THE INDIAN ANTIQUARY,
A JOURNAL OF ORIENTAL RESEARCH
IN
ARCHÆOLOGY, EPIGRAPHY, ETHNOLOGY, GEOGRAPHY, HISTORY, FOLKLORE, LANGUAGES,
LITERATURE, NUMISMATICS, PHILOSOPHY, RELIGION, &c. &c.

EDITED BY
SIR RICHARD CARNAC TEMPLE, BART., C.I.E.,
HON. FELLOW, TRIN. HALL, CAMBRIDGE,
FORMERLY LIEUT.-COLONEL, INDIAN ARMY.

76227

VOL. XXXVII. — 1908.

Swati Publications
Delhi
1985
## CONTENTS

The Names of Contributors are arranged alphabetically.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contributor</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S. Krishnaswami Aiyar, M.A., M.B.A.</td>
<td>Celebrities in Tamil Literature</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Gopala Aiyer, B.A., B.L.</td>
<td>The Date of Buddha</td>
<td>341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lavinia Mary Ansley</td>
<td>Some Anglo-Indian Worthies of the Seventeenth Century. No. III.</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. K. Narayanasami Ayyar, B.A., B.L.</td>
<td>Tamil Historical Texts</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. D. Banerji</td>
<td>The Scythian Period of Indian History</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Barth</td>
<td>The Inscription P. on the Mathura Lion-Capitats, translated from the French by G. Tamson</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. O. Blagden</td>
<td>Über Sondersprachen und ihre Entstehung. Von Dr. Richard Lasch.</td>
<td>339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Longworth Dames, I.C.S. (Retd.)</td>
<td>A Baker's Dozen of Catches from the Jhang District, Panjab (collected and translated)</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev. A. H. Francke</td>
<td>Remarks on a Photograph, near Atting, taken by the Hon. Eric Upton, during a Tour in Zangakar in 1907</td>
<td>332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geo. A. Grierson, C.I.E., Ph.D., D.Litt.</td>
<td>The Navaatita and the Bhagavatis</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. A. Gupta, F.Z.S.</td>
<td>Selection of Ancestral Names among Hindus</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Subbaraya Iyer</td>
<td>The Antarallas of Malabar</td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Sten Konow</td>
<td>Frank Kielhorn, Indian Historical Series, Vol. I. Early History of the Solankis, by Gaurishankar Hira and Cand Ojha. Ajmer: 1907; Vaidikya Yantras.</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contributor</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kalidasa's Abhijitnaka Sakuntalam, by Saradarajan Rani</td>
<td>Calcutta: The City Book Society, 1905.</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vincent A. Smith</td>
<td>The Early History of India from 600 B.C. to the Muhammadan Conquest, including the Invasion of Alexander the Great. Second Edition, revised and enlarged, Oxford: Clarendon Press. [March 3], 1908.</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beale Academia delle scienze dell'Instituto di Bologna, Classe di scienze morali, Serie I, Tomo I. Bologna: 1908</td>
<td>212</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devanagar. A Polyglot Magazine, Calcutta College Square, Bowbazar</td>
<td>212</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Krishnamacharya. Raghuramsa Vinarsa (Rvyanunadasa Series, No. 1). Siriranganam: 1905, No. 1</td>
<td>212</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capt. C. E. Luard, M.A.</td>
<td>Gazetteer Gleanings in Central India</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. M. Mulvany</td>
<td>Asoka Pillar, Edict V — Simile Samdake</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O. K. Nariman</td>
<td>The Religion of the Iranian Peoples by the late C. P. Ticle (translated into English)</td>
<td>338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. O. Erikel</td>
<td>Some Remarks on the Excavations at Sarnath Carried Out in the Year 1904-5</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. L. de la Vallée Poussin</td>
<td>The Buddhist Councils</td>
<td>1,81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. A. Gopinatha Rao, M.A.</td>
<td>Tamil Historical Texts</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. A. Rose, C.S.</td>
<td>Notes on Ancient Administrative Terms and Titles in the Panjab</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legends from the Panjab, No. II.</td>
<td></td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohanji Ki Ban, or Ban</td>
<td></td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions to Panjari Lexicography, Series I</td>
<td></td>
<td>359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Legends of Mohan Bari</td>
<td></td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Fanzadi of Bangash</td>
<td></td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONTENTS.

The late Major Baverst's General Index to his Translations ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ......
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Illustrations</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Scythian Period of Indian History, Plate I</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do. do. do. do. do. II</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do. do. do. do. do. III</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antiquities of Mandasor, Plate I</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do. do. do. do. II</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do. do. do. do. III</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celebrities in Tamil Literature—South India at the Sangam Period</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Remarks on the Excavations at Sarnath carried out in the year 1904-5—Capital of the Asoka Column at Sarnath</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sculptures at the Sena Gupa in Jangkar between Atting Village and Padam (Spadam)</td>
<td>338</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Appendix**

THE INDIAN ANTIQUARY,
A JOURNAL OF ORIENTAL RESEARCH.

VOLUME XXXVII. — 1908.

THE BUDDHIST COUNCILS.
BY PROFESSOR L. DE LA VALLEE POUSIN.

I.
THE FIRST TWO COUNCILS.

The discoveries and the researches of recent years have, at least partially, confirmed the views that Messrs. Oldenberg, Rhys Davids, and Windisch, not to mention others, had expressed concerning the antiquity of the Buddhist Canons; they have, to a large extent, invalidated several of the objections of Minayeff. I am all the more bound in candour to recognise this, as I reproach myself with having formerly adhered on certain points to the scepticism, or, if the expression is preferred, to the agnosticism of the great Russian savant, one of the most penetrating intellects which have done honour to our studies, who, however, in his short and fruitful career, evidently had not the time to point and bring to maturity all his ideas, and who has given us in his Researches merely the outline or the first edition of the book to which his life was consecrated.

The moment seems to us to have arrived for resuming, in order to recapitulate it and perhaps advance it a little, a discussion which, at times, was almost impassioned; to examine under what conditions and on what terrain it must be pursued at the present time; to determine what remains of the criticisms formulated by Minayeff. It will be seen that on some points where, according to Prof. Oldenberg, he was grievously mistaken, he sometimes was perfectly right,—notably in that which concerns the Councils; and that even where he was wrong,—notably about the edict of Bhabha (Bairat),—his work was useful and throws a singularly clear light on some of the problems of this old story.

There is scarcely need to say that all the studies bearing on the origin of the Canons are necessarily provisional. The fault of this lies above all with the sinologists, so zealous when it is a question of problems which interest sinology only, but at times negligent when Buddhism is concerned. We ought to be the more grateful to the few scholars who have revealed to us some details concerning the literature of the sects of the Little Vehicle.


2 Not to mention the older ones, Wasiliev, Beal. (The Vinaya of the Dharmagupta according to the Chinese Version, V., et of the 3rd. Congre., Ostasiat. Section, p. 17, Berlin, 1881, reprinted in Abstr. of four Lectures, 1882, and the notes on the Mahajana, ap. Oldenberg, Instr. to Vinaya Pitakas, I., p. xiv.).—I should mention the article of M. Suzuki, The First Buddhist Council (Monc, XIV, 21st January 1904, pp. 229—233, with a preface by A. J. Edmonds) which is the most complete work we possess on the Chinese Sources.—Tibetan Sources for the First Council (Sarvastivadinschool), Cosa Feer, Ann. du Musée Guimet, III. 1906; Rockhill, Life of the Buddha, p. 126; Schiefauer (Lebensbeschreibung). See also, Wasiliev, Buddhismus, and the notes on Taranatha.
I.—THE FIRST COUNCIL.

So that the reader may have all the evidence before his eyes, let us first of all sum up the eleventh chapter of the Cullavagga, which bears the title Chapter of the Five Hundred, and, as is well known, treats of the Council of Rajagha, held immediately after the death of Buddha.

§ 1. Kācyapa suddenly appears on the scene, no one knows where, and, addressing himself to no one knows whom, he relates how during his journey he has learned the death of the Master; he repeats the speeches of his travelling companions. "Then the venerable Mahākassapa said to the bhikkhus, One day I was travelling on the road from Pāvā to Kusinārā with about five hundred bhikkhus. Along the road there comes a monk of the Ajivaka sect who announces to the travelling devotees the death of Buddha. The faithful but imperfect brethren abandon themselves to grief; those who are already perfect content themselves with saying, "Impermanence are all the elements (saṅkhaṇīrasas)." "Enough, my friends! Do not weep, nor give yourselves up to lamentation! Has not the Most Happy One declared unto us that it is even in the nature of the things near and dear to us that we must be separated from them . . . ."

"At this moment, my friends, a certain old monk, named Subhadda, was there . . . ." Kācyapa relates how this Subhadda rejoices at the death of the Master: "Now we shall be able to do all that pleases us, and that which does not please us we shall no longer be forced to do."

Kācyapa does not say if he reproved this blasphemy. He continues his discourse to the unnamed bhikkus: "Come, my brethren, let us chant together the Dhamma and the Vinaya before the Non-Dhamma spread, and the Dhamma be put aside."

§ 2. "Let the venerable Therā choose, then the bhikkhus." Manifeely, the unnamed monks pray Kācyapa to choose the monks worthy of "chanting together the Dhamma and the Vinaya." "Then the venerable Kassapa chooses 499 Arahatas."

The bhikkus are not content; they demand that Anāndā be admitted to the conclave. "My Lord, this venerable Anāndā, although he is still under instruction, is nevertheless incapable of falling into an impasse, through desire, hatred, ignorance, or fear, and he has well learned the Dhamma and Vinaya from the mouth of the Most Happy himself. Consequently, let your Lordship choose the venerable Anāndā."

Without hesitation Kācyapa subscribes to this request: "And the venerable Mahākassapa chose the venerable Anāndā."

---


6 Paññāsa-atikkhandakakāra.

7 According to M. Suzuki, the Mahāvīra, Dharmagupta, Mahāsāṃghika Vinayas, the Sudāryanasatisthitasāha (Nanjo, 1123) and the Vinayasatisthitasāha give as motive of the conclave the blasphemy of Subhadda (ṃuṇabhaṇḍa in Sources, 1, 2, and 5; simply "Mahālakā" in 3, and Subhadramahaliṇka in 4). The Dharmagupta ascribes to Kācyapa this reason: "that it is necessary to compile the law so that the heretics may not say that the law is like smoke . . . ." [similarly in the Duṣaṇa (Rockhill, p. 143), Mānava, and Cola]. No allusion to Subhadda [according to Suzuki] in the Sarvāstivadins, but intervention of the gods before Kācyapa; similarly the Pratītyasatisthita and the Life of Āsoka. No allusion either to the gods, or to Subhadda in the Compilation of the Dharmagupta (Nanjo, 1929) (Kācyapa says: "It is for the laymen to occupy themselves with the relics of the Tathāgata, for us to tabulate the law") or in the Record of the Composition of the three Pitakas and the Miscellaneous Pitaka. In Mānava, 1, 60 Kācyapa spontaneously resolves to assemble the Council, so that the law may not be like smoke. [See below, note 83.]

8 Sakka = cañca, from cīkā, precept, rule, study, instruction.

9 Kācyapa should have said, "You must still be the one who have not yet attained to Nirvāṇa, yet he is incapable of falling into error through partiality, or malice, or stupidity, or fear." By Nirvāṇa the translators understand the supārañāsuddhi or nirvāṇa; see below, notes 44 and 52.
§ 3. The monks chosen by Kācyapa consult as to the place where it will be suitable to hold the conclave: they think of Rājaṅgāra, for it will be pleasant to pass the rainy season there: "What if we were to pass the rainy season at Rājaṅgāra and there chant together the Dhamma and the Vinaya; and let no other bhikkhu come to Rājaṅgāra for the rainy season?"

§ 4. Kācyapa presents officially to the bhikkus (= the Saṅgha) the resolutions formulated above. "... Let the Saṅgha decide that these five hundred bhikkhus shall take up their residence during the rainy season at Rājaṅgāra in order to chant together the Dhamma and the Vinaya, and that no other bhikkhu shall spend the rainy season at Rājaṅgāra. . . ." The Saṅgha approves according to the rule.

§ 5. The conciliators install themselves at Rājaṅgāra and spend the first month in repairing [the buildings] in ruins or in a bad state.

§ 6. During the night preceding the day on which the assembly is to open Ananda attains to the quality of Arhat: "To-morrow the assembly is to open; now it is not fitting that I should attend it, being still under instruction." He applies himself with success to a meditation which frees him from the passions.

§§ 7-8. The Conclave.—Kācyapa questions Upāli on the Vinaya, Ananda on the Dharma. They "chant" beginning with the four Pārájikas, the double Vinaya (ubhato vinaya); they chant the five Nikāyas, beginning with the Brahmajāla. Kācyapa conducts the recitation. "Where was the first Pārájika proclaimed? Concerning what person? Relative to what subject?" And immediately Upāli answers concerning the subject, the occasion, the individual introduced, the proclamation, the repetition of the proclamation, the fault, the case of non-responsibility. For the Nikāyas (Dharma) the interrogation only bears upon the place where the Sutta was pronounced and the person to whom it was addressed.

---

1 See below, note 69.
2 The proposition is made once, after having been defined and the assembly remains silent. It is the acācāra k上下 (see Vin. Texts, I. p. 169).
3 Khandhakajjāyana (Kācyapa) ; see Ov. VI. 5, 2 (Vinaya Texts, III. p. 191), M. Pyyi, § 282, 283 — Assembly room, see Suwaki, the article cited, p. 281.
4 To the Kāya-ruññapadhamo (Kācyapa sati).
5 According to the Sarvāstivāda (Chinese sources), and Dakṣiṇa, ed. Rockhill, p. 149) and the Mahāsāṃghikas, according to a great number of documents of the Great Vehicles at the moment of the opening of the Council an incident happens of which Gāvāmpati is the hero. At the order of Kācyapa, Pūrṇa has just sounded the call-bell: all the arhats, except Gāvāmpati, are present. Pūrṇa goes to the hermitage of the tree Čirika, where dwells this holy man, begs him to accept the salutations of Kācyapa and the Saṅgha and to come in haste for the business of the Saṅgha. Understanding that Buddha is dead, Gāvāmpati gives his robes and his vase to Pūrṇa, consumes his body by his magic power, and disappears into Nirvāṇa (Dulva).

According to the Mahāsāṃghikas, two arhats are absent from the assembly: Anuruddha, who soon joins his brethren, and Gāvāmpati. Anuruddha explains that Gāvāmpati is "in one of the heavens." A messenger carries to him the request of the assembly. Gāvāmpati is astonished that Kācyapa should govern the Saṅgha, questions the messenger and is consumed in a divine fire.

Still, from the same sources, Kācyapa renounces the same attempt, but with the same result, with regard to several other saints who are already in possession of celestial dwelling-places. From that time they ceased to convoke the absent saints and decided that no member of the assembly should enter the Nirvāṇa before the end of the work.

According to the Tih. Lebenăeschreibung (p. 305, n. 75), Gāvāmpati was living in the čā-ya-ri-khi gahal-mahā-khaṇḍa, "the Vinaya of the tree Čarika" (?).—Observe that, according to the Beschreibung, the chant begins with the Sūtras; the Vinaya follows.

10 The Dharma must here include the Abhidharma (Kern, Gesch. II. p. 234, n. 5). See below, note 41.
11 That is to say, the Vinaya of the monks and the nuns.
12 We shall speak of the scriptural work attributed to the Council by our different sources when we study the relations of the Canons.

1 Life of Arjha, Mahāprajñāpāramitāśāstra, Compilation under Kācyapa, Record of the Transmission of the Dharmaśāstra, Record of the Compilation of the Tripitaka and the Saṅghaśāstra — Suzuki, article cited, p. 267. It is interesting to authenticate the relation of the Mahāsāṃghikas to the Sarvāstivāda and the Mahāyāna.
13 Corresponds to the Čāvyapāla (?) of M. Suzuki.
14 The translation exact? A note tells us that the text speaks of the Čāvyapāla.
15 According to Suzuki, the Sarvāstivāda-vinaya, the Pratīṣṭhānārāmisūtra and the Compilation of Kācyapa say that four rivers flow from the transfigured body, proclaiming appropriate gāthās.
§ 9. Ananda, who had not been questioned on the Vinaya — and besides, the method adopted did not permit any initiative except to the president,—Ananda begins to speak: Then the venerable Ananda said to the theras: "The Most Happy, at the moment of his death, spake thus to me: 'When I am dead, O Ananda, let the Saṅgha, if it wish, abolish the small and lesser precepts.'" Then, O Ananda, did you ask the Most Happy which were these precepts? — "No, my friends."

Which are the small precepts? All the laws, except the four pārājikas? All, except the pārājikas and the thirteen savhādāsas? All, except the pārājikas, the sonāhadīsas and the two anigatas? etc. The "Fathers" offer six different opinions.

Kācyapa makes them accept his way of thinking: "For fear of scandalising the laymen, who know our laws of discipline, let us change nothing of what Buddha has decided."

§ 10. The monks reproach Ananda with a certain number of failings: "You committed a fault when you . . . confess this fault." Ananda consents to confess his faults: "It was by forgetfulness that I . . . I did that with the intention . . . . " And all his replies end with the formula: "I do not see the wrong in that. Nevertheless, out of deference to you, I confess this sin."

The sins of Ananda are known to all the sources of M. Suzuki, with the exception of the Sudarśana-vinaya.

Their number is sometimes six, sometimes seven, sometimes nine. As the agreement is not absolute, we may distinguish twelve heads of the accusation.

Here are the most important data:—

Cullavagga: (1) Not having informed himself concerning the lesser precepts; (2) Having stepped upon Buddha's robe for the rainy season, when wishing to sew it (Vassikāsītha, varācāra, M. Piyut, § 261, 92); (3) Having first admitted the women to venerate the body of the Master, so that the body should be profaned by their tears; (4) Not having prayed the Master to prolong his life; (5) Having obtained from Buddha the admission of the women into the order.

Mahāpākasas: (1) Lesser precepts; (2) Having stepped on the Master's robe, when wishing to sew it; (3) Admission of the women into the order; (4) Prolongation of the life of Buddha; (5) Not having given to Buddha something to drink, in spite of his thrice-repeated request; (6) Having first admitted the women to venerate the remains of the Master.

Dharmagupta: (1) Admission of the women; (2) "Buddha asked Ananda three times to serve him as one who offers things (7) to Buddha, but he declined him; (3) Having stepped on the

16 Khuddhamakkuddaka, "the lesser and minor precepts."
17 See below, note 31.
18 Niyamanisūrāṇa sattihitya = out of my faith in you.
19 This is the number at which M. Suzuki arrives: One point is proper to the Sarvāstivādins to have held useless discussions concerning the parables of Buddha. Two points are peculiar to the Collection of the Kācyapa (1) When Ananda was one time reproached by Buddha, he secretly cherished ill-will and was mischievous to others. (2) Ananda was not yet delivered from the three passions—lust, hatred, ignorance, while the other bhikkhus at the Council were freed from them. One point (Dharmagupta, 2) is a duplicate of the refusal of the water. Lastly, M. Suzuki distinguishes three variants of the episode of the women: (i) Having first admitted the women to the veneration of the body, (ii) Having permitted this "glided" body to be profaned by tears, (iii) Having uncovered it in the presence of the women.
21 Without mention of the tears that had profaned the body.
22 The order in Beal is very different.
23 This point must not be confused with No. 5 of the Mahāpākasas, which is repeated below. According to Beal, we must understand; three times Buddha asked Ananda to follow him and three times he refused.
robe when wishing to sew it; (4) Prolongation of the life of Buddha; (5) Having refused to give to drink to Buddha; (6) Lesser precepts; (7) Having shown the gilded body of Buddha to a multitude of women, permitting them to profane it by their tears.

_Mahāśāṅgikas_: (1) Admission of women into the order; (2) Prolongation of life; (3) Having walked on the robe while sewing it; (4) Having refused to give Buddha to drink; (5) Smaller precepts; (6) "Ānanda exposed the secret parts of Buddha in the presence of women, thinking that the act would tend to a cessation of their passion; but how could he know this when he had not yet attained to the stage of Arhatāship?"; (7) Having exposed the gilded body of Buddha.

According to the _Mahāvastu_, III. 48, Ānanda had authorised his disciples to eat in a group. This infringement of the rule, which we shall find again at Vaiśālī, does not appear to have been counted among the failings of Ānanda. It is to be noticed that in the recital of the First Council Ānanda is only named in passing (_Mahāvastu_, I. 1, 69 sqq.). Kātyāyana and KāŚyapa are the only notable characters.

_Sarvāstivādins._ According to Rockhill (_Dulca_), like the Mahāśāṅgikas, except for No. 3, where the occasion of Ānanda's sin (sewing or washing the robe) is not determined, and for No. 6, where it speaks of men and women of ill-manners. According to M. Suzuki (Chinese sources), we must add (2n) "When Buddha preached in parables, Ānanda made, in spite of his presence, some superfluous remarks on them," and modify (3) "Having walked on the robe when washing it," and (4) "Having given muddy water to Buddha."

§ 11. _Pūraṇa_, who was travelling in the mountain of the South with five hundred bhikkhus, arrives at Rājagṛha as the recitation of the Vinaya and of the Dharma is finished. He comes to salute the theras. The latter say to him: "The Dharma and the Vinaya, O _Pūraṇa_, have been chanted by the theras. Associate yourself with the choir."

_Pūraṇa_ replies: "The Dharma and the Vinaya have been well chanted by the theras. However, in the way in which I have heard and received [the law] from the mouth of Bhagavat himself, in that manner I purpose to retain it in my memory."

The episode of _Pūraṇa_ is more fully developed in the three Chinese sources which speak of this important personage; that is, the Vinaya of the Dharmaguptas, that of the Mābiṣṭhakas and the Vinayamāṭhasastra.

_Pūraṇa_ arrives at Rājagṛha when the Council is ended. At his entreaty, KāŚyapa gathers together the assembly afresh and Upāli recommences his recitation. _Pūraṇa_ approves of all; only he demands the insertion of eight permissions, eight "things" compatible with the law which forbids the eating of preserved foods and of which Buddha had entirely approved; these are (I reproduce the translation of M. Suzuki) "(1) keeping food indoors; (2) cooking indoors; (3) cooking of one's

---

24 According to Beal, only one woman was concerned.
24a Accordingly, Arhats only possess _abhijñā_.—According to the _Tib. Lebensbeschreibung_: "Du hast einem Ehepaare Geheimlehren mitgetheilt."
25 According to the _Dulca_, Ānanda excuses himself for not having given water to the Tathāgata to drink, because five hundred chariots had disturbed the water of the river (Kakusthanas = Kārthikā) in crossing it.
26 _Upoṭhi sam anāgāmi_. — Vinaya Texts: "Do thou, then, submit thyself to and learn the text so rehearsed by them," a translation which is elegant, but somewhat long. Buddhists say: _upoṭhi buddham sāyagam._
27 Besides the reports of M. Suzuki (article cited, p. 280), see Wasdileff ad Tārānātha, p. 291: "... the tradition of the Chinese Vinaya that already at the First Council, _Pīrāpa_ protested against seven points that _KāŚyapa_ had introduced."

We have seen that the _Dulca_ speaks of a _Pīrāpa_, bell-ringer of the Council and delegate to Gāvāmpati (above note 15).
own accord; (4) taking food of one's own accord; (5) receiving food when rising early in the morning; (6) carrying food home in compliance with the wish of the giver; (7) having miscellaneous fruits; (8) eating things grown in (or by?) a pond."

Kāyāya agrees that Buddha did, in truth, authorise the eight "points"; but it was only because food was scarce, in case of āpāda, we should say; later, he withdrew this permission. Purāṇa replies that Buddha, being omniscient, does not permit that which is otherwise forbidden, neither does he forbid that which is otherwise permitted. Kāyāya explains that the omniscience of the Master enables him on the contrary to modify the laws; he concludes: "Let us, O Purāṇa, come to this decision: that which Buddha does not forbid, shall not be forbidden, but his prohibitions shall not be transgressed. Let us exercise ourselves according to the disciplinary laws of Buddha."

M. Suzuki did not observe that the eight points are discussed in the M. Vagga (VI. 17—19, 20; 4, 32); but, if I dare to say so, the whole episode is antedated; it was Buddha himself who, after having authorised the "keeping food indoors, etc.," withdrew this concession.

§ 12. Ānanda begins to speak: "Bhagavat said to me at the moment of his death: 'When I am dead, Ānanda, let the Saṅgha impose the brahmadaṇḍa on the bhikkhu Channa.' And on the demand of the theras, - Kāyāya does not play part here any more than in the chapter on the failings of Ānanda, — the confidential disciple explains what is this punishment: "Let the bhikkhu Channa say what pleases him; the bhikkhu will not speak to him, will not exhort him, neither will they warn him." He agrees to go and announce this sentence to Channa, but accompanied by a group of brethren, of five hundred brethren, "for this bhikkhu is fierce and passionate."

§§ 13—14. These two paragraphs are devoted to an episode in Ānanda's journey in search of Channa: his meeting with the wives of King Udena and his conversation with this king. The recital is interesting and is not a digression in a book of Vinaya, for it is a question of the use of old garments and, in general, of all objects not in use.

§ 15. Ānanda announces his sentence to Channa, who receives it with much humility. His grief and his remorse are such that he attains the quality of Arhat. He goes to Ānanda. "Suppress for me now, O Ānanda, the brahmadaṇḍa."

§ 16. Conclusion of the Chapter: "As five hundred bhikkhus, without one less or one more, have taken part in this choir of the Vinaya, this choir of the Vinaya is called 'of the Five Hundred.'"

What does Prof. Oldenberg think of this account? It is rather difficult to say, for his opinion seems to be wanting in that fine unity which he is pleased to recognise in the first paragraphs which composed it. On the one hand, he has stated and repeated that he did not believe in the account

38 The Mahipāsakas enumerate differently the "points" of Purāṇa; there are seven of them, "receiving food in compliance with the wish of another; (3) taking fruits of one's own accord; (4) receiving things coming out of a pond; (5) eating fruit with its seeds (or stones) removed, when received from one who is not a regular attendant in the Saṅgha." The Vinayasaṅgraha appears to "allow the Dhammaguptas", for the two points which it explains accord with the list of that school.

39 To make the list of the Dhammaguptas correspond with that of the Culla (seven points) it suffices to combine the 4th and the 7th of the former, "taking miscellaneous fruits of one's own accord."

40 Brahmadaṇḍa is "the higher penalty." This expression is only met with here and Mahāparinibbānasutta. 
41 See Karm. G. 118-119. Channa had already incurred severe penalties (see Culla, I. 20—31).

42 In other sources (see p. 11-12) it is Kāyāya who takes up the word against Ānanda.

43 Weseler, ed. Tamilīka, p. 29. "According to the tradition of the Chinese Vinaya, at the time of the First Council the bhīṣa Chanda created at Kančāmbi a division among the monks and Ānanda was sent to adjust affairs."

of the Council proper [§§ 7-8]; and that for reasons whose whole weight he has caused to be felt afresh by well-disposed persons, for, in truth, they affect us very little; — moreover, he fearlessly dares to attribute any historic value whatever to the discussion relative to the "small and lesser precepts, and the major penance inflicted on Channa" (§§ 9 and 12); "Es mag sogar an irgendwelche Überbleibsel von historischer Erinnerung gedacht werden: das wird ebenso wenig zu beweisen wie zu widerlegen sein."] On the other hand, he protests himself with great vigour against the observations of Minayeff. The latter, retaining as historic or semi-historic all the episodes (Subhadra, small rules, faults of Ananda, etc.), puts aside as apocryphal or tendentious the history of the Council in its official convocation (§§ 3-4), in its literary labours (§§ 7-8), and tries to show, on the one hand, the incoherence of §§ 1-2 and 3-4; on the other hand, the contradiction between the episodes and the solemn drawing-up of a complete canon.

Our Chapter of the Cullavagga, says Prof. Oldenberg, opens with the textual reproduction of an episode of the Mahāparinibbāṇa-sutta (Culla XI, § I. = Mahāparinibbāna, VI, 36, 37, 38, 39, 41, 40); next it gives us a legendary reconstruction of the First Council, inspired by the narrative, authentic and historical in this case, of the Second Council; finally it makes use of Buddha's discourses relative to the secondary precepts and to the "boycotting" of Channa, discourses reproduced in this same Mahāparinibbāna. "The point of view of Minayeff, who claims to recognise in these episodes [and those of the "failings" of Ananda] an old kernel of authentic tradition (einen alten Kern guter Überlieferung) and to separate them from the rest of the account due to a much younger time, this point of view is illusory. In fact, "Der Culla, wenn er jene Andeutungen seinerseits ergreift und daranreih die Geschichte von dem Konzil mit den in Rede stehenden Episoden ausstattet, begibt damit nicht in mindesten, wie Minayeff will, einen Selbstwiderspruch."

Minayeff has not put on his spectacles when he maintains that the Culla identifies Kācyapa's five hundred companions, among whom were Subhadra and many of the faithful but imperfect bhikkus, with the five hundred Arhats (except one) whom Kācyapa elected for the conclaves. The § 1 of the Culla contains the account of his journey, given by Kācyapa before a numerous assembly probably at Kusinārā; this assembly is the one convoked by Kācyapa to chant the choir and in which he is going to choose the members of the choir.

Minayeff saw a contradictory repetition in the designation of the future conclaves by Kācyapa at the prayer of the Saṅgha, and the official decision following on a "double proposition" (and not quadruple, as the Russian savant says) which delegates to these same conclaves the power and the mission to hold their sessions at Rājagaha wrongly, for, adds Prof. Oldenberg; "Nothing can be more probable, nor more conformable to the habits made known to us by the literature." There is here (§§ 1-5) neither incoherence nor contradiction.

---

33 P. 623, note. These reasons are, firstly, that the Mahāparinibbāna does not breathe a word of the Council. See the Introduction to the text of the Mahāvagga, p. xxi and following, and the remarks of Mr. Rhys Davids—Buddhist Sutras, p. xiii.
34 Minayeff believed that we have to do with two accounts: according to the first, "perhaps the nearer to the truth," Kācyapa chooses the members of the Council and to them he adds Ananda; the second, of later origin, introduced in order to give to the Council a character of authenticity, admits of our § 4, the approbation by the Saṅgha of the measures it has itself instigated.
35 M. Oldenberg is in the right. It is all the same certain that if this part of the account, deftly interpreted, can be made to agree, the author has certainly not taken much trouble to make himself clear. To what monks does Kācyapa relate his encounter with the parārāja, bearer of the sad news, and his journey with Subhadra? The same, evidently, who beg him to choose the members of the future Council. Where does this scene take place? "The Culla does not say formally," says M. Oldenberg, "but decidedly we cannot hesitate about the way in which the editor of the Culla has represented the matter. The modern Singhalese sources, as also those of the North, place the scene at Kusinārā . . . . . . The account of the Culla, which joins on to (anachronist) the Mahāparinibbāna-sutta, long passages of which it reproduces textually, has certainly no intention of making Kācyapa appear in any other place than that to which the M. P. S. conducts him and where all the other sources quote him to appear." I quite agree; I should be more sure of it, if I were certain that the Culla has really interpolated the paragraphs M. P. S., VII, 35-39. 41, 40; — which, as M. Oldenberg has remarked many times, lead to nothing in the M. P. S.; if I understood why Kācyapa gives no answer to Subhadra, any more than the other monks whose piety is manifested by untimely weeping. Prof. Oldenberg, apparently, does not see any difficulty in this last detail.
At the most we can only speak, in one sense, of a certain Discrepancy,—for we must never lose
the feeling for nuances: "Von einer Discrepanz kann meines Erachtens nur in dem Sinne gesprochen
werden, dass die Konzilierschläfliche [§§ 1—5, 7—8, 16] offenbar, wie ich eben gesprochen habe, an den
Hauptvorgang ein paar dem Mahāp. S. entnommene Daten resp. auf Grund dieser Daten
hergestellte Konstruktionen herangezogen hat." That is, "At the most we may speak of a want
of harmony, in this sense that the Culla has joined to the principal account [that is, to the
account otherwise legendary or tendentious of the Council] a certain number of data borrowed from
M. P. S., or rather reconstructions suggested by these data." But what does it matter that these
reconstructions and these data are contradictory to the principal account? This principal account
is innocent of all contradiction: "Jene Erzählung ist—das werden wir nach allem hier
erörterten gegen Min. fast halten dürfen—von innerem Widersprüchen frei."

Wishing to set forth the primitive compilation of the Scriptures, postulated by orthodoxy, the
compiler of Culla XI. has naturally brought forward Kāśyapa, Ānanda and Upāli. He has added
the story of Kāśyapa’s journey and the episode of the lesser precepts, has grouped several
other souvenirs relative to this period: almost all were known to him through the M. P. S.
At the most can we notice the adoration of the remains of Buddha by the women is not
mentioned in this venerable Sutta.27

In one word, M. Oldenberg believes that all our chapter of the Culla is a "forgery," but
a forgery very well done and that the analysis does not permit us to draw from it the conclusions
formulated by Minayeé.

The Russian savant did not read with sufficient attention the proofs of his admirable book; he
would have avoided some mistakes over which his adversary triumphs.28 On the other hand, the
chapters which he devotes to the Councils are composed in a mediocre manner; the thought often

But the Buddhists have not understood it any better than Minayeé, as is proved by the variants of the episode.
Only the Mahāvamsa-bāññāsutta, translated by Fa-hien (Nanjo, 118) imitates the reserve of the Pali text. But in the
Sarvāstivādināsutta (Nanjo, 111)29 "An old, bad and stupid bhikṣu. . . .
Kāśyapa heard his words, but others did not perceive them, because through deva’s miraculous power they were kept secret.
"In the Mīsamāvatātā
kāla-mahāsamāvyuha-sutta (Nanjo 1191) which, I may say in passing, makes the M. P. S. followed by the account of
the Council,—this suits very well; "An old bhikṣu. . . .
many gods in the sky bearing his majestic utterance kept his voice secret by their miraculous power and let nobody hear it except Kāśyapa. Kāśyapa understood his
words. Then the Venerable One, to exhume him, stood for a little at the wayside and addressed the assembly
saying, ‘Subhāsaṃ vihiṃ api mānaṃ .
vaṇḍa dhammaṃ vijaṭṭih’ (M. P. S. VI. 41),"

In other sources, the words of Subhāsa (whose name varies) are, at least, mentioned by the narrator:
Nanjo, 119: "Banda of Cākya-clan. . . .
Kāśyapa was displeased;” Nanjo, 545, 2: "A Cākya-clara called
Banda. . . .
Kāśyapa hearing this was sad.” Similarly the Vinaya of the Dhammachakas (Nanjo, 1117). In
the Nanjo 553 (which would be, it is said, a translation anterior to 118, 119 and 545, 2), things happen less simply,
"One bhikṣu. . . .
all other bhikṣus disagreed with him and they complained to a deva, who, seeing that old
bhikṣu, threw him outside of the assembly. . . .
"In the Mahāvamsa Vinaya (Nanjo 1119): “Kāśyapa was sad, and as he snapped his right hand finger, fire came out of it, and he stamped the ground with his right foot.”

M. Kern very usefully recalls the Bhadra, incarnation of the devil, whom we shall find again in discussing
the Council of Vajjalaputra.

It seems that the disconnectedness of our report (M. P. S. VI. 1. = Nanjo 118 = Culla XI.) is a mark of
authenticity, and it is not without some reservations that I assever to M. Oldenberg’s thought. "Wie sich ein
(Cuina’s) Verfasser die Sache gedacht hat, kann doch schließen, dass nicht zweifelhaft sein."
It seems that this editor has not taken any care to picture the things to himself.

27 "Merkwürdiger weiss nicht in M. P. S. berichtet wie schön S. B. E. XI. 379, bemerkt ist.” (Buddh.
Stud., 618, n. 3.)

28 See above, p. 7, the confusion of the antikṣanāska and the antikṣiṇīya; below, note 55, the interpretation of
ubhāto vinaya and p. 19, insure expression "in the canon." Those are not serious faults.

* This quotation, as well as those which follow, are, according to a kind communication, from M. N.
Wogilara.
is merely indicated, and the author does not draw all the desirous advantages possible from the positions that he occupies and the weapons which he has at his command. Lastly, his manner may repel a reader who sees himself, from the first line, treated somewhat "cavalierly," — as is the case with Prof. Oldenberg — and who sees the venerable Suttantas treated with even still less respect. In fact, and this is the main point, Prof. Oldenberg was mistaken concerning the thought of Minayoff on the historical value of the Council and the episodes, and it is the fault neither entirely of Minayoff nor of Prof. Oldenberg : the latter does not believe in the Council, but he is so very near it! the former seems to claim to make history with the Culla, although he believes neither in the Sutras nor in the Culla.

These attempts at internal criticism are extremely delicate, especially for those who resign themselves to being ignorant of many things and who have not the faith of the coal-heaver in the texts. They are afraid, for subjective reasons, to distinguish that which can be historical from that which has not the slightest chance of being so; never, and the mere thought of it discourages them, never will they believe that the silence of a Sūtra about a dogma or an ecclesiastical event can furnish anything but an hypothesis. They read again two or three times Prof. Oldenberg’s remark about the absence of allusion to the First Council in the Mahāparinibbāna: "This silence is as valuable as the most direct testimony. It shows that the author of the Mahāparinibbānasutta did not know anything of the First Council" 39; still they are not quite sure that they have read correctly. For very little they would desert a discussion without issue, because it is without possible control and without any known principle. But if, like Minayoff, they think it necessary to take part in it, nobody shall be able to reproach them with relying upon data which they themselves do not accept without reserve, for their adversaries admit them. And it is a principle formulated by Dignāga in his controversy with the Brahmins, that in a dialectical tournament, every argument is of value, as soon as the adversary cannot refuse to accept it: it matters little what the arguer himself may think of it. Either I am mistaken, or Minayoff was too good a Buddhist to remain a stranger to this state of mind, and it is one of the reasons why he so often provokes his erudite and convinced antagonist.

I am, however, persuaded, as he was himself, that the Culla can furnish something better than a pretext for cleverness. It will suffice to establish that the want of harmony between the account of the conclave and the episodic data is still more radical than Prof. Oldenberg thinks; and perhaps the reader will admit that Minayoff judged rightly when he recognized in these episodes, not historical data properly speaking, but an old fund of authentic tradition of incalculable value for a right understanding of ancient Buddhism.

Let us once again consider in its different parts the study of Minayoff, taking advantage, as it is right to do, of the indications and materials furnished by Prof. Oldenberg.

1. The § 16 of Culla XI. recalls that "five hundred bhikkhus took part in this recitation of the Vinaya; in consequence this recitation of the Vinaya is called that of the Five Hundred."

Now § 8 sets forth the recitation of the Dharma, that is to say, of the five Nikāyas. Why does the final paragraph ignore the work of Ānanda? Does it mean that the Council was occupied exclusively with discipline, and that § 8 has been interpolated after Chapter XI. had received its title? Minayoff did not judge this little remark worthy of his; however, it borrows a certain interest from the fact that the Culla does not breathe a word of a recitation of the Abhidharma (a proof of antiquity, as M. Oldenberg very rightly observes), whilst the Vinayas of several sects, Dhammaguptas, Sarvastivādins, speak of the Abhidharma in their chapters corresponding to Culla XI. The Mahisāsakas and the Mahāsāṅghikas, on the contrary, imitate the reserve of the Culla in that which concerns the books of scholastic nomenclature 40: it would be curious if the Culla XI., in the edition which its title supposes, should, in omitting the five Nikāyas, have possessed over the Mahisāsakas the advantage which it shares with the Mahisāsakas over the Dhammaguptas and the Sarvastivādins by omitting the Abhidharma.

39 See Instr. to the Mahāvagga, loc. cit., above, note 31. There is a very simple and attractive idea I owe to my friend M. Louis Finot: the history of the Council was formerly the end of the Sutta dealing with Buddha’s nirvāna, i.e., the M. P. S. When the Scriptures were tabulated in the Pākas, it seemed more appropriate to have the Council in the Vinaya (see above, note 30, 2nd §).
41 Mahākāla. See Kern, Mon. pp. 3-3.
2. The sentence against Channa (§§ 12—15). — Of this procedure against Channa, the brahmadaṇḍa, the Vinaya, according to the authoritative opinion of M. Oldenberg, knows nothing: the monks to whom Ananda addresses himself are no better informed, since he is forced to explain it to them. Only the Mahāparinibbāna makes mention of it (VI. 4) and furnishes us with the conversation which Ananda repeats word for word to the bhikṣus of the conclave. (Culla, XI., § 12.)

This shows, at least, that Ananda did not make the members of the Council chant the integrity of the Mahāparinibbāna; for he would not have had to repeat to them this injunction of the dead Master.

This shows, to argue a silentio, that the Vinayas, with their Vibhāṅgas, are anterior to the Mahāparinibbāna, since they do not speak of the brahmadaṇḍa.43

3. Failings of Ananda (§ 16). — The recital is finished. The monks charge Ananda with a certain number of faults and Ananda replies as we have seen.

I. — Before entering into the detail of the sins, a few observations are necessary.

A. — How can any charge whatever be brought against Ananda, who is an Arhat?

"Ananda had already become an impeccable saint, that is, an arhat, and yet he submits to a trial; the assembly calls upon him to do penitence for some sins: Buddhaghosa, in his account of the First Council, has left aside all this episode. Perhaps he thought it would scandalise the faithful to read of the sins of an Arhat, impeccable according to the later dogmas; at any rate, it is a fact that the most ancient accounts have, in spite of their late redaction, preserved the vagueness of the primitive ideas with regard to the saint. We can hardly consider even the fact of the trial as an invention of the legend, and even in the VIIth century, at the place where Ananda was judged, there stood, if we must believe Hionen-Thsang on this matter, a stupa in memory of this event."44

Here are Prof. Oldenberg's remarks on this point: "Does the trial of Ananda allow us to oppose to the definitive dogmas concerning the Arhat, the vagueness of the primitive ideas with regard to the saint? Have we really any reason for believing in this primitive uncertainty? Everything seems to me to indicate that the "circle of ideas" of ancient Buddhism has endeavoured from its origin to establish the conception of the Impeccable, the Delivered." And the tradition, northern as well as southern, seems to me to be unanimous in guaranteeing this conception as very ancient: the divergences of view concerning the Arhat, which were met with in the later systematic theologians, do not, in my opinion, change anything on this point. But, in fact, it is useless to occupy myself with this problem here: it is sufficient to point out that Ananda becomes Arhat immediately before the operations of the Council. The account emphasises the point that he was not Arhat before. As regards the dukkata that he has committed, he committed them during the Master's lifetime, before being Arhat. Now, whoever is, in a certain measure, familiar with the statement of the disciplinary proceedings, such as the Vinaya gives them, will see without difficulty that every fault once committed must find its disciplinary sanction without taking account of the point as to whether the guilty person has in the meantime attained to some degree of spiritual perfection."45

I am not, alas! at home (zu Hause) in the disciplinary proceedings of the Vinaya: I may say, almost without affectation, that I have studied chiefly the eleventh chapter of the Culla. Fortune wills that I find in it an important detail relative to the problem which occupies us: we know that Channa, when Ananda informed him of the "boycotting" pronounced against him by

---

43 For other remarks on this episode, see p. 11 and note 70.
44 Minaya, Researches, p. 81. This last phrase recalls M. Oldenberg (p. 60). Perhaps Minaya does not carry credulity as far as Prof. O. believes: we may see here a notable example of his irony. The story of the sins of Ananda bears in itself a character of authenticity: the monument of which the Chinese pilgrim speaks is only a subsidiary proof. Not a few centuries have passed, in fact, between the trial of Ananda and the time of Hionen-Thsang. — But there are many people who believe in the birth of Buddha in the garden of Lambini on the faith of an inscription of Añoka. Now who will say when the Cakravartin was born under the tree of the clouds?
45 It is well known that the books of Abhidharma (Dhammasaṅgati, Kathāvatthu) distinguish very clearly between the nirāvara which alone is cannakriya and the arahat, which is nothing else than the disappearance of the nirāvara, of the gīna (sītārāgatva). The sītārāga is sīvarūpa or sīvarūpa. See M. Fyt, § 109, 101, and following. The impeccable is not delivered from the skhandha.
Buddha, fell into such repentance that he at once became Arhat. Thereupon, as we have already said, but this is worthy of repetition, he goes to implore Ananda to remove the excommunication. He is then of the same opinion as Prof. Oldenberg. A fault committed before the acquisition of the "Arhatship" must find its disciplinary sanction. Ananda who, we believe, understands the matter better than anyone, answers him in suitable words: "From the very moment, friend Channa, that you acquired the quality of Arhat, from that moment penance ceased." — "Whatever he may say, no one will speak to him, will exhort or admonish him": thus had Buddha spoken on his death-bed concerning Channa. But by the fact that one becomes Arhat, the penance falls to the ground, although it had been pronounced as decisive. — It is true that the Vinaya knows nothing of this penance styled "of Brahma," and that in consequence familiarity with the Vinayas is here without importance.

Let us notice again that Channa finds himself absolved from the excommunication when it is no longer harmful to him. We know that, according to the orthodox argument, not only the Arhat cannot fall, but also that the assistance of others, counsel or instruction, is perfectly useless to him.

The story of an Arhat culpable and subject to penance against his will is contrary to the orthodoxy of the "non-mahāsāṅghikas." When it was composed, the scholastic had not yet made use of the scriptural data and spiritual experience to develop the dogma in all its details. I believe, with Prof. Oldenberg, that the two traditions are in agreement in attributing great antiquity to the conception of the saint; but I add that they seem to me to put beyond all question the very ancient divergences of the doctors on this dogma. One cannot, in fact, consider these divergences as differences of opinion which appeared "unter den späteren theologischen Systematikern." The heretical "inventors" of the five points (four of which are relative to the Arhat) are neither systematic theologians nor persons of late date. Buddhists connect with their names the memory of the first division of the Saṅgha. But, were they as ancient as I believe, it seems that before the period when the Buddhists divided themselves into affirmers and deniers of the possibility of the fall and ignorance of the Arhat, there was one in which the question had not been dogmatically pronounced. That is what Minayefr saw here, and, in my opinion, with much reason.

B. — According to the Cullas, the Vinayas of the Mahācāras and of the Mahāsāṅghikas and several other sources whose independent authority is doubtful, Ananda's examination of conscience, instituted by the conclave or by Kāśyapa, took place after the operations of the Council and had not any connection with his qualification as Arhat or as member of the aforesaid Council.

This is strange, it seems, and suspect; and one can only approve of the Dharmaguptas for having placed the trial of Ananda before the Council, and the Sarvāstivādins as well as two other Chinese sources for having made Ananda's admission subordinate to his justification and to the acquisition of sanctity (arhatta). But this absence of order and propriety in three sources of the first rank, compared with the greater harmony which rules in the others, permits us to assert with Minayefr "the entire independence of the account, united by our disseners into one single whole." In the oldest account, we believe, there was no question of a Council; they reprimand Ananda. If one adds to this first nucleus the legend of a Council, the reprimand of Ananda will at first not change its character; and if orthodoxy, just about to be formed, exacts that all the members of the conclave should be Arhats, there will be no difficulty in assigning to the reprimand the place of second rank which is suitable to it after the narration of an event of so great importance as the redaction of the Scriptures. Orthodoxy is not yet sufficiently sensitive to feel the contradiction of this chronological arrangement; it is not sufficiently rigid to exclude the precise mention of the

46 What right does Ananda possess to take away an excommunication pronounced by Buddha and approved by the Saṅgha?
47 See our remarks on the Third Council.
48 See Childers, 530 ed. fn. If Arhat properly means only a venerable man and if Dk. 240 (25) we find it applied by a non-Buddhist to Acālaks or naked ascetics."
“non-sanctity” of Ánanda at the time of a gathering the object of which was to punish him.  
All that the orthodox tendency can obtain is to promote Ánanda to sanctity during the night of the Council.

With the Sarvástivādins, on the contrary, the reprimand of Ánanda has become a trial. Kācyapa asserts that the presence of the pious friend of Buddha mars the general sanctity of the whole assembly: he sees that Ánanda is still subject to the passions, anger, lust, ignorance, attachment. He excludes him. Ánanda replies: “I have not sinned, says the text, either against morality, or the doctrine, or against good conduct: I have done nothing unseemly nor harmful to the community!” Kācyapa returns: “Immediate disciple of Buddha, what is there astonishing in that you have not committed the sins of which you speak? But, as having done nothing harmful to the community, did you not pray Buddha to receive the women into the Order, the women whom Buddha declared as dangerous, as serpents and noxious to the Order...”

We see that the idea of the Arhat is still very inchoate here and as an accessory.

Also the text entitled Collection [of the Scripture] under Kācyapa adds to the reproaches addressed to Ánanda the only one which is of importance and which, up till now, did not figure among the faults, although it had slipped into the Sarvástivādin context: “Ánanda is not freed from last, hatred, and ignorance.” Then he is not Arhat, then he is not one of us! It is well to oppose to this version the text of the Culla: “Although he may still be a student, says the monks to Kācyapa, choose Ánanda, for he is incapable of lust, hatred, ignorance, or fear.”

II. — Among the sins of Ánanda especially interesting are the fifth, the fourth, and the first.

A. — Fifth fault: “Again you did wrong, O Ánanda, when you exerted yourself to obtain the admission of the women into the Dhamma and the Vinaya proclaimed by the Tathāgata.” Ánanda replies that he was thinking of Mahāprajāpati, the Gotami, sister of the mother of Bhagavat. The Sarvástivādins add, according to Rockhill (Life, p. 109): “I asked only that the women who were relations and friends might enter into the Order.”

Here we are treading upon very unstable ground. Minayaëff asks himself if there is not in this accusation “an echo of the very modern prophecies and ideas concerning the end of Buddhism in consequence of the admission of women into the monastic community.”

I believe, on the contrary, that here we hear an echo, very weak and indistinct, of a “prehistoric” controversy relative to the admission of the women.

B. — The fourth sin, says Minayaëff, deserves to be noticed. “In this also, O Ánanda, have you committed a fault: when Bhagavat made to you a suggestion, an invitation so plain, so evident, you did not apprise him, saying, ‘let Bhagavat remain during the ‘age’ (Kalpa)... out of compassion for the world.’ ” We do not know, continues Minayaëff, if the author of the account that we are examining attributed to Buddha this power [of prolonging his life during a kalpa]; but it is evident from these words that the holy members of the Council who were judging Ánanda did not doubt that Buddha could, if he had wished or if he had been properly asked, have continued to live for

---

50 The Karavaghasāika knows an Ánandaçaita. — See also Sakkavāti, § 1.
52 This is to say, he has laid aside the passions which the Arhats have laid aside. See note 54, the confusion of the abhijñas and of the arahats.
53 With regard to the second sin (having stepped upon the robes) and similar faults (having refused water) Minayaëff expresses himself thus: “This conduct on the part of Ánanda was not only a transgression of the rules of the Vinaya which determined in the sequel the relations of the disciple and the master, but it implied something more monstrous still, contempt for the supreme saint, for Buddha.” To me the observation does not seem conclusive.
54 We must connect this datum those pointed out by Minayaëff, p. 41, on the role of the family of the Cākyas in the Community, Mahāvagga, p. 71, and the recent archaeological discoveries.
55 See note 106, at the end.
56 I do not insist on the absurdity of the reproach addressed to Ánanda of having made himself the instigator of a measure taken by Buddha himself. “And the monks have just ‘chanted,’ without objection, the ‘double Vinaya’ (ubhato vinaya), that is to say, the Vinaya of the bhikṣuṇis as well as that of the bhikṣus: I may say in passing that Minayaëff has been mistaken about the meaning of this expression (=, according to him, Vihāraṇa and Khandaka). See Buddh. Studies, p. 618, n. 1.
an entire kalpa; they shared a conviction which, in the canons, is attributed to the Mahāsāṃghikas and declared heretical. The teaching of the Mahāyānikas on this possibility of prolonging human life was also the same.

Prof. Oldenberg observes, with good reason, that the words which we have underlined, in the canon, constitute an inaccuracy. The Kāṭhāvāṭthu condemns, it is true, the above opinion, — the Kāṭhāvāṭthu, the youngest of the books of Abhidhamma, which orthodox tradition only makes go back to Tissa Moggaliputta, to the Third Council, and which Minayeff himself considers as much later, so that we may, “if we wish,” say that the above doctrine is condemned in the canon, but that it is best to be a little more precise. But it is not in the Kāṭhāvāṭthu, it is in the commentary of the Kāṭhāvāṭthu that the Mahāsāṃghikas are designated as holding the heresy in question:12

“The Kāṭhāvāṭthu informs us concerning the activity of a generation of theologians who hold with the text of the Suttas a relationship analogous to that of the Christian scholastics with the text of the New Testament. The Suttas constitute firm data; more or less lengthy fragments of them are often quoted; they enjoy an unlimited authority. But it is necessary to interpret them properly and to find a solution when they seem to contradict each other. It is thus that in the passage of the Kāṭhāvāṭthu with which we are concerned there is examined the contradiction between the scriptural datum on the power of prolonging life which the iddhi [magic virtue] procures and that other scriptural datum which declares it impossible that he who can grow old should not do so, and that he who is mortal should not die.13 The conclusion is that in fact such a power could not have been attributed to the iddhi buta; and the commentary, rich in exegetical devices, as frequent among the pious Buddhist dialecticians as among their Christian confrères — gets rid of the Scriptural testimony which in truth is perfectly clear, by an [ingenious] distinction between the different meanings of the word kappa.”14

I have made a point of reproducing the whole of this page because it is very happy and very instructive; but it scarcely modifies the form which must be given to Minayeff’s argument.

It is granted that, according to the redactor of the Mahāparinibbāna (III. 3, etc.), Buddha attributed to himself, as he attributed to all the possessors of the iddhi buta, the power of “remaining” until the end of the “age.” Hence, the opinion of the Elders and of Ananda is in agreement with a text canonical in the highest degree. It is contradicted by the Kāṭhāvāṭthu, as also by the Miśinda. This proves, as Prof. Oldenberg very rightly observes, that from the moment that the Buddhists tried to construct a “dogmatism” they came into collision with sacred texts irreconcilable one with another, or irreconcilable with the theoretical dogmatic views formed or in formation. But at what epoch did dogmatic preoccupation become concerned with the question of the virtues conferred by the iddhi buta? Very early, in our opinion, for this question, like that of the impeccability of the Arhat, is in close connection with that of Buddha considered as iddhi buta; besides, it is connected with the attitude which the community will take up with regard to the Yoga. It seems that orthodoxies must have, or may have, been formed on these points long before the time of the Kāṭhāvāṭthu.

I easily believe the commentary of the Kāṭhāvāṭthu when it names on this subject the Mahāsāṃghikas; for the Northern sources attribute to the group of the Mahāsāṃghikas, Lokottarakāvasī, etc., the opinion that the life of the Buddhhas has no limit; as also, that there is nothing “mundane,” or, if one prefers, “terrestrial” in them. This doctrine, which exalts the Master and exalts the magic virtues, the passage cited from the M. P. S. and our “legend” of the trial of Ananda prove to belong to the oldest tradition, to the tradition of the “Elders.” The Kāṭhāvāṭthu and the Miśinda deviate from it, and although Buddhaghosa recognises clearly the sectarian views of the Kāṭhāvāṭthu. — “Buddha,” he makes Tissa say, “is Vibhajyāvādin,” — it is not superfluous to state it in passing. The tendency of the “Southern” tradition is, if I may so express myself, sublimated. Further, it is characterised by great sobriety in that which

12 The Tathāgata may remain alive for the kappa or for the remainder of the kappa, for an “age of the world” (many millions of human centuries), or for the residue remaining of the present “age of the world.” See M. P. S. III. 8, 45, and Miśinda, p. 140 or Bhys Davids, I. p. 168. 13 M. P. S. III. 8, 45, and Miśinda, p. 140 or Bhys Davids, I. p. 168.

14 Kappa would here mean the normal duration of human life. In other words, Buddha would have boasted of the power of escaping a premature death (ādina maraṇa). The problem of the ādina maraṇa of the Arhat has been much discussed. The cleverness of Buddhaghosa is therefore not solely his achievement.
concerns Yogism and all its forms. Some Indianists, as celebrated as authoritative, like to surpass the Suttas and construct a reasonable “Ultra-Hinayānist” Buddhism, reasonable, purified as much as possible from magic and the supernatural. It is interesting to observe that the conflict which divides us to-day is only the reflection of the dissension, which, we believe, separated into sects the believers of the early ages. Is he historic Buddha, that is to say, the Buddha of the first Buddhist generations, merely a “saint,” or is he a superior being, divine, lokottara? And, without questioning the sincerity of the old Singhalese theras of Vattagāma, the definitive compilers of the Nikāyas, one notices, in spite of oneself, that the school which has preserved for us the canon in the Pāli language is the same that has given us the Kathāvatthu and the Milinda in their complete redaction. The men who play with the words of Bhagavat, as do Buddhaghosa and Nāgasena, are we not to be suspected of having made sad mutilations in the old legend? Cannot we suppose, without too great credulity, that they have, more or less unconsciously, dropped a part of the “common tradition” of old Buddhism?

At least we must notice all the indications which throw light upon this old and problematic history. And, from this point of view, the observation of Minayeff on the fourth sin of Ānanda seems to us as precious as it is well-founded.

C. — The abolition of the small and lesser rules. See Culla XI., § 9 and § 10 initio (first sin of Ānanda, according to the Pāli reckoning).

Compare Mahāparinibbānasutta VI. 8. “When I am no more, O Ānanda, let the Order, if it so desire, abolish the lesser and minor rules”; and Pecittiya Ixxi.: “If a bhikkhu at the time of the recitation of the Pātimokka should speak thus: ‘What is the good of the recitation of the lesser and minor rules, except to engender doubt, wariness and perplexity?’, this bhikkhu is guilty of contemning the rules.”

“The hypothesis forces itself upon us” (drängt sich von selbst auf), says Prof. Oldenberg, “that the redactor of our chapter of the Culla spoke of these things (that is to say, of Channa and of the lesser precepts) because the Mahāparinibbāna had spoken of them.”

“Buddha had given orders to be executed after his death: ought one not, when one had to speak of what happened in the community after the death of Buddha, to explain how these orders had been executed? The tradition of the Mahāparinibbāna speaks in the sense which we know of the khandhakīmukhuddakas; on the other hand Buddhistas did not know that the community had supposed any of the intended rules. Hence, what is more simple than to suppose that the community had resolved to keep to the established laws?”

That is what the compiler of the Culla will have done, and the same reasoning holds good for the history of Channa and his penance: certainly, it is not bad; but it is not conclusive. Several other explanations may be given, if we wish, and all as good, on the question with which we are now occupied.

The observation of Minayeff remains entire. Let us take into account the allusion of the M.P.S. to the abrogation of the lesser rules, or the discussion recounted in the Culla or the indication furnished by Pec. Ixxii., or the three documents all at once; the fact remains that we have to do with a datum “bearing the mark of a remote antiquity,” — difficult doubtless to restore to the historical context to which it belongs, — but “rather” irreconcilable with a rigorous constitution already fixed by discipline. It gives us pleasure, a somewhat cruel pleasure I confess, to see the poor thers seek in their sacred Pātimokka, where Buddha has formally condemned the contemners of the lesser laws (Pec. Ixxii.), for the minor and very minor laws which this excellent Buddha,
with the most annoying inconsequence, gave them permission to repeal. To adopt one of the six interpretations of the Fathers, there is hardly anything but assassination which is forbidden to the sons of Čākyā! If the Most Happy One were still living, say the six bhikṣus of the Mahāsāṅghikavīnuṣa, he would abolish all the laws!" 64

The word of Buddha which authorises the Order to modify the laws fixed by the Omniscient is very extraordinary. Has he not, before making this confidence to Ānanda, just declared solemnly that "the truths and the laws of the Order which I have promulgated and established for you all, let them hold the place of Master to you when I shall be no more?" 65

We are, in truth, in darkness so profound that it is difficult, not to formulate hypothesis, for they present themselves in crowds, but to attach oneself to one definite hypothesis. The thought of Minayeff, and we shall see in examining the history of Vaiśāli, that this thought appears very wise and judicious, is that the disciplinary rules at the death of the Master were very far from being fixed as we know them. To be a Buddhist monk it was necessary, first of all, to be an ascetic, a gṛhaṇā, that is, to conform to the general laws of religious life already determined under diverse forms, Jain or brahmanic; it was necessary also to be a "son of Čākyā," by submitting to the particular form of religious life that the ever-increasing experience of the Master, then of the community, shall deem it well to formulate; by forming part of the Saṅgha, presided over by Buddha and constituted of friendly brotherhoods.

Now Buddha himself has recognised the inutility and the harmfulness of penance (tapas); the picture which he draws of the "fruits of the religious life" has nothing terrible in it; his first official word is to announce — he is addressing ascetics, Yogins — a middle course between austerity and "laxity." 67

From that a truly seductive solution presents itself and one which we may recommend to the conservative school. When Buddha allows the kusumadīsukhusuṣa to be suppressed, he does not mean principles proclaimed by himself, laws of the "honest ascetic," who can live and walk with great strides, following the Eight-fold Way, towards Nirvāṇa. He is speaking of the minor and very minor rules with which heretical disciplinarians encumber themselves and which overwhelm all spiritual vigour. 68

The First Council was not what a vain people thinks. The codification of the Scripture did not hold the position in it that has been stated by ecclesiastical tradition. But, as Minayeff remarks, in our account we must not "confound the statements which do not deserve the same belief.... the assemblies were instituted quite naturally and were a necessary consequence of a given state of things." These assemblies, partial, as Culla XI, § 11 (absence of Purāṇa) indicates, were organised, perhaps, under the "already" classical form of the conferences held during the rainy season by all the monks, without exception, belonging to the same centre. 69 Perhaps they are a little more solemn; they are provoked by difference of opinion among the monks, by accusations brought against one or another. The Master is no longer living: it was necessary that some authority should be organised or affirmed to formally contradict Subhadra, who believed himself freed from all rule by the disappearance of Buddha, to attain Channa, whose sentence the Master

64 The discussion about the lesser rules is there very elaborate. Suzuki, article quoted, p. 277.
65 M. P. S. VI. 1. It is strange also that Ānanda should reveal to the Council the delegation of power the Master made to the community, after the Vinaya has been changed by Upāla, after Ānanda himself has changed the Dharma. Is it still time to discuss the alteration of rules when they are already canonical?
66 See the remarks of Mr. Rhys Davids (Dialogues of the Buddha, p. 263), on the Kāmapāsāṇānāla.
67 See Rhys Davids, loc. cit.; "So hard, so very hard, was the struggle that the Arahat, or the man striving towards Arahatship, should be always sufficiently clothed, and take regular baths, regular exercise, regular food. He was to avoid not what was necessary to maintain himself in full bodily vigour and power, but all undue luxury and all worry about personal comfort."
68 According to our texts, if there was in the quarters for the rainy season one monk who did not take part in the assembly, it would have no authority. I believe this disposition ancient, at least in its origin, for it springs from the solidarity which the Master wished to establish between the scattered elements of his Saṅgha. (See p. 3. 1. 4. and the avadāna and the anātanikāya (Vaiśāli).
69 M. Kern has remarked that Buddha always remains a stranger to disciplinary proceedings. See Oldenberg, Buddha, 5th edit. p. 285, how the Saṅgha is raised itself to the dignity of "jewel."
did not have time to pronounce, to reprimand Ananda himself, who is no longer protected by the affection of Buddha against the jealousies it has aroused. Now the Master, as Purāṇa will say, if we are to believe two respectable traditions, and as the texts sufficiently prove, the Master did not always express the same opinion on all the points of discipline. His omniscience allowed him to seize the essential part in everything and to accommodate his precepts, like his doctrine, to the needs of each. But he is no longer there to soothe the conflicts (vīrūḍa), and the community, widowed of its infallible chief, must have rules. Ananda will recall that the Master condemned disciplinary futilities: but not everyone hear or understand in the same way this word of freedom.

"Even in the Vinaya, it seems to me," says M. Barth, "that there are several conceptions of the devout life. At one time the bhikṣu is a solitary wanderer, without fire or resting-place; two of them may not follow the same road; at another time they wander in numerous troops, ordinarily five hundred, in the train of the Master or of an eminent disciple; sometimes they form sedentary groups; there are the bhikṣus of Kosambi, of Vesali, of Śravasti (Svāsika, Naivāsika, M. Vj, § 270); they are authorised to possess personal property, absolutely incompatible with a wandering life; the Prātiśūkkha, the oldest nucleus, supposes the life of the convent." 73

Let us be sure that there are many later developments here, especially in the sense of the cenobitic life; but do not let us doubt, either, the primitive diversity of the Buddhist groups. Sometimes Buddha rallied to his banner of salvation communities of hermits, sometimes he took up the solitary as the rhinoceros, the furtive as the preyekabuddhas. Of course he is rescued from the world sons of good families, merchants and women. Thus, when Ananda, representative of the "worldly" elements, partisan of the broader ways, the man of the Eightfold Way, as Upāli is the man of the Vinaya, when Ananda wishes to cause an easy Prātiśūka to triumph, then Kācāra, the man of the Dīghāgama 74 "ascetic attracted from outside into the community," rises to answer him. "We must not scandalise the laity; the sons of Čākya must not be less gramaṇas than the heretical priests; we must suppress nothing of the lesser and minor laws."

He made sufficiently great concessions to Buddha when he clothed his ascetic nudity with the triple robe: before becoming the follower of the lion who roars out the way of Nirvāṇa, he assured himself that Gotama does not condemn all penance, that he does not reprove ascetics who lead a hard life, and only then did he consent to moderate his own roaring. But he will not slip further than is necessary down the slope of "laxity."

If we understand a certain passage of the Mīladā as an apologue, we shall find there the confirmation of this manner of regarding the matter. "Why," asks Mīlinda, "did the Most Happy authorise the abrogation of the minor rules? And, does he not, by this deed, enter into contradiction with himself?" "No," replies Nāgāsena; "Bhadra only authorised the abrogation of the lesser rules in order to prove his bhikkhus. Just so a king will counsel his children to abandon the frontier districts, for the kingdom is great and difficult to protect with the forces we have at our disposal. But at the death of the king, will the princes abandon the frontier districts which they already hold?" "No," replies Mīlinda; "kings love to take; the princes will perhaps conquer new territories, two or three times greater than their heritage, but they will not give up an atom of what they hold."

"In the same way, O King," replies Nāgāsena; "the sons of Buddha, in their love for the law, will be able to keep 250 rules, but they will never abandon one law which has been regularly established."

---

72 See p. 5.
73 See M. Barth's article on M. Vj, p. 28, J. des Savants, 1899. M. Barth quotes Mhv. I. III., 415-420 (415, caratha bikkhu evakāsasā sa sa sahā eva sa sa samasāta, and 421, pravatiṇī vīrakariṇī bikkhuva) and M. Vj, I. 11. Cf. the note of the Vinaya Bha, 7, p. 118, on the phrase: "Let not two of you go the same way." "This cannot be understood as a general rule, for it is repeated nowhere where precepts for wandering Bhikkhus are given, and, on the contrary . . . . The precept given here is intended to refer only to the earliest period in the spread of the new discipline.
75 We shall return to this problem after having examined the legend of Vaṭṭalī.
76 See Kern, Manual, p. 75, note b (Sūtra, Mv, I. 8 and 12; Therag. 518-522) and 61, n. 7 (d. Mhv. I. - 361; M. Vj).
77 See Kern, Manual, p. 75, note 5 (Dīpan. IV. 3, V. 7; Śūra, N. II. 126, Div. 61, 3 infra, 390), Beal, Laṅka p. 256, ap. Kern, Gesch. II. 15, Cullenrochef, V, 10, 3. Cf. below, our remarks on Devadatta (notes 100 and 194).
Like kings, the ascetics are very covetous (kuddhatara). It is their successive conquests which have consecrated the 227 rules of the Pali Prātimokṣa and the 250 rules of which Nāgasena? speaks.

I fear that the "Vagianes" of Minayev carries my zeal a little too far, for I am reasoning as a believer would do! But at least the position of the author of the Researches is excellent from a strictly negative point of view, and I do not at all understand why Prof. Oldenberg refuses to follow, — if not quite to the end, for I myself shall have to make some reservations, at least in that which is evident in itself, — the interpretation of Minayev, as he himself very well sums it up:79 "The episode [of the Kuddakanukuddakas] transports us to a time when no (Buddhist) code of religious discipline could exist;80 when one could not as yet know what was important or not in the rules of the monastic life.81 When the Culla, before relating this episode to us, makes the assembled saints recite the entire Vinaya, it contradicts itself."82

Does Prof. Oldenberg believe that the Vinaya was chanted at Rājagaha, immediately after the death of Buddha? No, it seems; and hence, why not admit that the discussion of the kuddakas takes us to a time when the Vinaya was not canonically codified? Does he believe in the authenticity of the words pronounced by Buddha on the kuddakas and on Culla, words preserved in the M. P. S.? Yes, doubtless; — certainly, much more than Minayev or myself. Why then suppose that the rector of the Culla has invented the above discussions in the context of the Sāṅgha in order to follow out the suggestions of the M. P. S. instead of admitting that the events themselves have followed out in the same way the Master's words? The only time that Minayev believes in the tradition, Prof. Oldenberg calls it in question. That is really unfortunate.

In vain will he tell us that the community was otherwise aware of not having changed anything in the rules fixed by the Omniscient; for it is too natural, in fact, that it should be persuaded of this, and the decision to abolish nothing, attributed to Kācyapa, is the only one which could triumph officially in the chronicle and in the ecclesiastical formulary.

It is not without utility that Prof. Oldenberg took up again this question; he has corrected several lajus of Minayev; he has, above all, brought to it useful material, by expressing his views on the progressive elaboration of orthodoxy, by pointing out the points of agreement between the Culla and the M. P. S. and several other references. It seems to us that he has not disturbed Minayev's ruling thought. Without fearing to betray the latter too seriously, we arrive at the following conclusions.

It seems evident that the account of the Culla, in that which concerns the Council and its (properly speaking) scriptural deliberations, is not historic. We put aside the idea of a solemn recitation of the Nikāyas and of the Vinaya, without, however, according any value whatsoever to the celebrated argument a silentio. On the other hand, the episodes of Sāṅgha, and of Purāṇa, the fallings of Ananda, the discussion about the kuddakas, bear the mark of a high antiquity; and

79 This number recalls the Chinese Prātimokṣa (Dharmagupta, 250 articles) or the Tibetan Prātimokṣa (253 articles); but see Rockhill, E. H. E. IX. p. 9. According to M. Kern (Man. p. 732) there are 229 articles in M. Fust, of which 196 are quoted; M. Fust, § 233. It seems to be that we must deduct No. 1 of this last list.
80 See below, the remarks on the Second Council.
81 "Dieser Argumentation kann ich nicht ohne doch nur zum geringen Teil folgen." — Buddha, Studien, p. 621; Minayev, p. 51.
82 That is too strong. There existed at this time only too great a number of disciplinary "codes."
83 Or better: in the different conceptions of religious life.
84 Reply of Prof. Oldenberg, Buddha, Studien, p. 622, 1, 9, infra. "Denn darin liegt doch nichts Ungereimtes, dass eine Mönchesordnung zuerst feststelle, was für Anordnungen der Meister getroffen, und dann erwog, ob man nicht etwa aus eigener Machtvolkommheit, sondern gestützt auf eine anströckliche darin gebende Autorisation des Buddha — von diesen Anordnungen irgend einen Teil aufheben sollte. Ich bin weit davon entfernt diesen ganzen Vorgang meinerseits für gesichertlich zu halten. . . . " Nor I, either, but also, I consider it absolutely improbable.

If we take into account the narrative of the episode of Purāṇa, as the Servitiśāram and the Mañjāṅgikas give it, and also this detail related in the Dīpan, that Ananda had for discipline a certain Vṛtputra (Rockhill, Life, p. 155) we shall be led to establish a close relationship between the events of Rājagaha, the quarrel about the lesser precepts, and the Vājasūraṇas whom the Council of Vaśāli will bring forward, great "overreachers" in small matters of discipline.
without fear of being too credulous we may admit as possible, indeed probable, not only that after the disappearance of Buddha assemblies did take place in which the ecclesiastical power was affirmed by the settling of questions of discipline, — of that we consider ourselves almost certain — but also that the cause of the existence of these assemblies was the discussion of our "episodes."

But the misfortune is that in researches of this kind "to give or to withhold are worth nothing." If we admit the deliberations and the disciplinary discussions, can we gracefully deny the possibility of deliberations and decisions doctrinal or scriptural? Why not accord some belief to the tradition, though it may be late and tendentious? It is impossible for the Sūtras and the Nikāyas to have made themselves, that is, that, like Minerva, having come out of the head of the Omniscient, they should have preserved and grouped themselves spontaneously. The agreement between the different sects — here, a little too soon, we touch upon a subject which it will be necessary to examine in detail — supposes the collective activity whose existence Minayeff has affirmed in the discussion of the points of discipline.

We believe that the account of the First Council has a historic value from a double point of view: as containing an ancient nucleus of authentic tradition, that is, "discussions on points of discipline," which are not necessarily anterior to all canonical codification; and as resuming under the symbolical aspect of a regular Council, of a complete recitation, the work of compilation and arrangement which must have occupied the first centuries, work of which the assembly at Rājagṛha constituted the germ and which tradition places at Rājagṛha, at Pāṇḍāliputra and in Ceylon (Vaṭṭagāmāni).

The scriptural question easily joins on to the question of discipline. Not only because the problems of discipline suppose laws or texts of Vinaya; but also because the question will arise if a certain monk or a certain group should be admitted, or should remain in the communion of the Saṅgha. It will be necessary to know if this monk or this group is not heretical, if it recognizes such and such a doctrine, if it believes in the karmas or if it does not, and the community will be more exacting than was & Saint, who, at will, transformed tirthikas into Arhats and Jātikas, into bhikkhus. They have "sacred words" (śubhāgata ityākatac, authentic histories (tiyāktakac); soon they will class them in nāyakas (āgamas) and the question of books will be most important: any one is Mahāyānist," says Ta-šing, "when he reads the Mahāyānasūtras." They could not but feel the necessity for drawing up the canon of the approved Sūtras in order to distinguish the true word of Buddha (?) among the apocrypha which abounded: for it was an amusement to poor forth in the classical form, no matter what idea, disciplinary, legendary, or dogmatic. It is much more easy to make a good Sūtra than a bad Upaniṣad. And we must consider this detail, that the questioning of Ānanda bears only on the place and the interrogator of the Sūtra, and that it does not allow, as does the interrogation of Upāli on the Vinaya, precise details of the contents of the work.

Thus we are led to adopt a much more conservative manner of thinking than the one Minayeff seems to have patronised, and this by the simple fact that with him we distinguish in the Culla between the elements which are authentic or nearly so, those which represent the Saṅgha as constituted as a "tribunal," elements certainly anterior to the data which give to the Council the aspect of a concave, met together with a theological and literary aim; the latter not being nevertheless, exempt from all value, at least symbolical, and not having necessarily been invented, as Minayeff believes, to establish against the Mahāyānistas the authority of the canon of the Hinayāna, — or, as Pro. Oldenberg thinks, according to the events of the Second Council.

I do not know that the Mahāyānistas have ever contested as a whole the authenticity of the Suttantas: their polemic is quite different; and the Second Council is a stranger, according to the tradition, to all questions of Scripture.83

(To be continued.)

83 We derive from Minayeff. See our remarks on the Second Council.
84 M. Vāspa, VI. 31., is remarkable for the contempt Buddha, which affects for questions of doctrine. This contempt goes even so far as to become impertinence. "Do you teach," they ask him, "annihilation (svevada) [that is to say, the doctrine of non-survival]?" — "I teach," the Master replies, "the annihilation of desire."
ASOKA NOTES.

BY VINCENT A. SMITH AND F. W. THOMAS.

(Continued from Vol. XXXIV, p. 251.)

No. IX. —The Third Book Edict.

When recently visiting the India Office Library, I had the advantage of discussing with Mr. F. W. Thomas the interpretation of the Third Book Edict of Asoka, which gives instructions for the official promulgation of the Law of Piety during the prescribed quinquennial tours. The discussion turned chiefly on the concluding sentence, which is rendered by Bühler (Ep. Ind., II, 467) by the words: —‘Moreover, the teachers and ascetics of all schools will inculcate what is befitting at divine service, both according to the letter and according to the spirit.’

In my book, Asoka, p. 117, the passage was translated, with reference to M. Senart’s commentary: —‘The clergy will thus instruct the lieges in detail, both according to the letter and the spirit.’ Neither of these versions is quite satisfactory, and it seems to be worth while to re-examine the text, and consider the possibility of an improved translation. Bühler’s rendering is based on the Shāhbazgarhī text, but that document has some lacune, and it will be convenient to set forth as the basis of discussion Bühler’s transliteration of the Gīrṇār text of the whole edict, which is perfect, as follows:

Devāṣaṃ priya Piyadāsī rājā evaḥ cha[1] bhāda-
svāddhābhāṣṭavā maṃ gā ṣdūṃ dānapaṇāḥ[2] sarvata
viṣṭe mama yutā cha rājaḥke cha prādetiḥ ke cha
paṃchanaṃ paṃchaṃ vāsaṃ anuvāma[3]
yādā nīyato etdyana atūdyā imāya
sādhu svātāri cha piṣṭīri cha suveśā mādesāṃtataṁ-
ṃśaṃ ṣaṃyāṣ[a] samāṇaṃśa ṣādhu
dēnāṃ prāyāṇāṃ sādhu anāṃbhā
anaparāṇāṃ aparādhaṇātā sādhu[5] Paṃḍā pī
yaddhā ṣānapaṇāṃ ānaṃbāyāṃ khetū cha
vyapryāṇata cha[6]


In the early part of the edict, Bühler, working on the Shāhbazgarhī text (sam.[5] viṣṭe yuttā rajuko pradeśikā[7]), translates ‘everywhere in my empire both my loyal Rajukas and vassals,’ taking yuttā as an adjective qualifying Rajuko. In the Oriyaan texts the corresponding words are:

Dhauli — . . (ta viṣṭešā me yutt(4) la[6]yāke [cha] . . . sūkha;
Jangada — cha pād(6)āśāke cha.

The perfect Gīrṇār text reads, sarvata viṣṭe mama yutā cha rājaḥke cha prādetiḥ ke cha.

The insertion of the word cha, ‘and,’ thrice in the Gīrṇār text seems to make Bühler’s rendering of yuttā untenable. That word, (as pointed out in Asoka, p.116, note 4,) clearly must be taken as a substantive. M. Senart, long ago, in accordance with the Gīrṇār text, had translated ‘pertout dans mon empire les fidèles, les rajuka et le gouverneur du district.’ Using modern Anglo-Indian terms, I followed the French scholar and translated, ‘everywhere in my dominions the lieges, and the Commissioners, and the District officers.’ This version, I think, might stand; but Mr. Thomas’ rendering of yuttā as equivalent to dyuktā, meaning ‘(minor) officials,’ is preferable.
The next question of interpretation concerns the word anusmṛtyuṇa, which Senart had no hesitation in translating as 'rendez-vous, assemblée.' Anusmṛtyuṇa, according to him (Inscr. de Piyāṣeṣi, Vol. I, p. 80), 'marquerait bien, par sa constitution étymologique, un vaste rendez-vous, une réunion publique, tenue dans certains lieux désignés.'

But Professor Kern seems to be right in translating 'tour of inspection.' The word anusmṛtyuṇa, as Mr. Thomas observes, occurs in both Brahmanical and Buddhist Sanskrit. Saṁyukta means 'a tour,' and the force of anus is to express the notion of 'to one place after another.'

The main difficulty lies in the last sentence, which is given as follows in the various texts:

Gimār — Pariṣī ṁ yute dīnapayisati gaṇanāyaḥ hetuḥ ca viṣayanatato cha:
Shābhāṣgarhi — Pariṣī [pi] [read Pariṣa pi] yutā[mi ga]na[sa]i anapayisati hetuḥ cha viṣayanato cha:
Kāśi — Paliṣṭ-ča yutā[mi] gaṇanāsi anapayisati hetuḥ-cāḥ viṣayanjanar[e] cha[.]
Dhauḷi — Paliṣṭ pi cha ... na[ri] (yu)[4][d][n][i] ḍnapayisati ... tut(e) cha viṣya(ja) ... [11]
Jauṭa — ... ... ... ... ... ... [12] hetuḥ cha viṣayanatato cha[.13]

The variations, it will be observed, are merely dialectical; the words are the same in the texts.

The Gimār form, being perfect, is the best to translate. Mr. Thomas suggests an entirely novel rendering, which makes the sentence refer to the audit of monastic expenses. I leave to him the task of explaining and justifying his interpretation of both the concluding sentence and the entire edict; and incidentally, of throwing new light upon the difficult texts of the Minor Rock Edicts.

VINCENT A. SMITH.

The proposed interpretation to which Mr. Vincent Smith kindly refers is not very pretentious, but it may be submitted for consideration.

I think it may be taken that the words apavyisyate and aparabhāṃḍaṭa near the end of the inscription correspond to a Sanskrit alpariyaṭā, 'moderation in expenditure,' and alparābhāṃḍaṭā, 'moderation in possessions (such as furniture).'* So far as alpa is concerned, this was the view of Burnouf. But M. Senart, who, in his edition of the Edicts (pp. 83-8), has recorded Burnouf's opinion as tenable, prefers to find here, as in apahala (Edict IX) and apaparishava (Edict X), the privative use of the preposition apa. Bühler, in his translation (Epigraphia Indica, II, pp. 447 sqq.), adheres in all the cases to this view, except that in the Gimār text he prints appaparishava. In spite of the authority of M. Senart and the late Prof. Bühler I venture to adopt the other opinion — for the following reasons. In the first place, analogous compounds with apa, are in Sanskrit and Pāli less common than those with ala. Secondly, in Edict IX alpariyaṭa forms a rather better antithesis than does apahala, to the adjacent mahāpala. Thirdly, one word in the Edicts, where the interpreters have generally recognised the preposition, certainly contains alpa: this is aparabāḍhata in the Bhāṣa inscription. That this word corresponds to the alparēṣhata of the Buddhist Sanskrit (Mahāvamsa, I, 254, 16; Divyadāna 19, 15; 158, 19) and aprāḍhā of the Pāli, no one will be found to deny.

If, accordingly, we understand Asoka to be inculcating economy, there can be no justification for ascribing to the gaṇanāyaḥ, which follows, any but its proper arithmetical sense. In Pāli and Sanskrit alike gaṇand is 'reckoning,' 'calculation'; gaṇaka is 'accountant.'
We find *gaṇāṇāpatī* in the sense of 'finance minister,' a meaning which may perhaps also be assigned also to the *gaṇaka* in the Buddhist Sanskrit compound *gaṇakahamahādītrā* (Mahāvastu, III, p. 44, l. 45).

Concerning *yutē*, Mr. Vincent Smith has written above. The Sanskrit *yuktē*, to which it corresponds, has the two meanings of (1) 'suitable,' (2) 'earnest.' 'Earnest men' might suit our present passage. But I feel rather confident that the word, like the Sanskrit *āyukta*, denotes 'officials,' especially subordinate officials, such as police officers and the like. Coupled earlier in the inscription with *ṣājakas* and *prādaśikas*, with whom they make quinquennial rounds, they are likely to be something more than 'the faithful' or 'the laity.'

We have then the following sense: — 'Let the *Parishāda* also (i. e., as M. Senart has explained, the [local] *sanghas*') appoint officials for reckoning. What are they to reckon? Plainly the expenditure and stores referred to in the *alpasyagatā* and *alpabhānādatā* of the previous sentence. This seems to imply a suitable meaning for the often-discussed ēśutoto cha *vyañjanato*.

The officials in question should in their audit take account both of the objects (*āyukta*) and of actual documents or figures (*vyañjanato*) of the expenditure (*vyaya*) and supplies (*bhānā*) required by the *sanghas*. An alternative, however, may be mentioned. Since the most proper sense of *āyukta* lies in the domain of abstract reasoning, where it denotes 'reason' or 'middle term' (*hutvidyā* = 'science of reasons' = 'logic'), while *vyañjana* has been shown (see M. Senart's observations, p. 85, and M. Lévi’s article in the *Journal Asiatique* for 1896 (VII, pp. 460 seq.), to refer often to the actual wording of texts, we might be tempted to render the words here by with regard to the dictates of 'reason and the prescriptions of actual texts.'

*Vyañjana* occurs a second time in the Edicts of *Aśoka*, namely, in the Sahasraṃ-Bairātā-Rapāṇāth-Siddāpur inscription. It is therefore pardonable if I now, following M. Lévi, proceed to consider that text in connection with the preceding.

It is unnecessary to remind the reader that the record is the famous one containing the word *vyuṭha*, *vivutha*, which has been by M. Senart explained as referring to missions, by M. Lévi as denoting the courier conveying the edict, and by Bühler and other scholars as a synonym for Buddha. The much-discussed number included in the text is by M. Senart regarded as the number of the missions dispatched under the orders of *Aśoka*, by M. Lévi the approximate number of *abhārās* in the edict, by Bühler and other scholars as the number of years elapsed since either Buddha’s *nivṛtta* or his *ahākārākṛmaṇa*.

In propounding yet a fourth interpretation of the passage and the figures, which, in its general lines, agrees with those of M. Senart and M. Lévi, I shall be content, as Mr. Vincent Smith has reproduced the text, to call attention to the words which seem to bear upon my conclusions.

(1) Sahasraṃ: *sa etṣa ayahāya iva ṣāvane.*

Rūmpāṭh: *etiya ayahāya cha ṣāvane kate.* (Ind. Ant., XXII, 302.)


What is a *sāvane* and by whom was it kate ('made'), āśvēpīte, or āśvēite ('proclaimed')? The word *sāvane* denotes 'a making known by hearing,' and in the present passage this sense is enforced by the use of the verb *śvēpīte* or *śvēite*. But, of course, we may find in it the weakened sense of *kti*, 'an authoritative saying,' and so acquiesce in a supposition that Aśoka is citing some word of Buddha or even a proverb.

1? *Vidhāravādīne* of later times?

2 For a summary of previous views concerning this number 23 and the words *vyuṭha*, etc., in this Edict we may refer to the article by Dr. J. F. Fleet in the J. R. A. S. for 1904, pp. 1-29.
But, according to one text, the śāvane is kāte, 'made,' and this seems to imply rather a newly composed, than an ancient, precept. The actual tenor of the precept confirms this theory. After celebrating the important results of exertion on the part of small persons no less than of great, results which he has himself experienced, he goes on to say, 'This śāvane (i. e. proclamation) has been made, namely, "Let small and great exert themselves."' The lesson, therefore, which he would inculcate is a new one, an outcome of a recent personal experience.

This being so, the author of the precept, the subject of the verbs kāte, śāvāpit, or śāvite, is Asōka himself.

(2) Sahasrām: iyāḥ [cha sanane] viṇṇhena.
Rūpānāth: viṇṇhena sāvane kāte.
Siddāpur (Brahmagiri): iyāḥ cha sāvane [e] śāvāpis te viṇṇhena.

From this passage it appears that the person who composed, or caused to be communicated, the sentiment in question was the viṇṭha, vyūtha, or vyūtha. What part of speech is this word? Probably all scholars agree that it is a participle corresponding to the Sanskrit vyuṣṭita and meaning 'gone abroad.' To take it in this passage as a participle agreeing with māya understood will be in entire harmony with syntax; and this I propose to do. The proclamation was made and published by Asōka upon his travels. What travels?

(3) Sahasrām: duṣa sāpanāndati sādit viṇṭhīte 256.
Rūpānāth: 256 sātanviṣād ta.
Siddāpur (Brahmagiri): vyūṭhena 256.

The viṇṭhī of Sahasrām corresponds to viśdā of Rūpānāth. It is therefore here a noun: but in that there is nothing surprising. A Sanskrit nester vyuṣṭitāni would similarly correspond to viśdā; and that a different sense is to be found in the present context (3) from what was found in (2) is proved by the fact that the Rūpānāth text has a distinction of words, here viśdā, there vyūṭhena.

In this connection we ought to advert to the phrase viṇṭha vasa, 'the year having been passed,' which occurs in the Khandagiri inscription. In Sanskrit vyuṣṭita rātri meaning 'the night has dawned (into day)' contains the root vasa 'to shine': but when we say vyuṣṭita śāvane sāvane or tām vyuṣṭitā rātrim, and perhaps sometimes when we say ad vyuṣṭitā rātrim, we are using the root vas, 'to dwell' (see B. and R.). Hence there is no inconsistency in taking viṇṭha as 'on one's travels' in the passage under discussion, while in the Khandagiri inscription it bears the passive sense of 'having been passed.'

Now the viśdās or 'changes of abode' are 256 in number. What point is there in that?

(4) Rūpānāth: etīnd cha vyaya jasmine yavutaka tu paka ahlā savara viśdāvarṣa (ti vyuṣṭhend śāvane kāte).

The new inscription from Sārāṇāth (Epigraphia Indica, VIII, pp. 166 seq., Dr. Vogel's article, with which, during the correction of the proof of this note, I have been enabled to consult M. Senart's paper, Comptes Rendus des Sciences de l'Académie, 1907, pp. 1 seq., and that of Mr. Venis, Journal and Proceedings of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, III, pp. 1 seq.) definitely proves that the reading here should be yāratahām uphaṃ bhāre sara viśdāvarṣaya and that the meaning of the whole phrase is 'with this document (or in accordance with this signification = command) you must everywhere go abroad so far as your district extends,' where I understand bhāre, not with Professor Kern (see Dr. Vogel's article) as a new word = adhāra, but as an equivalent of bhoga = (1) 'food,' (2) 'source of revenue,' and with Dr. Vogel and M. Senart (p. 10) I regard viśdā as having a non-causal sense.

1 Whitney, in his list of roots, gives both māyā and māda to each of the two roots. The expression rdhran śāvaneṣu, however, contains, as Professor Kielhorn has shown (J. B. A. S., 1904, pp. 364-5) the root vas, 'to shine.'
The fact that in this passage Aśoka brings his own journeys abroad (vyuṣṭena) into so close connection with those which he enjoins upon his subordinates, is a reason for believing them to have been of a similar nature: and we are accordingly inclined to the supposition that Aśoka’s vīraṇa or ‘goings abroad’ (opposed to uṣā) were of a missionary or propagandist character.

(5) Siddāpur (Brahmagiri): abhā savacharamāra etikri bhūsavaḥ kṛṣṇaḥ sāvage apyate bālakāh cha me pākante.

The other texts are not quoted, being all more or less fragmentary. But this is a matter of no moment, the interpretation being, except in one point, a matter of general agreement. After being for a period an ineffective layman (upāsaka), Aśoka had rather more than a year before the issue of this edict joined the saṅgha and exerted himself greatly and with remarkable effect. The only difference of opinion concerns the word savacharam which Bühler would take in the sense of ‘a period of six years,’ śahūtsaraṃ. This interpretation is based upon the fact that the Rūpniṇī version has chhauvachara, while at Sarasvām he reads sadvachhaile in place of savichchale. It seems a strong objection to this interpretation that in the previous line the Sarasvām has savachala in the sense of ‘year,’ and, further, ‘year’ is not a very early meaning of uṣāra. The Siddāpur text replaces the former samvatsara by varāha, but this difference seems to me due merely to the fact that in speaking of the single year of his activity Aśoka changes the expression to one (samvatsara) which denotes a calendar year, intending to emphasize the fact that he has been one whole year at work. The reading savichchale is indistinguishable from savachchale; probably it is for savichchala. Chhauvachara may be due to the influence of the neighboring cha’s. Accordingly, I follow most recent scholars (but see Mr. Vincent Smith’s Aśoka, pp. 139-40) in taking savachara to denote a year.

Now if Aśoka, having joined the Saṅgha, adopted a course of activity in the form of constant travel and changed his residence about once every day, 256 would be a probable number of changes — for the rainy season would be excluded.

Regarding sattā in sattā vivutha and 256 satavivāsa, I am inclined, in spite of the taxology in the latter case, to adhere to the view that we have here the equivalent of sata, ‘a hundred.’ But certainly there would be no objection to recognizing in it the Sanskrit satra ‘Verpflegungshaus,’ ‘Hospiz’ (B. and R.), in which case satra vivāsa would mean ‘moving from stage to stage.’

(6) In accordance with the above interpretations we should again have a choice between two alternatives as regards vyājana. For the etind vyājanaṇa of the Rūpniṇī text may mean either ‘with the text of my instruction’ or more abstractly ‘according to this signification’ (or command).

I can only lay these suggestions before the scholars interested in the matter.

F. W. THOMAS.

---

4 The difference between varāha and samvatsara corresponds to that between best and ceillir. It may be observed that only in this edict does Aśoka employ the word samvatsara.

6 [365 days = 119 = 346; 109 = 335; 120 or 121 days = 4 months. ‘For the Buddhists of India as for the other people of that country the rainy season began on the 16th of the month Ashādha (the fourth of their year) and continued for four months. This was chiefly for religious purposes, but to the non-Buddhists of India three months of this period formed also their summer.’ But the full period of Retreat was three months, and Buddha ordained that this period might be counted either from the middle of the fourth or the middle of the fifth month’ (Watters, On Yuan Cheang, I, 145). — V. A. S.]

8 Future editors of the Siddāpur inscriptions should take note of the very clear facsimiles published by Mr. B. Lewis Rice in Epigraphia Carnatica, Vol. XI, Bangalore, 1903, p. 153, No. 14; p. 164, No. 21; p. 167, No. 34. — V. A. S.]
In order to make quite clear what the effect is of the suggested interpretation of Book Edict III, we append a free version of that document, as understood by us:

"Thus saith His Majesty King Priyadarśin:"

In the thirteenth year of my reign I issued this command: — Everywhere in my dominions the [subordinate] officials and the Commissioners, and the District officers, every five years must go out on circuit, as well for their other duties, as for this special purpose, namely, to proclaim the Law of Piety; to wit, "A good thing is the heartening to father and mother; a good thing is liberality to friends, acquaintances, relatives, Brahmans and ascetics; a good thing it is to spare living creatures; a good thing it is to spend little and store little."

Let the Fraternities also appoint officials for the reckoning, with regard to both the objects and the accounts.

F. W. T.
V. A. S.

BOOK NOTICE.


Mr. GAURIKISHAN OJHA has long been well known to students of Indian history and epigraphy, and many an important inscription has, during the last years, been made available through his disinterested zeal. The work now under review gives, in a connected form, a summary of the results of his studies of the history of the Chalukyas. He first deals with the western branch of the dynasty, down to its overthrow by the Rāṣṭrakūṭas, and further, from the re-establishment of their kingdom under Tailapa, down to its termination under Somēvaras. Then he turns to the Eastern Chalukyas of Vēṇga, from Kunti-Vaiṣhavārdhana and down to Rājendra Chōla II, and to the branches of the dynasty established in Pithāpura, Śrīkumāram, and Viśakhapatīna.

The work has been numbered Part I, Vol. I. of a Series, and it is much to be hoped that it will be continued. It is a very careful and critical summary of the results obtainable from epigraphical and literary sources. It will be especially important to such Indian scholars as cannot make use of Dr. Fichta's and Dr. Bhāndarkar's studies on the same subject. And also to others it will be very useful, because it has been published so recently and has, consequently, benefited from such new materials as have been brought to light after the appearance of the Bombay Gazetteer.

The piecing together of the various documents from which the history of India is gradually being built up, is still going on, and so it is only to be expected that some of Mr. Ojha's statements will, in future, have to be modified. I do not think that it is possible to state with certainty that the famous Ajaṇṭā picture actually represents the reception of the embassy sent by Kharanu to Potočina II, and there may be some few instances elsewhere, where judgment should be deferred. Thus the statement that the Vakkalirī plate of Krittivarman II gives Sakα 679 as the eleventh year of his reign is not quite certain, the number "nine" of the date not being legible in the plate. Another plate of the same king, which will soon be published in the Epigraphia Indica, distinctively gives Sakα 672 as the ninth year of his reign. I do not mention this in order to find fault with Mr. Ojha's book. The fact only shows how our knowledge of Indian history is incessantly proceeding, and it demonstrates how Mr. Ojha's treatise must necessarily add much to the information brought together by his predecessors. And it is impossible not to admire the patient work and the sane criticism to which every page of his book bears testimony.

STEN KONOW.
THE SCYTHIAN PERIOD OF INDIAN HISTORY.

BY B. D. BANERJI.

At the time of the departure of Alexander the Great from India in 326 B.C. his Indian dominions were divided into three satrapies—

(1) Paropamisadai, to the west of the Indus. Oxartes, the father of Roxana, was the governor of this province;

(2) The second satrapy, the Panjáb, including the kingdom of Taxila and those of Porus and Sophytes, together with the territories of the Oxydraks and the Malloi, was placed under the military governorship of Philip, son of Machetas, while the civil administration was left in the hands of the native sovereigns;

(3) Sindh, including the kingdoms of Musukanus, Oxianus, Sambus, and Maris of Patalene, formed the third satrapy and was entrusted to Peithon, the son of Agemem.

Philip, the satrap of the Panjáb, was killed in a mutiny shortly before the death of Alexander and was succeeded by Endamos. This officer, who had no adequate forces at his command, managed to remain in India up to B.C. 317, when he departed to help Eumenes against Antigonus.

At the time of the second partition of the Macedonian empire in B.C. 321, effective control of the Indian princes was impossible, and Peithon, the satrap of Sindh, was obliged to retire to the west of the Indus. The Indian provinces to the east of the Indus were consequently ignored at that partition. These arrangements prove that, within two years of Alexander's death, the Greek power to the east of the Indus had been extinguished, with the slight exception of a small territory, wherever it might have been, which Endamos managed to hold for some four years longer.

Later on, when Seleukos Nikator tried to recover the lost provinces in B.C. 305, he found Cañadragupsh Māurya too strong for him. He made a humiliating treaty, formally abandoning Greek claims to the provinces east of the Indus, and ceding Kabul, Qandahar, and Hīrā to the victor. Cañadragupsh, Bindussā, and Asoka kept all intruders outside their dominions. After the death of Asoka in circa B.C. 230, the decline of the Māurya power began, and from the beginning of the second century B.C. up to the year 318 A.D. no date of Indian History can be fixed with absolute certainty. During this period various foreign nations are known from the Parāñas and other sources to have invaded India and subdued portions of the country. Among these foreign nations are the Bactrian Greeks, Parthians, and various hordes of Scythians, such as the Sc and the Yue-chi. The only available data for the construction of the history of this period are—

(1) Coins which are found in great abundance in Afghanistan and Northern India.

(2) Inscriptions; these are written in two scripts, Brāhmī and Kharšī.

(3) Mentions of Indian and Central Asian affairs in foreign annals.

The empire of Seleukos Nikator extended from the Mediterranean to the borders of the Māurya empire, and in this he was succeeded by his son, Antiochos Soter, and his grandson, Antiochos Theos. During the reign of the last named prince two of their easternmost provinces were lost to the Seleukids, etc., Bactria and Parthia. Bactria became an independent kingdom under Diodotos, the former satrap. Diodotos was succeeded by his son, Diodotos, surnamed Soter, who was ousted by Euthydemos. Euthydemos was succeeded by his son, Demetrios. About this period the second invasion of India by the Greeks took place. Antiochos the Great, the grandson of Antiochos Soter, invaded India in B.C. 206. He did not succeed in penetrating into India proper, but seems to have

1 Cunningham's Numismatic Chronicle, 1868, p. 98.
2 V. Smith's Early History of India, p. 109.
defeated a border chief, named Sophugasesos or Subhagasesa, and levied a contribution of elephants from him. It was under Demetrios that permanent conquests seem to have been made in India; because Kharoqghi legends appear for the first time on Greek coins during the reign of Demetrios. There is, also, a coin of Demetrios which seems to be the result of a compromise between the Greek and Indian methods of coinage. The regular type of the Greek system is retained, but the coin is of the square Indian form. 3

When Demetrios was absent in India, Eukratidas, one of his officers whom he most probably left in charge of Bactria, usurped his throne, and all attempts on the part of Demetrios to recover the province were of no avail. At this time, along with the coins of Demetrios, occur those of several other Greek princes, such as Antimakos, Pantaleon, Agathokles, etc. Eukratidas seems to have reigned in Bactria up to 160 B.C. He also conducted several expeditions against Demetrios and seems to have subdued him in the end. Eukratidas was murdered by one of his sons on return from one of his Indian expeditions. During the later years of Eukratidas, civil strife seems to have been rife in his dominions in which a rival prince, named Plato, seems to have played a prominent part. On one of the coins of Plato, occurs the date 147 of the Seleucidian era, equivalent to B.C. 165. Eukratidas was succeeded by Helicles in Bactria, who seems to have been the last Greek ruler of that country.

In or about the year 165 B.C., occurred one of the most important events in the history of Asia. At this time, a war broke out between two nomad hordes living on the borders of the Chinese Empire, the Yue-chi and the Hung-Nu, in which the former were completely defeated and ousted from their territories. The Yue-chi then marched westward with their flocks and herds in search of new lands and pastures. On their way they fell in with another nomad horde, the Wu-sun. In the fight which ensued, the Wu-sun were worsted and their chief, Nan-teou-mi, was killed. After this, the Yue-chi, still marching westward, attacked the Se or Sok, who abandoned their territories to the Yue-chi and migrated into Ki-pia to the south. But in the meantime Kwen-mo, son of the deceased Wu-sun Chief, had grown up under the protection of the Hung-Nu and attacked the Yue-chi to avenge his father’s death. He succeeded in driving the Yue-chi out of their newly-acquired lands into Ta-hia or Bactria. The Chinese historians derived their knowledge of the migration of the Yue-chi chiefly from the reports of Chang-Kien, who visited the Yue-chi in or about B.C. 125.

The next mention of the Yue-chi is in Pan-ku’s history of the first Han dynasty. Pan-ku states that the Yue-chi were no longer nomads and that the Yue-chi kingdom had become divided into five principalities, viz.—(1) The Hieu-mi; (2) Choung-mo; (3) Kovei-shoung; (4) Hi-thun; and (5) Kao-fu. To this the history of the second Han dynasty adds that about a hundred years later, the Kovei-shoung prince, Kieou-tsion-kio, attacked and subdued the other four principalities and made himself master of a kingdom which was called Koweichoang. This prince invaded Parchsa and took possession of Kabul. Kiu-tai-kio died at the age of eighty, and his son, Yen-kao-chin, ascended the throne. He conquered Tien-tchoh (India) and there set up generals who governed in the name of the Yue-chi. 4 Thus it appears, that a few years after the defeat of the Yue-chi by the Hung-Nu in 165 B.C., Ta-hia or Bactria was over-run by them, while the Se or Sok poured into Afghanistan and the Panjáb. From this period onward, the scanty notices of the classical historians, which were of some use to Cunningham and other scholars in their attempt to re-construct the history of the Eastern Greeks, become scantier still and then ceased altogether.

3 E. J. Basset, Indian Coins, p. 5.
4 The above account is taken from Mr. V. A. Smith’s admirable summary of the notices of the Chinese historians in his “Kushān period of Indian History,” J. R. A. S., 1908.
Numerous coins of this period (B.C. 165 to 318 A.D.) are available and are our chief sources of information about its history. These coins inform us of the existence of a large number of princes among whom are to be found later Greeks, Parthian and Scythians. The later Greek princes are about twenty in number and the most important among them are Menander and Apollodotus mentioned by classical historians as conquerors of India. Besides the Greeks, the princes of three other foreign lines are known to us chiefly through their coins. These are:—

(1) The Se or Sok, such as Maues, Venones, Azes, Anilises, and the satraps Liaka, Patika, Rājūvula, Saqdassa, Kharahostes, Jihniśa, etc.

(2) The Parthians, such as, Gondophernes, Abdagases, Arsakes, Pakores, and Sanahares.

(3) The Kushān family: Kosoulo Kadphises, Vima Kadphises, Kaniška, Huvishka, and Vaṣudeva.

There are several inscriptions of the Se or Sok, both in Brāhmi and Kharoṣṭhī, but only one inscription of the Parthian dynasty has been discovered up to date, whereas the inscriptions of Kushān family are fairly numerous.

The notices of the Chinese historians are confined chiefly to the fortunes of the Yüe-chi.

Among these princes, the name of Kaniška stands pre-eminent as the patron of Buddhism and a mighty conqueror. Among the inscriptions of this period many are dated and the large majority of the dated inscriptions belong to the Kushān dynasty. One of the chief difficulties in the construction of a chronology of this period lies in the fact that the inscriptions do not refer themselves to any particular era. The inscriptions of the Kushān period are dated in years from 3 to 99 of an unknown era. The single Parthian inscription is dated in the year 103 and two of the Sok inscriptions are dated.

Various theories have been put forward by various scholars about the interpretation of these dates and the chronology of this period. They are eleven in number and carry the initial year of the era in which the Kushān inscriptions are dated over a period of more than 325 years, ranging from B.C. 57 to A.D. 278. These theories may be classified as follows:—

I. — Theories which maintain that the dates in the Kushān inscriptions should be referred to an era of which the hundreds are omitted:

   (a) The theory put forth by Mr. V. A. Smith that the Kushān inscriptions are dated in the Laukika era with thirty-two hundreds omitted.

   (b) Mr. Devadatta R. Bhāndārkar's theory that the Kushān inscriptions are dated in the Saka era with two hundred omitted.

   (c) General Cunningham's second theory that the Kushān inscriptions are dated according to the Seleukidan era with four hundred omitted.

   (d) The theory that these inscriptions are dated in the Vikrama era with one hundred omitted.

II. — Theories which maintain that the Kushān inscriptions are dated in an era founded by Kaniška:

   (a) Cunningham's first theory which is still maintained by Dr. Fleet that Kaniška founded the Vikrama era.

   (b) Ferguson and Oldenberg's theory that Kaniška founded the Saka era.

   (c) The theory that Kaniška founded an era of which the initial year still remains to be ascertained.

* Trogus, p. 41.
III. — Theories which arrive at a conclusion from the point of view of the Chinese historians:—

(a) M. Sylvain Levi's theory that the coronation of Kaniṣṭha took place in B. C. 5.
(b) M. Boyer's theory that the coronation of Kaniṣṭha must be placed later than 90 A. D.
(c) Dr. Francke's theory that Kaniṣṭha preceded Kujula Kadphises and Hima Kadphises, and that his coronation is to be placed about B. C. 2.
(d) Mr. V. A. Smith's older theory that the coronation of Kaniṣṭha took place in 65 A. D.

Out of these theories I. (a) seems never to have been worked out in detail and III. (d) has been withdrawn by the author,6 while II. (c) is a bare statement and gives us no clue to its solution.

As the dates on the Kusāṇ inscriptions range from the year 3 to the year 99 it is certain that either Kaniṣṭha founded a special era of his own or that he used an older one with the hundreds omitted, since it is improbable that another reign of two or three years preceded that of Kaniṣṭha. The first of the theories enumerated above is that of Mr. Vincent A. Smith in which the author tries to prove that the Kusāṇ inscriptions are dated according to the Lāukiṅka era. Mr. Smith's paper is a long one and deserves detailed consideration. Mr. Vincent Smith states: “Two relevant numismatic facts are absolutely certain, namely, that Kadphises I struck copper coins on which the king's head is a copy of the head on the coins either of the later years of Augustus or of his successor Tiberius and that Kadphises II. issued a gold coinage agreeing in weight with the Aurei of the early Roman empires.” In a footnote Mr. Smith adds that Mr. E. J. Rapson informs him that the portraits on the copper coins of Kadphises I most closely resemble those on the coins of Caius and Lucius, the grandsons of Augustus, who died respectively in B. C. 4 and A. D. 27. This is admissible and does not stand in the way of the thesis which this paper puts forth.

Mr. Vincent Smith refers the dates in the Kusāṇ inscriptions to the Lāukiṅka era. The arguments which he adduces in favour of his theory are, that the years in the inscriptions which can be referred to one of the three kings Kaniṣṭha, Huvirka, and Vāsudeva with absolute certainty are all below one hundred, and that the use of the Lāukiṅka era goes back to very early times, as both Varāhamihira and Bhāṣpatīpala refer to the description of it given by Viśdha Garga. Alberuni states that the era was in ordinary use among the common people in North-Western India in 1000 A. D. Mr. Smith then proceeds to explain the Lāukiṅka era and observes: “In practice the Lāukiṅka dates are written in tens and units, only the hundreds and thousands being omitted.” This in fact is the case, but Mr. Smith is “led after this to make some peculiar remarks contradicting himself. Alberuni states that “the common people in India date by the years of a centumum... . . . . . if a centumum is finished they drop it and simply begin to date a new one.”

On which Cunningham said, “the omission of the hundreds was a common practice in India in reckoning the Sapt Rāshi Kal,” that is, the Lāukiṅka era. This evidently means that in practice only the hundreds of this era were omitted, the thousands being retained. Mr. Smith is quite right in remarking that “no such mode or practice ever existed.” But a few pages below he says, “it seems, however, to be quite possible that exceptionally the thousands of a Lāukiṅka date may be omitted and the hundreds expressed,” an assumption with which I do not agree. If in a date the hundreds are mentioned, it is absolutely certain that it cannot be referred to the Lāukiṅka era. Mr. Smith had fully recognised the value of this fact and has attempted to prove that the dates in three figures in inscriptions of this period cannot be referred to the same era as the main body of Kusāṇ dates, but to some other era, such as the Vikrama or Gupta Samvats. Inscriptions with dates above hundred, which can be referred to this period with certainty, are written in two

---

6 J. R. A. S., 1903, pp. 4 and 9, footnote 1.
7 J. R. A. S., 1903, pp. 5 and 20, footnote 1.
scripts, Brāhmī and Kharoṣṭhī. Mr. Smith mentions three Brāhmī records with dates above one hundred. They are—

1. Mathura inscription of the year 135. 10
2. Mathura inscription of the year 230. 11
3. Mathura inscription of the year 299. 12

It will be seen later on that out of these three inscriptions the third does not fall within the Kusāna period, as its characters are much earlier. The other two inscriptions have been referred by Dr. Fleet to the Gupta era and Mr. Smith supports this view. During a recent visit to Allahabad I examined the inscriptions of the year 135 in the Public Library of that place and it struck me that the characters of the inscription are of a much earlier period than that to which it is now supposed to belong. If referred to the Gupta era the date of the inscription would be equivalent to 135 + 318/9 = 453-4 A.D. This date is too late for the inscription. The case of the inscription of the year 230 is similar to this. There is another dated inscription from Mathura, the date of which must be referred to the Gupta era because it mentions the name of Kumāra Gupta. The date on that inscription is the year 113. 13 A comparison of the characters of the two inscriptions shows that they cannot both be referred to the same era; in fact, the inscription of the year 135 is much earlier. The comparison reveals the following facts:—

1. The Ja of the inscription of the year 135 is cursive in form, whereas in the other inscription it is angular. The cursive Ja is one of the peculiarities of the characters of the Kusāna period.

2. The lower part of the Ra of the inscription of the year 135 is curved to the left, a characteristic to be found only among Kusāna inscriptions and nowhere else among later inscriptions from Northern India. (The lower part of the Ra was changed into an angular projection to the left. It is to be noticed that it is not a curve. Cf. Bühlcr, Indische Palaeographie, Tafel III.)

3. The palatal Sa in the inscription of the year 135 has the lower part of its left vertical line curved to the left, but in the inscription of the year 114 it is not so. The form of Sa is ordinarily found in Kusāna inscriptions, but very rarely met with in those of the Gupta period.

Again the date of the inscription of the year 230, if referred to the Gupta era, becomes 230 + 319 = 549, which is quite inadmissible. A glance at Dr. Fleet's facsimile will bear out this statement. The other arguments of Mr. Smith in favour of the Gupta era are not of so much importance. The language of the two inscriptions is Sanskrit and in both of them the formula Sarvasatvān ācāśittra jānitrīpate or jānitrīpate has been used. This formula has been chiefly found in the inscriptions of the 5th and 6th centuries of the Christian era. But inscriptions of the 3rd and 4th centuries are scarce and so it cannot be said that the formula was not in common use during that period. As to the language, with the rise of Mahāyāna Sanskrit became the canonical language of the sect, and so it is not at all surprising to find some Buddhist inscriptions after Kaniṣṭha in that language. Hence, it is evident that these two dates cannot be referred to the Gupta era. As the characters betray a marked affinity to those of the Kusāna inscriptions, the dates of these two inscriptions can be definitely referred to the same era as that of the inscriptions of the kings Kaniṣṭha, Huviṣṭha, and Vyāddeva. The numerical symbols, Mr. Smith says, are those of the Gupta period. The only remarkable symbol is that for 200, and Dr. Bühlcr's 14 tables show that the symbols used in those two inscriptions show transition forms between the Maurya and Gupta symbols for the same number.

13 E. I., Vol. II., No. XXXIX., p. 210, and plate. 14 Indische Palaeographie, Tafel IX, column II and XI.
Mr. Smith mentions five Khareqthi inscriptions with dates above one hundred. They are—

(1) The Takht-i-Bahai inscription of Gondophernes or Guduphara, the year 103. 18
(2) Dr. Waddell's Kaldara inscription, the year 113. 19
(3) The Panjtar inscription, the year 122. 20
(4) Mr. Caddy's Luriyan Tangai inscription, the year 318. 21
(5) The Hashtmagar pedestal inscription, the year 384. 22

Mr. Smith speaks of another inscription of the year 113 from Kaladar Nadi, which mentions a Kušana king, but I have failed to find it. Probably it is still in site. Mr. Smith does not mention it in his list of dated inscriptions. The last two inscriptions of the five above should be omitted as Dr. Vogel has proved that they refer to an era the initial year of which must be in the 4th century before the Christian era.

Mr. Smith refers these dates to the Vikrama era. The first inscription will be dealt later on. The date of the second inscription, if referred to the Vikrama era, becomes 113 + 56 A. D., which is too early. Dr. Bühler, in editing this inscription, made the following remarks:

"The letters which vary between 1 and 2 inches in height and have been cut deeply and boldly show the type of the Saka period which is known from the Taxila copper-plate of Patika and the inscription of his contemporary Sudasa or Sudasa on the Mathura Lion Capital." In his Indische Palaeographie Dr. Bühler divides the Khareqthi documents into four chief varieties—

(1) The archaic one of the fourth or third centuries B. C. found in the Asoka edicts.
(2) The variety of the second and first centuries B. C. on the coins of Indo-Greek kings.
(3) The variety of the Saka period, first century B. C. to first century A. D., found on—
   (a) The Taxila copper-plate of Patika.
   (b) The Mathura Lion Capital inscription.
   (c) The Kaldara inscription.

(4) The strongly cursive script of the first and second centuries A. D. which begins with the Takht-i-Bahai inscription of Gondophrēs and is fully developed in the inscriptions of the later Kušana kings Kuśiṣka and Huvishka as found on—

   (1) The Zeda inscription, the year 11.
   (2) The Manikyala inscription, the year 18.
   (3) The Suś Vihar copper-plate, the year 11.
   (4) The Wardak vase, the year 51. 23

---

20 Cunningham, A. S. E., Vol. V., p. 61, and pl. XVI., fig. 4.
Only one inscription, the Sū£ Vihār copper-plate of the fourth variety, has been completely interpreted and this fact has led Dr. Bühler to adopt its letters as the characters representing the fourth variety. But this is questionable. The inscriptions of this last variety have been found on two classes of materials — (1) stone and (2) metal, and it is evident to the most casual observer that the inscriptions on stone are clearly cut and archaic in form, but those on metal are strongly cursive in form. Thus the Zeda and Sū£ Vihār inscriptions both mention the name of Kani£ka and are dated in the year 11, but the characters of the Zeda inscription are much earlier in form. Unfortunately the Zeda inscription is too far gone to allow of complete interpretation. But there is the Manikyala inscription which is neatly incised and the form of the characters of which are not cursive and may be taken to represent the fourth variety. The characters of this inscription are quite different from those of the Sū£ Vihār, Wardak, and Bimaran inscriptions. There is another objection against the Sū£ Vihār inscription being taken as the prototype of the fourth variety, which is, that the inscription has been very carelessly incised. If the characters of the Manikyala inscriptions are taken as the representatives of the fourth variety, one important fact follows. Most of the differences between the Saka and Kusana varieties of Kharoṣṭhī, as pointed out by Dr. Bühler disappear. But it is certain that the Taxila copper-plate and the Mathura Lion Capital inscriptions belong to an earlier period. Now, if the Kaldara inscription is compared with the Manikyala inscription, it becomes evident that the characters of the former inscription are much later than those of the latter. The ka of Kaldara in Pakara£ and Karatha is certainly later than that of Manikyala in Kani£ka; at the same time the affinity between the characters of the two inscriptions is clearly marked. The dental sa is not of the Saka period, but of the Kusana period. So it becomes clear that this inscription also must be referred to the same era as the other Brāhmī and Kharoṣṭhī Kusana inscriptions, since it belongs to the same period, and other eras, such as the Vikrama and the Seleukidian, are not applicable to it.

Similarly, the date in the Panjšār inscription is to be referred to the same era as the other dated Kusana records. Compare ka in l. 2 and da in l. 1 and the dental sa throughout. It is certain that this inscription is much later than the Manikyala inscription. There are several other Kharoṣṭhī inscriptions with dates above hundred which have been omitted by Mr. Smith, such as the Mount Bauj inscriptions of the year 102 and the Skara£deri image inscription of the year 179 and the Dewai inscription of the year 200. To these I have added a fourth from the Lahore Museum, which is dated in the year 111 and is edited probably for the first time at the end of this paper.

Bhājākar and Bühler were quite right in bringing the Kharoṣṭhī inscriptions with dates exceeding hundred in a line with those dated from 3 to 99. Mr. Smith, in attempting to bring the Mathura inscription of the year 299 in a line with those of the years from 3 to 99, has said that exceptionally the thousands of a Laukika date may be omitted, but the hundreds expressed. But instances of this have never been met with, and, as will be seen later on, the inscription of the year 299 does not belong to the Kusān group of inscriptions at all. In Laukika date only the tens and units should be mentioned. The mention of the hundreds or thousands clearly proves that the date is not a Laukika one. Now, if all the Kusān dates from 3 to 99 are to be referred to the same era, then the cognate dated inscriptions, with dates above hundred, should be in a line with the earlier inscriptions and refer to the same era. So it is clear that the dates in the Kusān inscriptions do not refer to the Laukika era.

---

22 I publish a facsimile of the Kaldara inscription, as I found M. Senart's facsimile to be very indistinct and too difficult to work with. The inscription is now in the Lahore Museum (No. 1, p. 77).
24 Senart, J. A., 9th série, tom. IV, p. 510, No. 35, pl. V.
26 Senart, J. A., 9th série, tom. XVII, p. 510, No. 34, pl. V.
The earliest Laskika date is that of the Baijuth Prāṣasti, year 80 and Saka 1126, i.e., 1204-5. The mere mention in astronomical works of the imaginary motion of the seven Rṣis (the Great Bear) does not prove that the era was in use at that time. There is no proof that the Saptarṣī era or Loka Kāla was in use before the Gupta period. Alberuni's statements do not in any way interfere with the above statement.

Mr. Smith then proceeds to deal with the notices of Chinese historians enumerated above and tries to adapt their statements to his theory. After the final defeat of the Yue-chi in 165 B.C. they migrated to the west and on their way met the Wu-Sun. In the fight which followed the Wu-Sun were worsted. This may have taken place in B.C. 163. The Yue-chi, though they defeated the Wu-Sun, were not able to appropriate their lands and passed on westwards. They next came into conflict with the Se or the Sok, who were also defeated, and, abandoning their lands, migrated southwards. This probably took place about the year 160 B.C., but the Yue-chi were not allowed to remain in peaceful possession of the conquered lands. The son of slain Wu-Sun chieftain, who had grown to manhood under the protection of the Hsiung-Nu, attacked them to avenge the death of his father and drove them further west. Mr. Smith places this event in B.C. 140 on the ground that at least twenty years are necessary for an infant to grow into manhood. This is not admissible. The age of an infant may be anything from a month to eight or ten years. Assuming that at the time of his father's death, Kwen-Mo was four or five years of age we find that an interval of ten or twelve years is quite sufficient to allow him of fighting age, for, in the north, they begin to fight early. Babar ascended the throne when he was in his teens and Akbar fought the second battle of Panipat long before he was twenty. It is quite possible that Kwen-Mo drove the Yue-chi out of the lands of the Sok in or about the year 150 B.C. The Yue-chi then migrated towards Tāhia. According to Mr. Smith, the Yue-chi arrived in Tāhia in the year 158 B.C., but, as we have seen, the year 148 B.C. would be somewhere nearer the mark. Mr. Smith for some unknown reason maintains that the Yue-chi remained to the north of the Oxus up to the year 115 B.C. Chang-Kian died in the year 115 B.C., and the messengers he sent to other countries are said to have returned at the same time. This seems to be the only reason in favour of Mr. Smith's statement. Chang-Kian returned to China in the year 122 B.C., and up to that time only authentic information about the position of the Yue-chi was available. Mr. Smith and M. Boyer distinguish two stages in the conquest of Tāhia or Bactria by the Yue-chi. The first is that the Yue-chi occupied the ancient Persian province of Sogdiana to the north of the Oxus, while they exercised supreme influence over the weak rulers of Bactrian cities, and the next is that they crossed the river and destroyed the remains of Greek sovereignty in that province. But is it all necessary to do this? A nomad people driven forward by an enemy would not pause at a distance to exercise overlordship over a weak people, but would, on the other hand, try to place themselves at a greater distance from their enemies without the slightest regard for the people whom they supplanted and destroyed. The Chinese description of the state of Bactria fully supports this, for we find that the people of Tāhia had no unity and were peace-loving. Moreover, the Greek kingdom was, at this time, convulsed by an internal struggle, probably led by the brothers, Heliokles and Apollodotus, after the demise of their father, Euxratidas. Chinese annals sufficiently prove that the Bactrian Greeks were unable to offer any resistance to the nomad hordes.

Mr. Smith places the deposition of Heliokles in 130 B.C. which is possible. The next mention of Yue-chi is in Paku's annals of the first Han dynasty. It is related there that the Yue-chi had lost their nomad habits and had divided themselves into five groups or principalities. Mr. Smith assumes that three generations must have elapsed before the Yue-chi lost their nomadic habits, but parallel cases are not rare in history, and actual experience has found that the time required by a nomadic people for the losing of their roving habits need not be so long. In fact, one generation of twenty-five or thirty years is quite sufficient for this purpose, and it is quite possible that the Yue-chi had lost their nomad habits and divided themselves into five kingdoms by the year 100 B.C. Mughals, who had fought under Bairam Khan at Panipat in 1556, were peacefully settled in Bengal and Behar.
by the year 1598 A.D. The next mention of the Yue-chi in the Chinese history is in the annals of the second Hun dynasty. There it is related that a hundred years after the division of the Yue-chi into five groups, Kiu-ts’iu-kio, king of the Koei-chang which was one of the five principalities, attacked and subdued the other four divisions. This Kiu-ts’iu-kio has been identified with the Kozouko-Kadphises or Kuzulo-Kara-Kadphises of the coins which seems to be certain. Mr. Smith, following his own line of argument, places the accession of Kadphises I in 45 A.D. But even if the Chinese text is taken to mean more than one hundred years by the phrase “about a hundred years,” the accession of Kadphises I may be placed in 10 or 15 A.D. The fact, that the bust on some copper coins of Kadphises I resembles those on the coins of Caius and Lucius, grandsons of Augustus, who died in B.C. 4 and A.D. 2, respectively, in no way interferes with the truth of the above statement. In order to adapt his Laukika theory to the statements of the Chinese historians, Mr. Smith was obliged to add these extra 45 years to the true date, since it is impossible to place the accession of Kaniška in the earlier years of the first century A.D. Mr. Smith was therefore obliged to place him in the earlier portion of the second century. If we assume that Kadphises I reigned for forty years, then the accession of his successor, Yen-Kao-Ching, falls in the year 55 A.D. This prince has been identified with the Ooemo Kadphises or Hima Kadphises of the coins. If a reign of thirty-five years is allowed to Hima Kadphises, then the accession of Kaniška falls in or about 80 A.D. Years ago Prof. Oldenberg put forth the statement that Kaniška founded the Saka era, and this theory has been generally accepted by the majority of Oriental scholars. But recently serious objections have been raised against it, and some scholars now regard it as an exploded theory. The principal objections against the theory that Kaniška founded the Saka era were raised by General Cunningham and Mr. D. R. Bhändärkar.

This brings us to the second theory of the first group. Mr. Bhändärkar’s theory that the dates of the Kuṣana inscriptions should be referred to the Saka era with two hundred omitted is based on a Jaina inscription discovered by Dr. Führer in the Kankali-tīlā at Mathura in the year 1895-96. This inscription should be fully dealt with before we proceed to examine the theory based on it.

Mathura inscription of the year 299; Plate III (see opposite page 66).

The inscription was discovered during Dr. Führer’s last excavations at Mathura during the working season of the year 1895-96. It is mentioned in his Progress Report for that year. It is also mentioned in the Report of the Lucknow Provincial Museum, where it was deposited along with the other finds of the excavations. It is further mentioned in Mr. V. A. Smith’s Jaina Stūpas of Mathura and other Antiquities, in which the author professes his ignorance as to the present locality of the inscription. It was published by Dr. Bühler in a short note in the Vienna Oriental Journal, Vol. X, p. 171. After the publication of his paper on the Kuṣana or Indo-Scythian periods of Indian History, Mr. V. A. Smith tried to obtain facsimiles of all dated Kuṣana inscriptions, and for this purpose Mr. Smith carried on a lengthy correspondence with Mr. Gaṅgādhara Gaṅguly, the Curator of Lucknow Provincial Museum. But Mr. Smith could not obtain a copy of this inscription of the year 299. During a recent visit to the Lucknow Museum I found it lying close to the Mathura inscriptions of the year 32. Dr. Bühler published it very hastily without any facsimile. He read it as follows:

(1) Nama Suvarṇāśīlānā Arakāntanā Mahāvīrasya Rājatīrījasya svavarṇa-śocaro-vate d(6)

(2) 200, 90, 9 (?) hehanti Māte 2 dice 1 arahāto Mahāvīrasya prātim(7).

(3) . . . . sya Ohārikāye eitu Uṣhārikāye ca Ohākeśye svāvākāhoṇaṁ(8)

(4) . . . . śukrasya Susvidināya ca eteḥ arahāyaṭānte Stūpaṭā(9) . . .

(5) . . . . dveskuṇaṁ ca.

Dr. Bühler then corrected Namas Sarva for Nama Scarva, Samvancharasate for Sarvascharasate, Dhitu for Viit, Srivikā for Sāvikā and etai for eteh.

I now edit the inscription from the actual stone —

(1) Nama Sarva Śiddhanām Arahātanaṁ māhārājasya rājatirajasya samvanchara — sate (du)

(2) 206, 90, 9 Hamata māsa 2 divasa 1 Ārūcāto Mahāvāsya pratiṁ(a).
(3) . . . sya Okhārikāye Viit Ujhatikāye ca Okhāye Sāvikā-bhaginīy(e).
(4) . . . Sirikāsyā Svādināsya ca ete Ārāhāyatāne sthāpit(e).
(5) . . . devakulaṁ ca.

