He is described by Farishta as a powerful chief of Telingana, who had possessed himself of the greater part of the territory of Vijayanagar. His illegitimate son, Krishnāraja, was the most distinguished of Vijayanagara princes, and although his name is not mentioned by Farishta, it is admitted that in his reign the Muhammadians sustained a severe defeat from the armies of Vijayanagar, and that subsequently a good understanding prevailed between that court and the Bijapur monarchy for a considerable period.

Nṛsiṃha had two sons, Viranṛsiṃha and Krishnāraja, the former by one of his queens Tippāmba, and the latter by a slave or a concubine, Nāgamambā. A story is related of the exposure of Krishnāraja, when a child, by the order of the queen, who was jealous of the favour he enjoyed with his father, and who therefore prevailed upon the king to put him to death. He was secretly brought up by the minister, Timmāraju alias Appāji, and restored to Nṛsiṃha when on his deathbed, who bequeathed to him the succession, for the warlike manner in which he removed the signet ring from the hand of his dying father, by cutting off the finger, on which the ring was worn, by the sword. Some accounts state, as has already been pointed out, that he acted as minister and general of his brother whilst he lived, and became Rāja on the death of that prince. These receive countenance from works like the Manucharitra, dedicated to Krishnadēvarāya. Other accounts assert that the latter was deposed, and one narrative adds that he died of vexation in consequence. It is clear that the regal power was usurped by Krishnāraja, at first perhaps in a subordinate character, but finally as king.

The existence of an independent principality on the east so near as Karnūl, the presence of Muhammadian sovereignties on the north, and the continued series of Pāpāya and Chōla princes to the south, shew that the Rāja of Vijayanagara could not boast, says Wilson in his Catalogue of Macnaghten Collections, p. 86, of a spacious dominion on Krishnāraja’s accession. From the range, however, of the grants of former princes, particularly of Harīhara, it cannot be questioned that their sway had at one time extended much further east, and it must therefore have been considerably reduced before the Kuruba dynasty was exterminated. Krishnāraja not only restored the kingdom to its former limits, but extended them in every direction. He defeated the ‘Ādil Shāhī princes on the north, and maintained possession of the country to the southern bank of the Krishnā, on the east he captured Koṇḍavīdu and Worangal, and ascended to Sattak, where he married the daughter of the Rāja as the bond of peace. In the south his officers governed Seringapatam, and founded a new dynasty of princes at Madura and Trichi-
The western coast had been held apparently through some extent by his predecessors, but he added to the Vijayanagara territory in that quarter also, and his besieging and taking Rachol or Salsette is recorded by Portuguese writers, whilst the imperfect traditions of Malabar preserve the fact of part of that province at least having been governed by the officers of Krishnapāya, although they refer the circumstance to an erroneous era. At no period probably in the history of South India, writes Wilson, did any of its political divisions equal in extent and power that of Vijayanagara in the reign of Krishnapāya. Opinions vary as to the date of this monarch.

The known lists of the kings of this dynasty are quite unsatisfactory, and hardly agree on any one point, differing in regard to the dates, numbers, and order in which each king succeeded another. A reference to Kelsall’s Bellary Manual, p. 109, and Wilson’s Mack. Coll. p. 264, will confirm this. The traditional tables give a complete statement; but these, obviously, cannot be implicitly trusted on all points. Any attempt to make records so evidently contradictory agree with each other, must, unless fresh evidence is forthcoming, only end in failure, and much labour and research must be incurred before the tangled web can be unwoven. The only course left is to examine the inscriptions, for even when they can be proved to be forgeries, they perhaps state truly that a certain king made a grant to a certain temple. Genuine Vijayanagara grants are extremely numerous, and fresh ones are continually turning up. But the forgeries are probably nearly as plentiful as the genuine grants, for, on the disruption of the kingdom, forgery was widely practised to retain possession of lands, etc.; and to shew that the lands had been in possession of the forgers or their abettors, from time immemorial, forged grants usually purport to have been those of the popularly accepted first sovereign Bukka, whose reign is usually ante dated by periods varying from 100 to 200 years.

Any attempt at present to give a genealogy of the kings is futile, as a great deal of what is sometimes accepted as fact is in reality only surmise. Thus for a list, differing in many points from either of those quoted, let the reader refer to Burnell’s South Indian Palaeography, pp. 54, 55. This list read in the light of inscriptions more recently discovered, and published in Sewell’s Lists, Vol. II., will prove instructive.

We cannot exactly say the day or the year in which Krishnapāya was born. Some are of opinion that he was born in 1465, while others fix the date at 1487, and there is hardly any material for arriving at the truth. In the biographies of Dekkan poets, published by Kavali Venkata Ramaswami, at Calcutta, in 1839, the date of Krishnapāya’s death has been fixed at S. S. 1446, i. e., 1524 A. D. From this we learn that he must have been born in 1484 A. D., for it is said in the same work that he was forty years old when he died. An impromptu poem of Allasāni Peddana, current in the Telugu country, pretty nearly confirms this view. Till more accurate information is obtained on the point, we may for all practical purposes put down the date of Krishnapāya’s birth as 1484 A. D. From the poem just referred to, we learn that his death must have taken place in S. S. 1447, i. e., 1524 A. D. But from the multitudes of inscriptions of grants of land, available, modern archaeologists are at one in fixing the date of his demise at 1530 A. D. There are some grants of one Achnutadvāraya in 1526-1529, and it is highly probable that these might have been made during the lifetime of Krishnapāya. We learn that this Achnutu was the son of Nrisimha, by another wife Obambā, from the following inscription of a grant of land made by Achnutu in S. S. 1459, i. e., 1537 A. D., to a Brāhmana of Nārāyaṇapura in North-Arcot District, in which it is said:

Tippājl-Nāgalī-dēvyōh Kansalyā-ārī-Sumitrāyōh
Jātāva viña-Nrisimhaṇḍra-Krishnaṇāya-mahipati
Asmād-Obammikādēvyām-Achytendrōpi bhūpāti
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4 [A genealogy of the dynasty, which may be regarded as reliable is, however, to be found on p. 3 of Epigraphia Indica, Vol. IV. — V. V.]
5 [Whatever might have been the dates of his birth and of his death, his inscriptions range from A. D. 1516 to 1529; Epigraphia Indica, Vol. IV. p. 3. — V. V.]
We learn from the Pārijātāpaharaṇya, that Nrīśimha, the father of Krishnādēvārāya, brought Madura and Seringapatam under his sway. We learn from the same work and from the Krishnārāyaṇācharitra, that in 1513 Krishnārāya began his campaign for the reduction of South-India, reduced Mysore and the country along the Kāveri to his authority — defeated the Muhammadan armies of Bijapur and Golconda — captured the forts of Udayagiri, Koṇḍavālu, and Koṇḍapalli, and invaded Orissa, the Gajapati prince of which country was compelled to do him homage. In the very same year he invaded the hill fortress of Udayagiri in the district of Nellore, and utterly routed Praharēsavāpātra, and brought the fort under his sway. Sometime afterwards, his minister Timmarasu (Appāji) invaded Kanigiri in the same district, and sent word to Vira-Rudragajapati, the king of the place and the last of the line of Pratāparudra of Worangal, requesting him to offer the hand of his daughter to Krishnārāya, as an emblem for peace. Now as Krishnārāya was the son of a concubine, he was not a married man at the time of his accession to the throne, because nobody would offer him the hand of his daughter on account of his low birth. Even in such a case as this, when the offer was made by Timmarasu, the Gajapati of Kanigiri was most unwilling to accede to the proposal, but being fully aware of the consequences of a point-blank refusal, apparently consented to the proposal, and invited both Krishnārāya and his minister to his palace, intending to put an end to the life of the former. But the minister, Timmarasu, scenting treachery, put on the imperial robes and dressed up Krishnārāya as a servant. Unfortunately, the members of the servitio inferred that this servant was the real king, from the signet ring that he wore in his hand. The brave Timmarasu, however, did not lose his presence of mind, and got the king out of the palace somehow. As soon as they found that they were beyond danger, they invaded Kanigiri, carried off the Gajapati's daughter, Chinnādēvi, as a captive of war, and drove him and his family to the Vindhya mountains. Their wailings and lamentations there found a poetic expression in Peddanna's Manusācharita.

Attempts were soon made on Krishnārāya's life by his new spouse at the instigation of the few female friends, who had accompanied her to the royal household. On the very day appointed for his nuptials, the bride was covered with knives by her attendants who induced her to try and murder the king at once, and thus save the honor of her father's family. She felt compelled, though most reluctantly, to yield to the advice of her friends, and went into the bridal chamber with the knives concealed on her person. Krishnārāya was startled at the sight she presented and called out to his friend and minister, Appāji. Timmarasu, who was at a considerable distance from the chamber on his own business, somehow heard the call, and sent the bride and her friends back to her father. However, in remorse for what she had done the bride led the life of an anchorite in a forest now in the Cuddapah District, where her husband provided for her decently. She constructed a beautiful tank there of about twelve miles square and her image is to be seen on the inscriptions adjacent. In its bed, numerous small islands, called Lankas, are formed, with plenty of cultivable land and a number of villages.

And about this tank there is a legend. Though she spent a large amount of money to close its two ghāţs, she could never complete them. She was pondering over the affair one day with sorrow at her heart, when an old shepherdess, who used to supply her with milk every day, asked her the cause of her sadness. She narrated to her the whole story, when the shepherdess solved the riddle by saying that each ghāţ was in need of a human sacrifice, and offered her two sons for the purpose, turning a deaf ear to all entreaties. The old woman went home, called her sons, and told them of what had transpired between her and the exiled

7 [That this story is not very probable and that the king treated his queen, Chinnāji-amma, as he did his other queen, Tirumala-amma, are shown by the inscription from Sīnhāchalam quoted below and by the fact that severe valuable gifts were made at Tirupati, Tiruvpparamalai and other sacred places by both of these queens. A labelled stone image of each of these two queens exists in the Tirupati temple on either side of an image of Krishnārāya; Madras Christian College Magazine, Vol. X. p. 794.—V. v.]
queen, and said that the time had now arrived for them to become famous in the world, so long as the world would last. Thereupon the two sons girded up their loins, and, intent upon acting up to the dictates of their mother, came as cheerfully as a person going to his own marriage, to Varadarājamā, for that was the name by which the exiled queen was familiarly known to them, and said:— "O mother, bless us that our names may last as long as the world lasts!" The queen was delighted at the brave words uttered, and told them of her incompetence and inability to do anything for them in return. But she offered them some money which they might devote to a charitable purpose. On this they said that if she was really in earnest about it, she might build two cities in their honour and in their names. Varadarājamā gladly acceded to the proposal, and then the two brothers went fearlessly like two brave warriors going to battle, and with hands upraised offered their prayers to Paramāvāra, and entered the ghatas as if to gain a victory over the lord of the waters. The diggers of the tank thereupon threw a few baskets of mud over their heads. Everything afterwards, it is said, went on smoothly. Varadarājamā, as promised, built two villages in honour of them. The brothers went by the names of Peda Kambadu and China Kambadu, and the villages bear the names of Peda Kambam and China Kambam. Their fame was afterwards amalgamated under the name of Kambam, familiar to all the presidency of Madras.

So far about the story of Krishnārāya's first marriage. Let us now turn our attention to some of the conquests he made. We have seen that in 1515 A. D. he started on a plan of campaign for subjugating the southern country, and brought under his sway Kondavilu, Bellamkonda, Vinukonda, Bezwada, Kondapalli, Rājamahendri, etc. In 1516, he raised a stone pillar at Potnur, about ten miles distant from Bhimiliapatam in the Vizagapatam district, describing the conquests he had made. He then extended his conquests to Vaddathi in the Viravalli Taluk of the same district, went on to Cuttack in Orissa and set fire to it, when Prataparudra, king of Kalinga, who was reigning over Orissa, effected a reconciliation with him by offering him the hand of his daughter in marriage. Krishnārāya, therefore, gave back the whole of the Kalinga country, as far as Rājamahendri, to Prataparudra, and entered Kanchi, the modern Conjeeveram, in the Chingleput District, towards the end of 1516 A. D. His marriage with the daughter of the Raja of Orissa and his return to Vijayanagara form the concluding portions of Krishnārāya charitra, a work by Dhūraji, son of Arugandi Kāśipati, composed by the order of the ruler of Āvadi in the Ceded Districts.

(To be continued.)

MISCELLANEA.

KALAMPAK—A FORM OF EXORCISM.

The Kalampak is a ceremony performed in certain parts of Malabar by Nairs, Tiyyas and other Malayāl Hindu; in the case of a married Malayāl Hindu girl of seventeen or eighteen years of age, with the view either of bringing about maternity; and with the view of insuring easy delivery in the case of a woman who is enceinte.

The evil of barrenness and miscarriage are ascribed to malignant genii who have special power and influence over women. These spirits are Vimāna Badakal (Spirit of the Skies), Vimāna Sundarā (Siren of the Skies), Xecchen, Brahman Rakhasan, Uddal Varati (Drier of Body), Pillay-Thanī (Eater of Infants), and Rēkta-Eeswāri (Goddess of the Blood). The propitiation of these malevolent imps is the

object of the ceremony, which is got up by the relatives of the young wife, but her husband has to meet the incidental expenses.

If the object is to guard against the misfortune of barrenness, an auspicious day is chosen for the function, but if the end in view is an easy delivery, some day in the seventh month of pregnancy is fixed upon. A pandal, standing on four pillars, decorated entirely with fruit and flowers, and ceiled and screened at one end with cloths, is put up for the occasion. Burning lamps are suspended near each of the pillars, and the sanctuary thus made is adorned with a representation of Kāmen, the Cupid of the Hindu Pantheon, wrought into a carpet made of field and meadow blossoms and pigments of various colours. A pot of gurus (consecrated water) is placed near the spot.
The ceremonial is performed after nightfall. The young woman in whose favour it is performed, bearing a pot containing rice, betel, a coconut, and three little bundles, enters the pandal and walks round the sanctuary thrice and then stands facing the East. Meanwhile, a band of kaniṣaṇa or astrologers have already turned up and taken their seats near the pandal, whence they chant a stōthram (anthem). The young woman sets the vessel down. Some rice and coconut flowers on a plate are handed over to her. She takes the plate and sits down. The astrologers resume their music, singing hymns of invocation to Ganaṃati, Sarasvati and Krisna. The afflatus at this stage descends upon the young woman who rises and dances about wildly. Should this mood prove to be unusually exciting, rice and ashes are prayed upon and are then applied to her head.

Time has slipped by almost imperceptibly while all these mystic functions have been going forward and while the stillness of the night has been constantly broken by the montonous and almost painfully weird chant of the indefatigable choristers. It is now noticed that the earliest streaks of the new dawn are beginning to appear faintly and gradually in the low Eastern sky. So the chief of the choristers rises from his seat and produces a plantain-tree stalk, which he cuts down to a convenient size and drives into it three broom sticks, at the higher ends of which are attached some little ornamental designs made of the tender leaves of the coconut palm. The top of the plantain stalk is lighted by means of three wicks, also attached to broom sticks. The chorister holds the illuminated stalk in his right hand, and a bell in his left. He approaches the young woman and squats down in front of her. He moves both his arms about, and the musical tinkling of his little bell harmonizes with the hymn or stōthram which he starts singing before the girl. After a little while he ceases chanting, sets down the bell, takes up the holy water, which, it will be remembered, had been placed there earlier, and going off to a corner of the yard throws down the plantain stalk and empties the holy water over it, thus removing all the malignant influences from the woman. He returns to the pandal and sacrifices a fowl and when the bird is quite dead, he throws it to some distance, going afterwards to see to which side the head inclines, in order to make certain predictions as to the results that may be expected from the ceremony. These results may be either good or evil.

The husband of the young woman recompenses the astrologers with new cloths. A kalopad may be conducted by from four or five to as many as thirty or forty of these hired astrologers, according as the means and the station in life of the family permit. The head astrologer of the village has to take the responsibility of bringing the other functionaries. In addition to the cloth, with which he in common with the others is presented, he is the recipient of certain other gifts, such as rice, coconuts, betel and money.

It may be remarked that considerable importance is attached to the lighting of the superstructure, wherein the described ceremony is held. No religious function of the Hindus or of the demonolators of Malabar is complete without its burning lamps. The Malabar dur-maṇtraṇādi sets the greatest value on his various little burning wicks. In the shrine of his snake-god, the pious Malayalāi nightly burns a little lamp, and at the family altar in a corner of the yard a little lamp sheds its fitful gleam on certain prescribed nights. This importance of light as a religious symbol is, of course, not peculiar to Malabar. Life and light have always been associated together, both by savages and civilised people. Fire, as the great Zoroaster said, “is the soul of everything.”

"Casual.”

NOTES AND QUERIES.

BAO.

I have lately come across yet another form of this curious word: safe, p. 196, and Vol. XXII. p. 165.

O. 1700. — "They (Peguans) have Images in all their Temples or Baws, of inferior Gods, such as Somna Cuddom (Sāmanā Gōtama) . . . . They never repair an old Baw, nor is there any Occasion for that: Piety or Expence; for in every September there is an old Custom for Gentlemen of Fortune, to make Sky Rockets, and set them a flying in the Air . . . . but the happy Man, whose Rocket makes him in the God's Favour, never fails of building a new Baw, and dedicates it to the God he adores, . . . . I must not omit giving the Clergy their due Praises in another particular Practice of their Charity. . . . and when the unfortunate Strangers come to their Baws, they find a great Deal of Hospitality. — Alexander Hamilton, East Indies, Vol. II. pp. 55 f., 62.

R. C. Temple.
THE SIEGE OF AHMANDNAGAR.

THE SIEGE OF AHMANDNAGAR AND HEROIC DEFENCE OF THE FORT BY CHAND BIBI—A NARRATIVE OF AN EYE-WITNESS.

BY MAJOR J. S. KING.

The Indian Staff Corps (retired).

(Continued from p. 270.)

Night attack made by Mubâriz-ud-Din Abhang Khan on the army of the Mughals; and explanation of some of the fatalities which occurred in that interval.

It has been already related that when the Habshi amirs, owing to quarrels among themselves, became dispersed, each of them became scattered through the various quarters of the dominions. Of these, Ikhlâs Khan, ‘Aziz-ul-Mulk, Bulâl Khan and others hastened to Daulatabad; and the garrison of that fort having espoused their cause, they raised to the sovereignty one named Moti, and called him “Moti Shâh,” and hoisted the standard of opposition and independence. And in like manner Mubâriz-ud-Din Abhang Khan, in order to get one of the sons of the kings and heirs of the country, hastened towards Bijapur, where he procured His Highness Miran Shâh ’Ali, [son of ] the late Burhan Nizâm Shâh, who was living under the protection of Ibrahim ‘Adil Shâh, with the sagacious son of that sovereign, who was twenty years of age. With a number of followers he then entered the district of Bhiq, where he engaged himself in arranging the affairs of State and the conquest of the kingdom; and collected a large crowd of dispersed troops in that district, who had been scattered throughout all parts of the country.

When Milyâ Manjû, through fear of the Mughal army, went with Ahmad Shâh towards the district of Bhiq, Her Highness Chand Bibi—who constantly took part in the affairs of State and the arrangement of the business of the kingdom—sent to Mubâriz-ud-Din Abhang Khan, a confidential messenger with her private seal, and forbade that nobleman to engage in war with Manjû or to pursue him; but ordered him to proceed to Daulatabad, and in conjunction with all the Habshi amirs and other confederates, to expel the Mughal army. In accordance with this order, Mubâriz-ud-Din Abhang Khan with His Highness Miran Shâh ’Ali and about 5,000 veteran cavalry, proceeded towards Daulatabad.

When the news of the approach of Miran Shâh ’Ali and Abhang Khan reached Ikhlâs Khan and the other Habshi, owing to a quarrel which had previously taken place between them, they were not desirous of an alliance with Miran Shâh ’Ali; so, taking counsel with one another, they said, “We have appointed a person to the sovereignty, and raised the regal umbrella over his head, and have given him the control of all the affairs of State. To depose him now without cause, and to choose the service of Shâh ’Ali, who is a protegé of Abhang Khan’s, and to place ourselves under the orders of our enemy, can have no result but repentance.” Consequently, not being willing to form an alliance with Abhang Khan or submit themselves to His Highness Miran Shâh ’Ali, they refused to meet them or speak with them; but about 500 celebrated cavalry—well armed and brave—of their army, separated themselves from Ikhlâs Khan and joined the camp of Shâh ’Ali and Abhang Khan.

When His Highness Miran Shâh ’Ali and Abhang Khan gave up all hopes of an alliance with, or the submission of, Ikhlâs Khan and the other Habshi amirs, they sent to Her Highness Chand Bibi a representation of the state of affairs, saying:—“If Your Highness so order it, with the force which we have with us we shall gird up our loins in the service of the State, and use our best endeavours in the defence of the fortress and fighting against these lords of arrogance.”

Chand Bibi issued orders summoning them to the capital, and accordingly they turned towards the city. When they arrived near it, they sent to the neighbourhood of the city a spy, to verify the roads and places intervening between them and the fortress, which might be free from obstruction by the Mughal army. The spy, after reconnoitring, brought information that the east side of the for-
tressa, which was the general highway for all, was clear of Mughals; consequently Miran Sháh ‘All and Abhang Khán, with a force of their warriors always eager for battle, at the close of Saturday, the 28th Rábr II. [21st December, 1595] started towards the fortress by the road which the spy pointed out.

It was a wonderful coincidence that on the morning of this same day Prince Sháh Múrúd started to examine the surroundings of the fortress, and to inspect and distribute among the umára of his army the various batteries and trenches; he went about like a travelling star in the revolving heavens, and with the eye of confidence and attention observed the surroundings of the fortress. The east side, which was the general highway and the road of the avenging army, he entrusted to the charge of the Khan-Khánán. At the close of the same day the Khan-Khánán marched from the neighbourhood of the namás-gáh, and alighted in the garden of the ‘abádat-khánah [house of worship], which is situated directly on the road of the force of His Highness Mirán ‘All Sháh and Abhang Khán. The whole of the Khan-Khánán’s army pitched their camp round that garden; and as they were not aware of the arrival of the hostile army, on this dark night both great and little of the Khan-Khánán’s army slept the sleep of carelessness, and observed no vigilance or caution. After two watches of the night had passed, His Highness Miran Sháh ‘Ali and Abhang Khán, with their formidable force like a powerful torrent and raging river, reached the army of their opponents and became aware of the encampment of the Mughal army; and as it was an exceedingly dark night, and the opposing force was wrapped in the sleep of negligence, they threw themselves on those incautious ones and attacked them; and falling on them like distracted lions in the midst of sleeping wildasses, they put those negligent sleepers to the sword. When the Khan-Khánán’s troops opened their eyes from sleep, they saw standing round them a formidable crowd like a sudden calamity; they found the road of escape blocked on every side, and the gates of death open in the face of their desires; consequently they saw no remedy but fighting, so they hastened to the field of battle and the acquisition of a name and reputation. Some at the doors of their tents and sleeping places travelled on the road of obliteration and oblivion, and a few, abandoning their property, went to the Khan-Khánán’s pavilion.

When the rank-breaking army of the Dakhan found the tents freed from the existence of their enemies, abandoning all caution, they hastened to plunder the property of their enemies. Abhang Khán, with a body of his troops like savage lions, took up a strong position like the mountain of Damáiwand near the Khan-Khánán’s tent, and for nearly two hours fought with that army. The Khan-Khánán, with a body of expert archers, who on a pitch dark night could have sewn up the eye of a snake or an ant [with their arrows], got into the house by the roof of a very lofty building, and made Abhang Khán and his followers the target of their arrows. From the fire of the stone-splitting arrows they set fire with it to the plain of battle, and dried up with it the bodies of the brave men, till time after time as the Khan-Khánán’s force increased in numbers, the Dakhan force, through lust of plunder, diminished. Since Abhang Khán saw that the enemy having become strong, the affair had gone beyond the bounds of rashness, he, with the body of troops which he had with him, carried off the son of Mirán Sháh ‘Ali and gallantly made for the fortress, whilst Sháh ‘Ali with some of his men returned by the way they had come. Danlat Khán Lúdy, one of the umára of the Khan-Khánán’s army, followed Sháh ‘Ali, took about two hundred prisoners, and killed a great number. But Abhang Khán with the sons of Mirán Sháh ‘Ali and a great number of men, on that dark night reached the gate of the fortress, and made up the strength of the garrison to 1,000. The chamberlains of the court, by order of Her Highness Chánd Bibi, admitted Abhang Khán with the sons of Mirán Sháh ‘Ali to the fortress, and brought them before her. Her Highness was much pleased at the account of the excellences and good qualities of the great umára, and suitably acknowledged his virtuous efforts in the cause of the State, and confirmed the signs of his intrepidity and boldness. By her gratitude and condensation as well as by general rewards and countless royal kindnesses she showed her appreciation of his services.

Since Abhang Khán had shewn such superiority over the Mughal army, and displayed such valour, extreme terror of the rank-breaking army of the Dakhan obtained ascendancy in the minds
of the enemy's army, and the vain-glory which they had hitherto felt, owing to the absence of opposition on the part of the Dakhanis, became changed into fear. From this great night attack a great terror reached the enemy's force, and they became excessively afraid of fighting against the people of the Dakhan. Abandoning their natural disposition of carelessness which they had shown on that night, after this they observed the greatest caution, and used their utmost endeavours to take the fortress.

The surroundings of the fortress were divided among the celebrated amirs and seasoned troops. The Prince chose the east side of the fortress, which is opposite the place of the battle, as the position of his own special division and the army of Gujarát; the south side, which is opposite the village of Shaitánpur and towards the Faraḥ-bakhsh Garden, he gave in charge to the force of the Khan Khánán; and the west side of the fortress, which is towards the city of Ahmādnagar, and is the principal gate of the fortress, was entrusted to Shāh Bāz Khan and Mīrzâ Shāh Rukh. The north side, which is towards Burhānabad and the Namáz-Gāh, was entrusted to Bājā 'Alī Khán, the wāli of Burhānpur. From all four faces the Mughal army, with the intention of battle, advanced the batteries and entrenchments and completely surrounded the fortress. Day and night they carried on the work of the siege, and strove their utmost to take the fortress.

The brave Mujāhid-ul-Dīn Shamsīr Khán, who with his sons and a body of his troops outside the fortress, up to the last showed eagerness in defending himself and fighting, came into the fortress; and then the doors of entrance and exit were barricaded, and the defenders, of all ranks, giving up their minds to war, were assiduous in the work of battle. For a long time from inside the fire of slaughter and fighting blazed up, and night and day they employed themselves in the arrangement of bloodshed.

Although the enemy used to strive their utmost to take that fortress, all their endeavours were of no avail, and the face of victory did not show itself in the mirror of their desires. The Prince, from the great energy and diligence which he used in the conquest of that fortress, used often himself to go into the batteries, and strive to fill in the ditch and erect the sar-kūb; so that in a few days it reared its head to a level with the walls of the fortress, and they also filled in the ditch with earth and rubbish.

Her Highness Chānd Bībd also took an active part in the defence of the fortress and observing the affairs of the troops; and used her queenly endeavours in arranging the affairs of religion and the State. By day, like the world-illumining sun, she rested not from bestowing benefits and instructing those under her; and at night by the aid of her own rare good fortune, she slept not, but with weeping and wailing before the throne of God, prayed for tranquillity; consequently the arrow of the enemy's arrangements did not hit the target of their designs, and none of their attempts to take the fortress gave birth to their desires. Although the Mughal troops used the utmost diligence in erecting the sar-kūb, the people of the fortress raised one of their towers to a level with it, or erected a building higher than it, and so rendered abortive the plans of their opponents.

In the midst of these affairs, Vankujī Kūlī, who before this had been a staunch ally of Ahmad Shah and Mīrān Manjū, with their concurrence now returned to the neighbourhood of the Mughal army. Several times he threw himself on the outposts of the Mughal army, who were charged with the protection of the forage place, and seizing many of their horses, elephants, camels and cattle, killed a countless number of their men. In like manner Ṣavādat Khán, who some time before this had gone to the Nasik district, having collected a numerous army, came directly on the road of the opposing army, and blocked the enemy's communications, so that no created being could possibly pass from the limit of Sultānpur and Nandurbar in this direction.

Sayyid Bājā — who was one of the amirs of Akbar's army, and was distinguished for his bravery — by the Prince's orders, went to drive back Vankujī; and from his excessive haughtiness and pride, giving no attention to the organization of his force, with a limited number who came to him proceeded to repel Vankujī. When he reached the enemy; in advance of his supports, helpless as a

---

10 This must be Venkatadri of Penkonda — vide Gazetteer, Vol. XVII. p. 326.
moth, he suddenly threw himself on the fire of battle; and the army of Vankújí, like a halo, surrounded Sayyid Rājū and his allies. Since divine predestination had decreed that the sigh of calamity should come forth from the illustrious house of Sayyid Rājū, and become the smoke of destruction of his family and his army, by the fortune of war, his troops who were brave as lions, being rendered helpless by the attacks, wherever they looked they saw the road of escape blocked by the blades of keen-edged, blood-shedding swords; consequently, washing their hands of their lives, they placed the foot of bravery on the plain of fool-hardiness, and drew the sword of valour. After much strife and slaughter, that sayyid of high degree, with a number of his own people and his allies and assistants, was killed on the field of battle. Some unfortunate ones, whose appointed time was delayed, with a thousand troubles, from that Red Sea of destruction, reached the shore of escape, and spread the news of the death of Sayyid Rājū. From this event immeasurable weakness owing to loss of prestige reached the proud army of the enemy; and the nobles of the conquering dynasty became much elated at the victory.

Simultaneously with this circumstance, news reached the Mughal army that a body of the Gujarát troops accompanying Sayyid ʿAlam — who was one of the amirs of that kingdom — bringing with them immense treasure and goods innumerable, was approaching the army. Saʿādat Khán, who was marching through the district of Nāsik and those parts, laid an ambush for them, and killed Sayyid ʿAlam together with a great number of his men, and took possession of the whole of the goods, elephants and baggage of that force.

On hearing this news, all at once the hearts of both great and little in Akbar’s army were disturbed; and in order to discover a remedy and repair this great weakness, Ṣādīq Muḥammad Khán Atāllık, with a large force, was appointed to repel Saʿādat Khán in order that he might remove the obstruction of that body from before the opposing forces. Ṣādīq Muḥammad Khán, with Mirān Khán, Sayyid Murānaq and a body of chosen warriors and one of selected young men and about 2,000 cavalry, marched with the utmost speed to take revenge on Rājá Jaganāth and Saʿādat Khán. It was nearly evening when they arrived near the army of Saʿādat Khán; and as they had marched a long distance, it would have been extremely difficult for them to engage him on that night; so they halted for the night.

When Saʿādat Khán heard of the arrival of the Mughal army, his force was heavily laden with the plunder of the Gujarát army, so making careful arrangements for guarding the baggage and defenceless part of his force, he marched away from Ṣādīq Muḥammad Khán’s army without baggage, with about three hundred skilled Afghán bow-men, and drew up his force on the bank of a river which intervened between him and the enemy. Ṣādīq Muḥammad Khán also on the other side of the river, with his army, made ready for battle. In a moment the two forces, from opposite sides of the river, opened the battle, and with their arrows and bullets made brisk the market of destruction. Notwithstanding the smallness of Saʿādat Khán’s force, Ṣādīq Muḥammad Khán, putting out of his head the claim of equality, stepped into the valley of return, and opened the door of reproach in his own face. At the time of his return the Khán turned topsy-turvy the pargānah of Sangamur, seized all the cattle of the country people of those parts, which had been collected in one place, made prisoners of a great number of both little and great of the pargānah of Sangamur, and hoisted the standard of return.

There was an old feud between Ṣādīq Muḥammad Khán and Shāhbaẓ Khán; and the Khán-Khánān in all matters used to protect and assist Shāhbaẓ Khán. Finding an opportunity at this time when Ṣādīq Muḥammad Khán was not in the camp, the Khán-Khánān sent a person to the Prince with a message, saying, “As long as Ṣādīq Muḥammad Khán may be on service, the affair of the conquest of the Dakhán will not advance; the most advisable course is to relieve him from the duties of sayyid, and give him permission to return; so that your attentive slaves may accomplish the conquest of the Dakhán, and devote all our energies to taking the fortress.” The Prince, according to the exiguity of the time, agreed to this suggestion; and in order to please them, went to the dwell-

12 Probably the Godāwarī.
13 This must be Sangamner, about half way between Aḥmadnagar and Nāsik.
ing-place of the Khan-Khanan, which at that time was the Farah-bakhsh Garden; and as the air of that garden was pleasing to the Prince, he moved from the village of Bhisarg to the building in that Paradise-like garden; and for ten or fifteen days he employed himself in pleasure and amusement in that delightful building. At that time Sadik Muhammad Khan—no longer engaged in the business of administrator (walif)—used to be in the village of Bhisarg; but there was secretly a constant correspondence between the Prince and the amirs.

In the midst of these affairs the spies of the Mughal army brought them news that Ikhlas Khan, with all the Habshi amirs who used to be in Daulatabad, and a person named Moti, whom they had named Moti Shah, with about five or six thousand cavalry, were advancing towards them. The Khan-Khanan on the surety of Sadik Muhammad Khan (who had contemplated repelling Sai’dat Khan, but had not advanced the work), appointed Daulet Khan Ludi Afghani—who was the most warlike of his army—with about 8,000 well-trained mounted archers selected from the army of the Prince and Shahbuz Khan and his own army, to repel Ikhlas Khan and the other Habshi amirs. On the bank of the river Ganges (Godavari) a battle took place between the two forces: at the close of the day they kindled the world-consuming fire of battle.

When Ikhlas Khan and the Habshi amirs saw the Mughal army, they sent on the advanced guard of their army towards Dauletabad, and they themselves drew up their force in battle array in a central position on the bank of the river Ganges (Godavari); but immediately on the arrival of the Mughal rank-breaking army, their firmness gave way, and without fighting or striving for their reputation, they took to flight. A few of the Mughal force pursued the flying army for some distance, and killed several of the stragglers; then halted in that same place, and passed the night there.

Next day they marched from that place, which was near the town of Patan, and moved towards the above-mentioned town, in which a number of poor merchants and some helpless and poor peasants, relying upon the promise of security, had remained. Immediately upon arriving in the town of Patan, they threw the fire of rapine and plunder among the houses and inhabitants, and by tyranny and glaring injustice forcibly removed all the stuffs, money and goods of those people. All the females and males of the above-mentioned town they stripped of their borrowed raiment, to such an extent that they did not leave in that town even the veil of a woman—whether plebeian or noble; after that they returned. A crowd of those oppressed persons, without a stitch of clothes, limped after them and reached the Khan-Khanan's army, and loudly complained in his darbar of this tyranny. But since Daulet Khan and the other amirs of the Khan-Khanan had brought the plundered property, the Khan-Khanan, who throughout the world had earned a false reputation for generosity and manliness, through covetousness of those stuffs, sprinkled the dust of inhumanity in the eye of generosity, and took no pity on the state of those wretched oppressed people. Most of the stuffs of the unhappy merchants he divided among his own troops. A few, with naked heads and feet, who were the owners, used day and night to weep and bemoan in that court; but out of their stuffs he did not give them a single article of apparel. Prince Shah Murad was much disgusted at this, and moved back from the Farah-bakhsh Garden to the village of Bhisarg; on the way two of the intimates of the Khan-Khanan having arrived near the army of the Prince, the rage of the latter was all at once excited against the Khan-Khanan, and he reinstated Sadik Muhammad Khan in the office of walif.

12 A small town about one mile east of the Ahmadnagar fort.
13 Or on a rugged difficult piece of ground.
14 This is evidently Patan or Pratishthana, N. Lat. 19° 29', E. Long. 73° 27', an extremely ancient town on the left bank of the Godavari, celebrated for its silk and fine muslin manufactures. — Bombay Gazetteer, Vol. XVII. p. 321.
15 Details of this occurrence are given as follows by Mirza Rafi-ud-Din Shahr-e: “At this juncture, one day Sultan Murad went out for a ride, and from a distance seeing a number of people who were going along quickly, he asked who they were, and was told it was one of the Khan-Khanan’s servants, who had also the rank of Fisheh. He said, ‘Why is it that he neglected to come and salute me? Bring him to me.’ When they brought him, Prince Murad ordered him to be beaten with a stick for not saluting him. When news of this reached the Khan-Khanan he sent the following message to Sultan Murad, — ‘In the same manner as your father and your elder brother treat me and respect me, you also must treat me; I cannot submit to such disrespect. Akbar Pishah will be a judge between me and you.’
The Khān-Khānān waited some days in the Farah-bakhsh Garden, employing himself in pleasure and amusement, and did nothing whatever towards the taking of the fortress; but the Prince from morning till evening used to go round the fortress, intent upon arrangements for its reduction. Then a number of the reformers of the State advised the Khān-Khānān, and brought him from the Farah-bakhsh Garden to the houses of the city of Ahmadnagar, when outwardly he was in all things attending to the siege of the fortress, and reducing the besieged to extremities; he posted a party of his own troops in the vicinity of the Kālā Chautarah, which is opposite the gate of the fortress.

As there was a firm alliance of long standing between Rājā 'Ali Khān, wāli of Burhānpur, and the people of the fortress, they continually kept up communication with him, and through his agency their requirements used to be conveyed to the fortress. And when a number of artillerymen from all the forts and districts came to the assistance of the people of the fortress, they made their way into the fortress from his side, and caused the strength of the garrison to be doubled. But the Prince having observed this, caused Rājā 'Ali Khān to march away from there and gave his battery in charge to Rājā Jagannāth, who was one of the greatest of the Rajput amīrs; so the road of coming and going of the people of the fortress became entirely blocked.

In the days of the siege of the fortress and the flaring up of the fire of battle, Rājā 'Ali Khān, wāli of Burhānpur, at the instigation of Akbār’s amīr, sent a letter to Chānd Bihā to the following effect — "I, knowingly, and for the sake of the honour of this high dynasty, have come to these frontiers in company with the Mughal army, and I know for certain that in a few days more, the fortress will be reduced by this army. Take care in the fighting not to exercise caution but to save your reputation surrender the fortress to the Prince; then any fort and any district which you wish for, they will let you have in exchange for this. Since, on account of the affinity between us my reputation is in truth bound up in that of Your Highness, I have determined with myself, regardless of arrows and musketry fire, to come to the gate of the fortress and convey Your Highness to my own camp."

When this communication reached the people of the fortress, it became the cause of increased perturbation and helplessness among them, and they were on the point of agreeing amongst themselves to surrender the fortress. Afzal Khān strove to assuage their hearts, and wrote as follows in reply to Rājā 'Ali Khān: — "It is surprising that with the perfection of Your Highness' understanding and planning you should write such a letter as this, and endeavour to ruin this high dynasty, seeing that you hastened to go forth to meet the Mughal amīr, and brought them into this country. The kings of the Dakhan will not forget this. By the aid of God Almighty the Mughal amīr will shortly be made to return, and Your Highness will again be subject to the kings of the Dakhan, and must fear the vengeance of the fierce warriors of the Dakhan, and take thought for your reputation and that of your own kingdom."

When this answer reached Rājā 'Ali Khān, he was ashamed of what he had written; and the Mughal amīr also, on the arrival of this letter, became hopeless of taking the fortress. But Miyan Manjā, who together with Aḥmad Shāh, in the beginning of the Mughal invasion, had taken refuge in the territory of Ibrāhīm Aṭīl Shāh, had sent to the foot of the throne of that monarch petitions founded on self-abasement and despondency, representing their weakness and imploring assistance. That king, looking to what was good for the State and the integrity of the kingdom, striving his utmost to repel the enemies of the country and to reinforce the people of the fortress, issued farrams about sending a force to those well-wishers of the State, and made prudent arrangements for repelling the army of Akhār Shāh. From the Aṭīl Shāh court, Suhail Khān — who at that court held the title of Ay bin-ul-Mulk — with a number of celebrated amīrs and about 3,000 well-trained cavalry, was appointed to go to the assistance of the Nizām-Shāhī kingdom, that with the world-consuming sword he

At this speech Sultān Murdā made use of very harsh language, and the dispute was the origin of much trouble. Tempests and tale-beaters used to widen the breach between them. One day Sultān Murdā was saying to those near him, "As long as the Khān-Khānān and Shāhbd Shāh exist they will not let me attain to the sovereignty of the Dakhan, but, please God, after taking Ahmadnagar ——. They replied, "Do what you please after taking Ahmadnagar, if you can take it."
should throw the fire of chastisement into the harvest of the existence of the hostile troops, and with the sponge of the sharp swords of his warriors, he should make the face of the earth a sea of blood, and clear the kingdom of the Dakhan from the discord and rebellion of the lords of perverseness and injustice.

From the Kutb-Shahi court also, Kuli Sultan Talaš — who was renowned for his bravery — with about 10,000 celebrated cavalry and 20,000 brave infantry, was sent to repel the enemy. In like manner, from the court of ‘Adil-Shah, farman was issued to Ikhlas Khan and all the Habshi amirs, inviting them to put aside their hostility, which was the cause of the ruin of the country and State, and join the nobles in repelling the enemies of the country. According to His Majesty’s orders, Ikhlas Khan and the other Habshi amirs, with about 20,000 cavalry collected from the various cities, marched in that direction. Through the kindness of ‘Adil-Shah, in a short time about 70,000 well-equipped cavalry, with elephants, cannon and all the implements of war, were assembled on His Majesty’s frontier. From the thronging of them, the plains and hills were pressed for room.

* * *

A breach is made in the wall of the fortress of Ahmadnagar. Fight with the enemy, in which the defenders are victorious. Great exertions of Her Highness Chand Bibi, and the sincerity of her faith.

When the siege of Ahmadnagar — owing to the perfection of its strength and fortification — had lasted a long time, and the face of its conquest still remained hidden by the veil of protraction and delay, it became manifest to the Mughal amirs that by the agency of guns and the filling in of the ditch, they would not be able to reduce the fortress; so, after praying for success, and taking council together, they decided on making excavations under the foundations of the wall and towers; and in order that the defenders might not obtain information of their plan, they kept it concealed from both small and great, and used their utmost endeavours to carry it out. Opposite the Prince’s battery they excavated several places, and hollowed out the pillars of the walls of the fortress. When they had finished the excavation, on the night of Friday, the first night of the moon in the month of Rajab [20th February, 1596], by the Prince’s orders, they filled the hollow of that excavation with gunpowder and tamped it with clay and stones, in order that at the time of dawn — which is the time of ease and repose of the sentries vigilant during the night, and time of the owl of negligence of the defenders of the fortress — they might fire the mine and throw down the wall of the fortress, and by that means their troops might complete the conquest of the fortress. But since Fate had decreed that the fortress was not to be taken, Khwajah Muhammad Khan — who was one of the nobles of Faras and a wazir of Shiraz, and was distinguished for the integrity of his faith and the sincerity of his intentions — having become aware of the position of the enemy’s mine, employed the people of the fortress, both small and great, on that dark night in digging down, to the foundations of the walls of the fortress in the positions where they imagined the enemy’s mines to be. They found one mine, and carrying away the powder which the enemy had put into it, they filled up its place with stones and earth. The defenders being relieved from the fear of this mine, commenced digging out another. And Sadiq Muhammad observing the day of Friday, the first day of the moon of Rajab, which is the sacred month, postponed the firing of the mines till after noon. In truth, according to the saying, “Good in what happens,” the defenders benefitted by this delay; for on that night both small and great of the people of the fortress were employed in the appearance of the true dawn, in excavating the mines; and after dawn, all of them, very tired, went to their houses to rest and repose.

The Prince and Sadiq Mu‘azzam Khan, at the first appearance of dawn on Friday ordered their forces to assemble and get ready all the implements of war, and parade fully armed at the foot of the fortress. When the Mughal army, with swords, shields, spears and daggers flocked from all quarters towards the fortress of Ahmadnagar, the ground round the fortress, from the thronging together of the forces was like a swelling sea in a state of commotion. Prince Shah Murad in his own person took an active part in the operations; and all the amirs and khan of high rank — except the Khan-
Khánán and Shábbáz Khán, who did not approve of the conquest of the Dakhan — with their horsemen and retinues, drums and standards, stepped into the plain of battle.

After the assembly of the Mughal army the engineers being ordered to fire the mines and throw down the walls, they set fire to those mortar-like mines. At this time the defenders had found two of the mines and emptied them of powder, and having found the third mine also, were in the act of digging it out, when suddenly the smoke of destruction came forth from that mortar-like mine, and the flame of misfortune fell in the foundation of that wall. All at once the wall of the fortress tottered, and from terror of it the earth came forth from its place, and the sound of it came forth from the position of that foundation, so that you would have thought the trumpet of the resurrection had been blown, and you beheld the day of resurrection face to face. About fifty cubits\(^{17}\)-length was breached and all at once demolished and broken, and by the force of the explosion the pillars of the walls of that impregnable fortress were laid low.

A number of the enemy's force who were standing by the ditch waiting for the destruction of the wall, threw themselves into the ditch and made for the breach; and as they expected the demolition of the other walls, most of the army were waiting for that in order that they might with ease enter the fortress and take it. The stones which, bird-like, flew from the wall of the fortress, like the hunting-falcon of death killed several of the Mughal troops who were near the fortress, waiting for the assault; and as many of the defenders were engaged in digging out the mine under the same wall, a number of them also were buried under the stones and earth. Some who were farther off, when they saw so great a breach in the pillars of the fortress, fled from the stones.\(^{18}\) Some crept into corners, and some went to Her Highness Chánd Bibtí. The amirs and leaders of the army, who, in their own houses heard of that great occurrence, hastened in a frantic state towards the breach in the wall. Of the amirs and great nobles, Mujahíd-ud-Dín Shamsír Khán and Umád-ud-Dauláh Mubáriz-ud-Dín Abhání Khán first arrived at the breach, and with arrows and swords opposed the entrance of the Mughal troops. After that, Saíd-ud-Umrán Muhammad Khán with his sons and relatives, and Multán Khán, Ahmad Sháh, ‘All Shír Khán and all the amirs and leaders of the army, following one another, went to the breach and blocked the way of the enemy's force. And a number of the foreign nobles, such as Afsán Khán, Mauláná Muhammad — ambassador of Ibráhím ‘Ádil-Sháh — Mauláná Hájí Muhammad — ambassador of Muhammad Kull Kúb-Sháh — Mir Muhammad Zamán, Mir Saiyid ‘All Astarábádí and Khwájah Husain Kirmaní, who, owing to the great bravery which he displayed on this day, received the title of Tir-andák Khán. Troops of strangers and all the foreigners too, who in their own houses heard of this occurrence, hastened with all speed to the breach, and with their stone-splitting arrows blocked the way of coming and going of the enemy's troops. Most of the foreign nobles, such as the ambassadors of the Dakhan kings, by the advice of the amirs and nobles of the State, hastened to wait on Chánd Sultánah, and in order to strengthen the warriors and further the business of the fighting, brought the Queen from the palace to the breach and the scene of the combat. When her sun-like umbrella cast the shadow of protection and favour over the heads of the lords of the State, the strength and ferocity of the warriors was increased a thousand-fold. The lightning-making guns and flaming rockets drove the enemy from the neighbourhood of the breach; and the engineers and artil-

---

\(^{17}\) 1 *pas*, or cubit = 24 finger-breadths.

\(^{18}\) In connexion with this Mirzá Raffí-ud-Dín relates an episode which reads like a story from the adventures of Baron Munchausen. — "It was an extraordinary occurrence that when a bastion and some of the parapet of the fortress were blown up, three persons on top of the bastion, sitting on a slab of stone, were playing a game of *nard* [a kind of backgammon], when suddenly they were blown to the heavens with that stone, and descended near Jāfar Áskí's well, which is nearly one *faráh* (8,000 yards) from the fort. One of those three escaped uninjured, and when I was sent on a diplomatic mission to mediate between Niğm-Sháh and the amirs, between whom dissensions had arisen, that person was shown to me. I asked him how he had felt in going up and coming down. He replied — 'Such terror pervaded my heart that I was unable to open my eyes till the stone reached the ground and I became separated from it. Thanks be to the Creator, who brings safely out of such a whirlpool of danger anyone He wishes. By this action the Almighty shows to his servants the perfection of His power.'" — Tashání *ibád* Múlák, I. O. MS. p. 275.
lery also from the tops of the towers, with guns and ḥuṣbāh-būzān and pūbbān [rockets] sent the flames of destruction to the lives of the enemy, and drove them away from the ditch. The well-wishers' exertions in the fight against the enemy were such, that Muḥammad Lāl, ambassador of His Majesty 'Adil-Shāh (although there was no pause in the fire of the rockets and guns), in the hottest part of the fight went up on one of the towers of the fortress opposite the breach in the wall and kindled a khūṣbān and firing several guns in that khūṣbān, opened the doors of destruction in the face of the enemy. As all the defenders were aware of the presence of the Queen herself in the battle, all ranks — young and old — harried in that direction, and with their own bodies blocked the breach in the wall.

They say that when the Queen arrived in the neighbourhood of the breach, a number of the elephant-keepers brought forward the elephants that they might interpose them between her person and the fire of the enemy, but she forbade them, and would not allow the elephants to be placed in front of her. With the tongue of inspiration she caused the following speech to be interpreted:—

"Although to take one's own life is forbidden both by the understanding and the divine law, yet I have brought a cup of poison with me, and it (which Heaven foretell !) the enemy take this fortress, I shall drink the cup of poison, and free myself from the annoyance of my enemies. Besides, since one will of a certainty obtain the rank of martyrdom from the wound of the enemies of the faith and the State, how can I guard myself against the wounds inflicted by the enemy?"

Consequently God, the most holy and most high, owing to the sincerity of intention and purity of her faith, bestowed on the Queen that fortress (which in fact had almost fallen into the hands of the enemy), and defended it against the oppression of that band of tyrants.

Of the people of the fortress, a number who were near the wall, engaged in the work of defence, some were killed by stones and earth, and some remained firm till the arrival of Muḥājīd-ul-Dīn Shamsīr Khān and Muḥārīz-ul-Dīn Abhān Khān saved the breach. By the will of the Omnipotent, Sādīq Muḥammad Khān, in order to fire the other mines and breach another part of the fortress, prevented his men from making an assault on the breach, and so gaining an easy victory. A number of rash ones who, in advance of the others had gone into the ditch reached the breach in the fortress, but as no one had the hardihood to follow them, they stopped; and after the enemy's force, from the failure of the other mines to explode, abandoned the hope of firing them, the defenders repaired the breach, and displaying much boldness and bravery, killed most of those who had gone into the ditch and scattered themselves about.

In the midst of the fury of battle, an arrow struck Asfāl Khān on the breast, but the covering of an amulet which he wore on his arm saved him from injury, and by the felicity of the sincerity of his intentions and the purity of his mind, no annoyance whatever was caused to him.

The remainder of the enemy's force, seeing the state of affairs, and none having the boldness to enter the ditch, with their own hands they opened the doors of misfortune and adversity in their own faces; but having no other resource, they formed up on the edge of the ditch and attacked the wall of the fortress. From both sides the world-consuming fire of slaughter and battle blazed up.