The only corrections that are needed are Namas Sarva for Nama Sarva, Homanta for Hamata, and etaiḥ for eteiḥ.

Notes.

(1) In the first line the Anusvara is clear and distinct after the final na in Sarva-Śiddhanām and also after the final na in Arahātanaṁ.

(2) The third word is māhārājasya instead of māhārājasya.

(3) The dental sa appears in three distinct forms in this inscription —

(e) The sa in sarva in the first line. (Here the letter looks like the Samyuktakṣara sva, the subscript sa being triangular in form.)

(f) The sa in samvancharasate and again in śāvika. (Here also it looks like the compound letter sva, the subscript sa being spherical in form.)

In these two cases it is natural to read sa as sva, but a little consideration shows that such forms would be meaningless. Dr. J. Ph. Vogel suggests that these may be abnormal forms of the letter, due to the caprice of the mason. The ta in Arahātanaṁ must also similarly be regarded as abnormal.

(e) The normal sa in māsa and divasa.

(4) The third numerical symbol is certainly 9. It resembles the symbol for no other numeral. To some extent it resembles the symbol for 9 in the Mathura inscription of the year 10.52

The only difference between this symbol and others for the same number is that in this the curve is to the right, whereas in the others the curve is to the left.53 This may be the earlier symbol for 9.

(5) In the fourth line the fourth word is ete instead of eteh, as the two short horizontal strokes which appear after it are probably interpunctuation marks. The inscription at this point descends from a higher to a lower level. Two similar horizontal strokes appear in the second line after the symbol for 9, and these would, if taken otherwise, be inexplicable.

Dr. Bühler has remarked that the type of the characters of this inscription fully agrees with that of the numerous votive inscriptions from Mathurā, and it preserves, in the broad-backed is with the slanting central stroke and in the tripartite subscript ya, two archaic forms which, during this period,

occur only occasionally for the later ṣa with the horizontal cross-bar and the tripartite ṣu. The following table shows the archaic forms to be found in Kuśana inscriptions discovered up to date:

**List of Brāhmī Kuśana inscriptions showing archaic forms occurring in them.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Religious Sect</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>J. A. S. B., 1898, p. 274, and E. I., Vol. VIII, p. 179.</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>A. S. R., Vol. III, p. 31, No. 3</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>E. I., Vol. I, p. 331, No. 19</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>E. I., Vol. I, p. 332, No. 2</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>E. I., Vol. I, p. 333, No. 3</td>
<td>Jaina</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>E. I., Vol. I, p. 333, No. 4</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>E. I., Vol. I, p. 395, No. 25</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>E. I., Vol. I, p. 391, No. 20</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>E. I., Vol. I, p. 385, No. 6</td>
<td>Jaina</td>
<td>Archaic ṣa occurs once. ṣa with horizontal cross-bar is also used. Ya bipartite.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

List of Brāhma Kuśana inscriptions showing archaic forms occurring in them—(contd.).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Religious Sect.</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
List of Brāhmi Kuşana inscriptions showing archaic forms occurring in them — (contd.).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Religious Sect.</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>A. S. R. Vol. III, p. 32, No. 8; I. A. Vol. XXXIII, p. 106, No. 20.</td>
<td>Doubtful</td>
<td>Archaic ( \hat{a} ), but subscript ( \hat{a} ) bipartite.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>E. I., Vol. II, p. 212, No. 42</td>
<td>Buddhist</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>E. I., Vol. II, p. 204, No. 20</td>
<td>Jaina</td>
<td>Archaic ( \hat{a} ), but subscript ( \hat{a} ) bipartite.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>E. I., Vol. II, p. 204, No. 21</td>
<td>Doubtful</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>A. S. R., Vol. III, p. 34, No. 16</td>
<td>Jaina</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>A. S. R., Vol. III, p. 34, No. 17</td>
<td>Buddhist</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>A. S. R., Vol. III, p. 35, No. 18</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>E. I., Vol. I, p. 388, No. 13</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>E. I., Vol. II, p. 205, No. 23</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>A. S. R., Vol. III, p. 35, No. 19</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>E. I., Vol. I, p. 387, No. 11</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>E. I., Vol. I, p. 389, No. 14</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>E. I., Vol. I, p. 389, No. 15</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>E. I., Vol. I, p. 389, No. 16</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>E. I., Vol. I, p. 392, No. 23</td>
<td>Jaina</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>E. I., Vol. I, p. 392, No. 25</td>
<td>Doubtful</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>E. I., Vol. I, p. 393, No. 26</td>
<td>Jaina</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>E. I., Vol. I, p. 398, No. 27</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>E. I., Vol. I, p. 397, No. 34</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
<td>No archaic forms.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
List of Brāhma Kuśana inscriptions showing archaic forms occurring in them—(concl.).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Religious Sect</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>E.I., Vol. II, p. 206, No. 27</td>
<td>Jaina</td>
<td>Archaic sa, but bipartite subscript ya.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>E.I., Vol. II, p. 206, No. 28</td>
<td></td>
<td>No archaic forms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>E.I., Vol. II, p. 207, No. 29</td>
<td></td>
<td>Archaic Class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>E.I., Vol. II, p. 207, No. 30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>E.I., Vol. II, p. 207, No. 31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>E.I., Vol. II, p. 207, No. 32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>E.I., Vol. II, p. 208, No. 33</td>
<td></td>
<td>No archaic forms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>E.I., Vol. II, p. 208, No. 34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>E.I., Vol. II, p. 208, No. 35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>E.I., Vol. II, p. 209, No. 37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I have been obliged to omit the following inscriptions from Mr. Smith's list of dated inscription for reasons stated against them:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Führer's Progress Report, 1891-92</td>
<td>These inscriptions have not been as yet properly edited. In a few cases only mere mention of the years have been made. According to Dr. Führer they are at present at the Lucknow Museum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>The first three inscriptions were discovered at Rannagar (Achchatra) in the Bareilly District. The last two came from Mathura.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>1895-96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The inscription of the year 45, which has been published by Mr. D. R. Bhāndārkar in the Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, Vol. XX., has also been omitted from the above list for the want of a facsimile. The inscription of the year 5736 has been referred by Dr. Bühler to the Gupta era 'on perfectly secure palaeographic ground; but in his list Mr. Smith remarks, “Bühler, I think, is mistaken in referring this inscription to the Gupta era” for reasons which are not obvious. The characters of the inscription resemble those of the inscriptions of the year 114 of the reign of Kumāra Gupta rather than any of the Kuśana inscriptions. I have examined the inscription very carefully in the Mathura Municipal Museum, and I am convinced that Bühler was perfectly right. The mere fact that an inscription contains a season date is not sufficient to refer it to any particular era. The inscription of the year 114 is a compromise between season dates and lunar month dates, because it mentions both the season Hemanta and the lunar month Kṛṣṭīkā. I believe that Mr. Smith is also wrong in referring the Bodh Gayā image inscription of the year 64 to the same era as has been used in the Kuśana inscriptions. The only

cause of this seems to be that "the impression of a coin or medal of Huvūka was found under the throne." The throne referred to here is a square slab of red sandstone, along the four sides of which there is an inscription. The connection between the throne and the statue, on the base of which the above inscription occurs, is that both of them are of the same variety of sandstone, and that there is a certain similarity between the characters of the two inscriptions. General Cunningham has published a photograph of this inscription and it will be seen below that the resemblance between the characters is not very marked.

The characters of the inscriptions of the year 64 resemble those of the early Gupta period as found on the Allahabad Prāśasti of Samudra Gupta. The ā in the first line in Mahārajaśa and in the second line Sīhāraša, also in Arthadharmaśāsāya in the third line and the ā in the first line in Tukamalāya, are peculiar forms of these letters which are to be found, so far as I know, only on the Allahabad Prāśasti of Harisena. Dr. Bühlner was of opinion that the year 64 found in this inscription should be referred to the Gupta era. Dr. Bloch thinks that the inscription is of the fourth century A. D. Recently Dr. Lüders of Rostock has opposed this view, but the above examination should clear all doubts about it. The reason for referring this date to the Gupta era is not only the looped ā as Dr. Lüders observes, but the paleography of the whole inscription. If the date is referred to the Gupta era it becomes equivalent to 64 + 318/9 = 382 3/8 A. D., which is quite satisfactory.

The list given above shows that among the inscriptions of the Kusāṇa period there is not a single instance where the tripartite ā occurs throughout the inscription, except in the two Sārnath inscriptions (Nos. 1 and 28 of the above list). Whenever the subscript ā occurs the tripartite form occurs along with it. But in the inscription of the year 299, in all cases of subscript ā, the ā is fully expressed, i.e., it is tripartite. The palatal ā is expressed throughout in its archaic form, but in the above list, with the exception of the Sārnath inscriptions, it will be seen that there is not a single inscription in which all cases the ā is archaic and the subscript ā tripartite. In most cases the archaic ā occurs along with the bipartite form of the subscript ā. In the two Sārnath inscriptions, the palatal ā is absent in the first inscription, but it occurs in a more archaic form in the second one (No. 28 of the list). This is the wedge-shaped form of this letter which occurs in the Kālai and Siddāpur edicts of Asoka and the cave inscription at Rāmagarh Hill in the Sirpur State. In both inscriptions the subscript ā has always been fully expressed. The only later forms to be found in this inscription is the letter na. In the first line the base line of the na in Nāma is slightly curved, as in the earliest inscription from Mathura. In other cases the base line of the Na is certainly a curve, the most pronounced being that of the na in Ayatūnā in the fourth line. But as Mr. Bhāndārkar observes, this form of the na is to be found in the inscriptions of Sōjānā. Compare the na in Brāhmaṇena and again in Vṛṣenā.

---

88 Cunningham's Mahābodhi, p. 20, pl. x, No. II.
89 Cf. Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum, Vol. III., pl. I.
92 Bühlner's Indische Palaeographie, Tafel II, p. 37, III., and XI.
97 A. S. B., Vol. XX, p. 49, pl. v., No. 4. I do not know where this inscription is at present. The above inscription is, I believe, in the Lucknow Museum. I have written in the Lucknow Museum and have been informed that this inscription cannot be traced out.
If we compare the \( \text{ya} \) of this inscription (year 299) with those in the Sārnath inscriptions we find that the \( \text{ya} \) in the Mathura inscription is much older and quite different from those of the Sārnath inscription. The \( \text{ya} \) in the Mathura inscription resembles those of the inscriptions of Sodasa and of the earlier inscriptions from Mathura, some of which have been included in the above list and marked as archaic, although they certainly do not belong to the Kuśana period. The main difference between the forms of \( \text{ya} \) of these inscriptions is that in the Sārnath inscriptions the \( \text{ya} \) has a loop to the left which is a characteristic of the Kuśana period while the right limb is angular, but in the Mathura inscription neither the left limb is looped nor the right one is angular. This form of \( \text{ya} \) is not to be found in any of the inscriptions of the Kuśana period. This detailed examination clearly proves that the inscription from Mathura of the year 299 does not belong to the Kuśana period. And likewise its date cannot be referred to the same era in which the Kuśana inscriptions are dated. Then the question arises as to which era the date in the inscription is to be referred. The inscription was incised in the reign of a king who bore the titles Mahāraja and Rājātirāja in the year 299 of an unknown era. Dr. Bühler says that though nine kings of the Scythic period are known to have borne these two titles, viz., Azes, Azilises, Gondophernes, Pakores, Kadphises I and II, Kaniśka, Huviśka, and Vāsudeva, only the last three can be here intended, because, as far as is known at present, none of the first six ruled over Mathura. But the above examination shows that the year 299 cannot belong to the periods of Kaniśka, Huviśka, and Vāsudeva. There may be three causes which led to the omission of the name of this Mahāraja Rājātirāja—

1. That the title belongs to the founder of the era used in the inscription whose name was forgotten at the time of the incision of the record. This is extremely improbable, as the genitive case ending cannot be interpreted in a similar way in other instances.

2. That the titles are those of the reigning prince of the time whose name was too well-known to require mention.

3. That the name has been omitted through the carelessness of the mason.

The last cause is probably the best one as there are many signs of the mason’s carelessness on the stone. The principal sign of this is that the right half of the inscription is on a lower level than the left half. Evidently the mason has not taken the trouble of reducing all portions of the face of the pedestal to the same plane. Thus the \( \text{ya} \) in Mahārajaśya in the first line, the numerical symbol for 1 in the second line, the \( \text{ye} \) in Ujhatāśye in the third line and the \( \text{te} \) in ete in the fourth line, are more than inch higher than \( \text{rū} \) in Rājātirājasya, the \( \text{A} \) in Arāhato, the \( \text{ca} \) and the \( \text{a} \) in Arhatirajatāne in the first, second, third, and fourth line, respectively.

Whatever may be the cause of the omission of the prince’s name, it is certain that the date 299 must be referred to an era, the initial point of which lies in the third or fourth centuries before the Christian era. Only two such eras are known to have been in actual use in India. The first is the Maurya era which probably was counted from the coronation of Candragupta in or about B.C. 321. This era has been found only in one inscription up to date, viz., the Udayagiri inscription of Khāravela. The other is the era founded by Seleukos Nikator in B.C. 312. Three instances of the use of the Seleucidan era have been brought to notice up to date, viz.—

1. On the coin of the Bactrian king Plato, the year 147.
2. On the Hashtnagar pedestal inscription, the year 384.
3. On the Lorijarī Tāṅgā image inscription, the year 318.

---

50 Cf. the remarks of Bühler in his Indian Paleography, I. A., Vol. XXXIII, Appendix, p. 41, and Tafel III (31, III, IV, and V).
52 The arguments of Dr. Vogel leave no doubt as to the early date of these two inscriptions. I think Dr. Vogel is quite right in referring these two dates to an era, the initial year of which lies either in the 3rd or 4th century B.C. But they may also be referred to the Maurya era.
If referred to the Maurya era, the year 299 is equivalent to 321—299—22 B. C., and it referred to the Seleukid era it becomes equal to 312—299—13 B. C. This detailed examination proves that the date in this inscription cannot be referred to the era used in the Kusāna inscriptions and so it may be said with certainty that any conclusions as to the chronology of the Kusāna period based on this inscription cannot be regarded as valid.

Mr. D. R. Bhāṇḍārkar begins his paper with arguments against the theory of Messrs. Ferguson and Oldenberg that Kaniśka founded the Saka era and that the dates in the Kusāna inscriptions should be referred to that era. Ferguson stated 23 that—

(1) Coins of the Roman consulary period (43 B. C.) are found in conjunction with those of Kaniśka in the Mānīkyāla tope. This certainly proves nothing beyond the fact that the Stūpa was built after 43 B. C., not even that Kaniśka is to be placed after 43 B. C.

(2) In the Ahiroptha Stūpa near Jallalabad, coins of Kadphises, Kaniśka and Huvīṣka were obtained together with the Roman coins of Domitian, Trajan, and the Empress Sabina, wife of Hadrian. This again only proves that the Stūpa was built after 120 A. D. and nothing else, not even what Mr. Bhāṇḍārkar holds,—that Huvīṣka reigned after 120 A. D.

Prof. Oldenberg 24 reads the Greek legend on a coin of the Scythian prince Hians or Mians as containing the combined name Saka Kusāna. This he held, proved that the Sakas and Kusānas were not different people and Kaniśka therefore was a Saka. But objections were raised against this reading and it was finally proved that the word in the coin legend was not Saka.

Mr. Bhāṇḍārkar then proceeds to prove that Kaniśka was not a Saka and so it cannot be held that he was the originator of the Saka era. His arguments against the Saka origin of Kaniśka are as follows:

(1) The Rajatāraṇī (I, 170) speaks of Kaniśka as sprung from a Turuṣka race.

(2) Alberuni (Sachau, II, 11) tells us a legend which makes Kaniśka the descendant of the Türk family called Shāhiya whom he describes as wearing Turkish dress, viz., a short tunic, open in front, a high hat, boots, and arms. Mr. Bhāṇḍārkar finds a confirmation of the above two statements on the coins of Kadphises and Kaniśka in which the king's effigy is somewhat similarly dressed.

The distinction between a Saka and a Kusāna was made for the first time by Cunningham. 25 Mr. Bhāṇḍārkar has since added to this distinction. It may be that the Se or Sok were of a quite different race than the Kusānas who were a portion of Yueh-chi. But this statement cannot be put forth as an argument against the use of the Saka era in Kusāna inscriptions. Scholars up to date have taken the Saka conquerors of India to belong to the tribe who were dispossessed of their pasture lands by the Yueh-chi about 160 B. C., and this assumption has led to the present chaotic state of the Scythian period of Indian history. The word Saka as used in India is a generic term and not specific as it has been taken to be by Mr. Bhāṇḍārkar, and the European scholars. Herodotos has recorded that the Persians used the word Saka to denote all Σακαί. 26 Recently much light has been thrown on this distinction through the researches of Mr. F. W. Thomas. 27 "The statement of Herodotos that the Persians gave the name Saka to all Scythians seems to be confirmed by the usage of Darius who applies it both to European Scythians (Sakā Turādbayū, the Sakas beyond the sea) and to his eastern subjects, the Sakā Tīγaκhada (Sakas with pointed caps) and Sakā Haumāvarū. 28 Mr. Thomas adds two other valuable statements to this, viz., "No one any longer doubts that the Scythians of Europe and Asia were merely the outer uncivilised belt of the Iranian family," and "the feature by which the Greeks, and no doubt the Persians also, distinguished tribes as

Seythian or Saka was their manner of living as Nomads, and this may have been peculiarity in virtue of which Darins applies the name Saka, if we have rendered, he did so, to the neighbour of the Makas.\(^{59}\)

The Sanskrit language no doubt has taken the word Saka from its neighbour the Persians. But in its denotation has increased and so we find in the Mahābhārata that Sakadeipa was twice the size of Jambudvipa.\(^{60}\) In fact, the Sanskrit word Saka means all nations to the west of India, including even the Pārāsikas or Persians, as we find in the verses cited above that the four castes existed there also and that the Brāhmans are called Magas (i. e., the Magi). Another work confirms this statement—

"Jamvudvipāt param yasma Chākadvipam iti amṛtaṁ.\(^{61}\)

Again, the Kuṣānas were a branch of the Yue-chi and the word Kuṣana was the name of a particular family or clan and not of a race. The adjective Guṇaavasasāwardhaka applied to Kanishka in the Mānikiya inscription leaves no doubt as to this. The Chinese annalists also state that the Kuṣānas (Koel-Chouang) were one of the five tribes into which the Yue-chi had divided themselves. No distinction can be drawn between a genus and a species: a clan or a family and a race. To the main body of the Indian people the Kuṣana Kanishka, the Parthian Gondophernes, and the Sogdian were Saka princes coming from beyond the limits of civilisation. Again, the inscriptions of the Kuṣana period occur both in Brāhmī and Kharoṣṭhī, but the name Kuṣana or Guṇana occurs only on Kharoṣṭhī records, such as the Mānikiya stūpa inscription, the Panjšar inscription, and, according to Mr. Vincent Smith, the newly discovered inscription from Kaladarānā. Up to this day no Brāhmī record has been discovered in which Kanishka, Huviṣka, and Vasudeva has been styled a Kuṣana. The most obvious explanation is that Indians knew very little about the particular family to which the king belonged. The conqueror came from the Sakadas and so was a Saka. They cared very little whether he was a Parthian, Sogdian or Kushan. Indeed, there was very little temptation at that time to go about searching for the antecedents of a foreign conqueror who lived in their midst and had abjured the religion, the manners, customs, and probably even the language of his ancestors and adopted those of their own. No reliable conclusion can be drawn from Alberuni’s description of Shāhiya kings and from the portraits of the Kuṣānas on their coins. The first mention of the Turuṣka in Sanskrit literature is to be found in the Kathaśārist-sūgara and the Rājatarāṅgini. Nor should we expect early references to a people who first acquired importance (and perhaps a common designation) not earlier than the 6th century A. D.\(^{62}\) Indeed, so much reliance cannot be placed on the Kāśmirian chronicle regarding matters relating to the earlier centuries of the Christian era. Too much reliance has been placed on a story which Alberuni himself styles a “legend.” As Mr. Thomas says, "we must put aside the Kāśmirian belief that Kanishka and Kuṣaṇa and Juṣka were Turuṣkakas, as this is precluded by their dates."

(3) Mr. Bhāpanēkar’s third argument is that “In the Allahabad inscription of Samudra Gupta, among the foreign powers with whom that prince entered into alliance, are the Daśaputra śēhī-sāhān-śēhī-saka-mūruga. There is some difference of opinion with respect to the first three words of this compound. Cunningham takes them all as a single compound title referring to a Kuṣana king. Dr. Fleet and Mr. Smith take them separately, each designating a different king. But whatever may be the explanation of the first three components of this compound, it remains incontrovertible that the Sakas are distinguished from the Devaputra kings of whom Kanishka was one. The only proper view of this compound has been taken by Messrs. Fleet and Smith, who consider that each component of this compound designates a different king. When Samudra Gupta began his career of conquest about the middle of the 4th century A. D. the Great Seythian Empire was no longer under the sway of a single monarch, but was divided in its decline like other oriental empires among a host of minor princelings, each holding different title. If in
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this compound a Devaputra king is distinguished from a Saka king, then a Śahi king is also distinguished from a Saka one. But the Jaina work Kālīśākṣāya-Kathākaṭa states that the kings of the Sakas were called Śahi. Again Kaniska also is called a Śahi in at least one of his inscriptions. So it is evident that no exact discrimination is possible, based on the words of the above compound.

Mr. Bhāndarkar proceeds to prove that the characters of the inscriptions of Sojāsa are later than those of the inscriptions of Nahapāna. This certainly is the case, but the characters of the inscriptions of Nahapāna are earlier than those of the inscriptions of those princes who, at the present moment, are regarded to be his contemporaries. Most of the inscriptions of Nahapāna's reign are the records of the donations of his son-in-law Uṣṇavatī (Ṛṣabhadatta). In one of these inscriptions Uṣṇavatī has been called a Saka. Again, the name of Nahapāna is certainly non-Indian and hence it has been assumed that the dates in his inscriptions, the years 41, 42, 45, and 46 are Saka years. It is held that after the year 46, Nahapāna was defeated and driven out of his dominions by Gotamiputra Sātakarni, an Andhra prince. But in the year 72, which in all probability is a Saka year, we find another prince named Radradama ruling over these territories, who had already been preceded by his father Jayadāma and his grandfather Cātana. So we find that 26 years has been allotted for the overthrow of Nahapāna and the occupation of his territories for a certain period at least by the Andhra princes and then their recovering by Cātana and the completion of his reign and that of his son, Jayadāma, and the accession of his grandson, Radradama. It is evident that this period is too short for such a long list of events. If we consider the statement of Dr. Bühler about the palaeography of Uṣṇavatī's inscriptions that the character of his inscriptions are certainly older than those of the Andhras who are regarded as the contemporaries of his father-in-law, Nahapāna, we are led to the conclusion that Nahapāna reigned at a period which is much earlier than that to which his reign is usually assigned. The mere mention that Gotamiputra Sātakarni extinguished the Khakharata family does not imply that he defeated Nahapāna himself. He might have defeated a weak descendant of that prince. Again, the argument that the absence of inscriptions and coins imply that none of Nahapāna's family succeeded him on his throne is not a conclusive one. The fate of his successors might have been the same as that of the sons of Raajajit Sinha of the Panjab. The omission of Uṣṇavatī's titles in another Andhra inscription does not prove either that much time had not elapsed since his decease or that he was living at that time. It is extremely probable that as Nahapāna is prior to Sojāsa, the dates in his inscriptions refer to the era in which the dates in the inscriptions of the Northern satraps are dated. The arguments adduced by Mr. Bhāndarkar against the theories that Nahapāna or Cātana founded the Saka era are, I think, conclusive. Both of them were satraps or provincial governors, and the Sarnath inscription of Kaniska (No. 1 of the above list) proves that the title Mahākeṣaraṇa does not imply that the holders of it were independent sovereigns. It is impossible to hold that local governors founded or established eras of their own.

The only remaining portions of Mr. Bhāndarkar's paper which require consideration are his arguments against the theory which holds that Kaniska was the founder of a new era. The first of these is that Kaniska is not the first king who established the independence of the Kuṇānas. In reply it may be said that it is not absolutely necessary for the founder of an era to be the establisher of the independence of his dynasty. Harṣavarman did not establish the independence of the Tākṣasar dynasty, yet he was the founder of an era. The next argument is that Kaniska was not a great conqueror who extended the dominions inherited by him. This statement is quite contrary to the statements of other historians. Chinese annalists affirm that Kahiṣka attacked Pataliputra, and Mr. V. A. Smith holds that he was the conqueror of Kāśmira. It is also possible that he
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conquered the provinces between Mathurā and Benares, as the co-existence of the coins of Hima-Kadphises with those of Kaniska is not a conclusive proof of the conquest of the whole tract in which these coins are found by the former. Then again Yuan-Chuang or Huen Thsang has related that Kaniska conquered Kushan, Yarkand, and Khotan. Though it is very hard to rely on this statement, it will be seen later on that fresh discoveries confirm them. In conclusion I may be allowed to state that Kaniska might have founded a new era.

Mr. Bhāndārkar then assumes that the Kuṣāṇa king referred to in the Panjjar inscription is Kozoulo Kadphises. Mr. V. A. Smith has also supported this identification. The terms Mahārāja and Mahārāja are convertible terms in Prakrit, and the fact that a certain king is called Mahārāja on his coins does not prove that he was not a Mahārāja like the modern tributary chieftains of British India. As we have seen, the inscription is much later than the Manikyala inscription of Kaniska, and so it must be admitted that the Mahārāja inscriptions referred to in the former inscription cannot be identified with Kozoulo Kadphises, the predecessor of Kaniska. Mr. Bhāndārkar places three other princes, viz., Kujula-Kara-Kadphises, the nameless king, and Wema-Kadphises before Kaniska, and, with an average allotment of twenty years for each reign, arrives at the year 200 of the Saka era as the date of the accession of Kaniska. But it is well known that Kozoulo-Kadphises, Kujula-Kara-Kadphises, and Kozoulo-Kadphises are variations of one and the same name, and that the coins of the nameless king were issued by the sarapa of Hima-Kadphises. Mr. Bhāndārkar finds a confirmation of his assignation of dates in the Mathurā inscription of the year 299, which he assumes should be referred to the Saka era. On this Mr. Bhāndārkar assumes that the Kuṣāṇa dates should be referred to the Saka era with 200 omitted. This would mean that at this time in the use of the Saka era the hundreds were both omitted and expressed, which is a contradiction in itself, but it has been shown that the Mathurā inscription does not belong to the Kuṣāṇa period, and so further examination of Mr. Bhāndārkar's arguments is unnecessary. It is also futile to refer this inscription to the nine kings mentioned by Bühler simply because we find the title Mahārāja-Rajāṭrāja on their coins. The title is common among princes who aspired to over-lordship.

The third theory of the last group is the outcome of the ripe judgment of Sir Alexander Cunningham who maintains that the Kuṣāṇa dates should be referred to the Seleucid era with four hundreds omitted. The author finds that the coins of some of the Greek princes bear dates and cites two or three instances of this. These dates probably referred to the Seleucid era. But with the exception of the unique tetradrachm of Plato, which bears the date 147, the occurrence of dates on other Greco-Indian coins are less certain. Recently it has been found that two Kharosthi inscriptions contain dates which may, with certainty, be referred to the Seleucid era. The author proceeds to say that the use of Greek month names in Indo-Scythian inscriptions proves that the era used was also Greek, so probably Seleucid. But it is to be observed that all three dates contain the hundreds, and if the Seleucid era had really been used in the Kuṣāṇa inscriptions we would have expected to see the hundreds expressed instead of being omitted, since there is absolutely nothing to prove the omission of the hundred.

The first theory of the second group was first of all put forth by Cunningham but was afterwards abandoned by him. It has since been an eminent advocate in Dr. J. F. Fleet. But Dr. Fleet has not yet published his promised paper on this period of Indian history, and I have been obliged to collect his arguments from among his scattered notes published in the Journals of the Royal Asiatic Society for the past four years. In all of his papers Dr. Fleet maintains that the Malava-Vikrama era is the historic era of Northern India, and that Kaniska was its founder. In support of his view Dr. Fleet quotes one of Dr. Kielhorn's papers on that era, but I must admit that I have
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not been able to find out precisely the passage referred to, where Dr. Kielhorn states it to be the
historic era. On the other hand, Dr. Kielhorn’s conclusions raise unsurpassable objections against
Dr. Fleet’s theory. After a detailed examination the highest authority on the subject of Indian eras
is led to the following conclusions:—

(1) “... Speaking generally down to about A.D. 1300 the use of the (Mālava-Vikrama)
era was confined to that comparatively small portion of India which would be included by straight
lines drawn from the mouth of the Narmada to Gayā, from Gayā to Delhi, from Delhi to the Runn of Cutch and the line of the Coast from the Runn of Cutch down to the mouth of the Narmadā.”
This observation shows that from the earliest time downwards the connection of this era with
Northern India has been very scanty and that it was practically confined to Central and Western
India.

(2) “The era was not established by, nor designedly invented in memory of, a king
Vikramāditya. Had it been founded by a king Vikramāditya in 58 B.C., or had there existed
any tradition to that effect, it would be indeed more than strange that no allusion should ever have
been made to this for more than a thousand years.”

(3) “The Vikrama-kāla of the dates originally was nothing else than the poet’s ‘war-time’
from autumn transferred to the year.”

Dr. Fleet’s view of the origin of the Mālava-Vikrama era is — “The Mālava-Vikrama era was
founded by Kaniska in the sense that the opening years of it were the years of his reign. It
was actually set going as an era by his successor, who, instead of breaking the reckoning, so started, by
introducing another according to his own regnal years, continued that same reckoning. It was
accepted and propagated as an era by the Mālava people ... it thus derived from the
Mālavās its earliest known appellation.”

To arrive at this conclusion two things have been assumed —

(1) That Kaniska founded the Vikrama era, and

(2) That it was adopted and perpetuated by the Mālavās.

But these assumptions are not based on anything which has any resemblance to facts, and as
Mr. V. A. Smith puts it, “such ex-cathedra assertions ... do not carry immediate conviction.”

In his latest paper Dr. Fleet has brought to his aid a new thing, an assertion of Dr. Kielhorn,
that “the wording of the dates of the dated records of Kaniska, Huviska, and Vāsansa is radically opposed to the wording of the Saka dates. On the other hand it is identical with the wording of the dates in the so-called Mālava-Vikrama era.” This statement was made by Dr. Kielhorn in
his paper “The Dates of the Saka Era in Inscriptions.” Dr. Kielhorn states that in the majority
of Saka dates the term “year” is rendered by the word Vare. In the dates of the inscriptions of
Kaniska, Huviska, and Vāsansa the word for year everywhere is Sātavatara, Savatara or Sāta;
and in those of the Sālavālana or Andhrabhṛtya family we have Sāntacakara, Sāntacakara or Sava
throughout. In a footnote it is added that another difference between these dates and those of the
Western Kṣatrapas is this that the former (with the exception of one date which quotes a Macedonian
month) are all season dates, whereas the latter all quote the ordinary lunar-months. In the
inscriptions of the Western Kṣatrapas ... the word for “year” everywhere is Vare, and this circumstance seems to me to connect these dates in unmistakable manner with the dates
which are distinctly referred to the Saka era in which the word Vares decisively predominates.”

17 Ibid, footnote 46.
These two things seem to be in favour of Dr. Fleet's theory that the Kuşana inscriptions are dated in the Vikrama era. But the first observation of Dr. Kielhorn that in the Kuşana inscriptions, the term year is always rendered either by Saka or Sackatasa, can be met with at once. Dr. Kielhorn himself has said on a previous occasion: "But in reality saṅkut and sak may be used of the years of any era, and only in quite modern times are those terms by the Hindus themselves employed to distinguish the Vikrama from Saka years." In fact the words Varga and Sackatasa are synonymous and such differentiation can hardly be exact. Again, there are some Kharoṣṭhi inscriptions in which the term year has been rendered by the word Varga or its Prakrit equivalent, and these are so intimately connected with the Kuşana group of Indian inscriptions through paleographical similarity that it is impossible to assert that the dates in them can be referred to any era other than that used in the Kuşana inscription themselves. These are-

(1) An inscription found in a Huara in Muchai in Yusufzai and referred to in the Report of the exploration by the 10th Sappers, under Captain Maxwell, in 1882. The date is the year 81. This inscription, as far as I know, has not been edited before, so I have edited it at the end of this paper.

(2) The Skarradheri image inscription, the year 179.

(3) The Käl darra inscription of the year 113.

As to Dr. Kielhorn's second observation, that the Kuşana dates, with one exception which mentions a Macedonian month, are all season dates, while the dates of the inscriptions of the Western Kṣatrapas, all quote ordinary lunar months, it must be admitted that all Brāhmi inscriptions belonging to the reigns of Kaniṣka, Huvrīka, and Vāsudeva contain season dates. But the dates in the Kharoṣṭhi inscriptions of these princes contain ordinary solar months—

(1) Zeda ... ... ... Sāṁ 11, 28th day of Asaça (Āṣāḍha).
(2) Manikyala ... ... ... Sāṁ 18, 20th day of Kṛṣṭīka (Kṛṣṭīka).
(3) Arā (edited at the end of this paper) ... Sāṁ 41, 5th day of Poṭhavada (Praṇāṭhaṭpadā).

To this may be added two others which do not contain the names of any princes—

(4) Qhind ... ... ... Sāṁ 61, 8th day of Cetra (Caitra).
(5) Fatch Jang ... ... ... Sāṁ 68, 16th day of Poṭhavada (Praṇāṭhaṭpadā).

The dates, with years above one hundred, should also be taken in a line with these—

(6) Takht-i-Bahāī ... ... Sāṁ 108, 5th day of Vaiśakha (Vaiśākha).
(7) Pājā ... ... ... Sāṁ 111, 15th day of Śravana (Śrāvana).
(8) Kadarrā ... ... ... Sāṁ 113, 20th day of Śravana (Śrāvana).
(9) Panjar ... ... ... Sāṁ 122, 1st day of Śravana (Śrāvana).
(10) Skarradheri ... ... ... Sāṁ 179, 10th day of Asaça (Āṣāḍha).
(11) Dewai ... ... ... Sāṁ 200, 8th day of Vaiśakha (Vaiśākha).

The Brāhmi inscription of the year 135 mentions the month and day as "Puṣyamāse dīvase viṁśe di 20," which seems to be a compromise between solar month dates and season dates. Similarly, also, in the Mathurā Jain image inscription of the reign of Kumāra Gupta I of the year 113 we find that the month and the day has been put in a manner which also seems to be a compromise between solar month dates and season dates, "Vijayarājya saṁ (100, 10) 3 Ka(rṭīka Hema) nta māṇi(sa 3) di(ya) sa 20, asapavrūṣāyam" etc. According to Dr. Kielhorn himself, the solar month is also used in Saka dates. But this use of solar months in Saka dates appears for the first time so late as in the year 944 = 1022 A.D. But the months mentioned above are undoubtedly solar months, and in these we see that beginning with the year 11 up to the year 200 the months used in Kuṣana dates are solar months. With the exception of some of Uṣavadā's inscriptions all Western Kṣatrapa...
dates are Brahmanical records. May it not be that the Buddhists of the earlier centuries of the Christian era used solar months in their reckonings, while the Brāhmaṇas used the lunar month, as their religious ceremonies and festivals are always connected with Tīhūsa and Pākṣa. Dr. Kielhorn holds that in the majority of Saka dates with solar months the Tīhūsa and Pākṣa are also quoted. But this may have been the effect of the long residence of the era in Southern India where “the solar reckoning, notwithstanding the nominal use of solar months, is of little practical importance” (I. A., Vol. XXV, p. 270). It may be that the use of the lunar month dates in Saka era is the result of its long residence in Southern India and that the use of the solar month names is the result of its northern and civil origin. The Saka era is undoubtedly of civil origin and during its earlier portion the omission of lunar months, Pākṣa and Tīhūsa, in it does not seem irregular. In any way it can hardly be maintained now that the wording of the dates of Kaniṣka, Huvirika and Vāsudeva are radically opposed to the wording of the Saka dates.”

Dr. Fleet finds a confirmation of his theory in the Takht-i-Bahāi inscription of Gondophernes which is dated in the year 103 and in the 26th year of the reign of Gondophernes. The coins of Gondophernes indicate, according to Cunningham, that he must be placed “later than those of the dynasties of Vonones and Azes and earlier than those of Kaniṣka.” The Christian legends make Gondophernes a contemporary of the Apostle Thomas. If the date of this inscription is referred to the Mālava-Vikrama era, then only a satisfactory result is obtainable. Because in that case the accession of Gondophernes falls in the year 21 A. D. In the Christian legends the name of Gondophernes is associated with another Indian prince named Mazai or Misesos, and M. Sylvain Levi identifies this prince with the BAZAHO or BAZAHO of the coins and the Vāsudeva of the inscriptions. The earliest inscription of Vāsudeva is dated in the year 74, and so if this date is referred to the Vikrama era it becomes equivalent to 18 A. D., which makes him a contemporary of Gondophernes. This result, according to Dr. Fleet, clearly shows that the dates in the Kuṣana inscriptions must be referred to the Mālava-Vikrama era, because in this case only a satisfactory solution of the problem is brought about by three separate lines of evidence, the palaeographic, the numismatic, and the historic. These three separate lines of evidence tend to prove that the reign of Gondophernes is to be placed in the first half of the first century A. D. Dr. Bühler placed the Takht-i-Bahāi inscription of Gondophernes in the fourth group of his classification of Kurashī records, “which begins with the Takht-i-Bahāi inscription of Gondophernes and is fully developed in the inscriptions of the later Kuṣana kings Kaniṣka and Huvirika.” But we have seen already that Dr. Bühler, throughout his work, has taken the characters of the Śūr-Vihār inscription as representing the characters of the Kuṣana inscriptions, because that inscription is the only one of which a complete and intelligible interpretation has been given. But it has also been shown that the characters of the Śūr-Vihār plate cannot be taken to represent Kurashī characters of the Kuṣana period. If we compare the Takht-i-Bahāi inscription with that of Manikya or that from Zeda, then the following conclusions follow:—

(1) The Xs, both in the Manikya and Zeda inscriptions, is archaic, while that in the fifth line of the Takht-i-Bahāi inscription is later, as it shows a slight curve on the top as found also in the Panjtar and Kāldarra inscriptions.

(2) The characters resemble those of the Panjtar and Kāldarra inscriptions rather than those of Manikya or Zeda.

(3) The symbol for 100 is exactly like those found in the Panjtar and Mount Banjār inscriptions.
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The above conclusions show that from the palaeographic standpoint Kaniṣka cannot be placed later than Gondophernes as proposed by Dr. Bühler, General Cunningham, Mr. V. A. Smith, and others; on the other hand the palaeographical evidence clearly proves that Gondophernes reigned after the Kuṇanā group. The historic evidence is chiefly based on the Christian chroniclers. According to the Acts of St. Thomas, that apostle came to the Court of the Indian king named Gondophernes. These Acts also relate the visit of St. Thomas to another Indian king named Mādai or Mīsdai who is thus made the contemporary of Gudnaphar or Gondophernes. These Acts occur in various languages, and in most cases the version of the story is the same. Dr. Wright, who edited these Acts, places the date of their composition not later than the 4th century, while Mr. Burkitt places the date before the middle of the 3rd century A.D. No author takes the date of the composition of these Acts to the first and second centuries of the Christian era, and no confidence can be placed on chroniclers who wrote two centuries after the actual occurrence. St. Thomas may have visited India, but the statement that he was a contemporary of the kings Gondophernes and Mīsaides is extremely unreliable. "That the stories in the Acts of St. Thomas have little or no historical basis is indeed almost self-evident." Mādai may be another form of Vaiṣṇava, but it cannot be said with absolute certainty that it is so. The numismatic evidence seems to fix the position of Gondophernes in the first half of the first century of the Christian era. But this happens only when the coins of this prince are compared with those of other Indian princes, but one important consideration has been lost sight of by the numismatists. This is that one class of coins of this prince on which the legend is only in Greek, the Khoreghi being absent, are undoubtedly of the Parthian type, and that they should be compared with the coinage of Parthian monarchs and not with those of the Indian princes. The date of Gondophernes, if it is to be obtained from numismatic evidence only, should be deduced by comparing his coins with those of the Arsakids. Thus we see that of the three separate lines of evidence which tend to place Gondophernes in or about the middle of the first century A.D., the first and second are uncertain, while the third is unreliable.

The Takht-i-Bahā'ī inscriptions of Gondophernes is dated in the year 108, and the question arises to what particular era this date is to be referred. Three eras have been mentioned up to date—

(1) Dr. Fleet's theory that the date should be referred to the Mālava-Vikrama era.
(2) Mr. V. A. Smith's theory that the inscription is dated in the Usurarean era of Antioch.
(3) The theory put forth by Messrs. Bhāndārkār that the inscription is dated in the Saka era.

The improbability of the use of the Mālava-Vikrama era in the Panjab in the first two or three centuries of the Christian era is evident from the remarks of Dr. Kielland. Mr. V. A. Smith has also clearly shown that the use of that era in this inscription is impossible.

The arguments put forth by Dr. Fleet against the use of Usurarean era of Antioch in India are decisive and leave no doubt.
The third theory has been objected to by Dr. Fleet on the ground that "there are no real grounds for thinking that the Sakas ever figured as invaders of any part of Northern India above Kathiawad, and the southern and western parts of the territory now known as Malwa." Up to date two inscriptions have been discovered in Northern India which contains the word Saka. These are —

(1) The inscription P. on the Mathura Lion Capital.99
(2) A Jain inscription from Mathura.100

The first inscription is in Kharosthi, and runs as follows: —

Sarvassa Sakastanae puyae.

This was translated by the late Dr. Bhagwanlal Indraji as — "In honour of the whole of Sakastana, i.e., Sakasthana or the land of the Sakas." Dr. Fleet proves that in this inscription the word Saka is equal to Svaka, i.e., 'own,' and so he takes the inscription to mean — "In honour of his own home."1 But Dr. Hultsch corrects him that evidently Sarvasa is the name of the donor in the genitive case, Dr. Fleet then translates it as follows: — (The gift of) Sarva in honour of his own home.3

It is plain that Dr. Bhagwanlal Indraji's translation is quite natural, while Dr. Fleet's version is rather strained. In other votive inscriptions it is generally said that such and such things have been erected in honour of one's father and mother or other relations or one's gods, but the erection of anything in honour of a land is novel. But again the erection of something in honour of one's homestead is absolutely incompatible with Indian ideas. An Indian honours his father and mother, his spiritual teacher, and it may be that he honours his other relations; he honours his own god, be it a Buddha or an Arhat; he may also erect something in honour of his country: but he never erects anything either in honour of his own self or his own homestead. Of course, it is possible to take these Prakrit words to mean many things at the same time, but there is always a limit beyond which these meanings, even when possible, should not be stretched. This interpretation of the word Saka as equivalent to Svaka takes the meaning beyond that limit. Dr. Fleet's other argument that the word Stūna in Sanskrit, does not mean a country is admissible, but Mr. Thomas' researches show that the word is foreign and probably of Persian origin, and it is sure that it has been used by one who was a non-Indian and probably a Persian. The Sakastana of the inscription P. of the Mathura Lion Capital is undoubtedly the Sakastana of Laidorus of Charax.3

The second inscription runs as follows: —

(1) (Na)mo Arahato Vardhamānasya Gotiputra-sa Pothaya-Saka-kālavājas.

(2) . . . . Köskiye Simitrāye Ayāgapato p(r)a(t).

The word Saka in this inscription has been interpreted in two ways. Dr. Bühler took it to mean the Scythians and translated the inscription as follows: — "Reverence to the Arhat Vardhamana! A tablet of homage (was set up) by Srimitrā, the Köski (wife) of Gotiputrawho is (or was) a black serpent to Pothayas and Sakas." But Dr. Fleet takes this word Saka to mean a Buddhist and it is quite possible. The word Saka in Prakrit may mean both a Scythian and a Sākya or Buddhist. To Dr. Fleet's list of instances in which the word Saka means a Sākya, I may add one more. During the working season of 1905-06 some excavations were made at Rājgir by Mr. J. H. Marshall and Dr. T. Bloch, during which a piece of inscribed red sand-stone was discovered. Only some boughs of trees are discernible on this stone, and below this are the words Saka Muni in Northern Kṣatrapa characters and this undoubtedly becomes in Sanskrit Sākya Muni, i.e., Buddha. But it cannot be maintained that in the Prakrit of this period the word Saka or Saka means only a Buddhist and not a Scythian.

There is another evidence, which shows independently of numismatics, that the Sakas ruled in India before the Kuśāna family, but this has been altogether ignored by Dr. Fleet. He has repeatedly stated that Rājāvula and his son Soṇaśa were contemporaries of Vāsudeva and that they kept him out of Mathurā; but this statement is not supported by a single fact. On the other hand, the characters of the three inscriptions of Soṇaśa are decidedly archaic and earlier than those of the inscriptions of the Kuśāna. These inscriptions constitute a special group in Indian palaeography which shows the transition between the earliest inscriptions from Mathurā and the inscriptions of the Kuśāna period. Dr. Bühlert has taken the characters of these inscriptions as the Northern types of Ksatrapa characters and has devoted a separate section to them. His remarks in the second volume of the Epigraphia Indica leave no doubt as to this: “Though the precise date assigned to Soṇaśa may be doubted, still he must have ruled at Mathurā in the first century B.C., before the time of Kaniṣka and his successor.” And again “the Mahakṣatrapas of Mathurā must have passed away before the Kuśānas reigned there.”

These three inscriptions prove that there was a line of foreign rulers in Northern India before the Kuśānas. Then again numismatics prove the existence of several other rulers who were also foreigners. They may be of Persian origin as Mr. Thomas takes them, but even then to the main body of the Indian people they were Sakas. The only other statement of Dr. Fleet which seems to me to be peculiar is that Kozonou-Kadphises and Hima-Kadphises were preceded by Kaniṣka, Huvika, and Vāsudeva, and that they belong to quite a different dynasty. Dr. Fleet has found a supporter of this view Dr. Otto Francke. There is no doubt about the fact that Kozonou- Kadphises and Wema-Kadphises were Kuśānas, as on their coins legends they are expressly called so. Then the types of the coins of these princes are decidedly earlier, and at the same time connected by a symbol to those of Kaniṣka, Huvika, and Vāsudeva. These two facts prove that Kozonou-Kadphises and Wema-Kadphises belong to the same group as Kaniṣka, Huvika, and Vāsudeva, and that former two princes preceded the latter three. On the data at present available the exact relationship between Kozonou and Hima-Kadphises and Kaniṣka cannot be determined. Indian numismatics has vastly improved since the days of James Prinsep, and his suggestion that the Kadphises belonged to a separate group can hardly be relied on at the present date. With regard to the latest argument of Dr. Fleet, adduced in favour of his theory, it may be said that the remarks of Huen Thang himself makes it impossible to place any reliance on them. The traditional date of Kaniṣka, which places him four hundred years after the death of Gautama Buddha, is a mere tradition. The exact date of Buddha’s death still remains to be ascertained, and Dr. Fleet’s assumption that Buddha died in 482 B.C. is a mere theory. Huen Thang himself states that “As regards the period since Buddha’s nirvāṇa the schools are of very diverse views. Some say it dates back over twelve hundred years, others over thirteen hundred years, a third section over fifteen hundred years, others again over nine hundred. Yet none say thousands.” On this the statement of Dr. Francke, “The Tang-Annals and the Sui-Annals each get different dates from these, so that it is impossible to fix the accession of Kaniṣka by this data,” seems to be conclusive.

The second theory of the second group is that put forth by Maxime Fergusson and Oldenberg. It holds that Kaniṣka founded the Saka era and that the dates in the Kuśāna inscriptions should be referred to that era. It has already been shown that this theory was based upon insufficient grounds and so it is untenable. But in spite of that we find eminent scholars still maintaining that the Kuśāna inscriptions should be referred to the Saka era. Dr. Bühlert never clearly expressed any opinion on this point, but the general tenor of his writings express the

---

7 I. A., February, 1905, p. 47.
8 Huc’s Buddhist Record of the Western Wards, Vol. II, p. 33.
10 I. A., February, 1906, p. 43.
Kašana dates should be referred to the Saka era. Though General Cunningham had put forth two theories on Kašana dates, yet in his last work we find that he places the Saka era by the side of the Seleucidan era in the interpretation of Kašana dates.  

11 Mr. Rapson, in his *Indian Coins*, says, 'the Saka era has unusually been supposed to date from the abhiṣeka of Kaniska at Mathura.  

12 Last of all Mr. V. A. Smith, before he undertook to prove the use of the Laukika era in Kašana inscriptions, was of opinion that the date of the accession of Kaniska lies between B.C. 57 and 78 A.D., and probably took place in the year 65 A.D.  

Later on, when he published his paper on the chronology of the Kushān period, he makes the following objections to the use of the Saka era in the Kašana inscriptions:

(1) The current belief that Kaniska ascended the throne in 78 A.D. adds half a century to the gap between the Kašanas and the Guptas and is less easily reconcilable with palæographic facts.

(2) The Saka or Śālivahana era originated in Western India and did not come even into partial use in Northern India until a late period.

(3) The theories of Oldenburg and Bhāndārkar, which agree in doctrine that the Kašana inscriptions are dated according to the Saka era, require us, contrary to all probability, to assume that the Saka reckoning was adopted for a century in Northern India and then dropped.

The arguments of Mr. Bhāndārkar have already been dealt with above and we have seen that—

(1) Kaniska was a Saka;

(2) The Kašana inscriptions are not dated in any era with the hundreds omitted; and

(3) It is possible to place the accession of Kaniska about the year 78 A.D.

If Kaniska was a Saka, and his accession took place in or about 78 A.D., the natural tendency is to connect him with the Indian era, whose initial year falls in 78-9 A.D. and which is known by the name of Saka era. But serious obstacles mentioned above have been raised against the use of this era in Northern India. The first objection is that the use of the Saka era adds half a century more to the gap between the Kašanas and the Guptas than does the Laukika theory, and so is less reconcilable with palæographical facts. As regards the palæography of the Kašana inscriptions, Mr. Smith says:— "It is not always easy by mere inspection to distinguish an inscription of the Kašana from one of the Gupta period. Many alphabetical forms specially characteristic of the Gupta inscriptions are found sporadically in Kašana records, while on the other hand Gupta documents often exhibit archaic forms specially characteristic of the Kašana age."  

The above statement is only partially true, because a number of Kašana records do not at all exhibit later forms, but on the other hand exhibit many archaic forms.

The study of Kašana and cognate inscriptions leads one to the following conclusions:

(1) The inscriptions which are marked as archaic in the list on pages 37, 38 above do not belong to the Kašana period proper but to an earlier one.

(2) The majority of Buddhist inscriptions exhibit archaic forms. Compare Nos. 1, 2, and 29 of the list.

(3) Archaic forms are absent from the majority of the Jaina inscriptions. Thus, out of 57 inscriptions in the list which are undoubtedly Jaina and belong to the Kašana period, only 10 inscriptions exhibit archaic forms.

(4) The characters of the Buddhist inscriptions are angular, neatly incised, and pleasing to the eye. Compare Nos. 1, 2, 29, 34, 39, and 48 of the list.

(5) The characters of the Jaina inscriptions are extremely cursive, in most cases incorrect and ugly.
Thus, if a comparison is made between two inscriptions, one of which is Jain and the other Buddhist, and which mention the name of the same king and contain dates near enough to allow of comparison, then the difference in the form of the characters would be instantly recognised. The characters of the Jain inscription would appear to be very late modifications of those of the Buddhist one. If the Sarnâth inscription of the year 3 (No. 1), which is Buddhist, is compared with the Mathurâ inscription of the year 4, a Jain record, the above statement would at once be evident. In fact, it is very difficult to distinguish between Jain inscriptions of the Kuṣâna period and those of the Gupta period, but not between Buddhist inscriptions of the Kuṣâna period. The only cause of this is that the Jain inscriptions of Mathura are in a script which was very much in advance even of the current script of the period. It is very well known that the current script used in every-day life of a period is very much more in advance of the script exhibited on epigraphical records. Dr. Bühler has already noticed the influence of the current hand of the period on Indo-Scythian inscriptions. Most of the Jain inscriptions mention the particular Gaja, Kula, and Sâkhi to which the donor, belonged, and in particular cases mention is made that the donor was either a Sreṣṭhin or Sârthavâhî so it is extremely probable that these donors of the Indo-Scythian period, like their descendants at the present day, were merchants or traders. Now it is well known that Indian merchants and traders use an extremely cursive script in their daily transactions. The Baniâs and Modis and the clerks of merchants and big traders at the present day use a script which is very much in advance of the current hand and still more so of that used in print. It is also extremely probable that the Jain merchants and traders of the Indo-Scythian period, in recording their religious donations, used the same script as in their business transactions. This in fact is the only explanation for the presence of later forms in inscriptions of the first and the second century A. D. In this case a difference of 40 or 60 years would not matter very much, and it cannot be held that, if the date of the accession of Kanîśka is placed 47 years earlier, it would be less easily reconcilable with palaeographical facts, because the later forms which occur in these inscriptions become common two centuries later. If we exclude the Jain inscriptions we find that the characters of the other inscriptions of this period do not show any marked affinity to those of the inscriptions of the Gupta period. The Jain records of the Kuṣâna period form a unique series of Indian epigraphs showing very advanced forms of characters, the parallel of which has not as yet been found in India.

I may note here that one at least of the inscriptions of this period is official. This is No. 29 of the list. Nos. 1 and 2 may also be taken as official. No. 1 is decidedly official, as it mentions the name of the two satraps, probably father and son, the Mahâkshatrapa Kharapallana and the Kṣatrapa Vanaśpara, while the second may also be taken to be an official inscription because the friars Bala and Paśyuruddhi were undoubtedly personages who possessed great influence at the Royal Court; for governors of provinces, however devout they may be, do not take so strong an interest in the gifts of ordinary monks as these two do. I may also note that I cannot agree with Dr. Vogel’s interpretation of the relation between the satraps and the monks. Dr. Vogel says: — “The question has been raised how mendicants who have to beg for their food and are not allowed worldly possessions could make donations which would necessarily involve considerable expenditure. Perhaps the Sârnâth inscriptions afford an explanation. We may suppose that the two satraps supplied the necessary funds, but the gift was carried on under the supervision of the friar Bala, who thus was fully justified in calling the gift his own.”

One of the main points of discussion which necessitated the making of a second Buddhist Council at Vaiśāli, was whether the monks were to receive gold or silver as gifts or not. Mention is made of monks of Vaiśāli who actually received gold and silver as gifts. This proves that the Buddhist monks were not above accepting gold and silver as gifts. Moreover, the inscriptions on the pedestal expressly states: —

(1) Bhûkṣṣaya Bâlsya Trepiṭkâsya Bodhisatvo pratiṣṭhâpito
(2) mahâkṣatrapena Kharapallâncena sahî kṣatrapena Vanaśparenâna.

17 Rockhill’s Life of Buddha, p. 172.
That is, the Bodhisattva image of the Bhikṣu Bala, who was well versed in the three pitakas, was set up by the great satrap Kharapallāna and the satrap Vanaspara. They may have placed the money at the disposal of the satrap and then left Benares to some other holy place, while the satraps superintended the carving and the erection of the statue. The text of the inscription on the umbrella shaft:

Line (3) . . . . . . . Bhikṣuṣya Balasya Trepiṣṭakasya
" (4) Bodhisattvo . . . . . . . pratisthāpito
 . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .
Line (8) saba kṣaṭrapena Vanasprena Kharapalla-
" (9) neva ca . . . . . . . .

In the way expressed above means accordingly that the satraps also acquired merit by their labour of superintendence.

The second and third objections to the use of the Saka era in Northern India in the Kuśāna period may be answered together. There is no direct proof that the Saka era originated in Western India. On the other hand, the researches of Mr. Bhāndārkār clearly prove that the era was originally founded in Northern India, and that Nahapāna and Cañāna were Northerners, and most probably were merely provincial governors. There is no need to assume that the Saka reckoning was adopted for a century in Northern India and then dropped. If we take the Saka era to have begun from the date of the accession of Kaniṣka, then we find that it was in use in Mathurā up to the year 308-9 A. D. Thus the Saka reckoning was not merely adopted for a century but for two centuries or more. Then the invasions of later Kuśanas from the North-Western provinces and the rise of the Gupta empire gradually drove it out of Northern India, but it remained in use in the South-Western provinces of the Kuśana empire. The use of the Gupta era affords a parallel case. It originated in Northern India in A. D. 318-19. It remained there in use for three centuries (if we exclude the dates from Nepal, then the latest date is the year 300 on the Gaṅgā plate of Sañjika—
E. I., Vol. VI, p. 143), then it was driven out of Northern India by the Haša and Malava-Vikrama era. It is possible that if the successors of Haravardhana had been able and powerful rulers like those of Candra Gupta I, the Gupta era could hardly have remained in use in Nepal for two more centuries. But it is known that the Gupta era was current in Western India up to the 12th or 13th centuries A. D., and that in its later days it was known as the Valabhi Āsāvat. So it is evident that it is also possible for the Saka era to have originated in Northern India, and after three hundred years to have been driven out of it and to have remained current in one single part of its original area for several centuries longer. It is also probable that the name of the era was given to it long after its formation. The inscriptions of the Western satraps do not mention its name, though it is certain that their dates should be referred to the Saka era. The earliest inscription in which the name is mentioned is the Bādami cave inscription of the Čālukya Mangaliśa. The name Sālivāhana was applied to it for the first time in the year 1194 of this era, i.e., 1272 A. D. Thus we find that all serious obstacles to the use of the Saka era in Northern India and in the Kuśana inscriptions disappear. But we must admit that there is no direct evidence to show that Kaniṣka founded the Saka era, and it is doubtful whether any such evidence will ever be found. But it is possible, as Dr. Fleet says, that this era is one of those eras that originated in an extension of regnal or dynastic years. It was actually set going as an era by the successor who did not break the reckoning so started by introducing another according to his own regnal years. But between the accession of Kaniṣka in 78 A. D. and the death of Eukratidas in B. C. 156, we find a host of princes ruling the country between Bactria and the Panjāb, whose position and sequence require to be settled before we proceed to deal with the events of the reigns of Kaniṣka and his

successors. Most of these princes are known to us only through their coins. They are, as we have seen, divisible into three classes — (a) The Scythians; (b) the later Greeks; and (c) the Parthians. It will be shown later on that it is impossible to place a Parthian dynasty ruling over Seistan and Gandhāra in the first century of the Christian era. There remain only the Greeks and the Scythians. The most important of the Greek princes were Menander and Apollodotos, who are mentioned by the classical historians as the conquerors of India. It is hardly possible to lay down the exact chronological sequence of the other Greek princes. The last of them is Hermias, who probably ruled in the Kabul valley in the opening year of the Christian era and was to some extent the contemporary of Kusrū-kio or Kozoub-Kadphises. There are some coins on which the Greek legend bears the name of Hermias, while the Kharoṣṭhī one bears that of Kadphises I. It may be that Kadphises I acknowledged the over-lordship of Hermias before he united the five Yue-chi principalities under his sway. It is certain that Kadphises I swept away the Greek rule from Afghanistan. The Scythian princes, who preceded Kaniṅka, are also known to us chiefly from their coins, but they have also left several inscriptions. The earliest of them, according to the numismatists, is Mauēs or Moes, but his coins are found only in the Panjāb, and Mr. D. R. Bhāndārkār accordingly takes him to be the last of the Scythian princes. Vonones, whose coins are found in Kandahar, Ghāznī, and Seistan, was probably the first prince of these early Scythian conquerors. He was succeeded by his nephew, Spalirises, who, with his father, Spalarethres, and his brother, Spalagadames, were his tributaries. After Spalirises, a prince named Azes or Aya seems to have ascended the throne. Azes was at first subordinate both to Vonones and Spalirises. Azes was succeeded by Azilises, after whom the dynasty seems to have been reduced to a subordinate position. According to the authority of Mr. R. K. Rapson, Vonones seems to have come to the throne at the beginning of the first century B.C. His coins are fairly numerous, and we may safely assign to him a reign of 15 years. He seems to have lived in the West, probably in Seistan, while his deputies ruled Afghanistan and the Panjāb in his name.

On the above assumption the accession of his nephew, Spalirises, may be placed in the year 70 B.C. Both Azes and his nephew, Spalagadames, were the tributaries of this prince. His coins are not so very numerous, and a reign of 15 years is quite sufficient for him. After Spalirises this dynasty comes to an end, and Aces, who was a tributary prince both under Vonones and Spalirises, makes himself independent in the Panjāb. Afghanistan seems to have passed into the sway of the Yue-chi chieftains. The coins of Aces are not obtainable in Afghanistan, but they are fairly numerous in the Panjāb, and a reign of 15 years may be allowed to him, as he is known to have reigned for a long time as subordinate to Vonones and Spalirises. He was succeeded by Azilises, whose exact relationship to Aces cannot be ascertained. At this time a prince of the Koi-Raouang or the Kuñas or Herāuṣ, who is most probably the Lu-mo-fu of the Chinese historians, conquered Ki-pin (Kapišā). The existence of Hermias at the beginning of the Christian era shows, that a number of Greek principalities still remained in the hill fastnesses of Afghanistan and the Western Panjāb in a subordinate position to the Scythian monarchs. After the demise or overthrow of Azilises, the Scythian provincial governors made themselves independent. They were known by the Persian title satrap (Sanskrit Kstrāpa), and probably recognised the nominal supremacy of the descendants or successors of Azilises, such as Aces II, Mauēs, and others. But there is much difference of opinion as to the exact chronological position of the Scythian satraps. Two of these satrap dynasties are well known. These are the dynasties of Taxila or Takṣāšā and that of Mathrā, while coins bearing the names of other satraps are not wanting, such as Hāgāṇa and Bagānāśa, Zedonisēs or ḇhunia, son of Manigal, and others. The following are the different opinions expressed about the chronological positions of these satraps:

(1) Mr. V. A. Smith argues that the hemdrāmsa of Rājāvula imitate and are found with those of Strato II, who was the son of Strato I, who was a contemporary of Heliokles, the last Greek king who ruled north of the Hindu Kush. Heliokles is certainly the son and successor of Enkratides.

22 Trogus, p. 41.
who died about B. C. 150. Inasmuch as Heliokles, the son and successor of Eukratides, was contemporary with Strato I, the father of Strato II, who was approximately contemporary with Rājāvula, the Saka satrap of Mathurā, the accession of the last named prince must be very close to B. C. 126.

The fact that the coins of Rājāvula imitate those of Strato II shows that Rājāvula must be placed after Strato II and not before him, and nothing more than this can be said to be an accurate deduction. Numismatics is of importance only when epigraphy is absent. It may also aid epigraphy, but numismatics can hardly be relied on against deductions based on epigraphy and paleography. These two satrap dynasties possess several inscriptions, and it will be seen later on that the characters of the inscriptions of these satraps preclude any possibility of their being placed 200 hundred years before the accession of Kaniṣka. One of the highest authorities on Indian numismatics places the Saka satraps in the middle of the 1st century B. C. 28

(2) Mr. D. R. Bhāndārkar places Soḍās, the son of Rājāvula, in the Saka year 72 = 150 A. D., and Patika of Taxila in the Saka year 78 = 156 A. D., while the accession of Kaniva is placed in the year 278 A. D.

(3) Dr. Fleet places Soḍās and Rājāvula to be nearly contemporaries of Vāsudēva.

The inscriptions of the Scythian satraps occur both in Brahmi and in Kharoṣṭhī. They are as follows:

(1) The Taxila copperplate of Patika, the son of Liaka Kusulaka. The record is dated in the year 78 of the (reign of the) Māharaja Moga. 23

(2) The Mathurā Lion Pillar Capital inscriptions, recording the various donations of the two satrap families of Taxila and Mathurā. This record establishes that Soḍās was a contemporary of Patika and consequently Rājāvula of Liaka. 22

The records mentioned above are in Kharoṣṭhī, while the others given below are in Brahmi —

(3) A Jain record of the year 72 of the reign of the great satrap Soḍās. 25

(4) A Brahmical record of the reign of the great satrap Soḍās. 27

(5) An inscription found on a well at Mota, seven miles from Mathurā. 24

The Kharoṣṭhī inscriptions mentioned above form the third variety of Dr. Bühler's division of Kharoṣṭhī records. But as has been shown above, if the characters of the Manikyala inscription are taken as representing the fourth variety instead of the Sūk-Vihār inscription, the difference between the forms of the characters of these two varieties diminish. The characters of the third variety show that they immediately preceded those of the fourth variety. The Taxila copperplate cannot be placed two hundred years before the Manikyala inscription. The paleography of the Brahmi inscriptions also supports the above conclusion. When Dr. Bühler's *Indische Paläographie* was published, it was supposed that the difference between the Kṣatrapa and Kuṣāna periods was considerable. But recent discoveries have shown that this difference cannot be much. The excavations of Sārnāth have yielded three records to the list of dated Kuṣāna inscriptions. Two of these are from Sārnāth, and the third is from Set-Mahet and was discovered more than forty years ago. The first line of the Sārnāti inscription is much damaged and consequently the name of the reigning monarch and the date is lost. When Dr. Bloch published this inscription in 1898 29 he was led by the paleography of the

22 Bapson's *Indian Coins*, p. 8.
24 J. R. A. S., 1894, p. 528. Dr. Bhagwanlal Indrajit edited these inscriptions without any facsimile. A fresh edition with a facsimile is much needed, but this inscription is out of the reach of Indians as it is in the British Museum.
inscription to place it in the period which included the reigns of Rājūvula and Soḍāsa. But the Sārnath inscription of the year 3 of the reign of Mahārāja Kaniṣka shows that the donors of the two statues are the same. There are also reasons to make us believe that the Srāvastī inscription was incised after the Sārnath record. The subscript ya, which is always tripartite in the Sārnath inscriptions, is once bipartite in the Srāvastī inscription (at the end of the second line in Pāṣa). This clearly indicates that the difference between the reigns of Rājūvula and Soḍāsa and Kaniṣka cannot be 200 years. In editing the inscriptions from Sārnath, Dr. Vogel says, that "the similarity between the scripts of Mathurā satraps and that of the earliest of Kaniṣka is so striking that the two can hardly be separated by more than one century. If the former are to be placed in the 1st century B.C., palæographic evidence would point to the conclusion that the commencement of Kaniṣka's reign has been rightly supposed to fall in the first century A.D."  

It is evident then that the satraps of Mathurā cannot be placed in B. C. 120. Dr. Fleet's statement as to the position of the satraps has been dealt with before, and it is also evident that the statement that Soḍāsa was nearly the contemporary of Vāsudeva is arbitrary. Mr. D. R. Bhaṇḍārkar also places Kaniṣka 200 years after Soḍāsa and makes the latter a contemporary of the Western satrap Rudrādāma. But the characters of the Junagadh inscriptions of Rudrādāma are later than those of the Sārnath inscription of Kaniṣka, and so much later than those of the inscriptions of Soḍāsa. The date of Kaniṣka certainly falls before Rudrādāma, and so it is not possible that Rudrādāma was a contemporary of Soḍāsa.  

The Sārnath inscription also shows that the title Mahākṣatrāya does not imply that the holder of it was an independent sovereign. Rājūvula and Soḍāsa were probably the governors of Mathurā under AIZES II and MAUSES, who may thus be the king Moga of the Taxila copperplate inscription. Soḍāsa was probably succeeded by Kharāhoṣṭes and Kahlī.  

The reign of the earlier Scythian princes and satraps was brought to an end by the conquest of Northern India by Wema-Kadphises about the year 60 A. D. It is also probable, as Dr. Vogel remarks, that the satraps Kharapallāna and Vanaṣpara were the descendants of the early Scythian satraps of Mathurā. The fact that the coins of Wema-Kadphises are found as far as Ghazipur does not prove that Kadphises II conquered the whole of Northern India as far as Benares. The rupee bearing the bust and name of William IV of England, issued in 1838, is current up to the present day in the Panjāb and the North-Western Frontier provinces. Is this a sufficient proof of the British occupation of the Panjāb before 1848 A. D.? On the other hand, the Sārnath inscription of Kaniṣka leaves no doubt as to the fact that Benares and the adjoining territory to some extent was included in the dominions of Kaniṣka. It is usual to find the coins of a previous reign current in provinces conquered years later. Numerous instances may be cited of this. We may safely assume, on the authority of the Chinese historians that Yeu-kao-ching or Wema-Kadphises conquered India. But it is impossible to state the extent of his conquests from numismatical evidence. Certain degree of probability may be imputed to the fact that he conquered only the Panjāb and the country as far east as Mathurā. But it is absolutely certain that Kaniṣka ruled as far as Benares. It may be that Kaniṣka extended the empire up to Benares. It is not at all necessary to place the accession of Kaniṣka in B. C. 554 or in B. C. 265 simply because the Compendium of the Wei states that a Chinese named King-li received Buddhist books from the Yue-chi at that time. The unification of the Yue-chi might not have taken place before the initial
year of the Christian era. King-lu might have received the Buddhist books from any other king of the five Yue-chi principalities. The coins of Kadphises I and II show that they favoured no particular religion. There is nothing to prevent us from supposing that King-lu received his Buddhist books before the conquest of the other Yue-chi principalities by Kusiu-Kio of the Kuei-Chouang or that he received them from a private person at the command of the king. According to a lost Sanskrit work named Sri-Dharma-piṭāka-sampradāya-nidāna, translated into Chinese in the year 472 A. D., and quoted by M. Lévi in his "Notes," Kaniška is said to have conquered India as far as Pātaliputra and carried off the Buddhist saint Āśvaghosa.56 There is nothing in the shape of a direct evidence to show that Kaniška conquered Kāśmir, but it is certain that he founded there a town called after him Kaniškapura, which is now known as Kanispur.57 So Kāśmir must have been included in his empire. His capital, as Mr. V. A. Smith holds, was probably Parusāpura, i. e., modern Peshawar. According to the Chinese translation quoted above, Kaniška engaged in a successful war with Pārthia. The most glorious exploit of Kaniška was his conquest of Kashgar, Yarkand, and Khotan. It has been objected to by some scholars that the accession of Kaniška cannot be placed in 78 A. D., because a king of the Yue-chi at this time is known to have been defeated by the famous Chinese General Pan-Chao. M. Lévi says, "If, as is generally done, we take the coronation of Kaniška as the starting point of the Saka era, we meet with an insurmountable difficulty. Pan-Chao's victorious campaign, pursued for thirty years (73-102 A. D.) without interruption, at this very time restored Si-Yu (the Western provinces) to the empire and carried Chinese arms beyond the regions explored by Chang-Kian as far as the confines of the Greco-Roman world. By 73 A. D. the king of Khotan had made his submission, and several other kings of that country followed his example and gave their eldest sons as hostages for their fidelity. Kashgar immediately after returned to obedience. The two passes by which the way to the South debouches into India were in the hands of the Chinese. The submission in the year 94, after a long resistance of Kharshar and the Kou-teche, secured to China also the route to the North. The Yue-chi had not renounced their previous supremacy without a struggle. In the year 90 the king of the Yue-chi sent an ambassador to demand a Chinese princess in marriage. Pan-Chao deemed the request insolent, stopped the ambassador and sent him back. The king of the Yue-chi raised an army of 70,000 horsemen under the orders of the Viceroy Sie. Pan-Chao's troops were much frightened by this numerous army and his General had great trouble to reassure them; however, he made them see that the enemy, worn out by a long march and by the fatigue endured in crossing the Tsung-Ling mountains, was not in a condition to attack them with advantage. Sie was vanquished and the king of the Yue-chi did not fail to send in every year the tribute imposed on him. It was not Kaniška at the apogee of his reign and power who consented to such a humiliation."58 New tradition affirms that Kaniška was a great conqueror and conquered Kashgar, Yarkand, and Khotan. Palaeography clearly places the accession of Kaniška in the year 78 A. D. The only possible conclusion that we can draw from all these data is that he was the king who was defeated and humiliated by Pan-Chao in A. D. 90, for it is certain that Kaniška was living in the year 96 A. D.59 To avoid this seeming discrepancy, Mr. V. A. Smith, as a further corroboration of his theory of Kusāna chronology, holds that Kaniška conquered Kashgar, Yarkand, and Khotan about the year 130 A. D., thus accomplishing what Wema-Kadphises, according to him, failed to do 40 years earlier. It is not the purpose of this paper to deny that Kaniška did not conquer Kashgar, Yarkand, and Khotan or that Pan-Chao did not defeat a Yue-chi king in 90 A. D., but to utilise fresh materials to render previous statements explicit and unite them into a homogeneous whole.

56 V. A. Smith's Early History, p. 227, footnote 2.
59 The Manikyalā inscription of the year 18 = 96 A. D.
In a Kharoṣṭhī inscription, which is at present in the Lahore Museum, we find there a confirmation of two things—

1. That Kaniṣka was possibly the Yue-chi king defeated by Pan-Chao; and
2. That Kaniṣka probably recovered Kashgar, Khotan, and Yarkand after the death of Pan-Chao in 109 A.D. The inscription itself contains no such thing, but the data which it supplies is sufficient to warrant such a conclusion. The inscription supplies us with two important informations. The first is that Wema-Kalphiases was not the father of Kaniṣka, and that he was still reigning in the year 41 of his era. This inscription was discovered in an ancient well in a sala known as Ara, two miles from Bāğnīlāb, and was presented to the Lahore Museum, by Dr. M. A. Stein. It has been mentioned above as the Ara inscription. (Lahore Museum, No. 1, 133). The inscription is a small piece of stone measuring 1 ft. 8 ins. by 9 ins. and consists of six lines. The surface of the stone is extremely rough and uneven. The mason has not taken the trouble of planing the surface.

I read the inscription as follows: —

Ara inscription of the year 41; Plate I.

1. Maharajasa rajatirajasa devapurasa pa(?)-ḥadharasa . . . .
2. Vasīṣṭhaputrasa Kapiṣkasa smavatsarae eka catarī(ṣ) . . . .
3. saṁ XX, XX, I, Cetasa mūsasa diva 4, atra divasami Namikha . . . .
4. . . . na puṣa paria pumana mabarathi Ratakhputa . . . .
5. atmanasa sabharya putrasya anugatyaarthae savya . . . .
6. . . . rae himacala. Khipama . . . .

Notes.

1. Some portions of the inscribed surface have peeled off, leaving holes, thus the upper portion of the second ja in Rajatirajasa is missing. The first line seems to have ended with a word which must have been an adjective, such as Devapurasa, etc. The possessive case ending is clear and distinct. The ending words of all other lines, except the first, seems to be missing. There is a big hole after the letter va in diva in the third line.

2. The stroke in Devapurasa is unusual. It has been attached to the nethermost part of the vertical line instead of the top of the horizontal loop.

3. The second letter of Kaniṣka's father's name is indistinct. It does not resemble any known Kharoṣṭhī single or compound letter. At first I took it to be dra, but now I find that dra has a quite different form in the Dutreuil de Rhins Manuscript of the Dhammapada and on the coins of Menander and Epander. Dr. Vogel suggests that it is Si, and I accept it as the most probable solution.

4. The compound tea in Sanevatsarae in the second line is new (cf. the inscription of the year 111 at the end of this paper, Lahore Museum, No. 1, 47, where tea has a similar form).

5. In the fifth line the second letter tma is different from the form in which it appears in Dr. Bühler's Tables.

6. The subscript ya is expressed here by a complete loop as also in the Suś-Vihar copper-plate inscription. Compare rya in Bharya and tya in Anugatyaarthae.

7. The compound letter arthea has never been met with, and, as such, the reading is open to correction.
Shakardara inscription: the year 40.

Ara inscription: the year 41.
I have been able to translate fully only the first three lines of this inscription. The fifth line only out of the last three lines is to some extent intelligible. I translate only the first three lines here. While at Lahore I heard that impressions of this inscription have already been forwarded to Dr. Lüders of Rostock, and we may confidently look forward to him for a complete rendering of this important inscription.

Translation.

"In the year forty-one, 41, on the fifth day of the month of Caiatra in the reign of Maharāja Rājātirāja Devaputra Kanṣika, the son of Vasiṣṭha . . . . ."

On the coins of the Western satraps such forms as Ghaumatikā putrasa Caṭanasa are frequent. Though the inscription has not been fully deciphered, its more important parts are certain. It supplies us with two important facts. It is now certain that Wema-Kadhphises was not the father of Kanṣika, though the latter certainly succeeded the former. Such forms of the mention of a king’s father’s name is found on the coins of the Western satraps with Caṭanasa,40 also on the coins of some of the Northern satraps, such as Bodāsa, Jihuniś, and Kharahostes.41 The name Vasiṣṭha has a distinctly Iranian sound, but that does not prevent him from being a Saka to Indians. Moreover, ethnological speculations on such grounds are not possible.

The more important part of the inscription is the date, which is certainly the year 41, and this leads us to certain irresistible conclusions. Heretofore the latest available date of Kanṣika was the year 18, found on the Manikyala inscription, and the earliest date of Huvikṣa is the year 33 on the Mathurā Buddhist inscription (No. 25 of the list on page 36 above). But, as Dr. Lüders has suggested, the Mathurā inscriptions of the year 28 and 29 also perhaps belong to the reign of Huvikṣa.42 Then Kanṣika was in the later years of his reign a contemporary of Huvikṣa. Was Huvikṣa a rival of Kanṣika? We can hardly assume that. Had he been his rival he would never have prolonged the regnal years of Kanṣika and set them going as an era. The coin types, as with the titles of Huvikṣa, show that he was closely connected to Kanṣika, and it may be that he was Kanṣika’s son. The latest Brāhmi inscription of Kanṣika is the Mathurā inscription of the year 9 (No. 9 of the list). Is it not possible that after a period of ten or fifteen years spent in campaigning in Eastern and Central India, that Kanṣika might have left the government of India in the hands of his eldest son and crossed the Indus to attend to pressing affairs on his Northern and North-Western frontiers? Panchao began his career of conquest in the last decade of the first century A. D. So we may safely assume that Kanṣika’s relations with China were strained from the tenth year of his reign. He demanded a Chinese princess in marriage, but his envoy was not allowed to proceed to the court of Heaven. In the 12th year of his reign he had sent an army across the Taung-ling range under his viceroy Sic, but it was crushed by the genius of Panchao. The defeat was probably followed by a series of rebellions in Northern provinces; the Chinese were also pressing forward and the outlying provinces were soon lost. Within ten years all provinces to the north of the Hindu Kush were probably lost to the Kuṣana empire. So we see that Kanṣika was probably very busy beyond the Indus after the 20th year of his reign. The only explanation of the synchronism of Kanṣika and Huvikṣa, who, up to date, are known as predecessors and successors, is that, after the first ten years of Kanṣika’s reign, Huvikṣa was left in charge of Indian affairs with full imperial titles, while the former attended to the long war in the frontier and in trying to reclaim the lost provinces. Panchao died in 102 A. D., and all further enterprise on the part of the Chinese died away with him. It is extremely probable that then Kanṣika set out to reclaim his lost provinces, but accomplished more than this and added Kashgar, Yarkand, and Khotan to his empire. If this view be adopted, the truth of the tradition at once

---

becomes evident, and the necessity of dragging Kaniṣka away from the Saka era, passes away. Moreover, Kaniṣka is known to Huen-Thaang or, as he is now called, Yuen-Chwang, as the king of Gandhīra, which was probably the result of his long residence in Afghanistan. So as Kaniṣka was alive in the year 41 of the Saka era, i.e., 119 A.D., a reign of 45 years may safely be allowed to him. The tradition current about Kaniṣka's death proves that his life was a career of long warfare. He is said to have conquered three-quarters of the world, presumably India, Persia, and China, and wanted to conquer the fourth which was the North. But his generals and ministers were already dissatisfied and loath to go on a campaign in far distant and unknown countries and so they smothered the aged king with a quilt. The most important event in Kaniṣka's reign was the convocation of the fourth Buddhist Council (Mahāsāṅghika or Mahāsāṅghikī), the chief authority for this is Yuen-Chwang, but the exact date or place of occurrence or the nature of business transacted in it cannot be determined. Coins of Kaniṣka show that he was a Buddhist, but he also respected Zoroastrian and Greek divinities. The stories of the devotion of a Buddhist of a man who spent the whole of his life in bloody warfare must be accepted with limitation.

The details of Huvikā's reign cannot be ascertained, but he is known to us from a large number of coins and inscriptions. After his predecessor or father's death he became the master of a vast empire which included Kabul, Kāśmīra, and the whole of Northern India as far as Benares. An inscription on the Sarāth pillar of Aśoka records the gift of something, the name of which has been lost, in the year 40 = 118 A.D., in the reign of Aśvaghosa, but this prince is only mentioned as a Rājā or, and most probably was a feudatory chief ruling under Huvikā. Behar also was probably included in the Kūṣāna empire at this time, as the impression of a medall of Huvikā was found under the Vaiṣānaka throne inside the temple at Bodh Gaya. The four sides of this throne were originally inscribed with characters of the Kūṣāna period, but it is too far gone to allow of decipherment. This throne is at present under the Bodhi tree at Bodh Gaya, where it was placed by General Cunningham after the completion of the restoration of the great temple. Huvikā is also said to have founded a town in Kāśmīra, which was called after him Husikapura, and is now known as Huskur. According to Cunningham a large monastery existed at Mathurā, which bore the name of Huvikā Vihāra. This monastery probably owed its existence to the munificence of this king. During the reign of Huvikā, Caṭṭana, who was probably his governor at Ajmer, seems to have conquered Mālwa and established himself at Ujjaini. Probably, it was this exploit which raised him to the rank of a Mahākṣatrapa. The reason for this assumption is that the coins of Caṭṭana are trilingual, the legend being in Greek, Brāhmi, and Kharoṣṭhi. The Kharoṣṭhi legend and the title Kṣatrapa proves that he was the subordinate officer of a king who ruled in a northern country where both Greek and Kharoṣṭhi coin-legends were current. As Rudradāman, the son's son of Caṭṭana, was a contemporary of Vāsudeva, we may safely assume that this northern prince was Huvikā. Dr. Bhagwanlal Indrajit places his tenure of office between the years 53 and 58 of the Saka era (111—136 A.D.), which is admissible. Caṭṭana was succeeded by his son, Jayādāman, in his governorship of Rājputana and Malwa. The only Kharoṣṭhi inscription of Huvikā was found at Wardak, near Kabul, which was inscribed in the year 51 = 129 A.D. The latest inscription of the

---

13 See Beal's Buddhist Record of the Western World, and Watters' On Yuen-Chwang. The mention of "Kaniṣka rāja of Gandhīra" is innumerable.
15 Beal's Buddhist Record, pp. 117 and 151.
16 For further particulars, see V. A. Smith's Early History, pp. 236-41.
17 A. S. R., Vol. XVI, p. 41, N. C., 1892, p. 49; and Cunningham's Mahā Baddhi, p. 58, plate x, fig. II.
18 Stein's Rājātorajāgīti Book, I, p. 168; and Vol. II, p. 483. Huen Thang is said to have passed several days in the monastery of Husikapura (Beal's Life of Huen Thang, p. 69).
reign of Huvishka is dated the year 60. So we may safely assume that he was associated with his father in the empire from the year 10 to the year 45 (c. 88 — 128 A.D.) and ascended the throne after his father's death and enjoyed a reign of at least 15 years. We may safely place the year of his death in the Saka era 62 = 140 A.D. At the time of his death the age of Huvishka could not have been less than 80, for his reign extended over the long period of 52 years, one of the longest reigns in the history of India. The name Huvishka is found in several forms, such as Huvishka; Huvaska, Haska and Huksha in the Brähmi inscriptions.

Huvishka was succeeded by Vásuška or Vásudeva, whose earliest recorded date is the year 68, found on an inscription from Sāsco in Bhopal. Dr. Fleet has based a theory on this inscription. He says that this Sāsco record mentions the name Vásuška, which is also to be found in the Mathurā inscription of the year 76, mentioned in Dr. Führer's Progress Report for the year 1895—96, also in the Mathurā inscription of the year 74. Inscriptions which were dated the year 80 and after mentioned the name of Vásuška. So the successor of Huvishka was Vásuška, and Vásuška and Vásudeva are not the same person. This reasoning possesses a seeming validity, as the transliteration of foreign names into the Indian language was as difficult then as it is at the present day. It was impossible for the Indians of the Scythian period to pronounce the name of a Scythian barbarian, and it was still more difficult for him to write it in his own language. As a result of this we find Rājāvala and Rajula as variations of the name of one and the same person. If Vásuška and Vásudeva are taken to be different personages, then Huvishka, Haska, and Huksha would also have to be taken as designating three different princes. The original name of this prince seems to have been Vásudeva, and this adoption of an Indian name by a foreign prince was the result of a long residence in India. The variation Vásuška may have been made by some ignorant person in order to harmonize it with the names Kanișka and Huvishka. Nothing is known about the name of Vásudeva but that he also enjoyed a long reign and was alive in the year 99 = 177 A.D. The great Kusana empire came to an end after Vásudeva. His dominions included the Panjab, the provinces around Mathurā, and the portion of Central India as far south as Bhopal. It was during the earlier years of the reign of Vásudeva that Rudradāman, the Satrap of Rajputana and Malwa, conquered Cutch and Surat and the adjoining countries. The fact that he himself assumed the title of Mahā-Kṣatrapa shows that he did not wait for his paramount sovereign to bestow it on him. It is possible that Rudradāman, like the later Moghul governors, virtually became an independent monarch, but did not assume royal titles: Alverdi Khān and Sarāfī Khān were practically independent sovereigns. Vásudeva was a feeble sovereign, and the Trans-Indus provinces were probably lost to the Kusana empire during his reign. Vásudeva enjoyed a long reign of 36 years from the year 63 to the year 99 of the Saka era (140—177 A.D.). During the later years of this reign, the Panjab gradually slipped out of his hands. A new conqueror appeared at this time on the North-Western border of India. The last years of the second century witnessed the decadence of the powers of three great Asiatic monarchies, viz., the Parthian empire, the Kusana empire, and the Andhra empire. It was an evil time for Rome also, for at this time the reign of her good emperors was drawing to a close, and after the death of Commodus, the Great Oriental Empire was convulsed by a scramble for the purple in which all the great generals of the Roman Empire took part. For Parthia it was the third period of decline, as Rawlinson puts it, as the whole of the reign of Volageses III is a blank but for the occasional notices of Roman campaigns. In India, after the decease or deposition of Vásudeva, we find a Parthian king reigning over the province to the east of the Indus in the year 103. This is the date of the Takht-i-Bahāi inscription of Gomplorphenes, which, as we have seen above, is closely allied by its paleography to the Panjtar, Kaldarra, and

**Footnote:** A. S. E., Vol. III, p. 83, No. 8 (No. 47 of the list), and I. A., Vol. XXXIII, p. 105, No. 20.
Mount Banj inscriptions, which are dated in the era used in the Kuşana inscriptions, i.e., the Saka era. But two objections have been raised against this—

(1) Gondophernes is the contemporary of the Apostle Thomas, and

(2) The coins of Gondophernes resemble those of Azes and Soter Megas (the nameless king), which fact places his reign in the first half of the first century A.D. As to the first Gondophernes contemporaneity with St. Thomas is doubtful. The first mention of the names of the two kings Māzāi and Gondophernes is to be found in the Acts of St. Thomas which were compiled in the first half of the third century A.D. and so cannot be trustworthy sources of historical fact. The probable cause of the mention of their names is that they were contemporaries whose names were still fresh for some reasons in the minds of Western sailors and that the chronologist connected their names by mere chance with the mission of the Apostle. As to the second it cannot be denied that numismatic evidence is of value only when epigraphy and paleography are absent and to aid and supplement the conclusions derived from them. The resemblance of coin-type and standards cannot be relied on against paleographic evidence. The accession of Gondophernes must have taken place in A.D. 155 or in the Saka era 77. The paleography of the Greek legends on his coins supports this. The square omegas and the square omikron also occur on the coins of Valēgeses III of Parthia, who was a contemporary of the emperors Marcus Aurelius and Commodus and most probably also of Gondophernes and Vāsudeva. The history of Parthia also compels us to place Gondophernes in the last half of the second century A.D. If Gondophernes is placed in the first half of the first century A.D., then he becomes a contemporary either of Phraateses, Orodes II, Vonones I or Artabanas III. The Parthian empire was even then too powerful to allow of the establishment of a powerful rival monarchy on their frontiers. Gondophernes was, no doubt, a Parthian. The establishment of an empire consisting of Seistan, Kabul, Kandahar, and the Western Panjāb is only possible when the Parthian empire was too feeble to lift its arms in self-defence.

According to Rawlinson, Parthia reached this stage of decline in the reign of Valēgeses III and IV. Thus it is extremely probable that the accession of Gondophernes took place in the year 77 of Saka era and the year 103 of the Takht-i-Bahai inscription is equivalent to 181 A.D. The conquest of the Western Panjāb must have been taken place somewhat earlier, say, in 170 A.D. But Parthian domination in the Panjāb must have been very short-lived, for 19 years after the Takht-i-Bahai record we find a Kuşāna prince once more ruling over the country bordering on the Indus. The kingdom of the successors of Gondophernes lay towards Kandahar and Seistan. They were probably deprived of their dominions by the earlier Sassanians. In India the remnants of the Kuşāna empire were divided into several small monarchies which continued to exist up to the middle of the fourth century until Samudragupta and Candragupta II made an end of them. Inscriptions of the third and fourth centuries of the Christian era are very rare in Northern India and the coins of the later Kuşānas are of no help, as they are mere copies of the coins of Vāsudeva. Some of these coins are imitations of those of Sapor I and Hormuz I. The latter prince is said to have married the daughter of a Kuşāna king of Kabul. Further mentions in Persian history show that the later Kuşānas continued to exist for a century or two longer until they were displaced by the Kidāra-Kuşānas or swept away by the White Huns. The latest date among Kharoṣṭhī inscriptions is the year 200 = 278 A.D. We may assume that the Kharoṣṭhī script was current up to this date, after which it was supplanted by the Brāhmī as found on the coins of the Kidāra-Kuşānas. The characters of the Dewā inscription of the year 200 fully bear out the above conclusion. They are a degenerate form of Kharoṣṭhī, later than the characters of the Skasserāder inscription. The

77 British Museum Catalogue of Greek Coins, Parthia, by Warwick Wrather, p. 244.
78 Rawlinson's Six Oriental Monarchies, p. 330.
characters are so bad that when I saw it for the first time, in the Lahore Museum, I took it to be one of Col. Deane’s novel inscriptions. 56

It will be observed that nothing has been said about three dated inscriptions —

1. The years 41, 42, and 45 in the Nasik inscriptions of Udayaśīa and the year 46 in the Junnar inscription of Ayama, all of which fall in the reign of Nahapāna. 57

2. The year 72 on the Jaina inscription from Mathura. 58

3. The year 78 of the Taxila copperplate of Patika, son of Liaka. 59 The year 72 of the Mathura inscription falls in the reign of Mahā-Kaśīrāja Soḍāsa, and we have seen that it cannot be placed in a line with the Kuṇāna dates and so referred to the Saka era. It is impossible to refer it either to the Lankika, the Mālava-Vikrama or the Csesara eras, since there are reasons to believe that the first two eras were never current in Northern India during the first six or seven centuries of the Christian era or before, and that the third was never heard of on this side of the Euphrates in those days. It is also impossible to refer this to the Seleucidian era or the Maurya era, since palaeographical evidence proves that Soḍāsa must be placed within one hundred years of the accession of Kaniṣka, i.e., between B. C. 90 and A. D. 78. It is also impossible to imagine that any era was in use in Northern India before the Gupta period in which the hundreds were omitted. The year 72 probably refers to an era long forgotten which was established by the earlier Scythian conquerors of Northern India.

The case of the date in the Taxila copperplate inscription is also similar. The inscriptions on Dr. Bhagwanlal’s Mathur Lion Capital prove that the Kaśtrapas Soḍāsa and Patika were, to some extent, contemporaries; and on this ground it may be assumed with safety that the year 72 refers to the same era. It is not at all necessary to refer these to any Indian era which is still current or the name of which has been discovered up to date. Many eras were established in India which have fallen into oblivion. Some new discovery may furnish the clue to solve the problem which seems too difficult to solve with the scanty materials at present at our disposal. The dates of the Mahā-Kaśīrāja Nahapāna should be referred to the same era as that used in the Mathura and Taxila inscriptions. We have seen above that it is hardly possible that Nahapāna established an era of his own. His connection with a Northern monarch is proved by the presence of the Kharoṣṭhi legends on his coin. The characters of his inscriptions are earlier than those of the inscriptions who are now held to be his contemporaries, and so much earlier than those of the Junagadh inscription that it is impossible to place Rudradāman 26 years after Nahapāna. The fact that the characters of Udayaśīa’s inscriptions are earlier than those of the inscriptions of Soḍāsa preclude any possibility of the use of the Saka era in these inscriptions. Moreover, Udayaśīa or Raṣhabhadatta is a very good Indian name, and simply because he has been called a Saka it cannot be assumed that he was a foreigner, and, further, that his father-in-law used the Saka era. 60 Nahapāna is a good old Persian name as Mr. Thomas has shown, 61 and may it not be that the Śākya Raṣhabhadatta married his daughter Dakaśamitra to improve his own position. The Prakrit word Saka is equivalent to two Sanskrit words — (1) Saka, signifying a foreigner; (2) Śākya, signifying either a Buddhist or a descendant of the tribesmen to which the Buddha Gautama himself belonged.

56 Voyez, J. A., 9e série, tom. 4e, p. 510, pl. 34.
59 Udayaśīa has been called a Saka in a mutilated Nasik inscription. E. L., Vol. VIII, p. 85, No. 14-5, plate vi.
60 J. R. A. S., 1865, p. 211, No. 17.
APPENDIX I.

New Kharoṣṭhī inscriptions from the Lahore Museum.

Including the Ara inscription (page 58 above), I edit four new Kharoṣṭhī inscriptions on this occasion. I have styled these inscriptions "new" because I have not come across them in any book or journal dealing with Indian epigraphy. Most of the inscriptions in Kharoṣṭhī characters were discovered in the new Frontier provinces and are now deposited in the Lahore Museum. The Kaldarra inscription has been edited before by Messrs. Bühler and Senart, but I have here reproduced it again because M. Senart's facsimile is too indistinct.

Muchai inscription of the year 81; Plate II.

I. — Dr. Stein's Catalogue of Inscriptions in the Lahore Museum mentions that this inscription was found in a Huirā in Muchai in Yusufzai. I am not certain as to the meaning of the word Huirā, but Muchai is the name of the place at which the inscription was discovered. The Lahore Museum Number of this inscription is I, 46. The inscription is incised on a big slab of bad sandstone or kankar and the inscribed surface measures 2 feet by 10 inches. The inscription is in two lines, and the characters are on the average 2 to 3 inches in height and have been clearly incised. Judging from the characters, the inscription can be safely classed with the Kuṣana group of Indian inscriptions, and consequently the date in it should be referred to the Saka era. The date of the inscription, the year 81, falls in the reign of Vāsudeva, The only other Kharoṣṭhī inscription of this prince's reign is the Fateh Jang inscription of the year 68. Beyond the year, the inscription gives no details of the date, such as the day and the month.

Text.

(1) Vāṣa caṇāśātimayō XX, XX, XX, XX, I.

(2) Sahayatena kac Vasiṣṭhena.

Translation.

"In the year eighty-one, 81, (this) was done by Sahayata (and) Vasiṣṭha:" or "In the year eighty-one, 81 (this) was done with assistance by Vasiṣṭha,"

I am not quite sure of the two words Sahayatena and Vasiṣṭhena. They may also mean something also, but I have adopted Dr. Bloch's suggestion that both of them are proper names. Kac is equal to Kita in Sanskrit. Sahayatena may also mean "by assistance (received from others)." Vasiṣṭha is undoubtedly a proper name. I find in the Lahore Museum Catalogue that this inscription has been referred to in the Report of the explorations of the 10th Sappers under Captain Maxwell in 1882. If I am right in referring the Kuṣana dates to the Saka era, then the date of this inscription is 81 + 78 = 159 A.D.

Paja inscription of the year 111; Plate II.

II. — This inscription was discovered at Paja in Yusufzai and was presented by Major (now Sir H. A.) Deane to the Lahore Museum. The inscription has been incised on a big boulder and the inscribed surface is 4 feet by 1 foot. The characters of the inscription belong to the Kuṣana group of Kharoṣṭhī characters, the only archaic form being the dental as in
New Kharoṣṭhī inscriptions from the Lahore Museum—(contd.).

which there is a small vertical line in prolongation of the tail which seems to be the later form of the Maurya sa in which the left side of the head of the later is connected by a straight line with the tail. This form of sa is also found on the Hastinagar pedestal inscription and also in No. I above, where it occurs only once. But in this inscription the archaic variety occurs side by side with the later or Keśāna variety. The inscription is dated both in words and in numerical symbols in the year 111 (189-90 A. D.) on the 16th day of the month of Sravana (Śrāvaṇa) and records some deed, probably the erection of a building and the excavation of a well by Saṅgamitra, son of Ananda. The votive formula at the end of the second line proves that the donor was a Buddhist. The formula is Mata pitae puyae sava satana hida suhae. If we compare with this the formula used in the Saranāth inscription of Bhikṣu Bala, Sarvasatvānā hi sa sukhārthasa, we at once come to the above conclusion. This formula is not altogether absent from Jaina inscriptions and also occurs on some Jaina inscriptions from Mathura 62 though there it is rare. There is one word in this inscription which offers some difficulty. This is the second word in the 1st line, ekada-katimayā, which is rather a curious form, evidently an apabhraṃśa of Ekadasi-khika-katamaya. Fortunately the numerical symbols are quite distinct and verify the above conclusion. The word Kue occurs in the second line, and is undoubtedly the apabhraṃśa form of kūpa, i. e., a well. The next word after kue is kattīte, which, as Dr. Bloch suggests, is the apabhraṃśa form of kartīteh, meaning cut or excavated. I do not know what this refers to. It may refer both to the excavation of a tank or kūḍa or to the quarrying of the block itself. The word Saṅgamitra is probably the Northern Prākrit form of Saṅgamitra, but it may also be Saṅgamītra, while Ananda is undoubtedly the apabhraṃśa form of Ananda.

Text.

(1) Saṅvatsaraye ekadasi-mayā, I, C. XI, Sravanasa masasa di (va) se paccadase 10, 4, 1.

(2) Ananda putrena Saṅgamitrena kue kattīte mata pitae puyae sava satana hida suhae.

Notes.

(1) The top of the word ku in kue in the second line is a little curved.

(2) The symbol for one hundred is like that in the Kaldarra and Takht-i-Bahai inscriptions.

(3) The last but one word Divase in the first line is incomplete, as the second letter sa has been omitted, apparently through carelessness.

(4) The letters sa and ta are easily distinguishable, as the former has a short vertical line, while in the latter it is usually long. Compare the ra in Saṅvatsaraye and ta in Mata pitae.

(5) The letters are neatly incised, but the stone has suffered much from erosion, the last words of the second line having suffered most.

Translation.

"In the year one hundred and eleven, 111, on the fifteenth, 15, day of the month of Sravana (Śrāvaṇa), this well was excavated by Saṅgamitra, the son of Ananda, in honour of his father and mother (and) for the well-being and happiness of all beings."

New Kharoṣṭhi inscriptions from the Lahore Museum—(conclud.).

Shakardarra inscription of the year 40; Plate I (see opposite page 58).

III. — This inscription was discovered in an old well in Shakardarra near Campbellpur, and was presented by F. S. Talbot, C. S., to the Lahore Museum (No. I, 142). It is a very small inscription, being equal in size to the Mount Bajaj inscription of the year 200. It is dated in the year 40 on the twentieth day of Prāṇḍhapaṇḍa, and consequently falls within the reign of Kaṇḍa. The name of the month is Pṛthavādā and not Pṛthavāda as Dr. Vogel observes, the right hand stroke of the subscript ra being absent at the end of the left vertical. I have been able to understand only the two first two lines of the inscription, the rest containing a strong mixture of some foreign dialect and consequently being unintelligible to me. My reading of the last two lines is consequently tentative and requires and admits of considerable improvement. At the end of the 4th line a horse and a pear or guava has been drawn on the stone, most probably by the sculptor himself.

Text.

(1) Saṅ XX, XX, Pṛthavādā massasa divas(a).
(2) Viśamiti, 20 atra divasa kale.—
(3) Ekaṃeka Vokhada otro niva-nasa.
(4) . . . . Danamukho.

The words in italics are uncertain. In the second line I have read the last but one word kale, because the first letter is almost like the ā in the Suś-Vihara copperplate. The second letter le is certain. The rest of the characters of the inscription belong to the fourth variety of Dr. Bühler's classification of Kharoṣṭhi. No full translation of the inscription is possible at present, and so I have attempted the two first two lines only.

Translation.

"In the year 40 on the 20th day of the month of Pṛthavāda (Prāṇḍhapaṇḍa) on the above mentioned day and year . . . ."

Kaladarra inscription of the year 113; Plate III.

IV. — This inscription was discovered by Dr. Waddell in the Kaladarra or Kaladarra Nādi near Dargai in the North-West Frontier provinces and was presented to the Lahore Museum by Major (now Sir H. A.) Deane. It has been edited before by Dr. Bühler in a short note to the Vienna Oriental Journal, Vol. X, p. 55, and by M. Senart in the Journal Asiatique, 1899, Part I, p. 533.

Text.

(1) Dataputra Tāhīdorena pukka
(2) rani karavita savra sapana puyae

Translation.

"By the son of Datī, Thāhīdora, a tank was caused to be excavated for the worship of all snakes (in) the year 113 on the 20th (day) of (the month of) Sravana."

APPENDIX II.

List of dated Kharoṣṭhī inscriptions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Era</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Locality</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td><em>E. I.</em>, Vol. IV, p. 54, and plate.</td>
<td>Shadheri (Taxila)</td>
<td>This is in the Library of the R. A. S. of Great Britain and Ireland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td>Edited in this paper by the author.</td>
<td>Shakardarah, near Campbellpore.</td>
<td>Lahore Museum, No. I, 142.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot;</td>
<td>Ara, near Baghonilab.</td>
<td>&quot; &quot; No. I, 133.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## List of dated Kharoṣṭhī inscriptions—(concl.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Era</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Locality</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Edited in this paper by the author.</td>
<td>Muchai in Yusufzai.</td>
<td>No. I, 46.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Edited by the author in this paper.</td>
<td>Pajā in Yusufzai.</td>
<td>No. I, 47.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td><em>J. A.</em>, 9e série, tom. 13, p. 523, et la planche; re-edited by the author in this paper.</td>
<td>Kaldara, near Dargh</td>
<td>No. I, 77.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td><em>J. A.</em>, 9e série, tom. 4, 1894, Part 2, p. 510, planche v, no. 34.</td>
<td>Dewai in Yusufzai</td>
<td>No. I, 44.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX III,

**Synchronistic table of the Scythian period.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. C. 231</td>
<td>Death of Asoka. Dismemberment of the Maurya Empire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. C. 225</td>
<td>Loss of the Trans-Indus Provinces and the Panjab.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. C. 184</td>
<td>Brhadhratha, the last Maurya King, killed. Acc. of Pushyantra the Sunga.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. C. 165</td>
<td>Defeat of the Yue-chi by the Hiung-Nu; war between Eukratides and Demetrius.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. C. 165</td>
<td>Plato, the Bactrian king and rival of Eukratides.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. C. 163</td>
<td>Nan-teou-mi, the Chief of the Wu-Sun, defeated and slain by the Yue-chi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. C. 160</td>
<td>Occupation of the territory of the Se by the Yue-chi. Retirement of the Se southwards into Kipin (Kapiā).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. C. 150</td>
<td>Heliokles succeeds Eukratides in Bactria. The Yue-chi expelled from the land of the Se by Kweu-Mo, the young Wu-Sun Chief.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. C. 148</td>
<td>Aqnimitra the Sunga, Emperor of Northern India.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. C. 145</td>
<td>Extinction of the Greek dynasty to the North of Paroponisos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. C. 136</td>
<td>Death of Mithridates the Great of Parthia and acc. of Phraates II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. C. 135</td>
<td>Chang-kien despatched by the Chinese Emperor Wuti on a mission to the Yue-chi. Strato I, King of the Panjab.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. C. 130</td>
<td>Scythian invasion of Parthia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. C. 127</td>
<td>Death of Phraates II and acc. of Artabanes II. Repeated invasions of the Scythians.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. C. 125</td>
<td>Chang-kien’s arrival in Bactria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. C. 124</td>
<td>Death of Artabanes II, in a fight with the Scythians. Acc. of Mithridates II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. C. 122</td>
<td>Return of Chang-kien to China.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Synchronistic table of the Scythian period—(contd.).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year.</th>
<th>Events.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.C. 120</td>
<td>Strato II, King of the Panjab.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.C. 114</td>
<td>Death of Chang-kien.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.C. 100</td>
<td>Extinction of the supreme power of the Greek princes in the East. Vonones, Emperor, of Seistan, Afghanistan, and the Panjab. Spalakes, Spalagadames, and Azas subordinate to Vonones, and Bhumaks, the Khararita Satrap in Western India. Formation of the five Yue-chi principalities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.C. 89</td>
<td>Death of Mithridates II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.C. 75</td>
<td>Spalireses, son of Spalakes. Acc. of Spalagadames and Azas subordinate to Spalireses; Nahapana Satrap of Western India.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.C. 72</td>
<td>Destruction of the Sunga Empire, Vasudeva Kasya’s acc. to the throne of.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.C. 65</td>
<td>Murder of a Chinese Officer by a King of Kipin in the reign of the Emperor Sien-fu (B.C. 75–49). Syria made a Roman province.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.C. 60</td>
<td>Disruption of the Empire of the earlier Scythians. Azas declares himself independent in the provinces to the East of Khyber. Azilises and Aspavarma subordinate to Azas. Hagamua and Hagamassa, Satraps of Mathura; Nahapana semi-independent in Western India.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.C. 53</td>
<td>Defeat of Crassus at Carrhae.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.C. 49</td>
<td>Yue-chi conquest of Kipin under Heraeus (Yin-mo-fu).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.C. 45</td>
<td>Azilises, the king of the Panjab and Mathura. Azas II subordinate; Manigul, Satrap of Taxila.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.C. 44</td>
<td>Assassination of Julius Caesar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.C. 42</td>
<td>Battle of Philippi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.C. 40</td>
<td>Refusal of the Chinese Emperor Yuen-ti (B.C. 48–33) to resent the insult offered to his envoy by Yin-mo-fu, King of Kipin. Rayvula, Satrap of Mathura; Jihunuia, Satrap of Taxila.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.C. 39</td>
<td>Syria recovered from the Parthians by Ventidius.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.C. 35</td>
<td>Liaka, Satrap of Taxila. Azas II, nominal King of the Panjab.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.C. 7-33</td>
<td>Parthian Expedition of Mark Antony.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Synchronistic table of the Scythian period—(cont’d.).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. C. 31</td>
<td>Battle of Actium.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. C. 30</td>
<td>Soñasa, Satrap of Mathurā. Roman conquest of Egypt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. C. 28</td>
<td>Mathurā inscription of the year 72 of an unknown era, probably founded by Venanes, of the reign of the Mahākṣatrapa Soñasa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. C. 27</td>
<td>Extinction of the Kānya dynasty by the Andhras in Northern India.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. C. 25</td>
<td>Refusal of the Chinese Emperor Ching-ti to acknowledge an embassy from the King of Kipin. Masise, Moa, or Moga succeeds Avas II in the nominal sovereignty of the Panjāb. Kharahostes, son of Artaus, Satrap of some provinces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. C. 22</td>
<td>Taxila copperplate inscription of Patika of the year 78 in the reign of the King Moga.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. C. 2</td>
<td>The Chinese graduate King Hien or King-lu receives Buddhist books from a king of the Yue-chi. Death of Phrastes IV of Parthia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. D. 6</td>
<td>Loriyan Tāngāi image inscription of the Maurya year 318.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. D. 8</td>
<td>Temporary cessation of intercourse between China and the West.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. D. 14</td>
<td>Death of Augustus. Tiberius, the Emperor of Rome.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. D. 15</td>
<td>Consolidation of the five Yue-chi principalities into the Kuśana Empire under Kadphises I.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. D. 20</td>
<td>Kadphises I conquers Kabol.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. D. 24</td>
<td>First Han dynasty of China ended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. D. 33-37</td>
<td>War between Artabanus III of Parthia and Tiberius.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. D. 38</td>
<td>Caius (Caligula), the Emperor of Rome. Peace with Parthia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. D. 40</td>
<td>Death of Artabanus III.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. D. 41</td>
<td>Claudius, the Emperor of Rome.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Synchronistic table of the Scythian period—(contd.).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. D. 51</td>
<td>Death of Gotarzes of Parthia. Rock-sculptures of Gotarzes,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. D. 52</td>
<td>Acc. of Volagases I.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. D. 54</td>
<td>Nero, the Roman Emperor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. D. 55</td>
<td>Death of Kadphises I. Acc. of Wema-Kalpīs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. D. 60</td>
<td>Rome recovers Armenia. Kadphises II conquers North India up to Mathūra.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. D. 67</td>
<td>Buddhist books brought to China by order of the Emperor Ming-ti.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. D. 68-69</td>
<td>Galba, Otho, and Vitellius, the Roman Emperors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. D. 70</td>
<td>Vespasian, the Roman Emperor. War between Parthia and Rome for Armenia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. D. 76</td>
<td>Hashtnagar image inscription. Maurya year 384.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. D. 78</td>
<td>Death of Kadphises II. Acc. of Kanīṣka. Establishment of the Saka era. Death of Volagases I. Kharapallāna, the Satrap of Mathūra.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. D. 79</td>
<td>Titus, the Roman Emperor. Kanīṣka conquers Northern India as far as Benares.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. D. 81</td>
<td>Domitian, the Roman Emperor. Sarnath inscription of Traipīṭakopādhyāya Bala and Bhikṣu Puṣyavuddhi. Vanaspara, Satrap of Benares.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. D. 82</td>
<td>Mathūra inscription of the year 4. Sravasti image inscription of Bala and Puṣyavuddhi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. D. 88</td>
<td>Strained relations with China.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. D. 89</td>
<td>Viceroy Sīh crosses the Sung-lin to punish the Chinese. Suś-Vihar and Zeda inscriptions of the year 11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. D. 90</td>
<td>Kughān army defeated by Panchao.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. D. 91</td>
<td>Huviguṇa left in charge of the Indian provinces with full imperial titles. Kanīṣka crosses the Indus and takes the field in person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. D. 96</td>
<td>Vespaš, the Satrap of Taxila. Manikyala inscription of the year 18. Nerva, the Roman Emperor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. D. 98</td>
<td>Loss of all provinces to the North of Hindu Kush. The Emperor Trajan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. D. 100</td>
<td>Death of Tiridates of Parthia. Internal troubles in Parthia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. D. 102</td>
<td>Death of Panchoa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. D. 105</td>
<td>Reconquest of Bactria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. D. 110</td>
<td>Conquest of Kashgar, Yarkand, and Khotan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. D. 111</td>
<td>Mathurā inscription of the year 33 of the reign of Huvishka.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. D. 115</td>
<td>Fourth Buddhist Council in the Kuṇḍalā-Vana-Vihāra in Kāśmīra (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. D. 115</td>
<td>Parthian Expedition of Trajan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. D. 116</td>
<td>Trajan conquers Mesopotamia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. D. 117</td>
<td>Hadrian, the Roman Emperor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. D. 118</td>
<td>Asvaghosa, a subordinate King of Benares. Aśoka pillar inscription of the year 40.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. D. 118</td>
<td>Sakardarra inscription of the year 40.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. D. 119</td>
<td>The Ara inscription of the year 41.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. D. 123</td>
<td>Death of Kaniška. Acc. of Huvishka. Cašṭana, the Satrap of Ajmere.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. D. 140</td>
<td>Death of Huvishka. Acc. of Vāsadeva.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. D. 146</td>
<td>The Sāñci inscription of the year 68.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. D. 148</td>
<td>Acc. of Volagases III. Rudradāma himself assumes the title of Mahākastrapa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.D. 155</td>
<td>Acc. of Gondophernes in Seistan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.D. 161</td>
<td>Marcus Aurelius Antoninus, the Roman Emperor. Parthian attack on Afghanistan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.D. 165</td>
<td>End of the Roman War with Parthia. Third stage of Parthian decline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.D. 170</td>
<td>Parthian Conquest of the Panjāb. Dāmazāda, son of Rudrādāma, becomes Satrap of Western India.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.D. 175</td>
<td>Eastern Campaign of Marcus Aurelius. Jivadāma, son of Dāmazāda, Satrap of Western India.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.D. 176</td>
<td>Latest known date of Vāsudeva.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.D. 180</td>
<td>Commodus, the Roman Emperor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.D. 181</td>
<td>Gunda inscription of the Kṣatrapa Rudrasimha, son of Rudrādāma, the year 103.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.D. 181</td>
<td>Takhti-Bahl inscription of Gondophernes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.D. 189</td>
<td>The Pājā inscription of the year 111.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.D. 191</td>
<td>The Kaldarra inscription of Theodorus. Death of Volagueses III. Beginning of the fall of the Parthian Empire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.D. 198</td>
<td>Re-occupation of the Panjāb and Afghanistan by the successor of Vāsudeva.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.D. 200</td>
<td>Muliasar inscription of the Mahākṣatrapa Rudrasena, son of Rudrasimha, the year 122. The Panjār inscription of the Kuśana prince, who was probably the successor of Vāsudeva in Mathurā.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.D. 211</td>
<td>Caracalla, the Roman Emperor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.D. 213</td>
<td>Mathurā inscription of the year 135.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.D. 222</td>
<td>Saighadāma, son of Rudrasimha, becomes Satrap of Western India. Alexander Severus, the Roman Emperor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.D. 226</td>
<td>Ardeshir-babekan found the Sāsānian Empire in Persia. Dāmasus, son of Rudrasimha, Satrap of Western India.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.D. 257</td>
<td>The Skarradheri image inscription, the year 179.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.D. 260</td>
<td>Sapor I, King of Persia, defeats Valerian.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.D. 278</td>
<td>Mounj Bāuj inscription of the year 200. Extinction of the Kharāṣṭra script in India.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.D. 308</td>
<td>Mathurā inscription of the year 230.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.D. 310</td>
<td>Sapor II, the King of Persia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.D. 320</td>
<td>Ascension of Candragupta I, and establishment of the Gupta era.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.D. 330</td>
<td>Samudra Gupta, the Emperor of India.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.D. 350</td>
<td>Allahabad inscription of Samudra Gupta.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Synchonistic table of the Scythian period—(concl.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.D. 377</td>
<td>Mathurā inscription of the Gupta year 57.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.D. 385</td>
<td>Both Gayā image inscription of the Gupta year 64. Tukamala, a subordinate king of Bihar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.D. 400</td>
<td>Extinction of the remnants of Kuśāna power to the East of the Indus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.D. 414</td>
<td>Mathurā inscription of the Gupta year 114.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Postscriptum.—The above paper was written in November, 1906. Many new facts have been brought to light during this interval. Dr. Vogel informs me that according to Dr. Kielhorn the true date of the Baijnath Prāśāsti is Saka 1126. But this in no way affects my arguments. He has since discovered earlier inscriptions dated according to the Loka-Kāla but none of them are earlier than the 10th century A.D.

Dr. Fleet has been kind enough to send me the reprints of the papers in Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society. But I am afraid I cannot agree with him in the reading of the date of the Skārā-dhiri image inscription. His notes on the Palaeography of Coins have opened up a subject in which practically nothing has been done and so require prolonged consideration.

The publication of Mr. F. W. Thomas’s paper on the Mathurā Lion pillar capital inscriptions has removed a long felt want. It remains to be seen whether some Continental scholars shall take up the Wardak Bimaran and Mankaula inscriptions or not?—R. D. BAIKIRI.]

NOTES ON ANCIENT ADMINISTRATIVE TERMS AND TITLES IN THE PANJAB.

BY H. A. ROSE.

(Concluded from Vol. XXXVII, p. 351.)

In the previous article on this subject it was shown how completely the ancient terms and titles connected with administration in the State of Chamba had fallen into disuse, and how an entirely new set of terms had come into use in modern times. The new terms are few in number, illustrating the simplicity of the more recent administrative system; and their meanings disclose how primitive, so to speak, the system has become.

An investigation into the terms and titles in use in other Hill States in the Pañjāb gives equally meagre results, and illustrates the rough-and-ready methods of their administration. Hardly an ancient record exists, the most important, if not the oldest, being a Chronicle of the Mauṭi State, written in Taṅkri, from which the following terms are culled23:—

बालिकानि Animukdāri, a post held by the Kaśwar (said to be equivalent to private secretary).
खेस आकार, a revenue in kind.
बलिक बालिक, income-tax.
बसी बसी, a revenue-free grant.
बांग बांग, a gate-keeper.
भरोप भरोप, an assistant clerk.
सोलह गोक, a fund out of which alms were given.
हरियागु, an allowance for the Raśā’s kitchen.
खारेज खारेज, a tester of grain.
चतुर्घर Pathiyāra, equivalent to tevāla, receiver.
साध माय साध, a deed of grant.

---

23 The terms used in this Chronicle throw little light on the military organisation of the State. Aṣṭ is defined as a 'band of soldiers': bāṅ as a refuge. These terms appear to survive in place-names. On the other hand, words like maṇḍ (intrigue against the State), raṇ and dā (rebel), bāṇikā (bloodshed and plunder), oṣṭ (an indecisive fight), and ḍhejā (flight to avoid plunder by an invader) point to constant disorders.
In the adjacent State of Kullū, the principal natural tracts or pargāns were divided into wastāra, each under a wastār, as a collector of revenue subordinate to the chakītra wastār, or chief minister. The title of wastār is clearly a modern importation from the Muhammadan system, but the remaining terms appear to be older. Each wastār was divided into koṭhi under pālārs. The koṭhi was a granary into which revenue in kind was paid. Each koṭhi contained from 2 to 5 phāttis and each phārī comprised from 1 to 20 hamlets (grūhā). Besides the pālār each koṭhi had its koṭhīldār or treasurer: its panjālī, who collected supplies, milk, curds, wood, etc., for the royal kitchen; its kāītā or accountant (not by caste a Kāyastha): its jādī, a messenger and watchman; and its sokā (sewāk) who managed the corvée or kēdrā. In the Highlands (Sarāj) of Kullū the sokā was called bhātangi. The commandants of the migōl (an Arabic term probably borrowed from the Sikhs) or militia of the koṭhis were called nēgīs, and those in command of hill forts, garhīd nēgū.

Sir James Lyall gave an interesting account of the old administrative system in Kullū in his Settlement Report on that tract (1875). He describes the people as divided into two classes, those liable to military service, and dēghs, i.e., those who rendered only monial service. The men of the former class had a standard holding, called jōld, which may be put at 12 bhārs, in area, of land, half of which was held rent-free in lieu of service and called bartosjōld, the rest being styled kōnī or revenue-paying land. Occasionally a family holding one jōld furnished two men and so got two bartos, i.e., the whole jōld free; and it might acquire as many kōnī jōlās as it could, at least in theory. A dēgh’s holding was called chheti and ranged from 3 to 5 bhārs of land, held rent-free. Traditionally the jōld (jōlā) or distribution into jōlās, was ascribed to one of the Rājās (probably Jagat Singh), who had a dhol bāhl or doomsday book prepared. Annual registers of title (chakk bāhl) were also in use. In these records, the jōlās were classed as garhīd (service in a fort), chālā (service in cantonments), hārīkād (personal attendance on the rājā) and tarīpur (service as a constable); while the men liable to military service of different kinds were formed into migōl (regiments) under nēgūs. All the jōlās in the same koṭhi, or some part of a koṭhi, were originally considered equal in value and assessed alike, but some of exceptionally inferior land were known as akāsī jōlās and only paid a cash assessment. On an average in a kānī tī jōlād of 6 bhārs, 9 items were paid in kind and 3 in cash, viz., grain (wheat or barley); a rōtī kārī or kitchen tax of a sheep, a goat, or a rupee; oil gh; rape rā; pātan at a rupee a year; rassūm at 3 annas; and bharan at 2 annas. But the miscellaneous items varied in different wastāras, e.g., in Sarāj kātā and jōg, for religious ceremonies, were taken, as well as contributions for the Raghunath temple. Honey was taken in some places, the principle being to take a little of every thing.

23 The bhār was a seed measure and upon it was founded the ancient measure of lands, if unirrigated, and less usually if irrigated. In Upper Kullū the latter land was divided into kānīs, each paying a bār or grain-rent, which varied according to its quality, e.g., on some it was chākārā, 6-fold, on others chūnārā, 4-fold — the quantity of seed required to sow it. The measures in use were —

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 pāthas</td>
<td>1 chālīkā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 pāthas</td>
<td>1 kānī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2 kānīs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4 khāntis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3 tārānts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>4 kānīrās</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1 bhārs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>1 kāhārd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24 Kānī, of course, words of Urdu origin.

25 Chheti is defined in Dikin’s ‘Kullū Dialect of Hindi as ‘a married woman’s private property’: cf. also North Indian Notes and Queries, Vol. III, § 362.

26 The dōs levié are also appear to illustrate another important principle of the old native administrations, viz., to realise a separate tax for each and every purpose. Thus, the kāṭh and jōg were levié as a special contribution for religious purposes. A study of the numerous cases levié in the Panjab Hill States will show that an extreme this principle was carried.
The following is a list of the State officials in the Simla Hill States:

Mīdā, the chief’s next brother, holding the appointment of inspector and examiner in general.

Wazīr, minister.

Mautd or mahīd, an officer of a pargānd, corresponding to the pālārd, and having under him as his subordinates:

A krād or kardwak (from kārd, revenue, and uṣhīd, to collect), whose duty it is to collect the revenue and hand it over to the mautd for payment into the State treasury.

Gheenghūd (from ghi, clarified butter, and uṣhīd, to collect), whose duty it is to collect the revenue in ghi imposed on certain grass-lands.

Pūddā (from Hindi pūddā), a peon, whose duty is to do what the mautd and krād order him.

Bīlār, an inferior kardār, termed halmandī in the upper hills.

Bhandīr (from Hindi bhimandī), the officer in charge of the granary, corresponding to kotādīr: from bhādīr (Hindi bhāandār), granary.

In the Simla Hill States, the following terms are, or were, in use:

Bārn, an oath taken on the Chief of the State, and therefore more binding than the chūk, dhāl, or darohī, q. v. (used in the Korhā tahsil of Bashahr State).

The barn can only be cancelled by giving the chief a little gold, as well as a rupee (Kumhārsain). Paṇḍīt Tikā Rām Joshi, late Secretary to the last Rājā of Bashahr, notes, however, that there is no tradition of the barn in the Simla Hills.

Chūk, an oath taken on an official of the State: (used in the State of Kumhārsain).

Chīchādīr, a collector of the grain, ghi, etc., levied as revenue, appointed by the State (Kumhārsain).

Darohī, an oath on a State official (Kumhārsain).

Dīt (Sanskrit divya, an oath or ordeal). Ordeal were formerly used in cases which the State officials could not determine. One, called garm-dīt, consisted in placing a coin in a pan full of boiling oil and requiring the party swearing to take it out without burning his hand. Another, called thanād-dīt, was less severe. Two balls of flour were made, one containing a little gold, the other a little silver. These were put in a jar full of water, and a boy made to take them out and give one to each party: he who got the silver won.

Halmandī, “mate,” a village headman or his deputy (Kumhārsain).

Kothāda, a watchman or keeper of the State granary (Kumhārsain).

Khoārdī, a word used on the occasion of a dīt, in which the parties pay one rupee each, in cash to the chief as a guarantee that so much will be paid by the man who is proved in the wrong.

Maṅgrār, a village headman (Kumhārsain). Cf. māṇgrī, demand for tribute in Maṅgrī.

---

27 According to Paṇḍīt Tikā Rām Joshi, the following are the officials of a village deوت or godling in these States—Dīvādā, the person who speaks on behalf of the deity, and in whose court the deity is supposed to play (kheenghūd), is held in great respect by all persons. He must keep himself clean and pure three days before he enters the temple. When ‘playing’—his words are believed to be those of the deity itself. He has under him three officials, viz., a bhandīr, a krād, and a pūddā, i. e., treasurer, collector, and peon.

28 Wazīr is clearly a modern term, but it is widely used throughout Chamba, Maṅgrī, Kullū, and the Simla Hill States, as are its derivatives wazīrī and wazīrīd. Wazīr does not appear to correspond at all to wazīr, nor does wazīrī equal pargānd. In Kuknawar the term for wazīr is biēf (bimandī), and a pargānd is biēfīng.

29 All these oaths (bārn, chūk, etc.) can also be taken on a god, in which case the parties go to the temple and offer him a rupee, with a goat as a sacrifice.

21 Possibly represents H. chīchā, to err, miss (Plat. s. v.), also said to mean “to proceed against.”

22 From Sanskrit dūra, hostile action.

23 From kothā, granary.

24 From māṇgrī, to demand, beg.
Mauði. The term mauði or mot, in the hill dialect, means a powerful and independent man, who has no chief and pays no revenue. The word mauð (a free grant of land) is from the same root. Generally, the Jais of the plains, who first invaded these hills and settled in them, were called mauði; and afterwards other castes, who followed their example and combined with them in their plots, came to be called mauði. Their descendants cannot now be traced. In Kuthār State, Kāshī Rām, the last of the mauđa died about 1902 without issue. He lived in Kuthār, a village in the Phetā pargānd. There is an old tradition that Brāhmaṇ mauđi held possession of Bhājī, a village in pargānd Ghar. The Badoh Kānats of Badoh invited them in a jāg and gave them poison in their food. All died except a pregnant woman, who fortunately was not present at the jāg, and she gave birth to a son, whose descendants are the Bhagorāl (belonging to Bhagri) Brāhmaṇs of Maiqū State. The images (called mauđi) of the Brāhmaṇs, who were poisoned, are still worshipped in Badoh, and a jāg is held every third or fourth year in their memory, half its cost being defrayed by the State.31

Pīlārā, the head of a pargānd32 (Kumhārsain).

Thāl,36 if a dispute arise concerning land, a tree, or a horse, an oath (called thāl) is taken on the Chief of the State. If the person on whom it is imposed desires to be released from it, he must pay a rupee to the Chief (Kumhārsain).

PERSIAN AFFINITIES OF THE LICCHAVIS.

BY PROFESSOR SATIS CHANDRA VIDYABHUSANA, M.A., M.E.A.S.

In connection with Mr. Vincent A. Smith's very interesting article, 
Tibetan Affinities of the Licchavis, published ante, Vol. XXXII, pp. 232—233, I beg to offer a few observations for consideration. In the article referred to an attempt has been made to establish the theory that the Licchavis were a Tibetan tribe, which settled in the plains during pre-historic times. While admitting the kinship of the Licchavis with the early Tibetan Kings, I beg to differ from Mr. V. A. Smith in his main theory as to the origin of the Licchavis. In my humble opinion the Licchavis were a Persian tribe, whose original home was Nisibis, which they left for India and Tibet in the 6th century B.C. and 4th century B.C., respectively.

According to Ptolemy,1 Arrian,3 Strabo,3 and other classical writers, Nisibis was a most notable town in Aria to the south-east of the Caspian Sea. Wilson4 identifies it with the modern town of Nissa (off Horat) on the north of the Elburz Mountains between Astabad and Meshed. Vines5 grew here abundantly and it is traditionally known to have been the birthplace of the wine-god Dionysos. M. de St. Martin6 observes that Nisibis must have been of Median or Persian foundation, for its name is purely Iranian and figures in the cosmogonic geography of the Zend Avesta, and this observation tallies well with the account of Arrian, who, in his Indika,7 distinctly says that the Nyasioi (the inhabitants of Nysa or Nisibis) were not an Indian.

34 [Mauđi, a term for the early inhabitants of these hills. Their descendants are still found there. — Note by Paṇḍita Tīkā Ram Jōhi.]  
35 In parts of the Simla Hills the pargāns are divided into ghorās, a word not precisely defined.  
36 Thāl, in Pahārī, means to prohibit. In Jubbūl the fākh is explained to be virtually the same as the dārākh, thus: — When a man wanted to prevent any one from doing a wrong act he would say, 'Let the dārākh or fākh of the Rānā be upon you if you do it.' And then the man could not do the act until he had paid the Rānā a rupee for 'opening the fākh.' The latter term might perhaps be translated 'ban.'  
1 McCrindle's Ancient India as Described by Ptolemy, pp. 226 and 228.  
2 McCrindle's Ancient India Described by Megasthenes and Arrian, p. 179.  
3 McCrindle's Ancient India as Described in Classical Literature, p. 90.  
4 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 McCrindle's Megasthenes and Arrian, pp. 179-190.  
8 It is not definitely known whether this Nisibis is in any way connected with the famous city of that name in Mesopotamia (on the borders of Armenia) which rose to importance during the Assyrian period, continued under the Seleucids, and became the residence of the Kings of Armenia from 149 B.C. to 14 A.D., being afterwards conquered by the Romans. It is, however, probable that while Cyrus, the King of Persia (559 B.C. — 331 B.C.), was extending his sway up to Chorasmia (modern Khiva) and Sogdiana (modern Samarkand and Bokhara), a colony from Nisibis in Mesopotamia was planted in the North of Aria (off Horat) which, too, thenceforth bore the name of Nisibis (vide Encyclopædia Britannica, 9th Edition, Volumes XVII and XVIII, Articles Nisibis and Persia).
race. In fact, Nisaibis was a part of Persia. It appears to me very probable that while about 515 B. C. Darius, the King of Persia, sent an expedition to India, or rather caused the Indus to be explored from the land of the Pakhta (Afghans) to its mouth, some of his Persian subjects in Nisaibis (off Herat) immigrated to India, and having found the Paujab over populated by the orthodox Brahmanis, came down as far as Magadh (Behar) which was at that time largely inhabited by Vraiyas or outcaste people.

The earliest reference to the people of Nisaibis in Indian writings occurs in the famous Brahmanic Sanskrit work, the Manu-samhitā (Chapter X, verse 12), in which they have been designated as Niochibi, which is, no doubt, an Indian form of the Persian word Nisaibis. Manu describes the Niochibis as Vraiyas, or an outcaste royal race, and names them along with Khasa, Karaṇa, and others. In the Dharisya Purāṇa, Chapter 139, verses 33—55, Nikshubha is described as a daughter of the sage Rijśi of the Mihiya Gotra or Solar clan, and under the name of Hāvani as married to Śūrya, the Sun-god. I imagine that Nikshubha represents the name of a Persian girl of Nisaibis, who worshipped the sun-god, like other members of her race.

In the Indian Pali. works they have been called LICCHAVI or LICCHAVI, which is only a softened form of Niochibi or Nisaibis, and have been mentioned as living in a large number in Vaisali (in Magadh). That in the 5th century B. C. the Licchavis were not yet fully established in India, is evident from the Mahāparinibbāna Sutta, Chapter I, in which Ajitāsattu, the King of Magadh, is found to have been making plans for their expulsion from his kingdom. But the excellent horse-carriages and magnificent variegated dresses of the Licchavi youths and courtiers, Ambapali, described in Chapter II of the Mahāparinibbāna Sutta, lead us to suppose that they must have descended from a civilized race. By the first half of the 4th century A. D. the Licchavis became very powerful in India and Nepal. In the Allahabad Pillar inscription of Samudra Gupta (vide Fleet's Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum, Vol. III, p. 16) we find that a Licchavi princess named Kamāra Devi was married to Chandra Gupta I about 319 A. D. "That the Licchavis were then at least of equal rank and power with the early Guptas, is shown by the pride in this alliance manifested by the latter." Jayadeva I, the first historical member of the Licchavi tribe, reigned in Nepal A.D. 330—355 (vide Fleet, p. 135). In the Nepalese records such as the Vaiśākavi, the Licchavis have been allotted to the Sūrya Vaisā or Solar race. As late as about 700 A. D. there reigned in the east in Varendra (North-eastern Bengal) a king named Sihina, who sprang from the Licchavi race (vide Lama Tārinātha's Geschichte des Buddhismus von Schiefner, p. 146).

According to Pog-sam-gon-rang, Gyalrab-sum-tsho-long and other Tibetan books, the earliest Kings of Tibet from Nya-θi-tsa-po downwards belonged to the Li-tsa-byi race. There is, no doubt, that Li-tsa-byi is only a modified form of Licchavi. The first King of Tibet was Nya-thi-tsan-po, who was a wanderer from a foreign country. The exact date of his arrival in Tibet is unknown, but from De-btse-sām-po and other Tibetan records it appears that he lived between the 4th and 1st centuries B. C. It is probable that during the occupation of Sogdiana and the neighbouring places by Alexander the Great, the Bactrian Greek Kings and subsequently the Scythians (the Yue-chi) about 150 B. C., some Persian people from Nisaibis (off Herat) migrated to Tibet into the Himalyan regions, where they established a monarchical system of Government on the model of the Government in Persia.

---

10 Compare Alexander Csoma de Koror's Tibetan Grammar, p. 194. As books in Tibet were written long after the intercourse of that country with India had been opened, the Li-tsa-byei Kings of Tibet are often mentioned as having originally come from Vaisali in India. As a matter of fact the Licchavis of Vaisali and Tibet are collateral branches of a Persian race in Nisaibis (off Herat).
The Bum-yik variety of the Tibetan alphabet, which is in common use in Tibet, derived, I suppose, its name from the city of Bamyian (off Nisibis), which was visited by Hizen-thsiang in 600 A.D., and is now subject to the Afghans.

The custom of exposing the dead to be devoured by wild animals, as it prevailed in Vaiśali and is still found in Tibet, was, I believe, introduced into those countries from Persia by the Liechavri immigrants. It is hardly necessary to add that the practice of exposure of the dead was widely followed in Persia and its dependencies, including Nisibis.

The Bon religion, which preceded Buddhism in Tibet, is said to have originated from Tušīk (Persia). According to Durbhakṣa-gyel-mo-long, twenty generations of Tibetan Kings from Nya-thi-tsan-po down to Thi-po-tsan-po followed no other religion than the Bon, which prevailed in Tibet up to 780 A.D., when it was persecuted by King Tho-rong-de-tsan. The various black arts—such as witchcraft, exorcism, magic, performance of miracles, sacrifice of animals, etc., in which the Bon-po priests were skilled—must have been imported from Nisibis (Persia) by the Magi priests, who accompanied the Liechavri into Tibet. Sen-vab, who was one of the most prominent Bon-teachers, had among his spiritual descendants a Persian sage, named Mu-yo-tra-be-si.

That there was intercourse between Persia and Tibet in the ancient days, is evident from Kālīdāsa's (Sanskrit) Rāghuvānas, Canto IV (verses 59–88), in which the foreign conquests of Rāghu are described. Rāghu after subduing the Pārashta (Persians), Hunas (Huns) and Kambojas (the inhabitants of the Hindu Kush mountains, which separate the Gilgit Valley from Balkh), ascended the Himalayas, where he fought hard against the mountain tribes called U-thu-vi-sai-ketān, and afterwards crossing the Launitya (Brahmaputra River) came down to Prājyotisa (Assam). This conquest of Rāghu is, perhaps, a mere fiction, but it shows that in the days of Kālīdāsa, about 500 A.D., the people of India were aware of a route existing between Persia and India on the one hand and Persia and Tibet on the other.

BOOK NOTICE.

Parsa, a Commentary on Madana's Pārījata-mārjā. By Srī Lakshmana Sūri, Leipzig, 1897 (Bombay: British India Press, Fycula). The works of Srī Lakshmana Sūri show that, even in modern India, there are still Panjits who are keeping up the traditions of the great commentators of past centuries like Mallinātha. Sanskrit scholars owe to him commentaries on the Vepusamhita, Mahāprachāryā, and Uttararāmācarīya; and quite recently he has further earned their gratitude by his commentary on Madana's Pārījata-mārjā. Having sent him a copy of this drama in August, 1896, Prof. Hultzsch received the manuscript of Lakshmana Sūri's commentary on it as early as the 3rd November of the same year, with the remark that it would have been finished even sooner, if the author had not been engaged in valuable examination papers. It must not be concluded from this that the work is superficial. Quite the contrary. The commentary indeed occupies only 10 printed pages, but it is very learned, clear, easy to understand, and always to the point. The author is fully acquainted with the various Sāstras, is a matter of course with a good Panjita; but how few deserving this name can still be found at the present time? And which European would have been able to equal him? Now, only, we are able fully to enjoy Madana's sometimes fairly difficult verses; see, for instance, the commentary on Act I, verse 23. The author deserves our best thanks, as also does Prof. Hultzsch for having had the commentary composed by him. The drama itself may now be safely recommended as a textbook, as it can be conveniently disposed of during a single term.

Richard Schmidt.

Hallo, S. (Germany).

12 Vide Raj Suresh Chandra Das's article on "The Bon Religion" in the Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, Part I, 1881.

14 Uttararāmācarīya, according to the Mahābhārata (Salāpocchārīya, Chapter 26, and Bhāgavatge, Chapter 9) was the collective name of seven tribes that inhabited the Himalayas. It is a compound word, which may be analysed as follows: u+a+tr+s+uva+sa+ng+ketān = u + da-yul + sa-yul + ba-thang + tsang + khotan. In this compound we discern several well known Tibetan names, such as U—Central Tibet, Tsang—Western Tibet, Ba—Bathang, etc. Sa-yul, Da-yul, and Khotan were also provinces of Tibet.
THE BUDDHIST COUNCILS.

BY PROFESSOR L. DE LA VALLÉE POUSIN.

(Continued from page 18.)

II. — THE SECOND COUNCIL. 68

The account of the Council of Vaiśāli (Culla XII.) is one of the finest pages of ancient Indian literature. In spite, or perhaps even because of the clumsiness of the style and composition — "breakings-off," repetitions, brusque transitions, episodes badly connected with the general course of the story — the writer pictures to us with a greyish back-ground, in the half light of a legend which aims at being history, or of a history which "the Buddhist style unique in the world" cannot fail to render legendary, a wide plan, full of suggestive details, and every one seems agreed on this point, more or less susceptible of historical criticism.

We will give first of all, as we did above, an outline of the Pāli document.

1. § 1. "At Vessali, a hundred years after the Nibbāna of Bhagavaṅga, the Bhikkhus (named) sons of Vajji, established at Vessali, proclaimed it lawful to practise the ten points: Sīvīla, dvācāla, śāntara, āsana, anusati, ācīṇa, amathā, jaliyā, adasaṇa nisadana, jātarāparajata." 69

At this time Yasu, son of Kākaṇḍaka, travelling in the country of the Vajjjis, came to Vessali; he took up his lodging in the Great Wood (Maheśvara), in the hall of the Belvedere (Kālaśīvara). Now the Bhikkhu Vajjiputtakas of Vessali, on the day of the Uposatha, having filled a copper basin with water, and having placed it in the midst of the circle formed by the monks, say to the laymen who come: "Give to the community a karaṇa, a half, a quarter, a sixth of a karaṇa! The community will have need of diverse things." In vain Yasu protests: "Do not give! Gold and silver are not allowed to the ascetics, sons of Sakya . . . ."


69 Vīsākhaṅḍaka (Dulce, XI. 281—330) pointed out by Tārāṇātha, p. 41; "Das das Wesentliche dieser Geschichte aus dem Vinnaya kārana vollständig sehr bekannt ist, ist es hier nicht auf geschrieben." This history has been translated by Rockhill, LIA, 171—180 (see Schieffer's note, Tār. p. 41); nevertheless we think it will be of utility to give below in an appendix the Tibetan text and the translation of the paragraph consecrated to the definition of the six infractions.

Mahāśākāsānas, according to Wessaloff, note to Tārāṇātha, pp. 289 and 290.

Hsien-thsang, II. 397; Kern, II. 223.

Dharmaguptas, Nanjo 1117, according to Beal, Four Lectures, p. 83.

70 According to Masa, Raja Davida and Oldenberg, these figures must be taken as round numbers.

71 Or: '[forming the community] of Vessali.'

It must not be forgotten that five hundred bhikkhus of Vaiṣāli, Vajjiputtakas, are represented, Culla VII. 4, 1, as having adhered to the five rigorist propositions of Devadatta. — A notable contradiction.

According to Tārāṇātha (p. 40) the brothers from Vaiṣāli professed by the sickness of the venerable Dhitika to practise the ten "points." They were reproved by 700 arhats, with the Arhat Yaça at their head and in the Vihāra Kuñnapura (Balaiputra), under the reign of Nanda (dga'-byed) as patron (dgo-spa'i) the second collection of the Scripture took place. The Arhats are said to be Bahuprutiya (P) and from the region of Vaiṣāli, or to have come from the "six towns." (Kern, II. 263.)

72 Vaṭṭha = vara. = Tib. gehti.

These technical terms are merely enumerated here; they will be explained later on, in the actual body of the account.

73 We shall not discuss the personality of this Yaça; see Kern, II. 234, and Masa, p. 105, 8, and Oldenberg, Buddh. St., p. 624.

74 "In the midst of the Bhikkhusahāga." — Compare Div. Avad. 335; Avadānaśat. apud Burnouf, Intr. 457.
When the night was ended, the monks shared the money between them, and also offered his portion to Yasa, who refused it.

§ 2. The monks bring against Yasa the act of “reconciliation” (pratisāraṇiya kamma) “as having blamed pious laymen, full of excellent intentions”; that is to say, they condemn him to ask pardon from the laymen.92

Accompanied by a brother, whom he has demanded as attendant (anudāta) in conformity with the rule, Yasa goes into the town and speaks to the laymen: “I acknowledge that I blamed you, you who are, nevertheless, laymen, pious and of good intention; it is true. But why? Because I call illegal (adhamma) that which is illegal, the law, the law; because I call disorder (āvīsaya) disorder, and discipline, discipline.”

§§ 3—5. And he proves his right by citing discourses of Buddha, which are absolutely decisive on the question of the monks being forbidden gold and silver.

§ 6. The laymen are convinced and decide to break with the lapsed brethren: “There is none but Yasa who is an ascetic and a son of Sakya; all the others are neither ascetics, nor sons of Sakya.”

§ 7. The attendant relates to the monks the unexpected issue of the “reconciliation” of Yasa. “Yasa, without being deputed by us has preached to laymen”:94 Let us bring against him the act of suspension (ulukhepāṇiya kamma)! The Vajji puttas meet together to put this project into execution.

However, Yasa rises into the air and descends at Kosambi; he sends messengers to the brethren of the West,96 to those of Avanti,96 and of the Decoan, saying: “Come! Let us take this question in hand97 before the non-Dhamma spreads and the Dhamma be put aside . . . .” (The same terms as in Kācagāya’s speech before the First Council.)

§ 8. Yasa pays a visit to Sambhvita Sāgavaśin;98 he enumerates the ten points to him without furnishing any explanation and invites him in the same terms as above: “Let us take this question99 . . . .” Sāgavaśin accepts.

There arrive on the mountain Ahogāna sixty ascetics from Pātheyya (western), all arhats and observers of the Dhutāngas,100 eighty-eight ascetics from Avanti and the Dakkan all arhats, but of whom only practise the extreme austerity of the Occidentals.1

92 See Kern, II. 118.
93 Amhēhi asammatavo gihānavo pakāsito: “Without being deputed by us has proclaimed to laymen [a false doctrine].” The sin referred to is that of asamatāpajjātā.
94 Pāthheyvakas. — “Pātheyya is one of the four divisions into which India was divided and includes the great westerly kingdoms of Kura, Pañcāla, Maucha, Sūrasena, Asaka, Avanti, Gandhāra, Kāmphejā (Kānōgga, VII. 211),” E. Muller, J. P. T. S. 1885, p. 40 (cited by Kern, Manual p. 104).
95 M. Vīyu, § 275, 11 Avantakas.
96 Imam adhikaryam adhipiṣāsāsa: “Let us take in charge this legal question . . . .” M. Vīyu, § 276; 16, 281, 298.
97 Elsewhere Sākasambhāra; in the northern sources Çāvaya, Çānavasika (Kern, II. 231, n. 1; 271) Sopāvāsin.
98 Imam adhikaryam adhipiṣāsāsa: “Let us take in charge this legal question . . . .” (Vīyuva Texts, III., p. 193). As if it was here a question of the tenth point only (gold and silver) and not of the nine others. Perhaps the original account was only concerned with the question of gold and silver.
99 Sobbe śravaṇā, sobbe pījipātā, sobbe panaśavā, sobbe tavatīśā, sobbe tavatīśā. — Dhutānagas, 3, 1, 2. See below, 101, n. 6.
100 On the laws promulgated in favour of the monks of the South and from Avanti, see M. Vīyu, V. 13.
§ 9. The Bhikkhus (theras) deliberate: "This question is hard and troublesome. How can we obtain partisans so that we may be the stronger in this question?" — They think of sammooring Revata, a contemporary of Bhagavat, if we are to believe M. Vagga (VIII. 31) — who was dwelling at Soreyya. Revata, thanks to his celestial hearing, hears their discourse: he thinks: "This question is hard and troublesome, and surely [it is not or it would not be] seemly for me to mix myself up with such a question. Now the Bhikkhus will come and, surrounded by them, I shall not easily get away. What if I took the pretention of leaving." Revata goes to Saúkkassa. The theras, not finding him at Soreyya, hasten to Saúkkassa; but the sañvat is no longer there, and they are obliged to pursue him from place to place, Kaöya, Kujja, Udambara, Aggalapura. Finally, at Sahajáti, where they finally arrive, they learn that Revata is still in the town.

§ 10. Sívávasin makes Yasa observe that Revata will probably be occupied in giving a lesson to his pupil. When the lesson is finished, Yasa questions Revata on the ten points: "Is the practice of the Síáy leóu lawful?" etc. The saint does not understand the formula: "What," he asks, "is the Síáy leóu, etc.?" After Yasa's explanations Revata replies that the ten practices are prohibited, except the sixth, which is sometimes lawful, sometimes not. Formulas 9 and 10 seem to have been sufficiently clear for them to have been condemned upon a mere hearing without Yasa having to take trouble to explain them.

"Such are, concludes Yasa, the ten points that the ascetics (called) Vajjiputtakas, from Vesáli, have proclaimed. Come, let us take this question . . . . " Revata accepts.

II. § 1. The Vajjiputtakas learn the steps taken by Yasa. They also seek for allies: "This question is hard and troublesome . . . ." They think to seduce Revata and repair to Sahajáti armed with all kinds of utensils for monastic life to give him.

§ 2. Episode. The venerable Síthá asks himself who is in accord with the Dhamma (dhammavádaín), the Orientals or the Occidentals. Considering the Dhamma and the Vinaya,

---

2 idáni kho adhikaraññhakkhtahatvamuccëta ca — "Kakkha = hard = difficult. Váli is doubtful: although the substantive váli may be represented by both, I am inclined to believe that váli corresponds to the adjective vála, bad." [Communication from M. Kern.] — Vinaya Texts: "This legal question now is hard and subtle." —

3 na kho me tañ pedajápyay no 'ham mavora adhikarama ocçikāyantah idáni ca pana te bhikkhu ājñavīsanti. se 'ham tohi ākiñcana ná pāthathu samissanti. Yá támahú pájiçaca éva gccheyyantah iti. On ocñkkásissi, see Childers and Mhv. I. 389 (avasakkati; sakk representing saccd) = "withdraw from." pájiçaxa and elsewhere pájiçaxaca = pratiññhya = means 'by way of preclusion." See M. Vagga. I. 31 ("kasas"); C. Vagga. VI. II; Suttaváda. II. p. 44; Theraváda. 547; Ját. III. 295, 25 ("kasii ca"). [Communicated by M. Kern.]

In order to follow M. Kern I depart from the version of Messer. B. D. and O.: "This legal question is both hard and subtle, it would not become to me to hold back therewith. But even now those Bhikkhus (the Vajjians) will be coming. It would be unpleasant travelling for me were I to fall in with them. Let me go on before them." This version seems to me to be reconcilable neither with the text nor with the context. "These Bhikkhus (te bhikkhu) can only be the therav bhikkhus whose deliberations Revata has just heard and who are, in fact, coming to Soreyya, as the Saint had foreseen.

4 idáni ca pamànaññham Rayco anettaniham sarabhágakham bhikkhum ajñhaññam, so tassa tassa bhikkhum sarabhágamanipàriññhabhikkhum ajñhaññam Rayco. " — Vinaya Texts: "And even now Revata will call upon a Bhikkhu who is an intiner, and a pupil of his. Do you, therefore, when the Bhikkhu has concluded . . . ." — "ajñhaññam" provided that the reading is correct, can only mean "will invite" [see Morris, J. P. T. S. 1905]. The Master will invite (polite expression instead of "will command") his disciple (his pupil) to recite his lesson. Ajñhaññam would be more natural. The exact sense of sarabhágaka is not determined. Without doubt, a recitation of some nature or other." [Communicated by M. Kern.]

Buddha having forbidden the "intoned recital" of the Dharma (ajñhaññam stharnama dharmam gáyanti), the monks abstain from the sarabhágá. The Master corrects them with regard to this (C. Vagga. V. 3, and the translators' note).

5 yáciññhasa and páññhâyakas.
he resolves the problem in favour of the second. A divinity comes to confirm him in this view. All the same, the sage decides not to show his opinion before being "chosen for this question."

§ 8. The Vajjipattakas offer Revata the presents they have brought: "No," replies Revata, "I have the three robes." Not regarding themselves as beaten, they turn to Uttara, a monk attached to the person of Revata and having twenty years [of ordination]. He refuses at first; but a little delicate flattery shakes his resolution. He accepts a robe, saying: "Tell me what do you wish?" — "Nothing but this, that the venerable Uttara say to the theri that the theri should announce in the midst of the Samgha that the Buddhas rise in the countries of the East, that the Orientals agree with the Dhamma and the Occidentals are against the Dhamma." Uttara transmitted the request to his master, who, being indignant, dismissed him. "What did the theri say?" ask the Vajjipattakas. "We have done wrong," replied Uttara; "the theri dismissed me, saying that I was pleading him to non-dhamma." "Are you not old, and have you not twenty years' ordination?" "Yes," replies Uttara. "Ought we, perhaps, to put ourselves under the guidance of a master?"

§ 4. The Samgha meets to decide the question. Revata presides, and formally, in accordance with the rules, remarks: "If we were to settle this affair here, it might happen that the Bhikkhus who inaugurated it would be able to renew it; therefore the Samgha must make its decision at the place where the affair happened." Thereupon, the theras go to Vesali.

A new episode. At Vesali lived the old Sabbakamin, "Father of the church for the [whole] earth," who had had Ananda as upadhyaya, who counted a hundred and twenty years of devout life. Revata, after having taken the advice of Sâ服务于t, goes to this venerable old man. Couches are placed for the two saints. It is late, but Revata does not go to bed, for he thinks: "This theri is old, but he does not think of sleeping;" and Sabbakamin does not go to bed, for he thinks: "This Bhikkhu, although wearyed by his journey, does not think of sleeping."

§ 5. And, as the night advances, a delightful dialogue ensues in which the two friends, to their edification and ours, forget the question of discipline.

---

1 We shall meet with an Uttara, a fementer of schisms.
2 By comparing Berata to Buddha, Uttara to Ananda, who often accepted presents in his master's place and stead;
3 puratthi ca samapadaa.
4 yajjikus ca sarusam kaatam "It is an evil you have wrought me, Sir."
5 api ca mayas guruisayyata pakhama ti. "Then we take the niyama under you as your pupil."
6 Korn had translated (Gesch. II. p. 235) : "the brothers of Vajjula; ... tried to console him (Yaqas) and promised to take him under their protection." He is willing to allow me to make use of the following remarks: api ca or ask a question: under you is not represented in the text. "We ought, perhaps, to put ourselves under the guidance of a master?" that is to say: "We (you and ourselves) are wise enough to know how we ought to conduct ourselves; we have no need of reprimands from Revata." — It is not sure that guru = master.
7 Messrs. B. D. and O. refer the reader to Cullata单项 IV. 14, where is fixed, with great fulness of detail, the procedure relative to the settlement of difficulties of all kinds. See also Pârîsîya lxxii., and lxix.
8 Korn, II. p. 235 — pahâsaa saythagha.2
9 saddhikkarikas of Ananda. We have seen (n. 82 at the end) that Vajjiputra was also a disciple of Ananda.
10 Kusamala) ca mayam viharaa starah bharkan viharaa, et cetera, kusamala; bhulani viharaa, kusamala; bhulani viharaa, kusamala; viharaa, kusamala.
11 The English translation is less faithful than elegant. "By what manner of life, beloved one, have you lived so many years?" — "By continuing in the sense of love, beloved one, have I continued thus so many years."
12 They say that you have continued thus, beloved one, by easiness of life, and that indeed, beloved one, is an easy life. [I mean] the continuing in love." See Korn, Gesch. III. p. 225; "To what thing honoured Lord, do you apply yourself before all at the present time?" — "To benevolence," replied Berata. — "It is a fine thing to apply oneself to benevolence." "Yes," replied Revata, "already previously, when I had a family ..."

---
§ 6. There arrives Sāgavāsin who questions the disciple of Ānanda upon the ten points: “You have, O ther, much studied Dhamma and Vinaya at the feet of your teacher; what then is your opinion when you consider the Dhamma and the Vinaya . . . .” Very politely, the centenarian begs Sāgavāsin in the same terms to say himself, first, what is his way of thinking. The two sages are in favour of the Occidentals, but, before speaking, they will wait to be charged with the affair.

§ 7. The Council begins. “But as they examined the affair many speeches were made, ‘away from the point,’ and the sense of not one single speech was understood [by the whole of the assembly].”

Confirmaely to a rule established by Buddha, Revata proposes to refer the matter to a jury; he chooses four Bhikkhus from the East (Sabbakāmin, Sāhā, Kujjasobhita, Vāsabhagānika) ; four from the West (Revata, Sāgavāsin, Yasas, and Sumana) and has this choice formally approved by the Sāṅgha. There is added to the arbitrators, as regulator of the sittings, a monk named Ajita, who counted ten years seniority and who, at this moment, was charged with the recitation of the Prātimokṣa.

§ 8. Revata, as president, proposes to the Sāṅgha, this time composed of the eight delegates, to hear the opinion of Sabbakāmin on each of the ten points; he questions the old man who successively condemns the propositions of the Vajjiputtakas by appealing to the rules of the Vinaya, sometimes to the Prātimokṣa, sometimes to the Vaggas. As was just, Sabbakāmin, except for the two last points, demanded the explanations that Revata himself had solicited from Yasas: “Pardon! Salt in a horn (stāglāga), is it permitted?” “What is salt in a horn?” asked Sabbakāmin in his turn. “Is it permitted to preserve salt in a horn in order to be able to use it later on when one has no salt under one’s hand?” — “No, that is not permitted.” “Where was that forbidden?” — “At Śāvatthi, [as is stated] in the Suttavibhaṅga.” “Of what does one render oneself guilty then?” — “Of the use of food put aside.”

Similarly for the other points.

The assembly agrees, by a unanimous vote, with the opinion of Sabbakāmin, who concludes: “This question is decided, settled once for all. However, question me on these ten points in the midst of the assembly, with a view to persuading these Bhikkhus.”

And thus it was done.

§ 9. “And as in this recitation of the Vinaya seven hundred Bhikkhus, not one less and not one more, took part; this recital of the Vinaya is called the recital of the Seven Hundred.”

At first sight, it seems that the hesititation of the theras; the care with which the holders of the just cause, first Yaças and then Raivata, seek for light and patrons; the profound knowledge necessary for the examination of a problem declared by the good as by the evil ones, by the “foresters” as well as by the “monastics,” “to be hard and troublesome”; — all this mise en scène

---

18 sāpoṣṭi s'eva bhāsanā jāyanti na c'essa evāśāsanācathī viśeṣāyati: “both was much pointless speaking brought forth and also the sense in no single speech was clear.” The same formula, Culla IV. 14, 19, where is indicated the procedure to be followed in such occurrences, proceedings which Revata will propose here.

17 Culla IV. 14, 19.

18 ānapiṣṭipākha, ‘seat regulator.’ This duty is unknown elsewhere; it should have been mentioned (Culla VI. 21, 3); there are good reasons to justify this omission (Vinaya Texts, III. p. 406, note).

19 Kern, II. p. 257.

20 As regards the sixth point, in which the treatment is somewhat different, see below, p. 89.
which precedes the meeting, so interesting, so amusing when we have placed before us intrigues of the Vajjiputtakas with Raiyana and Utara,—it seems, we say, that all these preparations fall short and that even the least important of the Bhikkhus, as well as the centenarian, pupil of Ananda, the "Father of the church for the whole earth" might have found in the Pātimokkha or in the Mahāvaṇga, the formal articles, drawn up by Buddha, which condemn the innovators. Nevertheless, we are told that Raiyana tries in vain to avoid so obscure a case, and that the sages, cleverly circumvented, while communicating their way of thinking to the "leader" of the Occidentals, are agreed to keep it secret until the great day of the assizes.

What! there exists a formal text, a rule numbered xviii., in the collection of the Nissagga-prātiyās, which forbids the Saṅgha to receive money; and the monks of Vaśyāli, not content with violating it, dare to decree against Yaśas, who reproves them, the act of reconciliation and the act of suspension! Further, they form a cabal, try to seduce Raiyana and do seduce Utara, who, a faithful disciple of a holy man, becomes the accomplice of the dissolute. This is strange and we conclude—at first sight—that the Vinaya did not exist at the time of Vaśyāli: if we must believe the Culla with regard to this, when it defines the nature of the "Points of discipline" practiced and defended by the Vajjiputtakas and when it narrates these pious debates to us, we could not admit that the Vinayas were known to the embarrased theras and the heretical Vajjiputtakas. "Of the ten abuses which must have provoked the meeting of the Council, seven, at least, violate formal decisions of the Pātimokkha. How could the Bhikkhus of Vaśyāli have hoped for a moment that they would be overlooked if they had known the formulary, if they had recited it twice a month?"

Without observing this difficulty, Prof. Oldenberg, in his Introduction to the Mahāvaṇga, so meritorious otherwise in so many respects, Māsara. Oldenberg and Rhyes Davids, in the preface to the Vinaya Texts,²² have built up on the recital of the Culla a very curious combination, one very characteristic of the expedients to which we are reduced in the study of Buddhist origins. This combination Prof. Oldenberg has not abandoned in his Buddhistische Studien. Here, as shortly as possible, are the broad outlines of it.

The general dispositions of the Pātimokkha are opposed to the innovations of Vaśyāli; but the Vinayas know nothing of these innovations in so much as they are designated by the laconic formule of which we have spoken; consequently, the Vinaya was drawn up before the events of Vaśyāli, since the innovations are not specially contemplated in it; a long time before, since these innovations are not contemplated in some interpolated passages. And to quote the original: "Is it possible that in a collection of works like the Vihaṇga and the Khāḍakat, which seek to set forth, down to the minutest detail, and even with hair-splitting diffuseness, all that has any relation to the daily life of the Brethren, and the regulations of the Buddhist Order,—is it possible that in such a collection, if, when it was compiled, the struggle on the Ten Points had already burst into flame, there should be no reference at all even in interpolations, to any one of these ten disputes?"²³

²¹ Barth, Bulletin des Rel. de l’Inde, 1892—1909, III. i. p. 29.
²² S. B. XIII. p. xxii.
²³ Vinaya Texts, L p. xi—xxi. M. Oldenberg’s thought is not expressed exactly in the same terms, Buddhist Studies, p. 621, 2: "Ich habe früher ingewiesen und kann jetzt nur von neuem thun, dass man nicht, wenn die Verfasser, sei es der Regeln selbst oder auch nur derjenigen Beigaben, von der Vorhandenheit von Vessā etwas gewusst hatten, eine Spur davon, eine Benennung auf den streitigen Punkt, zu erwarten berechtigt wäre." M. Oldenberg says a few words of the sīgloka and the jaloji (see below) and concludes: "Ieh meine also: ein Vinaya, der nach dem Streit über den sīgloka, über das jaloji pūjā, etc., redigirt worden wäre, müste aller Wahrscheinlichkeit nach an den betreffenden Stellen anders aussehen als der uns erhaltene Vinaya." See below, p. 99, n. 41; p. 99, n. 82; p. 100, n. 1.
The argument is very subtle and very hard to tackle. The conclusion is, assuredly, somewhat heavy; but it furnishes a plausible explanation of the difficulty we have pointed out above. The innovations of Vaiśāli are indeed innovations; the legislator did not foresee them: the problem is truly "hard and subtle." However, on examining them, we perceive that they fall under general rules; and we condemn them by urging authentic texts. As advocate of the Pāli tradition, Prof. Oldenberg deserves our congratulations: we shall not refuse them to him.

Minayeff, whose powerful attention was strangely quickened in the critical sense, could not fail to consider this solution somewhat naïve, or, to express his thought more exactly, almost frivolous. By this is explained why he treats the problems of Vaiśāli with a very fine but disconcerting ease of manner, sustaining, as he does, at a distance of two pages, two opinions which apparently are contradictory. In truth, a firmly bound system is hidden under this outward disorder.

Minayeff proves in fact, that the greater part of the derogations of Vaiśāli are condemned by the existing text of the Vinaya"— which is absolutely unmistakable, if the derogations are faithfully defined in the Cuṭṭa; but he believes that "even if one admits that in the Vinaya there is no special interdiction for all the innovations of Vaiśāli," this hypothetical assertion can, nevertheless, not serve as a proof of the age of the Vinaya, for, "in the present text, there are a number of concessions and prescriptions which perfectly justify, in principle, all the guilty inclinations of the brethren of Vaiśāli." There is not a strict tribunal, having before it the present text of the Vinaya, which could affirm the culpability of many of the innovations of Vaiśāli, or resolve to reject them as practices irreconcilable with the spirit of the Vinaya.

In other words, either the innovations of Vaiśāli are condemned, at least the greater number of them, in the actual text of the Vinaya, or they are not. If they are, Prof. Oldenberg's argument falls to the ground; for we shall be able to maintain that the dispositions of the Vinaya which condemn them were compiled after Vaiśāli. Minayeff will show, then, that they are condemned. For example: the rule which forbids all provision (Pāc. xxxvii.) forbids the provision of salt (first innovation of Vaiśāli) and, "if the rule of the Prātimokṣa does not mention salt, does it follow from that that the Prātimokṣa was already in existence before the appearance of the innovations of Vaiśāli and that it is for this reason that the rules do not mention salt?" But if you judge of it otherwise and answer: "Yes, in our opinion, for if the Suttavibhāṅga were later than the discussion on salt, there would have been mention made in it of the salt; — this controversy, the origin of a capital schism, and "as important for the history of Buddhism as the controversy of Arianism was for Christian

---

24 Researches, p. 23.

25 Has Minayeff the right to consider as "riskio" the thesis according to which the absence from the Vinaya of the formula which sum up the innovations, the non-mention of these "war-cries" (except Jātarpāṇa), or, to speak more correctly, the complete ignorance in which the compilers of the Vinaya would be of the objects of this discussion, peremptorily prove the seniority of the Vinaya in relation to the innovations of Vaiśāli?

In principle, the argument a silentio is only conclusive if we know in full detail the context of the events, the psychology of the writers, the history of the books.

The Mahāparinibbāṇa and Culla XI. cite the proceedings of the Brahmanātha, which the Vinaya ignores shall we say from this that the Vinaya is anterior to the Mahāparinibbāna?

Besides, it is always easy to oppose reasoning to reasoning. The community thinks it knows (Culla XII. is the proof of it) that the Vajiputakas thought to make provision of salt and maintained the opinion of the "salt in the horn." The whole community, occidentals, orientals, and meridionals, was shaken by this controversy. And Prof. Oldenberg argues: If the Vinaya, in its present state and in its entirety (except the Parivāra), were not anterior to the events of Vaiśāli by a sufficient number of years to assure its sacred character, certainly some forgers would have been found into it some allusion to the salt in the horn. But we shall say, the Vinaya, in the eyes of everyone, is proto-canonical and "proto-Vasalian"; every allusion to the salt in the horn would have constituted a flagrant anachronism, and we must certainly credit the compilers of the Vinaya with some minimum of the critical spirit.

But this discussion as hominem does not seem suitable to decide the question, far from it.
history," 28 was certainly worthy of being mentioned;" — then, not only will Minayeff recognise that in the Vinaya there is no special interdiction for all the innovations of Vaïśali, but he will adopt the second branch of the dilemma. The innovations of Vaïśali are not condemned in the present Vinaya in this sense that, if there are in it rules which touch upon them, there are also dispositions which betray the same spirit of non-asceticism and confirm my impression that the rules contrary to the innovations were compiled after Vaïśali: "The spirit of the existing Vinaya [although modified by the later triumph of asceticism] is not irreconcilable with many of the innovations of Vaïśali . . . . In the Vinaya, divers usages are established in the community to receive as a present, to preserve and to share clothes as well as food. The community has the right to possess property, both movable and immovable; the movable property may also belong to one single monk," which is, at least, in opposition to the communist customs one has been pleased to ascribe to the ancient fraternity. 27

By this change of front, and this contradiction, at least apparent, Minayeff furnishes Prof. Oldenberg with an opportunity for an easy success. 29

I say 'apparent,' because the contradiction is not the act of Minayeff, but of the Vinaya. The Pàtimokkhà forbids the provision of food, but the Mahàvagga allows all kinds of provision, medicines of all kinds, beginning with the medicinal roots. The ascetic may not accept money, but he may have a deposit of money with a layman, "who renders acceptable to him" (kappiyakàraka) the things bought with this money. 30 So, also, the convent possesses halls for provision, "storehouses," which are kappiyabhûmis, kappiyakuts and make lawful the food preserved, salt, oil, and rice. 30

It is the same thing for many other points on which the vigour of the Pàtimokkhà is weakened or enervated. We know, also, that the Pàt. itself tolerates exceptions; one of the most notable is that of Nissaggiiya xxiii., by which it is allowable to keep for seven days the principal medicines, ghi, butter, oil, honey, and molasses.

Do not let us be astonished, then, to read in the Researches, p. 53, the contrary of what we read, p. 55. 31 In the first passage, Minayeff places himself at the point of view of the Fathers of the Council, armed with the Pàtimoke, and, not without a pleasantly simulated reprobation, he condemns with them this abominable practice of the provision of salt, "flagrant violation of the rows of poverty." In the second he observes that, for the reader of the Mahàvagga, the provision of salt is only one of the manifold and permissible derogations from the laws of rigid asceticism.

An examination of the "innovations" will, perhaps, enable us to form a personal opinion on the problem. What precedes suffices, we hope, to clear Minayeff from the reproach of inconsistency.

The points of Vaïśali may be grouped into two categories:

I. — Derogations relative to the monastic organisation, ānasakappà (4), anumait (5), uciya (6).

II. — Derogations relative to discipline: food, viññayokappà (1), deviégula (2), gámanara (3), amathila (7), drink, jalogi (8), bedding, adasaka-misdana (9), law of poverty, jâtarpavọjata (10).

28 We shall return to this appreciation of Vin. T., I. p. xxi.
30 M. Vajra, VI. 34, 1.
31 M. Vajra, VI. 33.
32 "Wer dessen Ausführungen S. 53 liest, wird doch das Gegenteil von dem finden, was derselbe Gelehrte zwei Seiten später sagt." — Oldenberg, loc. cit.
I. 4. "Aṇuṣṭhāpaṇa or "practice of the dwelling-place." "Several convents (or dwellings) which are in the same "parish" are allowed to hold separate usṣānas."³² Compare M. Vagga II. 8. 3: "At this time two halls of Uposatha had been instituted in a certain parish. The Bhikkhus assembled in both halls, because [some] thought: 'The Uposatha will be held here,' and [the others]: 'The Uposatha will be held there.' This was reported to Bhagavat, who said: 'Let no one establish two halls of Uposatha in the same parish. . . . I order the suppression of one of the two and I desire that the Uposatha be held [only] in one place.'"

Did the M. Vagga designate here the heretical thesis by its technical name, it could not more clearly keep in view the fourth innovation of Vaiśālī, at least such as the Culla defines it.³³

5. Aṇuvadānakappā, or "practice of approbation." "It is permitted to a Saṅgha, which is not sufficiently numerous, to accomplish an ecclesiastical act, by saying: we will make the [other] Bhikkhus consent when they come."³⁶ The Fathers condemn the proposition, according to M. Vagga IX. 3. 5, which defines the act of an "incomplete Saṅgha." The rule demands, not only that the absent Bhikkhus should have sent their adhesion, but also that no member present required them to be waited for. Not only does it touch upon the innovation in question, but it foresees a more complicated case.

The same conclusion as for the preceding paragraph.

6. Aḍḍikattuṭṭhāna: "It is allowable to follow the precedent of the preceptor and the instructor."³⁵ "Yes," replies the Thera, "the practice of the precedent is permitted in certain cases; in others it is forbidden." The proposition of the Vajjivuttakas is rejected, without any text being alleged, as contrary to the Dharma-Vinaya.

Messrs. Rhys Davids and Oldenberg explain how the Aḍḍikattuṭṭhāna is sometimes admitted, sometimes forbidden: "That is, of course, according as the thing enjoined is, or is not, lawful."

Minayeff recalls, very appropriately, "this rule of Āpastamba according to which the brahmaṇāśīrin must submit to the preceptor in everything, except in actions which lead to excommunication." Perhaps the question is really to know if the authority of the Master, of the upādhyāya upon whom depends the doctrine, of the ārya who regulates the discipline,³⁸ will be as prevailing in

---

³² According to Kern (Gesch. II. p. 239). Culla: Kappati samahāhā adhā samāsāhā mahānapasāhāh kīvanī — Vinaya Texts: "Circuit-license. It is allowable for a number of Bhikkhus who dwell within the same circuit, within the same boundary, to hold separate usṣānas."

The Uposatha is the bi-monthly ceremony, in the course of which, all the monks of the "parish," having met together, the Puṭimokka is read. The boundaries of the "parish" are fixed by a solemn decision of the brethren resident in such or such a place. (See Kern, Gesch. II. p. p. 69–73). They must number at least two to hold Uposathas.

³³ The interpretation of the Dharmaguptas differs: "In the Temple, besides the regulation acts, the innovators accomplished others (f)" (We know that temple = vihāra = convent). See Minayeff, p. 49. The Mahācāvakas, it seems, do not mention the Aṇuṣṭhāpaṇa. For the Śrīvastivādins, see the Appendix.

³⁴ Kappati vagga saṅgha kaṇhāha kīvanī āyu phā bhikkhā annaṃsvaṇāḥ. "It is allowable for a Saṅgha, which is not legally constituted, to perform an official act on the ground that they will afterwards obtain the sanction of such Bhikkhus as may subsequently arrive." The confession may be begun before the Saṅgha is sufficiently numerous.

For the Śrīvastivādins, see the Dharmaguptas agree with the Culla; the Mahācāvakas: "Nach Vollziehung des Karma andere herbeirufen um die Entscheidung zu hören" (Schiffner) or perhaps: In the accomplishment of the Karma, to call the others one by one afterwards to hear.

³⁵ Kappati idaṃ me ujjñānāya ujjñānakṣaraṃ idaṃ me ujjñānaṃ ujjñānakṣaram ujjñānaṃ ujjñānakṣaram.

³⁶ Our gloss is, perhaps, somewhat venturesome. See Vinaya Texts, I. p. 178; II. p. 18; Charavannes Religions Éminentes, p. 140, n. 3; Barth, Indog. p. 7. (J. des Sacraus, 1898): "Two masters, one to inculcate the theoretical teaching of the truths of the faith and to watch over his religious instruction (ujjñānāya), the other to teach him the rules which he must observe in practice and to be the director of his conscience (jñāna)." But see Kern, Man. p. 84, tutor, professor. Divers fuctions, pāñjārya, etc., M. Vinyo, § 279.
the Saṅgha as among the crowd of heretical ascetics. At first sight, this question can only be put if the community is ignorant of the lesser and minor rules, and of the subtleties of doctrine. The history of the sects proves, however, the importance attached to the opinion of the immediate master, even at the historic time, when there exist Vinayas and Abhidharma.37

According to the Dharmaguptas, the Vaipānikas think their conduct may be justified by alleging that “this has been done from time immemorial.”

According to the Mahāyānas: “To continue to occupy themselves with what they had been in the habit of doing before becoming ascetics; certain occupations were declared lawful, others were forbidden.”

II. 1. Sīlānākakṣa (sīlānā-karaṇa), or “practice of salt in the horn.” “It is lawful to keep salt in the horn by saying: ‘I will eat [it] when there is no more salt.’”38 The proposition is condemned by virtue of Pāṭatiṣṭha xxxviii.: “Whoever takes food which has been kept (saṃśīniśākara),39 whether this food be bhādakācika or bhujācika,40 is guilty . . . .”

The problem is here presented under an appreciably different aspect.

On the faith of Prof. Oldenberg, who does not call attention to the matter,41 I believed that the Pāli Vinaya did not treat of the provision of salt; and, turning to the Tibetan sources, I have found a few interesting details. “Buddha,” says M. Rockhill,42 “allows salt to be kept in certain cases: for this, a box furnished with a lid must be used.” When Pāṇḍ. lxxv. condemns the monk who hides the dish used for alms . . . . the drinking-cup (phor-bu) from one of his brethren, the Viśālī (ad. loc.) substitutes for the word phor-bu the expression teka-phug, which Mr. Rockhill translates: “Salt-horn.”43

According to the Tibetan and Sarvāstivādin data, we might conclude that the verdict of the Viśālī had remained a dead letter, at least in one part of the community, and thus explain the silence of the Pāli Vinaya on the provision of salt.

Happily, the M. Vajra, in default of the Pāṭatiṣṭha, is very circumstantial on the question which concerns us, and it seems to decide so perfectly in favour of the Vaipānikas that we remain amazed.

37 I believe that Minayeff is wrong in formally connecting with the Saṅnakakṣa one of the five points (cāndu) with the discussion of which Vasumitra and Bhavya connect the origin of the great schism. It should, however, be observed that the Maṅgālokaṇṭhas, p. 96, on the occasion of the Second Council, oppose the doctrine of the “Presbyters” (tharuvāda) to the doctrine of the Masters (karaṇadhāra).

38 Kasmīniḥ lokaṃ parihāraḥ yathā okenakṣai bhavanti tathā parihāraḥ uṣāntari. Kern . . . . “in order to use it later when we shall have no salt at hand.” “Salt-license . . . . with the intention of putting it into food which has not been salted.”

39 M. Vajra, 123a, 34, saṃśīniśākaraḥ and saṃśīniśākaraḥ, 245, 263, read saṃśīniśākaraḥ. The more abridged and, as Minayeff thinks, the older form of Pāṇḍ. xxxviii., is furnished by M. Vajra, § 281, 42: saṃśīniśākaraḥ (see below, p. 95).

40 Hard and soft foods. On the value of these two terms, see Vinaya Texts, I. p. 39, n. 5.

41 We see how dangerous is the argument a silentio! “Eine Pāṭatiṣṭharetel (38) beispielsweise verbietet voraussichtlich ungewünschte Speisen zu genießen. Nun wurde von Einigen behauptet, dass doch die Aufbewahrung von Salz zulässig sei, und dies war einer der Streitpunkte in den erbitterten, durch die ganze buddhistische Welt berühmt gewordenen Kämpfen von Vaiśālī: dachten wir da nicht erraten, dass wo nicht der Wortlaut jener Regel selbst so doch mindestens die Erweiterungen, die Zunahme jener eben beschriebenen Art auf die Frage des Salzes irgendwie eingegangen wären, hätten nicht eben Regel und Erweiterungen zur Zeit des Konzils von Vaiśālī bereits fertig vorgelegen?” (Buddh. Stud. p. 632.) See M. Vajra, VI. 3.


43 Cf. Revue de l’Histoire des Religions, 1884, IX, p. 175 (Bhikṣuṇī-Pāṭimokṣa, Pāṇḍ. 52 = 60). Unfortunately, I do not see that phug signifies horn; it is rather any receptacle easy to carry, whatever it may be otherwise; may then be lasaṇapūrṇa, Salabotel (M. Vajra 273, 68). See Candra Nīla, p. 146.
The M. Vagga VI, 3, enumerates a series of medicinal roots (ginger, hellebore, etc.) of which one may make provision for life in order to render more digestible the hard and soft foods. Otherwise, they may only be used when one is ill.

In § VI, 8, are enumerated, under the title of medicines, five kinds of salt: "sea salt, black salt, rock salt, cooking salt, red salt, and any other kind of salt which can be used as a medicine." One may make provision of it "for life" and it may be used as was said of the roots.

Finally, § VI, 40, specifies that the "foods" of which one may make provision for life, literally "which one may eat, at no matter what moment during life," do not render allowable the foods with which they are mixed beyond the term fixed for these same foods.45

The Tibetan Vinyakuswadraka, defining the heresy of the Vajjipattakas, speaks of salt "consecrated for life"; but the Sanscrit word which corresponds to "consecrated" (byin gtsis-brlab-pa), that is adhisthitita, may have a less precise meaning: in any case, it is a question of a provision ýarájítítikám.46

On the other hand, boxes of bone, ivory, horn, etc., are authorised for the preservation of unguents (āñjana).47

Therefore it is allowable to keep salt, and we cannot see that the "horn," permitted for unguents, can compromise the sanctity of this practice.48 At the most, we may wonder if it is allowable to make use of it when one is well. But nothing indicates that the theras put this rather subtle question. Who is ill, who is well?

We arrive then at this statement, so strange at first sight, that the first innovation síjīlopa, implicitly forbidden by the Pātimokkhā,49 is authorised by the Khaṇḍakas.

The explanation of the Dharmaguptakas (7th innovation) and of the Mahāvihāras (1st innovation) presents this peculiarity that it ignores the horn: "Mix [the food] with salt and ginger (= grāgacara) has the effect of circumventing the law which declares impure stale foods or those kept until the next day."50 "To employ salt in order to preserve foods during the night and to eat them next day."

---

44 The translators of the Vinaya Texts (II. p. 144) remark: "What this refers to is unknown to us." I believe we must connect the law, allowing provision to be made of salt, etc., for life, with that which authorises the use of the five bhājajījas (ghū, butter, oil, honey, molasses) beyond the time (M. Vagga, VI. 1, 5).

45 The bhājajīja may be taken at any hour of the day, when one is ill and when one is not. Bhagavat, having allowed the meal time to pass, has prepared for him foods and drinks called akṣikāras (Dhāraṇī, p. 130, akṣikāsphākyācāra), akṣikāpānākāram āryāsāṃkārī akṣikā, Mts. I., 364, 14 = akṣikā (without black grain) as M. Snart observes.

46 Ghū, butter, etc. (the fifth pāṭigajīja bhājajīja) may be preserved for 7 days; by mixing hellebore (which may be kept in provision all one's life) one does not render the 'ghū' lawful on the eighth day.

47 See M. Vagga, VI, 13, 1.

48 See Appendix. Cf. the nāyikās of M. Vagga, 290, 50.

49 As any rate a horn needle-box is forbidden, Pæc. 82. See M. Vagga, § 273, 65, laconzpātalā, 82, trāgacara (f).

50 We remember that salt, forbidden to the bhājanās, allowed to the vīnaprasthas, was prohibited in one of the five theses of Devadatta (according to the Duke, Bhandūlīshālī, p. 97; Udayana, p. 204; and Wasulieff, p. 56).

51 The translator tells us, "Sals mit Ingwer Mischerei." But it is certain that the ginger here plays the same part as the salt. It is among the "Medicines" which may be kept all one's life. — M. Vagga, VI. 3.
These practices are formally forbidden, as we have seen, by the Mr. Vagga.\footnote{Above, p. 91, n. 44.} They are not contemplated by the explanation of the Culla, as is indicated by the expression \textit{ya\text{\text{"}}d\text{\text{"}} alopakam bhūrissati}. But, it is not impossible that they correspond to the first notion of the \textit{sāngītaka}, ‘the question of ginger and salt’.

2. \textit{Dvāṅgulakapassa}, practice of the two fingers. “It is allowable to take food beyond the time, the moment being passed when there is a two-fingers-shadow.”\footnote{Kappati dvāṅgulāya chāyāya vīśvātāya vīśāha bhōjanam bhūjītum. Kern: “To take food after the hour permitted (after mid-day) when the shadow is more than two inches long.” Minayev: “The Bhūru might take his meal at certain moments determined by the measure of the shadow thrown by him, that is to say, these moments were indicated by a kind of sun-dial. The heretics said that if this shadow was longer by the length of two fingers than the length fixed by law, one could, nevertheless, accept food.” – \textit{Vinaya Texts} . . . . . . . . “to eat the mid-day meal beyond the right time, provided only that the shadow has not yet turned two inches.”} Thesis condemned in virtue of Pāc. xxxvii, by which it is forbidden to the monks, as to ascetics in general, to eat beyond the time.\footnote{Vināya, vīśāha = “Since mid-day is past, until the rising of the sun.”} It remains for us to know what is the legal time. If I understand correctly the gloss of the Culla, the Vajjiputtakas do not believe they sin against the rule of \textit{aṅkābhōjana} by eating after mid-day, but, according to the \textit{Vibhāṣa}, vīśāha = “Since mid-day is past, until the rising of the sun.”}

It is remarkable that the Pāli source should be quite alone in this interpretation of the ‘practice of the two fingers.’\footnote{It is only possible to submit to the reader a few references difficult to utilise.} It seems at any rate that it may be a question here of a small quantity of food.

3. \textit{Gāmantarabapassa}, practice of another village. “It is allowable, after having eaten, to take foods (bhōjaniyā) which are not the remains [of the meal] (anātirītta), by saying: ‘I go into another village.’”

\footnote{Mahīcaksasaka: Die Speise mit zwei Fingern rühren, d. h. wenn nach beendigten Mahl, dass nur einmal täglich statt finden darf, Speise noch sich darbietet, diese geniessen, indem man, dieselbe mit zwei Fingern umrührt, dadurch wird das Verbot die Speise zu verderben übertreten” (Tar. p. 28). This prohibition of spoiling food must be understood from the prohibition of eating preserved food, see Pāc. xxxviii. of Ben. Calma. p. 226: “eat spoiled or sour food,” corresponding to the samudhiśāraṇa of the Pāli. Sarvāstivādins: “Make two fingers of foods of two kinds,” anātirīetakas (aṅkābhōjanasambhāvana, M. Vin. 521, 58). [The syntax of the Tibetan phrase is very obscure = aṅkābhōjanasambhāvanā yathābhāvanyabhāvanā karnta.] Dharmagupta: “Arenement from schrieity, as if, for example, a monk, after an ample repast, forgetting the rule of good conduct, began to take with two fingers and to eat the food remaining.” (Minayev, p. 43.)}

The shadow of two inches is perhaps the shadow cast by a man, at mid-day, at the summer solstice, in the 25\text{o} of latitude. Then we should have dvāṅgulāya vīśāha vīśvātāya maghaṁtika vīśvātāya = [the moment] when the shadow is two fingers [being] past = mid-day being past.

\footnote{Vīśāha . . . . = aṅkābhōjana, M. Vin. 521, 58; vīśāha bhōjanaśveti, ibid. 288, 8.}

\footnote{The practice of the two fingers’ may also refer to some position of the hands in begging for food. See Pet. Wort. Nagosa.

\footnote{Mahīcaksaka ad Pāc. 3, 4, 51, dvāṅgulakapassasambhāvanā, kh妪tikaṁ = he eats pieces of the length of two fingers = dvāṅgulakapassasambhit, a woman, who is an idiot or having very little intelligence, Thirukkūri 60, Mūnu. III. 391, 19. According to the commentary of the Thiruv, the women are such idiots that, though passing their life from childhood in cooking rice, if they wish to know if the rice is cooked, they have to take it out of the water and crush it between their fingers. (Widisch, Mūnu and Buddha, p. 153; references indicated by Senart.) The explanation is ingenious.}
This was condemned in virtue of Pāc. xxxv.: "The Bhikkhu who, after having eaten, shall take foods kheṇa or khaṇaṇa..." 16

The foods kādāniya would not be contemplated in gāmantaṭhakappā.

From the explanations of the Viśāṅga it follows that, as soon as one has eaten, it is with the tip of a blade of grass, of the foods offered in a house, or if the host has invited one to eat, it is forbidden to go to seek fresh foods (anātirikta) in another house: it is only permitted to eat the remainder (ātirikta) of the first offering. 17

What must we understand by the words: "gāmantaṭhā gamissāmiti?" The Vinaya Testa translate: "On the ground that he is about to proceed into the village." This interpretation, although it may be that of Childers, does not seem very coherent.

Mr. Kern and Minayeff seem to us to have understood more correctly: "because of the journey from one village to another." But, for the rest, Minayeff seems to be wanting in precision. 18

The Mahāvīsaksas and the Sāravelavāsins diverge.

According to the reckoning of the former, the third innovation is formulated thus: "to eat a second time after having risen before taking a sufficient meal" (and hence, according to the Viśāṅga, the food is anātirikta; consequently forbidden by Pāc. xxv.) 19; and the fourth: "to eat on leaving the village." 20 According to Wisselius, the condemnation of these points is found in the explanation of the terms akṣantaṭikākādāna and gāmabhūjana. 21

---

16 The law, Pāc. xxv., according to the Viśāṅga, is divided "historically" into two parts. First text: "īyo pana bhikkhu bhūsīsa parārī ḍaṇaṇāya vā bhājanāya vā kādaṇaṇa vā kādaṇaṇa vā bhūsīsaṇaṇa vā gāmantaṭhāni sū Plātiya Research II: "it is forbidden to eat after having satisfied one's hunger." Ne mention of anātirikta. Second text, complete: "I allow those who are ill and those who are well to eat [the foods] anātirikta," that which remains in the dish; and the law was completed by the addition of the word anātirikta, which restricts its application.

I believe I have faithfully rendered the text by translating the two words bhūsīsa parārī by the single expression "after having eaten." As M. Kern has pointed out to me, parārī = samghṭa (badly translated by Childers: "to cause to refuse," as is stated Vinaya Testa ad. M. Vagga, 1. 5, 4) which is near to satthuppatti. See M. Vagga, I. 12, 15; Lālita, 66, 18, kādāniyasa satth uppatti satth sinhavagga; also Mih. III, 143, 3, 14: Kāmi. IV, 75, 1, bhūsīsa . . . . vacetum . . . . parārīya.

Parārīya does not mean invite, nimpatte; see Viđh. ad Pāc. xxv. . . . . nimpatte bhūsīsa . . . . (XXXV. I, 1, 6); parārīya does not mean "having been invited and having refused" (as Vinaya Testa, I. p. 59: "When he has once finished his meal [bhūsīsa], though still invited (to continue eating) [parārīya], and III. p. 298, "who has once finished his meal and has refused any more"), for Viđh. Pāc. xxv, 3 (1, 7) abhūsīsaṁ katho hiti, bhūsīsaṁ parārīya āseṭi vupākā samaih katho hiti — [For the contrary opinion, see M. Vagga, IV, 1, 13, Cittār, 58, 4, Divyavad 116-17.]

But, as a fact, every fresh food is anātirikta, not remaining, either if the monk have eaten and been satisfied (parārīya) in a house, or if he have refused the foods offered to him (abhūsīsaṁ). If he rises to go, when the host puts fresh dishes at his disposal, he cannot receive more food elsewhere. Hence the idea of refusing introduced by the commentator into the law, Pāc. xxv; an idea wrongly localized in the word parārīya.

17 According to Vinaya Testa, I. p. 39, n. 4. The Bhikkhu who is well, when he has finished a meal, cannot eat what remains in the dish. But see n. 55.

18 Childers, e. c.: "gāmantaṭhā gacchati seems to mean merely to go as far as the village," and Minayeff . . . . to consider as permissible a superfluity of food because of the journey." It seems that he has mistaken the word anātirikta. — Derogation from the law of anātirikta (nourishment brought from the house where one has eaten) VI, 19, 4 (because of Śāṇḍ.); repeated, VI, 29; and again, VI, 24 (honey and milk with rice allowed before a "dinner in the town": rice with milk forbidden).

19 M. Vagga, 261, 33, 40.
The Sarvāstivādins have a proposition which may be called of the ‘road’ (addhānagamana), and which allows the “meal in a group.” It is their fifth innovation. “To eat, having proceeded a yojana and a half [from the convent ??] and having met together, is allowable in virtue of the road.” It is to take advantage, by a fictitious journey, of the law, Pāc. xxxii., which allows the gāraṇabhōjana on the occasion of a journey.64

It results, it seems, from this comparison, that the Pāli explanation of gāmanatara rests on the contamination of two theses, which the Mahāyānists distinguish from one another, for the formula supposes a “journey,” whatever it may be otherwise, and the Pāc. xxxv. essentially concerns the anātirikta.

7. Anātirikta, or “unchurned milk.” — “It is allowable, after having eaten, to take milk which is no longer in the state of milk and is not yet in a state of curd, and which is not the remains of the meal.”65 A thesis condemned by virtue of Pāc. xxxv., which forbids, as we have seen, all anātirikta.

According to the Mahāyānists, “to drink beyond the time allowed a mixture of cream, butter, honey, and honey in the form of a stone [i.e. sugar].” Almost identical herewith is the explanation of the Dharmaguptakas. The Sarvāstivādins come very near to the Cullā in what concerns the nature of the milky compound (sweet milk, mixed with sour milk); but, in agreement with the Mahāyānists, they indicate also as characteristic of the innovation the fact of eating “beyond the allotted time.”

According to a tradition of the Sarvāstivādins, Devadatta forbade the brethren to use milk and its derivatives.66 Buddha, on the contrary, allows the five products of the cow, milk, curds, ghṛta, buttermilk, and butter. (M. Vagga, VI. 34, 21).67 He anoints, also, “milk with rice” (gūrya) with blocks of honey, which the brethren thought they ought to refuse (VI. 24), and which if taken in the morning, does not render anātirikta a dinner accepted later on in the town.

It, certainly, is difficult to form an opinion on this seventh innovation; but one has the impression that the indices anātirikta and akalā, which make it culpable in the eyes of the theras of the Cullā and the Dālāra, are artificial; the tradition no longer knew that unchurned milk had passed for illicit.

8. Jālojī vātum. “It is allowable to drink of the surā which, [starting:] from the nature of the non-surā, has not attained to the quality of being intoxicating.”68 A thesis condemned by virtue of Pāc. li., which forbids the drinking of surā and mārya.69

63 khejaniya. See below, Appendix.
64 M. Barth has drawn attention to the curious conversation in which Kṣārya, whose affection for the Dharmaguptas we know, reproaches Asanda with “the bad habit of eating in a group”: the trikābhājana is opposed to the parabhājana (Mahāvīravīra, III. 48, 6; Barth, article on the Mahāvīra, in J. der Orient, 1680, reprint, p. 28). According to Pāc. xxii.; Cullā, VII., 2, 17: there is a paśa as soon as they number more than three. On the provisions of the journey, M. Vagga, VI. 34, 21.
65 niyati yathā tathā kathā bhajān vijahītāh samayāmāt dādhibhāpām bhūtavānna yādhatu anatiriktaṁ vātum ṣ (read: bhajāṅkā vijahītāh). “Churn-license: Is it allowable for one who has once finished his meal and has refrained any more, to drink milk not left over from the meal, on the ground that it has left the condition of milk and has not yet reached the condition of curds.” (That is, which is neither liquid nor solid: something apparently like buttermilk.)
66 Rockhill, Life, p. 87. “Not to make use of curds and milk, because by so doing one harms calves.”
67 The context appears to indicate that it is a question of monks when travelling.
68 Cullā: koṭṭa ni yā sā surā āsmālā āsmātaṇā mājābhāranā sā yātum. Commentary (Ap. Minaya Pūjārakās, P. xxii.): sarvaṃ samayāmāma bhūtavām kathā bhajānām samayāmām (read: samayāmāma kathā kathā). Kern: “May one drink new wine of the palm-tree? That is to say: May one drink that kind of strong drink which has not the character of strong drink and which has not yet acquired the nature of an intoxicant.”
69 Churn-license: Is it allowable to drink spirits which have left the condition of not being spirits (āsmālā = āsmātaṇām and yet have not acquired intoxicating properties.)

68 M. Vagga, § 261, 83, surāmamayāsamayā samayā samayāḥ — itib. § 220, fermented drinks, of which 33 surā, 37 mārya.
According to the Mahiṣāsakas it is a question of an intoxicating liquor which had fallen back into fermentation.

According to the Dī JAVA, "to drink like a leech intoxicating liquors, while making the excuse of sickness."

Prof. Oldeberg argues: "The Vīḵhāṅga treats of the different kinds of sura and merayga, speaks of the case where one would only drink the intoxicating liquor with a blade of grass, speaks of an intoxicating drink which the drinker considers to be non-intoxicating, and, reciprocally, and of a series of subtitles of this nature: now it does not speak of jaloji." Then the Vīḵhāṅga is previous to Vaṭṭāli.

The Pāṭimokkha forbids the drinking of intoxicating drinks. It is a very old law of asceticism, as old as the palm-wine or the rice-water. But what is drinking? What is an intoxicating drink?

Drinking is bringing in any way whatever, the drink in contact with the mouth, were it only with a blade of grass so that the jaloji, as the Tibetan source (Sarvāstivādin) understands it, "to drink in the manner of a leech," is condemned by the Vīḵhāṅga.

What is an intoxicating drink? Every substance which intoxicates, according to the account recorded in the Vīḵhāṅga (Pāc. ii.); but, according to the definitions with which the paragraph ends, every substance capable of fermenting (sambhūrasanīyutta), the jaloji, therefore, according to the interpretation that the Culla and the Dharmaguptas give of it, is contemplated in the Vīḵhāṅga.

But the severe and just tribunal, which Minayeaff in imagination substitutes for the thesas presided over by Revata, will not fail to study the chapter of the M. Vaṭṭa (VI. 35, 6) consecrated to the drinks allowable or forbidden. Whilst the Vīḵhāṅga enumerates as merayga and prohibits the juice (ārava) of flowers, of fruits, of honey, of the sugar-cane (gyula), because it is sambhūrasanīyutta, the M. Vaṭṭa allows the juice (raja) of fruits, grains excepted; the drink prepared with leaves and flowers, except the dākas ("pootherb") and the mukhukapuppha (Bassia latifolia), and the juice of the sugar-cane.

9. Adasakham nīṭalana, "a mat without fringes to sit upon." Neither Revata, nor Sibbakkāni, claim for exact information; but the thesis is condemned in virtue of Pāc. lxxxix., which indicates the legal dimensions of the mat. Therefore, according to the interpretation of the Culla, the heretics maintained that "the fact of not being ornamented with a fringe makes legal a mat whose dimensions are irregular."

76 See Minayeaff: see Appendix. — Srīru-ṛap-ma = jaloji, juloji, jaloji, (M. Vuyt, § 215, 86). Compare jaloji?
78 antarāsana kusavajjana pitikata. The same formula to explain what is eating.
79 Childers remarks: maṇjaunabhāra, the elements of intoxication (in newly drawn toddy), opposed to maṇjaunabhāra, intoxicating property (i.e., fermented toddy or palm-wine).
80 See also, M. Vaṭṭa, VI. 14, on the oil mixed with strong drink. — It must be added that, as a technical term, ārava = alcoholic liquor made without decoction, at a low temperature; ārīja is made by decoction.
81 Kern (Manusii): "the use of a mat without fringes (not conform with the model prescribed)," "a mat which has not a fringe (of the prescribed dimensions)." Vīnaya Tenti: "Is a rag or mat (when it is beyond the prescribed size) lawful because it is unfringed?" The translation "unfringed seat" may lead to confusion. Pāc. lxxxvii. treats of mats, and pithas, the Pāc. lxxxix. of nīṭalana.
82 "Two cubits of Sukaeta" (Bockhill, R. H. R. IX. 178) in length, one in width, one for the border. According to the Dharmaguptas, Pāc. lxxxvii. (there are only 90 pāc. in this list), two in length, one and a half in width; but it may be made half a cubit longer and wider. (Beal, Catenas, p. 231.)
According to the Mahiçâsakas, to make for oneself a mat of undetermined dimensions; there is no question of fringe.\(^7\)

According to the Sarvâstivâdins, the innovation consists in the contempt of the law Nis. Pâc. xv., which ordains that for a new mat a piece of about a cubi should be cut from the old one. There is no question of a fringe.\(^8\)

It seems that these two different interpretations of the ninth innovation were conceived in view of the rules of the Vinaya which may be brought forward to condemn it. The M. Vagga VIII., 16, 4, which ought to throw some light on the question, permits a covering as wide as one wishes, for this unexpected reason that the nisidana was too narrow. Should we be imprudent if we sought an element of appreciation in the Tibetan tradition relative to the five laws of Devadatta?\(^9\)

"Gautama wears robes whose fringes are cut, we will wear robes with long fringes!"

10. Jâtarâparajata, "gold and silver." "According to all appearances," remarks Prof. Oldenberg, "at the Council of Vesâli (said to be a century after the death of Buddha), the question of accepting gold and silver was the essential point of the debate, in the midst of secondary and subtle differences."\(^10\)

In our opinion, it would, perhaps, be better to say that this question is the only one of which we may believe with relative security that it brought into conflict Yaças and the Vajjiputtakas. In any case, it is admitted that the Jâtarâparajata is here of the utmost importance.

We recall the interesting episode whose principal details we have indicated. Are the innovators in any way excusable? Can any one maintain that they know and respect the law, since they circumvent it? Or perhaps, on the contrary, do we find here proof that, not only the Vibhâsaga, but also the Prâtimoksha, were not, at the time of Vaiśali, constituted as they are to-day?\(^11\)

When Yaças points out to Revata the "moralties" of the supporters of heresy and when he finally arrives at the question of gold and silver, Revata does not ask for any explanations, as he did for the eight previous points.\(^12\) It suffices for him to hear that word, tabooed beyond all other, "gold and silver"; and, in fact, from the point of view of Revata, which is that of a doctor familiar with the Vinaya, is not the question of a remarkable simplicity?

The Nissaggaavâ xviii., invoked by Sabbakâmì, is formal: "Every Bhikkhu who shall receive gold or silver, or shall make any receive any, or shall cause it to be kept in deposit . . . ." The Nis. xix. and xx. forbid all connection with money, buying and selling.\(^13\) Nis. x. is still more precise. It specifies that, if money is offered to a monk to buy robes, he shall point out a faithful layman, "the man who keeps the ârâma in order," for example, "to whom the money may be given and who will attend to the buying and making of the robes."\(^14\) For whatever motive it may be, the monk must not receive money.

\(^7\) According to Wass. relates to [Nis.] Pâc. xv.
\(^8\) See Rockhill, Life, p. 67; Udâna-avagga, p. 294. This "law" is missing from the corresponding Cangalesa list (Culla, VII. 3, 14). There is, besides, a positive mistake, whether in the Duiva, or in M. Rockhill's translation, in what concerns the fifth law of Devadatta. It is the latter who forbids the brethren to live in villages, and not Buddha. Vinaya Texts, 111. p. 225, last line, read: fish [and meat] . . . uucchâharaaka.
\(^11\) Just so Sabbakâmì questioned by Revata.
\(^12\) M. Fyut, § 230, 21—23.
\(^13\) It is known that M. Fyut (§ 310) list of the Naïsâsargikas corresponds to that of the Pâtimokha. The order is the same for the first 22 terms.
\(^14\) M. Fyut, § 230, 12, prâsaaga.
Truly, what a "hard and troublesome" question and how probable it is that the monks of Vaipāli had knowledge of the Nissayagatas and repeated them piously at each phase of the moon! Now, not only do they accept gold and silver, but they do not regard the coins as the undivided property of the community; they share them among themselves.

Everything becomes clear, things at least follow each other with an appearance of logic, when we examine this history from Minayef's point of view. If the community, for reasons that it is not our business to explain, had not yet formulated an exact law about money, the error of the Vaipāli monks, their arrogant attitude, their manoeuvres, their struggle, their condemnation, and the importance which it seems to have had, all this would be less extraordinary.

"Gold and silver are contrary to the spirit of detachment of ascetics in general," Thus Yañàs denounced the Vaipāli monks to the pious laymen, as much because they are refractory to religious disciplines as because they are violators of the code of Çākyas: "They are neither Samaññas, nor sons of Sakyas, these pretendó monks who accept money."

We may, in the same spirit, attribute a precise import to one of the discourses which Yañàs holds with the laymen to justify his remonstrances (XII, 1, 4). It is a question of a conversation otherwise unknown in the other sources, which Budi 2 is supposed to have had with Mahāvīrāca. This fictitious passage is only a double of Yañàs. The latter relates that one day Mahāvīrāca protested against the royal officers, who said: "Gold and silver are allowable to the devotees, sons of Sakyas"; then, going to find Buddha, he told him what he had heard of the congregation and what he himself had answered: "In maintaining what I did maintain, he asked the Master, did I speak according to the word of Bhagavat, far from incorrectly making him responsible for [a doctrine he does not teach]! Did I speak in accordance with the Dharma, without anything to be blamed in my words, in my principal and accessory theses relative to the duties of the brethren?" The answer which Yañàs ascribes to Bhagavat may be imagined.

---

44. M. Vyu, § 278, ahiyana, aprimana, aññayapañña.

45. kacc' akhat dham' esa vajjanañña vattaraddaññi c'eva bhagavato hami, na ca bhagavannti abhiyantena abhiyantena abhiyantena abhiyantena. (See the strictly parallel passage, M. Fagg, VI, 31, 4. The only difference is that the subject is in the plural, and that we read dhammanat ca instead of ca.)

46. It is with regret that I differ from the translation of the Vinaya Texts: "Now am I, Lord, in maintaining as I did, one who speaks according to the word of the Blessed One, one who does not falsely represent the Blessed One who does not put forth minor matters in the place of the true Dhamma? And is there anything that leads to blame in such discussion, this way and that, as touching the observance of the rules of the Order?" We read ad VI, 31, 4: "Do they say the truth of the Blessed One, and do they not bear false witness against the Blessed One and pass off a spurious Dhamma as your Dhamma? And there is nothing blameworthy in a dispute like this, regarding matters of Dhamma?"

47. M. Kern, to whom I submit this passage, thinks that the word omnadhamma is adverbial. Compare passages like Su. Nip., stanza 30, dhammanu nissaya omnadhammacari; Dh. pada, stanza 20, dhammanu ko'c omadhammacari; and expressions like asaññadhamma = who is not treated by right [cf. M. Vyu, § 48, 49-50, omadhammacatirini dvamadhavatipaggamana], omnadhamma seems generally to have the meaning which Childers gives to it, "relating to the ordinations which bind all the pietists," omnadhamma = an addition, corroboration or of detail, of a thesis, proposition or rule [omadhamma in the sense of blane, see M. Fagg, index].

In this way we obtain a phrase whose two parts are parallel: "Is it not the fact that speak in accordance with Bhagavat, and not travesty his thought? Is it not the fact that speak according to the Dhamma and not travesty the Dhamma?"

I had proposed the following translation to M. Kern: "Have I proclaimed the corollary of the Law (omadhamma)?" He thinks it may be possible. However, it can only rest upon the glosses of the Dhp. and of Som. Ph. interpreted by Childers (dhammanu sāvaka dvamadhavatipaggamana, Dhp. p. 378). I do not know what to make of the six omadharmas of M. Vyu, § 331, 130; see also, ibid. § 123, 81, dvamadhavatipaggamana.
Yaçaś, Bava, Sarrakāmin did not condemn the propositions of Vaiśāli, notably the jāṭāra-para-
jata, by invoking as the Culla relates, the text of the Prātimokṣa supported by the exegesis contained
in the Vīhāra-sūtra. They condemned them, and rightly so, in the name of the "Dharma," speaking
and explaining conformably to the Dharma, as did Maṇiṇiḍaka. Rightly so, we say, for "every good
word is the word of Buddha"; and if Buddha may have left out some detail, he no less
forbids all that is bad.

But Minayař calls upon us to examine the facts a little more closely.

"In the special, technical terms which designate the innovations of Vaiśāli and in other similar
ones which are to be met with, for example, in the Mahāvnttāti, there is, perhaps, preserved the
most ancient form of the rules of the Vinaya, a form which, in the course of time, developed by
various explanations into commandments (pitasāpada), into the rules of the Prātimokṣa, etc."
As a matter of fact, to the leppatā jāṭāra-para-jaṭam of the Vajjiputakas is opposed the principle
which forbids the jāṭāra-para-jaṭa-paṇća. 80

Minayař regards it as assured that the whole of the legislation on gold and silver, legislation
in which "the spirit even of the community seems to be at stake," 81 certainly is not anterior to
Vaiśāli. But there was, perhaps, a law forbidding them to touch money, to receive silver in their
own hands, a law which we read in the Vinaya of the Dharmaguptakas: "If a Bhikṣu with his own
hand take gold, silver or even copper . . . . . " 82

The Nis. x., where there is an evident purpose of avoiding contact with the money, is the natural
result of the principle thus conceived. So with the precept relative to the journey, M. Vagga,
VI. 34. 2. 83

The Vajjiputakas do not receive the money from hand to hand: as we have seen, they placed
a copper vase filled with water in the midst of the circle of the brethren.

One then is inclined to believe that the Vajjiputakas erode a law too special, to have the scope
that it has acquired in the sequel.

But, for everything is strange in this affair of Vaiśāli, this impression is suddenly destroyed
by a brutal matter of fact: it seems, in truth, that the practice of the Vajjiputakas is conformable if
not to the Dharma, at least to the spirit of the community. This vase, of which, as far as I know,
we find no information in the Pāli Vinaya 84 and which excited Yaṣaś's indignation to such a high

80 See J. R. A. S. 1902, p. 375.
81 M. Vagga, VI. 40: "What I have not forbidden in direct terms is permitted or forbidden according as it
is conformable to the law or not; what I have not permitted . . . . . ."
82 M. Vagga, § 200, 21, jāṭāra-para-jaṭa-paṇća; § 261, 63, ratnasāpaṇča. This conjecture of Minayař is
certainly not exact for all the terms contemplated by M. Vagga.
84 Nis. Pāc. xxvii., ap. Beal, Cola. The Pāli text says perhaps the same thing, upasamāya in opposition to
uppamāya, cause to be taken by another, and to upasamākhitum, cause to be kept in deposit; — but it
is less clear.
85 The brethren will remit the money to a koppiyāraka, who will make the purchases necessary to the monk.
86 The Sārvāstivādins are more detailed than the Culla. The pātra is rubbed with ointments, perfumed,
ornamented with flowers; it is placed on the head of one of the brethren who traverse the streets and squares,
crying: "Give, inhabitants of the town and strangers; this pātra is a bhāja-ṣaiva; to give into this pātra is to
give infinitely . . . . . ." We cannot help thinking of the bhājasaiva of Hinduism.
degree, is used regularly in the church of the theras, in the Holy Cingalese Church!" Spence Hardy bears witness to this: "In some conspicuous place there is a large copper-pan, into which the alms of the people are thrown."²³

I do not wish to leave this "monetary" question without observing that the Suttavibhaṅga also, with a mixture of hypocrisy and naivety, distorts the dispositions of the Pāṭimokkha. One can see, Viṅhaṅga Nis. xviii,²⁴ the use that has to be made of the money unduly received by a monk; how the Saṅgha, while condemning the monk, knows how to profit by the good windfall;²⁵ how they go as far as inventing a special and delicate function, that of "gold thrower," which supposes fixed moral qualities, for the improbable hypothesis that a layman would not accept the duty of buying, with cursed money, "ghī" or oil for the Saṅgha. Prof. Oldenberg, who loves, as I also love, the Buddhist monks, sees in this a "scruple in which there is something touching."²⁶ Doubtless; but this scruple being combated by considerations in themselves legitimate, the whole of the dispositions may pass for very ingenious.

Having reached the end of this examination we shall affirm first of all that the question of the innovations — are they new or are they not? — does not present itself to the disciples of M. Kern and Minayeff in the same terms as to Prof. Oldenberg.

The latter, given the date and authority that he attributes to the Culla, cannot but know in what consisted the theses of the Vajjiputtakas, when the Pāli text consents to say it with sufficient clearness. We have followed him on this ground and we have examined if these theses are, or are not, contemplated in the Vinaya. It is certain that they are, since the theras condemn them. We have shown that the innovations 4 and 5 (urũṅkappā, anumattā²⁷) are prohibited in precise terms by the Mahāvagga; we believe we saw that innovation 8 (jātosi) is attacked by the Viṅhaṅga. The points 1, 2, 3, 9, 10 are in violation of fixed laws on food (ātriṅka, akāla, sāsānāthakāra), on the dimensions of beds, on money. As to innovation 6, it may be regarded as ruinous to every disciplinary canon, as an attack on the authority of Buddha and the community.

But, in fact, even when the Culla is clear, even when the three other sources (Sarvāstivādins, Mahāpiṭkas, Dharmaguptas) confirm its interpretation of the "points" of Vaiśāli, we are very far from knowing anything but traditions, often suspicious. It is not doubtful that the theses are defined by authors who, rightly or wrongly, consider them heretical and who know the prohibitive resources of the Prātimokkha; hence, are we sure of the exactness of the definition? Or, rather, what do we know with certainty of the innovations?

The urũṅkappā and the anumattā are defined in the Culla by people who have under their eyes the ecclesiastical rules that Sabhapāmin invokes in kind. The words ahūttatiṅkā parāritṭam anatirittam are introduced into the definition of amāhita and of gūmavatvā to make them fall under the formula of "non-remaining" food. The same for the note "akāla" in the case of the two fingers. Perhaps, also for the gaṇabhājana brought forward by the Sarvāstivādins à propos of "the village."

Add that the pseudo-historic context of the Council is more than subject to caution.²⁸

²³ A savoury detail which the translators of the Vinaya Texts could have mentioned. Sp. Hardy does not say that the vase is filled with water. See East. Mon. p. 233; quoted by Kern, Gesch. I. p. 249, 1.
²⁴ Vinaya Texts, I. p. 23; and Oldenberg, Buddha, trans. Fonnier, p. 319.
²⁵ The punishment for the guilty monk consists especially in not having his share in the things the money buys — Sic vos non vobis . . .
²⁶ On this point see M. Kern's observations and those of Prof. Oldenberg. I doubt if the second has convinced the first. The relations of the Vajjiputtakas with Devadatta on the one hand, with Vajjiputta, pupil of Ananda, on the other, add nothing to the probability of the account.
The argumentation of Prof. Oldenberg, not very strong even when one places oneself at his point of view, which necessarily nearly approaches that of the compiler of the Culla, when one recognises the authority of the Culla and the unlawful character of the innovations of Vaiśāli, loses all authority if we abandon these postulates.

We have some little information about the way in which the Vajjiputtakas collected the money from the faithful; and it happens that the Cingalese have recourse to the same copper-vas. 

If the "salt in the horn" is preserved salt, the Vinayas authorise the provision of salt for life. If it is a question of ginger, ginger also is allowed. The Gāṅapārā is, perhaps, only this form of the "repart in a group," which Pāc. xxxii, authorises on a journey, as in several other circumstances, but which was abominable to the ascetics of the school of Kācya, to those ārya-kathikas who come to the help of Yāca; it would be a proof of an excessive good will to admit, with the Dūna, that the heresy of the Vajjiputtakas consisted in making a journey the pretext. The amathita, rendered unlawful by a vain pretext of anustīrka, is permitted in principle to the brethren; but we know that certain heretics prohibited it: "the school of Devadatta," among whom were the monks of Vesāli (Culla, VII. 4), condemned preparations made of milk. The same Devadatta forbids convicts (ājītas), "roots" (channa), the vicinity of villages (gāmanta); he allows only the forest and "the foot of a tree." He forbids the aśīsaka; he forbids salt. Perhaps the "innovations" of Vaicāli are unknown, with their specific names, in our Vinayas, not because the compiling of the Vinaya is previous to Vaicāli, but because the community which compiled the Vinaya itself practised the unlawful innovations introduced and sanctioned by the cousin of Devadatta. There is nothing absurd in the hypothesis itself; and in a certain measure it is confirmed by the vague indications we possess on the primitive state of the community.

We do not believe that the Pāṭimokka, as it is, with the Vibhaṅgas and the Khandhakas, certainly existed before Vaicāli: "This is poetry, although it may be written in prose." But the antiquity of the books of discipline is none the less more than probable.

M. Kern has shown, in fact, that in many of its parts the Vinaya is nothing but the transposition of the Brahmanic or Jaina rules. On the other hand, we know, or we think we

---


100 Can one make use of the information furnished by M. Roehrl (Lif., p. 50): "The Duva informs us that the most important rules of the code, which was afterwards called the Pāṭimokka, were only formulated when Devadatta commenced sowing strife among the brethren, some ten or twelve years before the Buddha's death. At all events our texts lead us to suppose that until after the conversion of Pravassajj, the mendicants of the Order did not live together, and that the only rules laid down for their guidance were that they were obliged to beg their food, that they must observe the ordinary rules of morality (the pāla precepts), that they must own no property, and that they must preach to all classes of people."

1 Vinaya Texts, I, p. xxxii: "That the difference of opinion on the Ten Points remains altogether unnoticed in those parts of the collection where, in the natural order of things, it would be obviously referred to, and that it is only mentioned in an Appendix where the Council held on its account is described, shows clearly, in our opinion, that the Vibhaṅgas and the Khandhakas (save the two last) are older than the Council of Vesāli."

It is sometimes since M. Kern cited "certain proofs of the ignorance of the authors of the two Vaggas and of the Sutta-Piṭaka, so strong that they can only be explained by the supposition that these two works are of a date much more remote than the rule itself." (Gesch. II, p. 10.)

2 Brahmacārīna, bhikṣas, viṇapaṭhaṇas, vālikānaṃ, jātīlas, guṇikas. This demonstration was made for the first time in a complete manner in Gesch. Vol. II, first chapters. See Minseyff and Oldenberg (Foucher, p. 385) who calls attention to the comparative remarks of Jacob; Sacred Books, XXII, p. xxix, and following. On the development of disciplinary rule, consult Oldenberg, loc. cit. In our opinion, the author spoils by the rigidity of his orthodoxy the most ingenious views in the world.
know, that Buddha was rather "loquacious" and it is not impossible that Buddha himself and the Saṅgha, from its dawn and in the great trouble which followed upon the death of the Master, exerted itself to assure the Buddhist originality as compared with other sects.\(^5\)

And we must go further. The community, we have already said, comprises two classes of monks who took their refuge in the Buddha, the ārya-vakabhiṣuṣ, of whom Devadatta, father of the Dhomeṅgka, was with Kāçyapa, the legendary patron;\(^4\) and the bhikṣuṣ who constitute the centre of the community and whose disciplinary organisation Buddha confided to Upāḷi.\(^6\)

The divergence of the views of the two groups could only hasten the codification of two sets of rules.

We possess these two sets of rules, and if it is difficult to fix their distant antecedents their history in Buddhism and their reciprocal relations, it is easy to recognise the two tendencies which dominate them. On the one hand, the four "resources," or "points of support" (mīsaya, mīgaya) of the monastic life; in the matter of food, the mouthfuls received as alms; as regards clothes, the robe consisting of rags; for a house, the foot of a tree; for medicines, decomposed urine.\(^6\) And Buddha declares that all the rest, meals in the town, clothes made on purpose, monasteries and grottoes, ghi, butter or oil are superfluities (atticovalānas), that is to say, if you like, dispensations (extra allowances). These are, for certain, derogations from grāmaya.

On the other hand, — I have in view the rule rather than the organisation of the fraternity — the Prātimokṣa, itself, it seems, is only a translation of the essential axioms of Hindoo asceticism, but a translation much less integral. One is a grāmaya only on the condition of conforming to the immemorial principles of chastity, of poverty, of temperance, of obedience also, at least for the novices and within certain limits. But there is a way of understanding these principles. Now it seems indeed that the Prātimokṣa not only is unacquainted with the

\(^5\) Kern, Manual, p. 74: "In general it may be said that the whole organisation of the Saṅgha and a good deal of the rules for monks and nuns, — if we may trust the canonical writings, — were introduced by imitation or by accident. The Master is less a legislator than an upholder of the Law . . . ."


\(^6\) Fāhien relates that the disciples of Devadatta, his contemporaries, honour the three last but one Buddhas, but not Cākyamuni (Dean, p. 82, quoted by Rockhill, Udana, p. 264).

\(^6\) On the role of Upāḷi see the texts (note Cutta, VI. 13, 1) quoted in Vinaya Texts, I, pp. xii. and xiii. The documents which go even so far as to substitute Upāḷi for Buddha in what concerns the promulgation of the Vinaya are as suggestive as the conclusion of the translators is prudent: "There may well be some truth in this very ancient tradition that Upāḷi was specially conversant with the Rules of the Order; but it would be hazardous on that account to ascribe to Upāḷi a share, not only in the handing down of existing rules, but in the composition of the Prātimokṣa itself."

The Niṇṇayas are declared to the monks immediately after ordination; if they were declared to them beforehand, no one would wish to be a monk! (M. Vanga, 1. 30); they constitute the ideal of the ascetic life. The Bhikṣuṣ are free to follow or to ailing the Dhāsas. Among the Arhata of Vaiśālī (Southern and Avantaka), some only, as we have seen, p. 82, n. 106, practise the dhāsas 8, 3, 1, 2. It is clear, however, says M. Kern, that the six first dhāsas have nothing special to the āryakiras.

The three first niṇṇayas correspond to the Dhāsas 1, 9 of the Fālli list. On these see Kern, Man. p. 75. The women are necessarily excluded from the niṇṇayas.
rigorous niṣīdikā, but also brings numerous mitigations to the prohibitions of food anatirikta or samādhiṅkāra, of gauṣūhojana, and doubtless also to several others.

In its turn, the discipline, such as it appears in the Khapakṣa, is constructed in the margin of the rules of the Prātimokṣa, made up of diverse and sometimes incongruous accommodations. It is not unreasonable, not only to believe that the greater number of the elements of these two codes of discipline are ancient, even though they are in moderate agreement with each other, but also to carry back very far the time of the compilation of these codes. Who knows if the ancient Tathāgatas did not collaborate in it?

In any case, Buddha did not speak in vain when he allowed the Saṅgha to determine in the absence of rules emanating from himself, what is lawful or unlawful: when he left to this same Saṅgha the care of putting aside the lesser and minor rules; when he congratulated Maghaṅiṣi on having reasoned in conformity with the Dharma. His own life furnished two opposite images of the ascetic life (prāmāṇya). The legend claims that he was a naked monk and an ascetic before discovering the middle road between senseless asceticism and the life of the world. The point of discipline on which the texts are most formal is the condemnation of nakedness. For the rest and the detail, the Master refers to the interpretation which the Church will give of the Eight-fold Path. Let Saṅgha, so delicately reared that hairs have grown under the soles of his feet, come to terms with Kāsyapa, who still shudders at having renounced the great tapas.

There will be before and after Vaiśāli, whatever may be the time of Vaiśāli, heads of schools, innovators if you like, some lax, others rigorous, “whose memory is not even preserved in the Buddhist Saṅgha.” There are some, however, who could be named, especially among the latter

---

1 The law of the three cīvaras, which is one of the dhātus (No. 2), is, at the bottom, contradictory to dhāta No. 1 (clothing made of rage). This first dhāta is Hindu; the third cīvara is Buddhist by definition. Nis. xxiii., which orders to sew a piece of the old cīvara to a new one (above, p. 93), clearly shows the opposition of the Prātimokṣa and the Dhāta.
2 The anatirikta appears to be a variant of khaluṣoṣṭhiṅkāra (Dhāta 7); see Kern, p. 76, and Childers.
3 Compare Für., xxx., prohibition of taking what is not given and the authorization to take fruits.
Für. xxxix. forbids, except in case of sickness, ghee, butter, oil, honey, molasses, fish, meat, milk and curds, M. Vagga, VI. 31, allows meat and fish “unheard, unseen, unsuspected.” See Kern, Man. p. 64, and his note: “The Buddha himself is represented as eating the pork expressly prepared for him by the Canda, and thus proved, specie factae, that he was no Buddhist!”
On the question of the meat in the Great Vehicle, see Chavannes, Religieux Éminents, p. 48. Ibid. p. 49, the note on bhogasīya—also Cittāna, 122, 14 sāl.
4 M. Vagga, VIII. 15, 7; 28, 1. Above, p. 16.
5 Minu. st., 51: “A certain monk, after having freely submitted to the ascetic regime, common in all its fundamental features to the Buddhists and the solitary or to the forest ascetics of Brahmanism, could begin to preach the legality, the piety of actions contrary to the spirit and to the real meaning of the commandments which he had agreed to fulfill, but whose interdiction was not yet formulated in precise terms in any code”; probable consequence of a certain demoralization produced by the life in common of the monks; he might also, we will add, tax his ingenuity to elude the precise terms of a code.
6 How can we explain how these deviations arose in the brotherhood of Vaiśāli? Were they the result of demoralization? Or perhaps these innovations, at the bottom, were neither innovations, nor derogations to any code whatever of disciplinary rules, for this reason that no such code existed in the community . . . . ? We may even believe that the appearance among the ascetics of this repugnance to detachment and austerity were due to the two causes at once . . . .”
And, in this sense, we may say with Minayeff without impropriety that the divers prohibitions of the Vinayas sum up, in a concise and condensed form, the history of a series of conflicts.

The mistake would consist in thinking that the Prātimokṣa is nothing else than the focussing of the solutions successively adopted. As a theoretic construction, destined to be legally violated before as well as after its compilation, the Prātimokṣa is, perhaps, contemporaneous with the first Vinayadhāras. This does not mean, for instance, that the keeping of salt, allowed in the Mahāvagga, was forbidden at the time when the Prātimokṣa, which does not recognise it, was compiled. The weekly provision of bhājīyāyas, permitted in the Prātimokṣa (Nī. xxiii.), although all provision was forbidden, is not necessarily a later interpolation: when repeating an axiom of the grāmānya, in order to clear their conscience, they may very well have noticed an alleviation, solemnly authorised by Buddha or the Sāṅgha.

It seems that the episode of the Vajji-puttakas and Yaças-Revata-Sarvakāmin, however hard put to we may be to characterise it, belongs to that obscure history of the ancient disciplinary conflicts. We decidedly refuse to recognise in the ten points derogations from the Vinaya of Vatāgāmanī or from the Tibetan Vinaya. Perhaps we should make a less grave mistake by seeking to discover underneath this motley tradition, uncertain in itself, full of gaps, altered, perhaps transposed as a whole, an ancient stock of authentic remembrances relative to the struggle of the āruṇyakas with the bhikṣus or to the conflicts of the bhikṣuṃs and the āruṇyakas among themselves.

One last word. The prohibitions of the Prātimokṣa are one thing, the ordinances relative to the constitution of the Order another. Minayeff recognises this, although in places he seems to forget it. Messrs. Rhys Davids and Oldenberg have well said “that Gotama’s disciples, from the very beginning, were much more than a free and unformal union of men held together merely through their common reverence for their Master and through a common spiritual aim. They formed, rather, and from the first, an organised Brotherhood.12 The history of Buddhism becomes very obscure if this point is contested;13 if, according to Minayeff, we picture the Sāṅgha, at the death of the Master, as “a group of ascetics having neither clear doctrines, nor definite disciplinary institutions.”14 The doctrine is not clear, nor the discipline definite; but there is something more than a group, there is a brotherhood, or rather, for the plural is necessary,15 there are brotherhoods of which Kāyapa, Upālī, Purkha, etc., will be the heads.

These fraternities are independent, but they do not remain without relations. The sons of Cākya constitute only one family. The history of Vaiṣṇīl tells us of the intervention of a saint in the affairs of a community to which he does not belong, concerning the control by the āruṇyakabhikṣuṣ over the customs and usages of a sedentary community; it puts beyond all doubt the solidarity of the divers groups, always open to visitors. The whole Buddhist world, we are told, was represented at Vaiṣṇīl: it is indeed necessary, in order to explain the relative unity of the Scriptures, to admit the efficacy of the centralising efforts.

12 Vinaya Text, I. p. xii. (It seems to us that Gotama’s disciples . . . . . .) This appreciation is not absolutely exact, first, because the reverence due to the Master was not understood by every one in the same way, nor was the spiritual aim that Buddha preached. It is wrong to ignore the Lokottaravādins and the hymn, disciples also of Buddha; second, because the elements grouped together by Buddha are many and diverse: Among the monks clothed in the triple robe, there were recluse, bands of wandering ascetics, sedentary brotherhoods. The organization of the Sāṅgha never comprised all the Buddhist monks under uniform rules.
13 But one may ask if it is necessary to bring to it a clearness of which it scarcely admits. Renan was very wrong when he said that an explanation is as good as a document.
14 Minayeff, Researches, p. 40.
15 As Prof. Oldenberg very well says, transl. Foucher,7 p. 234.
APPENDIX.

The Ten "Points" of Vaiśāli.

[ Kanjur, Sūtra Vol. 102, fol. 336 (red edition). ]

One hundred and ten years after the Nirvāṇa of Buddha, the son of the Jina declined, and among the monks of Vaiśāli there arose ten illegal practices, contrary to the Sūtra and the Vinaya, divergent from the teaching of the Master, foreign to the Sūtra, unknown in the Vinaya, contradictory of the Dharma. These illegal practices the monks of Vaiśāli, enjoined as legal, practised, and followed.

What were those ten practices?

The monks of Vaiśāli having rendered legal the exclamation Aho! performed an ecclesiastical act, illegally in an incomplete Sāṅgha, illegally in a complete Sāṅgha, legally in an incomplete Sāṅgha. This was the first practice, contrary to the Sūtra and the Vinaya, divergent from the teaching of the Master, foreign to the Sūtra, unknown in the Vinaya, contradictory of the Dharma, that the monks of Vaiśāli, illegal as it was, enjoined as legal, practised, and followed! (1).

Again, the monks of Vaiśāli, saying 'The venerable ones [absent Brothers] having approved, do ye count it as approved,' caused [the resolutions of the incomplete Sāṅgha] to be approved by the monks of the parish and rendering the approval legal, performed an ecclesiastical act . . . . This was the second practice, contrary to the Sūtra . . . . (2).

Again, the monks of Vaiśāli, turning up the soil with their own hands, rendered legal the practice of turning up the soil. This was the third practice, contrary to the Sūtra . . . . (3).

Again, the monks of Vaiśāli, mixing salt consecrated for life-time with the [food] appropriate at the moment, declared the salt legal and so acted. This was the fourth practice, contrary to the Sūtra . . . . (4).

Again, the monks of Vaiśāli, having gone a yojana and a half-yojana and having eaten food in troop, rendered [the meal in troop] legal by reason of the journey. This was the fifth practice, contrary to the Sūtra . . . . (5).

Again, the monks of Vaiśāli, eating foods of both kinds, not being 'remainder' (akṛta), while 'making two fingers' (?), rendered legal [the practice of the] two fingers. This was the sixth practice, contrary to the Sūtra . . . . (6).

Again, the monks of Vaiśāli, drinking fermented liquor with a sucking action like leeches, rendered [the fermented liquor] legal by reason of illness. This was the seventh practice, contrary to the Sūtra . . . . (7).

Again, the monks of Vaiśāli, having agitated a full measure (droga) of milk and a full measure of curds, eating [this preparation] out of time, rendered [this practice] legal by reason of the mixture. This was the eighth practice, contrary to the Sūtra . . . . (8).
Again, the monks of Vaiśāli, not having patched their new mats with a border, a Sugata’s cubit broad, from the old mat and so indulging in luxury rendered [the practice] legal because of the mat. This was the ninth practice, contrary to the Sūtra

Again, the monks of Vaiśāli, taking alms-bowls such as were round, pure, and suitable for ritual; having anointed them with perfumes, fumigated them in sweet incense, adorned them with various fragrant flowers; having placed them on the head of a monk (or of monks) protected by a cushion; perambulated the highways, streets, and cross roads, crying as follows: “Hear, ye multitudes who have come from various towns and countries and ye wise people of Vaiśāli! This pātra is a ‘lucky’ (bhadra) pātra. To give in it is to give much: or whoever shall fill it will obtain a great fruit, a great advantage, a great activity, a great development. And receiving therein precious stones, gold, and other valuables, enjoyed themselves therewith, and rendered gold and silver legal.” This was the tenth practice, contrary to the Sūtra

(1) The Tibetan presupposes a text: vyagreṣa [svahyena] adhārmikam, samagreṣa adhārmikatva ca, vyagreṣa dhārmikatva ca karma karonti.

A comparison with M. Vagga, II. 14, 2, and IX. 2, 1, leaves little doubt as to the sense of this passage, which has not resulted in exercise the sagacity of Mr. Rockhill (Life, p. 171 and note). It is a question of an ecclesiastical act (kamma = los), Upasatha or otherwise, which, in the Pāli, is termed complete or incomplete (vagga, samagga) according as the assembly is complete or incomplete, legal or illegal (dhhamma, adhamma) according to the observance or non-observance of the rules relating to the ṣaṭti, putting of the resolution, etc. (IX. 3, 1). Of the four categories adhamma vagga, adhamma samagga, dhhamma vagga, dhhamma samagga, the fourth alone is authorized.

The monks of Vaiśāli practice the first three, imitating therein the monks of Campā (IX. 2) and the famous six (Chabbogiya, IX. 3). The rector of the Duḷva is not unaware of the fact; for, when Yaśas demands of Sarvakāmi where that practice has been prohibited, the old man replies: ‘In the village of Campā’—‘A propos of what?’—‘On account of the acts of the six’—‘What kind of offence is it?’—‘A dhūkṣa.’ The same passage of the Mahāvagga (Campagiyaka vinayavatthu) is contemplated in the Culla with a view to the condemnation of the fifth practice (anumatt).

Compare Abhidharmakośavyāhāryā, Soc. As., fol. 329 b, 5: manḍalaśīyām ekasyān hi simūyān pūthakakarmakararajit saṅghadvidaḥ bharati.—Simābandha, Div. 156, 21; M. Vyut, 245, 420.

It remains to ascertain what relation may exist between this practice, bordering upon the āvīsakappa, and the interjection adho.

(2) It is, we believe, a question of anumatti, as is proved by the repetition of the formulas concerning the incomplete Saṅgha. The word anumodana throws light upon the relation between approbation and “enjoyment,” “to amuse oneself,” in Rockhill. The text contemplated with a view to the condemnation is the same as before.

(3) Condemned by Pāc. x. (LXXXIII. in the Duḷva). According to Sarvakāmi the proposition had been condemned at Čravasti ā propos of the six. In the Pāli Vibhaṅga, the Ājīvakas are concerned. This practice is wanting in the other sources. It is replaced by the āvīsakaṇḍa, one of the most obscure points of this obscure tradition, against which, as we have seen, no text is adduced.
(4) According to Sarvākāmin condemned at Rājaṅgha à propos of Cāriputra. If Tibetan scholars could, without some degree of shamelessness, rely upon the principle of the Latinists: “to us both reason and fact are preferable to a hundred manuscripts,” we should like to read: dus•su•ma•ruñ•ba•dañ . . . =yācājñātan adhitthātena lavoṣanena ta ha akālaka . . . =adding salt laid by to foods for which the time has passed, with the result of rendering legal those forbidden foods. The explanation of the Sarvāstivādins would agree with that of the Dharmaguptas and of the Mahāgacchākās (see above p. 91). For akālika (akālika) “the time being disregarded,” see M. Vyut, 63, 15 (and the locus classicus concerning the characteristics of the Dharma); for akālaka in a sense precisely the opposite of that which we here attribute to the word, Div. Av., 130, 22 akālakāni sajñārāhāni—there were prepared foods (bhajaṇyas) that could not be taken outside the time. Both by reason of the sanidhi and by reason of the sense and of the variants akālika and akālika (from a-kūla), akālika (from a-kūla), we can explain the reading dus•su•ruñ•ba for dus•su•ma•ruñ•ba.

(5) Condemned at Rājaṅgha, à propos of Devadatta (hūna•cin•sa•ba=gaṛabhajana, M. Vyut, 261, 40—Dr. P. Cordier).

(6) Condemned at Crāvasti à propos of a great number of monks (lha•mar•ma•byas•pañ•bzañ•ba=abhinnirūthakālāna, M. Vyut, 261, 28—Dr. P. C.).

(7) Condemned at Crāvasti à propos of the venerable Sūgala (leś•cān; Suratha, according to Rockhill). Compare the Sāgata of Vābh. Pāc. li; but the scene is not at Crāvasti.

(8) Condemned at Crāvasti à propos of several monks.

(9) Condemned at Crāvasti à propos of several monks. According to the text: “ . . . rendered legal [this practice] by reason of the mat.”

(10) Condemned as Naiṣārgika in a great number of texts (Vinaya, Dirgha, Mahāyama, etc.).

Here the difficulties abound: (1) It is at first a question of several vases (gañ dag . . . de-dañ), later of “this vase” (hūla); (2) the epithets of the vases are curiously accumulated; (3) the red text has: dge-sloñ•gi-mgo•bo•la•khrīñ•stan•dañ•chas•pañ•sten•du•bzañ•nas; khrīñ = seat (mañca, pītha, pīthukā, M. Vyut, 273, 92), stan = mat (āsana), khrī•stan = āsana, mañca-pītha, chas = garment (chas-gos) and in general, utensils “things, tools, requisites” — mgo•sten•de-bzañ = alicui opus imponere (Desgodins). If sten•du = ched•du, we have: “placing the vase at the head of the Sangha with a view to obtaining chairs and mats and utensils” (?) It is better to make khrīñ•stan a cushion and read dan•bcas•pañ with the black edition, thus: “furnished with a cushion” = “then they put a mat on a cāramañ̄a head and on it (the bowl)” (Rockhill), “to place a round begging-bowl . . . on the head of a cāramañ̄a” (Schiefner ad Tār., p. 41); and (4) the instrumental ges•dus•g genocide is analogous to that cited note 9 “by reason of the mat.”

We may usefully compare M. Vyut, 239, 25, and following gacchā-mālyena māhīyate, abhyarhitam, dhūpanirdhāpitaṃ, saṃpūjitaṃ, pūjyaṁ pūjitaṃ, māhitam, abhiprakiranti sva, jīvitopakahāram, gānaṃ pratyayabhāsayaṃ, sukhopadbhānām.
ANTiquities at Mandasor.

Plate II.

1. Statue at Sondni.

2. Fragments at Sondni.
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I.

1. — The Mandasor Pillars.

I propose, as opportunity occurs, to give, in a series of articles, miscellaneous information on places in the Central India Agency, and any other matters of interest, which have come to my notice while engaged on the Gazetteer work.

The pillars dealt with in this article, though generally designated the Mandasor pillars, actually lie at the village of Songi [24° 3' N., 76° 10' E.] also called Soindli and Soindani: 3 miles from Mandasor. These pillars bear the inscription of Yabodharman, which has been dealt by Dr. J. F. Fleet. It records the defeat of the White Han Chieftain Mihirakula.

The position now occupied by the remains is shown on the accompanying Plan and on Plate I.

SURVEY PLAN OF THE FIELDS IN WHICH THE BROKEN IMAGES AND
PILLARS ARE LYING

AT
SONGHI
DISTRICT MANDASOR

SCALE 500 FEET = 1 INCH

A. Slab said to represent old pillar
B. Base of broken pillar
C. Figure of dwarapala (complete)
D. Figure of dwarapala (broken)
E. Pillar in two pieces
F. Base of second pillar with capital beyond it.
G. Coped capital of pillar E. on edge of the field.
H. Piece of pillar F. near village.

The general appearance of the pillars as they now lie is given in Plate I. The pillar marked E in the Plan, and which lies across Plate I is the more perfect of the two.

On making inquiries I found that tradition asserts the former existence of four pillars, indicated in the Plan by the letters A, B, E, and F. Examination showed that the remains at B consisted of the base of a pillar and the spring of the shaft. It consists of a base in the shape of a cube of 3 ft. 3 ins., from which a shaft with a diameter of 3 ft. springs ornamented with crenellated bands, 4 ins. in breadth. Only 2 ft. of this column remains. At A there is now no indication of a pillar. A slab of sandstone still lies here, but is too dilapidated, for it to be possible to say, that it ever was part of a pillar. As it consists of sandstone, however, and as all the local rock is trap, it must have been imported.

1 I. A., Vol. XV, pp. 222 and 232; Gupta Ins., p. 146.
2 I regret that my photograph of this fragment has been mislaid, but see Plate I.
Assuming, however, that there were four pillars originally, they would have enclosed a rectangular space of 211 ft. by 67 ft. The remains at A and B, however, stand on a sort of terrace about 4 ft. higher than the general level on which E and F lie. This terrace is certainly the site of old foundations. If so, the monoliths E and F must have stood in front of the building to which A and B belonged, either forming a gateway or simply standing alone. There is not a dissimilar gateway to the fine old temple at Baro, also in Gwalior State. The dwārpalas' figures lying near the pillars would support the hypothesis of a gateway.

To turn to the individual pillars. The pillar at E is broken into two pieces, but is otherwise in fair preservation. It consisted of a single sandstone block with total length of 39 ft. 5 ins., the lower piece now measuring 21 ft. 8 ins. and the upper 17 ft. 5 ins., while the base is formed of a cube of 4 ft. 3 ins.

About twenty yards beyond the top of the pillar, G in the Plan, lies the rectangular cap. into which the column is fitted. It is a square of 3 ft. 8 ins. and shows on one side the hole into which the top of the column was fixed, and on the reverse side the sockets by which the bell and lion capital was attached; the bell lies a little way off, but the lions have vanished.

The second column, F in the Plan, is incomplete, but was undoubtedly a replica of E, and is lying as it fell, the bell capital and lions being just in front of it, while a part of the shaft lies at H.

Close to these pillars lie two stone figures, shown at C and D in the Plan. They represent dwārpalas, and are carved to stand, respectively, on the right and left of a gateway. They would certainly seem to have stood one beside each pillar. The general appearance of these figures, of which that at C is in good condition, is given in Plate II, Fig. 1. The figure wears an elaborate and well-executed head-dress. The muslin waist-cloth is also well represented. Each of the dwārpalas is accompanied by a small dwarf, whose head-dress is very much like a judge's wig, a form of head-dress not uncommon in sculpture of the Gupta period.

The dimensions of these Figures are as given below —

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ft</th>
<th>ins</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canopy above Figure</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head-dress</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chin to Top of Thigh</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top of Thigh to Knee</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knee to Pedestal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knee to Pedestal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Foot</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoulder</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Across Shoulders</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Length</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The features of both are flat with broad noses; the earrings are in the shape of lotus flowers.

The site where these pillars lie has long been used as a quarry both by the inhabitants of Mandasar and the Railway Contractor, the Rājpūtāna-Mālvā line passing within a hundred yards of the spot. The soil is of the "black-cotton" class and the rock in the neighbourhood is Deccan trap. The sandstone pillars must thus have been brought from a considerable distance.

4. Khilchipura pillars.

5. Figure of Siva at Mandasor.
A series of miscellaneous carvings found on the spot are given in Plate II, Fig. 2. It will be remarked that the big male figure has the judge's-wig-like head-dress. This site is one which might possibly repay investigation by excavation scientifically carried out. The Rājā of Sheopur-Baroda, in Gwalior, who is a Gaur Rājput, says that traditionally his ancestors held this tract in the 11th and 12th centuries, but he has no stories about the place.

I would suggest that the more perfect of the two pillars with its capital and dwarpāla might be secured and set up or put in safe keeping at Gwalior or Indore. There is already a museum in the former place, and one is being started under official auspices in the latter. Though of immense weight, the railway line is so close that the removal could certainly be effected, and it would be well worth while.

2. — Khilchipura.

Dr. Fleet in his paper on the Mandasor inscription notices the village of Khilchipura, two miles from Mandasor, and refers in particular to an ornamental column there, remarking that it probably possessed more carving than was visible above ground at the time. I have had the pillar excavated to its base (Plate III, Fig. 4). It is one pillar of a tovan, as the socket of 10 x 4'5 ins., into which the architrave was inserted, can be seen on one side, and the remains of an asalāga fruit are still to be seen on the top.

The carving is interesting. It consists of a series of plaques on both sides of the pillar, apparently relating a story. A man, woman, and child, or dwarf, are apparently the dramatis personae. The woman is always naked and the man in the act of uncovering himself. The man has a wig similar to those in the Mandasor carving. The excavation disclosed one more plaque. The total length of the pillar, as it stands, is 17 ft. 6 ins., and when complete must have been quite 20 ft.

At 5 ft. 5 ins. below the present ground level, the remains of an old floor, composed of slabs of stone, and some old bricks were found, while the end of the pillar was 3 ft. 6 ins. below this.

Close to this pillar stands a small temple, made up of stones from an older structure, while there are many signs of old foundations round it. It would appear from the carving on the stones that a 12th century temple once stood on this spot. This was, no doubt, destroyed when Mandasor fell to the Muhammadans, and became a place of importance in the 14th century. A tomb to a Muhammadan saint, Ankā Pir, evidently placed on the site of an old temple, and some other ruins stand in and near the village. A very fine tank dating from Muhammadan times lies to the north of Khilchipura. A massive dam, which helps up the southern end, has been cut through. It must have retained a very large area of water.

3. — Mandasor.

This town, the Dasapura of early days, is now the head-quarters of a silt in Gwalior State. It stands 1,416 ft. above sea level on the banks of the Siwana, Sauna, or San river, a tributary of the Sitrā. It is a considerable trade centre, especially for the opium trade. It was a place of importance in early days, as it is mentioned in an inscription of the Western Kahaṭrapa at Nāsik and in one of the time of Kumāra Gupta I. The fort, which is the most important feature, is said to have been founded by 'Alā-ud-din Khilji (1296–1316) and to have been completed by Hoshang Shāh, the Māluwā Sultan (1465–34). It is largely built of Hindu and Jain remains supposed to have come from Afsalpur, a village not far from the town. Though this may be in part true, a great deal of the material was certainly local, and excavation in the fort might produce relics of value. An instance of what might come to light is shown in the large mutilated statue given in Plate III, Fig. 5. It was once a fine piece of carving and must have belonged to a building of merit.

---

*Ants, Vol. XV, p. 194.*

There is also a curious piece of wrought iron work lying in the fort. There are said to have been originally two of them, brought from Songi. Tradition, possibly judging from their appearance, says they were the axles of the cart used to convey the great monoliths. Whatever their use, they are apparently of some age. The diagram below gives the dimensions. The holes $a$ and $b$ pass completely through the mass: the portion $c$ and $d$ is a cube of 7 ins.: the part $e$ and $f$ is circular with a diameter of about 6 ins.

Plate III, Fig. 3, shows the Muhammadan gate leading up the main street to the fort.

MISCELLANEA.

THE LEGENDS OF MOHAN BÁRI.

Mohan Bari is an ancient village in the Rohtak District, Pañjáb. According to the District Gazetteer the site found there are the well-known ones of Rájá Samant Deva (flourished c. 820 A.D.).

An old tank contains a fragmentary inscription which reads—

Sammat 1014 Ḡāph baddi
9 Belír bhi yástū. 1

Legend says that Mohan Bari was once a place of some importance, destroyed owing to a curse invoked upon it, the usual explanation given in Indian legend of the ruin of a city or the overthrow of a kingdom. The following tales are current about the place:

Once upon a time a bride revisited her father's house to receive her bātī, but before she could return to her father-in-law's house her husband died and she remained a widow in her paternal home. There she gave birth to a daughter, and when the child grew up she asked her brothers to help her in the celebration of her wedding ceremonies. This they promised to do, and as their sister said she would not need help in money, they agreed to send her an ample supply of ghf. But in filling the jars they placed cow-dung in the bottom and only a thin layer of ghf on top, so that when the bātī (wedding procession arrived, the supply of that commodity ran short and the widow was disgraced before her guests. In consequence she cursed her brothers for their faithlessness, with the result that their village was ruined.

Another story is told of the place: Once a faqir took up his abode on the Rájá kā tālāb, where he passed his days in religious meditation. The king's son, however, turned him away, whereupon the faqir, opening his eyes wide in anger, said that he had heard that the Rájá was free from avarice and that he treated all men justly, but now he knew that he was a bad ruler; and so he cursed the place and it became a ruin. The prince returning to his father told him all that had occurred, but though the Rájá searched high and low for the faqir, he was unable to find him, and his rāj came to an end.

It is also said that a dhānā, or sacred fire, 2 is seen here at night and that torches are occasionally seen also, and the wilder Dhani Ram has himself seen them, but on following their light nothing could be found. The light is said to sometimes move in the direction of Jhäril village. The name of the Rájá was Mahojit, and he had a small garden or bārī whence the name Mohan

1 Mr. E. A. A. Joseph, the Settlement Officer, writes: “A local pañji says the last three words are written backwards and should be read Saska miśtar! There are a number of old carvings here, some worked into the walls of the masonry ghf at the tank or into those of temples and houses, and two lying loose. The two latter are the best: one in sandstone represents a trinity of male nude figures, crowned with small elephants and other devices. The other in marble has a seated Buddha and an excellent representation of an elephant. Both are apparently of Buddhist origin. Amongst the ruins of the old site is also a 'Sayyid's,' (or Shaikh's) grave, built within living memory by a successful contractor on the railway works.”

2 Either a will-o’-the-wisp than a faqir's dhānā.—E. A. A. J.)
BOOK NOTICE.

MAURICE BLOOMFIELD : A VEDIC CONCORDANCE, being an ALPHABETIC INDEX to every line of every stanza of the published Vedic literature and to the liturgical formulas thereof, that is an INDEX to the Vedic Mantras, together with an account of their variations in the different Vedic books. Cambridge, Mass., 1906, xxii; 2 vols., 1,078 pages, etc. Harvard Oriental Series. Edited by Charles Bockwell Lamman. Vol. X. Price, £1 4s. 8d.

It is difficult to write a review of this book, because it is all but impossible to find fault with it. It is the result of long and patient labour during a long series of years. Everyone who has tried to collect similar materials from some branch of Sanskrit literature, will be able to understand what it means to note down every Pada occurring in the vast published Vedic literature. It takes an immense amount of work, and, let me add, often tedious work. It is almost worse than cataloguing books from morning to night and never getting time to read them. The author, therefore, laid the learned world under great obligation in devoting so much time to this index, when I feel certain that he would often have preferred to take up some more interesting subject. The whole book is a glorious monument of unselfish devotion to a great idea. For two things are certain, a book like Mr. Bloomfield's Concordance is of the utmost value, and it could not have been compiled by anybody, who is not himself a first-rate Vedic scholar. Professor Bloomfield has also refrained from proceeding in the way, which has so often been resorted to in India, to leave the work of collecting materials to others, and to confine himself to arranging them. He has personally gone through the whole literature, and only left part of the mechanical copying on slips to his pupils. It goes without saying that this method is the only safe one, and the only one worthy of a scholar like Mr. Bloomfield. In this connexion I note with particular pleasure that the author has conscientiously acknowledged the assistance he has received in this way. It is such a gratifying contrast to the procedure of several authors, with well known names, who do not hesitate to adopt the results arrived at by others, without testing them and without quoting their authorities.

The plan of the work will be apparent from the title, and it is unnecessary to dwell on it. I only want to draw attention to the fact that the index comprises not only the verses of the Vedas, but also the old sacrificial formulas, the yajus, etc., which are here indexed for the first time. It is evident that this new departure adds considerably to the value of the book. The yajus are, perhaps, as pointed out by the author, the oldest specimens of Indo-European prose in existence. The Arzava tablets from El-Amarna, which some scholars consider are written in an Iranian or Scythic dialect, have not as yet been read, and even if they should prove to be older than the old liturgic formulas of the Vedas, they could not detract anything from the value of the latter.

The arrangement is, as will be seen from the title, simply alphabetical. Various readings have been noted to a great extent, and numerous cross-references account for such cases where the beginning of a Pada differs in the different places where it occurs. The whole arrangement is so practical that everybody who has the slightest practice in using books of reference, will find his way without any difficulty.

Similar indexes of various Vedic books have already been published before. It has, however, often been difficult to hunt up any particular Vedic verse without knowing in which Veda it occurs. This will all be different now, for very few omissions can be pointed out in the new Index. Moreover, a glance in it will show at once all the places in which a verse occurs, including the numerous instances when it is used for sacrificial purposes. It goes without saying that it will be of invaluable importance for every future editor of Vedic texts.

But it is of no use to go into details. It must be sufficient to draw attention to this monumental work. It will speak for itself. It would, however, be unjust to close this note without mentioning the splendid appearance of the book, though there is nothing extraordinary in the fact, considering that Professor Lamman is the editor.

H. A. ROSE.

STEN KONOW.
KALIDASA'S ABHISJANA-SAKUNTALAM. The text with a literal English translation and an original Sanskrit Commentary by SADABAHANJIN JAY. Calcutta: The City Book Society, 1908, iv, 376 pages. Svo.

This new edition of the Sakuntalam is not intended to be critical. The editor mentions three of the current recensions of the play, the Bengali, the Devanagari, and the South Indian. He does not profess to know more than the two first ones, and he has not apparently heard about the Kashmiri text. For the Bengali recension he made use of Fischer's standard edition, but the best edition of the Nāgarī recension by Boehtlingk has apparently escaped his notice. He is rightly of opinion that none of the known recensions can, in every respect, represent the original. But he forgets that it is too early, if it will ever be possible, to reconstruct Kālidāsa's work, as it was written by him. And at all events, that can never be done in the way, in which he has set to work, by comparing six editions and selecting his readings from "considerations of style, propriety, and so forth." He seems to think that our manuscripts of the play have been "copied by the pupils, when they commence reading. They take down daily from the Professor's manuscript their lesson for the next day. At this stage they are not competent to add or alter designedly." Indeed, I do not think additions or alterations come from the copyists be they 'with or without scholarship.' These are due to the Professors themselves." He goes on to point out, how the Professors are apt to add to and change the texts in order to make them more legible, or to insert their own ideas. I am afraid that the editor will not easily be able to convince other scholars of the soundness of this view.

With regard to Kālidāsa's date, the editor reverts to the old theory that he belongs to the first century B.C. He promises to return to the subject on some other occasion, and I may then have something to say about it. For the time being, I shall only remark that personally I do not feel any doubt that Kālidāsa belongs to the best times of the Gupta Empire. The importance of the Guptas in the history of Indian art and literature becomes more evident every day. And a poet with such exceptional grasp of art as Kālidāsa would scarcely be intelligible at any other period of Indian history.

The editor has not made himself acquainted with the rich literature on dramatic theory. If he had, he would at least have added something more about the śānti. Nor has he made a thorough study of the Prākrit, and his treatment of the various dialects is unsatisfactory. The fact remains that only the Bengali recension presents a good and consistent Prākrit, and in this respect it is hopeless to arrive at a satisfactory text on eclectic principles.

But the editor does not, as already remarked, intend to give a critical edition of Kālidāsa's play. His intention seems to be to furnish a text book for University examinations. And in this respect I suppose that his work may be of use, because he has added a very easy commentary and a fairly correct translation. Besides, the number of misprints is not very great. Most other editions which could be used by Indian students, share the mistakes and shortcomings of this new one. But it is a pity that no critical edition exists in India of this the most famous of all Indian plays. Indian scholars complain that the study of Sanskrit is on the wane in India, Sanskrit being gradually replaced by English. I am of opinion that this fact, if fact it be, is very much to be regretted. A nation with such a splendid old civilisation as the Indian is sure to loose heavily, if it gradually gives up the earnest study of its own history and literature. And the Sakuntala is one of those works, which seems eminently adapted for keeping the interest alive. It would be of importance if it could be presented to the Indian public in as pure a form as possible. To effect that aim, it would perhaps prove necessary to combine Indian and European scholarship. But as matters have developed in India, I think that we must be thankful for every work that opens the door to the beauties of Kālidāsa's masterpiece. And here, I believe, lies the importance of this new edition. It makes it easy to those who have learnt more English than Sanskrit to understand the play. And I sincerely hope that some students will learn from it that the Indian literature is well worth a study for its own sake, and not only as a subject for University examinations. Unselfish study and search for knowledge used to be the pride of the educated Indian, and everyone who has had the privilege to meet Fāujīts of the old school, will know that the soil is still prepared, and that some more encouragement would be sure to contribute to a revival of that Indian learning, which has always been admired by those who know.

Stern Konow.
FRANZ KIELHORN.

BY DR. STEPHEN KONOW.

Not long ago the mail brought the sad news that Professor Kielhorn of Göttingen died suddenly on the 19th of March.

It is now just a little more than 43 years since Dr. Kielhorn arrived in India, to occupy the chair of Professor of Oriental Languages at the Dakhan College, Poona, up to the beginning of the eighties. During this time he lived in the closest contact with Indian learning, and contracted friendships among Indian Pandits, which only ended with death. He always remembered with pleasure his stay in India, and he felt it very keenly, when one or two years ago a passing misunderstanding threatened to estrange him from some of his old friends. The influence Dr. Kielhorn exerted on Indian scholarship, by introducing modern critical methods, can hardly be overrated.

Dr. Kielhorn came out to India with a well established reputation as a sound critical scholar. He had for some time assisted the late Professor Max Müller in his first edition of the Ṛgveda with Śāyang’s commentary, and he had already proved himself to be a good grammatical scholar in his edition of Sāntana’s Pāṇḍita (Leipzig, 1866). In India he eagerly availed himself of the opportunity of studying Indian Grammar under the guidance of Indian Pandits. In Europe he was considered as the only scholar who had thoroughly penetrated into the depths of the old grammatical system of the Hindūs. The results of these studies were masterly editions of Patañjali’s Mahābhāṣya (Bombay, 1879–85) and Nāgārjuna’s Paripāṭaladvānaṇhara (Bombay, 1888–74), and several papers about Indian Grammar and grammarians, most of which have been printed in this very journal.

Later on Dr. Kielhorn turned his attention to Indian inscriptions, and in this field he has always played a leading rôle. He never took active part in the elucidation of the oldest Indian inscriptions. He confined himself to such researches as illustrate the history of India in classical times. It would be impossible here to try to enumerate the many important contributions Indian history owes to his indefatigable and unselfish work. I shall only mention how he fixed the initial date of the Chéd era, how he threw new light on the important question about the dates of Kālīdāsa and Māgha, his contributions to the history of the Chédas and Pāñcayatas, and, last but not least, his invaluable Lists of Indian Inscriptions printed as appendices to the Epigraphia Indica. The numerous papers he himself contributed to various journals about Indian inscriptions do not, however, represent all that epigraphy and history owe to his untiring zeal. It had become an established practice for every worker in Indian epigraphy to consult Dr. Kielhorn about difficult points, especially if the date of some inscription had to be calculated, and nobody ever appealed to him in vain. He always unreservedly placed his great knowledge and large experience at the disposal of fellow-students.