Although the enemy fought bravely, yet since it was not so decreed by Fate, the face of victory did not show itself in the mirror of sword and dagger; and they only opened the register of their endeavours at the verse "suffering loss" and "regret." A number of celebrated and brave men of the enemy's army, by the arrows, stones, guns and matchlocks of the defenders were overthrown and sent to the house of perdition. Many of the warriors received disabling wounds, and retired with repentance, wailing and restlessness.

When the sun set and darkness came on, the enemy's army, who after all their exertions had experienced no result but hurtfulness and regret, drew back their footsteps from that fatal place, and only half alive, wounded by arrows, matchlocks, cross-bows and stones, went to their habitations.
But Her Highness Chandi Bhata remained fixed as a mountain in the same place, and ordered expert workmen to build up the foundations of the wall of the fortress; she herself waiting in the same place till the skilled builders and stone-cutters, with clay and stones built up the wall about four cubits high; thus blocking the way against the entrance of the Mughal force; and then fortified the wall with many hukkāhs [guns?] and much ammunition.

After that, the Queen, with much courtesy and queenly favour, rewarded those of the defenders who in the place of battle had remained firm as mountains and displayed conspicuous bravery. Among the foreigners, Khwājah Ḥusain Kirmanī — since he had shown much valour on that day, and had killed many of the enemy with arrows — was ennobled by the title of Tir-andāḵ Khān; and Ḥusain Aḵārī Turkman received the title of Kazai-bāš Khān. After straining every nerve in fulfilling the requisites of defence and the observance of vigilance, the Queen returned to the haram.

But Prince Shah Murād on that night, owing to the loss of his prestige, and the weakness which had found its way to the foundation of his good fortune; brooding over the fact that the face of his object was not reflected in the mirror of his desires, was biting the finger of anxiety with the teeth of astonishment; while tears of sorrow were streaming from his eyes. He took counsel with his amīrs and the leaders of his army as to the best means of reducing the fortress.

In the morning, at the first streak of dawn, the Prince, son of Akbar Shāh, paraded his forces and advanced to the breach of the fortress. When he reached the wide ditch he wished without delay to attack the fortress; but a number of the amīrs and great men of the State dependent on his favour were opposed to entering the ditch, and to his personally engaging in the fight. On account of the advice of his well-wishers, the Prince dismounted from his horse on the very edge of the ditch, and encouraged his men in fighting against the people of the fortress; making them hopeful by promises of increased rank. He sent one of the nobles to the Khān-Khānān to ask him for assistance; but the latter hung back with excuses, and abstained from taking part in the war. Prince Shah Murād's sense of honor being roused, he ordered his troops to commence the attack; and a special corps of abādīs and men of rank, under the Prince, at once attacked the fortress with swords, arrows, cross-bows and baldarahs.

The defenders, whose strength (in spite of the weakness of the wall of the fortress), owing to their success of the previous day, was increased a thousand-fold; having built up the breach to the height of several cubits, with their fire-arms had made it like the vestibule of hell; and fought with the utmost bravery and strength, and with the fire of hukkāhs, pāk-bāns, guns and matchlocks which they brought to bear on them, burnt up the harvest of the existence of many of the enemy.

Although the intrepid ones of the distinguished army rushed in close order towards the breach of the fortress, yet the warriors in the fortress, with their arrows, guns, hukkāhs and pāk-bāns, scattered them and killed numbers of them, and cleared them away from the neighbourhood of the breach; till from the number of killed in the ditch, it appeared like a repetition of the story of the seven-fold slaughter of Māzandarān.

Prince Shah Murād, on the page of whose fortune the signs and indications of regret were showing themselves; with his heart full of grief and his tongue full of lamentations and sighs, returned towards his camp, having abandoned the desire for war and the acquisition of a name and reputation; and removed from his mind the sovereignty and dominion of the Dakhan, which had been fixed in the world of his boasting imagination.

18 Tir-andāḵ meaning "archer."
20 A kind of sword.
21 A kind of Indian military corps. — Dict.
Terms of peace arranged between Chând Bibi and Prince Shâh Murâd.
Completion of the predestined events which occurred in that interval.

It has been already mentioned that Ibrahim 'Adil-Shâh had ordered about 3,000 trained cavalry to go to the assistance of Nigâm-Shâh. Muhammad Kuli Kutb-Shâh also had sent about 10,000 cavalry and 20,000 infantry to the assistance of Queen Chând Bibi and the Nigâm-Shâhî army. From all quarters within the limits of the 'Adil-Shâhî dominions a force was collected, and about seventy or eighty thousand cavalry, with elephants, artillery and rockets, after making all warlike preparations, marched towards Aḥmadnagar.

The days of the siege of the fortress being prolonged, the defenders were reduced to helplessness owing to the scarcity of provisions; so the nobles of Her Highness Chând Bibi wrote letters to the amirs of the Dakhan army, and mentioned in them the superiority of the enemy's force and the weakness of the defenders. By chance the spies who were the bearers of these letters, were captured by the advanced-guard of the Muḥ哈尔 force, and the letters were shown to the Khân-Khânān and Shâlik Muhammad Khân. Akbar's amir then wrote the following letter to Suhail Khân, who was the Amir-ul-Umarâ of the army of His Majesty 'Adil-Shâh:— "We have long been expecting your coming in order that this fighting may be put to a stop; and the quicker you come, the better." Giving this as well as the letter from the people of the fortress to the same spy, they sent him on. It is said that when the letters reached Suhail Khân, and he became acquainted with the contents, in the same hour he sounded the drum of march, and with the utmost possible speed, from the road of the mountainous country, turned towards Aḥmadnagar.

When the news of the approach of this formidable army of the Dakhan reached Prince Shâh Murâd and all the amirs and Khânâns of the Muḥ哈尔 army—who, having become hopeless of taking the fortress of Aḥmadnagar, had given up fighting—it increased the fear and terror of their army; so that all at once the foundations of their patience and firmness being shaken, the reins of self-possession and repression went out of the hands of their power. Consequently a council of war was assembled, and after consulting together, it was unanimously agreed that since the army of the Dakhan, in great numbers and well equipped, was advancing to take vengeance on them; and as the conquest of the fortress had gone beyond the area of their power, it was necessary to show a bold front and make some kind of terms with the defenders; and by this pretence the abandonment of the siege would not be attributed to their weakness. Accordingly Sayyid Murtâṣâ (who from olden time had been the arranger of this royal family, and used constantly to perform similar diplomatic duties for the State) was charged with the duty of arranging the terms of peace.

Sayyid Murtâṣâ, by the advice of the Prince and amir, wrote to the rulers of the State and sent into the fortress a letter to the effect that they should send out a person to arrange terms of peace, and induce the Prince in some manner to raise the siege and quit the foot of the fortress.

Although the people of the fortress were reduced to extremities owing to scarcity of provisions; and the reins of choice having gone from their hands, were all demanding peace and a treaty; yet since they perceived an odour of weakness from the signification of Sayyid Murtâṣâ's message, and knew that only when the arrow of the enemy's desires had missed the target of their intentions, and the dawn of happiness had failed to appear on the horizon of their fate, they entered by the door of peace and knocked with the knocker of agreement; consequently becoming hopeful of victory, in order that the enemy might bear the burden of weakness, they wrote as follows, in reply to Sayyid Murtâṣâ:— "If first on your part a confidential person will come to this court, and propose terms of peace, on our behalf also an ambassador will be appointed to complete the matter."

Sayyid Murtâṣâ and Mir Hashim (who for a long time had been paymaster of the Prince's army, and for his great intelligence, bravery and sagacity was greatly distinguished above his equals) were sent to the Nigâm-Shâhî court.

The sayyid remained in the fortress for the space of ten days without getting permission to depart, so that the Muḥ哈尔 amirs became hopeless of obtaining terms of peace, and dismal news was
circulated in their camp; till the people of the fortress sent many rare presents for the Prince, the Khân-Khânân, Shabbz Khân and Sadik Muhammad Khân.

Afzal Khân, owing to the high reputation which he enjoyed among the grandees of the country and celebrated men of the State as a diplomatist, was appointed Nigâm-Shâh ambassador; and having earned the approbation of Her Highness Chând Bûj by his praiseworthy services, especially in the days of the siege, she conferred on him the office of Naib and the rank of Pishwâ, and exalted him with the title of Chingiz Khân.

In like manner a legation from the Prince was selected to arrange the terms of peace: it consisted of the Khân-Khânân, Mr Muhammed Zamân Raâlî Mashhâdî (who to the end of time will be renowned for his faithfulness in the discharge of his duties); and Shâh Bahram Astaraabadî was appointed as the deputy of Shabbz Khân.

On Sunday, the 10th of the month of Rajab [1st March, A.D. 1596], the dawn of which was the rising of the sun of happiness and reconciliation, and the beginning of the happy and fortunate days, the ambassadors above mentioned, by order of Her Highness the Bilkâ of the age, went out of the fortress and hastened to their duties. When the news of the arrival of the ambassadors reached the Prince, he ordered a place to be given to them in the camp of Saiyid Murtasâ, in order that whenever he should summon them Saiyid Murtasâ might bring them. Then he sent a person to summon the Khân-Khânân, Shabbz Khân, Raâlî 'Ali Khân, Sadik Muhammad Khân and all the great men and amîrs. A royal assembly was arranged for the reception of the ambassadors. Afzal Khân, Khân-i Khawwând Chingiz Khân with Mr Muhammed Zamân and Shâh Bahram were taken to the foot of the Prince’s throne, and kept in the place of servitude. After the ambassadors had performed the ceremonies of “kurfush” and “tasâlim” — which is the method of salutation of the Chaghâ;î kings — the Prince and the Khân-Khânân called them near, and they asked an explanation of the cause of the war and their object in coming. Concerning the terms of peace they used the above-mentioned words. Afzal-ul-Khawwând Chingiz Khân hastened to reply; and after the usual complimentary phrases, he represented his case as follows:

The Prince approved of the eloquent words; he bestowed on the delegates of the Queen robes of honour and Arab horses, and said: — “The completion of your affairs I entrust to the care of the Khân-Khânân: represent your case to him in order that it may be settled according to your wishes.”

Next day, the Khân-Khânân having met in council, summoned the ambassadors of the Queen; and at first deceiving them asked for a promise and agreement, in order that they might seduce that well-wishing khan from his allegiance, and by bribes and stratagems obtain possession of the fortress. They said to Afzal Khân: — “We will make you a commander of five thousand, and cede to you by treaty whatever district of the Dakhan you may desire; your opinion shall be made the rule in all affairs, and we shall allow no transgression of your wishes. It may be that in some way this fortress may come into our possession.”

Afzal Khân, in reply to them, said: — “The conquest of this fortress by assault is an impossibility; for though at one time it seemed to be attainable because the provisions of the fort and war-like material came to an end; yet now that they have the provisions of ten years in corn, gunpowder, arms and war-like implements; and nearly 10,000 brave warriors, all anxious to achieve fame, are in the fortress, and for the sake of guarding the rights of salt and service of so many years, as long as they have a breath left in their bodies, they would choose to die rather than yield the fortress.”

When the amîrs saw that their fraud and spells had no effect on Afzal Khân, they became hopeless of taking the fortress, and made the following insolent speech: — “Since His Majesty the late Burhãn Nigâm-Shâh, at the time of going towards the Dakhan, made a present of the kingdom of
Varhād [Berār] to the Nawāb of His Majesty the King [Akbar], that province now belongs to the servants of that court; you must therefore withdraw your hand from its possession. And as the Prince has honoured this country by a visit — and in fact holds possession of the whole of the kingdom of the Dakhan — your advisable course is to consign to the servants of His Highness the province of Daulatābād also with its dependencies, in order that the army may withdraw from the siege of the fortress. We shall then return all the provinces to Prince Bahādur Shāh, and afford him assistance in taking vengeance on his enemies.”

Afsal-ul-Khawānī Chingiz Khān replied to them:—“At present there is no king in this State to whom this matter can be referred. The province of Varhād [Berār] now belongs to the Sulṭān of the Dakhan, and the army of this State also has confirmed them in its possession. The mention of Daulatābād is the cause of the increase of matters of sedition and mischief; because for a long time past the people of that province have withdrawn the neck of obedience from the halter of subjection, and having become travellers on the road of rebellion, have set up another king, but according to the orders of Her Highness Chānd Bibī, he will not exercise dominion. Besides, the amīrs of the Dakhan who are in the fortress will not agree to this, and the peace negotiations will be altogether abandoned. What defeat have you inflicted on the army of the Dakhan that the provinces of Varhād [Berār] and Daulatābād should be given to you? Your fortune was good, in that hypocrisy having shown itself among the amīrs of the State, each of them became scattered in a different direction, and the State remained denuded of troops. You, seizing the opportunity, hastened in this direction; if there had been 10,000 cavalry in the limits of the Gālān Gāh, you would not have been able to invade the frontier. Now, one lak of man-over-throwing cavalry of the Dakhan with the utmost preparation and grandeur are advancing towards you, and have arrived within eight farsakhāns. You must first fight with them: after you have answered them, you can then talk of giving and taking.”

Ṣādik Muḥammad Khān Ṭāliq, who was at the head of affairs in the Dakhan, being much disturbed, said to Afsal Khān:—“What nonsense this is! You keep a woman in the fort in hopes of a eunuch coming to your assistance, or that assistance will reach you from him. This is the son of His Majesty Jalāl-ul-Dīn Muḥammad Akbar Pādshāh, in whose court so many monarchs have girded up their loins in his service. Do you imagine that the crows and kites of the Dakhan which have sat down on some spiders, can oppose the descendants of Tūnūr and celebrated amīrs such as the Ḵān-Khānān and Shāh-bāz Khān, each of whom is equal to any ten of the Dakhan? We have thrown down the walls of this fort of yours, and have undermined the remainder. In two or three days more we shall level it with the ground. Behold! up to now the conquest having happened, did you imagine that the honour of Her Highness would remain, and that men like you, who are of our own race, would not perish?”

Afsal Khān hastened to reply:—“For the space of forty years we have eaten the salt of the kings of the Dakhan, and on the day we entered this fort, we resigned our lives, property and offspring; and now we have come to this service of yours. Since all cannot fly from death, we are prepared for death, and having made up our minds to suffer martyrdom, have waited on you. What can be better than this, that a person should be killed in the service of his benefactor, and by this means obtain an eternal good name? We used to hear that Akbar Pādshāh was laying claim to godhead; now we see, that his amīrs also lay claim to the prophetic office. Apparently it has been revealed to you in a vision that this country shall be conquered by you; but the Most High God has no admission to this laboratory that you can make so positive a statement as ‘in three days more we shall certainly take this fort’. It is possible that with the assistance of the people of this country, you may be obliged to return from the foot of this fortress without the attainment of your object; and it is apparent to you that the people of this country live at enmity with foreigners, and will continue to do so. I am a well-wisher of His Majesty the King, and my advice is that the great amīrs of the Prince be sent away from the neighbourhood of the fortress, lest there happen to them a fatal misfortune, to remedy which may be beyond the area of possibility. There are great numbers of warriors in this fortress, who if they

---

21a About 27 miles.
be killed, become martyrs, and if they kill, they will become ghāfs [heroes]: how can you compel them to submit to you? Very shortly the army of the Dakhan will arrive; the road of going to and fro will then become closed on you, and after much ruin and misfortune, trouble and injury, you will return with the greatest difficulty, and seek assistance and protection in the service of the King. And certainly what I am now saying will also be represented to His Majesty the King."

Mr Muhammad Zaman also in that assembly fearlessly made a well-weighed and manly speech, and convinced his opponents.

Several days were spent in this controversy, and the pacification was delayed, till news of the approach of the formidable army of the Dakhan was circulated in the Mughal army. Spies brought information that about 70,000 cavalry with many elephants and artillery were advancing by march; consequently the amirs of the Mughal army, deeming it advisable to abandon contention and dispute about Daullatabad, forbore to make useless demands, and contenting themselves with the province of Varhad [Burnār], concluded the treaty of peace. On Tuesday, the 23rd of the month of Rajab [14th March, A.D. 1596], the lords of peace and reconciliation came and went from both sides.

Since the provisions of the fortress were exhausted, the besieged were in great difficulty. In these days when Afsal Khan was in the Mughal camp the people of the fortress several times wrote to him, saying:— "By whatever means it is possible, conclude the treaty of peace quickly, for we cannot hold the fort another day." Moreover most of the people of the fortress, owing to the scarcity of food and want of strength, had agreed among themselves and intended throwing themselves down from the towers and walls and taking refuge with the Mughal army. On this account Afsal Khan arranged with the Mughal amirs that they should send Sayyid Murtaza and Kasim Hassan to the gate of the fortress to arrange the terms of peace. The two being appointed for the purpose, hastened to attend at the court, and were distinguished by royal favours. These nobles, for the sake of peace, and owing to the exigency of the time, consented to give Varhad [Burnār], and the foundations of friendship and agreement were strengthened by a treaty. Muhammad Khan with a number of the great men of the country and celebrated men of the State, for the purpose of completing the treaty of peace, hastened from the fortress to the presence of the Prince, and had the honour of kissing his hand, and were distinguished by royal kindnesses according to their circumstances. Their leader was treated with the greatest honour, and all the amirs and khans of the assembly were presented with special robes of honour and Arab horses.

When from both sides the foundations of friendship and agreement were laid, the matters of contention and resistance ceased; and the causes of alienation being changed to a state of courtesy and unity, the gardens of good-fellowship flourished; the bases of familiarity and friendship received fresh strength; the ties of faith of the agreement of both sides arrived at a stage of firmness; and the affairs of religion and the State, and the affairs of the kingdom and the faith, by the blessing of this reconciliation were arranged anew. Muhammad Khan, Chingiz Khan and all the great men returned from the Prince's camp with happy and cheerful hearts, and had the honour of kissing the vestible of sovereignty of Her Highness the Bilkis of the age; and the endeavours of all in arranging the affairs of State having met with Her Highness' approbation, they were distinguished by innumerable royal favours.

The Mughal army also withdrew their hands from the siege of the fortress, and their feet from the plain of war and battle; and returned the sword of contention and opposition to the scabbard of agreement.

The people of the fortress of Ahmadnagar who from weakness and want of provisions had been reduced to helplessness, stepped from the narrow pass of the siege into the open plain of the desert, and opened the doors of purchase and sale with the army. The Mughal troops, who in the days of the siege had hoarded up much grain, having by the peace obtained tranquillity of mind, and being relieved from the troubles of the siege and fighting, now made themselves lightly loaded. In two or three days the people of the fortress collected so much provisions, that if there had again been war and a siege, they would have been free from anxiety.
When the news of the approach of the relieving force (which was marching from the direction of the mountainous country and the district of Mānikdaund\[22\]) reached the Mughal army, they had arrived within five gāw of Aḥmadnagar. At first the Prince, with the intention of giving them battle, marched from the neighbourhood of Aḥmadnagar on the night of Wednesday, the 27th of Rajab [18th March, A. D. 1596], one day's journey towards [Shāhdurg], but the plans of the Mughal army being again changed, they turned their reins from opposing that force; and turning towards the Jeur Ghāṭ, they marched from there towards Daulatābād; and passing through the neighbourhood of Daulatābād, started in the direction of Jaisāpur\[23\] and Varhād [Berār].

When the news of the march of the Mughal army reached the amīrs and leaders of the army of the Dakhan, they came to the neighbourhood of Aḥmadnagar, and halted at the village of Pāturīl [Pāthārdīl]. Ikhlāṣ Ḳhān and most of the Nigām-Shāhī amīrs sent to the foot of the throne petitions tendering their obedience and submission, and asking for the royal promise of amnesty. According to the royal commands written promises were issued to the amīrs and leaders of the army, and all were made hopeful of ungrudged royal favours. Consequently Ikhlāṣ with the whole of the Ḥabshi amīrs separated themselves from the army of His Majesty 'Ādīl-Shāh; and coming to the neighbourhood of the city of Aḥmadnagar, encamped in the garden of the 'Abādat-Khānāb, and sent a person to the foot of the throne of sovereignty, asking for an audience. An order was issued from the palace that the purchased amīrs should be honoured by kissing the threshold of sovereignty. Ikhlāṣ Ḳhān with his sons and brothers, and 'Aṣīl-ul-Mulk with his brothers, and Māl Ḳhān and Khudāwīd Ḳhān, and Dilpāt Rāy with all the amīrs of the sacred places [aḥrām] attended at the royal court, and their heads were exalted to the heavens by the honour of kissing the ground; and they were distinguished by robes of honour and copious honours.

When His Highness Mirān Shāh Ṭʿoll used to be among the Ḥabshi amīrs, all the Ḥabshi in the kingdom were willing to serve him. At this time when the Ḥabshi amīrs hastened to present themselves at the royal court, Shāh Ṭʿoll becoming alarmed, abandoned all the paraphernalia of royalty, and taking refuge with Shāh ʿĀdīl-Shāh, placed himself under the protection of Suhail Ḳhān. A body of troops which had been ordered to go in pursuit of him, when they reached him, plundered his tents and other property and returned.

*(To be continued.)*

**DISCURRENT REMARKS ON THE AUGUSTAN AGE OF TELUGU LITERATURE.**

**BY G. B. SUBRAMIAH PANTULU.**

*(Continued from p. 279.)*

**WHEN the marriage of Krishnārāyana with Pratapa Budra’s daughter was settled the matter was reported to the bride, who could not brook the idea of taking a man of low birth as her partner in life. She, therefore, thought over the affair for a long time, and resolved to murder the king, and then slay herself. Her resolution was communicated to an intimate friend of hers, who extolled her for her daring resolve, and assured her of the secrecy of the affair, but no sooner did the lady reach home than she communicated it to a very intimate friend of hers, who in turn intimated it to another, till it reached the ears of Timmarasu. Meanwhile, Krishnārāyana was anointed for the marriage. Timmarasu had pondered over the affair, and approached Krishnārāyana, and secretly informed him of what was intended, but at the same time assured him that he was equal to the occasion, provided the king did as he told him. On this Appāji (Timmarasu) prepared a likeness of the king and filled it with pure honey, and substituted it for the king on the bed of soft swan feathers in the mystical chamber, covered it with a sheet, and informed the women of the palace not to disturb the king as he was very tired. As the women were in the secret, they left the bride in the chamber, while Appāji hid himself beneath the cot. No sooner did the bride find herself alone in the room than she struck the image on the bed with a sword, when the honey in it spurted on to**

---

22 Mānikdaund is a village about 26 miles east of Aḥmadnagar. Gāw is a land-measure of about six miles.
23 Not identified.
her face and mouth. She at once began to regret being unable to live with a man whose blood was so very sweet! And on this Timmarasu rose up and gently approached her, and said that he would bring her back the king if she would promise him to behave very much better in the future. She remained petrified for some time, and when she grasped that it was the seer who was standing before her, became very much abashed, and requested him to intercede on her behalf, and procure the king’s pardon for her treachery. She further requested him to bring her back the king immediately. After making her swear fidelity Timmarasu went to an adjacent room where the king was lying concealed, narrated to him what had happened, fetched him thither, and took oaths from both of them that they should not bear any ill-will in future towards each other, blessed them, and went home. After this they lived happily together. That the king had two wives is ascertained from the Vishṇuchitiya, a poetical work by the king himself.

When he set on his first campaign, he visited Simhāchala, and made various grants of land to the temple there. This is proved by the inscription on the seventh pillar of the Simhāchala temple, of which the following translation is culled from the local records of the District of Vizagapatam:

Blessings and greetings. Mahārajādhirāja Paramēśvara Mūra Rāyara Gaṇḍa Ādi Rāya Vijaya Bhāshege tappura Rāvaya Gaṇḍa Yavanarājyasaṃsthamānāhaṅkāryā Virapratāpa Kṛṣṇadēvamahārāyaṇa, who is reigning at Vijayanagara, having come on his first campaign and subdued the fortresses of Udayagiri, Koṇḍaḷī, Koṇḍapalli, Rājamahendri, etc., came to Simhādri and visited the place in S. S. 1438 on the twelfth day of the black fortnight of the month of Chaitra of the Dhātu year and for the salvation of his mother Nāgādevammma and his father Narasarāya, gave to God one necklace of 991 pearls, a pair of diamond bangles, a padaka of śrīkha and chakra, one gold plate of 2,000 pagoda weight, and through his wife Chinnadēvamma, a gold padaka of 500 pagoda weight and one of a similar weight through his other wife Tirumaladēvamma.

There are a good many stanzas in the Manucharitra and Pārijatāpadarana illustrative of Kṛṣṇadēvārya’s conquests, which need not be quoted here.

Three years elapsed between Kṛṣṇa’s first campaign and his second, which interval was spent by him in conversations and discussions with the chief litterati of the day. It was during this time that Nandi Timmana prepared his Pārijatāpadarana and Allahēni Paddana his Svarichika Manucharitra, and dedicated it to the king between 1516 and 1520. We are led to infer this, as in neither of the two works mention is anywhere made of his fight with the Muhammadan sovereigns of Bijapur in 1519 and of his complete victory over Ādil Khān in 1520, whereas the event finds a poetical expression in Kṛṣṇa’s Āmuktanādiyada or Vishṇuchitiya, from which we infer that the latter work must have been composed by the king after 1520.

His South-Indian empire embraced a vast extent of country, including Golconda and Worangal. He was by far the best of the South-Indian emperors. He had all the elements of greatness — prudence, activity, and courage — in a great degree. His success in arms had gained him the highest military reputation, while the good order that prevailed in his kingdom, notwithstanding his frequent absence from it, proves his talents for government. It is said of him that he never fought a battle that he did not win, nor besiege a town that he did not take. But though great as a warrior, he was greater as a scholar and a patron of letters, and his fame rests more on the large sums of money he gave to learned men than on the conquests he made, which marked him out as a liberal supporter of literature and the arts. He subjugated the Gajapatis of Orissa, the Molem Aśvapati, and the Telugu Narapatis, and received the title of Mūrurāyara Gaṇḍa, a Kanarese appellation meaning “the husband of three Rāyas or kings.” He had many such titles. He built a dam over the Thungahadra near Vijayanagara.
He conducted his affairs both in peace and war in person, and was very much benefited by the aid and council of the minister of his father, who had preserved his life, and who continued to be his minister until his death, three years preceding that of the Raja. This person known as Timmarasa, Timmaraja, Appaji, and so on, is evidently the same as the Heemraj of Scott, who makes so great a figure in the Muhammadan annals. The account given by Farishta of the various princes successively elevated and deposed by Heemraj, originates probably in the circumstances attending the death of Viranrisimha and the accession of Krishnaraya, but the particulars are evidently confused and inaccurate. E.g., the inscriptions prove that Krishnaraya reigned for above twenty years, although the Muhammadan account would leave it to be concluded that he came to the throne an infant, and died without reaching maturity. He belonged to the Tuluva family. Sajuva is his house name. He is also known as belonging to the Sampeta and Selagola families named after the villages in which his ancestors flourished. We learn the two latter names from the Kondavji Kaulla Charitra written by certain Karnams or village accountants.

As regards Krishnaraya's literary attainments. He was called Andhra Bhoga on account of his occupying the same place in Telugu literature as king Bhoga in the Sanskrit. He was not only a patron of learning, but was also a man of letters himself, but none of his Sanskrit writings are available at present. Whatever may have been his work in the field of Sanskrit literature, there can be no gainsaying the fact that he did an incalculable amount of good for Telugu literature. The Prabandha had its origin under him. Up to this work the local poets merely translated into Telugu from Sanskrit liltidas and Purapas. Among them Kotana and Srinatha translated into Telugu metre Yajavalkyamrithi and Harsha's Naishadha respectively. Allasaani Peddana, the Laureate of Krishpadavaraya's court, was the pioneer of original poetical composition in Telugu. His first work is Svarochisha Manucharitra. The plot of the story was taken from the Mrkanjayya Purana. As he was the pioneer in this respect he was called "Andhrikavatita Pitamah, the Grand sire of Telugu poets."

That Krishnaraya had an extraordinary command of both Sanskrit and Telugu is shewn by his Amuktamalyada. Some are of opinion that this work was not his, but was the work of Allasaani Peddana, who out of courtesy published it in his name. The king, it is said, wanted Allasaani Peddana and Ramarajbabushana to prepare and bring him each a Prabandha. When the works were brought, it is said that the king expressed an opinion that the Manucharitra, the work of the former poet, was not as elegant as the Vasucharitra, the work of the latter, and therefore it was that Peddana afterwards prepared the story of Vishnuchitta under the appellation of the Amuktamalyada. We do not know if Ramarajbabushana, the author of the Vasucharitra, was alive at the time of Krishpadavaraya or not. Even if he was, he must have been very young, for he prepared his Vasucharitra not earlier than half a century after the date of the Amuktamalyada. We can also with certainty say that the Manucharitra and the Amuktamalyada are not the compositions of a single poet; as there are differences in style between the two works, and while the one is free from grammatical errors, the other for a major portion abounds in them. In the latter work are found certain sanadhisis (viz., c-kara-sanadhisi, a-bhara-sanadhisi in Tattama sodboda, Kavrthiuka sanadhisi) which are ungrammatical, and are not found in the former work. Certain of these sanadhisis are exemplified and discussed by Chinnayakari in his Billa-Vyakarana, p. 12, which is more or less a Telugu rendering of Atharvavarchy, a treatise on Telugu Grammar in Sanskrit, written by Atharvavarchy, who may be taken to be more or less a contemporary of Nannayya Bhatta. We can infer therefore that the Amuktamalyada, which can be said to be more or less flooded with ungrammatical sanadhisis is not the work of that "Grandsire of Telugu Poetry." Moreover, it is not so soft and flowing as is the work of Peddana.

Others are of opinion that the work should be ascribed to Peddana on account of the similarity of diction in the opening stanzas of both poems. In the description of the family of
the king in the opening stanzas of the \textit{Amuktamālīyada}, he was obliged to speak in eulogistic terms of his own character and of the conquests he had made, and out of proper feeling inserted stanzas for the purpose quoted from Peddana's \textit{Manucharita} into the mouth of God Veṅkaṭēśvara, and thus incorporated the needful phrases into his work. But as there are a good many stanzas, more especially in the 5th and 6th cantos of the poem, modelled after "the hard-constructed" Peddana's verses and "the sweet words" of Nandi Timmana, it is to be inferred that he at least received help from the poets of his court, more especially from the two poets above referred to, in the preparation of the poem. We should not, however, attribute literary plagiarism to the king, merely on the ground that a few stanzas of Peddana's are found in the poem under consideration. It was but natural that, when a poem was prepared by the king, he should have brought it and read it before the assembly of learned \textit{pandits} of his court, and thrown open the subject for discussion. And then certain stanzas might have been altered and certain others remodelled, while certain other fresh ones might have been introduced by the poets. It ought not to be forgotten that it was a maiden attempt of the king, so far as Telugu literature was concerned, and considering the respective literary attainments of the king and his Laureate, Peddana, he would have been naturally glad to allow his poem to benefit by the fine touches of Peddaśa's pen.

That the poem is really the composition of the king is further evidenced not only by the opening and closing stanzas of the poem in which mention is plainly made of the author, Krīṣṇa-pāṇi, but also by certain stanzas in the body of the poem itself, in which he plainly talks of the other works in Sanskrit, etc., which he had written. That the king was a poet of a high type is mentioned by the poets of his court in some of their works written anterior to the composition of the \textit{Vishnuḥchititya}, \textit{e. g.}, Nandi Timmana, in \textit{dāsīa 4} of his \textit{Pārijitāpāharaṇa}, speaks of the king as \textit{Kavitāprāṇyaśabhaśa}.

It is stated in the \textit{Vishnuḥchititya} that he went to Bezwaśa for the subjugation of the Kālīṅga country, and then pushed on to Cicacole for paying a visit to the Vishņu temple there, and that Veṅkaṭēśvara appeared to him in a dream on the night of the Hariṇāsara and called upon him to write the work. This event took place, as we have already seen, in 1515 A.D., but from certain events narrated in the poem, \textit{e. g.}, his victory over 'Adil Khan, etc., we are able to infer that the poem was not completed before 1520 A.D.

One strong point in favour of Krīṣṇa-pāṇi being the author of the poem under discussion, is that it is filled with descriptions of Vishṇu. It begins with a tinge of Vaishnavism; the plot of the story is Vishṇuva; it treats of Vishṇuva dharmas, of the secrets of that faith, and is surcharged with Vaishnav stories. We are, therefore, led to believe that it must have been written by a person of that faith, to which the king belonged, and not by a pure \textit{adwaitin} of the type of the writer of the \textit{Manucharita}. Indeed, the king was a Vaishṇavaitin and an earnest disciple of Tātāchārya, a fact which speaks volumes in his favor as the author of a poem so Vishṇuva in its nature.

There are, however, certain resemblances between the poetry of Peddana and that of Krīṣṇa-pāṇi. The same sort of similes, hyperboles, proverbial sayings, hardness of style, abound in both, so that it is sometimes rather difficult to draw a fixed line of demarcation between the compositions of the two poets.

It is said that the \textit{Amuktamālīyada} was written by Peddana after his \textit{Manucharita}. But would a work of a later date abound in more mistakes, grammatical, rhetorical, than one of an earlier date if written by the same individual? Would not Peddana have lost his reputation by the later work? Moreover, there is not that elegance of diction in the \textit{Amuktamālīyada} which is discernible in the \textit{Manucharita}, and Krīṣṇa-pāṇi, being a king, would surely have tried to find out a royal road to learning, resulting in a certain inferiority in his work.

Recently a story has been afoot for the rise of the \textit{Amuktamālīyada}, which seems to strengthen our position instead of weakening it, A certain poet prepared a work entitled \textit{Kavi-}
karnarashya, on the model of Peddana’s Manucharitra, and wished to dedicate it to Krishnaraya. He therefore took it to Vijayanagara, shewed it to Peddana, and requested him to shew it to the king. Peddana having read it carefully, thought that by shewing it to the king he would lose his position in the king’s court, and therefore devised means for shutting out the new poet from the presence of the king. Meanwhile, the new poet starved, and at last in despair, as he did not know what to do under the circumstances, he wrote four stanzas from his poem on a sadius, gave it to his servant, and told him to effect a sale for it at the market-place. The servant perambulated the city, and coming to the palace, said in a big manly voice that he offered for sale four stanzas at a thousand rupees each, when the king’s daughter, who was sauntering in the verandah adjoining her room on the topmost story, heard this, she called on one of her female attendants to fetch her the stanzas. They were accordingly brought. She read them, was exceedingly pleased, paid the servant the amount demanded, and got them off by heart.

Meanwhile, the author of the Kavikanyasayana, still unsuccessful in seeing the king, finally went to Srivariam, the island in the Kaveri, famous for its Vaishnava temple and in the early annals of the English in South India, dedicated his work to the god Raiganatha, and became “double-lived in regions new.”

Afterwards, while at a game of chess with her father, the king’s daughter chanced to make some remarks on the play, and quoted a line of the poetry she had learnt. This attracted the king’s attention, and he requested her to quote the whole stanza. She did so, and the king was exceedingly pleased, and asked her for some details of the author, when she narrated to him the circumstances in which she got possession of the stanzas, but said that she knew nothing of the author. The king immediately rose up, went to his court, read the stanza before the assembly, and asked them whence it was, when one of the assembly informed him that it was from such and such a work of the author’s advent hither, how he had remained a long while in order to see the king, how he was frustrated in his attempt, and how in utter disgust he left the place. The king was very grieved, and immediately sent word to the poet to come to see him. But by that time the poet had dedicated the work to the god Raiganatha, and he sent word to the king to that effect. The king thereupon requested the poet to allow him an opportunity to go through the book, which request was complied with. The king then, it is said, compensated himself by the writing of Vishnuchitta, though some maintain that the work of writing the new poem was entrusted to Peddana by the king as a sort of punishment. But considering the importance of the position Peddana held at the court, and the amount of respect he commanded, one is bound to say that this was highly improbable in the very nature of the circumstances.

Although a Vaishnava, Krishnaraya shewed no hatred towards the Saiva, and the various grants of land he made to Saiva temples speak very well of him. At his court were members of other sects also.

There were Saivas of the type of Nandi Timmana, extreme Saivas of the type of Dhurjati, Madanagari Mallaya, etc. Of the learned men of his court, eight are distinguished as the ashta-diggojas, or eight elephants who uphold the world of letters, in allusion to the eight elephants that support the universe at the cardinal and intermediate points of the compass. Allasani Peddana, Nandi Timmana, Iyalaraju Ramabhadra, Dhurjati, Madayagari Mallana, Pingsali Surana, Ramarajabhushana and Tenali Ramakrishna are their reputed names. We have our own doubts as to the three last being contemporaries of Krishnaraya, but we can learn from some of the works of these authors that the first five flourished in his time. We have already seen that our own two have dedicated their works to the king. The third must have been very young at the time, but he began to write, under the orders of the king, the Kathadaarasamhagraha, which was afterwards completed. It is not half so chaste and elegant as his later work the Ramabhyudaya. Dhurjati in his Krishnarajavijaya states certain facts about
the conquests of Krishnaraya over the Musalmān princes of Bijapur and Golconda, which he says were recorded by Mallana in his Bājāśēkharacharitra. We learn from the History of Kondavīḍu that Talaḷapāka Chinnana, the writer of the Ashāmahiśikalayya, flourished at the same period. But though Rāmarājabhūṣana and others are said to have flourished at this time, and though stories are current in the Telugu country to that effect, we learn a contrary state of things from a study of the inscriptions and from other more reliable sources. A study of the works themselves will confirm the inscriptions.

There is a story current that Timmarasu atīśa Appāji was a Niyōgi Brahma. Of all those, who by their own efforts and without usurpation of the rights of others, have raised themselves to a very high social position, there is no one the close of whose history presents so great a contrast to its commencement as that of Appāji. Left an orphan at a very early age he eked out a livelihood by tending cattle near Tirupati. And the story goes that while sleeping under the leafy spreading branches of a large banyan tree on a summer afternoon, a huge snake about the thickness of a walking stick emerged from the tree, approached the boy, and with its hood upraised prevented the sun’s rays from falling straight on his face. A wayfarer saw the incident, waited at a distance till the boy rose up from his sleep, informed him of what had happened, and requested him to remember him when he should attain an exalted position. The wayfarer was, it is said, Bhāṭṭamārti, a celebrated poet. But it can be proved, however, that they were not contemporaries!

We learn from a great many records that Krishnādēvarāya left no sons, while from one of the inscriptions we find that Achnyatarāya was his son, and from another that Sadāśivarāya was his son. But these are matters for further investigation.

The transactions that followed the death of Krishnaraya, says Wilson in his Catalogue of Mackenzie Collection, p. 87, are very unsatisfactorily related by native writers. The prince had no legitimate male children of his own, and the nearest heir, Achnyatarāya, who is variously termed his brother, cousin, and nephew, being absent, he placed a prince named Sadāśiva on the throne, under the charge of Rāmarāja, his own son-in-law. Achnyata returned and assumed the government, and on his death Sadāśiva succeeded under the care and control of Rāmarāja as before. There is in some statements an intimation of a short-lived usurpation by a person named Salika Timmana, and of the murder of the young prince who succeeded Krishnaraya in the first instance, and the Muhammadan accounts tend to show that some such transaction took place. On the downfall of the usurper, the succession proceeded as above described. The reigns of Achnyata and Sadāśiva and the contemporary existence of Rāmarāja are proved by numerous grants. Those of Achnyata extend over a period of twelve years, from 1530 to 1542 A. D., and those of Sadāśiva from 1542 to 1570, whilst those of Rāmarāja occur from 1547 to 1562.

Who Sadāśiva was, however, does not very distinctly appear. Some accounts call him the son of Achnyata, whilst others represent him as descended from the former Rājas of Vijayanagara; at any rate, it is evident that during Rāmarāja’s life he was but a puppet prince. According to Fariyhta, Rāmarāj was the son of Hēmrāj and son-in-law of a Rāja whom he names Sivaray erroneous for Krishnaray. Rāmaraya, he adds, succeeded on his father’s death to his office and power, and on the death of an infant Rāja, for whom he managed the affairs of the government, he placed another infant of the same family on the mansad, and committing the charge of the prince’s person to his maternal uncle, Hōji Trimmal, retained the political administration of the state. During his absence on a military excursion, the uncle of the Rāja and several nobles conspired against the minister, and gained to their party an officer of Rāmarāj, who was one of his slaves left in military charge of the capital. Finding the insurgents too strong for him Rāmarāj submitted to an amicable compromise with them, and was allowed to reside on his own territorial possessions. After a short interval, the slave, being no longer necessary, was murdered, and Trimmal, the uncle, assumed the whole power. He next killed his nephew, and reigned on his own behalf, conducting him-
self with great tyranny, so that the chiefs conspired to dethrone him, but with the assistance of Ibrahim 'Adil Sha'ah he was enabled to maintain his authority. On the retreat of his Musalmān allies, the Hindu nobles with Rāma rāja at their head again rebelled, defeated the usurper, and besieged him in his palace in Vijayanagara; when finding his fortune desperate, he destroyed himself. Rāma then became Rāja.

Now, comparing this with the Hindu accounts, we should be disposed to identify Hoji Trimmal with Achyutarāya. Some of the Hindu accounts, as above noticed, concur with the Muhammadan as to the murder of the young prince, and in Salika Timma we may have the slave of Rāma rāja, although the part assigned to him in both the stories does not exactly coincide. Rāma rāja, both agree, was obliged to resign the authority he held after Krishnārāya's death, and the only irreconcilable point is that Hindu accounts specify the appointment in the first instance of Sadāśiva. But the weight of evidence is unfavourable to their accuracy, and Sadāśiva was probably made Rāja by Rāma rāja and his party in opposition to Achyutarāya. This will account for the uncertainty that prevails as to his connection with Krishnārāya, as well as for his being taken, as some statements aver, from the family of the former Rāja. At the time of the demise of Krishnārāya, the kingdom of the Carnatic had reached its zenith, and Achyutarāya who succeeded him in 1530 A. D. added to the empire by subjugating Tinnevelly and other places.

We shall next enquire in detail of the poetical merits of the Achyuta-duggajas (?), who formed the beacon-lights of the court of the Andhra-Bhāja. The foremost of them was, as we have already seen, Allatani Peddana. He was a Pandavariya Niyog Bhāma, the son of Chokkana. He was born in the village of Dāranāla, in Dapad taluk, in the Bellary District. He was, as we have already seen, the Laureate at the court of Krishnādēvarāya. In his infancy he studied the Sanskrit and Telugu languages, and in due time obtained a critical knowledge of both these tongues, and was able to compose verses in either of them. His abilities procured him the situation of court poet to Nrisimhrāya, on which monarch he wrote several panegyrics. After his death, his son and successor, Krishnārāya, patronized him, and appointed him as one of his Asha-duggajas.

Peddana's Telugu poems are much esteemed for their harmony. He composed an elaborate work, entitled Svarōchisha Munucharitra, or more shortly Munucharitra, in four dicāsas. The poem deals with the following subject. A religious Brāhmaṇ, Pravarākhyā, an inhabitant of Mayapuri, felt an ardent desire to visit the summit of the Himālayas, and as it was impossible to proceed there by human ingenuity, he was anxious to satisfy his desire by some supernatural agency, and in consequence stopped every sanāśudān and traveller that he saw journeying thither, in order that he might obtain from them the secret, by which they were able to surmount all difficulties, and go to the mountain-top. He was in the habit of inviting these people to his house, and courteously to entertain them in hopes to obtain from them the secret. In this way there came a devotee to his abode, and as his manner was more than usually complaisant, the Brāhmaṇ strenuously besought him to furnish him with the means of proceeding to the summit of the Himālayas. The devotee acceded to his entreaties, and gave him the juice of a plant, which he rubbed on his feet, and desired him to soar up into the ethereal regions, repeating the name of the goddess. Pravarākhyā immediately soared up into the skies, not for a moment thinking how he was to return home, and when the juice on his feet was dried up, he lost the power of flying, and reamed about the beautiful gardens on the mountain-summit. While he was thus strolling about, he heard certain soft sweet notes, and proceeding thither, saw a beautiful Gandharva damsel, went up to her, and besought her to direct him in the right track. As he was very comely, and the damsel had never before beheld a human being, she fell in love with him, but was resolved to behave with reserve, so that he might not discover her real sentiments. She, therefore, reprimanded him for entering her bower without her permission, and told him to find the road out as well as he could for himself. The Brāhmaṇ, discouraged at the harsh tone in which the damsel spoke, made a precipitate
retreat, and making his way to a neighbouring grove, performed intense devotion to the god of fire, who, it is said, appeared to him under the semblance of a Brāhmaṇ and conveyed him to his own lodgings. Meanwhile the Gandharvā was inconsolable at his loss, having no idea that her behaviour to the Brāhmaṇ would have such a termination. She expressed her grief by dashing her head on the ground and rolling on the floor, and by various other deeds which showed the poignant of her affliction. A male Gandharva, in the interim, took the form of the Brāhmaṇ, came to her, and passing himself off for Pravarākhyā, enjoyed with her. She discovered the trick when too late, but resolved to be revenged. She became pregnant, and was in due time delivered, and the child waxed great, and became Svārochishya-Manu, the sovereign of Jambudvīpa.

In the introduction to the poem, Peddana takes an opportunity of expatiating on the valour of Krishnārya and describing his victories over his enemies, and chiefly over those of the Muslim faith. The poet must have survived the king probably by about five years and breathed his last about 1535 A.D. at his own residence at Doranala. The severe misfortune he experienced in the loss of his royal patron found a poetic expression in the very pathetic elegy he wrote on the occasion, in strains the more touching as they were really felt. The sorrow that he expressed was unfeigned on his part, as the munificence of his royal master, on many an occasion, created in the poet sentiments of the most fervent gratitude. The heir and successor of Krishnārya, Rānarāya, showed great kindness to the poet, who commanded a world of reverence and love from the king, and would utter verses only when he willed, and not at the royal command. His works are disseminated in every province where the Telugu language is spoken and understood, and there are few poets who gained more popularity during their lifetime and have been more esteemed by posterity than Allasāni Peddana. Tikkana (the writer of the later fifteen parts of the Mahābhārata in Telugu) excepted.

One day, when the court was full of poets of all descriptions, Peddana poured forth an impromptu verse at the request of the sovereign and displayed his equal knowledge of Telugu and Sanskrit languages and received marks of distinction from the king to the entire satisfaction of the people assembled, poets included. The poets had previously been contented with translations from the Sanskrit and had never tried their hands at original Telugu compositions. As Peddana was the pioneer of that movement, he was called "the grandair of Telugu Bards." He gathered materials from a scrap of the Markandeya Purāṇa, and wrote an original poem, the first of its kind, — the Svārochishya Manucharitra, and from his time to that of Rāmarāja-bhūṣaṇa, the writer of the Vasucharitra, the poets one and all followed his footsteps.

He was treated more or less as a sort of feudatory prince, and was presented with a good many agrahāras, the chief of which was Kōkata. Though by birth a Smārta, he was a latitudinarian in religion. This is borne testimony by the following inscription found in Col. Mackenzie’s Manuscript Collections: — "Allasāni Peddana, a Brāhmaṇ, a Nandavarika, the son of Chokkarājha. The village of Kōkata conferred on him by king Krishnā Deva Roya, was given over by the poet to a certain number of Vaishnavas. The new appellation which the village received was Satagōpurā. In S. S. 1440, on the 15th day of the white fortnight of Vaisākha (i.e., full-moon day) of the year Bahudhānya, the poet raised a stone inscription in Sarvākāśvara Swami temple of the place, that he gave over land yielding two puṇṇis for purposes of daily oblations. The next year on the twelfth day (āvādira) of the white fortnight of Karttika, he gave land yielding four puṇṇis and a half to Channakesava Swami and raised an inscription to that effect . . . After the time of Krishna Deva Roya, i.e., during the time of Sadasiva Roya and Krishnā Roya, and Mallu Ananta Roya of Nandyal, this Kōkata Agrahāra became the exclusive property of Bhrāmans."

It is said that Peddana has written a poem entitled Harikathāśāra, but we know of it only from fragments that have come down to us of the work in the Raṣṭārgaṇḍhandas and other treatises on Rhetoric. He was the first to introduce a large influx of Muhammadan and other words of foreign origin into serious composition in Telugu, and more or less thoroughly
naturalised them. His contemporaries followed his footsteps in this direction also. A critic on his *Manucharitra* finds fault with him for having plagiarised from the *Naishadha* and *Márvánódha Purāṇa*. It is true that he has taken the plot of his poem from the *Śvardeśika Manasaśambhava* in the *Márvánódha Purāṇa*, and that he has imitated in certain methods of expression Márana, the Telugu translator of the aforesaid purāṇa. From a study of Peddana's poem itself, also, numerous instances can be found, shewing that he had the greatest regard for Srinatha and his *Naishadha*, and that he, to a major extent, modelled his expression after the fashion of the *Naishadha*. Srinatha was the first to introduce long Sanskrit *samāsas* into Telugu poetry, and there can be no gainsaying that Peddana stuffed his poem, the fourth *divśasa* excepted, with long-tailed Sanskrit *samāsas*, the result of a careful study of the work of Srinatha. We have no reason, however, on this account, I think, to find fault with Peddana, and charge him with plagiarism. Indeed, the system of borrowing expressions from the older poets is in vogue down to the present day. There are certain stories current of Tenali Rāmakrishṇa finding fault with Peddana for certain stanzas of his, but such stories are far from being credible, considering the times in which both of them flourished, and the reputation the latter enjoyed in and out of the king's court and the way in which he put poetical queries to people who visited the place to receive royal presents.

The poet next in importance was Nandi Tirmmana. He was a Niyogi Brāhmaṇa of the *Āpastamba sūtra*, Kauśika *gōtra*, and the son of Nandi Siṅgana and Tirmāmbā. He was a pure Saiva and the disciple of Aghorāgarā. He was the nephew of Malayāmārāla, the writer of the *Varāha Purāṇa*. He was a native of the village called Gannavara. He composed a work called the *Pārijātāpāharana*, in which is recorded the story of Śri Kṛṣṇa procuring the *pārijāta* flower from the garden of Indra through the sage Nārada, for his consort Rukmiṇī. The poem consists of three *divśasas* written in a smooth, elegant style, and the images and similes are very bold and striking.