When Dr. Kielhorn left India, he returned to Germany as Professor of Sanskrit in Göttingen. Together with his friend, the late Professor Bühhler, he here exercised a great influence in opening the eyes of the learned world in Europe to the importance of traditional Indian scholarship. It had become fashionable to distrust Indian tradition, and to try to find the way back to the old Indian civilization without consulting it. Bühhler, and still more Kielhorn, showed that this is a very grave mistake. I remember hearing my own German guru, Professor Pischel of Berlin, derive the scientific investigation of Indian literary history from the example set by scholars like Fitzedward Hall, Kielhorn, and Bühhler, but it was only the last two that have exercised an influence in Europe. The result of the new course in the study of Indian philology and history chiefly inaugurated by Bühhler and Kielhorn, with whom a splendid army of young German scholars joined hands, is that Germany has long played the leading rôle in the investigation of Indian history and civilization in Europe. The contributors to the great Encyclopedia of Indoc-Aryan Research, started by Bühhler and after his death continued by Kielhorn, are, so far, with very few exceptions, Germans, and those few exceptions received their training in Germany.

It is not my intention to give a full sketch of Professor Kielhorn’s work. That would take more time than I can spare. My only aim is to recall the great debt Indian research owes to him. Every worker in the field will feel the irreparable loss of the scholar and of the man, whom everybody that knew him, from personal intercourse or from letters, had learnt to consider as a dear friend. It is pathetic to think that he passed away while still engaged in strenuous work for the studies he loved, and while we were still looking forward to important contributions from him. There was no sign that old age had begun to set in. His very last works bear testimony to the same profound knowledge, the same exactitude, and the same critical acumen, that have always formed a prominent feature in everything that proceeded from his pen.
THE HISTORY AND COINAGE OF THE CHANDEL (CHANDELLA) DYNASTY OF BUNDALKHAND (JEJAKAMBHUKTI) FROM 831 TO 1203 A.D.

BY VINCENT A. SMITH, M.A., I.C.S. (RETD.)

The Chandél,¹ or Chandélla history, antiquities, and coinage have received considerable attention from the Archaeological Survey. Some inscriptions of the dynasty had been roughly edited in early volumes of the *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal* in 1857 and subsequent years, but the subject never was treated systematically until the cold season of 1864-5 when Sir Alexander Cunningham visited Mahóbá, Khajuráho, and other localities in Bundélkhánd, and published the results of his investigations in Volume II of the *Reports of the Archaeological Survey* (Simla, 1871). This volume gives fairly full descriptions of the ruins, a slight notice of the coinage, and the first attempt at a connected history of the Chandél dynasty. But the errors in detail are numerous.

In 1871-2, Cunningham's assistant, Mr. J. D. Béglar, went over the same ground, and was permitted to print his crude observations as Volume VII of the *Reports*. Mr. Béglar's disquisitions are full of grotesque blunders and absurdities of all kinds, although a few grains of valuable fact may be picked out of the mass of rubbish. Volume IX of the *Reports*, written by Cunningham, gives the tradition that the fort of Singurghá was built by Rájá Béló Chandél, and some other minor particulars bearing on Chandél history. Volume X, describing tours made by Cunningham through Bundélkhánd and Málwá in the years 1874-5 and 1876-7 (Calcutta, 1880), contains a revised list of the Chandél dynasty, and a formal description of the coinage, illustrated by a plate, as well as sundry miscellaneous information. Like most of Cunningham's work, it is disfigured by inaccuracies of detail. Volume XXI (Calcutta, 1885) describing tours made by Cunningham through Béwá, Bundélkhánd, Málwá, and Gawláo in the years 1883-4 and 1884-5, gives revised lists of the Chandél kings and of the inscriptions of their period, with much general information of value. But even in this volume there is room for correction.

In the *Progress Report of the Archaeological Survey of Western India* for the year ending 30th June, 1894 (Bombay, N. D.), Mr. Cousens makes some observations on the Khajuráho temples, supplementary to and in correction of Cunningham's accounts (p. 16); while Mr. D. R. Bhandárkar (p. 47) notices some minor unpublished inscriptions, and corrects Professor Kielhorn's reading of the date in the record on the pedestal of the Khajuráho image of Hanumán.

The reproductions and editions of the inscriptions in the various publications of the Archaeological Survey being all deficient in accuracy,² the late Professor Kielhorn undertook the formidable task of bringing out scholarly editions of all the Chandélía records of which he could procure trustworthy facsimiles. With some help from Drs. Hultzsch and Cartellieri he accomplished this task in various volumes of the *Indian Antiquary* and *Epigraphia Indica*, and was, consequently, able to include an authentic list of the Chandélía dynasty in the 'Supplement' to his 'List of Inscriptions of Northern India' and the 'Synchronistic Tables' recently published in *Epigraphia Indica*, Vol. VIII. References to the invaluable labours of Professor Kielhorn and his co-adjuvants are given in detail in the List of Chandélía Inscriptions included in this essay.

For six years (1874—80) the author of this paper was employed in revenue settlement work in the Hamirpur District, which includes Mahóbá. His duties required him to inspect with the utmost minuteness the land of a large part of the district, and to compile full descriptive notes, village by village. Although, of course, the main purpose of the inspection was the valuation of the soil and rental, the opportunity was seized to put on record a multitude of local traditions and historical details, which were prefixed in the case of each village to the fiscal observations. The 'inspection

¹ Chandél is the spoken Hindi form of the name, which becomes Chandélía in Sanskrit. The variants Chandrirá and Chandrátí which occur in certain inscriptions have been invented to support the myth of the descent of the clan from the moon (Chandra).

² Cunningham's *Reports of the Archaeological Survey* are cited as Rep.
notes" were bound in large volumes in duplicate, one copy being preserved in the Collector's Office at Hamirpur and one in the Office of the Board of Revenue at Allahabad. During the Christmas vacation of 1878 the author managed to visit Khajuraho, accompanied by the late Mr. F. C. Black; and from time to time he read a large part of the Māhābīd Khaṇḍ by the poet Chand.

The results of his local investigations and the study of all available printed matter on the subject have been utilized during thirty-two years in the following publications:

**Publications by the Author on Chandella History, etc.**


The object of this essay is to review the considerable amount of material described in the preceding pages, to eliminate the numerous errors more or less current, and to give an accurate presentation of the existing state of knowledge concerning the history and coinage of the Chandella dynasty.

It is hardly necessary to add that such an undertaking has been rendered possible only by the labours of Professor Kielhorn and his helpers, which supply the necessary epigraphic basis. That basis is conveniently exhibited in the annexed List of Chandella Inscriptions, compiled from Kielhorn's "List of the Inscriptions of Northern India" (*Epigraphia Indica*, Vol. V), the Supplement to the same, the Synchronistic Tables (*Ibid.*, Vol. VIII), and other sources, as indicated in the references. Those references give only the best available editions of the inscriptions, no mention being made of superseded editions. Unfortunately, several records, apparently of some importance, are very imperfectly known, good facsimiles not being available. Dates are expressed invariably in the Vikrama era.

The List of Inscriptions is followed by the genealogy and a chronological list of the members of the dynasty, as determined by the epigraphic and numismatic evidence. The names of princes recorded by tradition only will be found in the subsequent discussion and narrative.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial No.</th>
<th>No. in Kielhorn's List</th>
<th>Stone or Copper-plate</th>
<th>Place of Origin</th>
<th>Where Preserved</th>
<th>Date: V.E.</th>
<th>Date: A.D.</th>
<th>Chandella Prince Named</th>
<th>Abstract of Contents</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>S. Khajuraho</td>
<td>Mansoleum at Khajuraho</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>Jejjaka, Vijjaka, Harshadeva</td>
<td>Fragmentary; also mentions Kashitapaladeva (of Kanauj), see K. No. 31 of V. S. 1005</td>
<td>E. I., Vol. I, p. 121; Rep., Vol. XXI, p. 85, Pl. XVI-B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>&quot; Lakshmanjii (Chaturbhuj) temple at Khajuraho</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>1011</td>
<td>954</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>Genealogy from Naunaka to Dhanga</td>
<td>Erection of temple of Vishnu by Yasovarman, or Lakshavarn; description of extent of dominions of his son Dhangaga; mention of King Devapala of Kanauj, and of Vinayakapaladeva; also of Sahi, king of Kira, and of the lord of Bhothe.</td>
<td>E. I., Vol. I, pp. 122-135, ed. by K., with facs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>&quot; Temple at Duddah (Lalitpur, now Jhansi, D.)</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>Devalabdhi Chandella (note form), grandson of King Yasovarman</td>
<td>Six brief documents recording erection of temple by Devalabdhi.</td>
<td>I. A., Vol. XVIII, p. 236, transl. and commented by K.; Rep., Vol. X, pp. 91, 94, Pl. XXXII, Nos. 1, 2, 4-6, reduced facs. = respectively, e, a, d, e, f of K.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serial No.</td>
<td>No. in Kielhorn's List</td>
<td>Stone or Copper-plate</td>
<td>Place of Origin</td>
<td>Where Preserved</td>
<td>Date V. E.</td>
<td>A. D.</td>
<td>Chandella Prince Named</td>
<td>Abstract of Contents</td>
<td>Reference(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>C. P.</td>
<td>Nanyaura (Hamirpur D.)</td>
<td>A. S. B. Library, Calcutta</td>
<td>1055</td>
<td>6th November</td>
<td>Dhanga, with genealogy from Harsha</td>
<td>Grant, executed at Benares (Kasi) of a village named Yulli to Yasodhara Bhaṭṭa</td>
<td>Ed. and transl., with facs., by K.; I. A., Vol. XVI, p. 201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td>Khajurāho (Khajuravahaka)</td>
<td>&quot;  &quot;</td>
<td>1059</td>
<td>1002</td>
<td>Dhanga, with genealogy from Nannuka</td>
<td>Erection of temple of Siva posthumous panegyric of Dhanga; inscrip. added to in 1173 V. E. See No. 11 (86) below.</td>
<td>Ed., translit., and commented by K.; E. I., Vol. I, p. 137; reduced facs. in Rep., Vol. XXI, Pl. XVIII.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Inscriptions of the Chandella, Chandrêlla, or Chandrâyya Dynasty—continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial No.</th>
<th>No. in Kielhorn’s List</th>
<th>Stone or Copper Plate</th>
<th>Place of Origin</th>
<th>Where Preserved</th>
<th>Date V.</th>
<th>A. D.</th>
<th>Chandella Prince Named</th>
<th>Abstract of Contents</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Khajurāho</td>
<td>Image of Vrajinath at Khajurāho.</td>
<td>1212</td>
<td>1155-6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ibid., Vol. II, p. 448, No. 22.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Inscriptions of the Chandella, Chandrălla, or Chandrātręya Dynasty—continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial No.</th>
<th>No. in Kielhorn's List</th>
<th>Stone or Copper-plate</th>
<th>Place of Origin</th>
<th>Where Preserved</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Chandella Prince Named</th>
<th>Abstract of Contents</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Inscriptions of the Chandella, Chandrélā, or Chandrāvya Dynasty—continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial No.</th>
<th>No. in Killerm’s List</th>
<th>Stone or Copper-plate</th>
<th>Place of Origin</th>
<th>Where Preserved</th>
<th>DATE. V. E</th>
<th>A. D.</th>
<th>Chandella Prince Named</th>
<th>Abstract of Contents</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Ajaygarh</td>
<td>On jamb of upper gate of fort at Ajaygarh</td>
<td>1227</td>
<td>1171, 7th June</td>
<td>27th</td>
<td></td>
<td>Building of well</td>
<td>Incorrectly ed. by Cunningham, Rep., p. 49, Pl. XII-B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serial No.</td>
<td>No. in Kielhorn's List</td>
<td>Stone or Copper-plate</td>
<td>Place of Origin</td>
<td>Where Preserved</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Chandella Prince Named</td>
<td>Abstract of Contents</td>
<td>References</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Kalañjar</td>
<td>Rock at Kalañjar</td>
<td>1240</td>
<td>1184, 26th April</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>The words containing the date and king's name transcribed by K. from rabbings supplied by Burgess, E. I., Vol. V, App., No. 178; and I. A. Vol. XIX, p. 37, No. 67.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serial No.</td>
<td>Name of Inscription</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Place of Discovery</td>
<td>Textual References</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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Ajayaghat</td>
<td>1187</td>
<td>Jambhgate, Allahabad</td>
<td>Not known</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Bhekal, Sisunath</td>
<td>1135</td>
<td>Lakhnavar, near Mahoba</td>
<td>Not known</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Kilaigarh</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>Temple at X.</td>
<td>Not known</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Ajayaghat</td>
<td>1213</td>
<td>Outside the city of Ayaghat</td>
<td>Not known</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serial No.</td>
<td>No. in Keiohern’s List</td>
<td>Stone or Copperpllate</td>
<td>Place of Origin</td>
<td>Where Preserved</td>
<td>Date V.E/A.D.</td>
<td>Chandella Prince Named</td>
<td>Abstract of Contents</td>
<td>References</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>356</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1288/1241</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ibid. p. 148; possibly not Chandella.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>239</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rock near figure of Ganesh at Ajaygarh</td>
<td></td>
<td>1337/1281, 3rd February</td>
<td></td>
<td>Supposed to be dedication of the figure of Ganesh by the minister.</td>
<td>Noticed in <em>Rep.</em>, Vol. XXI, p. 52, Pl. XIV-G.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serial No.</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Place of Origin</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Inscription Details</td>
<td>Reference</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>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- Inscriptions of the Chandra dynasty, Chanda dynasty, or Chandela dynasty—concluded.
- Serial No. and corresponding dates, place of origin, and other details are provided for each inscription.
- References include dates and volumes of publications where the inscriptions are discussed or published.
- Inscriptions are associated with the Chanda dynasty, which was a ruling dynasty in northern India.
- Each entry provides specific information about the inscription, such as the year, place of origin, and the type of inscription (Sati stone, Sati memorial, etc.).
- The table format aids in organizing and comparing the various inscriptions systematically.
Genealogy of the Chandella Dynasty.

I. Nannaka.
   II. Vākpatī.

III. Jayāśakti
     (alias Jējā,
     alias Jējāka,
     alias Jejāka).

IV. Vijayaśakti,
    younger brother
    (alias Vijaya,
     alias Vijā,
     alias Vijāka).

V. Rāhila

VI. Harāha
    (married Kañchhūka
     Chāhamāni).

VII. Yaśövarman, married Puppā
     (alias Lakshavarman).

VIII. Dhangā

IX. Gaṇḍā (married Asarvā).

X. Vidyādhara Dēvalabdhi

XI. Vijayapāla (married Bhuvana-devi, mother of Dēvarvarman).

XII. Dēvarvarman
     (childless apparently).

XIII. Kirtivarman

XIV. Sallakshanavarman XVI. Prithivivarman

XV. Jayavarman

XVII. Madanavarman Pratāpa  
     (younger 
     brother).

XVIII. Paramardi

XIX. Trailōkya varman

XX. Viravarman (married Kalīpadēvi).

XXI. Bhōjavarman
### Chronological Table of the Chandella (Chandell) Dynasty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial No.</th>
<th>Name of King</th>
<th>Approximate Date of Accession A. D.</th>
<th>Known Dates A. D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td>Nannuka</td>
<td>831</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>Vākpati</td>
<td>845</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>Jayasakti (Jējaka)</td>
<td>860</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.</td>
<td>Vijayasakti (Vijāka)</td>
<td>880</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.</td>
<td>Bāhila</td>
<td>900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.</td>
<td>Harsha</td>
<td>915</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.</td>
<td>Yasovarman (Lakshavarman)</td>
<td>930</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII.</td>
<td>Dhanga</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>954, 955, 979, 998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX.</td>
<td>Gaṇḍa</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1002, 1019, 1022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X.</td>
<td>Vidhyādhara</td>
<td>1025</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI.</td>
<td>Vijayapila</td>
<td>1040</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII.</td>
<td>Dévavarman</td>
<td>1055</td>
<td>1056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII.</td>
<td>Kirtivarman</td>
<td>1060</td>
<td>1098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIV.</td>
<td>Sallakshañavarman</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XV.</td>
<td>Jayavarman</td>
<td>1110</td>
<td>1117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVI.</td>
<td>Prithyivarman</td>
<td>1120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVII.</td>
<td>Madanavarman</td>
<td>1128</td>
<td>1129, 1130, 1131, 1133, 1135, 1155, 1157, 1162 [? 1163]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVIII.</td>
<td>Paramardi (Parmāl)</td>
<td>1165</td>
<td>1167, 1168, 1171, 1182, 1184, 1203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIX.</td>
<td>Trailokyavarman</td>
<td>1203</td>
<td>1212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX.</td>
<td>Viravarman</td>
<td>1245</td>
<td>1281, 1286, 1281, 1286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXI.</td>
<td>Bhōjavarman</td>
<td>1287</td>
<td>1288</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

His conquests required a fairly long reign.

**Note.**—Dates in italics are from Muhammadan histories; the rest are from inscriptions. For the doubtful date 1163 of Madanavarman, see *J. A. S. B.*, Part I, 1881, pp. 18, 20. The date 1002 for Gaṇḍa is deduced from v. 55 of inscription No. 7.
Before proceeding to discuss other matters, it will be well to give such explanations as are necessary to justify the entries in the genealogy and dynastic list. The publications on the subject anterior to those of Professor Kielland and B. B. Farquhar both contain numerous errors in detail which might give rise to misunderstanding, if not formally corrected.

The first two names, Nannuka (which has been sometimes misspelt Nāniki) and Vākpati, are known from two inscriptions only, Nos. 2 and 7 of my list. Both these princes are given royal titles in the records. In the former, the founder of the family is described as भी भविष्यकाभाषु; ‘the illustrious prince Nannuka’; and in the latter as भी महर्षिका भविष्यकाभाषु; with the same significance (verse 10 of No. 2, verse 14 of No. 7). Vākpati is mentioned in verse 12 of No. 2 simply as भी भविष्यकाभाषु; ‘the illustrious Vākpati’; but in verse 16 of No. 7 he is called भविष्यकाभाषु: भाषित; ‘king Vākpati.’ It would seem, therefore, that both these princes, whether as small local Rājās, or otherwise, enjoyed some share of sovereign power, and that they are not referred to merely as ancestors. Reasons for the date 831 A. D. assigned to Nannuka will be found in J. A. S. B., Part I, 1881, p. 6.

The brothers Jayaśakti and Vijayaśakti, sons of Vākpati, are mentioned under those names in No. 2. Jayaśakti appears to have died without leaving issue, and the succession was continued by his younger brother, who is called simply Vijaya in No. 7. The brothers appear under the variant forms Jejjaka and Vijējaka in the fragmentary inscription No. 1. Their names are further abbreviated to Jejā and Vijā in verse 10 of inscription No. 10, the information being added that the province of Jējēbhūti was named after the elder brother. Inscription No. 26 mentions Jayaśakti and Vijayaśakti as remote ancestors of Paramardi, and describes them as warriors. In inscription No. 29 the name of the province is spelled Jējēbhūti; and in the Ratnapura inscription of Jajjaladeva, dated 866 of the Chedi Era = 1114 A. D., it is written Jējēbhūtikā.

The only epigraphic record of Rāhila, son of Vijayaśakti, is in inscriptions Nos. 2 and 7, but he is also remembered by the works called after his name. The sixth prince, Haraha, son of Rāhila, is mentioned in inscriptions Nos. 1, 2, 5, and 7 as Harahadeva, with or without other titles. His consort, Kachchhuā of the Chāhāmaṇās clan, is named in Nos. 2 and 7.

The name of the seventh king, Yaśōvarman, appears in Nos. 2, 4, 5, and 7. No. 2 (verse 31) describes him as having conquered Kālāpiya. The same record (vv. 37 and 39) gives him the alternative name of Lakṣhaṇvarman. His consort’s name, Puppa, is given in No. 7 (vv. 40 and 41). Devalabhi, son of Kṛishnasa and Asarva, is specifically described as grandson of Yaśōvarman in inscription No. 4.

Dhang cru, the eighth king, son of Yaśōvarman and Puppa, is named in inscriptions Nos. 2, 3, 5, 7, 10, and 24, and is referred to in Muhammedan history, but not by name.

The only inscription which names Dhang’s son, Gaṇḍa, the ninth king, is No. 24; but he is mentioned also by the Muhammedan historians under the name of Nanda, owing to a clerical error.

Vidhyādhara, son and successor of Gaṇḍa, is named in inscriptions Nos. 8, 9, 10, and 24. His destruction of an unnamed king of Kanaaj is recorded in No. 10, and the Dūkupāli inscription of Vikramasimha Kachchhaṉaghaṇṭa narrates in some detail the slaying of Rājyāpala, king of Kanaaj, by Arjuna Kachchhaghaṇṭa, who acted under the command of Vidhyādhara. At that time king Gaṇḍa was still living, and Vidhyādhara was Crown Prince (P. I., II, 233).

Vijayaśalva, son and successor of Vidhyādhara, is named in Nos. 8, 9, and 24. His queen, Bhuvanadēvi, mother of Dēvarman, is mentioned in No. 8. Dēvarman describes himself in inscription No. 8 as the son of Vijayaśalva and Bhuvanadēvi, and successor of the former.

Kiritivarman also is described as being the son of Vijayaśalva in inscriptions Nos. 9 and 10; and in inscription No. 24 his name follows that of Vijayaśalva, no mention being made of Dēvarman in these three records. The correct explanation clearly is that Dēvarman, like Jayaśakti, died without leaving issue capable of succession, and was consequently succeeded by his
younger brother, Kirtivarman, whose mother’s name is not stated. At one time I erroneously identified Kirtivarman with Devavarman. If Maisey’s version of the No. II Nilkanth inscription from Kālānjīr (No. 43) could be relied on, Bhumipała would be an alternative name for either Kirtivarman or Devavarman, but the reading probably is erroneous (see J. A. S. B., Part I, 1881, p. 13).

The son and successor of Kirtivarman was Sallakshānavarman whose name is written Hallakshāna on coins. He is mentioned in inscriptions Nos. 15 and 24. The inclusion of a second Sallakshāna in Cunningham’s list is due to a mistaken interpretation of an inscription (J. A. S. B., Part I, 1881, p. 16; E. I., Vol. I, p. 185, note).

Sallakshanaavarman was succeeded by his son, Jayavarman, who is mentioned in inscriptions Nos. 11 and 24.

Evidently, Jayavarman left no capable issue, for his successor was Prithivivarman, the younger uterine brother of Sallakshanaavarman (v. 12 of inscription No. 24), and son of Kirtivarman. Inscription No. 15 gives the genealogy of Madanavarman as the successor of Prithivivarman, the successor of Kirtivarman, and makes no mention of either Sallakshanaavarman or Jayavarman. Coins of both these princes are extant. They were omitted from No. 15 as not being in the direct line of descent.

Madanavarman, son and successor of Prithivivarman, is mentioned in more inscriptions than any other member of the dynasty. As stated above, his genealogy, or order of succession, from Kirtivarman is given imperfectly in inscription No. 15. No. 24 gives it in full, including both Jayavarman and Sallakshanaavarman. The name of Madanavarman, without any genealogical statement, is inserted as that of the reigning king in the dedicatory inscriptions Nos. 12, 13, 14, 19, 21, 22, 22a, and 24a; and a grant of his (No. 23) is referred to in Paramardi’s grant inscription No. 25. He had a younger brother, named Pratapa, who is named in the imperfectly edited inscription No. 43.

Paramardi, the Parmāl of tradition, and Parmār of the Muhammadan historian, was grandson and immediate successor of Madanavarman, being the son of Yasōvarman, who never came to the throne, presumably having predeceased his father. The name of Yasōvarman is recorded in the Baghāri inscription only (No. 33), but the fact that Paramardi was grandson of Madanavarman is also stated in the Sēmār plate (No. 25). Yasōvarman corresponds in position with the synonymous Kirtivarman, who is inserted between Madanavarman and Paramardi by all the bards’ lists. The Icchhāvar plate (No. 28) simply describes Paramardi as the successor of Madanavarman, without mentioning the relationship. The date of the conquest of Jējākbhūtī by Prithivirāja Chāhumāna is obtained from his Madanpur inscriptions (No. 29) as Sambat 1239 = A.D. 1182-3. The Kālānjīr inscription (No. 34) professes to be composed by Paramardi himself. The dates of his death, 1203 A. D., is certified by the Tāj-nil-Malādir. His name occurs as that of the reigning king on a Jain inscription dated 1224 S. = 1168 A. D. (No. 25).

The date of the accession of Trailōkyavarman is taken as that of his father Paramardi’s death. The only certain inscription of this prince, at Ajaygarh (No. 35), is dated 1289 S. = 1213-4 A. D. His dominions may have been confined to the eastern part of Jējākbhūtī. His name occurs in the genealogies in inscriptions Nos. 36, 40, and 45. Cunningham probably is right in referring to this prince the Rāwa copper-plate inscriptions C and D, which respectively give the name of the paramount sovereign as Trailōkyavarman and Trailōkyamalla, and are dated 1297 and 1298 Sambat (inscriptions No. 35a and 35 b).

---

5 Cunningham always spells the name Paramardu, erroneously.
4 1239 V. E. = 6th March, 1182 — 23th February, 1183 (Book of Indian Eras).
6 1239 V. E. = 23th March, 1182 — 18th March, 1184 (Book of Indian Eras).
The genealogy of the next ruler, Vitarravāman, from Kṛttravāman is traced in inscription No. 36, which also gives the genealogy of his queen, Kālayāndēvī. The imperfectly edited inscription No. 43 gives his genealogy from Viṣyāpāla. His name occurs also in Nos. 38, 39, 40, and 42, but is omitted from No. 45.

Bhōjavārman, the successor of Vitarravāman, is known from two Ajaygarh inscriptions only Nos. 44 and 45, the former of which gives the date 1245 S. = 1268 A. D. (5th March, 1288 — 24th March, 1289).

It is thus apparent that the dynastic chronology is fixed within narrow limits of possible error. The only absolutely certain date for the close of one reign and the beginning of another is 1203 A. D., the year in which Paramārī died and was succeeded by his son Trilokārvārun in, at least, part of the kingdom. The accession of Paramārī is determined by the inscriptions as lying between 1162 and 1167, and there is some reason for thinking that it took place in 1165. The one known date of Kṛttravāman, 1098, must be close to the end of his reign, because his successor was reigning in 1058, and the next successor but one, namely Jayāvārman, in 1117. The result follows that the reign of Sallakṣaṇa, who intervenes between Kṛttravāman and Jayāvārman, must have been short. As the first known date of Madanārvāman is 1129, the reign of Jayāvārman and Pīthtravārman likewise must have been very brief. Kṛttravārman's reign evidently was long, about forty years. The limits of the long reign of Dhanga are fixed by the inscription within a year or two. The date of the accession of Bhōjavārman is known with sufficient accuracy, his dated inscription being of 1246 V. E., while the latest of his predecessor is of 1242 V. E. = 27th February, 1216 A. D. As there were six generations (seven reigns) before Dhanga's accession in or about 950, the beginning of the dynasty must be dated about the time entered in the Table, 831 A. D.

The province in which the Chandēl clan and dynasty were dominant for several centuries is now known as Bundēlkhaṇḍ, 'the Bundēla country.' The Bundēlas, although counted as Rājputa, are of mixed blood, and probably are descended from an intermarriage between a Gahārvar Rājput chief and a Khaṇvar girl. The first Bundēla chieftain in Bundēlkhaṇḍ seems to have made his appearance about 1335 or 1340 A. D., but the clan did not become prominent until much later. The most famous and powerful Bundēla chief was Rājā Chhatarālī who died in 1731 A. D. Although Bundēlkhaṇḍ has now comparatively few Bundēlas resident within its borders, at least in the British districts, the name derived from their presence has become attached permanently to the country. The use of the word Bundēlkhaṇḍ is vague and indefinite, the only official recognition of it being the application of the collective term, the 'Bundēlkhaṇḍ Agency'; to a group of petty Native States, Pannā, Charkhāri, and others, which are comprised within the larger group known as the 'Central India Agency.' Cunningham was informed that in its widest extent, Bundēlkhaṇḍ was 'said to have comprised all the country to the south of the Jamna and Ganges, from the Bētwā river on the west to the temple of Vindhiyavāsini-devī [in S. Mirzapur] on the east, including the districts of Chānderi, Sāgar, and Bihār, near the sources of the Narbada on the south' (Anc. Geog., p. 432). In other words, the province comprised the British Districts of Hamīpur, Bāndā, Lalītpur (now a subdivision of Jhānaś), with parts of Allahābād and Mirzapur in the United Provinces — the Sāgar and Damōh Districts of the Central Provinces — and a large intermediate space, now mostly occupied by a crowd of small Native States.

The region so defined agrees roughly with the kingdom known as Jājahūti (Jajhūti, Jihōti) to travellers, from Huen Tsang in the seventh to Ibn Bātuta in the

* J. A. S. B., part 1, 1881, p. 46. The Khāngāras are very low-caste people, probably in reality Gonds. The Gahārvaras are regarded by the aristocrats of Rājputād as being of impure blood, and there are indications that they are connected with the Bhars (Beames' Elliot, Vol. I, pp. 121 and 122). Biljāgarh, where the head of the clan resides, is an old Bhor settlement.

† Pāī bādī 3, Sahvat 1768 (1768, p. 44).
fourteenth century, the Jêjâbhukti (with variants) of inscriptions. The territorial name Jîjhôti is not recorded to have been used at any later date, but the limits of the ancient kingdom are still marked by the distribution of the Jîjhôtiya Brahmans and Banîjas. In the time of Ibn Batuta, as also in the time of Albérînî, who completed his book on India in 1081 A. D., the capital of Jîjhôti (Jajhôti) was Khajurâho, now a village 34 miles south of Mahôbâ and included in the Chhatarpur State.

The same name, Jîjhôti, evidently is represented by the Chinese Chî-chi-t'ô (Watters=Chi-kî-to of Beal), which was visited and described by Hiuen Tsang in 641 or 642 A. D. The pilgrim states that Chî-chi-t'ô lay more than 1,000 li to the north-east of Ujjain, and more than 900 li to the south of Mahêûvarapura. He adds that 'this country was above 4,000 li, and its capital about 15 li, in circuit; the soil was rich, the crops were abundant, and pulse and wheat were products. The majority of the people were not Buddhists, but there were some tens of monasteries with a few Brêthren; there were above ten Deva-temples and 1,000 professed adherents of the other systems. The king, who was a Brahmin, was a firm believer in Buddhism, and encouraged men of merit, and learned scholars of other lands collected here in numbers' (Watters, Vol. II, p. 251). This description is so indefinite that little use can be made of it for fixing the position of the capital. But if we assume that the distance from the kingdom of Ujjain is reckoned from its capital, the indications given will bring us to the western frontier of Jîjhôti, on the Bêtâwâ river westward from Sâgâr. Usually, the assumption is made that Khajurâho must have been the unnamed capital referred to by Hiuen Tsang. But the fact that that town was the capital of the kingdom in the eleventh century is very little reason for assuming that the same place was the capital in the seventh century. Supposing the distances to be estimated as from capital to capital, Khajurâho will not suit the indication given by Hiuen Tsang, because it lies S.-E., not south, from Gâwâlior, which seems to be Mahêûvarapura, and is too far from Ujjain. If we assume that Érån (Èrâkâna, Èrâka, Érâk), on the Bîsa river, a tributary of the Bêtâwâ, 45 miles W.-N.-W. from Sâgâr, was the capital of Jîjhôti referred to by Hiuen Tsang, all his distances and bearings will agree sufficiently well. Érån is practically due south from Gâwâlior, and about E.-N.-E. from Ujjain.

At the close of the fifth and the beginning of the sixth century, it certainly was an important place, as is proved by the inscriptions of Budhagupta and Toramâga, and it may well have been the capital of Jîjhôti in the seventh century, a hundred and forty years after the approximate date of Toramâga's inscription. The required position should be a little more distant — some 20 miles — from Ujjain than from Gâwâlior. This condition is fulfilled accurately by Èrån.

The earliest proof of Chandél occupation of Khajurâho is the inscription dated 1011 S. = 954 A. D., recording the erection of the magnificent Lakshmana or Chaturbhuj temple there. The latest known Khajurâho inscription of the Chandél times is No. 22, recorded on a Jain image during the reign of Madaanavarman in 1215 S. = 1157-8 A. D. Yasôvarman, father of Dhangâ, is said in inscription No. 2 to have conquered Kâlânâjâr, and it is probable that Khajurâho was not occupied by the Chandéls much earlier than his reign which began about 930 A. D. The Chandéls were recognized as Râjpûtâ (Kâhâtriyas) and were orthodox Hindus; but the king of Jîjhôti in the seventh century was a Buddhist Brahman; and there is no special reason for believing that the Râjpût kings of the tenth century necessarily retained the capital of the Brahman king in the seventh century. I am of opinion that Èrån probably was the capital of the kingdom of Jîjhôti in the seventh century, and that Khajurâho was not occupied by the Chandél Râjâs before 900 A. D. The oldest dated inscription at that place is that incised on the pedastal of a statue of Hanumân, which is dated in the year 316. This date must be referred to the Harsha era, and is consequently equivalent roughly to 922 A. D. This dedicatory
inscription, which has no apparent connexion with the Chandellas, affords some evidence that the kingdom of Jihotia had been included in the extensive dominions of Harsha (606–48 A. D.). It is not likely that his era would have been used in a place outside the territories which he had once held. Without laying stress upon this argument, we may be confident for other reasons, that Jihotia was comprised in the empire of Harsha. The oldest temple is the hypostyle granite structure dedicated to the 64 Jëgínis, which possibly may be slightly earlier in date than the Hanumân, but the script of the brief inscriptions on its walls does not indicate a period much, if at all, anterior to 900. I am inclined to believe that the Jëgínis' temple and the Hanumân statues are almost contemporary, and that both were erected between 900 and 950 A. D., probably in the reign of either Harsha or Râhila.

Tradition places the original home of the Chandellas at Maniyagar in the Chhatarpur State, one of the eight Chandele forts. These are enumerated as being—(1) Bârigâr, now in the Charkhãl State; (2) Kâlanjar, in the Bända District; (3) Ajaygarh, in a Native State of the same name, 20 miles to the S. W. of Kâlanjar; (4) Maniyagar, in the Chhatarpur State; (5) Marph, in Pargana Badausa, Bända District; (6) Maudh, in N. E. of Hamirpur District; (7) Garh, near Jabalpur in the Central Provinces; and (8) Mahiyar (Maihar), a Native State to north of Jabalpur; or, according to other accounts, Kulp in the Jâlaun District.

The boundaries of the Chandell dominion, of course, varied from time to time. In the reign of Madanavarman (1128–1165), a Chandelle governor stationed at Bâhilir, in the Jabalpur District, administered the surrounding territory, including the Sagar and Damhû Districts, where the Chandell-Raj is still remembered. From about 930 A. D. up to the date of Pâmâl's (Paramadî's) death in 1208 A. D., that is to say, for more than two and a half centuries, the kingdom always included Khajurâho, Kâlanjar and Mahôbâ. The first named town, with its group of magnificent temples, may be regarded as the religious, the second, with its strong fortress, as the military, and the third, with its palace, as the civil capital. No traces of the Chandelle rule have been found in parganas Hamirpur and Sumerpur in the north of the Hamirpur District, and it would seem that those parganas were covered with jungle during the Chandelle period, and sparsely inhabited by aboriginal tribes, who were displaced by Râjput immigrants during the fourteenth century and afterwards.

The name Khajurâho is sometimes written Khajurâhâ, but in the Bundelkhand dialect final o represents d of ordinary Hindi, so that the ending in o may be read as the more correct. The name is Sanskritized as Kharjurâvâhaka in an inscription No. 7. The derivations which have been suggested are merely guesses.

The buildings at Khajurâho have been described in some detail by Cunningham, whose accounts have been supplemented by the author and other writers. But no really adequate account of the remains has been prepared. Cunningham's plans are on a scale much too small, and not

---

11 See Rep., Vol. X, p. 57, Pl. XX. Five temples dedicated to the 64 Jëgínis are known, viz.—(1) the Khajurâho one, which is peculiar in being oblong; (2) Bhûra Ghat near Jabalpur (Rep., Vol. IX, p. 74); (3) Surâd in the Pâlan or Pâlâna State, one of the Tributary States of Orissa (I.A., Vol. VII, p. 26); (4) Râjpur-Jurâl in name State (Rep., Vol. XII, p. 132); and (5) in Coimbatore District, Madras (Rep., Vol. IX, pp. 73 and 74, without exact indication of locality). Nos. 2–5 are circular. Surâd is in the Pâlan State, not in the Kâlâhând State; as also is Râjpur-Jurâl (Rep., Vol. XII, p. 132; erroneously placed in the 'Karund' State, Íslâd Intro.).
12 Maniyagar was the ancient fort of the town of Bârigâr, situated on the Kén, and so lay in a westerly direction from Khajurâho (J. A. S. B., Part I, Vol. XLVIII (1879), p. 238).
13 Brief Account, para. 19.
14 C. P. G., 2nd ed. (1879), p. 178; Brief Account, para. 19; J. A. S. B., Part I (1881), pp. 18 and 20, quoting Sleeman.
15 This is the spelling of the Cânsîteer. Others write Bilhri, etc.
16 The village of Phära, about 14 miles from Mahôbâ, has the alternative name of Khajurâha (J. A. S. B., Part I, Vol. XLVIII (1879), p. 236). The name might arise anywhere if date palms (khaøjû) were abundant. Many villages are named Phâra and the like from a conspicuous pipal tree (Piper Êligiosum).
always accurate. The remains are well worthy of a special volume fully illustrated by adequate plans and photographs, but enough has been done in the way of description to render it unlikely that anybody will undertake the task of preparing a special and satisfactory work on the subject. Here it will suffice to note the principal monuments as proofs of the magnificence of the Chandel kings. The remains, more or less complete, of more than thirty temples are traceable at Khajurâho and the neighbouring village of Jâtkari.

The largest building is the fine Saiva temple, called Kandâriya or Khandâriya Mahâdeva by Cunningham (properly Kandariyâ) which stands 116½ feet high, and seems to have been erected during the tenth century (Rep., Vol. XXI, p. 62). The temple known as Vişvanâtha or Lâlajî contains the two inscription slabs dated, respectively, 1059 and 1058, of which the former doubtless belongs to the building. This record, which contains the posthumous panegyric of King Dhanga, commemorates the erection of the temple, which must have been built during his reign, towards its close. The Lakshmanji, Chaturbhuj, or Râmâchandra temple, with the date 1011 (= 954 or 955 A.D.) was built by Dhanga's father Yaśôvarma. The Jain temple of Jînaṇâth, with an inscription of the same year, was built in the beginning of Dhanga's reign. The Ghaṇṭâ Jîn temple, so called from the balls (ghantâ) carved on the pillars, is an incomplete medieval restoration made up from older materials. The original temple probably was erected in the tenth century (Rep., Vol. XXI, p. 61). A Buddhist statue now lost was found on the site, which possibly may have been occupied originally by a Buddhist building. The temples described by Cunningham under the names 'Derâ Jagadâmbl' and 'Kuṅvar Math' are among the best, and, like the others, may be assigned to the tenth century (Rep., Vol. XXI, pp. 62 and 63). The temple of Pritâng Mahâdeva is remarkable for its large dome of overlapping stones, with a diameter of 22 feet, without extraneous support. The similar dome of Kuṅvar Math is 14' 9" in diameter. The domes of the other large temples are supported by extra pillars. Khajurâho luckily lay out of the path of the Muhammadan iconoclasts, to which fact we owe the preservation of the finest group of Hindu temples in Northern India. Many of the buildings have been repaired extensively from time to time, and the Jain temples, especially, have been continually altered and restored.

From what has been said about the buildings it is clear that the splendour of Khajurâho reached its highest point in the tenth century during the reign of Dhanga (950-1000 A.D.). His successor Gânpa was twice defeated within his own territories by Mâhâdeva of Ghaṇṭâ, first in 1019-20 A.D. (410 A.H.), and again in 1022-3 A.D. (413 A.H.). It is not unlikely that, as Cunningham conjectures (Rep., Vol. II, p. 488), the decline of Khajurâho may date from that time. But the inscription of Jayavarman dated 1117 A.D. (No. 11) shows that the later kings did not wholly neglect Dhanga's favourite town. The memory of Paramârî (Parnâl) and his grandfather Mâdanavarman is associated chiefly with Mahâbha. After Parnâl's time the only allusion to Khajurâho found in medieval writers is the mention by the traveller Ibn Batuta in 1335 A.D. that the place was frequented by long-haired Jôgâls with a reputation for skill in magic. At the beginning of the nineteenth century the site was overgrown with jungle, although, no doubt, a small population continued to cling to it. The local Chandel zamindars claim to be autochthonous and boast kinship with King Parnâl. At present Khajurâho is a village, with less than 2,000 inhabitants.

Mahâbha, now a small country town in the Hamirpur District, 54 miles to the south of Hamirpur, and 34 miles to the north of Khajurâho, is associated by tradition very closely with the Chandel dynasty. The name of Parnâl (Paramârî) is in everybody's mouth, and the legend of his war with Pithirâj Chauhan (Prithvi Rāja Châhâhumâna), as told by Chand Bardâl in the Mahâbha Khaṇḍ,

19 Tâhâkhrī-Ahârî, in Elliot, II, p. 405.
20 Ibid., p. 457.
a canto of the Chand Râsa ëpic, is familiar to every native. Many spots and buildings at and near Mahôbâ are undying memorials of the names of Chandél kings and princes. The reigning kings can be identified from inscriptions, but other princes who do not happen to be mentioned in the inscriptions, and are remembered only for having formed a lake or built a temple, cannot be assigned a precise position in the genealogy of the ruling clan.

The earliest sovereign locally commemorated by existing material works is Râhila, the fifth of the dynasty, who reigned from about 900 to 915 A.D. No inscriptions have been discovered which can help the determination of his date with greater accuracy. The Hanumān dedication at Khajurâho dated in 922 A.D. does not mention the name of the reigning king. The Râhilyâ Sâgar, or lake, two miles to the south-west of Mahôbâ and the fine, though much injured, cruciform granite temple on its embankment, undoubtedly, are monuments of the reign of Râhila. Cunningham (Rep., Vol. XXI, p. 63) observes that the Kuâwar Mârth, or Prince's Temple, at Khajurâho, which has a granite plinth and sandstone superstructure, agrees very closely with the Râhilyâ shrine, and may be referred to the same period, the early part of the eleventh century. According to Mr. Baglar (Rep., Vol. VII, p. 47) one of the tanks in the Ajayârâgh fort is ascribed by some people to Kîrtîvarman, and by others to Râhilvarman (Râhil Brihâm) whose name is said to occur on several stones of one of the temples; but Cunningham does not mention these alleged facts. Tradition, as recorded by the poet Chand, ascribes the foundation of the ancient fortress of Râsan in Bândâ, about 20 miles N.-E. from Kâlânjâr, to Râhilvarman.

The Kirat Sâgar lake, a mile and three-quarters in circumference, which lies to the west of Mahôbâ, was the work of Kîrtîvarman, the thirteenth king (c. 1000—1100 A.D.). Cunningham found near the Dargâh some remains of a temple of Siva, which probably was built in the reign of Kîrtîvarman (Rep., Vol. II, p. 441). Another Kirat Sâgar, no doubt, contemporary, exists at Chandrâ in Lalîpur.22 The name of Kîrtîvarman is also connected with buildings at Ajayârâgh and Kâlânjâr.

Mâdanavarman, the seventeenth king (1128—1165 A.D.), is commemorated at Mahôbâ by the Mâdan Sâgar on the south side of the town, by Mâdan Khêri, a small mound at Mâhilpur about three miles to the east, and by three Jain images, on which the dedicatory inscriptions mention him as the reigning king in 1155, 1157, and 1163 A.D. The granite temple, known as the Kâkrâ Mârth, which stands on a rocky island in the north-west corner of the Mâdan Sâgar, escaped Muhammadan destructiveness, and is still fairly complete. It is equal in size to the largest of the sandstone temples at Khajurâho. The Kâkrâ Mârth, which was dedicated to Siva, and a second temple dedicated to Vishnu, called Mâdârî, the ruins of which exist on a second islet in the lake, may be ascribed safely to the reign of Mâdanavarman. His name is found also on buildings at Kâlânjâr and Ajayârâgh.

The eighteenth king, Parmâl or Paramârdi, as already observed, is remembered by popular tradition at Mahôbâ more distinctively than any other member of his family. The remains of his palace on the top of the slightly fortified hill known as the fort are still pointed out, notwithstanding their conversion to the purposes of a mosque. The dedication on a Jain image dated in 1168 A.D. mentions him as the reigning sovereign, and the Baghârî inscription, found at Singhâpur-Baghârî near Mahôbâ, commemorates the erection of temples dedicated to both Vishnu and Siva, by his ministers in 1195 A.D. A hymn of praise to Siva, recorded on a slab at Kâlânjâr in 1201 A.D., professes to be the composition of Parmârdi himself.

When he was driven out of Mahôbâ in 1182 A.D. by Prithvîraj (Prithvîrâj), most probably he retired to Kâlânjâr. The imperfect inscription from the fort wall at Mahôbâ, which records the building of a temple in 1249 A.D., the year after the Chandél defeat, does not seem to contain any king's name, and it is impossible to say under what circumstances it was recorded.

22 Cunningham spells Chândâl, but wrongly, I believe. His spelling Chândel certainly is erroneous.
Except as above stated, and a tank at Ajaygarh and a gateway at Kâlânjâr, no particular building or artificial lake is definitely connected with the name of Parmâl, although loose popular tradition attributes to him in a vague way many of the antiquities of the country.

According to Chand and local tradition, Parmâl was succeeded at Mahâbâ by his son Samarjit, who retained the control of the local administration until he was killed by a Muhammadan named, Binâis-ud-dîn (see note 49 post). Although the name of Samarjit is not mentioned in the inscriptions, I do not see any special reason for disbelieving the tradition. The incursion of Prihtrâj seems to have been a merely temporary raid, which did not imply any permanent conquest of Jejikabhukti, and the epigraphic evidence indicates that Trailôkyavarman, the recognized successor of Parmâl as sovereign, had his headquarters at Ajaygarh. Samarjit may have been his younger brother, and may have held Mahâbâ as best he could until 1203 A. D., when both he and his father were overwhelmed by the Muhammadan invader.

The fortress of Ajaygarh stands in the State of that name to the south-east of Mahâbâ, to the south-west of Kâlânjâr, and a little north of east from Khajurâhô. The irregular quadrilateral formed by these four places was the centre of the Chandâl power. The dynasty, which arose at Maniyâgarh and Mahâbâ about 931 A. D., seems to have occupied Khajurâhô about 900 A. D., and certainly seized Kâlânjâr, in the reign of Yaôvarman, the seventh king, about 930 or 940 A. D. Ajaygarh, if Mr. Beglar is right, was held by Rihîla, the fifth king, at the beginning of the tenth century. Cunningham's description of Ajaygarh (Rep., Vol. XXI., pp. 46—54) must be read with caution, as his account of the inscriptions contains many errors. A private dedication (Inscription No. 19), which mentions Madanavarman as the reigning king in 1151 A. D., is the earliest Chandâl record at this site. A tank in the fort is ascribed to Parmâl, and there are inscriptions of his successors Trailôkyavarman, Visnavarman, and Bhôjavarman. It seems that after the capture of Kâlâanjâr by Kutbb-ud-dîn in 1203 A. D., the Chandâl chiefs resided ordinarily at Ajaygarh, twenty miles distant. Inscriptions No. 36a and 35b, as interpreted by Cunningham, indicate that they sought compensation by pushing eastward into Râwa, but his interpretation is open to doubt.

The history and antiquities of the famous fort of Kâlâanjâr have been related and described by Cunningham in Volume XXI. of his Reports, making use of the earlier accounts by Pogson and Maisey. From very ancient times the hill had been a favourite resort of Saiva ascetics, and it is said to be included in a list of nine holy places of Northern India given in the Padma Purâna. It is impossible to say when or by whom it was first occupied as a fortress. Cunningham's theory that the Kalachuri Era of 249 A. D., commemorates the occupation of Kâlânjâr at that date by the Kalachuri kings of Chedi is not supported by the most recent researches, which indicate that the era was used first in Gujarât and the Thâna District near Bombay. Inscription No. 2 of my list distinctly affirms that Yaôvarman, the seventh Chandâl king, annexed the hill of Kâlânjâr. There is no reason to doubt the truth of this statement, and we are consequently justified in believing that the Chandâl connexion with the fortress began about 930 or 940 A. D. After that date the titles of the Chandâl kings usually include that of 'lord of Kâlâanjâr,' which was also assumed by some of the kings of Chedi, the rivals, and at times the enemies of the Chandâls. The Chandâl inscriptions at the fortress mostly belong to the reigns of Madanavarman and Parmârdî (1128—1203 A. D.); but a tank, named the 'Budhi or Burûvya Tal' by Cunningham, is associated by tradition with the name of Kâlîvarman (c. 1060—1100 A. D.). This king is believed by the people to have been a leper, and to have recovered his health by bathing in this tank at Kâlâanjâr. The fortress was taken by Kutbb-ud-dîn Îbak (Âibak) in April, 1203, from Parmâl (Parmârdî), who died immediately afterwards. The Musulmans held it only for a short time, and it was then recovered by the Hindus, as is proved by inscriptions Nos. 41 and 48.

The buildings at Kālanjār do not seem to possess any high degree of merit as architecture. The upper gate, leading to the outwork in the middle of the west face, where the great lingam of Nilakantha stands, is attributed by local tradition to king Parmāl (1165–1203 A.D.). The Muhammadan attacks on Kālanjār will be discussed more fully subsequently.

Ajaygarh and Kālanjār are the best known of the eight Chandēl forta (ante, p. 132), but it will be well to add a few remarks on the remaining six. I have no information about Bārīgarh in the Charkhārī State, distant about ten miles from Mahōbā, except that it possesses a fort ascribed to a prince named Bālaivarman (Bār Brahm), who is not mentioned in the inscriptions, but is given an early position in the dynasty by the bard’s lists.24 The Bārī tank and mound at Pahra (also called Khajurāhā) fourteen miles N.-E. of Mahōbā, preserve the name of the same prince.25 Maudhā, in the north-eastern corner of the Hamirpur District has no ancient remains of interest now visible. Māniyāgarh, already referred to as the original seat of the Chandēl clan, according to Khajurāhā tradition, is described by Beglar and Cunningham (Rep., Vol. VII, p. 43; Vol. XXI, p. 69) as a large ruined fort, situated on the left bank of the Kēn river, on a hill overlooking the town of Rājgarh in the Chhotāpur State. The fort derives its name from a shrine of Māniyā Deo (? Devī). This goddess was regarded as the tutelary deity of the Chandēls, and another shrine dedicated to her exists at Mahōbā. I have shown reason for believing her to be a tribal deity of the Bhars, one of the so-called aboriginal races, formerly numerous in the Hamirpur District, but now merged in the general low-caste population. The Bhars and Gōśīs seem to have been closely akin, and the Chandēl clan probably shared in both Bhar and Gōśī blood (J. A. S. B., Part I, Vol. XLVI (1877), p. 233; Rep., Vol. VII, p. 44; Brief Account, p. 2).

The little known fort of Mārhā in the Bāndā District, twelve miles to the N.-E. of Kālanjār, is comparable in size with the fortresses of Ajaygarh and Kālanjār, and was considered by Tiefenthaler to be even larger than the latter. The site is overrun with jungle, the haunt of tigers and leopards, and so is not convenient for archaeological exploration. I believe it to have been the stronghold of the chieftain called by the Muhammadan historian Dalaki-wa-Malaki who was the opponent of Ulūgh Khān in 1248 A.D. There is little doubt that he was a Bhar.26 Gārghā, four miles west of Jabalpur, is well known as the traditional early seat of the Gōśī dynasty, but does not seem to possess any buildings of importance, except the late castle known as the Madan Mahal.27

Mahiyar, now a station on the Allāhabād and Jabalpur Railway, commands a pass over the Kaimūr range, and possesses a famous temple of the goddess Sarasvatī, or Sārdā Devī. No Chandēl remains are recorded.28

Some traditions substitute Kālpī for Mahiyar in the list of Chandēl forta. It is situated in the Jālam District on the southern bank of the Jumna, to the N.-W. of Hamirpur; and, if ever held by the Chandēl kings, can have been in their hands for a very short time. The existing remains are Muhammadan.29

The origin of the Chandēls, like that of all the Rājput clans, is obscure and uncertain. The Chandēls themselves have a silly legend to the effect that they are descended from the union of the moon (Chandra) with a Brahman maiden. The only significance of the myth is its implied admission that the pedigree of the clan required explanation, which was best attained

26 Cunningham did not visit Mārhā, which he believed to have been ‘explored’ by his assistant, Messrs. Beglar and Carlleye. But Mr. Beglar did not even succeed in finding the place (Rep., Vol. VII, p. 21); and Carlleye does not mention it. The position is fixed by Cunningham (Rep., Vol. XXI, p. 18, Pl. I). Tiefenthaler erroneously places it seven miles to the S.-E. of Kālanjār (Geographie de l’Indostan, French tr., Berlin, 1791, p. 247). For Dalaki-wa-Malaki, see J. A. S. B., Part I, Vol. L (1881), p. 97.
by including it in the group of 'moon-descended' Rājpūts, and adding respectability by inventing a Brahmans ancestry. As a matter of fact, the Chandél are still regarded as a clan of impure descent. It seems quite clear that the ancestors were not immigrants from the northwest, and had nothing to do with the Huns and such people, who appear to be largely represented in the present day by the 'fire-descended' Rājpūts, the Chaubáns, and others. The indications are fairly distinct that the Chandél clan originated in the midst of the Gondás, with whom other similar tribes were intermixed. The Chandél Zemindars of Khajuráho claim to be autochthonous and trace their origin to Maniyágarh, the ancient ruined fortress on the Kén river, not many miles distant. This tradition is confirmed by the fact that Maniyá Déo [? Dévi], whose shrine exists at Maniyágarh and gives the place its name, was the tutelary deity of the Chandél. When they occupied Mahóbá, early in the ninth century, they brought with them the worship of this goddess, who appears to be akin to the Gondá deities. The third and only other known shrine dedicated to her is at the village of Baré in pargana Ráth, Hamirpur District, which probably was formerly occupied by Bhars. The poet Chand associates Maniyágarh with a Gondá chief named. As late as the sixteenth century the Chandél princess Durgávati married the Gondá chief of Gaqá Mandiá. Without going into further detail, I may state that I still hold the opinion which I published thirty years ago, that the Chandél really sprang from an aboriginal stock; whether this stock was called Bhar or Gondá we cannot say, and if I am right in thinking the two tribes to be very closely connected, the question is of no importance. The Gondáwás, with whom the Chandél are also connected by tradition, and the Haíhayás or Kalachuris of Chádi probably came to the front in the same way, as successful adventurers among some one or other of the aboriginal races, who after attaining power, claimed the rank of Khatriya, Rájpút, or Thákur—all synonymous terms in practice—as Gondá chiefs do to this day. I accept the Khajuráho tradition that the original seat of the Chandél clan was Maniyágarh on the Kén river in the Chhatarpur State.

The newly formed clan, the Chandél, then spread northwards to Mahóbá, taking with them the worship of their tutelary deity, from which town they gradually extended their rule over all Jijaúkabákti, the modern Bundélkánd. I do not believe that the Chandél ever were very numerous during their period of sovereignty. They formed a ruling caste, holding in more or less complete suzerainty various races, including a crowd of Gopés, Kós, Bhils, and other so-called aborigines, whose former presence under those names can be traced in scores of village traditions, specimens of which are recorded in my early publications. These people are not known now by the old names in the Hamirpur District, where I studied the subject, but they certainly form the principal element in the existing low-caste population of that district, under the names of Chámárs, Khangárs, Árakhis, and so forth. I have, no doubt, that investigations of a similar kind in other districts of Bundélkánd would yield similar results.

The Chandél were only one of several clans which attained eminence during the ninth century, and, in virtue of the de facto exercise of sovereign powers, claimed to rank as Khatriyás or Rájpúts, whatever might be the flaws in their pedigrees. The exact process by which these clans came to the front nearly at the same time is not known, and is not likely to be ascertained. It is easy to see that the death in 648 A.D. of Harshavardhana, paramount sovereign of Northern India, loosed the bonds which had held together for a time a multitude of separate States, and so gave free play to the action of local ambitions. We know as a matter of fact from the strange story of Wang-Huien-tsé, the Chinese envoy, that the death of

21 J. A. S. B., Part I (1877), p. 231. 'The fort of Rehuta [or Gúrgi-Másun in Rewá] is unanimously ascribed to Raja Karan Dahariyu, who is supposed to have been a Bhar chief. But his very title of Dahariyu shows that he must have been the famous Karpa Deva, the Kalachuri Raja of Dahal or Chádi' (Rep., Vol. XXI, p. 169).
Harsha was followed immediately by serious disorder; but information concerning the course of political events from the middle of the seventh to the beginning of the ninth century is so scanty that it is impossible to trace fully the steps of the development of all the new powers, which were well established by the middle of the ninth century. A summary of the present state of knowledge on the subject will be found in Chapter XIV of the Second Edition of the Early History of India, and the development of the Parihar clan from a section of the Gürjars is worked out in my essay on the Gürjars of Rājputāna and Kanauj, which will appear this year in the J. R. A. S.

There can be little doubt that the province or kingdom of Jējākabhuṅkti was included in the empire of Harsha, and that the local Brahmān Rājā, mentioned by Huen Tsang in 642 A. D., must have been a feudatory of the paramount power. But nobody can tell what happened to the Brahmān Rājā. The Chandel clan, as already explained, seems to have originated among the Gōḍa and cognate tribes in the territory now known as the Cutchpur State. The early Chandel Rājās probably were subordinate to the powerful State formed by the Gürjars—a tribe of foreign origin—which attained its greatest extent under Bhōjā I in the middle of the ninth century, when Kanauj (Mahādāya) was the capital. In this connexion it is relevant to note that tradition represents the Chandels as having succeeded a Parihar (Prathāra) kingdom, which had its capital at Mau-Sabaniyā between Nowgong (Nangāon) and Cutchpur. These Parihars probably were Gürjars connected with the White Hans, descended from the armies of Tōramāṇa and Mihirakula. The subordination of Jējākabhuṅkti to Kanauj may be assumed to have lasted until the end of the reign of Rāhila, the fifth Rājā (about 915 A. D.), who is not known to have carried his arms beyond the limits of his ancestral province. But his son and successor, Harshadeva, the sixth Rājā, is recorded to have placed (or replaced) on the throne a Rājā named Kāṣṭhipāla, who must be the king of Kanauj known from other inscriptions under the names of Mahipāla and Herambapāla. Taken in connection with the ascertained fact of repeated subsequent wars between the Chandels and the rulers of Kanauj, the inference may be drawn that Harshadeva waged a successful war with the kingdom of Kanauj, defeated its king Kāṣṭhipāla (Mahipāla), and, before returning home, replaced him on his throne. These events may be dated approximately about 917 A. D., which may be assumed as being very nearly the correct date for the development of the Chandel power as the equal and rival of Kanauj, which had lost its predominant position soon after the death of Bhōjā I (about 890 A. D.). Recent researches have demonstrated that the kingdom of the Rāśtrakūṭa dynasty and clan lay immediately to the south of the western provinces of that of Kanauj (Mahādāya), and that Indra III, Rāśtrakūṭa, in or about 916 A. D., attacked Kanauj successfully, and drove its king, Mahipāla, from his throne. It is possible that the victory credited to Harshadeva Chandel may have been won by him in alliance with the Rāśtrakūṭa prince, who makes a similar claim to martial success. But it is more likely that the Chandel king, notwithstanding his usual rivalry, came to the rescue of the Kanauj sovereign, and delivered him from the hand of the Rāśtrakūṭa invader. Neither of the powers to the south of the Jamnā was strong enough to hold permanently the kingdom of Kanauj. Both the Chandel and the Rāśtrakūṭa had to be content with the glory of a successful invasion and the credit of having dethroned and replaced king Kāṣṭhipāla (Mahipāla).

Yasovarman (Lakshavarman), the seventh Chandel king (c. 930–950 A.D.) greatly increased the power and confirmed the stability of his dynasty by his conquest and occupation of the fortress of Kalanjjar. The possession of this strong place, with which all his successors closely associated themselves, substantially enhanced the rising influence of the Chandels, who were henceforth undoubtedly free from all dependence on Kanaaj. In fact, the rise of the Chandels seems to have been one of the principal factors in the political decadence of that kingdom, when Yasovarman built his magnificent temple to Vishnu at Khajuraho, he obtained the image for the shrine from king Devapala of Kanaaj, the successor of Kshitiapala or Mahipala, who had been defeated by Yasovarman's father, Harshadeva. This incident probably means that the ruler of Kanaaj was not in a position to refuse a favour to his southern rival.

Interminable warfare between rival local potentates has always been the normal condition of India when left free to follow her own devices, and the sufferings resulting were accepted as a matter of course. But she was now about to be called upon to endure unwillingly the cruelties of a foreign invader, and we must turn aside to consider the progress of Muhammadan advance from the north-west in order to understand the causes of the ultimate overthrow of the Chandels and the other medieval Rajput powers.

The Amir Alptigin, who previously had been governor of Khurassan under the Samanid dynasty of Persia and Bukhara, occupied Ghazni in 934 A.D. (322 H.) and so became the neighbour of the powerful Hindu State in the Indus Valley and Pakhrib, of which the capital was Bahlindah (Bakindas). In either 366 or 367 H. (976-8 A.D.), the Amir Sabuktigin wrested Ghazni from the hands of a Muhammadan governor named Pirey. The Hindus of the adjoining kingdom on the east could not allow the Musalmans to proceed unchecked, and, as early as 363 H. (973-4 A.D.), they had attempted the invasion of Ghazni, but were repulsed by Pirey. The name of the Hindu leader on that occasion is not recorded. A few years later, in 369 H. (979-80 A.D.), Jaipal, king of Bahlindah, whose dominions extended from the mountains west of the Indus to the Hakri, the 'lost river' of the Indian desert, and so included a large part of the modern provinces, the Pakhrib and Sind, advanced towards Ghazni, but came to terms with the Amir and retired. In 376 H. = 986-7 A.D., Sabuktigin raided the Indian frontier and collected much booty. A year or two later in 378 H. = 988-9 A.D., Jaipal repeated his invasion of the Musalmans territory, but lost most of his army from the excessive cold, and was again compelled to retreat. The terms settled between him and Sabuktigin provided that the Indian king should pay a large cash indemnity, forfeit a hundred elephants, and surrender four fortified towns to the west of the Indus, in the direction of Ghazni.  

Jaipal was also required to give hostages, and to receive commissioners empowered by Sabuktigin to take over the cash, elephants, and fortresses in accordance with the treaty. But when he reached his own territory, Jaipal violated the compact, detained Sabuktigin's commissioners as hostages, and failed to carry out the terms agreed on. 'On becoming aware of this conduct, Sabuktigin mustered his forces to take vengeance upon the Hindu for this piece of treachery. He entered Jaipal's territory, and carried slaughter, plunder, and devastation wherever he went. Idol temples were overturned and masjids (mosques) erected on their ruins, and the Langhan territory and Nang-Nihar (Jalalabad), which were the most western parts held by Jaipal — the more level tracts in comparison with the old Afghan country —

36 The terms are as stated by Baverty. Al'Utm in the Firdausi-Shahnamah (Elmot, Vol. II, p. 21) says that the Amir was promised ' 1,000,000 dinars of royal stamp, and fifty elephants, and some cities and forts in the middle of his country.' The spelling 'Ghazni' is correct, but alternative forms, 'Ghazina,' etc. are used by some writers.
were reduced under his sway. After this success Sabuktigin returned to Ghazni. In the narrative of these proceedings the historians make no mention of allies of Jaipal. That prince seems to have relied upon his own resources, and was compelled to recognize the fact that they were unequal to the task of stopping the progress of the foreigner.

Soon after, probably in 989 A.D., Jaipal resolved to make a supreme effort to save his country, and, according to Ferishtah, summoned to his aid the Raijas of Delhi, Ajmir, Kalañjar, and Kanañj (Elphinstone, 5th ed., p. 321). The combined forces are said to have numbered 100,000 men. This huge army engaged Sabuktigin somewhere between Bannu and Ghazni, probably in the Kurram (Kurram) Valley, and was destroyed. Successive charges of cavalry produced the effect wrought long ages before, by the similar tactics of Alexander the Great, and so demoralized the Indian host, that it broke before the final general attack. The Hindus gave way, and were pursued with dreadful slaughter to the Indus. Sabuktigin obtained rich plunder in this camp, and levied heavy contributions from the neighbouring districts. He also occupied the city of Peshawar and appointed a governor to rule it, but the bulk of the Hindu dominions west of the Indus was not finally annexed to the kingdom of Ghazni until the reign of Sabuktigin's successor, Mahmud. The Raja of Kalañjar, whose contingent shared in this disastrous defeat, was Dhanga.

The Muhammadans did not attempt to attack Jijakabukht or the other internal parts of India during the reign of Dhanga. During the tenth century the kingdom of Jijakabukht seems to have been decidedly stronger than the rival realm of Kanañj.

Inscription No. 2, dated 954 A.D., informs us that Dhanga's father, Yasovarman, who annexed Kalañjar, had waged successful wars with the Gaudas, Khasas, Kosals, Kaminas, Mithilas, Malavas, Chedis, and Gurjaras. No doubt the boasts of the official panegyrist must be subjected to considerable discount, but, allowing for this, we may accept the fact that Yasovarman was an aggressive monarch who caused the weight of his arm to be felt by most of the northern powers between the Himalaya and the Narbada. The reality of the conquests ascribed to him, at least to a large extent, is proved by Jaipal's call on Dhanga for assistance. Unless the Chandel king had attained an admitted place among the leading powers of Northern India, he would not have been invited to send a contingent to fight in a region so remote as the Afghan frontier. Recent investigations show that the Gurjaras referred to must mean, at that date almost certainly, the Gurjara-Pratihara rulers of Kanañj or Mahòdaya.

The same record which enumerates the conquests of Yasovarman gives valuable information concerning the extent of the dominions of his son Dhanga, the ally of Jaipal, which shows how quickly the chiefs of the petty Mahob State had developed into the masters of a powerful kingdom, extending north and south from the Jamna to the Narbada, or at least to the Kaimir.

37 Bavarty, Notes on Afghanistan and Port of Beluchistan (1898), p. 320. See also his transl. Tabaqät-i-Nisri, pp. 71—74; and Elliot, Hist. of India, Vol. II, pp. 18—24. Jaipal (Jayapala), king of the Indus Valley and Southern Pathj, who had his capital at Bathinda (Bhatinda), now in the Patiala State, seems to be confused by some writers with a supposed king of Delhi or Kanañj of the same name. Miss Druff (Chronology, p. 308) inserts him in the list of 'Hindu Shâhiya kings of Kabul,' whose capital actually was at Ghândi (Waihindi, Udahâhâshâpur). See Catalog. of Coins in Indian Museum, Vol. I, p. 245). The dominions of Jaipal lay further south than those of the Shâhiyas. Jaipal was defeated finally by Mahmud of Ghazni on Thursday, 9th Muharram, 399 H. (27th November, 1001), whereas the last of the Shâhiyas, Trilochâhanapala, was not defeated until about 1019 A.D., at the Tonri river. Jaipal, 'the greatest of the Bânas of Hindu,' was taken prisoner and detained in Khwarezm. After his release and return to his own country, he committed suicide by burning himself on a pyre. He was succeeded by his son Abraham, who, with his son, Ibrahim, suffered a disastrous defeat at the hands of Mahmud in 399 H. (1608-1609 A.D.). See Bavarty, transl. Tabaqät, pp. 51 and 51; Elliot, Vol. II, p. 445; and Albid, ibid., pp. 27 and 33. Jayapala was the name of the Raja of Kanañj which has been misread as Jaipal (E. Hist. India, 2nd ed., p. 354, n.)

38 Bavarty, as cited in notes 36 and 37. Elphinstone (5th ed., p. 321) locates both the battles between Sabuktigin and Jaipal in "Laghmân, at the mouth of the valley which extends from Peshawer to Kabul"; but Bavarty shows good reasons for believing that the fighting took place in or near the Kurram (Kurram) Valley, on the road to Ghazni.
Range, and east and west from the frontier of the kingdom of Benares (Kāśi) to the Bētwā river. We are told that Dhangā's western frontier was marked by the town of Bhāsrat on 'the river of Mālava,' which seems to be meant for Bāilsa (Bhāilsā) on the Bētwā. His northern boundary was the Jumna, which, of course, separated his dominions from the Gūrjara (Pratihāra) kingdom of Kānaūj. On the north-east his frontier touched, and perhaps included, Gopādri, or Gwālior, which Vajrādīman wrested from the grasp of the Kānaūj sovereign, and probably held as a feudatory of Dhangā. Dhangā's southern neighbour was the king of Chēdī, whose capital was at Τīrāpur (Tēwar), near Jabalpur. The frontier may have been either the Kaimūr Hills on the Narbādā river. The kingdom thus described was sufficiently extensive and wealthy to supply its monarch with an ample revenue and considerable forces.

The time limits of Dhangā's reign are fixed by the inscriptions within very narrow limits of possible error. He certainly was on the throne prior to 964 A.D., and had died a little before 1002 A.D. His reign, therefore, must have occupied the second half of the tenth century, and may be assumed to have covered the period from 960 to 1000 A.D. His life was prolonged beyond the ordinary term. We learn from Inscription No. 7 (v. 55) that Dhangā had passed the age of a hundred years, where he died at the confluence of the Ganges and Jumna at Prayāga (Allahābād), 'closing his eyes, fixing his thoughts on Rudra (Śiva), and muttering holy prayers.'

The northern style of temple architecture, characterized by the curvilinear steeple, to which Fergusson gave the rather inappropriate name of 'Indo-Aryan,' reached its climax in the noble temples erected at Khajurāho during the reigns of Yaśvē.varman and Dhangā (c. 938—1000 A.D.), which are justly entitled to be regarded as the standard models of the style, worthy of admiration for their harmonious design, massive dignity, and rich decoration. The finest of the group is the temple of Kandariyā Mahādeva, but the temples dedicated to Viśvānanāth and Chaturbhuj are little inferior.

In the year 587 H. (997 A.D.), almost exactly at the same time as the aged king Dhangā transmitted his crown to Gaṇḍā, the Amīr Sabuktīgin was succeeded on the throne of Ghazni by his celebrated son, the Sultan Mahmūd, who devoted all his energy during a long reign to the task of harrying the Indian idolaters. Authorities differ concerning the exact number of his incursions into India. Elliot, after careful study of the texts, came to the conclusion that Mahmūd's raids were seventeen in number. According to that computation, his expedition in the year 599 H. (September, 1008—August, 1009 A.D.) was the sixth.

It was undertaken in order to punish Jaipāl's son and successor, Anandpāl, who had opposed the recent Muhammadan invasion of Multān. That prince, following his father's example, summoned the other Indian powers to his aid, and was joined by contingents from the kingdoms of Ujjain, Gwālior, Kālañjar, Kānaūj, Delhi, and Ajmer. The combined forces which advanced into the Pañjāb under the supreme command of Anandpāl formed an army greater than any that had ever taken the field against the Amīr Sabuktīgin. The host, already enormous, daily grew in numbers, and received a specially valuable reinforcement in at least 30,000 fierce warriors of the Khōkhār tribe. Battle was joined; according to the contemporary historian Al'ūthī, on the bank of the Indus not far from Ohind (Waihind), and a successful rush made by the Khōkhārs, during which, in a few minutes, three or four thousand Musalmāns were killed, very nearly decided the fortune of the day in favour of the Hindus. But the sudden flight of Anandpāl's riding elephant, which had been wounded, caused a panic in the Indian ranks. They broke, and were pursued for two days, suffering a loss of eight thousand killed. Thirty elephants and immense booty of all kinds fell into the hands of the victors, who transmitted the spoil to their master, the Sultan. In this fight Brahmanpāl,

39 The language of the inscription that the king 'abandoned his body' does not necessarily imply suicide. It is merely the 'ordinary civil way of announcing a death' (Bājendralāla Mitra, J. A. S. B., Part I, Vol. XLVII, p. 47). A similar phrase occurs in Inscription No. 24, v. 49.
son of Anandpal, took a leading part. The Raja of Kalanjar, whose contingent shared in the defeat of the allies, was Ganja, but whether or not he was present in person is not known. 10

During the course of his twelfth expedition, in January, 1019 A.D. (409 H.), Sultan Mahmud accepted the submission of the Raja of Kanauj, Rajyapala, who purchased the clemency of the invader by the payment of an indemnity of a million dirhems, equivalent to a quarter of million of rupees, and the surrender of thirty elephants. The Sultan then passed on to the city of Mathuri, which he plundered, and thence returned to Ghazni with twenty millions of dirhems in cash, three hundred and fifty elephants, and fifty-three thousand captives. When the raider had departed, the Chandeli king, Ganja, sent his son Vidhyadhara, aided by allies, against Kanauj. The allied forces captured the city, and slew its Raja as punishment for his too ready submission to the foreigner. This vigorous action must have taken place in April or May, 1019 A.D. When Mahmud heard of Ganja's audacious defiance, he resolved to avenge the king of Kanauj, and started from Ghazni in the autumn of 1019 A.D. (410 H.). Kanauj being distant three months' march from Ghazni, the Sultan must have reached the Jumna in January, 1020 A.D. An ally of Ganja, whose identity is obscured by the imperfection of the Persian alphabet, but almost certainly was Trilochanapala, son of Rajyapala, and Raja of Kanauj, attempted to defend the passage of that river, but failed. Mahmud crossed the stream, captured and sacked the town of Barli, and then advanced towards the south in order to chastise Ganja within his dominions. The Chandeli king, in accordance with the usual Hindu practice, assembled an unwieldy host, said to have comprised 36,000 horse, 105,000 foot, and 640 elephants. The sight of such an enormous force, outnumbering his small army many times, naturally caused the Sultan to feel uneasy and entertain doubts as to the prospects of victory. But his anxiety was soon relieved, for during the night Ganja fled with some of his personal attendants, leaving all his baggage and equipments. The next day the Sultan, being apprized of this, rode out on horseback without any escort, and carefully examined the ground. When he was satisfied that there was no ambush or strategic device, he stretched out his hands for plunder and devastation. Immense booty fell into the hands of the Musalmans, and five hundred and eighty of Nanda's [Ganja's] elephants, which were in the neighboring woods, were taken. The Sultan, loaded with victory and success, returned to Ghazni. 41 The locality of Ganja's craven flight is not specified; and it is not easy to understand why a prince, who was so eager to punish the king of Kanauj for submission to the invader, should himself take to flight without striking a blow. We have no Hindu account of the event, and must be content to take the Muhammadan version as it stands.

The cowardice of the Chandeli king, and the richness of the plunder taken from his camp encouraged Mahmud to renew the invasion of Ganja's territory. Accordingly, he again marched from Ghazni in the autumn of 1022 A.D. (413 H.), and made his way to Gwalior early in 1023. The ruler of that fortress, perhaps Kirtiraja, made his submission, and so left open the road to Kanauj, which Mahmud proceeded to invest, probably in the month of March or April. Ganja again played the part of a coward, capitulated without fighting, presented three hundred elephants and immense treasure to the invader and was content to accept from his hands the investiture of fifteen forts, including Kalanjar. 'The Sultan then victoriously and triumphantly returned to Ghazni in 1023 A.D.

40 Al-Uthbi, in Ellicott, Hist. Vol. II, p. 33; Ferishta, ibid., p. 418. The latter author, as translated by Elliot, calls the tribemen on the Indian side by the name of 'Gakhara.' But, long ago, Havers showed reason for believing that their name should be read as 'Khakhara,' and his conclusion is confirmed by Mr. H. A. Rose in his paper entitled 'The Khokhars and the Gakhars,' Jod. Ant., Vol. XXXVI, p. 4.

41 Nizam-ud-Din, in Elliot, Vol. II, p. 435. The Chandeli king's name is written in the Persian erroneously as 'Naada.' The name which I interpret as Trilochanapala was read as Tarbi Jaiib in Elliot's manuscript. In Persian writing there is not much difference between copying 'Naada.' The dropping of the l is enough to make the name unintelligible.
Notwithstanding the successes gained so easily by Maḥmūd, the Chandel kingdom was not again attacked by the Muhammadans until a hundred and eighty years had elapsed, and Gaṇḍa's successors were left free to manage their own affairs, or fight with their neighbours, as they might feel inclined.

Little is on record concerning the short reigns of Gaṇḍa's successors, Viṭhāyādhara, Viṣajyapāla, and Dēvavarmā, which cover the period from about 1025 to 1060 A.D. The only contemporary document is the deed granting a village in 1056 A.D., which alone reveals the existence of Dēvavarmā, who is not mentioned in the genealogical inscriptions, because he died apparently without issue and was succeeded by his brother. We learn from Inscription No. 18 that Viṭhāyādhara continued the hereditary war with Kanauj, at that time under the rule of Trilōčana-pāla. Viṭhāyādhara is also alleged to have terrified Bhējadeva, the famous Paramāra king of Mālava, who reigned from about 1010 to 1050 A.D., but it is impossible to say whether or not this statement is a mere rhetorical flourish.

Kirtivarmā, brother of Dēvavarmā, who came to the throne about 1060 and reigned for about forty years, evidently was one of the most notable members of his dynasty. He was contemporary during part of his career with Kāṇḍādeva, or Lakṣhamikāra, the powerful king of Chedi, with whom he engaged in protracted hostilities. At first Kāṇḍādeva had the advantage, and even succeeded in driving his rival from the throne, probably annexing Jējākabhukti to his own dominions for a time. But in the end Kirtivarmā gained a decisive victory. Inscription No. 10 declares emphatically that Kirtivarmā 'acquired fame by crushing with his strong arm Lakṣhamikāra [= Kāṇḍādeva], whose armies had destroyed many princes.' This statement is verified by the prologue to Kṛishṇa-miśra's play entitled Prabodha-chandrodaya, 'The Rise of the Moon of Intellect,' which recites that Kirtivarmā had overcome and crushed the armies of Kāṇḍa, who was 'as terrible as the fire at the end of the world to the multitude of all princes.' Insanuch as Kirtivarmā did not come to the throne until about 1080 A.D., previous to which date Kāṇḍādeva had been reigning for some twenty years, it is obvious that the defeat of the latter must have taken place at some time in the closing decade of Kāṇḍa's reign, between 1060 and 1070 A.D.

The only dated record of Kirtivarmā's reign is the Déogār Inscription (No. 9) of 1154 V. E. = 1196 A.D., at which time his power was well established, and his reign drawing to its end. The inscription was set up by the king's hereditary minister, Vatsaśri, who had himself wrested the Déogār district from an unnamed enemy, probably Kāṇḍa, and built the fort which he named Kirtigiri in honour of his master. Déogār stands in a strong and picturesque position at the western end of the tableland of the Lalitpur range of hills, overhanging the river Bētāwā, in N. lat. 24° 32', E. long. 76° 18'.

The play entitled Prabodha-chandrodaya, above mentioned, was performed before Kirtivarmā at the command of his Brahman general, Gopālā, who had defeated Kāṇḍa immediately before, and replaced Kirtivarmā on the throne, which he had lost for a time (E. I., Vol. I, p. 220). The final victory of Kirtivarmā and the production of the play must have taken place in or about 1065 A.D., some appreciable time after the accession of Kirtivarmā about 1060 A.D., and prior to the death of Kāṇḍa some ten years later. The drama so performed in honour of a brilliant victory is not of the kind that might be expected on such an occasion. It was composed in honour of the god Viṣṇu and the Veda-sāstra philosophy, with an elaborate plot in which all the personages are allegorical. The play ends triumphantly with the reunion between King 'Discernment' and Queen 'Theology,' who had been long at variance, and their coming together is blessed by 'Faith in Viṣṇu' (Pitahubhakti).12

Tradition ascribes the foundation of the town of Ballī (Bilhārī) in the Jabalpur District of the Central Provinces to Rājā Kāṇḍa Dāhārī (i.e., Dāhāl or Chedi), by whom Kāṇḍādeva must be meant.13 The soubjugation of Kāṇḍādeva by Kirtivarmā probably involved the cession

---

12 M. Sylvain Lévi gives a lucid summary and appreciative criticism of the play in Le Théâtre Indien (Paris, 1890), pp. 239-38. On the authority of Rājākēshākhar he mentions that another king of Khalijār named Bhīmaṭa was reputed to be the author of five plays, including one named Suryānakñāknta (op. cit., pp. 229, 233, App. p. 26). This king Bhīmaṭa is not known from any other source of information.

13 Rep., Vol. IX, p. 34.
of Bālihri to the latter; and there is reason to believe that the town continued in possession of the Chandellas at least up to the end of Madanavarman's reign. Nothing is recorded concerning the political events of the short reigns of Sallakshana Varman, his son Jayavarman, or his brother Prathivarman, from about 1100 to 1138 A.D.; except an allusion to a war carried on by Sallakshana Varman in the Dāb or Antervēdi country between the Ganges and Jamna, probably against the kingdom of Kanauj (Inscription No. 24, v. 38).

Madanavarman, who reigned about thirty-seven years from 1128 to 1165 A.D., certainly was one of the most distinguished members of his house. The testimony of early tradition, as embodied in Chana's epic, agrees with that of the inscriptions in describing him as a successful warrior, who largely extended the Chandella dominion. According to Chana and a late inscription at Kālañjar, which has not been edited satisfactorily, he defeated the king of Gūrjara.\(^{44}\) The works of the Gujarāt historians prove that the king of Gūrjara referred to must mean the famous monarch, Siddhārāja-Jayashīluha, of Western Gujarāt (Anhilvaṭa), who died in 1142 or 1143 A.D. Although the Gujarāt authors do not admit the defeat of their sovereign as claimed by the Chandella king, one of them (the author of the Kumārapāldaśāhita) seems to suggest that Siddhārāja was compelled to come to terms and make peace.\(^{45}\) Towards the south Madanavarman's dominions included both Bālihri (Bilihari), already mentioned in connexion with Kṛṭivāman, and the fortress of Singaurgarh. Sir William Sleeman found at Kōndalpur, three miles west of Bālihri, a stone slab recording the dedication of a temple by Rājā Mulun Deo in Samvat 815. If the obvious correction is made of substituting Madanadeva for Mulun Deo, and the date is interpreted as being expressed in terms of the Chōdi era, the approximate equivalent will be 815 + 248 = 1063 A.D. The figure 8 may easily have been a misreading for 9, and if this further correction be made, the resulting date will be 1163 A.D., towards the close of Madanavarman's reign. Sir William Sleeman also noted the tradition that Singaurgarh, a fort situated twenty-six miles north-west of Jabalpur had been held, as well as Bālihri, by a Chandella Rājā from Mahābā. Other traditions connect both Bālihri and Singaurgarh with a Rājā Bēl or Bēlo Brahm (Bēlavarman), who is also remembered as having constructed the embankments of the great Bālā lake at Jaipūr in the Hamirpur District. The traditional date for the formation of that lake as stated to both Mr. Wigram and myself is 1200 S. = 1148 A.D. But the figure looks as if intended only for a round number. Another enquirer was given the date as 1268 S. = 1211 A.D., which is too late for the execution of a work of such magnitude. In 1211 A.D. the Muhammadans were in possession of Mahābā.\(^{46}\) Such evidence as is available suggests that Bāla or Bēlavarman, although not mentioned in the inscriptions, was a real person and most likely a contemporary and member of the family of Madanavarman. Of course, there can be no doubt that the Madan Sāgar, or lake, at Mahābā with its two granite temples, one of which is still standing, was formed by Madanavarman. The Man inscription (No. 24) records the alleged facts that Madanavarman defeated the king of Chōdi in battle, exterminated the king of Mālava, and kept the king of Benares (Kāñṭa) in friendly alliance. The statement as to Chōdi agrees with the other evidence, and there is no reason to doubt the allegation that Madanavarman maintained amicable relations with his eastern neighbour of Benares. The king of Mālava referred to must have been one of the Paramara dynasty, probably Yāśīvarman, Jayavarman, or Lakshmīvarman, but there does not seem to be any independent record of his fate.\(^{47}\)

Madanavarman had a younger brother named Pratāpā (Inscription No. 43), and a son named Yāśīvarman, corresponding with the Kṛṭivāman of the bards, who evidently predeceased his father. The name of Yāśīvarman is preserved only in Inscription No. 33.

---


\(^{45}\) In the time of Dhanga and Gaipā the principal Gūrjara kingdom meant Kanauj, which was then ruled by the Pratihāra dynasty; but the contemporary of Madanavarman was the powerful king Givindachandra Gihādevīla (Gihāwīr), whose father, Chandradēva, had acquired the sovereignty of Kanauj shortly before 1100 A.D. The Pratihāras were a branch of the Gūrjara tribe (Gūrjarapratihārācaprayag in Rājār inscription of Mahānāṭa, E. I., Vol. III, p. 396, v. 4, Sāgar Tāl inscription, Archæol. S. Annual Rep., 1903–4, p. 277). The testimony of the Gujarāt historians is summarized in Bombay. Gaz. (1896), Vol. I, Part I, p. 179.


\(^{47}\) Known epigraphic dates for Yāśīvarman are 1124 and 1155 A.D.; he was succeeded by Jayavarman, who was succeeded by Lakshmi Varman, with known date, 1143 A.D. (Kielhorn, E. Z., Vol. VIII, App. A, p. 15).
The immediate successor of Madanavarman undoubtedly was Paramari, who must have come to the throne in or about 1165 A.D. and who died after the occupation of Kalanjhar by Kusht-ud-din Ibak (Aibak) early in 1203. His name in the vernacular form Parmal is well remembered throughout Bundelkhand, being kept alive by the poem of Chand, the Mahbub Khan, with which everybody in that country is more or less familiar. The Muhammadan historian calls him 'the accursed Parmal.'

Popular tradition represents king Parmal as a coward, and gives all the credit for the stout fight against the army of Prithviraj Chauhan to Alha and Udal, the Mahbub heroes of the Banapur clan. Many localities are associated with the names of the champion brethren. A very ancient fortified dwelling-house, supposed by Cunningham to date from the eighth or ninth century, situated at Chilal in the Allahabad District to the south of the Jamna is believed locally, and with doubt erroneously, to have been the abode of Alha and Udal, whose fame has travelled far beyond the limits of Bundelkhand.48 The war between the Chauhan prince and the Chandels probably began in October, 1182 A.D., and certainly ended in the Vikrama year 1239 = 1182-83 A.D. by the decisive defeat of Parmal on the field of Sirdwagarh on the Pahuj river, a tributary of the Sind, now in native territory to the west of the Jauna District.49

The vanquished Chandels were pursued across what is now the Hamirpur District, as far as Mahoba, when a final, but ineffective stand was made. Mahoba was occupied for a time by Prithviraj. According to Chand, his lieutenant, Pajun, was driven out from the town by Samarjit, a son of king Parmal, aided by Narsing, an officer of Raja Jaychand of Karanji. The same authority affirms that Samarjit ruled the country between Kalanjhar and Gaya, and was ultimately killed by a Musalmân named Binse-ud-din.50 But no reliance can be placed on the details of such traditions. The fact and date of the conquest of Jenakabukti in 1239 V.E. = March 1182 to March 1183 A.D., fortunately are established definitely by the short inscriptions recorded by order of Prithviraj at Madanpur in the Lalitpur sub-division of the Jhansi District (No. 29). Evidently these inscriptions were set up in the spring of 1183 A.D., when Prithviraj was on his way home from his successful raid. Madanpur had been founded by and named after Madanavarman Chandel. In these days it was an important town commanding a pass on the road from Sagar (Sanger) to Gwalior (Rep., Vol. XXI, p. 173). Chand represents the defeat of Parnal as so overwhelming that only two hundred of his warriors escaped, but this tale must be a gross exaggeration; because twenty years later, the Chandel king still possessed considerable forces and was able to offer a stout resistance to the army of Kusht-ud-din Ibak (Aibak). This attack of that Muhammadan general is the second noteworthy event in the reign of Parmal. It has been described from the victor's point of view by Hane Nizami, the contemporary author of the Taj-ul-Ma'asir, or 'Crown of Exploits.'

In the year 599 H. = September 1202 to September 1203 A.D., the year in which Sultan Ghiyas-ud-din died, and his brother Muizz-ud-din (otherwise known as Shihab-ud-din, or Ghori, son of Sain) became supreme sovereign, Kusht-ud-din, accompanied by Shams-ud-din Muhammad Yialtumish (Altamsh,) afterwards Sultan of Delhi) proceeded to invest the fortress of Kalanjhar. The 'accursed Parmal,' we are told, retired into the fort after a desperate resistance in the open, and then surrendered. Evidently the resistance had been stout, for the Musalmân leader accepted his submission and an undertaking to pay tribute and deliver a number of elephants, on terms similar to those enforced by Sultan Mahmud against Parmal's ancestor, Gaya. The Chandel king, however, died a natural death before he could fulfil his engagements. His minister, Aijdewa, thought he would be able to renew the resistance, but was
compelled to capitulate owing to a failure of the water supply. On Monday, the 20th of the month Rajab (April, 1203 A. D.) the garrison came out in 'an extreme state of weakness and destruction' and surrendered unconditionally. Thus was taken the fortress which was 'celebrated throughout the world for being as strong as the wall of Alexander.' Elephants, cattle, and countless arms became the spoil of the victors, the temples were converted into mosques, fifty thousand men 'came under the collar of slavery, and the plain became black as pitch with Hindus.' Kuṭb-ud-dīn then occupied Mahōbā, and after conferring the government of Kālaṇjar on Hazābbar-ud-dīn Hasan Arūnāl, marched northwards to Būdīn.  

The history of the Chandēl dynasty as one of the powers of Northern India ends in 1203 A. D. with the death of PARMĀL and the capture of Kālaṇjar and Mahōbā by the Muhammadan invaders. Trailōkya-Varman succeeded his father Parmāl as a local chieftain, holding the eastern part of the ancestral kingdom, and in due course was succeeded by Virar-Varman and Bhoj-Varman. But no man can take interest in these purely local chiefs, and it is not worth while to discuss their scanty records in detail. Kirat Rāj, who was Rājā of Kālaṇjar in 1545 A. D., when Shēr Shāh laid siege to the fortress and besieged both perished, presumably was a Chandēl. The last glimpse of the old ruling house is afforded by the romantic history of the princess Durgāvatī, daughter of the Chandēl Rājā of Mahōbā, who married the Gānḍī Rājā Dalpat Sā of Mandlā, and was killed fighting the Muhammadans under Aśā Khan in 1564. The Chandēl clan dispersed after Parmāl's defeat and death. The fortunes of the scattered clan, and the obscure traditions concerning the rulers of Mahōbā in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries are fully discussed in my paper entitled 'Contributions to the History of Bandākhañḍ,' published in 1881, and written while I was saturated with local information. I have nothing to add now.

In order to complete the review of the subject I append a summary of all that is known concerning the Chandēl coinage. It is unnecessary to give a plate, the coins having been fully illustrated in other publications.

The Chandēl Coinage.

Although the genealogy of the Rājās of the dynasty of Western Chhēḍī or Pāhāla who belonged to the Hāna or Kalachuri clan, and had their capital at Tripuri (Tewar) near Jabalpur, contains fifteen names, coins have been found of only one Rājā, Gāṅgēya dēva, who assumed the title of Vikramāditya, and reigned from about 1015 to 1040 A. D. He was the father and immediate predecessor of Karkādeva, or Lakshmikarna, the enemy and rival of Kirtivarman Chandēl, who defeated Karkādeva about 1065 A. D. Gāṅgēyadēva, who was contemporary with the Chandēl kings, Gāṅgēya and Vīḍyādēva, was a powerful chief, and seems to have extended his influence over a good part of Northern India. His coins are fairly common in the eastern and southern districts of the United Provinces, and he is mentioned in the colophon to a manuscript from the Champāran District as reigning in 1019 A. D. However, it is not easy to understand how he could have exercised authority so far east as Champāran. No documentary evidence of his conquests is extant, but the abundance and distribution of his coins cannot be explained except on the assumption that he carried his arms into the country north of the Jumna. The disturbance caused by the raids of Suljān Mājūn of Ghaznī may have given him the opportunity.

The type of coinage introduced by Gāṅgēyadēva was novel, and very simple. The obverse is wholly occupied by the Rājā's name in bold characters, not differing widely from modern Nāgarī, arranged on the larger coins in three, and on the smaller, in two lines. The reverse type is a rudely

---

51 Elliot, Vol. II, p. 521; Ravery, transl. Ṭubājīdīr-Māvīrī, p. 522. Ravery makes a blunder in translating the personal name 'Parmār' as 'of the Pramārah race.'
52 The story of Durgāvatī was well told by Sleeman in J. A. S. B., Vol. VI, p. 629; and is quoted at length in Rep., Vol. IX, p. 39.
53 Bhandāl, 'Hist. of Nepāl,' J. A. S. B., Part I, 1903, p. 18, of reprint; V. A. Smith, E. Hist. of Indiā, 2nd ed., p. 503. The only known inscription of Gāṅgēyadēva is in a valley called Pākswā, 25 miles N.-N.-E. of Bēbā, dated 738 (Chhēḍī or Kalachuri era) = 1057 or 1058 A. D., and is a brief record of adoration at a spot sacred to Śiva. It has been roughly edited, without facsimile, by Cunningham, Rep., Vol. XXI, p. 133, and is mentioned by Mr. Garriek, ibid., Vol. XIX, p. 71. It proves that Gāṅgēyadēva's rule extended as far as the Vindhyā range, fifty miles from Allāhābād.
executed figure of a goddess seated cross-legged, and facing, presumably to be interpreted as Laksmi, but Cunningham calls her Durga or Bhairavi. The coins of Gangayadva are most commonly met with in gold, which varies in quality, sometimes being yellow, and apparently of high standard, but usually much debased. Some specimens seem to be intended for silver, but it is not easy to draw the line between metal apparently silver and the extremely debased gold of many examples. Copper coins of the same type as the gold and silver are rare. The largest coins are Attic drachmae in weight, perhaps slightly reduced. The heaviest specimen in the Indian Museum weighs 63 grains (4-082 grammes), the Attic standard being about 76-5 grains (Heads). The other denominations are the half, quarter, and one-eighth of a drachma. The small coin of good gold in the Indian Museum (Cat., Vol. I., p. 252, No. 9) which weighs only 5-6 grains (about 360 of a gramme), seems to be intended for one-eighth of a drachma or dramma, and to have lost weight. The large inscription from Sir Jahan, or Sir Jahan Khur, in the Gwalior State, some ten miles W.-N.-W. of Lalitpur, which contains ten dates, ranging from 560 to 1105 V. E. = 924 to 998 A. D., frequently mentions coins called dramma, and enumerates several species of them (E. I., Vol. I., p. 105). The Strimaddhivarideha dramma of line 87 is the coinage in base silver issued by Bhadjata I, the Gurjara-Pratihara king of Kanauj (Mahodaya) and N. India, who reigned from about 840 to 890 A. D. Fine specimens of this coinage weigh up to 68-4 grains and thus agree in weight with the coins of Gangayadva. The Indian Museum Catalogue describes nine gold and three copper coins of Gangayadva. Cunningham had two specimens in gold, eight in silver (or apparently silver) and five in copper. Three of the 'gold' coins in the Indian Museum, which to my eye seem to be very base gold, were labelled by the late Mr. Rodger as 'silver.' Probably, however, some specimens really were struck as silver. The smaller coins in gold or silver, that is to say, the half, quarter, and one-eighth dramma pieces, are rare. All the known copper coins are 'drammae.' The one-eighth dramma in gold, and the half and quarter dramma in silver have not been recorded yet.

The foregoing detailed description of Gangayadva's coinage has been given because it applies exactly to the Chandell gold (and silver?) coinage, which is an accurate copy of Gangayadva's, the king's name only differing. Close examination is necessary to distinguish a Chandell from a Gangeya coin. Cunningham mentions a silver coin of Jayavarman Chandell, said to be in the British Museum, but no such specimen can now be traced. Dr. Hoye has a quarter dramma of Madanavarman which seems to be silver. I have never heard of or seen any other Chandell coin which could be described as silver.

The reverse of the Chandell copper coinage is distinguished from that of Gangeya by the substitution of the figure of Hanuman for that of Laksmi. The Hanuman type may have been suggested by the boar-headed figure on the Strimad Adivarideha drammae of Bhadjata I of Kanauj, to which it bears a general resemblance.

All the Chandell coins are rare. In 1897, when I collected the notices of all the recorded coins, I could not enumerate more than 41. The Indian Museum has seven specimens, all in gold. The Lahore Museum possesses one gold quarter dramma of Madanavarman. I have no information concerning the contents of the Lucknow Museum cabinet. Altogether, about fifty or sixty specimens of the coinage of the dynasty are known to exist. The Chandell coinage begins with Kirtivarman, the thirteenth Raj (c. 1060-1100 A. D.), and ends with Viravarman, the twentieth Raj (c. 1245-1287 A. D.). It is extraordinary that so few specimens should be extant of a coinage struck during a period of two centuries by eight kings.

Reason has been shown for believing that the conquest of Karpadäva, king of Western Chedi, or Dabalsa, by Kirtivarman Chandell occurred between 1060 and 1670 A. D.; and, presumably, it was at this time that Kirtivarman adopted the type introduced by Karpadäva's father, Gangayadva. The earlier Chandell Rajas and their subjects, of course, must have used some other kind of money, and the probability is that they utilised chiefly the various sorts of Indo-Sasanian drammae in base silver, such as are mentioned in the Siyadboy inscription. Similar anonymous drammae are extremely

---

44 For other inscriptions mentioning drammae, see Cunningham, Coins of Med. India., p. 50. But I cannot trace the inscription dated in a year equivalent to 1216 A. D., which, according to him, was found at Jampur, and mention shahboddika drammae.
abundant. Small change may have been supplied partly by the so-called ‘Gadhiya piece,’ which, also, are of Indo-Sassanian descent. The extensive and prolonged series of Indo-Sassanian issues owed its origin to the White Hun, or Ephthalite, invaders at the close of the fifth century, and, in one form or another, continued to be issued up to the end of the twelfth century, chiefly, if not exclusively, by the ruling clans of foreign origin.

The coinage of Kirtivarman (c. 1060 to 1100 A.D.) is recorded in gold only, and in no more than two denominations, the dramma and half-drama. I know three examples of the latter, viz., F. M., Cunningham (now B. M.), and Hoey. The dramma is a little less rare.

Sallakshana Varman (c. 1100-1110) spells his name Hallakshana on the coins. Cunningham had one copper dramma unique, so far as I know. His gold dramas are very rare, but I have noted 5 specimens of the quarter dramma in that metal. The alleged silver coin of Jayavarman (c. 1110-1120) cannot be found. Eleven of his copper dramas are recorded, but nothing else.

The coinage of Prithivivarman (c. 1120-1128) is known only from Cunningham’s two copper dramas. (Reports, Vol. II, p. 459; 1n Coins Med. I. he mentions only one).

Dr. Hoey has a quarter dramma of Madanavarman (c. 1128-1165) apparently of silver, which is believed to be unique. Cunningham’s copper quarter-dramma likewise is unique. About 6 specimens of the quarter-drama, and two of the dramma in gold are recorded.

The base gold dramma of Paramardi (c. 1165-1208), obtained at Khajuraho, and now in the Indian Museum, is the only coin known of his long reign.

The late Mr. Rodgers described two gold dramas of Trailokyavarman (c. 1208-1245) as existing in the Indian Museum, but only one was sent to me, when I was preparing the catalogue. Dr. Hoey’s copper dramma from the Bundelkhand District is unique. The Indian Museum gold dramas of Viravarman (c. 1245-1287), from Khajuraho, likewise is unique.

The following bibliographical references for the subject are, I think, complete:
Dr. Hoernle, J. A. S. B., Part I, Vol. LVIII (1889), p. 24, Pl. XXVI, figs. 6-10 (Paramardi and Viravarman).

Allusions to the coinage in other publications are unimportant. Several other dynasties issued similar coins, which are duly noticed in Cunningham’s Coins of Medieval India, and in the Catalogue of Coins in the Indian Museum, Vol. I.

NOTES AND QUERIES.

ORIGIN OF THE TERM ORINGALL BETELEAH.

The word Beteleah has been fully discussed by Yule. In the new edition of Hobson-Johnson, under Fice-Goode, it is suggested that “Oringal (clothes) probably take their name from the once famous city of Warangal in Hyderabad.” This surmise is correct, because the proper form of the name of Warangal is the Telugu Orungalla, Warangal therefore represents the Europeanized form of the Telugu name for the place. There are many 17th century references to Oringall

Beteleahs, or Veilings from Warangal, among the India Office Records:

R. O. TEMPLE.

55 The allusion in Thomas’ Chronicles, p. 65, is wholly erroneous. No such person as “Sallakasamadha I, the Chandal monarch of Mahoba,” ever existed; nor was Madana Varmmadava ‘his grandson.’ See Proc. A. S. B., 1890,pp. 1-3.
LEGENDS FROM THE PANJAB.

BY SIR E. C. TEMPLE AND H. A. ROSE.

(Continued from Vol. XXXV., p. 302.)

II.

THREE LEGENDS OF THE MUGHAL COURT.

1. A Legend of Akbar and Mirzâ Jamil Beg of Dehli.

ONE day King Akbar was sitting in darbâr, when Nawâb Jain Khân said: — "I have heard that the products of India are not exported to Khurâsân, nor are those of Khurâsân imported into India. If your Majesty orders it, armies may be sent to invade Khurâsân."

The King sent for Râjâ Tarwâr Tîlôk Chand, the Governor of Kângra, and said to him: — "I have heard that the goddess, Devî, plays chaupar with you. So you better get me permission from your goddess, Bhawâl." The Râjâ replied: "Some sinner must have deceived you, but since your Majesty is my master, I must explain everything clearly. The gods are, as it were, the horses of the air and no one can control them. To-night I will enquire from the goddess."

At night the Râjâ made his whole army keep a fast. At midnight Deîv appeared at her own (appointed) time, and addressed him thus: — "Râjâ, why have you given me so much trouble?"

The Râjâ said: — "Mother, some sinner has slandered me to the King, what am I to do?"

The goddess said: — "Râjâ, on the eighth day from to-day shall be the conquest of Nûrâpur, the fortress of Râjâ Bâsîl Pathânt. You may join in the attack."

In the morning the Râjâ related all this to the King, and he at once sent his army to attack the stronghold of Chittaur. There it remained for twelve years, but the fort remained untaken. The King in great amaze said to his courtiers: — "Twelve years have passed and this place has not yet been taken, what plan should we adopt?"

On the other side Rânâ Kômâl Dê in his fort sent for his commandant and asked him what to do, saying: — "The emperor has been encamped here with his army for a long time." He answered: "Fight well." At last a battle took place and the King gained a victory and returned to Dehli.

[When Husain 11 Sardâ, King of the Turks, invaded Dehli and fought with Akbar, he (Husain Sardâ) fled, after writing these lines upon the gate: — "The empire of Dehli is great, I will never again invade Dehli. King Akbar is very powerful." 12]

8 Zain Khân Koksâhâ is meant, — for a full account of his life see Blochmann's Aín-i-Âkhârî, Vol. I. pp. 344-45; also History of India, by Elliot and Dowson, Vols. V and VI.

9 Râjâ Tarwâr Tîlôk Chand appears an impossible name. No Tîlôk Chand of Kângra is traceable, but possibly Tîlôkâ (Tîlôk Sāin?) the Kachhwâhâ is alluded to, but he was not governor of Kângra according to the Aín (Vol. I. p. 390).

10 For an account of Râjâ Bâsîl, Pathântâ, Zamindâr of Man and Pathântâ, see ante, Vol. I., p. 264.

11 Husain Sardâ probably Ibrâhîm Husain Mirzâ, one of the sons of Muhammad Sultan Mirzâ, a descendant of Tâmûr. This family, as claimants presumably to the throne of Tamerlane, gave much trouble in Akbar's time; see History of India (Elliot and Dowson), Vols. V and VI; also the Akber-nâma. The legend makes Husain (titular) King of Turkey, doubtless as a pretender to Tâmûr's dominions. Sardâ is inexplicable. Ibrâhîm Husain is repeatedly referred to in the Aín also.

12 [This seems to be an interpolation unconnected with the story—En.]
Akbar gave permission to all the Rajas to return home. When they had got mid-way, Nawab Jain Khan said to the King:—“Your Majesty has dismissed all the Rajas, though it is reported that the road to Kabul is not yet open.”

The King asked:—“Where were they when the twenty-two Rajas were here present?”

Jain Khan said:—“May it please your Majesty, even now your orders are but awaited.”

The King ordered him to recall all the Rajas, and they all returned. The King then put down a folded betel-leaf, called bir, and a naked sword, with the order that no one should come to pay his respects to him, until he had pledged himself, by taking up the betel-leaf, to go to Kabul. Eight days passed without anyone going to salute the King. Rajah Basu Pashani, Governor of Nurpur, then came and bowing to the King took up the betel-leaf. The King was greatly pleased at this and said:—“Rajah Basu, thou art a very brave man.”

Rajah Basu took a large force and set forth to invade Kabul. When they reached Bhairowal, a place on the Blas, that same backbiter Jain Khan, who was with him, plotted with some of his rascals by night, saying:—“We are under the orders of this Rajah. Let us kill him and take his place.”

Rajah Basu heard of this talk and said to himself:—“This is the villain who slandered me to the King. He must be punished somehow.”

Thus they fell out, and while the Rajah with his troops made for his home at Nurpur, Jain Khan set out for Dehli. On reaching Dehli the King asked him:—“How did you people go and why did you come back, and where is Rajah Basu?”

Jain Khan answered that he had had an altercation with the Rajah, who had gone off to his home. The King enquired about the affair from his officers and ascertained that it was due to Jain Khan’s baseness. So Jain Khan was imprisoned, and again a folded betel-leaf was put down in the same way, with the announcement that only he might come to salute the King who would attack Rajah Basu. Eight days elapsed without anyone coming forward to do so. Then the King remarked:—“Among so many is no one willing to go?”

Tash Beg was present and the King addressed him, saying:—“Mirza Tash Beg, thou wilt, I hope, attack Rajah Basu.”

The Mirza urged that he was old, but Mirza Jamil Beg, his son, was also present. He was really the King’s son by a slave girl who had been bestowed by the King on Mirza Tash Beg. He made obeisance and said:—“My Lord, my father is old, but if your Majesty be pleased to order me, I will cut off the Rajah’s head and bring it hung on to the end of my bow, to your Majesty’s feet.”

The King was extremely pleased and said:—“I am highly pleased with thee. Ask anything of me.”

12 Tash Beg Khan Moghal (Taj Khan) advanced against Rajah Basu of Man without waiting for the other contingents to come up, and his son, Jamil Beg, hastily attacked Basu, but fell with fifty of his men at Pashan (kot), Blochmann’s Asia, Vol. I, p. 457. It will be noticed that the legend is inclined to make Jamil Beg Akbar’s own son. The whole legend is based on a confused recollection of events in Akbar’s reign. Curiously enough Mannuci has a somewhat similar tale about Akbar’s siege of Chitaar, which he, however, connects with the well-known legend of Jaimal and Fathah: Storia de Mogor, I, p. 124.
He placed 30,000 men under his command and the Mirzâ marched with them to Kâlichenoor, near Gurdaspur, and having encamped there sent an envoy to Básî, challenging him to fight. The Râjâ said that he would fight in eight days, but this proposal was rejected by Jamîl Bèg who marched his forces and took possession of Gurdaspur and thence seized the fort of Patânkot. When the Râjâ came to know this, both sides commenced to fight. The young men of the Râjâ’s army fought hard, and some of Jamîl Bèg’s army fled, while the remainder became weary of the campaign. Thus the Râjâ was victorious and Mirzâ Jamîl Bèg fled.

Kabîl.

Ek same bâj hâth, boje nagrâ sâth.<br>Ek same shîsh pâsu boîsh hun jî saheû.<br>Ek same pândâ mitâd se anvâdûn hot.<br>Ek same andû ki mûth bhi nd bhaeûn.<br>
Ek same mangat ki dwârûdà par bhir hot,<br>Ek same par dwâr âp jînd lâhêû.<br>Hârîye na himmat; bisdrîye nd Har nâm.<br>Idhû bidh rdhûke Râm, idhû bidh ruhîye.<br>

Verse.

A time when the hawk sits on the hand to beat of drum.<br>A time when the feet bear the burden of the head.<br>A time when betel and sweets give indigestion.<br>A time when even a handful of grain is not obtained.<br>A time when a crowd is begging at one’s door.<br>A time when one sits at another’s gate.<br>Lose not thy courage: forget not the name of God.<br>Where God places (thee) there remain.


Râjâ Amar Singh was the owner of the fourth foot of the throne of Shân Jahân, King of Dehli, and was specially employed in guarding the King’s bed in the royal mansion. One Râjâ Chitrâsûl, Chief of Gîrûmdâsî in the Dakhan territory, was the owner of the second foot of the throne, and enjoyed the rank and salary of Rs. 24,000. He gave his daughter in marriage to Râjâ Amar Singh. Râjâ Amar Singh had started with his newly married Râni, but halted in a garden and had not yet reached his palace, when the emperor sent for him. Having sent the Râni to his palace, the Râjâ went to Dehli and took up his office. A period of twelve years elapsed, during which the Râjâ never thought of his home or palace. Then Râni Hâdû wrote a letter to Râjâ Amar Singh to say that “since our marriage we have not seen each other’s faces.” Tis â pity that my unworthy father married me to a man who cannot find leisure

\*\* Signs of royal dignity.
\*\* Signs of affluence.
\*\* For an account of Amar Singh, who is probably meant, see the Wâli-Shâh Jâhânî in Elliot’s History of India, Vol. VI. The legend has no transparent historical foundation.
\*\* These may be regarded as the grades of councillors and advisors to the throne.
\*\* In the courts of Indian kings the rank of grandees was to be regulated by the amount of their salaries! So says a commentator on the legend, but he is wrong. Commander of 24,000 men must be meant, though no such rank is mentioned in the Sîr.
from service." When the Râñâ’s letter reached the Râjâ he read it, and represented to the King that since his wedding day, twelve years before, he had never gone home and that he must go that day. The King ordered him to make up his accounts and receive his salary for the twelve years. The Râjâ said:—"I will settle the accounts on my return, as I must needs go to-day."

Sâlabat Khân Nawâb, who was present, suggested to the King:—"Your Majesty may grant the Râjâ leave, but ask him in how many days he will return."

Râjâ Amar Singh said he asked for seven days' leave, and Sâlabat Khân told him that if he failed to return within seven days he would be fined a lakh of rupees for each day's absence.

Having taken his leave Râjâ Amar Singh went to his home and entered his palace, but he forgot all about his leave and his office and fourteen days elapsed instead of the promised seven. Sâlabat Khân informed the King that Râjâ Amar Singh had gone on leave of absence for seven days, whereas fourteen had now elapsed. The King said:—"Write a letter to Amar Singh and say: 'If he is obedient, he will return at once, otherwise we will have him arrested and brought back here.'"

According to the King's order the letter was written and sent to Râjâ Amar Singh. It reached him at dead of night, when he was resting in his private apartments, and he and his wife were conversing together. No sooner had the Râjâ read the letter than he prepared to start for Dehli. When the Râjâ was about to mount his horse, the Râñâ took hold of the reins saying:—"Tis no time to attend court at midnight. Amar Singh, drink a cup of wine and do not be anxious. Don't worry about the seven lakhs, I will give you nine. I will sell my ear-rings and necklace worth nine lakhs. If I write to my father he will send us many lakhs more."

The Râjâ would not listen to any of her suggestions, but taking off his ring threw it down and then asked the Râñâ to pick it up; then, as she knelt down to do so, the Râjâ shook up his horse and rode away. When he reached Dehli and went to the imperial court, Sâlabat Khân, who was seated there, said to him:—"Thou Lout (Gaâvâ), go no farther, but first pay your fine and then seek admittance."

Kebhî,

Un mukh se 'gagdâ' kañâ, un kañâ biñâmâr.
Yeh 'rarrâ' kañâ na pûyî, jo jumâhîr utât pûr.
Ankar Sâlawat ne sor se janât bâl; bôlalt ne mîtâ; bin bôlalt hadâ râkhâ.
Pakar jumâhîr ghusal-khâmâ par dîna jhâr: pîle hain bâhîl, rañg vnte sob sakhî.
Mâni kûnî par hêjho nâtîh, Amar Singh châûdî ke bâjûs dâm dêmê lagiñ loh ke.
Lohni hî kûhî par bûrát hain Amar Singh; de eh gñâdâ dîna vagne vîdpâh, jî.
Na dînal ki panâh, na ditâdî ki panâh; eke nimak ki pândh se bâchî bai Dehli Pâtishâhpî.
Dehli Pâtishâhpî ke charan bhage, chailâ ko ghnâi Amar Singh jân ki bôt bûhî bûhî bôr kî.
Khât Manî Râm, woh to tharâk thorâk lot loîhân seâ pHî ki.
Hindân ki hâd sad bânîh gorî Amar Singh karse; sardheîn ki sardheîn jumâhîr ki hî!
Pôñ soñ lohe ki bojîr se hêld dînt badshâhî; hôtî shâmîher rung Hôrt ki kôtâdât.
Amîr umdô sab bûîhı rhâhe, eh ko na jûnë dat; sâhî ko gerâdât,
Dûkât Sadâshubhî hî! Mahârâjî bîsâdî kante, nimak ki na hais, sêr gûdî ko shukâdât.
Verse.

This said *gagā*,\(^{19}\) that drew his dagger.

This had begun to say *rrārā*,\(^{20}\) when the dagger was out.

Salābat showed a stern face: his speech was not sweet; without speech his mien was harsh.

Seizing his dagger (Amar Singh) smote him in the bathing place: (he) whose hands were fair were red with blood.

Amar Singh went not back on his exploit, instead of paying silver\(^{21}\) he began to pay the price in iron (sword).

Leaping the mire of blood, Amar Singh gave a wound each to all the soldiers, sir.

It was not the protection of the shield, nor the protection of walls; it was only the protection of loyalty\(^{22}\) that saved the King of Dehlī.

The King of Dehlī fled while the brave Amar Singh’s sword triumphed over life.

(Saith Manū Rām\(^{23}\)), corpse was jammed and hidden under corpse.

The rank and dignity of the Hindus were upheld by Amar Singh: praise upon praise to his dagger!

With a dagger of a quarter *sēr*,\(^{24}\) of iron he shook the kingdom: had there been a sword it would have been like a Holi play.\(^{25}\)

Of all the nobles sitting there he would not have let one go: he would have slain all.

Protection of the Eternal Siva! The Mahārājā\(^{26}\) paused, lest he should fall in his loyalty, or the whole fort would have been slain.

When Salābat Khān called Amar Singh a lout and demanded payment of the fine, the Rājā was roused to anger, because he was the son of a Rājput, and he thought: — "If to-day this man calls me a lout in open court, to-morrow he will abuse me." Taking a dagger from his waist he slew Salābat Khān and twelve other youths who were present in the imperial court. The King was afraid and applauded the Rājā, who replied: — "I have eaten your salt, else I would have killed your Majesty also."

The King went to his palace and ordered his troops to surround the Rājā, promising to bestow the rank of commander of 24,000 on anyone who should capture Amar Singh, and bring him alive to the King; and the rank of commander of 12,000 if he were brought in dead. One, Arjan Gaur, sister’s son to the Rājā, was employed as an officer at the porch of the royal palace. He represented to the King that he could only bring in Rājā Amar Singh, if he killed him first. The King said: — "If you bring him in dead I will give you the rank of commander of 12,000, and if alive of 24,000."

---

\(^{19}\) *Gahādr*, meaning a term of reproach. *Gagā*, the letter *g*, the first letter of *gahādr*.

\(^{20}\) *Rrrārā*, the letter *r*, the last letter of *gahādr*.

\(^{21}\) By way of blood-money.

\(^{22}\) Lit., salt: the meaning is that it was Amar Singh’s loyalty to his sovereign that saved the King.

\(^{23}\) The writer of the verses.

\(^{24}\) That is, with a dagger containing about half a pound of iron.

\(^{25}\) Flashing sword play is frequently used at the Holi and other festivals.

\(^{26}\) That is, Amar Singh.
So Arjan Gaur set out to capture Amar Singh and said: — "My dear uncle, all the doors are shut, but I will make a hole for you by which you can escape."

Amar Singh said: — "Your line is notorious for treachery. You are my sister's son, leave my presence and send some one else to me."

Arjan Gaur said: — "Uncle, surely Mother Ganges is between you and me. I would not deal treacherously with you."

The Raja said: — "Go you from my presence! You will assuredly act treacherously."

Arjan Gaur again said: — "Uncle, Almighty God is surely between you and me if I deceive you."

When he had thus taken God's name, the Raja went with him, and Arjan made a hole, and told him to go out by it. When the Raja had thrust both his hands into the hole, and nearly half his body had passed through it, Arjan smote him in the back with his sword and cut him in two. But a little life still remained to him, sitting in the hole, he held himself together, and uttered the following words: — "Thou hast proved treacherous according to the tradition of thy family. Well, take this dagger of mine."

When Arjan had spread out his skirt, the Raja threw his dagger so that it cut his forehead and nose. The Raja soon expired and Arjan then cut off his head and took it to the King, who asked how he had obtained it. Arjan related the whole story and described what had passed between him and the Raja. The King said to him: — "Since thou hast treacherously slain so brave a youth, get thee from my presence."

And he bade his wazir to banish him, after blackening his face. Thus was he driven away, and Ram Singh, Raja Amar Singh's nephew, took charge of his body and carried it to Amargahr.

3. A Legend of Aurangzeb, King of Dehli.

There was a King of Dehli, named Shah Jahân, who had four sons, namely, the Crown Prince Dara Shikoh, the ihotâh28 Murad, Sultan Shuja, and Aurangzeb. Shah Jahân had two ministers, one of whom was Ali Mardan Khan by name, the other Nawab Wazir Khan, who built the mosque in Lahore.

One day, when a royal darbâr was being held, the King asked: — "Which of the four princes is fit for the royal throne?"

In accordance with the King's orders Nawab Wazir Khan visited each of the four princes to prove him. First he went to the Crown Prince Dara Shikoh, who received him with respect, bade him be seated, and gave him a reward of Rs. 15,000 with a horse. The Wazir took the reward, thinking to himself that the prince was totally unfit, since he first seated him with all honour and then gave him a reward. Should an enemy happen to invade the kingdom, he might give him his daughter. In the same way he went to the second prince, who also gave him a reward; and to the third who acted in the same way. But, when the Wazir went to Aurangzeb Shah, he found a sentinel standing at his gate, who stopped him, saying that it was a royal darbâr, which no one could enter without the King's order. The Wazir asked to

27 That is, I assure you in the name of Mother Ganges that I will not deal treacherously with you.
28 A curious instance of a purely Hindu title applied to a Mughal prince. For the term itself, see ante, Vol. XXXIV, p 273.
be announced to the King, and the sentry went and did so. The prince bade him tell the Wazir to come to him only on the day of Shâh Jahân's death, or when an enemy invaded the kingdom, as it did no good to come aimlessly in the way. Thence the Wazir returned to Shâh Jahân and reported the unfitness of the three elder princes, saying that Aurangzêb would succeed to the throne of Dehli, put to death the other three princes, and his Majesty, as well as both his ministers.

The King then sent for the superintendent of the elephant-shed and bade him bring a mad elephant. Every Friday all four princes used to attend the royal court to pay their respects to the King, who gave order to the elephant-keeper that, when the four princes came, three of them should be told to turn back, but that the mad elephant should be let loose on Aurangzêb to kill him. When prince Aurangzêb came, the elephant-keeper, in accordance with the King's order, let loose the elephant.

As Aurangzêb was facing the elephant, his mother looked out of a window in her palace and uttered a

Kabît.

Kāche ghāya mēn bīldī ke chetaṇa dhatwaṣṭ; kumhar ne dūd châṣhīt.
Châhuṣ or te mukh mûndh dīo; bahutero kîo kuchh râh na pât.
Jab fîr surni mahrând ne, Prîbhû, ap ne koṭi leno bachît.
Mērâ bine bane na bane bâne, Brijnâth, tîkîrî bândît.

Verse.

The kittens were placed in an unbaked pot; and the potter put it on his kiln.
He shut it down on the four sides; however much they tried they could find no way out.
Lord, when thou hearest the cries of the elephants, thou didst hear and protect (my son).
I can make nothing but thou canst make everything, Lord.\(^{29}\)

Kabît.

'An lâre gojôt', mahâbalti Sâhib Shâhjahân sarmâdîo.
Ab tēr saanjār Qalîsâdâ;\(^{30}\) ki tēr; ab tēr saanjâr saroṣar dhatîo.
Sâng saânâdî dīye, sar meṅ gîrî goj, Aurang Shâh gîrdîo.
Rohar ki â lîl chhûṣî, nāsî jaisi ân phûnt; dek dek jo gunê ne, 'jaï, jaï' kar gîdo.

Verse.

Said the great lord Shâh Jahân, 'let the elephant come to the fight.'
Now he has broken his chain on the banks of the Jamnâ; now he has broken his chain and rushed forward headlong.

Poising his spear, it fell a yard into his head and Aurang Shâh felled him.

A stream of blood gushed out, as a stream it burst forth; when the crowd saw it, they cried 'victory, victory.'

So by the grace of God, Aurangzêb killed the mad elephant, and the three princes also and the King, and placed himself on the throne.

\(^{29}\) Allusion here to two well-known Hindu tales of the pot-full of kittens saved from the kiln 'by the grace of God,' and of Visknu saving the life of an elephant from a crocodile.

\(^{30}\) The Jamnâ.
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A little further & low in the valley is a cave where 8 of ye Apostles hid themselves when o Savio' was led from Gethseman.\(^{10}\) Over ye doore of ye Cave is 8 rases cut in ye natural rock in memory of ye place; other marks wein ye Cave are through tyme warne out. Hallowedinge the valley, we caime to that of Jehoshaphat, wh is but narrow, yet reacheth to ye Dead Sea, wh is about 20 Eng. miles from Jerusalem. Att this place, by a small building & part of an Oly ruin howse, is a deep well [the well of Nehemiah] wherein the Jews, when they were carried into Babylon Captives, hid the holly yer & at theire returne found it there in an Oly substance, wh by them beinge sped on the wood ypnon the Alter, yer from heaven [cane] & Consumed the wood.\(^{11}\) The water in that well, near 30 yards below the Top, doth Overflow once in two yeares,\(^{12}\) thereby containing great plenty. Frater Thomas, in 10 yeares wh he had lived in Jerusalem, hath knowne it Overflow 4 times, & ye effects seene as aforesaid. Near this place was the tree, & an other grows there, wherea Isaiah [Isaiah] fed to from Manasses, wh tree opened to receive him from the pursers & closed againe, but the pursers seing where he went sawed him wh the Tree in two.\(^{13}\)

Siloa [Siloam] is hard by, where the man borne blind wash'd & was restored to his sight. Thire I wash't. Neare this is ye hill [on which] Solomon build a temple to ye Idol Molock\(^{14}\) & by ye is the fontaine Modon [Madonna].\(^{15}\) A little above ye is the place where Judas hanged himselfe [Aceldama] And a little further is many Selpuckers of the Jews. Thire the Sepulcher of Zacharias cut out of a great rock & stands now as in the time when first finished, a verie large place of One intire stone sepated from ye rock 10 yd. & is as bigg as many Chappells in England. A stones cast from it is the Sepulchre of Absolon cut out of the rock in his life tyme, & stands vndefaced as in o Savio's tyme. Neare this is the tomb of Jehosaphat in a vall.\(^{16}\) A vall neare this in ye rock, in wh St James Junior [the Less] hid himselfe. A little about these is ye head of Brooke Kydon, now noe water runs there, by wh head they show in a stone the print of o Savio's foot in a rock, & thiere touch there heads & Crosses & Kisse it and pay Devotions. Where Gethseman was is now a wild wood, near wh is ye place, where o Savior left 8 Apostles when he went to pray in ye Garden; against this was ye Golden gate. Neare this they show ye place y Virgin Mary prayd for St Stephen. And the place where y Virgin Mary let fall her girdle to St Thomas.\(^{17}\) A little further is ye grot [grotto] in wh o Savio's swett drops of blood & in ye grot we all p' of devotions.

---

\(^{10}\) See Maundrell, A Journey from Aleppo to Jerusalem, p. 137.

\(^{11}\) See Maundrell, A Journey from Aleppo to Jerusalem, p. 137, and Pococke, Travels in the East, p. 424, for variants of this legend.

\(^{12}\) "They told me that sometimes it overflowed." Pococke, Travels in the East, p. 424.

\(^{13}\) Compare Maundrell, A Journey from Aleppo to Jerusalem, p. 137, "a little higher in the valley, on the left hand, you come to a tree supposed to mark out the place where the evangelical prophet was sown another." Pococke says the tree was a white mulberry, Travels in the East, p. 423.

\(^{14}\) i.e., the Mountain of Offence. See Pococke, Travels in the East, p. 424.

\(^{15}\) i.e., the Fontaine of the Blessed Virgin. See Maundrell, A Journey from Aleppo to Jerusalem, p. 137.

\(^{16}\) All these places are described by Maundrell.

\(^{17}\) Compare Maundrell, A Journey from Aleppo to Jerusalem, p. 141, "Near the bottom of the hill is a great stone, upon which you are told, the Blessed Virgin let fall her girdle after her assumption, in order to convince St Thomas, who, they say, was troubled with a fit of his old incredulity upon this occasion."

Maundrell remarks, A Journey from Aleppo to Jerusalem, p. 153, "Almost all passages and histories related in the Gospel are represented by them that undertake to show where everything was done, as having been done most of them in grottos."
In a Chappell vnder ground into we descend by 49 large flagg stone steps, & seer[all] nations have their Chappells in it, & men are Constantly in it to keepe the lps [lamps] Continually burninge, we are many according to Chappells, saints & holly places in it. There theye Sepulchre of y Virgin Mary & Joseph, St Anna & S Joakim. Above this is the place wherey St Stephen was stoned to death without ye City.19 The gate in ye City wall cally the gate of St Stephen.19 The Pool of Bethesda without ye City wall, or rather a hollow whereor was ye pool, but now dry.20 The house of Anna within the City, who was Mother to ye Virgin Mary, who was borne their.19 The house of Symon the Pharisee. The dolorous way,18 soe calld by reason of Saviors was led that way to be Cruiseyed, the lenth about 800 paces. The Pallas of Pylat.19 The place where St Saviors was scorged & Crowned with thorns.19 The arch on without Pylat stood when he said behold ye Man.10 The place where ye Saviors let fall his crosse & Symon compeld to carry it.21 The pallas of Kinge Herrod.21 The house of ye rich gluton, the house of Lazarous ye poore man against it. The house of St Auronics [Veronica] whereof Saviors had ye blood wiped from his face.21 The gate of Justice leading to mount Calverye.21 The preson of S Peeter.21 The beautifull gate of the Temple.21

2d days process. 10 July 1669. Wee went out at Damascus gate beinge the 10 day July 1669 and see first the great of Jeremiah, in weh he composed his lamentations.21 A little further we Crete into a grotto, in weh we see in severall rooms or valls 7 or 8 [of] the Sepulchres of 42 Kings since Solomons tyne. At ye entrance of ye first is a round stone like a Milstone but thicker, by art turns to stop ye entrance. There are severall doores all stone hewne out of the rock & Turne on their natural hinges to admiration, lett into ye rock abowe and below at ye mouth of the tombs, see artistically neither I nor anie weh have scene them before understand how they are made to move. A piece of One I brought away wth me. We returned by ye gate of Herrod, weh is a little One.