There is a curious story current regarding the circumstances under which the poem was written. It is said that on a certain night after supper the king held court till midnight, and then retired to bed. His wife who remained a long while conversing with her female friends, waiting for her husband, at last retired to bed as it was very late. Her female friends then covered her with a sheet and went their own ways. Kṛṣṇarāya then entered the room, and reclined on his bed. Not long after his wife's feet came in contact with his ears. The king immediately rose, surveyed the room, saw the sleeping posture of his spouse, and, bitter with rage, stood pondering thus within himself: — “How hard-hearted are women? Perhaps she was angry with me for having delayed so long. It does not matter much if she is angry, but she has tried to insult me. She will not do so in future, if I punish her now.” Grinding his teeth, he resolved to punish her very severely, and went and slept in a different room. The queen heard of what had transpired from her maid-servants, was sore afraid, and remained disconsolate. Nandi Tirmmana, the poet who accompanied her from her father's household, understood that something was wrong from her face, approached her in secret, and requested her to inform him of what troubled her. She replied that her very life would be at stake if the secrets of the seraglio got abroad, that she would have to suffer according to her past *karma*, and that he need not trouble himself about her trouble. He assured her that he would hide her secret, and devise means for an amicable settlement, and that he was of no use to her if he could not render such thrilling help, being an intimate friend of her father. The queen then informed him of what had happened, sobbing from very heaviness of heart. The poet consoled her, assured her that within a week everything would go on smoothly, and that her husband would pardon her. He then went home and thought seriously of the difficulty of his undertaking, prayed to his deity, and came to a resolve that he would write a poem in which he would incidentally give full expression as to what he had undertaken to do and thus bring the king over to his side. He, therefore, took the story of Pārijātāpāharana, and composed a poem on the subject, and accomplished his object in the very first *divśasa*. He then finished the.
poem and informed the king, who, on an auspicious occasion, ordered Timmana to read his poem. In the course of the reading, Timmana narrated how Nárada, on a visit to Srl Krísha, gave him a párvitá flower, which was given over by the latter to Rukmiñi, how Satyabháma, another wife of Srl Krísha, became enraged at it, and abused Srl Krísha for his partiality, how she kicked him on the forehead with her left leg, how the latter tried to console the former instead of feeling angry with her, and so on. This immediately recalled to the king’s mind his quarrel with the queen. He became very sorry for his past conduct, and desired to effect a compromise with his spouse. The poet understanding the accomplishment of his object from the expression of the king’s face, was right glad, and, at the special request of the king, continued his poem. After the court was dispersed, the king went and lived happily with his queen. The matter was communicated very confidentially to the poet by the queen next morning, who, when he heard it, was exceedingly glad.

(To be continued.)

FOLKLORE IN SALSETTE.

BY GEO. P. D’PENHA.

No. 21. — The Louse and the Rat.

A New Cumulative Rhyme.

A louse was once going to seek, as she said, pót bharon khává pivála ani áng bharon kapré, a bellyful of food and clothes to cover her body. As she was trudging on slowly she was met by a dog, who said: — "Vu bái, Vu bái, káhá go záté? Sister louse, sister louse, where are you going?"

The louse answered: — "Zátaív saavá mílél pót bharon khává pivála ani áng bharon kapré, I am going where I can get a bellyful of food and clothes to cover my body."

Upon this the dog said: — "Chal mánjé sánátí, Come with me."

But the louse said: — "Kón ál tuje sánátí? Tulá kóni márloan kelañ mhanje tum bhu bhu bhu karíil ani páláil; mangam ni kavár sáun? Who will come with you? Should any one beat you, you will cry ‘bow bow wow wow’ and run away; where shall I go to then?"

So saying the louse resumed her slow walk, and as she walked and walked and walked, she came across a cat who said to her: — "Vu bái,Vu bái, káhá go záté? Sister louse, sister louse, where are you going?"

And the louse answered: — "Zátaív saavá mílél pót bharon khává pivála ani áng bharon kapré, I am going where I can get a bellyful of food and clothes to cover my body."

Hearing this the cat said: — "Chal mánjé sánátí, Come with me."

Whereupon the louse replied: — "Kón ál tuje sánátí? Tulá kóni márloan kelañ mhanje tum mew mew karíil ani páláil; mangam ni kavár sáun? Who will come with you? Should any one beat you, you will cry ‘mew mew’ and run away, where shall I go to then?"

Having thus spoken she went her way, and again she walked and walked and walked. On her way she met many animals who all asked her where she was going, and who, on being told of her errand, asked her to go with them, but she refused every offer. At last, as she was still walking and walking, she came upon a rat, who asked her: — "Vu bái, Vu bái, káhá go záté? Sister louse, sister louse, where are you going?"

The louse answered: — "Zátaív saavá mílél pót bharon khává pivála ani áng bharon kapré, I am going where I can get a bellyful of food and clothes to cover my body."

The rat hearing this said: — "Chal mánjé sánátí, Come with me."

Now the louse knew that a rat must be living comfortably, with plenty of food to eat and clothes to wear. So she accepted the rat’s offer and went into a hole in which the rat dwelt.
There, as she had anticipated, the louse found plenty of all things — food as well as clothes, — and lived happily for some time.

One day the louse said she would make āḍfolaṅ! if the rat would fetch some rice and spices and jaggree. The rat went about and soon brought what was necessary from shops and elsewhere, and handed it to the louse, who set about making the āḍfolaṅ. As the āḍfolaṅ was cooking, the rate smelt a fine savour, which made him restless as to when it would be ready, so that he might eat it. The louse, who observed the restlessness of the rat, and knew well the greedy propensities of that animal, warned him not to peep into the pot, as he might possibly fall inside. Having thus warned the rat, the louse went to fetch water. As the āḍfolaṅ became more and more savoury in the course of the cooking, the rat became more and more restless, so restless that he could restrain himself no longer, and, disregarding the warning of the louse, got up on the oven to have a look at the āḍfolaṅ, but down he fell in the pot and died.

When the louse returned with water she missed the rat, and easily guessed that he had not heeded to her warning: and right enough, on looking, she found him dead in the pot in which the āḍfolaṅ was being cooked. But what was to be done now? She threw away the āḍfolaṅ, dug a hole near a hedge, and buried the rat. In digging the hole, some of the roots of the trees that formed the hedge were cut up, and consequently the trees became somewhat shaky.

Now it happened that a bagla (a crane) was in the habit of every day coming and taking his stand on one of the trees. For many a day the crane had found the tree steady, and was, therefore, surprised when it shook as he alighted on it, and thought to himself: — "Kāl mi ỉd ūd rāv ḫālān te en ḫār ḫālāt Ṽālān, dā ḫālān te ḫār ḫālāt, Yesterday when I sat upon this tree it did not shake, but to-day as I sat down it shook." So he asked the tree for the reason of it.

The tree replied: — "Undir māmu mel te oichī Ḫāṭtī gārīle, oi reli mulān vin, ani baglaṅ ḫelaṅ pīṇān vin, Uncle rat died and was buried at the side of the hedge, so the hedge became rootless, and the crane became featherless."

Upon hearing this, "gal gal gal gal" the crane dropped all his feathers and flew away and alighted upon a banyan tree. The banyan tree which had often seen the crane before with his feathers on, now began to wonder at seeing him featherless, and began to think within itself: — "Kāl en baglaṅ āṭlān te tiṅlā pīṇān hot, ḫālān te tiṅlā pīṇān nāi, Yesterday when this crane came he had feathers, to-day he has come, but he has no feathers" — and the tree asked the crane for the reason of it.

Said the crane: — "Undir māmu mel te oichī Ḫāṭtī gārīle, oi reli mulān vin, baglaṅ ḫelaṅ pīṇān vin, ani vīr ḫeḷā pāṅān vin, Uncle rat died and was buried at the side of the hedge, so the hedge became rootless, the crane became featherless, and the banyan tree became leafless."

Upon this "khal khal khal khal" fell off all the leaves of the banyan tree. Now a horse, that was in the habit of grazing in that part of the forest, often took protection from the rays of the sun under that tree, and was quite surprised to see the tree leafless. The horse began to think over the matter, and thought within itself: — "Kāl āṭlān te ḫeḷā vīrāṅ pāṅān hot, ḫālān ani bagīlān te pīṇān nāi, Yesterday when I came I saw that the tree had leaves, to-day when I come I see that there are no leaves upon it." So he asked the tree for the reason of it.

The tree replied: — "Undir māmu mel te oichī Ḫāṭtī gārīle, oi reli mulān vin, baglaṅ ḫelaṅ pīṇān vin, vīr ḫeḷā pāṅān vin, ani ḫeḷā vīrāṅ kāṅān vin, Uncle rat died and was buried at the side of the hedge, so the hedge became rootless, the crane became featherless, the banyan tree became leafless, and the horse became earless."

---

1 This is a sort of gruel, prepared out of new rice, with the addition of jaggree and some ingredients such as cardamom to sweeten and lend flavour to it. Almost every Bombay East Indian family makes āḍfolaṅ on All Souls' Day.
As soon as the horse heard this, he dropped his ears! Having done this, the horse went, as was his wont, to a tank close by to drink water. When the tank saw the horse without his ears, it began to wonder, and to think thus: — "Kál o ghórā úlā te tiúlā kán hote, ús úlā te tiúlā kán nai. Yesterday when this horse came he had ears, to-day he has come but he has no ears" — and the tank asked the horse for the reason of it.

And the horse replied: — "Undır mámā mele te oiche faṭṭī gārile, oī remlā mūla dī vin, bagloh relān pīnānā dī vin, vōr remlā pānānā dī vin, ghórā remlā kānānā dī vin, ani talah relih pānānā dī vin, Uncle rat died and was buried at the side of the hedge, so the hedge became rootless, the crane became featherless, the banyan tree became leafless, the horse became earless, and the tank became waterless (dried up)."

Scarcely had the horse finished his tale, when the water in the tank dried up. An old groom, who drew his daily water-supply from the tank, came to fetch water, and was surprised to see all the water dried up. Thought he to himself: — "Kál álūnā te talah bharīlah hāta, as bagītānā te suklaśanā, Yesterday when I came the tank was full, and to-day I see that it has dried up" — and the groom asked the tank for the reason of it.

The tank replied: — "Undır mámā mele te oiche faṭṭī gārile, oī remlā mūla dī vin, bagloh relān pīnānā dī vin, vōr remlā pānānā dī vin, ghórā remlā kānānā dī vin, talah relih pānānā dī vin, ani ghorevālā relih sosā dī vin, Uncle rat died and was buried at the side of the hedge, so the hedge became rootless, the crane became featherless, the banyan tree became leafless, the horse became earless the tank dried up, and the groom must remain without quenching his thirst."

When the old groom heard this story, he was so overcome with grief that he dashed his head against a stone on the edge of the tank, and then, wonder of wonders! the tank immediately filled with water, the horse got back his ears, the banyan tree its leaves, the crane his feathers, and the hedge its roots!

---

**NOTES ON MARATHA FOLKLORE.**

*When a Marāṭhā gets up in the morning, he will not allow the first sight to be the face of a widow. If he sees one accidentally, that day is supposed to pass not without much friction. To see the face of a baby or child early in the morning, is considered to be very lucky. Some people, as soon as they awake, take the name of God, and then look at the palms of both hands. The finger ends are supposed to be the seat of Lakṣmī (Goddess of Wealth), the palm that of Śrīsapati (Goddess of Learning), and the wrist is supposed to be the seat of the Almighty. Some repeat some ennobling poems for an hour or so. After washing their mouths in the morning they utter the twelve names of Arjun — the beloved of Śrī Kṛśna. The name of that great hero of the Paṇḍava Age is supposed to do away with all calamities, and to lead to success. Then they utter the names of the five virtuous, much eulogised, women — Ahilyā, Draupāti, Śīlā, Tārā and Ṣāndārtī. Their names are supposed to have the power of expiating all sin.*

*A man going on an important business will not allow the first sight to be the face of a widow. But if he accidentally does so, the object looked for will not be attained. On stepping out of the house, if he first sees a virgin or a woman coming towards him with a pot full of water, it is considered to be very auspicious. The simplest rule — as it obtains among the Marāṭhās — is to take the name of God and then go to work.*

*Whenever any one writes a letter or any other important paper he puts on a turban or a cap on his head. Mourners write such things bareheaded.*

*Unwelcome or shocking news is not given to a man while he is taking his meals. The object of this is not to disturb the feelings of anybody while he is taking his meals. Letters are not read while a meal is being taken.*

*Men in mourning do not put on their turbans. They tie a dhōtī round the head. Females in mourning do not apply kunkum (a vermillion spot, the sign of wifeshood) to the forehead. They neither put on their ornaments, nor comb their hair, as long as the mourning lasts. Toilet is strictly prohibited in mourning. Sweetmeats are not taken nor holidays are observed, out of respect to the memory of the deceased. When a*
man dies, his friends and relatives go to his house and console the members of the family. They allude to the virtues and keen intellect of the departed, and then say that they were very much aggrieved when they heard the news. The feelings of the family, especially women, being touched, they begin to cry. They are then told that the world is all mayā or illusion. It is just like a bājad, where we come for business and then depart. Death is sure to overtake everybody and what happens is through the will of God. No marriages or other festivities take place in the house of mourning for at least six months. The family is even prohibited from cooking rich dishes. If the neighbours, especially women, see that they do so, they murmur and taunt the family with having no respect to the memory of the deceased. If a father or mother dies, the eldest son abstains from going to parties or other entertainments at his friends or other relatives. He sleeps on a hard bed, and does not put on shoes for a year. Lamps, drinking pots, dhōṭis, bedding and other clothes are given in charity. It is said that the soul of the dead requires a year to go to heaven.

On the tenth day after the death of a person, his relatives go to a river and make small balls of rice, which, after some ceremonies, are thrown to crows to eat. If the crows do not come, they say that some desire of the deceased remains unfulfilled. Judging from the character and wishes of the dead, they guess what these may be. They then express every likely desire one by one, and call on the crows to eat the balls. When a crow touches a ball, the desire named at the time is considered to be unfulfilled. They guarantee to fulfil that desire themselves, and then leave the place for home. Two days after they give a sumptuous banquet to their caste-fellows in the name of the dead.

If the father or mother of a person dies within six or eight months of the date of his marriage, the bride is considered to be unlucky. They say that the family did not fare well on account of her coming to their house. But if the family, gains some pecuniary ends during the said period, they attribute that incident to her presence.

Among Marāthās, the husband and wife never address each other by their names. Life is supposed to be shortened if they so address each other. This supposition, I believe, has grown out of the modesty peculiar to the Marāthā society.¹

A Brāhmaṇ will not drink water or eat anything, when his sacred thread is broken asunder. A married woman will not go out of the house unless there is kunku (sign of wifehood) on her forehead. She will not drink water if the mangal strā (small beads of glass with golden beads in the middle threaded together and tied by the husband round the neck of his wife at the time of marriage) is broken asunder.

The mother of the bridegroom is very much respected and honoured by that of the bride. The latter has, on one occasion in the marriage ceremony, to wash the feet of the former.

When the bride comes to the house of her husband, a new name is given her. The bride is then introduced to the friends and relatives of her husband. The couple have to go to the shrines of their family gods. The Bāstras enjoin that, whenever a man makes a pilgrimage to any holy place, he should be accompanied by his wife. If he disregards this injunction, his act is not considered to be meritorious. At sacred places,—especially at Banaras—they vow not to eat for the rest of their lives certain vegetables and fruit.

On the fifth day of the birth of a child the goddess Sati is supposed to write the future career of the child on its forehead. The goddess is therefore worshipped and invoked to make the future of the child as brilliant and successful as possible. On the twelfth day, a name is given to the child, and sugar distributed amongst friends and relatives.

A mother, while applying lamplight to the eyes of her child, applies the same a little to its cheek. The object of this peculiar act is that the child should not suffer from the glance of the Evil Eye. When a child cries too much the mother attributes it to the effect of the Evil Eye. She then takes a little salt and chillies and removes (by uttering certain charms) the blast of the Evil Eye.

A widow wears a red, yellow or orange-coloured sārī. She is prohibited from wearing black or semi-black coloured sārīs, and from putting on ornaments or jewels on her person. The object of such a prohibition seems to be that she should not make herself attractive by putting on ornaments, or rich and fancy clothes. Child-widows keep their hair, put on ornaments, and wear any sārīs they like. The father or mother see to this, that being the only kindness which they can show to their beloved child.

Sārīs worn at night are considered unclean, and are not touched so long as the morning meal is not over.

Women generally worship the tulasi (a sacred plant) and Rāgnāth (the idol of Śri Kṛishna).

¹ [It is, however, a custom common to all India.—Ed.]
In the morning they bathe, change their sārās, and, before eating anything, attend to the worship. They pray and implore for the longevity and welfare of their husbands. A virgin prays for a virtuous and good husband. In the evening, males as well as females go to temples.

In chatur maesa (i.e., four months in a year) Purāṇas are everywhere read, and Kirtanās (religious lectures accompanied by singing) celebrated. A woman generally takes up some vrata, i.e., she vows to give daily some article of food in charity; to supply some articles of worship to a temple; to abstain from eating some articles of food during the said period. She chooses such vrata as the means of her husband will permit or as will be compatible with her health. Some women make it a rule throughout life to utter the name of Rām before eating anything. When anybody commits sin inadvertently, or hears any horrible news, he says:—

"विष्णुनाम: " (we bow to the God Vishnu).

The bride and bridegroom tie to the hand of each other a kankū, which is a sign of the life-long bonds of union. They have also to walk seven steps together and utter some mantras to the effect that mutual love should be genuine and that they should contribute to the welfare of each other.

A pregnant woman is very sumptuously fed, and all her desires are attended to. Clothes of her liking are also supplied her. Her desires and likings are supposed to have effect on that of her child. If any of her desires be thwarted, the child will subsequently hanker after the desired object.

A woman is called the "Lakshmi of the house." If a husband unnecessarily abuses his wife the Goddess of Wealth (Lakshmi) will not smile on him. On the contrary he will be cursed and destined to drag a miserable existence.

Before going to stay in a newly-built house, a religious ceremony is performed. The object of this ceremony is two-fold: to pacify the evil spirit if the house is haunted by one, and to pray that the new house should be propitious to the family.

If a crow enters a house, it is considered to be polluted, and a religious ceremony is prescribed for its purification. It is a great sin, in the eyes of a Marāṭhā, to see a couple of crows sitting together. If anybody kills a cat, the penance for his sin is to go on a pilgrimage to Bāndara. To hear the hooting of an owl is considered to portend evil.

At the time of bathing, a Marāṭhā invokes the rivers Ganga, Yamuna, Godavari, Narmadā and other Tirthās to come to his bathing water and to expiate his sins.

The morning and the evening times are considered to be sacred, and everybody tries then to speak truth and to avoid bad language.

Y. S. Vatikar.

NOTES AND QUERIES.

CYPAYE AND BAILLAREDEE.

Here are two extracts from the Journal of M. Flouest, 1782-6, in Burma, which by the way is full of valuable Indo-European expressions, giving new forms, not to be found in Yule's Hobson-Jobson, for two well-known words:—

Sopy.

"Je reçu (le 7 Janvier, 1785) les ordres de ce général de partir le 12 pour l'établissement de Karikal, d'embarquer le mât de pavillon, l'artillerie, les vivres et 400 cyphœs commandées par M. Hobillard avec dix officiers passagers."—

Young Pao, Vol. I. p. 204.

Bayadère.

(Bayadère is not a real Indo-European, but a Franco-Portuguese term.)

"Lorsque tout est préparé, orné et décoré avec art, ils donnent un festin, font jouer la comédie, ensuite ils donnent un bal ou figurent les Baillardères . . . Femmes qui sont appelées à toutes les ceremonies pour danser."—

Young Pao, Vol. II. p. 15.

R. C. Temple.

MARATHA MARRIAGES IN HIGH LIFE—

SUDRA CASTE—BRIDEGROOM'S PROCESSION.

On his way to the bride's house, the bridegroom stops at the Māruti (temple of Hanumān) to rest and make his devotion. Every village in Western India possesses one. The Gāyakwārs of Baroda halt at Rajrajaswar, a well known temple to Mahādeva in Baroda, containing also a shrine to Māruti (Hanumān, the monkey-god). A brother or some very near relative of the bridegroom precedes him, carrying in procession to the bride jewellery, a sari (robe), and a chôdi (bodice). On arrival he is feasted, but returns in time to meet the bridegroom with people from the Māruti to invest him with the pāshak (dress of honor). The whole cavalcade then proceeds to the bride's house, so as to reach it at the appointed hour, the bridegroom being mounted on a charger or an elephant.

The Late B. V. Shastri in P. N. and Q. 1883.
ESSAYS ON KASMIRI GRAMMAR.

BY THE LATE KARL FRIEDRICH BURKHARDT.

Translated and edited, with notes and additions,
by G. A. Grierson, Ph.D., C.I.E., I.C.S.

(Continued from p. 232.)

PARAGRAPHS.

202. 1st Declension (Masculine, a base).

\[ \textit{tsür}, \text{thief, Oblique base } \textit{čůr} \textit{tsura}. \]

| Nom. \( \textit{čůr} \text{tsür, the thief, } \textit{ք-more ak} \textit{tsürak, a thief} ... | Plural. \( \textit{čůr} \textit{tsür} \)
|---|---|
| Voc. \( \textit{čůr} \textit{tsür} \text{ or } \textit{čůr} \textit{tsür, O thief!} ... | ... \( \textit{čůr} \textit{tsürau} \)
| Acc. \( \textit{čůr} \textit{tsür} \text{, a thief} ... | ... \( \textit{čůr} \textit{tsür} \)
| Instr. \( \textit{čůr} \textit{tsüran, by a thief} ... | ... \( \textit{čůr} \textit{tsürau} \)
| Dat. \( \textit{čůr} \textit{tsüras, to a thief} ... | ... \( \textit{čůr} \textit{tsüran} \)
| Abl. \( \textit{čůr} \textit{tsüras} \text{[gur] nishq, from a thief} ... | ... \( \textit{čůr} \textit{tsürau nishq} \)
| Gen. \( \textit{čůr} \textit{tsür} \text{sond, etc. (see §§ 198 and 206), a thief's} ... | ... \( \textit{čůr} \textit{tsüran hond, etc.} \)
| Loc. \( \textit{čůr} \textit{tsüras mans, in a thief} ... | ... \( \textit{čůr} \textit{tsüran mans} \)

Example of a noun of action. — \( \textit{dün} \text{ diun, to give; Nom. acc. } \textit{dün} \text{ diun; Dat. } \textit{dün} \text{ diun, etc.} \)

203. 2nd Declension (Masculine, i base).

\[ \textit{čůl} \text{ kul, tree, Oblique base } \textit{čůl} \textit{kuli}. \]

| Nom. \( \textit{čůl} \textit{kul}, the tree, } \textit{čůl} \textit{kulak, a tree ... | Plural. \( \textit{čůl} \textit{kuli} \)
|---|---|
| Voc. \( \textit{čůl} \textit{kuli} \text{ or } \textit{čůl} \textit{kuli, O tree!} ... | ... \( \textit{čůl} \textit{kuli} \text{au} \)
| Acc. \( \textit{čůl} \textit{kul}, a tree ... | ... \( \textit{čůl} \textit{kuli} \)
| Instr. \( \textit{čůl} \textit{kuli, by a tree...} ... | ... \( \textit{čůl} \textit{kuli} \text{au} \)
| Dat. \( \textit{čůl} \textit{kulis, to a tree ...} | ... \( \textit{čůl} \textit{kulen} \)
| Abl. \( \textit{čůl} \textit{kuli} \text{[guris] nishq, from a tree ...} | ... \( \textit{čůl} \textit{kuli} \text{au nishq} \)
| Gen. \( \textit{čůl} \textit{kuli} \text{uk, etc. (see §§ 198 and 206), of a tree ...} | ... \( \textit{čůl} \textit{kulen hond} \)
| Loc. \( \textit{čůl} \textit{kulis mans, in a tree ...} | ... \( \textit{čůl} \textit{kulen mans} \)

The Genuitive will be dealt with separately, hereafter.
204. 3rd Declension (Feminine, i base).

\[\text{kūr, a daughter, Oblique base } \text{kōrī.}\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nom.  \text{kūr, the daughter, } \text{kōrah, a daughter...} &amp; \text{kōrī}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voc.  \text{kōrī or } \text{kōrī, O daughter!} &amp; \text{kōryau}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc.  \text{kūr, a daughter} &amp; \text{kōrī}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instr.  \text{kōrī, by a daughter...} &amp; \text{kōryau}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dat.  \text{kōrī, to a daughter...} &amp; \text{kōren}\text{75}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abl.  \text{kōrī nisha, from a daughter...} &amp; \text{kōryau nisha}\text{76}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen.  \text{kōrī hond, etc. (see §§ 198 and 206), of a daughter.} &amp; \text{kōrī hond, etc. (see §§ 198 and 206), of a daughter.}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loc.  \text{kōrī mans, in a daughter...} &amp; \text{kōren mans}\text{75}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[This Hindū grammarian Īśvara-kaula, in his Kaśmīra-kabaddārītā, makes the oblique base of the dative, genitive and locative singular, and the nominative and accusative plural, in this declension, end in e not i. Thus kōre hond, kōre mans, kōre, kōre. This does not apply to the instrumental or ablative singular. This refinement of pronunciation does not seem to prevail amongst Musalmāns.]

205. 4th Declension (Feminine, a and a base).

\[\text{gād, a fish, Oblique bases, } \text{gādi (sg.), } \text{gāda (pl.).}\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nom.  \text{gād, the fish, } \text{gādah, a fish...} &amp; \text{gāda}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voc.  \text{gādi, or } \text{gādi, O fish!} &amp; \text{gādau}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc.  \text{gād, a fish} &amp; \text{gāda}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instr.  \text{gādi, by the fish} &amp; \text{gādau}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dat.  \text{gādi, to the fish} &amp; \text{gādan}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abl.  \text{gādi nisha, from the fish} &amp; \text{gādau nisha}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen.  \text{gādi hond, etc. (see §§ 198 and 206), of a fish...} &amp; \text{gādau hond}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loc.  \text{gādi mans, in a fish...} &amp; \text{gādau mans}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\text{75 On account of the frequent interchange of } \text{a} \text{ and } \text{a}, \text{ we find, side by side in Np., forms like } \text{gāda.}\]

\text{76 Abl. kōryau nisha, from } \text{gādau, the eye (cf. the 1st Declension). [The correct form is } \text{gādau nisha.]}\]
208. The Genitive of the four Declensions.

There are four possible cases in each instance:—

(a) When the governing noun is in the masculine singular.
(b) When it is in the feminine singular.
(c) When it is in the masculine plural.
(d) When it is in the feminine plural.

Thus:—

1st Declension.
[Animate Noun.]

Singular.

(a) सन्न सन्द...
(b) सन्ज सन्ज...
(c) सन्द सन्ज...
(d) सन्ज सन्ज...

1st Declension.
[Inanimate Noun.]

Plural.

(a) होह होह...
(b) होह होह...
(c) होह होह...
(d) होह होह...

[An example of the case of an inanimate noun of this declension is मुल-उक, मुल-ख, मुल-खि, मुल-खेच, of a root; plural, मुलान होह, etc.]

2nd Declension.
[Inanimate Noun.]

Singular.

(a) युक युक...
(b) ज़ुक ज़ुक...
(c) ज़ुक ज़ुक...
(d) ज़ुक ज़ुक...

2nd Declension.
[Inanimate Noun.]

Plural.

(a) होह होह...
(b) होह होह...
(c) होह होह...
(d) होह होह...

[An example of an animate noun of this declension is गुरी, सोंद, etc., of a horse; plural, गुरें होह, etc.]
### 3rd Declension

[Animate or Inanimate.]

**Singular.**

(a) 

(b) 

(c) 

(d) 

**Plural.**

(a) 

(b) 

(c) 

(d) 

### 4th Declension

[Animate or Inanimate.]

**Singular.**

(a) 

(b) 

(c) 

(d) 

**Plural.**

(a) 

(b) 

(c) 

(d)
207. The following are examples of the use of the Genitive:

1. Governing noun, and noun in Genitive, both masculine:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>سند</th>
<th>سند</th>
<th>لوکر</th>
<th>لوکر</th>
<th>دناکارا</th>
<th>دناکارا</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the master of the servant</td>
<td>the master of the servants</td>
<td>the masters of the servants</td>
<td>the masters of the servants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>کہد</th>
<th>کہد</th>
<th>لوکر</th>
<th>لوکر</th>
<th>دناکارا</th>
<th>دناکارا</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the master of the servant</td>
<td>the master of the servants</td>
<td>the masters of the servants</td>
<td>the masters of the servants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Governing noun, feminine; and masculine noun in Genitive:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>سند کتاب</th>
<th>سند کتاب</th>
<th>دناکارا</th>
<th>دناکارا</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the book of the servant</td>
<td>the books of the servants</td>
<td>the book of the servants</td>
<td>the books of the servants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>کہد کتاب</th>
<th>کہد کتاب</th>
<th>لوکر کتاب</th>
<th>لوکر کتاب</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the servant of the daughter</td>
<td>the servants of the daughter</td>
<td>the servants of the daughter</td>
<td>the servants of the daughter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Governing noun, masculine; and feminine noun in Genitive:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>کہد</th>
<th>کہد</th>
<th>لوکر</th>
<th>لوکر</th>
<th>دناکارا</th>
<th>دناکارا</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the servant of the daughter</td>
<td>the servants of the daughter</td>
<td>the servants of the daughter</td>
<td>the servants of the daughter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>کہد</th>
<th>کہد</th>
<th>لوکر</th>
<th>لوکر</th>
<th>دناکارا</th>
<th>دناکارا</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the servant of the daughter</td>
<td>the servants of the daughter</td>
<td>the servants of the daughter</td>
<td>the servants of the daughter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Governing noun, and noun in Genitive, both feminine:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>دناکارا</th>
<th>دناکارا</th>
<th>کہر</th>
<th>کہر</th>
<th>دناکارا</th>
<th>دناکارا</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the book of the daughter</td>
<td>the books of the daughters</td>
<td>the book of the daughters</td>
<td>the books of the daughters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>دناکارا</th>
<th>دناکارا</th>
<th>کہر</th>
<th>کہر</th>
<th>دناکارا</th>
<th>دناکارا</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the book of the daughter</td>
<td>the books of the daughters</td>
<td>the book of the daughters</td>
<td>the books of the daughters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The governing noun has often to be understood; e.g., "ای کیہ خانہ عامہک نہ کہی" ai kāṣh τσք ṣānahak τι(q) kathe yīmā chāni salāmāt khaṇqā chhe (sg. ḫāṭhī khaṭhī), if thou hadst known the things which belong unto thy peace (Luke, xix. 42).
208. Declension of the words सद and सन्द, etc., which indicate the genitive. The masculine forms are declined according to the second, and the feminine forms according to the third declension.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>सन्द</td>
<td>गौद</td>
<td>सन्द</td>
<td>गौद</td>
<td>सन्द</td>
<td>सन्द</td>
<td>सन्द</td>
<td>सन्द</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>हौद</td>
<td>हौद</td>
<td>हौद</td>
<td>हौद</td>
<td>हौद</td>
<td>हौद</td>
<td>हौद</td>
<td>हौद</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>सन्द</td>
<td>सन्द</td>
<td>सन्द</td>
<td>सन्द</td>
<td>सन्द</td>
<td>सन्द</td>
<td>सन्द</td>
<td>सन्द</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Governed Noun in Singular, Masculine:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>हौद</td>
<td>हौद</td>
<td>हौद</td>
<td>हौद</td>
<td>हौद</td>
<td>हौद</td>
<td>हौद</td>
<td>हौद</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>हौद</td>
<td>हौद</td>
<td>हौद</td>
<td>हौद</td>
<td>हौद</td>
<td>हौद</td>
<td>हौद</td>
<td>हौद</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>हौद</td>
<td>हौद</td>
<td>हौद</td>
<td>हौद</td>
<td>हौद</td>
<td>हौद</td>
<td>हौद</td>
<td>हौद</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Governed Noun in Plural, Masculine:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>हौद</td>
<td>हौद</td>
<td>हौद</td>
<td>हौद</td>
<td>हौद</td>
<td>हौद</td>
<td>हौद</td>
<td>हौद</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>हौद</td>
<td>हौद</td>
<td>हौद</td>
<td>हौद</td>
<td>हौद</td>
<td>हौद</td>
<td>हौद</td>
<td>हौद</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>हौद</td>
<td>हौद</td>
<td>हौद</td>
<td>हौद</td>
<td>हौद</td>
<td>हौद</td>
<td>हौद</td>
<td>हौद</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case</td>
<td>Plural</td>
<td>Singular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nom.</td>
<td>غرک</td>
<td>غرک, of a house</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instr.</td>
<td>غرک</td>
<td>غرک</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dat.</td>
<td>غرکس</td>
<td>غرکس</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abl.</td>
<td>غرکی</td>
<td>غرکی</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen.</td>
<td>غرک</td>
<td>غرک</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loc.</td>
<td>غرک</td>
<td>غرک</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.**—Before prepositions (post-positions) which are properly substantives (such as ***سَبَابِي*** ِ ***sababi***, by the reason, ِ ***i. e.***, on account of; ***مَرْفَاتِي*** ِ ***marfati***, by the means of, ِ ***i.e.***, through; ***کُوُرِی***, with the intention (i. e., for), before the word ***کُوُری***, then, used with a comparative, and before adjectives in ِ ***u*** ِ ***uk***, used for the genitive, the genitive always takes the form in ِ ***u*** ِ ***i***; thus, ***سَنِتی*** ِ ***sanidi***, ***هَنْدی*** ِ ***handi***, ***سَنی*** ِ ***sanii***, ***هَنْزی*** ِ ***hanzii***. I also find therein, a vocative ***هَنْدی*** ِ ***handi*** instead of ***وَدِی*** ِ ***vadi***.

[A genitive in ِ ***uk*** is thus declined. Only the principal parts are given.

**First Declension.**

**Singular.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Plural</th>
<th>Singular</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nom.</td>
<td>غرک</td>
<td>غرک, of a house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instr.</td>
<td>غرک</td>
<td>غرک</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dat.</td>
<td>غرکس</td>
<td>غرکس</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abl.</td>
<td>غرکی</td>
<td>غرکی</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen.</td>
<td>غرک</td>
<td>غرک</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loc.</td>
<td>غرک</td>
<td>غرک</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Plural.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Plural</th>
<th>Singular</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nom.</td>
<td>غرک</td>
<td>غرک</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instr.</td>
<td>غرک</td>
<td>غرک</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dat.</td>
<td>غرکس</td>
<td>غرکس</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**[In the 3rd declension, in the plural, ِ ***i*** becomes ِ ***o***, ِ ***yau*** ِ ***ou***, and ِ ***en*** ِ ***an***, after ِ ***e.***]**
2nd Declension.

Singular.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Masculine</th>
<th>Feminine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nom.  ... कुलिक kuliuk ...</td>
<td>...  ... गुलिक gulich, of a true</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instr.  ... कुलिक kuliık</td>
<td>...  ... गुलिची gulichi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dat.  ... कुलिकस kulisık</td>
<td>...  ... गुलिची gulichi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abl.  ... कुलिकि kuliği</td>
<td>...  ... गुलिची gulichi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Plural.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Masculine</th>
<th>Feminine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nom.  ... कुलिक kuliık</td>
<td>...  ... गुलिची gulichi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instr.  ... कुलिकास kuliıkas</td>
<td>...  ... गुलिचास gulichyas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dat.  ... कुलिकेन kuliıkên</td>
<td>...  ... गुलिचेन gulichen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

So also Genitives in **u**.

Thus (first Declension).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Masculine</th>
<th>Feminine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nom.  ... रामा rama ...</td>
<td>...  ... रामः ramaḥ, of Rama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instr.  ... रामाः ramaḥ</td>
<td>...  ... रामः ramaḥ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and so on.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again, Genitives in **u**.

Third Declension.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Masculine</th>
<th>Feminine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nom.  ... हाचिव hachiv</td>
<td>...  ... हाचिव hachiv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instr.  ... हाचिव hachiv</td>
<td>...  ... हाचिव hachiv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and so on.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On adjectives agreeing with a Genitive; On Genitives dependent on a Genitive; Appendix.

209. (1) An adjective agreeing with a genitive, is put in the dative case; e.g., बड़ी shudāwanda-soud naukar, the servant of the great Lord.

210. (2) So also a genitive dependent on a genitive, is put in the dative; e.g. देवां-हांदिस sarð̥a-ḥandi wadāq sof, through the help of the chief of the devils (Luke, xi. 15).
nabiyan-handen marawul-en-handi nechiv\', the children of the killers of the prophets (Matth. xxiii. 31).

prat b\'tsi
den handi nechiv, the names of the people of each village (prat is an indeclinable).

isr\'ilaq-sandis khudaga-sans sitayish, the praise of the God of Israel (Matth. xv. 31).

sabadi-(§ 212, 3, c)-sanden nechive-hons m\'oj, the mother of Zebede\'e\'s children (Matth. xx. 29).

insan\'an-handen (kathan) ch\'usan-honz fikr, care for (of) the needs of men.

lukan-handen gun\'ahan-hansi mat\'af-(§ 214, 4, b)-

handi sababa, for the sake of the forgiveness of the sins of the people.

211. (3) So also a noun in apposition to a genitive\(^9\) is put in the dative. It may, however, also be put in the nominative; thus, S\'an\'s Mal\'s D\'aad\'o S\'an\'i D\'ash\'aht, the kingdom of David, my (our) father (Mark, xi. 10).

zakuriyahq-sandis nechivis yo\'hann\'ahas, to John the son of Zachariah (Luke, iii. 2).

sardari k\'a\'ne a\'bar\'a\'q-sandi waq\'is, in the time of Abiathar, the high priest (Mark, ii. 26).

pananis b\'and\'a d\'aad\'a-sandi gar\'a andar\'a, from the house of his servant David (\'and\'a b\'and\'a for \'and\'us b\'and\'as) (Luke, i. 69).

khudaga-sandis Yasu\' Matta\'a-sani injilq-

hond god, the beginning of the Gospel of Jesus, the Messiah; the Son of God (Mark, i. 1).

pananis b\'ogis Pilpusani (of. § 198)

\'as\'a\'i Hari\'adi\'a\'i-handi sababa, on account of Herodias, his brother Philip\'s wife (Luke, iii. 19).

There is no doubt that Dr. Burkhard\'s account of adjectives in agreement with a genitive is in the main correct. But my experience is that, as a matter of practice when the genitive is the genitive of a masculine noun in the singular number, the adjective in agreement is usually in the oblique case masculine. This is also the teaching of Is\'vara-kaula in his Kas\'mir\'a-kal\'a-
mrita, although he gives no example either way. The following are examples of what I mean. They are all sentences spoken by a Kas\'miri, and may be depended upon to be correct.

Tam\'i-sand\'i (not sand\'is) khatuk kus to\'rikh chhu\'-a, what is the date of his letter?

Tam\'i (not tam\'is) ch\'isuk mol, the price of that thing (ch\'is is masculine).

Doyim\'i retaki godam\'ak to\'rikh \'awit tam\'i-sand\'i m\'at\'uk kast, the dividend on his estate will be paid on the first date of next month. — G. A. G.]

(to be continued.)

\(^9\) See § 198.
THE SIEGE OF AHMADNAGAR AND HEROIC DEFENCE OF THE FORT BY CHAND BIBI — A NARRATIVE OF AN EYE-WITNESS.

BY MAJOR J. S. KING,

Indian Staff Corps (retired).

(Continued from p. 295.)

[The Durhán-i-Maḏīsir here ends abruptly, without any conclusion. Probably the author died when he had written thus far.

As a supplement to the foregoing history I shall now quote from the Taṣkaraṭ-ul-Mulāk of Mirzā Rafiʿ-ud-Dīn Ibrāhīm B. Nūr-ud-Dīn Taufīk Shahrist,23 the author's personal narrative of a diplomatic mission to Ahmādnagar about a year after the conclusion of the great siege. This account is quoted almost verbatim in the Basāṭin-as-Dalāṭin, by Muhammad Ibrāhīm-az-Zubairī.]

'Ālam-Panāh (Ibrāhīm 'Ādīl-Shāh II.) sends the author to Ahmādnagar to arrange the affairs of Bahādur Shāh and the Amir.

In A. H. 1005 (A. D. 1596) 'Ālam-Panāh ordered me to hand over my duties to one of his sons and go to Ahmādnagar, and by peaceable means to put an end to the dissensions which had arisen between Bahādur Shāh and his amirs, and which had disorganized the affairs of the State. 'Ālam-Panāh added:—"They have so terrified Suhail Khān, now stationed on the frontier, that he has become dispirited. First see him, and re-assure him on our behalf, and consult with him as to the best means of settling the affairs of the people of Ahmādnagar; and while doing the work of your mission you should avail yourself of the first opportunity to bring the matter to a conclusion."

It happened that at this time much important business had been intrusted to me, such as the governorship of the capital (Bijāpur) and the office of Pishwā of the district under the government of the (king's) eldest son, Fath Khān, the control of the royal mint and superintendence of about 200 elephants, 700 camels and 1,500 horses. For the keep of the horses nearly a lakhs of hans had been assigned from the revenue of ten large villages. Many papers and petitions which the Bādhkana of the districts used to send in, as well as the secret papers, used all to be laid before me, and I used to submit them to His Highness. Having handed over all these to one of the (king's?) sons, I proceeded on my mission.

When I arrived in the neighbourhood of Shāhburg,24 Suhail Khān met me about a jābahe out, and we asked after one another's health. When we arrived near his sleeping-place I found a commodious camp pitched. On all sides tents, screens and pavilions were erected, and carpets of the utmost magnificence were spread out in regal fashion. The great men, chiefs, nobles and amirs, like servants were all standing or sitting each in his own place. He did not abate a jot or tittle in ceremonious treatment; but he was excessively afraid, for people had frightened him by saying that his glory and rank having exceeded that of the other amirs, 'Ālam-Panāh had become wanting in courtesy towards him, and had behaved so because he had no option in the matter. But when I repeated to him the ūrā d'ā'id of 'Ālam-Panāh; words full of clemency and kindness, all his timidity was driven away.

23 This work is extremely rare. Though I made special search for it in India for several years, I could only find one copy, and that a very mutilated one, in the Muṣlih Firdūs Library of Oriental MSS. in Bombay. A description of it is given in Reateson and Catalogue, pp. 72-5. It was so badly worm-eaten that there was great difficulty in finding anyone willing or competent to undertake the work of copying it. At last I found a well-educated Persian gentleman, named Mirzā Jawāb Shahrist, who copied those portions of the book relating to the Muhammadan dynasties of the Dakhan; but the Bombay Government had to pay him a specially high rate for his labour. This copy now belongs to the India Office Library. The only other copy I know of is in the British Museum Library. On a future occasion I hope to have more to say about this remarkable book and its author.

24 Nalūdurg, Lat. 17° 49' N., Long. 75° 21' E., situated on the Beri river, a branch of the Bhāmā. The name Shāhburg was given to it by 'All 'Ādīl-Shāh I. The Bijāpur and Ahmādnagar frontier line passed a little to the west of it. For description, see A Noble Queen, by Meadows-Taylor, also Imperial Gazetteer of India, Vol. X.
I uttered several congratulations, and said: — "At this time 'Alam-Panâh is very well satisfied with you, for terror of you has impressed itself on the hearts of the Mughals, and as long as you maintain your position on this frontier they will not attack us, but will remain in their own place." And the fact of the matter was that as long as Suhail Khan was on that frontier they did not attack at all, though after his time they did much damage. He brought to notice all those of his adherents who had evinced loyalty in the service of 'Alam-Panâh; and to put his mind at ease, the latter sent him a robe of honour and presents. When we set foot in the Nigâm-Shâhi territory, we found a ruined country in a state of confusion; in short nothing was to be seen but the four walls of houses and a wretched, poverty-stricken populace at enmity among themselves.

Abhang Khan Habshi, who with the amîrs and 20,000 horse had taken up a position outside the fort and cut off the supplies of their own people and sovereign, paraded the whole of his army and came out to give us a ceremonious reception. He reviewed his army and each of the amîrs paraded his own regiment. In truth, it was a well-organized force. They had besieged their own sovereign, and, being at enmity with Chând Bîlî, wished to get Bahâdur Shâh into their hands. The amîrs insisted upon our alighting near them.

Next day Saiyid 'Ali — known as Târikhi — who was one of the celebrated men of the place, came with one of the officers (sar-naubat), and took us into the fort, where we had an interview with Bahâdur Shâh. A number of the nobles within the fort in a wretched and distressed state, with one tongue and a thousand complaints, related the affairs of the hostile faction. I assumed the office of mediator in the business, and after I had repeatedly and severely admonished and threatened them on behalf of 'Alam-Panâh, terms of reconciliation were arranged. The whole of the amîrs then went to the foot of the bastion and rampart, and had an interview with Bahâdur Shâh, who was on top of the bastion. Robes of honour and presents were bestowed, but night having then come on [the proceedings were adjourned].

Next day the court of Nigâm-Shâhi was erected in the midst of the camp. A half-throne (shân-hâkh), with the waist-belt and head-dress of Bahâdur Shâh on it, was placed in the midst of the court. Each of the amîrs, members of council and military officers then came forward, saluted (the throne) and received his customary robe of honour. There was boundless rejoicing at this both on the part of the people of the army and the garrison. The drums of rejoicing were beaten and prayers for the safety, long life and prosperity of 'Alam-Panâh were recited, in that he had put an end to the sedition and disturbance and was the cause of the tranquillity of the people. Some of the garrison of the fort went outside, and, entering the camp, inquired after their relatives whom they had not seen for a long time, and thanked God that they had met one another safe at last. The men of the army also went to and fro to the fort, and presenting their petitions in the court of Bahâdur Shâh, had their claims settled. Fresh officials were appointed, that the business of the State and the army might be properly arranged.

But this peace did not suit the views of some of the disaffected mischief-breeders, so they began to excite sedition and again hoisted the standard of opposition, and seized and imprisoned three or four of the (new) officials. The garrison of the fort also joined in the rebellion; the troops, with money, promises and threats, having gained them over to their side, made an agreement with them that when the amîrs with the army should come to take the fort, the men of the garrison should refrain from firing the cannons, guns and rockets. On this understanding one day the amîrs outside the

25 There is no subsequent mention of Suhail Khan in the course of this narrative, but we are led to infer that he with a portion of the frontier force, accompanied the author as escort to the mission; but certainly not in a political capacity, as stated by Firishkâh. The latter makes no mention of our author, although they must have known one another personally, for they both at the same time held high appointments at the Bijâpur Court.
fort, with the intention of seizing it, came with 20,000 cavalry, and, surrounding the fort, commenced the attack. The garrison, true to their compact, refrained from fighting, but some of the awârs and soldiers resisted to the best of their ability and displayed much valour. When the fight waxed furious in front of the gate of the fort, the Nawâb Bahâdur Shâh, in spite of his youth, sat on top of a bastion of the fort encouraging his men to fight. At this juncture the people of the army shot three or four arrows in the direction of Bahâdur Shâh; one arrow struck the handle of his umbrella, passing within a span from him; another struck the throat of a eunuch who was standing behind Bahâdur Shâh, and came out at the back. He fell dead on the spot, and two or three other persons were wounded; but in spite of this, Bahâdur Shâh continued encouraging his men. From above some of the soldiers fired cannons and guns at the enemy, and some of the letter were killed, and others turning about went to their camp. Again those most contemptible of people advanced, — that shameless crew who had besieged their own sovereign — cut off the supply of water and food and even aimed at taking his life. With admonitions and threats I stepped forward and reminded them, saying:— “Sultân Murâd with a countless force is stationed near you on your flank, and will take possession of the whole of your country. Why do you strike an axe at your own feet and overthrow the master of your own house? This disgrace and ingratitude will for years to come be recorded as a blot on the page of your history.” By these impressive words I smoothed matters and again made peace. But on this occasion Chând Bibi was not willing for peace, and would not acquiesce. She said:— “Abhang Khan, the Habshih slave is the purchased slave of my father, and in the time of my father and brothers, owing to his vicious disposition, he was thrown into prison, and after the death of my younger brother (Bürhân II.) I took him out of prison and exalted him to this rank, yet, in the face of these kindnesses, he requites me by wanting to take my life; he has no other object. All this fighting and sedition is aimed at my life, so what confidence can I have in him, and how can I make peace with him? In this blessed month of Ramaân he has laid siege to the fort and cut off our supplies. During this month we have not even seen meat, and have had nothing with which to break our fast but the bitter water which is inside the fort and old and rotten grain. After behaviour such as this, how can my heart reconcile itself to peace with him? Now I have consented to become a slave of the Mughals, but I will not submit to the lordship of this Abyssinian slave, Abhang Khan.”

One of Chând Bibi’s people had written to Sultân Murâd a detailed account of all that had occurred. He communicated this letter to his father, Akbar Pâshâ; and the latter, after reading the letter, threw it down before Sultân Salâm, who is commonly known as Jahângîr, and said:— “Great is my good fortune, which is increased by these results which have occurred. Wherever my army goes; whatever they do, they do of themselves, and my desires are accomplished without effort.”

After many and strenuous endeavours, with the utmost difficulty I persuaded Chând Bibi to agree to a reconciliation, and the peace was announced to the awârs outside. For some days the sedition and disturbance was quelled. Most of the awârs and soldiers went out of the fort and took up their abode in the camp, with the object of uniting to oppose the Mughal army, and driving Sultân Murâd out of the Dakhan.

At this juncture one day one of the private servants of Bûrâh Shâh, having ascended to the roof of his house, saw a number of the troops of the fort sitting in a retired place, dividing among themselves a quantity of money which was spread out before them. He informed Chând Bibi of this, and when the matter was inquired into, it appeared the Abhang Khan, having sent some money for the soldiers, had induced them, when opportunity offered, to open the gate to him and his men and admit them to the fort, so that they might take possession of it. When the soldiers heard that Chând Bibi was aware of their compact, and was making arrangements to drive them out, being filled with fear, they sent word to Abhang Khan, saying:— “The plot has been discovered, therefore the first thing for you to do is, at dawn to-morrow morning, mount and come to the neighbourhood of the fort, and we will open the gates; thus our lives will be saved.”

Next day, at dawn, Abhang Khan, with his army drawn up in battle array, came to the neighbourhood of the fort and awaited events. Since the gate of the fort had been completely built up
with stone and sun-dried brick, they got through the wicket, and, having opened it, sent some one running to Abhang Khan to tell him to come quickly, as they had opened the wicket.

Meantime Chand Bibi, having been informed of this occurrence, sent some one to summon the officers of the garrison, and she urged them to desist from this idea of rebellion; and in obedience to her orders, some went from her presence, but others, disobeying her, remained at the gate and prepared for hostilities. Then Abhang Khan came near the gate of the fort and sent forward an Abyssinian slave named *Ambar Chapū, 28* who was one of his servants. Chand Bibi had sent some people to fetch the remainder of the garrison, and they, obeying the order, came to the front ready to fight, and from both sides arrows and guns were discharged. The (rebel) garrison of the fort, being unable to stand against Chand Bibi’s force, took to flight and got out through one of the wickets. *Ambar Chapū, who had come in through another wicket, made his way out through a second, for he saw that the garrison of the fort, having been defeated by Chand Bibi’s force, were going out, and the latter were in pursuit of them.*

Standing on top of a tower of the gate of the fort, Malik Sandal Baridi, on whom had been conferred the title of Masnaat-i ‘Alī, with two hundred of his own private retinue, discharged grenades and guns among the force of Abhang Khan, and sometimes among the fort garrison. *Ambar Chapū, owing to the number of people, could not find a way out, and there was no room to make a stand, and as there was a heavy fire from above, he was obliged to turn back. Abhang Khan dismounted and came near the gate of the fort to enter it, but some of his followers were annihilated and dispersed by a cannon-ball, and he himself, having no standing-place and no way of advancing, retreated and joined his own force, and *Ambar Chapū made his way to him. Some of the garrison of the fort, when they found an opportunity, went outside and escaped, but some of them were made prisoners.*

Four times in the space of fourteen months (that I remained in Ahmadnagar) I made peace between the contending factions, and again each time they came into collision, so I became hopeless. Just then news came from the frontier that some of the amirs of Sultan Murad had laid the foundations of plunder in the country, and had taken forcible possession of some villages and their dependencies; and that a large force was following to assist them, and would soon reach Ahmadnagar.