3d day. Being 11th July 1669. Wei went out at ye gate of Bethlehem. On the left hand is Mount Sion, where of Savior instituted the holy Sacrament. Their ye hollygest descended at Pentecost. Their ye Sepulchres of David & Solomon, [on] weh place now the Turks have built a Moske.21

On ye west side of ye hill is the burying place for xpians, and many Tombs.22 The xpians therre, especially Greeks & armiyens goe to ye graves of therre dead relations & in Company, 7 or 8 or more. Some tymes I have scene 80 in a Company Kissinge the grave & howlinge; This not for one day but many days. And therre is One weh generallly begins ye cryinge note, or leade ye muryng tone & ye rest follow. The crie is to this purpose, wouldst then die ye had wife, Children & lands, & did this & thother good deede. On this mount is ye Pallas of Caiaphas & ye place where Peeter warmd himselfe & the Cock Crew.24 We entered back by the gate of Mount Sion & vewed the Palace of Anna [Annaa]. The armien Church in a little grote of weh is ye boddy of St James major [the Apostle] interred, whose head was cut of.24 We said Mass & observed therre Music with simbals & brass beaten thin put on a long staffe, wth moneing wth they make musique. They have Images in therre Churches but give noe adoration to them. The house of ye S. Thomas neare it, now a Morgue [mosque]. The house of ye S. Mark, now ye Church of ye Sirrians. The Iron gate at weh ends the Old City.24 The house of Zebbee.24

4th day. The 12 July 1669. We went out at ye gate of St Stephen to Bethlehem. In ye way stood ye figg tree or Savior Cursead. The house of y Symon ye Learer. The sepulchre of Lazarus neare his Castle, the ruins of weh stand to this day.24 Halfe a mile further is the house of Mary

19 All these places are mentioned by Maundrell.
20 Cf. Maundrell, A Journey from Aleppo to Jerusalem, p. 145, 'It (the Pool of Bethesda) is 120 paces long, and 40 broad, and 'at least 6 deep, but void of water.'
21 All these places were seen by Maundrell and Pococke.
22 Maundrell, A Journey from Aleppo to Jerusalem, pp. 102-104, has a long description of the sepulchres of the kings.
23 These places are mentioned by Pococke.
24 Lazarus, the brother of Martha-and Mary.
25 All these are mentioned by Maundrell.
Magdalen, neare wch is a stone in the ground in the forme of a Dolphin, wch cr Savior sat on when they told him Lazaras was deceas. The house of Martha neare it.

From thence we went vp to Mount Calverey, from wch Mount we see princtly ye Dead sea & river of Jordan. Thence we went to Bethage [Bethphage] wheer cr Savior sent for the Asse. Theirs a Church, & in it they show ye print of cr Savior foot he left when he ascended. Great devotions we pay there. Neere this, a bow shot of, is the place cr Savior made ye Lds prayer, & the place cr Savior wept over Jerusalem. A great heapne out of a rock wth a Church & 12 Arches, in wth ye Apostles made ye Creede. By this in [?] is a rock, in wch is the Tomb of 47 Prophets.

We returned by the gate Sturkele, neare wch is the house of St John, ye Evangelist now a Convent. The City we Compassed; they say its 3 Eng land miles round, but I judge them not above two. The wall was built about 100 yeares since by a Genoa Runagado, and hath 7 gates. 1. The golden gate was wald up. 2. The gate Sturkele. 3. Mount Sion gate. 4. Bethlehem gate. 5. Damaskus gate. 6. Herrodes gate. 7. St Stephens gate.

5th day. We entered the Temple, being ye 13 day July 1669, every Pem Payinge 17s Lyu Dollers. 1st place we see is on Mount Calverey, on wth Abram offereth his son Issac, but this is wthout ye temple gate & a Chappell to it. 2. The stone of vocation, where they annoyncted cr Savior when taken from the Crosse. On this stone is spent abundance Kisse & prayers and much Merchandize balledow, as Lynnken webbs, beads & many other things, & all reliques. 20 Lamps burne over it, & are very large & rich, being all of Silver, & some set wth rubies & other Jewells. 3. The holly Sepulchre, in wth burne Continually 42 great Lamps, all Silver, & set wth Jems & very ligge. 4. The stone, Noli me tangere for cr Savior had not then ascended. 5. The Chappell of the Apperition. 6. The Alter of Scorgeinge. 7. The Alter of the holly Crosse. 8. The preson where cr Savior was putt. 9. The Chappell where they devided cr Savior garment. 10. The Chippell of St Hellen where ye 3 Crosses were found. 11. The Chappell of ye intencion of the holly Crosse. 12. The assent to Mount Calverey. 13. The Chamber where Christ was naeld to ye Crosse. 14. The place where he was Crucified. 15. The rent in the rock impossible to be don by art. 16. The Navell of ye world. 17. The Stone where the Angell sat. 18. The Chappell of ye Lattins. 19. The quire of the Church. 20. The Sepulchre of ye Kings Died in ye Holly band. 21. The Chappell of ye Abissians [Abyssinians]. 22. The Chappell of ye Armynions. 23. The Chap: of ye Grecques. 24. The Chap: of ye Copies [Cop[a]]. 25. The Chap: of ye Jacobites. 26. The Chap: of ye Gregorians. 27. The Cha: of ye Nestorians. 28. The Chappell of ye Marrionites [Maronites]. 29. The Sepulchre of Joseph of Aremscha & Nocodemus. 30. The Rock where they say ye head of Adam was found; they show ye heade.

July the 14th 1669. 1. We went out at Bethlem gate for Bethlem, formerly called the gate of Hebron. On ye left hand is the village where the Jewes tooke Counsell against cr Savior. 2. In the way is ye place where the Turgentine tree grew. 3. The Cisterne of the

26 All mentioned by Manndrell.
27 Manndrell gives the dimensions as 24 miles. A Journey from Aleppo to Jerusalem, p. 146.
29 Manndrell says, "Ne se enter in but such as have first paid their appointed caphar . . . . . . . . . . . For Franks it is ordinary 14 dollars per head." A Journey from Aleppo to Jerusalem, p. 99.
30 These and the following places are mentioned by Manndrell and Pococke.
31 "in the road (from Jerusalem to Bethleem) you meet . . . . the famous turpentine tree, in the shade of which the Blessed Virgin is said to have reposed, when she was carrying Christ in her arms, to present him to the Lord at Jerusalem. Manndrell, A Journey from Aleppo to Jerusalem, p. 116 f."
Magy. The place where ye Prophet Habakkuk was taken vp by the haurc of the heade & Carried to Babblion. 5. The Convent of the Grecians where ye Prophet Elias dwelt; near it is a stone where they say he lay, & theirs seemingly a print of a Boddy in ye stone. 6. The howse where Jacob Lodged when he caime from Mesopotamia to Hebron. 7. We came to Rama Ephrathi where is ye ruins of ye sepulchre of Rachel. 8. Bethlehem, a mile from it, is severall systems belonging to K. David, in his tyne were kept lockt, now open, but the springs that fed them most stopt. 9. Att Bethlehem is A monastrey of ye franciscans, & by it is a Large Church built by Q. Hellen, & afterwards by S. Paula Romana, in wch are 44 large Marble pillars in the boddy of ye Church, such as are rarely now in anie other place to be seen for leuth & bignesse. We were shonwe tymber at Joppa, wth they spped to repayre the roff of it; pitty its it should lie as it now does. 10. Att ye upp [upper] end of this church is (downe 6 steps) ye place where stood ye Manger, & ye Virgen Mary was delivered of ye Saviour. 12. On the right side of ye place ye virgen was delivered in, is a great Marble Stone in wch Marble they show, & its lik ye picture I genly see drawn for S. Jerom in the naturall stone Naturally theire. 13. Next is the Chappell of ye virgin Marter S. Katherine, whose heads & Chappell the[y] haue shonwe me in Spaine & in the Duk [unkedom] of Tuskany. 14. The Alter of Joseph. 15. The Sepulchres of the Innocents. 16. The Sepulchre of S. Eusebius, all in the same grotte, & round wth we went in prestion [procession] wth Kandells in ye hands, singing according to ye bokes then in ye hands, & kneeling see often ye pesterant [protestant] knees were not a litte weary. 17. The place where S. Jerom Translated ye bible out of hebrew into latinn, & S. Jeroms Sepulchre. 18. The Sepulchre of S. Paula & Euchia his daughter. 19. Going out of the Church on the left hand is the scholes of S. Jerom. 20. A bow shot south from this Church, is ye grotte ye virgen Mary fled to wth ye Saviour for fear of Herrod and as she past into the Grotte, wth is in a rock, some of his Milk spurted agst ye side of ye grotte, wth, by its virtue, hath Chained them into Milkey earth, wth they make into Cakes & sell to pilgrims for ye virgins Milk, & being pulverated, they give to Cattle or nurses wth want Milk, & it increaseth their Milk, or if lost, recovers it.

15th day July. We went to the fountaines of Sollomons, full the sealed fountaines, 3 Miles from Bethem west, & by them are 3 large fish ponds of grt depth, And below them are, in ye valley, ye Gardens of Sollomans. The seale fountaine we went downe into, ye spring some 10 yards lower then the surface of ye earth & a large vall in wth is a great Cisterne, from whence by aquaducts its carried throw dailes & over rock to Jerusalem, being about 8 english miles from it. 31 Nears these are ye village of the shepherds. Next to them the hause of Joseph. Next thing shonwe vs the place where the Angell appeared to the shepherds, now a ruined Church therein in memory first built. A place on a hill where S. Paula Dyed.

16 July 1689. We returned back to Jerusalem by ye Mountains of Judea; in ye way we rid over ye place where Senacharibbes army was incampt & ye Angell slew 1,000,000 in a night; ye place is very little, & in reson unlikly to containe halfe ye number; its about 5 Mile fro Jerusalem.

32 See Pococke, Travels in the East, p. 435, for all these places.
33 S. Paula Romana was abesse of the convent of Bethlehem in the fifteenth century.
34 The author is confusing Saint Catherine of Alexandria with Saint Catherine of Siena. The former, martyred in the fourth century, was said to have been transported to the monastery founded by St. Helena on Mt. Sinai; the latter was buried in Spain in the fourteenth century.
35 St. Eusebius, a bishop of the fourth century, was killed by an Arian woman with a stone, and was afterwards canonized.
36 St. Eustochia was superior of a monastrey at Bethlem, and was martyred in A.D. 419.
37 Maundrell gives this legend, and adds, A Journey from Aleppo to Jerusalem, p. 122, "the virtue ascribed to the chalk perhaps may be true enough, it being well-known how much fancy is wont to do in things of this nature."
38 See Maundrell, A Journey from Aleppo to Jerusalem, pp. 118—129, for a description of Solomon's Pools.
39 "An old devoted monastrey, built by St. Paula, and made the more memorable by her dying in it." Maundrell, op. cit., p. 126.
Distant from this is a village now, & many years agoe, is & was inhabited by Christians, & the Turks have attempted to live among them, but die all in very short time after their coming among them; Soe now they let ye xpans live quiet there. Neare this is ye place ye marble pillers at Bethlehem were hewn out. A mile from this is ye place ye bunches of grapes were taken from by Caleb & Joshua, unluckily now to ye eie to beare anis such. A mile further is ye fountaine where Phillip Baptized the Eunuke. By this is St. Phillips village.

3 mile further is the Desart of St John Baptist. In ye edge of a rocke is his house, & hewn out of ye rock, & the bed wherein he lay cut out of ye stone, wth the Padrey shows be his real bed. 3 Miles further is the house where Elizabeth dwell & the fountaine wth we dyed. Neare it are stones cast the house where St. John Baptist was borne.

Next that a mile on ye rocks is the Sepulchres of ye Maccabees. Some few miles from that, & about one mile from Jerusalem, is a Convent of Greeks called ye Convent of the holly Crosses. The tree on wch ye Cross was made or Savier suffered on being cut thence. Over wch place was built by Queen Hellen a faire Church, in ye upper end of wch they, the Greeks wth now hold it, tho ye xpans of xpiamdom did formerly, show the hole out of wch it was dugged, & paite not vs to geve near it wth or shows On, they esteem ye ground soe holly. We refreshd or seats there wth good water & one hower stays, being almost spent wth riding in the heats. Betwixt this & Jerusalem is Mount Gibeon, on wch Solloman was crowned Kings, alsoe is a faire fish pools calld Sollomons. We entred ye City at ye gate Bethlehem, & as at every Mile & some tymes less, we p foot & ½ a doller & 3 dollars a man for Copher headmony, Gards & usance. Soe now, coming from Bethlehem, they at ye gate took 3 a p foot as usance Money.

17 day July 69. The Ceremones of the Convent, where all this while we were and dranke & lodged, for, the abroad, o" prayers attended vs from that Convent (save at Nazareth & Bethlehem where ye 2 Convents belong to them), being performed, & Leaues or Gratuity of 30 Dollers a man, we Mounted for Rama. Little of note in ye way, save ye houes of Jeremiah & the good thiefs, near wch we lay in the wide rocks, & had Jacobo pilloe & noo see much plain ground as to lie at length in. Att Ramah we got by sun rise ye 18, at wch place the villanous druggerman of Joppa lives, a took 28 Dollers a head to Gide vs 50 Mile & sent Only one footman. The Druggerman [Dragoman's] name is called Abram [Ibrahim], a grand Robe, for he is for this money to give vs a Meals of good treat at going & ye same at ye returne & send wth ye good gard of Jennesarys & Mount vs well, none wth we had.

18 July. Arrivinge at Joppay, we hyred a boat for Mount Carmell but or landinge place was Capha, a mile beyond it. Soe we took horse & paid 2 doller a p foot for Copher & horses; ye Arrabs take it, being theire Command. Arrivinge at ye top of Mount Carmell, wch is 2 Mile from Capha, theire stands ye mine of an Old Convent, Above ye groote where Elias slept. Kept by 7 Padrey or franciscan friers who live in a small Convent under that ruind, wch is a bow Shott aboce. At the bottom of this hill, they showed vs a large Grote or Cause hewed out of ye naturall rock, where Elias preached, & wth in ye a place where ye Angell appeared to him, both now kept by 5 Indians, wth live there, Converted in India by the padre Guardian, & came out of it wth him, & spend all their tyne in Devotions. Two leages of, above on the Mount, they tell vs of Elias fountaine, & in ye way to ye, ye feild in wch are found ye Stone water Mellons. Telling vs this story, inst. Elias passing by ye Garden, desired of him a Mellon. The gardner said they were stones. Replied the yelet [prophet] Elias, stones lett them be, of wth I have One to show.

44 "We came to a village called Bochessallah; concerning which they relate this remarkable property, that no Turk can live in it above two years. By virtue of this report, whether true or false, the Christians keep the village to themselves without molestation." Maundrell, A Journey from Aleppo to Jerusalem, p. 123.
45 All these places were seen by Maundrell. Vol. XXXVI, p. 172; n. 100.
46 See Maundrell's explanation of Elizabeth's two dwelling-places. A Journey from Aleppo to Jerusalem, p. 125.
47 See note on Vol. XXXVI, p. 172; n. 100. 48 See Maundrell, A Journey from Aleppo to Jerusalem, p. 75.
49 See Thévenot, A Voyage into the Levant, for these and many of the other sites mentioned by Bell.
19 July 1669. We departed from Mount Carmel for St. John de Acre, where we landed by 10 Clock in the morning: ye bay is 8 leagues over. But I must not forget of hansom, tho' meane, treat at ye Convent on Mount Carmel: ye patriy, governor, being a pious & wise man, prayed for vs, & gave vs good advice, & with fish, eggs & fruite & clean linen, & box [of] dishes, spoones & forks, as neat as if in a princes Court. At night we put to sea for Sidon, but put back; ye 22th we attempted againe, & proceeded. In the way we viewed Tyre, with hath little to show, being broken to ye maine land, the formerly an Isle. Theirs a small Caine [khan] for Marchants; its 7 leagues from Sydon & 3 or 4 Leagues good ground & well Cultured; Olive trees & walnuts & small Towns in ye way.

We arrived at Sydon at 4 Clock in ye afternoon 23 day, & were respectfully treated by ye French Marchants there. In ye town is little of ace & salt ye bashaws Serail, we had ye privilege to see & drink a dish of coffee with him; 2 Castles it hath within in ye sea, with a bridge from them to ye town, Its forme[?] Circumference yet to be seen, with I judge 5 English miles, but now not One.

23 day July. Att 8 Clock at night, we unbarqued for Byrute, with is 8 leagues from Sydon & on ye sea coast. We arrived there before day of the 24th July 1669. The trade of it ye French hane Tottally, with is for silk & is ye finest turkey keys. The price Current, when wee were there, was 10 Lyon Dollers the Rottile, for since false to 9. Their Rottile makes 3 Engl. great pounds at 24 ounces to ye pound habberdepoys [avoidupois]. Its well stocked with variety of good fruite, And hath many Mulberry trees about it, with good plains about a mile broad & a mile longe, Its a small Towne but hath severall vessels belonginge to it. One, when I was there, on the stocks, judged would cost to put to sea 7000 Dollers. Its much ruined, as appears by large houses of fre stone with are not inhabited, & decays more & mor as ye March told me. Eight of the longest & biggest Pillers of blew stone all of a peace lie without the towne, & stand at some distance one from an other but not in anie order as when sett in the building the did belonge to, of with they only remaine to tell ye there formerly was at in or near the place they now lie & stand in,

About a mile from Barute they show the place wher S. George slew the dragon, and honor S. George as their Champion.

July, 25 1669. Wee unbarqued from Barute at assara[=aer], with is 4 Clock in ye afternoon, & arrived at Trippilo in Sirria next day, 25 July 1669, at One Clock in the afternoon. At Consul Waggoners [Wagner's] house, a Dutchman.

In the way, with is betwixt Byrute & Trippilo 10 Leagues, we se severall small townes on ye Mountains adjoyasing Mount Lebanon, with are inhabited by the greeks & better cultured then anie place of ye Turks seen by vs since we pitched from Jerusalem till we came there.

---

44 We were met by several of the French merchants from Sidon; they having a factory there, the most considerable of all theirs in the Levant." Maundrell, A Journey from Aleppo to Jerusalem, p. 59.
45 Compare Thévenot, A Voyage into the Levant, ed. 1637, Part II, p. 32, "The weights that are used in that Country (Aleppo) for gross commodities are the Bottile and the Oune. The Bottile weighs commonly 900 Drachmes, or 593 Pound weight of Marseilles. The Bottle of Persian Silk, contains 598 D. or five pound and a third of Marseilles weight, the Bottle of Aleppo is of 728 D., or 5 pound weight and a half of Marseilles."
46 At the east end of Barock are to be seen seven or eight beautiful pillars of granite, each foot long, and three in diameter." Maundrell, A Journey from Aleppo to Jerusalem, p. 56.
47 Maundrell, op. cit., p. 50.
48 Compare The Travels of Certain Englishmen into Foreign Countries, 1600—1611 (Collection of Voyages and Travels, p. 791). "The third time for publice prayer, every day, is at the tenth hour of the day, called by the Turks, Kindi, by the Moors, Assera, about three or four of the clock, afternoon."
Att Trippolo, Consull Peter Waggoner, a noble spiritted & Genrous psom, both for Company & his entertainm, weh I tasted of, staying there till the 27 day July, I found there be Suereall Engl Marchants of Alleppo, french & Dutch, Chased away by ye sickness theire. Mr. Blunt & Mr. Hemsworth, my fellow travellers into ye holy land, then pted with me. They for Mount Lebanon to a greke festivall & I for Scanderone. This feast the Greeks call ye feast of Expistion in Commemoration of or Savio Transfiguration.

In the Cittie of Trippolo are severall faire buildings. It stands a mile from the Sea, a place of good-trade for Loge silk, & the Bashawe hath a Doller for every Rottelo shipt out & sends his serv't to see it weighed before balleinge. Theirs 5 Castles or towres on the Marrone, wh is a mile from ye Citty. & On the Marrone is a large Caine for all marchants goods to be put in, or safely laid up.

27 July 1669. I imbarqued for Scanderone in a bote I hyred, all ye Marreners tarkes, & I all alone, Consull Peter Waggonee having sent aboard pritons & wyne for 3 tymes my voyage vnowne to me. It was 8 Clock at night when I imbarqued, & at 7 Clock in the mornnge on ye 29 day July I arrived at Scanderonee, hauing had a fresh gaile all ye way. Its betwixt these two places 45 Leagues. In the way is only one little towne for we saille terra terrae for fear of ye Malteeze; The land towars the sea very high & mountaneous, always hauing Clouds dwelling on them.

Thursday 29 July 1669. I went aboard Capt. Dyer Bates, who would not let me goe for Cyprusse as I had hyred the boat to dee, but Capt. Kerrington sent hir ththere to meete Capt. Midleton & Capt. Morris to hame ththere Company for Englad.

4th Aug' on ye Wed 1669. With Capt. Bates, Mr. Basal, Mr. Steele we tooke horse fro Scanderone for Alleppo at 6 Clock afternoone, Mr. Alexander Traveall, Mr. Pine, Mr. Hussey & 7 More set [out] for Alleppo the day before. We lay the first night at Byland, weh is 10 Engl miles from Scanderone & in ye way were much hinderd or stoppt by a great Caravan from Mecan [Mecca], weh weer from first to last a dayes jurney longe, in Cammelles, menes & horesmen. At Byland, by ye cold waters, we pitched, and had ye Music weh the Jackalls made who are thhere very many, & 20 Coupe of deepe-mouthed hounds in a fielde make not halfe the noyse. Thaire barque is like a Contrey Curr.

5 Aug' 1669. Thirsday, noone, we owrer tooke ye worship the Consull of Alleppo the psom [parson], Mr. Frampton & about 20 of the Alleppo Engl factory, who had been in the mountains during the heate of the Contage at Alleppo and were returning to Alleppo, pitched at a place Cold the Cold waters. They ingaged o' stay in ththere Tent, for o' owne being put on a varnely Mule run away with it & spoiled it.

6 Aug'. We pitched at ye brink of ye River Ephraim & at sun sett removed, And Caine by sun set on ye 7, for we lie still all the day & ride in the night, for ye theate is not to be indued to ride in in the day time.

7 Aug'. We pitched at A Church & ye ruins of a famous Monastery Cold St Symons.

8 Aug'. We arrived in Alleppo by Sann rising in the Mornings, but in ye way were assaulted by the Arrabs, who see we were to strong after ye fyring some pistolls & long Guns; [they] wer inavisable to vs but as we past ne[ar], thire stones heere & thire out of thire slings caine amongst vs. The Crack they gauve told vs they wer not far of, but thay were in ye rocks: see safe we

---

81 See note on p. 161, n. 47. 82 See Thévenot, Voyages to the Levant, ed. 1597, p. 221. 83 See Vol. XXXVI, p. 174, n. 71. 84 i.e., De Lannoy, see Vol. XXXVI, p. 181, n. 60. 85 See Vol. XXXVI, p. 184, n. 61. 86 "The Monastery of St. Simeon the Styliche with the remainder of his so famous Pillar, which is still to be seen." Tavernier, Travels, ed. 1684, Vol. 1, Book II, p. 56.
could not find them. In Aleppo, Tho invited by the Consull to accept his houose, yet I did excuse myself & made bold with Mr. Jno. Shepherd, a merchand there, whose entertainments for five weeks during o' stay was bountefull, & he thought not his owne houose entertainments enough, but betwixt Meales, morn & night, treated vs, either in gardens or some other place, with rarities of drink & meat & other Noveltie of pleasure.

Allep is esteemed One of the best & fynest built Citty in ye Turkish Empire. Its a place of great trade, Many Caravans comeinge to it with Druggs, Calls, talladoes, Goats Wool, But silke ye Chiefe. In ye Bazars or Shoppes, are in streets intire, & all trademans together, are more variety of Commodities then in anie other Citty in ye Empire. The Bashaw was at my being there in Candia, & ye subbashawa Gouern. The streets are full of Doggs, with ye people have great Charritie for, & give money for them, as we to o' poore. The great number of these doggs make there Citty stinke, for when anie die, they never bury them, but one eats an other, & in every place his Carrasses, with are Noyson. It stands in as good an Aire as anie Citty in the universse, not a Clude [cloud] to be seen six Months in ye yeare near it. Its well served with fresh water, fruits of all sorts very good, with Beefe, but especiallly Mutton. For goodness I never Tasted anie in my life Soe palatable & fatt. The sheepe follow ye shepherds in those pis as a dog his M'. in England, & hauie tales to ye houghs that weigh 20, 15, some 25th weight, all fatt. What is more then can be eaten they make Candles of, with are ye best of Tallow in the world. There Wyne is also very good, This Citty is 50 Engl Miles from anie part of the Sea.

The factories recreation is Coursing at ye Season with Grayhounds, & they begin ye 15 September, & soe hauie hunting till March following. There Chiefe officer in ye fields is call ye Coppe of ye Hunt. He hath 2 assistants & severall other officers. They hauie genly 10 brace of grayhounds in ye feld at once And seldom lesse English in the field then 50 English. Many turks at Certain tymes attend their sports, some French and Dutch. Their Course is often after the passe [hare] 3, 4, & 5 Engl miles with a brace or lesse [leash] grayhounds after his, & she often out runs them all. The Coppe fynes all ye observe not order in ye feld. Some tymes they hunt ye wild boare, of with they hauie many & furious many of their horses show. I need not commend their horses, for genly faine spaires me ye Charactere. Their grayhounds are like or Mongrell Grayhounds in England, Coras shapt, and their feete more longe & large & will endure besides being rapid & swifter, a larger Core.


---

87 See Vol. XXXVI, p. 134, for John Campbell's complaint of his treatment by De Lannoy.
90 Fat-tailed sheep, dummis.
Mr. Alexander Travell, Mr. Arther Pyn, Mr. Rosse Wood, Mr. P. Rockesley, Mr.
Lee, Mr. Gravesmer, Mr. Kinges, Mr. Wm. Shraunton, factor Marreeen.
These 8 persons Died at the tyme of my beinge there, 2 of ye sickness, 6 of the Scanderroome
sickness.

In discourse with Mr. Shepherd, ye King of ye Arrabbs haizng then given him a visit, told
me its thaire Custome to say, when anie euell thought comes in thaire heade (as to take life or
estate), they say, stollblos [saq/qfrul‘lah], whi is in Eng, God forbid I doe it; yet none more redy.
And in discourse concerning the Devell, they Dend their honoring him, and when reproved, Ask
ye what he was. Ye say, a great Angell in ye Cort of heaven, & for his disobedience cast out.
Why, say they, then should we not feare him. He is but a courrier out of faore & may be receed
in againe, soe its good to keepe frends. The Arrabbs whan an. call ye wild, defend thaire robbing
as inst, & declare themselves the offspring of Essan. And Jacob, haweing got all the good blessings,
Easaw, say they, caine, & his father had not ought to give him, soe bid him goe a broad & Catch
what he could. Soe they at this day doe. And when they rise in ye morning, they tum to ye Sun
riseng and pray that some good thing may come thaire way, Carrauan, or passangers, or other bootey,
whi they take as if god had sent it them; for, say they, its not reasen thou shoule have soe much &
I see little, & live to this day by rapine.

At 12 Clock at noone, whi the Turks call Assarab [sara'ul'shabar, 63 noon]. They, on thaire
steeples whi haue turrets, but no belly [belfry], crie with great noys, some tymes 6, 6, 7, or more, for
then all must pray where ever they are. The men in ye great Moosk steeple crie in the Turks lingua,
glory to ye great god & prases to their great stdt, whi is ye light of god else would sit in Darkness & words to this purpose. They haue songs at eight or 12 Clock at night. And at
4 Clock in ye morning, some times an hower, some tymes two or more together, Some tymes for
safely of some from Mecc a, there stdt tomb; some tymes they sing, or howle rather, for some sick
or deceased, & will doe both very lively. They haue poons they hier whi does it, & soe they are many
or few at one place or 2 or 3 for lesser or shorter space.

The Turks thinke they offend not when they cheate or breake faith whi the franks, for the
ou[n] trew beleivers thother Doggs. And if money be in the way they care not to keep peace whi
Kings. They say anie wind will blow away that paper thats not fastned with barg of Money on it.

Min[st]er xpians [s. e., christian ministers] ought to be of Courage for otherwise they get noe
esteemne. A xpian embassadordr, [was] affronted by a basshaw appoynted to dispatch him, [who]
demanded a great some & would not dispatch him. Soe ye xpians became troublesome, often
thrusting himself befor ye Basshaw when he would [have] had him els wheer. On whi ye Basshaw
said, did he not see or feare his attendants, who commanded his life at a word. Sd ye xpians, does
not thon feare to tell me soe, when thy life in ye word is in my hand, pantes a daggar at his brest.
He, seeing ye currage, Commended it, and Granted his dispatch.

In the Galle Caine [? Ghall Khan, Corn-market] The Cammells hards whi come thether with
goods are lott at 1000 Lyon Dollars p’ an [annum] to ye Bannian men. 64

One night at Supper on ye tarras, some in waggenary threw a p’ [piece] of a tile among vs, whi
begot a discourse, & Mr. Shepperd affirmed it common to be among ye Turks for great stones,
pothers, tiles & such like to come among them as if it rained them, And ye on thaire tarras among
them Once it was soe, but hurt to none, whi thing[s] are Cast by the Spirritts.

63 i. e., God keep me from the very idea of it: see Dow, Supplement aus Dictionnaires Arabes, s. v. ghafir.
64 See p. 151, n. 50. 64 The author shows his Indian training. By 'Bannian men,' he means merchants.
The people call'd ye Turkman [Turcomans] are great Grassers & reputed a Cast of honest people. They Graze from Bagdat to Stambole in a yeare, & pass wth numberlesse herds of Cattle & drones of sheepe. Some tymes a part of them are 10 days passing a towne. The[y] spreat [spread] above 100 [?] miles in the Contrey & furnish all places as they pass & Travell wth their freindles.

10 August 1668. I wth Mr. Downs betwixt 5 & 6 Clock in the morning rid around ye City of Aleppo & vew'd ye graven of ye deal, at wth were 100 more weeping over ye graven of their deade freindes. That day Mr. Langley, Mr. Godac, Mr. Goddycare were chased ashore by a Corsair of Malta, & rob'd the vessell of all, & after sunk hir. They came from Tripelo in Assiria, but lost all their robes. I, the wecke before escaped narrowly.

Several words I learnt of ye Arrabes.63

| Ish ish ma haddah          | [aysh ism hadda?]       | What call ye this       |
| Ish ish mack              | [aysh ismack?]          | What ye name            |
| Subbolk heir              | [Subb-ak-ka1yr]         | Good morrow             |
| Mishalk heir              | [mish'ak-ka1yr]         | Good night              |
| Shitak Haddah             | [shita1k hadda]         | Is this yours           |
| Shite                     | [shita1]                | It is mine              |
| Became or Escod toman     |                          | What price or           |
| Kittier                   | [ka1hir : ke1tr (colloq.)] | for how much            |
| Gibb                      | [jib : gib (colloq.)]   | It is too much          |
| Roe                       | [ruh]                   | Goe, fetch, or bringe   |
| Autane                    | [a'it-ni]               | Goe                     |
| Tawell                    | [ta1]                   | Give me                 |
| Cosseir                   | [qa11ir]                | Longe                   |
| Hyke                      | [hayk]                  | Short                   |
| Halcod                    | [ha1kadda : like this]  | Thus                    |
| Haddah                    | [ha1da (colloq.)]       | Thus much               |
| Haddack                   | [ha1dak (colloq.)]      | This                    |
| Howne                     | [ha1wn (colloq.)]       | That                    |
| Howneke                   | [ha1wnk, ha1wnik (colloq.)] | Here                    |
| Hatme Beed                | [hut-m bid (colloq.), give me wine, 'al-ni-im11d'] | Give me wyne (without water) |
| Sheede                    | [shte1]                 | take away               |
| Ish hallock               | [aysh ha1lok]           | how doe you             |
| Tybe                      | [sayyib]                | well                    |
| Cow Mille                 | [kahmi]                 | very well               |
| Orack                     | [waray]                 | Paper                   |
| Gambonhes                 | [ba1ban, ba1bah (colloq.) = Pers. pa1-pa1sh] | slippers               |
| Mille                     | [mali1k]                | Good                    |

63 The chief meat-supply of Egypt still comes through Syria in this way.

I have to thank Professor R. G. Brown of Cambridge for much generous help in solving the riddles of this list. The author took down his words in the Syrian colloquial form of Arabic (see Crow's Arabic Manual, Luzac's Oriental Grammar, Series IV), apparently, from a Jewish guide or dragoman.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Pronunciation</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moimille</td>
<td>[mā-mah]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or Wakesh</td>
<td>[vahish]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entee</td>
<td>[ayn-tā (colloq.)]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helwack</td>
<td>[hala-k (colloq.)]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashan</td>
<td>[ahsan (colloq.)]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eigh</td>
<td>[a'y]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La</td>
<td>[lā]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is youn</td>
<td>[al-yawen]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amssee</td>
<td>[ams]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godde</td>
<td>[ghadī]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imberhahh</td>
<td>[em-bā-i]</td>
<td>colloq.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Il-lyle</td>
<td>[al-layla]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Il youn autane sooff</td>
<td>[al-yawen 'alt-nāf]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godde betecke hhorrofle</td>
<td>[ghadī 'bi-tēika' kharāf]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wahad</td>
<td>[wāhid]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>temine</td>
<td>[itna-yn ; inu (colloq.)]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>telatlah</td>
<td>[thalatha, telāia (colloq.)]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arbah</td>
<td>[arba'nu]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ham see</td>
<td>[khami]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitte</td>
<td>[sitti]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subbah</td>
<td>[sab'a]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temane</td>
<td>[hamānīya ; tenāni (colloq.)]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tissah</td>
<td>[tis'a]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashharah</td>
<td>[asra]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edash</td>
<td>[hidāsh (colloq.)]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tensash</td>
<td>[itn-dāsh (colloq.)]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teltasash</td>
<td>[taltrāsh (colloq.)]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arbatasash</td>
<td>[arbāt-dāsh (colloq.)]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amstasash</td>
<td>[khamstāsh (colloq.)]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sittasash</td>
<td>[sittrāsh (colloq.)]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subbatash</td>
<td>[nebāt-dāsh (colloq.)]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temane tash</td>
<td>[tamuntāsh (colloq.)]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tissa tash</td>
<td>[tis'tāsh (colloq.)]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashbetteene</td>
<td>[tsihrin]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telsteene</td>
<td>[talātin (colloq.)]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arbeene</td>
<td>[arbā'tin]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hamseene</td>
<td>[khame'sin]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sitteene</td>
<td>[sitti'n]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subeeene</td>
<td>[sab'tin]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tammaneeene</td>
<td>[tāmānīn (colloq.)]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tisseene</td>
<td>[tsit'n]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meash</td>
<td>[mi'a]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Else</td>
<td>[ol't]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asharatellaa</td>
<td>[askhra-laf]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badd</td>
<td>[bad]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When</td>
<td>[now]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better</td>
<td>[yēs]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>[nee]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>today</td>
<td>[yesterday]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tomorrow</td>
<td>[Last night]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This night</td>
<td>[Today give me wull]</td>
<td>Tomorrow lle give yu y°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laube</td>
<td>[one]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>[two]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>two</td>
<td>[three]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>three</td>
<td>[lower]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>five</td>
<td>[six]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>six</td>
<td>[Searen]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eight</td>
<td>[Nyne]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ten</td>
<td>[Elleveren]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleven</td>
<td>[Twelve]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twelve</td>
<td>[Thirteene]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thirteene</td>
<td>[foverteene]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>foffteteene</td>
<td>[Sixenteene]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixenteene</td>
<td>[Searenteene]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eightene</td>
<td>[Nynteene]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nynteene</td>
<td>[Twenty]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twenty</td>
<td>[30]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>[40]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>[50]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>[60]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>[70]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>[80]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>[90]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>[100]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>[10000]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fryday the 9th September 1669. Att 5 Clock in ye morning, Cap Bates, my Sonn Cambell &amp; my selfe tooke horse at Alleppo for Scandroon, all ye factory accompaninge vs a league on or way, And returnd all, saue Mr Jn Shepperd, Mr Vaene, Mr Hartop &amp; Mr slyer who</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The first mention of John Campbell in this narrative.
accompanyed vs to Han Jarr to ye howse of Ruston, ye Carr [? Carrier] where we staid all that night and tooke our leave in ye morninge, being very merry all ye night. We run some dainger of robbing in the way, but got safe aboard ye Mary & Martha the 12 instant. Abundance of Jackalls, partridge & phesant we see in e'way.

20 September 1669. Monday. We weighed Anchor the Wind at N° N° W°, little winde in the middle of the day, but at 6 at night a fresh gale at Cape hogg, and brought vs by day next morninge at Cape St. Andreas, or ye Isleland of Cyprus. The breadth of Cyprus is about 30 Eng. Miles, the length 160.

23 [September]. Being thursday, & ye wind faire & fresh till Sunday the 26. at wch tyme we weere becalm'd in 5 Leagues of Candia, at ye east end, till Weldon's day followinge. Then a fresh Gailie wch held till the Sixt of October, wch day we Anored before Messena in the Monti. And I offered the Jurats for päke [pratique] for my selfe & Sonn Cambell 200 p. of 8 but could not päake.

Sunday the 10 October 1669. We weighed from Messena, & past ye vaire [phare] Sceillia On ye One Side, The Callabria On the other, wch is ye popes Contry. And not above 2 Leagues betwixt poyn't & poyn't, and always seting in a greate Current Betwene Scilla & Charibdis. Scilla is the poyn't on the Callabria side & Charibdis on the Sisellene side.

Monday ye' 11 October 1669. We weere becalm, & lay by Strumbelo [Strumboll], ye burning Isleland, & within 3 or 4 leagues 6 or 7 little Islelands not inhabited, wch smooke, but ye Cald vulcan [Volcano] most, & now burns more furiously then Strumbeloe did, wch at this day flames much most visible in the night.

Tuesday 12 [October]. A faire gale, wch held till Fryday, on wch night we sailed by the Isleland Elba. Part ye Spaniards haue Cald port Langowne [Porto Langore]; thother half ye Legornese or Italiains haue Cald port Ferra [Porto Ferro], a Brave port. ye Isleland betwixt 40 & 50 Miles about, and lies 12 leagues South of Legorne. We past 5 or 6 small Islelands not inhabited, And at 12 Clock Saterday none, we were in the rote of Legorne.

Saterday 16 October 69. We arrived at Legorne, but weere not permitted to goe to ye Lazeretto till Thursday after ye 21 October 1669.

Fryday ye' 22 of October 1669. We weere receed into ye Lazeretto by 8 in the morninge, and judged 4 days in One Chamber, and after remon to an other. And three days after we had bene there, I, R. B. was driving a nail, and on thether side in an other Roome I herd repeated the blowes I had given. I knockt at senall places, other Roomes adjoyninge to the places I knockt, & were empty, yet had what blowes soever I gaue answerd jestly [immediately] at ye 4th places.
Saturday ye 9 November 1669. This Spirit and till fryday ye 15 November 1669 continewd knockings, & soo loud, and at seuerall places, some tymes from 7 to 12 Clock at night; but this night it came & knockt at Mr. Cambells bed head or wall, & this pillow lay (for so beds were on the floor), & soo violent as if he would [have] beaten downe the wall. I was then at ye table reading but minded it not, wth Mr. Cambell did, and was answerd exactly. This Continued every night for 13 nights, and at last we herd noe more, but on the 10 November 69, at 8 Clock at night, Mr. Cambell would knock to see if the spiritr or Devell would answer, wth it did, at ye 3 small places Mr. Cambell knock at, wth ye violence as if it would [have] beaten downe ye wall & to be herd 40 yds out of ye roome. Mr. Cambell took a glass wne, & said to me, heeres to ye. The spiritr sently said a loud heere to ye, and said how doe ye, how doe ye. Wee then were struck wth admiration (wonder). The Spirit, as he turnd himselfe in Escorne and going away, sa in Turkish, Anass & a victum, wth is in English, sonn of a Whore, And went away.

Monday the 1st December 1669. I had ye night before taken some milk to boyle wth rice & boiled it, & eate a pettenger full, soe did my sonn Cambell, but wth half an hower after I was taken with soe violent vomitting as I never had formerly. My Sonne was not altogether soe bad. The Doctor had notis of it, and verry Diligent, in 4 days recoverd me to my former helth, & told me ye Milk of this Contray deales little better wth all Strangers & ye the Contray people dair hardly medle wth it. My Dyet was Lemmon broth wth egg beat in it for the 4 days. We said from ye 22nd October to ye 25th December in ye Lazaretto, wth is 40 days. We said in Legorne 10 days, & in ye nothings of note, sene ye its a place of great trade and a free port, And a garrison & Exceeding stronges & ye yards exact in there dewty, Soe as none an come in, horsman or by Coach, but by ye tinkling of a Bell at ye gate they pass, notis is given Round ye town to ye gates.

13 December 1669. Wee tooke boste for Peesa & said there 2 days, vewelinge the Antiquities of ye. Once famous place, but now lost by Legorne, wth steals away all there trade. In it is a faire Church calld ye Doms [Duomo], & to it 4 pairs of Brazen gates, 3 at ye west end of Cast brass, for bigness & rare worke I never saw ye lik; ye 4th pair are sa to [have] been brought from Jerusalem.82 Near ye Church stands a Tower [the Campanile] verry high & built Crooked, 8 stories high, and alsoe a Copeole [the Baptistry] verry faire at ye west end of the Dome [Duomo]. On ye North side is A place Calld Campa Santa [Campo Santo], by reason ye earth of it was brought from Jerusalem, And ye vertue of it is to swell ye Deade boddy put into it for 2 or three days and in 24 howers turns it to ashes.77 The next famous Church is ye of ye Knis of ye Order of St Stephen,78 of wth order ye Grand Duke is of. They weare a reed Crosse in Sattion on their left side of there Clokes.

All more is ye Physique Garden, wth hath noe thing admynrable in it. The Towne is about 4 mile Englis aboute by ye wall, wth is very good, and a Cittidell [Cittadella d'Artiglieria] by ye river side, wth comes from florrence wth a Garrison in it. From Pisa we tooke horse to Sciana

---

74 i.e., John Campbell, who was, seemingly, Bell's son-in-law.
75 Compare Basilius MS., C. 709 (Bargrave's Travels in 1646), fol. 8, "Legorne is a small City under the Duke of Tuscany but a very valuable one, in respect of its Trafick, its forme and its Strength, and as she wants the convenience of a handsome mould for Shippes, nor the embellishments of a faire Piazza (from which Enra in Covent Garden took its pattern)."
76 The ancient Bronze Gates, destroyed by the fire of 1295, were replaced in 1666 by the present doors.
77 The Campo Santo was founded in 1293, by Archbishop Ubaldo de Lanfranchi, who caused 23 ship-loads of earth to be brought to it, from Jerusalem. The story of the marvellous properties of the earth appears to have no foundation in fact.
78 Santo Stefano di Cavelleri, built in 1565—1569.
Sienna] and in two days got thether. This City is 6 miles in compass, ye streets very faire, and the houses high. The Madona, or Chiefe Church, is, for ye paumt under foot, ye rarest I ever beheld. Its story of ye Old testament in figures of Marble, all Complexions laid in in naturall stone. The library in large books of parchment & signers in gold & other rich Callers painted very rare on parchment. Nothing else memorable but ye Chappel of St Katherine, ye virgin saint.

18 December 1669. We tooke horse for Roome, in the way Lodged at Monte frisone [Montefiascone], ye place where ye Muskadine grape is (ye wyne very pleasant and good). Next to a wyne Cittated town Calde voets herba [Viterbo] in a plaine, for 2 miles round well Cultured for grapes, Olives And all other garden herbs.

20 December 1669. We got Roome & Lodged at ye fortune in the Peaches dispanzia [Piazza di Spagna], Jeronimo Martello, patron. In Roome we see St Peters, The Pallas of Prince Deburgaza [Palazzo Borghese] And ye Queen Swedens pallas. The Pallases of seall Embassadors & Cardinals, but none Exceeding within Roome or without prince Deburgaza his pallas without ye City. Its but little, but ye walls about is 3 English miles, and brave gardens, wildernesses & walks within it & fountains, none Exceeding it about Roome & in the house many rarities, as Statues of Purbre & soueraunt great vns and Pillars. Most of ye Eminent Churches and Colleges & there festival we were at to see there Riches & hear there Musique. We also rid round ye Walls Roome, wh are judged by vs to be 10 English miles, But the buildings within fills not a quarter of the Ground. We alse viewed ye ruins of Nereus pallas, part of with ye English Jesuits have for a garden to recrease themselfes, lately given to them.

March ye 16, 1669 [1670]. We left Roome and returned to Legorne. On some errand ye surprised vs. I continewed in Legorne to ye 13 April 1670 and then toke a feluke [faluca] for Genoa where the arrived thursday morning the 17th by 3 Clock in the morning at ye house of Zachery Humphreys, An Engleman, & ye only house for entertainment as an Osteria [osteria] in Genoa, & hath lived in it 38 yeares. Its 40 leagues betwixt Legorne & Genoa, & with a faire winde they Genally make it one day & night & noe more, but the winde was inst a head & we put to lodge a shore every night; its by land 120 Engil miles, but few travellers goe it for fear of ye Bandereettoes [bandit] and the bad accommodation in ye way.

In Genoa is ye largest artifitial mold [Molo Vecchio] in Chrissendome, One for ships one for Galleys, One for Barks or Settees. The new wall about ye City is faire & about 15 miles in Compass ye City contains 50 parishes & devided into 4 quarters. One called St Lawrence [San Lorenzo], One St George [San Giorgio], One St Barnardo, 4th St John baptista [San Giovanni]. In ye City are hundreds of Princeley Pallases Richly furnished with rarities. Indeed its a City of Pallases & gardens for Beauty & rich furniture, as Caballets, Pictures & Looking Glasses, of which I saw one in a Gentlemans house Cost 30000 Scowdey [scudi] or Crowner, Marble tables, most Rich & beautifull of all Callas. Its a Republique Consisting of a Duke cald prince Royall or Imperiall who is Crowned King of Corsaka, 24 Senatorios, The greete & little Counsell, 400 Gentlemen, out of which is chosen ye Duke or prince who is Chiefly. Only for 2 yeares & then a new One is Chosen out of ye 400. They are all traders & their Riches is in moneys. Their Chief Commodities made with there Contrey is wrought silks of all sorts, with they make in vast quantities & furnish most of xendome. Marble good & very plentifull for Callers natural & with they improve by art. They haue for other things all almost like London.

Monday 29th April 1670. In discourse with Mr Zachery Humphrey And Capt. Archer in Relation to ye City, Mr Zachery Humphrey, who hath lived in Genoa 38 years, told vs ye in ano 1658 ye plague began in Genoa & ended in August ano 1658 and many days therei
died three thousand a day, soe that in a Spacious & populous Citty in the aforesd tyme was not left a living of all sexes & ages above thirteenth thousand & odd hundreds. But now in ano 1670 its very full of people & trade. In ano 1650, Mr Zachery Humphreys wife, then frying Collops & Eggs, the wind soe strange, it blew ye tops of houses of, & the frying pan out of her hand quite away, never since knowne what way it went. It also blew shippes out of the Mould into ye Sea, & out of ye Eye Sea into ye Mould againe.

The same day a Flemminge rideinge in the new Mold [Molo Nuovo], a Gust caime & carried quite away his Meeceen Marsi, ropyes & yards, soe as it was never herd of or anie part; ye Ship was 600 tons.

Of Saturday ye 26 April 1670 Arrived from Calais [Calais] 2 of ye King Engls friggotts, ye Jersey & Centurion with money for ye Genoes & sume for ye Legoners, [which] they, every yere [on] ye West Spanish India fletes arrivall, Receives for Marchandise & interrest money; ye King Spaine owes vast somes.9

END.

TAMIL HISTORICAL TEXTS.

BY M. K. NARAYANASAMI AYYAB, B.A., B.L., AND T. A. GOFINATHA RAO, M.A.

No. I.—Nandi-kalambagam.

A kalambagam is a variety of poetic composition in Tamil, in which the hero is praised in a variety of metres on a number of topics or subjects, and should consist of 100, 98, 90, 70, 50 or 30 verses according as it is in praise of a deity, a saint, a king, a minister, a merchant or a warrior. The verses should run in antidi fashion, i.e., the last word of each verse should begin the succeeding one. The most famous compositions of this kind are Thirukaraikku-kalambagam of Pillai—Perumal—ayyàgar and the Ajarag-kalambagam by an unknown author.

The Nandi-kalambagam is a poem in praise of a king called Nandi and contains strangely enough 110 verses, having ten verses more than even the highest number which is prescribed for a deity by the Paaypira—pattigal. It is commonly ascribed to a younger brother of the hero of the poem, though from the way in which the author speaks of himself this does not appear to be the truth. In the final verse of the poem in describing the hero's death, the poet feelingly says:

"Your countenance has gone to the moon in the heavens,
Your fame has entered the dark ocean,
Your valour has passed to the tiger in the wilds,
Your fingers have attained the kal
She of the honeyed lotus flower (Lakshmi) has joined Hari,
The ruddy fire has claimed your body,
O! Nandi, the all-bountiful! where shall I and my poverty find refuge?"8

9 The MS. ends abruptly here. I have failed to find any further mention of either of the authors of this work.

8 See the Paaypira—pattigal under the head kalambagam.

This verse follows the idea of the hymn in the funeral rites portion of the Thiruvela Aranyaka, in which the several elements are asked to take unto themselves their own contribution to the physical body of the dead man. The king's countenance is said to have gone to the moon, because during his lifetime his face rivalled the moon in its brightness, and after his death it is left as the sole hair to all the brightness and beauty, which was once shared by them both. His fame likewise was as vast and unfathomable as the ocean, his valour was like the tiger's, his fingers would yield every request and wish of the suppliant, like the satpaka tree. Lakshmi is said to have rejoined Hari, because during the king's lifetime the Goddess of Fortune was undivided from him. [Vide Trpaṭiṣṭhak, 6, Amaraṇa 1, section 4.]
The impression produced by the verse is also corroborated by the general tenor of the whole work. The hero, Nandi, is described in this work as being a Pallava king:—Pallavar kōṅ Nandi—verse 2 of Introduction, verses 15, 35, 40, 70, &c., of the poem. (The Pallava king Nandi.) Pallavar tōṅgal—v. 1 (born of the Pallava dynasty). Pallavar kōḷi—v. 59 (a lion among the Pallavas). Pallavaḥ—vv. 65, 83. Kāṭavāṅ—v. 29.

In verse 39 the king is said to have belonged to the race of the moon:—Chandra-kula prakāśa (the light of the Chandra = kula or the Lunar Race).

His capitals appear to have been Kāñchi, the modern Conjeevaram—vv. 8, 10, 22, 29 and 80; Mallai,2 the modern Mahābātilpuram, situated in the Chingleput District—vv. 1, 3, 46, 54, 72 and 83; and Mayilai, or Mallappūr, the modern Mallapur, a suburb of Madras—vv. 44, 51, 55 and 69.

His rule extended over (1) the Tōṅgangādī—vv. 4, 5 and 39; (2) the country watered by the Kāvēri:—Kāvēri vaḷa uṇḍan—vv. 11, 17, 27, 28 and 44. Pōṇgi nāppōḷu māṇṇaḥ—(king of the prosperous country watered by the Pōṇgi, i.e., the Kāvēri). Sōḍāṭaḥ—(owner of the Chōla country) v. 74. (3) Over the Chēra country:—Śrīraṅgān—v. 74. (4) Over the Koṅgu country:—Koṅgāl—v. 41. (5) Over the Alagai Nāḍu:—Alagai nāḍan—v. 39. (6) Over the western regions:—Kuḍakkal uḷāi vēṇaṇ—v. 65.

In verse 28, he is described as “Kāvēri vaḷa uṇḍan Kumari = kknṛgān Gāṅgai-maṇḍālaṇ kūrai koḻal rīga = Nandi” — “the valiant Nandi, lord of the prosperous country watered by the Kāvēri, of the sea-coast round Kumari (the Cape Comorin) and the spouse of the Ganges.”

He is said to have held sway over the Bāna kings:—“Vēṅgada-nāḍuḷai māṇṇar pirṇa”—v. 55. “Lord over the kings of the northern Vēṅkata (hills).” See also vv. 33 and 67, where he is described as vēṅgadaṭṭāṅ (lord of the northern Vēṅkata hills).

Nandi is said to have won battles at the following places:—(1) Tēḻukku—vv. 28, 33, 49, 52, 53, 71, 75, 79, 80, 85, 86 and 96. (2) Kurukkēḻu—vv. 2, 35 and 84. (3) Palaiyōḍu—v. 31. (4) Vēṭṭukku—v. 23. (5) Nallēḻu—v. 61.

In verse 27, the Chēra, Chōla, Pāṇḍya kings and the kings of the northern regions are said to have paid tribute to him. He had fought with the Chēras and the Chōlas (vv. 42 and 81), and also with the Pāṇḍyas (vv. 4 and 81).

In verse 81 he is described as having thwarted the intentions of his younger brothers, thus:—

“Kula sārvar = ṛgum = ṛgyat-

vāmbiyar = ṛgum = ellēn pāṇumāḷa vēṇ a talai māṇa vēṟṟumāṇ

Sembiyar Teṉṉar Sārvar = elir vandi māṇu = cheṟwēṇa ṛg. ṛg.”

1 In vv. 54 and 58, the place is called Kāḷan—Mallai, which is the name by which it is known to the Vaishnava Āḷvar Tirumāṇaṅkai (see the two decades on Kāḷan—Mallai—Tirumāṇaṅkam, and the decades on Tiruvāḷikādī and Tirumāṇaṅkai). The Āḷvar describes it as a flourishing sea-port (Tirunāducāṅkam, verse 9.) The place was also praised by Bhātattāḷvar in verse 70 of his Āḻagāh.
"The great hero who conquered so as to destroy the hereditary warriors [who perhaps helped his younger brothers] and so as to defeat the intentions of his younger brothers; and who killed the Sembiyar (the Chōla), the Tēpuvar (the Pānḍya) and the Chēvar who opposed him in battle." From this we can infer that the phrase "hereditary warriors" may refer to the Chōlas, the Pānḍyas and the Chēras, who might have helped the younger brothers of Nandi against himself.

Nandi seems to have been a patron of Tamil Literature — paimānaiṭhe = ṣagaiṛa Nandi (the king Nandi who studies classic Tamil) — v. 104. Tamil Nandi — v. 107.


Having now summarised all the information of any historical interest in the poem, we shall proceed to discuss them in the light of inscriptions. The king, who is the hero of this poem, cannot be Nandivarman-Pallavamalla who was opposed by the Dravīdas in about 760 A.D., since of the numerous battles which he and his general Udayachandra are said to have fought, not one of those given in this poem are mentioned. We are therefore compelled to conclude that he must be the same person as the Nandi, who was the son of Dantivarman mentioned in the Bāhūr plates. We have inscriptions of Nandippottarārā, who fought the battle of Tēḻḷaṟa at Conjevaram in the Chengalpattu District, at Sendalai, Kōviladu and Tillaithavam in the Tanjore District, and at Tiruvadai in the South Arcot District. We know from the poem that one of his surnames was Avani-Nāraṇa. In one inscription to Nandivarman found in the Muktisvara temple at Kāvēripakkam, the place is named simply as Kāvēripakkam, while in the inscriptions of Nṛpatungavarman and the Chōla kings who came after him the place is called Kāvēripakkam alias Avani-Nāraṇaya-chaturvediṟṟiṟṟiṟṟaṟṟam. The inscriptions thus corroborate our poem in these particulars. That "Nandippottara-rārā who was victorious at Tēḻḷaṟa." should be the same person as Kōví-la-Nandivikramarāvarman is evident from the fact that Kāḍuvōṭṭi = Tamiḻa = Pēṟaṟaṟyai, who is a general of the one is also mentioned as an officer of the other. The Bāhūr plates say that Nandivarman was the son of Dantivarman. This Dantivarman was a contemporary of the Rāśtrakūṭa Gōvinda III. (A.D. 782-814). Therefore the Nandi of our poem must have belonged to the middle of the 9th century A.D. We do not propose in this paper to enter into the question of the necessity of postulating a Gaṅga-Pallava dynasty, which has been dealt with by one of us already in the Madras Christian College Magazine and which will be dealt with again in detail in a forthcoming paper in the Epigraphy Indica.

In the Bāhūr-vaṟṟi of Perundēvaṇār mention is made of a king who was victorious at Tēḻḷaṟa. If this reference is to "Nandippottara-rārā who was victorious at Tēḻḷaṟa," we can fairly infer that Perundēvaṇār was a contemporary of his.

---

4 Perhaps Ugra-kōpan (a man of fierce anger).
8 No. 12 of the Government Epigraphist's Collection for 1905.
11 No. 22 of the same year for 1905.
12 No. 283 of the same for 1901.
14 No. 52 of the same for 1905.
16 No. 19 of the same for 1905.
18 No. 404 of the same for 1905.
19 Christian College Magazine for April, 1907.
As to the country that he ruled over, we find inscriptions of his, as already pointed out, in the Chōla, and the Tosādi-nādu, but we have not as yet succeeded in getting any from the Chēra and Kōṅgu countries. We cannot say what particular region is denoted by Aḷagaiṇḍu, but there is a village called Aḷagāpurī in the Pudukkōṭai State. That he was a suzerain of the Bāṇas, who ruled over the Vada Vēṅgoda-nādu, is proved by a number of his inscriptions in the Vēṅgoda-nādu, which is said therein to belong to the Bāṇa country. Nandi's predecessor, Dantivarman, is mentioned as the overlord of the Bāṇa king Viḷḷuyādiṭya Māvalī Vagāraṇya, and his successor, Nṛipatnāga, as overlord of Vāṇa Viḷḷūdhaṇa. Nandippottarasaṇar himself in an inscription belonging to the 23rd year of his reign is mentioned as suzerain over Viḷḷuyādiṭya Māvalī Vagāraṇya.

The poem unfortunately leaves us entirely in the dark as to the person or persons against whom he fought the several battles mentioned. The following passage in verse 64:—

“Teḷḷāru = aṭṭaṇā pōs Vaiģai muṇindā Nandi” (Nandi who fought on the banks of the golden Vaigai (river) on the same day as at Teḷḷāru), leads us to suspect that about the time of the battle at Teḷḷāru, the king's forces must have fought another battle on the banks of the Vaigai river in the Mādura District.

Of the king's surnames, we have already dealt with Avasi-Nāranṇa. Viḷḷūdhiṇḍu occurs in inscriptions found at Tiruvallam, Tirupalāṭturī, Kōṇjevaram, &c. The meaning of this term is not clear. But we meet with similar names such as, Mārpiṇḍu, Māṟṟippīṇḍu for Dantivarman and Mahēndravarman respectively. The last part of the surname means the thunderbolt in the Kāṇnada and Telugu languages. The other surnames given in the poem are not met with in inscriptions.

The following places are mentioned in the poem as the scenes of the king's battles, viz., Teḷḷāru, Nāḷāru, Paḷaiyāru, Kurūgōḍu and Veḷḷāru. Of these Teḷḷāru is a village in the Wandiwas Taluk of the North Arcot District; Nāḷāru is famous for its Saiva temple of Darbhārāṇyēvar, and is situated in the French Settlement of Kāraikkal in the Tanjore District; Paḷaiyāru is perhaps the same as Paḷaiyāṛai, a village about three miles to the south of Kumbhakonam, also in the Tanjore District. There are two places called Kurūgōḍu, one in the Bellary Taluk of the Bellary District and another in the Kolar District of the Mysore Province. The former is called simply Kurugode, while the latter is called Doḷḍā Kurugode. In the first mentioned are several ruins, consisting of beautiful temples of the Chalukya style of architecture, a fine fort on a hill, and it was one of the strongholds of Tippu Sultan. The latter is believed to be an old capital of the Gangas. Veḷḷāru is the name of two rivers, one of which runs between the South Arcot and the Trichinopoly Districts, while the other passes through the Pudukkōṭai State. Which of these two rivers is meant by the poem we are not able to judge from the reference.

The Bāhūr plates assert that Dantivarman, the father, and Nṛpatungavarman, the son of Nandivarman, were devout worshippers of the lotus feet of Viṣṇu. The Kālamānugam describes Nandi as “Śivapāi muṣṭaṛu = maṟṟuddā chintaiyṭu,” verse 97 (one whose mind never forgot Siva).

17 No. 223 of the Government Epigraphist's Collection for the year 1903.
18 No. 223 of the same for the year 1903.
19 No. 223 of the same for the year 1903.
20 No. 541 of the same for the year 1905.
21 S. I. L., Vol. II., p. 311. See also the footnote 5 on the same page.
THE FAUJDĀRĪ OF BANGASH.

The Bangashāt or 'two Bangashes' included Upper Bangash, the modern Kurram Valley, and Lower Bangash or Kohāt. Under the Mughals both constituted a faujdārī which appears to have gradually been confined to Lower Bangash, i.e., Kohāt. Its history can be traced for more than a century.

The faujdār of Bangash appears to have been independent of the Sūbahdār of Kābul, as was apparently the case in all the Provinces of the Mughal Empire. Under Akbar the tomān of Bangash had lain in the Sarkā and Sūbah of Kābul, but in 1627, after the death of the emperor Jahāngīr, Lashkār Khān became sūbahdār of 'Kābul and the Bangashāt.'

According to another account, however, Sa'īd Khān was faujdār of Bangash in 1627, for in that year he marched from Kohāt to relieve Feliwār, then besieged by the Afghāns, who had risen on the news of Jahāngīr's death.

In 1631-32 (1041 H.), Sa'īd Khān superseded Lashkār Khān in the sūbahdārī and Shamāh Khān was made faujdār of the two Bangashes. Three years later in 1634-35, Rājā Jagat Singh was appointed thānādār or faujdār of the Bangashāt, with orders to collect supplies of provisions to send to Kābul, whither Muhammad Dārā Shikoh was about to proceed, Shāh Jahān following in person, in consequence of the Persian designs on Kandahār.

In 1668 Jagat Singh still held this office, or had been re-appointed to it, for in the following year he was directed to pour supplies into Kābul, during Shāh Jahān's stay there. Shāh Jahān returned to Lahore and Upper Bangash and Kohāt, and the prince was directed to follow later. At Kohāt, Jagat Singh got up a hunt, during which 56 mārkhor, besides other big game, were killed. How long Jagat Singh continued to be faujdār of the Bangashāt does not appear, but in May, 1675, Khanjār Khān became their thānādār or faujdār, apparently superseding Muhammad Wafā, thānādār of the Resāl Ferry and Kohāt, who had been appointed in January of that year. This was after the unsuccessful attack of the Mughals on Shergar at the Ādam Khel Afrīdī country. In the next year Iftikhār Khān was appointed faujdār of the Bangashāt. He did not hold the office long, for about 1677 we find Ahmad, a Suyyid, brother of Shahāmat Khān, faujdār, and in 1880 Lashkār Khān, who turned the Khaṣṭaks out of Kohāt, held the post, but only for a short time, for Tarīn Khān the next faujdār was reduced to great straits by the Malik-Mīrās of Kohāt, who held the Bāla Hisār of Kohāt. Then, in 1685, Rājā Rām Singh became faujdār of Kohāt and Bangash, and we find him refusing to obey the order of Amīr Khān, the Sūbahdār of Kābul, to arrest Asrāf Khān the Khaṣṭak. The next faujdār must have been one Abdūl-Hādī, a worthless fellow, son of Iftikhār Khān, appointed in or after 1695, he was succeeded by Fakhr Khān before 1700, and about 1708, Allāhādā Kheshtī was appointed, but he was afraid to take up his office and sent a deputy.

About 1718, Ahmad Beg Khān, Ming-bahtī, was faujdār.

After or in 1722 Yūlāb Khān became faujdār of Bangash.

H. A. ROSE.

A BAKER'S DOZEN OF CATCHES FROM THE JHANG DISTRICT, PANJAB.

COLLECTED AND TRANSLATED BY M. LONGWORTH JAMES, I. C. S. (RETIRED).

I.

My Wife.

Sthib dittā jālnā ran kuisjje nāl.
Hāthī vāngo patī, tave vāngo lāl.
Kārī khāndi rojliāī, kunnā piwe dāl.
Chappar jāyā ghaghrā, trūū kare rumāl.
Gadhā vāngo hingīdī, sāre vehrā dā singār.

Translation.

God has given me to live with a hideous woman,
As slender as an elephant, as red as a griddle.
She eats a basket of bread and drinks a degāh of dāl.
Her skirt is a thatch and her handkerchief
A grass mat.
She brays like a donkey, and is the ornament of the courtyard.

II

Topsy-turvy Land.

Jaggū sande bol phutto.
Sakrān kāsāī kuṭṭe.
Bhanukan chor 'te naan kutte.
Vainde chor Kirāṇā muthe.
Mīhū nū te chappar uṭṭe.
'Bagul na chik, dāntri phāḍḍī hai.'

1 The mahādīl of Teri Bolqī was a royal jādeir, or chief, which generally pertained to the faujdārī of Lower Bangash.

2 He had a thomsa post at the Tāqāl of Hangū.
Translation.
Let the world hear a topay-turty saying,
The goats slaughter the butchers,
The thieves bark and the dogs bolt.
The Kirars come and rob the thieves.
The thatch falls upon the rain.
And 'Don't pull the blanket or the sickle will be torn.'

III.
Another Version.
Chor uchakka chaudhri, lundt ran pardhana.
Translation.
Thieves and blackguards are headmen, and prostitutes respectable women.

IV.
My Lover.
Mil-gaay yar karori.
Lat-pat vaelf, muhabbat torfi.
Vikhendar darwaaz tap-vencch morfi.
Translation.
I have got a lover of a thousand.
Much talk and little love.
Shows himself at the door and gets out by the drain.

V.
The Jatt.
Jatt toon bhala mul na bhala.
Jatt viqaa' muhakhat mar.
Jatt buliayaan hando ghall,
Sir-ton lach-ke maae bhulli.
Lahri hik na dewne ditta.
Translation.
Never think a Jatt good,
A Jatt will quarrel with his religious adviser.
If you call a Jatt, he will abuse you,
He will take off his head (his turban) and fling it on the ground,
There is neither first taking nor second giving with him.

VI.
The Bad Wife.
Bhairi ran cae bhaiya chali.
Chhunle ute ros bald.
Ate ghandeena khurke val.
Nak phojindi godiyahi nall.
Translation.
An evil wife has an evil gait,
Her child cries on the hearth,
She scratches her head while she grinds the meal,
And wipes her nose upon her knees.

VII.
Another Version.
Bhairi ran Khudia di chati
Na mari-vanje na sati.

Translation.
A bad wife is a punishment from God;
She can be neither killed nor thrown away.

VIII.
The Wicked Woman.
Hik nar ku-lachan, hai da ayya,
Jharsa kendi, yerba phoo.
Translation.
A wicked woman, burner of the heart,
Stirs up strife and splits the household (lit., the courtyard).

IX.
Misfits.
Trehi kamm kush;
Mard nuh chakki;
'Aurant nuh rah;
Sadbe nuh gahn.
Translation.
There are three bad roads:
A handmill to a man;
A road to a woman;
Treading out the corn to a bull-buffalo.

X.
Vanity.
Jab gund parandaa, mera jhugga ujar-jandaa.
Translation.
Do up my back hair at once, or my house will be ruined.

XI.
Bad Habits Stick.
'Ilat na vanje 'iltiyaan,
Adat mul na ja.
Uth kanak-ke chorfiye,
Chug jawahaa khaa.
Kutia raj baahaiye,
Chakti chaata jia.
Bhed ke janne popale?
Pad-babere khaa.
Translation.
An evil custom is not given up,
Nor a habit abandoned.
A camel will leave wheat
And grate on camel-thorn;
If you make a dog king,
He will go to lick the millstone.
What does a sheep know of fruit?
It will eat toadstools.

XII.
Horses and Women.
Madhri, chaghrri, khanki,
Mato ute wat,
Turri2 dii dh eh shifatii,
Narii chaur chapat.

1 Lit., of a haroi.
2 Arabic.
Translation.
Low stature, fatness, greediness,
And a spot on the forehead
Are good qualities in horses
And very bad in women.

XIII.

Heredit.

Ghore, muniś, lathícín, rag nānehārī.

Translation.
Horses, men, and elephants take after the maternal grandmother.

NOTES AND QUERIES.

THE LATE MAJOR RAVERTY'S GENERAL INDEX TO HIS TRANSLATIONS.
The accompanying list of works by the late Major Raverty in the possession of his widow is published for the information of scholars who may desire to know of them to communicate with her at Grampound Road, Cornwall, England. They consist chiefly of MS. translations into English of vernacular works on Indian History. The list was compiled by Major Raverty himself.

R. C. TEMPLE.

Volume I.
Habib-us-Siyar, pages 1 to 10.
Conquest of the 'Arabs in Khurasan.
The Race who ruled in Iran.
Tahirīs — Kara Khitaes in Kirmān.
Saffarīs — Aghāwānī and Jarmānē Hazārah.
Samaniās — The Kurāt Dynasty.
Ghaznavīs — Excerpts from Life of Timūr.
Ghūris — His Descendants to end.
Khwarazmīs — Saljukīs—Chingiz Khān.
Shāhrasb inserted: "Extracts from Bahār as to Hazārah," etc.

Volume II.
Descendants of Timūr to page 278.
Accounts of Za'un-Nūn, Arghūn-Ulugh Beg at Kabul.
Shah Isma'il, Safawī, and Uzbaks.
Bābar from Tabakāt-i-Akbarī.
Sher Khān — Sher Shah and successors.
Akbār Badehah.
(See also Vol. 7 for extracts from Tuḥfat-i-Akbarī-Shāhī.)

Volume III.
Reign of Akbār Badehah.
History of Kashmir.
Reign of Jahan-gīr.
Reign of Shāh-i-Jahan.
Reign of Aurbān-Zeb.

Volumes IV and V.
Contain the reign of Aurbān-Zeb.
Reign of Bakādur Shāh.

Volume VI.
Descendants of Aurbān-Zeb to end.
(With it are Travels of Ghulām Muḥammād.)
Translations as to Mansabs and Sarkārs in Aīn-i-Akbarī.

Volume VII.
Extracts Geographical from Kitāb-i-Agār-ul-Bilād.
Extracts from Tuḥfat-i-Akbarī-Shāhī continued from page 320 of Vol. 2 (Tarīkh-i-Sher Shāhī).
Ibnu-al-Wardī.
Extract from Al-Ma'sūdi (Sprenger's).
Tarīkh-i-Haft Iklīm—Geographical Extracts from the Masālik-wa-Mamālik; more extracts from Haft Iklīm.
Miscellaneous Notes on various Hindū Rulers.
Extracts from Tarīkh-i-Salāṣīn — descendants of Bābar in Hind.
Geographical extracts.

Volume VIII.
Abd-ullāh bin Khuršād Bih from the Gardaizī.
(On opposite side Alī — year 195 II. Some Chach-nūma too).
As to Hindūs from Khurshād Bih. Tabari to 84 year — Gardaizī — On ancient rulers of 'Ajām. As to the Turks — From Lubā one side, from Muntakhab-ul-Tawārikh on the opposite page.
The Hākims of Turkistān.
The Karā Khiṭāsā.
Jahān Arū on Turks.

Volume IX.
Yāsī-Khwarzam Shāhs, Gur Khāns and Ilāks. Gardaizī continued.
Alī on opposite leaves.
Eras of Different Nations.
Fanakati on the cīf of Zamin-i-Hind. Tibbat too.
Date of Shākamūnī's birth and tenets.
Short Geographical extract on Wirasat of Shāst, etc., the birthplace, residence and place of burial of some saint.
Mirā Haidar's Account of Tibbat.
Saljūkīs from Alī, including notices of the Bughrā Khān, etc. Hira also, Ghūr, and other places — several years of Alī.
Part of Tarīkh-i-Rashīdi.
Volume X.
Particulars in History of Hārāt and Marw from Fāsīfī, etc., and events of those parts yearly, up to 744 H. Nikūdaris too.
Extract from 'Abd-al-Karim Bukhari.
Short Extract on Khwarazm.
Bakhr MS. on the Mughals, Turks, and Tartars.
Extracts from Bād-Rūhīn—titles of different rulers.
Extracts from Bom. Lit. Soc. on Brinjaris.
Kattianār.
Haukil of Major W. Anderson.
Extracts from Accounts of Jammū Rājahs—8th year of Alī-Khīrīsh of Uqmān.
Badghīs, Ghur, Gharjistan, conquering beyond the Oxus—Turkāshīn and the Queen of the Turks—The Kābul Slāhī and all events up to the death of Tāhir-i-Sulṭān-Yāmanīn—More from Tabarī.

Volume XI.
On the Afghānīs Akhlīnd Darwezaah and Khush-hāl Khān.

Volume XII.
History of Hindūstān from Tabākāt-Akbarī, Badāmī, etc.
Fābar from Kālī Khan with extracts from Alī and others.
Humāyūn also—extensive extracts.
Tabākāt-i-Nāshī, rough draft to death of the Changiz Khan.
Kings of Dakhān, etc., independent rulers of Hindūstān.

Volume XIII.
Hindus' History of Hindūstān.
Extracts from Dow and Briggs. Yafai—Short extract on Mu'izz-ud-Dīn.

Volume XIV.
Mīr Ma'sūm, History of Sind.
Afghānīs of Binnd extract.
History of Bābar from his Turāk.
History of Humāyūn.
History of Akbar, Zuhd-ut-Tāriḵh, and others.

Volume XV.
Tāriḵh-i-Tabarī, copious extracts.
Kāihil-Fiṭāhū, Conquests of the 'Arabs.
Jami'-ut-Tawārīkh
Khaliḥfāhīs of the House of 'Abbāsī and notices of Sind, etc.
Extracts from the Tāriḵh-i-Ibrāhīmī on early Dynasties, Prophets, etc.
Nizāmī on same subject.
Kings of Iran, Zamin, Tabākāt-i-Nāshī with copious additions from Tabākāt-i-Ibrāhīmī Tabarī, Gūzīdāh, Jami'-ut-Tawārīkh, Majma'-ut-Tawārīkh, Rauzaat-us-Safā, Tābir Muhammad, etc.

Volume XVI.
Gūzīdāh—Atabakā—Account of Turks and Mughals from the beginning. Account of Khwārazm Shāhā, of Tughril Beg, Saljūkī, and successors, etc.
Saljūks of Kirman, Yafai Nur-ud-Dīn, Atabakā, etc.—Gūzīdāh.
The Il-Khānān of Iran.
Other extracts from Bābīhakā, Jāhān Ārā, Gūzīdāh on "Shārs of Gharjistan." Togha Timūrīs—Gūrgānīs, Hansīf Iūbdūr tribes.
Rulers of Ghūr.
Rulers of Turκistān—The Il-Khan from Hasan—Jūjī Khan's descendants.
Sultāns of Miwār-un-Nahr Mughals.
Ahl-Il-Khair (Uzbakē), Sultāns of Khwārazm, Tārikh-i-Shams-i-Sirāj—Tattār Khan's descent.

Volume XVII.
Extracts from Rauzaat-us-Saffīs.
Rule of Hajjāj in 'Irāq and progress of 'Arabs eastwards. Yafai on the same subjects.
Amīr Timūr's Life. Afghānīs submit to him.
Timūr's Invasion of Hindūstān.
Mirza Kaidū's doings—Afghānīs too; account of Sabuk-Tīgīn—The Afghānīs and Māhmūd—Life complete, etc., etc.
On the Chronology of Kitīb from Panakātī.

Volumes XIX, XX, and XXI.
Translation of the Tāriḵh-i-Ali.

Volume XXII.
The Muḥammadan Dynasties.

Volume XXIII.
Jami'-ut-Tawārīkh on the Mughals, etc.

Volume XXIV.
Ghūr Turkmenān—History of Jaunpur, etc., etc.
Completed Works.
The History of Ilīr or Hārāt, and its Dependencies, from the Foundation of the old city in the time of the Khāỉnān Kings of Iran, and—The Annals of Khurāsān from its Conquest by the 'Arabs, and Death of the last Aḥsirah Monarch down to the Present Day and its Last Investment.

Three MS. Books of Stories, from the earliest times to 916 H. (1510-11 A.D.).

The Māhātī.
A Brief History of the Rise of the Ismāʿīlīs Khaliḥfāhīs of Afrikāh and also of the Mizārīs Ismāʿīlīs of Persia to the period of the destruction of their Temporal Power by the Mughals.
A History of the Mīngs or Hāzaraah of the Chingis or Great Khan, etc.
Richard Cœur-de-Lion and Conrad of Montferrat from Muḥammadan Chronicles.

H. A. Rose.
BOOK-NOTICE.


Mr. Vincent Smith's History of India has been a great success, and the fact that a new edition has already become necessary sufficiently shows that his work really supplied a long-felt want. There cannot be any doubt that Mr. Smith has many qualifications for undertaking the work and doing it well. He writes with great clearness, and he knows how to impart something of his own enthusiasm for that long-neglected field—Indian History. He has, therefore, rendered a real service in spreading knowledge in circles which did not formerly take any interest in the matter and in providing a handy book of reference.

As everybody knows, Indian History presents extraordinary difficulties, and nobody would expect all of them to be overcome, even in the second edition of a book like the present one, which, moreover, addresses itself to a larger public and not only, or even principally, to the scholar. The remarks which I intend to make in the following are not intended to detract from the value of Mr. Smith's book. They are offered in a perfectly friendly spirit for the consideration of the author, when he will have to prepare a third edition. I offer them with the less hesitation, as his own judgment about the writings of others is often hard, whether he characterizes the taste of a famous Indian writer as the worst possible (p. 316), or categorically declares the views of other scholars to be wrong. Even when his verdicts are less definite, I sometimes miss the consideration due to excellent work: thus when he declares Senart's standard work on the Ashoka inscriptions to be 'largely obsolete.'

To return to the book itself, I think that some objection can be raised against its general plan. The treatment of the different parts is very uneven. Generally speaking, the book almost exclusively deals with Northern India, and it gives the impression of being intended as an interesting sketch of such periods as are comparatively well-known rather than to furnish a well-balanced treatise of Indian History in its entirety. This may be a result of the somewhat popular character of the work, but even so I do not think Mr. Smith is justified in filling 68 out of 429 pages with a description of Alexander's Indian Campaign, though this latter episode may claim to make a special appeal to the interest of readers trained in the ordinary course of classical studies.

Four and a half of these 68 pages form an appendix about Aornos and Embolimma, with remarks which the author himself declares to have been largely refuted since the first edition of his book was published. Considering the small immediate results of Alexander's expeditions, it would have seemed more sensible to devote more space to the history of his successors. In this way it might also have proved possible to make at least some remarks about the ethnographical and political relations revealed by the Mahabharata, even if 'the modern critic fails to find sober history in bardic tales.'

The fact remains that the Mahabharata problems belong to the most important ones in Indian civilisation, and it would seem necessary at least to draw attention to them in a book dealing with ancient Indian History.

A more serious objection is that the author often makes categorical statements without quoting his authorities or weighing the arguments that make against his views. The ordinary reader will accept such statements even in cases where Mr. Smith's authority is not comparable with that of his opponents. More reserve would not, I think, have been out of place in many cases. I shall take some instances.

When speaking about the influence of Greek civilisation, Mr. Smith on p. 226 in the text treats the hypothesis of the Greek origin of the Indian drama as a proved fact, and only mentions in a footnote that most scholars are of a different opinion. Most readers do not care about footnotes, and Mr. Smith's remark is sure to produce a wrong impression in wide circles.

On the very next page we read that there is no evidence that Greek architecture was ever introduced into India. It is very difficult to understand what he means in saying so. If he only wants to say that no really Greek building is known to have been erected, the remark seems to be rather superfluous. What he says gives the impression that only a few Ionic pillars can be pointed out as traces of Greek influence.

The remarks about the Gandhara sculptures are of the same kind. We are told on p. 227 that they are of late date and the offspring of cosmopolitan Greco-Roman art. Scholars know that this is Mr. Smith's private opinion, but general readers will certainly get the impression that it is the accepted theory, which is by no

1 In this connexion it may not be out of the way to note that a new edition of all the Ashoka inscriptions by a competent scholar, is already under preparation.
means the case. People who know inform me that the technique is certainly Greek and not Roman. Foucher mentions the fish-god with the double tail as one of the Greek elements in Gandhāra art. If this is the case, and I do not doubt it, it will probably be necessary to date the Gandhāra sculptures back to at least the times of Menander, for the same fish-god figures on a Mauryan rail dug out by Mr. Marshall and myself at Sārnath this winter. It cannot be urged against an early date for the Gandhāra sculptures that they have developed the idea of the Būdhisattva, because it has not been, and I think cannot be, proved that the Būdhisattva is a late development in Buddhism. Nor does Mr. Smith's dictum that the Mahāyāna was largely of foreign origin carry immediate conviction. That the Gandhāra school knew other Būdhisattvas than the prince Siddhārtha, is certain enough. Maitrāya with his flail, sometimes standing and sometimes sitting in European fashion, has long been recognised (thus in the Lahore Museum Nos. 569, 572, 1127, 1121, 2853), and it is probable that also Avalokitēśvara is represented. But the great variety of stereotype Būdhisattvas which we find in the Gupta period, does not exist in Gandhāra. There are indications that the development had set in which finally led to the differentiation of the Būdhisattvas by means of the dhāru in the Mahāyāna. Thus, I have seen small medallions with a Buddha seated in Dharmapāla or Bhūmisparśa, and a head of some Būdhisattva excavated by Dr. Spooner at Sārnath and now exhibited in the Peacock Museum. If this is, as it would be in later art, Amitābha, the Būdhisattva is Avalokitēśvara. And there are, as pointed out by Dr. Spooner, various forms of the head-dress, from which it will perhaps some day be possible to distinguish various Būdhisattvas. In this connection I may note the curious half-moon in the head-dress of a Maitrāya in the Lahore Museum (No. R. 2077). There are thus indications that the development resulting in the manifold Būdhisattva types of later times had already set in. But the conception is throughout free, and the stereotype art of the Gupta period seems to be centuries removed from the best Gandhāra school. It must be borne in mind that it is especially the latest phase in Gandhāra art which has been imitated in India, and even in late Mauryan art, there are things that point towards the Gandhāra school.

I think it is very risky to base any conclusions on a theory like Mr. Smith's about the age of the Gandhāra school, which does not account for important features and which is certainly not generally adopted. But the author probably wanted the theory for his dating of Kanishka. He states, again categorically and without proofs, that the best examples of Gandhāra art belong to the time of Kanishka and his successors, and "numismatic evidence alone proves conclusively that Kanishka lived at a time considerably later than the Christian era." I do not think that it is possible to dogmatise in this way. It seems to me impossible to bring Kanishka down to the same time as Chāshāha and other princes mentioned by Ptolemy. The fact that the Kushāna art in so many points seems to be a direct continuation of the Mauryan, is strong against such an assumption. And I am unable to see how the Mathurā inscription of Sānvasa from Sahvat 72 can be placed in 105 B.C., while Kushāna inscriptions found in the same locality and dated in the same way are brought down to the second century A.D., or later. But I do not feel competent to take up the thorny question of the Kanishka era. It still remains one of the most important problems in Indian history, though very much has of late been done, especially by Dr. Fleet, towards its solution. I think, however, that Mr. Smith would have done a greater service if he had pointed out more strongly how little advanced our knowledge about the matter actually is. This also applies to other parts of his book where he, apparently, brings order into the chronological chaos. His arguments are not always convincing. It is a, p. not evident why the traditional period of 100 years assigned to the two generations of the Nandas should be impossible. It is a well-known fact that many Indian kings had exceptionally long reigns. I shall only refer to the fact that the Eastern Gaṇga king, Chāḍāgaṇa, who ascended the throne in A.D. 1078, reigned for 70 years, and was succeeded by three sons, who reigned 16, 15, and 25 years, respectively, while a younger brother of the last one, who is not expressly stated to be a son of Chāḍāgaṇa, subsequently reigned 10 years. This brings the total for these two generations up to 150 years. I do not say that the traditional period assigned to the Nandas is correct, but Mr. Smith is hardly justified in putting it aside simply because it does not suit the chronological system adopted.

On the whole I think Mr. Smith's book conveys the false impression that considerably more is known about the ancient history of India than is actually the case. Everything sounds so plausible, that nobody who does not know, understands how great the difficulty really is. In this connection I will also mention the tendency of the author to tell us that there is reason to believe that the development has been such and
such, or that certain solutions of the problems are probable. The ordinary reader will think that there is sufficient proof in such cases, though very commonly there is not. I only wish to call attention to the statement that the oldest Burmese Buddhism was probably of the Mahāyāna

This theory appears to be very commonly held in Europe, and Mr. Smith already wrote about it several years ago. It was originally started by Mr. Taw Sein Ko, but the proofs adduced by him have failed to convince me. He takes his arguments from Burmese tradition, which is not a very trustworthy source, and, besides, he argues from some archaeological finds, which can, of all them, be satisfactorily explained in other ways. And so far as I can see, the whole foundation is so weak that the theory cannot be said to have been made probable. It would lead me much too far to take it up for discussion in this place, and I only want to point out that, in my opinion, it would have been much better not to mention it at all in a book like that under review.

The history of Buddhism does not, on the whole, play a great rôle in the book. The author remarks that his account of the Buddhisteanings of two Gupta kings is new. It has, however, been known for some time that the rule of the Guptas saw the highest development of Buddhist monasteries in India. Not less than three big Gupta monasteries have been found in Sarnath alone, and we know also that Kumāragnāṇa dedicated statues to the Buddha.

Some of the author’s remarks about topography are also misleading. Thus the designation of new Ājīravāha as the lower town, while the old and new towns are on a level, though the old one is surrounded by hills; the remarks about Kaśīra’s stupa as situated at Sāhājī kī Dhāra outside the Lahore gate of Peshawar, though the locality an question lies just outside the Ganj gate, and it is extremely doubtful whether it really marks the site of the old stupa; and above all, his statements about the site of Sārāvati. I have personally always thought that the excavation of the famous Būdhisattva statue at Set Mahāt was sufficient proof that that place is the old Sārāvatī, but Mr. Vincent Smith has not admitted this.

Now, Dr. Vogel has found the mutilated inscription on the umbrella staff belonging to the statue among the antiquities found by Mr. Hoey in Set Mahāt, and deposited in the Lucknow Museum; and Punji Dāya Ram has, some months ago, found a copper-plate in Set Mahāt registering a donation to the Jātavara. I think that most scholars will consider these proofs as sufficient.

I do not think it would be fair to give a complete list of the details where I think the author’s statements will have to be modified. The above remarks are only meant to illustrate the most seri-ous defect of the book, the insufficiency with which the author quotes his authorities and gives his reasons. Those who do not know are often unable to decide whether an individual statement represents an established fact or simply a hypothesis by the author. On the whole, however, I think that Mr. Vincent Smith’s Ancient History of India is an extremely useful book, for which we have every reason to be thankful.

The proof-reading has not always been satisfactory. Compare the nasty misprints Kashān (the printer has introduced this form throughout); Kautalya (p. 38); Kāśī (p. 193); sāhājī (p. 199); Vaiśakha (p. 197); Kāj-gyū (p. 250); jāy-askandhāvala (p. 367), and so on. Some etymologies offered by the author such as Kharwār = Gahwar; Thāṅsēr = Thāṅtsēr; Bihīl = Villar, might also be challenged. But most of them are of no importance for the history of the period. The state of affairs is a little different where he uses the form chaḍa occurring on Andhra coins as a support of the tradition of the Purānas that there was an Andhra king Chandara. In the first place I fail to see how chaḍa can correspond to Bānskrit chandara. In the second place, the actual name occurring on the coins is Chajudden, and that this is the real name is proved by an inscription found some time ago by Mr. Rea on the top of a hill at Kodavalu in the Ganjam District.

Though the impressions have been and are insufficient for giving a full translation, it is quite certain that it begins:

$sidhamu rāṇa Viśālāśuta sāmi-sīri-Chaḍa-

Śren Konow.
REFERENCES TO THE BHOTTAS OR BHAUHTAS IN THE RAJATARANGINI
OF KASHMIR.

Translations and Notes on the Sanskrit Texts
BY PANDIT DAYA RAM SAINI.

Notes from the Tibetan Records
BY A. H. FRANKE.

I.
The References contained in Kalhana's Rājatarangini.1

Kalhāna Rājat. I, 312 contains a note on a raiding expedition into Kashmir undertaken
by impure Dāradas, Bhauṭṭas, and Mlechcas in the days of Mihirakula, c. 510 A. D.

Kalhāna Rājat. IV, 168, refers to Lalitādiya-Muktāpīda's expeditions against the
Bhauṭṭas, probably c. 722 A. D.

Kalhāna Rājat. VIII, 2336-2338. The pretender Bhoja, who rebelled in the reign of
King Jayasīnuha, 1120-1149 A. D., is advised by his Dard allies to march through the Bhauṭṭa
territory to the seat of the powerful Trilaka. Whether he acted according to this advice or
not, we do not know.

Tibetan Notes.

It is only with regard to the second reference that any light can be thrown from the
Tibetan records.

The Tibetan emperor Khri-srong-lde-btsan, who reigned from c. 728 to 786 A. D., is said
in the rGyal-rabs to have conquered all the neighbouring nations, the Chinese, the Baltis, the
Turks, and the Dards of Gilgit (Brushal).2 All Western Tibet was in his power. His
successful campaigns must have taken place after 750 A. D., for in 751 A. D. the Arabs
had gained a victory over the Chinese and compelled the latter to abandon Gilgit, as well as their
other possessions in the extreme West. See Stein's Ancient Khotan, Sect. II and III.

That Khri-srong-lde-btsan's name was known in Western Tibet, is made probable by the
Bala-mekhar Inscription (see ante, Vol. XXXIV, p. 203), where the custom-house officer
mentioned in the inscription was plainly called after the emperor, his name being Khri-shong's
'trum-ylugs. The power of the Tibetan empire in those days is attested by the Annals
of the Chinese Tang dynasty, and perhaps also by the eighth century Inscription at Endere
in Tibet, which speaks of a victory of the Tibetans over the Chinese. See Stein, Ancient
Khotan, Detailed Report, p. 569, Inscription C. So that it is quite possible that before
750 A. D., the Kashmiris did assist the Chinese during their successful wars with the Tibetans,
the object of which was to gain a foothold at Gilgit, as shown by Chavannes and Stein.

1 As Kalhana's Rājatarangini has been already exhaustively treated by Dr. M. A. Stein, it is unnecessary to
do more here than merely mention the references to the Bhauṭṭas which are contained in that work.
2 I wish to draw attention to Sarat Ch. Das' note on Brus-tha, Brusha, or Bruska (forms of the name of Brushal,
  i.e., Gilgit). He says: "We have in the bKa' byu, certain treatises in incomprehensible syllables asserted to be
  in the Brusha language." These treatises are apparently written in the ancient Dard language, and should be of
  the greatest importance as relics of an ancient Dard literature.
3 (For wrong).
The best proof of a former Tibetan occupation of Gilgit is the occurrence of a considerable number of Tibetan words in the Dard language of Gilgit. The following are a few specimens: *chumno*, Tib. *chungba*, small; *tiuki*, Tib. *tahi*, bread; *darum*, Tib. *daring*, yet; *kore*, Tib. *kore*, cup; *zanglug*, Tib. *zanglu*, copper-kettle; *zhu*, Tib. *zhu*, greeting; *gushe* [bom], Tib. *guses*, to bow; [chege] *mi sto*, Tib. *mi sto*, 'does not matter.' — A man called Ghulam Shah, or Ghulam Ali, from the house *Komer* (Yarrakot), Gilgit, tells me that on a stone in his field there is an ancient Tibetan inscription and an old *school-rien*, also containing a Tibetan inscription. Tibetan cremation tablets can be found there as well.

II.

Jñanarāja's Rājstaraṅgini (verses 157—254)

The history of Riśchana Bhoti.

(157) At that time the Bhoṭa princes, named Kālamānyaḥ deceitfully slew, in their territory, one Vakatanyā, the son of a descendant of their dynasty, together with his kinsmen.

(158) One of his (Vakatanya's) sons, Riśchana by name, honourable and possessed of an uncommon intellect — a wild fire (as it were) to the Kālamānyaḥ family, escaped by chance.

(159) Having patched up an alliance with Vyāla, Ṭukcha and others, who had combined together with secret plans and policies, he resolved to vanquish those fools (Kālamānyaḥ).

(160) Through a messenger, he requested his enemies to enroll him as a servant, for his funds were running short.

(161) With his weapons concealed in sand, that lion among men (Riśchana), awaited them (the Kālamānyaḥ) on the banks of the river, in order to drink their blood and not (to receive) riches.

(162) The Kālamānyaḥ who approached the place unarmed, were destroyed by Vyāla and the others, like grass, by the fire of the axes (formerly) hidden in the sand.

(163) Having washed off the soil of the treason against his father, with the blood of his enemies, he went away to Kashmir together with his kinsmen for fear of the remaining enemies.

(164) The sun of the land² suffered in the sky the rise of Riśchana, like that of Rahua, as a safeguard against the ascendancy of that full-moon, Rāmachaudra.

(165) In that fire — Dauncha³ who consumed the country with his flaming sword — all the people of Kashmir became like moths.

(166) The eastern and northern districts being occupied by Dauncha and Riśchana, the people first fled in the western and then in southern direction.

(167) (Like) punnāga plants laden with fruit and requiring shade, the distinguished and wealthy (though) seeking protection, were threatened in the valley by a flood of water in the shape of Dauncha, and on the mountains, by the wind-storm, Riśchana.

¹ The text has Kālamāti, evidently an error.
² Dauncha, a Turkish (Turkusha) invader. [Dr. J. P. Vogt].
³ Sūhadeva, King of Kashmir.
⁴ The region of Yama, the God of Death, lies in the south.
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(168) The swift soldiery of Riśhchana carried away the inhabitants of Kashmir like a swift kite, a young bird fallen from (its) nest.

(169) Having acquired wealth like water from the Bhottas by the sale of the people of Kashmir, the raving Riśhchana held all quarters like a thunder-cloud.

(195) By his prowess did Dulcha overpower (the country, and when he was gone), Riśhchana became predominant. Unchaste women are happy (when) darkness prevails over the world.

(196) Riśhchana obscured the king delivered from Dulcha, by his increasing supremacy as does the western mountain, the moon freed from an eclipse, by its lofty peak.

(197) Seeing that sun, Riśhchana, standing on the top of the mountain of heaven, who did not suspect the imminent decline of the moon-like king?

(198) Rāmachandra, the moon of his race, at every step opposed that royal falcon Riśhchana in his attempt to seize the piece of flesh in the shape of the city (Srinagar).

(199) Bent on fraud, Riśhchana every day sent Bhottas into the Lahara Fort under the pretence of selling cloth.

(200) When the Bhottas people had thus been introduced into the fort of Lahara, Riśhchana caused their weapons to drink the honey of Rāmachandra's blood.

(201) The large-armed Riśhchana planted on his breast queen Kotā, that kazha-creeper in the garden of Rāmachandra's house.

(202) For fear of the illustrious Riśhchana, the king (Sūhadēva) then left the town; how could prosperity sprout in one burnt by the fire of a Brāhmaṇa's curse?

(203) Afraid, that jackal of a king took refuge in the Pramanḍala (?) cave; how could such a sinner encounter death on the battle-field?

(204) Oh marvel! The cloud of enemies, by showers of the blood of the king on the battle-field, dried the eyes of the twice-born who (by the king) had been made to pay fines.

(205) For nineteen years, four months less five days, did this demon of a king devour the land under the pretence of protection.

(206) The illustrious Saratān (Sulṭān) Riśhchana gave rest to the land weary of the Yavana disturbances, in the lofty window of his arms.

* The next twenty-five verses (170-194) contain a description of the oppressions Dulcha perpetrated in Kashmir, and the devastation accompanying his invasions.

* The metaphor is taken from the fact that a roasted seed cannot put forth sprouts.
The district of Kashmir saw again the welfare (enjoyed) under its former kings, as on the disappearance of darkness a man sees everything as he did before.

The Lavan"as who had been so firm at every place, trembled before the prowess of the king, as do lamps in a strong morning breeze.

When a hole had been made by the needle of (the king's) stratagem, and the thread in the shape of an arrow passed through it, Oh wonder, the wallet (patched garment) of the Lavan"as became loosened (instead of fastened).

Where, like a naked man in a thorny wood, he (Ra"chana) was entangled, even there did he roam like a bird in the sky.

Though prompt in showing kindness, he for the sake of his subjects' weal, never showed forgiveness to a wicked person, whether son, minister, or friend.

Having caused a division among his powerful enemies of increasing prosperity, he once went hunting, shining with his royal parasol.

On the way, Ta"uka's brother, Timi by name, tormented by heat somewhere in a village, (took) by force some milk from a cowherdess and drank it.

When questioned by the king, who was at once informed by the cowherdess, he denied it all.

Since the cowherdess, though suspected of falsehood, did not lose her firmness, the king caused Timi's stomach to be cut open, in order to ascertain the truth.

By the stream of milk, which gushed forth from his severed stomach, the fame of the king and the lovely face of the cowherdess were brightened.

Two mares belonging to two inhabitants of Vana"ala bore, in a certain forest, two colts which much resembled each other.

The young of one of them having been killed in the forest by a lion, she treated the other colt as her own, owing to its similarity in appearance.

"This is mine, this is mine": thus did the owners of the mares quarrel with each other, and being unable to settle the matter, approached the king.

The king having listened to their dispute, caused the two mares and the colt to be brought to him by his own men.

Since the colt, owing to its youth, playfully gamboled far and wide, (both) the mother and the nurse showed their affection and even neighed.

Feudal land-owners or barons, also called Damaras. [Dr. J. Ph. Vogel.]

Ra"chodana. Is it a proper name? [D. R. S.]
As the judges were deaf and dumb, and the parties ready to quarrel, the king took the mares with the colt in a boat to the middle of the Vitasta.

When the sagacious king then threw the colt overboard, the mother at once jumped after it into the river, while the other (only) neighed.

When that king decided dubious cases in this manner, the people thought that the golden age had, as it were, returned.

When the king entreated the illustrious Devasrāmin to initiate him into Saivism he was not admitted, because as a Bhoṭṭa he was not deemed a proper recipient.

Owing to his devotion to the sole service of truth, Viyālarāja was to the king a brother, son, minister, companion, and friend.

Viyāla could undo the deeds of the king, but not the latter of Viyāla. The mind can put down bodily action, but not the body that of the mind.

The pleasure of the king reflected on the tasteful Viyāla, that store of art, destroyed the impenetrable ignorance of the people, as does the light of the sun, reflected on the watery moon, the darkness of the world.

When Dulecha was ready to invade Kashmir, Udyānadeva was at once deputed by the king, to turn him back by means of bribes; but when Dulecha refused and entered the country, he fled out of fear to the country of Gaṇḍhāra, as soon as he got an opportunity.

The illustrious Udyānadeva intent on taking advantage of (the king's) weakness, and relying on the chief of Gaṇḍhāra, thus addressed Tukka and others:

"You will, methinks, go down to hell alive, since craving for honour, you serve an indiscriminating master.

Viyāla enjoys the prosperity acquired by you at the risk of your lives; the hands exert themselves and the tongue enjoys.

The king rolling in wealth, gives all prominence to Viyāla and disregards you, though you belong to a high caste, as Siva with his limbs besmeared with ashes, makes the serpent his necklace and discards golden ornaments.

On the pretext that he had drunk some milk, the king killed Timi like a fish, (in reality) out of fear of your valour."

Hurt by this message and overwhelmed (lit., blackened) with grief, Tukka and his companions attacked the king at once at Viṃśapraṭṭha.

By (a shower of) blows from their (own) sharp swords, Viyāla drove out of their hearts their envy of his sovereignty. The king only fainted.

They (the enemies) then thinking themselves victorious, freed from anger by his (the king's) death and puffed up with pride, entered the city in order to seize the kingdom.
(239) Afraid of receiving another blow, the king for a while lay like one dead; but when he saw the enemies far advanced, he rose again to his royal state.

(240) While these poor-witted men ascended the king’s residence, they beheld the king approaching, who had recovered from his swoon.

(241) “Why did you not, why did you not slay the king?”: thus did those wicked fools at that time violently accuse each other.

(242) Angry with each other, they pushed one another from the royal palace and caused their own destruction, which (otherwise) should have been caused by the king.

(243) The angry king impaled the wicked survivors; he thus raised them high, but down they went to hell.

(244) The pregnant wives of his Bhoṭṭa enemies, the wrathful king split asunder with his sword, like pods full of seeds (dara split) with the nails.

(245) The pain in the king’s heart arising from his anger at their treason was allayed by the destruction of their race, but not that in the head caused by the blows of their swords.

(246) Having witnessed, for a while, the deeds of Ṭukka and the others, like an evil dream, the land, so to speak, woke again and free from fear, obtained peace.

(247) Pleased with Shāh Mir who had taken no part in the treason, the king entrusted to him his son Haiḍar, as well as his (Haiḍar’s) mother Koṭā, to bring him up.

(248) Reared by queen Koṭā, like a sprouting plant in the rainy season, (the boy) enjoyed the protection of Shāh Mir.

(249) The king built after his own name a town which was surrounded by a moat which was (as it were) the disgrace arising from his defeat.

(250) Like the sun on a cloudy day in Pauṣa, the king again illumined the world for a few months.

(251) By a disorder of the wind-humour brought about by the bitter cold of winter, the pain in the king’s head became more intense.

(252) Alas! the headache of the king, whose virtues were ever capable of relieving the pain of numberless heads, went on increasing.

(253) On the eleventh lunar day of Pauṣa in the year 99, the headache of the king was at last relieved by the physician Death.12

(254) Having protected the earth for three years and two months less eleven days, king Bīṣhūna went to heaven.

12 The date of his death corresponds with Friday, November 25th, A. D. 1323. [Dr. J. Ph. Vogel.]
Tibetan Notes.

The Ladakhi Chronicles contain only a very short passage which seems to have reference to Rinchana Bhoti of Kashmir. It is this: "His (Lha-chen dNgos-grub's) son was Lha-chen rGyalbu Rinchen (or Prince Rinchen, the Great God")." It is somewhat difficult to reconcile the Kashmiri record with this short notice.

According to Jonaräja, v. 157, it was the murder of Rinchana's father, a Vakatanya, by a tribe of Kālamānya that caused his departure from Tibet. The word Kālamānya probably stands for 'men of Khar-mang,' Khar-mang being the capital of a tribe of Baltis. And it looks almost as if the Baltis had at that time tried to overthrow the Ladakhi dynasty. The term Vakatanya may refer to the Castle of Vaka near Mulbe, which was in the hands of the Ladakhi kings. We shall hardly, however, ever get beyond conjecture with regard to the political state of Western Tibet of those days and must not expect the Kashmir chronicler to have troubled much about Rinchana's early history. There are, nevertheless, three reasons in particular which make us believe in the possible identity of rGyalbu Rinchen and the Rinchana of Kashmir: (1) the fact that the Tibetan record speaks of Rinchen as a prince (rGyabu); (2) the identity of name; (3) the identity of time.

With regard to the latter point the following may be added. My first attempt at a chronology of the Ladakhi kings is found in my article 'The Rock Inscriptions at Mulbe,' ante, Vol. XXXV, p. 72 ff., where Lha-chen rGyalbu Rinchen is given the second place among the four kings who reigned during the 14th century. This infers that in the ordinary course he reigned in Ladakh between 1325 and 1350 A.D. But we now find from the Kashmir record that Rinchen left Ladakh quite as a young man, and that his reign in Kashmir lasted only from 1320-1323. This would make my date for the commencement of his reign too late. As there is no break in the succession of Ladakhi kings, we suppose that a son was born to Rinchen, before he left Ladakh, but how the government of Ladakh was managed during the minority of Rinchen's son, we are not told.

There is another little item which may be adduced in proof of the general correctness of my chronology above mentioned. Of Rinchen's father, Lha-chen dNgos-grub, it is stated that the Lamasist Encyclopædia, bKa'-lugs-pa, was introduced into Ladakh in his time. This would point to the two first decades of the 14th century as the date of the introduction, which is exactly the period when the Mongols also received the Encyclopædia for the first time.

It may be said, however, that Rinchana Bhoti could just as well have hailed from Zangkar, Purig, or Balistan as from Ladakh, but until we can find an historical record of these countries, we must content with such scanty evidence as the above from Ladakh. It is remarkable also that Ladakhi folklore contains an ancient song, which relates the departure of a 'Prince Rinchen' from Ladakh.

As regards the names in Jonaräja's Chronicle. Rinchana is the Tibetan Rinchen; Kālamānya is Tibetan mKhar-mang; Vakatanya is Tibetan Vaka (?); Tukka is probably Tibetan 'aBrug pa (pronounced Ḍugpa or Ḍugpa). With regard to the name Vyāla, two explanations may be given: (1) the name may have always been Vyāla, for we know that Indian names were used in Ladakh in former days; (2) the name may have been originally Byarba, Tibetan for 'sentinel,' the Kashmiris changing the word byarba to Vyāla on account of similarity of sound. Tumi is perhaps a corruption of a compound name, the first part of which was Tibetan khrims (pronounced thim), custom, law.
III.

The Expedition of Zainu'l-ʿabidin of Kashmir against the Bhoṭṭas.

(a) Jonaraṭa's Rājatarangini.

Dr. J. Ph. Vogel writes about this passage in a letter to myself, dated the 1st September, 1906: 'I intended to send you the passage about Zainu'l-ʿabidin's expedition to Bhoṭṭaland also, but it is rather obscure .... .' In a letter dated the 11th August, 1906, Dr. Vogel had, however, given me the general contents of the passage in question as follows: Zainu'l-ʿabidin of Kashmir (1420-1476) invades Gogga-deśa (Guge?), saves a golden image of Buddha from the hands of the Yavanas (Muhammadans) in Sayā-deśa, and takes the town of Kūliṭa (Kūli), which apparently at that time was occupied by the Tibetans.

(b) Srivara's Rājatarangini.

Taraṇaḍa I, v. 51. 'Having conquered the outlying provinces of Sindhu and Hinduvāja, the king (Zainu'l-ʿabidin) marched with his army to conquer the Bhoṭṭa country.'

Translator's Note.

The date of this event is not stated in the Sanskrit text. But since Jonaraṭa, whose chronicle narrates the history of Kashmir till the year 1450 A. D. does not notice it, it is very probable that the expedition mentioned in the above stanza took place some time in the last or fifth decade of Zainu'l-ʿabidin's reign, i.e., between 1460 and 1470 A. D.

Tibetan Notes.

Although the Ladakhi Chronicles do not mention any expeditions of the Kashmir kings to Western Tibet, they contain a reference which becomes intelligible only through our knowledge of the Kashmir Chronicles, viz., that one of king 'aBum-ide's sons has the half-Muhammadan name, Drungs Ḵa Ali. The occurrence of such a name at that time is quite extraordinary, but we can explain it in the light of Zainu'l-ʿabidin's expedition. The Ladakhi king was probably compelled to seek the friendship of the Kashmir king, and may have accepted from him a wife or a rich among his relations. A similar case occurs in the history of King 'aJam-dbyang-rnam-rgyal, who, after he had become the captive of the Balti king, Ali Mir, had to marry one of his daughters.

The expedition which is mentioned in Jonaraṭa's Chronicle, may have taken place during the second decade of Zainu'l-ʿabidin's reign, and the fourth of king 'aBundle IV, that is between 1460 and 1470 A. D.

In Schlagintweit's 'Die König von Tibet,' Abb. der K. Tiirischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Bd. III, p. 863, king 'aBundle's son is called a tributary king, as if he had paid tribute to Kashmir. I wish to state that the translation 'tributary king' is due to a mistake. Schlagintweit's MS. has the orthographical mistake glaṭi rgyalpo, 'king of wages,' when glaṭi rgyal po, 'godly king,' was meant.

As regards the place-names given in the Kashmir Record: Sayā-deśa is probably the village of Shāl, pronounced Sbā, above Leh, on the Indus, which village has apparently always been famous for its large Buddhist images. Gogga-deśa is doubtless Guga.
Dr. Vogel’s note, that Kulūta was probably occupied by the Tibetans at that time, is quite in agreement with Ladakhi history. The king of Kulūta was in a loose way a vassal of the kings of Leh.

The route taken by Zainu’l-ābidīn was that taken by the Ladakhi king, Thse-dbang-mam-rgyal I, later on, when he went to Guge and Purang, and returned to Ladakh by way of Kulū and Lahaul.

Of the expedition of King Zainu’l-ābidīn, which is mentioned in Śrīvāra’s Chronicle, we hear nothing in the Ladakhi Chronicle. It may have been directed against Baltistan.

IV.

Ādam Khān’s Expedition to Tibet.

Śrīvāra’s Rājataraṅgīṇī. Tāraṅga I.

(a) v. 71.

Being afraid of his (Ādam Khān’s) assassination, the king (Zainu’l-ābidīn) sent his son away after a few days by the road leading to Bhोṭṭa.

Translator’s Note.

Ādam Khān was the eldest son of Zainu’l-ābidīn, the younger ones being Hājī Khān and Bahrām Khān. Ādam Khān and Hājī Khān hated each other, and the latter conspired with some officers of the State against the life of the former. It was to avoid this danger that the king (Zainu’l-ābidīn) had to send away his eldest son.

(b) v. 82.

When in course of time, Ādam Khān had returned (to Kashmir) having conquered the Bhōṭṭa country, Hājī Khān marched to the mountain of Lohara under the king’s (Zainu’l-ābidīn) orders.

Translator’s Note.

It is not possible to find out the precise date of this event, but that it probably took place in 1451 A.D. may be inferred from Śrīvāra I, v. 86, which supplies the Lankika year 23 (A.D. 1452) as the date of Hājī Khān’s return from the campaign referred to in the verse translated above.

Tibetan Notes.

Ādam Khān’s expedition must have taken place during the reign of the Ladakhi king blo-gros-mohog-lidan, who reigned from c. 1440-1470 A.D. No mention is made in the Ladakhi Chronicles of a war with Kashmir under him. The expedition may have been conducted against Baltistān.
V.

The Expedition against Tibet under Hasan Khān.

Srīvāra’s Rājatarāṅgini. Tarāṅga III.

(a) v. 32.

By his (Ahmad Malik’s) advice (the king Hasan Khān) sent back to the Bhoṭṭa country those who, having been taken captives by his father (Hāji Hailar Shāh) and grandfather (Zainu’ll-ābidīn), lived in captivity.

Translator’s Note.

This passage alludes to the liberation of prisoners by Hasan Khān (King of Kashmir, from A. D. 1472 to 1494), soon after his coronation. Ahmad Malik was his favourite minister.

(b) v. 396.

They (the Sayyids (?) and other opponents of Ahmad Malik), the adherents of the minister (āṣikta) Natthaka, observing the king (Hasan) favoured him (Ahmad Malik) and being unable to fight, left (the country Kashmir) and went to the interior of the Bhoṭṭa country.

Translator’s Note.

The expression āṣikta-Natthakaḍygas is doubtful. I have ventured to take Natthaka as a proper name.

This passage alludes to the internecine hostilities of the ministers of Hasan, King of Kashmir. Tājibhaṭṭa, guardian of the Crown Prince, Muḥammad Khān, and the Sayyids (?) were jealous of Ahmad Malik, the beloved minister of the king, and had succeeded in exciting the king’s anger against him. Ahmad was, however, wise, for not only did he not himself take offence at his opponents’ conduct, but he also prevented his powerful son, Nauroz, from engaging in a contest with the Sayyids (?), etc. The king afterwards became reconciled to Ahmad, whose enemies had consequently to abandon Kashmir. This took place in the tenth regnal year of Hasan, i.e., in A. D. 1482; see Srīvāra, III, 391. We learn (however) a few verses further on, that the king changed his mind again, and that Ahmad died in prison.

(c) v. 440.

Desirous of conquering the Little and Great Bhoṭṭa countries, the Sayyids (?) sent the illustrious Jahāngīr and Naṣīr (or Naṣīr) on the expedition.

(v. 441). The two Sayyids (?) (Jahāngīr and Naṣīr) did not follow the Mārgēśīa’s advice that, if they went together, their work would succeed.

Translator’s Note.

The control over all these frontier-stations and the command of the ‘Marchesa,’ generally was invested in Hindū times in one high state officer, known by the title of ‘Dvārāpati,’ ‘Lord of the Gate,’ or some equivalent term. The organization of the system was somewhat changed in the Muḥammadan times, when the guarding of the several routes through the mountains was entrusted to feudal chiefs known as Maliks (Skr. mārgēśś). These held hereditary charge of specific passes, and enjoyed certain privileges in return for this duty. Dr. Stein, Rājat., transl. II, p. 391.
(d) v. 442 — 444.

One of them conquered the country (Bhōṭa), and entered the capital in glory. The other was fearful and, having been captured, saved himself by a trick.

(v. 443). Out of consideration for a time, even a brief description is not given (says the author Srivara) of the slaughter committed by the Bhōṭas, who attacked the (Sayyid’s?) army from behind.

(v. 444). Bahādur Ḍhā and some other servants of the old king (were consumed) like moths in the fire — like battle with the Jyulchānas and Bhōṭas.

Translator’s Notes.

According to Dr. Stein, the terms Little and Great Bhūṭa-land refers to Baltistān (Skardo) and Ladakh, respectively.

In the time of Hasan, the Sayyids were exceedingly powerful. The Jahāngir referred to in v. 440 was Mārgesa or Margapati (Superintendent of Passes) and minister in the time of Hasan.

The term Jyulchāna occurring in v. 444 denotes some such people as the Bhōṭas, and the five verses quoted above describe a campaign against the Bhōṭas by Jahāngir and Nāgir in the reign of Hasan (i.e., about the year 1483 A.D.). The leaders though desirous of invading the territory together, did not actually do so. The result was that only one of them was successful, while the other sustained a miserable defeat at the hands of the Bhōṭas.

Tibetan Notes.

This expedition which ended in the defeat of the Kashmir army, probably took place during the reign of the Ladakh king Lhachen Bhagan, who reigned about from 1470-1500 A.D. He deposed the last king of the first dynasty, and was the first king of the second (rnam-rgyal) dynasty. Of this king it is said in the Ladakh Chronicles that ‘he was very fond of fighting,’ but we are not told whom he fought against. The change of dynasty and the great confusion resulting from it, may be the reason why the historical accounts referring to the latter half of the 15th century are particularly meagre. It is, however, very probable that it was Lhachen Bhagan, who inflicted the blow on the Kashmiris, and that in consequence of this victory, he was enabled to make himself supreme king of Ladakh. The consequence of this victory was that the Kashmiris came no more on raiding expeditions into Ladakh.

Since I wrote my article ‘Archaeology in Western Tibet,’ ante, Vol. XXXVI, p. 89 ff., it has occurred to me, with regard to the Inscription of Lhachen-Kun-dga-rnam-rgyal at Daru, that it is possible that it refers to Lhachen Bhagan, on the ground that the founder of the rNam-rgyal Dynasty may himself have taken a new title containing the words rnam-rgyal.

Jyulchāna is very probably a Tibetan word, but hardly a proper name. It may be a corruption of the Tibetan words rgyal chen, or rgyalchos, the former meaning ‘great king’ the latter ‘victorious.’ If Jyulchānas stands for rgyal-chen, it would probably point to Lhachen Bhagan, who had made himself supreme king, the deposed members of the old dynasty having become rgyal-chung, or ‘little kings.’

VI.

The Bhōṭas in Praṣyaḥṣaṭa’s Rajastāṇiṇī.

(v. 28). At that time (in the time of Faḥ, pronounced, in India, Fateh) through the predomination of Kali there was a (remarkable) equality of all classes of people, whether they were wicked or virtuous, learned scholars (Bhāṣṭas) or Bhōṭas, actors or rogues.
Translator's Note.

Fatḥ was King of Kashmir from 1468 to 1513 A.D. Being incapable of governing himself, he entrusted the discharge of royal duties to his Mārgapati and minister, Ibrahīm. The latter proved worse than the king and so misused his powers that the country was a scene of utter lawlessness during the whole of that reign.

Tibetan Notes.

At first sight this text would make it appear that there were Bhōṭṭas among the subjects of the Kashmir kings. This is not probable, for Ladakh as well as Baltistan were independent possessions during the 16th century. But the trade between the Panjab and Yarkand, through Kashmir and Leh, was probably carried on without any interruption, and this trade brought many Ladakhis and Baltis to Kashmir. They had there not only a rest-house of their own, but apparently also a Buddhist place of worship. There is a masjid below the castle hill of Srinagar, which is still known as the Bodh Masjid, and that it was formerly a Buddhist temple is shown by the fact that behind the white-wash on the walls the pictures of Buddhist saints are to be found. This is well known to all Ladakhis.

Conclusion.

In conclusion I may say that the Muhammadan Chronicles of Kashmir seem to contain material which is of importance to Western Tibetan history, though as yet a single instance only has come to my notice. It is in the Tawārīkh-i-Kashmirī written by Sultan Sa'id's son in Kashmir. It is there stated that in 1531 A.D., Sultan Sa'id of Kashgar invaded Tibet (Ladakh) with an army of 5,000 men and died on his way back. This is very probably the same expedition as is mentioned in the Ladakhi Chronicles under King bKrashis-rnam-rgyal l, who reigned during the first decades of the 16th century, probably till about 1535 A.D.

I cannot think that Sir Walter Lawrence drew upon Muhammadan sources when he wrote his account of Raineihan Shah (Rīnehana Bhott) in his Valley of Kashmir. He calls Raineihan Shah the founder of the Jama Masjid and of the shrine of Bulbul Lankar. With regard to this statement, Mr. Nicholls says: 13—

"The first line of the inscription over the gate-way of the Jama Masjid at Srinagar is illegible, but the Tawārīkh-i-Kashmirī Agami states that the mosque was first built by king Sikander the second and then burnt down. The second line of the inscription says that after several years Hassan Shāh rebuilt it. Since then the inscription records other fires and restorations.

A manuscript from which I have taken an abstract, records that Sikandar But-shikan first built the mosque, and it goes on to mention its being burned down and rebuilt by Hassan Shāh and Zainu'l-Abidin.

I have no evidence regarding the building of the mosque by Rīnehana, the Ladakhi king of Kashmir, and should be glad to know on what the supposition is based... . . .

I regret I have no notes regarding the 'Bulbul Lankar,'" 13

Sir Walter Lawrence may have based his statement on popular tradition. The man from Gilgit mentioned above who visited the Jama Masjid, tells me that people connect the Jama Masjid with the Ladakhi king of Kashmir, because, in the court of the masjid, there is an ancient stone-sculpture with a Tibetan inscription, which is believed to date from the time of the Ladakhi king.

13 Dr. Vogel's letter to me, dated the 5th November 1903.
TAMIL HISTORICAL TEXTS.

BY M. K. MARAYANASAMI AYYAR, B.A., B.L., AND T. A. GOPINATHA RAO, M.A. MADRAS.

(Continued from p. 178.)

No. II.—Iraiyanar = agapporu.

Nature of the work.—This is a treatise on the subject of love (agapporu). It deals mainly with the analysis of the mind in love and incidentally also with courtship, elopement, marriage and such other topics. To give an exact idea of what is meant by agapporu we shall take the definitions of porul and agam as given in the commentary of Nacheshinarkkiniyar on that classical Tamil grammar, Tolkâppiyam.\(^1\) Porul is defined as the three purushârthas (dharma, artha and kâma or in Tamil âram, porul and ikham), their transitoriness and (mâkha), liberation from these three; and that division of rhetoric, which deals with porul, as defined above, is called porul-adigaram: thus we see that porul-adigaram is universal in its character and embraces every variety of subject bearing on human life. Porul-adigaram is divided into two classes, purapporul and agapporu. Of these purapporul deals with the deeds of the warrior hero outside the family circle,—mainly with war; agapporu has for its subject love, pure and simple, which is defined in Tolkâppiyam (p. 2) as "the happiness which is generated by the coming together or meeting of two lovers equally devoted in the love, which happiness continues even in their separation as an inner feeling towards the other, indescribable in its nature." Agapporu is further divided into kalâciyil and karpu. Kalâciyil is described both in Tolkâppiyam and Iraiyanard = agapporu as "being the same as the gandharva system of marriage described in the Sàstras of the Bràhmans," while karpu is defined as "the union in marriage of a woman and a man of proper lineage and with proper ceremonies." The essential distinction therefore between the two consists in that kalâciyil analyses the sentiment of love as exhibited in secret courtship, whereas karpu deals with that sentiment in the married state. Iraiyanar = agapporu, in treating of agapporu, comprehends within its scope both kalâciyil and karpu.

Description of the work:—The work consists of sixty sàtras and there is attached to it a very masterly commentary in the finest Tamil prose. The commentary gives a very interesting tradition of the three Tamil Sàigams, about which so many conflicting things have been written. For fuller information regarding the subject the reader is referred to Prof. M. Sêshagiri Sàstri's Essay on Tamil Literature, and to Mr. V. Kanakasabhai Pillai's Tamil Eighteen Hundred Years Ago.

Authorship. Sàstras. The pàdicas portion of the Commentary attributes the work to Sàmasundara, the Siva deity at Madura, and the story it gives as to its origin is shortly this:—In the time of the last of the Forty-nine Kings, who patronised the third or the last Sàigam, and went by the name of Ugrâ-porna = Vajuli, there was a severe famine, and the king, finding it impossible to support the learned men who were gathered round him, requested

---

\(^a\) In the former article insert the following errata. Page 170; Footnote 2: add: — "(vide Tropädaka 3, Anurdha I, Section 14)."

Page 171. For tamiyur = esagam = elam read "ellam."

\(^1\) See page 81 of Tolkâppiyam—porul-adigaram, edited by Dâmôdaram Pillai, Madras, 1885.

The references to the Iraiyanard = agapporu in this work are to Mr. Dâmôdaram Pillai's second edition printed at Madras, which contains a long but very misleading introduction. See for this account, pp. 6 to 9.
them to scatter themselves to seek their livelihood. After the lapse of twelve years, when the rains fell and the country attained its normal state, the king sent his emissaries to gather the scattered scholars. They were able to bring only those who were versed in orthography, syntax and prosody. But they could find none who were versed in porusādīgāram. The king exclaimed: "Are not these three subjects useful only as aids to the porusādīgāram? My getting these is as though I never got them." The god Sūmasundara, perceiving his trouble of mind, determined to remove it,—seeing that it was in pursuit of knowledge. He, therefore, composed these sixty śāstras, engraved them upon three copper-plates and placed them underneath the pīḷa or platform, on which the image of the deity was placed. The next morning, the priest of the temple, after sweeping and cleaning the whole temple, unlike his usual custom, began to clean the base of the platform also, when he was overjoyed to find the set of copper-plates with the porusādīgāram engraved upon them. He ran with the copper-plates to the king, who saw the special grace of the deity towards him and gave the work to the poets of the Saṅgama, to be interpreted and explained. The several poets gave conflicting interpretations and, finding themselves unable to come to an understanding, went to the king and requested him to nominate an umpire to give an authoritative decision. The king replied that the forty-nine poets of the Saṅgama were the best litterati of the land and that it was impossible for him to nominate one better than themselves, and advised them to pray Sūmasundara himself 3 to vouchsafe to them an umpire. While they all lay within the temple praying to the deity, a voice was heard thrice repeated, which said: "In this place is a dumb boy aged five years, named Rūdra-saṁman, who is the son of Upurū-kūḍi-kīḷār (= the headman of the village of Upurū-kūḍi). Do not slight him as a mere boy, but seat him on a pedestal and recite to him the various commentaries composed by you. Whenever he hears the true interpretation, tears will come into his eyes and he will manifest symptoms of pleasure, but he will remain unmoved when the interpretation is not correct. He is the deity Kumāra (i.e. Subrahmanya) and has taken this birth owing to a curse." Hearing this voice, all the poets arose and, after circumambulating the temple, they approached Upurū-kūḍi-kīḷār, related to him these circumstances and requested him to permit his son to be taken with him. With his permission, they adorned the boy, and seating him on the elevated Sangha platform, they all sat down below and recited their respective commentaries. He heard all without any symptoms of pleasure, except occasionally when the commentary of Maḍurai-Maṛudap-ilānāgaṇapati was recited. But at every word of Nakkiṭar's Commentary there were evident signs of pleasure exhibited by him. Thus was Nakkiṭar's established to be the true interpretation.

The Commentary then continues the story thus: — "On account of this some say that the Commentary is by Rūdra-saṁman, the son of Upurū-kūḍi-kīḷār. But he did not compose it, he only heard it. Thus the fact is that the work itself was composed by the deity of Ālavāy, 4 the Commentary by Nakkiṭar, and that the latter was heard by the deity Kumāra. We shall now relate how the Commentary was handed down.

1. Nakkiṭar, the son of Maḍuraik-aṇakāṇapāṭar taught it to Kīravi-kograpāṭar;

2. He taught it to Tūṝa-kīḷār;

3. He taught it to Paḍiyān-gorrapāṭar;

3 The reference is here to the custom, according to which people will not leave the temple until the deity vouchsafes their requests to them.

4 i.e., Maḍura.
4. He taught it to Solvatt-āśiriyar Perunāṉṉar;  
5. He taught it to Maṇsalur-āśiriyar — Paḻiyakēṟṟu-perunjōndanṛ;  
6. He taught it to Sellur-āśiriyar Āṇḍai-puṟumkumāṉar;  
7. He taught it to Tiruk-kuṟṟatt-āśiriyar;  
8. He taught it to Mādaṉaḷaṉar Ijāṉaṅgar;  
9. He taught it to Muskiriy-āśiriyar Nilakaṇṭaṉar.

Thus does the Commentary come."

This is a free rendering of the very interesting account given in the Commentary regarding the origin of the work. The tradition is that all these events took place in the reign of Ugra-pperu-Valudi and that the Commentary itself was written at that time by Nakkrar, the president of the Saṅgam. The date of the work we shall discuss later on in the light of the facts disclosed by the verses quoted in the Commentary. But we may observe that the Commentary itself clearly negatizes the tradition that it was actually written down by Nakkrar. No doubt it might have been the fact that the substance of the work was what was propounded and taught by Nakkrar to his disciples; and this seems to have been handed down from generation to generation, till at last Musiriy = āśiriyar Nilakaṇṭaṉar, or his disciple, might have reduced the work to writing.

Illustrative verses in the Commentary. — There are more than 400 of these, of which 315 only, in praise of a king going by various names, such as Neḻumāṉar, &c., are serially numbered. These 315 form the larger portion of a species of composition called kōvai, which according to the Tamil grammars should consist of 400 verses in the kalittuvai metre. These verses will form the material for our study. From an analysis of these only one conclusion is possible, viz., that they refer to one individual alone.

The hero of the Kōvai. — The hero is named Neḻumāṉar of the Paṟṇya Dynasty. That he is a Paṟṇya is evident from the following verses and designations which denote a Paṟṇya: — Vv. 1, 7, 44, 83, 89, &c. Mīṇavaṉ — v. 11, &c. Nērīvaṉ — v. 19, 80, &c. Paṅchanaṉ — v. 20, 51, &c. Teṇavaṉ — v. 23, 36, 65, 76, &c.


9 Evidently a missection of Paruṇāṉaṉar. 10 Vv. 1, 7, 44, 83, 89, &c. 11 Vv. 3, 10, 27, 38, 71, &c. 12 Vv. 12, 45, 63, 161, 170, 173, &c. 13 V. 155. 14 Vv. 175, 181, 261, 291. 15 Vv. 24, 44, 70, 72, 79, 81, 84, &c.
Personal characteristics of the king.

That he was a dark man appears from the descriptions: ‘kuru-ad-maṇi vaṇṇam,’ r. 141 (he who has the complexion of the large blue jewel), and ‘kāri-vamoc piṇi vaṇṇam,’ r. 145 (he whose complexion was as that of the cloud-coloured Vīṣṇu). He was a great lover of the Tamil language, as he is called: — ciṇa = dāmī vēndan, ev. 1, 26, 67, &c. (the king who belongs to a race having sweet Tamil as its language), and anag = Agastīyanaṇdy = urai = taru in = dāmī kēṭṭōn, r. 89 (he who learnt classic Tamil as spoken in the days of old by the sage Agastyā). In verse 228, Neṭunāraṇ is described as having churned the ocean and obtaining nectar therefrom given it to the Dēvas. The same facts are mentioned in verses 234 and 394. Perhaps he was regarded by the poet as the incarnation of Vīṣṇu.

Battles won by the king: —

1. Sennīlam, ev. 1, 17, 20, 38, 65, &c.
2. Pālli, ev. 3, 13, 51, 73, 88, &c.
3. Vīḷāṇam, ev. 4, 7, 10, 39, &c.
4. Kōṭṭāru, ev. 5, 36, 86, 149, 234, &c.
5. Āṟṟukkaṇṭi, ev. 6, 11, 26, 59, 43, &c.
6. Pūlandai, ev. 8, 12, 27, 31, 87, &c.
7. Sēṟū, ev. 9, 16, 44, 52, &c.
8. Nāṟiyāṟu, ev. 15, 18, 23, 57, 100, &c.
11. Māḷagari, ev. 38, 42, 175.
14. Kaḷattūr, ev. 120.
17. Iruṅgiṟai, ev. 205, 269.
19. Kaḷanalai, ev. 257, 298, and
20. Vāṭṭūṟu, ev. 305.

Of these battles, those occurring at Āṟṟukkudi, Pūlandai, Sēṟū, Kaḍaiyal, Nāṟiyāṟu, Kōṭṭāru, and Vīḷāṇam, were fought with the Chēras. At Kōṭṭāru, Pālli and Kaḍaiyal the king is said to have encountered a number of kings (ev. 298, 162 and 39). The battle of Nāṟiyāṟu was probably a naval one (ev. 57 and 299).

23 Agastya is said to be the author of Prapāṭhiyam, the earliest grammar of the Tamil language, which is now only known by quotations. The author of the earliest extant grammar, Tolkāpīyam, is said to have been his disciple. The work under discussion describes the Pēr = agastiyyam as being extant in the first and second Sahgams.
21 ev. 8, 95, 118, 110.
22 ev. 15, 44, 92, 155.
23 ev. 24.
24 ev. 57, 157, 292.
25 ev. 149.
His titles. The king is styled Vāṇavaṇ vegetal. Sembiyan and Sēlṣap (Chēla), and Tenṇavaṇ (Pāṇḍya). He was so styled, because he claimed to have conquered the territories ruled over by the Chēlas and Chēran. He is also called Pōṇiṇ-nāṉi (Lord of the Kāvēri country). v. 309, and Kāṇṇi = pPerumāṉ (lord of the country about the Cape Comorin), v. 36.

His date. The two Sīnmmamunḍī plates recently discovered by Mr. G. Venkoba Rao give the following genealogy for the early Pāṇḍyas:

1. Jayantivarman.
2. Arikēsavī, Parâṅkūsa, Māravarman; conquered the Pallavas at Saṅkaraṁmaṅgai.
4. Rājasimha I.
5. Varagunā Mahārāja.

7. Varagunavarman.

The Aṇṭimalai Inscription of Parântaka aḷḷaś Māraṇaḻaṇaiyana, discovered by one of us and published by Mr. G. Venkoba Rao, gives the date 770 A. D. With the aid of the information gathered from these sources, we can find the period of Arikēsavī Parâṅkūsa aḷḷaś Māṇaṇ of the poem we are discussing. The hero is said to have fought at Saṅkaraṁmaṅgai and Nāḷvēṭī against an unmentioned foe. From the fact that the former place is situated near Conjeevām, the capital of the Pallavas, we might infer that it must have been fought with Pallavas. This conclusion is borne out by the statement made in the Sīnmmamunḍi Plates, where Saṅkaraṁmaṅgai is called by the more correct name of Saṅkaraṁmaṅgai. Mr. V. Venkayya rightly guesses that this battle must have been the same as that fought by Nandivarman Pallavamalla and his general Udavachandra at Saṅkangrāma, and hence Māravarman aḷḷaś Arikēsavī. Parâṅkūsa must be the contemporary of Nandivarman Pallavamalla of the Udayēndram grant. This Pallavamalla is supposed to have died about 760 A. D. The Parântaka-Māraṇaḻaṇaiyana of the Aṇṭimalai Inscription has been identified by Mr. G. Venkoba Rao with No. 3 of the genealogical table given above, and should therefore be the son of the hero of the poem. Nēḻumāṉaṉ of Iraṇṇaṉ = agapporul, therefore, being the father Parântaka aḷḷaś Māraṇ-Saḍaiyyaṉ or Jatila, whose date is 770 A. D., and being a contemporary of Nandivarman Pallavamalla, who died in 760 A. D., must have lived during the middle of the 8th century A. D.

The date of the Sītraṇa.—In addition to the narrative we have given in full above, which occurs in the paṇīrṇam portion of the Commentary, there is a passage at the end of that portion, which says that the Sītraṇa were composed during the time of the Pāṇḍya king Ugra = pPerur-vajudi, or the last of the 49 kings who patronised the last or the third Saṅgam, the...
reason for its composition being that the deity of Madras took pity upon the king, who was sincerely regretting the loss of porul = adigaram.\(^{24}\) Who this king was we are not in a position to say definitely in the present state of historical knowledge of that period. But he does not seem to be identical with the Nejumaran of the illustrative verses. This much is certain from the padyaram, viz., that the composition of the Sūras was contemporaneous with Nakkar, the original propounder of the Commentary.

We saw above how the padyaram portion of the Commentary relates that the substance of the Commentary was composed by Nakkar and handed down to nine generations of disciples. Thus it appears probable that Nakkar taught the interpretation orally to his son, which was similarly transmitted by him down to Musiri-Muriar Nilakantha, who, or whose disciple, probably reduced the matter to writing.

Coming to the body of the Commentary, the fixed point from which we should start is furnished by the references to the Pāṇḍya king, Nejumaran, in the illustrative verses, whose age we have assigned to the middle of the 8th century A.D. In regard to these verses there is but one possible theory, viz., that they were subsequently added by the person, whoever he was, who might have reduced to writing the matter handed down orally from Nakkar. Then the date of Nakkar, and consequently the date of the Sūras, should be earlier than the middle of the 8th century A.D. Anyhow it cannot be earlier than 750—270 = 480 A.D.; working backwards by allowing the usual 30 years for each of the nine generations of pupils. This is the earliest possible date, but perhaps the true period in which the Sūras were composed lie somewhere between 500 to 700 A.D.

Place names mentioned in the work. Of the places that are mentioned in the work some might be easily identified; thus:

Vijilnām is situated on the sea coast 7 miles South of Trivandram.

Kottāru is a flourishing town near Nāgarcoil in South Travancore.

Pulandai is perhaps the modern Pulam in the Tinnevelly District, notorious for its Marava highwaymen.

Kadaiyal is the modern Kadayam, a station on the Quilon-Maṇiyāchehi branch of the South Indian Railway.

Kulandai is also in the south of the Tinnevelly District and contains a Vaishnav temple praised by the Śrīvaishnava Āḻvār (saints).\(^{25}\)

Vattāru another place sacred to Viṣṇu and sung by Āḻvār, is situated in the South Travancore.\(^{26}\)

Neveli is Tinnevelly, the chief town of the district of the same name.

Saṅgamangai is near Conjeeveram and is noted as the birth-place of the Saiva devotee Sākya-Neṣanasār.\(^{27}\)

Sēvār is known to be the scene of a battle fought between the Chōja Parantaka II and Vira Pāṇḍya. According to this work, it was also the site of a battle fought between Nejumaran and the Chēra king. Hence, it must be looked for in the south of the Tinnevelly District.

We are unable to identify the rest of the places.

\(^{24}\) See p. 11. This is very strange, since the padyaram says that the Tolkāppiyam, which contains the entire porul = adigaram, was current during the 2nd and 3rd Saṅgam and it survives in its entirety to the present day. What had become of the Tolkāppiyam in the days of Ugra = Īpparavaiṭṭ?  

\(^{25}\) Nammāṭār.

\(^{27}\) Vide Sākya Nāyanār Parāṇam, verse 2, Periyapaitram.
ANCIENT HISTORY OF THE NELLORE DISTRICT.

BY V. VENKAYYA, M. A., BAI BAHADUR.

Introduction.

Indian antiquities have often been the hobby of hard worked District Officers and there is no doubt that to them Indology — including folklore, epigraphy, ethnology, numismatics, and literature — has been more indebted in the past than to the professional archaeologist. In Southern India the contributions of Mr. F. W. Ellis, the linguist, Sir Walter Elliot and Dr. Burnell to historical research are well known. To Mr. Sewell we owe the foundations of systematic archaeological work in the Southern Presidency. The vicereignty of Lord Curzon and the great importance he attached to Indian monuments have, no doubt, led to a great deal of interest being taken in the subject throughout the country. In the Madras Presidency the cause of historical research has been greatly strengthened by the addition to antiquarian ranks of two senior Civilian officers, viz., Mr. A. Butterworth, I.C.S. and Mr. V. Venugopaul Chetty, I.C.S., on whose "Collection of the inscriptions on copper-plates and stones in the Nellore District" this article is mainly based. The historical interest of the former and the literary tastes of the latter have apparently led them to combine together and undertake the arduous task of printing in one volume all the stone inscriptions and copper-plates found in the Nellore district. The two editors certainly deserve to be congratulated on the successful completion of their self-imposed and disinterested undertaking. Those who are conversant with the work of editing inscriptions will appreciate the anxiety and trouble to which the two gentlemen must have been put, particularly because both of them were not working in the same district all through the period.

The editors are naturally disappointed at the poor results of their laborious undertaking. It is true that if these two gentlemen had devoted their energy to a tract of country possessing more ancient and valuable monuments, they would have made a more substantial contribution to South Indian history. All the same, the fact of their having exhausted the inscriptions of a district cannot be overlooked. No doubt, excavation under skilled supervision — particularly in the northern portion of the district — may bring to light more monuments. But for all practical purposes we may proceed on the supposition that all the inscriptions of the Nellore district have been secured.

Linguistic Value of the Nellore Inscriptions.

In the first place it may be remarked that the collection of Nellore inscriptions has a linguistic value. The district appears to have been in ancient times one of the localities where the Tamil and Telugu races came in contact. The traditional boundary of the Tamil country is Vêôgâdam, i.e., Tirupati, in the north, according to the Tamil grammar Naśgûl, composed about the beginning of the 19th century A.D., though at present the prevailing language at Tirupati is Telugu. The author of the Naśgûl evidently repeated what he found in the Tolûdrpipiam, the earliest Tamil grammar, where Vêôgâdam and Kumari, are said to be the northern and southern boundary, respectively, of the Tamil country.

1 The archaic fragments and damaged inscriptions found in the Ongole (O. 9 and O. 39), Kandukâr (KB. 31, KB. 32, KB. 67, and KB. 69) and Kâsilgiri (KG. S and KG. 55) tankas and the Darû (D. 2 and D. 7) and Podillî (P. 1) divisions justify this surmise to a certain extent.

The word tritiña (to which Telugu has to be traced) is connected by Vidyānātha, the author of the rhetorical work Prātaṇaparāśiga, with the three famous śringās of Śiva, viz. those at Kālaṇant, Dvārakāram, and Šrīśālām. This derivation does not represent the extent of the Telugu country. The three places might denote roughly the extent of the dominions of the Kākutiya king Prātaṇapradāna, whose protégé Vidyānātha was, and who flourished about the end of the 18th and beginning of the 14th century A.D. At any rate, this does not in any way help us to find out the southern boundary of the Telugu country. Of course, when the Tamil grammar gives Tirupati as the northern limit, it cannot mean that the Tamil language was unknown beyond that place. In more ancient times, the Tamil race probably extended further north. The Chōla king Karikāla seems to have been remembered in the Nellore district even better than in the modern Tamil country. Consequently, it may be presumed that during his reign, and perhaps also during the period represented by the Tamil classics, the northern boundary of the Tamil country was further north than Tirupati. It may be argued, however, that the reminiscences of Karikāla in the Telugu country cannot be taken to represent the extent of country over which Tamil was spoken at his time. They can at best denote only a temporary occupation of the Telugu country by the Chōlas during the time of Karikāla. The volume of Nellore inscriptions proves that, even at the time when the Tamil Neṇaḷḷi was composed, the language was understood and might have been spoken much further north than Tirupati. The northernmost village in the Nellore district, where Tamil inscriptions have been discovered, is Pākāla in the Kandakūr Tāluka. Here were found three Tamil records more or less damaged. Two of them belong to the last quarter of the 13th century, while the third is undated. Telugu inscriptions of about the same period are also found in the village, and I suppose the fact of some being in Tamil is due to the accident of the donors in these cases belonging to the Tamil country. In fact, the donor in one of them was from Uttaramallūr in the Chingleput district. Similarly, an inscription at Sirhabālam in the Vizagapatam district belonging to the time of Kūlūṭṭāṅga I. is in Tamil, because the donor hailed apparently from the Tamil country. Such stray records are due to accident and cannot prove anything. But in the Ātmakūr tāluka of the Nellore district, Tamil inscriptions have been found in four villages, viz. Ātmakūr, Battpāṇu, Chiramana and Ārāvula. Three of them belong to Kūlūṭṭāṅga III., and in one of them Chiramana (Sirumaṇi) is said to be situated in Jayaṅgula-Chōla-māpṭālam (A.D. 26), which was the name in ancient times of Toṣalai-nāḍa, i.e., the Pallava dominions. In the tālukas of Nellore, Goḍūr and Rāpuḍ, and in the Veṅkaṭagirī Zamindāri, Tamil inscriptions are more numerous, while all the villages of the Sūṭūpāṭ division have them. Consequently, the volume before us establishes beyond all possible doubt that, in the southern portion of the Nellore district, Tamil was known in the 12th, 13th, and 14th centuries. Telugu must have taken the place of Tamil in this tract of country after the Vijayānagara kings extended their dominions theretofore. The same change appears also to have taken place in the south-easter portion of the modern Cuddapah district. These facts show that we must accept with reservation the statement of Pavaṇandīmuni, author of the Tamil Neṇaḷlli, as regards the northern limit of the Tamil country.

4 See my Annual Report on Epigraphy for 1905-6, Part II., paragraph 44.
8 In the sequel it will be shown that a number of local families in the Telugu country and particularly in the Nellore district claimed descent from this ancient Chōla king.
6 Annual Report on Epigraphy 1909-00, paragraph 22.
7 We know from other inscriptions that Toṣalai-nāḍa extended in the West as far as Punganur in the North Arcot district; see my Annual Report on Epigraphy for 1905-7, Part II., paragraph 33.
8 See also my Annual Report on Epigraphy for 1903-04, paragraph 14.
Facuity of early Inscriptions in Nellore.

As regards the history of the district, what strikes one on looking through the 1,400 pages of the volume of Nellore inscriptions is the paucity of materials for the earlier periods. This characteristic the district shares with the rest of the Telugu country on the east coast. It is true the other coast districts of the Telugu country have not been exhaustively explored. But so far as they have been examined, the same characteristic feature of their antiquities is noticeable. No doubt, the history of the country has been made out largely from copper-plate grants. The Eastern Chalukya dynasty which held sway—according to an inscription of the 11th century from the river Mannega to Mahendragiri—over the districts of Ganjam, Vizagapatam, Godavari, Kistna, Guntur, and the northern portion of Nellore, is represented mostly by copper-plate grants. Only two exceptions to this general rule occur in the Nellore volume. At Bujamarniyalapu in the Podili Division (P. 1) is a curious inscription which, like the Amarasvati pillar, has to be read from the bottom upwards. It is dated in the 12th year of Visnupardhana-Maharaja. Visnupardhana was a title borne by no less than ten of the Eastern Chalukya kings. But as the alphabet of the inscription is archaic, there is no doubt that it has to be assigned to one of the earlier kings bearing this surname. The other early Chalukya stone inscription belongs to the time of Vikramādiya-Mahārāja (D. 2) of the Chalukya family, who, if he was an Eastern Chalukya at all, must be Vikramādiya II. (11 months A. D. 925 to 926). It is a significant fact worthy of record that Telugu literature cannot be traced beyond the period represented by the earliest stone inscriptions of the Telugu country. Names of poets belonging to earlier periods have, no doubt, come down to us. But none of their works has survived. Though these facts do not admit of satisfactory explanation at present, they deserve to be registered for future investigation.

(To be continued.)

12 Ants., Vol. XX, p. 229.
13 In his Lives of the Telugu Poets (p. 9) Rao Bahadur K. Viswanatham Pandita Guru mentions the fact and says it is reported to be due to an accident. He says that the whole country was once burnt down by foreign invaders, when all literary monuments disappeared. This seems to be a surmise based on the name given to the country, viz. Vēgī, Vēgī-dīśam or Vēgi-dīsam, which is apparently derived from the root vēgya. But the name existed already in the 4th century A.D., as it is mentioned in the Allahabad pillar inscription of Samudragupta, and the kingdom of Vēgī was established in the 7th century, as will be pointed out below. As most of the lithic records of this part of the country are not older than the 11th century and as the earliest known literary work is the Telugu translation of the Mahābhārata made by Nānasaṅkaraya in the same century (ants., Vol. XXVII, p. 245, footnote 1), this explanation is untenable. At any rate, the absence of inscriptions and architectural monuments cannot be accounted for in this way. Professor Kielhorn has noticed the absence of stone inscriptions in the case of three families, viz. the Gāhāgāvila kings of Kamaj, the Maitrakas of Valabhi, and the Eastern Chalukyas of Vēgī (Ep. Ind., Vol. VIII, p. 140, footnote 3). He is of opinion that there must have existed a considerable number of stone inscriptions of each of these three families and remarks: "The stones on which these inscriptions were engraved have been probably used for building purposes or lie buried in the ground." The process by which the stones of deserted temples disappear gradually may be seen even now in villages. For instance, at Eyll, in the South Arcot district, the Jainas asked the Collector for permission to use the stones of the Śiva temple for repairing their own. If the permission sought for had been granted, no trace of the Śiva temple would have been left. The stones of the enclosure wall in the temple at Gaṅgālkoppa-Ghajaparam in the Trichinopoly district were utilized by the Public Works Department in 1836 in building the dam across the river Coleroon, known as the Lower Anicut (Trichinopoly Manual, p. 343). The rampart of the ruined fort at Kāagaṇḍi (near Trichinopoly) is said to have been pulled down by some "Nawab" and the stones used in building or repairing the Trichinopoly fort. It is also reported that the stones of several māndapas and of the enclosures of the tank in front of the temple (at Kāagaṇḍi) were utilized for building the bridges over the Coleroon and the Kaveri rivers. In earlier times, religious animosity played no small part in the destruction of ancient monuments and their eventual disappearance. If the reigning king happened to be opposed to a particular creed, the monuments belonging to it stood very little chance of being protected against vandalism. On the other hand, we have authentic instances of ancient kings and chiefs utilizing the materials of a monument belonging to an opposite creed in raising one to their own religion. For instance, the Tamil Periyapuram informs us that a Pallava king, who was originally a Jain, was subsequently converted to the Śaiva creed through the efforts of the Śaiva saint Tirunārākkaar. One of the first acts of the convert was to demolish the Jainas buildings at Pāñaliparam (near Tiruvall in the South Arcot District) and build a Śaiva temple out of the materials. Buddhism and Jainism were common opponents of the Brahmanical creed, and it is easy to imagine how the Buddhist and Jainas monuments of the Telugu country have disappeared. The disappearance of the monuments belonging to the orthodox Hindu creed and of the stone inscriptions of the Pallavas and Eastern Chalukyas remains to be satisfactorily explained.
A VISIT TO RAMTEK.

BY HIRA LAL, B.A., M.R.A.S.; NAGPUR.

Ramtek is the headquarters of a tahsil in the Nagpur district of the Central Provinces. It derives its name from the temple of Rama on the hill (tek or tekh), at the foot of which the town is situate. It is regarded as a very sacred place in that part of the country, and an annual fair is held there in the month of Karttika commencing on the Purnima which lasts for a fortnight. The attendance at the fair is estimated to be 60,000.

I visited the place just before the fair on 3rd November, 1907, and the following days, and took the opportunity of jotting down the following notes, especially in view of the fact that the archaeologists and antiquarians, who have visited the place, being mostly Europeans, have not had access to the principal temples. So far as I know, Beglar was the first archæologist who visited the place in 1878-79. He has given a somewhat detailed account in his report,¹ but he was not admitted inside the inner group of temples. Mr. Cousens, who visited the place 31 years afterwards, found himself similarly excluded. He writes in his report,² that 'the European is permitted on sufferance to approach this holy of holies as far as the lower step of the inner gate, where he is met by a fat Brahman with an olistinous smile, who politely informs him he may go no further.' About 20 years ago when I first visited it, I was also about to share the same fate, but my coat saved me. I then grew a small beard, which, dubbed me a Musalman in the eyes of the temple-keepers, but an intelligent fellow amongst them observed that I could not be one, because my coat, or more properly angarkha, was cut on the right side and not on the left.

Ramtek has been held by some to be identical with the Ramagiri of Kalidasa's Meghaduta.³ Various names for Ramtek.

Rama is believed to have stayed for some time at Ramtek while on his way to Lanka, and to have visited the place again from Ayodhya, after his installation as king, to chastise Samba for his audacity in practising the penance, which the Brahman complained that he, being a Sudra, was not entitled to. The other old names of Ramtek are said to have been Sinduragiri 'the vermilion mount,' and Tapogiri or 'the mountain of penance.' Both of them occur in the mutilated inscription belonging to the end of the fourteenth century, to be referred to further on. The reason assigned there for first of these names is that god in his man-lion incarnation killed the demon Hiranyakasipu on this hill, which became red like vermilion with his blood,⁴ but there can be little doubt that the name, as suggested by Mr. Cousens, was given because of the red stones, which when newly-dressed or broken, look almost blood-red, especially when the sun shines on them. The second name Tapogiri is said to have been given to it because the sage Agastya, who was born of a pot and had once drank off the ocean on getting annoyed with it, practised penance here. The Ramayana says that Rama, after leaving Chitrakuta and visiting the hermitage of Satiksha, went to that of Agastya. On entering his abode he saw the places sacred to Agni,⁵ to Vishnu,

¹ Included in Cunnningham's, Vol VII, p. 192 ff.
² For 1905, p. 41.
³ See Bai Debi Prasad's (Purna), Dwarakadhara Dharmasastra, an excellent metrical version in Hindi of Meghadut, with critical footnotes, p. 2 ff.
⁴ Praguara dved jishnavah surdava vishveda vasubha vasubha hara nijak satyagriha tad ratra parvarupatiesita yajan.
      (Here the line is broken off in the inscription.) The Ramtek Mahayana also says;—Hiranyakasipor deha bhishma vishvam pura tat kundha tatra sarvagam bhadito vichhchhahaya sita sita raya jata sita sita sparicah.
⁵ There was an Agniirtha at Ramtek, which is mentioned in the inscription.
to Indra, to the sun, to the moon and the other gods, and beheld the sage Agastya, surrounded by his disciples, clothed in the skin of antelopes and vestments of bark. The *Ādhyātma Rāmdyana* says that there were thousands of sages engaged in religious pursuits in this hermitage, and well may the mount have been named Tapogiri.

The temple of Rāmachandra stands conspicuous amidst the group on the western end of the hill, some 500 feet above the town. With their many coats of white-wash, these temples can be seen gleaming in the sunshine from a long distance. The group is enclosed within a citadel, said to have been built by the Bhonsā king, Raghunāt I. (1743–1755). In front of the temple of Rāma stands that of Lakshmanā, both built in the same style, locally called *hemdjpanthi*. They are made of hewn stones, well-fitted together without mortar, the *mandapa* before the *sanctum sanctorum* being supported by eight massive pillars. The idols are of black marble, and are said to have been found in the Dudhāla tank, and to have been substituted for the original ones which had been or become mutilated. The other temples in the group are dedicated to Kausūli, Satya Narāyana, the eight-armed Mahāishāsura-mardini and Dharmēśvara Mahādeva (in one temple), Lakshmī Nārāyana, Vyākranāta, another Mahāishāsura-mardini and Hanumān. Over the Lakshmi Nārāyana temple there is a domed balcony called Rāma Jharokha, which Régular took to be the name of a god. Looking from this place down below, the Rāmāk town looks like a beautiful map, the numerous tanks distributed in the various quarters of the town and the green fields on the outskirts contributing much to the charming scenery. All these temples are included in the innermost court-yard, and there is also a palace said to have been the residence of the Sūryavaṁśī kings, who came from Ayodhyā and ruled there. There is also a platform with an arch, known as Kabir Chabta, Kabir Asana or Kabir Kāmā, which is claimed by the Kabirpanthis to have been the place where Kabir sat, but the pujāris say that it was the swinging place of a Sūryavaṁśī princess. None but the higher-class Hindus are admitted within this court, the gate of which is named Gokula Darāvā. In the second court the principal place is the temple of Harihara with two statues. It is popularly known as the Daśarath Temple, this name being more lucrative, as the pujārī informs the pilgrims that it is absolutely necessary for gaining full religious merit to see the father first before seeing the son. Of course, no darōpana is meritorious without a present. The entrance of this court is named Bhairava Darāvā. The next court, whose entrance is called Singhpur Darāvā, is occupied by temple servants. This was the place where the Marāthas had their arsenal, of which a few wall pieces may still be seen on the spot. The last court contains a very ancient and huge image of Varāha (boar incarnation) under a small flat-roofed temple; and in another part there is a Māṅbhao temple dedicated to their black deities, Kṛiṣṇa and Devi. The gate-way of this court is called Varāha Darāvā, outside which there is a small *mazjid*. There are various stories about it, one of them being that the Mussalmān king, who wanted to despoil the temple, was attacked by a swarm of black bees, which prevented him from desecrating the inside; so he built a mosque outside and left the place. Others say, ‘Rāma Raḥm kā jodā hai; ‘Where there is Rāma, there is Rahim.’

The other antiquities on the hill are two temples with huge idols of Narasimha holding a wheel in one hand, an old *baoli*, a very old temple of the dwarf incarnation called Trivikrama, of which only the portico remains, and a modern temple of Dhūmrēśvara Mahādeva besides the remains of fort

---

* On the bank of the Ambāl tank there is still a temple dedicated to the sun.

† This is popularly known as Eddals.
walls. About two miles away at the eastern end of the hill, there is a cave dedicated to Nāgirjuna. Down the hill the most notable places are the temple of Chaṇḍikā Devi built of massive blocks of hewn stone; the Kaḍur Baoli, which is a small square tank embanked on all sides with rows of temples, in one of which there is a slab containing mutilated figures of the eight Siddhās (likely to be now submerged in the new irrigation tank to be constructed by Government at a cost of about Rs. 18 lakhs); the Ambalā tank with several temples on its banks, of which that dedicated to the Sun is noticeable; and other tanks and wells, such as Chakorā Talao, Rām Talao and Daḍāsvanātha Baoli. There is also a group of Jainas temples and images which are all modern, except the huge image of Sāntinātha, about 13 feet high, which is very old. The local Jainas say that Rāma was one of their persuasion, and that when he visited Rāmātek, he first worshipped Sāntinātha, since when that image has been in existence.

The Inscription, which has been incidentally referred to before, is affixed to the temple of Lakshmana on the wall of the sanctum. The rough stone of the building is plastered with a black shining cement, which has the appearance of a real polished black marble. There used to be about 80 long lines engraved on it, but many are gone on account of the cement having fallen off. The major portion of the inscription is devoted to the description and religious efficacy of the tirthas at Rāmātek and the surrounding places included in the pañca krośī or 5 kos area, which is recorded in the Rāmātek Mahātmyas as being protected from the influence of the Kali Age. The whole composition is in Sanskrit verses written in beautiful characters, exactly resembling those in which the Kalachuri inscriptions of Ratnapur are found engraved. Indeed, when I saw it the resemblance was so strong that a mere look suggested that it might be a Harihavānti record, which it finally turned out to be. The top portion, which is much mutilated, contained some historical data about the family of the reigning dynasty, of which the only suggestive phrases which remain are: 'Yāsavāṁsaka, Sīri Sīrānas Kenaṣupāti, and Sīri Rāmaṇanda. The last two names occur in the Raipur and Khalāri Inscriptions of the Harihavānti king, Brahmāvā, from which it appears that Brahmāvā's father was Rāmaṇanda, whose father was Sīrāna. The mention of Yāsavāṁsa further confirms their identity as Harihayas belonged to that race.3 Brahmāvā's inscriptions are dated10 1409 and 1415 A.D. So his father must have lived about the end of the 14th century. This establishes the fact that the temples of this group are at least 600 years old. The tenor of the inscription shows that it was engraved when the temples were repaired rather than built, which would place their construction a century or two earlier. The Harihaya ruled over Mahā Kosala now identified with Chhattīsgarh, but it once included all the country up to the confines of Berar, as would appear from Huien Tsang's record. In fact it seems that in the 7th century A.D., the capital of Mahā Kosala was somewhere in this part of the country, very probably, at Bhāndāk, which the Chinese traveller apparently visited. Latterly, it would appear that it was transferred to Raipur in Chhattīsgarh, and the western portion must have remained in their possession, while the original house long established at Tumma11 and subsequently at Ratnapur kept the eastern portion under their sway.

---

1 The orthodox way of calculating this area is a kos in each of the four directions and one towards the sky.
4 A village of this name with ancient remains unknown to archaeologists, still exists in the Bijāpur district. It is 45 miles north-east of Ratnapur. (Epigraphia Indica, Vol. I, p. 82 F.) Since I wrote the above, I visited Tumma on 22nd May 1908, and dug out a superb temple-door beautifully carved in the medieval Brahminic style. I propose to give an account of this place in a separate article.
With regard to the description of the holy places, many can be easily identified. Thus of the Ashathirthas mentioned in the Inscription, the Pitrikirttha I take to be the Ambalà Tank, where oblations to the deceased ancestors continue to be made. The Chakravrittha is the present Chakorjá Tank. The Vajiméchathirtha is the present Damavamshtha Baoli, and Rámajirtha, the Rántalai, at the foot of the hill. The Manjikála-kaṇḍa is, apparently, the Manasar Tank, about 4 miles west of Rámétk, and Haṁsajirtha one of the two tanks in Nagardhan, five miles south of Rámétk. Here there is an old temple of Mahádeva called Kolásva, near which there is a tank that is said to be Samkhatirtha by some, and Sukla Jirtha by others. Haṁsa (swan), Samkha (conch-shell), and Sukla, all connote whiteness, and it is possible that these may be alternative names. There is another tank here called Pushkarní close to the fort, which is also visited by pilgrims when going the Ashtájirtha round.

The Inscription states that Lakshmi Jirtha was the most important of all, and this may possibly be the Japáli Tank, from which the pilgrims begin their round. The eighth Jirtha was, apparently, Mokshakurja, possibly the Kanmárkí Baoli, which is reckoned as one of the eight Jirthas. It is stated to be situated to the south of the hill and, for ought we know, it may be one of the two tanks at Nagardhan mentioned before. The Sinduravati on the hill and Karpuravati down the hill, still retain their old names, and are known as Sindur Baoli and Kapur Baoli. The story about the former is that Narasimha, after killing the demon Hiranya-kaśipu, threw his mace down, which fell with such an impact as to create a hole, afterwards the Sindur Baoli. The inscription mentions ‘udāra udā Mahāsiddha,’ whose statue, as intimated before, is lying beside the Kapur Baoli, and the ‘terrible-faced Kiliŋá,’ which may be identified with the goddess of the Chaṇḍiká Temple.

Sambuka has also been alluded to as ‘that Śūdra saint who attained salvation by meeting his death from the hand of Ráma, and known here as Dhúmráka.’ The name is now changed to Dhúmréśvara, and is represented by a linga, over which a temple has been recently constructed, and is the first to be met with on the way to temple of Ráma. This is believed to be the spot where Sambuka practised his austerities, and was killed by an arrow discharged by Ráma from a place at the foot of the mountain, now turned into Rántalai Jirtha. The story is that, while dying, Sambuka asked for three boons at the request of Ráma, to wit, that his corpse might be petrified into a linga in situ, that Ráma should stay on the hill for ever, and that he should be first worshipped before Ráma. These were granted, and this is why every pilgrim first makes offerings to the Dhúmréśvara Mahádeva before worshipping Ráma. This story probably refers to the existence of a Saiva worship prior to the existence of the existing Vaishnavá temples, and the concession made to the older creed. Several Saiva temples are mentioned in the Inscription, such as Ghaṇṭéśvara, Sudhésvara, Kédára, Ambikásthá, Dharméśvara, Muktávara, &c., showing the predominance of a Saiva worship, and one of the gods, Dharméśvara, who derives his epithet from having given shelter to Dharma, whom Kali (Age) was pursuing, is even enshrined within the inner court of the Vaishnavá temples. In the same court there are two Mahishásura-márdinis, the consorts of the Destroyer, and there is mention of Mahá Bhairava, after whom perhaps the Bhairava Darwázá was named.

11 This is situated within the horse-shoe curve of the mountain. The Súdra Jirtha or Rámétk Mahádeva also says, “saivaladáhyabhairav jayé pitrikirttham uddhúman.

12 This is supported by the Súdra Jirtha Mahádeva where it is said that Maṅgikála is near Kédára, which is to the west. Again ‘Manjikála narah adhíd Hásimdám archayáh sadháh,’ ‘A wise man after bathing in the Maṅgikála should worship Héjimá.’ The Héjimá hill is situated exactly on the bank of the Manasar Tank.
The other gods (outside the family\textsuperscript{14} of Rāma) mentioned in the Inscription are Nṛsiṁha (man-lion), and Adi Kola, or bear incarnation, together with Arjanēya or Hanumān, but I could not find any reference to the dwarf incarnation, whose shrine appears to be the oldest on the hill. The statue is still on the hill with one leg raised, but much mutilated, the details of which may be seen in two similar figures beautifully carved and placed in niches of two temples\textsuperscript{16} at Purl, within the enclosure of and near the great Jagannāth temple. Lastly, the rivers Sura and Kalipā, which join near Rāmtēk and retain their old names are eulogised for their sanctity. It appears to me that this Inscription formed the basis of the Śudārañjī or Rāmtēk Māhātmya, expanded into sixteen Ādhyāyas as published by a local Press, but at Rāmtēk there is said to be a manuscript containing forty-two Ādhyāyas.

The most interesting place appears to be the cave of Nāgarjuna, over the entrance of which a Mālguzar has recently set up a structure, to give it an appearance of a temple. This makes the place conspicuous, as the solitary white speck on the eastern end of the mountain can be seen from a long distance. Inside the cave there is placed a figure of Nāga, and a human head supposed to represent Arjuna, worshipped with a meaning satisfactory to the vulgar. Those who claim to be more informed tell the tradition that Nāgarjuna was a Brahmāṇḍ, who practised severe austerities in that cave, long before the advent of Rāma to Rāmtēk. His penances ultimately secured him the boon that he would be an era-maker like Śālivāhana or Vikramāditya. This is yet to come, and the people believe it will.

I am inclined to believe that this tradition has some facts underlying it. It discloses that one Nāgarjuna lived in that cave long before the construction of Rāma's temples, and although the evidence is not very great at present, I venture to surmise that this Nāgarjuna was the great Buddhist reformer of ancient India, the founder of the Mādhya-mātika philosophy. He appears in literature as a man of remarkable genius, as an almost universal scholar, a Buddhist religious enthusiast of rare liberality, a profound philosopher, a poet, and author of great literary abilities and an intense lover of his species.\textsuperscript{16} It was not only as an apostle of Buddhism, however, that Nāgarjuna was famous in his life-time and long afterwards both in his own land and foreign countries. He was also trained in all the learning of a Brāmanical student; he knew the virtues and qualities of herbs, the secret influences of the stars, the science of alchemy and the arts of the magician and exorcist. He was so renowned as a physician and eye-doctor that the fame of his success reached China. Mr. Thomas Watters considers that he probably lived about the 3rd century A. D., and the general testimony as to his native place is that he was born in Vidarbha.

\textsuperscript{14} Sīṭa and her sons, Kusa and Lava and Lakshmanya, whom the composer of the Inscription describes paradoxically: 'mādhya-mātikaman kālamān indiś vāhrān, chi bhīrān viśvā vāhrāh Śrī Rāmaśantār hārāh sahaśkarah śrīkāh, 2 py adahūmānākha. Lakshmanya though a snake (kṣaṭika) by being an incarnation of Śrīsūkha, is not snake-souled.

\textsuperscript{15} I observed a slight difference in the subordinate figures of these statues. In the Rāmtēk statue there is a figure close to the leg on the ground, and an absurd story has been invented to the effect that the whole represents a brother and sister, the former kicking the latter (which the uplifted leg suggests), with the result that for that sin he got maggots in his other leg, which the sister, out of compassion for her brother, is picking out. The popular name of this statue is 'Dhau-babina,' i.e., brother and sister.

A legendary account of him which Mr. S. O. Das, C.I.E., has given at some length from Tibetan sources in the Bengal Asiatic Society's Journal, Vol. LI., pp. 115 ff., states that a rich Brahman of Vidarbha, to whom no son had been born for many years, once saw in a vision that if he gave alms to 100 Brahmanas he would get a son. He did so accordingly, and a son was born, but the astrologers predicted that he would not live more than a week. They were, therefore, requested to find some remedy for averting such a calamity, and they said that his life could be prolonged for 7 years only if the parents entertained 100 Bhikshus. This was done, and the child lived on until the fatal seventh year began, when his parents, unwilling to see the painful end, caused him to be removed to 'a certain solitary place in company with a few retainers. As the boy was passing the last mournful days, one day the Mahabodhisattva Avalokiteshvara Khasarupa visited him in disguise, and advised him to go to the great monastery of Nalanda in Magadha, as the surest means of escaping from the hands of death. He, accordingly, repaired to that famous Vihara and informed the head of the monastery of his impending danger. The latter, thereupon, advised him to enter the holy order of monks. This saved him from the clutches of death and he was ordained a Bhikshu and commenced his studies there. After a few years' service in the monastery, he obtained the subordinate office of steward of the congregation. During the first part of the tenure of that office, Nāgarjuna is said to have propitiated the goddess Chāṇḍikā, by whose agency he succeeded in providing the great body of priests with the necessities of life. He learnt other mystic arts, and by his religious practices he obtained the perfection of a Siṁhā. The Nāgas used to attend his sermons in the shape of young boys and they invited him to their abode in the Nāga-land (nether-world), where he spent three months. He was asked to settle permanently there, but he declined on the ground of his being required to preach the sacred religion in Jambu Dwipa. He returned to Nalanda with costly presents, and also with the religious volume called Nāga Sahasrikā. It was for this connection with the Nāgas that he obtained the name of Nāgarjuna. He afterwards visited many places, and then returned to his country, where he erected many chaityas and temples and composed many works on science, medicine, astronomy, and alchemy. When the high-priest of Nalanda died, he succeeded him and matured the Mādhyamikā philosophy, which had been merely conceived by his illustrious teacher and predecessor. He finally became the head of the whole Buddhist church. Nāgarjuna is said to have been a great friend of King De-cbye (Sankara) of Southern India, whom he had converted to Buddhism. Both the friends took vows of meeting a common lot, i.e., to live and die together. Nāgarjuna being a saint, no messenger of death ever ventured to approach him. The friends, therefore, attained to unusual longevity, during which time the king witnessed successively the death of his many wives, children, and grandchildren. In his old age the king got a son who alone, fortunately, survived him. Once the mother of this prince prepared a handsome robe, which she desired him to wear. The prince did not use it, saying that he would do so when he became a king. The mother with a deep sigh exclaimed: 'Son, how vain is that hope? Thinkest thou, my darling, that the king, thy father, will ever die. He has obtained immunity from death which awaits all mortal beings but himself.' The prince replied: 'Mother, must I not rule as a king since I am born as a prince? Live or die, I shall be a king.' Seeing the son's resolution, the mother revealed to him the secret of her husband's death, and said, 'Go and beg Nāgarjuna's head and that shall quench thy succession to the throne.' The prince accordingly went off at once in search of Nāgarjuna and found him on the top of Sripurva. Approaching the venerable Sriman, he asked him to present him with his head. Nāgarjuna knowing what brought him there, consented. The prince tried several strokes of his sword to cut the saint's throat, but in vain. Nāgarjuna, seeing the ignorance of the prince, showed him the secret which could effect the cutting off of his head, by saying: 'Prince, hundred of such swords would not sever my head from the body, but go and bring that kusa grass which alone will effect it.' In one of his former births, Nāgarjuna is said to have killed a worm by cutting its throat with a stick of kusa grass. On account of the inevitable consequences of karmas in this life, that very person
was born as the prince, who severed his head from his trunk with the kusa grass. At the time of death, Nāgarjuna told the prince that he would rise again at a future time and his head would again be one with his body. As the prince was carrying off the head, it was snatched away by a yaksha, who threw it to a distance of five miles, where the saint's remains turned to a stone. It is mentioned in the book of prophecies that the head is now in the course of drawing every day nearer the trunk to effect its junction. It is said that Nāgarjuna will again appear in India, and live one hundred years to teach the sacred dharma to men and gods.

To the Rāmātek tradition all these details are unknown, but the little story related by the people has some striking coincidences, viz., the existence of a petrified head associated with a cobra, and the tradition of Nāgarjuna's revival to life at a future time. Apparently, these are not fortuitous, and the vicinity of Rāmātek, to the ancient Vidarbha, the modern Berar, lends weight to the conjecture I have ventured to throw out, viz., that the Rāmātek cave may be the place where Nāgarjuna awaited his death, after being sent away by his parents. Apparently, it is not the place where he was killed. That place was somewhere in the south on the Srīparvata, as the legend relates, and which Mr. Thomas Watters identifies with Fa-hsien's P'o-lo-yue apparently, the same as P'o-lo-mo-lo-ki-li of Huien Tsang. In this place, which is placed three hundred or about fifty miles south-west of the capital of Kośala, which I take to be Bhondak (about 120 miles south-west of Rāmātek), the royal friend of Nāgarjuna had a monastery quarriled for him, which was certainly much greater than the modest Rāmātek cave, as its description by the Chinese traveller discloses. According to the legend, Nāgarjuna's head was not allowed to remain in the place where it was cut. It was snatched away and thrown to a distance. May it not be that the Rāmātek cave, which was originally intended to be the grave of Nāgarjuna, was, on his death, selected as a suitable place for depositing at least a portion of his supposed petrified remains?

17 Mark the portions italicised above.
A BALLAD OF THE HAKILAS OF GUJRAT IN THE PUNJAB.

The Hakilas, who claim to be Punwar Rajputs by origin, give the following legendary table of their descent —

Alexander the Great

| his son |

Gang (took possession of Khorasan)

| his son |

Raja Jagdeo of Mathrā

| his descendants for 14 generations ruled Mathrā, among them being: Raja Nand Pāl |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Godam</th>
<th>Mād</th>
<th>Dhār</th>
<th>Dūd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raja Bhagwāna (Dhabal)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raja Sāngāna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raja Hik or Raja Hikdev</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>his descendant Raja Bārā</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| grandson — dethroned by Shahaubuddin Ghorī. | They say that Bhagwāna was the most powerful Punwar ruler of his time and that his son Sāngāna ruled over Mathrā and Narwarokot, with an army so numerous that it required a lakh of tents to shelter it. Hik or Hikdev is said to have been king of Bajpūtaṇa, and to have conquered all India. Later, a descendant of Sāngāna (not of Hik), called Raja Bārā, founded Barnālī in the Khāhrān tahsīl of the Gajīāt District and ruled over the Jeth Doāb, as well as Mathrā — which in his time was plundered and burnt by Mahommed of Ghaznī. Bārā himself was also taken prisoner, but restored to his dominions in the Jeth Doāb. Barnālī, the chief village of the Hakilas, was founded in 1009 A. D. and Bārā's son and grandson ruled the Doāb till deprived of it for helping Khurshād Malik against Muhammed of Ghorī, who left them only a few villages. Yet Hakil chiefs accompanied the Ghorī when he conquered Herāt. The Hakilas claim to be Greeks who married Bajpūtas, and are called Punwar from the ancestor of that name (sic). They say Alexander's son cared for nothing but religion and renounced his kingdom, but his son Gang wished to reign and as he could find no kingdom in Greece he came to Khorasan, was there hailed as king, and founded Herāt. Forming alliances with Indian kings and by intermarriage, Jagdeo, his grandson, became ruler of Mathrā, where fourteen of his descendants reigned after him. |

The Hakilas are now Muhammedan. In 1297 their chief, Chandri Ahmad Khan, recovered from the Jhelam river the guns of Ghūlām Shāh Abdāl and received as his reward Barnālī and Bāgho in jāgrā — worth Rs. 25,000 a year. His son, Ali Dīn, also held the jāgrā, and his grandson Mir Dīn aided the British at Chilānwālā in 1848.

The following ballads are attributed to Mir Jamāl, Panjūrānā, a mirdās or bard, apparently.

I.

Bismillah-ir-Rahmān-ir-Rahīm.

Hāq ikhīa ko yā Hālā ādī tum (dō) Powār, Godam, te Masāḥ, Dhor, Dhabal chār bejā Rājā Nand Pāl.

Wadīān waddā Rājā Bhagwānā, Mathrā-nagri, te Narwarokot, kahā gaōsālī, milk Rājā Sanghānā.

Lākā pakhrān, te lākh baphatā nagānā, Charhā Rājā Hāq Dev, dār heh tin pālaṅā, Charā kāṭān sādhīs, kahā Mir Panjūrānānā.

II.

Qadrat kardā saakehche mihrān Rāb ne we phālāi, Rājā Bārā ne Barnālī rat kārāt, Rājā Bārā dē Pone Hārāt kārā pāi, Gare chauðhri takhi bhangara bādaskhā. Hukum Allāh de bajar jīnān chillīāt, Barchhā Kahal kī kahal fīye wadīāṭ, Wich Barnālī-prāh tizān dain qulāt. (Mir Jamāl ṣān.)

Translation.

From Hāq (in truth) are the Hakilas, who are by caste Punwar. Godam, and Masāḥ, Dhor (and) Dhabal, the four sons of Rājā Nand Pāl. Rājā Bhagwānā was the strongest of the strong. Mathrā-nagri and Narwarokot, singhet the bard, were the realm of Rājā Sanghānā.

A hundred thousand quarters and as many tents were needed for his army. When Rājā Hāq Dev2 got into the saddle and rode forth, He subdued the four corners, saith Mir Panjūrānānā.

Under (an auspicious) Destiny, a Just and Merciful God wade the creeper to blossom, Rājā Bārā founded Barnālī, Rājās Banā and Ponā over-ran the Herāt. Their brave chiefs have subverted thrones and kingdoms.

[ No translation of his line can be had. ]

Kahal was made famous by Kahal's spear:

In Barnālgāṛh their chargers used to prance.

(Composed by Mir Jamāl.)

1 Sāngānā, son of Bhagwānā.

2 Hāq Dev: Dev or Deo is the, was the, usual affix of ruler's name among the Bajpūtas of the Jamna Hills.

3 J. q., Barnālī.
I am indebted to Capt. A. C. Elliott for the above notes. To them may be added the following by Mr. E. Molloy from Punjab Notes and Queries, Vol. II., p. 250, when, after observing that the Haklás are one of the three Gujar tribes of a Hassára District which have some pretensions to Rajput descent, he writes:

"The Haklás are probably very recent converts to Muhammadanism, for their social customs show many traces of their former faith. They are said to be in the habit of eating, stripped like Hindus to the waist, with nothing but a cloth tied round their loins. Some make a chaukh (a Hindu cooking-place) or something very like it, in which they fence themselves off from intrusion during meal-time. All vessels used for purposes of cooking or of purification before prayer are strictly kept for their own special use, and are not permitted to be touched by any outsider. Another peculiar custom of the Haklás is said to be that they pray with the palm of the hand downwards instead of upwards, as is the usual custom of Muhammadans."

I may make one or two notes. It is curious that the inventors of this tradition should make the Haklás Punjábs, for Yurus is not improbably connected with that tribal name. Further, part of the Gujrat District is or was called Herát.

H. A. ROSE.

IS TOBACCO INDIGENOUS TO INDIA?

Some time ago (ante, Vol. XXXV, p. 292) I inserted a query headed as above with reference to the assertion made by an anonymous writer in the Times on the 22nd November, 1902, that there could scarcely be a doubt that certain varieties of tobacco were indigenous in India. When publishing the query, I observed that the writer quoted gave no authority for his statements, which appeared to be opposed to well-known evidence. Nobody has answered my question, but I am now in a position to give a satisfactory reply based on an article by Sir Ray Lankester which appeared in the Daily Telegraph of March 28th, 1908. Sir Ray refers to De Candolle's "delightful" volume, the History of Cultivated Plants, reprinted in the International Scientific Series, and to writings of Colonel Pain, now Director of Kew.

All the varieties of the tobacco plant belong to the genus "Nicotiana," named after M. Jean Nicot, who was ambassador of France to Portugal in 1560. The fifty species of the genus are all American, except two, namely, spevolina, which is native in Australia, and fragrans, which is found in the Isle of Pines, near New Caledonia. Most of the cultivated varieties are derived from the species tabacum, but the Shish plant, persica, is of Brazilian origin, and radica has been cultivated in South America and Asia Minor. New varieties produced artificially in parts of Asia have been supposed erroneously to be indigenous. No Asiatic language has any native word for the herb, which is not mentioned by any writer on China earlier than 1630. It was brought from America for the first time in 1668, and quickly spread over the world through the agency of the Portuguese, English, and Spanish peoples. Turkey and Persia probably were indebted to England and Spain for the introduction of the new drug, while India undoubtedly obtained it through the Portuguese.

Asad Beg, the author of Wakhya (Eliot, VI, p. 164; von Noer, Akbar, II, pp. 261-264), tells a long story how he procured some tobacco from Bijapur and introduced it to Akbar's notice. The Emperor tried a smoke, but was dissuaded from acquiring the habit of smoking by his physician, who said: "We do not want to follow the Europeans and adopt a custom which is not sanctioned by our own wise men without trial."

Other people were less timid, and Asad Beg goes on to say that "as I had brought a large supply of tobacco and pipes I sent some to several of the nobles, while others sent to ask me for some; indeed all without exception wanted some and the practice was introduced. After that the merchants began to sell it, so the custom of smoking spread rapidly. His Majesty, however, did not adopt it."

The hookah is not mentioned before 1600 — it is referred to, sometimes under the name bubble-bubble, by Terry in 1616, Florio in 1614, Olearius in 1633, and many other writers of the seventeenth century. Several quotations will be found in Yule and Burnell's Hobson-Jobson.

It is quite clear now that no species of Nicotiana is native in India, and that the use of tobacco was introduced into India by the Portuguese during Akbar's reign in the latter part of the sixteenth century.

VINCENT A. SMITH.
NOTES AND QUERIES.

ASOKA PILLAR, EDIT IN- SIMILE SUNDAKA.

Possibly the former word is Hindi—*sūrā*, a small beetle (Fallon). The second must be not *sāt* (which does not represent the *s* and gives an improbable meaning; for Indians would hardly kill a bull), but *sātā*, an animal like a lizard. The oil is believed to be a cure for gout and impotence.

"Tel hai sātā a kā!
Kanjar's cry." (Fallon, Hindustani Dictionary, p. 741.)

C. M. MULVANY.

Benares, 31st December, 1907.

THE SĀBAHĀRS OF KĀBUL UNDER THE MUGHALS.

The history of the Mughals in Afghanistan has yet to be written, but the following list of the Sābahārs of Kābul may be of interest. It is excerpted from the late Major Ravery's Notes on Afghanistan and the references are to the pages of that work.

**Year**

- Shāh Beg, the Khān-i-Daurīn, resigned (p. 381)  1615
- Zamāna Beg, the Mahābāt Khān, Turk (Sang-Pājah disaster, 1619-20) (p. 392)  1616-22
- Aman-ullāh, his son, deputy  1622-24
- Khānshād Khān, his other son, deputy  1632-34 H.
- Khwaja Abūl-Hasan  1637
- Musaffar Khān, his son, deputy  1627
- Shā'īd Khān Musaffar-i-Jang, circa (p. 397)  1637-38
- Under Aurangzeb—
  - Luhrāib Khān, Safawl, son of Ali Mardān Khān, Mahābat Khān II  1658-70
  - Sayyidnā Khān (p. 399)  1661-68
  - Mahābat Khān II, re-appointed  1668-70
  - Muhammad Akbar Khān (after defeat in Khairpur)  1670-72
  - Mahābat Khān II, again re-appointed  1672-73
  - Fidā Khān, "Azam Khān i-Kukah (p. 498)  1674-77
  - Amīr Khān (p. 493)  1671
  - On Amīr Khān's death in 1701, the prince Shāh Alām Bahādur, Sābahār of Multān, advanced to Kābul to take over the government of that province. He appointed Sher-i-Zamān, his deputy. (p. 415)  1701
  - Ibrāhīm Khān  1708
  - Nāsir Khān, Nāsir-i-Jang  (p. 418)  1710-18
  - Muhārīz-al-Mulk, Sarbuland Khān, Tunī  1718-22
  - Nāsir Khān, with Gajī Ali Khān as his deputy at Peshāwar (pp. 419-20)  1722-24

*After his removal in 1724, no Sābahār appears to have been appointed, and the Mughal control virtually ceased.*

H. A. ROSS.

BOOK NOTICES.


The Sātrālāmkīra belongs to those works of Indian Buddhism which have not so far been recovered in the original Sanskrit. The Chinese translation by Kumārajīva belongs to the beginning of the 5th century A.D. and forms part of the Tripitaka.

The Sātrālāmkīra is an Avadāna work of the same kind as the Dīyaavādāna, the Dīvīvātakāyavādāna and other works. Some of the stories....

1 In 1647 Zul-Qādir Khān was promoted to the governor of the city and fortress of Kābul, with charge of Upper Bangash (Kurram), to which Lover Bangash was added.
2 Not his Sābahār. Shāh Alām in 1703 would not consent to the appointment of a Sābahār, and in 1710, Nāsir Khān was, originally at least, only appointed as deputy of the prince Raft-ul-Qādir. Sherī-Zamān had been governor of the citadel of Kābul, and he is said to have replaced Nāsir Khān (who had acted as deputy, apparently of Amīr Khān, but fell into disgrace).

In 1704 occurs the first mention of a Dīvān of Kābul. Musīm Khān, Dīvān of the prince Shāh Alām, then became Dīvān of the province.

3 As first only, deputy (see the foregoing note) Nāsir Khān was removed in 1714, and Sipāhār Khān appointed, but the latter was removed in 1715 and Nāsir Khān re-appointed.
4 The son of Nāsir Khān, who was the son of Husain Beg Khān Zīk, a relative of Ali Mardān Khān.
it contains have been incorporated in the Dīvyāraddha, and others can be traced in parallel forms in other collections. But enough remains to make the publishing of the present translation an important event. Some of the stories of our book have been previously translated by Mr. Beal, but in a rather unreliable form. M. Sylvain Lévi has translated two stories dealing with Kanishka in his Notes sur les Indo-scythes. But now the whole is presented in what appears to be a fully reliable translation.

According to tradition, Āśvaghoṣa was a contemporary of Kanishka and lived at his court. There is, so far as I can see, nothing in the book to make this improbable. M. Lévi has shown that the stories about Kanishka contain several features which are corroborated by other evidence. On p. 423 a story is told about Ya-yue-ki, and this name has, in the translation, been rendered Huvishka. But in the index this has been corrected to Aśoka. There are, therefore, no allusions in the book to events subsequent to the time of Kanishka.

In the story No. 14 on pp. 80 and ff., we are told that Kanishka went to visit Kanishkapura. We are therefore here taken to Kashmir, where the old Kanishkapura can still be traced in the village Kānapur, between Bārāmula and Srinagar.

The historical information which can be derived from the Sūtrakṛtā is comparatively small and unimportant. Many of the stories themselves are, however, new, and add to our knowledge of Buddhist lore. They are written in a much more vigorous style than is usual in similar works, and even through the double translation we are able to enjoy the beauties of the original.

STEN KONOW.


The old Bologna Academy has up to last year confined its operations to natural science. A new class has now been added, called Classe di scienze morali. It comprises two sections, devoted to philology and law, respectively. The first fascicle of the first volume of its Proceedings has recently been published. The first article is a paper by Professor Alfredo Trombetti, Saggi di glottologia generale comparata I. I Pronomi personali. The author's aim is to show that identical pronominal bases can be found all over the world, and that this can be adduced as a proof of the original unity of human speech. As the result of his investigations, he puts down i as the base of the first person, and that of the second, and these bases, he thinks, are originally demonstratives, meaning "this" and "that", respectively. I do not intend to follow the author through his learned and interesting, but not convincing study. Suffice it to say that even if it could be proved that two demonstrative bases i and u are used in the formation of personal pronouns all over the world, that would not prove the original unity of human speech. Just like terms of relationship such as ma, pu, da, &c., demonstrative bases such as i and u belong to the language of the nursery, which is the same all over the world, and which has without any doubt played a great rôle in the formation of the various groups of languages.

STEN KONOW.

DENAVAG: A POLYLOT MAGAZINE. Calcutta College Square, Bowbazar.
I wish to draw attention to this new Magazine. It contains contributions in the various Indian languages, Sanskrit, Hindi, Gujarati, Marathi, Bengali, Sindi, &c. The chief interest of the journal to a European does not rest with the contents of the various papers, but with the opportunity it offers of finding samples written in the modern vernaculars. The annual subscription is Rs. 3-8.

STEN KONOW.


This book is an attempt at introducing higher criticism into the study of Sanskrit poetry. The author analyses Kālidāsa's masterpiece in order to show how the plot is developed, which rasa prevails, the poetical diction, and so on. Though it is impossible to agree with his views in all cases, the reading of his book is very instructive, especially for Western scholars, who are often, I fear, too apt to overlook many of those points which to a Hindu constitute the principal charm of a poem. But I am afraid that the author will not be able to convince us that his methods are in all points superior to ours. Thus he maintains that the very first verse of the Raghuvamsa is an interpolation, on purely aesthetic grounds. We should here certainly expect an investigation into the history of this verse in the works of rhetoric. Higher criticism cannot be based on aesthetic considerations alone, but must also take into account other points. Literary taste varies, and it has varied also in India. But even though I cannot agree with the author's views, I have read his book with great pleasure. His Sanskrit is much above the average, and in many cases his remarks help us to detect new beauties in Kālidāsa's famous poem.

STEN KONOW.
SOME ANGO-INDIAN WORTHIES OF THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY.

BY LAVINIA MARY ANSTEY.

No. III.

AMBROSE SALISBURY.

Ambrose Salisbury, whose career in India extended from 1668 to 1676, was one of the lesser lights among the East India Company's servants on the coast of Coromandel. Like William Jearsey, Salisbury was, for some years, out of favour and out of the Company's service, but, unlike Jearsey, Salisbury never openly defied the authorities at home. He was, indeed, a man of a very different calibre to the fiery chief at Masulipatam. The glimpses of his character obtained from his own letters and from those of his contemporaries, show him as timid, undecided, and alternately pitiful and apologetic. It was little wonder that he was made a cat's-paw by the more daring spirits around him, nor that he hovered perpetually between favour and disgrace. Of his business capabilities it is difficult to judge. On the few occasions when he asserted himself, he boasted of his economical and skilful management of the Company's investments. For his diligence in attending to the dyeing of gingham, &c., he earned a measure of praise from the Council at Masulipatam, but he appears to have been incapable of holding his own either with the "peeter men" or with the native underlings at Peddapallo. Still, insignificant as he was, the story of Ambrose Salisbury's life in India affords much valuable information with regard to the working of one of the Company's minor factories, at a time when records are sparse and fragmentary. The correspondence between Salisbury and his superiors in 1666, 1670 to 1673, and again, in 1675, is detailed and connected. From these letters a clear idea can be formed of the methods adopted to procure "Saltpeeter and Packing Trade" and of the various means employed by the Company's servants to serve their own ends under cover of their masters' interests. How the unhappy Salisbury was alternately threatened, censured and cajoled, these records sufficiently set forth. As will be seen, though not an illiterate man, he was not a facile writer. At times, his sentences are hopelessly involved, but, except in a very few instances, his meaning is apparent. His letters, in fact, reveal the man as he was, and the intensely human tone of the whole correspondence is an adequate excuse for reproducing it in its entirety.

Of the parentage and early history of the subject of this paper little is known. Beyond the facts that his mother was Susanna Salisbury, that he had a sister Susan and two nieces, Susanna and Anna, nothing definite has come to light about his family. It is probable that Ambrose was related to Hugh Salisbury (frequently mentioned in the Letter Books of the E. T. Co.), who was Collector of Customs and Controller of Prizes at Portsmouth from 1664 to 1676. He may also have been connected with "Mr. Samwell Salisbury, an ancient sober man of good breeding," the Company's "steward" in their factory at Surat in 1664. In 1630, "Ambrose Salisbury of Ravenstone in the Counties of Leicester and Derby" died, leaving a "hopeful son Ambrose at Cambridge." It is possible that the Cambridge undergraduate may have been the father of the East Indian factor, but no proof of the relationship is forthcoming.

1 See ante, Vol. XXXIV., 1905, pp. 161 f.
2 Administrations, 1672, at Somerset House.
3 See Calendars of State Papers, Domestic Series.
5 Wills proved in the P. C. C., Scroope, 41.
The first mention discoverable of Ambrose Salisbury is in a "Generall Letter" from a Court of Committees to Fort St. George on the 27th February, 1658. The first time he appears in the documents is on the 27th March, 1658, when he is appointed as one of the factors at Fort St. George. He was sent to Bengal to serve as a factor, and the factory was established there. This factory was dissolved in 1653, and since that date there had been no regular resident factors at that place.

Unfortunately, the Court Minutes of the Company for the year 1658 are defective and there is consequently no means of ascertaining how Salisbury obtained his appointment. On the 15th March, 1658, another "Generall" states that "Persian Merchant" now ready to sail for Fort St. George. Upon this ship took his passage the persons following: viz. Mr. Jonathan Treviss, Mr. Ambrose Salisbury, Mr. Wm. Vassali and Mr. Stephen Charleton. On the 27th March the appointment of Jonathan Treviss was annulled. He was sent to Bengal and it was ordered that William Daniell, who was already in India, should be "Chief" at Peddappali.

The "Persian Merchant," in which Salisbury sailed, never reached her destination, but was "cast away" off the Maldives on the 9th August 1658. The account of the wreck has already been given in this Journal. After various vicissitudes, Salisbury, in company with those of the passengers and crew who escaped imprisonment by the "Mallabars," reached Fort St. George on the 6th October, 1658. Three months later, on the 18th January, 1659, the Council at Surat informed the authorities at home of the disaster: "By Letters from our Friends at Coast Coromandel Wee are given to understand the sad newes of the Persia Merchant being Cast away upon one of the Maldives Islands, the Ship and Goods all Lost, God be praised all the men saved except six. Our Agent Mr. Treviss, Capt. Johnson, Capt. Middleton, Mr. Salisbury and Mr. Charleton with divers others were arrived at Fort St. George, from whence you will hear further Concerning the whole passage of the sad losse to which we refer you." In reply, the Court of Committees wrote to Surat on the 22nd August, 1659, "The sad disaster which happened to our ship Persian Merchant we have had the full relation thereof from the Coast, and willingly submit to the good hand of God who disposest of all things according to his pleasure."

It is to be presumed that Ambrose Salisbury proceeded to his post at Peddappali at the end of the year 1658 and that, for some months, he served under Mr. Daniell. On the 25th May, 1659, the Council at Surat wrote to Fort St. George, "Having in ours dated the 25th April past ordered Mr. Johnson to be our second and Mr. A Court Cheife of Mitchlepatam, Mr Daniell of Verrasheroon, Wee hope that you will furnish Petripolee with one that may agree with the rest, that in our masters business every man may act in his sphere without clashing, which behoves you to take notice of." The appointment at Peddappali seems to have been given to Mr. Thomas Shingler, subject to the supervision of Mr. Daniell. On the 23rd April, 1660, in the "Forts Generall to Verrasheroon," Mr. Daniell was desired to order Mr. Shingler to make up the Peddappali accounts.

---

15 See ante, Vol. XXXI, pp. 153-156.
17 Factory Records, Surat, Vol. 84.
The first mention of Salisbury, after the note of his arrival in India, is on the 9th May, 1661, in the "Forts Generall to Mr. Thos. Shingler at Pettipole." The Agent, Thomas Chambers, wrote, "The Agent is now alone, Therefore, whenever Mr. Thos. Shingler (after he hath setled the Company's business which cannot be long in doing) leaving the same in Charge with Mr. Ambrose Salisbury, to repair to Fort St. George." On the 14th August of the same year, 1661, the Agent at Fort St. George decided to give up the establishment of factors at Pedaapalle. The instructions in the "Forts Generall to Metchlepam" were as follows: "Now wee have no Cargo (as wee know yet) to provide for Persia, We conceit that Pettipole Factory wilbe of the less use, So that if you have need of assistance, you may send for Ambrose Salisbury, or if otherwise you see occasion be for his stay there, to allow him 4 old Pagodas per month for all Charges, which is as much as Mr. Edward Winter was allowed in Verashroon, and when he knowes his allowance bee will conform his expence thereafter." Ambrose Salisbury appears to have accepted the stated allowance and to have remained at Pedaapalle, for, in the "Forts Generall to Surat" of the 16th September, 1661, we read, "Mr. Thos. Shingler, according to your Order, is constituted Accomptant Generall in this Agency but by reason of the death of Mr. Wm. Daniel and the Long sickness of Mr. Wm. Johnson, there is a necessity for his repair to Metchlepam and those Factories for a matter of 25 daies, for Mr. Johnson hath noe body with him but himselfe, and in each of the Factories of Verashroon and Pettipole there is but a single Person, and there is a greate businesse there to bee setled in relation to the accompts and investments to bee made in all these Factories this present yeares." On the same date, 16th September, 1661, in a "Generall to Metchlepam," the Agent at Fort St. George issued orders stating the position that Pedaapalle was henceforward to hold with regard to Masulipatam. "Mr. Thomas Shingler will acquaint you what a confusion it hath made in our books and yours comparing one with another with the Subordinate Factories of Verashroon and Pettipole, they being distinct by themselves as having no relation to Metchlepam, whereas we understand now his Contrary to the meaning of the Company as you will perceive by what they have ordered in relation to Bay Bengal. Therefore, we do henceforward, in their names, require that all such of the Company's servants as shall live in Verashroon and Pettipole bee accountable to Factory Metchlepam and to receive their Orders from Mr. Wm. Johnson or whome ells shall bee principal in that Factory and to yeild obedience thereto, but as yet to appoint Chefs of the subordinate Factories or a Second in Metchlepam wee shall deferre to doe till the arrivall of those the Company's Factors that are expected on the Hope and Trucore." The Instructions given to Mr. Thomas Shingler on his departure for the subordinate factories, also dated 16th September, 1661, contain the following reference to Salisbury: "Wee cannot conceive any necessity at present for continuing the Factory of Pettipole because wee cannot tell yet if any investment will bee made there this yeare for Persia see that at your coming to Metchlepam, if you see that Mr. Johnson doth want Assistance, see much as hee advises us, Mr. Ambrose Salisbury may be called away to him and I wonder Mr. Johnson should Complain see much for want of help as hee doth when wee have many weeks past signified to him our pleasures therein." Salisbury, however, remained at Pedaapalle. In the "Fort St. Georges Addition to their Generall to Metchlepam" of the 1st December, 1661, the Agent wrote, "At Mr. Wm. Johnson's Voyaging to Fort St. George, wee would have him take either Mr. Ambrose Salisbury from Pettipole or Mr. Wm. Smyth from Verashroon (wee meane him that may bee best spared) to remayne att Metchlepam till Mr. Johnson's returne to take Charge of the Company's remaines and Factory."
As "Second" in Peddapalle Factory, one of Salisbury's duties was to keep the books in accordance with a clause in Sir Edward Winter's "Commission," of the 20th February, 1662, "Wee doe Order and apoint that our Second at Fort St. George and in all other Factories under your Comand, where wee shall have above two Factors Resident, to keepe our Books of AccoRTnts, which books shall bee allowed by the Cheife of each respective Factory and afterward transmitted to your Resident to bee perused and allowed of by your selfe or whose shall Succeed, which Bookes being examined and attested, wee doe require that they, with your owne Bookes kept in Fort St George, with the Bookes of Consultations, bee yearely sent us home for England." 25

From a paragraph in the "Forte Generall to Metchlepatain" of the 11th March, 1662, it appears that Salisbury had at last gone to Masulipatam. "And if it is needfull, you may dispatch Mr. Smyth and Mr. Sted for Verashroone to gaine the trade there which is lost but that is referred to you according to Consultation as well Mr. Salusbury to Petipoele, but that must bee when there is a Persian Investment." 26 In consequence of this permission, Salisbury returned to Peddapalle some time before June 1662, when instructions were ordered to be sent to him about his accounts. On the 27th June, the Agent at Fort St. George wrote to Masulipatam, "Verashroone and Petipoele Invoyces should bee taken into yours of Metchlepatain and you may instruct them in the two factoyres to abreciate theirs by making goods of the same sort and price of one number and to keep your Accounts at 80 Cash to a fannam as you doe at Metchlepatain and let the accounts of the subordinate Factoyres bee taken into yours as wee enquired in ours of the 16th September last." 27

Since the departure of Mr. Shingler, Salisbury had been acting "Cheife" at Peddapalle. His appointment as head of the factory was confirmed at a "Consultation held October the 20th 1662 per the Agent and Councell of Fort St. George in Metchlepatain... Wee doe hereby declare and agree... That the undermentioned persons are to take place in order as they are underwritten... Vizt. Petipoele, Ambrose Saulsbury, John Sted." 28 But, though his rank as senior factor at Peddapalle was thus acknowledged, he was not recognized as the actual "Cheife" of the Factory. In the "Fort St. George Generall" to the Company of the 10th January, 1662-3, there is "A list of the factors that are livinge at the dispeede of Your Shippinge... as follows... Petipoele, Ambrose Salusbury, John Sted." Then comes the remark, "Though these persons are placed as above, yet wee are not fully resolved on their disposals." 29

On the 26th February, 1663, a "Consultation held at Fort St. George, it was again resolved to discontinue a regular factory at Peddapalle:— "Wee conclude it best that the Factories of Verashcroone and Petipoele bee dissolvd because they are soe chargeable, and the business may as well bee done without them, and if at any tyme any shall bee employed to procure Goods in those parts, they shall bee allowed lower Pagothaes &d per month during the tyme they are out in that employment and to bee allowed Charges Merchandize besides." 30

Salisbury evidently preferred to remain in partial independence at Peddapalle rather than be subject to the restrictions of the position of a junior servant of the Company at Masulipatam. In the "Forte Generall" to the Company of the 10th December, 1663, we read, "Those debts standing out at Metchlepatain in Mr. Johons Bookees were theSalt petre men, which Mr. Jearsey turned over to Petipoele Factory, which when Mr. Salusbury hath made up his yeares businesse with

26'Probably a copyist's error for 80. Thomas Bowrey, Countries Round the Bay of Bengal (Iahkynt Society's Publications), pp. 114-116, gives 80 copper cash to a fannam (worth 3d.) at Fort St. George, c.e. 1669.
30 O. C. No. 2920.
them, wee shall know what is done.” In the same letter, we have the first reference to Salisbury’s investment of saltpetre at Peddapalle, and also the first hint of censure on his conduct:—“Mr. Ambrose Salisbury from Pettipooe hath invoced unto us on the George and Martha 703 Bagga of Saltpetre at several prizes from 4 to 5½ pagotthes Old per Candie, besides Charges but hath not made any distinction thereof unto us. The petre which goeth from hence is marked M, That from Pettipooe hath neither marke nor Number. This wee thought fit to hint to your Worsips least you should impute the omission unto us.”

The Company were of the same opinion as their Agent at Fort St. George about the undesirability of continuing a Factory at Peddapalle. In the “Generall to Fort St. George” of the 16th December, 1663, the Court of Committees wrote, “Wee absolutely prohibit the making of any debts at Pettipoly, Mesaliputam or Verashroone, where wee have already smarred for the same . . . And as wee desire the Reducing of our Factories in the Bay, see wee doe alsoe on the Coast, And therefore refer unto your Consideration the quitting the Factory in Pettipooe, which wee conceive is not necessary to bee continued, The Gallicosse which wee receive from thee beeinge inconciderable and may bee made in the same sorta and goodnesse with you at the Fort or Mesaliputam.”

The year 1664 was a disastrous one for Salisbury. Hitherto he had enjoyed the favour and protection of William Jearsey, who had succeeded Mr. Johnson as Chief at Masulipatam. Jearsey, however, was in violent opposition to Sir Edward Winter, then Agent at Fort St. George, and Sir Edward’s severity towards Salisbury appears to have been aimed at the underling’s supporter. In the “Generall to Fort St. George” of Masulipatam, dated 18th March, 1664, Mr. Jearsey was informed, “If you want money for the provision of Saltpeter, their will be a necessity for you to take up some, for we cannot Supply you with any from hence. Wee are Sending of Mr. Robert Fleetwood to reside at Pettipooe, whom wee shall appoynt for that Employment and gett in the old debits, to whomse would have you deliver 1000 or 1500 pagos, and to Consult toether aboute the old debitoris. If you deliver them any money, that they bring in one fourth part [more] than they shall receive now in money upon Accompt of their debts, that soe in time they may be able to Clearse them.” On the 25th March, Ambrose Salisbury was summarily dismissed from his post.

“Orders Sent to Mr. Ambrose Salisbury.”

Mr. Ambrose Salisbury, Upon Sight of this our order you are to Deliver unto Mr. Robert Fleetwood an Accompt of all things apperteyninge to our honourable Masters At Pettipooe and places adjacent, whomse have Enorded to reside in that place to looke after our Said Employers affaires in those Parts, And this our order and his Receipt Shall bee your Discharge from Your loving frends, Edward Winter; William Gifford; Edward Reade; William Dawes.

Dated in Fort St. George the 25th March 1664.”

Mr. William Dawes was sent to Peddapalle to carry the Agent’s orders into effect.

“Instructions Given to Mr. William Dawes.”

Loving Friends Mr. Williams Dawes, By occasion of Several Complaints of the Saltpeter makers At Pettpooe against Ambrose Salisbury, which that wee may more fully understand, have thought requisite to send you thither, in Regard of your language, to Examine and make report unto us, and have likewise Mr. Robert Fleetwood to take Charge of the Company affayres there, and for the managging of this affayre referre unto you unto the followinge lines for Instructions.

---

20 O. C. No. 2933.
21 The candie at Masulipatam was reckoned at 281 lbs. at this period, Bowrey, op. cit., p. 217, n. 5.
First, at your Arrivall at Metchlepam, if Mr. Salusbury Bee there, you togeather with Mr. Fleetwood are to produce or Show him our order for transferring the charge of what ever apperteynes to the Company in Petepolee from him, the said Ambrose Salusbury, unto Ditto Robt. Fleetwood, according to which wee expect his Complyance. But if you findes him not at Metchlepam, Then you are to goe immediately to Petepolee and Exact his Complyance to our Said order herewith Delivered you.

Secondly, you are to Convene all the Salkpeter makers and takes account of them what Debts they owed and what money hath bin Delivered to them, alsoe what peter they have brought in Since Sir Edward Winters going home for England.

Thirdly, if uppon Examination it Shall appeare that Mr. Salusbury hath wronged the Company, you are to Call on him and Demand Satisfacion.

Forthles, you are to apply your selves in person or by writeing unto the Governour in Chiefe of Petepolee and the adjacent places where the Peter is made, touching his favour unto the Salkpeter merchants Else, business, this in Complyance to the King's chirmand [farmān] Soe long observed by his Subjects, and as soon as the Shippes out of Europe Arrive, wee Shall Remember him With a present and, as hee Shall Deserve, Every yeere bee mindefull of him.

Likewise you are to take Care for the Securing of Such Debts As are Dew from Severall persons unto Sr. Edward Winter.

Lastly having Examined the matters of Difference betweene the Salkpeter makers and Mr. Salusbury, leaving Mr. Fleetwood there At Petepolee, and Ditto Salusbury (if Comply with our order) At Metchlepam, but if hee bee averse, then to hasten your returns, and (as in a former Clause hinted) bring him along with you to Render Accomp' Unto Your loving freinds, EDWARD WINTER, WILLIAM GYFFORD, EDWARD READE.

Fort St George, 25 March 1664.36

Though Winter's orders for Salisbury's dismissal appear to have been carried out, the Agent was unable to detach the disgraced factor from his protector, William Jearsey. In a letter to Masulipatam on the 25th May 1664, Winter wrote, "Wee have it Reported from Severall that you and Mr. Salusbury by your lycence, Employ Severall to buy up the Salkpeter at Petepolee by which the price is raised and the Company will be prejudiced for which you must Expect to give Satisfaction hereafter, and your making a Factory there under the name of Metchlepam will not bee well Pleasing to the Company."37

Salisbury continued at Peddapalle, although Sir Edward Winter, writing from Madappollam on the 23rd September 1664, assumed that he was at Masulipatam: "I shall not consent that Mr. Jearsey at his Comming from Metchlepam shall intrust Mr. Niclase with the Companies affaires or any of their estate, But, as occasion requires, it shall bee Committed to the care and Management of Mr. Charles Proby or Mr. Ambrose Salusbury as Shall bee most Convenient." Whether Winter had, by this time, modified his opinion about Salisbury is uncertain, but if not, it seems strange that he should have been willing to give him a temporary responsible post at Masulipatam. The result of Mr. Dawes' enquiry into Salisbury's conduct is not recorded, but had he found the accused factor guilty of any grave misdemeanour the fact could hardly have been ignored. That Winter realized his mistake is evident, for, writing to Jearsey from Madappollam on the 4th October 1664, he gave quite a different reason for Salisbury's dismissal from that contained in the Orders of the previous March: "As touching Mr. Salusbury's being Displaced there was good reason for it, hee plainly affirming

that he would not resolve whither he would serve the Company any longer till the years Shipping Arrived, his time being before expired, but if he shall enternote himselfe againe, hee shall bee placed as shall bee thought fittinge." 39 That Salisbury was still at Peddapalla at this time is evident from a letter to Captain Egmont of the 29th October, 1664, informing him that "Mr. Fleetwood's boats being all gone to Metchlopata," the writer "hath now borrowed of Mr. Salisbury his boat." 39

By the time the letter from the Court of Committees of the 16th December 1663, 40 reached Indis, the Agent and Council at Fort St. George had realized that it was to the Company's interest to retain a factory at Peddapalle, and on the 8th December, 1664, they wrote to the Court, "Petropolis is no otherwise made use of then for the provision of Saltpetre, which if wee doe not encourage, the Dutch will quickly snatch it from us, they having againe after many yeares absence, renewed their Factory in that place." 41

Sir Edward Winter too, would seem to have repeated of his hastiness and evidently feared that the authorities at home would consider his high-handed conduct towards Salisbury in an unfavourable light. In a letter to his brother, Thomas Winter, dated 2nd and 12th January, 1665, he gives the following explanation of his action: "I know the Company will be informed of my discharging Mr. Salisbury their service, but not the true Cause and Reason of it, which was because he plainly told me in March last that he would not resolve me whether he would any longer serve the Company till the Europe Ships arrived, his time being Expired. Besides, I have under my owne hand his agreement with the Salt petre Merchants, wherein he Contracted with them to bring in per 4½ pages. new per Candy, 42 and he rates the same to the Company at 6½ pages. old per Candy; and in his Books hath Charged many large and unnecessary expenses as he pleased himselfe, which must not be allowed. This I think a sufficient Ground to keep me from being Employed in it again; and yet Mr. Buckridge (whom I have informed of all this) is so made by Mr. Jeeves that they would Continue him in that busines. Pray let the Committee have notice hereof." 43

It is difficult to decide on the justice of Winter's charges. In the matter of indcision, the allegation might well have been true, for Salisbury's vacillation is in constant evidence throughout his life, and he seems to have been incapable of forming a definite resolution.

In the year 1665 there is no record whatever of the late head at Peddapalle, but on the 1st January 1666, there is a reference to him in a letter from Jeremy Sambrooks at Fort St. George to William Jeeves at Masulipatam: "This night is a Letter come from Mr. Cloten to Petropolee to Sir Edward, declaring how hee &c. are wounded by some falling out with Mr. Salisbury. I know not the particulars." 43 On the 25th May 1666, Salisbury was at Masulipatam, when he appended his Signature after those of Messrs. Jeeves and Niches to a letter to Sir George Oxinden at Surat. 44 This shows that the Chief at Masulipatam, at any rate, still accounted his protegé a Company's servant. Jeeves, no doubt, had his own ends to serve by making Salisbury a debtor to his kindness and protection. In August, 1666, he suggested a voyage to Tanasserim, the real object of which was to anticipate Sir Edward Winter in the seizure of goods at that place. It did not suit Jeeves to appear openly in the matter, and Salisbury, being virtually out of the Company's service, was a safe tool to make use of in the matter. However, weak though he was, Salisbury saw through the motives of his would-be employers.

40 See ante, p. 317.
41 O. C. No. 3037.
43 Factory Records, Fort St. George, Vol. 15.
44 O. C. No. 3175.
"Proposals of voyaging to Tenassaree mad: to Mr. Ambrose Salisbury, Metchlepam, the 6:
August 1666.

Mr. Ambrose Salisbury, Wee have often propounded to you your going to Tenassaree
to secure the Company's Freights of the Madrass Merchant, which may bee judged to amount
to 7 or 8000 pagothanas of which Mr. Deering yet never gave any Accompit, much less made any
Returne of that, nor of 8000 and odd pagothanas New Mr. Chamber adventured on the Madrass
Merchant, which he hath turned over to the Company, besides other Considerable venture
of other mens, which Sir Edward Winter endeavouring to get all into his possession, Wee have
all the Reason that may bee to prevent it, as alsoe to Seize upon what may bee the[re] Remayneing
of his, thereby to save our Masters as much indemnified as wee can, hee having usurpt their authority and Seized on their Fort and estates, and keepes the Agent
George Foxcroft, Esca. close Prisioners against all Law or Reason, wherefore we desire you
to give us a speedy answer in Writinge whither you will undertake the business and doe the
voyage or not, the Monsoon drawing nigh, that if you Refuse it, wee may have time to
Consider of some other course, as alsoe that wee may give advice to our Freinds in the Day of
your Resolutions, whoe indeed have picht upon you as a fitting Person to send, Wee
Rennynge, Your assured Freinds, WM. Jearsye ; JOHN NICLAES.42

To this proposal Salisbury replied on the same day as follows:—

"Mr. Salisburies Answer to the proposals for his voyaging to Tenassaree,
dated in Metchlepam the 6th August 1666.

Mr. William Jearsye &ca., Respected Friends, That you have propounded my going to
Tanassaree to secure the Companys Freight of the Madrass Merchant with the several
advantages belonging to Mr. Chamber and other persons, I acknowledge. Yet, on the contrary,
you never yet provided any Convaince, nor proposed any conditions, or what commission
you would give. It is certaine it will bee an acceptable Service to prevent Sir Edward Winter
his seizure on the Companys Estate, having possesst himselfe of your Fort and Interest at
Madaras. For my owne part, shall ever give my assistance to advance the Companys Interest and
would now gladly proceed on this Employment, were times peaceable and other affaires settled,
as they ought to bee in these parts. You know I have bin out of Employment and livyd at my
owne expence upwards of two years, and now in this time of warre with the Dutch, upon soe
short warning, it will bee much discouragement to goe the voyage upon one of the Country
juncas, besides the underhand dealing that may bee used by Sir Edwards means with bribes
&ca., of which hee will not bee sparing, and you not sending some Estate or Effects to doe the
same cannot, in my apprehension, prove advantageous to the Company, and to returne and not
doe the service I should: and you may expect will redound to my great discreditt. Therefore,
desire you to make choice of some person you shall approve of (as here are them both capable
and willing to accept) and excuse, Your assured Friend, AMBROSE SALISBURY.43

This answer was probably partly dictated by the fear of incurring the enmity of Sir
Edward Winter. At the same time Salisbury realized, what he hints at in the close of his letter,
that, in the event of his failure to bring back a goodly haul from Tenassereim, his actions would
be disavowed by Jearsye and his following, and he would thus be in a worse plight than he was
already.

41 Sir Edward Winter was superseded as Agent by George Foxcroft in 1665. Instead of resigning, Winter
imprisoned his successor and kept him in confinement for three years.
42 Factory Records, Masulipatam, Vol. 5.
On the receipt of Salisbury's answer to their proposals, Messrs. Jearse and Niclaes wrote again:

"Mr. Ambrose Salisbury, In your answer to our paper delivered you to day, you acknowledged that wee Long since propounded your going to Tannaharee, but now declyne it under pretence of the Dutch war and short warning. As to the former, that was knowne long before wee had ever any thoughts of sending you, or indeed did imagine wee should have any Necessity for it, and for the latter, you have been often spake to some monethes since, and about a moneth agoe you said you would Consider of it and give your answer in two or three thyres, but did not minde it. Besides, the tyme is not soe short as you speake of, having neere a moneth that you may provide your selfe. Conveighance of the Companys you knowe we have not, and therefore must make use of the Moores [Muhunmadans], which was alsoe told you, to carry you over, of which you may take choyce of three or four. 'Twas never a Custom to give any man a Commission that [? when] there was noe Certainty of his proceedings upon the voyage, the Conditions were to goe upon [were] as the Companys Servant to secure what belonged to them and what you could more of Sir Edward's in; however, your Endeavours would bee acceptable and you Blameless.

Your Indented time with the Company we knowe to be long since Expired 49, and that Sir Edward did, upon his owne humour, turne you out of Service, without the Consent of any body else, and this Wee finde you have taken for a Law and discharge, and thereupon have taken your owne time to follow your owne occasions, which in all reason should have its owne charge, for while you were here you never was debarred the Companys accomodation and you may very well Remember that with Mr. Buckridge 50 Wee resolved, Notwithstanding what Sir Edward had done, not to Leave you out, which Sir Edward, after his departure, nuld againe, but noe Sooner that the Worshipfull Agent Foxcroft arrived [in 1665], but wee had you in Consideration againe; but bee, being betrayed into those villaines power before any thing was Effected, and having noe shipping here since the departure of Mr. Buckridge, things have Remained unsettled, soe that you cannot Justly blame any body but Sir Edward that you have not been in a Settled Employment, the which could not have lasted longer than wee had had Businesse, and then you must, to save Charges have repaired hither. But all the while Wee have Observed you Unconstant and wavering as it were between two Opinions, and as if You had slighted or Neglected noe farr as not to acknowledge your selfe to bee in the Number of one of the Companys servants, and that is the reason that Wee have not at any time since nor now absolutely Commanded your observance, but desire you to take the Employment upon you which, if you doe refuse, you may chance meet with a worse, and repent you of missing this, which wee would not have doe you, and therefore doe not take your present answer as a positive answer but doe Expect it to this, and Remayne Your assured Friends, WM. JHARSWY;

JOHN NICLAES 50.

Machilipatam, the 6 August 1666."
Jearsey. When safely back at Peddapalle, he wrote a long, involved and courteous reply to the document of the 6th August:—

"Mr. Salusbury's General to Matchlepam, dated in Pettipoa, the 10th August 1666.

Mr. William Jearsey & Co., Respected Friends, The Reasons I have given no reply to your paper of the 6th instant until now are two, better consideration being of concernment, and opportunity, as on my Journy, which had not till my arrivall to the place last night.

My paper delivered you the day of your date acknowledged what you express, my going to Tanassaree, which you say I decline under pretence of the Dutch Warr and Short warning, which was not so much pretence as Reality, being the same expressed by word of month before; and as in that paper of mine you mention you never yet propounded any conveyance nor proposed any condition, therefore did not esteem it other then by way of discourse, a thing not really intended, and therefore replied would give you my Answer in two or three days, and after did not regard it, you having eight months since propounded the same and not till of late days did mention of it again, therefore had little regard to your Second propostall, concluding it would be buried in oblivion with the former and not prosecuted nor observed more; that to provide being, as you say, near one month, I looke not as sufficient for such a voyage, and to take passage on a Moors Jounck to that or any other place (unless compelled) should not of my own accord. Had your result gone along with your discourse so long since as you speak of, there might have been conveyance of the Companies. Tis not usual to give a Person a Commission before there is a certainty of proceeding, and very few that will promise or engage until the conditions concluded on, and therefore that I have not resolved, you cannot impute my fault. I conclude with you I was to goe as the Companies Servant to secure what belongs to them, as alsoe what I could of Sir Edwards. The former is very legal and necessary, the latter I will not dispute; and if my endeavours will not accomplish either, they will bee acceptable and blameless, but you never promised engagement to Secure mee Soe to the Company and Sir Edward in case of future troubles Should I prove an unprofitable Servant and returns only with an account of charges, which conclude you have some Suspicion will prove mee better, therefore you Say you will send mee estate of the Companies, and whome you will find to expend his owne on this account shall bee glad to heare, or that you Informe how it can bee done without a considerable charge.

As you understand that Sir Edward did upon his owne humour turne mee out of Service without the consent of any body else, you alsoe know I have bin ever ready and willing to accept the Companys Employment and have not removed from this place in expectation of a Settlement according as concluded on by Mr. Buckeridge and your Selves, and Since promised many times by you, although at first opposed by Sir Edward, yet after the arrival of the Worshipfull Agent Foxcroft his power was voyage as to the Companys Servants, and Since the Agent his Imprisonment the power hath laine only in you to order the Companys affairs in these parts. I conceive you might as well have answered my Settlement to the Company as you can the continuance of a person in employment established without your knowledge and consent by Sir Edward Winter, which may cause a conjecture or Suspicion by strangers and no good opinion by the Company, but since you approve it I submit and am content.

My opinion was always settled and constant to doe the honoble Company Service and will not say I have bin much slighted, onely this, that having bin called to engage myself with you in matters of greatest concernment in behalfe of the Honoble Company, the Agent, &c., concluded I might have bin accepted off and acquainted with matters of less moment, and that is the reason that I have not of late desired to acquainte my selfe with either.
If my refusal of this employment now propounded prove to my prejudice and losse and that I may meet with a worse, will rather content my Selfe with it then accept of this. Am confident the Honorable Company will not require any person to goe upon an Employment against his owne approbation, therefore depend on your favour for pardon for my non-acceptance, and this please to accept as the resolution of Your assured Friend, AMBROSE SALSBURY."

The attempt to assert himself was a failure. Jersey retorted at once with a sharp decisive letter and his attitude left no doubt about the scant regard he had for Salisbury or for any threats he might use.

Mr Ambrose Salisbury, This instant wee Received your Resolution in Answer to ours, which wee did not Expect at this distance, but before your departure, see that you might have Saved the labour of it, for as sylence giveth consent, see wee Easily concluded that you going away without giving a Respond, did not like what wee had Writt and would not goe the Voyadge.

To give a particular answers to every thing in yours is not of any necessity, however here and there shall touch at some things that either in vindication of our selves or Confutation of you may Seem to Require it.

The Dutch War was knowne to you long before the proposal of this voyadge to you, therefore could not now bee brought in for a pretence more than at first, and if a moneths warning, as you confess, were not enough to fit your self for a voyadge, Wee cannot conceive what time you would Require, but undoubtedly you could have fitted your selfe in less time if you had pleased and given us a positive answer at first as well as now, to tell us you did not regard it and had little regard to our second Proposal. Had Wee absolutely ordered your going at first, which wee might have done if you are the Companys Servant, without making any other Conditions with you but commanding you to observe such instructions as wee should give you, this had been the Way to know your mind sooner and have Received a flat answer from you as now that you would not, and wee will not press it any further, much less Compell you to any thing.

Tis to bee supposed that if wee ordered you any thing in the Companys behalf that they should beare you out in it, but 'tis very strange that you should scruple to act what you have set your hand to as the securing of what wee could light on of Sir Edwards to have the Company indemnifyed as much as you can. If you think you have done any thing amiss or gone too far herein, you know how you may bee absolved. 'Tis but relenting and making a Submissive Confession of your Error to Sir Edward, but had you Undertaken the designe and required any Security from us, wee should have given it you, but before you asked it how should wee know you were so Wavering, having formerly told you see much of that that 'twas thought you would never have appeared see againe.

As to your Employment, our former is Sufficient answer, if you could bee satisfied with it, and for our Employment of Mr. Fleetwood which you distast, 'tis to get in the goodes for the money delivered out by him, under which hee may for Ready money procure some more, and when this business is over he hath done until further order from the Agent.

Your complaints of being made onely acquainted with business of greatest concernment will not signify much, if it were granted to bee soe, as you say that you were not acquainted with matters of least moment, but wee doe not know wherein nor the time, unless you were incapable by Sickness or otherwise.

---

If you read over your Indenture with the Company, you will find you are obliged to serve in such places and in such employment as shall be appointed by your superiors and are not left to your own choyse as you infer, which we think sufficient answer to you and Remaine Your Reall Freinds, WM. JERSEY; JOHN NICLAES.

*Metchlepatam the 13th August 1666.*

After this passage of arms with Jersey, we hear no more of Salisbury for some time. The next mention of him, which is far from flattering, is in 1668, when he was still at Pedrapalle. It occurs in a "Letter from an unknowne person" to the Company dated in Fort St. George, 4 April, 1668:

"Truly your Factory at Pettipolee is rather a Charge then a benefit to you (being managed by a very debauch'd Idle fellow one Salisbury) not furnishing from thence a piece of Cloth towards your returns this yeare.. . . I give you a Character of your Metchlepatam Servants... they are all greate abusers of the Company in words and deedes especially Salisbury at Pettipolee, that miscreant." 53

From the above extract it seems clear that Salisbury was acting at Pedrapalle as an accredited servant of the Company. In 1669 he desired to be transferred to the Bay of Bengal. The "Fort Generall" to Masulipatam of the 30th of June, 1669, contains the following paragraph on this head:

"Mr Bridges also advised that Mr Ambrose Salisbury desired he might goe into the Bay for some fitting employment which might present, and Mr Salisbury also having acquainted the Agent and others of us of that his desire, if he doe continue in that minde and still desire it, we give our consent that he also may goe for the Bay, so as that before his departure he give up a trew and faithfull account of all that hath beene under his management and a true delivery of whatsoever shall be found remaining or due from him to the Honble Company; and, in case he leave his place, we appoint Mr Robert Fleetwood to succeede him as Chief in Petepolee, as a person who by his long experience is the fittest for that employment, and doe appoint Mr John Hopkins who hath long servd the Company faithfullly to be his second to assist him in Petepolee." 54

How long Salisbury had been acting as "Chief" at Pedrapalle, is uncertain, but it is probable that, on the release of Agent Foxcroft in August, 1663, he was reinstated in the Company's service.

The death of John Niclaes, shortly after Salisbury's request to go to "the Bay," created a vacancy on "the Coast," and the "Chief at Petippolee" was appointed "Second" at Masulipatam.

"Fort Generall to Metchlepatam, 20th July 1669.

To Mr. William Jersey. We have taken into consideration the Vacancy of a second in Metchlepatam by the death of Mr John Niclaes, and do find it to be Mr Ambrose Salisbury his right of sucession, since we have no intention of sending any from hence to fill up that vacancy, and therefore have appointed the said Mr Ambrose Salisbury to succeed and be second in Metchlepatam, having given up account of all under his charge at Petippoolee, as you will perceive by

53 Factory Records, Masulipatam, Vol. 3.
54 Factory Records, Fort St. George, Vol. 16.
a Copy of our Consultation about that business, whereunto we do refer you, by which also you will find that we appoint Mr Robert Fleetwood to be Chief in Petepole and Mr John Hopkins to be his Second and Assistant."

At this time Salisbury was occupied in getting in a supply of salt petre for the Company. On the 17th August 1669, he wrote to Masulipatam that he should have 300 Candy ready by the end of the month. Knowing that the position of "Second" at Masulipatam was a post of less independence than that of "Chief" at Pedapalle, he was in no hurry to repair to his new appointment. On the 8th September, 1669, Agent Foxcroft, who seems to have heard of Salisbury's disinclination to succeed at Masulipatam, wrote to William Jersay:—

"Wee doe concurr with them that it is convenient that Mr Salisbury and Mr Fleetwood doe respectively continue in the places were they are, untill they have effected and gathered in the investments they have entered upon for this yeare, before they settle themselves in the places whereunto they are designed, unless you finde some other necessity to appoint it sooner, and that the business may goe on currantly in their absence. Wee did understand and intend the charge [? change] of Mr Salisbury from Petepole to be second to be a raising of him, as well as we understand it to his desire, claryming the same by right, in which we concurred." 67

Three days latter in another "Generall" to Masulipatam of the 11th September, 1669, Foxcroft remarked, "Mr Salisbury advises that 125 tons of salt petre which he is ordered to provide whie at Metchlepole by the end of August, onely he saith Oxen are hard to be had, thers being a sickness among them of which many dye." 68

Meanwhile, the proposal to send Salisbury to "the Bay" met with great disfavour from the factors there. In a "Genereall to Fort St George" of the 11th September 1669, they wrote, "Wee find likewise that your Worship &c. have licensed Mr Ambrose Salasburys coming downe to be employed in our Masters affaires as wee shall find convenient. You very well know that wee have already more Persons of large expectations than employments proportionable thereto, thers being besides the Chiefs of the severall factoryes, eight of Queanell who will all bee as unwilling to grant the precedence to him as he (having officiated as Cheife of Petipole for some yeers) to some of them, by which means we must never expect a mitigation but rather encrease of differences, yet if your Worship &c. shall think fitt to gratify his request, wee desire you to appoint the Station he shall act in to prevent clamours against us." 69

The Factors in Bengal need not have troubled themselves about the coming of Salisbury, for that individual had long since abandoned his desire to remove thither. On the 14th October 1669, the Agent wrote from Fort St George to Masulipatam:—

"Mr Salisbury is very earnest to continue in his employment at Petepole. We are not willing to appear to the Company so inconstant to our orders of settlement, whereof we have advised them, without some good reason, therefore, before we conclude to gratify him therein, we appoint that he and Mr Fleetwood both maste at Metchlepole and there consult with yourself &c. about the same, and give us advice of your result, that if you find there is any good reason for it, and no detriment to our employers, we may then make some farther order in it, as the case shall require." 70

---

65 This Consultation does not exist.
68 O. C. No. 2349.
69 O. C. No. 2345.
In England, the report of Salisbury’s character by the “Unknowne Writer” had borne fruit. At “A Court of Committees, holden the 30th of September 1569, [it was] Ordered that it be referred to the Agent and Council to send for Mr Nicholas and examine the particulars objected against him, as also against the said Mr Nethorp, Mr Fleetwood, Mr Arnold, Mr Salisbury and Mr Farley, And if they be satisfied thereof by any particular information or by the common report that goes of them, Then that they be sent home for England by this yeares Shipping.” In consequence of this resolution, the Company wrote, in their “Generall” to Fort St George of the 7th December, 1669, [We] “doe require that you send for Mr Nicholas and examine the particulars objected against him, And also against Mr Robert Fleetwood, Mr Ambrose Salisbury and Mr Henry Arnold, whom wee have discharged our Service, being represented to be persons of very profligate spirits, scandalous in their behaviour and notoriously wicked. And if you are satisfied thereof by any particular information or by the common report you have of them, We then require that they be sent for England by this yeares shipping with all others in our employ of the like disorders. But if it appears otherwise, and that any of them are reformed, Then wee would have them sent for to the Fort and remaine in India till wee have an accoumt of their behaviour.”

Salisbury’s reluctance to leave Peddapalle for Masulipatam may have arisen from the fact that his accounts would not bear investigation. On the 12th January, 1670, Mr Smithson, who had been entrusted with the inspection of the Peddapalle books, wrote to the Directors in England: “Mr. Salisbury att his coming hither [Masulipatam] promised to Deliver his Books to me within four days but I could never obtaine them though he had remayned there Two Moneths. He doth absolutely refuse to give any Answer to what Concernes him in the paper for the Extra Expence and wrongs done to the Company but only this that his Bookes were past and allowed by the then Agent att Fort and therefore he is not further concerned in them. All that is material which is charged against him is in the Bookes Letter E which will not be found at Matchlepatam nor Petypoles and it is certain they are not att the Fort, Dilligent search having bin made for them.” The inference in this letter of Smithson’s is that the books had been wilfully destroyed or concealed.

The Company’s letter containing Salisbury’s dismissal arrived at Masulipatam in July, 1670. At a Consultation held on the 5th July, it was “Resolved that the paragraphs notifying his discharge be read to Mr Salisbury.” On the 14th July, Richard Mohan, who had succeeded Jearsey as Chief at Masulipatam, wrote to the Company, “We shall now come to speake of Mr Jearseys disbursements upon this Comodity (Saltpetre) which is alreadie 11000 pagos. new besides 3000 more required to redeeme 600 Candy now made, [in] which Mr Jearsey and Mr Salubursys credits are engaged.”

On the 16th July, 1670, Mohan wrote to Fort St George, “As for those persons discharged from our Masters Service and required to bee at the Fort, wee doe not thinke fitt to acquaint them with it yett not having conceivage for them, being well assured that theye not bee at the travell and Charge of an overland Joursey voluntarily . . . as for Mr. Salisbury, wee have not yet seene him.”

When the news of his dismissal reached him at Peddapalle, Salisbury wrote to Masulipatam as follows: “Worshipfull Sir, &c. Counsell, I have lately writ in Generall to Mr. William Jearsey &c., acquainting them of the Saltpetre affayre, to which having not received reply, therefore now direct my letter to your Worship, &c.

[August, 1908.]

My laste acquainted that their is now in a readiness 600 [Candy] of Course peeter, besides some refyned to make good the Kings Accounts, and that the owners thereof are not willing to let gone parts and the other to Remayne on theyre hands, having my promise for their Security, the Company not then having Stock for its management, the Raynes now drawing on, it is high tyme the Kings Peeter [was] sent away and that the remainder were now Refyneing if the Companies Occasions require it.

I understand the Company have turned mee out of their service, but for what am Ignorante. Had the Company given [me] the opportunity other persons have had, Presume should not now bee esteemed an unprofittable Servant to them. I formerly paste my promise to procure them 500 Tons of the above named per annum and to Invest them 20000 per annum in the Sorts these parts afford, and it was never my desire to kepe a Jurnal of charges onely, and the charge would be the same as now, were the Investment 50000 Pagoes, per annum that hope your Worship &c. will not impute the faulce to mee, having one day Loste my tyme in expectation of uncertaintyes.

In the Booke lately delivered, Metchlepam Factory hath Cr. 8080 Pa. new, of which I have received but 3000 Pa. and 10 Casks of Alloam. The remainder was delivered the Bramony before my tyme and since the close of them Booke have received 1080 Pa. which am to give Account of and 10 Casks of Alloam, Metchlepam hath 1000 Pa. Cr. for the charge off the phirmaud &c. which the agent hath enordered to take off. Desiring your Worship &c. answer, with my humble Service subscribed, Your Worships &c. assured friend and Servant, AMBROSE SALISBURY.

Sir William Langhorne, who became Agent at Fort St. George at the end of the year 1670 differed from the "unknowne writer" in his opinion of Salisbury's character. In answer to the Court's instructions of December 1669, he and the Council replied, on the 19th July 1670, "Wee have neither had any Satisfacion, either by particular information or by Common Report that Mr Robert Fleetwood or Mr Ambrose Salisbury are persons of such profane Spirrits Scandalous lives, or notoriously wicked as they are represented to you, unless their Zeale for Conformity and against nonconformity are made the ground of that accusation."

(To be continued.)

CELEBRITIES IN TAMIL LITERATURE.

BY S. KRISHNASWAMI AIYANGAR, M.A., M.R.A.S.

Prefatory Note.

I propose to give in the following papers a brief notice of what can be gathered from Tamil literature, so far brought out, of those that have attained fame either as poets or as patrons. I owe the idea to Dr. Haltsch, Professor of Sanskrit at the Halle University, of attempting a catalogue on the lines of Dr. Aufrecht's great work. Having neither the ability nor the opportunities of the late eminent savant, I held back for over two years. I now venture upon the task, since no one else has come forward to do it. As a starting-point for such a work, which must necessarily be chronological at least in part, an attempt is made to fix in the following paper the probable age of the third Tamil Sangam. In the succeeding papers, I shall give an account of what I have been able to gather regarding the Sangam and post-Sangam celebrities, as far as I can. The attempt must necessarily be tentative in character and it is hoped it will eventually lead to a better knowledge of the literature of the ancient Tamils and their history.

THE AUGUSTAN AGE OF TAMIL LITERATURE.

DREADLY as the prospect may well appear to the earnest student of Tamil literary history, as in fact does early South Indian history in general, there has, of late, been brought to light a considerable body of Tamil literature which throws a flood of light upon the much-doubted, though often debated, period when literary activity in Tamil reached its high water-mark. Scholars are much divided in opinion as to the Saigam having ever existed at all, except in the active imagination of later poets and the idle tongue of tradition. This is not strange, considering how much truth is generally overgrown and interwoven with fable and legend. Whether wantonly or otherwise, the truth is very often hidden almost beyond recognition in later literature; and early scholars in modern Indian research have unwittingly contributed their own quota to the very same end. Much has, therefore, even to be unlearnt before making an attempt to learn something about this distant past of the oldest of the Dravidian languages of South India. Even in the traditions handed down to us, much distorted though they are, there are certain cardinal facts and characters standing clearly marked out from the rubbish outgrowths. It will not, therefore, be without interest to attempt to place these facts in the light in which they appear, on an unbiased and impartial enquiry.

An attempt will, therefore, be made in this paper to set forth the available evidence, literary and historical, which tends towards the following conclusions:—

(1) That there was an age of great literary activity in Tamil to warrant the existence of a body like the traditional Saigam.

(2) That the period of the greatest Saigam activity was the age when Senguttuvan Bera was a prominent character in politics.

(3) That this age of Senguttuvan was the second century of the Christian era.

(4) That these conclusions are in accordance with what is known of the later history of South India.

There are a number of works in Tamil literature of a semi-historical character of a later and of an earlier time; and these alone will be relied upon here, without altogether eschewing tradition of a reliable character, as the sequel will amply shew. So far as tradition is concerned, there had been three Tamil Saigams that flourished at or about Madura, and of these the third is all that we can presume to speak about. This Saigam had for its members 49 critics and poets who constituted a board of censors. There were 49 Pandya rulers, among whom were Mudalirumdar and Ugra-Pundrajuda, who actively patronised the Saigam. This last personage is the sovereign before whom the Kurai of Tiruvalluvar received the Saigam imprimatur. It is not out of place to remark here that the author of the Kurai was not among the Saigam members, and there were a large number like him at different places, as will appear in the sequel.

Taking this Ugra-Pandyen for reference, a number of poets and kings could be grouped around him from internal evidence of contemporaneity without having recourse to any legends concerning them. But it is first of all necessary to show that it is probable that Tiruvalluvar was a contemporary of Ugra-Pandyen. Apart from the verse in praise of the Kurai ascribed to him, it is a well-known fact that Tiruvalluvar had a sister by name, or rather title, Avvaiyar. This poetess sings of this same Pandyan and his two friends the Chola Kili, who performed the

1 The poem quoted at page 3, note. Slepapadavidam.
Devasūya, and the Chēramān Mañērkō, although the names of these personages are not mentioned as such in the poem 367 of the Purandāra. But poem 21 of the same collection by Iyūr Mūlāngiḷār, specifies his victory over Vengaimārban and the taking of the 'great fortress of the forest (Kānappēryil). It also refers to the fame of this Pandyan, transcending the skill of poets. This Ugra-Pandyan is credited with having got the collection Ahāndāra made. Certain mythical achievements are ascribed to one Ugravarmā Pandyan in the Madura Sthālapuruṇa and the Hēlēṣṣa or Tiruvēḷaiyāḍal, which achievements are alluded to in the 'Epic of the Anklet.'

Leaving aside Ugra-Pandyan for a while, the greatest of Avvaiyar's patrons — in fact, almost the patrons — were Adiyāmān Neṣumān Anji and his son, Pōhuṭṭeḷina. Their territories were in the modern Mysore province and in the Salem District, with the capital at Tagaḍūr, identified with Dharurupuri in the latter district, though there was another Tagaḍūr of some consequence in later history in the Mysore District, not far from Nanjanagūḍu near Mysore town. There was an Adiyāmān about the same region who, as the Chola viceroy, was driven across the Kaveri when Talakāḍu was captured by the famous Ganga Raja, the general of Vishnuravardhana Hoyāsala before 1117 A.D. Of the many poems in the Purandāra collection ascribed to Avvaiyar, the great majority celebrate Anji, one of the last 'seven patrons of letters,' as patronage went in those days. Several of these mention the hero and his son by name. Poem 91 gives the hero's name and refers to the gift to Avvaiyar of the black gooseberry supposed to confer immortality on the lucky eater thereof. The same incident is referred to, with the name of Avvaiyar put in it, in the poem Sirupāḍiruppattu of Nāllūr Nattattammār included in the 'Ten Tamil Idyls' another Saṅgam collection. The poem has for its special object the celebration of Ėyūmaṇāṭṭu Nālīyakōṇu, a petty chief over Vellore, Amur and other places near about, as the most liberal among the liberal patrons of those days, i.e., the Chērā, the Chola and the Pandya, and the seven last patrons. Poem 99 of the Purandāra is of importance, as giving us another clue to a different synchronism of the utmost consequence. This poem celebrates Anji's conquest of Tirukkōvilūr and states that the hero's fame transcended the capacity of the poets of an older generation, and yet the poet Paraṇar 'sings to-day of the glory of your conquest of Tirukkōvilūr.'

This mention of Paraṇar is of very great importance to literary history. He was a poet among the Saṅgam members and is credited with a large number of the Purandāra collection. But Paraṇar's fame should have been greater, had he really enjoyed the patronage of Seṅguṭṭuvan Sēra, whom he celebrates in the fifth division of another Saṅgam collection, the 'Ten Tens' (Paṭṭiṭiruppattu.) The parentage ascribed to Seṅguṭṭuvan there agrees word for word almost with that given by the author of the 'Epic of the Anklet,' a brother of the king, and is even fuller of particulars. The last verse, the Padigam, written either by a friendly contemporary or disciple or some one else in a similar position, explicitly gives us the names of the hero and the author, and thus leaves us in little doubt as to the correctness of the connection. It is on these two accounts that the commentator of the latter work relies for his fuller account of the Chērā's history. From the reference to the Sirupāḍā made above, it is clear that Avvaiyar enjoyed the patronage of Adiyāmān Neṣumān Anji. Poem 99 of Purandāra refers to Paraṇar as having celebrated the same patron. The last verse of the fifth division of the 'Ten Tens' connects unmistakably Seṅguṭṭuvan with Paraṇar. Thus then it is clear that Seṅguṭṭuvan Sēra,

---

1 Śilappadikāram, canto xii, II. 20–31.
2 Mr. Kanakasabhai Pillai identifies this place with Dharurupuri, Salem District. Vide Epigraphia Indica, VI, No. 34, and ante, XXII, pp. 66 and 145. Mr. F. J. Richardes, M.A., I.O.S., informs me that a hill overhanging the town Dharurupuri goes by the name 'Avvaimalai,' the hill of Avvai.
3 II. 29–109.
Adyamāna Anīl, Aavaiār and Paraṇar must have lived, if not actually at the same time, at least in the same generation. Seigunvaṭīvan was a remarkably great ruler, and thanks to the efforts of our modern 'Nachechinarkinaiyar' Mahāmahopādhyāya Pandit Samimaha Iyer of the Madras Presidency College, we have two great works composed at his court and in his time, which shed a flood of light on contemporary history and which would go a long way in settling many a knotty point in the literary history of South India. These are the 'Epic of the Anklet' (Silappadhikāram) and 'the Jewel Belt' (Manimēkkhalai) The first is the work of Ilango, the younger brother of Seigunvaṭīvan, who, after renouncing civil life, resided at Kupavayil near Karūr ('Vanji'), the ancient capital of the Chēra; and the second, the companion and supplement, though the earlier composed, from the pen of ( otherwise the style of) Madurai Kulavānigat Banīt, otherwise known as Sīthalaiachēttattān, the corn merchant of Madura. (His head was believed to have been eviscerated on account of the blows dealt by himself whenever he detected errors in other's composition, considering it a misfortune to have to read or listen to such blunders; so uncompromising was he as a critic.) Before proceeding to a consideration of these great works, it is better to dispose of a few other important characters.

Of the last seven patrons celebrated in the Sirupēdānappadai of Nallūr Nattattattān (believed to be one of the Saigam forty-nine), there is one Pēhan (otherwise Vaiyāvikkōn Perumōbōhan) who was so liberal (inconceivably so) as to give a warm covering to a peacock. This same incident is referred to in poem 145 of the Purandāna ascribed to Paraṇar. This personage sometime in his life transferred his affections from his wife Kuṇaḷi (to be carefully distinguished from the heroine of the 'epic') and several poets, among whom Paraṇar, made poetical appeals on her behalf. The others were Kapilār, Ariśil Kilār and Perumkuṇṭhur Kilār (poems 48—47 both inclusive of the Purandāna). There is considerable similarity of sentiment in these. Poem 343 of the same work is also ascribed to Paraṇar and it refers to a Kuṭṭuvaṇ very liberal in the donation of wealth 'brought down hill-country and from overseas.'

Passing on to Kapilār, another Saigam celebrity reputed by tradition to be the younger brother of Tiruvaiyūvar, it is found that he had for his patron and friend a chieftain, Vēḷ Pāri, whose demesne Parambumāṇu comprised 300 villages and who was master of Parambu Hill. Kapilār is credited with having composed the kurinji section of the Sīgurmanu, the seventh of the 'Ten Tens,' the kurinjiippū of the 'Ten Idylls' (all Saigam works) and the Ima (that which is bad and therefore to be avoided), forty. When Pāri fell a victim to the treachery of the three powers, who made a futile attack on him jointly, Kapilār as his chief friend took his two girls with him to be given away in marriage to some person worthy of them and thus do his last duty to his departed friend. Poems 200, 201 and 202 of the Purandāna refer to the incident of Pāri's giving a car to the creeper mullai and to Kapilār's offering the girls to Vichiikkōn and Pulikadāmāl Irūṅgōvēl of Mahānāṭu. Both of them refused to marry the girls, and some insult offered as to the social standing of his patron's family the poet resents in poem 202. Poem 201 refers to Irūṅgōvēl having been descended in the forty-ninth generation from the ruler of 'Tuvarai'9 who was born from a sacrificial fire. The title Pulikadāmāl has considerable similarity in its origin to a story which is given as explaining the origin of the Hoyalsas in inscriptions of a later time. The following poem resents Irūṅgōvēl's refusal to marry the girls and refers to the destruction of Arayam city, the headquarters of this family, in consequence of an insult offered to the poet Kuṭṭalalaiyar10 by an ancestor of Irūṅgōvēl's. The poet further beggs, with biting sarcasm, to be pardoned for his having introduced the girls as the daughters of Pāri, instead of as the descendants of Evvi (a chief in the Pandya country).

---

6 The actual story connecting these is regarded as a fabrication by some scholars.
7 Vide Siyupāyā.
8 He that killed a tiger.
9 'Tuvarai' may be either Dwāraka in Gujarat or Dwāravati or Dwārasamudra of the Hoyalsas.
10 Another poet who celebrates Kāриkāla, and his Chēra contemporaries, Perumēralikān. (Poem 65, Purandāna.)
Kapilar himself is connected with the Chēra Māntharai Sēral Iyṟumporai and spoken of with great regard as a poet by another poet, Forundhī Ḍangaran. Poem 125 by Marōkkattu Nappasaiyār refers to his having praised Mālaiyamān Tirumudikārī, who was in possession of Mūḷūr Hill. It incidentally refers to the naval strength of the Sēra, likening the futurity of the author’s attempt at celebrating Kārī when Kapilar had done so, to the endeavour to sail a ship in the face of the Chēra fleet. Poem 174 by the same author refers incidentally to Mūḷūr Hill, celebrated by Kapilar, and directly to Soliyavēnadhi Tirukkanṭam (otherwise Tirukkīlī), who rendered yeoman’s service to Peruvirarkīlī while in hiding at Mūḷūr. The poem further credits the Mālaiyamān Soliyavēnadhi Tirukkanṭam with having restored the Chōla to his position.

Another person that Kapilar celebrates is Tirumudikārī, ruler of Mālaiṇḍu, with his capital at Tirukkovīūr and with the hill Mūḷūr. Poems 122 and 123 refer to his having been sought in alliance by the three powers.

Beginning with a consideration of what little is known of these three personages, Arvaiyār, Paraṇār and Kapilar, we have been introduced to a number of poets and potentates living within a generation of one another. Before proceeding to a consideration of the chief rulers of the age and their geographical location, let us turn aside to glean what we can of contemporary history from the two epics of the age of Saṅgūṭṭavan, who was, by far, the most important character of the period and about whom we could gather an amount of information from the above works.

The ‘Epic of the Anklet’ is the story of Kōvalai (Gopala, and his wife Kaṇṇaḥi, both of the mercantile community of Puhār (Kaverippūmbaṭṭinam), and has, for its moral, the triumph of the wife’s chastity and the vindication of the husband’s innocence. The story is as follows in brief outline:—Kōvalai, the son of Māśṭutvaṇ of Puhār was early married to Kaṇṇaḥi, the beautiful daughter of Mānāygan of the same place and community; and the marriage was celebrated with great pomp and becoming circumstances, as the two parties were of high social standing. After a while the mother-in-law set her daughter-in-law up independently in a different house in the same city, provided with all that the young couple might need for conducting a successful and virtuous life, as householder and housewife. Sometime after, Kōvalai took a fancy for a highly accomplished and exceedingly lovable professional dancing-woman, whose skill in her art was unsurpassed—nay, even unsurpassable. The lover and mistress led a happy life and had a daughter, the only offspring of their affection. Disconsolate as Kaṇṇaḥi was, she never lost her affection for the husband who had thus given her up, and was quite as faithful to him as she would have been under ordinary circumstances. At the conclusion of the annual festival to the god Indra, the usual bathing in the sea brought the festivities to a close. This was a day of enjoyment for all and the whole elegant society of Puhār turned out to the beach to spend the day in music, dancing, and other such amusements. The happy lovers singing to the accompaniment of the ‘yōt’ (a Tamil musical instrument now gone out of use) by turns, suspected each other of having changed his or her affection, from the tenor of the songs. Stung by this imagined bad faith on the part of his sweetheart, Mādhavai, Kōvalai went home to his house, instead of to hers as usual, and felt quite ashamed of himself for his treatment of the wife, who redoubled her attentions to him since she had seen that something ailed her lord. Overcome with remorse, Kōvalai confessed to his wife his position with respect to Mādhavai and communicated to her his resolution to make amends for his past misconduct by entering on business in Madura on his own account, asking her if she would follow him, should he act upon his resolution. Kaṇṇaḥi signified a ready assent and gave her husband the pair of anklets (sālambu), the only thing valuable he had not as yet given away to Mādhavai, for providing the requisite capital to the prospective merchant of Madura. That very night the repentant and admiring husband with his faithful spouse started away before dawn unknown to anyone, and took his away along the northern bank of the Kaveri. Picking up the nun Dēvandhi, a few miles above Puhār, they continued their journey to Srīrangam and Urniyūr.
Thence taking one of the three roads indicated by the Malainācu Brāhmaṇa from Māngālu (Alawayi in Travancore), who was returning from Madura on a pilgrimage to the shrines of Vishnu, they reached the outskirts of the capital city of the Pandyas. Leaving his tender wife in charge of a hospitable shepherdess and her daughter, he entered Madura city the next day to sell one of the pair of anklets. Not finding a ready sale, as the jewel was of very high value, he wandered long before he was accosted by a goldsmith, who was going palaceward at the head of a number of his apprentices. On Kōvalan’s offering the jewel for sale, the wily smith promised to get it sold, with a request that he would keep the jewel with him and wait there till he should send for him from the palace whither he was then going. Proceeding gleefully to the royal residence, he reported to the king that the thief who had stolen the queen's anklet had been caught with the jewel in his possession and had been kept waiting under promise of purchase. The king was much distressed at the loss of the jewel and the pain it caused the queen, asked that the jewel to be brought, ‘killing the thief’; he actually meant, asking the man and the jewel to be brought, to kill the man, if guilty. The plot of the goldsmith, the real culprit, succeeded so well that the king was deluded and the innocent hero was murdered, after transacting a pathetic scene much like the one in Shakespeare's Richard III. News of this calamity reached Kappahi, who, in great anger, forgot her usual modesty, and bent upon establishing her husband’s innocence and the power of her chastity, walked boldly forth quite, unlike her ordinary self, with the other anklet in her hand and rang the bell of justice in the great gate of the palace. This alarm, quite unheard of in the reign of the then Pandyan ruler, aroused the suspicions of the hall-porter that something seriously wrong had taken place. The unusual apparition of a young injured woman with an anklet in one of her hands, anger and grief on the countenance, was immediately announced to the king. Admitted without delay into the royal presence, Kappahi proved that the anklet for which her husband suffered death was hers and not the queen’s, demonstrating that the jewel in dispute was filled with rubies. The queen affirmed hers was filled with pearls. Kappahi invoked a curse that Madura be consumed by fire for this remissness of her king, who, rather than survive this disgrace he brought upon a line of illustrious rulers, died immediately. The queen followed her consort, and Kappahi left the city by the western gate towards the hill-country, where she was to join her husband in a fortnight, as promised by the goddess of Madura.

This union of the wife and the husband was seen by the hill-tribes, who duly reported the matter to their king, then in camp on the hills with his queen and retinue. At the request of the good queen, the king built a temple and consecrated it to the chaste lady (Pattini Dévi) who had undergone so recent an apophasis.

This is, in the merest outline, the story of the first epic, and the second is a sequel to this. Information of all the proceedings at Madura was given at Pūhar by a Brahman friend of Kōvalan, who, having bathed at Kumāri (Cape Comorin, near which was once a river), was bating at Madura on his homeward journey. The mother and mother-in-law of Kappahi died of grief. The father and father-in-law renounced life and became Buddhist monks.

Mālhāvi, disconsolate at Kōvalan’s sudden disappearance, sent him an importunate appeal to return, while he was yet on his outward journey to Madura. Finding it of no avail, she had been overcome with grief, and when news of Kōvalan’s death reached her, she gave up life and all its pleasures to become a lay disciple of a Buddhist monk; while her daughter just blooming into a woman of rare beauty and womanly grace, entered the Buddhist cloister. “Jewel-Belt” (Mānimēkhalā) was her name and her renunciation forms the subject of the epic with her name. The heir-apparent of Pūhar is very deeply in love with her, but she is taken care of by a goddess, who plays the guardian angel, much like the Ariel of Shakespeare. To save her from the loving prince’s ardour, she is removed to an island by the goddess while asleep; and there she is initiated into the Buddhist mysteries. Having understood her past life, she returns to Puhār with a begging-bowl of
Extraordinary virtue. The prince, still prosecuting his hopeless love, falls a victim to the jealousy of an angel, whose wife’s disguise the heroine assumed to keep out her importunate lover, her own husband in a previous life. Consoling the queen and the king in their sorrow for the loss of their son, she leaves Puhár (at the mouth of the Kaveri) and proceeds to Vanji (not far from Krangānur at the mouth of the Periyār), where she learns all that the teachers of different religious systems have to teach her. Not satisfied with their philosophy of religion, she is directed to Kānci by her grandfather, who had betaken himself to Vannī in anticipation of Puhár being overwhelmed by the sea. Maṇimēkhaḷe proceeds to Kānci and relieves the place from famine by the use of her begging-bowl. Learning the true philosophy of the Buddha from a saintly monk, she stopped there. This is the merest outline of the two poems, forming a single epic, which are of a dramatic-epic character with something of the narrative in it. Containing, as they do, a great deal of the supernatural, there is yet much that must be regarded as historical. In one word, the setting is poetical, but the back-ground is historical.

The ‘Epic of the Anklet’ has much to say about the “three great kings of the south” and its companion concerns itself with three likewises; but the place of the Pandyan is taken by the ruler of Kānci. To begin with the Chola kings celebrated by the poets, two names stand out; those of Karikālā and Kili, called indifferently Nejumūkkūri, Veluṟkkīḷi, Mavāṉkilli, etc. Of these two, Dr. Hultzsch has the following in his south Indian inscriptions11:—“It will be observed that each of the four documents, which record the names and achievements of these ancient Chola kings, enumerates them in a different order. One of the four kings, Kōkkūri can hardly be considered a historical person, as he is credited with having entered a subterraneous cave and there to have contracted a marriage with a serpent princess, and as the Vikāram Sōlan Ud, places him before the two mythical kings, Sibi and Kaverar.” . . . Of Karikālā and Kō-chhechengan here follows what the same authority has to say: “A comparison of these conflicting statements shows that at the time of the composition of the three documents referred to, no tradition remained regarding the order in which Kō-chhechengan and Karikālā succeeded each other. Probably their names were only known from ancient Tamil panegyrics of the same type as Kajavali and Pāṭtinappalai. It would be a mistake to treat them as actual ancestors of that Chola dynasty, whose epigraphical records have come down to us. They must rather be considered as representatives of extinct dynasties of the Chola country, whose names had survived in Tamil literature either by chance or by specially-marked achievements.