I sent to ‘Alam-Panah a written account of all that had occurred; and when it reached him, he sent me an order saying that it was not advisable for me to remain any longer; and that immediately on receipt of the order, I was to return to Bijapur. I showed the order to Chand Bibi, and asked her permission to depart. She gave it — but reluctantly, saying: — “Whilst you have been here, on the three or four occasions when the fire of rebellion has broken out, you by strenuous efforts have thrown water on the fire of that clique, and succeeded in quenching it; now who is to say anything to them to keep them from carrying out their threats?” At last she gave me leave to depart.

Next day I left the city, and at a distance of two or three farsakhas on the way, halted for some necessary matters. All the amirs, both small and great, unceasingly came and handed in written petitions about their claims. Then we started from there for Bijapur; and next day about 20,000 men — some on horseback, some on foot — with women and children; high and low, owing to the revolution and the wretchedness of their affairs and being deprived of their ordinary habitations, travelled in company with us, because there was danger on the road farther on. Having arrived safely in the vicinity of Bīlbāpur (Bijapur), when they had recovered from the fatigue and danger of the journey, they dispersed and took refuge in various parts of the country.

When I had been exalted by kissing the threshold of *‘Alam-Panah’s* court, I was reinstated in my former appointment; that is to say, governor of the capital. *‘Alam-Panah said so many flattering things to me, which were a hundred times beyond my deserts, that if I were to relate them, I should rouse people’s envy: for this reason I have abridged them.*

---

28 Here for the first time appears on the scene the celebrated Malik *‘Ambar* who afterwards became absolute ruler of nearly half of the Ahmadnagar dominions.
DISCURSIVE REMARKS ON THE AUGUSTAN AGE OF TELUGU LITERATURE.

BY G. R. SUBRAMANIAM PANTULU.

(Continued from p. 304.)

Another version of the same story relates that the king informed Timmanava, when he read the poem, of the unnatural and improbable nature of the events related in it, and that the poet made no response. Not long after, however, the king had to experience similar incidents in his own harem when he, unable to restrain his lust, acted exactly as was narrated in the poem.

Nandi Timmanava is more familiarly known as Mukku Timmanava, on account of his long nose, or, according to an obviously apocryphal story, on account of a beautiful stanza on the nose, which was purchased from him by Ramarajabhushana, for four thousand pagodas, and incorporated in his Vasucharita. It is sufficient to remark as to this improbable tale that they were not contemporaries. As has been already noted, he was the poet who accompanied the queen from her father's household, and numerous instances are on record to show that his ancestors were pandits at the court of Vijayanagara, and received presents from the king. Among them, Nandi Mallaya and Malayaamaruta, who flourished at the court of Narasa Raya, the father of Krishnaraya, jointly wrote the Varadhapurana, and dedicated it to Narasa Raya.

Ayyalarazu Rama Bhadra was a Niyogi Brahmana of Woosimmītta (Ekashilanganaga in Sanskrit), in the Cuddapah District. This place is famous as being also the birth-place of Ramamen Pottaraja, the celebrated writer of the Telugu Bhaagavata. Rama Bhadra had leanings towards Vaishnavism, being the disciple of Mummadi Varadacharya. He was the son of Akkaya and the grandson of Parvatanna. In his early days he composed a sataka called the Raghuvarsha-sataka on the local Virginavasavami temple. He entered Vijayanagara during the last days of Krishnadvara, and was requested by the king to translate into Telugu metre the Sakalakaatha-dasaavatara, but as the king breathed his last before the completion of the poem, the poet merely entered in the introduction that it was written at the special request of the deceased king. This poem appears to be in nine cantos, giving a detailed account of the family history of Sri Ramu, Pururavas, etc., and though it vividly brings before us the poet's genius and quick-wittedness, it smacks of youthful days, being in certain portions ungrammatical and non-rhetorical. He seems to have begun to write about 1330 A. D.

He was very poor, and as he had about a dozen children, he was familiarly known as Pillala (= children) Rama Bhadraraya. As he was in great distress, and sorely puzzled to find a livelihood, he resolved, while the trouble was weighing on his heart, to flee to the woods, leaving his wife and children to their own fate. His intimate friends prevailed upon him to go back to his family, saying that a wise man should be above the joys and sorrows of this world, and advised him to seek his fortunes elsewhere. The poet acted up to the advice thus offered, and left his birth-place for Vijayanagara the same evening, and not long afterwards reached it, arriving with his family, wet-through, in the midst of a violent thunderstorm and taking refuge in a temple, where were some students, who had been asked by their master to compose a verse on the after-deeds of forelorn lovers, and were shirking the task. Our poet, after enquiry promised to extricate them out of their difficulty, if they would relieve him and his family. The students gladly agreed to the proposal, and warmed the new-comers by the fire and dressed them in their own clothes. The poet in his gratitude composed a verse and gave it to them. They then took it and gave it to their master, who proved to be no other than Rama Raja Bhushana. He read the verse, was much pleased, and asked them who the author was. On their informing him that it was the work of one of their own number, he reprimanded them, and insisted on their speaking the truth. When the truth was told, he desired to be taken to the poet, which was accordingly done. Rama Raja Bhushana approached the strange

* [From epigraphical records we know that Ekashilanganaga was the Sanskrit name of Worangal in the Nizam's dominions and the capital of the Katakya kings. The well-known rhetorical work Pradipurudravya confirms this statement. — H. K. S.]
poet, embraced him, fed him and his family sumptuously for three or four days, took him to the king's presence, and spoke in glowing terms of his abilities, so much so that he was immediately enrolled as a poet of the court. The verse, in question, was afterwards amalgamated by Rāmarājabhūshaṇa in his Vasucharitra in honour of the new poet, or, as others say, was purchased and plagiarised. But before the Sahalakathādarsanamgraha reached its completion, the demise of Kṛṣṇapāla left Rāmabhadra once more on the world, and he, therefore, associated himself with Gūti Appalarāja and others, and then finally settled himself at the court of Gobhūri Narasarāja, the nephew of the son-in-law of Kṛṣṇapāla. It was to this Narasarāja that he dedicated his later poem, the Rāmābhūṣadāya.

The friendship between Rāmabhadra and Rāmarājabhūshaṇa did not last long, as the story goes that the latter grew jealous of the reputation that the former enjoyed at the court of Kṛṣṇapāla. Rāmabhadra remained indifferent until one day the king received Rāmarājabhūshaṇa into his good graces and seated him on his throne. This made him lose his head and laugh at Rāmabhadra, and so the latter in his rage, wrote a verse to this effect: — "Of what avail is the elevation of a mean despicable wretch while the best poets are kept down? Do not lions remain quiet under the shadows of trees, while monkeys are skipping from one branch to another?" This he tied to the throne, and went his way. Bhūshaṇa read it, was overcome by shame, and kept silence, but the enmity between the two poets waxed high. Some time afterwards, a literary discussion took place between them, which ended in their laying a wager as to which of them was the better poet. They accordingly entered into an understanding that one of them should write a poem, and the other should point out the blemishes in it, and if the mistakes were proved, the winner should kick the forehead of the loser. The king as arbitrator settled that Rāmabhadra was to compose the poem in six months. The poet went home and thought over a subject to write upon, and of the rough outlines of it, but all to no purpose. The time at his command had nearly expired, but not a syllable of the poem was written. But when there were but three days left, he went and closeted himself, and prayed to his tutelary deity, Rāma, who, it is said, wrote a poem for him, and went his way. The poem was then taken and read before the king, and Rāmarājabhūshaṇa raised an objection, but it afterwards proved to be irrelevant. The two poets were then called upon to satisfy the terms agreed upon. Rāmarājabhūshaṇa, therefore, removed his head-dress and put it down, and Rāmabhadra kicked it instead of the rival's forehead. Thus the quarrel terminated.

The story must, however, be apocryphal, as it does not appear anywhere that Rāmarājabhūshaṇa had begun to compose verses during the lifetime of Kṛṣṇapāla, and so it is highly improbable that he should have a retinue of students at the time. For aught we know, the Vasucharitra was not composed till about thirty-five years after the demise of Kṛṣṇapāla.

Dhūrjaṭi was a Niyōgī Brāhmaṇa of Paṅkāndu. He belonged to the Bhāradeśa gōtra, Āpāstamba śūtra. He was born and bred up at Kālāchāri, in the North Arcot district, and was a good Saiva. As he lived at the time of Kṛṣṇapāla, we may fix his date as probably about 1520-1530 A. D. He has written a work entitled Kālacakṣaśāhātya, a Sthala-sūtra, and dedicated it to the local god, Kālāchāriśvara. His style is elegant and chaste. It is said of him that he yielded to the weaknesses of the flesh and the peculiar temptations of lust. It is a pity that the common folk generally pride themselves in attributing such conduct even to the most righteous. The same thing was attributed to Tikkanaśāyōjī, that celebrated writer of the later fifteen Parvas of the Mahābhārata. Such a thing is highly

---

9 This mode of solving puzzles by blending the natural and the supernatural has taken possession of the Telugu mind to such an extent, that the ordinary Telugu fully believes that there can be no gloomier form of infidelity than that which questions the moral attributes of that Great Being in whose hands are the final destinies of us all.

10 [As regards the situation of this ancient division of the Telugu country see, Epigraphia Indica, Vol. III. p. 31. — H. K. S.]
improbable, considering the position they occupied and the high veneration with which they were regarded.

Mādayyagāri Mallana, in contradistinction to Praudhakavi Mallana, the writer of the Bhadrasāndhānyya, a poet who had lived some time previously, was a writer on Rhetoric of the time of Krishnārāya. He was an inhabitant of Konavlidu, and the son of Mādayya. He was a Brāhmaṇa of the Liṅgāyat sect. A very large number of Brāhmaṇas were converted to this sect by Bījalārya, king of Kalyāṇa.î They wear a stone liṅga round their necks and worship it after their daily ablutions. Mallana received a good education in his infancy, and while in his budding manhood, wrote the Rājaśekharacaritra, or a poetical history of Rājasekhara. He dedicated it to Nandayal Appaya, the son-in-law of Sāluva Timmaṇḍa, the prime minister of Krishnārāya. This poet received rich rewards from his patron in lands and other presents.

Tenāli Rāmakrishna alias Tenali Ramalīlā, was a Yājñavalkya Brāhmaṇa of the Kausūṁya gōtr. He was the son of Rāmaya and Lakshmmamma. It is said of him that he first bore the appellation of Tenali Rāmalīlā, and under that name wrote the Liṅgaprākāra, still extant, but afterwards embraced the Vaishnava faith to please the sovereigns of Chandragiri, and changed his name to Rāmakrishna. Kāvali Venkaṭarāmasvāmi, in his Biographies of Doblan Poets, p. 69, speaks of him as being one of the ashta-digambras at the court of Krishnaprāya. He was born, he says, in the village of Tenali in the Kistna district in S. S. 1384, i.e., 1462 A. D., and was of the family of Īśvara-praggaṇa. His horoscope exhibits him as born under a very propitious star. In his infancy he studied the Telugu dialect, and by the association of the bhadrīyas or bards of Bhatīpalli, he became a perfect master of that language, and a professor of rhetoric. He likewise possessed a tolerable knowledge of Sanskrit. We have no records to prove the truth of these statements, and it is highly probable that the horoscope of the poet was a later invention. Had he been born in 1462 A. D. as is alleged, he must have been about 50 years old at the time of Krishnārāya's accession.

Having heard, it is said, much of the patronage afforded by Krishnārāya, Rāmakrishna went to Vījayanagara in hopes of receiving countenance from the king. As he had no friends to forward his case, he was obliged to ingratiate himself into the good graces of the inferior servants of the household and composed a few verses on one of the female attendants of the queen. The fame of Rāmakrishna thus reached the ears of the king, who appointed him one of the court poets.

He was of a humorous character, and loved to play practical jokes. The guru Tātāchārya was a very orthodox man, and was in the habit of visiting a cow-stall every morning as soon as he rose from bed, being taken to the place blind-folded in order to view the cows' excrement as the first object seen during the day, thinking it to be a very meritorious act. His habit was to keep his eyes shut and laying hold of a cow's tail to wait till she evacuated, when he opened his eyes to behold the excrement. One morning Rāmakrishna got up early, and removing the cow from the stall, stood in its place stark naked. The guru came as usual, and instead of the cow's tail he found a man. His rage knew no bounds, and running up to the king, he laid a complaint against Rāmakrishna. The king became exceedingly angry and ordered the poet to be forthwith executed. The executioners carried him to a plain and buried him in the earth as far as the neck, leaving only his head above ground, agreeably to the sentence passed on him. They left him thus, intending to return with a certain number of elephants to trample him to death. It so chanced that a hump-backed washerman was passing by, and asked the poet how he came to

---

11 The founder of the Liṅgāyat sect was Basava, the prime minister of Bījala. An inscription at Maṇavaḷi in the Bijapur district, dated in the reign of the Kalachurya king Bijjala, mentions this Basava as one of the five-hundred mahājanaś of that village; see Ep. Ind., Vol. V, p. 10 f.—H. K. S.
be in such a predicament. "My good friend," said he, "I was born a hump-back like yourself, and having long suffered the scorn of ill-mannered individuals, I applied to a sage who had great knowledge of the occult sciences, and begged of him to relieve me from my misfortune. He informed me that if I should consent to be buried up to my neck in this identical spot, I should be entirely cured of my deformity. In pursuance of his directions, I got some of my friends to bury me here, and as I really believe that I am cured already, I shall be very thankful to you if you will verify my statement." The washerman did as the poet requested, and to his utter amazement found him a well-made man; and as he was a credulous fellow, he believed in all that the poet had said. "As one good deed deserves another," said the washerman to the poet, "I now ask you to bury me in this place that I may be cured of my bodily deformity as you have been." Rāmakrishṇa with a grave countenance buried the poor washerman up to the neck, and after the lapse of an hour went to the king to inform him that by the personal interposition of a god, he had been restored to life. The executioners in the interim had executed the washerman, and were making their report to the king that they had killed the poet according to the royal commands. The whole court were consequently astonished to see Rāmakrishṇa, and as the king really believed that the poet had been killed and restored to life by some god, he promised to forgive him the first hundred crimes that he should commit in future!

Now, Ana-Vēma Reḍḍī had in his possession two beautiful horses of the Kandahar breed, entirely black, except the ears which were grey. Kriṣṇarāya was eager to obtain one of them, and sent an embassy to Ana-Vēma Reḍḍī to ask him for one of them, but the latter monarch replied, that if the former would send a poet, who could excel any that he had at his court, he would give him both the horses. All the poets at the court of Kriṣṇarāya refused to depart save Rāmakrishṇa, who forthwith proceeded to the court of Ana-Vēma Reḍḍī. When there, he completed every task set to him, and in his turn wrote a part of a stāṇḍa, which he desired his fellow-poets at the new court to complete. He then took his departure, and in the course of six months returned, but the poets had not been able to finish the stanzas. He therefore wrote the conclusion which so pleased Ana-Vēma Reḍḍī, that he embraced him and gave him one of the black horses, and sent him away with innumerable presents. When Rāmakrishṇa returned to the court of Kriṣṇarāya, he was received with great marks of attention, and enjoyed the king's favour in a very high degree, but he once more forfeited the good opinion of his royal master by playing on him the following practical joke. He informed the king that he had procured for him a beautiful damsel, and asked him when he would wish to visit her. The king being of a lascivious turn, appointed an early day. The poet then decorated a bed fit enough to receive his royal visitor, but instead of the maiden, placed on it a stone image, which he covered over with a rich brocade quilt. The king came at the appointed hour, and to his surprise and consequent indignation, found a stone instead of a charming virgin, and immediately ordered the poet to be executed. Rāmakrishṇa, however, concealed himself, and when the king's wrath was abated, was taken once more into his good graces.

Sometime after this, the king's daughter had composed a poem entitled Marichiparīṣṭa, or the marriage of Marichi, and proposed to read the same before the king's court. But as she was aware of the satirical character of Rāmakrishṇa, she stipulated with her father, that he should not be allowed to be present. The king thereupon forbade the poet to come to the court on the day that his daughter read her poem. The poet, however, disguised himself as a maidservant, and stood close to the princess, who began to read her poem publicly. The poem was really well-written, and abounded in good moral reflections and beautiful descriptions of the scenery and dresses of the females and other subjects, among which was the description of a pregnant woman. Just at this moment Rāmakrishṇa made a gesture which set the whole court in a roar of laughter, and so abashed and crossed was the princess that she could read no more and abruptly left the court. The king was very much vexed at the poet, and sentenced him on pain of death to leave his dominions. But he was again afterwards admitted into the king's
favour. Such are some of the stories current in the Telugu country about the vagaries of Rāmakrīshna, more briefly known as Tenali Rāma.

As to the evidence for fixing the date of the poet apart from all popular tradition, instances are on record to show that Rāmakrīshna was a contemporary of Appayadiksāhita and Tātāchārya and flourished at the court of Veṅkaṭapatirāya of Chandragiri. This king flourished after Tirumalādeva, to whom the Vatscharitra is dedicated, changed the seat of his government from Vijayanagara to Chandragiri, and ruled from 1585 to 1614 A.D. If, therefore, Rāmakrīshna was alive at the time of Krishnarāya, he must have been quite young at the time, as there was an interval of more than half a century between the demise of Krishnarāya and the accession of Veṅkaṭapati. This consideration contovers the story of the horoscope.

To reconcile the facts some have made Appayadiksāhita to be a contemporary of Krishnarāya. As Appayadiksāhita lived to a ripe old age, he might have been a contemporary of Krishnarāya in his early days, but he is known to the world as the court poet of Veṅkaṭapatirāya. He was a Tamil Brāhmaṇa, an inhabitant at Adāyapala agraḥāra, about forty miles south-east of Conjeevaram, in the Chingleput district. He was the son of Nārayaṇadiksāhita. It was current among his contemporaries that he was born of the spirit of Siva, on account of the learning he exhibited in divinity and theology, which they thought to be too great for an ordinary mortal. At twelve years of age he gained a mastery over the Vīdas and several of the more abstruse and philosophical sciences. He was a Śiva bhookta. In early life, he obtained the favor of Veṅkaṭapatirāya of Chandragiri, for he confuted all the king’s poets, in open court, on religion and philosophy, especially in shewing the perfect parity between Siva and Vishnu. The king granted him a tract of land, rent-free, for the maintenance of himself and his pupils. He is the author of the Sivārchanachandrika, the Sivatattvaśiva, the Sivamāndipā, the Ātmāpā, etc. The first three of these works were written after the author became a sāmyaggīn (i.e., a performer of sacrifices). It is said that just before he wrote the Ātmāpā he partook of the seeds of a plant, which is said to possess the marvellous quality of keeping the brain clear and fitting the mind for divine contemplation. By its use, he became inspired and dictated to four scribes at once. The poem is very much admired throughout the Dekhan. In course of time, he visited the sovereigns of Tanjore, Trichinopoly and Madura, who gave him every encouragement on account of his talents and virtues, so that, being a strict observer and zealous advocate of ritual, he performed through the bounty of his numerous patrons, innumerable sacrifices on the banks of the Kaverī. He chanted forth verses in praise of Siva wherever he went, and made a good many converts to his faith from Vaishnavism.

Tātāchārya, who had been vanquished and baffled by him at the court of Veṅkaṭapatirāya in a religious controversy, cherished a mortal hatred against him, and was determined to destroy him. He consequently engaged ruffians to waylay Appayadiksāhita and to put an end to him as he was wending his way through a wood. They acted as they had been directed, but at the critical moment a man of great strength, it is said, suddenly appeared on the scene and rescued the poet from danger. On this circumstance reaching the ears of the king, he made the poet valuable gifts for his firmness of faith in Siva. At the age of sixty, as he was passing measures to go to Benares, the Brāhmaṇas of Chidambaram, in the district of South

[12] Tirumala I. transferred for the first time the seat of government to Pennakopā in A.D. 1507, i.e., two years after the battle of Tālikōla. This town continued to be the residence of the kings of the third Vijayanagara dynasty even to the time of Veṅkaṭa II, the third in descent from Tirumala I. It is therefore unlikely that Veṅkaṭa I, the son of Tirumala I. and the patron of Appayadiksāhita could have changed the seat of his government to Chandragiri, see Ep. Ind. Vol. III. p. 226 f. — H. K. S.


[14] Adāyapala is a village belonging to the Ārni Jagir in the North Arcot district. It is this village that is known as the birth-place of Appayadiksāhita. — H. K. S.

[15] Appayadiksāhita was the son of Śrī-Rāmagaṇadiksāhita; see extracts from Nos. 1009, 1015, and 1656 of Dr. Hultzsch’s Reports on Sanskrit Manuscripts No. II. — H. K. S.]
Arcot requested him to come there, as according to his confession, their place was more sanctified than Benares and the tank of Sivaganga more holy than the Ganges. The poet thereupon went to Chidambaram, where he remained engaged in religious controversies for the space of thirty years. At his death, he had in his possession five crystal kṣīgas, two of which he presented to the Brāhmaṇas, and one to his nephew, to be established at Madura, another he gave to one of his relatives, while the fifth he himself established at Chidambaram sometime previous to his death. He is said to be the author of eighty-four works on theology, a good many of which are lost. The Kṣālayāṇanda and Prabhūdakachandrādīya (18) are some of his works handed down to posterity.

Ayyādikshita, who wrote the Nilakaṇṭhaṇavijaya to commemorate the religious victories of his father (19), was the nephew of Appaya, and the wazīr of Tirumala Nāyaka of Madura. This Nāyaka reigned from 1623 to 1659 A. D. over the whole of the Pāṇḍya kingdom. The story, therefore, that Appaya, the uncle of Ayyādikshita, flourished at the time of Krishṇarāya, who lived a century earlier is incredible. Rāmakrishṇa, as a contemporary of Appaya, cannot, therefore, have lived at the time of Krishṇadēvarāya, an inference which confirms the other evidence available.

A good many stories are told of Rāmakrishṇa’s dealings with Tātāchārya. A brief survey of Tātāchārya’s life is therefore desirable here. He was a native of Conjeevaram, and was so celebrated for his virtues and talents, that he was believed to have been born from the spirit of Viśṇu as Appaya was from that of Śiva. He obtained the surname of Kanyādān, for the numerous marriage ceremonies which were performed at his expense. He wrote a philosophical work entitled Sattvikabrahmacaryavidyāvedī. He was the family priest of the Rājas of Chandragiri, and used to visit them from Conjeevaram. While absent from his abode, his chaste and affectionate wife was in the habit of standing at the gate of the dwelling, awaiting the arrival of her lord. On an unfortunate day, however, some unfeeling scoundrels informed her that her husband had been accidentally killed. The shock was too much for her, and she soon afterwards died. Tātāchārya arriving soon after this, died of a broken heart. His loss was much regretted by all classes of people, for despite his erudition, he was the most affable and benevolent of men, bestowing large sums of money on the impoverished, especially for marriage ceremonies. He rose into prominence during the last days of Rāmarāja, and forced so many to embrace the Vaishnava faith, that it became a current saying that “though the shoulder escapes Tātāchārya’s impress, the back will not escape it.”

As to the internal evidences in his works for fixing the date of Rāmakrishṇa. The Pāṇḍurangamahātya is his chief work. It is a legendary account of a shrine of Viśṇu at Pāṇḍurang, the pale-complexioned deity, who sanctified his presence in this form, the place where Paṇḍarika, a muni, performed his devotions. The place is now known as Pandharpur, a town on the left bank of the Bhima, celebrated as the scene of the murder of the Gāyakwād’s Prime Minister, Gaṅgādhara Śāstrī, by the ex-Pēshā Śāhī Rāo, about 1813 A. D. The deity now worshipped there is supposed to have fallen from heaven. He is, therefore, denominated Viśṇu Śvāmi, an emblem of Viśṇu. The proofs of the efficacy of this shrine are brought out in glowing colours in the poem. One Nigamaśarma, who during the whole of his life haunted scenes of dissipation and debauchery, came to the spot during the last

---

18 [Prabhūdakachandrādīya is the name of the famous philosophical drama written by Kripāmīśa. From Aufrecht's Catalogus Catalogorum it appears that a commentary on this drama was written by Appayaṭikshita. It is not known on what authority the writer of this article thinks that the original work was written by Appayaṭikshita. — V. V.]

19 [Nilakaṇṭhaṇavijaya is a chantiśāṣṭra of great repute in the South. It was written by Nilakaṇṭhadvijita the grand-nephew of Appayaṭikshita; see Dr. Hultsch's Reports on Sanskrit Manuscripts, No. II., p. viii., and also extracts from Nos. 999, 1011 and 1281. The writer of the article would have done well to quote the authority on which he says the author of the Nilakaṇṭhadvijaya was a minister of Tirumala-Nāyaka of Madura. — V. V.]

10 [The surname in question is not īṣṇuḍān but kṣīgas, nāyaka. — V. V.]

11 [In inscriptions of the third Vijayānaga Dynasty he is called Tātārya, the Karnāḷābhūḥrīḍyaguru. — H. K. S.]
moments of his life and gave up the ghost in the temple there. A controversy ensued between the servants of Yama and the servants of Vishnû as to who should be in charge of his yātanâkarî, and the latter gained the day. He gained Vishnû. No doubt, he repented the sins of his life at a time which, regarded from a merely human point of view, would be an hour too late. No doubt also, he had not during his lifetime remembered that moral contagion, like the infectious power of physical diseases, borrows half its strength from the weakness of the subject with which it comes in contact. If one were only half as pure as Sri Krishna, one might go about with harlots and be none the worse for it. No amount of sensuous excitement can compensate for the degradation which the moral nature must suffer by associating on familiar and tolerant terms with the most degraded and abandoned of the human species. In this mere human view there can be no toleration of vice. We may, and we ought, to weep for the sinner, but we must not sport with sin. But the divine view is quite different. Heaven divides the state of man into diverse functions, setting endeavours in continual motion, for which is fixed as an aim or goal, obedience. The one great difference between the human and the divine condition is that while the former judges actions by their results, the latter pierces into the secrets of the heart and judges by motives; while there is a lack of equality and mercy in the former, these form the bed-rock, the sine qua non of the latter.

The work is dedicated to Viruri Vêdadri, who had Kandâla Appâlâcharya as his guru. Mention is made of this guru by Saranâgu Timmakavi, in his Vaijayanâvîlita. Râmâkrishnâ must, therefore, have been a contemporary of Timma, who speaks of himself in his Vîlaira as the Kârsam of Gólocqâ, which was then ruled by Mahomed Shâh. We know that he was Nawâb of Gólocqâ from 1681 to 1611 A.D. Râmâkrishnâ must, therefore, have flourished, towards the end of the sixteenth and the first quarter of the seventeenth century. We know, moreover, that Viruri Vêdadri, to whom the Pâdâraangâvîjaya is dedicated, was the premier of a petty Jâgirdâr, Peda Saêngamarâja, whose father, Guravârâja, is said to have been a contemporary of Sadâsivârâja, and that in S.S. 1463, i.e., 1543 A.D., he gave four villages for the consecration to the deity. Mention is made of this in the local records in Col. Mackenzie’s Collections. Saêngamarâja, the son of Guravârâja, must have reigned in the last quarter of the sixteenth century. It is highly probable, therefore, that Râmâkrishnâ must have been a poet of his court about 1650 to 1670 A.D.

His diction is on the whole excellent. It is alleged that he has written another work entitled Pâdâraangâvîjaya, on the same subject as the Pâdâraangâdhamâmya, but this is highly improbable, as this would have been a waste of his energies. And, moreover, the verses that are generally quoted from the Pâdâraangâvîjaya (still extant), do not savour of the poetry of Râmâkrishnâ at all.

The next of the Aśtâdiggajas was Piêngal Saêrana. He was a Niyêgî Brâhma, of the Āpâstamba sûtra and Gautama gôtra. His father was Amara, and his mother Abbamma. He had two brothers, Amalana and Errana, Piêngal was his house-name. This is a pretty village in the Kistna district, at present called Pinâli. In describing the progenitor of his race, Goûka, in his Prabhâdevi-Pradyumma, the poet describes him as being a resident of Piêngal, who had a maid-servant, Pêki by name. The story of Pêki is even now current in the Telugu country. Once upon a time while Goûka was wandering in the woods, he came across a beautiful bead, which he concealed in his box. On the very same day a maid-servant, Pêki by name, took service in his house, and discharged the duties of the household to their entire satisfaction. Sometime after, the lady of the house became pregnant and the maid-servant was left in charge of the lying-in room. While on this duty, it is said, that on a certain night she trimmed the wick of the lamp burning in the room, by stretching out her tongue without rising from her bed. This made her mistress quake with fear, and she told her husband the next day about it. They wanted to get rid of the maid as soon as possible, and set her on the most difficult undertakings, all of which she performed with the greatest
case. Baffled in these attempts, they told her to go to Benares and bring the sacred Ganges' water, and in the interim changed their residence and went to a place afar off. Peçi came home, bringing the sacred water of the Ganges, and not finding any of the family there, went in search of them, taking with her a huge stone not easily carried by even half a dozen of the strongest men and gave it over to her master. On his enquiring of her kindly, as to the best way of getting rid of her, she replied that she would go on his giving over to her the bead he had obtained in the forest. This was done, and she immediately left the house.

Though his ancestors belonged to the Kistna district, Sûrana seems to have travelled southward, and to have taken up his residence at the courts of Akavûda and Nandyâl in the district of Kurulu, formed after the dissolution of the kingdom of Vijayanagara. It is said that he was one of the Aksadîgajas of the court of Krishnaâya, but we have no records to shew that he flourished at the time or at the court of the said monarch. The mistake that he was one of the eight poets of the court of Krishnaâya must have arisen, I think, from the confusion of the name of that monarch with one who bore the same appellation and ruled long after at Nandyâl, and who seems to have maintained Telugu literature to a certain extent, just as did his more celebrated name sake of Vijayanagara. We are led to believe that the poet flourished about the middle of the sixteenth century. His Karlîparyâda is dedicated to Krishnaâya of Nandyâl, who is there the sixth in descent from Arvîti Bukkarâya. The latter monarch had, as his eldest son, Simgarâya, who had Narasîngâraya, whose son was Nârâparâya, whose son was Narasîngâraya, whose son was Krishnaâya. Bukkarâya, as we have seen already, ruled from 1473 to 1481 A. D. If we should fix twenty years as the reigning period of each of the four kings who succeeded Bukka, Krishnaâya must have flourished about 1560 A. D. It appears, therefore, that he was a contemporary of Sadâsîva-râya of Vijayanagara, which fact is rendered manifest by the inscription in the Aksalam Temple at Karimadâla village. Achyutarâya, who succeeded Krishnaâya in 1530 A. D., reigned till 1542 A. D.

We have already seen how Salika Timma assumed the reighns of government during the minority of Sadâsîwa, how he tried to confine Ramaîja (the son-in-law of Krishnaâdevâraîya) and his brother Tirumalarâya in prison, how they both fled to Penukopda and mustered forces, and with the help of the sovereign of Kurulu invaded Vijayanagara, defeated and killed Salika Timma, and proclaimed young Sadâsîwa king in 1542 A. D. Sadâsîwa was king only in name, and Ramaîja assumed the actual reins of government and ruled as the real monarch till 1565 A. D., when he was overthrown and killed by the Muhammadan armies at the battle of Talikota. The Muhammadan kings entered Vijayanagara and by many atrocious acts ruined the kingdom, but, on account of internal dissensions, did not completely occupy the place. For the next five years anarchy prevailed in the land, and about 1567 A. D. Sadâsîwa died. In the same year Tirumaladâva left Vijayanagara for Penukopda, proclaimed himself king in 1569 A. D., and reigned there for the brief space of three years, when he died. His son, Srîraîgaîraîya, reigned from 1572 to 1585 A. D. His brother, Veikasapatirâya, then became king, and removed the seat of his government from Penukopda to Chandragiri, where he died in 1614 A. D., leaving no issue. Now as Krishnaâya of Nandyâl was a contemporary of Sadâsîwa, he must have flourished about 1564 A. D. And Piîgali Sûrana, who dedicated his Karlîparyâda to Krishnaâya of Nandyâl, must have done so at about the same period. This king is also the same Krishnaâya of Nandyâl that flourished towards the beginning of the reign of Veikasapatirâya. He must, therefore, have reigned for a very short period after 1585 A. D. Moreover, mention is made in the Karlîparyâda that Nârâparâya, the grandfather of Krishnaâya, utterly routed Kutubull-Mulk, the progenitor of the Kutub-Shâhî family of Golkopda, at Kopdavida. This Kutubull-Mulk, we know, reigned at Golkopda from 1512 to 1543 A. D. As this battle came off in 1515 A. D., at the time of

Krishnadévarāya, it cannot be far from the truth to say that the grandson of the person who fought the battle must have been living thirty or forty years later.

The inference, therefore, is that Pingali Sūrana must have lived about 1560 A. D. We may infer the same thing from a study of the Rāghavapāṇḍavīya. We know that this work is dedicated to Pedda Veṅkatesa of Akavīḍu, about twelve miles to the west of Koilukkintla in the Kurnul district on the banks of the Tungabhadra. We learn from the poem that Veṅkatesa's grandfather, Immarāya, conquered the country as far as Rajaṃundry in the district of Godavari. We learn further that Immarāya and Nāraparāya were kings tributary to Krishnadévarāya, and that they led his forces against the Muhammadas. We have already seen that Krishnadēvarāya conquered Vijayanagara in 1515 A. D. It is highly probable that Immarāya may have been with him at the time. That the Akavīḍu kings were vendyatories of the kings of Vijayanagara is borne out by the Rāghavapāṇḍavīya. From that inference, we are led to infer that the poem must have been written previous to the dissolution of the kingdom of Vijayanagara in 1565 A. D.

There is also a story current which confirms the above statements. It is said that this Sūrana was the husband of Allāsāni Peddana's grand-daughter, and in his young days roamed about like a loafer in the streets, and so the people not only laughed at him but also at his wife for having secured a pudding-headed husband. Sūrana enraged at this treatment went away to a foreign place, became a good pandit, returned home, and began to write the Rāghavapāṇḍavīya. When the matter was reported to Peddana by his grand-daughter, he asked the poet Sūrana to read a stanza from it. A certain portion of a stanza was read, when Peddana said that it was a laboured one, but before the same stanza was completed, he changed his opinion, and extolled his grandson. As Sūrana lived with the Akavīḍu kings and wrote the Rāghavapāṇḍavīya before his other work, the Kalapūrṇadaya, was written, he must have written it about 1550 A. D., when he was in the first flush of manhood. The Garudaṇḍapuraṇa, written previous to this date, is lost.

Sūrana is by far the best of mediæval poets and makes a near approach to Tikkanā. We learn from the opening stanzas in his Prabhāvatī-Pradyumna that he wrote previously the Garudaṇḍapuraṇa, the Rāghavapāṇḍavīya and the Kalapūrṇadaya. Rāmarājaḥbhaṭṭa's Harśchandra-Nālakāṭayana was composed after Sūrana's Rāghavapāṇḍavīya. Sūrana was the pioneer in the production of those complete poetical works, of which each stanza carries two meanings and so continually tells two stories. Such poetical compositions are called dyarīhakādayas in Telugu. In the preface to his Rāghavapāṇḍavīya, Sūrana has well defined the way in which such kāyas ought to be written, and has thus paved the way for the guidance of future poets treading on the same lines.

We have already pointed out that the Rāghavapāṇḍavīya must have been written by Sūrana in the flush of manhood. Taste, the handling of subjects, and style, generally differ with men with the advance of age. This is clearly brought before us in the case of poets generally. Take Śrīnātha for instance, who has written voluminously, and compare the poetry of his youth with that of his manhood and old age, and one perceives a world of difference. There is a world of difference between his Paṭīnātaka and his Naśīṣadha between his Mārutardāṣṭharītra and his Śāhīvaṇasaḍapakati, between his Kāśīkhaṇḍa and his Paṇḍitīrdhā-yācharītra. The spectacles through which poets view the world are different at different stages of their life. When a man begins to write poetry in his youth his head is so stuffed with a surfeit of Sanskrit poetry and dramatic lore that he merely pours forth his book-learned skill. But when the flush of youth has cooled down, when he is no longer brisk when he is tossed about in the wider sphere of busy and active life, he no longer sees through the spectacles of his books, but observes things as they are in the work-a-day world. When men come to view life through the spectacles of nature, a wide change comes over them, which a brought very vividly before us in their style, no longer laboured, no longer that of the studious recluse, but flowing like running water.
Sanskrit drama seems to have taken so firm a hold of Pindali Sūrana, that he could not help adopting the style of the dramatists in his poetic compositions. He had the greatest regard for Kālidāsa and some for Bāṣa. But still he did not tread the beaten track of poetic routine, and shews some originality in his poems. He lead a phase of Telugu poetry to a certain extent. The one great peculiarity with him is that his descriptions are true to Nature, and are dramatic. The descriptions of Ayudhāya and Hastināpura in his Rādhavamsavatvam are not hyperbolical as is generally the case with other Telugu poets, and I am puzzled to observe that he has fallen into that pit in his descriptions towards the beginning of the Kalāpūrūḍāya, for there is a certain conventionality which Telugu poets generally adopt in their descriptions of towns and cities, which Sūrana did not generally follow. In his Prabhavati-Pradyumna he went straight on with the subject as if it was a drama to be enacted on the stage, and then made Indra and his charioteer, Mātali, view Dvārakā from their seat in the heavens and describe the place, so that the description of the town was not the poet's but Indra's and Mātali's.

The Kalāpūrūḍāya is the best among Sūrana's prabandhas. It was entirely a product of the poet's brain. The following is its story in brief:—

I. — In the Trētā-Yuga. Nārada, put to shame by Tumbura, prays to Vīṣṇu who confers on him certain gifts.

II. — In the Dwāpara-Yuga. In a park at Dvārakā, Kalabhāṣīḷī with her female friends is swinging in a cradle. Nārada informs his disciple, Maṇḍikandhara, that these women of the earth are setting the celestial at naught. Rambā, who is beneath a cloud, sauntering in the heavens with her lover Nalakūbara, overhears the conversation, comes before them with her lover, and speaks in rather an arrogant fashion, and says that in beauty she has no compeer. Nārada informs the celestial lovers that there shall arise a false Rambā and a false Nalakūbara, to put a barrier between them, and descends to the earth near the park. The two lovers go their own way. Meanwhile Kalabhāṣīḷī, who is in the park, sees Nalakūbara and falls in love with him. Nārada comes and sees Kalabhāṣīḷī, and informs her that she will one day become a co-wife with Rambā. She hears the good news gladly, serves Nārada as becomes a hostess and goes home. Nārada then retires to Sri Kṛishṇa's court.

III. — Nārada goes to Sri Kṛishṇa's seraglio with Kalabhāṣīḷī, leaving Maṇḍikandhara outside to play on the vina, and under the orders of Sri Kṛishṇa learns music from Rukmini and other members of the seraglio. Sri Kṛishṇa invites Nārada, Kalabhāṣīḷī and Maṇḍikandhara to his presence, hears their music, and says that they are on a par with each other in the art, and are unrivalled in the fourteen worlds.

IV. — Nārada has doubts as to whether the praise bestowed on him by Sri Kṛishṇa is merely formal or real, and sends Kalabhāṣīḷī, with the gift of assuming any feminine form she pleases, to learn the true opinions that the members of the seraglio entertained about him, and informs Maṇḍikandhara of the cause of his bitter enmity with Tumbura. Kalabhāṣīḷī returns and informs Nārada that the praise bestowed on him was real, which satisfies him very much. Nārada then dismisses her, and sends Maṇḍikandhara on a mission to sacred watering places.

V. — Maṇḍikandhara goes to Ēlaśvara Upādhyāya of Sāradāpitha in Kāśmir on a mission which provokes fruitless. He thereupon retires to perform tapas.

VI. — Kalabhāṣīḷī who has centred her mind on Nalakūbara remains in her park, being very much troubled by her love for him, when Maṇistambha, a Siddha, comes and creates confidence in her, both by his words and deeds, tells her that he will take her to Nalakūbara, and goes up to the heavens with her in his lion-shaped chariot (śīha vṛhana).

VII. — As his chariot does not proceed far, Maṇistambha informs Kalabhāṣīḷī that they have arrived at the temple of a deity who has a lion-shaped chariot, and that unless the deity is propitiated, they will not be able to proceed further, descends from his chariot, leaves Kalabhāṣīḷī near the temple, and goes in search of flowers,
VIII. — An old woman, Sumukhāsatti by name, comes and informs Kalabhāshīpi that the Siddhā is a magician, and that he has brought her there to be offered up as a sacrifice to the deity, and shews her in corroboration thereof an inscription which she reads, and is satisfied with the veracity of all the old woman has said, and bursts forth into lamentations. Meanwhile, the Siddhā returns, holds Kalabhāshīpi by her tresses, and is about to slay her, when the old woman makes a vow on the deity, whereupon the Siddhā slays the old woman. The deity soon after this appears before them, and allows the Siddhā to roam the heavens with Kalabhāshīpi. Sumukhāsatti then becomes a young woman and extols the deity.

IX. — Maṇiṣṭambha and Kalabhāshīpi fall on a bed of flowers in a park. When the latter cries out, Maṇiṣṭambha who has assumed the form of Naḷakūbara and has enjoyed Raṃbhā, at a distance, hears the cry, and comes and terrifies Maṇiṣṭambha. Meanwhile, Kalabhāshīpi looses herself from the hold of the Siddhā, assumes the form of Raṃbhā, and approaches the false Naḷakūbara to live with him. In the interim the real Raṃbhā goes in search of him, and comes upon the scene, when both the real and the apparent Raṃbhā quarrel with each other as co-wives, and the latter is cursed and retires. Soon after the real Naḷakūbara appears on the scene, curses the false one, and retires to heaven with Raṃbhā. Maṇiṣṭambha flies with his sword.

X. — Kalabhāshīpi, Maṇiṣṭambha and Maṇiṣṭambha come one by one to Sumukhāsatti at the temple already mentioned and narrate to each other their respective stories. Maṇiṣṭambha then offers up Kalabhāshīpi. She is cut to pieces, and the pieces become invisible. Sumukhāsatti and Maṇiṣṭambha go their own way. Maṇiṣṭambha then retires to Srīkāla, to breathe his last, and a Maḷaṅgā Brāhmaṇa, who comes there, takes possession of the necklace of the deceased and performs japa.

Such is the main story of this beautiful poem which contains many shorter stories as well all happily brought to a close in its fifth canto.

The last of the bards whom we have to deal with is Rāmārājabhūshāna, sometimes styled Bāṭumurti. No two critics, however, agree as to whether these two names belong to one and the same poet or are the names of two different poets. I shall endeavour in the following lines to present the reader with the case on either side and leave him to form his own judgment.

Rāmārājabhūshāna was the poet who wrote the Vasucharitra. Some are of opinion that this name was an honorific title, conferred on him by the fact of his having played an important part at the court of Rāmārāja, and that his real name was Bāṭumurti. He was born at Bāṭinpalli. The village was given to the poet’s ancestors, known as the Prabhandhāṇkas, by Krishnadēvarāya, for their poetic excellence. Some identify the village with one near Pulivendla in the Cuddapah district, and others with one in the district of Bellary. The poet may have been born at the time of Krishnadēvarāya, but it is highly improbable that he was one of the eight poets of his court. He really gained the title of Rāmārājabhūshāna for a few impromptu verses on Rāmārāja, during the last days of his life. Rāmārāja, as we have seen already, was the son-in-law of Krishnārāya, and the regent who guided the helm of the state during the minority of Sadásivarāya from 1542 to 1564 A. D. We may say, therefore, that possibly the poet began to write about 1560 A. D. We learn that he addressed some commendatory verses to Rāmārāja during his lifetime from the fact of Tirumalarāya, to whom the Vasucharitra is dedicated, referring to the same fact in addressing the poet in his Vasucharitra. From the Narapatiśayya we learn that Rāmārāja married Tirumalarāmā, the daughter of Krishnārāya, and had by her Krishnārāya and Peda Timmārāja.

After the demise of Rāmārāja, the kingdom of Vijayanagara, which ought properly to have fallen to his son Krishnārāja, as being the property of his maternal grandfather, was usurped by Tirumalarāya and Veṅkaṭapatiśayya, the brothers of Rāmārāja.
To return to the names of Rāmarājabhūshaṇa. Some say that Mūrti and Rāmarājabhūshaṇa are the names of two different poets, and that the former was the author of the Narasabhaṇḍaliya, while the latter wrote the Vasucharitra and Harīśchandra-Nalōpakhyaṇa. Others maintain that Mūrti was the real name and that Rāmarājabhūshaṇa was an honorific title given to him for holding the leadership of the court of Rāmarāja, and that he was the son of Sūraparāja and the adopted son of Veṅkaṭarājabhūshaṇa. Those who maintain the latter view say that the colophons in the Vasucharitra, Narasabhaṇḍaliya, and Harīśchandra-Nalōpakhyaṇa vary, and that in the colophons of the last two works there is a variation in the names of the father of the poet. Vīrēśalingam Pantulu says that though at the first reading of the works under reference we are led to believe that the writers are different, further reflection will make us feel that we must receive that opinion with a little caution.

In the beginning of each of these works, there is a slight difference in the adjuncts used, but as these are not contradictory, we have no reason to infer that the poets are two different people. As both the writers are bhaktas of Hanumān, as their style is not different, as it has been generally admitted till lately that Bāṭumūrti was the author of the Vasucharitra, and as the commentators of the Vasucharitra, who flourished very soon after him, say that he wrote the Narasabhaṇḍaliya illustrative of the figures of speech used in the former work, we are forced at least to doubt that these works are due to two different authors.

There can be no gainsaying the fact that Mūrti was the author of the Narasabhaṇḍaliya. 'Bāṭu' and other adjuncts must be either family names or honorific titles. In the work under consideration, there is an adjunct 'Subha' attached to the word 'Mūrti.' How came this word to be there, and to whom ought it to be properly applied? From the colophon to the Harīśchandra-Nalōpakhyaṇa, we learn that this adjunct 'Subha' was conferred by Rāmarāja on the poet Rāmarājabhūshaṇa. All this tends to show the identity of the writers of the Vasucharitra and Harīśchandra-Nalōpakhyaṇa. Were 'Rāmarājabhūshaṇa' a mere title, there would be no occasion at all to doubt the identity of the writers. But were the word used to express the name and not the title of a person, then there would be no occasion for using 'Rāmarājabhūshaṇa' in one place, 'Ramanripabhūshaṇa' in another, and 'Rāmaśabhaṇḍaliya' in a third. In his preface to the Harīśchandra-Nalōpakhyaṇa, Poondla Ramakrishnah says that this is a fact of trivial importance, and that he is at a loss to know how Vīrēśalingam Pantulu drew that inference. For, says he, had the expression 'Rāmarājabhūshaṇa' been a mere mark of honor, the poet would not have carelessly applied it, but assuming it to be the poet's own name he was at liberty to deal in whatever way he pleased with it as suited his own convenience. If, as that writer maintains, 'Rāmarājabhūshaṇa' is a mere title, what means have we, asks Poondla Ramakrishnah, to learn the genuine name of the poet? A book does not go by the mere title of the writer, and what has Vīrēśalingam Pantulu to say for the word 'Veṅkaṭarāyabhūshaṇa'? If he explains 'Rāmarājabhūshaṇa' in the way he does, he must also explain 'Veṅkaṭarāyabhūshaṇa' in just the same way. And as the latter appellation seems to be an anonymous one, it follows, says Poondla Ramakrishnah, that the word 'Bhūshaṇa' is a common appellation for all the members of the poet's family. It is said in the last of the works, the Harīśchandra-Nalōpakhyaṇa, that the poet had written previously the Vasucharitra, and other works, and that he had dedicated them to many of the greatest kings.

We learn two facts from the foregoing statements, viz., that the poet must have written at least one more work than the Vasucharitra, i.e., the Narasabhaṇḍaliya, and that he must have dedicated these to more than two, at least three, kings, viz., Rāmarāja, Tirumalaraya, and Narasarāja. I leave the credibility of this explanation to the reader.
Some maintain that the poet wanted to please his real and foster fathers, and has therefore entered the name of the one in one of his works and of the other in the other, while in the third no mention is made of either, and that in the Hariśchandra-Nāṭyopakhyāna the mention of the expression 'Sūrapāma' shows that he was the son of Śrīraparāja, while in the Narasahāpātiya, the mention of 'Veṅkatarāyaḥabhūṣaḥṣaputra' shows that he was the adopted son of Veṅkatarāyaḥabhūṣaṇa.

The first of the poet's works is the Vasucharitra, which is an exaggerated description of the loves of king Vasu and the beautiful nymph Girikanyakā. It was dedicated as we have already seen to Tirumalarāya. The following metrical rendering is taken from the second book of the poem, and is supposed to be spoken by Mañjuna when she was deputed by her mistress Girikanyakā to Vasaraṇa:

"O ruler of the world, thy presence bright
Fills each expanding heart with true delight
And joy, as when propitious fortune pours
Unmeasured treasures down in golden showers,
Or when the moon in plenitude arrayed
Shoots her bright splendours through the midnight shade.
Friend of the world! O powerful deity!
The effulgence of thy penetrating eye
Dispels the darkness and the gloom profound,
Whose sable mantle covers us around.
Thy graceful presence this auspicious day,
O king of kings, sends far each care away!
With every keen desire and wish possessed
Filled to satiety we stand confessed.
O sovereign of the earth! Thy heavenly tread
Approaching doth with potent blessings shed
On mortals immortality and grace,
And makes us wise as is the ethereal race.
Pre-eminent in good thy virtue pours
Like fruitful autumn its prolific stores:
Our homage paying we profit by thrift.
The rural goddess sheds her choicest gift
Exuberant on me and on my friends; with joy
In plenty we our happy hours employ,
That can a grateful voice enow upraise,
Receive the boon and give eternal praise?"

The Vasucharitra was much admired by the contemporaries of Baṭumūrti, and became a model for later poets to follow. The poet was highly rewarded by Tirumalarāya for this and other works that he composed at the command of that monarch. The descriptions of nature and the diction of the poem are excellent. It was written after 1570 A. D. Tirumalarāya, to whom the work is dedicated, removed the seat of his government to Penukoranda in 1567 A. D., and his battle with the Moslems after that date is recorded in the poem, and a slight reference is also made to the king transferring the reins of government to his second son Śrīraṅgarāya after making him heir-apparent, after the demise of his eldest son Raghunāṭharāya.

Whoever the writer of the Narasahāpātiya may be, it is dedicated to Narasarāya, the nephew of Rāmarāya and Tirumalarāya. Śrīraṅgarāya, the maternal grandfather of Narasarāya, had five sons — Kōnaraṇa, Timmarāja, Rāmarāja, Tirumalarāja, and Veṅkaṭapati-
rāja, and three daughters—Lakkamāmbā, Obaṃmbā, and Kōnamāmbā. Of the offspring of the daughters: to Narasārāya, son of Lakkamāmbā, is dedicated the Narasabhāpāliya, to Gobhūrī Narasārāya, son of Obaṃmbā, is dedicated the Rāmākhundaya, while the Parasnāgyeniinā is dedicated to Timmarāya, son of Kōnamāmbā. The Narasabhāpāliya is a Telugu rendering of the Sanskrit Pratāparudraīya, of which the portion dealing with the drama (Nātaka Prahalada) and the examples illustrative of the rules are omitted. The examples were prepared afresh by the author in the name of Narasārāya. It is said that Rāmārajabhūshaṇa had a taste for music.