“To Karikālā the Leyden grant attributes the building of embankments along the Kaveri river. The same act is alluded to in the Kalingattupparaṇi and Vikāram Sōlan Ud. The Kalingattupparaṇi adds that he paid 1,600,000 gold pieces to the author of the Pāṭtinappalai. According to Parāṇaṇappadai of Mujaṭhāma Kaṇṭiḻāy, the name of the king’s father was Iḷaṇjēṭchennai. The king himself is there called Karigāl or blackleg or the elephant-leg; while the Sanskritized form of his name Karikālā would mean ‘death to elephants.’ He is said to have defeated the Chera and Pandya kings in battle fought at Vēṇgil. According to the Silappadhikaram, his capital was Kaverippūmbsṭṭinai. In one of his interesting contributions to the history of ancient Tamil literature, the Hon’ble F. Coomaraswamy allots Karikālā to the 1st century A.D. This opinion is based on the fact that the commentaries on the Silappadhikaram represent Karikālā as the maternal grandfather of the Chera king, Seṅguṭṭavan, a contemporary of Gajabhaṭu of Ceylon. Mr. Coomaraswamy identifies the latter with Gajabhaṭu I, who, according to the Mahāvaṃsa, reigned from (135 A.D.). With due respect to Mr. Coomaraswamy’s sagacity, I am not prepared to accept this view, unless the identity of the two Gajabhaṭus is not only supported by the mere identity of name but proved by internal reasons, and until the chronology of the early history of Ceylon has been subjected to a critical examination.”

A careful examination of the first book of the 'Epic of the Anuket' shows that during the early part of the life of the hero, the king of Puhār was Karikāla Chola. Apart from the fact that the commentator invariably interprets all references to the ruling king as applying to Karikāla (and this in itself is much, as the commentator was one who was thoroughly qualified for the task and can, as such, be expected to embody nothing but correct tradition in his commentaries), there are a number of direct references to him—either by name or by the attribute of his having erected the tiger-emblem on the Himalayas. The last four lines of canto i bless the ruler "who erected the tiger-emblem on the crest of the Himalayas." There is direct mention of Karikāla's name and his rewarding the post of the Pātu [patinnappadai] in one of the manuscripts consulted by the editor; further down, lines 158-160 of canto vi, mention as clearly as one could wish Karikāla as ruling at the time, and the commentator explains it as such by giving the passage the necessary expansion, not to mention the allusive but undisputed reference to the same personage in lines 95-98 of canto v. Of the three kings praised in canto xvii, there is reference to Karikāla's Himalayan exploit in the last stanza on page 400, and this is the last Chola ruler referred to. Canto xxi, lines 11 et seq., clearly state that Karikāla's daughter had married the then Chera king, whom she joined when he lost his life in the sea. These would undoubtedly point to Karikāla as having ruled at Kaveripūsāltumam till Kāvalan's departure for Madura. The supernatural achievements are clearly nothing more than the fanciful way in which these Buddhist authors attempt to explain even the most ordinary occurrences. The most cursory examination will discover that it is so, and the faith of these authors in the doctrine of karma comes in for much that would otherwise be inexplicable in the story.

To return to Karikāla. He was the son of Uruvappahārār-Ilanjēṭohanni and had married among the Nāṅgūr Vēl class. He is reputed to have assumed the form of an old judge in order to satisfy the scruples of the parts, who were afraid that, being a youth, he could not bring mature experience to bear upon the question coming up for decision. His name is actually accounted for as having been due to an accident by fire while yet a baby. He is the hero of the two poems in the Ten Tamil Idylls, "Porrnāḍīruppadai" of Madalhamakkapiyār and the Patinnappadai of Radirāṅaṅganār, for which latter the author received the 16 lakhs of gold pieces mentioned above. He defeated the Chera by name Pernāsēralaḥhan and a Pandya whose name is not mentioned in the battle of Vepipil. This Chera wounded in the back in battle retired to the north in disgrace. Radirāṅganānār celebrates another hero, the Tondaimān Ilandravan of Kānchi whose tradition traces to the Chola Killi by a "Naga" princess, as stated by Dr. Hiltsch, in the quotation above.

This Killi, otherwise Nejumadi Killi, is the ill-fated successor of Karikāla, in whose reign a catastrophe befell Puhār and brought the Chola fortunes very low indeed. While luckily there are but a few Karikālas among South Indian rulers, there are a number of Killis, among whom it is a matter of great difficulty indeed to fasten upon the individual here mentioned. Fortunately for us there are certain distinguishing features which give us the clue. One of the exploits of Seṅguṭṭavan Sēra is the victory at Nērivāyil, a village near Uraiyūr (Trichinopoly), where he

12 Pages 44 and 45—Pandit Samudrath Iyer's edition of Silappadikāram. There is nothing in the lines to lead one to regard them as later interpolations.
13 The text has it that when he was drowned she called out for him. The waves showed her to where when she joined him and both disappeared, much like Kaappi's union with her husband.
14 The 3rd stanza from the Palamaṇi quoted at the end of the Porrnāḍīruppadai.
16 Poem 65 and 66.
17 Twelve in Perandāra, and nine in Silappadikāram.
defeated the nine Kiliis of the Chola family and thus restored his cousin [brother-in-law] to power. From the ‘Epic of the Anklet’ and the ‘Jewel-Belt,’ we learn he was the last ruler in Puhar and it was in his reign that the ancient Chola capital was overwhelmed by the sea. It is this Kili, whatever his distinguishing epithet, that is the father of the Tonjamom referred to by Dr. Hultzsch. While in the Perumbartruppadai, the commentator Naishainar Kiniyar [who must have lived in the 13th century A.D. or thereafter] makes the Tonjamom the son of a Naga princess with whom the Chola lived in a cave, which is generally taken to mean the nether-world, the ‘Jewel-Belt’ gives the following much less romantic version of the story, which agrees in all details except the cave, so far as it goes, while accounting for the destruction of Puhar. Without going too far out as the Hades, we find reference to Naga rulers in India and Ceylon, between whom a war once took place for the possession of some Buddha-rello, according to the ‘Jewel-Belt.’ The same also refers to another race of the Nagas as “naked cannibals.” The story goes on to state that Kili fell in love with a Naga princess, who appeared before him all alone like a damsel from the fairy-land, in what is called the “Kali Kanaal” [the grove by the back-water] at Puhar. After a month of happy life, she left him and is explained away by predetermination, when she had taken her residence in an island near the coast 500 miles away from the Puhar. Sometime after she became the mother of a beautiful son, she sent the child to the father through a merchant, whose ship called at the island on its homeward journey. While nearing Puhar, the ship got wrecked off the coast and the baby’s fate was not known for certain. On hearing of this disaster, the king ordered a thorough search to be made, and in his paternal anxiety forgot his duty to the god Indra, whose annual festival had been forgotten. The wrath of the god shewed itself, very likely, in a storm-wave which destroyed Puhar completely.

This account taken from the ‘Jewel-Belt’ of the birth of the Tonjamom makes Dr. Hultzsch’s objection as to the myth, lose edge, and therefore it is quite possible — nay, even historical — that there was a human ruler by name Kili, who ruled at Puhar after Karikala.

[Note. — The descent into the Hades, therefore, will have to be regarded as an eastern figure of speech and nothing more. There are other incidents throughout these epics, which interpreted literally would be quite as absurd; and these are easily accounted for by the author’s belief in the doctrines of Karma and re-births, the main pillar of the Buddhistic faith, as also to a modified extent of the Brahmanic. It is this that makes them attempt to account for actual phenomena by causes supernatural. This modern European critics fail to bear in mind, and hence all appears grotesquely legendary and absurdly fabulous. These remarks find their full application in the ‘Jewel-Belt,’ though there is hardly any Indian work of a quasi-religious or ethical character in criticising which one could afford to forget them.]

The destruction of Puhar referred to above accounts for the association of Kili with Uraiyr at the end of the ‘Epic of the Anklet,’ in the course of which the catastrophe to Puhar must have happened. The ruler at Kanchi during the period, according to the ‘Jewel-Belt,’ was an Iti Kili, the brother of Kajar Kili.  

17 Mr. Anavardha Vinayagam Pillai allot him to the 9th century A.D. (Christian Coll. Mag., XVIII), 1900.
18 We find reference to such wars in Mahakavams, in the earlier chapters of the work.
19 This Kali Kanaal is referred to in canto viii as the place of resort of pleasure-seekers — nay, a veritable "lover’s abode" in Puhar.
20 Vide Montesquio, note, pp. 97 and 98. The island of Ceylon, in which is Adam’s Peak, is sacred to the Buddhists. This hill is now known as Samantabhum and Samanabhi, but referred to in the work as Samantabhum and Samanof.
21 There is a story of similar import with respect to a Ceylonese king, whose wife was abducted by a Chola king under similar circumstances. There are no grounds to connect the two at present, at any rate.
The last ruler of Puhár is referred to in the "Jewel-Belt" with the following adjuncts indifferently, viz., Vadivérkîli, Velvérkîli, Mâvekîli and Nênumudikîli. With the help of his younger brother, Ílango [perhaps Íjankîli] of Kânchî, who was probably the heir-apparent as the term would indicate, he defeated the Cheras and the Pandyas on the banks of the river Kâlî.22 The three poems concerning this personage in the Purandârâ, refer to his having been besieged at Uraiyûr and Ámûr by Nalaîkîli. After the destruction of Puhár he must have been reduced to the woeful plight from which Sêngûtuvañ Sêra must have relieved him by his victory at Nêrivâyûl23 over the nine Chola princes who forgot their allegiance to the Kîlî. This is borne out by the enmity between Nênumudik-kîli and Nalaîkîli indicated in poems 44, 45 and 47 of Purandârâ. There are besides a number more of Kîlîs, each with a distinguishing epithet which would support the existence of the nine Kîlîs [Kîli being a generic name of the Cholas like Senni, etc.]. The authors of these poems, Kôvîl Kîlîr, celebrates another Kîlî who died at Kâlâmûrgam. None of these Kîlîs is associated with Puhár. In fact neither in the Purandârâ nor in the Sirîpûrdârâmpadat do we find the city of Puhár associated with these Cholas.

Leaving aside the Cholas, we find the whole time, during which the incidents narrated in the two epics, took place, taken up by Sêngûtuvañ Sêra, whose capital was at Vanjî [Kârûr] at the mouth of the Periyr on the west coast. His exploits are recorded in some detail in these works and the others referred to already. His father and uncle are celebrated in the two preceding sections of the "Ten Tenas." His chief achievements were a naval victory over the "Kadambu," two invasions of the north with victories on the banks of the Ganges over Kanaka and Vijaya, sons of Bâlakamâra and the victories at Nêrivâyûl and Vijalûr [there is a Vijalûr connected with Namman, an ancestor of Vibhichikôn, whom Kapilar celebrates in poem 200 of the Purandârâ]. Like his father, Sêngûtuvañ also claims to have cut out the bow-emblem on the Himalays.

Coming to the Pandyas of Madura, we have two names in the "Epic of the Anklet," viz., Nênum Chelîyân, victor over the "Aryan army," and Ijâm Chelîyân, who was viceroys at Korkai when Nênum Chelîyân died at Madura. Before discussing these names we have to dispose of one other Pandyan of importance in literary history. When Tiruvâîyar submitted the Kuvai to the Sângam critics, the king was Ugra-Pandyan, victor over the "big forest fort [Kânapâryîl] under the chief Vengaimârân." The Tiruvâîyâlâ purâña ascribes to him some achievements which are of a legendary character, though some might have been possible. These are the very achievements 24 ascribed to a Pandyan ruler by the Malainâdu [hill-country] Brâhman from Mângâdu, (Alângâdu or Alavâyûl) then at Uraiyûr in the course of a pilgrimage to the shrines of Vishnu, who directed Kâralan to Madura from Uraiyûr. This praise would lose all point unless it referred to the ruling Pandyan when the Brâhman pilgrim sojourned at Madura, on his visit to Tirumâlîrûjîlai. The author of the epic clearly designates him the Pandyan Nênum Chelîyân "victor over the Aryan forces," whatever these forces might have been. There are a number of references throughout the works to the erecting of the fish-emblem on the Himalays. It is the boast of Karikâla Chola and Ugra-Pandyan, Nênumdâralîthân [father of Sêngûtuvañ], that they cut out their respective emblems on the Himalays. These achievements are clearly ascribed to the reigning Pandyan in the commencing and the concluding lines of canto xvii. Thus then the Ugra-Pandyan 25 of the

22 Pandit Sâminâtha Iyer's edition of Mâyîndâkalâ, page 174, canto xii, lines 124-129.
23 Nêrivâyûl in later history belonged to the Kâhâtiya Sîkkhâmâpi Vâlânâdû, d. c., the region round Uraiyûr, and the royal secretary of Virâjandâra was the owner of this village as also of Tîlî Tîrâppanangânû. South Indian Inscriptions, Vol. III.
24 Canto xi, lines 23-31. There are besides references to his achievements in connection with the ruling Pandyan in many places throughout the work.
25 Stanzas 4, bottom of page 400. Mr. Kânakânameîl Pillai in his interesting papers on "The Tamils 1000 Years Ago," makes Ugra-Pandyan the contemporary of the successor of the Kîlî, the grandson of Karikâla. This would bring Tiruvâîyâlar's Kural too late for quotation by the friendly authors of the two epics, as the Kural received the Sângam approval under Ugra-Pandyan. [Madras Review, Vol. II, No. 6].
purânâs and tradition could not have been any other than the ill-starred Pandyan Neôûm Cheûliyan of the 'Epic of the Anklet.' Avvâiyâr's reference to Paraspar referred to above would agree quite well with this identification, as in accordance with that reference, Paraspar should have been the earlier of the two.

The successor of the Pandyan, apparently his son, Pandyan Îlam Cheûliyan, otherwise Vêrûvêrî-Chêliyan, was in Korkai when his father died and succeeded to his father's estate in the course of the story. We are vouchsafed no other information, except that he propitiated the maus of the murdered lady, Kaçuari, by the sacrifice of 100 goldsmiths [perhaps a massacre of that class of artisans]. Probably his reign was short and uneventful. He must have been succeeded by Pandyan Nêûm Cheûliyan, victor at Talâyâlâgânam26 under the two other king and seven chiefs. Kapîl is connected with prince Mântharârum Sêralîrumporai of the "elephant-look" by Porundhip Tiam Ktranâr in poem 53 of Purandhûru. This Ochera was ruling over Tondî [Quilandy, and not the Sojâj Tondî, on the east coast now in the Râmnâ ñâmndrî], and was the master of Kolli Mâl27 [a hill in the Salem District quite on the border of Trichinopoly]. His position in this region would have been possible only in the light of Seùântuvûn's victories over the Kongûs at Seigâlam [red-field], at Vîyâlûr, about the same region, and over the nine Cholas at Nértîyîl [near Trichinopoly]. This personage was taken prisoner by the Pandyan Nêûm Cheûliyan28 of Talâyâlâgânam fame. At this latter place, the young Pandyan overthrew the "Tamil army" under the two king and seven chiefs. This Pandyan was a great celebrity in literature and in his reign flourished a number of poets of the Saigam fame. He is the hero of Mângûr Marandâkâr's Maduvûkâdat and Nârîkâr's Nêûmuluâldat among the "Ten Tamil Idylls." He was himself, like several other rulers of those days, including his grandfather, a poet. There are a number of poems relating to him in the Purandhûru collection. Thus we see that during the course of the story, the rulers of Pûhûr were Karikâla and his grandson, Kokkîlî29 of Mâdûra, Nêûm Cheûliyan identified with Ugra-Pandyan and Îlam Cheûliyan, followed later by Nêûm Cheûliyan, victor over the Tamil army at Talâyâlâgânam; the Ochera ruler all the time at Karur [Vaijî] was Seûântuvûn Sêra, the brother of the author of the epic and the patron of the author of the 'Jewel-Belt,' the father and the uncle of this personage having been the heroes of 2nd and 3rd section of the "Ten Tens." Cheûy, (prince) of the "elephant-look" must have been his son and viceroy of the newly-conquered territories.

These were the sovereigns of the three kingdoms who flourished in the generation of the literary celebrities headed by the names chosen at the commencement, viz., Avvâiyâr, Paraspar and Kapîl. These were the three stars of the first magnitude in the literary firmament, as those in the political, of South India. Other poets there were and patrons likewise. Of the latter, mention has already been made of Pâri of Parâmûnasû and Parâmbû Hill; Kîri of Tirukkûvîlûr in Malâinâdû and Mâlûr Hill; Irungûvîl of Arâyan in the Western hill-country of the "Tvûrarî30 family with the special distinction of having killed a tiger to save a saint absorbed in contemplation"; Pêhan of Mâlûr in Malâinâdû [hill-country]; and Adiyamân Anjî of Tagàdûr and the Horse-hill, overthrown according to the 8th section of the "Ten Tens" by

26 He must have been particularly young when he came to the throne, Para, 7.
27 The last lines of canto xiv, the 'Epic of the Anklet,' refer to the reigning Chera as the ruler over the country between the Himaâyânas with the bow-embellished Kolli Mâlû.
28 S. A., canto xxviii, lines 115-125. Seûliyan is again a generic name like Pandyan, and the father or the son have the adjective "big" "young," much as 'Smith, senior or junior.'
29 Mr. Kaçsumâbî Phillû places a Nâlâmûkîlî between these two. [Madras Review, Vol. II, No. 7.]
30 Tvûrarî might have been either Drârakû in Guûtûr or Drâvaratî or Haûtûd in Myaûr; but the latter does not appear till much later, and the name Drâvarî in classical works is always taken to mean Drârakû.
the Perum Sārāl who overthrew Tagaṭār. These are all mentioned by name as well as by distinguishing achievements, most of them in a somewhat fabulous garb in the Sirravatupāpadis of Nallūr Nattattanār. Besides these, we have already mentioned the prince Chera of the 'elephant look,' ruler of Tondi and master of Kolli Hill. To come to the poets, in addition, to the three already referred to, we must mention here only a few of the more important, such as Tīrvaiṭuvar, Ṣaṅgavaṭigal, Šītthaiilī Śatārā, Rudirānagarayar, Muṇṭāṭhāmakāṭiyār, Mācụdī Marudanār, Narktrar and others, whose works are held even to-day in high esteem by the Tamil world as masterpieces in their respective departments. Some of the rulers were themselves poets of some merit, and Avvaayar was not the only poetess. The two young daughters of Pāri could compose verses and the elegies ascribed to them is proof of their ability in this direction. There is besides a poem in Purandara ascribed to the wife of Bhūta Pandyan, who performed saṅti on the funeral pyre of her husband. These names raise a strong presumption in favour of the view that, as the age of Saṅgavaṭiyan [including in it a generation either-way] was one of great literary activity, it might have been the time when the Saṅgām activity was at its height.22 This was the age when the creed of the Buddha was in the ascendancy, which, like all other reform movements of a later time, gave a powerful impetus to the development of the vernaculars of the country. Although the Saṅgām is not mentioned as such in these early works, we find the cultivation of Tamil specially associated with Madura, which is often referred to as 'Tamil Kōṭaḷ,'23 despite the fact that a large number of poets mentioned above flourished in other courts. In the traditional lists of Saṅgām celebrities we find mention of the names of most of the authors referred to above. It is not improbable, therefore, that a board of censors like the Saṅgām existed about this age at Madura.

Without pausing to examine what other literary men could be grouped along with those spoken of already, we might pass on to the consideration of the more important question of the probable age of this great literary activity in South India. The two chief epics — the 'Epic of the Ankle' and the 'Jewel-Belt,' — were Buddhistic, the latter more so than the former; and the other works of the age show considerable Buddhist influence and follow in this order with regard to dates of composition. The Kūṟaḷ is the earliest of the major works, as there are quotations from this work in the companion epics, which even acknowledge the quotations. The two epics must have been composed about the same period — the 'Jewel-Belt' preceding the epic — the Aṭṭāṉūṟu miscellany is ascribed to Ugra Pandyan, before whom the Kūṟaḷ received the Saṅgām imprimatur. The Kundaḷakēṭi is another Buddhistic work and, so far as we know it at present, of a controversial character, much like the 'Jewel-Belt' in plan of work. This was followed by the Nilakēṭiruttu, which attempts a refutation of the Kundaḷakēṭi and must, therefore, be of a later age. If this general course of literary activity is correctly indicated by the editor of 'Śrī Tamil,' whose account is relied on here, and if we can fix the probable period of this literary activity, this will prove the shoot anchor in the literary chronology of South India.

In the midst of the confused tangle of mere names and names of similar sound and meaning, we have, luckily, just a few distinct characters and characteristics that make the attempt not altogether hopeless, provided the question be approached in the spirit of unbiased enquiry. Although Kuli is quite a common name among the Chola rulers, Karikalai is somewhat uncommon. Saṅgavaṭiyan is definite enough and his Ceylon contemporary Gaṇabāḷa's name occurs, luckily for students of Tamil

22 It will be clear from the above that the author of the Kūṟaḷ could not have been much earlier than the friendly authors of the epics. Still they quote with great respect from the Kūṟaḷ. This could only be if the Kūṟaḷ were authoritatively approved of after being read out before the Saṅgām. Śītthaiilī Śatāra being one of the augurs.

23 Śīnputra and Purandara and Kalinguttuppan, of a later age.
history, but twice among 174 names unlike Vikramabahu, for instance. The Kalingattuppavaram, a work composed between (1111-1135 A.D.) refers to Karikala and Kili in the reverse order, Kili being followed by Kshenagash, Karikala following both. There appears, from the Purandartha, to have been a Kili in the third generation before Karikala; but the Chola succession is fixed as follows with respect to this, taking only such names as are specifically mentioned in the order given below:—

Iajjathamani, his son Karikala, his grandson Nejumugi-kili. The Kalingattuppavaram, like the great commentator who must have lived after Jayam Kona, the author of this work, ascribes to Kili the descent into the Hauda. It is just possible that there was a mistake made, as to the particular Kili whose union with the Naga princes was thus described by later writers. If this were so, the Karikala of the Himalayan fame could not have been Kullottunga I. (1070 A.D.—1118 A.D.) certainly, nor the viceroy of Koji [Uraiya] in the reign of his father-in-law Rajendra [1063—1060 A.D.]. There is one other Karikala of the later dynasty whose epigraphical records are available to us — Aditya Karikala [circa 950—985 A.D.] who killed Vitra Pandyan in battle, as if in sport. But the author of the Kalingattuppavaram places Karikala three names before Vranarayana or Parantaka I, while Aditya was the eldest son of Parantaka, a grandson of the first of that name. So then we are driven to the necessity of looking for this Karikala far earlier than 900 A.D.

It was shown above that the works themselves point to an age when the religion of the Buddha was in the ascendant as the probable period when the works under consideration — at least the greatest of them — were composed. Buddhism was overthrown by about the 7th century A.D. when Hiren Thasang was travelling through India, and when Tirojjanasambanda flourished. About 862 A.D., a battle was fought between Varaguna Pandyan and the western Ganga king Sivamara, at Sri Parambi [Tiruparambikulam near Kumbakonam]. This would not have been possible had the Cholas been at all powerful. Nor do the works of the age under review mention the Ganges as so powerful. We are at this period (700—850 A.D.) passing out of the Pallava ascendency in South India which must have begun about 500 A.D., if not earlier, with Vishnugopa of Kanchi, the contemporary of Samudragupta. There is no reference in the works under notice to such premier position of the Pallavas or even the Tondamam rajas — the only Tondamam of the period figuring as a minor chief, Kanchi being a Chola viceroyalty. In the Rajakottam plates, a Pallava king by name Skandasishya, who must have been earlier than Vishnugopa claims descent from Aivattamman through a Naga princess. Perhaps by this time the origin of Iandiranayan had been so far forgotten as to make this credible. These considerations leads us to an earlier period for Karikala. This personage is associated with Puhar even in tradition, and the ‘Jewel-Belt’ tells us in unmistakable language that Puhar was submerged in Kili’s reign. All the poems in the Purandarthabuti Kili, a number of them with distinguishing epithets, connect them with Uraiya, and none of them is connected with Puhar. Uraiya figures as a considerable town in the ‘Epic of the Anklet.’ Even the Sirupandrappadai does not mention Puhar. This is a very important circumstance as will appear presently.

When Sehuttuvan performed an elaborate sacrifice on the occasion of the consecration of the temple to Pattini Devi [the heroine of the ‘Anklet’], there was present, among others, Gajabahu of Lanka surrounded by sea [as opposed to Mavilangai of Erumanaathun Nalliyakkon]. This Gajabahu of Ceylon, Iain Cheklyan of Madura, and Kili of Uraiya built temples to the same deity, following the lead of the Chera. The question now is whether this Gajabahu is the first or the second of the name. The first Gajabahu ruled as monarch of all Ceylon from 113—135 A.D.; the
second as one of three from 1142–1164 A.D. as in the list appended to Miss Duff’s Chronology of India. Dr. Hultzsch’s challenge to the Honourable Mr. Coomaraswamy is to establish by internal evidence that the Gajabahu mentioned was the first and not the second of the name. As to the other part of his objection, it must become clear from the above that for the myth about Kiltji, later writers alone are responsible; and enough direct evidence has been adduced to show that Karikal was ruling at Puhar when Kovalan began life as a married man, and that his daughter was the wife of the Chera king then reigning. To return to Gajabahu; let us for the sake of argument take him to be the second of the name. We know something of the history of South India in the middle of the 12th century and the geographical distribution of powers. The Chola rulers ought to have been either Vikrama or Kulottunga; the rulers of Madura, either Vira Pandyan or Vikrama Pandyan, the sovereigns of the Chera country were Vira Kera Varman and Vira Ravi Varman; of the Mysore country, Vishquardhana and his son, Narasirma. There were no separate rulers at Kanchi, except in the sense that it was an alternative capital of the Cholas. There was an Adiyaman, no doubt, about this period [somewhat earlier], but he was the Chola viceroy at Talamad [not connected with Tagadur]. There were no Kanga rulers such as are mentioned in the ‘Epic of the Anklek.’ Gajabahu himself was in no plight to come to Vanni [Karnar] at the month of the Purur, not far from the modern Kranagar [Kedungulur]. Gajabahu was fighting his own battles nearer home with his two neighbours, Manabbara and Parakramabah, and it was all he could do to keep himself from being permanently overwhelmed.

The first Gajabahu invaded the Chola country to bring back the inhabitants of Ceylon, carried off by the Chola army on a previous invasion of the island during his father’s reign; they were then in bondage at ‘the city of Kaveri in the country of Soli.’ He brought back besides the relics and the begging-bowl of the Buddha [‘which aforetime had been carried away by the Dinaillas’]. The Raudrattakari while ascribing the same achievements to him, states that the Ceylonese went of their own accord ‘to serve at the river Kaveri.’ He is there said to have brought a number of the Tamils and settled them in Ceylon. In the Raudravali, however, there is an even more elaborate version. The ruler is there called Rajabahu [which may be due to a misdirection]. He was accustomed to make solitary night-rounds; when he heard the wailings of a widow in her house, for her two sons had been taken captive by the king of ‘Solli Rattra.’ The adilga [officer] failing to discover anything wrong, the king sent for the woman and learnt from her that 12,000 families had been carried away, ‘when the king of Solli Rattra made his descent upon the island.’ The same achievements as in the previous account are recorded, with the addition ‘that the king of Ceylon also, upon that occasion, brought away the foot ornaments of Pattini Devi and also the four arms of the god.’ This Pattini Devi could have been no other than the heroine of the epic, who was known as Pattini Devi or Pattini Kadavul. This must have been regarded as a valuable relic in those days, when relics played such a prominent part in religion. As to the begging-bowl of the Buddha, a bowl of extraordinary virtue had been brought by Marainakhal from an island south of Puhar, where there was a Buddha seat as well, which had the divine quality of letting people into the secrets of their former existence, a belief in which was one of the cardinal doctrines of Buddhism. The ‘Jewel-Brush’ also states that two Naga kings fought for the possession of this Buddha-seat. These then are the native accounts of the Ceylonese chronicles with respect to Gajabahu I.; but, unfortunately, the

26 Vanji itself was not the capital of the Chera at the time. The capital of Kerala was then Quilon, and during the period of the Chola ascendency (900–1300 A.D.)

27 Vol. II, pages 77–83. This mention of the river instead of the town would show that when the Raudrattakari was compiled the existence of the town was passing into oblivion.

28 The distinction between the Chola country and other parts of South India is not carefully made in the Maldecatha. Sometimes they specially talk of Soli Rattra, at others of Malabar generally, meaning not the Malabar Coast necessarily, but India generally.
reference to Pattini Dëvi does not occur in the earlier compilations. This is matter for great regret. It must, however, be noticed that all these works were compiled from earlier writings and living tradition. Here follows what the learned translator of the works has to say about them:—"So carefully has the text been handed down that the discrepancies found to exist between the more ancient and modern copies are very slight indeed. The Råjavadii is a work of different hands and compiled from local histories; it is used as a corollary or addition to the two preceding works, continuing the narrative through the struggles between the Portuguese and their rivals, the Dutch, etc."

All tradition, therefore, and the historical circumstances attending the stories of these epics point to the first Gajabahu, as the Ceylon ruler who was present at the celebration of the sacrifice by Seigattuvan Sera and if the Råjavadii could be relied on, the conclusion would be forced upon us. As it is, however, there is but little ground to connect these events with the second Gajabahu, as some scholars would have it.

As to the date of the first Gajabahu, the chronicle gives 113–135 A.D. as the period of his reign. Whether be the real worth of this actual date, we have little reason to regard that of his successor namesake as inaccurate. It has been pointed out that the middle of the 12th century could not possibly be the time when the poets flourished. There is the Kalingattupparayi, the date of composition of which could not have been much later than 1111 A. D., certainly not later than 1118 A.D. Sundaram Pillai placed in the 8th century A.D. refers to Pari,29 the patron of Kapilav, and the general tenor of the epic points to Buddhistic times, which the 12th century was not. Taking the Buddha Nirvâna, at 427 B.C. instead of 543 B.C., as recognised by most authorities now, the reign of Gajabahu I go up to 162–191 A.D. Until it is proved that the earlier dates of the Mahâdevâsa are unreliable30 [except for this error], these dates will have to stand, and the period of the greatest literary activity in Tamil must thus be put down as the 2nd and 3rd centuries of the Christian era at the latest. This will be quite consistent with the power of the Tamilas in the centuries preceding the Christian era, when they several times invaded Ceylon and imposed themselves on the Ceylonese as usurpers, about the middle of the 1st century B.C. These facts coupled with the emperor Asoka's reference to these Tamil powers, along with the five Hellenistic potentates, warrants great probability with respect to the high state of civilisation of the Tamilas.

Besides the mention of Gajabahu, we find mention of a number of other rulers in the course of the 'Epic of the Anklet,' who were some of them friendly and others hostile. The friendly kings were the "hundred karnas," who provided Seigattuvan with a fleet of ships with which to cross the Ganges, when he invaded the Northern country to punish Kanaka and Vijaya, sons of Bâlkumâra, who spoke disparagingly of the Tamil rulers. These brothers were helped by Uttara, Viśnitra, Radra, Bhairava, Chitra, Sings, Dhanurtha and Sveta.31 Mr. Kanakasabahai takes the "hundred karnas" as equal to Sâtakarnî of the Mattepurâya. But against this, there is the objection that the Tamil poet mentions 'the hundred persons, the karnas' 42; and in one place the author even speaks of "the karnas" without the hundred.43

---

29 The reference is to the complaint which the devotee makes in respect to the lack of liberality in people in his days, although one should choose to describe a miser as a patron liberal as 'Pari,' much as Bacon complained of learned men turning Fanatics into Lucrétia.
30 Prof. Bhaya Davids finds the chronicle borne out in important details by the inscriptions among the finds of the Snchd Toge, etc. (Buddhist India, pp. 295-500), page 1 et seq.; J. B. A. S., 1908; Indian Review, May, 1908; the Date of the Buddha by Mr. Gopala Iyer.
31 S. A., canto xxvi, ll. 180-185.
32 S. A., canto xxvi, l. 149.
33 S. A., canto xxvii, p. 177.
Besides, as would appear from Dr. Bhandarkar’s *Dekhān*, the name Sātakarnī was that of a dynasty and not of only one ruler. The name Sātakarnī alone appears in the early part of the list and the date is 40 B.C. to 16 A.D. [see 166, *Bombay Gazetteer*, Vol. I., Part II.]. The word itself could be taken to mean “spear-earred” (rather than hundred-earred), figuratively. It is hard to understand how a contemporary could have rendered it with the number attached not to the ears but to men. Besides, these were ruling in Southern India, although Magadha was included in their dominions. So then, even if the “hundred karnas” meant Sātakarnī, the particular sovereign might have been Yajñavalkya who ruled from 154—174 A.D. in the Mahārāṣṭra, and 172—202 A. D. in Telingana. If this be so, we have also a Vijaya mentioned in all the purāṇas, who was in Telingana from 202—308 A. D., but at the same time, there is the objection that Seṅguṭṭuvan crossed the Ganges and fought with Vijaya and his brother on the northern bank of Ganges. This notwithstanding, that Seṅguṭṭuvan must have flourished about this time, could be inferred from the fact that Seṅguṭṭuvan’s father, Pandya Nāḍumuliyay and Kakkala all claim victory over the Aryan forces. It is very likely that the Tamil forces helped in the overthrow of the foreigners by Gōtampultra Sātakarnī and the direct mention of gifts to Kakkala by the Rājas of Bundelkhand [Vajrajāda], Magadha and Mālava [Avanti] could not be altogether a fragment of the imagination, since it is so very definite. All circumstances attending point to the 2nd century A. D. as the era of Seṅguṭṭuvan; and the era of the greatest literary activity may be taken to be the 2nd and 3rd centuries after Christ.

Buddhism was introduced into South India during the last quarter of the 3rd century B.C. It must have taken some time to strike root and in those days must have been somewhat slow in spreading. Judging from the exposition of it, as shown in the ‘Jewel-Belt,’ we might take it that it was as yet so free from any element of corruption as to evoke the admiration of even Christian scholars, like the learned translator of the Geylonese chronicles. The early centuries after Christ may, therefore, be regarded as the age of Buddhistic ascendancy in South India. When Fa Hien was travelling in India, there was already the early signs of revaluation and Brahmanism returned to the fray. In the next two or three centuries Buddhism was swept off the country and the restoration of Brahmanism was completed when Huen Tsang came to India, chiefly through the agency in the Tamil country of the earlier Saiva devotees and some among the Vaishnavas. From this time the struggle is not so much between Buddhism and Brahmanism, as between the latter and Jainism.

In the first centuries of the Christian era then, we find India south of the Tungabhadra thus politically divided. If we start at the source of the Kaveri and follow its course till it meets the Amaravati near Karūr, and then go up the latter river continuing our journey till we reach the Palmis and the Western Ghants, we shall have marked the land-boundary of the Chera sphere of influence. If we take a straight south-easterly line from Karūr till we reach the sea, east of the Zamindari of Sivaganga and south of the old Chola town of Tondi, the south of this line would be the Pandya, and north of it the Chola sphere of influence. It must not be understood that the territory allotted to each power was always directly under it. The frontier regions were always of doubtful allegiance, as could be seen from the care with which rulers in those days fortified and strengthened frontier towns. So far as the Cholas were concerned, they had always prominently before them the strategical advantages of Uraiḍūr on the west and Kānci on the north, although their chief city was Puhār on the sea-coast. Karūr was the meeting place of the three powers and it was in its neighbourhood that many

---

44 This is the more likely, as the Saka Nāhapāna and of his successor, Bishabhāda, ruled over the Mahārāṣṭra, with Jannak for their capital, and their territory extended up to Mahārāṣṭra. This dynasty, together with that of Chalapatha Mālava, was overthrown by Gōtampultra Sātakarnī and his son, Puliṣamai, among whose possessions we find “the regions of the Mālava and the Saṃgha.” These Andhakāsima came from Dharmakāta, near Canter, and driving back the usurpers, recovered their ancestral dominions. (Introduction to Literary Remains of Dr. Bhan Dhaḷi, page 23, and Dr. Bhandarkar’s *Dekhān*, Secs. 4, 5, and 6).
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a hard-fought battle took place. This central region, particularly the hilly portion, was therefore filled with petty chieftaincies owing allegiance, so long as it could be enforced, to one or other of these powers, constituting a group of frontier "buffer-states." Thus there was Irnagörēl north of the Mysore District and on the frontiers of Coorg. Next to him was the Adiyamān in the southern-half of the Mysore District and part of Salem with his headquarters at Tagaďdrū. He belonged to the Chēra family. South of this must have been the territory of Pēlān with Nālūr for his headquarters, the country round the Palni; between the two last was probably Pālmbūkāṇḍu of Pārī. Next follows the Kēngu country, which we might put down as including a part of the Coimbatore and Salem Districts. In a line east of this is the hill-country of Kārā with its headquarters, Tirukkōvīlūr. South of this is the Chōla country proper, and north the province or kingdom, according to circumstances, of Kānchī. South of the Pālgāt gap and in the Pandya country was the chieftancy of Ā'ay round Pōdiyil Hill in the Western Ghats. On the opposite side round Kōrkāi were the territories of Eārī. During the latter part of the reign of Seṅgūṭuvān there was a Chēra, probably a viceroy only, holding a tract of country extending from the Kolli Māl'aisa to Tōndi on the coast, with the Chōla and the Pandya countries on either side. This was the prince Chēra of "elephant-look" [probably he had small deep-set eyes]. The above appears to have been the geographical division of the country. This kaleidoscopic arrangement vanished and another pattern presented itself with every turn that affairs took.

If we call the age under consideration the age of the Chēra ascendancy, as Sēṅgūṭuvān Sērā appears to have been at one time in his life the arbiter of the destinies of this part of the country, we pass on gradually from this into a struggle, the Chēra supremacy being shaken by the Pandyan. Here we lose the thread till we come to about A. D. 400, when the Pallava rise into importance. The Pallava ascendancy begins with Vishnu-gōpā of Kānchī, the contemporary of Samudragupta, and reaches its grand climacteric under Narasimhavarman, the destroyer of Badmi [Vātāpī], the Chalukya capital about 640 A.D. A century hence we find the Gangas and Pandyas fighting near Kumbhakonam. This rôle the Pandyas play several times in history. Their position at the farthest end of the peninsula gives them safety. It is only when the frontier powers fall, that we see the Pandyas asserting themselves. Throughout history the South Indian powers had to oppose the incursion of the Deccan powers, and from the rise of the Pallavas we can have a clear idea of the general position of the South Indian powers. Vargaṇa Pandyan succeeded in chasing the Gangas back into their territory. In another century a new dynasty of the Chōlas rise into eminence and achieve an ascendancy, matched only by that of the later empire of Vijayanagar in its best days. The decline of the Chōlas again brings into prominence the Pandya in the south and the Hoysalas in the north. Both alike of these powers are overwhelmed in that great wave of Moslem invasion under Malik Kāfūr. The Muḥammāl is beaten back by the heroic efforts of a number of chiefs and this movement culminates in the establishment of the Vijayanagar empire in the middle of the 14th century. The fall of this empire brings the history of Hindu rule in South India practically to a close, and the Marāthā Empire belongs to a different chapter of Indian history.

NOTES AND QUERIES.

- SELECTION OF ANCESTRAL NAMES AMONG HINDUS. 

In the Garbhādhāna (Conception) Ceremony, a Hindu woman is advised, on the authority of the Purāṇas, to "hold in mind" the features of eminent ancestors of her husband. She is also advised to "look upon" her husband's features immediately after the purification bath, which she takes on the fourth day of the monthly distemper, or "if he be absent to meditate on his features." This seems to give expression to the notions underlying a custom in naming boys after the paternal grandfather, or if he be alive after the great-grandfather, which obtains in the Bombay Presidency.

Prominent instances are numerous. Sirājī's grandson, nicknamed Shībub by Auranżīb, was named Sirājī. At the adoption ceremony of the Glīkwēd of Baroda he was named Sayājīrāo, the name of his illustrious ancestor, though his true name was Gopālā. The hereditary Dīvān (Minister) of Baroda is named Vīthālā, which

43 This was the tract taken from O'ri by his enemy Kari and given to the Chēra.

was also his grandfather's name. The son of Gangadhárráó Mádhavráó Chitnavis, C.I.E., a member of the Viceroy's Council, is named Mádhavráó, after his grandfather: and so is Gangadhárráó himself.

The Guptáí of Sáleste,1 to which the present writer belongs, have adopted the custom for a long while. His name of Bálkriháta was decided on for the following reasons. When he was born his grandfather was alive, and so he was named after his great-grandfather, whose uncle was also named Bálkriháta after the same personage, who was, of course, the uncle's grandfather. The writer's paternal grandfather was named Jánáráán after his deceased grandfather, and this name is now that of the writer's uncle's grandson.

The eighth ancestor, who was the founder of the family in the Deccan, the Karkhána at Hágdúó under Sríráí of historical fame, was named Rámaí, and among the writer's cognate there have been Rámas, Rámajís, and Rámbaurdráras ever since. The father of Híó Bahádur Appájí Ramchandra Gupte, formerly Accountant-General of Baroda and the right-hand man of Sir Théodore Hope, the author of the Bombay Account Code, was an example in the last generation. So, again, the writer's uncle is named Jayáráám and his son Rámaí (Rámbaurdrára).

The idea is that a boy named after an eminent ancestor will take after him, and if, at birth, a boy cries a great deal, the belief is still current that an ancestor who left some desires unfulfilled has been born again in him and demands a repetition of his name. He is solemnly promised that the demand shall be granted. On the 12th day after birth, the namakarana ceremony takes place and the baby is addressed thus: — "We accept you as so and so and thus give you your name. May you shine and prosper as you did in your former birth, and may your desires be fulfilled."

All this is done in the belief that the soul will have no salvation until the unfulfilled desire has been satisfied and must be reincarnated until that consummation is reached. But there is another aspect of this belief, as there is a fixed idea that naming a child after a living representative of the name in the family shortens the life of the person whose name has been taken. If also there is any emulation or jealousy between branches of a family it is held to be an affront, amounting to an insult, to name a child after a cousin just dead. The present writer, about twenty years ago, unwittingly got into a serious family scrape over the name Rámaí, which he gave to his son, and in this trouble his wife was involved, though she had no hand in the naming. When the child was born, he was in England on duty, and was not so close a student of custom as he is now, and had his child named Rámaí. It so happened that the wife of one of his uncles had just lost a good-looking boy of that name, and her superstitions feelings were grievously hurt. And then within a year another of her sons, a promising graduate, died leaving a child-widow behind. The loss of her son and the presence of the poor young widow roused her to such an extent that she sent us word: — "Go and tell Bálkriháta that my son is here laid, and that there is another vacancy in the names for him to appropriate for his sons." This was a veritable bomb thrown into the family-circle, and all the gotónjáds (cognates) wereaghast, strongly bellowing that the name unfortunately given to our son was the cause of all the trouble. One result was that the writer's next son should have been, in the ordinary course, named Lakshman, but that was the name of the deceased graduate. He had by that time learnt his experience and searched about for a safe name and found it in Rághunáth. This personal experience is related to place the existence of the feeling and custom beyond all doubt, but here is another instance in the family to show how the stigma of a wrongly-bestowed name sticks. In 1861 Dádóbá died in England, and of him the relatives were particularly proud. A cousin named his grandson after him, and the ill-feeling aroused thereby is quite lively to the present day. The generation that caused the trouble has passed away, but a few years ago the present writer observed the cynical smile that passed over the face of a direct descendant of Dádóbá on hearing a boy shouting for another so named and belonging to the branch, which he considered had usurped the name. A son of the Dádóbá, who had been given the usurped name, should, in the ordinary course, have named his own son Dádóbá, but he was wise in his generation and called him Sánkár, a title of Sádásíra. The ceremonial name of the child was, of course, Dádóbá, but the additional and invariably used name Sánkár was supposed to counteract its evil effect, owing to the attributes of the deity after whom it was given.

In yet another instance bad blood was avoided. An uncle had named his child Mádhav while at a distance from the family home, but a brother also had that name, and as soon as the mother of the newly-named Mádhav heard of it, she changed the name of her babe to Mähkódev and there was family peace.

B. A. Gupte.

---

1 No claim is made to a descent from the ancient Guptas.
2 It represents jaya, success, and is an affix of respect.
THE INSCRIPTION P. ON THE MATHURA LION-CAPITOL.

BY A. BARTH, MEMBRE DE L'INSTITUT.

(Translated from the French by G. Tamson, M.A., Ph.D.; Göttingen.)

[The original article, of which a translation is given here with the author’s permission, appeared in the Comptes Rendus des Séances de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, 1907, p. 384 ff. The translation was made at the suggestion of the late Professor Kielhorn, who thought that it would be of interest to many readers who have no access to the original. The sudden and lamented death of Professor Kielhorn prevented him from adding any introductory remarks, which he could have done so much better than myself. — G. T.]

This inscription, one of the shortest, — it consists of only three words, — is perhaps, in some respects, the most important one, of the whole series; for, even before it was published, it had become customary to see in it a direct proof that a whole dynasty of Satraps and Great Satraps, with barbarous names, some of which figure also in other records at this same place, Mathurā, and at Takṣaḷa in the Panjāb, the Tārā, the ancient, and on coins, belonged to that branch of the Scythian nations which, from the time of Herodotus, was known among the Greeks under the name of Zērōν, the Çakas of Sanskrit literature. So Mr. Fleet, one of the masters of Indian epigraphy, has recently drawn attention to this document: in a very ingenious article he has improved the interpretation of the commencement: but he appears to me to have gone astray half-way, and I much fear that he has rather spoilt the interpretation of the end.

The inscription is cut, with seventeen others, on a capital of red sandstone, of rather modest dimensions (1 ft. 7 ins. by 2 ft. 8 ins.), formed by two lions placed back to back. Judging from the [385] mortises in it above and below, it ought to rest on one of those stambhash or pillars that formed a portion of the ornamentation of sanctuaries, and, in accordance with what we see on ancient bas-reliefs, it should itself be surmounted by some other religious symbol, such as a dharmacakra or wheel of the law. In one of the inscriptions, the one entitled I., the interpretation of which, it is true, is very doubtful, it would seem that reference is made to an army, to war and victory; and if so, the pillar would have been both a dharmastambha and a jagastambha, a monument of devotion and a trophy of victory.

The block came originally from the immediate neighbourhood of Mathurā, the Mēkha of the ancients, on the Jumna, the holy city of the cult of Krishna, but which, like almost all the great religious centres in Indus, was also a holy land for Buddhists and Jains. The stone was discovered in 1869, and was acquired in the following year, for his patron, Bhan Daji, by one of the men who have rendered the most eminent services to Indian archæology, the late Bhagvān Dāl Indrajit. Unfortunately, the Pandit has not indicated the site of the find with sufficient accuracy: he simply tells us that he made it at some distance from the Saptarṣiṇā, “the mound of the seven Rishis,” no doubt one of the numerous tumuli in the plain of Mathurā, but for which I find no indication either in the Reports of Cunningham or in the voluminous monograph on the district of Mathurā by Growse. Moreover, at the time of the discovery, the stone was no longer in situ; it had been used for erecting an altar consecrated to the goddess of small-pox. The exact provenance is therefore unknown, and we possess as yet no clue to locate, even approximately, the otherwise unknown Guhāvihāra, which is mentioned in inscription H, and to which the monument probably belonged. The capital was bequeathed by Bhagvān Dāl to the British Museum, where it is now on view. [386] Also, it was only after the death of the Pandit, and from his papers preserved with

2 These letters refer to the publication of Bhagvān Dāl — Bühler, in which the eighteen inscriptions are marked A. B. C. to B.
the Asiatic Society of London, that his great work on the Ksatrapas, both those of the West and those of the North, was summarised by Mr. Rapson, and his version and translation of the present inscriptions were piously published by Bühhler, with the corrections of the editor, and as the result of a new and careful collation with the original monument.

The eighteen inscriptions are cut on every part of the capital, very irregularly, in various directions, and in letters of very different sizes. Thus, they strangely recall the mementos which, in every country, obtrusive travellers like to leave behind them on their way. Yet they are not mere scribblings; even the smallest of the characters are well-formed and cut deeply and carefully. Most, if not all, of them were nevertheless to be necessarily illegible when seen from the foot of the pillar, and two, A and N, cut close to the two mortises, were even entirely hidden when the capital was once put into its place and surmounted by its appendage. From this fact Bhagvánlal concluded that they must all have been cut at one and the same time, before the stone was put into its place. And, in fact, this is very probable in the case of the chief inscription A, which records the consecration of relics of the Buddha Čākyamuni, of a stūpa, and of a monastery, the whole for the benefit of a community of Sarvāstivādin monks, and the work of the chief queen of the Great Satrap Rajula, jointly with her mother, grandmother and other relations. It is the only one of these texts that presents a certain development, and it is exactly one of the two that were to remain for ever invisible. The same conclusion will also readily be admitted in the case of some others, relating, as is probable for some and certain for others of them, to members of the same family and commemorating acts of homage, intended for those personages according to Bhagvánlal, or rather, according to myself, performed by them. The fact that those commemorations should have been thus engraved so as never to be read would, in any case, be no objection. As the Paùdit points out, nothing is more common with that sort of documents. In fact, instances abound in every period, from the numerous epigraphs buried within the stūpas up to that temple of Upper Siam in which, in a long gallery, a sort of absolutely dark tube made in the thickness of the masonry, M. Fourneron collected about a hundred bas-reliefs accompanied by descriptive inscriptions intended to be never seen by anyone. We may also recall the fact that at Girnār a portion of the inscriptions of Aço, which were, for all that, edicts, we might say notices, can only be read by one lying down at full length under the rock, and that, it would seem, such has always been the case. Those are pious works which indeed admit of a certain amount of publicity, but a publicity intended especially for the next world.

But must the same conclusion be applied to all the inscriptions of the capital, even to those which concern personages who were as devoid of titles as possible and appear to have had no connection whatever with this family of Satraps? Here I should have considerable hesitation. On the one hand, there is the want of order in which all these epigraphs are scattered, as if at random, on the stone, while they record religious acts without any apparent interconnection; there are, moreover, the differences in the size of the characters, which appears in no way proportional to the dignity of the personages mentioned; also certain divergences of an orthographical kind; also many indications which do not well agree with the hypothesis of a common origin, of a work accomplished on one occasion, by the same hands and in the short space of time required for the construction of the capital. On the other hand, even in the still so regrettable absence of fac-similes, it must indeed be admitted that there are no characteristic differences in the writing, since, not to speak of Bhagvánlal, epigraphists as distinguished as Bühler and Mr. Fleet, who were able to examine the stone and had excellent reproductions at their disposal, have not pointed to a single one. But I confess that this latter consideration does not appear to me to possess any great weight. Those inscriptions are in Kharoṣṭhī, in that cursive writing, with its indecisive forms, in which the

---

2 J. R. As. Soc. of London, 1890, p. 639 sq., and 1894, p. 541 sq.
3 Ibid., 1894, p. 525 sq.
4 Since the time when this was written, excellent fac-similes, prepared under Mr. Fleet's direction from photographs made by Sir Alexander Cunningham, have been published, as an accompaniment to an article on these inscriptions by Mr. Thomas, in *Ej gr. Ind., IX*, p. 135 sq.
variations of the conformation, numerous as they are, do not allow themselves to be reduced to any definite chronological order. If we had the least doubt with regard to this, we should only have to refer to the strange interchange of positions (as in the figures of a dance) which equally capable and competent men continually make those dynasties to carry out that belong to some time about our own era, and do so, in fact, while basing their arguments on the same documents, some of which, nevertheless, are in Brahmi, that is to say, in a more regular writing in which the variations are much more noticeable.

Every thing considered, I should, therefore, rather be inclined to believe that a considerable number of these inscriptions have nothing to do with the erection of the pillar, that they are not contemporaneous with the first consecration, and that they were engraved, not before the capital was put into its place, but on various occasions after its fall. Earthquakes are not unknown in the district; people there still remember that of 1864; nor can Mathura, which according to tradition was ravaged by the Yavanas, the Greeks, have been safe from hostile enterprises during those certainly troubled times. We have no means of estimating the duration of that interval; yet there are reasons for believing that it cannot have been a long one; for the Kharoṣṭhī writing was never fully acclimatised at Mathura, and, at whatever period its appearance there is placed, it does not seem to have remained long in use. At all events, I do not hesitate to class among those (in my opinion) later inscriptions our inscription F, to which I now return after this long preamble.

[389] The inscription is cut in two lines, on the flank of the lion on the right hand, and is entirely separated from its neighbours. It was read by Bhagyvānīlī thus:—

Savasā sakastanaṣa puyae,¹

and was translated by him:—"In honour of the whole of Sakastana," that is to say, in honour of the whole Sogdian, in the name of which there has been preserved, down to our own days, the memory of the Čakas. The reading, on the testimony of Bühler and Mr. Fleet, is absolutely certain, and Bühler has also shown that the translation is faultless with respect both to phonology and to orthography. As far as the mere form of the Prākrit words is considered, these are in fact rendered perfectly and as it were spontaneously into Sanskrit by:—

Sarvaṣya ṣaḍakṣarṇḍhasya pūjāyai.

From this glorification of Čakasthana, the conclusion was afterwards drawn that all these Satraps and Great Satraps were Čakas, namely, those who figure here and elsewhere, Rajula or Rājūvula and his son Çadhāsā or Çođāsā, Kusulka Patika and his father Liaka Kusulka (the two last-mentioned being vassals of a Great King Moga), also others whose names are of little importance here, who appear to have ruled in one or in several divisions, as more or less independent sovereigns² from the Jamnā to the Indus, and for whom we possess the dates 72 and 78 of a non-specified era.

If the preceding remarks as to the respective independence of these documents have any value, it may [390] perhaps be thought that the conclusion does not necessarily follow, even if the accuracy of the translation from which it was drawn is admitted. But is that translation an accurate one? Bühler, who admitted both the translation and the conclusion, appears, nevertheless, to have been somewhat astonished at this homage to the whole district of the Čakas.

"It is a remarkable fact," he says, "no other analogous instance is known." As for myself it has always seemed to me that even this instance could not be taken into account, and for several reasons.

¹ [But the first word, as read by Bhagyvānīlī, Bühler, and Fleet, is sarvasa not sarvaṣa. — En.]
² There is, perhaps, an inclination to exaggerate the degree of independence of these Satraps, especially of those of whom we possess no coins. The title itself already indicates a certain subordination. To the case of Liaka and Patika, vassals of the Great King Moga, is now added that of the Great Satrap Kharapallana and of the Satrap Vasapana, who, in inscriptions recently discovered at Sārnāth, recognised the Great King Kapiṣka as their sovereign: Epigr. Ind., VIII, 175-179.
In the first place, it is not evident that this name of Çaka, or any other of the same kind and of a very general signification, has ever occurred in the protocol of any of those foreign dynasties; here, as a matter of ethnology, are found only names of tribes or of clans. Even the members of those dynasties that are called Çakas by their enemies and are now, almost by universal consent, recognised as such, the founders of the era of that name, the Satraps and Great Satraps of Surāṭra and Mālwa, do not give themselves this qualification, with the exception of the son-in-law of one of them, Uśavatāsa, and even this unique confession of a foreign origin is not absolutely certain.¹

Another reason that makes me suspect the translation is that no mention is found in it of the performer of the homage, in my opinion as essential a point as is the signature to a petition, and one which, in fact, is never absent. Even here it is absent only once, in inscription O, which, as is shown by the word puya in the nominative, is a quite general formula of adoration, like nano buddhāya and so many others, and does not imply any particular act of homage. Everywhere else, where, in these texts, a similar act is involved, the performer of the act is carefully mentioned; for, with Mr. Fleet, I think that all these proper names [391] in the genitive indicate the persons that pay the homage, not those that receive it.

Finally, one more reason, namely, that this translation appears to me contrary to the usage of the language and to the natural sense of the words. Pājā has not the meaning of ‘glorification;’ it is a concrete act of worship, of homage, of great respect, which always attaches to something of a religious nature; it is addressed to a god, to a superior, to parents; accompanied by a mental invocation it may be addressed to an absent person; it may even be addressed to inanimate objects, to a sanctuary, a stream, a sacred tree; the warrior may make a pājā to his weapons, the master of a house to his hearth; I could even understand that, on returning from a distance a traveller should make one to his native country. But I do not see how, from Mathurā, a pājā should be made to the whole Sėgēstan. In short, “in honour of the whole Sakastana” is an English phrase; it is not a religious Indian phrase, nor even simply an Indian phrase at all.

Mr. Fleet is not any more satisfied than myself with that translation, but for another reason. He will absolutely not have it that there is the slightest mention made of Çakas in the epigraphy of Northern India. While he is dislodging them from another inscription of Mathurā in which it was thought that they were found,² they must therefore disappear from the present one. He therefore thinks that it is not this name, but the possessive adjective sāvaka, that forms the first term of the compound sākastana, which must be transcribed into Sanskrit as saukasthāna. As to sārada, he accepts it as a proper name, Sarva or Çarva, the genitive depending no longer on puya, but on some word like dāna, ‘gift, offering,’ understood. He thus arrives, after a first trial on which I will not dwell, since he has himself abandoned it, at the translation:—

“(An offering) of Sarva, in honour of his home.”

[392] That sārada should be a proper name of the donor and be construed with a word understood, is an excellent suggestion, quite in conformity with the usage of those documents; but the interpretation of sākasthāna appears to me absolutely inadmissible. Sthāna cannot, like our word “mansion,” and, strictly speaking, like the English word “home,” be taken in the sense of “family,” it is the place of one’s sojourn, the residence, the dwelling in the material sense, and only that. Now, one does not make a pājā to one’s lodging, any more than one makes one to “the whole Sēgēstan.” Something else must, therefore, be looked for.

I will not stop to discuss the various propositions that one may be tempted to offer for the solution of this riddle, such as, for instance, that of seeing in it a homage addressed to the Çākyasthāna, the establishment of the Buddhist monks to which these inscriptions relate. That


would give us neither the name of him who performed the homage nor any very acceptable expression for what the texts themselves indicate by the proper word saṅgha, ‘the community.’ I prefer to proceed directly to the interpretation which appears to me the most probable, the only one in conformity with the spirit of the language and the usage of the documents.

The inscription states that, at the Buddhist sanctuary of which the pillar formed a part, a pājā, an act of homage, was performed, we do not know exactly what, but no doubt some offering or gift to the community; we therefore require the name of him who performed the act; for we may be quite sure that the act was registered only in order that the name might be so. Moreover, the designation of the person must be sufficiently explicit; to make it so, we require more than the simple name, we require at least a qualifying expression, that is to say, two words. Now, these two words are supplied by the text itself, namely, sasās and sakastānā. For, sakastānā is not only the proper name of a place, it is also the adjective derived from that proper name, with the meaning “native of Sakastana, inhabitant of Sakastana.” In order that it may have this second signification, it suffices to assume a long ā in the first syllable, and nothing prevents us from reading it thus, for [993] the Kharaṣṭra writing does not mark the quantity of the vowels. In the Brāhmi writing, in which this quantity is marked, we should probably have sākastāna, as in Sanskrit we have māṭhura, ‘native of Mathurā,’ kānya-kubja, ‘native of Kanyakubja,’ saurastra, ‘native of Surāstra.’ The Sanskrit grammarians have given rules for this derivation and have imposed restrictions on it; but the Prākrit dialects are very free in this respect; at the most, they sometimes add their ever-occurring suffix ka, as in nāsika, ‘native of Nāsika,’ and even here, in the inscription P, nakara, ‘native of Nagara;’ but in R we have tachila, ‘native of Takṣilā,’ the exact counterpart of our sakastāna. According to a constant practice, these two genitives, indicating the performer of the act, depend on a term understood, which we may, however, be dispensing from supplying, since we do not know in what, exactly, the act consisted. At all events, they are independent of puyā; so much so even that the latter may in its turn be suppressed, as it is in O and R, where we only find “of Khardas, Satrap,” “of Kodina, native of Takṣilā,” both of whom, however, without any possible doubt, claim to have performed an act of pājā. We have, then, the following translation:

“Of Sava, native of Sakastana; to render homage.”

Who was this Sava, whose name, such as it is, I leave as it stands, as being probably a foreign one? Was he a soldier of fortune in the pay of an Indian sovereign, after the immemorial custom of the men of his country? And was this sovereign himself a Caṇka, or some other barbarian or a native? Or again, was Sava a merchant on his travels, who came with one of those caravans from the Khyber, which at all times brought into India the horses and camels of Iran? Was he perhaps settled at Mathurā? Or was he a simple pilgrim? We know nothing about it; all we can say is that he must have been a man without a title, but of a [994] certain fortune; that he was a lay Buddhist; and that he had come from a country then called Sakastana. I believe that Mr. Fleet himself will take no umbrage at this mention of a Caṇka, when it is reduced to these proportions; for it commits one neither to the acceptance nor to the denial of what he calls the historical presence of the Caṇkas in Northern India.

Here, however, there is a question on which I do not wish to touch. Were there in Northern India, somewhere about the commencement of our era, any Caṇka rulers? We know absolutely nothing about it. Mr. Fleet denies it; and the fact is that, if there were any such, they have not told us so. But this is an argument that should not be strained; for the rulers of the South-West, who appear indeed to have been Caṇkas, also have not told us so at all, and from ancient times the name appears to have been a comprehensive designation very variously applied. However, the mention here of Sakastana should not surprise us. The term is an ancient one; it goes back at least to the time of Isodorus of Charax, in whom we have no reason for not recognising the geographer employed by Augustus. He places Sakastana between Drangiana and Arachosia,10 that is to say, in the Segestan of the later geography; and the appellation must have been already ancient, for the country was

10 Geogr. Græci Min., ed. C. Müller, I, pp. 244-245.
then under the dominion of the Parthians; much earlier, even, it was just about in this region, among the nations of the eastern frontier of his empire, that Darius enumerates the Çakas, or at least certain tribes of the Çakas, who, as mercenaries much in request, must have possessed settlements in various places. It might even be that already, before the Christian era, they had some establishments on Indian soil; for, long ago Lassen, and more recently M. Boyer, have drawn attention to the fact that with the Mis-ičans of Isidorus of Charax, one of the four capitals of the Çakas of Sakastanæ, two others exactly correspond in the Periplus of the Erythraean Sea (2nd half of the 1st century), namely, Mysçap or Myçap (νυσαρα = πολις), one on the lower Indus, the other on the Gulf of Cambay. And here also, if, as is probable, these names belong to the language of the Çakas, they should be ancient, for the Scythians, that is to say, the Çakas of the first of these capitals, were at the time of the Periplus subject to Parthian kings, and those of the second one were so thoroughly Hindooised that the compiler no longer recognised foreigners in them. “It is here,” he says, “that India commences.”

Hitherto I have not touched upon the question of the date of these inscriptions, or at least I have only referred to it in vague terms as somewhere about the beginning of the Christian era; for I think it would be temerity to aim at greater precision. All that we actually possess of data, direct and indirect, foreign and indigenous, has been turned over again and again in all possible ways, and arranged in almost countless combinations, not one of which appears convincing to the exclusion of the others. When we see, for instance, Bühler asserting, as an absolutely certain fact, that the Satraps of our inscriptions came before Kausika and the first Kusana emperor, and Mr. Fleet stating, as a no less certain fact, that they came after them, and this when, on one side and the other, Kausika and his immediate successors are referred to epochs differing by 135 years, we may be allowed to think that the question is not ripe for solution, and may be excused from setting up one more system after so many others. We have seen that for two of the Satraps who figure in our inscriptions, and exactly in those which may probably be contemporaneous with the erection of the Pillar and consequently may be the most ancient ones, namely, for Çujasa and Patika, we possess the two dates 72 and 78. Unfortunately, these dates, like all which we have of that period and which are not simply regnal years, belong to an undetermined era. The Bhandarkars, father and son, refer them to the Çaka era of A.D. 78. Most scholars seek their origin towards the middle of the first century B.C., not to mention “outsiders” who contend that they should be removed much farther back. Mr. Fleet, with greater precision, refers them, with all the other dates which we possess for this period, in Northern India, to the era afterwards called that of Vikrama, which commences 58 B.C. This is evidently a simplification of matters, and round this thesis, which he has been defending for some years, he has not failed to group, very ingeniously, a number of reasons which may render it plausible. But still it remains the principal one of these reasons that Northern India is in possession of a well-established era, the Samvat of Vikrama, that it is not proved that it had others for this period, and that, therefore, it had no others in reality. The reply to this might be that a plurality of eras is a normal fact in India, where almost every dynasty has had its own; that this plurality is a priori probable in that period of invasions and of rather unstable governments, when there were even several calendars, the Macedonian and at least two indigenous ones; that the general usage of the Vikrama-Samvat in ancient times would itself stand in great need of being proved; and that, finally, there is in this demonstration something like arguing in a circle; for, by taking everything for one of these anonymous eras, it is clear that nothing will remain for the others. But it is also very clear that all the objections in the world could not advance the question by a single step. It will be possible to take this step only when some fortunate find has introduced a truly solid fixed point into this mass of still floating data which lend themselves only to hypothetical constructions.

11 Behistun, 7, 16; Persepolis, I, 18; N. Ba, 55. I quote after the edition of Spiegel, the only one that I have at hand. These lists are somewhat confused, but the general position shows clearly enough.
THE NARAYANIYA AND THE BHAGAVATAS.

BY GEORGE A. GRIESON, C. I. E., P. D., D. LITT.

It is probable that at least ninety per cent of those who are popularly called Hindus, follow some form or other of religion in which the essential element is bhakti, or devoted faith directed to a personal God. As will be seen hereafter, this is essentially typical of a Monotheistic religion and, as it is a commonplace amongst most Englishmen that Hindus are polytheists, the point requires some explanation.

The object of the present paper is therefore to exhibit in a convenient form the contents of the oldest available text-book of the Bhágavata-Páncaratra Religion, from which all these various sects of the Bhakti-márga are directly derived. This text-book is the Nárayaniya section of the Sára Parvan of the Mahábhárata. As will be seen from the following remarks, it does not represent the tenets of the sect in their original purity, but, with the aid of notes, which I have given where I thought they would be necessary, I hope that it will not be found difficult to separate the kernel from the Brahmanish shell in which it has been enclosed.

As Professor Oldenberg has pointed out in his Life of the Buddha, although that part of the Gangetic Valley which lies East of the confluence of the Gângâ with the Yamuna had been already occupied by Aryans when the Vedic Religion had become developed in the country to its west, nevertheless even so late as the 6th century B.C. these Eastern Aryans were not thoroughly Brahmanized. Here philosophic speculation was the characteristic rather of the warrior than of the priestly caste. Buddha and Mahávira were both Káshtriya. So was Janaka, and so, according to the Bhágavata Puráña, was Kapila. Janaka’s name is intimately connected with the origins of the Bhágavata Religion, and the other three were founders of Buddhism, Jainism, and the Śaṅkhyya philosophy, respectively, all of which were in their essence absolutely inconsistent with the Brahmanical Pantheism of the Upanishads.3

I think, however, that Oldenberg’s proposition can be stated in wider terms. In these early times I would confine Brahmaiṇa to the old Madhyâdèśa in its narrowest sense — the country of the Kuru between the Sarasvati on the West and lower Gangetic Dâb on the East. I should say that round this, in an Outland semi-circle, east, south, and west, was a band of unorthodox Aryan communities. According to the Brihadârañyaka Upanishad, II, i, 1 ff. and the Kaukântaki Drámate Upanishad, IV, 1 ff., Gârgâya, a Brahmana of the Outland, was taught by the Outland Káshtriya, Ajâtaśatrû of Káshi. Immediately to the east and south of the old Madhyâdèśa were Páñchâla, whose king showed despite to Dráma, the Brahmana, in that

1 In these introductory remarks, I have made free use of the following, to which the reader is referred for further particulars: — Professor R. G. Bhandarkar’s Report on the Search for Sanskrit MSS. in the Bombay Presidency during the year 1883-84. Professor E. Washburn Hopkins’s Great Epic of India. Professor R. Garbe’s Śaṅkhyâ-Philosophie, and his German translation of the Bhágavad Gîtâ. Professor L. Barnett’s English translation of the Bhágavad Gîtâ.

2 iii, xxi, 23. His mother was Dêvâditi, the daughter of the Râjâshi Mâna. According to Bhágavat Gîtâ, IV, 1 ff., the doctrines of the poem were essentially the prerogatives of the Káshtriya, to whom they came through Mâna from the sun. In Madhuśûdana’s commentary on the passage, emphasis is laid on the fact that the sun was the origin of the whole Káshtriya race. Kumaâra Bhaṭṭa on Mûndana-sûtra, i, iii, 7, admits unwillingly that Mâna was a Káshtriya, and Śûnu-sarva on i, iii, 3, states as plainly.

3 Daksha, who was sprung from Brahmâ’s right thumb (cf. the legend of the origin of Káshtriya from Purusha’s arms) had a thousand (sthabha-sthâkhyä) sons who, according to Mâbh., i, xiv, were taught Śaṅkhyâ by Nârada. The commentator explains that therefore they begat no children. Similarly Sanaka and his brethren, who, according to tradition, took a very prominent part in the promulgation of the Bhágavata religion, refused to begat children (Bháy, P., iii, xii, 4).

4 This is the convenient name given by Professor Hopkins to the Brahmanical teaching of the Upanishads before it had developed into the later Vâdanta.
quarrel which (like the wrath of Peleus’ son) created the devastating war of the Mahābhārata, and who consented to the polyandrous marriage of his daughter with the Pāṇḍavas. Pravāhaṇa Jāvali was a Pañcāla Khatriya, who according to the Čhānḍālaya Upanishad,6 silenced the Brāhmaṇas and taught the Brāhmaṇa Gauṭama. He even (V, iii, 7) claimed that his system of religious thought belonged to the Kṣatriya class alone.

At the time of the Mahābhārata War, a tribe in close connection with these Pañcālas was that of the Śrīṇjayas. So far back as the period of the Atharva Veda,6 these people were noted as enemies of what was perhaps the most typical Brāhmaṇa tribe in India——that of Bṛihṣu. It was a descendant of Bṛihṣu, Parāṣu Rāma, who is said to have wiped the Kṣatriyas off the face of the earth.

In the eleventh khaṇḍa of the 5th prāṇāyāna of the Čhānḍālaya Upanishad just quoted, we come to the Kaikēya country in the Panjāb, west of the Madhyadēsa. Five great theologians went to the Brāhmaṇa Uddālaka with hard questions, which he could not answer; so he sent them on to Āśvapati, the Kṣatriya king of Kaikēya, and brother-in-law of Dāsaratha7, and it was he who solved their difficulties. Nor were the doctrines of the Outland always considered as orthodox. The teaching of Svarjīt of Gandhīra is made short work of by the author of Satapatha Brāhmaṇa, VIII, i, 4, 10, who contemptuously compares it to the words of a Kṣatriya (Ṛṣiṣya).

If we go further back to Vedic times, we see traces of the same contest between what was subsequently Brahmanical orthodoxy and Kṣatriya unorthodoxy in the famous struggle between Vasiṣṭha and Viśvāmitra for possession of the sacrificial gifts of king Sudās. At this stage of history, the Aryans had not penetrated so far into India as they had at the time of the Mahābhārata War, and the scene of the combat is hence further west,——in the Panjāb, but the relative positions are noteworthy. Vasiṣṭha, the Brāhmaṇa, was far to the west, while Viśvāmitra, the Kṣatriya, came from the Gaṇgetic Dēbā.

In later times, to the south of the Madhyadēsa, in the north of what is now Gujarāt and Rājputāna, were the Yādavas, and we shall see that it was amongst them that the unorthodox Bhāgavata Religion arose.8

Putting accidental alliances and enmities to one side, any one who takes a general view of the Mahābhārata War will recognize that here the same stage of affairs is reproduced. On one side were the Kūrās, inhabitants of the central Madhyadēsa, supported by the Brahmanical caste represented by Drāguṇa. On the other side were the Pañcālas, the Yādavas, and the Matsyas of the Southern Panjāb. The protagonists on this side were the polyandrous Pāṇḍavas, whose chief hero won the decisive combat of the battle by inflicting a stroke which, to Kūrā eyes, was against the rules of Aryan warfare.9

6 I, viii, 1, and V, iii ff. Of Brāhaddārayaka, VI, ii, 1 ff.
7 Vālmiki, Rāmāyana, II, i, 2.
8 The anti-Brahmanic tendency of the Bhāgavata Religion is well illustrated by the story of Ambarīla, as told by Priyā-dāsa, the commentator of the Bhākṣa-udās. Durvāsas, the Brāhmaṇa, has insulted a Bhāgavata Kṣatriya (Ambarīla). He is pursued by Viśvānātha, and after appealing without effect to Brāhmaṇa and Śiva, is constrained at length to appeal to Bhāgavat (Viśvānātha). Viśvānātha tells him that he (Viśvānātha) has formerly three qualities, i.e., (1) that of protecting suppliants; (2) that of destroying distress, and (3) that of being the god of Brāhmaṇa-hood (brāhmaṇa-ādea). "Now I no longer honour these qualities," says he, "for they have been put aside by my new quality of tenderness to bhaktas (bhaktas-ādea)."
9 Even so late as the 11th century A. D., the country inhabited by the Kūrā was looked upon as the true home of Brahmanical orthodoxy. In the second act of the Prāchāchārandī-dīya, we have the unorthodox Čhārvāka congratulating king Mahāmohita that all the world has abandoned the Vēdas, and that even in the land of the Kūrās nothing is to be feared from learning or knowledge. Tena kuru-khāṭśr-śiśu śūrad dēśāna upapāt śi na vidyā-prabhād-dīyaḥ kākamukhyah.
We see again the same state of affairs in the language of India; the *Linguistic Survey of India* shows that there is a central language of the Madhyadésa, and round it, west, south and east, a group of languages which are all much more closely related to each other than any of them is to the central one. It has long been suggested that these facts point to what may, for convenience sake, be called the existence of two Aryan invasions of India at widely separate epochs. The descendants of one of these swarms were the Brahminized occupiers of the Madhyadésa, while the descendants of the other were the people who inhabited what we may call the once unorthodox outer band. In this light, the war of the Mahābhārata resolves itself into a struggle for supremacy between the two nationalities, as well as into a struggle between unorthodoxy and Brahmanism. In the struggle, the Kshatriya party vanquished the Brahmanical, but the victors were ultimately compelled to yield to those whom they had conquered. Nothing is more interesting in the history of Indian civilization than the skill displayed by the Brāhmaṇas, in gradually, with their characteristic astuteness, drawing the unorthodox Bhāgavatas, and their allies the followers of Śāmkhya-yoga, into their fold, and in enlisting their aid in the struggles against Buddhism.

The Bhāgavata Religion was a very old one, — certainly older than Pāṇini, who mentions bhakti applied to Vāsudēva in one of his sātras (IV, iii, 95, 98). Its founder was Kṛṣṇa Vāsudēva, — not the mythological Kṛṣṇa of later Hindū legend, — but the actual person to whom the myths became attached, and who must be identified with the Kṛṣṇa Dévalakṣma mentioned as a disciple of Góra Ágirasa in Chhândogya-Upanishad, III, xvii, 6. Kṛṣṇa Vāsudēva was a Kshatriya, and a member of the Sātvata or Sātvata sept of the Yādava tribe. In the older parts of the Mahābhārata this Kṛṣṇa appears in the two-fold character of a mighty warrior and of a religious teacher. He was the traditional founder of this religion which was strictly monothistic, the object of worship being named Bhagavat, “the Adorable One,” and its followers calling themselves Bhāgavatas, the worshippers of Bhagavat. Its practical teaching was strongly ethical from the Kshatriya point of view. The religion was at first adopted by the people of Vāsudēva’s tribe, the Yādavas, especially by those of the Sātvata sept to which he himself belonged; and gradually spread beyond the national limits into other parts of India. Hence, in later writings, we often find the name Sātvata used as a synonym for Bhāgavata without any ethnic signification whatever.

Before the time of Pāṇini, its founder, as has happened to other similar cases in India, became deified, and under his patronymic of Vāsudēva, he was identified with the Bhagavat. Long afterwards, his proper name, Kṛṣṇa, received the same honour. Other names given to the Supreme in later times were Purusha or “the Male” (probably borrowed from Śāmkhya-yoga) Nārāyaṇa, and so forth, but the eldest and the original name was, as has been said, Bhagavat. The passage just quoted from Pāṇini shows that in his time his worshippers were also called Vāsudēvakas and (from the name of Kṛṣṇa’s chief disciple) Āruṇakas.

We have no literary evidence as to the train of reasoning by which this doctrine was reached, but to me it appears more than probable that it was a development of the Sun-worship that was the common heritage of both branches of the Aryan people, — the Eranian and the Indian. All the legends dealing with the origins of the Bhāgavata Religion are connected in some way or other with the sun. According to the Mahābhārata (xii, 1893),

---

10 Or we may put it that the invasion lasted for several centuries, and that the latest comers were of a stock different from that of the earliest ones.

11 See Kielhorn in J. R. A. S., 1898, p. 505. Neither Pāṇini nor Pātañjali states in so many words that Vāsudēva is the name of a deity. The latter treats it merely as a proper name; but the application of the technical word Bhakti to Vāsudēva makes it difficult to imagine who else can be intended, if it be not the God. To the present day, the most holy verse of the Bhāgavata teaching is the “twelve syllable mantra,” i.e., his name Bhagavat Vāsudēva.

12 Cf. MBh., II, 1106-7; 1529-7; IV, 85, 140; XVI, 74, 91-4, 118.
the Bhagavat himself taught the religion to the seer Nārada, who taught it to, amongst others, the sun, who communicated it to mankind. The greatest and most worshipped of all the incarnations of the Bhagavat, — that of Rāma-chandra, — was by human origin a descendant of the sun. Several of the legends connected with Bhagavata saints are also connected with the sun. Sugriva, Rāma’s ally, had the sun for his father. Many stories are told about Draupadī, the wife of the five Pāṇḍavas, but in the Acta Sanctorum of the Bhāgavatas, the Bhakti-māla, only one is thought worthy of mention, and that is connected with a miracle performed by Krishna with the aid of a marvellous cooking-pot given to her by the sun. Satrājit, Krishna’s father-in-law was a sun-worshipper, and received from the luminary a jewel which became the subject of many stories. One of the very earliest hereties recorded in Brahmanical literature was Yajñavalkya. According to the Vīṣṇu Purāṇa (III, v, ff.) he refused to obey his preceptor’s command to join in worship with people whom he styled “miserable and inefficient Brāhmaṇs.” He explained that he acted “in” or “for bhakti” (the MSS. differ) and rejected so much of the Yajur Veda as he had learnt from his teacher. He then departed and worshipped the sun, who imparted to him a new and schismatical White Yajur Veda of its own. With this he betook himself to Janaka, a famous king of the Outland, the legendary father-in-law of Rāma-chandra, and intimately connected with the origins of the Bhāgavata monotheism. The Brihadāraṇyaka Upanishad (III, i) of this Veda tells how he discussed religious matters with Janaka and converted him, and how he disputed with and silenced orthodox Brāhmaṇs. According to Bhāgavata eschatology, the saved soul first of all passes through the sun on its way to the Bhagavat after death. Nimūditya, the earliest of the modern Bhāgavata reformers, commenced his career by causing the sun to stand still, and was an incarnation of the sun. Even at the present day the sun is given the title of “Bhagavat” by the peasants of Northern India. In modern language Bhagavat Sūrya, the Adorable Sun, becomes Sūruj Bhagavat. Finally, in the latter stages of the Bhāgavata Religion, the Bhagavat is identified with Vishnu, a deity who, in the oldest Indian literature, was worshipped as a sun-god.

We know little about the Bhāgavata Religion as it was originally promulgated by Krishna Viṣṇu. The usual tradition is that it was taught by the Deity Himself to the ancient Rishi Nārada, who taught it to various saints, including the Sun. The Sun told it to the Rishis in his train, who taught it to the Gods, who taught it to Asita, a famous Hindu worthy, the traditional Simeon of Buddhism, though not a Buddhist. From Asita it spread over the world through various channels.

Modern Bhāgavatas recognize two great teachers of their Religion. One of these was the Nārada just mentioned, to whom is attributed a work entitled the Nārada-bhakti-stotra. It possesses great authority. Equally esteemed is the collection of Śrīdīśa-bhakti-sūtras. Like the other it is of modern origin. The author to whom it is attributed, composed the Śrīdīśa-viśd quoted in the Chhandogya Upanishad, III, xiv.14

The doctrines of the Bhāgavata Religion will be discussed on a later page. Here we may briefly say, that in contradistinction to the Pantheistic Brahmaism of the Madhyādīṣeṇa, it was from the beginning strongly monotheistic. It also taught that the Supreme Deity was infinite, eternal, and full of grace (prasadā), and that salvation consisted in a life of perpetual bliss near him.

13 This is important for what follows.
14 This famous description of Brahma closely agrees with the idea of the deity found in Bhāgavata scriptures. It is noteworthy that Śaṅkaraschārya (Vedānta-sūtras, III, iii, 19, 31 and elsewhere) maintains that it does not teach the knowledge of the Highest Brahma, who is destined of constituents. Rāmānuja (III, iii, 19, 33) who was himself a Bhāgavata, quotes the text with approval.
As Professor Garbe has well remarked, in India there has always been manifest a strong tendency to combine religion with philosophy, and this being fostered by the speculative inclinations of the Kshatriya caste, it followed that as time went on, and as interest in philosophical questions spread among the people of India, this monotheism, as expressed in their Bhāgavata Religion, was given a philosophicăl basis. We have seen that the pantheistic Brahmaism was radically opposed to this monotheistic belief, and the professors of the latter naturally turned to those systems of philosophy which sprang up in the freer atmosphere of the less Brahmanized outer band of nationalities. These were the ancient Sāṁkhya system, and its daughter the Yōga.

Sāṁkhya is a purely atheistical system of dualism. It recognises nothing but countless eternally existing souls (or males, purusha), and matter. It is the oldest philosophical system of India, and had arisen in the eastern portion of our outer band where for centuries it had developed unregarded by the Brāhmaṇs to its west. It is not till after the time of the Buddha that we see traces of its influence upon Brahmaism. Besides that of the Bhāgavatas, several other Indian Religions owe their philosophy to Sāṁkhya or Yōga: such are the forms of belief founded by the Siva-worshipping Sāktas and Pāṇḍavas, not to mention the far more important Buddhism and Jainism.

I have above referred to the Yōga system of philosophy, as the “daughter” of Sāṁkhya. This is true only of the system, not of Yōga itself. According to Sāṁkhya, the soul obtains release from personality and transmigration by contemplation on the nature of the soul and matter. The system does not trouble itself with the ethical side of life. This deficiency was supplied by the Yōga system. As Garbe points out, in the Bhāgavat Gītā, which is largely influenced by both Sāṁkhya and Yōga, the word yōga is employed to mean the teaching in regard to duty, while sāṁkhyā is, in contradistinction, used to mean the abstract theory of right knowledge. The conception of Yōga — the abstraction of the thought from the outer world, and the internal concentration of the mind, was very old in India. Originally a belief in the superhuman powers which could be gained by this concentration (a kind of Shamanism), it became a branch of philosophy when this acquired power was intended to be utilized for the attainment of the knowledge demanded by Sāṁkhya. The interaction of the two currents of thought was certainly older than Buddhism, and, as we have it now, it was systematized in the second century B.C., long after the rise of Buddhism, by Patañjali. But, as a branch of the Sāṁkhya system, Sāṁkhya-yōga as it is called, it was then no new thing. The Bhāgavata scriptures continually refer to Sāṁkhya-yōga, but never to Patañjali. According to them the author of the system was Hiranyagarbha “and no other.” The teaching of yōga inculcates morality, a feature which was almost wanting in Sāṁkhya; and the strong ethical tendency of the Bhāgavata Religion led it to ally itself with the yōga development of Sāṁkhya, rather than with the original system of philosophy.

---

15 Bhāgavat Gītā, p. 23.
16 Garbe, Sāṁkhya Philosophie, p. 7.
17 Garbe, Sāṁkhya Philosophie, p. 15.
18 It is worth noting that in the Nāḍyapītha (1329) the close connexion between the Vaishnava Bhāgavatas and the Śiva worshippers is strongly insisted upon.
19 Sāṁkhya Philosophie, p. 44 and elsewhere.
20 See Senart, Origines Buddhistas, pp. 17 ff.
21 See Nāḍyapītha, 1370. Manu Svayamibhava was called Hiranyagarbha, and his daughter, Devahuti, was the mother of Kapila. This tends to show that, traditionally, Yōga was older than Sāṁkhya.
But Sāṁkhya has no God, nor, originally, had Yāga. There is no room for the deity in these philosophies. On the other hand the Bhāgavata Religion was not only theistic but was monotheistic. How were these two opposing theories as to the soul's relation to the Infinite to be reconciled? The Bhāgavatas solved the puzzle by giving Sāṁkhya-yāga a God.

The Yāga system agrees with Sāṁkhya, and differs from that of the Bhāgavatas, in its definition of salvation, or “release,” as the absolute isolation of the soul, which remains henceforth for ever without consciousness of any kind. On the other hand, the prominent characteristic of the Yāga system as distinguished from the Sāṁkhya is that it is theistic (śāśāra), while the latter is atheistic (nirākāra). Sāṁkhya philosophy gives no place for God in the arrangement of its principles. The Yāga system on the other hand adds a God, and thereby disturbs the philosophy. In order to avoid this disturbance as much as possible, the Yāga śāśāra is described as merely a particular soul, possessed of supreme knowledge and power. He is not the origin of other souls, but is quite distinct from them. He is gracious and merciful, and can influence the connexion of the other souls with matter. He is hence able to assist these souls in their efforts to obtain release defined above. It has long been recognized that the Yāga system adopted this theism, in order to make its teaching acceptable to wider circles. The conception of God has really nothing to do with its system of philosophy, and was added on to it from outside without organically affecting it. Although the Yāga God may help a soul to obtain release, his help is not necessary. All that he does is at most to put the soul into the right way of understanding its connexion with matter. That the conception of God—a monotheism—was taken from the Bhāgavata Religion there can be no doubt. The fact was admitted so long ago as 1838 by Rajendra Lālā Mitra on p. 28 of his translation of the Yāga-sūtras.

On the other hand, the Bhāgavata Religion was counter-influenced by the philosophy to which it had allied itself; while it gave theism to Yāga, it took in exchange the general conception of Yāga, but in doing so altered the meaning of the word from “concentration of thought” to “devotion to God.”

In later writings of the sect we can trace the various changes of signification through which the word has passed. Professor Garbe points out that in the Bhāgavata Gītā, it sometimes means the regular yāga practices of the Yāga philosophy, but more often signifies “devotion to God.” In combination with other words we have karma-yāga in the sense of the disinterested practice of duty or morality, in contradistinction to jūdāna-yāga, the Sāṁkhya immoral system of contemplation on the distinction between the soul and matter. The Bhāgavata Purāṇa, III, xxiv ff. makes much the same distinction.

In later times the expression karma-yāga, under Brahmanical influence gradually lost its moral aspect, and became identified with the karma-mārga of the Mīmāṃsā system, and we see this fully developed in the Arthasaṅgakāla of Nārāyaṇa-parivarādī, which mentions five upāya or ways to God, viz.:(1) karma-yāga; (2) jūdāna-yāga; (3) bhakti-yāga; (4) prapatti-yāga; (5) dhyāya-bhūtīdāna-yāga. The first is now represented as the whole Vedic sacrificial ritual and the Śākta ceremonies, along with fasts and other observances. These give purification, and, having attained this by the performance of the proper yāga practices, the devotee is led to the stage of jūdāna-yāga,

23 See, for instance, Garbe, Sāṁkhya und Yāga in Grundrisse der Indo-Arischen Philologie und Altertumskunde, p. 58.
24 See Garbe, Bhāgavat Gītā, p. 43.
which is now no longer ānkhya philosophy, but consists in concentrating the mind upon Vāsudēva. This leads to the third and highest stage,—bhakti-yoga, in which the devotee sees nothing but the deity. The two remaining ways are resorts for the weaker brethren, and do not concern us here.26

In tracing the development of the meaning of the word yoga, we have, however, anticipated events. When we branched off on to that subject we were in presence of the monotheistic Bhāgavata Religion in alliance with the Yōga system. In the second stage of its existence we find this religion in process of Brahmanization. It was, as we have seen, radically opposed to the pantheistic Brahmanism of the Brāhma of the Madhyadēśa, but the latter conquered it and absorbed it. The incorporation was carried out in exactly the same way as that in which we see Brahmanism extending its frontiers amongst aboriginal tribes at the present day. We have the process before our eyes. Animism is discovered to be orthodoxy. Local aboriginal deities are discovered to be identical with Śiva or some other member of the Brāhma pantheon, and the distinction of caste is conferred upon the converts. In other respects the aboriginal customs and belief are at first left untouched and are allowed to develop of themselves into one of the many branches of modern Hinduism.

So was it with the Bhāgavatas. Professor Garbe26 has suggested, and it seems to me that his suggestion bears upon its face the greatest probability, that the immediate cause was the struggle for life and death between Brahmanism and Buddhism. The period of absorption (300 B.C. to 0 A.D.), which has been fixed on entirely different grounds, exactly agrees with the requirements of this supposition. The purely atheistic Buddhism, also an offshoot of Sāmkhya-yoga, was naturally further removed from the Bhāgavata monotheistic position than the Pantheism of the Brāhmaṇa, and the latter won over the Bhāgavatas as their allies, the price paid being the identification of Vāsudēva with the Brahmanical Vishnu, and the admission of the Brahmanical orthodoxy of the Kautilya pantheon. The result was a cult of Brahmoized anti-Brahmans. The treaty of peace is found in the older portions of the Bhagavad Gītā, which belong to this time.27 These are the earliest available documents referring to the teaching of the school. Already Vāsudēva has been identified with Vishnu, but not with the Brāhma of the Upanishads; and the personal name of the warrior Kṛishṇa, the founder of the religion, who, under his family name had been defined as Vāsudēva, is now also given admission to the Hindū pantheon, as that of an incarnation of the same deity. Brahmanism has now become master of the souls of India, and has imposed upon them chains,—light enough it must be admitted—from which they have never been released.

As time went on, the Bhāgavata Religion became more and more Brahmoized. We see this earliest in the later parts of the Bhagavad Gītā, which belong to the first two centuries of our era. In Northern India, where the Brahmanic influence of the Madhyadēśa was strongest, we even see the Bhāgavatas adopting the Brahmanism of the Upanishads: but they

26 The value of the Yōga system of philosophy is recognized by Bhāgavatas down to the present day. A legend of the Bhāgavata Purāṇa is still popular, and is referred to by Malik Muhammad in his Padumavati (dīkṣā, 245), which was written 1549 A.D. Malik Muhammad says,—ekharaḥ kha kriśnaṁ kara śūḍā; “They (ex. yōga) can destroy the well-looked actions (even) of Kṛishṇa.” The commentator explains that this is a reference to Bhāgavata Purāṇa, X, lvi, 29. Akṛตรา, who was a proficient in yōga, fled in terror from Dvārakā on hearing of the death of Batahmu. Kṛishṇa thereupon became powerless; and disease, famine, and other calamities, supernatural and physical, assailed Dvārakā. Kṛishṇa advised the people to call him back. They did so, and peace and plenty again reigned in the country.

27 Bhag. Gī., p. 35.

28 Garbe, op. cit., p. 37.
never made it a real vital part of their religion. It was added on as loosely as their own
theism had in former times been added to the Yoga philosophy. It never worked itself into
the texture of the doctrines, but is proclaimed and recognized as truth, or silently ignored
almost according to the passing mood of the votary. We may say that the text-book of
one form of this semi-Brahmaized Bhagavata religion is the Nārāyaṇya section of the Śānti
Parvan of the Mahābhārata, which is one of the latest portions of the epic (between 200 and
400 A.D.), and of which a summary is given below. In this, while the influence of Brahmaism
is clearly visible, the old Saṁkhya-Yoga doctrines still form the essential groundwork of the
teaching.

The Nārāyaṇya sometimes alludes to the religion which it teaches as the doctrine of the
Bhagavatas, and sometimes as that of the Pāñcharātras. The two terms are not exactly
synonymous, for the Pāñcharātras\(^{28}\) formed only one sect of the great Bhagavata Religion.
Professor Bhandarkar\(^{29}\) tells us that Dhrusānanda I, one of the earliest princes of the Valabhi
Dynasty (circa 520 A.D.) is called a Bhagavata, and Bāha (circa 600 A.D.) in the 8th chapter
of the Itihasa-charita mentions both Bhagavatas and Pāñcharātras.

In the early part of the ninth century, Saṁkarāchāryya systematized the Brahmatant Pantheism,
and founded the modern Vedānta philosophy with its doctrine of māyā, or illusion. In
a well-known passage of his commentary on the Brahma-sūtras (II, ii, 42-45 he combats the
Bhagavata doctrine (which he also calls Pāñcharātra) and asserts its incompleteness and
unorthodoxy.

I have said that the Brahmatant influence upon the Bhagavata religion had been strongest
in Northern India. In Southern India, where the old monotheistic Saṁkhya-Yoga basis had been
preserved in greater purity, Saṁkara's doctrines were vigorously opposed. The best known
reply is that of Rāmānuja (himself a convert to the Pāñcharātra religion) who, in his
commentary on the same Brahma-sūtras (early part of the 12th century) strongly maintained
the orthodoxy of the Pāñcharātra cult, and asserted that its dogmas were in essential
agreement with the Upanishads. He accepted the original Brahma-sūtras, but interpreted them
differently from Saṁkara.

Later in the same century, another Bhagavata convert from Saivism, Ānandatirtha or
Madhvāchāryya, also attacked Saṁkara, and maintained that his doctrines of māyā and the unity
of the spirit with the Supreme Brahms, were but Buddhist nihilism in disguise.\(^{30}\) He
went further than Rāmānuja,—who, at least nominally, found a Brahmatant basis for the
Bhagavata Religion,—and propounded a doctrine of duality, laying particular stress on the five
eternal distinctions, between (1) God and the soul, (2) God and matter, (3) the soul and
matter, (4) one soul and another, and (5) one material object and another.

Ānandatirtha's teaching has remained in Southern India, but Rāmānuja's was carried north
by Rāmānanda to the Valley of the Ganges, and there, in its turn, superseded the prevailing
pseudo-Brahmaism which was current under the influence of the Madhyadēśā, and developed
through the preaching of Kabir, Tulasi-dasa, and many other reformers of less importance, into the
Bhakti Religion of northern India. This Bhakti Religion is still in its essence strongly

\(^{28}\) The name is a derivative of Pañcha-rātra, a period of five nights, and probably refers to the five sacrifices
performed by the sect. See note to Nārāyaṇya, 12847, below.


\(^{30}\) See Bhandarkar, op. cit., p. 74, from which the following account of Ānandatirtha's teaching is taken.
monotheistic, and in spite of what we are told by writers about India, it is no more polytheistic than was that of the Jew who wrote the Eighth Psalm. Just as the Psalmist believed in one God, " כְּלָהוֹם, and at the same time speaks of man as " a little lower than the angels " ( כְּלָהוֹם) (82), so the modern Hindús believe in the existence of one personal God, Bhagavat, Nārāyaṇa, Puruṣa, Vāsūdeva, or Vishnū, whom he calls a déva, and who created Brahma, Siva and countless other beings, divine but finite, also called déva, to work his will. The fact that we translate the word déva, uniformly by " God," whatever idea it expressed in the original, does not prove that the Bhāgavatas are polytheists. It is true that these subordinate dévas are objects of adoration; but many Christians, who adore persons other than the Supreme, would be most indignant if they were told that they were not monotheists. The Bhāgavata scriptures, continually insist that a true believer must be a monotheist,— an ēkāntin. This word which literally means " devoted to one," cannot be interpreted as meaning " devoted to one amongst several Gods." The context, and the whole course of the argument shows that it can only be translated as " solely devoted to The One."

It is well-known that the great characteristic of the Religion is bhakti, or " faith devoted to the Supreme." It has often been discussed whether this characteristic is of Indian origin, or is a later addition borrowed from Nestorian Christianity. (83) The subject has been last considered by Professor Garbe in his translation (pp. 29 ff.) of the Bhagavad Gītā, and his arguments as to the Indian origin of this phase of religion, and as to the pre-Christian application of the word to the idea are conclusive. In the first place, a monotheistic religion, in which the object of worship was looked upon as a kindly, not a terrible, deity, would naturally beget the feeling of bhakti in the hearts of his worshippers; but Professor Garbe shows that the word itself was used in Pali scriptures in this sense in the 4th century B.C., and that Pāṇini, as has already been stated, probably in the same century actually speaks of bhakti dedicated to Vāsūdeva. That bhakti, under this name, formed a constituent doctrine of the original Bhāgavata Religion before the 4th century B.C., we cannot prove, but the feeling existed in India from the earliest times and was not confined to the Bhāgavatas, though it was amongst them that it subsequently received its full development as a cardinal point in the religious attitude of the soul to the Supreme. We see what it is difficult to distinguish from bhakti even in the Vāraṇa hymns of the Rig Veda. (84) But there is no room for the idea in the impersonal pantheism of Brahmaism, and it is therefore natural that the occurrence of the word in early Sanskrit literature should be rare. India owes the preservation of the idea of faith to the Bhāgavatas.

The object of this devoted faith is The One God, Bhagavat, Nārāyaṇa, Puruṣa, or Vāsūdeva, existing from eternity and to eternity. He is defined as The Endless (ananta), The Imperishable (anābyuta), and The Indestructible (aśīvita). He is the Creator of all things out of matter, (85) to

---

(82) On the present occasion I avoid discussing the question of the relationship of Christianity to the modern forms of the Bhakti Religion; but it is necessary to state that I believe that these have been in many particulars influence by the cognate doctrines of the Nestorians of Southern India. Rāmānuja, who was brought up as a Vedantist, studied, lived most of his life, and became a Pādācharita, within a few miles of the Hindu-Christian Shrine of St. Thomé. Similarly Madhvāchārya was born at Uḍipi, near Kalyan, where there was an ancient Christian bishopric.

(83) Rig Veda, II, 28; V, 85; VII, 69-69. I have to thank Mr. Tawney for these references. See also Max Müller, Ancient Sanskrit Literature, pp. 82 ff.

(84) I find different statements about matter. The original belief of the Bhāgavatas seems to have been that matter was the first thing created out of nothing (नाना भूतं not त्रित्व भूतम् द्राक्ष or द्रव्यं गतम्) by the Bhāgavat, but sometimes we notice echoes of the Sāmkhyayoga theory of the independent pre-existence of matter from all eternity.
which is given the Sāṁkhya name of Prakṛti, Pradhāna, or the Indiscrete (avyakta). From Him issue all souls, which henceforth exist for ever as distinct individuals. He has created Brahmā, Siva, and the countless subordinate deities to carry out his orders in creating and ruling the world, and to promulgate the true religion. He generally leaves the burden of ruling the earth upon their shoulders, but, as occasion demands, from time to time in His infinite grace (pratīti). He Himself becomes incarnate to relieve the world from sin, or His followers from trouble. The greatest and most perfect incarnations are those of Rāma-chandra and Kṛṣṇa, but there are twenty-four (not the usual ten) in all. India, again, owes the preservation of the idea of a God of Grace,—of the Fatherhood of God,—to the Bhāgavatas.

There is the usual theory of ages (kalpa), each divided into four ages (yuga). At the end of a kalpa, the universe is absorbed into primeval matter and thence into the Bhāgavat, awaiting emission again in the creation at the commencement of another kalpa.

Turning to the relationship of the individual soul to God, it is most probable that from the earliest times the soul was not looked upon as eternally self-existent from the past. Each soul was considered to be an eternal part (ātma) of the Supreme, emitted by Him and given a separate existence. On the other hand, once so emitted, a soul exists for ever and ever as an independent entity. It may be taken as certain that the doctrine of the immortality of the soul was an essential part of the original Bhāgavata Religion.

We may also say with certainty that from the earliest stages of their Religion the Bhāgavatas have shared the universal Indian belief in the transmigration of souls, and in the inevitable sequence of cause and effect. Everything that a man does is at once an effect of things that have gone before, and a cause of things to come. These causes and effects cling to the particular soul that produces them, and determine its fate after death. As a man soweth, so shall he reap, and the harvest is the weary round of perpetual transmigration. All the religious systems of India have been based on the principle that it is possible to break the chain of cause and effect, and so to "release" the soul from the necessity of rebirth. They differ in the means proposed for effecting this, and in their accounts of what becomes of the soul when so released. The Mimāṃsā method of release consists in the due performance of ceremonial works. That of the Vādānta is recognition of the identity of the soul with the Pantheos. And that of the Sāṁkhya is recognition of the dual nature of soul and matter.

---

26 This doctrine of pratīti or grace has formed an essential part of the Bhāgavata Religion, so far back as literature takes us. It is true that the same doctrine appears in the Upaniṣad-s but only in the latest ones (Kaṭha, I, ii, 20; Br., III, 20; VI, 21; Mun, III, ii, 3; See Hopkins, Great Epic, 188). It is hence reasonable to assume that in these cases it has been borrowed from the Bhāgavatas. Indeed it is difficult to see how such a doctrine could form part of the pantheistic Brahmanism.


28 Garbe, Bhāg. Gr., pp. 41, 43.

29 Garbe, ib., p. 53.
Putting the Mimāśa doctrine of works to one side, we have before us three alternative systems of philosophy. In one (the Sāṃkhya) there is an assertion of two co-existent eternal principles. In the second (the Vedānta), the predominance of the intellectual principle is asserted, and this in the end necessarily leads to the negation of the opposite principle. The third,—that of the Bhāgavatas—argues that the Supreme Being carries within His own nature "an element from which the material universe originates; an element, which indeed is not an independent entity, like the pradhāna of the Sāṃkhya, but which at the same time is not an unreal māyā (as the Vedāntists assert), but quite as real as any other part of the Deity's own nature."33

Modern Bhāgavata doctors arrange souls under four classes, according to their position in regard to release. These are (1) those who are devoted to things of this life (buddha), and who are not on the way of salvation; (2) those who desire salvation, but have not yet become fit for it (nirnākṣha); (3) the pure in heart, who are devoted only to the Bhāgavat, and who are thus on the way of salvation (kēlata); and (4) the saved (mukta). These last enjoy a perpetual independent existence of never-ending bliss at the feet of the Supreme (Bhagavat-pada). Their only joy is waiting upon Him (karmākṣara); they become like Him, and remain in peace.34 Note that they become like Him. They do not become Him, or the same as Him. There is no absorption into the Supreme, as taught by the Vedānta, nor is there the loss of all consciousness that is aimed at by the Sāṃkhya. The doctrine that the released soul has an everlasting individual conscious existence "near the Lord," has been the persistent mark of the Bhāgavata religion down to the present day. Here we have another debt which India owes to the Bhāgavatas, the belief in the immortality of the soul.

The principles according to which creation is developed resemble closely those of Sāṃkhya-yoga, but, owing to the assumed difficulty of bringing the purely spiritual Supreme into connexion with matter, the initial stages are more complicated, and the terminology is not always the same. The Bhāgavat, or (as he is usually called when looked upon as the Creator) Vāsudeva, in the act of creation produces from Himself, not only prakṛti, the indiscriminate primal matter of the Sāṃkhya, but also a rūpā or phase of conditioned spirit called sakti-rūpā. From the combination of sakti-rūpā and prakṛti spring manas, corresponding to the Sāṃkhya bhūtī or intelligence,35 and also a secondary phase of conditioned spirit called pradīpikā. From the association of pradīpikā with manas spring the Sāṃkhya ānīkṣa or consciousness, and also a tertiary phase of conditioned spirit known as ānīkṣa. From the association of ānīkṣa with ānīkṣa spring the Sāṃkhya mahākāla or elements, with their qualities, and also Brahmā, who from the elements, fashions the earth and all that it contains.36 I have put all this quite shortly, as full accounts can be found in Colebrooke's Essays (I, 437 ff.), and in Professor Barnett's English translation of the Bhagavad Gītā (pp. 48 ff.).

The Bhāgavata eschatology of the saved is peculiar and interesting. It need not be given here as it will be found in the Nādiyānta below (v. 13888).

---

33 Taı̂baut, Translation of Vādānta-sūtras, I, xcvii, with one or two verbal alterations.
34 There is a fifth class, which hardly concerns us, viz., the māya-mācū, or those who, like the Bhāgavat's personal attendants, are saved from the moment of coming into existence.
35 Often, however, confused with the Sāṃkhya manas, which is a later stage of creation.
36 Cf. Nādiyānta, 13933, 13934. It will be observed that several of the Sāṃkhya categories, viz., the subtle elements, the ten organs of sense, and the Sāṃkhya manas are omitted in the above scheme. Nādiyānta, 13934 omits pradīpika manas. See however, 13888 ff.
The twelfth, or Sānti, Parvan of the Mahābhārata is divided into several sections, the latter half (Chapters 174—367) is called the Mokshadharma Parvan, and a portion of this (Chapters 336—353) is called the Nārāyaṇiya. Nearly the whole of the Mokshadharma Parvan, consists of lectures onŚiṅkhya-yoga, together with attempts to reconcile it with Brahmanism. One system which results from the attempted reconciliation of these two opposing philosophies is attributed to Paśchātika, and is explained at some length, but not very clearly, in Chapters 213, 276 and 320 ff. Another attempt at reconciliation is found in Chapters 194, 248 ff. and 286. They have nothing to do with the Bhāgavata teaching, and it is sufficient to refer to Professor Hopkins's excellent account of the various, and somewhat incoherent, doctrines, on pp. 143 ff. and 157 ff. of his Great Epic of India.

The Nārāyaṇiya on the other hand, while claiming to describe Śiṅkhya-yoga, really describes the Bhāgavata monotheism as united with this system, but also with more of a Brahmanical colouring than we find in the Bhāgavata Gītā. It is valuable as, till the formal scriptures of the sect are made available, it is the only fairly full account of the Paścharātra doctrines that we possess in the original Sanskrit.

The religious system of modern Aryan India, if we except a few tracts where Śiva or Durgā is the object of worship, is loosely called Vishnuism. Everywhere it is really some form or other of Bhāgavata Monotheism, and the immense importance, for the study of the attitude of the modern Hindū mind towards the Supreme, of an accurate acquaintance with the system of theology on which it is founded, is my excuse for presenting the following pages to the readers of the Indian Antiquary. My own experience is that it is useless to attempt to understand the work of the Great Medieval Bhakti Reformers, without being familiar at least with the Nārāyaṇiya. I myself wandered through a maze without a clue till my attention was directed to it. All the bhakti writers from Rāmānuja down to those of the present day, assume the reader's acquaintance with the principles enunciated therein and in its absence hundreds of allusions will be passed over or misunderstood.

I think there are very few Englishmen who have ever taken the trouble to read it. If it had been more generally known, we should have been spared the frequent mistaken allusions to Hindū polytheism, which are a commonplace wherever Indian religions are discussed. At the present time it cannot be too emphatically stated that modern Hinduism is at its base a religion of Monotheism. What follows is a very brief summary of the earlier chapters of the Mokshadharma Parvan, succeeded by a pretty full abstract of the contents of the Nārāyaṇiya. As to whether the religion here taught is polytheism or monotheism, the reader will now be in a position to judge for himself.

(To be continued.)

42 It calls this Brahmanism "Vēdkuta," but it is hardly necessary to point out that it is much older than the developed "Vēdkuta" of Śaṅkarkārya.

43 The gross cloud of combined polytheism and fetishism which covers and hides this monotheism, is kept, even by the unlearned Hindū, upon a different plane of thought. The monotheism has to do with the future life, and with what we should call "salvation." The polytheism and fetishism serve only for the daily needs of the material world. In a country where, as in India, the majority of the people are poor and ignorant, the material overshadows the spiritual; but even the poorest recognizes (even if he thinks them too high for him) the truth of the doctrines concerning the One Supreme Being, which have descended to him from the Bhāgavatas.
SOME ANGLO-INDIAN WORTHIES OF THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY.
BY LAVINIA MARY ANSTEY.
No. III.

AMBROSE SALISBURY.
(Continued from p. 227.)

From this time until his re-installment in the Company's service, in 1672, Salisbury remained at Peddapalle and conducted the Company's investments in much the same way as before, at the same time, no doubt, carrying on a profitable trade for himself. The correspondence between Salisbury at Peddapalle and Mohun and the Council at Masulipatam, from 1670 to 1672, on the subject of Saltpetre, the dyeing of Gingham, etc., is complete and tells its own story.

"Metchlepam General to Pettepole.

Mr Ambrose Salisbury, Being ordered by our Masters to send them 50 pieces of Gingham dyed red, which we suppose are for an experiment, they being see small a quantity, and to bee in a readiness against the returne of their Shippes from the Bay, which we suppose will bee early in the month of December, if not before, you may remember upon your departure hence, we did then make it our request unto you that you would undertake the getting of it done at Pettepole, it being the only place in these parts for dyeing that Colour, which we now againe desire, and that they may bee dyed a very good red, and with what possible speed they may bee. Wee endeavoured their getting done at Maddapollam, where wee provided the Cloth, but the people there not being accustomed to that Colour, would not undertake it. The Cloth wee have some dayes since ordered to bee sent you from thence directly, which we hope will arrive soe tyme as that you may Seasonably gett it finished. Wee desire you would pardon the trouble which from us is unwillingly imposed upon you by Your loving friends to serve you, W. Langhorne; Richard Mohun; Joseph Hynmers.

Metchlepam, the 28th October, 1670."

"Metchlepam General to Pettepole.

Mr Salisbury, Sir, this day was received yours of the 36 Current, which gives us an account of your reception of our General, wherein wee desired you would take care for the dyeing of fifty pieces of Gingham for the account of our Masters, which wee had then ordered to bee sent from Maddapollam, and is, as we finde by Mr Hopkins's and Fields last Letter unto us, accordingly done. Wee accept of your readiness in the preparation you have already made with the Dyers for the more speedy finishing, and returne you our thanks, desiring you will excuse the trouble we have given you and, according unto your desire, have sent you Eighty Eight Pieces, which, at the rate that you informe us they will stand the Company in, or nears it, being one Page, and three quarters per piece, is Eighty Seaven and a half. Wee intreat your care in the goodness of the Colour, and that you will gett them dyed as Cheape as you can, in both which you Will doe your Selfe noe disservice, since you know whose Concernes they are, and alsoe oblige us to continue Your reall friends to serve you, W. Langhorne; Richard Mohun; Joseph Hynmers.

Wee have alsoe sent you according to your desire six yards of red broad cloth.

Metchlepam, the 5th November, 1670."

[Notes: 12 An Indian cotton cloth, generally striped, see ante, Vol. XXIX., p. 392.
13 There is no note of Salisbury's visit to Masulipatam in 1670, but it was probably then that Langhorne enquired into his case and formed a favourable estimate of his character.
14 Maddapollam (Mudhavanappalem) factory, a settlement of the Company, subordinate to Masulipatam, was a depot for cotton cloths, also a place for ship-building and a health resort.
15 Factory Records, Masulipatam, Vol. 5.
16 This letter does not exist.]

[Factory Records, Masulipatam, Vol. 5.]
On the same date (5th Nov. 1670) the sending of 88 pagodas to Salisbury at Peldapalle is recorded in the Masulipataam Consultation Book, where Salisbury is described as "a person experienced in those parts and the Honourable Company having no servant there at present."

"Metchlepam General to Peletono.

Mr Ambrose Salisbury, Sir, your several Letters of the 7th were all received the 6th instant with some you desired may be sent the Honourable Company, which shall accordingly be done. We are sorry that you made that mistake about the charge of dying the Gingham sent you, which we now find is 2½ Pagos per piece and formerly you advised us was but 1½ each, which we had before your last acquainted the Agent and Council with, but must now pass for a mistake of yours. We then sent you according to your desire Eighty Eight Pagos, and now send you more fifty Pagos, which, after the rate of 2½ Pa. per piece, is more than Completes the Samm you write for [by] half a Pago.

Sir, we desire you will hasten your dispatch what possible you can, for that we have had lately advice from the Bay, a Pattermer [patherm, a courier] arriving with us the 7th past, that the Happy Entrance they intended to dispatch from thence the (?) uho. last month and two more immediately to follow her. The last ship, the Zant, will be detained with them until the 5th of December and noe longer. Sir, you now know the longest tyme we have, therefore pray use all diligence to have them in a readiness against the tyme, but if possible before, for wee would not deferr it untill the last. Mr Stiles is dead. Having not farther to add, Savoring the committing you to the protection of the Almighty, doe remain, Your loving friends, W. LANGHORNE; RICHARD MOHUN; JOSEPH HYMERS.

Metchlepam the 11th November, 1670."79

"Metchlepam General to Peltipole.

Mr Ambrose Salisbury, Our Masters occasions requiring packing trade, and understanding from several of your Letters that its much cheaper to bee had with you then here, wee have thought good by your Peone to send you two hundred Pagos to provide 1000 Gunneys [gogi, sacking], Ropes 10 Candies, Twine 5 Candies, Cotton 5 Candies and of Dungarees [dangi, coarse cotton cloth] of 12 Corts [of 18 in.] in length, if to bee bought at 6 patch to a Pago, 5 or 600 patch, all which wee presume you will gett as cheape as you can; and for money, wee shall furnish you withall as the necessity shall require, desiring you that you will bee as speedy in your returns as possible, for that wee stand in great need of them, having much Cloth still to bee imbale. The Gingham we hope you will have in a readiness to bee here against the appointed tyme, which you may conclude will not exceed the 10 next month, therefore hasten your quick dispatch, which will undoubtedly doe you a kindness. With the Company, noe less to us, Your loving friends, W. LANGHORNE; RICHARD MOHUN; JOSEPH HYMERS.81

Metchlepam the 28th November 1670."

The above transactions with Peldapalle were entered in the Masulipatam Consultation Book as follows: — "Observing the packing Charge of the Honourable Company to amount to a considerable same and that supplied hitherto at worst hand, wherein much might be saved by providing the stuff from Peletono, it was resolved to enorder Mr Salisbury, he living there upon place and the Honourable Company having no Factor there, to make a provision of Dungarees, Gunneys, Cotton Roape and twine for their Accomp and to send up to us by Boates: on accomp whereof we send him new pagodas 200 this day."82
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Salisbury's answer to the letter from Masulipatam of the 23rd Nov. is dated four days later.

"Mr. Richard Mohun &c. Counsell, I have received yours of the 28th ultimo with two hundred Pagos, which you desire to have speedily returned in Packing Trade for Supply of your present occasions, therefore, in Conformity to your order, upon reception, sent one hundred and fifty Pagos, with strict charge to hasten all that possibly may bee and to take speciall Care to buy as good and cheap as any Merchants doe. I have ordered one hundred Pagos, for Dungarees and suppose their will bee per Pa. 6 pieces of them or 12 Co. if not more; it being the only place for that Sort of Cloth in the Country that I know, as also Cotton, of which we have ordered 5. Candy which price cannot certainly advise you, but assure you as much as can bee boughts, doubt not in both you will find a Considerable difference betwixt that price and Metchlepam it being much cheaper then in that place. The remaining fourty Pagos have this morning delivered in parts for Gunyes, Ropes and Twine, having contracted for 200 Pa. and promised one hundred and fifty Pa. Speedely, therefore desire the favour of you to remitt the Sayd Value that I may Comply, and what of that above Sorts now in a readiness shall Speedely bee sent you, the remainder Soe soon as finished. The Gingham, had not the Wether prevented, would now have beene neare finished. Here hath beene noe cleare Wether this 12 dayes and more, but now hope it will not bee wanting, and that they will bee done by the tyme lymitted or in two or three dayes after, for I doe hasten them all that may bee, and shall endeavour in all the above expressed the Honble. Companyes advantage and your good likeing. With kind respects subscribed, Your assured Freind, AMBROSE SALSBURY."

Pettipole, 2nd Dec. 1670."

On the 5th December 1670, it is recorded in the Masulipatam Consultations that "New Pagos, 88" were to be sent to "Mr. Ambrose Salisbury att Pettipole in order to the dying of 50 Pa. Gingham into red... he being a person experienced in those parts and the Honble. Company having no servant there at present nor any here that can be spared from hence to assist therein."

On the 8th December "150 New Pagos, more" were sent to Ambrose Salisbury upon his "advice that he was at work to make provision of Dungarees, Gunyes &c." 89

The letters containing these remittances must have also contained orders for Salisbury to repair to Masulipatam. In reply, he wrote:—

"Mr. Richard Mohun &c. Counsell, By your Servant have received yours of the 8th with one hundred and fifty Pagos, which shall lay out according to your Order in your formers, and at my coming give you account of all received for Account of the Honble. Company. The Gingham might now have been finished, had not the Weather prevented, here having been noe fitting Weather for this purpose, for this Close Cloudy Weather the Chay89 cannot speedily bee dried and prepared. All haste possible is made with them, and they will very speedily be done. The Dungarees and Cotton have send againe to hasten, and may now dayly expect them. I shall now hasten what Gingham etc. in a readiness, and shall set forward towards you soo soo as the Gingham done and that the Dungarees Arrive. [I] Take Notis of the Company order to Accompany you to Fort St. George 87 which shall readily Obay, with kind respects, conclude, Your assured friend and Servant, AMBROSE SALSBURY."

Pettipole, the 11th December 1670."
"Metchlepam Generall to Pettepoloe.

Mr. Ambrose Salisbury, Sir, The Coast had her dispatch hense the 14th instant, and just now is a great ship coming into the Roade, which wee judge to bee the Rainbow. We therefore desire you to hasten the Gingham Etc. Packing trade that all may arrive seasonably with us, for that wee shall not longer detaine her then there is a necessity for, which, as we suppose, will not bee above foure dayes at farthest. Therefore pray fail not as you value the Esteeme of those whose business it is, besides the kindness done to Sir, Your loving friends, W. Langhorne; Richard Mohun; Joseph Hynmers; Geo. Chamberlaine."

Metchlepam, the 19th December 1670.

"Mr. Richard Mohun, I presume you have received the Ginghames sent you with myne of 19th, which hope are to your liking; the remainder shall bring with me. Sir, I writ to the Peeter Branecey [Brahman], who is now in Metchlepam, that I have Sent for such Goods for you, and wish him to give a Peon (he having Severall now unimployed) that the Goods might not bee hindered in the Way, but bec, upon purpose that [?] might gain your displeasure by non complance hath denied, and I have the news that they are detayned [by the] Governor of Cundevare to whom have writ to free them. They were stoped by a noter before, otherwise they had beene with you eight dayes agone. Sir, pray demand of him the Cause of his denying a peon, the Goods being for the Company. Sir, I doubt not in the future more oly complaces, and purpose to Set forth, as in my laste advised. In the mean tyme Present you the Service off, Sir, Your much obliged friend and Servant, Ambrose Salisbury."

Pettepoloe the 21th December 1670.

"Metchlepam Generall to Pettepoloe.

Mr. Ambrose Salisbury, The last night was received yours with 23 Ps. of Gingham, which are soo well done as wee doubt not but will bee to our Masters Likeings and future encouragement for the dying that Comodity. Wee desire you to hasten the remainder with all Speed. Captain Coollad came into the Roade yesterday about 5 a Clock, but as yet none come on Shoare, see that wee cannot informe you any thing of the Bay affaires. Pray minde the quick dispatch of the Packing trade to us, for that we stand in great need thereof, which is all at present from Sir, Your friends, Richard Mohun; Joseph Hynmers; Geo. Chamberlaine."

Metchlepam the 22th December 1670.

On the 28th December, 1670, in a "Generall to the Honble. Company" the factors at Masulipatam thus allud to Salisbury's services:— "We shall bee glad the redd Gingham dyed att Pettepoloe may give good content, Mr Salisbury having looked very well after that buiness and reduced the Charge to 2½ Ps. per piece, which wee have tried with Lime Juice and dide to hold the Colour extraordinary well. Wee are informed they will looke much better when washed, which doubting whither to bee done soo cheape or well with you, shall reserve two or three Ps. for the tryall to send hence by the first shipp. The said Mr Salisbury having likewise done you very good service in the providing of Dungarees Etc. Packing stuff enordered to him. And truely, whatsoever may have been said of him for the past, whereof wee cannot altogether excuse him, wee heare noe new cause of blame since our arrivall, hoping your pious animadversions on the like occasions have and will works a very good effect in all your Factories and bring the desired blessing on your affaires."
Salisbury duly arrived at Masulipatam, probably early in January 1671. While there, he received the following letter:— "Mr. Ambrose Salisbury, Sir Wm. Langborne and Mr. Hyamers intending this day to Sett forwards towards Madras, We thought good a second time to mind you of your going thither, It being our masters orders for your soe doing, as we formerly advised you, wishing your Compliance in accompanying these Gentlemen thither, and that you accommodate Sir Wm, with the Companies Flagg, Trumpets, Crooked horns, pipes and Drum, which is all at present to tell you we are Sir, Your Loveinge Friend, Richard Mohun; Matt : Mainwaring ; Geo. Chamberlaine." 267

*Metchlepam, the 4th February 1670-1.*

It is to be presumed that, as directed, Salisbury proceeded to Fort St. George, but there is no record of his arrival at or departure from that place. In August of 1671 he was once again at Masulipatam, engaged on business of his own, and he subsequently resumed his investments at Peddapalle for the Company. From September onwards he kept up a constant correspondence with Richard Mohun and the Council at Masulipatam.

"Mr. Ambrose Salisbury, Sir, We haring an order from the Agent and Councell for the Spediest provision of Gunnyes and Ropes for their Occasions at the Fort, it was the Cheifs &c. intentions upon his first arrival here from thence, findinge you here, to have desired your speedy undertaking it, since we know you are well acquainted and knowing in those Commodities, and did the last yeares make provision for as of what we had then occasion to use, but findinge you then had some business of your owne which Detarried you in this place, we were not so pressing as otherwise the necessity of that business required, which now from your one information being accomplished, and your Selfe ready to imbace your desires, we herewith give you 500 hundred Pa., in the investment of which we minde you to use all possible diligence for its procury and at the Cheapest and best terms, since it Concernes our masters, wherein with them you will doe your Selfe Credit. We likewise remember you of Clearing the last years account upon the Same occasion, which is all at present Sive to wish you good success in your undertaking. We remaine, Sir, your lovinge Friends, Richard Mohun; Matthew Mainwaring; George Chamberlaine."

*Metchlepam September 3rd 1671.*

"Mr. Richard Mohun &c, Esteemed friends, In performance of your order, inclose the accounts which suppose you will find to agree with your booke. I did use my utmost endeavoure to agree with the Gunnye people and, upon the same condition agreed on last yeare, would have given them out the 500 Pagos, received from you for that account, but their demands are [so] unreasonable that I could not close with them, they denying to give more then 50 Gunnyes per Pago, and their price for ropes is 3 Pa. per Twine, 4 Pa. per Candy, pretending want of Raines hath advanced the price of Hemp, but I am of opinion they will accept the former terms in a day or two. If not, shall forbeare to give out money without your order. There is one Gundell Ancatwdrree [Gundala Venkatadri] in Metchlepam of the Gunny people cast, who hath a long tyme taken the name of the English and under that pretence employeth most of these persons that are best able to comply, and latelye received one boates Ladging of the above Goods and hath now two more Ladings which you may justly make Seizure on and take at the prime cost which, should he refuse, and make his address to the Governor, hee will fleece him when you informe him this action; hee hath given out 150 Pa. new lately, which you may please to returne him, or I will doe it heare to his order, which hee cannot deny, for hee hath not any such grant from the king. Please to hasten your order for the money shall remain untill your answer. I shall by next give you account of Alejayan and Dungarees. In the Interim, with kinde respects, close up, resting Your assured friend, Ambrose Salisbury."

*Pellep opes the 11th September 1671.*

---
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99 Aiuchah, a silk cloth.
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"Mr. Ambrose Salisbury, Sir, Yours of the 11th present came to hand this day, by which we observe that the packing trade were ordered you to provide cannot be done upon those cheaper terms which both you and us expected. However since their occasions at the Fort require them, and that as speedily as possible, we desire you to make the best and cheapest contract for them you can. And for Gundell Ancatadree whom you mention to be a great dealer in that commodity, having one boat laden and two more in a readiness with you to come away, and all this done under the notion of the English, we disown the knowledge of it, and are resolved as his boats thence arrive here, to make seizure of them; and if he shall upon it make any address to the Governor, we shall then acquaint him that, contrary to our knowledge, he hath used the name of the English to abuse both him and us. Minde the Dungarees and musters of Allijas to send as soon as conveniently you can unto your loving friends, R. Mohun; M. Mainwaring; G. Chamberlain.

Wee intend to send you the same quantity of Ginghames we did last yeare to bee dyed red. Wee therefore desire you to advise us when you can be in a readiness for them."

Methlepatan, the 13 September 1671.

"Mr Richard Mohun Esq., Esteemed friends, last night yours of the 13th instant received, wherein you are pleased to refer it to me to make the cheapest contract I can with the Gunney People. With much difficulty it has concluded with them the day before yours arrived, for 300 Rs, at 34 great Gunneys, 60 [Pa.] the small, Ropes 2½, twine 3½ as before. Indeed theirs more trouble and danger in dealing with these People for this Summer than with Merchants for ten times its value. I have sent to other places for People and hope in few days to make an agreement for them. The time is so short for so great a quantity that causeth them to stand upon their terms. Had it been for my own account, should have given them their demands, rather then have been troubled so long with discoursing about it. As to Gundell Ancatadree, shall refer him to you when the two Boates arrived, which Suppose may already, or in a day or two, but hope shall have sufficient for the Fort. I am enquiring for Allejaes, which shall speedily give you account of. If you intend the Dyeing of Gingham the sooner you send them the better, for the longer time they have to take the oyle the better they will take the Dye. This is what the present requires, save that to assure you my readiness to comply with any of your Commands imposed upon your assured friend, AMBROSE SALISBURY."

Pettepokes, the 22nd September 1671.

"Mr Richard Mohun Esq. Councell, the 20th instant writ you by a Pecone I sent to accompany 7100 Gunneys therein express'd, which you may expect by Land to be with you in nine or ten days. The 21st writ you, concerning the above, as also the red Gingham, to which refer you, having used all Diligence to accommodate your occasions with Packing stuff and sent to many parts of the Country Where its name [?] made. Have now, this very Instant, bought the quantities undenamed you saying you should want more and the amount of the 500 Rs. and they being now made thought it might bee an acceptable Service, the price being the same as formerly, and such a quantity is not at any time to bee had, and to give out money for provision of them may stay Six months, that I hope you accept, therefore desire you to send by a Servant of yours 200 Rs, and assure you all hast possible shall bee made for their speedy arrival to you. I hope the Balance of last account will also bee cleared. These [?] hope will be a Sufficient Supply for the Fort and your own occasions for the present shipping. I shall bee glad if in any other service I may appear to bee Your assured friend and Servant, AMBROSE SALISBURY.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goods</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Price Pa.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gunneys</td>
<td>34 Pr.</td>
<td>4750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>60 Pr.</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roapes 16 Cs. Md.</td>
<td>2½ Pr. Md.</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twine &amp; Candy</td>
<td>3½ Pr.</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>200</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pettipole, the 22nd September 1671."