By the time he composed the Hariścandra-Nālpākhyaṇa, Rāmārajabhūshaṇa must have been of a ripe old age, and by that time the dissolution of the kingdom of Vijayanagara had reached its completion. This work was written after Pīṅgali Sūrana wrote his Edhyavāpeḍeviṇi, dedicated to Śrī Rāma, towards the end of the sixteenth century. We may, therefore, safely say that Rāmārajabhūshaṇa wrote his works from 1550 to 1690 A.D.

In his preface to the Hariścandra-Nālpākhyaṇa, Poondla Ramakrishniah says that the fact that the colophons of the Vasucaitra and Hariścandra-Nālpākhyaṇa, the first and third of the works, agree, and that mention is made of a totally different personage in the second of the works, Narasabhāpāliya, shows that the writer of the first and third of these works must have been one and the same person. Had the second work been written by this person there would have been no possibility of so many inconsistencies in prosody as are to be found in it, for they are wholly absent in the Vasucaitra.

In the preface to his commentary on the Vasucaitra, the commentator Sōmanātha (who also wrote the Choturkhuddhishka, Vādavacitra, and Gangyamatrikamudda) says that the Vasucaitra was written by Mūrti or Baṭṭumūrti. We know that this commentator flourished towards the beginning of the seventeenth century, a few years after Appakavi and Ahōbalapati. What have the modern critics to say to this?

Telugu poets are in the habit of introducing into their later works certain stanzas from their earlier ones, with slight rectifications and modifications. Take for instance Tikkana’s Nirvānarāvaravārānaya and his Mahābhārata. This habit is also visible in the Vasucaitra and Narasabhāpāliya. An inexplicable fact unless we admit that the two works are the compositions of one and the same poet.

The evidence therefore comes to this that the so-called Ashta-diggajas did not all flourish at the time of Krishṇadēvarāya, and that there can be no gainsaying the fact that the golden age of Telugu art and literature began sometime previous to Krishṇarāya, whose nearer ancestors had discovered and nursed the genius of the Telugu people, while he, after his military achievements, gave them a home. His wars with the Muhammadans had established his supremacy over the vast extent of Telugu country. Vijayanagara had become an imperial State, and the Telugus, bound to her not merely by legal bonds, but by indissoluble ties of interest and affection, brought to her their civilization. Their arts and philosophy were easily carried to the new seat of learning, where Krishnarāya was ready to receive them with due honor. Not content with patronizing literature, he built many mahāpadas and temples, nor, while hospitable to the authors of the city’s civilization, was he unmindful of her material prosperity, and the trees he planted in the town extended their cool, umbrageous branches over many a weary way-farer. Later on, though her political power waned and disappeared; though kingdoms rose and fell and the centuries rolled away, they did but bring fresh triumphs to the city of the poet and the sage. Revolution after revolution has since passed over the face of India, but time has only half succeeded in its theft. Vijayanagara has been removed and ruined, but its power through its writers to delight the Telugus is still left.
CORNAC.

Here is the latest quotation I can find of this curious Europeo-Indianism, as an addition to those in Yule's Hobsin-Johnson, s. v. It means an elephant-driver.

1895. — "Si deux éléphants sont capturés, l'un reviendra au maître de la monture: le chasseur et le cornac se partageront le prix de l'autre." — Aymonier, Voyage dans le Laos, Vol. I. p. 64.

R. C. TEMPLE.

BAZARUCCO AND BEZOAR.

Here is a further contribution towards the history of these words, vide Yule, Hobsin-Johnson, s. v., Budgrove and Bezoar.

1839. — "Here (Borneo) is also Gold and Bezoar. This Stone breeds in the Maw of a Sheep or Goat, about a knot of Grass that stays in the Maw, and is often found within the Stone. The Persians call these Beasts Basans, and the Stone Bazar, which is, a Market, as by excellence proper for a Market or Fair: and from the same word comes the Bazaruqueux, he east money that is sent to the Market. The Stone is smooth and greenish, and the more substantial and weighty it is, the better it is and of the greater value. In the Country of Pan, near Malacca, they find a Stone in the Gall of a certain Swan, more highly esteemed than the Bazar. It is of a reddish colour, as smooth and slippery in the feeling as Soap, and exceeding bitter; so that when it is to be used, they only steep it in cold water, and the water is a most sovereign Amicidol against all poisons, and an effectual cordial against all infectious Diseases." — Mandelstah, Voyages and Travels into the East Indies, E.T., 1669, p. 124.

R. C. TEMPLE.

A TELUGU SUPERSTITION.

When troubled by fleas or mange dogs bring their hinder parts (or posteriors) in contact with the ground, and move on for some distance in that repulsive attitude and in this manner some of the parts of their bodies which are not accessible to the tail or the teeth are scratched or scraped, and when a Telugú observes in a house this canine action for which Nature is responsible, he at once attaches to it a superstition to the effect that the house is ruined, but as the house is usually not ruined in consequence it may be inferred what truth there is in the superstition!

M. N. VENKETSAMY.

INDIGO AS A TABUED PLANT.

I have seen it stated that Musalmán object to red in the Maharan. Is this objection general? and what is its foundation?

It would perhaps explain the fact that in the east of the Panjáb red is distinctly the Hindú, and indigo (which good Hindús will not grow) the Musalmán colour.

But why will not Hindús grow indigo? There must surely be some older reason than its adoption by Musalmán as a favourite colour in their clothes.

DENZIL ISBETSON, in P. N. and Q. 1883.

A WANDERING GHOST AT THE NICOBARS.

The following extract is from the diary of the Agent at Mā in Car Nicobar.—

"5th May 1885. — The chief Offendi, Friend of England, and a few other nobles of Mā came and asked my permission to expel from the Beacn the ghost of the boy who had died the other day. I told them that the Beacon was a standard erected in honor of Her Majesty the Queen Empress, and that no ghost could go into it. I also told them that, if they defiled the Beacon, they must not expect the usual presents from the Queen (i.e., the Indian Government). They then went into the nearest jungle, and caught the ghost in a thick bush and threw it into the sea.

R. C. TEMPLE.

MURDER IN ORDER TO PROCEIVE A SON.

In December, 1885, a low class Musalmán woman 35 years of age, from the Jalandhār District, Panjáb, arrived in Port Blair, sentenced to transportation for life for murder in the following circumstances. She had had several male children who had died in infancy, and had been told by a faqir that, if she killed the eldest son or daughter of some one, and bathed herself over the dead body, she would have another son, who would live. She had daughters, one of them a little child, with whom the eldest daughter of a neighbour, aged three, used to play. With the assistance of her elder daughter, a grown girl, she took the little girl into her home and cut her throat. Next day she and the elder daughter took the body into a barley field, where the woman bathed herself over it.

R. C. TEMPLE.
GEORG BÜHLER, 1837-1898.
IN MEMORIAM GEORGE BÜHLER.

GEORG BÜHLER.

IN MEMORIAM.

BY M. WINTERNITZ, Ph.D.

On the 16th of April, 1898, the terrible news reached Vienna that Hofrat Dr. J. G. Bühler, G. I. E., Professor of Sanskrit and Indian Antiquities in the University of Vienna, had met his death by drowning in Lake Constance. He had left Vienna on the 5th of April to spend the Easter vacation with his wife and son, who were staying with relations at Zürich. Tempted by the unusually fine weather, he broke his journey at Lindau on Lake Constance, to enjoy two days' rowing before proceeding to Zürich. On the 7th of April he hired a small boat, and returned to the Hotel towards evening. On Good Friday the 8th April he hired the same boat again — a small rowing boat, ominously called 'nut-shell' by the natives — to take another trip across the lake. He was last seen about seven o'clock in the evening. Those acquainted with the locality believe that he must have lost an oar and, in attempting to recover it, over-balance the boat, and so was drowned. Next day the boat was found floating on the lake bottom upwards, but no one knew who the old gentleman was that had been seen in the boat the night before. While his servants in Vienna believed him to be in Zürich with his family, his wife thought that he had been unexpectedly detained in Vienna, though she was not at all distressed at receiving no reply to her letters. A few days passed before the proprietor of the Hotel, in which the Professor had been staying, communicated with the police. Enquiries were set on foot, and at last, on the 15th of April, it was ascertained that the occupant of the boat was Hofrat Bühler of Vienna. The body has never been recovered.

Readers of this Journal, in which so many of Dr. Bühler's discoveries have been published, need not be told what an irreparable loss Sanskrit scholarship and Indology have suffered by the death of the great scholar who seemed to be quite indispensable as a guide and worker in the field of Indo-Aryan research. Many of the readers of this Journal, too, were friends and pupils of the deceased; need they be told of his untiring readiness to help, of the noble unselfishness with which he sacrificed any amount of time to those whom he had enlisted as co-workers in any branch of the science which was all in all to him, or of his wonderful enthusiasm as a teacher? Yet a short sketch of the life-work of the eminent scholar and master whom we have lost, may not be unwelcome to readers of this Journal, which owes so much to him.

Johann Georg Bühler was born at Borstel near Nienburg in Hanover on the 15th July, 1837. He was a student at the University of Göttingen where he took his doctor's degree in 1858. His master was the famous linguist and folklorist Theodor Benfey, and Benfey was always very proud of his pupil, while the latter was attached to him as long as he lived, in the sense that a Hindu pupil is attached to his Guru. I remember (it was about a year after Benfey's death) Bühler saying that he did not agree with Benfey's theory, according to which the Buddhist fairy tales were the oldest source from which all Indian fairy tales were derived, but that he did not care to write anything in opposition to his old teacher.

The first articles published by Bühler were concerned with questions of Comparative Philology and Vedic Mythology. They were published in Orient and Occident (1862 and 1864), edited by Benfey; an essay on the god Parjanya, an article on the etymology of Eos, etc. A paper 'On the origin of the Sanskrit Linguins' appeared in 1864, in the Madras Literary Journal.

But before long his enthusiasm turned more and more to the study of Sanskrit as an independent branch of knowledge, and no longer a mere handmaid to Comparative Philology. It was this enthusiasm which awakened in him a strong desire to go out to India, and in order to form connections for achieving this purpose, he went to England in 1859. Here he continued his studies in the libraries of Oxford and London, entered into relations with Prof. Max Müller, and held for a short time the post of Assistant Librarian at the Royal Library in Windsor. After three years he returned to Göttingen, to take up an appointment at the University Library.
But he had not been there very long when at last an opportunity seemed to offer itself for the fulfilment of his greatest desire. At that time he was determined to go to India at any cost, and (as he often told his pupils, when he wished to encourage them to go out to India) would have gone out as a merchant's agent, had no better chance offered itself. Thus, when he was told that there was an opening in the Education Department in India, he did not stop to consider the circumstances connected with the appointment in question, but started at once for India, and when he arrived in Bombay, he found that the post which was promised him was not vacant! Happily, however, in those days European scholars were constantly wanted in the Educational Department. He became acquainted with Sir Alexander Grant, then Principal of the Elphinstone College in Bombay. Sir Alexander had already done much for education in India, and was particularly anxious to raise the standard of Sanskrit studies in the College. It was through his exertions that in December, 1862, Raghoonath Sastry was sent from the Poona College to Bombay, to teach Sanskrit, and he soon succeeded in obtaining for Bühler an appointment as Professor of Oriental Languages at the Elphinstone College.

In his Report to the Director of Public Instruction, Bombay, for the year 1862-63, Sir Alexander Grant refers to Bühler's appointment and adds: 'Dr. Bühler seems in every way well qualified for the duties of his chair. He reports that as Sanskrit studies have been only just started in the college, the standard is as yet low. This will be doubtless remedied by his exertions in the course of time, and we are now in a position to assert that every student in college will be regularly grounded in either Sanskrit or Latin. I need not point out to you the importance of this step from an educational point of view.' In his next Report (1863-64) Sir Alexander, after referring to the services of the Professors in general, adds: 'Dr. Bühler especially seems to me to deserve mention for the cordial way in which he has thrown himself into the work of the College. Not only as a man of learning, but also as a practical educationist, he has been a great acquisition to our staff.' He not only taught Sanskrit, but also Comparative Philology and Latin, occasionally also Ancient History. He paid great attention to the College Library, to which many standard Sanskrit works were afterwards added through his exertions. In every way he worked hard to make the Natives acquainted with European methods of research and with the results of Oriental studies in Europe, but at the same time he was aware of the great value, which the traditional learning of Native Paṇḍits may have for the progress of Sanskrit studies, both in Europe and in India. In one of his first Reports on his college work he recommends to Government the appointment of 'one of the thorough-bred Śastraś of the old school,' both as a help to the advanced students and as an assistance to the Professor. 'The Śastraś, he says, 'are the representatives of the traditional knowledge of Sanskrit, and in the present state of Sanskrit studies their services are by no means to be underrated.' It was his constant effort to combine the advantages of classical European education with those of the traditional Hindu methods of teaching. That India has produced such scholars as Bhandarkar, Shankar Paṇḍit, Telang, Apte, and others, and that these men, who have acquired and made so excellent a use of European methods of criticism, have been educated in the Bombay Presidency, is to a very great extent due to the beneficial influence of Bühler and it must be said later on also of Kielhorn.

In the Report of the Director of Public Instruction, Bombay, for the year 1865-66, reference is made for the first time to the plan of publishing 'A Collection of Sanskrit Classics for the Use of Indian High Schools and Colleges' under the title Bombay Sanskrit Series, to be edited under the superintendence of Profs. Bühler and Kielhorn. Although, in the first instance, intended, for the use of schools in India, the excellent editions of standard Sanskrit works published in the Bombay Sanskrit Series have become of the greatest importance for the progress of Sanskrit studies in Europe. We need only compare the beautiful editions of Sanskrit texts, published in this Series, with the carelessly printed and (excepting a few laudable exceptions) utterly uncritical editions published in the Calcutta Bibliotheca Indica, to see how beneficial the influence of men like Bühler and Kielhorn has proved also in this
respect. Bühler himself took his share as an editor in this Series by publishing excellent editions of some books of the *Pañcāhata* of the first part of Daśādī's *Daśakumārakūpti*, and other important texts.

From 1870 Bühler acted as Education Inspector in the Northern Division of the Bombay Presidency. If we read his Annual Reports on his work in this capacity, they are printed in the Reports of the Department of Public Instruction in the Bombay Presidency (1870-1880), we can get an idea of the zeal and enthusiasm with which he devoted himself to his official duties, ever anxious to raise the standard of education in the district entrusted to his administration. Bühler's services were fully appreciated by the Education Department, and when, in 1880, he retired from the service, the Director of Public Instruction in the Bombay Presidency, in his Report for the year 1879-80, referred to Bühler's work in India in the following words: 'His Excellency in Council will take this opportunity of expressing his great regret at the loss which the Department has sustained by the retirement from the service of Dr. Bühler, whose zealous labours have done so much to lay the foundation of a sound popular education in Gujarāt, while he has no less distinguished himself by his successful exertions in the collection of some thousands of manuscripts in Central India, Rājputana, the Panjab, Kashmir, etc., as well as in this Presidency; in the preparation of standard works on Hindu Law and literature, and in adding to the stock of philological and archaeological lore. By his influence as a Teacher in Government Colleges and Examiner in the University of Bombay, he has not only kept alive an interest in Sanskrit, but has extended the study of that language, and raised the standard of Oriental Scholarship throughout the west of India.'

Bühler's great and important travels for the Search for Sanskrit Manuscripts began in 1866, and the Report of the Department of Public Instruction of the Bombay Presidency for the year 1866-67 contains an highly valuable report by Bühler on discoveries made on his tour to the Southern Maratha Country in search of Sanskrit Manuscripts. The Director of Public Instruction, referring to Bühler's labours during this tour, says: 'By conversing fluently in the Sanskrit Language with Brahman Shastris at the various places which he visited, he succeeded to a great extent in inspiring confidence and in allaying the prejudices of persons who were at first unwilling to show their sacred volumes to an European.'

This search for Sanskrit MSS., for which, thanks to the efforts of Mr. Whitley Stokes Government had made an annual grant of 25,000 Rupees, now occupied Bühler for many years. With untiring zeal and energy he searched the libraries in many parts of India, and discovered most valuable and unexpected treasures. And his investigations, carried on with no less enthusiasm than knowledge of his subject, led to discoveries in all branches of Indian literature. Indeed, some entire branches of literature were brought to light by him for the first time.

Thus, before the days of Bühler, our knowledge of the highly important literature of the Jainas was very scanty indeed, although the members of this sect had for centuries displayed an extraordinary literary activity, and the most valuable collections of Sanskrit and Prakrit MSS. were hidden away in the old and rich libraries of the Jaina monasteries. Bühler was the first to start a systematic investigation of these 'treasuries of Sarasvatī' as the Jainas call their libraries. The Library of Jesalmer, searched by Bühler in 1874, was the first Jaina library, which a European was allowed to search. It was no easy matter to be admitted to these jealously guarded treasures. The monks and ministers in Jesalmer tried, by every possible means, to prevent the inspection of their library, and it required not a little patience and tact and diplomacy on Bühler's part to enable him to examine all the MSS. in it. But his labour was amply rewarded. For not only was this library rich in valuable MSS. both of the religious literature of the Jainas and of profane Brahmanical literature, but these MSS. also proved to be of high antiquity. Before the year 1873 no MSS. were known in India to be older than the 15th century. In 1873 Bühler had discovered MSS. dated as early as A.D. 1258, and here in Jesalmer he was delighted to find MSS. of a still earlier date, some going back to
A.D. 1100. It is of course well known now that since then much older Sanskrit MSS. have been discovered in Nepal, Japan, and Kashgar.

Throughout his travels in search for Sanskrit MSS. Bühler paid special attention to the Jaina MSS., and it is through his exertions that numerous specimens have become accessible to European scholars in the libraries of London and Berlin, as well as in Indian libraries. Thus it is, that we are now comparatively well informed about the history and the religious system of a sect, of which hardly anything was known thirty years ago, is chiefly due to Bühler's efforts. For his discoveries and collections of MSS. led to the excellent works of Profs. Albrecht Weber, Hermann Jacobi, and Ernst Leumann, in the department of Jaina religion and literature. It is no small comfort to know that Bühler's labour will not be lost, and that in this branch of Hindu literature these scholars will continue the work, which he had inaugurated with so great success.

The general results of Bühler's indefatigable labours in the search for MSS. are found in numerous Government Reports and Catalogues; e.g., in his Catalogue of Sanskrit MSS. contained in the Private Libraries of Gujarát, Káthiádá, Káckhá, Sind and Khádá, published 1871-73, in the annual reports for the years 1870-80 of the Royal Asiatic Society on the progress of Oriental learning (generally reprinted in the Indian Antiquary), in many of the volumes of the Journal of the German Oriental Society, and in the easter volumes of Weber's Indische Studien, we constantly come across references to new discoveries made by Bühler, — discoveries of works pertaining to all branches of Indian Literature, which were either altogether unknown before, or of the re-discovery of which scholars had long given up all hope. These labours reached their climax in the famous Detailed Report of a Tour in Search of Sanskrit Manuscripts in Káśmir, Rájputána and Central Indiá (Bombay, 1877), a very mine of information about almost every point of Sanskrit Literature. Details were given here about numerous works which had hitherto been entirely unknown, and about authors whose very names had never been heard before.

To mention only one instance, it is in this Detailed Report that we first hear of Káhembre, the Káśmir poet and polyhistor whose numerous works, though of small value as works of art, are of the greatest importance for the history of the contemporaneous literature and especially also for the history of the Hindu epic literature. It is impossible to write a history of Indian literature now-a-days, without constantly referring to Bühler's Detailed Report, which contains not only names and titles, and brief notices of numerous works and authors, but also most valuable discussions on the literary and historical importance of the discovered MSS.

For Bühler was not only a successful discoverer and zealous collector of MSS., but he was also most eager to use his discoveries for literary and historical investigations. Though he never grudged the treasures, which he had discovered, to other scholars, and though he was ever ready to place any MSS. he had found at the disposal of scholars in Europe or India, who were anxious to edit texts or to avail themselves of the new MSS. for literary purposes, — he also took his share in the laborious task of editing texts, and above all he never lost sight of the one great aim he had in view, to bring light into the dark ages of the ancient history of India, and to disentangle the chaos of the history of ancient Hindu Literature.

How often have we heard complaints about the unsatisfactory state of history in India! We are told that, as regards the history of ancient India, we have nothing but fables and legends, no real historical facts at all; that, with an enormous mass of literary compositions, we have no chronology in these works that could be depended on. Well known are the words of the great American scholar, W. D. Whitney, that 'respecting the chronology of this development, or the date of any class of writings, still more of any individual work, the less that is said the better;' — that 'all dates given in Indian literary history are pins set up to be bowled down again.' All these complaints, which twenty years ago were still fully justified, are
now-a-days greatly exaggerated. That this is the case, that Sanskrit Literature is no longer the chaos it was, that one or two 'pins,' at any rate, stand so firmly rooted that they cannot be 'bowed down' again, that the hope at least is justified that, instead of the chaos of Indian history and literature, we shall some day have a cosmos, — is in no small measure due to the efforts of Bühler himself and of a considerable number of pupils and fellow-workers who had gathered around him.

Bühler never felt satisfied with what is called 'inner chronology,' which is based on a comparison of the contents of the different literary compositions and in this way tries to establish a kind of chronological sequence of the works, — a proceeding in which too much scope is left to individual opinion. One safe historical date which could be depended on was worth more to Bühler than a volume full of more or less convincing arguments as to might-be. But how were such firmly established historical dates to be obtained? If not from works of literature yet from monuments of stone and metal. Bühler was fully aware of this, and with his characteristic enthusiasm he devoted himself to the task of searching for, deciphering, and interpreting inscriptions, and no one was more eager than he was in turning these inscriptions to account for historical, geographical, and literary purposes. The results of these investigations are recorded in numerous papers in the Indian Antiquary, the Epigraphia Indica, and other Oriental Journals, and we owe to them many important chronological data, not only about the political history of India, but also concerning many Hindu authors and works of literature, and light is thrown by them on the history of entire branches of literature, as well as on the history of certain religious systems. In a most important paper on Indian inscriptions and the age of the Kāvya Literature (Die indischen Inschriften und das Alter der indischen Künsteuphrate, Sitzungsberichte der Kais. Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien, 1890) Bühler has shown, in one particular instance, how much valuable information concerning the history of the classical Sanskrit literature may be gathered from the inscriptions. The fact that from the literary works themselves the so-called Kāvya Literature cannot be traced back further than the 6th century A. D., led to Prof. Max Müller's famous theory of a 'literary interregnum' in India, and a 'Renaissance of Sanskrit literature,' beginning about 400 A. D., and reaching its highest development in the 6th century, but Bühler showed in this paper that the irrefutable testimony of inscriptions proves a much higher antiquity of the Kāvya Literature, that it was developed not after but before the beginning of our era, and that a 'literary interregnum' probably never existed in India. In the new edition of his work India, what can it teach us? (published in 1892), Prof. Max Müller readily acknowledged that, in view of the arguments of his friend Bühler, the theory of the 'Renaissance promulgated by him could not be upheld any longer without considerable modification.

But it is not only with regard to the history of classical Sanskrit literature that Bühler's epigraphic discoveries and researches have led to new and important results, they have also thrown a flood of light on many dark points in the history of religious movements in India. The sect of the Jains, whose literature (as already mentioned) has only become properly known by Bühler's discoveries, has, also by the investigations of the same scholar, received its due position in the history of religious systems in India. Not so very long ago, Jainism used to be looked upon as a mere offspring of Buddhism, but Bühler succeeded in proving, by the indisputable testimony of inscriptions, that the Jains were in early times (as they are now) an important sect, independent of and contemporaneous with that of the Buddhists; that both Jainism and Buddhism arose about the same time in the same part of India — a fact which is of the greatest importance, not only for the history of Buddhism, but also for the history of religious movements in the east of India during the 6th and 5th centuries B. C. The results of Bühler's investigations, which are laid down in a series of articles on the authenticity of the Jaina tradition (in the Vienna Oriental Journal, 1887-90) have been fully borne out by further researches of Profs. Jacobi and Leumann. Bühler himself has given a clear and popular account of the Jaina religion and of the historical importance of the Jaina sect, in a paper
read before the Imperial Academy of Sciences in Vienna, entitled 'Ueber die Indische Sekté der Jaina' (1887).

It is well known that the writings of the Jainas, apart from their intrinsic value as religious writings and their bearing on the history of religion, are of the greatest importance for the history of Indian literature and civilisation in general. For the Jaina monks, much like the monks of the Middle Ages in Europe, did not content themselves with the study of their own sacred literature, but devoted themselves as eagerly to the study of various branches of learning, and we owe to them many excellent works on grammar and astronomy, besides both original compositions and commentaries on works of poetry. In his important paper, 'Ueber das Leben des Jaina-Mönche Herrachandra' (Denkschriften der Kais. Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Wien, 1889), Bühler has given us an account of the life and works of a famous Jaina monk, who distinguished himself in the profane sciences, especially as a grammarian and lexicographer.

By his labours in connection with Jaina literature, Bühler was led to the study of Prākrit and we owe to him many valuable contributions to Prākrit grammar and lexicography.

But all this pioneer work, to which Bühler was led by his epigraphic researches, and which would have been enough to make the reputation of any scholar, was with him only a small part of his work. His chief aim, which he never lost sight of, was always the elucidation of the political history of ancient India. I need only refer to his epigraphic and historical investigations reported in numerous articles and papers found in the Indian Antiquary, in the Epigraphia Indica, in the Vienna Oriental Journal, in the Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft, in the Proceedings of the Imperial Academy of Sciences at Vienna, and in some volumes of the Archaological Survey of India. Especially to the famous Edicts of King Asoka he devoted no end of time and patient labour, and how much he has done for the decipherment and correct interpretation of these important inscriptions is well known to all who take an interest in the history of ancient India.

But no less important than the inscriptions seemed to him the few, but all the more valuable, historical works of the Hindus — the historical romances and chronicles — as well as the accounts of Chinese and Arabian travellers on India. In 1874, when searching the library of Jassirmir, he discovered an old palm-leaf MS. which (to his great delight) contained the Vīramāṇakavadacarita, a chronicle composed by the Jaina Bilhaṇa. He started at once to copy the whole MS. He had not much time to spare, but together with his friend Prof. Jacobi (who was his companion during this tour) the whole work was copied within seven days. An edition of this work, with a valuable historical introduction, was published by Bühler soon after in the Bombay Sanskrit Series. Another historical work, the Raṣṭarāṇī or the Chronicles of the Kings of Kāsmir, also attracted his special attention. In his famous Detailed Report he devoted to this work a long discussion, in which he dwelt on its importance for the history of India, and pointed out the oldest MSS., which, later on, formed the basis for Dr. Stein's excellent edition of this work. Professor Sachau's edition and translation of Alberini's famous account of India excited Bühler's liveliest interest, and when the translation was published, he devoted to it a review of 20 pages in the Indian Antiquary (1890), pointing out the eminent importance of this work for the History of India.

All this was only intended as a kind of preliminary work for the great scheme which he had in his mind for years — to write a connected history of ancient India. That this scheme was not to be carried out, is probably the most deplorable loss, which Indian studies have suffered by the untimely death of the eminent scholar, who — with his wonderful historical instinct, his critical tact, his accuracy, and his ever unbiased judgment — was the very man to write a history of India. And it is a fact only too well known that a history of ancient India, based on secure epigraphic and literary dates, is one of the greatest desiderata of Indology.
His intimate acquaintance with manuscripts and inscriptions naturally made Bühler a first rate authority on all questions of palaeography. When Prof. Max Müller published the famous specimens of ancient Indian writing found in Japan, he requested Bühler to discuss the palaeographical importance of the new finds, and his palaeographical remarks form a most valuable appendix to the texts edited by Prof. Max Müller (Anecdotae Oszoniensia, Aryan Series, 1, 3). Only three years ago Bühler published a most valuable contribution to the history of Indian writing in his essay 'On the Origin of the Indian Brāhma Alphabet' (Indian Studie No. III., Sitzungsberichte der Kais. Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Wien, 1895), a second revised edition of which, together with two Appendices on the Origin of the Kharoshṭhi Alphabet and of the so-called Letter-Numerals of the Brāhma (with three plates), appeared almost simultaneously with the distressing news of the author's death. And two years ago he published, as part of his Encyclopedia of Indo-Aryan Research, a most exhaustive treatise on Indian palaeography (Indische Palaeographie, with seventeen tables and map) of which an English translation, happily still written by Bühler himself, is now in the press and will be published before long.

But there is hardly any branch of Indian Philology and Archaeology, in which Bühler has not done pioneer work, on which his extensive knowledge has not thrown new and unexpected light. It is true that his writings are more concerned with classical Sanskrit literature than with the Veda, yet we owe to him most important discoveries of MSS. belonging to the Atharva-veda and to the Yajur-veda, and he took the greatest interest in all questions of Vedic philology. He sympathised with those Vedic scholars who (like Prof. Ludwig or Prof. Pischel) see in the Veda, first of all, a product of the Indian mind which can only be rightly understood in connection with the rest of the Indian literature. But above all he was interested (and here we see again the historian) in the history of the Vedic schools, and he never ceased to hope that with the help of inscriptions it would be possible to gain information about the development of the different Vedic schools, their spread over various parts of India, and their age, — and in time also about the vexed question as to the age of the Veda itself, i.e., of individual Vedic works.

These questions as to the age and geographical distribution of the Vedic schools were discussed by Bühler on several occasions in connection with his investigations into the history of the Indian Law-books, — a branch of Sanskrit literature in which, again, we owe to Bühler real pioneer work. Beyond the law books of Mann and Yājñavalkya and some modern Commentaries and Digests, little was known, before Bühler, about the oldest legal literature in India. To Bühler (whose labours in this direction have been most successfully continued by Prof. Jolly) we owe our acquaintance with the most ancient Hindu law books, the Dharmasūtras. As early as 1867 he wrote his important introduction, Sources of the Hindu Law, to Sir Raymond West's Digest of the Hindu Law of Inheritance, Partition, and Adoption, of which a third edition appeared in 1884. In this introduction he gave, for the first time, a concise but complete survey of the Hindu law literature. In 1868 and 1871 he published an edition of one of the oldest Hindu law books, the Aparihana on the Sacred Laws of the Hindus, by Āpastamba, — the first critical edition of a work of that kind. A second edition of this work appeared a few years ago (1892-94) in the Bombay Sanskrit Series. For Prof. Max Müller's Sacred Books of the East he translated the oldest and most important Hindu law books in two volumes The Sacred Laws of the Aryas (Vols. II. and XIV. of the series; a second edition of Vol. II appeared last year). These translations were chiefly made from MSS. discovered by Bühler himself. Editions of the texts have since been published by various scholars. The introductions to these two volumes contain highly important investigations concerning the age of the works translated, and their relation to one another. In 1886 Bühler translated the law book of Manu, the most popular of all Hindu law books, for the same series (The Laws of Manu, Vol. XXV. of the Sacred Books of the East). This volume contains not only an excellent translation of the work, but also extensive extracts from the numerous commentaries, and
Appendices illustrating the relation of the Manusmṛti to other Hindu lawbooks. And it also contains a most valuable introduction of 183 pages, in which he not only continues his investigations into the history of the Hindu law books, but also enters into discussions on some of the most important chronological and historical questions touching almost every department of ancient Hindu literature.

Amongst other things he discusses in this introduction the relation of Manu's law book to the Epic literature of the Hindus, and for the first time grapples with what is perhaps the most difficult problem in the history of the Indian literature,—the chronological and literary problem of the gigantic Hindu epic, the Mahābhārata. In dealing with this question he again evinces his eminently historical instinct. Here, too, he was utterly dissatisfied with the 'inner' criticism and the vague hypotheses defended by Prof. Holtzmann and other scholars. Eagerly he sought for epigraphic and literary documents from which any secure dates as to the history of the Hindu epic could be obtained. In his Contributions to the History of the Mahābhārata (published together with Prof. Kirste's paper on Keshananda's Bhāratamaṇḍapa in the Sitzungsberichte der Kais. Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Wien, 1892) he has shown how, by the patient study of inscriptions and by a comparison of other branches of literature, the dates of which are more or less approximately known, it is possible to bring light even into this darkest of all problems in the history of ancient Hindu literature. He was most anxious to interest his pupils in this much neglected branch of Sanskrit literature. It was on his suggestion that my articles on the South-Indian recension of the Mahābhārata, were printed in the Indian Antiquary, and the last letters of the deceased which I received from him during the last months preceding his death, are an eloquent and melancholy proof to me of the great and lively interest he took in all questions of Mahābhārata criticism. In this department of Indology his loss will be felt by no one more painfully and more acutely than by the present writer, whose first thought in all his Indological studies had hitherto always been, 'what will Bühler say?'

We are often told that to make discoveries is merely a matter of luck, and some people might think it was just Bühler's good luck which enabled him to make so many important discoveries, which in their turn led to his fruitful labours in all departments of Indian research. Now it may be called 'luck' that at the time when he was in India there were still so many unknown treasures hidden in Indian libraries. But surely no one was better qualified that Bühler to unearth these treasures.

First of all, he was stimulated by an enthusiasm for his particular line of research, of which only he can have some idea who has ever seen him, standing with sparkling eyes and almost childlike delight before some impression of a difficult inscription from which he had succeeded, after patient and often renewed attempts, in reading the correct Sanskrit words. This enthusiasm was the main spring of the zeal and energy with which he pursued his researches. Moreover, he had acquired a thorough knowledge of the languages, in which he could freely converse with native scholars, on whose assistance he had greatly to depend in his travels of research. But above all it was his hearty sympathy and tact which won him the love and affection of the Natives and, whenever wanted, their ready help and co-operation. He counted among his friends members of all classes of the native population, among learned Brahmins, as well as among the Jain monks. He tells us (in a German paper read at the Vienna Oriental Museum in 1883, describing his 'Journey through the Indian desert') how much of his success in searching Jain libraries he owed to his intimate friendship with the Śrīpu Jiñānaktisūri, the head of a portion of the Kharatara-Gachchha. He was never tired of mentioning, in words of grateful recognition, any services rendered to him by Pādita. I need only refer to the kind and hearty words of friendship, which, in the very first pages of his Detailed Report, he devotes to Pādita Radhakishn, who had brought him the first MSS. of his Kashmir collection, and how carefully he mentions every one of the Native scholars, whose assistance had been of any use to him during his search for MSS. in Kashmir.

Printed in the Österreichische Rundschau, 1888, pp. 517-535.
Readers of this Journal will remember the beautiful obituary which (Indian Antiquary, Vol. XVII., 1888) he devoted to his lamented friend Pandit Bhagvanlal Indrajit, — a scholar whose excellent contributions to Indian epigraphy and archaeology would probably have been lost to the European world of learning, if it had not been for Bühlcr, who translated into English the papers written in Gujarati by his friend. With a kindly and sympathetic interest, and at the same time with that strict accuracy and conscientiousness which characterizes everything written by Bühlcr, he gives in this obituary a full account of all that Pandit Bhagvanlal has done for Indian history, epigraphy, and archaeology. In stirring words he refers to the noble character of this scholar, and then proceeds to describe his own relations to him, — how they sat together for hours, working and conversing about problems of Indian history and archaeology, but frequently also about the social, political, and religious conditions of modern India. "His amiable, frank character," (he concludes) "his keen intelligence, and his extensive learning, made him very dear to me. I shall never forget the pleasant days, when I used eagerly to look forward to the announcement that the Panditji had come; and I sadly acknowledge now, as I have done already on special occasions, that I have learnt a great deal from him."

Never have I heard from Bühlcr any of those slighting and disparaging remarks about the character of the Natives, which one hears so frequently from people who have spent a few months, or may be years, in India without ever making the least attempt to become really acquainted with any class of Natives. When he spoke of the people among whom he spent so many years of his life, it was always with words of just appreciation of the good he had found in the Native character, and words of kindly and grateful remembrance of the services they had rendered him in his scientific pursuits. An incident, which occurred during his stay near Jesalmer, and which he relates in the above-mentioned paper on his Journey through the Indian Desert, may show how he surmounted even serious difficulties by the tact and shrewd commonsense, with which he respected and even adopted the religious prejudices of the Natives. One day it happened that a cow was found in the neighbourhood of his camp, ransacking the fodder stores of the camels, and one of the camel-drivers threw a stone to frighten the cow away. Unfortunately he hit her leg. Now, since cows are sacred in Rajputana, this offence created a great stir. The owner of the cow appeared greatly excited, and stoutly refused to accept any recompense offered him for the damage done. The cows, he said, he loved like his family, and nothing short of corporal punishment inflicted on the offender would satisfy him. The minister of the Rawal, who had hurried to the spot, also insisted on the same demand. The camel-driver was to receive a hundred strokes. Bühlcr refused to endorse such a sentence, and a whole day passed in futile negotiations with the local officials. At last Bühlcr hit on a new plan. When the minister of the Rawal came again, Bühlcr offered to inflict on the camel-driver a heavy fine, and to use the sum for a pious work. To this the people agreed. If a certain amount of fodder were bought, and spread out on the spot of the accident to give the cows of Jesalmer a solemn feast, the atonement would be considered sufficient. Bühlcr at once promised to do this, and imposed on the offender a fine of twenty rupees, with which he bought five camel loads of hay. These were spread out outside the camp, and for three days all the cows of Jesalmer assembled for a solemn pasture. The wounded cow soon recovered, and the incident, which otherwise might have led to serious disturbances, had no further consequences. It even proved useful, inasmuch as it raised Bühlcr's authority in the eyes of the people, who were impressed with his sense of justice, since he had offered such a suitable pratyakshitta for the horrible offence committed. The Sirdar, too, heartily approved of Bühlcr's action saying, 'You have acted rightly, now the people know that you respect their prejudices.'

Personal contact and frequent exchange of ideas with native Pandits, were considered by Bühlcr as indispensable for the progress of research. It was on this account that most of his contributions to Indology were written in English, that he wished his pupils to do the same,
that he insisted on articles relating to India being written in English for the Vienna Oriental Journal, and that he persuaded even the Imperial Academy of Sciences at Vienna to print in its Proceedings papers in the English language,—as he once said to one of his English friends, 'not to save you trouble, but for the good of those in India.' His friendly relations with the Natives of India enabled him to find many things which no other European could have found; they also enabled him to gain an insight into the inner life and thought of the Indian people, such as only few Europeans, though they may have spent years in India, have been able to obtain. And it was this intimate acquaintance with Hindu modes of thought and with the inner life of the Hindus, which made intercourse with Bühlér, and above all his academical teaching, so very inspiring and so extremely instructive.

In fact, what was said of Benfey, that 'his inspirations were more wonderful than his science,' applies even in a greater measure to Bühlér, Benfey's great pupil. It was impossible for any one, whatever special department of Indian research he might be interested in, to converse with Bühlér even for half an hour only, without gaining from him new points of view and many new inspirations. How much more must this apply to those who (like the present writer) have actually had the good fortune of sitting as pupils at Bühlér's feet? When in 1880 the Indian climate affected his health and he had to leave India, he was speedily appointed to the chair of Sanskrit and Indology in the University of Vienna, and with unabated energy he devoted himself to the duties of his chair. Even when teaching the elements of Sanskrit, he was inspired by the same enthusiasm as that with which he pursued his important archaelogical and epigraphical researches and worked out the most difficult problems of Indian history. It was a real pleasure to attend his 'Elementary Course of Sanskrit.' The same practical method of teaching the elements of Sanskrit, which he and Prof. Bhândárkar had, with such great success, used in Indian Colleges, was introduced by him in the University of Vienna. For this purpose he published, in 1883, a practical handbook for the study of Sanskrit,—his Leitfaden für den Elementarkursus des Sanskrit. When I began the study of Sanskrit in 1881, he was just printing this Leitfaden for use at his own lectures; and how we rejoiced at every new sheet that came from the press! An English translation of this Handbook, under the title Sanskrit Primer, was published in America by Prof. Perry (Boston, 1886). His 'Elementary Course of Sanskrit' was followed by the reading of easy texts, and never shall I forget the happy hours when I read with Bühlér the immortal Nalopâkhyâna. When we had surmounted the initial difficulties of the study of Sanskrit, he began to initiate us into the different branches of Sanskrit literature by reading with us specimens of the ornate style of classical Sanskrit poetry and poetical prose, e. g., Bâga's Kâdambari; we were introduced to Pâñini by the reading of the Siddhânta-kumudâ, to the Alankâra-âstra, by Vâmana's treatise, to Hindu philosophy by the Vedânta-sûtra and the Tarkasastra, to the drama by Kâlidâsa's Mâlâyâkhyânitra to the Veda, by reading a selection of hymns with Sâyaña's commentary, to the Dharma-âstra by the interpretation of the Mitâkshara, and at the same time he lectured to us on Sanskrit Syntax, on Indian History, on Epigraphy, on the history of the Hindu law books, etc.; and both within and without the lecture room he took the greatest personal interest in every one of his pupils: like a true Indian Guru, he was as a father to his disciples, who will cherish his memory with unceasing gratitude.

As Professor in the University Bühlér was also anxious to make Vienna a centre of Oriental studies. With this end in view he became one of the Editors of a literary and critical supplement to the Monatschrift für den Orient, edited by the Vienna Oriental Museum, in which he published several important reviews (1884-86). Shortly before the Congress of Orientalists held at Vienna in 1886, he founded, together with the other Professors of Oriental languages at the University and with the assistance of Baron von Gautsch who was then Minister of Public Instruction, the Oriental Institute of Vienna University. I still remember the proud satisfaction and delight, with which he walked through the two rooms of the University devoted to this Institute, and how pleased he was to see his pupils working in it.
It was in the same Oriental Institute, where soon after the newly founded Vienna Oriental Journal was edited, in which (from 1887) he published many valuable contributions to Indian history, epigraphy, archaeology, lexicography and other branches of Indology.

As a Member of the Imperial Academy of Sciences at Vienna he not only added many valuable papers to the Proceedings of the Academy, but he also took every opportunity of urging the Academy to support Sanskrit studies by grants of money for scientific purposes: — e. g., only a few years ago, for the edition of a series of highly important texts, the Sources of Sanskrit Lexicography.

Nevertheless, friendly relations to India and England suffered no interruption. We meet his name in every volume of the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, and he often sent communications to Mr. Cotton's Academy, and to the Athenæum. And readers of this Journal know only too well what his loss means to the Indian Antiquary.

As a representative of Vienna University, he regularly attended the International Congresses of Orientalists, and in the meetings of the Indian Section he always took a prominent part, in fact the part of a leader, — a part in which he will be sadly missed at the next Congress to be held at Rome. It is in no small degree owing to his initiative and his great influence that the various resolutions proceeding from the Indian Section of the Congresses, and addressed to the Governments of India, have led to substantial results, and helped on the progress of archaeological and epigraphic research in India. At these Congresses it became clear that Bühler held the position of a recognised leader among the Sanskrit scholars of Europe, a position which he did not assume from any ambition on his part, but which was tacitly granted him as a matter of course. That this was the case is due as much to his personality as to his great scholarship. For it is characteristic of Bühler that while he won the love and respect of the Natives to so great an extent, he enjoyed at the same time the friendship and regard of Englishmen in India, both of scholars and of high officials. In Europe, too, he had, by his tact and shrewd knowledge of the world, made many friends and won influence, not only in the learned world, but also in high and influential circles. In this respect also Bühler's loss to Indian studies is irreparable. For he never used his influence but in the interest of Science.

And it lies in the nature of our studies, that for their advancement the quiet labour of the student alone is not sufficient. We want, not only pioneers willing to work in the field of archaeological and epigraphic research, but also large sums of money to enable them to undertake long journeys, to make excavations, and so on, and to make their discoveries generally accessible by costly publications; we want not only patient scholars willing to edit voluminous texts, but also large sums of money, again, to make the publication of such texts possible. All this can only be done with the help of Governments, Academies, and learned Societies. Bühler was the very man to work in this direction in the interest of Science. He had connections in influential circles both in India and in England, in Austria and Germany, and he knew how to interest persons in his cause, who are otherwise difficult to approach in anything relating to a branch of knowledge, which is still anything but popular. But by his energy and his wonderful knowledge of men he succeeded in carrying his point, where many another would have failed. Though he was a German scholar in the true sense of the word — industrious, patient, and accurate, — there was yet something of the practical Englishman in him. He was a true scholar, yet his world was never limited to his study. He was a man of the world in the interest and for the benefit of Science.

And while he possessed those qualities which enabled him to exercise influence, he was ever ready to help and to advise. No one, — whether he was a friend or pupil of his, whether a well known savant, or a young Sanskrit scholar just writing his 'doctor's dissertation,' applied to him in vain for help and advice; and I know many who call themselves pupils of Bühler, who have never attended a single lecture of his. He who wanted to edit a text applied to
Bühl for MS. He who wanted to do archaeological or epigraphical work, turned to Bühl for inscriptions and, it may be, for ways and means to go out to India. He who wanted information about any difficult point in Indian research, turned (it seemed the most natural thing) to Bühl for advice. Thus he will be missed by every Sanskrit scholar and Indologist; but his nearer friends and pupils feel without him as if cast adrift.

Bühl's leadership among Indologists, though it had long been an understood fact, was to find its outward expression in the great work, which occupied him during the last years of his life and which was to be the crown of his life-long labours in the field of Indian research, — in his Encyclopedia of Indo-Aryan Research. Upwards of thirty scholars of various nationalities — from Austria, England, Germany, India, the Netherlands, and the United States — had joined Bühl, in order to give, according to an elaborate scheme which he himself had worked out, systematic treatises on all the different branches of Indology, and thus for the first time to render a complete account of the present state of our knowledge of India in a concise survey of Indian philology, literature, history, antiquities, religion, sciences, and art. Bühl had not only planned the whole work, enlisted his collaborators, and undertaken the general editorship, but he had also reserved for himself the treatment of some of the most difficult subjects. He had the satisfaction of seeing the great undertaking started by the publication of several excellent contributions. But only one of his own contributions was he allowed to see completed, — that on Indian paleography which has already been mentioned. He had also promised to treat, together with Prof. Jolly and Sir Raymond West, on sociology, clans, castes, etc., and on economics, tenures, commerce, etc.; and how he would have brought his extensive knowledge of modern Indian life to bear on these subjects! Together with Dr. Stein, he had intended to treat the subject of geography, with which he was so familiar, both by his journeys extending over so many parts of India and by his epigraphic researches. But above all, his plan, which he had carried about for so many years, of writing a Connected History of India, was to be accomplished in this work. He had promised to treat on the literary and epigraphic Sources of Indian History, and on the 'Political History from the earliest times to the Mahomedan Conquest, with a chapter on Chronology.' That he has not been spared to accomplish this task, is undoubtedly the greatest misfortune that could have befallen Indian studies. It is one comfort to know that the Encyclopedia which has been started so auspiciously is to be continued, Prof. Kielland having undertaken the editorship of the work in succession to Bühl. And there can be no doubt that men like Prof. Kielland, Dr. Hultsch, and Dr. Fleet will be able to take up the work on Indian history, which Bühl left undone, that Prof. Jolly, Sir Raymond West and Dr. Stein will be able to accomplish the task in which Bühl was to assist them, and that they will do so in the spirit of their departed friend; but surely these scholars, and in fact all those who are still engaged in any work in connection with the Encyclopedia, will feel the loss of Bühl most deeply, and miss him most frequently and most painfully.

What enabled Bühl so eminently become the leading spirit of such an undertaking as the Encyclopedia, was the fact that he was one of the few universal Indologists (a term recently applied by Bühl to the veteran Sanskrit scholar Prof. Weber) who are still living. With the advance of Indian studies it has become well nigh impossible for any one scholar to

---

8 The following Parts have been published up to the present date, i.e., under Bühl's editorship:——
Vol. I. 3. 8. The Indian Systems of Lexicography (Koshas) by Th. Zachariae (in German).
   II. 11. Indian Paleography (with 17 plates) by Bühl (in German).
   II. 3. 6. Coins (with plates) by H. J. Rau (in English).
   II. 8. Law and Customs by J. Jolly (in German).
   III. 1. 4. Vedic Mythology by A. Maedeneil (in English).
   III. 2. Ritual Literature, Vedic Sacrifices and Charms by A. Hillebrandt (in German).
   III. 4. Sankhya and Yoga by E. Garbe (in German).
   III. 8. Buddhism by H. Kern (in English).
IN MEMORIAM GEORGE BÜHLER.

December, 1898.

Master all the different branches of Indology, and the period of specialisation (which by a sad necessity must come in every branch of knowledge) has set in. Bühler fully recognised the necessity of specialising, but he also saw the danger of carrying specialisation too far, and he often warned his pupils against limiting themselves too much to one special branch of research. He himself never forgot and often took occasion to point out, how the various branches of Indology, and the different periods in the history of Indian civilization are most intimately connected.

Nor did he ever lose sight of the relations existing between the various nations of the East and the different branches of Oriental studies in general. Although he limited himself, in his writings, as much as possible to those departments of knowledge which were his particular domain, yet his view reached far beyond the limits of India, and the history of Indian civilisation was to him but an act in the great drama of the History of Mankind.

Bühler's clear-sightedness in questions of detail, his far-sightedness in dealing with great historical problems will be missed for years to come. We shall miss again and again his noble character, his great and influential personality, his inspiration, his advice and his help. And all that he might still have produced, is lost, — irretrievably lost! He who has been a leader of men, a trusted guide, has been taken from us! He is gone, and it merely remains for us to cherish his memory by continuing the work which he had so much at heart, to the best of our power and by building on the solid foundations which he has laid; for, though he is no longer with us, his life-work will remain for ever, — na hi karna kahiyate.

GEORG BÜHLER, 1837-98.

BY THE RIGHT HON. F. MAX MÜLLER.1

It is not often that the death of a scholar startles and grieves his fellow-workers as the death of my old friend, Dr. Bühler, has startled and grieved us all, whether in Germany, England, France, or India. Sanskrit scholarship has indeed been unfortunate: we have often lost young and most promising scholars in the very midst of their career; and though, Dr. Bühler was sixty-one years of age when he died, he was still so young and vigorous in body and mind that he made us forget his age, holding his place valiantly among the πρωταχτων of the small army of genuine Indian students, and confidently looking forward to many victories and conquests that were still in store for him. By many of us he was considered almost indispensable for the successful progress of Sanskrit scholarship — but who is indispensable in this world? — and great hopes were centred on him as likely to spread new light on some of the darkest corners in the history of Sanskrit literature.

On the 8th of April last, while enjoying alone in a small boat a beautiful evening on the Lake of Constance, he seems to have lost an oar, and in trying to recover it, to have overbalanced himself. As we think of the cold waves closing over our dear friend, we feel stunned and speechless before so great and cruel a calamity. It seems to disturb the regular and harmonious working of the world in which we live, and which each man arranges for himself and interprets in his own way. It makes us feel the littleness and uncertainty of all our earthly plans, however important and safe they may seem in our own eyes. He who for so many years was the very life of Sanskrit scholarship, who helped us, guided us, corrected us, in our different researches, is gone; and yet we must go on as well as we can, and try to honour his memory in the best way in which it may be honoured — not by idle tears, but by honest work.

Non hoc praecipuum amicorum munus est, prossequi defunctum ignavo questu, sed quae voluerit meminisse, quae mandaverit exsequi.

1 Reprinted from J. R. A. S., 1898.
A scholar's life is best written in his own books; and though I have promised to write a biographical notice for the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, in which he took so warm and active an interest, I have to confess that of the personal circumstances of my old friend, Dr. Bühler, I have but little to say. What I know of him are his books and pamphlets as they came out in rapid succession, and were always sent to me by their author. Our long and never interrupted friendship was chiefly literary, and for many years had to be carried on by correspondence only. He was a man who, when once he knew him, was always the same. He had his heart in the right place, and there was no mistaking his words. He never spoke differently to different people, for, like a brave and honest man, he had the courage of his opinions. He thought what he said, he never thought what he ought to say. He belonged to no clique, he did not even try to find what is called a school. He had many pupils, followers, and admirers, but they knew too well that though he praised them and helped them on whenever he could, he detested nothing more than to be praised by his pupils in return. It was another charming feature of his character that he never forgot any kindness, however small, which one had rendered him. He was kритьяна memori, in the real sense of the word. I had been able, at the very beginning of his career, to render him a small service by obtaining for him an appointment in India. I never forgot it, and whenever there was an opportunity he proved his sincere attachment to me by ever so many small, but not therefore less valuable, acts of kindness. We always exchanged our books and our views on every subject that occupied our interest in Sanskrit scholarship, and though we sometimes differed, we always kept in touch. We agreed thoroughly on one point—that it did not matter who was right, but only what was right. Most of the work that had to be done by Sanskrit scholars in the past, and will have to be done for some time to come, is necessarily pioneer work, and pioneers must hold together even though they are separated at times while reconnoitring in different directions. Bühler could hold his own with great pertinacity; but he never forgot that in the progress of knowledge the left foot is as essential as the right. No one, however, was more willing to confess a mistake than he was when he saw that he had been in the wrong. He was, in fact, one of the few scholars with whom it was a real pleasure to differ, because he was always straightforward, and because there was nothing astute, mean or selfish in him, whether he defended the Purvapaksha, the Uttara-paksha, or the Siddhānta.

Of the circumstances of his life, all I know is that he was the son of a clergyman, that he was born at Borstel, 19th July, 1837, near Nienburg, in the then kingdom of Hanover, that he frequented the public school at Hanover, and at 1855 went to the University of Göttingen. The professors who chiefly taught and influenced him there were Sauppe, E. Curtius, Ewald, and Benfey. For the last he felt a well-deserved and almost enthusiastic admiration. He was no doubt Benfey's greatest pupil, and we can best understand his own work if we remember in what school he was brought up. After taking his degree in 1859 he went to Paris, London, and Oxford, in order to copy and collate Sanskrit and chiefly Vedic MSS. It was in London and Oxford that our acquaintance, and very soon our friendship, began. I quickly recognized in him the worthy pupil of Benfey. He had learnt how to distinguish between what was truly important in Sanskrit literature and what was not, and from an early time had fixed his attention chiefly on its historical aspects. It was the fashion for a time to imagine that if one had learnt Sanskrit grammar, and was able to construe a few texts that had been published and translated before, one was a Sanskrit scholar. Bühler looked upon this kind of scholarship as good enough for the vulgus profanum, but no one was a real scholar in his eyes who could not stand on his own feet, and fight his own way through new texts and commentaries, who could not publish what had not been published before, who could not translate what had not been translated before. Mistakes were, of course, unavoidable in this kind of pioneering work, or what is called original research, but such mistakes are no disgrace to a scholar, but rather an honour. Where should we be but for the mistakes of Bopp and Burnouf, of Champollion and Talbot?
Though Bühlcr had learnt from Benfey the importance of Vedic studies as the true foundation of Sanskrit scholarship, and had devoted much time to this branch of learning, he did not publish much of the results of his own Vedic researches. His paper on Parjanys, however, published in 1862 in Benfey's Orient und Occident, Vol. I. p. 214, showed that he could not only decipher the old Vedic texts, but that he had thoroughly mastered the principles of Comparative Mythology, a new science which owed its very existence to the discovery of the Vedic Hymns, and was not very popular at the time with those who disliked the trouble of studying a new language. He wished to prove what Grimm had suspected, that Parjanya, Litt. Perkunas, Celt. Perkons, Slav. Perun, was one of the deities worshiped by the ancestors of the whole Aryan race, and in spite of the usual frays and bickerings, the main point of his argument has never been shaken. I saw much of him at that time, we often worked together and the Index to my History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature was chiefly his work. The important lesson which he had learnt from Benfey showed itself in the quickness with which he always seized on whatever was really important in the history of the literature of India. He did not write simply in order to show what he could do, but always in order to forward our knowledge of ancient India. This explains why, like Benfey's books, Bühlcr's own publications, even his smallest essays, are as useful to-day as they were when first published. Benfey's edition of the Indian fables of the Panchatantra produced a real revolution at the time of its publication. It opened our eyes to a fact hardly suspected before, how important a part in Sanskrit literature had been acted by Buddhist writers. We learnt in fact that the distinction between the works of Brahmanic and Buddhist authors had been far too sharply drawn, and that in their literary pursuits their relation had been for a long time that of friendly rivalry rather than of hostile opposition. Benfey showed that these Sanskrit fables of India had come to us through Buddhist hands, and had travelled from India step by step, station by station, through Pehlevi, Persian, Arabic, Hebrew, Latin, and the modern languages of Europe, till they supplied even Lafontaine, with some of his most charming Fables. Benfey was in many respects the true successor of Lassen in calling the attention of Sanskrit scholars to what are called in German the Realein of Sanskrit scholarship. He was bold enough to publish the text and translation of the Sāmaveda, and the glossary appended to this edition marked the first determined advance into the dark regions of Vedic thought. Though some of his interpretations may now be antiquated he did as much as was possible at the time, and nothing is more painful than to see scholars of a later generation speak slightly of a man who was a giant before they were born. Benfey's various Sanskrit grammars, founded as they are on the great classical grammar of Pāṇini, hold their own to the present day, and are indispensible to every careful student of Pāṇini, while his History of Sanskrit Philology is a real masterpiece, and remains still the only work in which that important chapter of modern scholarship can be safely studied.

Bühlcr was imbued with the same spirit that had guided Benfey, and every one of his early contributions to Benfey's Orient und Occident touched upon some really important question, even though he may not always have settled it. In his article on brāh, for instance (O. u. O., Vol. I. p. 508), which was evidently written under the influence of Curtius' recent warning that brāh could not be equated with deus and Skt. dēva without admitting a phonetic anomaly, he suggested that brāh as well as the Old Norse dīr, 'gods,' might be derived from a root dhi, 'to think, to be wise.' Often as we discussed that etymology together — and it was more than a mere etymology, because on it depended the question whether the oldest Aryan name of the gods in general was derived from the bright powers of Nature or from the more abstract idea of divine wisdom — he could never persuade me that these two branches of the Aryan race, the Greek and the Scandinavian, should have derived the general name for their gods from a root different from that which the other branches had used, viz., dīs, 'to be brilliant,' and from which they had formed the most important cluster of mythological names, such as Zeus, Jovis, Diespiter, Dia, Diana, etc. I preferred to
admit a phonetic rather than a mythological anomaly. If I could not persuade him he could not persuade me, et aliusc sub iudice lio est!

Several more etymologies from his pen followed in the same journal, all connected with some points of general interest, all ingenious, even if not always convincing. In all these discussions, he showed himself free from all prejudices, and much as he admired his teacher, Professor Benfey, he freely expressed his divergence from him when necessary, though always in that respectful tone which a Sishya would have observed in ancient India when differing from his Guru.

While he was in Oxford, he frequently expressed to me his great wish to get an appointment in India. I wrote at his desire to the late Mr. Howard, who was then Director of Public Instruction in Bombay, and to my great joy got the promise of an appointment for Bühlcr. But, unfortunately, when he arrived at Bombay, there was no vacancy, Mr. Howard was absent, and for a time Bühlcr’s position was extremely painful. But he was not to be disheartened. He soon made the acquaintance of another friend of mine at Bombay, Sir Alexander Grant, and obtained through him the very position for which he had been longing. In 1865 he began his lectures at the Elphinstone College, and proved himself most successful as a lecturer and a teacher. His power of work was great, even in the enervating climate of India, and there always was work to do in India for people who are willing to do work. He soon made the acquaintance of influential men, and he was chosen by Mr. (now Sir) Raymond West to co-operate with him in producing their famous Digest of Hindu Law. He supplied the Sāisākrit, Sir Raymond West the legal materials, and the work, first published in 1867, is still considered the highest authority on the subjects of the Hindu Laws of Inheritance and Partition. But Bühlcr’s interest went deeper. He agreed with me that the metrical Law-books of Ancient India were preceded by legal Sūtras belonging to what I called the Sūtra period. These Sūtras may really be ascribed to the end of the Vedic period, and in their earliest form may have been anterior to the Indo-Scythian conquest of the country, though the fixing of real dates at that period is well-nigh an impossibility. When at a much later time I conferred with him on the plan of publishing a series of translations of the Sacred Books of the East, he was ready and prepared to undertake the translation of these Sūtras, so far as they had been preserved in MSS. Some of these MSS., the importance of which I had pointed out as early as 1859 in my History of Ancient Sāisākrit Literature, I handed over to him; others he had collected himself while in India. The two volumes in which his translation of the legal Sūtras of Āpastambha, Gantama, Vasishtha, and Baudhāyana are contained, have been amongst the most popular of the series, and I hope I shall soon be able to publish a new edition of them with notes prepared by him for that purpose. In 1886 followed his translation of the Laws of Manu, which, if he had followed the example of others, he might well have called his own, but which he gave as founded on that of Sir William Jones, carefully revised and corrected with the help of seven native commentators. These were substantial works, sufficient to establish the reputation of any scholar, but with him they were by work only, undertaken in order to oblige a friend and fellow-worker. These translations kept us in frequent correspondence, in which more than one important question came to be discussed. One of them was the question of what caused the gap between the Vedic period, of which these Sūtras may be considered as the latest outcome, and the period of that ornate metrical literature which, in my Lectures on India delivered at Cambridge in 1884, I had ventured to treat as the period of the Renaissance of Sāisākrit literature, subsequent to the invasion and occupation of India by Indo-Scythian or Turanian tribes.

It was absolutely necessary to prove this once for all, for there were scholars who went on claiming for the author of the Laws of Manu, nay, for Kālidāsa and his contemporaries, a date before the beginning of our era. What I wanted to prove was, that nothing of what we actually possessed of that ornate (alaśkātrā) metrical literature, nor anything written in the continuous śloka, could possibly be assigned to a time previous to the Indo-Scythian invasion. The
chronological limits which I suggested for this interregnum were from 100 B. C. to 300 A. D. These limits may seem too narrow on either side to some scholars, but I believe I am not overstating my case if I say that at present it is generally admitted that what we call the Laws of Manus are subsequent to the Saamayulchutra or Dharma-sutras, and that Kalidasa’s poetical activity belongs to the sixth, nay, if Professor Kiellhorn is right, even to the end of the fifth century B. C., and that all other Sanskrit poems which we possess are still later. Bühler’s brilliant discovery consisted in proving, not that any of the literary works which we possess could be referred to a pre-Gupta date, but that specimens of ornate poetry occurred again and again in pre-Gupta inscriptions, and, what is even more important, that the peculiar character of those monumental poems presupposed on the part of their authors, provincial or otherwise an acquaintance, if not with the Alankula Sutras which we possess, at all events with some of their prominent rules. In this way the absence or non-preservation of all greater literary compositions that could be claimed for the period from 100 B. C. to 300 A. D. became even more strongly accentuated by Bühler’s discoveries. It might be said, of course, that India is a large country, and that literature might have been absent in one part of the Indian Peninsula and yet flourishing in another; just as even in the small peninsula of Greece, literary culture had its heyday at Athens while it was withering away in Lacedaemon. But these are mere possibilities, and outside the sphere of historical science. There may have been ever so many Kalidasa between 100 B. C. to 300 A. D., but silencio mibile premium noce. The question is, why were literary works preserved, after the rise of the national Gupta dynasty, in the only ways in which at that time they could be preserved in India, either by memory or by the multiplication of copies, chiefly in Royal Libraries under the patronage of Rajas, whether of Indian or alien origin, and why there is at present, as far as manuscripts are concerned, an almost complete literary blank from the end of the Vedic literature to the beginning of the fourth century A. D.?

The important fact which is admitted by Bühler, and was urged by myself, is this—that whatever literary compositions may have existed before 300 A. D., in poetry or in prose, nothing remains of them at present, and that there must surely be a reason for it. Here it was Bühler who, in the Transactions of the Vienna Academy, 1890, came to my help, drawing my attention to the important fact that among certain recently published ancient inscriptions, eighteen of which are dateable, two only can with any probability be proved to be anterior of what I called the four blank centuries between 100 B. C. to 300 A. D. (See Indol, p. 353). There occur verses which prove quite clearly that the ornate style of Sanskrit poetry was by no means unknown in earlier times. The as yet undeveloped germs of that ornate poetry may even go back much further, and may be traced in portions of the Brhadanas and in some Buddhistic writings; but their full development at the time of these Sanskrit inscriptions was clearly established for the first time by Bühler’s valuable remarks. So far we were quite agreed, nor do I know of any arguments that have been advanced against Bühler’s historical views. There may be difference of opinion as to the exact dates of the Sanskrit Ginnir inscription of Radharaman and the Prakrit Nasik inscription of Pulumayi, but they contain at all events sufficient indications that an ornate, though perhaps less elaborate style of poetry, not far removed from the epic style, prevailed in India during the second century A. D. All the evidence accessible on that point has been carefully collected by my friend, and reflects the greatest credit on his familiarity with Sanskrit Alankula poetry. But the fact remains all the same that nothing was preserved of that poetry before 300 A. D. and that of what we actually possess of Sanskrit Kavya literature, nothing can for the present be traced back much beyond 300 A. D. We must hope that the time may soon come when the original component parts of the ancient epic poetry, nay, even the philosophical Darshanas, may be traced back with certainty to times before the Indo-Scythian Invasion. It is well known that the Mahabharata and the Puranas are mentioned by name during the Sutra period, and we cannot be far wrong in supposing that something like what we possess now of these works must have existed then.
Bühler was full of hope that it might be possible to fix some of the dates of those popular works at a much earlier time than is assigned to them by most scholars. I was delighted to see him boldly claim for the Veda also a greater antiquity than I had as yet ventured to suggest for it, and it seemed to me that our two theories could stand so well side by side that it was my hope that I should be able to bring out, with his co-operation, a new and much improved edition of my chapter on the Renaissance of Sanskrit Literature. I doubt whether I shall be able to do this now without his help. The solution of many of the historical and chronological questions also, which remain still unanswered, will no doubt be delayed by the sudden death of the scholar who took them most to heart, but it is not likely to be forgotten again among the problems which our younger Sanskrit scholars have to deal with, if they wish truly to honour the memory and follow in the footsteps of one of the greatest and most useful Sanskrit scholars of our days.

These chronological questions were, of course, intimately connected with the question of the date of the Sanskrit alphabets and the introduction of writing into India, which produced a written in place of the ancient mnemonic literature of the country. There, too, we had a common interest, and I gladly handed over to him, and for his own purpose, a MS. sent to me from Japan that turned out to be the oldest Sanskrit MS. then known to exist, that of the Prajñāpāramitā hridaya-sūtra. It had been preserved on two palm-leaves in the Monastery of Hōrinui, in Japan, since 609 A.D., and, of course, went back to a much earlier time, as the leaves seem to have travelled from India through China, before they reached Japan. Bühler sent me a long paper of palaeographical remarks on this Hōrinui palm-leaf MS., which forms a most valuable Appendix to my edition of it. Thus we remained always united by our work, and I had the great satisfaction of being able to send him the copy of Aśvaghosa’s Buddha-charita, which my Japanese pupils had made for me at Paris, and which, whether Aśvaghosa’s date is referred to the first or the fifth century A.D., when it was first translated into Chinese, represents as yet the only complete specimen of that ornate scholastic style which, as he had proved from numerous inscriptions, must have existed previous to the Renaissance. Thus our common work went on, if not always on the same plan, at all events on the same ground. We never lost touch with each other, and were never brought nearer together than when for a time we differed on certain moot points.

I have here dwelt on the most important works only which are characteristic of the man and which will for ever mark the place of Bühler in the history of Sanskrit scholarship. But there are many other important services which he rendered to us while in India. Not only was he always ready to help us in getting MSS. from India, but our knowledge of a large number of Sanskrit works, as yet unknown, was due to his Reports on expeditions undertaken by him for the Indian Government in search for MSS. This idea of cataloguing the literary treasures of India, first started by Mr. Whitley Stokes, has proved a great success, and no one was more successful in these researches than Bühler. And while he looked out everywhere for important MSS., his eyes were always open for ancient inscriptions also. Many of them he published and translated for the first time, and our oldest inscriptions, those of Aśoka, in the third century B.C., owe to him and M. Senart their first scholarlike treatment. This is not meant to detract in any way from the credit due to the first brilliant decipherers of these texts, such as Prissep, Lassen, Burnouf, and others. Bühler was most anxious to trace the alphabets used in these inscriptions back to a higher antiquity than is generally assigned to them, but for the present, at least, we cannot go beyond the fact that no dateable inscription has been found in India before the time of Aśoka. It is quite true that such an innovation as the introduction of alphabetic writing does not take place on a sudden, and tentative

---

2 *Anekdota Osmissionis, 1884.*

3 Th text of the *Buddha-charita* was published by Cowell in the *Anekdota Osmissionis*, the translation in my *Sacred Books of the East.*
specimens of it from an earlier time may well be discovered yet, if these researches are carried on as he wished them to be carried on, in a truly systematic manner. In this field of research Bühler will be most missed, for though absent from India he had many friends there, particularly in the Government, who would gladly have listened to his suggestions. One may regret his departure from a country where his services were so valuable and so much appreciated. I have not dwell at all in this place where his services which he rendered as inspector of schools and examiner, but I may state that I received several times the thanks of the Governor of the Bombay Presidency, the late Sir Bartle Frere, for having sent out such excellent scholars as Bühler and others. Unfortunately his health made it imperative for him to return to his own country, but he was soon much restored under a German sky that he seemed to begin a new life as Professor at Vienna. If he could not discover new MSS. there, he could digest the materials which he had collected, and he did so with unflagging industry. Nay, in addition to all his own work, he undertook to superintend and edit an *Encyclopedia of Indo-Aryan Philology* which was to be a résumé up to date of all that was known of the languages, dialects, grammars, dictionaries, and the ancient alphabets of India; which was to give an account of Indian literature, history, geography, ethnography, jurisprudence; and finally, to present a picture of Indian religion, mythology, philosophy, astronomy, mathematics, and music, so far as they are known at present. No one knows what an amount of clerical work and what a loss of time such a superintendence involves for a scholar who has his hands full of his own work, how much reading of manuscripts, how much letter-writing, how much protracted and often disagreeable discussion it entails. But Bühler, with rare self-denial, did not shrink from this drudgery, and his work will certainly prove extremely useful to all future Indo-Aryan students. One thing only one may regret—that the limits of each contribution are so narrow, and that several of the contributors had no time to give us much more of their own original work. But this is a defect inherent in all encyclopaedias or manuals, unless they are to grow into a forest of volumes like the *Allgemeine Encyclopädie der Wissenschaften und Künste* by Ersch, begun in 1831 and as yet far from being finished. Under Bühler’s guidance we might have expected the completion of his *Encyclopädie* within a reasonable time, and I am glad to hear that his arrangements were so far advanced that other hands will now be easily able to finish it, and that it may remain, like Lassen’s *Alterthumskunde*, 1847-1861, a lasting monument of the lifelong labours of one of the most learned, the most high-minded and large-hearted among the Oriental scholars whom it has been my good fortune to know in the course of my long life.

---

**ON PROFESSOR BÜHLER.**

**BY C. H. TAWNEY, C.I.E.**

The death of Professor J. G. Bühler, came as a terrible shock to his numerous friends in England. It appears that he left Vienna on the 5th of April, 1898, to pay a visit to his wife and son, aged sixteen years, who were staying with relations at Zürich. He broke his journey at Lindau on the lake of Constance. Being an expert steersman, he was tempted by the fine weather on Good Friday, the 8th April, to take a trip alone in a small rowing boat down the lake. He was last seen about 7 p.m. on that day. It is surmised that he lost an oar in attempting to recover it, overbalanced the boat, which was apparently very crank, and so was drowned. The boat was found floating bottom upwards, but no one had any idea who had been in it. As Professor Bühler had evidently intended to surprise his family in Zürich with his visit, and had therefore given no hint of his movements, they continued to correspond with him at his address in Vienna and were much distressed at receiving no answer. Meanwhile the proprietor of the Hotel in which he was staying, finding that he did not return, communicated with the police, and enquiries were at once set on foot. It was not ascertained that the occupant of the boat was Professor Bühler of Vienna, until the 15th April, when the melancholy tidings reached his wife in Zürich. The body has never been recovered.

---

1 Reprinted from Luzać’s *Oriental List.*
Professor Bühler was born at Berkel near Nienburg in Hannover. He was educated at the University of Göttingen and studied Sāskrit under Professor Benfey, for whose scholarship he always retained an enthusiastic admiration, and took his Doctor's degree in the year 1858. He passed many years in the Bombay educational service (1863-1880), and thus came to acquire great familiarity with Gujarāṭi and Marāṭhī and also the power of speaking Sāskrit fluently, an accomplishment which impressed considerably the pāṇḍits of lower Bengal. The famous Sāskrit scholar Mahāmahāpiśāchāya Mahāeśa Chandra Nyāyaratna carried on an animated conversation with him in Sāskrit in the hearing of the writer of the present notice.

Professor Bühler possessed a sympathy with Indian thought and feeling, and a knowledge of native customs and the obvious everyday facts of native life, which removed him from the list of dry and dusty Sāskrit Scholars, and entitled him to be styled rather an Índianist of a very wide range of acquirements. While in Bombay, he paid great attention to the study of Indian Law. Of this the book, which he brought out in connection with Sir Raymond West in 1867 and 1869 on the Hindu Law of Inheritance and Partition, is an abiding monument. He subsequently returned to this study and produced the Sacred Law of the Áryas as taught in the schools of Ápastamba, Gautama, Vasishtha, and Baudhāyana, in the Sacred Books of the East Series (Oxford, 1879, 1882). In 1886 he translated the Laws of Mann for the same series.

Professor Bühler was well read in Sāskrit Philosophy, though we cannot call to mind any work that he wrote in connection with the orthodox systems. In Belles Lettres (Kāvyas) he was thoroughly at home. It was a pleasure to hear him unravel the intricacies of a difficult stanza, constructed, as too many Sāskrit stanzas are, for the express purpose of displaying the recondite learning of the author. In this field he edited four books of the Pancharatha in the Bombay Sāskrit Series, which was originally brought out under the superintendence of himself and Professor Kielhorn. Of these books many editions have appeared. He edited for the same series the first part of the Daksikumdrcharita of Daśād. The second part was edited by Professor Peterson. Professor Bühler considered the style of this author in the admittedly genuine portion, as the highest flight of Sāskrit prose.

In 1875 he edited the Vīrāṅgadakadesacakarita of Bihāra, a historical work written in ornate Sāskrit, from a single MS. copied by himself and Professor Jacobi in seven days. This brings us to the distinguishing feature of Professor Bühler's Sāskrit scholarship. No one has done more for the elucidation of the Hindu period of Indian History. By means of his papers on Indian inscriptions in the Indian Antiquary and elsewhere he has established the history and chronology of that period on a secure basis. Of the knowledge thus acquired he made a memorable use in his article on the "Indische Kunstpoese" which appeared in 1890. In this paper he shews from an examination of dated inscriptions and other sources, that the ornate style of classical Sāskrit poetry and poetical prose was in full bloom in the second century of the Christian era. The wide-reaching consequences of this demonstration are at once apparent. In fact this short paper revolutionised the views of Sāskrit scholars with regard to the date of important branches of Indian literature. Other historical writings of Professor Bühler are his pamphlets on the Sākrītasambhārtana of Arisimha, on the Jain monk Hemachandra and the Nāvasākṣadakacharita, the latter brought out in co-operation with Professor Zacharias.

His knowledge of Jaina literature and of living Jaina teachers was extensive. It may be assured that his love of history gave him a particular sympathy with Jainas, as some of the best medieval chronicles of India appear to have belonged to that "Dāśāma." His short treatise "Über die Indische Secte der Jaina," which appeared in 1887, is perhaps the best account of that somewhat neglected sect. It is much to be regretted that it has never been translated into English.

The ripest fruit of his epigraphic studies is to be found in his English pamphlet on the origin of the Indian Brahma Alphabet, in which he derived those characters from the most
ancient North Semitic letters, and his contribution on Indian Palæography (with nine tables) to the Indo-Aryan Encyclopedia. The latter treatise is so complete that it is difficult to imagine that it can be ever superseded or supplemented. His loss as editor of this Encyclopedia will be widely felt. He was most active as a decipherer of Indian inscriptions to the last, and took a lively interest in the archaeological investigations of Doctors Hultzsch, Führer, Waddell and others.

Professor Bühler was a most painstaking teacher. He taught the Saïskrit language in Vienna even from the Alphabet, the letters of which he drew on a black board for his less advanced class. He was always ready to help any serious student, and averse sometimes to having his assistance acknowledged. In fact, his distinguishing moral quality was unselfishness. He was perhaps hardly conscious himself to what an extent he carried this virtue. His manners were genial and unassuming. He was always in his element in the society of cultivated Englishmen. Before devoting himself to the classical language of India, he had been thoroughly disciplined in Greek and Latin. He was well acquainted with the modern languages of Europe and particularly with English. He could read with ease the most difficult English authors, and composed fluently in that language. It was these qualities that enabled him to give such a powerful impulse to Saïskrit scholarship both in India and Europe. Nor was his influence confined to the old world. He certainly counted among his pupils one native, at least, of the United States. His work will long survive not only in the books that he has written, but in the interests and capacities that he has created and trained.

PROFESSOR BÜHLER.

BY CECIL BENDALL.

Every practical student of Indian learning must have heard with consternation of the death, by a boating accident in the Lake of Constance shortly before Easter, of Hofrat Johann Georg Bühler, Professor of Saïskrit at Vienna, and for many years a prominent member of the Bombay Educational Service.

Born in 1837 at Berstel in Hanover, he studied Saïskrit under the leading Saïskritist of the last generation, Theodor Benfey. Bühler was Benfey’s joy and pride. I remember Bühler once describing to me his embarrassment because old Benfey insisted on kissing him on a public occasion. Bühler made early acquaintance with England, visiting this country for the study of Indian MSS., working for a time in the library of Windsor Castle, and also assisting Prof. Max Müller in the index to his Ancient Sanskrit Literature. In 1863, mainly through the influence of the last-named scholar, he joined the Bombay Educational Service, holding successively the Professorship of Saïskrit at Elphinstone College, Bombay, and an Inspectorship of Schools in Gujarat. He did excellent work in both capacities.

It is due to the critical scholarship and personal influence of men like Bühler and Kielhorn that the best native scholarship of the “Bombay side” is at least half a century ahead of the rest of India. And yet the rulers of India have decreed that native instruction in Saïskrit is strong enough to run alone, and the race of such European teachers is to become extinct! One wishes there were a few men on Indian Councils capable of feeling the force of remarks like those of Böhltingk (the greatest living lexicographer) on the last Saïskrit dictionary by Bengali scholars. But to return to Bühler. In his educational tours he collected and published statistics of private libraries of MSS. These researches culminated in his great tour in Kasmīr in 1875, where he made discoveries of unprecedented importance in the literary history of India. Returning to Europe in 1880, he was at once appointed to the Chair of Saïskrit at Vienna, which he occupied till his death.

1 From the Athenaeum, No. 3678, April 23, 1898.
His chief works were the Digest of Hindu Law (1867-70), written in conjunction with Sir Raymond West; Manu, translated with a masterly introduction (Oxford, 1886); and texts and translations of Apastamba and other minor jurists. He also edited several important texts in lexicography and historical romance, besides useful works for educational purposes. Of his contributions to periodicals a few only can be mentioned. The chief are to be found in the Vienna Oriental Journal (mainly founded, and largely edited, by him) and in the Indian Antiquary. He frequently wrote in the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, of which he was an honorary member and also an active supporter. Amongst his other articles I may note: Die Asoka-Inschriften; ‘Über das Leben des Hemachandra’ (1889); ‘Über die Secte der Jaina’ (1887); ‘Die indische Inschriften und das Alter der Kulturgeschichte’ (1890); and his Indian Studies, written in English, though published in Austria, not to save you trouble, as he once told me, but for the good of those in India. The crowning work of his life was to have been the Encyclopaedia of Indo-Aryan Research, designed and edited by him, of which some account has already been given in the Athenaeum, No. 3593. Of his great published contribution to this, ‘Indische Philologie,’ it is impossible for me to speak without gratefully recording the generous acknowledgment (as charming as it was characteristic) of the work done by others who had preceded or aided him in any line of research. During his visit to London in 1897, and also up to his death, I believe, he was mainly engaged on the ancient geography of India. I fear however, from what he told me, that he had made but little progress with what might have been his greatest work, the pre-Mohammedan history of India. He would have gathered together in this his numerous and brilliant contributions to the Epigraphia Indica.

Bühler had the true nature of a scholar — accurate, inclusive, critical in his own work helpful, kindly, stimulating to others. His tact and savoir-faire made him a natural leader of men on occasions like congresses of Orientalists, where, indeed, his familiar figure will be very greatly missed. His genial, hearty manner made him equally popular and influential with scholars and with men of the world. In all senses he made the best of both worlds.

GEORG BUHLER.

IN MEMORIAM.

BY A. A. MACDONELL, M.A., PH.D.

I feel that the various able and full obituary notices of Prof. Bühler which have appeared, leave hardly anything for me to say. But I am glad to have an opportunity of saying that little as a small tribute to the memory of one whose abilities and achievements I have admired ever since I began the study of Sanskrit, now nearly twenty-four years ago, under his old teacher, Theodor Benfey. Never since then has the death of any scholar produced on me the impression of an irreparable calamity, till the papers last Easter announced the news that Bühler, a solitary sculler on a Swiss lake, had mysteriously disappeared beneath the waves in the evening twilight of Good Friday. All the eminent Sanskritists, Benfey, Stenzler, Whitney, Roth, who have died within this period, were all old men, ranging in age from about seventy to eighty years, and had accomplished their life’s work. Bühler, on the other hand, was only sixty and, though he had already achieved so much, was really but entering upon what would have been the most important epoch of his career. Quite a short time before his death he expressed the opinion that he would require ten years to finish his chief work, for which his past life had only been a preparation. It was at least fortunate that he lived long enough not only to plan, but to carry out to a considerable extent, the greatest enterprise yet undertaken in the field of Sanskrit scholarship, his Encyclopaedia of Indo-Aryan Research. His organising ability, his practical talent, his intimate knowledge of modern India, and his keen interest in all departments of Sanskrit learning, singled him out
as the man best fitted for the accomplishment of this task. Having had the good fortune to spend seventeen of the best years of his life in India, he owed much to native learning; but he richly repaid the debt by doing more than any other scholar to reveal to the Indians of to-day the history of their past.

Years before I made my personal acquaintance I had heard much about Bühler from Benfey, who often spoke with pride of the achievements of his distinguished pupil. I can still remember some of the very words Benfey used in describing the circumstances of Bühler's appointment at Bombay. It was not till 1883, some three years after his return to Europe, that I first met him. Since then I had every two or three years opportunities of frequent personal intercourse with him at successive Oriental Congresses, especially at Stockholm, London, and Geneva, as well as on the occasion of his visits to England. In August 1887 I came across him by accident in the street at Lucerne. It was then I learnt that, as his wife was a Swiss lady, he was in the habit of spending a considerable part of his vacations in Switzerland, and of taking hard rowing exercise on the Swiss lakes after his exhausting labours at Vienna. His fondness for this form of exercise, which he indulged in for the sake of his health, was destined to bring about his untimely death. Since 1893, when he asked me to contribute to his Encyclopedia the part on 'Vedic Mythology,' I also had occasion to correspond with him a good deal in connexion with that work. These opportunities furnished sufficient data, I think, for forming a fairly correct estimate of his character. He struck me as having a peculiarly scientific cast of mind. But with this was combined an intellectual enthusiasm which caused him to be perpetually on the watch for whatever was calculated to promote Indian studies in every direction. Though of a thoroughly matter-of-fact temperament, he was not altogether lacking in sentiment. This betrayed itself in the emotion with which he used to speak of what he owed to the teaching and inspiration of Benfey. The special interest he seemed to take in the pupils of his old guru doubtless sprang from the same source. His high-mindedness always deterred him from doing or saying anything against those to whom he felt he owed a debt of gratitude. Nor did he stoop to personal controversy. But had he ever been unjustifiably attacked, his aggressor would probably have had cause to repent his temerity. For Bühler, as he told me himself, kept a record of the blunders which he found in the work of other scholars, and which he might have felt compelled to refer to in self-defence.

One quality which especially distinguished Bühler was that power of concentration which enables a man to devote weeks or even months of intense application to the decipherment of an inscription without the certainty of any tangible result. Such labour, though sometimes apparently fruitless, serves to sharpen and strengthen the mental powers, and it is only those who are capable of it who can hope to become really great scholars. This quality was possessed in an eminent degree by Benfey, and was undoubtedly fostered by Bühler, in his turn among pupils such as Dr. M. A. Stein, who has done such valuable archaeological work in Kashmir. The paramparā of teachers becomes really fruitful by the cultivation of such qualities and the propagation of scientific method and accuracy, rather than by the formation of schools, which by their very nature must suffer from one-sidedness. Thus Bühler's death is to be deplored not only as a direct loss to learning, but also because of the indirect disadvantage resulting from the premature removal of a great trainer of scholars. Altogether Bühler came near to the ideal of what a Sanskritist of the present day should be. Like Colebrooke, the great founder of Sanskrit scholarship, he combined with universal learning and untiring industry, distinguished practical ability. This enabled him to acquire a vast knowledge of the concrete data of modern Indian life, a knowledge particularly valuable to scholarship in a country which has experienced for three thousand years a continuity in literature and civilization which is unparalleled in any other branch of the Aryan race. Bühler thus became capable of understanding and illuminating the intellectual and social history of India as a whole to an extent which will hardly ever be equalled.
PROFESSOR J. GEORG BÜHLER.

BY PROFESSOR A. KAEGI, ZÜRICH.

All the newspapers have reported the tragic end of the famous Indologist Hofrath Dr. J. Georg Bühlcr, Professor in the University of Vienna. No one can help feeling the deepest sympathy with his relatives, whose sad bereavement has been rendered all the more painful by the melancholy circumstances attending his death. But not only the relatives and numerous friends of the departed, but also Sanskrit scholarship itself has suffered the heaviest and most unexpected loss — a loss that is simply irreplaceable. For Georg Bühlcr was more than 'an eminent Sanskrit scholar'; he held and has held for years the undisputed position of a leader of Indian philology; he was the scholar who at the present time was the leading spirit of all researches relating to ancient India. May I, then, as a grateful admirer of the wonderful man, be permitted to devote a few lines to his memory?

Bühlcr was born in the parsonage of Borstel near Niemerg on the Weser, and educated at the grammar-school of Hannover, where H. L. Ahrens and Raphael Kühner were amongst his teachers. At Easter, 1855, he proceeded to the University of Göttingen to study Classical and Oriental antiquities, and found there such eminent teachers as Hermann Sauppe, Ernst Curtius, Theodor Benfey, and Heinrich Ewald. After having taken his doctor's degree he went, in the autumn of 1858, to France and England, where he devoted three years to the thorough study of Vedic MSS. in the great libraries of Paris, London, and Oxford. In England he became acquainted with Professors Max Müller and Theodor Goldschmidt who assisted him in many ways, and for a time he held the post of assistant librarian in Her Majesty's library at Windsor Castle.

In October, 1862, he returned to Göttingen with the intention of qualifying himself as a University lecturer. But in November he was offered a professorship at the Sanskrit College in Benares, the principal seat for the study of Brahmanical philosophy, and while the negotiations about this appointment were being carried on, he was invited to take the newly created chair of Oriental languages at the Elphinstone College in Bombay. Bühlcr gladly accepted the offer, and began his work at Bombay in the spring of 1863. His very first lectures on Sanskrit, Prakrit and Comparative Philology, and still more the zeal and energy with which he threw himself into the educational work at the college, making new practical arrangements for instruction in the philological department and procuring a library of books and manuscripts to be used by students and teachers, could not fail to attract the attention of the authorities, who very soon began to employ the young scholar in the Educational Department in other ways also.

As early as 1864 Bühlcr, together with Sir Raymond West, then judge at the Bombay High Court, was appointed by the Governor of Bombay Presidency, to compile a Digest of Hindu Law, which was to take the place of the Sāstras (native scholars versed in the customary law), who until then had acted as legal advisers at the lower courts.

During the summer of 1866 he was employed at Poona as superintendent of Sanskrit studies, and in the winter of 1866-67 he travelled, by order of the Government, through the Marāthā and Kānāra countries, in order to search the Brahmanic libraries for important manuscripts. As the result of this very first journey Bühlcr brought home more than 200 old manuscripts, among them many rare and until then quite unknown works, and he lost no opportunity in pointing out to the authorities the necessity of a systematic investigation of the old libraries.

Two years more of quiet teaching and study followed, till, early in 1869, Bühlcr was appointed Acting Educational Inspector for the Northern Division of the Bombay Presidency (Gujarat and neighbourhood), being thereby charged with the administration and superintendence of all elementary and secondary schools of a territory extending over about 56,000 square miles, with five millions of inhabitants. For many years afterwards the administration of the lower and secondary Anglo-Indian schools in that province was Bühlcr's principal task, which he undertook at once with that

1 Translated from an article published in the Neue Zürcher Zeitung.
incapable energy so characteristic of him to the very end. First of all, he was anxious to develop and improve the colleges for a higher and more general education of native teachers, and then new school-books were procured and new regulations introduced; wherever possible, new schools were founded, the existing schools carefully classified, systematic annual inspections of all colleges and schools were arranged, and finally, through Bühler's initiative, the salaries of teachers at secondary schools were considerably raised, and the masters at the lower schools were given opportunities of earning an annual increase of their salaries by especially good work. We may form an idea of Bühler's extensive activity in this administrative work from the fact that when he entered on his office in 1869 there were in the province 730 schools with 47,800 scholars, while at the end of his term of office in 1880 the number of schools had risen to 1,763 with 101,970 scholars.

However, while his time and energy were to such an extent placed at the service of the Administration, Bühler yet found it possible to render his official work, especially his inspections of schools and colleges (of which occasionally he used to give most interesting and vivid descriptions), at the same time fruitful in the highest degree for scholarly purposes. When he entered on his office as Educational Inspector he obtained from the Government, which had already become aware of the important results of his first journey in search of MSS., the order and authority to search all libraries within reach in the province for MSS. and to acquire for the Government any works of importance. Consequently, during his tours of inspection he communicated, in all the larger towns, with the learned Pandits, and enlisted agents who had to hunt up the libraries, carry on negotiations with the owners, and to compile lists of MSS. He soon found out that the number of books and libraries was enormous, and that more especially the Jainas possessed exceedingly rich treasures of MSS. As these efforts of Bühler were crowned by such unexpected results — during his very first year of inspecting he had succeeded in purchasing upwards of 200 important old MSS., and in acquirong catalogues containing something like 14,000 titles of works of the Brahmanical literature alone — he was commissioned to undertake several tours to different parts of India as far as Kashmir and Nepal, and from all these tours he returned with valuable treasures of MSS. and inscriptions (on stone, copperplates, coins, etc.). Especially famous became his tour to Kashmir, when he discovered and acquired not only a great number of hitherto unknown Brahmanical works, but also an almost complete collection of the sacred books of the Digambara Jainas. Besides the purchases for the Indian Government Bühler also bought, with the permission thereof, large and systematic collections of MSS. for European libraries. Upwards of 5,000 MSS. have since those years become generally accessible to scholars, apart from numerous corrected copies of Sanskrit works, which he privately procured for scholars of all countries.

That Bühler in spite of his extensive-practical work should have found it possible still to devote himself to literary pursuits in such an eminent degree, has always been a matter of surprise. His very first greater work, the Digest of Hindu Law, published by order of the Governor of Bombay (1867 and 1869) became a standard. From numerous law-books, which at that time mostly existed in MS. only and had to be collated for the first time, and from information gathered from the mouths of Shástris versed in the customary law, West and Bühler compiled a code of the law of inheritance, partition, and adoption, which has since been repeatedly edited, translated into the vernaculars, and enjoys great authority throughout the whole of India.

Next Bühler, whose school-books for Indian colleges have already been mentioned, founded, together with Kielhorn (then Professor of Sanskrit in Poona, and now in Göttingen) the Bombay Sanskrit Series — an undertaking which was intended to give young native scholars an opportunity of learning European methods of criticism in editing texts, and to procure cheap and good editions of Sanskrit standard works for use in Indian schools and colleges. Bühler himself published in this collection the Pañchatantra, Panji's Daśakumudaracharita, the historical romance Vikramāditya-vasácharita of the 11th century which he himself had discovered, the ancient law-book of Ápastamba, and others. His catalogues of MSS, and his well-known Reports are of great scientific value, and his epigraphic researches in connection with the famous edicta of King Piyadasi-Aśoka and other Indian inscriptions have marked a new epoch and led to new results of the highest importance.
His literary activity became still more extensive and fruitful, when, in 1881, after leaving the Indian Civil Service, he took the chair of Sanskrit in the University of Vienna. Partly through his instruction, by which he trained a number of younger scholars, still more by his numerous publications and his extensive connections both in the East and in the West; he became more and more the centre and the chief promotor of Indological studies in Europe—a fact which came out clearly enough at the Congress of Orientalists' held in Vienna in 1886. With untiring and never failing courtesy and with an unschlichness that was truly surprising, he placed the vast stores of his experiences and studies, as well as the rich treasures of his MSS, at the disposal of his fellow students, and by his numerous connections with the leading authorities in India he was able to procure for European and American scholars anything they might want for their work, if it could at all be had from India.

To mention even only the most important of Bühler's larger works or of his numerous articles in different journals both of Europe and India, would of course be impossible here. Of his books, I will only mention that he translated for Max Müller's Sacred Books of the East five of the most important law-books, amongst them that of Manu—this alone a volume of 760 pages, including important introduction and notes. Of his smaller essays also I will mention only one. In his book India, what can it teach us? (London, 1885) Max Müller had expressed the startling view that the whole of the Indian literature, as far as it is not Vedic or Buddhistic, was written in the time after the Turanian (Indo-Seysthan) invasion of India, i.e., after the second century of the Christian era. The Veda, he declared, was evidently a wreck saved from a general shipwreck; everything else that has come down to us—epic literature, law-books, works on grammar, poetry—was merely a late renaissance, a new life sprung up under more favourable circumstances: it was a Renaissance literature. This hypothesis, of course, created a great sensation and called forth lively discussions. Most scholars opposed or doubted this theory without however (considering the great uncertainties prevailing in all questions of Indian chronology) being able to refute it entirely, others were led away by Max Müller's fascinating argumentation, until Bühler took up the discussion with his splendid and methodical essay on the Indian inscriptions and the age of the Indian Kāvya literature (Sitzungsberichte der Wiener Akademie, 1890, Vol. 122). Starting from some recently discovered inscriptions, eighteen of which bear perfectly certain dates which are fully discussed by Bühler, he refutes in this essay Max Müller's arguments one by one, and establishes besides a number of secure dates.

Again in the discussion which has lately been revived and has excited such great interest, as to the age of the Veda, Bühler has taken the most sober and moderate view of the question.

About six years ago Bühler conceived the plan of editing an *Encyclopaedia of Indo-Aryan Research* on a grand scale—a work which was, as it were, to crown his life-long efforts for the general development of Indology. Within a very short time he succeeded in securing the co-operation of about thirty scholars from different parts of the world—from America, India, England and the continent of Europe. With youthful zeal he set to work himself, and twice the Austrian Government granted him a year's leave of absence for the purpose of devoting himself entirely to his work in connection with the *Encyclopaedia*. Besides the *Palaeography*, published in 1896, he intended to treat of the Antiquities, Geography, and History. Especially in the last mentioned part he hoped to be able to bring out new and unexpected results. Only a short time ago he explained to me with his cheerful enthusiasm, how he was going to do it all to refute the general talk about the Hindus, lacking the historical sense—and now all at once this terrible blow, this sudden and cruel destruction of all hopes and schemes! And what might we not have expected from a man so full of vigour and energy! His capacity, his love of work and his power of work seemed simply unlimited—and now! It is true, we may hope that at least the *Encyclopaedia* (to say nothing of his other schemes) is so firmly established that it can safely be carried out to the end. But the parts which he was to work out himself will never be accomplished by any one, as he would have done it. "If there ever was a man," writes the Nestor of German Sanskritists, Professor Albrecht Weber in Berlin, "whose loss can be called irreparable, it is Georg Bühler." Of him it may be truly said: "He has lived for all ages!"
P.S. — While I was writing the above, a newspaper came to my hands, in which a Vienna correspondent reported rumours circulating in Vienna as to a voluntary or violent death of Hofrat Bühler. The correspondent added that indeed no tangible proofs of either the one or the other hypothesis are forthcoming, and that Bühler’s nearest Vienna friends “deny most positively the very possibility of a suicide committed by Bühler from ethical or philosophical motives” — and surely they are right. Whoever has known Bühler ever so slightly, must certainly arrive at the same conclusion. I knew him for nearly twenty years, since August 1878, and from that time to the very last I have had frequent intercourse with him both personal and by letters, and I venture to assert most emphatically that with him “a tendency to the negation of the pleasures of existence” or any kind of Buddhist mysticism is entirely out of the question, and the hypothesis of a suicide is absolutely groundless. Nor is there any foundation for the hypothesis of a violent death of a crime, it being entirely uncalled for in view of the facts which have come to light. Boating was Bühler’s favourite sport, and he often liked to practise it, particularly after hard work. Already on the 7th of April he had made an excursion from Lindau, and after his return in the evening was seen engaged in cheerful conversation with other visitors at the Hotel. On Good Friday the 6th he was induced by the beautiful spring weather to stay one day longer, “in order to make a longer excursion,” as he was heard saying. After having drawn up a telegram to his wife, ‘Come to-morrow,’ which was afterwards found in the Hotel, he started in the afternoon in one of those long and narrow boats, the ears of which lie so lightly on the outriggers, that they are lifted even at a great distance by the wash of a steamer, if they are not held tightly as soon as the waves approach. Now Bühler was seen from the banks rowing forward and backward for some time on one and the same spot after 7 o’clock in the evening. Next day the empty boat was found floating on the lake with one ear, while the other ear was found at some distance from it. In the opinion of experienced people living near the lake it is highly probable that he lost one ear, which he tried to secure again, and in trying to catch it he, being a stout man, fell overboard. By this natural and simple hypothesis the terrible accident becomes perfectly plain and intelligible.

A CONTRIBUTION ON BÜHLER.

BY PROF. F. KNAUER (KIEW).

In the case of Bühler I hardly know which to admire most: the greatness of his learning and mental power, or the greatness of his mind and character. I do not think I can honour his memory better than by quoting a few extracts from his letters addressed to me, and by adding an account of an incident which shows the great scholar also as a man of rare human qualities.

On January 2nd, 1891, he writes:—“I think, we shall before long become acquainted even with older temples of the Brâhmans. The excavations of Mathurâ, Ahichchatrâ and Sravasti will no doubt considerably modify our views about the religions of India.”

On March 3rd, 1893:—“The [London] Congress was one of the finest and most successful. A great deal of useful work was done: some of the papers were very important; Cowell’s speeches the most important of all.”

On June 6th, 1893:—“The work (Mânasaçrihyasûtra) is one of the most interesting of its kind.” And with reference to new discoveries:—“The brutal facts are now demolishing the finest theories concerning the age of Sanskrit literature, which a so-called criticism has derived from ‘inner’ reasons. But what we have learnt until now is only the beginning, we may look forward to far more startling discoveries, and I am afraid, of all that has been considered as the correct thing during the last forty years not much will stand the test of time. Our salvation is in the pick-axe and the shovel and in paying more attention to Hindu tradition.”

On June 22nd, 1893:—“The worthy Bhâtji never cared much for the state of their Mantras; they always felt like that famous priest who baptised nomine patris filii et spiriti sancti, and it did not matter in the least. The Saumskâra has its effect with a nonsensical Mantra just the same as with
a correct one." — "In support of your quite correct view that the gṛihāṇi harṃāṇi are older than the svaudāni, I should also like to point out that the tariffs for the latter were much too high to be ever carried out completely."

In Vol. I. of the Vienna Oriental Journal, 1887, Bühler had published an article on the elliptic use of iti and cha, which was to a certain extent directed against myself, inasmuch as I had, in my edition and translation of the Gobhila-grhyasūtra, taken a different view from that of the Hindu commentators which Bühler defends in his paper. I considered it my duty to oppose Bühler in a special article. With some misgivings — for I was an admirer of Bühler and could ill spare his help and advice — I wrote to him pointing out my objections. And what was his reply? "As to iti and cha it does not matter. I shall return to the subject on some other occasion. All I ask for, if anybody wishes to enter upon a controversy with me, is that the tone should always be that of polite society." A few days later he writes: — "The fuller the discussion the better." I do not know what impression my article published soon after in the Fest güsse an Otto von Böhlingk had made upon him; but when I announced to him my intention to come to Vienna in the summer of that year 1888, he invited me to stay with him. Of course, I did not like to trouble him. But when I came to Vienna, he frequently invited me to his house, and we met every day in the Oriental Institute. With the heartiest kindness he placed everything that could be of any use to me at my disposal, and assisted me with his advice and help with an unselfishness shrinking from no sacrifice that was truly touching. What could it be that induced the wonderful man to be so exceedingly kind to me? His personal acquaintance I had only made in 1886 at the Vienna Congress of Orientalists and, of course, then only very superficially, as he could not pay much attention to a beginner in those eventful days which taxed all his energies. I had not been his pupil, and was already a professor. Neither personally nor in literary matters could I be of any service to him; besides I had attacked him in public. Were these not reasons enough for him to receive me, in 1888, with cool reserve and to grant me only such favours as he could deny me for decency's sake? Far from that, he fully opened to me the rich stores of his learning and allowed me a deep insight into his world of ideas, which proved a lasting gain to myself. It was clear that Bühler considered no one as too unimportant whom he thought capable of contributing in any way to the progress of learning, and that he tried to help and assist any such person to the utmost of his power. At the same time he had a charming manner of placing himself on a level, as it were, with those below him, so that even the humblest became inspired with courage.

On the 10th of July, 1896, he wrote to me on some other occasion: — "This I should like now to substitute in the place of former conjectures, and you may print and criticise it as much as you like." And in his last letter to me he writes to thank me 'heartily' for the 'splendid' work (my edition of the Manavagrihyasūtra), although in this work I had repeatedly made critical remarks directed against him. Bühler was free of all touchiness in questions of scholarship, and granted to everybody the full liberty of his own opinion, nay, he seemed to experience a certain pleasure in meeting with views differing from his own, if only they were expressed judiciously. One might think that such a feature should be a matter of course in any scholar, particularly in one who has everything at his command and can afford to be superior to little weaknesses. However, experience teaches that this is not so and that even men of the greatness of a Bühler are not always proof against 'gnat bites' received in literary warfare, in consequence of which they become disagreeable (though it may be only for a short time). Bühler, however, was a lion without fear. He was a truly great scholar, an extraordinary character, an exceedingly keen observer of human nature, and a wise educator in matters of learning. Honour to the memory of a master!

AN APPRECIATION OF BÜHLER.

BY EMILE SENART, MEMBRE DE L'INSTITUT.

When I agreed to add a few words to the notice that Dr. Winternitz was writing on the life and works of Bühler, I only considered, with my old sympathy for the Indian Antiquary, my affectionate admiration for the eminent scholar whose loss has left us an irreparable void.
Since I have read this touching memoir however, I feel the rashness of my promise. With the accuracy of a thoroughly well informed witness, and the pious fervour of heart-felt devotion, the writer reviews the entire life and work of the master, bringing into prominent relief the originality and importance of his rôle. Nothing further would therefore remain for me to say, were I not eager to accept the opportunity that is offered to me to add to such numberless expressions of homage and sincere regret the tribute of the high and respectful esteem that is felt by his French fellow-workers for this indefatigable pioneer of Indianism.

In spite of the fact, that, but for a friendly exchange of correspondence, I only made the personal acquaintance of Bühlcr a few years before his death, I cannot forget that having followed the same course of studies under the same "Guru," there existed, if I may be allowed the expression, a bond of common origin between us. When I began the study of Sanskrit, under the direction of Benfey, I remember what high expectations that clear-sighted judge had already formed of the distinguished destiny that awaited the man, still so young, whom he loved to proclaim his most remarkable pupil. Bühlcr himself never failed to acknowledge on his part, with fervent gratitude and faithful sympathy, the value of his instruction and the encouragement of such flattering predictions. Benfey was not only singularly suggestive in his teaching, and his conversation; he was not only an admirable grammarian and linguist. One of the first, he had fully perceived, beyond the mere linguistic interest that had first excited the attention of the West to the study of Sanskrit, the attraction which was offered to the highest curiosity of the mind by the insight into the past history of India and the development of its life, religious, political and social. He was the first who ventured to sketch a general view of it in his famous article, which appeared in Erman and Gruber's *Encyclopædia*; and so he was certainly most influential in the course which his pupil's ideas early adopted. Bühlcr wanted to study India in itself, and for itself, and to trace, before all else, chronological, and positive data as given by its literature, and monuments. With this object, he decided to seek, in the familiar intercourse of the country itself, in its scholastic traditions, in a methodical research for manuscripts and documents, the information that this great work required.

It was to himself alone, however, to his own perseverance and ardour, to his enormous capacity for work that he was indebted for the success that so largely crowned his plan. Always distrusting specious deductions and brilliant generalisations, he showed in his whole aspect that harmonious fusion of qualities peculiar both to the German and the English mind to which Dr. Winternitz has so happily alluded. Varied and profound science, decided precision, unflinching tenacity, a practical knowledge of both men and affairs, nothing was wanting to make him, not exactly the leader of a certain school, but what was even better, a diligent leader of workers, or, as I may express it, a *chef d'atelier*, endowed to a striking degree, with authority and power. Such he showed himself in India, where he succeeded in making enthusiastic fellow-workers of several Natives, as well as of those of his own countrymen whom he attracted and imbued with his enterprising spirit, and still more so in Europe when he returned to Vienna and there founded a course of teaching which proved so fruitful. By the current use of Sanskrit, by certain ways of teaching — and even by certain habits of mind, he used some coquetry to maintain the stamp of his long and affectionate familiarity with the Hindu world.

Thanks to the high position he enjoyed both with the Administration of the British Government, as well as with the Indianists of the East and West, he became under all circumstances, the natural intermediary between India and Europe, and he never refused his aid, whenever it was required, either by men or by useful enterprises. Of this I had a striking proof during the latter part of his life, the memory of which is all the more agreeable to me,
as it recalls a circumstance which gave me the opportunity of offering him a few days' hospitality and of enjoying his society more intimately. The Eleventh Congress of Orientalists having brought Bühler to Paris, where a number of other celebrated Indianists were also assembled, I thought it a duty to take advantage of the occasion for the realisation of a desire I had for some time entertained. The project in view was the organisation of an International Association, the object of which would be to further, by all means, archaeological investigations in India. That Bühler should take a warm interest in the project at once, will not seem surprising. His enthusiasm, however, was not displayed only in promises. This was proved by the zeal by which he obtained the patronage of important personages, whose aid and assistance was essential to the success of the plan. He also, in a most precise and practical spirit, drew a sketch for the future working of the Association and kept up strenuously, to his death, the active correspondence which was entailed by our common interest in the undertaking. To him is certainly due, in a large measure, the valuable and powerful intervention of our eminent friends, Lord Reay and Sir Alfred Lyall, which secured for the project, the favourable disposition of the Indian Government. His loss is certainly a fatal blow to the new Association. May his memory protect it!

The least attentive observer would perceive, that in Bühler the man of work and of thought was also the man of action. Both his words and appearance, as well as an indescribable air of promptness and decision, showed it at first sight. He never indulged in reveries — in vague speculation, or in the frail adjustment of conjectures. In a field of research, where the uncertainty of chronological bases or the rarity of positive statements, as well as the national quietism and mystic disposition, opens so large an area for hypothesis, it remains a striking honour in his career that he devoted himself by a determined effort conscientiously and indefatigably to the conquest of facts, even when slightly prominent, and the fixing of dates even though secondary or provisional. It was a logical consequence of this frame of mind, that the Vedic Literature for him held a less prominent place than the epigraphic matter, that, in the study of law the genealogy of books and schools were of greater importance to him than the analysis of institutions. Even in the investigation of religious antiquities he was more busy in testing the tradition than in expatiating upon the systems.

From the first and until the end of his life, Bühler followed with undeviating firmness the path he had traced out for himself after due reflection. He has accomplished his task. He has accomplished it with éclat, for, with the clearness of purpose that was one of his chief characteristics, he had chosen his line in the direction of his most prominent faculties, and to it he devoted such a power for work, a vigour and an ingenuity of mind as never failed. All these brilliant qualities were at their best when the fatal accident occurred for which we shall long remain insensible.

In France, it revived among us sad memories, as a similarly cruel and unforeseen catastrophe had just ten years before deprived a fellow-worker and contemporary of Bühler of his life. In some respects one may say that Bergaigne, by the turn of his mind, by the direction of his favourite studies, presented a living antithesis to Bühler. But he also was cut off at the very moment when he seemed almost to have reached the crowning point of his labour, at an age when many fruitful years appeared to be still in store for him. Two masters, so widely different in their lines of work, are thus brought together for us by a common fatality which seemed to cling to their common studies. We had long been eager to manifest our high respect for the science and services of Bühler. Our Academy had considered it an honour to number him among its correspondents. While recalling a loss so near to our hearts, his tragic end, has, even for those who only knew him through his books, added a thrill of intimate emotion to the regrets which naturally accompany the premature death of a powerful worker.
His mind was of an unceasing activity and ever awake. His learning, admirably suggestive, was never taken unawares. A rich fullness of culture, a wide store of remembrances, animated his conversation, which was at once solid and lively. All those who have had the good fortune to know Bühler personally will retain a faithful memory of a man, obliging, without any display — who softened by unvarying uprightness and true benevolence the commanding authority of a vast science and of a very decided turn of mind. As to the scholar, his useful impulsion is sure to survive him long, and his name will remain inscribed in the first ranks of the golden book of Indian studies.

A NOTE ON THE FACTS OF BÜHLER'S CAREER.

Johann Georg Bühler, son of a clergyman, was born on the 18th July, 1837, at Borstel, a village near Nienburg (county Hoya, Hannover). The first part of his education was domestic, after which he was sent, in the spring of 1852, to Hannover, to complete the course of the Lyceum under the well known scholars H. L. Ahrens and R. Kühner. In 1855 he matriculated at the University of Göttingen and studied classical philology and archeology under K. F. Hermann, Schneidewin, E. Curtius, H. Sauppe, and F. Weiseler, and oriental philology under Th. Benfey, and H. von Ewald. Having taken his degree as Ph. D. in that summer of 1858, he went to Paris in October, 1858, thence to London in June, 1859, where he accepted in May, 1861, the post of Assistant to the Librarian of the Royal Library at Windsor, which in October, 1862, he exchanged for a similar one at the University Library at Göttingen.

He was nominated Professor of Oriental Languages at the Elphinstone College in Bombay on the 10th February, 1863; in December of the same year, Fellow and Examiner of the University of Bombay; in March, 1864, a Member of the Commission for the Publication of a Digest of Hindu Law; in June, 1864, Professor of Ancient History and English at the Elphinstone College. In January, 1866, he was promoted to the post of Acting Superintendent of Sanskrit Studies and Professor of Ancient History and English at the Deccan College, Poona, and was sent on a tour of research in the Southern Marāṭha and Kānāra country during the cold seasons of 1866-69. He then returned to Bombay as Professor of Oriental Languages and Ancient History at the Elphinstone College, and was advanced, on the 20th December, 1868, to the post of Educational Inspector of Guzerat and Officer in charge of the search of Sanskrit MSS. in the Bombay Presidency. He was sent on special duty to Rajputana from December, 1873, to March, 1874, and to Kashmir and Central India, from July, 1875, to April 1876. His health failing, he was pensioned on the 12th September, 1880, and accepted the professorship of Indian philology and archeology in the University of Vienna in October, 1880. He was Corresponding Member of the German Oriental Society (1871), of the American Oriental Society (1873), of the Berlin Academy of Science (1878), of the Royal Society of Sciences at Göttingen (1883), of the Imperial Academy of Sciences in Vienna (1883), of the Petersburg Academy (1893), of the Institut de France (1887), and of the École des Langues Orientales Vivantes at Paris. He was an Ordinary Member of the Imperial Academy of Science in Vienna (1885), of the Société Asiatique at Paris, of the Asiatic Society at Bombay, and of the

1 Communicated by Prof. H. Jacobi and others.
Gujarat Vernacular Society. He was an Honorary Member of the American Oriental Society (1887), of the Asiatic Society of Bengal (1885), of the Imperial Russian Archæological Society, and of the Anjuman-i-Punjab.

He was appointed a Knight of the Prussian Order of the Crown (III Class) in 1872, a Companion of the Order of the Indian Empire 1st January, 1878, and Comthir of the Order of Franz-Josef, and was nominated K. H. Hofrath in 1889, and Honorary LL.D. of Edinburgh in 1885.


His publications in the “Schriften der Wiener Akademie der Wissenschaften” are the following: — (a) Über eine Sammlung von Sanskrit und Prakrit Handschriften, 1881; (b) Übersetzung der Kaschmirischen Dichter Somadeva, 1883; (c) Über eine Inschrift des Königs Dharasena von Valabhi, 1888; (d) Über eine neue Inschrift des Gujarā Königs, Dadha II., 1887; (e) Über eine Sendraka Inschrift, 1887; (f) Über die Indische Secte der Jainas, 1887; (g) Über das Navasāhasānkalrātha des Pādmapārtha, 1888; (h) Das Leben des Jaina Mönches Hemachandra, 1889; (i) Über das Sukrita-sanatkundana des Arisīuha, 1889; (j) Die Indischen Inschriften und Das Alter der Indischen Kunst Poësie, 1890; (k) Indian Studies No. I., The Jāgadīśhachariya of Sārvājana, 1892; (l) Indian Studies No. II., Contributions of the History of the Mahābhārata, 1892; Indian Studies No. III., On the Origin of the Braham Alphabet, 1895 (Second edition, 1898).

**BÜHLER AS A COLLECTOR OF MSS.**

**BY PROF. ERNST LEUMANN, STRASSEB.**

It is generally not known or scarcely noticed to what an extent the history of any science is dependent on the local distribution of its materials. When a town or country shows some predilection for this or that branch of research we are, at first, inclined to find the reason in some local or national instinct, or in the efficacy of the teaching and writings of some scholar, who may be considered to be the ‘local genius.’ And this inclination is strengthened by the undoubted facts that there are such things as local ‘schools’ of science as there are of art, and that nationalities do tend towards different standards in science and art. This does not,
however, explain how it is that — to turn to Indian research — Denmark has only produced Pāli scholars (Westergaard, Fausbøll, Trenchner, Andersen), that Northern Buddhism is chiefly cultivated in Paris (Barnouf, Feer, Senart, Lévi, Guimet), and that other branches of Indian studies are more or less equally confined to particular seats of learning. The real explanation lies in the dispersion of the materials. Rask furnished Copenhagen with a splendid collection of Pāli manuscripts which roused the interest of Danish scholars, just as Hodgson sent to Paris an excellent collection of the writings of the Northern Buddhists as preserved in Nepal. So the famous general Sanskrit Library of Chambers went to Berlin and found there an indefatigable interpreter in Weber, while the India Office and the Bodleian have become seats of Indian philology through the manuscript libraries of Colebrooke and Wilson. In later years also Cambridge received a series of manuscript treasures from the enlightened activity of Daniel Wright, with the consequence that two Cambridge scholars (Cowell and Boudall), have made them their special study. Now on the same level with those great collectors of manuscripts who, by bringing or sending over to Europe their treasures, have founded therĪ different seats of Indian Wisdom, we have to mention Bühlert. Indeed, he not only equals Rask, Hodgson, Chambers, Colebrooke, Wilson, and Wright as a collector of manuscripts, but far surpasses them all. And therefore, had he done nothing else for Sanskrit Philology, he would be one of its greatest promoters, — one of those whose activity most decidedly and most happily determines the progress of Indian Research. On this fact we insist all the more, as the general public, in appreciating scholars, is inclined to overlook merits of the kind described. Well written books, like fragrant flowers, chiefly attract the general attention and also in a titanic publication (like Muramy’s or Littre’s or Grimm’s Dictionary), which looks like majestic oak in the park of literary and scientific productions. But who thinks of the roots hidden in the ground, which furnish the elementary materials for stems, branches and blossoms? Who longs to hear of the pioneer work, which furnishes the materials for those publications that the general reader may use or enjoy?

But let us, nevertheless, inquire in what way Bühlert has been an unparalleled collector of Indian manuscripts. Between 1863 and 1866 Bühlert bought for himself about 300 manuscripts, which in 1883 he presented to the India Office, and the zeal and ability exhibited in bringing together this small but remarkable collection induced the Bombay Government to secure Bühlert’s services in that line. And so between 1866 and 1868, Bühlert was specially deputed to explore the native libraries in the South Marîthâ and the North Kânîrâ countries, and obtained for Government about 200 manuscripts which were deposited in the Elipstone College; and in 1868, when a regular and most important ‘Search for Manuscripts’ was instituted by the Government of India, Bühlert became the head of the Bombay organisation, which up to 1890, when he left India, has bought for the Deccan College Library 2,363 manuscripts. Besides all this, between 1873 and 1890, Bühlert asked for and received on several occasions permission to send over to Europe such texts as were already well represented in the Government Collection. Among the European Libraries it is particularly that of Berlin which unhesitatingly grasped this splendid opportunity of adding to its stock of Indian manuscripts; and thus it came about that nearly 500 manuscripts, partly presented and partly sold, have, through Bühlert, found their way to Berlin.

By mentioning in each case the exact or approximate number of manuscripts acquired we only mean to give a general idea of the enormous extent of new materials that we owe to Bühlert’s activity in India. A considerable part of the texts represented were entirely unknown before, many of them were brilliant discoveries due only to Bühlert’s exceptional energy and sagacity and to his profound learning. Thus he rescued two whole branches of literature from oblivion, viz., the Kashmiri branch which comprises Vedic and Sanskrit texts and the extensive Prākrit and Sanskrit literature of the Svetambara Jains. Who would, thirty years ago, have thought that India still contained so many unknown literary documents? And who would have found them or even looked for them, if Bühlert had not gone out, of his own
accord, to India, as an adventurer of philological research — comparable in this respect only to Anquetil Duperron and Czoma Körösi?

The majority of those five hundred manuscripts which Bühlner sent to Berlin belong to the literature of the Svetambara Jains. This has had the effect that Jain Philology is comparatively much cultivated in Germany, while in England and France, where the scholars are still greatly absorbed by the occupation which their rich stores of Buddhist manuscripts affords, no effort has yet been made to deal with Jainism. First of all Weber devoted to the new materials ten years of his life, as the fruits of which he brought out — not to speak of smaller publications — his New Catalogue (three 4to volumes of 1,364 pages) and his Sacred Literature of the Jains (an English translation of which was published in the Indian Antiquary). Klatt also was won for the new branch of study by the materials, as well as by Bühlner personally (when on leave in Europe in 1878); and with a remarkable skill and assiduity he selected from the new literature all that tended to yield chronical and bibliographical facts. What Klatt contributed and what later on by ill fate he was prevented from contributing to Indian Research may be inferred from a Note in a former volume of the Indian Antiquary (1894, p. 169, note 2). A few years after Klatt, Lehmann began, as a student in Berlin, his Jain investigations, transferring them afterwards to Strassburg where he tried to complete Bühlner's work in that line by procuring for his University Jain manuscripts not represented as yet in the Berlin-Bühlner Collection.

But Bühlner founded the German Jain Philology not only through Berlin. In 1873-74 Jacobi had accompanied Bühlner on one of his tours and had acquired with Bühlner's consent and friendly support a manuscript collection of his own, containing chiefly Jain texts. It is well known how much Jacobi has fertilized this collection, and what valuable editions and translations of Jain texts he has brought out and furnished with most instructive introductions — not to mention the independent papers in which he has dealt with Jain subjects.

As to the impulses which Jain Philology received in India from Bühlner we might refer to many, but confine ourselves to record here only what certainly is the chief and most promising impulse. Bühlner imparted his desire of discovering or uncovering all that is hidden or unknown in Jain Literature to Peterson, his successor in Bombay, who has been so fortunate as to be able to enter sanctified temple libraries, which, in spite of all exertions, were closed to Bühlner. Peterson has indeed been continuing Bühlner's work in the 'Search for Manuscripts' very much to his credit, and his endeavours well supplement those of the highly accomplished scholar, Bhandarkar, who naturally favours the Brahmanic literature, though, like Weber, he has temporarily been induced to devote himself also to a very earnest perusal of Jain texts.

We have dealt here somewhat at length on the position which Bühlner holds towards Jain studies through his search for manuscripts. But his search claims to be of nearly the same primary importance in regard to the study of Indian Law and Custom. And further, all the other branches of Indian Learning have received new impulses and gained new prospects through the materials that have become available through Bühlner. So, once more, we may state fairly that Bühlner would have marked an epoch in Indian Philology, — he would, indeed, have remodelled it by giving it a new and larger base, even if he had done nothing else than securing for scientific investigation the three thousand manuscripts that we owe to him.

BÜHLNER AND THE INDIAN ANTIQUARY.

A Note

BY JAMES BURGESS, C.I.E., LL.D., FORMERLY EDITOR.

With Professor Dr. J. G. Bühlner, I became acquainted immediately on his arrival in Bombay as Professor of Sanskrit in the Elphinstone College, and during the next ten years we met occasionally at the rooms of the Bombay Branch of the Asiatic Society and at the University
examinations. But it was in 1871-72 that we became intimate. The Bombay Asiatic Society was then publishing little, and at long intervals; and it occurred to me that, by using the grant it had from Government for the publication and inviting papers from many men able to contribute such in the numerous branches of Oriental research, the Society might publish every quarter, if not every second month. This proposal I brought formally before the Society's Managing Committee, urging it as a duty to use the funds granted for publication in this way, and pointing out the extent of the field. But the Secretary, Mr. Jas. Taylor (who had formerly been in the firm of Smith, Elder & Co.), pooh-poohed the proposal as chimerical. This led me to promise to attempt what the Society declined, and towards the close of 1871, I wrote to all the scholars I knew in India, asking whether they would support a monthly magazine on the plan of the programme of the *Indian Antiquary*. I had an immediate and encouraging response from several, including Dr. Burnell, Mr. Beames, Prof. R. G. Bhandarkar, Prof. Blochmann, Dr. Bühler, Mr. T. W. Rhys Davids, Mr. F. S. Growse, and others. Thus the *Journal* was commenced. Dr. Bühler sent me his first paper "On the Chandikāśātaka of Bāṇabhaṭṭa" in March 1872, and it appeared the following month. From that date we started a correspondence which continued more or less regularly till the time of his lamented death. To the *Indian Antiquary* he was a warm friend and frequent contributor, and, during the thirteen years I edited it, I never appealed to him in vain when I wanted a paper; he commended it to his friends; and though so liberal a contributor, he insisted on paying his annual subscription for it, — thereby testifying practically his anxiety for its success.

From 1885 our correspondence continued quite as regularly as before, and touched mostly on chronology, ancient geography, paleography and epigraphy. From the latter part of 1888 till 1894, his contributions to the *Epigraphia Indica* were also frequent and extensive. During all these years we had much personal conference, meeting in Vienna, Edinburgh, London, Paris, and elsewhere, and I always found him the same, — full of information drawn from all sources, enthusiastic about everything connected with Indian history and antiquities. His judgment was remarkably accurate and his knowledge of human nature instinctively clear, while his energy, wisdom and tact ensured success in whatever he undertook, and rendered his opinion one of great weight in any matter he expressed it upon. He was a true and valued friend as well as an accomplished scholar. His loss for the ancient history of India seems almost irreparable.

---

**A NOTE ON DR. BÜHLER.**

**BY PROFESSOR MAURICE BLOOMFIELD.**

Professor Bühler was an almost perfect embodiment of what might be called the pragmatic scholar. His work was full of action, but in all his varied activity he never lost sight of the highest scholarly ideals. He gave freely to all that came of his advice and help. Whether it was necessary to search obscure catalogues for notices of manuscripts; to engage the co-operation of the Government officials in India; or to stir up a dreamy Paśhit to the point of answering a letter, or parting with a manuscript in his possession; in all these and many other contingencies you might count upon his help given in the most cordial fashion. Yet how far was he from becoming the agent and business-man of others: he always remained the master. With all his wonderful grasp of the realities of India, and Indian life and history he never lost patience with the pains-taking closet-work of the philologist that is needed to secure a firm foundation for the reconstruction of the past. He was an ideal philologist; philologist and historian in one. Every Indian scholar, that is not a mere tradesman, is something of an historian, but the force of most of us is spent at the door of historical inquiry. To edit and translate, to restore and decipher, these are certainly important and unavoidable tasks; most of us are so busy with such labours as to be at times in danger of not 'seeing the forest for the trees that
are in it.' Bühler was in an eminent degree both common labourer and architect: it is hard to say where he will be missed most. As a searcher and finder of manuscripts, as a promoter of archaeological inquiries, and as a decipherer of inscriptions he had no rival. But he was even greater when he stepped out, as it were, from the intricate maze of his knowledge of details and turned to works of generalization: when he helped to digest Hindu Law; when he presented his unrivalled essays on Indian Paleography; when he conceived and guided the first attempt at a connected Encyclopaedia of Indian Philology; above all when he propounded and solved in his own clear-headed way questions in literary history and chronology. It is but the soberest truth to say that just such a man we shall not count as one of us again, that his loss will never be quite repaired. Western scholarship owes him a debt of lasting gratitude; India may fittingly deplore the loss of perhaps her truest historian.

By way of adding something to the record of his extraordinary activity in India, I may be permitted a quotation from a letter of his, written scarcely two months before his untimely death (dated February 22nd, 1898). He is speaking of the unique manuscript of the Kashmirian Atharva-Veda, the so-called Pāippalīda Chālidh, which was sent to the late Professor von Roth by the British authorities in India, and is now in the possession of the library of the Tübinger University: ‘If, as I presume, you will print a history of the manuscript, I would ask you to mention that Sir William Muir decided on my advice to despatch the MS. to Professor von Roth. On its account I had to travel from Indor to Calcutta in February 1876, because Sir William Muir did not know what to do with the ragged volume. I pointed out to him that in the first place it stood in need of a bath; this it got in Sir William’s bathroom. After that the MS. looked quite fresh, and Sir William handed it to me to have it mended by the Native book-binders. The repairs lasted for nearly a week.’

NOTES ON G. BÜHLER.

BY PROF. RHYS DAVIDS.

After reading the strikingly able paper by Dr. Winternitz I feel that it is only possible to add one other proof of the all-round nature of Professor Bühler’s enthusiasm for knowledge of all things that had to do with the history of India. When I first knew him he had scarcely read a line of Pali. But he soon afterwards became a member of the Pali Text Society, and also (this does not always follow) read the books himself. He became as keen about the issue of each new volume as if he had been a mere Pali scholar. And the last time he was in my study he said — we were talking about Privat-docents — that no one should be appointed a University teacher for Sanskrit unless he was at home also with Pali, and vice versa. He was interested chiefly in what could be gained for Indian lexicography, and the history of social institutions. But I confess I was amazed to find — knowing how very busy he was, how many other interests he had had for so long a time — that he should have been able to make time to read so much in these new texts. His articles on Pali subjects in the Vienna Journal, in the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, and in the Indian Antiquary, the great importance attached by him to Pitaka evidence in the opening pages of his Indische Paleographie, and such notes as that in his Manu, p. xci., show the object he had in view. And I know from personal conversation, that he was meditating other papers of a similar kind.

It is perhaps important to point out, as regards the subject of ‘inner chronology,’ that no one was more skilled at drawing conclusions as to the comparative chronology of two or more books from a careful comparison of their contents, than precisely Bühler. The introductions to his translations of Manu and Apastamba are elaborate examples of the importance and value of such comparisons, and of the right method to be followed in making them. It would be amply clear from them alone that it was not the use of ‘inner chronology’ as a means of investigation, that Bühler objected to, but the

1 See, for instance, op. cit., 1894, pp. 148-154, 242, 247.
wrong use of it — the drawing of conclusions too wide, and too absolute from insufficient data; a reliance on comparisons of isolated passages, instead of including all the passages relating to the same point; a limitation of the comparisons to one or more points, omitting other matters also available for chronological purposes, and so on. The conclusions reached by Bühlcr, on grounds of 'inner chronology,' in the two essays referred to, are stated, not only once, but on several instances, in quite positive terms. They have obtained the assent of those of his fellow-workers most competent to judge of them. And 'inner chronology' used in the like judicial spirit, based on the like wide and accurate knowledge, guarded by the like painstaking industry, will always form an important element in our attempts to elucidate the history of Indian thought and institutions. That is the test:—do the conclusions arrived at by the method of inner chronology gain the assent of other scholars?

I venture to hope that this is really about what Dr. Winternitz would himself say; and would express the thanks we must all feel to him for having, with so much judgment and insight, shown us the varied sides of the activity of the great scholar whose personal qualities, and whose enthusiasm for the cause, so endured to all of us that we feel his loss as that, not only of a master, but also of a personal friend.

IN MEMORIAM G. BÜHLER.
ON SOME SWAT LANGUAGES.

BY GEORGE A. GRIESON, C.I.E., Ph.D., L.C.S.

When the Editor of the Indian Antiquary honoured me by inviting me to be one of the contributors to the Bühlcr Memorial Number, I felt some hesitation in complying. I could but offer a tribute of affectionate remembrance to him who I knew both as a guide and a friend, and I knew that any poor halting, words of mine would be inadequate to express what I felt and what I wished to say while others, more able and better qualified than I, would adorn these pages with eloquent tribute to his worth. On second thoughts, I gathered courage, and it seemed to me that the best offering which I could make to his memory, would be of the first fruits of an undertaking whose inception owes much to his advice and encouragement.

It was in 1886, at the Oriental Congress held in Vienna, that I first met Bühler, and discussed with him a project, which had long occupied my mind, for holding a Survey of the languages now spoken in India. Encouraged by him, I laid the proposal before the Congress itself, and a resolution, strongly supported by him, was passed urging on the Government of India the advisability of undertaking the investigation. I avoided writing of the warm friendship which dated from those days, or of the close correspondence enriched by the treasures of learning ungrudgingly poured forth which continued through the next eleven years. Suffice it to say that, largely due to his personal efforts and to his advice, the preliminary operations for the Linguistic Survey of India were commenced some two and a half years ago. One of the last occasions that we met was when I read to the Aryan Section of the Paris Congress of 1897 the progress report of these preliminary steps, and I still seem to see him sitting on the dais as Vice-President and to hear the words of encouragement with which he welcomed the story of what had been done. A day or two afterwards we parted, never, alas, to meet again. Early last May I learned that the project had been finally sanctioned, and was on the point of writing to him to tell him the joyful news, when the sad and much belated tidings of his death reached us at Patna. Never can I forget what I owe to him. True were the words of my Pañḍit when I told him of it, 'Mahābhārata astānu gatā sitī, a great sun had set, and had left many without the light which they could hardly spare.

So I venture to dedicate to his memory some of the earliest results of the Linguistic Survey of India, because it was an inquiry in which he had continually taken an exceeding interest, and because these very results illustrate points on which he laid special stress in his correspondence with me.
With his full concurrence, it was determined to delay the publication of the section of his Grundriss which was to be devoted to the modern vernaculars of India till after the completion of the Survey. Surprises, he was sure, were in store for us, and, unless we postponed the production of the section on the 'Tertiary Prakrits,' there would be danger of its being out of date almost as soon as it was issued. How true this was, the subsequent progress of the Survey has shown, and of the two specimens which I now proceed to give, one illustrates these surprises.

Gujarí and Ajarí.

One of the most well-marked dialects of Rajputana is Mewāri, spoken by the Chauhān Rajputs of Mewār. It is one of the great West-Central group of Indo-Aryan languages to which belong Eastern Panjābī, Gujarātī and Standard Hindi, and forms one of the connecting links between these last two languages. Closely connected with it is Mārwāri, spoken in the neighbouring state of Mārwār. The grammars of both will be found in Mr. Kellogg’s work, and need not be described here.

More than eight hundred miles from Mewār, across the Indian Desert and the entire Panjāb, beyond the North-West frontier of India, lies the Swāt valley, inhabited principally by a Puṣhtō-speaking population. There are, however, two Muṣammādē tribes, the Gūjars and the Ajarās, who speak an Indian, and not an Iranian, language. The Gūjars are cowherds, and the Ajarās, who are closely connected with them, tend a flock. The former are a well-known tribe, and seem to be at home right through the hill-country north of the Panjāb, though strongest in the North-West. They are also numerous along the banks of the upper Jamna near Jagādri and Buriyā, and in the Saharapūr District, which during the last century was actually called Gujarāt. To the east they occupy the petty State of Sāmpatār, in Bundeikhand, and one of the northern districts of �:[[Gvālić]], which is still called Gūjerāt; but they are more numerous in the Western States, and especially towards Gujarāt, where they form a large portion of the population. The Rājās of Riwār to the south of Delhi are Gūjars. In the Southern Panjāb they are thinly scattered, but their numbers increase rapidly towards the North, where they have given their name to several important places, such as Gūjānwālā, in the Rechna Duāb, Gujarāt, in the Chaj Duāb, and Gūjār Khān, in the Śindh-Sāgar Duāb. They are numerous about Jēlām and Hasan Abāl, and throughout the Hazāra District; and they are also found in considerable numbers in the Dardu Districts of Čhilās, Kōli, and Pālās, to the east of the Indus, and in the contiguous districts to the east of the river.1 Regarding the Gūjars of the Panjāb, I have not as yet received any certain information, except that, the language-specimens, received from the District of Muzaffarnagar on the east bank of the Jamna show several points of connection with the language spoken by their brethren of Swāt. The Gūjars of the rest of the Panjāb Himalayas, and those of Kashmir are reported to speak a language of their own, but specimens of it have not yet been received. We must therefore content ourselves for the present with that spoken by those who are the most western and the most northern of all the Gūjars with whom we are acquainted. This brings us to the surprise already alluded to. The language of the Swāt Gūjars is practically identical with Mewāri, spoken, more than eight hundred miles away, in Rajputana. As might be expected they have borrowed a portion of their vocabulary from the neighbouring Puṣhtō and Panjābī, but the grammars of Swāt Gujarī and of Ajarī, on the one hand, and of Mewārī, on the other, are to all intents and purposes identical. This will be manifest from the following notes and specimens. It is an interesting fact that, both with the Gūjars and the Ajarās, one of their septs is known as 'Chōhān.' I am indebted to Major H. A. Deane, C.S.I., for all these specimens.

1 Cunningham, Arch. Surv. Rep. ii., 61, quoted by Crooke in the Tribes and Castes of the North-Western Provinces and Oudh, s.v. Gūjar.
# GUJARI SKELETON GRAMMAR

## I. — NOUNS.

### (a) Masculine.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nom.</th>
<th>Sing.</th>
<th>Plur.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ghór-o</td>
<td>ghór-o</td>
<td>ghór-o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ghór-o</td>
<td>ghór-o</td>
<td>ghór-o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### (b) Feminine.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nom.</th>
<th>Sing.</th>
<th>Plur.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dhi</td>
<td>dhi</td>
<td>dhi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dhi</td>
<td>dhi</td>
<td>dhi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Genitive Terminations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Masc.</th>
<th>Fem.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kó</td>
<td>kó</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obl.</th>
<th>Fem.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kó</td>
<td>kó</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## II. — PRONOUNS.

### I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thou</th>
<th>He</th>
<th>We</th>
<th>You</th>
<th>They</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tó</td>
<td>oh</td>
<td>wah</td>
<td>tam</td>
<td>wé</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nom.</th>
<th>Ag.</th>
<th>Gen.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kó</td>
<td>mañ</td>
<td>tairb</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dat.</th>
<th>manó</th>
<th>taná</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tam-tah</td>
<td>tam-tah</td>
<td>tam-tah</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## III. — VERBS.

### A. — Auxiliary and Verbs Substantive

- Pres., hai, for all numbers and persons.
- Past. Masc. Sg., thó, Pl. thé; Fem., thí, for all numbers and persons.

- Irregular Past Participles:
  - gió, gone

### B. — Finite Verb

- Infinitive, — má-r-aj.
- Pres., — már + personal endings.
- Future, — már + personal endings + go.
- Def. Present, — már + personal endings + hai.
- Imperfect, — már + personal endings + thó.
- Past, — már-dó.
- Perfect, — már-dó hai.
- Imperatives, — már-dó thó.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal endings.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dí</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sing.</th>
<th>Plur.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dí</td>
<td>dí</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plur.</th>
<th>dí</th>
<th>dí</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dí</td>
<td>dí</td>
<td>dí</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following points may be noted in regard to the grammar of the specimens:

I. — NOUNS.

The Agent case is generally the same as the Nominative. Indeed the use of the Agent with the Past tense of a Transitive verb appears to have almost disappeared.

In the case of nouns in ā, the oblique form singular usually ends in ā, but sometimes, probably owing to careless speaking, the direct form is used; thus, ghāńī kā, of a horse, instead of the more correct ghārā kā; mandā (or mandā) kam mā; mairō bāp kā, for mairō bāp kā. Sometimes, under the influence of Panjābī, the oblique form ends in ā. Thus, when the younger son speaks to his father, the narrative says, correctly, apdō bāp tah kahā; but when the elder son answers his father, the Panjābī idiom, apnē bāp tah, is incorrectly used.

On the other hand, the influence of Panjābī sometimes makes these nouns have the direct form in ā instead of in ē. Thus us kā (for us kē) bardō pūṭ pāttī mā thō.

Amongst the postpositions may be mentioned mā, in; kahā, with. The postpositions tah and d̆ẖā are borrowed from Pūṅẖā. They are used indiscriminately to mean both 'to' and 'from.' Thus, dẖār tah dẖā, come to this place, and dẖār tah dẖā, go from this place.

Examples of the correct use of the direct and of the oblique forms: mairō pūt mā bẖā thō (Hindī, mārē pūt mā thō), my son is dead; apṇā mā tah (Hindī, apnē mā thō), from his own property; chaṅghā astī (Hindī, chaṅghā āstī), good men; is kē pairā mā (Hindī, is kē pairā mā), on his feet; apṇā dōstī kahā (Hindī, apnē dōstī sāthī), with (my) own friends; chaṅghī trīma (Hindī, chaṅghī strī), a good woman; is kē ṛāngū mā (Hindī, is kē ṛāngū mā), on his finger.

The use of the word yakō, one, appears to be irregular. I have noted, —

Yakō bāp, a father; yakō bāp kō, of a father; but yakō dẖār, in a certain place.

Yakō dẖī, a daughter; yakō chaṅghī trīma, a good woman; yakō dẖī kō, of a daughter.

II. — PRONOUNS.

The proper form of the Agent of kā is maī. Thus: maī tairō kẖāńmat kīō hai (Hindī, maī nē ērtī kẖīśmah kīō), by me thy service has been done. But kā is sometimes substituted for it. Thus: thē mārīō, I killed, instead of maī mārīō, by me killed.

An example of the Agent of the second person is tā nē dātī hai (Hindī, tā nē nāhī dīyā dātī), by thee has not been given.

So for the third person usd bāngō (Hindī, us nē bẖādā), by him was divided; us kahā (Hindī, us nē kахā), by him it was said; but oh (not us or usd) uṣṭīō (Hindī, wāh uṣṭā), he rose.

III. — VERBS.

In the conjugation of verbs, note the peculiar way in which the Present Definite and Imperfect are formed. Here the verb exactly follows the Māraī custom. To form these tenses, the auxiliary verb is added, not to the Present Participle, but to the various persons of the simple Present Tense. Thus: mārī, I beat; mārī Ĥai (not māṛō kīō), I am beating; mārī thō (not māṛō thō), I was beating. Other examples are kārī Ĥai, I am making, used as a present subjunctive, (that) I may make (merriment with my friends); kārī thō, I was making. Irregularly influenced by Panjābī are dīyā nā thō, (anyone) was not giving; chalī nā thō, he was not going; chārdī thō, he was grazing.

The Present Participle is used to form a Habitual Past. Thus: kẖātiū, he used to eat; Plural Masculine, kẖāti, they (the swine) used to eat.

In the Simple Present, which is also used as a present subjunctive, there are some irregularities observable in the specimens. In kham kẖuṅẖūļ ĥarū, kẖuṅẖūļ kā, the first person plural is used for the first-person singular. Panjābī is responsible for kẖā-lai, and kẖē sāyā, and also for kẖū (they eat), in which last the singular is used for the plural,
As already observed, the use of the passive construction of the Past Tense of Transitive verbs appears to be dying out. The Agent form of the personal pronouns is still usually employed before these tenses, but all traces of the Agent case have disappeared from the noun. The feeling for Gender, too, is very weak. Thus we have māi tairā (instead of tairī) kharat kīō (instead of kī) hai, I have done thy service; so we have jīlī kīō, instead of jīlī kē, he shouted.

**Specimen I.—Parable of the Prodigal Son in Gujarli.**

Yakē admi kā dō pūt thā. Naṇga pūt appā bāp tāh kahō chi, 'ai bōp,
One man of two sons were. By-the-young son his-own father to it-was-said that, 'oh father,
nāmā appā mā tāh bāngō dāi-lāi.' Usā dwonyam pah appā mā bāngō-
to-me thy-own property from share give.' By-him both on his-own property was-divided.
Kī dē pachhā naṇgō pūt harkuj yakē-thār kar-kē dūr dēs tāh gīō. Ut
Some days after young son everything (in) one-place having-made far country to went. There
īā appā mā mandō kan mā udā-līō. Chi hābbā mā wajhār-līō,
by-him his-own property bad works in was-wasted. When all (his) property was-finished,
oh dēs pah yakē bāṛō gādat dyō, oh savāḥ hō-gīō. Oh gīō, oh dēs mā yakō
that country on one great famine came, he straitened became. He went, that country in one
khand kanah naukar hō-gīō. Usā appā pāṭī tāh dāi-gīō, chi 'mandah śūnār
chief with servant became. By-him his-own field to he-was-sent, that '(you) unclean animal
čhā-lāi.' Oh appā-śūnāh-pah oh hīō ḍhādō, chi śūnār khātā, ḍhāo kōtā diyā na
graze.' Chi his-own-desire-on that straw would-eat, which animals eat, but any-one giving not thā.
īā mā hō-gīō, īā kahō chi, 'mairō bōp kā katnā naukar chāngō
was. When senses in became, by-him it-was-said that, 'my father of how many servants good
pā khāi, hā bhāḥō marā. Hā uśṭāgō, appā bōp tāh jāwāgō, us tāh kahāgō chi,
food eat, I hungry am-dying. I will-arise, my-own father to will-go, him to will-say that,
'ai bōp, hā tairō hī ṣubāhgar hai, Khudā kē hī ṣubāhgar hai. Is kō lēyīg ni,
'Oh father, I thy aśe sinner am, God of also sinner am. Of this worthy not-I-(am),
chi tairō pūt hō-jāwā; kho appā naukarā mā manā ghal-lāi.' Oh uśṭāgō, appā
that thy son I-may-become; but thy-own servants among me put.'" He arose, his-own
bōp tāh ayō. Yā lā dūr thō, chi appā bōp śem ḍaṭhō, tars īā khō,
father came to. He yet far was, that by-his-own father to him it-was-seen, pīṭ on him-was-made,
īā bḥaʃātō, gẖaʃa-ṁhaʃāt hō-gīō, īā čhōnīgō. Pūt is tāh kahō chi, 'ai
to-him he-ran, embracing took-place, him-to it-was-kissed. By-sont him to it-was-said that, 'Oh
bōp, hā Khudā kē hī ṣubāhgar hai, tairō hī ṣubāhgar hai. Is kō lēyīg ni chi
father, I God of also sinner am, thence also sinner am. This of worth not-I-(am) that
tairō pūt ho-jāwā.' Us kō bōp appā naukarā tāh kahō chi, 'changō chīyiro
thy son I-may-become.' By his father his-own servants to it-was-said that, 'good dress
lā-ō, is tāh ṣubāh-yakā ṣaṃgrī is kī ṣaṃgrī mā kar-ō, pāŋpē is kō paʃrā mā kar-ō.
Āō bring, him-to put-on one ring him of finger on put, shoes him of feet on put. Come
ēk, ṭuk kā-ṛāi, khushtā hō-jāyāt is sawāb tāh chi, yō mairō pūt meyō thō, jitnō hōyō
that, food-vee, merry become, this reason for that, this my son dead was, living become
hai, gum gīō thō, lab-līō hai.' Wē khushtā hō-gīō.
is; lost become was, recovered is., They merry become.

Hūn us kē bāṛō pūt pāṭī mā thō. Chi oh uyō, ghar tāh mairō hō-gīō, gīt nāchā kā
Now him of elder son field was. When he came, house to near became, songs dancing of
awād suŋpō. Yakē naukar tāh bōtō, usā pachhī, 'yō kī chhā hai?' sound was-heard. One servant to (he) called, to-him (by-him) it-was-asked, 'this what matter is?'
Us kahō, chi, 'tairō bōtō uyō hai, tairō bōt kharāt kīō hai, chi usā
By-him it-was-said, that, 'thy brother come is, (by)-thy father feast made is, as him
rōg jōṛ lādō-hai. Oh rue-gīō andār khalā na thō. Bōp is ka
sound-and-well (by-him-it)-has-been-found.' He sulked within going not was. Father him of
A Fable in Gujar.ι

Yaľa jākat har d gu <Transform to lower case>chārā-thō, parbat mā grā tah dār. Yaľa dē
One boy every day buffaloes cows used-to-graze, mountain in village from far. One day
khā pah jīl-kīlō chi, 'bāgyār āyō han!'. Grā kā lōk warnakriō, chi bāgyār joke on it was-shouted-by him that, 'wolf come is.' Village of people went-out, that wolf
khadē-λai. Chi lōk aprīd, bāgyār na thō. Jākat tah ind pachhē kiō; us
should-drive-off. When people arrive, wolf not was. Boy from by-them enquiry was-made; by-him
chahīō chi, 'hā chhā kārā thō.' Lōk ghar tah pachhē gō. Dējā dī yaľa parro āyō.
it was-said that, 'I joke making was.' People house to back went. Second day one leopard came.
Jākat jīl-kīlō chi, 'warhārā-deō; parro āyō han!' Lōk kahīō chi
By-the-boy it was-shouted that, 'come-running; leopard come is.' By-the-people it was-said that
'yō hār kahāi,' kawē na giō. Parro-nē jākat khā-lōi. Chhā mā kārīo,
this-(boy) lie tells,' any-one not went. By-the-leopard boy was-devoured. Joke in lying,
jākat mar-giō.
boy died.

Gujarī Numerals.
Ek, ekō dō tin chār pāich chhē sat aśh naśi dāh yārd bārā terā chaudāh panārē sahā
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16
satārā aśhārād unī bē ek tē bē dō tē bē, etc. dah tē bē yārd tē bē, etc. chawē ek tē chawē, etc.
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 30 31 40 41
dah tē chawē or pānjāh yārd tē chawē, etc. sahē ek tē sahē, etc. dah tē sahē, etc. chār bē
50 60 61 70 80
ek tē chār bē dō tē chār bē tin tē chār bē char tē chār bē, and so on dah tē chār bē yārd tē chār bē
81 82 83 84 90 91
bārā tē chār bē and so on, up to unī tē chār bē sau,
92 93 94 95

A Folk-Tale in Ajari.
Ek jāyō dhākā mā bakri chārāī thō, Ek dē par mā maikhā lao-lōi. Us
One man mountain in goats grazing was. One day rock in a-honey-(comb) was-found. By
nē kahīō chi, 'hā kap-līyūgō', kēhā kath us kō mā aprīō, kējē thār sauro tē
him it was-said that, 'I will-cut-it-off,' but hand him of not reached, because the-place narrow and
aukhā thō. Mēh vah grā tah āyō, dārā lōi, tē par tah giō; us kō
difficult was. Then he village to came, gunpowder was-taken-by him, and rock to went; it of
hēt ḍab-chhērīō chi ag lā-kē par udā-līyūgō, tē maikhā habbā kap-līyūgō.
beneath it was-buried-(by-him) that fire applying rock I-will-blow-up, and honey all will-extract.
Gärwi.

The modern Indian language with which Bühler's name is most closely connected is Kāshmirī. The first scientific account of that language appeared in his famous Kashmir report, and during the years of our intercourse, he was never tired of dwelling on its importance for the linguistic history of India. At length, some three or four years ago, at his earnest solicitation, I took up the serious study of this interesting form of speech, and have been amply rewarded. Similarly, the late Dr. Burkhardt's papers on the Musalmān form of Kāshmirī, which are now appearing in these pages, were undertaken at his suggestion and with his assistance.

One of the result of these studies has been the establishment of the existence of a North-Western group of Indian languages, all closely connected, and extending from Karachi, in Sindh, through the Western Punjab, into Kāshmirī. The Linguistic Survey, thanks to the kindness of Major Deane, the Political Officer at the Malakhand, has brought forward two more languages, also spoken in the Swāt country, which belong to the same group. They had been previously described by Colonel Biddulph, but their affinities had never been established. Their names are Gärwi and Törwālī. They closely resemble each other, and, in this paper, I shall only give some grammatical notes, and two of the specimens which I have collected of the former. Other specimens have also been utilised in preparing the notes, but considerations of space forbid their being printed here.

Gärwi is the language of the Gāwār, a sept of which tribe is named Bashghar, a fact which has led Colonel Biddulph to erroneously call the language 'Bushkarik,' and to call the entire tribe 'Bushkar.' The language is closely connected with that of the Törwālī, who inhabit the Swāt and Panjūrā Valleys lower down than the Gāwār. It is evidently of Indian origin. Regarding the Gāwār, Colonel Biddulph says:—

"Bushkar is the name given to the community which inhabits the upper part of the Punjkorah Valley, whence they have overflowed into the upper part of the Swāt Valley, and occupied the three large villages of Otrote, Ushoo, and Kalam. They live on good terms with their Torwal neighbours, and number altogether from 12,000 to 15,000 souls ... The Bushkarik proper are divided into three clans, the Moolanor, Koottakhur, and Joghior. They say that they have been Musalmans for nine generations, and the peculiar customs still common among the Shins do not exist among them ... The Bushkar dialect approaches more nearly to modern Punjabi than any other of the Dārī languages; but in some respects seems to show some affinity to the dialects of the Siah Posh."

With reference to the above remarks, the conversion of the people to Islam began in the time of Aḵhūn Darwēza, about three hundred years ago, and has been carried on up to within the last century. Gärwi, like the other languages of the Swāt Kohistān, has one remarkable peculiarity. The verb, except in the Future Tense, and in the Imperative mood, does not distinguish between the various persons. In some of these languages, e. g., Gärwi (as described by Biddulph under the name of Bushkarik) even number is not distinguished. On the other hand, throughout the conjugation of the verb, the distinction of gender is carefully maintained. Thus, in Gärwi, the present tense of the verb "to be" is, masculine, tā, feminine, tāi. According to the gender of the subject, each of these words means, I am, thou art, he, she, or it is, we are, you are, they are, as the context may require.

It is not possible to form a complete grammar from the specimens, but the following instances of grammatical forms show that the language is closely connected with Kāshmirī.

2 Tribes of the Hindoo Koosh, p. 70. A brief notice of Bushkarik Grammar is given in Appendix E. of the same work.
I. — NOUNS — Declension.

Sing. Plur. Similarly,
Nom. bab, a father babu jāt, a daughter.
Gen. babu-داول babu-داول Genitive, āt-داول: but Nom.
Dat. babu-ki or -kā babu-ki or -kā Plur. āt-अ.
Loc. bab-मā babu-mā A good man is āk rān mēhā.
Abl. bab-mā, from a father babu-mā A good woman is āk rān mēhā.

II. — PRONOUNS —

I, ya; of me, mā, ma; Obl. form, mai; We, mē; our, mē.
Thou, tā; of thee, chā; Obl. form, tai; Ye, thā; your, thā.
He, that, ashi; his, asā; Obl. ās; they, tum; their, tumbo; by them, tumo.
Other forms are sah; he; tasā, his; tas-kī, to him; tan, by him. ‘This’ is ah or āt.

III. — VERBS —

(a) Verbs Substantive —

Pres. — thā, thō (masc.); thī (fem.); for both numbers and all persons. Used once to mean ‘was.’ ‘The elder son was in the field.’

Past — āsh, āshō, āshā; tem. āshi; for both numbers and all persons: used once to mean ‘is;’ ‘what matter is?’

I may or shall be, hōm; he became, āhā; he (Imperat.) hō; to be, kūndā; being, kūyā.

(b) Finite Verbs —

Chāpā, to beat.

Chāpā, beaten; so, mūrā, dead; chhārā, lost; gat, gone.

Imperative, — chāpā, beat. Other examples are, ā, give; giya, bring ye; shāvā, shā, clothe ye; yī, come (? 1st person, plural); chū, go.

Present, — chāpā, I beat, for all persons and both numbers. Other examples are, khānt, I would eat; mardānt, I am dying; kharānt, thou art defiling; wār, it comes; grānt, thou hastest: bachānt, I go.

Imperfect, — chāpānt āsh, (I, etc.) was (were) beating.

Past, — (a) Transitive Verbs — Passive construction — With Masculine Object, — mai chāpā, I beat (him); partālā, (he) sent (him); kēr, (he) made; līth, (he) saw (him); gas, (he) caught (him); manās, he said; būd, (he) heard (a sound); lāf, (he) found (him). With Feminine Object, — kēth, thy (father) has made (a feast), (I) diū (not disobedience) to thee; dēth, thou didst (not) give (a kid); gis, (he) caught (her); kēg, (he) ate (her).

(b) Intransitive Verbs, — gā, (I, etc.) went; yā, yūg, (he) came; iticāth, (he) arose; bāg-chhārā, (he) ran up (to him); nūkās, (he) came out.

The following are apparently Past Particles used as Past Tenses; — khīlsā, they ate; kārāsh, I might do (merriment, fem. obj.); sūdā, (he) gave; būchash, (he) went; pūsh, they were drinking.

Future, — ya chāptām, I shall beat; chām, I will go; ya manām, I shall say; karam, I will make; ya pōmām, I will understand.
GARWI.

Specimen I.—The Parable of the Prodigal Son.

_Ah mosh-á dá puít ashá. Lakosh puít taní babha mánó, 'mai-ki mál-má taní._

One man-of-two sons were. Younger son his-own father-to said, 'me-to property-in my-own dáb do.' Taní taní mál duéra dáb-kér. Kidi dás pait lakosh puít share give.' And his-own property (on)-both (he)-divided. A-few (some) days after younger son harkáh jamá kér, déb utan-ki gá. Tati báy taní mál lál kar anchan-kér. everything together made, far country-to went. That place his-own property bad act dissipated. Súú mál khlá-l-kér, tati utan-má giám gáhat yág, tát-tang há. Sah gá taiti All property finished, that country-in big famine came, and he straitened became. He went that utan-má khán-sah naukar hú. Tan tó hór partául utár chár. 'At súár country-in chief-with servant became. And his-own field sent (him) swine grasso. 'Which swine khálhakta, ya pa khánti; kamí na dídáh. Pata khál-má yá, mánó, 'má baba are-eating, I also will-eat;' anyone not gave (him). Afterwards sense-in came, said, 'my father-of kito naukar thó, rén gi khán, ya bátho mánúnt. Ya itión, tan bab-ki chóm, how-many servants are, good food eat, I hungry am-dying. I will-rise, and father-to will-go, tás-ki manam, "O bab, ya Khuddhí gunákágár cháh gunákágár. Até láyág na kó chhá him-to will-say, "O father, I of-God sinner thy sinner. So worthy not (am) that thy dút hém, naukar-má mai khidá-kar."' Sah ititéth, taní bab-ki yág. Sah son be, servants-among me reckon.' (And) he rose, his-own father-to came. (And) he pátha esho taní bab léth, rahm kér, báy-chhóré, már-má gas, kólik-kér. afar was his-own father saw (him), pity did, ran-up (to him), embrace-in caught (him), kissed (him). Púú mánó, 'O bab, ya Khuddhí gunákágár, cháh gunákágár. Até láyág na kó chhá-pit Son said, 'O father, I of-God sinner (am), thy sinner (am). So worthy not (am) that thy son hém.' Bab taní naukar-ki mánó, 'rén jáma giya, as sháua; anguir anguir sháua; késb be.' Father his-own servants-to said, 'good dress bring, him clothes; ring finger put-on; shoes khur shá. Xá, gi khéd, khushtí hóé. Tithí ní dh puít mähr, jándó; chhársh feet put-on. Come, food eat, merry be. Because ny this son dead, revived (is); lost taí.' Tána khushtí kér, recovered (is).' They merriment made.

Mít taní giám puít kéhr-má thó. Séc yág, shit-ki niárá há, svaré utáah awáh.

Now his elder son field-in was. (When) he came, house-to near was, music dancing sound bháh. A naukar-ki awá-kér, tapam-ker, 'kó chhá dah?' Tan mánó, 'chhá já yág heard. A servant-to called, inquired, 'what matter is?' He said, 'thy brother come thó; bab khaírát kér, tithi rógh jór láth.' Séc báy óh há, shité na is; father feast has-made, because whole well found.' (Then) he angry became, inside not báchash. Bob núkás, minat kér. Tan jawáb-má bab-ki mánó, 'bér, até bér módáth went. Father came-out, entertain made. He reply-in father-to said, 'lo, so long time chhá khilmát kér, khánkar chhá bá-ámít na kérth. Tai mai-ki á sér na déth, mai taní thy service I-did, ever thy disobedience not did. Thou me-to one kid not gave, I my-own dostán-sah khushtí karásh. Kaí sét át puít yág, chhá már báchan-wá kharár-kér, friends-with merriment might-do, Which time this son came, thy property harlots-on wasted, tai khaírát kér.' Tan mánó, 'O puít, tó kallat mai-sah bái, má harákái chhá. At thou feast did.' He said, 'O son, thou always me-with live, my everything thine (is). This mundán ashá, má khushtí kér, khushtí há, tithi chhá á tá jór mursh, jándó; proper was, we merriment did, marry become, because thy this brother dead, alive (is); chhársh, taí.' lost, recovered (is).'
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Specimen II. — A Folk-Tale.

Aktor asha, akh chhel daai. A hsrdu pudes. Borr rat asha, chhel tuud
A tiger was, a goat was. A spring at water were drinking. Tiger above was, goat below
was. Tiger said goat-to, my water why do-you-make dirty?’ Goat said, ‘water thy, side-from
wanti, ya tuu thi. Chhel u kikhu char baram?’ Borr mane, ’tika baur le shu, mait-sah
comes, I below am. Thy water how dirty can-I-make?’ Tiger said, ‘thou very bad art, me-with
het grante. Mai-kha tshkur mane. Ya lai-sah poham.’ Ai mane, syp
words dost-bady. Me-to liar say (call). I thee-with will-understand.’ This saying, a-jump
bor, chhil gis, sau khog.
(ba)-made, goat caught, whole devoured.

Aktor dha chhor panj sko set uzh num dasu ikyu baks bho chohd panjaa chohr saath ojia aunsh
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19
basih dasu-bish dasu-bish dasu-bish dasu-bish dasu-bish dasu-bish dasu-bish dasu-bish dasu-bish.
20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100.

A NOTE ON BÜHLER.

BY PROF. J. JOLLY (WÜRZBURG).

While referring for details to a comprehensive biography to be published elsewhere, I beg to send
you for the Indian Antiquary, to which Bühler during the last quarter of a century has devoted
so much of his time and energy, a few lines in illustration of the personal views and character of a
revered friend older than myself. In all the obituary notices hitherto published it has been pointed
out correctly that Bühler’s surprising universality made him the born leader of such an enormous
undertaking as the Encyclopaedia. But I do not find the fact mentioned anywhere that Bühler had
planned a similar work many years ago. As he told me in 1878 and later, he had made arrangements
with Nikolaus Trübner, the well-known London publisher, for the publication of a bulky work on
Indian Antiquities, destined to replace Lassen’s Indische Altertumskunde, which work was then
fast becoming antiquated. His epigraphic researches, and other works in which he had meanwhile
become engaged, compelled him to lay aside his plan for some future time. Then old Trübner died,
and it was reserved for his nephew, Karl J. Trübner of Strassburg — the founder and publisher of the
Encyclopaedia (Grundriss), who has rendered such signal services to nearly every branch of
philology — to secure Bühler as the Editor of the Encyclopaedia of Indo-Aryan Research, without
knowledge anything of his deceased uncle’s plan.

Let me quote one more instance of Bühler’s “distinguishing moral quality of unselfishness”
(Tawney). In connection with his extensive preliminary work for the Digest of Hindu Law, he had
collected ample materials for critical editions of the law-books of Baudhāyana, Gautama, Vishnu,
Vasisṭha and Nārada, but he handed them over to myself and other junior scholars to help us in the
editing of those texts. Thus at all times and in everything he would care for the cause of science only;
and the inspiration which he disseminated in every direction has contributed no less to the
progress of learning than his own pioneer work exhibited in so many publications. But for him, many
important works would never have been written or printed, many old inscriptions would never have been
evacuated, many temple and private libraries in India would never have been searched for MSS.

It is well known that Bühler afforded a splendid proof of his generous liberality by the presenta-
tion of his private collection of MSS. (consisting of 128 valuable old MSS. and 193 modern copies)
to the India Office Library in London, in 1888. He also presented to the Royal Library in Berlin a
collection of 177 MSS. in 201 volumes.
IN MEMORIAM GEORG BÜHLER.

A POSTSCRIPT.

BY R. C. TEMPLE.

It has been a melancholy pleasure to me, after much correspondence and with the effective assistance of Dr. Winternitz, to compile this memorial number of the Indian Antiquary in honour of my genial friend and invaluable guide and co-operator of so many years. It is natural that, when called upon, many fellow-workers should have come forward with their parting appreciation of one who was not only a matured scholar and a safe master, but also always a kindly friend, a generous opponent and a fair fighter, thinking in all controversies not so much of himself as of the right of the cause he fought for. It is natural also that the conductor of this Journal, which he helped from its very commencement, as we have already heard from Dr. Burgess, continuously to his sudden death 26 years later (I had to publish his last contribution uncorrected for the press, and from the other side of the world, from Yokohama and San Francisco, in ignorance of the calamity that had overtaken my friend, I "wrote letters to the dead" about projected contributions), should desire to go out of the usual course to do honour to the memory of one who had conferred so many benefits with such unstinted, unselfish lavishness on the studies it serves to forward. Indeed, those who have been able to assist me in this undertaking have esteemed their pious labours to be a privilege; so do I in my turn esteem it a privilege to have the right to indite this postscript as a last testimony, however inadequate, to the worth of the mutual friend, who was also the actual master and teacher of so many of us.

I have been able to set before the reader a goodly array of writers for this special number, but it will be readily understood that for individual reasons many who would gladly have come forward with friendly articles or notes have been prevented from doing so. From these I have had kindly expressions of sympathy and regret at inability to actively assist. The venerable scholars, O. von Böhtingk and A. Weber, pleaded age and infirmity, and generous and appreciative letters were sent by Lord Reay, Sir Raymond West, Drs. Whitley Stokes and Fleet in England, and from Prof. Garbe, R. Pischel and Hillebrandt among others on the Continent of Europe.

Abundant information has already been given as to the main facts of Bühlcr's career:—his services to Comparative Philology and to Indian Studies of a very wide range; mythology, Vedic and Sanskrit; Indian literature, ancient and modern, Sanskrit, Pali, Jain, Buddhist, legal, Belles Lettres; geography, chronology, epigraphy, archaeology, paleography; history and philosophy, ancient and modern, religious, political, epic; grammar, lexicography, philology, law:—his many works, culminating in the great Encyclopaedia unfinished at his death:—his efficiency as an official, a teacher, an organiser:—his exceeding skill as an Oriental and European linguist:—his many fine personal qualities, knowledge of human nature, tact and skill in bringing to the fore the better instincts of those with whom he was in contact:—his knowledge and energy as a collector of MSS, and his large-hearted generosity in their disposition:—his power of making and keeping friends.

There is, indeed, nothing for me to add to the long catalogue of Bühlcr's capacities and works accomplished, beyond making good one small deficiency, which after all it properly lies with me to supply, a list of his 80 contributions to this Journal, though it cannot be a full measure of the work he did for it, owing to his never-ending kindness in looking over and improving on the work of others less gifted and less completely equipped.

Bühlcr's Contributions to the Indian Antiquary.

1872.

2. Note on MSS. of the Atharvaveda.
3. Note on Valabhi.

1873.
5. The Desisabda Samgraha of Hemachandra.
6. Abhinanda, the Ganda.
7. On the Authorship of the Ratnavali.
8. On a Prakrit Glossary entitled Pailalachhi.
9. Pushpamitra or Puahyamitra?

1874.

1875.
11. The Author of the Pailalachhi.
12. A Grant of King Dhruvasena of Valabhi.
13. A Grant of King Guhasena of Valabhi.

1876.
15. Inscriptions from Kavi (2 papers).
16. Two Inscriptions from Jhalrapathan.
17. Grants from Valabhi.
18. A Grant of Chhittarajadeva, Mahamandalesvara of the Konkana.
19. Analysis of the first seventeen Sargas of Bilhana’s Vikramankakavaya.

1877.
21. Note on Pandit Bhagvanlal Indraji’s “Ancient Nagari Numerals.”
22. A New Grant of Govinda III., Rathor.
23. Three New Asoka Edicts.
25. The Rajatarangini; extract from official report.

1878.
26. The Digambara Jains.
27. Additional Note on Hastakavapra-Astakampron.
28. MSS. of the Mahabhishya from Kasmir.
29. Gujar Grants No. II.; The Umeta Grant of Dadda II.
30. Additional Valabhi Grants, Nos. IX.-XIV.
31. The Three New Edicts of Asoka.

1879.
33. An Inscription of Govana III. of the Nikumbhavamsa.
1880.
34. Inscriptions from Nepal (with Bhagvanlal Indraji).
35. Valabhi Grant No. XV.

1881.
36. Sanskrit Manuscripts in Western India.
37. A New Khatrapa Inscription.
38. Note on the Dohad Inscription of the Chaulekya king Jayasimhadeva.
39. Note on the word Siddham used in Inscriptions.
40. Forged Copper-plate Grant of Dharasena II. of Valabhi, dated Saka 409.

1882.
41. Inscriptions from the Stupa of Jagayapetta.
42. On the Origin of the Indian Alphabet and Numerals.
43. Valabhi Grants No. XVII; Grant of Siladitya II., dated Sam. 352.

1883.
44. The Dhiniki Grant of King Jaikadeva.
45. Rathor Grants, No. II.; Grant of Dhrupa III. of Bharoch (with Dr. Hultzach).
46. Grant of Dharanivarsha of Vadhvan.
47. The Ilichpur Grant of Pravarasena II. of Vakataka.
48. On the Relationship between the Andhras and the Western Khatrapas.
49. An inscribed Royal Seal from Wala.

1884.
50. The Recovery of a Sanskrit MS.
51. Prof. Peterson's Report on the Search for Sanskrit MSS.
52. Two Sanskrit Inscriptions in the British Museum.
54. Dr. Bhagvanlal Indraji's Considerations on the History of Nepal.

1885.
55. A Note on a Second Old Sanskrit Palm-leaf MS. from Japan.
56. The Banawasi Inscription of Haritiputa-Satakammi.

1886.
58. Valabhi Inscriptions, No. 18; a New Grant of Dharasena IV.
59. Beruni's Indica.

1887.
60. The Villages mentioned in the Gujarat Rathor Grants Nos. II. and IV.

1888.
61. Gujarat Inscriptions, No. 3; a New Grant of Dadda II. or Prasantaraga.
62. Pandit Bhagvanlal Indraji.
1889.
63. Some Further Contributions on the Geography of Gujarat.
64. The Bagumra Grant of Nikumbhallasakti, dated in the Year 406.

1890.

1891.
69. The Barabar and Nagarjun Hill Cave Inscriptions of Asoka and Dasaratha.
70. The Date of the Greco-Buddhist Pedestal from Hashtnagar.

1892.
71. The Dates of the Vaghela Kings of Gujarat.

1893.
72. Asoka's Sahasram, Rupmath and Bairat Edicts.

1894.
73. The Roots of the Dhatupatha not found in Literature.
74. Note on Prof. Jacob's Age of the Veda and Prof. Tilak's Opinion.
75. Bulletin of the Religions of India (Dr. Morison's Transliteration).

1895.
76. The Origin of the Kharoshthi Alphabet.

1896.
77. Epigraphic Discoveries in Mysore.
78. A New Kharoshthi Inscription from Swat.
79. The Sohagura Copper-plate.
80. A New Inscribed Greco-Buddhist Pedestal.
81. Apastamba's Quotations from the Puranas.

1897.
82. The Villages in the Gujarat Rashtrakuta Grants from Torkheda and Baroda.
83. The Origin of the Town of Ajmer and of its Name.
84. A Jaina Account of the End of the Vaghelas of Gujarat.

1898.
85. A Legend of the Jaina Stupa at Mathura.

To this last paper I was obliged to add a footnote to p. 54 of the volume for 1898, the very last page of the Indian Antiquary on which it was destined that Bühler's handiwork should appear: - "It is right to add that Dr. Bühler, my personal friend for many years and the greatest friend and supporter that the Indian Antiquary ever possessed, had no opportunity of seeing this, his last article, through the press."

And now, with thanks to those who have helped in this act of piety, I conclude these last words in memory of the universal scholar, whose loss our generation will not see replaced.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Archipelago, table of weights in the Malay</th>
<th>36</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aaró, an angelic spirit</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>at = son sianois</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aurangabadar, weights</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Awat̥ha (Obhāśa), head of the Minbu monasteries, his Burmese translation of the Maha-ye-nāka Jātaka</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aymonier, Silvestre, Voyage dans le Laos of the Mission, 1895, 15; his Siamese-Shán weights, 17; on kāl</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Axes, coins of</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bactrian coins, imitations of</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bedega of the E. Nilgiri Hills</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balahur, Prince</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>baṅg or bhagat, a spirit medium in Bengal</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>baṅgārī, bangārī, bangārī, banārī</td>
<td>298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balai, a spirit</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>balance = chāng</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bannuma Pōtama, a Telugu poet</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bau, discussed, 220; in 1782</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bāpīḍa, a spirit</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bappabhaṭṭi</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>barre</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>barber: cowries, 170; gold dust as, 43;</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pine torch or ma-fah of the Laos</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bat or pad</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bellaghe = Lai = Ḡokā</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bellāre or bellārī</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bellārī</td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bemisse, greater, various computations of the weights of, 120; Myingun bell, 120: inscriptions on, at Mānlima, 114; at Rangoon, 115, Mahāśaṅkā, 116, 120, 121, Mahāśi-Paddaganda, 115, 120, 121, Dhammachāṭī's</td>
<td>120, 121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bengali, weights</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bensoor</td>
<td>336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bghai, dialect of Karen</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bhaṅg = baṅg</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bhāmo Shān</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bhātyā Khatri, a spirit</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bhutahanga, fort of</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bichāra</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bījāpura, the fifth king of</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>birth customs, Musalma</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bōḍ = Bōṛ = Kachāri</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bōḍ, derivation of, discussed, 118; calculation of the</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bōṛ = Bōḍ = Kachāri</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bowring on Siamese weights</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bhamasa-Rākṣasa, a spirit</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Ajas, Chinese = mengan</th>
<th>19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>aboob seed</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acheem, weights and coins at</td>
<td>41 f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>adenothera seed is fo seed</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Afsal Khān</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aghastākules, coins of</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ahmānaγur, siege of, and heroic defence of the fort by Chānd Bibī, 232 ff., 262 ff.</td>
<td>284 ff., 318 ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ahhūt Khān</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Afsal Khān</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Afsal Khān</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Afsal Khān</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ambār Pādānā</td>
<td>321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chānd Suḥānā</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mahābārī nārā</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mirābād ‘Adī-Shāh</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kāhā Khān</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kāhā Shāh Kān</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rayābād</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kūl Kūl-Shāh</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kūl Suḥānī Tālāsh</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mān Shāh ‘Ali</td>
<td>281, 296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mīr Ḥāshīm</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mīr Mūḥammad Zamān</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ṭariq Khān</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ṭariq Khān</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ajarī, a folk-tale in</td>
<td>378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Al ‘Adī-Shāh I</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Al ‘Adī-Shāh I</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alvaṅsing, a spirit</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amanāṭa, Beppabhaṭṭi’s patron</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>anting or chāng</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ananda = Telugu</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anura country, dimensions of</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anegondi = Vijayanagara</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anagāmi Nāgas; measures of capacity, 210; numerals, 209; terms for metals</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anjengo, weights</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annum, table of weights</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anār Khān</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ao Nāgas: avoirdupois weights, 206; measures of capacity, 208; numerals, 206; terms for metals, 206; terms for money, 206</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British coinage, Siamese version of, 13; comp-</td>
<td>Burnams called Kulaś .......................... 28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British coinage, use of, in rural Siam.............. 19</td>
<td>Burmese, currency and coinage among the, 1 ff., 29 ff., 57 ff., 85 ff., 113 ff., 141 ff., 169 ff., 197 ff., 253 ff.:—decimal scale of mo compared with ancient Chinese scale, 30:—mental arithmetic, natural, 20:—method of using the sunpan, 19:—weights, concurrent decimal and quinary system of, runs side by side thro' all the wide districts occupied by the Sinh tribes, 14:—comparative, and Siamese bullion weights, 1 f.:—old, and Pali weights, 113 ff.:—same as Siamese, 3:—standard weights .......... 141 ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bühler, George, in Memoriam: by the Right</td>
<td>Calicent, weights of ................................ 88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bühler, George, in Memoriam: by the Right</td>
<td>Cambodians, concurrent tables of weights for, 3; derived perhaps from Siames, or vice versâ ........... 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. F. Max Müller, 349 ff.; by C. H. Tawney, C. I. E. 355 ff.; by Cecil Bendall, 357 ff.; by Dr. Macdonell, 358 ff.; by Prof. A. Kaege, Zürich 359 ff.; by Prof. F. Knauer (Kiew), 363 ff.; by Emile Senart, Membre de l'Institut, 384 ff.; by Prof. Jacobi and others, 387 ff.; by Prof. Ernst Leumann, Strassburg, 385 ff.; by Dr. Burgess, 370 ff.; by Prof. Maurice Bloomefield, 371 ff.; by Prof. Rhys Davids, 372 ff.; by Dr. Grierson, 378 ff.; by Prof. J. Jolly (Würzburg), 382; by Col. R. C. Temple ... 383 ff.</td>
<td>Cambodian ideas of currency, modern Chinese influence on, 34: denominations ............ 31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bühler, George, in memoriam: by Dr. Winter-</td>
<td>candedeen, discussed ......................... 91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nitz ........................................ 337 ff.</td>
<td>Carwar, weights ................................ 87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asoka, edicts of king ................................ 342</td>
<td>cash, probable derivations of:—Burmese, Far Eastern Commercial, Malay, Sanskrit or Prakrit, Talaing .................. 91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bombay Sanskrit Series ......... 338</td>
<td>cattie ........................................ 16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative Philology and Vedic Mythol-</td>
<td>catty, modern Achiense = Siamese .............. 38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>education inspector ..................... 339</td>
<td>Abhang Khan Habsul .................................. 319</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindus, epic literature of the.................. 344</td>
<td>AlamPanah ........................................ 318</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindu literature, hist. of ancient .................. 340</td>
<td>Bahadur Shah ........................................ 318</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India, ancient hist. of .................... 340</td>
<td>Fath Khan .......................................... 318</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian law-books, hist. of ................. 343</td>
<td>Ibahrüm 'AdilShah II ................................ 318</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian philology and archeology ............ 343</td>
<td>Suhail Khan ........................................ 318</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indo-Aryan Research, encyclopedia of .... 348</td>
<td>Chand Sultânah ...................................... 233</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaina, literature of the ................... 339</td>
<td>chang or cachong ................................ 16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kâvya literature ......................... 341</td>
<td>Châran Mâti = Bard Mother ......................... 243</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientalists, International Congresses of .... 347</td>
<td>Châvandh, fort of ................................ 233</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paleography .................................. 343</td>
<td>chi ................................................. 16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panjâb Bhagvânâl Indrajâf .................. 345</td>
<td>Chins:—coin and currency, notions of, 256:—definition of, 253:—language, sources of information for the, 253:—metals, terms for, 257:—numerals, 254:—Sylig, terms for currency, 256:—Southern, dialect of, 255:—their numerals, 253:—method of counting rupees, 257:—trade, aptitude for, 258:— Troy weight ................................ 257</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panjâb Rhâkâshn ......................... 344</td>
<td>Chinese influence on modern Cambodian ideas of currency, 34; weights, 29 ff.; modern metric system based on natural seeds or grains of plants, 33; ancient and modern systems based on Adenanthera seed .......... 38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>political hist. of ancient India ....... 342</td>
<td>Chowtean = Sâvisiân = Sebastian .................. 188</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prâkrit grammar and lexicography .......... 342</td>
<td>Christian names, corruption of .................. 168</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>religious movements in India, hist. of .... 341</td>
<td>Chutâl, a female spirit ......................... 243</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>search for Sanskrit manuscripts .......... 339</td>
<td>Cochin, weights of ................................ 88-89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sriprêj Jîsunâkûtâri ...................... 344</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INDEX.

Oechin-China, oblong ingots of gold and silver issued in ........................................ 14
table of weights .................................................. 35
coinage, currency and, among the Burmese, 1 ff., 29 ff., 57 ff., 85 ff., 113 ff., 141 ff., 169 ff., 197 ff., 223 ff. 379 ff., parable of the prodigal son, 381; a folk-tale .............................................. 382
cuduru or small red bean ........................................ 33
corned .............................................................. 336
couries as barter, 170; reckoning by ............... 172
cowry connected with Lhota-Naga weights, 294; = zabé in Ao Naga language .................. 296
creme and Princess, story of ................................. 54 ff., 82
Crawford on Siamese weights, 6 —— on weights at Acheen: cumulative rhyme, a new, The Louise and the rat ................................................................. 43
cyypass = sepoy .................................................... 306

Dagon and Klaekieck .............................................. 83
Dagun ............................................................... 83
Dakkan, a spirit .................................................. 241
damling or domleng .............................................. 16
daus, 400, adopted by Akbar as final division of his gold jaldla .............................................. 170
Davis, on Malacca weights ..................................... 40
Devagiri, Singhana king of .................................... 250 ff.
Devavarshâ ........................................................ 251
Dhammacheti, Kalyâni inscriptions of ..................... 116
Dhammacheti's bell .............................................. 120, 121
Dikshiti, Mr. Shankar Balkrishna, his death and work ......................................................... 193
effigy, burnings in ................................................ 168
Enkatiades, coins of ............................................. 225
Euthydemus, coins of ........................................... 225
exorcism, a form of, Kalumpât ................................. 297

fai = soun siamois ................................................ 17
foun seed is adenanthora seed ............................... 33
folklore, in Salsette, 54 ff., 82, 304 ff. —— Maratha, 306 ff. —— in S. India, 165 ff. ——
Kâsava, story of .................................................... 165 ff.
folk-medicine, latter-day, in Nicobar islands .... 28
French authorities on Siamese weights ................. 5
gandæ, Indian scale of, borrowed by Kachchira .... 266
Ganâs, story of, omitted in Grantha MS., 77; more recent than rest of introductory story of the Mahâbhârata, 80; found only once in epic literature ....... 81
Ganjam, a spirit .................................................... 271
Gâru, 379 ff.; parable of the prodigal son, 381; a folk-tale ...................................................... 382
Gauḍa ............................................................... 27
Gaur ................................................................. 27
Gentoo is improper name for Telugu ....................... 244
ghost at the Nicobaras, a wandering ...................... 336
Gon, weights ....................................................... 86-87
Gôla ................................................................. 27
Gujarî, skeleton grammar, 375; parable of the prodigal son in, 377; a fable in, 378; numerals .............................................................. 378
gumchî or abrus seed .............................................. 57
guîna = gumchî or abrus seed ............................... 57, 63

Hâkâ = Lai = Bamgahâ ........................................... 253
Hâkim ............................................................... 234
Hamilton, Alex., on Siamese weights, 7: ——
on weights and coins at Acheen, 41; at Johore, 41; at Java and Malacca ...................... 41
Harakhal Jalâmpadil, a spirit .................................. 242
Harîhara ............................................................. 247
Harâk Bâi = Lady Madness .................................... 241
Hédall, a spirit ..................................................... 240
Heliecle, coins of .................................................. 285
Hinâ weights ......................................................... 141
Hinâ: 'usulman titles of ........................................... 98
horns, napes ......................................................... 98
Hyrokodes, coins of .............................................. 227

Ibrâhîm Nîgâm-Shâh .............................................. 233
Ikhsâs Kâh ........................................................... 233, 234
Indian weights, Southern ..................................... 57 ff., 85 ff.
Indigo as a tabbed plant ......................................... 334
ingots of gold and silver, oblong, issued in Tonking and Cochin-China ......................... 14

Jaima Stupa at Mathurâ, a legend of the, 49 ff., inscriptions from the Kankâli Thâ at Mathurâ .............................................. 49
jaldla, gold, of Akbar ........................................... 170
jembor = yambo .................................................. 37
Jânsêns, a tribe of the Kâk race ................................ 258
Java, table of weights ........................................... 36, 41
Jews, black, at Cochin ........................................... 168
Jhelam district, Pânjáb, tomba in .......................... 146
Jina-prabha's Trîthakalpa ....................................... 49
Jinn, a Musalmân spirit .......................................... 243
Jóđā Bâvalâ, a famous exorcist of spirits .......... 240
Kachin is a Burmese appellation, 197; Assamese equivalent is Singpho, 197; book money table, silver and copper, 198; language connected with Naga language, 197; language, sources of information for, 197: — Myitkyinā, money table, 199: — terms for currency and metals compared with Singpho, 200: — terms for silver, gold, brass, copper, iron, tin, lead, zinc, 200: — troy and avoirdupois weights, 200.

Kachin-Naga numerals, comparative table of, 212; terms for metals, comparative table of, 213.

Kal, 27: — applied to the Burmans, 27.

Kalit, 28.

Kalumpit, a form of exorcism, 279.

Kaleum, 28.

Kāl Bhairava, a spirit, 241.

Kalā, 28.

Kālā Mātā, a spirit, 241.

Kālyāpi inscriptions of Dhammachet, A. D. 1476, 116.

Kāmān, the Hindu Cupid, 279.

Kamkar of the Tinnevelly district, 185.

Kampa, father of Sangama, 247.

Kankāli Tīla at Matheūs, Jaina inscriptions from the, 24.

Kareem, 28.

Karen, authorities for study of language of, 144; consonants adopted from Burmese characters, 146; dialect of, Sgaw, Pwo, and Bghai, 145: — pendorary scale, 147; terms for brass, copper, iron, spelter, 149; alloyed silver, gold, money, pure silver, 149; terms for British money, 147; for the rupee and its parts, 148: — tones reproduced by four symbols, 146.

Karen, Burmese, Red, and Talaing, 146.

Kaśmiri grammar, essays on, 179 ff., 215 ff., 399 ff.

Aorists and plurals, examples of, 183.

decensation, 228 ff.: — oblique base, nominative, vocative, 228; accusative, instrumental, dative, 229; obliative, genitive, 230; locative, case of unity, 232.

Mādhava, entitled Vidyākara, 247.

Mahābhārata, on the S-Indian recension of the, 67 ff., 92 ff., 122 ff.
INDEX.

Anubrata, discrepancies in the recensions of the ....... 122
extracts from MS. Whish No. 65 with corresponding passages of Northern recension .......... 123
Grants to MS. Whish No. 65, 69; omits story of Gāpēt ...... 77
has many omissions in the Pāramāsīraṇa ..... 101
Northern recension, unsatisfactory state of the text in the
Pāramāsīraṇa, eighteen ........ 122
Sakuntala episode ........ 185 f.
S. Indian MSs ........ 67
Mahābhārata, Telugu recension of the .... 246
Mahābhārata Jātaka, the, Taw Sein Ko's edit. of, 117; Burmese translation by U. Awa-
tha, 117 — the pō or bōt of the ...... 119
Mahānuni collection of inscribed stones,
114—shrine near Amarpura, Burmese inscrip-
tion at the, A. D. 1454 ...... 118
Mahānātha Sarita ...... 23
Mahārāja Matā, spirit of the Mahā river .... 241
Mahā Sun, a spirit ........ 242
makkhaí, the only recognised indigenous coin in
Manikgār, 170
Malay bullion weights, 1 f. — weights .... 37 ff.
Malacca on Siamese weights .......... 6
Maliars of the Anamala Hills ........ 168
Manillai, weights at .......... 45
Manipur: — account keeping, 170; avoirdupois scale, no indigenous, 178; bell-metal, cannot make, 177; Brit.-Ind. silver pieces, names for, 178; concurrent Manipuri terms for, 176; copper money, 176; Brit.-Ind. copper money, 177; rupee in accounts, 174 — sōt or makkhi the only recognised indigenous coin, 170; scale of 400 to rupee of account, due to system of reckoning 400 cowries to the anna, 171; same as 111 of Akbar's time, 171; reckoned by fours, 171; method of enumerating, 178; coined, Brit.-Ind. silver coins in terms of, 178; minting of, described, 177; forged, 178; sources of original information, 169; — Troy weights .......... 178
Manipūri Nāgas — terms for metals, 215: —
numerals ...... 215
maradoe ...... 35
Marathi folklore, notes on, 306 ff.; mar-
rriages in high life .......... 308
Marriage dialect ...... 238
Marriages in high life, Maratha .......... 308
Mareden, on weights at Malacca .......... 43
Musnā Shikōtar, a spirit ...... 242
nasīka ........ 61
Mātā Rāpāni — Mother Silver ........ 242
Mathurā, Jaina Stupa at, a legend of the, 
49 ff.; Kākālī Tīla at, Jaina inscriptions 
from the ........ 49
Maulmain, Kyankūnlūgan Pagoda at ........ 114
Menander, 18. ms. of ........ 227
Mēralī, a spirit ........ 241, 242
Millburn, on weights at Acheen .......... 43
Miri-Abara: — money, calculation, 210: —
numerals, 211; — terms for metals .... 211
Miyan Hasan .......... 234
Miyan Manjū .......... 233
Mōneo, Shāh weights at .......... 9
Mōneo, Shāh weights at .......... 9
Money, paper, in Cathay in 13th and 14th 
cent. ........ 32
m, Burmese decimal scale of, compared with
ancient Chinese scale, 30; is merely sur-
vival of ancient Chinese universal scale .... 31
Muhammad Khān .... 236
Mujahid-ul-Dīn Shamshīr Khān .... 268
Mujahid-ul-Dīn Shamshīr Khān Habahī .... 234
Mung Nan, trade of, for 1896 .. 17
Murād, Prince Shāh .... 238
murder in order to procure a son .... 336
Musulman birth customs, 56: — titles of Hīd-
dus, 28; 224: — tombs, pictures on .... 140
Myitkyinā Kachin's money table, 188; me-
thod of counting ........ 262

Nāgas: — language connected with Kachin
language, 197; sources of information on, 
208: — method of reckoning money, 
268: — terms for "a ten" ...... 256
Nannaya Bhaṭṭa .... 245
Narasīṅgh, a spirit ........ 242
Narsī Rām on Hill Tipperā money, 365; on
metals ........ 265
Navlā, an angelic spirit .... 229
Nēgal, curious coinage extends into Central
Asia thro' Tibetan trade ........ 30
Newbold, on Malay weights .......... 43
Nicobar islands, latter-day folk-medicine,
28: — a wandering ghost at the .... 336
Nigān-Shāh dynasty of Aḥmadnagar, a his-
tory of the ........ 333
Nunes, on Malacca weights .......... 40

once = Chinese tael ........ 16
Onor, weights at ........ 89

pad or bat ........ 16
paddamāḷa paddamāḷika .......... 262
INDEX.

pala ........................................... 61, 90
pala of the Sanskrit = phala of the Pāli .... 118
Pāli weights .................................. 118 ff.
Panhalā ..................................... 230
Punjabi nicknames ............................ 140
P’ao .......................................... 16
parad favoured ............................ 231 ff.
Peravasignagha the, 101; list of Peravas according to the .... 101
Peddana, a Telugu poet ..................... 246
Penang and Province Wellesley, weights at ...... 48
phala, a Troy weight esteemed by the Burmese monks .... 117
phala of the Pāli = pala of the Sanskrit, 118

Phūlābā, a spirit ............................ 241
Pillay-Thimi, eater of infants, a spirit .... 279
Pindyā near Mēktīla ......................... 11
plague in Bombay, a notion as to the .... 168
pō, a weight = bōl or phala, 117; calculation of the .... 119
Pois, a tribe of the Kiki race ............... 258
Port Blair, idioms from: —
  chauldāri (shuldār) a native tent ...... 89
  chāndh-bhalal, a lime kiln .............. 88
  dīpāman = department ................... 83
  dīpāman adhik = forest officer ...... 83
  dīpāman adhik = forest officer ...... 83
  dādā-lain = the milk-line .......... 82
  Hāthi-ī或是 = Elephant Point .. 86
  kīās = class ............................. 88
  Nāmanāghar = Pattern-house ......... 86
  Nīnak-bhaṭṭa = salt-pans .......... 86
  parāsā = promotion ..................... 88
  rāson = ration ........................... 82
  rāson-mād = ration master ........... 86
  rēl = rail ................................ 85
  shēr adhik = overseer of convicts .... 83
  ēkīmān = sick-man ...................... 86
  singal (signal) = a semigram ........ 86
  tikat = (1) ticket of leave, (2) its holder, 
    (3) neck-ticket ........................ 85
  tikatāl = (1) ticket of leave, (2) its holder, 
    (3) total .............................. 83
  totāl = total ............................ 83
  totāl karnā = to compare the totals .... 83
Port Blair, some technical terms and names in: —
  Bālà Ghat = Barwell Ghat ................ 27
  bījan = division .......................... 25
  chauldāri ................................ 27
  Chōna Bhattā ............................. 27
  dhōbbi, a washerman ..................... 27
  Hāthi Tāpū = Elephant Point ..... 27
  Hārīdō = Haddo .......................... 27
  Mōhan Rēt = Mount Harriet ......... 27
  Nabī Bēg = Navy Bay .................... 27

Raffles, on weights at Acheen ................ 43
Rājaprāsāda ................................ 49
rahkta ................................. 61, 90
Rāngk’ēlas, a tribe of the Kiki race ...... 258
raî .......................... 61, 63, 90, 91
Rektā-Eswari, goddess of the blood, a spirit .... 279
Repee, Brit.-Indian, is chief currency in Shān
States outside Siam proper ................ 14

Sādānt Kān ................................ 234
Salsette, folklore in ................... 54 ff., 82, 304 ff.
Sauhkarachārāya ......................... 247
Sangama, son of Kampa ................... 247
Sangamāswar, temple of Siva .......... 250
Sathvāl, an angelic spirit ............... 239
Saurīt, coined silver in 1815 ............ 178
Śiyāsa ...................................... 249
Schmidt, Herr, his visit to the Madras Presi-
dency .............................. 168
Scytho-Bactrian coins in the British collec-
tion of Central Asian Antiquities .... 225 ff.
senso discussed ......................... 252
satī, the only recognised indigenous coin in
Manipur, 170; 400 satī = 1 rupee .... 170
sepoy or syuye ............................ 308
sīr ........................................ 61
Sgau, dialect of Karen .................... 145
Shāns — Burmese, 8; Cambodian, 8, 14;
Chinese, 8, 12; Siamese, 8, 13; — Ay-
moier’s weights — Siam-Cambodian scale,
Chinese decimal scale, relative French and
Shān, 17; — Brit.-Ind. rupee is chief cur-
rency among the, outside Siam proper, 14;
— comparative money table (Bhāmo Shān,
Thēnī Shān, Wunthō Shān), 11: — old
native pieces of money, 14; — money of
higher account than tickal or rupee, 15: —
Siamese, terms employed in the currency
and weights of the, 15 ff.; their weights, 1 ff; at
Lōngnīa-ék, 13; at Mōnēt, 9; at Mōnē, 9;
INDEX.

at Pindhy near Méktli, 11; their method of calculating bullion weights ............... 8
Shikotá, a spirit .................................................................................. 241
Siam, computation of British currency in rural, 19: — report on trade of, in 1679, 8; — version of British coinage ........................................ 18
Siamese weights, 1 ff.: — Bowring on, 4; — comparative Burmese and Siamese bullion, 1 ff.; common origin with ordinary ancient Indian scale, 6; — Crawford on, 6; — derived perhaps from Cambodian, or vice versa, 4: — French authorities on, 5; — general table of, 6; — Hamilton, Alex. on, 7; — La Louère on, 5; — Malcom on, 6; — same as Burmese, 6: — relation between, and other Far Eastern scales, 5: — Stevens on, 7; — Vanshousten on 5

Silēgār Nāgas: — terms for metals, 214: — calculation of money .................................................................................. 214
Sikhadamuchchaya, the, book-notice of ........................................ 84
Singanakidi .......................................................................................... 250
Singapore and Malacca, weights at ........................................ 45, 48
Singhana, king of Devagiri ................................................................. 250 f.
Singpho (Assamese) = Kachin (Burmese), 197: — terms for currency and metals compared with Kachin ........................................ 200
Sing or singh ......................................................................................... 16

Southern India, notes on ................................................................. 168

Badaga of the E. Nilgiri Hills ....................................................................
Black Jews at Cochin ...........................................................................
Kamkars of the Tinnevelly district ........................................................
Malsers of the Anamala Hills .................................................................

Spirit basis of belief and custom. notes on, 22 ff., 104 ff., 137 ff., 153 ff., 221 ff., 237 ff., 270 ff. — exorcists, 237 ff.; Aarā, Sathvā, Navālī, Vēṭal, 239; Hindu procedure different from Musalmān, 238; Konkan, procedure of Hindu exorcists in the, 239; Vēṭal, Hēḍali and Bāṇḍe, 240; methods adopted to drive out spirits in N. Kānnara, 270; Panems of Mahabār, 271; Perak in Malay peninsula, case there, 273; Umēthā, procedure there, 240: — how spirits are kept off, 223: — spirit-entries, 139 ff., ear, 189, why pierced; 139, foot, 158, hair, 153; reasons why it plays so noticeable a part in early beliefs and rites, 153, hand, 155, head, 153, mouth, 155, nose, 160, why bored; 160, sneering, 155, yawning, 155: — spirit-hunts, 104 ff., boundaries, 105, caverns, 110, deserts and waste places, 110, empty houses, 111, funeral places, 104, groves, 111, heartsh, 111, hills, 111, house-roofs, 111, looking-glass, 112, river-banks and rea-shores, 137, roads, especially cross-roads, stone, 166; bored stones, 108, trees, 109, un-

tael, Malayan compared with Chinese ........................................................................ 38
Thi ................................................................................................. 8

Talainga: — alphabet, language, and writing, 150 ff.; — authorities for study of, 150; — silver money scale, 152; — terms for brass, copper, gold, iron, lead, silver, tin, 153; — terms for parts of the rupee and tickal .................................................................. 164

Talaing Vocabulary, Haswell’s, on kiyah ........................................................................ 84
Taunggūs .............................................................................................. 10
Taw Sein Ko’s ed. of the Mahājānava Jātaka ........................................................................ 117
Tuzkaraṭ-al-Mulk, the ........................................................................... 318 ff.
Telīqā = Telug ......................................................................................... 244
Tellicherry, weights ............................................................................ 88

Telugu literature; discursive remarks on the Augustan age of, 244 ff., 275 ff., 295 ff., 322 ff.

Achyottudēvarāya ................................................................................. 278
Achyutarāya ......................................................................................... 300
INDEX.

Allana Peddana ........................................ 296, 297, 299, 301
Anderakavita�i'sana................................. 297
Andra Bhujya ............................................ 297
Appaji .................................................... 296, 297
Appayaliksha ............................................ 326, 327
Aasha-diggeja ........................................... 335
Atharvadaharya .......................................... 297
Ayyalaru Rambahadra ................................... 322
Banu-rama Pataraja ..................................... 322
Bustumurti ............................................... 332
Chinmavamana .......................................... 296
Dewariya ................................................... 275
Dhurjati ................................................... 299, 323
Gokul ...................................................... 328
Hariharnathas ........................................... 275
Hemraj ..................................................... 297
Hoji Trimnal .............................................. 300
Iswaraditya .............................................. 276
Ivadaru Rambahadra .................................... 290
Kalapuredaya, the ....................................... 331
Kanthadasam .............................................. 327
Ketana ..................................................... 297
Kukuta ..................................................... 329
Krisnadavamentharyalya ............................. 296
Krisnaldavendrya ........................................ 276, 335
Krisnaraaya .............................................. 295, 297, 332
Madamagari Mallaya .................................... 299
Madavaryagri Mallana .................................. 298, 324
Malayamurata ............................................ 322
Mukku Trimana .......................................... 299
Muraaryan Gaya ......................................... 296
Nandi Mallaya ............................................ 322
Nandi Trimana ........................................... 296, 298, 303, 322
Peke ....................................................... 328
Pillala Rambahadraya ................................... 323
Pingali Surana .......................................... 299, 323
Pratapadura .............................................. 279, 295
Prasankavali Mallana .................................. 324
RamaKrishna ............................................. 324
Ramakrishana ............................................ 297, 299, 332
Ramaija ................................................... 300
Sadassivaraya ............................................ 300
Sathya Nyasimbara ..................................... 279
Shovit Trimna ............................................ 276
Sarang Trimakavi ....................................... 328
Shiva Chala .............................................. 296
Somanatha ............................................... 335
Srinatha .................................................. 297, 303
Surana .................................................... 330
Tattacharya .............................................. 326, 327
Tenali Rama .............................................. 326
Tenali RamaKrishna ..................................... 299, 324
Tenali Ramalinga ....................................... 324
Tikkana .................................................... 330
TikkanaMooyi ............................................ 323
Timamaraja .............................................. 276, 297

Timmarasu ............................................. 295, 297
Timmarasu alias Appaji .............................. 279
Timmaladavamna ....................................... 296
Vijayabhujati ............................................ 275
Vijayanagara ............................................. 296
Viralapindha ............................................ 276, 297
Vira Prajñaraya ......................................... 275
Vira-Rudragajapati ..................................... 278
Telugu susperstition, a ................................ 336
Tenugu = Telugu ........................................ 244
Theiini Shan ............................................. 11
Thipi = current British coin of Burma ............ 17
Tical, pl. ticus, 17: of pure brass, 116, of gold, 115, of silver 115
Ticus ...................................................... 17
Tickal, modern, or kyun = ancient Chinese kiau ........................................... 31
Tipperak, Hill, numerals, 264; metals 265
tota, 61, 90, 91: = 96 abrus seeds in S.
India, 57: nowhere suggested by Hindu
legislators, 61: Akbar ................................. 170
Tombu, Musalman, pictures on ........................ 140
Tongking, oblong ingots of gold and silver
issued in, 14: table of weights .................... 35
Tollinga = Telugu ....................................... 244
Totta, an Alexandria weight, 117; the ancient
119; name given by the Pali scholars
of Burma in 16th cent. to the present
Madrass maund of 25 lbs. Av. .................... 119
Turkistan, table of weights ......................... 37

Uddal Varatti, drier of body, a spirit ............ 279

Valmiki, a popular legend about ................... 112
Vanak about Siam weights ........................... 5
Villiayathaivanahavara .................................. 249
Vijayanagara grants to temples ..................... 277
Vimana Badakal, spirit of the skies ............... 279
Vimana Sundaran, sirem of the skies ............. 279
Viss, the isolated Burmese denomination, 91:
in inscription on bell at Kyunkhanlan
pagoda at Manimal ................................. 114
Vittal, the archieaf ..................................... 239

Wahini or Valmiki .................................. 112
weights, Burmese standard, 141 ff.: — Hintha
weights, 141: — stamped standard, in form
of various animals .................................... 142
weights, Chinese, 29 ff.; ancient, 29, 48; com-
pared with Burmese; decimal scale of sqd.
30; Annam, table of 35; Archipelago, table
of, 36; Java, 36; Cochin-China, table of,
55; commercial, table of, in 1599-7, 11.
INDEX.

Laos, table of, 35; modern indigenous table of, 39; Tongkang, table of, 38; Turkic compared with, 37; Turkistan, table of, 37

weights, Malay, 37 ff.; in 1895, 41: — Acheen, at Lockyer on, 41; Hamilton, Alex., on (and coins), 41; Stevens on, 42; Milburn on, 43; Raffles on, 43; Crawford on, 46; can be clearly separated from concurrent modern Chinese decimal scale, 45; Chinese influence on, 44; — derived from same original source as Indian and Far-Eastern scale, 45: — general Chinese-Malay scale in 1673, 44; — identical with Siamese or continental Indo-Chinese quaternary scale, 38; — Johore scale, 49; — Malacca, at Davis on, 40; Lockyer on, 41; Marsden on, 43; Newbold on, 44; Nunes on, 40; Stevens on, 42; bullion, table of, 44; commercial, table of, 44; and Singapore, 45, 48; scale, 47: — Manila, at, 45; Penang and Province Wellesley, 45: — rise of modern system discussed, 39: — standard terms, tables of Malay vernacular and international commercial, 40; — virtually the same as Far-Eastern continental scale, 45: — Sulu archipelago in 1814, 44

weights, Minor tongues, 143 ff.

Chin-Lushai, 144

Hill language, 144

Kachin-Naga, 144

Karen, 144

Manipuri, 144

Talaing, 144

weights, old N. Indian scales, 60; N. Indian Muhammadan scales, 60; general Indian Muhammadan, 60, two separate scales for centuries, 61

weights, Pali and old Burmese, 113 ff.; of the greater Burmese hills, 120

weights, Siamese and Shan, 1 ff.; — Aymonier's, 17: — bullion, concurrent Burmese and Siamese, 1 f.; — bullion, Shan method of calculating, 8; Burmese, concurrent systems of, explained, 2; — decimal scale due to Chinese influence and concurrent quaternary scale to Siamese influence, 2: — Cambodia, concurrent tables of, for, 3; derived perhaps from Siam, or vice versa, 4: — Further-Eastern system of, traceable to an Indian source, 15: — Malay bullion, 1 f.; — Siamese and Burmese are the same, 3; — Siamese, relation between, and other Far-Eastern scales, 5; general table of, 6; common origin with ordinary ancient Indian scale, 6, 15

weights, Southern Indian, 57 ff., 85 ff.

ancient Chinese scale, 90

Anjengo and Onor, money, 89; Avoirdupois, 91

Aurangabadar, Troy, 88; Avoirdupois, 86

Bengal, money, 85; Troy, 85; Avoirdupois, 85

Bombay, money, 64; Troy, 64; Avoirdupois, 65

Calicut and Tellicherry, money, 85; Troy, 88; Avoirdupois, 88

Carwar, money, 87; Avoirdupois, 87

Cochin, money, 88; Avoirdupois, 89

existing scales are direct descendants of popular Indian scale of 96 ralis to the tóla, 90, 91

five principal tables of general denominations, 57; average Troy and average Avoirdupois, 57

Guz, money, 86; Avoirdupois, 87

Gujarat, money, 65; Troy weights, 64; Avoirdupois weights, 64

imperial, of the Govt. of India, 60

Indian popular scale, 90

Lileafu! popular scale, 90

literary scale of 320 raktikas to the pala became extended to the Far East, 90

Madras, money, 67; Troy, 67; Avoirdupois, 67

Malabar, money, 65; Troy, 66; Avoirdupois, 66

modern Avoirdupois, 58

modern Troy, 58

Muhammadan Avoirdupois, 59

Nepalene Troy and coinage, 91

related to N. Indian scale thr'o' rati, tóla, and sér, rather than thr'o' raktikas, masha, and pala

Wuntho Shan, 11

yambo = jambor, 37

Yecchen, a spirit, 279

sabá = cowry in Ao Naga language, 226

Zô Lushai numerals, 252
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