"Mr. Richard Mohur &ca. Council, These are to acquaint you that in 10 days or 12 you may expect 7100 Gunneys, Soe that if the Bantam shipp with you and your occasions require her stay near that time, a day or two presume will not hinder her proceedings, and if the Fort in present want of Packing stuffs, in my Judgement you cannot have a better opportunity to supply them. The remainder, to complete the value of that sum received last from you, will arrive in good time with you, for I hope you will have 5 or 6000 more with you within a month; the rest will follow Soon after. I assure you have used all Dilligence to Comply with your desires. If your Intentions for the Dyeing of the Gingham you mentioned continue, pray procure your Governours Letter to this, that I may have freemade to Employ my Dyers whom I please, for the late Governour was soe abusive that many people have left the Government and the Dyers that are here will compel me to employ them, and forbid my taking any other unless you send the Letter above desired. I have not more but to assure you my ready desires to Comply with any your Commands, which shall upon all occasions endeavour to manifest, as also that I am Your assurde friend to serve you, Ambrose Salusbury."

Pettipole, 24th September 1671."

Mr. Ambrose Salusbury, Sir, Yours of the 22d Came to hand yesterday, wherein we observed the quantity of packing trade already provided, with what now contracted for. The 500 Pagos. already delivered you, wee would have its full value sent from Pettipole to the Fort upon boatens, which wee suppose may be hyred there, which we desire you to doe, and not, to send it heither. Since it will by soe doeing only ad to its charge, which we would avoid whatsoever, therefore pray minde it. 200 Pagos. according to your desire wee now send you to be invested as the former, and sent us heither, but would have the Gunneys to be those of 60 for a Pago. and likewise those for the Fort if possible, but if the other sort of 34 for a Pago, already contracted for and must be received, wee know not how to help it, but must accept them, which wee desire with all speed may by boates be dispatched for the Fort directly from you, and the Gingham, as already advised, to be dyed red, wee shall with what possible speed send you from Madapolam, they being of the same sort wee sent you the last yeare which pray prepare for. Our Governours letter to your Governour shall send you that you may be permitted to make choise of your owne dyers without any molestation. We hope this will be timely to prevent the coming heither of the packing stuff for the Fort, which is the needfull at present from Your Loving friends, Richd. Mohur; Mat. Mainwaring; Geo. Chambrelaine.

As to Gundall Ancatadrees boat of packing trade which you informed us he had bought in the name of the English, at their arrivall we seized upon them, but the Dutch cheife sent to us that they were his and that he had been employed by him, upon which we dismissed them.

Metohlepataam the 25th September 1671."
"Mr. Ambrose Salisbury, Sir, we have now four of yours before us, vizt. the first of the 28 past with two of date the next day, the latter of the 12 present, to all which we shall reply the most needful. The 200 Pagos. sent you we understand you have received, and that you intend the observance of our order in the sending for Madras 500 pagos. worth of packing trade, which we still confirm, but for what part of it you have sent us neither we intend to keep or return you your boate empty. Since we have lately received the Forts General, wherein we find they are not so pressing for that commodity as formerly, and therefore you will have the better leisure to make up on the quantity out of what you since have or shall provide, which, being accomplished, dispatch directly to them, and the overflow to us as soon as conveniently you can. Your account we likewise received. We reiterate our desires concerning those Gunneys of 60 for a pago, that as many of them as you can be sent us, and those of 34 for a pago to the Fort. You have done well in making provisions for dying the 50 ps. of Gingham, which, whilst we were at Madinapollam, used our utmost endeavors to get in a readiness to send you, but the weavers could not so soon provide them. We hope ere this they are upon the way towards you, having given Mr. Field (whome we have appointed there for negotiating our Masters affairs) a strick charge for their speedy dispatch. Your diligence in the things will undoubtedly much commend you to their favours and oblige us to remaine, Your very loving friends, R. Mohun; M. Mainwaring; G. Chamberlaine."

Methlepatam 17th October 1671."

"Mr. Mohun Esq. Council, my last was of the 12th instant, to which have not my reply. You may please to understand that I have contracted and delivered out the value of the 700 Pagos. and there will bee more 37 pagos., as I am advised, due to the Gunney men with Charges, which please to send, some Gunneys being now detained for it. Also, please to remit 75 Pagos. for Boates. I shall have them as cheaper as Customary. Soe soon as the Goods arrived and laden shall send you the account. If you please to supply your present occasions with 2 or 3000 of them Gunneys, shall have sufficient to make up the Fort 500 Pagos. I have given forth money for ashes for the Ginghams, but here is none arrived. I did omit with the Ginghams last yeare to advise you write with them to England, that if they should, when they arrive, bee spotted (as I doe think they may, being not well dyed) that wash them in faire water and the Chay will return & not a spot appears after being well dyed. This is the property of good Chay, which bad will not endure. Desiring your speedy answer and Complianc, I remain, Your assured friend to serve you, Ambrose Salisbury."

Petrolpolae the 19th October, 1671."

"Mr Richard Mohun Esq. Council, Yesterday Morning writt you, and in the Evening received yours of the 17th, wherein you have confirmed your order for sending to Madarass 500 pagos. worth of packing trade, which shall accomplish with what hast may bee, and, since the occasions are not so urgent, you have done well in keeping them sent you. When the above Summ Complleted, the remainder shall bee sent you in that Sort of 60 Per pago, with the account of the whole. My last desired you to send 37 pagos. for said account and 71 Pagos. for Boate Cooly [ hire ], which doubt not of your Complianc. I have, as advised, given out money for Ashes, and yesterday, before yours arrived, Sent money for oyle, and have this Morning delivered money for Pets, the tyme being

3 These letters do not exist.
6 See above.
very short for that worke and the Season is unsfitting, Dry weather being the tymne for Dyeing; but however, my Endeavours shall bee Employed to have them done in tymne. When the Company shall think mee worthy the Service, hope your friendsshipp will bee ready to give it. Your reall friend to serve you, Ambrose Salusbury.

Pettepole, the 20th October, 1671."

Salisbury was, at that time, looking forward to the arrival of the Company's letter in answer to the one in which Agent Langhorne had commended his conduct. On the 23rd October 1671 in a "Generall to Metchlepam" the Council at Fort St. George wrote to Masulipatam; "Pettepole was the only Factory the Company settled under Metchlepam and that order hath never been contradicted, therefore we will continue our former order that what business is transacted there that it be ordered by you, and an account thereof be given to you, and if there may be such Considerable Investments be made there at cheaper Rates then at Metchlepam as Mr. Salisbury formerly advised, there may the next years, if our Masters advise for such Commodities as are there to be had, then be occasion to settle factors there if it be found needfull."

The correspondence between Poddapalle and Masulipatam from the 24th Oct. untill the 26th Nov 1671 is mainly concerned with details about the dyeing of Gingham, the procuring of "packing trade" and Salisbury's difficulties with the sub-governor.

"Mr Richard Mohan & ca. Counsell, This Instant is arrived the 50 Ps. of Gingham you enordered for Dyeing, which shall with all possible speed hasten, therefore intreate you to send effects that tymne may not bee lost. I desired you to send 75 ps. for Boates, but am not yet assured how many Boates they will require, but assure you I will bee as frugall as I can in this and what else you shall Committ to my care. With kinde respects, I remaine, Your friend and Servant, Ambrose Salusbury.

Pettepole the 24th October 1671.

Sirs you may please to send 50 ps., which, if not Sufficient for Boates, shall advise.""

"Mr. Richard Mohan & ca. Counsell, I desired you to send 37 ps. for Gunneys, there being that quantity laden more than I delivered money for, which have returned. I doubt not Compliancy to the full amount of what received. Last night arrived a Boate with the vallue of 200 ps. in packing stuff or neare that amount. The rest will in few dayes bee ready. I alse writ for 75 ps. for account of Boates, but you may please forbear sending untill the Boates Laden and my advice arrive of it, but for Dyeing the Gingham, pray hasten Effects that they may not bee hindred. I remaine, Your assured friend to Command, Ambrose Salusbury.

Pettepole, the 25th October 1671.""

---
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"Mr Ambrose Salisbury, Sir, Wee shall now give answer to both yours of the 20 and 24 instant, received the 25 and 26 following, and to the first take notice of your diligence in your quick provision of the packing trade appointed for the Fort, and of your speedy intentions to dispatch them towards them, and, for the surplusage, to hasten to us as soones as ready in that sort of 60 Gunneys for a pago, wherein you will doe well. The 37 and 55 pags. you desire have sent you, wee have now delivered to two of our house peones with more pags. 59 towards the Charge of the 50 pieces of Ginghams in your last advised us to have received, which we desire you to see that they are well dyed and timely for our shipping. Your frugallity and readiness in the managagement of those our Masters concerns will undoubtedly give them occasion to take notice thereof and oblige us to Continue Your assured frends, RICHARD MOHUN, &c.

Meethiapalam, the 27th October 1671."

"Mr. Richard Mohun &c. Council, I have received yours of the 27th October with the money sent by your Servants, being 200 pags., 37 pa. an account of packing trade my last acquainted you I had returned, but my order came to late, they being on the way before it was received. The 75 pa. for Boates shall deliver soe soone as the Contract made, and when the Goods are laden, shall advise you what agreement made, and sent you the account. I have paid good part of the 88 pa. received toward the Ginghams, which shall take care to have well Dyed and tymely, which doubt not of, the weather being now fittting for that worke, and assure you shall be as frugall as I can. I am obliged to you for your readiness in answering my desires, the money coming very opportunely to pay for a quantity of Chay, which had I must, and if been disappointed of, should have found it difficult to have mett with soe much of the like Goodness. I hope my Endeavours and Complyance with your Commands will bee answerable to your expectations, which if you please to approve, the Honoble Company will accept, for which favour shall acknowledge my selfe, Your obliged friend and Servant, AMBROSE SALUSBURY.

Pettopee, the 1st November, 1671."

"Mr Richard Mohun &c. Council, Since your Peons departure this Morning, a person hath informed the Governour the Garden upon the Island is not the Company's but his owne, upon which I sent a Bill under his hand, received by Mr. Wm. Daniell, in which two Moores are named as witnesses, who deny that they had any knowledge of it. It is the Custome of these People to put the names of absent persons as witnesses. There hath formerly been many disputes in tyme of Sir Edward, who can best informe you of it, as alsoe Mr Fleetwood, if with you. I doe understand the busines in realitty to bee thus. The Persones father whom I have above named, being Servant to Mr Miller who made the Garden or planted it, this person having the manudgment of it at the Charge of his Master after Mr Miller gone, hee pretends the Garden to bee his owne, here being none of the Nation in many years. I have all my tymes kept a Gardener in it to continue the right to the Company, and have had noe discourse of it many years. This Governour being newly come, may thynk to gaine of mee Something, but hee will miss of his expectation, nor doe I thinck the Garden worth a rupee, onely to continue the name of our Nation. The Governour sent word hee would be[er]d a Musket [Mosque] in the Garden to prevent our further Clame to it, and place the man that pretendeth hath right to it to oversee it. I leave it to you to end the dispute with your Governour to whomse this Governour now writeth, and remaine, Your assured friend and Servant AMBROSE SALUSBURY.

Pettopee, the 4th November 1671.

This Bill is indorsed by Mr. Daniell with his name to it.
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Mr. Richard Mohun &ca. Council, I have acquainted you what I conceive needful concerning the Garden,16 which if you please to have the business ended there and confirmed under the hands of the Governor &ca. it will prevent any further demands. Please to send your Governours Letter to the Governor that the Dyeing works &ca. may not be hindered, the Governor being gone you sent a Letter unto from your Governour. Last night hee sent to mee to take some Chay of him for my Dyeing work, but I sent him word that I was furnished, but though I am not fully, yet I will not bring up that custome to buy of a Governour, for it will bee after demanded, as a Custome, and in tyme, may force it upon them that may succeed here, and his Chay is all refuge, the best being Cull'd out and gone, but were it as good and cheape as I buy else where, I will buy none of him, and this I promise, sticks in his stomach and maketh him bee soe busy about the Garden, which doth not concerne him, which I sent him word, but I keepe faire weather with him and purpose to continue it, desiring you to hasten the Letters, which pray lett bee effectuall. I remaine, Your friend and Servant, AMBROSE SALSBURY.

Settepolee, the 4th November 1671."16

"Mr Ambrose Salbury, Sir, Wee have now before us two of yours both bareing date the 4th Currt, by which wee understand your receipt of one from us of the 27th past with the 200 paggs. sent you for the carrying on our Masters affaires appointed by us under your managemt. That you are provided with materials necessary for dyeing the Ginghames wee are pleased, the same that the money sent soe opportunely arrived for its procure. Wee hope their well and timely finishing that they may be here soe early as to take their passage upon our homeward bound shipping, which pray minde, since it concerne you as well as us, and for any further supply, it needful for the carrying on of those concerne of our Masters, advise us and wee shall furnish you. Wee shall not be unmindfulfull to acquaint the Governor the indignity offered to the Honble. Company by a pretender to their Garden with you, and doubts not but to procure this reprehensive Letter to his Sub Governour for permitting and punnishing the imposures with what else requites, wee shall in a few dayes advise you. In the interim, wee remaine, Sir, Your Loveing freinds, RICHARD MOHUN, &ca.

Mettlepatam, the 6th November 1671."

"Mr Richard Mohun &ca. Council, Yours of the 6th present have received and doubt not of a tymely Compliance in what you have Committed to my Ucharge for account of the Honoble Company, the Packing trade being neare done, and the Ginghames will not bee long in hand, but I have not yet the full quantity of Chay they require, and the money received is all disposed on for Chay and other Charges, Therefore, desire you by the Bearer to send the remainder 37 paggs. If the Companies occasions require a quantity of those Goods, and the Chay bought at first hand in the Season when new cometh in, which will bee in January and February, they will finde the Dyeing to come much cheape, but at this tymc good Chay is dificult to procure, being very little remaining now in the hands of persons that will part with it. This is what at present requires from Your assured friend to Command, AMBROSE SALSBURY.

Settepolee, the 10th November, 1671."18

---

16 See the foregoing letter.
17 Factory Records, Mestlupatam, Vol. 5.
"Mr Ambrose Salisbury, Sir. Yours of the 10th we received the last night, and are well satisfied that our Masters Affaires committed to your management are in soe good a forwardness and will, according to expectation, bee in a timely readiness both for the Fort and this place. The 30 pages you desire wee now send you, and for what else necessary for the compleating their business upon advice shall be complied withall, from Sir, Your lovinge friends, RICHARD MOHUN &ca.

Methilepatam, the 14th November 1671."

"Mr Richard Mohun &ca. Counsell, I have received yours of the the 14th with 37 pa. The Ginghames will bee with you in good tyme and the packinge trade is all done. When laden, shall advise you the quantity, and what more is requit for that occasion, which is all the present requires from Your assured friend, AMBROSE SALISBURY.

Pettipoole, the 17th November, 1671."

"Mr Ambrose Salisbury, Sir. The Companys goods contracted for are now most of them brought into the Factory and our present want for imbalancing them is ropes and twine, which wee desire you to dispatch towards us per the first oppertunity of wind and weather, and that you hasten the Ginghames that all may be timely for our expected shipping, which by Gods blessing will not now be long ere doe arrive here. The packinge trade for Madress, if not already sent, wee judge will now doe better to send it directly either for the savinge of charges, which may be done by ladeing it upon the Companys ship from hence either, but let it be made up apart with a distinct account of it sent therewith to Sir, Your lovinge friends, RICHARD MOHUN &ca.

Methilepatam, the 24th November 1671."

"Mr Richard Mohun &ca. Counsell, This instant yours of the 24th received, by which understand your occasions require Ropes and Twine for Imbaling your Goods, which shall speedily bee sent you. The Ginghames will bee finished in 10 days, which suppose will bee tyme enough for the Shipping, but had not I a daily Eye over them, they would not bee done in this short tyme. The Packinge trade, as you enordered, have prepared Boates for, and paid the money received from you in part, therefore cannot now get back, part being Laden and the rest will very speedily, when you shall have account of the whole and what Contract made. This is the newsfull from Your Assured friend, AMBROSE SALISBURY.

Pettipoole, the 28th November 1671."

On the 28th November 1671, Salisbury was re-instated in the Companys service.

"At a Court of Committee holden the 28th day of November 1671: Resolved That upon the good character received of Mr Salisbury of his being reclaimed, the Court consent that he be readmitted into their service and to receive encouragement as he shall deserve."

19 Factory Records, Masulipatam, Vol. 5.
20 Factory Records, Masulipatam, Vol. 5.
21 Court Minutes, Vol. 27, fol. 192.
Extract from a "General Letter to the Agent and Counsell at Fort St George" from the Court of Directors, dated London, 18 December, 1671:

"Wee doe also order that Mr Ambrose Salisbury be againe admitted into our Service and that he receive such incoragament as his abilityes and faithfullnes in our Service shall merritt."

Extract from a "General Letter to the Cheifs and Counsell at Mesulapatam" from the Court of Directors, dated as above:

"Upon creditt of your Recomends, wee have againe entereteyned . . . Mr Ambrose Salisbury."

The news of his rehabilitation did not reach Salisbury until the June of 1672. Meanwhile, he continued to transact the Company's business at Pednapall as before.

"Mr Ambrose Salisbury, Sir, Yours of the 26th present are received yesterday, which advises your receipt of ours of the 24th and that you will, according to our desires, hasten the ropes and twine therein mentioned, and as for the packing trade ordered to be sent to Madras, Since the boat agreed for and the moneys paid in part to them for its transport theither, you must keepe to your contract and dispatch it away as soon as you can. The Ginghams, if here in the time you mention, I hope will be erly enough for the Bay shipping, which wee presume you will not be unmindfull of. Since wee in a very few dayes expect one from thence if not all three, which is all save that we remember us unto you, and remaine Your very loving friends, Richard Mohun, &ca.

Mesulapatam, the 29th November 1671."

"Mr Richard Mohun &c. Counsell, I have received yours of the 29th uesto. In Performance of your order, have sent a boat for Ropes and Twine, but the Governor of Battapeude [?] Bapatla] hath sent mee word that noe boat shall passe untill hee have a piece of good redd Cloth for his Master, Mahmud Cawne [Muhammad Khan]. Therefore, pray, by the bearer, send three yards of the best Broad Cloth of 2 pagos. per yard, and if you please not to allow it, Charge mee with it. This Governoour hath now detained a Boute of Gunneys about Six dayes and demands junca. Since the falling out about the Garden, wee have not had any Message or businesse till now, and hee knowing that I sent you the Engagement, and in all this tyme you not giving any reply, doth encourage him, as well it may to proceed in this manner. Therefore, pray Immedietly send an Effectual order from your Governoour to cause him to Suffer all business to pass freely. The Ginghams are neare done. Had not the Cloudy weather hindred they had been with you now. They will bee with you in good tyme, doubt it not, and the Gunneys &ca. will have dispatch as soon as your Governoours Letter received. With kinde respectes, Remaine, Your reall friend, Ambrose Salisbury.

Petepolee, the 3rd December, 1671."
"Mr Ambrose Salisbury: Sir, Late last night we received yours of the 3 present, which advises that the Governor of Beattaupunde would not permit those boats to pass you intended with ropes and twine for us until you have presented him with a piece of fine Red Cloth 3 yards, of which, as you desire, we now send you, which you may present him, rather then that our business should be impeded, since our Masters goods are now most in the Factory and ready to embale, had we those materials, which we desire you to hasten, since our want presses us to it. To your Governor of Pettipolee, we send you two of this Governors letters, which he hath sent us word are to require and Command him that he peaceably permit you to send us the Company's goods as you shall think most requisite, and that in his assistance he doth further you by boats or what else necessary for your accommodation, and likewise about the Garden, that you continue it undisturbed. Pray hasten the Gingham, for we now every hour expect ship on ships from the Bay. Not having further to enlarge, we remaine, Sir, Your loving freinds, Richard Mohun &c.

Metclepatam, the 8th December 1671."

The Masulipatam Council evidently realized that Salisbury's position at this period was anomalous, and if we can judge from a paragraph in a letter to Fort St. George, were anxious for his re-instatement.

Extract from "Metclepatam Generall to the Fort," 8th December 1671.

"As touching Pettipolee, if a settled Factory there by appointment of the Company, we should then concurr with you in point of provision of pecking materials for your supply, but since they have not, and that we are forced to request Mr Salisbury to doe us that kindness, who either to hath done it for God amercy, although out of there Service, we judge you may better doe it then us being a power above to gratifie him."

(To be continued.)

BOOK-NOTICE.


The present catalogue is a continuation of the volume published by the late Professor Bendall, and Dr. Barnett in the preface informs us that the principles observed are mainly the same in both works. The various works of the Pali Canon have, however, been arranged under the heads of Abhidhamma, Sutta and Vinaya, and the various recensions of Pali and Kaschāyana under the headings Pāṇini and Kaschāyana respectively. This is, of course, a deviation from the strictly alphabetical arrangement, but I think it is a welcome one. The numerous cross-references make it easy to find every book, even to those who do not know that it may belong to one of the above wider groups, and those who know will like to see such books brought together in one place.

The number of books with Burmese titles occurring in this catalogue has made it necessary to give rules for the transliteration of the Burmese alphabet. These have been drawn up in accordance with the actual pronunciation, and, as closely as possible, follow the official transliteration. I have always thought this a very unsatisfactory method. The use of ow to denote an o-sound is not in accordance with the transliteration of other connected alphabets, and the same holds good for the denotation of aspirates. On the whole, the transliteration of Burmese is, from the point of view of philology and bibliography, a very difficult question, and also a very important one. I hope that the system adopted by the British Museum will not become generally used. This is, however, here a minor consideration. The whole catalogue is an admirable work, which will be extremely useful to the student, and the author is to be heartily congratulated on its completion.

Sten Konow.
SOME REMARKS ON THE EXCAVATIONS AT SARNATH CARRIED OUT
IN THE YEAR 1904-5.

BY F. O. GEBEEL.

[This paper was read in the Indian Section of the Fifteenth International Congress of
Orientalists at Copenhagen in August, 1908. The Congress formerly adopted Mr. Gebel's
suggestion, that arrangements should be made to collect and translate all the
Silpaśāstras, dealing with architecture and sculpture, that can be traced. Perhaps some of
our readers may see their way to co-operating in this work. — Editor.]

I must claim your kind indulgence in respect of my paper being somewhat sketchy and
wanting in illustrations, but I had only a few hours yesterday afternoon to prepare it in.
The Annual Report of the Archæological Survey of India for the year 1904-5, with the account
of the excavations carried out by me during that year, has only just appeared, and until it was
published I did not feel justified in making any communication on the subject. The volume
is amongst the books presented to the Congress by Sir Charles Lyall on behalf of the
Secretary of State for India, and I only saw it for the first time yesterday.

The appearance of the volume at this time enables me to give you a brief supplementary
account of the results of my work at Sarnāth. It may not be out of place if I explain how
I, an engineer by profession, came to undertake these excavations. The study of Indian
art and architecture has for many years engaged my attention, and my travels in Burma and
Ceylon have given me a special interest in the Buddhist art and religion. So, when Benares
became my head-quarters, I soon came to occupy myself with the ruins at Sarnāth. My first
work there was to erect a suitable building for the custody of some statues and carved stones,
which had been removed from Queen's College to Sarnāth. Next I prevailed on the local
authorities to construct a good metalled approach-road to the site. And finally, during the
last season I was there, I obtained through Mr. Marshall, the Director-General of Archæology,
the permission of the Government to attempt some excavations. The success attending my
preliminary trials led to a liberal grant from the Government of India, supplemented by one
from the Local Government. There were about two hundred coolies at work for nearly
four months, and the total expenditure incurred by me approximated to £400. The
excavations were started in December, 1904, and brought to a close at the beginning of April,
1905, when I was transferred to Agra. It was a matter of great regret to me that I was
unable to continue the work at Sarnāth, but the exigencies of the Government service did not
permit of it. I am glad, however, to be able to report that the Archæological Survey
Department, under the direction of Mr. Marshall, have since resumed my excavations and are
carrying them on to completion.

Sarnāth lies a few miles to the north of Benares, and is a very ancient site, originally
known as śrīkhapatana, 'the slighting or dwelling-place of sages.' In Buddha's time it was
known as viṣṇupāta, 'the deer-park,' where the Blessed One once gave his life to save that of
a doe with young. For this reason the armorial device of the Sarnāth establishment
contained two deers, which were placed on either side of a wheel, the symbol of the Sacred
Law. This device has been found on many old clay seals and stone images at Sarnāth, and is
used to the present day as the symbol of the Dalai Lama in Tibet. Sarnāth may be looked
upon as the birthplace of Buddhism, for it was here that Buddha commenced "turning the
Wheel of the Law," made his first converts, and established his first community. Its interest
is heightened by its close proximity to Benares, the old sacred city on the Ganges, a city which
must have already taken a leading part in Buddha's time, for, when he had attained to supreme
wisdom under the bodhi-tree at Bōdhi-Gaya, he turned to Benares as the most suitable place for
promulgating his doctrine. The Chinese pilgrim Hiuen Tsang tells us that a column was
erected to mark the spot where Buddha delivered his first address. This column, with
a magnificent lion-capital and a long inscription, I was fortunate enough to discover, and was thus able to add another to the number of the so-called edicts of the great emperor Aśoka. The capital of this column is of the Pseropolitan bell-shaped type, crowned by four lions supporting a stone wheel or Dharmachakra — the symbol of the Law first promulgated at Sārnāth. Mr. Marshall, the well-known head of the Indian Archeological Department, who is a recognised authority on Greek as well as Indian art, speaks of the capital as follows: — "Both bell and lions are in an excellent state of preservation and masterpieces in point of both style and technique — the finest carvings, indeed, that India has yet produced, and unsurpassed, I venture to think, by anything of their kind in the ancient world." 1 Professor Flinders Petrie has drawn my attention to the similarity of the treatment of the hair of the lions to those found at Halicarnassus and now preserved in the British Museum. The edict found in the column sets forth some regulations of monastic discipline, and threatens with expulsion from the community all monks and nuns not following its precepts. The text and rendering have been given by Dr. Vogel and others in various epigraphical journals.2 Among the other inscriptions found by me at Sārnāth are two of Kanishka, whose connection with a place so far east as Benares was, I believe, previously unknown. Two other inscriptions mention an otherwise unknown king Aśvaghōsa. Altogether forty-one inscriptions were discovered by me, ranging from the 3rd century B.C. to the 12th century A.D., and displaying in a continuous series the various changes in the written characters and Prākrit dialects, which should make these inscriptions of special interest to the students of Indian epigraphy. It is probable that this covers the period of the supremacy and decline of Buddhism at Benares, and that the 12th century, with the advent of the Muhammadan invaders, saw the final overthrow of the Buddhist establishment at Sārnāth. Signs are not wanting to show that the overthrow was of a sudden and violent nature; the shattered walls, broken columns, and mutilated images, and the charred roof-timbers and remains of food, testify to this. It is curious to note that at Sārnāth, as elsewhere in India, there are no remains earlier than Aśoka. There can be little doubt that such remains do exist here or elsewhere, and that it only remains to discover them.

Although Sārnāth was probably sacked and burned as earlier as the 12th century, — when its shrines and cloisters were wilfully destroyed, its columns and images were mutilated and overthrown, and its sacred community was dispersed never to assemble again, — much remained to testify its past greatness and to attract the wonder of succeeding generations. We have a record of a visit of the emperor Humayun and his son Akbar to the ruins, in a Persian inscription dated A.D. 1588. This inscription is found in the octagonal tower, which Akbar erected on the Chaukhandi mound, south of Sārnāth, to commemorate the visit of his father, and testifies alike to the liberal views of the great Moghul emperor and to the importance of the ruins in his days. It is sad to think that all this should have now been changed, and that all that made the site of interest should have been removed, leaving nothing but a barren wilderness round the one solid tower, which had resisted all attempts at spoliation. This is how I found the site on arrival at Benares. What it was like before even as late as Cunningham’s time, we can learn from his own words. When speaking of the Mahabodhi temple at Bōdhi-Gayā, he wrote: — "The same countless number of small Stūpas was found by Kittoe and myself around the great Stūpa of Dhamek, Benares. But there were hundreds of thousands of even smaller offerings in the shape of little clay Stūpas, both baked and unbaked, from two or three inches in height, to the size of a walnut. Scores, and sometimes even hundreds, of these miniature Stūpas were found inside the larger Stūpas, enclosing small

1 Annual Report of the Archaeological Survey of India, 1904—5, p. 38. The capital is illustrated in plate XX. of the Report. I give here with another illustration of it from a photograph placed at my disposal by Dr. Holy.

2 I take this opportunity to correct a misprint on p. 70 in my official report. It was Professor Vasis of Benares and not ‘Amin,’ as it is there spelt, who gave the reading in the Bengal Asiatic Society's Journal.
CAPITAL OF THE ASOKA COLUMN AT SARNATH.
clay seals." We cannot but regret that all these multitude of interesting objects should have entirely disappeared. Probably their very abundance was partially the cause of their destruction, as it did not seem necessary to preserve what was so plentiful. As instances of ruthless spoliation, Sherring mentions that "in the erection of one of the bridges over the river Bānā (viz., the stone bridge erected by Jonathan Duncan), forty-eight statues and other sculptured stones were removed from Sārnāth and thrown into the river, to serve as a breakwater to the piers;" and that, "in the erection of the second bridge (locally known as the Iron Bridge) from fifty to sixty cart-loads of stones from the Sārnāth buildings were employed." Cunningham further tells us: — "My excavations at Sārnāth were brought to a close suddenly by my removal to Calcutta. Luckily I had prepared plans of the buildings while the exhumation was going on, for nothing whatever now remains of all my excavations, every stone and every brick having been removed long ago." That I was able to discover as much as I did, was entirely due to the hardness of the soil at the part where I carried on my excavations. It was only after a very long study of the ground that I came to select this spot, as there were few or no indications above ground to guide me.

I have so far only spoken of the inscriptions, as these are our guide to the history of the place, but the detailed lists at the end of my official report show that the yield in sculptures and other antiquities was equally important. I laid bare the remains of a great temple or Vihāra, which once contained a large brāhma image of Buddha "turning the Wheel of the Law" or, in other words, seated in the dharmachakra-mudrā or attitude. Round this temple and the so-called Jagat-Singh Stūpa to the south of it, I uncovered numberless smaller shrines and Stūpas of all sizes, with stone images and carvings scattered about amongst them to the number of 470 separate pieces of sculpture. These are described in my official report, but they admit of a great deal more study in detail. Much information may be gained from them about Buddhist iconography. There is a continuous series of Buddha images from the earliest known examples to the last, beginning with a colossal inscribed image of Kanishka's time, carved at a time when the conventional Buddha type was not yet settled, and representing him as a monk with shaven head and without the ārāma or topknot. This image is of special interest, as it was accompanied by a magnificent stone umbrella, 10 feet in diameter, which the inscription on the post declares to be the gift of the same two donors in the third year of Kanishka's reign. The series continues through the Gupta period, when the Buddha type is seen already fixed, and ends with the latest presentations of Buddha accompanied by numerous Bōdhisatvas and Tārās and other northern female deities with many arms and heads. These sculptures and inscriptions may also be found useful to settle the relative positions of the northern and southern Buddhist churches in Behar. Huen Tsang speaks of 1,500 priests at Sārnāth studying the "Little Vehicle," and makes no mention here of the Northern Church, but, as the sculptures show that the "Greater Vehicle" was also represented at Sārnāth, we may perhaps conclude that its influence arose after Huen Tsang's time.

Another direction in which the recent discoveries should be useful, is in fixing the identity of some of the ruins with the buildings described by Huen Tsang, and in modifying some of our previous views on the subject. The Dharmera tower, for instance, has so far been generally taken for the Stūpa erected by Aśoka. The discovery of the dharmachakra column completely upsets this view, and makes it more likely, that we have to seek the Aśoka Stūpa in the so-called Jagat-Singh Stūpa, not far from the column. If this be so, then the Dharmera tower may perhaps be identified with a Maitreya Stūpa spoken of by Huen Tsang. I have given some reasons in favour of this view, but we must wait the completion of the excavation before we can venture to pronounce a final judgment on this point.

In the meantime, I am glad to be able to announce that all the finds of my excavation, as well as the subsequent ones, are to be kept at Sārnāth, and that a commodious new building is

---

* Cunningham, Mahabodhi, p. 43.  
* Sherring, Sacred City, p. 25.  
* Cunningham, Mahabodhi, p. 45.
now in course of erection, in which they will be housed, and in which some accommodation will also be provided for scholars, who may wish to study the Sārnāth antiquities on the spot.

Before concluding my remarks on Sārnāth, I may mention that there are traces left of the old direct road which used to lead due north from the centre of Benares to Sārnāth and crossed the river Barnā near a spot known as Parānā Pal, or Old Bridge. Near this spot, on the Benares side of the river, is a large ‘Idgāh or Muhammadan place of worship, erected on the site, and with the materials, of some more ancient buildings. On the platform of this ‘Idgāh, facing the kabhah or place of worship, is the stump of a large column, now covered with a copper casing and worshipped by the Hindus as Lāt Bhaīro or ‘the Staff of Bhaīro,’ the hereditary Kāṭwāl or police-officer of Benares. We know, from the accounts of early European residents of Benares, that this stump is the remains of a large and beautiful column which was upset by the Muhammadans in a riot during the ‘Id festivals in the early part of last century. Now, turning to Hiuen Tsang, we find that, just after leaving the city of Benares on his way to Sārnāth, he passed a large Stūpa, with an Aśoka column near it. This makes it probable that the ‘Idgāh just mentioned, was erected on the site of the ancient Stūpa, outside the northern gate of Benares, and that the Lāt Bhaīro is the remains of the Aśoka column mentioned by Hiuen Tsang. If this be so, and I have little doubt on the point, the column probably bears an Aśoka inscription hidden under the platform of the ‘Idgāh which is some 15 feet above the ground around it. It would be interesting, could permission be obtained, to remove some of the pavement of the platform and dig round the stump to verify this conjecture. There is no need for disturbing the column in doing so, and the place could be covered up again after a copy has been made of the inscription, if found there.

In conclusion, I would like to take this opportunity to draw the attention of the Congress to the difficulty experienced in the study of Indian art and architecture, owing to the want of accurate translations of the Silpasāstras dealing with these subjects. Dr. Coomaraswamy, in his forthcoming book on Indian art, is, I understand, giving a translation of a portion of a manuscript from Ceylon dealing with the making of images. This will be interesting in its way, but what we more particularly want is full translations of the Sanskrit works on the subject of architecture, with the rules for the construction of Stūpas, temples, monasteries and other edifices, rules still partially followed by the present-day native builders. That such works exist, not only in India, but also in Ceylon and other countries in the east, is well-known, but, so far, Sanskrit scholars have not cared to take up the subject, probably on account of the difficulty of translating the technical terms. If the Congress agree with me and will give their support to my proposal, something may perhaps be done to supply this defect. Professor Thibaut has already announced that the Calcutta University are going to arrange for the translation of Sanskrit astronomical works. This encourages me to suggest that some other University or public body, should take up the subject of Indian architectural works, and, if possible, depute some young Sanskritist to study the subject in India itself. The only work I know of, which deals at all with the subject, is a book on Hindu architecture by a native of India, Rām Rāz by name, which was printed as long ago as 1830 or thereabouts by the Oriental Translation Fund of the Royal Asiatic Society. This book has proved of some use, and was the source from which, I understand, Ferguson and others derived their technical terms. But it is out of date now, and it would be more satisfactory if we could go direct to the Sanskrit works from which Rām Rāz obtained his information.

[In the Brhat-Saṁhitā of Varāhamihira, chapter 53 deals with the building of houses, chapter 58 with the description and sizes of various kinds of temples, and chapter 59 with the description and measures of images. These chapters, presenting a variety of interesting details, have been translated by Professor Kern in the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, New Series, Vol. 5 (1873), pp. 279-330, 316-30, 323-30. Reference may also be made to the Hindu Law of Endowments, by Sarasvatī, Calcutta: 1897 (Tagore Law Lectures for 1897). This work contains translations from various Sanskrit books regarding the establishment and consecration of temples, the material, sizes, and proportions of images, etc., etc. — Edd.]
ANCIENT HISTORY OF THE NELLORE DISTRICT.

BY V. VENKAYYA, M. A., RAI BAHADUR.

(Continued from p. 201.)

The Early Period.

The inscriptions at Amaravati and Bhaṭṭiprāgl, some of which are as old as the Maurya period, show that the civilizing influence of the emperor Aśoka and of his Buddhist creed extended into the delta of the river Krishnā. Mr. V. A. Smith goes further and declares that the river Northern Pennar may be regarded as the limit of the imperial jurisdiction on the south-east. If this be the case, the northern portion of the modern Nellore district must have come under the influence of the Maurya emperor.

The Andhras who, in later periods, occupied the modern Telugu country, are mentioned already in the Aitīrya-Bṛhadāraṇyaka, where they figure among the progeny of the sage Viśvāmitra condemned to live on the borders of Aryan settlements. The same work gives the names of certain degraded, barbarous tribes, and mentions the Andhras among them. In the Mahābhārata, Sabhādeva, one of the five Pāṇḍavas, is said to have subdued the Andhras along with several other tribes. The Greek ambassador Megasthenes mentions the Andhras, who occupied the deltas of the Godāvari and Krishnā rivers. The Andhra territory included 30 walled towns, besides numerous villages, and their army consisted of 100,000 infantry, 2,000 cavalry, and 1,000 elephants. Their capital at the time was Sākikulam on the lower course of the river Krishnā, about 19 miles west of Maanlipatam. In one of the edicts of Aśoka, the Andhras are mentioned among the tribes resident on the outskirts of Maurya dominions. According to Mr. Smith they were subject to the imperial commands, but enjoyed a considerable degree of autonomy. It may, therefore, be supposed that the modern Nellore district, or at least the northern portion of it, was originally subject to the Andhras and that the latter, also called Sālavāhanas or Sātavāhanas and Andhrabhṛtyas, became subject to the powerful influence of the Mauryas during the time of Aśoka. Soon after the close of Aśoka's reign, the Andhras became independent and expanded so rapidly that in the reign of the second king their dominions extended as far west as Nasik in the Bombay Presidency. The names of several kings of the family are known from the Purāṇas and inscriptions found mostly in Western India. The capital of the dynasty in later times was Dānyaakara or Dharajikara, and the family must have exercised no small influence over the history of the northern portion of the Nellore district.

11 Early History of India, second edition, p. 151. In the first edition, p. 143, Mr. Smith remarked: “On the south-east, the Palar river, the northern frontier of the Tamil race, may be regarded as the limit of the imperial jurisdiction.” In his book entitled Asoka, the Buddhist Emperor of India, p. 70, the same scholar says that the 12th degree of North Latitude would approximately represent the southern boundary of the Maurya empire.
13 Professor Bühler was of opinion that the sage Aśvaghosa, who lived not later than the 3rd century B.C. (Sacred Books of the East, Vol. II, p. xlv), must have been born or naturalized in the Andhra country; ibid., p. xxxvi, and Mr. R. C. Dutt’s Civilization in Ancient India, Vol. I, p. 209.
15 Sir Walter Elliot’s Coins of Southern India, p. 9.
17 Dr. Burgess’ Buddhist Stupas of Amaravati and Jaggayypeta, p. 31.
19 Sālavāhana is another mode of pronouncing the word Sātavāhana; Bombay Gazeteer, Vol. I, Part II, p. 131.
20 Ibid., p. 155.
21 Mr. V. A. Smith’s Early History of India, second edition, p. 195.
22 When the Chinese pilgrim Hsien Tsang visited Southern India, Dhanakaṭaka was the name of the province south of Andhra. How far it extended we do not know at present. Perhaps Dhanakaṭaka and the northern portion of the Nellore district belonged to the Eastern Chaukṣyas of Vēṣiḷī.
The Pallavas.

There is no necessity here to enter into the question of the origin of the Pallavas, Mr. Vincent Smith, who had accepted the identity of the Pallavas with the Pahalvas, Pahavanav or Palhavas, mentioned in the Purāṇas, in the first edition of his Early History of India, discredits it in the second edition. He says that recent research does not support the hypothesis and adds that the Pallavas were probably a tribe, clan or caste, which was formed in the country between the Krishnā and Gōdāvārī rivers.24 There are some difficulties, which I have pointed out elsewhere25 in accepting this theory of the origin of the Pallavas. At any rate, until Mr. Smith’s theory is satisfactorily established,26 we may proceed on the assumption that the Pallavas are identical with the Pahalvas, Pahavanav and Palhavas of the Purāṇas. In A. D. 150 we find a Pahalva named Suvināka as a minister of the Kahaṭrapa king Kradudāman in Kāthiavār.27 Twenty years earlier, the Andhra king Gōtamiputra claims to have destroyed the Palhavas with the Sakas and Yavanas.28 This defeat was probably one of the causes that led them to seek their fortunes further south and east. Their alliance29 with the Kahaṭrapas, who, in spite of an intermarriage, were fighting against the Andhras, might possibly have led to their migration to the east coast. The exact time when they settled in the south is not known. In editing the Koḍamudi plates of Jayavarman, Dr. Hultzsch remarks30: “The alphabet of his inscription shows that he must have lived in the same period as the Pallava prince Sivakandavarman, who issued the Mayidakūla plates. Further, the language and phraseology of the inscription are so similar to the Nasik inscriptions of Gantamputra Satakarni and Vaśishṭhiputra Pajumāyi, that Jayavarman’s date cannot have been very distant from that of these two Andhra kings.” At any rate, we have the Pallava king Vishņugopa settled in Kāśi about the middle of the 4th century A. D.,31 and it is quite reasonable to suppose that the family must have taken possession of Kāśi sometime before the reign of Vishņugopa. It is, however, doubtful if the Sivakandavarman of the Mayidakūla and Hirānājakallī plates was earlier or later than Vishņugopa.32 The former claims to have performed the asamēthō sacrifice,33 which implies that he was a strong and powerful ruler and that he could boast of extensive conquests.34 The facts that his capital was Kāśi and that he had a subordinate at Dhānyakaṇṭaka give us some idea of the extent of his dominions. Vitiya-Skandavarman and his son Vitiya-Buddhavarman of the British Museum plates of Chāndrāvi35 come next. Of Vitiya-Gopa, who was the contemporary of Samudragupta, no records have been so far found.

14 Early History of India, second edition, p. 423.
25 In an article on the Pallavas which will be published in the Director-General’s Annual for 1906-7.
26 Mr. Smith does not seem to be quite convinced of the indigenous origin of the Pallavas. Before putting forward this theory on p. 423, he remarks that no definite answer can be given at present to the question of the origin of the Pallavas. On p. 404 he says that the origin and affinities of the Pallavas remain obscure.
27 Ep. Ind., Vol. VIlth, p. 49.
29 The position occupied by the Pahalva chief is shown by the fact that he had been entrusted with the government of two provinces in the Kahaṭrapa dominions. He was an able administrator, and, in repairing the extensive breaches of the Sudarśana tank, accomplished a task which had been given up as impossible by the other ministers.
30 Ep. Ind., Vol. VI, p. 316. The Andhra dynasty came to a close, at least in the Telugu country, in the 3rd century A. D. (Bombay Gazetteer, Vol. I, p. 169), and as at Jagayyapati there is an inscription of Purushadatta, son of Mālahati, of the family of Ibrahīm, who must have preceded the Pallavas (Dr. Burgess’s Buddhist Stupas of Amravati and Jagayyapati, p. 110 A.), the latter could have become the ruling power in the south only about the end of the 3rd century A. D.
31 Bombay Gazetteer, Vol. I, p. 319. Mr. V. A. Smith remarks: “Samudragupta’s inscription is good evidence to prove that the Pallavas had occupied Kāśi (Conjeeveram) as their capital at least as early as the beginning of the fourth century A. D.” (Early History of India, second edition, p. 425).
32 Dr. Fleet seems to think that Vishņugopa was earlier (Bombay Gazetteer, Vol. I, Part II, p. 319), while Professor Hultzsch appears to believe that Sivakandavarman was earlier.
35 These conquests of his are, however, not mentioned.
The Pallava kings of the Sanskrit charters.

The kings mentioned in the Sanskrit copper-plates are admittedly later, and this is their succession:

- Skandavarman I.
- Viravarman.
- Skandavarman II.
- Yuvamahadeva-Vishnugopa.
- Sinhavarman.

This pedigree is derived from three copper-plates, viz. the Uruppati, the Mângalur, and the Pikira grants, which are all critically edited. The first records the grant by the Yuvamahadeva-Vishnugopa of the village of Uruppati in the Mukharashe to a temple at Kañjukura. The Mukharashe must be identical with the Mukhâ in the mentioned in some of the Nellore inscriptions, while Kañjukura is perhaps identical with the modern Kandukur. The second and third grants belong to the time of Sinhavarman. The former records an order addressed to the villagers of Mângalur in the Vignârashe country, and the latter registers the gift of the village of Pikira in the Mukharashe. The Darsi fragment belongs also to the same family. No inscriptions have been found as far as the first three kings, viz. Skandavarman I, Viravarman and Skandavarman II. The fourth does not appear to have reigned, as he is called Yuvamahadeva in two of the grants, while, in the third, he makes a gift during the reign of Sinhavarman. Of these four charters, two were issued from Daśanapura, one from Palakkada and the fourth from the king's camp pitched at Mînâkatru. Daśanapura seems to have been the capital at the time, while Palakkada was the name of the locality where the Yuvamahadeva-Vishnugopa was residing. The Chandaluru grant of Kunôravishnû II and the Udayandiram grant of Nandivarman have to be assigned to about the same

---

29 Ibid., pp. 154–57.
30 Ibid., pp. 50–53.
32 The temple (śrīnâkara) was built by the general (śrīvâra), Vishnukâla and was called Vishnukâla.
33 The Kadamba king Râvivarman, who may be assigned roughly to the 6th century AD. (Bombay Gazetteer, Vol. I, Part II, p. 291) boasts of having slain Vishnukâla and other kings and of having uprooted Chandralâpa, the lord of Kâla (above, Vol. VI, p. 29 f.). The Vishnukâla slain by the Kadamba king might be either the śrīvâra Vishnukâla or the Yuvamahadeva-Vishnugopa. The family to which Chandralâpa, the lord of Kâla, belonged is not stated.
34 Gapîvaram (N. 19), Koñavâla (N. 31), and Yegîrâ (N. 131) in the Nellore tahâka belonged to Mûndai-âda (N. 83, N. 72, and N. 109 also mention the district.
35 The village of Kandukur is called Skandapura in a Sanskrit inscription (KR. 35). A fragment of an ancient stone inscription of the Eastern Chalukya dynasty has been found at the place (KR. 31 and 32). The other inscriptions of the town are much later.
36 Ep. Ind., Vol. I, p. 297 f. It belongs to the time of the great-grandson of Vîrakoñhavarman whose name must be mentioned in the missing portion of the grant. Vîrakoñhavarman might be identical with the Vîravarman of the foregoing pedigrees. In this case, it is just possible that the Darsi fragment belongs to the reign of Sinhavarman. Vîrakoñhâra is mentioned in the Kâkârâjî plates among the remote ancestors of Nandivarman Pallavamalla (South-Ind. Jour., Vol. II, p. 342).
37 Skandavarman, Vishnugopa and Sinhavarman are mentioned in the Kâkârâjî plates among the remote ancestors of Nandivarman Pallavamalla (South-Ind. Jour., Vol. II, p. 341). Kâlîvarman, Kâpîvaram, Vîra-śrihâ and Vishnusairâja referred to in the same connection probably belonged to about the same period.
38 It is not impossible that Daśanapura was the ancient name of the modern village of Darsi. It is called Darsi (D. 10, D. 12) and Darsi (D. 13) in inscriptions of the 14th century found at the place.
40 Ibid., Vol. III, pp. 142–47.
period.59 Professor Hultsch is of opinion that the former is palaeographically later than the Pikira grant.60 The extent of the Pallava dominions during the period from the 4th to the end of the 6th century A. D. cannot be ascertained. At any rate, they appear to have been in possession of the modern Nellore district or at least a portion of it. In fact, four of the abovementioned Pallava grants are from that district. Kāñchī, which was the capital during the reign of Sivakandavarman and Vishnugōpa, figures as such only in the last two of the abovementioned grants, which are evidently later than the rest.60

(To be continued.)

SOME ANGLO-INDIAN WORTHIES OF THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY.
BY LAVINIA MARY ANSTEY.

NO. III.

AMBROSE SALTER.

(Continued from p. 276.)

From Dec. 1687 until the end of March 1687 the correspondence between Peddapalle and Masulipatam contains bitter complaints by Salisbury of the obstructions he met with from the petty governors in their endeavours to extract or due customs from the English. Salisbury's letters seem to imply that he considered the Council at Masulipatam somewhat lax in that they did not force their governor to give him protection at Peddapalle. At the same time, though he was most insistent about getting the "chyam" into his own hands free of duty, he appeared to be quite indifferent as to the fate of the Company's "Allom." It seems probable, therefore, that the "chyam" was his own private investment, for it is not likely that he would have remained at Peddapalle doing the Company's work and receiving no pay, had he not, in addition, done enough business on his own account to make it worth his while.

59 How they fit in with the pedigree given above is not apparent. Besides, the authenticity of the Udayāndiram grant has been questioned by the late Professor Kielhorn.

A. Chendalūr grant—
  1. Skandavarman.

B. Udayāndiram grant—
  1. Skandavarman I.

  2. Kumāravishnu I.


  4. Kumāravishnu II.

The pedigrees of the Uruvapalli, Miajūpur, and Pikira grants furnished in the text is in accordance with the suggestion made by Professor Hultsch on p. 190 of Ep. Ind., Vol. VIII. The pedigree originally given by Dr. Fleet which we may call C for convenience of reference is as follows:

C—

  1. Skandavarman I.
  2. Vītrāvarman.
  3. Skandavarman II.

  4. Skīnhabarman I.

  5. Vishnugōpa.

  6. Skīnhabarman II.

1 and 2 of B might be identical with 3 and 4 of C. In that case, it may be supposed, tentatively, that Skīnhabarman I. of C had a son called Skandavarman III, and his son would be the Nandivarman of the Udayāndiram grant. As regards A's connection with C is more difficult to imagine. Kumāravishnu I. may possibly be identical with the Uruvapalli-Vishnugōpa (No. 5 of C), who does not appear to have reigned. If we suppose further that, in addition to Skīnhabarman II, he had a son named Buddhavarman, it is possible to connect A also with C.


61 If this is not due to a mere accident, it may be that the Pallavas had to retreat from Chōla and Chera kings or to the domination of one of them. In this case, the Pallavas had probably to confine themselves to the Nellore district or to a portion of it, where the villages granted in two of the copper-plate inscriptions can be traced. Datanpura, Palākkadi, and Mūnumūr have, accordingly, to be looked for in the Telugu country.
"Mr Richard Mahun &c. Counsell, I desired in my last 3 yrs. of red Cloth of two paper yd. The Boate which hath been gone about ten dayes cannot return with Gunney &c. until it arrive, therefore if not sent before this arrive, pray hasten it, and you shall speedily be Supplied with Roapes and Twine. I writ to you of a Boate of Gunney arrived hither which are to bee laden on another Boate to proceed to Madaras, But the Governour will not Suffer them to bee removed or Landed, therefore desired your Governours Letter, which pray hasten and the Cloth that the Boates may proceed, all being ready. The Ginghamsh next weeks [you] shall not fail to receive. Desiring your Speedy Complance, and if you please not to allow the Cloth, Charge mee with it. This, with kinde respects, is the needfull from Your assured friend, AMBROSE SALUSBURY."

Pettepolee, the 8th December, 1671."

"Mr Richard Mohun &c. Counsell, I have deferred answering yours of the 6th, which accompanied the red Cloth, which immediately sent the Governour of Beattapundu, who hath given leave for the Goods, but that your occasion may not bee hindered for want of Roape and Twine, have now sent you 15 Candy of the former and 5 candy of the latter, which will bee there delivered you upon receipt of this, which esteeme better then to stay for some from hence, because they may bee tedious coming to you. The Ginghamsh will bee with you on Tewday. Had not the weather hindered, they should have been with you long Since. The Gunneys &c. will have their dispatch to Madaras very speedily when shall advise you the needfull. In the Interim, remaine Your assured friend, AMBROSE SALUSBURY."

Pettepolee, the 16th December, 1671."

"Mr Richard Mohun &c. Counsell, My last to you was of the 13th instant, which hope you have received with the Roape and Twine therein Mentioned, which hope will bee Sufficient for your present occasions. The Dyers have caused the Breach of my word in the Ginghamsh, which accompany this, and doubt not to your content, and hope they are in good tyme, although not see soon as I expected. Soe soon as the Boates arrived which I writ to you the Governour of Beattapundu had detained, which I expect to Morrow or next day, they shall proceed, all Being ready. By next shall give you account at large. In the Interim, Subscribe, Your assured friend, AMBROSE SALUSBURY.

Pettepolee, the 16th December, 1671.

If the dampness of the Shipp should cause the Ginghamsh to spott (which suppose not, they being well Dyed.) you may please to write with them to wash them in faire water and the spotts will not appear. Otherwise it may bee they may bee esteemed not well Dyed or not know they will endure washing, as our reds will not."

"Mr Richard Mohun &c. Counsell, I here inclose the account which hope will give you satisfaction, Having Easiously Complyance with your order as near as in my power, which hope you will accept. Some of the Gunnea people have failed of Complyance and are now my Debtors that I have been forced to buy of others to make good their defect. The Ginghamsh hope to hear are to your likeing, assure you they are very much Courser then the former that I was fearfull they would not take the Dye. I have not more at present save to assure you that I am Your ready friend and Servant, AMBROSE SALUSBURY.

Pettepolee, the 31st December, 1671."

"Mr Richard Mohun &c. Counsell, I sent you an account which pray returne, the Boatmen having taken out part from one Boate, being over laden. They not willing to venture to Sea, have laded the same upon one that was not fully compleated, and that you may not bee displeased at the Boat hire Charge as formerly advised, although assure you I offered a Due [Din] Boatman 35 and bee would not proceed under 40 pago. I have not more then to assure you that I am Your ready friend and Servant, AMBROSE SALUSBURY.

Pettepolee, the 3rd January, 1671-2."
"Mr Richard Mohun to Counsell, In my last to Mr Mohun sent the acount the Error being rectified, the Baliance is pa. 71: 12: 4 which pray lett bee the Same in your booke. Understanding your Allome remaininge, did Acquaint one or two of the Gunney people, who promised to accept it at ½ sa. less 1 pa. per Mound, which is pa. 10: 6 sa. per Candy 529 is. if I deliver it where they appoint in truck of Packing trade at the price formerly delivered, but them persons are gone some distance hence. However, if you please to accept of the above, then pray with all speed send the Allome, for about this tyme of yeare is brought out of the Country a sort of red Allome which will hinder the Sale of this if not very speedily disposed on. If you send it, I must bee at Charge to convey it unto places convenient, for it will not sell for 12 sa. per Mound in this place, the Custome and Charges here being great. What packing trade in a readiness shall bee sent you, which I heare is to the value of two or three hundred paige, the rest shall bee with you in good tyme. With my service, I rest, Your assured friend, Ambrose Salisbury.

Of noe date [? 23rd February 1671-2]."

"Mr Ambrose Salisbury, Sir, Your Generall to us without date came to hand the 25th Currant and, according as you therein desire, have now laden all your Masters Allom on board of a boate, to which wee shall give the speediest dispatch wee can to Pettipolee that you may there receive it according to your expectation and appointment. The price you have proffered us for it wee are contented to accept, which is 10 Pa. 6 sa. per Candy of 529 pound, only doe expect that wee are at noe further Charge or Risq of it then boate hyre unto you. The invoice of it goeth here inclosed. Its amount wee desire may (as you advise) be as speedy sent us in packing trade as conveniently you can, which is what wee have at present to imparte save to remember us kindly unto you. Wee remaine, Your lovinge freinds, Richard Mohun, &ca.

Pettipolee, the 28th February 1671-2."

"Mr Ambrose Salisbury, Sir, Yesterday came to hand yours of the 10th Currant by which wee observe that you are still obstructed by your Governor aboute landinge and disposinge of the Company's Allom sent you, though had this Governors rucas for its peceable disposure. Inclosed wee now send you another, which even now came to us from him, which wee have perused and judge to be effectuall. Mirabola Bakere [Mir 'Abdullah Bākīr] at present is not in towne but will be here this night, see that to murther you may expect his letter to your Governor though we judge that what now sent will be sufficient to the accomplishment of the premente business, which is the most necessary at present from Sir, Your lovinge freinds, Richard Mohun, &ca.

Pettipolee, the 12th March 1671-2."

"Mr Richard Mohun to Counsell, Yours of the 11th with your Governours rucas received, when Immediately sent it to the Bramany, who still saith he hath not order to lett the Boate goe hence, nor had hee knawse of it, had not your Governor advised and given him order to detaine her, which otherwise hee had not, therefore pleas to hasten an absolute order that the Boate may pass and that I may have freedom to carry the Allom where I please without obstruction. If the Governour send a Nobattee [nambiti, Mal., a trustworthy messenger] will bee more effectuall then his rucas, for hee givinge onely his order to his Bramany who both not write an absolute order. With my Service, I remain, Your assured friend, Ambrose Salisbury.

Pettipolee, the 14th March, 1671-2."

"Mr Richard Mohun to Counsell, When I writ you for the Allom thought your Governour would not have made any denyall of former privilidge, but hees see unreasonable to demand jucan or land the Goods, when, as advised it will not sell for 10 pa. per Candy in seven yeares, nor will any come hither to buy it, the Custom see unreasonable, therefore shall returne it. With my Service remains, Your assured friend to Command, Ambrose Salisbury.

Pettipolee, the [ ? ] March, 1671-2."
Mr. Ambrose Salisbury, Sir, Wee expected that the last Rucca sent your Governor by us from this would have been sufficient for the clearing the Company's Alliance but since yours of the 14th instant wee finde the Contrary. Wee have again sent to this Governor for another Rucca more effectual which he hath now sent, which goeth here inclosed unto you. Our Dubash acquaints us that the Governor was passionately concerned when he heard that his former Ruccas sent were not observed, that if, upon the receipt of this, it was not immediately released he would discharge him from his place and see acquainted your Governor's Brother who was then present. Wee likewise advised him concerning your Chay that there might be no stop, but that you might be free to carry and dispose of it as you should see most Convenient, which he readily consented unto, wherein, if you finde any obstruction, as also in the Alliance, be speedy in your advices, and wee shall endeavours what in us lies, which is at present, save that we remember us heartily unto you, and Remaine, Sir, your real friends, Richard Mohun, &c. 44

Matchlepataam, the 16th March 1671-72."

"Mr. Richard Mohun &c. Council, The Letter you sent with yours of the 16th is of noe value, the Governor denying to lett the Alliance goe. I think I formerly advised if landed here, the buyer must pay 5 pa. juncan per Candy. I formerly landed some here, and it lying two years near upon by the walls, was forced to send it from hence. The juncan where I purpose to send it is about 80 fan. or, at most 1 pa. per Candy, which difference is great. This Bramany Rogues pretending to your Governor hee doth this for his profit see that 50 such Rucces will bee of noe more value then those received and the Boaste must thus remaine. Hee make noe account of Mier Abluba Bakeir Letter, nor will hee lett my Chay goe. Please to send such order that the Alliance and Chay may passe. With my Service, I remaine, Your assured friend and Servant, AMBROSE SALISBURY.

Pettipole, the 19th March, 1671-2.

I suppose your Governor giveth private order not to lett the Goods goe although hee pretended to you fairly but it was false as they are all, if not, the least Rucca this Bramany would not deny to obey." 45

"Mr. Richard Mohun &c. Council, Last night in hast advised you the Bramany continued his resolution to detaine the Alliance and hath the Impudence to say your Governor, his Master is a fool to give his Rucces. I think your Governor useth the Sea Custome and giveth one order to lett the Goods goe, another that it should not, which is most certaine, if not, it would have gone at the first, this fellow not daring to deny his absolute order, but it is like unto that, give Butter, give none. Pray acquaine Mier Abluba Bakeir that his Letter was not regarded by the Bramany and please to desire him to send one that may free my Chay and pray lett the Governors Rucca clare all that I may not give you for him further trouble. Hee may save the Paper hee sends in Rucces for another use And send a Maklarr [mahsidar, revenue officer] to carry the Boastes away, and in future shall not trouble his Government nor myselfe with any more Chay, and what have to doe shall bee out of his power where shall have assistance of the Governor and not the least obstruction. With hearty respects, I remaine, Your assured friend and Servant, AMBROSE SALISBURY. 46

Pettipole, the 22d March, 1671-2."

"Mr. Richard Mohun &c. Council, My last acquainted you the effect your Government Rucces produceth. This Bramany Government saith all the Rucces he hath yet received giveth him order not to suffer the Boaste to goe before junkcan paid. This peone of yours will acquaint you the same, by which you may judge how false your Governor is to pretend one thing and act contrary. The least ruccas if absolute, would be sufficient, but 100 such will availe nothing. Therefore, since hee writeth nobody knoweth what, it were much better hee save his pains and paper and send Nobuttees to carry the Boastes away and pray lett him have the same order for my Chay. The old Bramanys are gone to Golboudah. Had they beene in place, the Boastes would not have beene thus long detained. With kind respects, remaine, Your assured friend and Servant, AMBROSE SALISBURY.

Pettipole, the 22d March, 1671-2."

---

44 Factory Records, Mysilipatam, Vol. 5.
"Mr Richard Mohun &c. Councill, I was in hopes you would have sent one Rocca to have served for all the Boates, but you mention only the Allome. I desire you will please to procure a Rocca for three Boates of Chay and shall not in future trouble you on the like occasion. Had the Bootemen observed my order, the Chay had been landed at Motepalle [Motapalle], which would have prevented the inconvenience. To land the Chay I will not, because in Seven years it will not sell in this place and to pay you cannot an unwilling, having not hitherto, for if now paid, all other Goods must, in the future, doe the Same, which will bee prejudicial to them Which may hereafter reside here. If you cannot prevail with the Governor Mier Abelala Bakeir or Miemeir Sier, at your request will doe it. I shall send you some Gunneys on the Allome account soon enough as my Boates are free. Please to hasten such a Rocca as you now sent, for here was raine last night.

I remaine, Your assured friend and Servant, AMBROSE SALSBURY.

Petepole, the 26th March 1672."

Whether Salisbury's "chay" was ever "cleared" does not appear, for there are no further letters in existence between Pedapalle and Masulipatam until nearly two months later.

It was some time in this year that Thomas Bowrey, captain of a "country" vessel, was entertained by Salisbury at Pedapalle. Bowrey gives the following account of his visit: — "Anno Domini 1672 I stroke downe to Petipole in a Journey I tooke Overland From Fort St Geogr's to Metchlepattam, where I visited and paid my respects to Mr Ambrose Salsbury at his new house he built in a pleasant part of the towne, he being Chief of the Affairs of the Honourable English East India Company here. He treated me and my people very Gent-ly and would not suffer me to depart that night. I condescended to stay all night and take my leave Early in the Morning, but he was as loth to part with me then. I Staid to take a View of the towne and after dinner set forward." Bowrey's reference to his host as "Chief" seems to show that the visit took place after the receipt of the Company's orders for Salisbury's reinstatement.

On the 13th June, 1672, the correspondence between Pedapalle and Masulipatam recommences.

"Mr. Richard Mohun &c. Councill, The packing trade to make good my Contract hath been ready some time, but the Rivers are not yet soe furnished with water but hope will bee speedily when you may expect the full amount to Ballance my account, although were I now to buy the like quantity of Allome, should not give £ a pago. or £ Per Mann. With my respects I rest, Your Reall friend, AMBROSE SALSBURY.

Petepole, the 13th June, 1672.

Pray send the weight of each Caske with the number.

On the 21st June, 1672, the Council at Masulipatam wrote to Salisbury desiring that he would undertake the business of procuring saltpetre for the Company.

"Mr Ambrose Salisbury, Sir, Its our desire that you Speedily advise us what Quantitiye of Peeter you can provide for us in four or five months time at furthest, and the Sorts, wheather double or treble refined, with the respective prizes, for we have occasion either for 30: 40: or 50 tons as you shall be able to procure, which pray acquaint us, wheather you will engage the provision of it, wherein desire you will [be] as Speedy as Conveniently you can, not omitting the full Charge upon it, untill it shall come to be laden on board. We Cannot give you an account of the weight [of the] Caske sent you, since those that Allome Came in were so miserable Shatered and torn that we were forced, at its landing, to shift in other Caske as we could get, which were not

48 Mr Mirhabhr, which would mean the Governor of the City, but probably Mirhabhr, Chief of the Customs, is meant.
50 A Geographical Account of the Countries Round the Bay of Bengal (Hakluyt Society's Publications), Second Series, No. XII., p. 57 f.
weighed. Pray advise the most profitable time in the yeare for making investments in Packing trade, and what you have now by you of that Commodity to compleate the former Account send either as soon as you can. Further we have not to add then that we are, Sir, your very loving friends, Richard Mohun &c.

We shall expect your advises and accordingly returne you answer. 52

Metchlepam, June 21, 1672."

Unfortunately, Salisbury's reply to this letter is much damaged, but his mention of Jearsey and his unwillingness to again undertake the salt-petre investment are evidently connected with his recollection of the disastrous consequences that resulted from his dealings in that commodity prior to 1670. 53

Mr Richard Mohun and Counsell, I had . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 54 Business but Mr Jearsey's . . . . . Investments. God Almighty in his Justice reward him in his due time and way for what I have sustained by his means. I returned two or three times very ill, in danger of my life, from the Peter Countrey and the Company have given me the reward you see, therefore resolve to mede noe more with Peter. The Company want not Servants for their other business, therefore may spare one to two for this if their occasions require it. I sent you a Boate of packing stuff and shall hasten the remainder to Ballance the account. The dry time is the fittest time for provision of that Commodity, it being usually made not in the house, but for price I suppose noe difference in the time, for it will bee difficult to alter the price. They are a very poore People and therefore danger in dealing with them. I remaine, Your assured friend, Ambrose Salisbury. 55

Metchlepam, 24th June 1672:"

Mr Ambrose Salisbury, Sir, Yesterday came to hand yours of the 24 instant in Answer unto ours concerning the provision of Peeter, wherein we finde you all together unwilling to that undertaking so shall [not] further impose it upon you then to desire you will direct us in that affayre how we shall proceed for the Speediest obtaininge that quantiety mentioned by the Agent and Counsell for the Honble. Companies occasions, which we Communicated to our last unto you, wherein we doubt not your speedy complaynce. Your boate of Packing trade not yet arrived, the remainder to Ballance that Account you promise will haysten, which we shall accordingly expect and subscribe, Sir, Your loving friends, Richard Mohun &c. 56

Metchlepam, June 27th 1672:"

However, unwilling as Salisbury was to "meddle" again with "peter" he was afraid to risk the Company's displeasure by an absolute refusal. Therefore, when he received the news of his reinstatement, he wrote in a different strain. At the same time he showed his resentment for the injustice he considered he had suffered. Throughout the whole of his career in India, Salisbury behaved like a petulant child, indulging in occasional outbursts of indignation, with as sudden transition to almost cringing humility.

"Mr Richard Mohun &c. Counsell. Although the many years loss of time in expectation of the Company's implant answerable to the knowledge of the Commerce of the Countrey, and the losses have sustained by leaving my residence to serve them may sufficiently discourage me from taking the trouble of the Peter business, however, since the Company are now pleased to esteem me worthy their Service (although know not what it is) am willing to accomodate their occasions and comply with your desires, which they have not deserved from me, having preferred all strangers, and not taken the least observance of me, saving to dispose me upon the Clandestine reports of them ill minded persons, whom God will, in his due time, reward. I desire you not to lett your
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house Servants know of your want of Peter, for they will lett the Peter men know it, which will cause them to advance the price as they please themselves and the Peter Braminy is much behind and by renting of ten townes, that hee's not to be trusted. Your desire is to receive the Peter free from debts and Charges and to bee at a certainty in the price, which indeed is the onely way for the Companies advantage. The Companies price was old for the Sort double refined besides the debts and the Dutch now give 64 and 7 pages. new for the Peter they receive at Ramapatam [Ramapatnam] and they are at all C[harges] upon it, as Baggs, Cooly and Boates &c. which leave to your Consideration and desire you to advise the price you will give for the double and the [price] for the treble refined to bee delivered in the tyme you name, four or five months, on board Shipp in Metchlapatam or this Roade, and if your price encourage, I will assure you 50 Tonnes, or if your occasions require, 190, but you must bee very Speedy, the quantity requiring time, [and] the more now in the raines. If you please to send 1000 ps. you shall not fail of Packing trade to its full amount, with the Ballance of the Alkon account in good time, I remaine, Your assured friend, AMBROSE SALISBURY. 57

*Pettepolese, the 27th June, 1672.*

In the correspondence following Salisbury's re-appointment as "Cheife" at Peddapalle, the Council at Masulpapatam adopted a different tone. Since Salisbury was no longer an independent person doing their business voluntarily, they affected to be filled with wonder that he should expect a commission on the saltpetre he was to procure, said they would "consider of" his demand for "ditt money," utterly refused to take any extra "packing trade" off his hands, and, in their letter of the 19th Oct. 1672, reproved him for complaining of their tardy replies to his letters. Unfortunately, there is no letter of Salisbury's extant between the 27th June and the 11th December 1672, so that we only have the one point of view during those months.

At the end of October, Salisbury proposed to provide the bags for saltpetre of a different size than formerly and was very aggrieved that his suggestion was not immediately complied with. On the 4th November he received a sharp rebuke for his unreasonableness. But, in spite of their lordly attitude towards the "Cheife" at Peddapalle, the Masulpapatam Council were only too ready to thrust the whole of the "peter business" on his shoulders, as appears by their letters of the 4th and 20th and 30th November 1672. The following correspondence from Masulpapatam continues the story up to that date. Salisbury's replies during this period do not exist.

"Mr. Ambrose Salisbury, Wee have received yours of the 15th Currant To which as soon as receive advises from the Fort (which we expect within a day or two) shall particularly Reply and advise you the needful, till which time you must endeavour to persuade the Peeter men to stay with you. The remainder of the packing trade pray hasten, being our Masters occasions [require] it, which is all at present from, Sir, Your Loving Friends, Richard Mohun &c. 58

*Metchlapatam, July the 18th, 1672.*

"Mr. Ambrose Salisbury, Sir, We have received yours of the 16th Currant and now, having received answere from the Fort, shall advise you the needful. For Peeter twice boyled delivered at the Fort Cleare of all hazard and Charges except bagges, they pay 7 Pages. per Candy, but not questioning but that you can procure that sort much cheaper, we have sent you by the bearers herewith of 500 new pages. with which wee desire you to begin that investment, as also to procure for packing 10000 ps. Gunny, whereof 2000 must be thick and Substantiall, 30 Candy ropes and 6 Candy twine both some what finer then the last, and of Peeter the quantity desired is 100 Candy which must be ready against the returne of the Europe shippes from the Bay. In the provision of both and especially the latter, we must entreat your more then ordinarie Care to prevent bad debts and that in all. Charges you use all frugallity which will be much for your Credit, not ecle but that we are, Your Reall friends, Richard Mohun &c. 59

*Metchlapatam, July the 26th, 1672.*

"Mr Ambrose Salisbury, Our last to you was of the 26th Currant wherein wee advised you the needfull, to which refer you, and then sent you by your and one of the Companys Pees, 500 new Pagos, which wee hope you will have received [ere] this gett [to] your hands, since which we have received yours of the 25th ditto, to which have only to answer to what you say touching of allowing you 7 Pagos per Candy for double refined Peeter which wee admire you should now mention for you know that our masters allow noe advantage to be made of their Immployment (in that nature) into which you are now re-admitted, soe you must act as their Servant. When wee proposed an agreement with you to deliver it Cleare of Charges &c. you were suspended, see at you[r] one Liberty. The Peterman that tells you wee offered him 6 pagos per Candy where its made saies false and designs by it, as wee suppose, to deceive, which is all, Your assured Freinds, Richard Mohun &c.

Metahepatam, July the 27th, 1672."

"Mr Ambrose Salisbury, Wee have received yours of the 3d Currant, and perceive that you have already given out Part of the 500 Pagos sent you for Packing trade, which is well, but to accept of the 1000 Pagos, worth you say you have Contracted for Cannot by any means doe, it being what will be prejudicial to our Honble. Employers to keep 500 Pagos, dead the whole yeare about. The 500 Pagos, you desire for the Peeter goes herewith, and must desire you to be as quick in the provision of it as possible you can, that soe it may be in a Readiness against the returne of the ships from the Bay, and, for the goodnesse, you must take speciall care. For this year you may only send us your accounts as formerly you have done, and for the diett &c. wee shall Consider of it and in the next advise you the needfull. Your loving Freinds, Richard Mohun, &c.

Metahepatam, August the 7th 1672."" 

"Mr Ambrose Salisbury, Wee have received two of yours of the 10th and 12th instant, the first acknowledging the receipt of Pagos. 500 wee sent you for the provision of Peeter and for Packing trade. Neither the Fort nor this place will require more then what already enordered you. We doubt not your promised Care both in the gouneness and prises of what you are to provide with its timely readiness for the Bengal shipping. The broad Cloth you advised for, vizt. 10 yards of fine red and 10 yards ditto Collour ordinary now send you, which wee shall charge you withall, and Remaine, Your very loving Freinds, Richard Mohun, &c.

Metahepatam, August the 15th 1672."" 

"Mr Ambrose Salisbury, Sir, This day wee have received the Fort Generall of date the 10th Currant, wherein the Agent and Councill enorder us to provide more than what we have already given you order for Seaven hundred Candies of the best twice boyled Peeter, if to be had good, Cheaps and seasonable for the returne of their whomward bound shipping, which we desire you with all speed to advise both the Agent and us with the price it will come out at, and to send a master of that you are a providing to the Fort heither, and if you are satisfied you can timely provide so great a quantity and to the Honble, Companys advantage, advise us and we shall send you money accordingly. More wee have not to add, but to desire you will be speedy in your advises as directed. We kindely Salute you, and Remaine, Sir, Your loving Friend, Richard Mohun.

Mr Mainwaring and Mr Chamberlaine being at Madapolam."

Metahepatam, September the 19th, 1672."

"Mr Ambrose Salisbury, Sir, Your Generall to us of the 21th Instant Came to hand the 23d following, wherein you advise the good forwardness the 100 Candy of Peeter formerly Enordered is in, and that both for goodness and price you doubt not but it will answer expectation, which we are very glad to hear, and wish that you could provide the 700 Candys since enordered upon the same good terms, for without it the Honble. Companys Shipping will be in great danger of returning some hundred tons dead Freight, which we desire you to Consider and doe what you can in the
Provision of it and be speedy both in your advisses to them and us what quantity of Cotton you are able to provide, for both it and Peeter must be in a readiness against the returne of the Bay shipping, and for what monies you shall need for provision of both shall, as you advise, be sent you which is needful at present from Sir, Your very loving friend, Richard Mohun.

Mr Mainwaring and Mr Chamberlaine being at Madapollam.  

Metclopatam, September the 20th 1672."

P. S. to the "Generall from Metclopataam to the Fort."

"Mr Salusbury's letter will informe you Concerning his provision of Cotton; your directions to us about it wee shall observe."

7th October 1672.

"Mr Ambrose Salisbury, Sir, Wee shall give answeres to yours of the 3d and 5th Instant taking notice of the Provision of the 100 Candy of Peeter formerly Enourdered you and of its price of 4 Pagos per Candy, which wee Esteeme as well bought, and should be heartily glad that you could, against the returne of the Bay shipping, provide the 700 Candy more so earnestly pressed for by the Agent and Counsell, since otherwise our Houble. Employers shipping wilbe in great danger of returneing with much dead Freight, which we desire you by all endeavours to prevent, since that quantity, if obtainable, would very much helpe out. Cotton is a Commodity not at all desired, but in Case of necessity to fill up, so that if the quantity of Peeter mentioned to be had upon any reasonable terms and good, wee then suppose there wilbe now occasion for the other, or at least a very small quantity. Wee observe that you have lately received Intelligence out of the Peeter Country of 200 Candies there in a readiness more then you have bought, which we wish you to agree for at the Cheapest and best terms you can, and be not wanting in your Care of overlooking it well that it be not mixt with salt or other trash, but that it be Clean and twice boyled and if possible not in any measure adulterated. Its Probable you may, in a short time, have further advisses of more which, if you doe, and that it can be timely ready and so Contracted for as to our Masters advantage, let not slip the opportunity. Pagos, twelve hundred wee now send you, supposing it a sufficient supply for the Present, but as your occasions require, advise us, and you shall accordingly be furnished. Your muster of Peeter sent us wee have this day sent for the Fort and advise them concerning Cotton to which wee expect their answere. More wee have not at present to acquaint you then to wish you all good success in your undertakings and to assure you that wee are, Sir, Your loving and respective Friends, Richard Mohun.

Mr Mainwaring and Mr Chamberlaine at Madapollam.

The Peeter you receve being in a readiness and boates lading, send it us, that all may be timely here against the shipps."

Metclopatam, October the 8th, 1672."

"Mr Ambrose Salisbury, Sir, This day wee received two of yours, both of the 12th Currant the one by wen of your Poons, the other by our Masters, which carried you the twelve hundred Pagos, which wee are glad to here are arrived with you in safety. The two Masters of Nallacundepalum [Nallakandapalem] Peeter wee have likewise received, but such trash as in our lives wee have not scene, judging it to be rather durst and Salt mingled together then Peeter. You mention one of them to be twice boyled, but which it is wee cannot discover, both being so alike and so bad as that wee are of opinion that to meddle with it would be but a Cheat to our Houble. Employers, of which wee must and shall allwayes have a great Care, besides the prime Cost of 5 Pagos, per Candy with Oxe hire at 1l bringing to this place Equals the price of the best Peeter in the Country, in soe much that wee doe not thinkes it fit to Meddle with it, but leave the Provision for the Quantity of Peeter required from us unto your managemnt or as much of it as possible you can to be in a readiness against the Returne of the Bay Shipping, and what you doe
provide, we desire your great care in seeing that it be clean and good and free from any mixture of salt or trash. You advise that the two hundred Candy mentioned in your last letters and which you advised the twelve hundred Pagos to be in readiness, and that you were sending said money into the country to pay for it, which we are glad to hear and that you have since advice of the like quantity but more remote, but had no muster of it. It should be good by the price you mention, being 6\underline{\text{c}} or 7 Pagos per Candy of 520 lb., which is less in weight than you have already bought and much more in price, which we desire you to consider by your endeavoring to augment the one and lessen the other, and to be as speedy in the provision of it as possible you can. The whole quantity desired by the agent and council is Candies 800, of which you advise you have 300 in readiness. What more you can procure, pray do it, for we shall leave it wholly unto you, and now send you, as desired, more Pagos, twelve hundred that money may not be wanting. In one of yours to us, you blame us for not sooner answering your letters and sending you money. Pray compare the dates of yours and ours together and then see whether you have caused to complain, but if the weather be such as to hinder the arrival of our Peons and money with you or your letters with us, we cannot help that. Both your and our letters have been 7 days returning. Part of them not at present to enlarge save to commit you and your affairs to the protection of the Almighty, and remain, Sir, your loving friend, Richard Mohun, &ca. 73

"Methelepatam, October the 19th, 1672."

"Mr Ambrose Salisbury, after dispatch of yours to you yesterday, came to hand yours of the 21st, wherein you continue to encourage us not to doubt your timely compliance in provision of the Peeter, which we are very glad to understand, as also that the rumour of the Kings People being in the Peeter Country has proved false. However, as our last advised you, we immediately upon receipt of yours of the 15th, despatched for Gulondah for the Kings Phirman, which, as soon as come to hand, shall forward to you. The knives and looking glasses you desire we herewith send. We have considered of what you propose as to the contents of the baggs of Peeter, but we judge it most convenient not to alter an old custom when their accresas noe benefitt by an innovation, therefore we would have such as formerly to contain 1 C. [cwt.] and to be put in double. Ginnies of the best procurable, which is the needful at present from Your assured friend, Richard Mohun."

"Mr Mainwaring and Mr Chamberlain at Madapollam. 72

"October the 24th, 1672."

"Mr Ambrose Salisbury, Sir, your of the 26th and 28th October, came to hands yesterday in the evening, and we observe that you do not mean to accept the Peeter as twas, but to have it refined and made fitter for the companies use and that the owner shall do this, and leave it to choice to accept or leave. The proposition being reasonable, we advise you to give him encouragement to go in hand with it, for that you know there is orders for 700 Candy, and you mention but of fine that you are in intention to have, besides the prementioned parcel. You do very well to provide baggs before hand that there may be no loss of time. As soon as the Phirman or [farman] arrives it shall be sent you, though we are glad to hear you hope you shall have little occasion to make use of it, which is so much the better. The agent and council are very desirous to be certainly informed that you can do that they may the better govern themselves. We never heard the Commanders complain of these baggs. If you have, and think it convenient to put more peeter in a bagg then accustumary in these parts, we leave it to you. We desire to advise what quantity of Cotton Yane you can provide at 11 Pagos, the Candy for we detain our advice to the Fort to receive yours. Resting your very loving friend, Matthew Mainwaring, George Chamberlain."

Mr Mohun at Madapollam. 77

"Methelepatam, November the 1st, 1672."
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"Mr Ambrose Salisbury, Sir, Wee are with yours of the 31st past, wherein you seeme dissatisfied that wee should require the Peeter bags to be made of the old demotions, which you cannot in reason blame us for, before you gave us a reason wherefore wee should alter them, since you will perceive wee have let it to you. Wee cannot call to minde that you were taxed by us for any wrong done the Company, Itherefore better you waved your unseasonable expressions as to the vindicating your selfe as if accused for the future. The 1st Instant wee received a Letter from the Agent and Councell wherein they say the cotton yarn may be brought cheaper from Turkey then to buy it here at 11 Pagos. the Candy, Mr. Mohun being absent have detained your case until his returne, who, tis possible, may furnish you, being destitute our selves. Wee remaine Sir, Your very lovinge Friends, Matthew Mainwareing; George Chamberlain.

No date [? 4th November 1672], Masulipatam."

"Mr Ambrose Salisbury, Sir, Wee have received yours of the 12th Instant. It came to hand yesterday in the Evening, when wee Immediately wrote to the Governor, but instead of granting our desires, he returned the Letter sent him without opening. Such is the daily afronts of [the] Capan [capon, ennucho] Governor in Stopping our necessaries and provisions, that we dare not by any means oppose, being the time that he may much prejudice the Company on any the least disgrant. Besides the Companies orders are positive to kepe a faire correspondency with the Moores, see that you must endeavor to manadg your business to the best advantage you can. Here is noe Wine procurable or see Small a quantity of Spice as you mention. Wee remaine, &c., Matt. Mainwareing; Geo. Chamberlain.

Mr Mohun at Madapolam.
November the 4th, 1672."

"Mr Ambrose Salisbury, Sir, Both yours of the 4th November came to hand yesterday, for which wee have waited some daies. You will perceive by our formers that the Governor will not rouchsafe us a reply to any Letter sent him, being greedy of a Piscash [peach] and, his time now short, are in hopes to avoid giving him any, otherwise wee doubt shalbe forced to comply with him for the better carrying on the Companies Affairs. Wee are unaquented with the Peeter man for the 200 Candy course Peeter, which you leave to us to Contract for. Wee desire you to doe it if you can without hindiring your provision of the other 500 Candy, but in case you cannot, then to direct us how we shall come to the knowledge of the Prementioned Party. Though the place where it is, is farther distant from Pettipoles then from hence, conceive it may be done at the same charge and see the same thing to the Honble. Company and more proper to bring all into one Accomp. The Agent and Councell, in a Letter lately received from them, disapprove of Cotton at the price you mention as being to deare. Wee therefore desire you only to send us 5 Candy for Packing immediately and as many Dungarees as you can, of which wee shall want 3000 Patch. Wee send you now on that account 200 pagos. Pray deliver the Madras Peons the musters of Peeter. They call with you to receive them, being the Agents Order. Wee remaine &c., Matt. Mainwareing; George Chamberlain.

Mr Mohun at Madapolam.
November the 7th, 1672."

"Mr Ambrose Salisbury, Sir, Wee have received yours of the 13th Current, whereby wee take notice what you write about the petre, and wish it may prove according to your advice. The musters wee take notice you will also send to the Fort. As to the Peeter you write of on this side the river, wee hope shall have noe occasion to meddle with it, relying upon you for the full quantity desired, and that it be ready in due time, for the provision whereof, if you want any more money, advice, and it shalbe sent you, which being what offers, wee remaine, Sir, Your assured friends, Richard Mohun &c.

November the 29th 1672."

---
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"Mr. Ambrose Salisbury, Sir, We are glad to observe that you are furnished with Oxen and that you are in hopes to have the Peeter in Pettipolee by the 15th next month. Pray hasten as much as you can, and you need not doubt the Agent, as well as our selves, will represent your service home, where you need not question the Honble. Company's good resentment of it to your advantage. The Phirmaund is not yet arrived. As soon as we receive it, it shall be despatched to you. In the Interime we hope you will have no obstruction in the business. If you cannot procure Cotton as well as Dungarees for the 200 Pagos. sent you, pray send the whole amount in Dungarees, for that we daily want to embole the Company's goods. We remaine, Sir, Your very loving freinds, Richard Mohun; Matt. Mainwaring; George Chamberlaine."

Metchlepam the 30th November 1672."

On the 11th December, 1672, Salisbury's letters recommence. If we may judge from his own account, the pebre investment was indeed an arduous task and it is not strange that he was loth to undertake it. His conduct of the affair elicited the praise of Messrs. Mainwaring and Chamberlaine, who, in their letter of 21st December, reminded him of the "credit" which would "redome" to himself "alone." Salisbury's protestations of incorruptibility in his letter of the 26th December seem rather uncalled for and ring somewhat false.

"Mr. Richard Mohun Etc. Counsell, I was in hopes, when I writ the former, to have the Peter at Pettipolee by the 15th this month, but as in my last advised have caused great part to be boiled againe since my being in these parts, that it will bee the latter end of this month before all the Peeter will arrive to Pettipolee. Had not the great Rain put a Stopp to this business a month should have sett forth sooner, and not have doubted to provide 800 Candy, however have made such improvement of this short time that by the blessing of Almighty God hope you will see such effects of my labours that will compleat the 500 Candy. I formerly advised that I had contracted for the first hundred Candy at 5 pago. per Candy and 200 at 5 pago. per Candy, but, since my arrival, finding the Peeter men I made Contract with to have brought up the Peeter at 3 pago. and 3½ and 4 per Candy, I shall use my Endeavors to make an abatement of half pago. per Candy in the 200 Candy when the business is at a period. Should I now compel them to it, they would make Complaints and bribe the Governor and ruin all se in that I must desist till the business be compleat. I hear not of any Phirmaund and the Peter Bramling denieth to send downe the old one, the Peeter at se many places where no small difficulty to content the Government &c., and to bring the Peeter &c. to one place to send a quantite together, your services all disposed on, and I am in want here, there being se many to please that I am forced to give cloth and glasses, and all will not content some ill Conditioned people. And, in the Way to Pettipolee, in some places my letters, the Peeter in others, are forced to pay Juncan, and for the Oxen what it will be I shall when all concluded, give you Account. He assure you in some places I stay not so long as to eate, time being soe short, I have not time to dine but stay from one night to the next. You cannot judge of the trouble of this business. God grant me good success in it that my service may be to the Honble. Company and your good likeings. Dungarees shall hasten per the next Gaffalgh [kasha, caravan]; Cotton dear, therefore buy none at Pettipolee and in the way with what have now ready q.t. 600 Oxen [sic] the rest. Is now arrived News that the Governour of Cundeneere [Cuddalore] hath sent his De-Roy [duraţ, prohibition in the king's name] upon the Peeter, Soc that now if your Governours letter will bee of none effect, the Company will bee Sufferers and that ruined. I have in many Letters desired you to procure a Phirmaund Soc that I hope you will not blame mee. I remaine your assured, Ambrose Salisbury."

"[Goodeaund], the 11th December 1672."

"Mr. Richard Mohun Etc. Counsell, I advised you last night the Kings people have put the De Roy and chop [chāp, a stamp] on the Company's Peeter that is in Gunneys ready to goe hence, and upon all the Peeter not weighed. The Peeter at Pettipolee and on the way, and this in Gunneys
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ready to goe is to the amount of nearest 300 Candy. I fear the Peeter in the way will bee detained which is upwards 80 Candy. I should complete all in 10 daies had not this accident happened and have to the full amount of your mony five hundred Candy, having made the greatest hast possible and used all meanes to accomodate the Honble. Companys occasions. I have writ the Governour of Cundaneere, who hath sent 10 gun men to this place and some horsmen to another, who have put the Chop on the Companys Peeter that if hee obstruct my business the Kings business will receive the greater damage when his occasions require the Service of the English Gunners in Golconda, and that it is an unjust act not done in any Kings Country to make Seizure of goods provided by the Company, and for every Cask hee shall take from mee thus unjustly, the Company will receive a thousand from the King, the Shipping being disappointed of the Commodity, therefore bid him read his Phirmaund with good observation and hee will find hee is only to buy Peeter where Merchants and others have it to Sell, but not to rob the Company or violently to Seize on their goods. I will send you his answer when received, which expect in two daies. I long Since advised you to procure a Phirmaund and acquainted you that I heard the Kings people coming to obstruct the Peeter, therefore cannot justly Impute Per mee in fault. I purpose to take of [I] the chop the Kings people have put on the Gunneys and the Peeter, and will venture a brush with them. Pray give your Speedy answer unto [this]. You cannot but heare the news of Oram Zaaba [Aurangzeb's] Army being neare Golconda and have taken two Castells from the king and are 6 leagues from Golconda. Pray, on sight herof, Send fifty Bundarees and good Peons and I shall not much question to bring away the Peeter. I remaine, Your assured friend, AMBROSE SALSBURY.

Goodepovlee [Gundlapalli] the 12th December, 1672." 10

"Mr Richard Mohun Etc., This instant have notice that two of the Peeter men have bin with the Governour of Cundaneere and have bribed the Governour &c. to send Peons to obstruct my business under pretence of the Kings Phirmaund. They are the most notorious Rouges under the Sun. They now pretend their price formerly was 5 pagos. old per Candy. I have their bill for one hundred Candy, being the first which you desired. Herewith send you their Receipt for fourle hundred Pagos. The rest I promised them, if good Peeter, ½ pago. more per Candy, which being foure and ½ pago. per Candy which they were content with, but give them 10 Pago. per Candy they will not bee content. I have had Peeter detained and obstructed from being waiged this 10 daies by the meanes of these villains, which if they had not done, the full 300 Candy had bin at Pettipollee. I must end as I can with them. I bought 21 Candy at 8 pagos. 2 ½a. which they had not any right unto, but now they will pretend it to belong to them. Pray send at sight 30 or 40 good Bundarees or 50 and I hope to secure them Rouges. I have sent for one hundred and twelve Candy of that Peeter I advised you were farr hence and have agreed at 5 Pago. to receive it 10 Miles from hence but its not arrived. God send me good success. I shall not undertake this trouble and danger for all the Honble. Companys Estate. Pray send two dozen large knives and six penknives and detain not the Peons. However I have bought you 150 Pagos. of Dungarees at 7 patch and 50 pagos. at 5 patch per Pago. which might have bin at Pettipollee had not them Rouges obstructed. They shall accompany the first Peeter. I remaine, Your assured friend, AMBROSE SALSBURY. 31

Goodepolldoe, [Gundlapalli] the 14th December, 1672."

"Mr Richard Mohun Etc., Councell, I have in three [letters] advised you of the obstruction the Peeter men have made, and of my writing to Cundeneer Governour, from whom have received Answer and order for to free the Peeter although order from Golconda for Peeter. I sent him 3 guz. of cloth and the Mazendar [mahaśīrī, revenue supervisor]. Two Peeter men and one of my Peons are run away that I fear some loss, although I have given them all the Encouragement possible but all will not prevaile with them to be honest in their dealing. You may forbare giving your selves the trouble of sending Bundarees or Peons, for I hope speedily to end, and if occasion require, an Eminent Governour whom have had acquaintance with at my first being in these parts has promised as many Peons as desire to assist. Pray hasten my Peon,
being in want, and send a dozen large knives and Six penknives. I am sending part of the Dungarees with Peter from hence. The rest with my selfe will accompany the last Peter speedily. I shall now only stay for Peter I formerly advised at so great distance having sent many [*] and contracted to receive it not far from this place. Time is now short, hope for a happy conclude. My Endeavors have not bin wanting which I hope will be acceptable. I remaine, Your assured Friend, AMBROSE SALSBURY.  

Goedepell Bro, the 15th December 1672."

"Mr Ambrose Salisbury, Both yours of the 28th past and 12 instant are come to hand, the former two days past, the latter to day. Wee are glad to read in them you have and shall be able to Provide the whole quantity of Peter already received money for, But will not be ready soe sone as otherways it might have Beene had not the Kings people obstruted you. Wee wish it lay in our power to helpe, Mr Molun having wrote to obtaine a Phirmandal, which it seems yet is not procured. Such things you know by your experience are not easily obtained from the Moors empty handed, and now to send you 50 Rashboats [rajpats] would prove to little purpose, in regard there is hardly any Petty Governour But is able to Raise 3 times the quantity and will doe it on this occasion in Behalf of their King, Besides the Company's order Not to make any Breach or difference With the Moors if otherwise to be avoided, which wee would rather advice you to compose it by a small Piscash [pesahzah, present]; though wee cannot pay Junean, a Custome soe considerable, that after once paid they will expect that wee should see continue for the further [*future]. Thereby will accrue a great disadvantage and strainer to our Honourable employers. Wee commend you and their affairs to Gods Protection, Remaining, Your Loving Friends, MATT. MAINWARING; GEORGE CHAMBLERLAIN.

P. S.—Wee have sent to you a dozen silver hafted knives which Wee hope will Please the people you are to Present. Just now come to hands yours of the 11th Instant. This Governour endeavors the Company's prejudice as much as [in] him lies in this place, from who wee cannot expect noe assistance. Wee heare he is upon the Journey to Gokonah, otherwise wee must be forced to Piscash him. Being noe other remedy for it."

Mitchlepom the 16th December 1672."

"Mr Richard Molun, [g]sir. Sirs, since our last we have received advice from Mr. Salisbury that the Kings people put their cap upon the Salt pester and doubts this hinderance will occasion that the Phirmandal was not procured, which hee sayed would have prevented all this. Wee yesterday wrote to the Governour the Report of whose flight and Masters death proved only a fiction, he remaining some foure leagues hence, to desire him to write to the Petty Governours not to obstruct the Company's Business under Mr Salisbury's manager smoothing him up with faire words to keepe in hopes, Not promised him any thing. Wee hope will take effect. The Merchants cloth comes now in from the washers and hath done for these two or three days . . . . . . . [Signed] M. MAINWARING; O. CHAMBLERLAIN.

Mitchlepom the 17th December 1672."

"Mr Ambrose Salisbury, This instant came to hand yours of the 24th. Wee are very sensible of the trouble you undergo in having to doe with such pittfull Merchants these Salt Peeter Men commonly prove. However, wee hope and question not But your experience will furnish you with such means as may prevent there evil intentions as this appears to be when they deny their own hand, which we return you herewith againe, to be a testimony against them. Wee partake in trouble with you, for this Governour obstructs this what hee canne in the Company's Business, here. His assistance wee cannot expect for your helpe, to whom else we are to seeke addresses to forward this years Business, the time Being noe Neere at hand for the approach of the Companies ships, which wee now dayly expect. This Governour hath forwarned our hired Servants longer to us. More wee cannot purchase upon any terms to ayd you. We intrepte you to make what hast you canne with the dungarees, having most occasion of them of any thing. Wee Remaine, Sir, Your Loving Freinds, MATT. MAINWARING; GEORGE CHAMBLERLAIN."
"Mr Ambrose Salisbury, Yours of the 15 instant came to hand yesterday in the Evening. You did very well in presenting the Govr. of Cundanare [Cuddalore] after his reception and performance of his kinlesse may oblige him to the continuance of the same for your future occasions, which we hope may not find that obstruction another year. As we observe, notwithstanding it hath this, you conquered at last and brought to perfection, the credit of which will redound to your credit alone. Your endeavours being applied, we question not but you will prevent loss likely to be sustained by those Peeter Men that are Runne away. Wee have already sent you a dozen silver hafted knives, which you had not receiv'd at your writing of this. Wee hope they will supply the want of the two dozen large and peaknkes which are not on Enquiry upon any tarks procurable in Towne. [Signed] M. MAINWARING & ca.99

Metchilapatam (21) Decr. 1672."

"Mr Richard Mohun Etc. Council, Your of the 21th last night came to hand. The Peeter men that are run away made stop of the Peeter againe about 3 leagues hence and beat the poor Ox people and carried them to the Castle of Cundanare and put stop on my Peeter, which hath caused my writing to the Governour againe that admired a Person of his quality and place should countenance and encourage such men in their abuses, and desired him to consider the injustice and how much it would bee to his dishonor to regard the false reports of those men whom all the country know to bee false cheating Knares. The Muzendar did take the Cloth sent the Governour and the Governour sent mee word that I formerly gave the Governour 6 Guzz of Scarlett and 3 mounds of Sandell wood (which was by Mr Johnsons advice, being the first Journey upon this occasion), and that bee, being in the same place, and not at all inferior to the other Governour, expected the same, that I have promised him, if hee give mee a pean or two to pass the Peeter, that when finished shall return them Peons with the Cloth desired; but that have not Sandall nor is any procurable that I know of. Had not the Peeter men obstructed the 300 Canly, or as much as it now holdeth out, had bin att Pettipole by the 15th and I expected by the 20th to have bin at home. The Peeter men promised mee a pago-per Candy to accept such stuff as the Bramiysis prorvided, but have not hitherto, nor shall I ever desire to chance a penny by this or any other unjust means. I advised you the 60 denied Candy as reported to bee, which sett 3 peons to cause its boylng night and day will not now bee fifty Candy. I bought 21 Candy at 8 pago. 2 an. per Candy, but they saying that they gave earnest for it and being short of their debts must give them I fear five pagos. at the conclude for the 200 Candy as formerly advised. God grant it come forth at the price as I hope it will. My Ox people are run away and I am forced to hire others, time being soe larre spent. The 21 Candy and about 20 more is bad Peeter, but haveing Oxen ready and the Peeter men in debt must accept that or loose the money. The rest of the Peeter is excellent good. The Peeter writ you a great distance from hence have sent money for near 150 Candy, two Parcells arrived, have given order for what remaines, but the way being Woods and Hills I was not willing to send the money at once but 3 times. I must desire you to send 6 Guzz. or yards of Scarlett against my return home for the Cundanare Governour. Here [are] soe many Governours, Nauges [Naguk, chief], Bramiysis &ca. to please you cannot judge of the trouble. I purpose to send Cundanare Governour and Mon[unders] 8 of your knives and the Chefe Nauges one. The rest will to day to and to morrow bee disposed on, for I purpose to returme to make ready the Peeter arrived and leave my Servants to accompany what remaining, I remaine,

Your assured Friend. AMBROSE SALISBURY.100

December 26th 1672."

"Mr Ambrose Salisbury, Esteemed Friend, Since our last are arrived here all the Honorable Companies six ships. Having composed the difference with the Moors we hope we shall end our Business here in three or foure days. Wee intreate you to make all imaginable hast in the dispatch of the Peeter hither that soe they may not be detained for want of that Remaining. Your assured Friends, Matt. MAINWARING; GEORGE CHAMBERLAIN.101

Metchilapatam the 31 December 1672."

(To be continued.)
MOHIYE KI HAB, OR BAR.  

BY H. A. ROSE. 

The Chronicle of Rájá Mohl Parkash, Ruler of Náhan (Sirmur) State. 

This poem is in Keonthali, the dialect of Keonthal, but many forms appear to be used in the poem, which are not given in the Grammars of Keonthali by the Revd. T. Grahame Bailey, C.M.S., now under publication by the Royal Asiatic Society.

Text. 

1 Sat kañwar Rájá Náhítí re, sáño mán-go ráj; 
Máñgarho re nege mat lañ kamá;3 —
“Ure ão, kañworo, ráj lenk-le.”6

Sát Ráje re kañwar Máñgarho-khe čewa,4 
5 Páñj kañwar nego bert de pâe.7

Do kañwar Ráje re bháigyro ãé.8 
Bháir Chand čewá Kálas, Akal Btr čewá Pálásí.
Máñgarhó do nege; pber mat kamá; —

“Jigrù chaundhrí, áwe Kálas jî; 11 
10 Bháir Chando12 kañwaro13 leáve bulâe; 
Bolo “ráññt chhutí parjá, suhág jánà chañrâwe.”12 

Jigrù chaundhrí rohá Kálas jâe; 14 
Bháir Chando kañwaré râkhá neshñá lâe; —

“Jigrù chaundhrí, rohá kant jogá áwe?”15

Translation. 

1 Seven sons had the Rájá of Náhan, and each of them coveted the throne, 
But the negi of Máñgarh cunningly schemed (to invite the princes, saying: —) 
“Come hither, O princes, and assume the crown.” 
So all the seven princes came to Máñgarh, 
Where five of them were cast into prison by the negi.

10 (But) two of them escaped. 
And fetch Bháir Chand kañwar hither; 
Tell him that the people grieve like a widow without her lord and that he should make himself master of the State.” 
So Jigrù chaundhrí went to Kálas, 
And Bháir Chand began to enquire (saying): —

“O Jigrù chaundhrí, why hast thou come here?”

1 The râg of this song is Brindâbhâni Shrâng. 
2 Náhaní re, pl. of ‘Náhan.’ This form in -í appears to be rare. Sát, seren, is here declined, but -ó for the plural is not found elsewhere. Mán-go, the -ó in the present emphatic tense appears to be confined to Eastern Keonthali. 
3 Máñgarho, the regular formative of nouns ending in a consonant. Negi, the regular agent-form of nouns in -í. Mat lañ kamá; “mat,” from Sanskrit mánt = wisdom; “laf,” from the root lañ = to take, past tense feminine gender; “kamá,” from kamāñá = to gain; kamá lañ lañ = gained. Idiomatically the whole phrase means wisely resolved or made a wise plan. 
4 Mán-go is in Náhan territory. 
5 Bhé, acc. and dative (regular). Êce (past tense pl.) from ëddáhù, to go (not used in compounds). 
6 Bertí de, dâ (declined) is the locative = ‘put in fetters’— (de = in, pl. of dâ = in). 
7 Bháigyro ãé, bháigyro ãé, compound verb, meaning having escaped; from bháig = ‘to run or escape,’ ãé from ãand = to come (past tense plural).
8 Ráj lañ lañ = ‘you may take the throne’ (imperative). 
9 Kálas lies between Dehrá Dún and Náhan. 
10 Pálásí: also near Kálas. 
11 Añe Kálas jâe = ‘having gone to Kálas, you may come back.’ 
12 Bháir Chando kañwaro, -ó, -ó, declined forms in the oblique case. 
13 Suhág jánà chañrâwe: ‘he should become our ruler or king.’ 
14 Rohá Kálas jâe; ‘arrived in Kálas.’ 
15 Rohá neshñá lâe; ‘began to inquire.’ 
16 Rohá kmi jogá ãé = Of. lines 31: ‘why have you come?’
“Mangarho re negle rākha17 Nahtāi-khe bulāwe.
Kānti chhūt raht parjā, suhāg ānā chaṟāwe.”

Bhārī Chand kaḵwar rohā Nahtāt āwe;
Guhā chhṛt Gāṅgā rā de18 kaḵwaro-khe gāḍi,

Sejī19 khabar hot Stāhi re Koṭe19,

20 Stāhi Koṭere20 Thākure mat lei kamāšt, Pāle Pālāntō loī ghart ro khāt : 23
Kimā kāṭā bāro rā, chaure rā pājā.

“Jāt ūla Nahtāt khe,24 pāchht Āwaṅā Rājā.” 24
Stāhi Koṭe re Thākura rī hot Nahtāt khe25 tayār;
25 Sone rī bijaurt la26 peḵo dī26 bānī ;28
Hāthe27 lat āṅgū27 hor kāno pāndē27 lewā.27
Stāhi Koṭe rā Thākur Nahtāt khe ānā.
Nahtāt re changāno dī28 sabbā Rāje rī baštīt:
Stāhi Koṭe re thākure Rājā loā juhārt.29

30 Sone rī bijaurt bhe to rī nuārt,30
Bhārī Chand kaḵware21 Stāhi neshnā lāyā:

“Stāhi Koṭe re Thākurā, kant jogā āyā?”

When the news of his (accession) reached Sidhā, (the Thākur) of Koṭ,20

20 Sidhā, the Thākur of Koṭ, made a plot.
(He pretended that) the Pālāṅt tribes23 beyond the river had harassed him,
And had cut down the mulberry tree in the enclosure, as well as the pājā tree (the padma-kāṅha) in his court-yard.
(And said he) : “I must make a trip to Nāhan and petition the Rājā.”
So Sidhā, Thākur of Koṭ, made ready to go to Nāhan.

25 Into his waist-band he put a citron fruit made of gold,
And in his hand he took a stick, and over his shoulder (he threw) a shawl.
Thus Sidhā, the Thākur of Koṭ, reached Nāhan.
The Rājā’s court was being held in the court-yard at Nāhan.
Sidhā, the Thākur of Koṭ, did obeisance to the Rājā,

30 And presented his gold citron.
Bhārī Chand kaḵware questioned Sidhā (saying): —

“Sidhā, Thākur of Koṭ, why hast thou come hither?”

———

17 Rākha : kept.
18 Dej : gave (feminine gender, its nom. pāṭḍ being fem.)
19 Sejī : that (in fem. gen., the word khabar being fem.), in Pālāṅt : Koṭe in Koṭ.
20 Koṭ, the capital of Rāteh territory, whereof Sidhā was Thākur.
21 Koṭe-re, regular gen. of Koṭ. Cf. Māṅgarho in line 2.
22 Lāṭ, Pārā, beyond the river. Pālāṅt, the name of a Katchewan sept : loī, am ; ghart, having manufactured ; re kāṭā, eaten ; ē., I am greatly harassed by the Pālāṅts beyond the river.
23 Pālāṅt : the name of a clan of Kanses.
24 Jāt āṅgū : the name of a clan of Kanses.
25 Nahtāt khe : to Nāhan.
26 Pāchht āṅgū Rājā : I have to ask the Rājā.
28 Changāno dī : on the polo-ground (fem. to agree with sabbā).
29 Loā juhārt : offered his humble respects.
30 Neḵo rī nuārt : gave, as a present.

21 Kaḵware : agent case.
36 "Boi, Sidhā ñhākurā, kiyā auñski tāñkhe?
Balsaño re Palañüh āu gharñ ro khāe.
Kimā kāta bārō rā, chaure rā pājā?
Āwighā āuñ ārj khe; śhikh lāt de Rājā.
Khōt shiro dī pārgt pichhārñ ro lāt,
40 Bhāri Chand kashwar loā ñhākur samijhāī?
"Kī, Sidhā ñhākurā, ānāh naññū thweñ?
Teri majad, Sidhā, āpī pūrñī mūweñ.
Sathī lejā majad, hor dārū lejā golt."
Sidhā Kōt rā ñhākur tabe araj karta;
45 "Chālo Rājā Sāhibā, ṛñēñ pahāro khe jāī?
Chāndī seenā lyāūn meñ, khalī ḍā ḍāshāī.
Bhāri Chand kāññwaro rī tabe hoī tayārt.
Navā Rājā hoā Nahiñ, hor kar śaṅñī narjī.
Rājte Gulerīe rākhi arjī lāt:
50 "Śuñgo, Rājā Sāhibā, Rāññ rā jīñā:
Lāgē hundē śṭre, khoñā nahiñ Jungo rā Rāññ.
"Rānte Gulerīe, teri holt kante ḍāth?
Chāññī seenā lyāwaññ pahāro rā, khalī ḍā ḍāshāī.
Rājī tinñe Nahiñī re, loe kāgat likhāī.

Sidhā, the ñhākur of Koñ, began to weep (and said):
"No one helps me, O Rājā, when I am in trouble." (Said the Rājā:) —
35 "Speak, Sidhā ñhākur, what is thy trouble?"
(And he answered:) —
"The Palāñū clan of Balsañ have greatly harassed me;
They have cut down the mulberry tree in my enclosure, and the pādī in my court-yard.
I have come with this petition: be pleased to do me justice, Rājā."
The Rājā unwound his turban for a moment, and then put it on again,
40 While Bhāri Chand kashwar consolèd the ñhākur (saying): —
"Sidhā ñhākur, do not be afraid:
I myself will give thes all my aid, Sidhā.
Take men with thee. Take too powder and ball.
Then Sidhā ñhākur of Koñ besought him (saying): —
45 "Rājā Sāhib, let us go to the hills.
We will bring back silver and gold, packed in skins."
Then Bhāri Chand kashwar made ready.

A new Rājā having been installed at Nāhān, some one else had to be harassed. 145
But the Golerī 43 Rānī besought them (saying): —
50 "Rājā Sāhib, hearken to thy queen’s advice:
We are friendly with the Rāññ of Koonthāññ 44 and should not attack him.” (But the Rājā said): —
"O Rāññ of Goler, where are thy wits?
We will bring from the hills silver and gold,
packed in skins.”
So the Rājā of Nāhān bade that a letter be written.

22 Āuñski tāñkhe: in time of trouble.
28 Āpī porñī mūneñ: I myself will fulfill.
31 Ānāh naññū thweñ: give me much trouble.
32 Lāgē hundē śṭre: to shed tears.
34 Thāñeñ: to thes (tajhā = tāñhē).
35 Balsaño re Palañüh: the Palañūs of Balsañ. Loā gharñ ro khāe: give me much trouble.
37 Āwighā āuñ: I have come. arjī khe mārñī khe: for a request. Śhikh lāt de Rāññ: O king, instruct them, l.s.
38 be pleased to punish them.
39 Loā ñhākur samijhāī: began to console the ñhākur.
40 Āpī pūrñī mūneñ: I myself will fulfill.
41 Ānāh naññū thweñ: give me much trouble.
41 Āpī pūrñī mūneñ: I myself will fulfill.
42 Gor: a State in the Kāññā District. Mōhā Parkhāññ was son-in-law to the Rājā of Goler.
44 Lāññ, Jungk, which is the name of the capital of Koonthāññ, as well as the name of the Deota, who lives at
Pujāññīl village near Jungk.
55. He wrote a letter to the Raja of Guler and sent it to him.

55. He asked the Raja of Guler to march with them into the hills.

55. Throughout all Sirmur went the Raja’s order.

55. That the young men of Sirmur should come (to Nahan) and pay their dues.

55. The Raja of Guler also came and reached the palace at Nahan.

60. All the youth of Sirmur came, bringing in the revenue,

60. And the Raja’s levies reached the polo-ground at Nahan.

60. Eighteen kharis of powder were packed and thirteen barrels of ball.

60. On the polo-ground at Nahan the kettle-drum resounded.

60. Thus marched the warlike Raja against Keonthal:

65. Foremost went the spearmen, with flags on their spears:

65. After them came the barho’s litters:

65. After them the Raja’s horsemen:

65. And after them the elephants with their howdas.

65. On the polo-ground at Nahan resounded the kardal.

70. As the army climbed the hills, every ridge grew white (with the uniforms).

70. The Raja’s camp reached Gujar village (and his order came):

70. “Servants, don your clothes as well as your armour.

70. To-day the Raja’s order is to march to Mohipur.”

70. The Raja’s camp reached Mohipur field,

70. And there at the field of Mohipur they resolved.

70. That as a new Raja had been crowned at Nahan, his name should be solemnly chosen.

70. So learned paroids came and made their calculations.

46 Bhaddon, past tense: ‘called or invited.’ From shadd: to call.

46. Char-fod, past tenses: ‘invaded.’

47 Bare, past tense of barda: to proceed (in the plural).

47. Bajjit, present of bajvary, to sound; in the feminine: ‘are sounded.’

47. A hill musical instrument made of brass.

48 Borno, imperative of borno: to wear or put on.

49 Paidi, imperative of paadwa: to wear or put on.

50 Mohipur, also in Sirmur. Not only did the new Rk’s assume the suffix ‘Parkah,’ which distinguishes the Rikas of Sirmur, but he also took a new name selected in a auspicious manner. For the suffix Parkah, see ante, Vol. xxxiv., p. 271.
Seven days they spent in divination, but found no auspicious name for him.

Then the cowherds of Mohtpur begged (that they might select a name saying):

(They were told) they would get a village in free-grant and also a robe of honour, And their arms would be loaded with silver bracelets and their ears with gold earrings. (So they answered): "The name of the Raja of Mohtpur must be Moh Parkash;" And in return they got their village free of revenue and their robes of honour,

And their arms were loaded with silver bracelets and their ears with gold earrings.

(Then came the order):—

"Servants, don your clothes as well as your armour,

The Raja's order to-day is to march to Bichar."55

The Raja's camp reached the garden at Bichar,
And in the market-place of Bichar his tent was pitched.

Geja, the bandī, was fined one thousand seven hundred rupees:
He held the free market of the Deshū-dhār (the ridge above Phēgū).

"Servants, pack your baggage, and don your armour,
For to-day the Raja's order is to march to Kargāṇū."56

So the Raja's camp reached the Kargāṇū plain,

And on the plain of Kargāṇū the Raja's horses were exercised,
And by exercising the Raja's horses the dust was made to fly,
And the people of (pargamū) Ayelū came to offer greeting to the Raja.
There the Raja seated himself in his tent and bade them
Bring a sheet of paper, a pen and ink.

54 To kāmā kyā del?: then what will be given to us?
55 Bichar: also in Sirmūr.
56 Deshū: was fined. 57 Bāndhā, imperative of bāndhū: to bind or fold up.
58 Kargāṇū: a large village in Sirmūr on the bank of the Giri river.
59 Baikhi: is sitting. Tabe hukmo ārā: then gives orders.
60 Āyan, imperative of āya: to bring.
100 Bané tes Baghátro khe, likhi-denf do bátó.
Shirt náwán likho kágto, hor rám-rám salámo.
Dúj likhólikhó, harli pyúult ghareho.
Páro majat mere desho ri, ná to phékúmán desho.
Sáthí le’awaŋl majato, áp têuáŋ têuén.

105 Bánó shiro de kágto, jawaŋá awaŋá jao.”
Bánó págó de kágato, kar-lal salámoñ.
“Chákro rā nokro rā, ye Rájā ji kámeh.”
Ráje re rigrá rahe, jawaŋe jál.
Ráje Baghátro rā rahî sabáh béthi.

105 (And he bade that) they should write of two matters to the Ráñá of Baghát.62
On the paper was written the address, and after that his greeting to the Ráñá,
With green and yellow lines drawn on it (and he wrote):
“Come to my kingdom’s aid, lest I lay waste your lands.
Bring with you reinforcements, and come yourself also.”

105 (And he bade his messengers) “tie this letter in your turbans and go and come back quickly.”
They tied the paper in their turbans, and did him obeisance,
(Saying): “it is the duty of thy servants and attendants to do the Rájá’s bidding.”
So the Rájá’s messengers went their way.
The court of the Ráñá of Baghát was in session.

110 The messengers of Móbí Parkash saluted the Ráñá,
And the Ráñá of Baghát asked what had brought them thither.
(Saying): “O messengers from Náhan, for what purpose have you come?
Tell me truly, messengers, what order is there for me?”
They replied: “By word of mouth, my Lord, we know nothing, ‘tis all in the paper.”

115 And they took out the letter from (one of) their turbans, and laid it before him.
Then the Ráñá of Baghát read the letter.

First he read the address on the letter, and then the greeting.
Then he read the lines, the green and yellow lines:
“Furnish aid to my kingdom, lest I lay waste your lands.
Bring with you reinforcements, and come yourself also.”

In all the land (of Baghát) it was known that there was to be a levy.
All the youth of Baghát were summoned to the levy.

61 Likhi-denf: should be written (in the fem.).
62 Baghát: the State in which Sólan lies.
63 Likhó, imperative of likhou: to write.
64 Loá jahár: past tense of jahár-lánda: to offer salutation.
65 Rohe káni joga duc: what have you come for?
66 Sach bolo: speak truly (imperative of sóli: to speak).
67 Ékkáhátro dhar: presented (past of rakhá: to keep).
Sāthī leāyā majato, sāthī āyā āpe.
Rānā poīchā Baghāṭrū rā Kargāṅū rī sert.

125 Kargāṅū dī sert de phūl phūlo tilo.
Mohīye rī Baghāṭrū rī ho Kargāṅu-e melo.
Rāje re tāmbū dī bājo¹⁰ chāādī rī ghāṅčī.
Kāu mūl Kargāṅū deh Rāge rā bāṅčī.⁷¹
Simlā dittā⁷² Baghāṭrū khe, Kahāūrie khe Sabāthū.

130 Koṭī ditt Bāshērē khe, Rājā rākha ghāṅū.
Rāje Gulerie khe dittī Nāgāne rā kilā;
Thākūr Kumhārsainī khe dittī Baghāh hor Bharaulī:
Sīthīe Thākūro khe dittī Jāl hor Karaulī.
"Eehī jāṅā, Siṅhā, soī Jāī rī,

135 Deshū-ḍhārō khe jāīde, kharacho khe hālt!"
Āt pālgī Mohīyo rī Shargāon rī bāḥī:
Chell rī taṁ Ṽuṭī⁸⁰ Ḍabī rī hāṭūt.
Naṅaṅa re Kāṅgūwo mat laī kamāī,
Chālāṅo dā pōrī chāer lādo chhērāt.

140 Naṅaṅa re Kāṅgūwo likhto talāko:—
"Jāmā holā rāṅīe, to chhūṅwe Simle re dhāṅko."
Balārā phūṅī ghāṅā,⁸² Bachīrā rā kharā lāṅā
dhūṅān;
Jāṅūnā āṅ ni, Bachīrā jīlāṅā kī mūwāṅ.
Āt pālgī Rāje rī Hāṅāṅo rī bāṅe:

(The Rānā) brought his reinforcements, and he came himself also.
The Rānā of Baghāṭ reached the plain of Kargāṅū.
In the plain of Kargāṅū the sesamum flowers were in bloom.
Mohī (Parkāsh) and (the Rānā of) Baghāṭ met in Kargāṅū.
In the Rājā’s tent rang a silver bell.
Below Kāṭū³ (a village) in Kargāṅū, they divided the Rānā (of Keonthāl’s) kingdom.
Simlā was assigned to Baghāṭ and Subāthū to Kahūrī.

130 Koṭī⁷⁴ was given to Bāshāh, whose Rājā had remained at home.
The fort of Nāgān⁷⁵ was awarded to the Rājā of Goler,
To the Thākūr of Kumhārsainī was allotted BaghārŽ⁷⁶ and Bharaulī.⁷⁶
To Siṅhā, Thākūr of Koṭī, fell Jāl and Karaulī.⁷⁷
(And to him said the Rājā): “Right thro’ Jāl, Siṅhā, you will pass

135 On your way to Deshū dhār:⁷⁹ it will pay your travelling charges!”
The palaquin of Mohī Parkāsh came by the path of Shargāo.⁷⁷
For breakfast they plundered the bazar of Ḍabū.
The Qānūng of Nāṅu⁸¹ steadily resolved beyond the ridge of Chāṅīrā⁸¹ to raise his levies.

140 The Qānūng of Nāṅu wrote ironically (to the Rājā of Nāhān):—
“If you were born of a ṣīṅat, you will attack the Simla slopes.”
Balārā³³ was burnt to ashes; thro’ Bachīrā’s⁸⁶ house blew the smoke.
It was not known whether Bachīrā was alive or dead.
The Rājā’s palaquin reached Hāṅāṅ forest:

¹⁰ Bājo : is sounded. From bējā : to sound.
¹² Dittā : past tense of deṣā : to give, masculine (feminine, dittī ).
⁷³ Koṭī : the name of a village about three miles from Juṅgā, said to be the old capital of Keonthāl.
⁷⁴ Nāgān : situated near the Ghūṅē State.
⁷⁷ Jāl and Karaulī : two parganas of Keonthāl.
⁷⁸ Shargāon and Ḍābū : both in Keonthāl territory.
⁸⁰ Luṭū : to be plundered. ( fem. agreeing with hāṭī).
⁸¹ Phūṅi ghāṅā : was burnt, or has been burnt.
⁸² Balārā : in Keonthāl.
⁸³ Qānūng of Nāṅu : both in Keonthāl.
⁸⁴ Bachīrā was a man’s name.
145 Pithāt làgt go Hābāge re, māwū ryo jyo gaqo;
Āyā jērā Rāje rā Pajhote rī Shīlī;
Pajhote rē Pajhotre mat lāt kamanː —
"Rājā āyā Mohiyā, chhandi kante rākhūn?"

Baro būche ĵērā Rāje kha, piplī khe
tamākhū.
150 Āyā Rāje rā ĵērā Bālg re bāge,
Hāsū Pāndže rī Bāmīle mat lāt kaman.
Loṭā bharī le dūdho rā, Rāje bheiḍā āī.
Dudd kāle Bāmīle Kāmdhenū rā lālī.
Phūlt karī phūrlū, phūle karī āīū.
155 "Hāmeī chāle Deshū-dhāro, tū khōli āyī bālī."
He Rājā āyā Mohiyā, innā bai nā bōla."
Kāmdhenu āī ghīchhā, parī rē nā hołe.
Chaukhaṇke pyōkā mero, Rājāː kīndā roā
chālī?
"Jāt āwānā, Bāmīle, Junū go rī Koṭī."

160 Jethe lāl-bāhā rā bhalāk khatī, hor jau rū
rōī,
Deshū-dhāro dī karpī, baqē rī thaloṅī.
Dērā karpī Deshū, hor judh lāṅā Koṭī.
"Jā shūne, Rājā, Bāman rā jānā,  
Ayke Kōṃštalo khe, pair nāhiṅ pāṅā,
165 Dewḷī tete, jāṅge jē, āyā terā kālo!"

145 To the forest of Hābinū came the army like
a swarm of bees.
The Rāj's camp reached Shīlī, (a village)
in (pargōsa) Pajhōṭ.
The people of Pajhōṭ made a shrewd resolve:
They said to one another: "The Rājā
Mohl (Parkish) has come, what reception
shall we give him?"
They presented provisions to the Rājā, with
red pepper and tobacco.
150 The Rājā's camp reached the garden of
Bālg."
The wife of Hāsū Pāṇḍā, the Brāhmaṇ,
made a shrewd resolve.
She brought a jugful of milk when she
came to visit the Rājā,
She, the Brāhmaṇ, brought milk of the
black cow Kāmdhenu."
The flowers were blooming and the potatoes
were in blossom.
155 "We are marching on Deshū-dhār and you
come without your nose-ring," (said the
Rājā to the Brāhmaṇ).
She replied: "O Rājā Mohl, say not so! Kāmdhenu's milk and curds you will not
find in any of your subjects' houses.
My parents live in Chauchanko village —
whether are you going?"
(The Rājā answered): "O Brāhmaṇ, I am
on my way to Koṭī Junū."
160 Where the red pot-herb is eaten with barley
bread,
I shall build me a dwelling-house in the
Deshū-dhār.
I shall halt on Deshū, and shall conquer
Koṭī.
(He said:) "If you hearken, Rājā, to
a Brāhmaṇ's words,
You will not turn your steps towards the
Kōṃštāl of to-day,
165 If you will go there, know that your hour
is come!

82 Hābinū: a ridge in Kōṃštāl.
83 Bālg: in Ratāsh territory.
84 Kāmdhenu: the mythical cow, which never bears a calf, yet always gives milk.
85 To pay a visit without a nose-ring is a bad omen.
86 Kindā roā chālī?: where are you going to?
87 Junū: the name of a deity, who lives in Pajhōṭi village, near the palace at Junū.
88 Kālo: is eaten.
Būrā bairī tetiyā, Guṭhāṇo rā Ḍūmō
Chhūrie bādhakā57 ghore re shūmo.
Deo būrā59 Jungā, Rāṇā Nūp Saino rā tapo,
Deṣū-dhār rī Kālā. Mūn-wēn pagrā japo; 60

170 Būre bairī; Rāṇe re Haṃumānie clele.
Deṣūho rī dhārc dī már gupti dele.100
Jē shūche mere, Sāhībhā, Bāmaṇtī rā jāgu,
Bādu iā dūn sanāngō, haṭi Naḥtī jāgu,
Lāge būde sātre, ukhō khoŋgh Rāṇā.”

175 “Hāsū Pāṇje rie, Bāmōle, thagyft ho ki ū?
Khāis ḍiyān”) jīto Keoṃthalo rī māṣ.
Ghore pyāwā, Bāmaṇtē, Raṭhmū rā pālī.
Garh Karṇā Tārabe, jo uṇdā dīsino Kūshālā
Dehī ṣwāṅtē, Bāmaṇtē, Nūp Saino Rāṇā.”

180 Jāṇt bolī Keoṃthalā, bāchchhā rī Dīlī!
“Brāg chāro jethi bākē, dūdē chhālo64 billī.
Je āwelā ḍittī rō,6 shīre pāgrī pāmīti65.
Je āwelā hāllo, to gale ghaṅgi pāmīti.”

185 Sainō rī sert āpā Rāje rā tāmbū.
Sārā hālī guwā66 Keoṃthalā, ḍō rā jya lāmbū.
Gūri rowā meghūlā, jhunī roio kohēto.

Your enemies are very fierce there, and Dūm, the god of Guṭhāṅa,
Will hack off with knives your horses’ hoofs.
The deo, the warrior Jungā, Rāṇā Nūp Sain’s star,
Kālā devī of Deṣū-dhār (— all will be against you.” She added: —) I tell you clearly,

170 Fierce are your enemies: for the Rāṇā’s subjects are devotees of Haṃumān.
On the Deṣū-dhār they will slay you secretly.
If, my Lord, you listen to me, a Brahmani,
I will adorn your wrists with a pair of gold bracelets — and to Nāhan you will return.
Being on cousinly terms with the Rāṇā, you must not attack him.”

175 (The Rājā replied): “O Brahmani, wife of Hāsū Paṇḍā, art thou sane or mad?
By dint of sword shall I conquer the land of Keoṃthal.
I will make my horses drink, Brahmani, the cool water of Raṭhmū.
I will build a fort on Tārā Hīl,67 so that I may look down on Kushālā.
I will come, Brahmani, when I have seen Rāṇā Nūp Sain.”

180 As if, so to speak, Keoṃthal were like imperial Delhi!
“(In Keoṃthal) the panther grazes goats, and cats churn cream.
If you return victorious, I will bind a turban on your head.
But if you come back in defeat, I will tie my petticoat round your neck.”

185 The Rājā’s camp reached the plain of Sainj.
On the plain of Sainj68 was pitched the Rājā’s tent.
All the land of Keoṃthal shook like potato-stalks.
The roar of the guns was like thunder, and their smoke like mist.
Sainjo re garhe parā Rāje rā meço.

Andro dā bahro dā dhúnwān rā laṅt.

190 Pāṇī rā jyā jhārṇā, rot chhuṭt chhuṭt.\(^{10}\)

Dhyāre jōnt chauṭhe, garh govā chhūt.\(^{11}\)

Sainjo rā Hāmiyā mantri\(^{14}\) Kamālā :—

"Gheri ghāllā\(^{16}\) bairie, porā bhāgt ro jāmā."

190 Like a stream of water, their\(^{9}\) tears rolled down.

Sainjo rt lāṅt bāte hāṅḍ de sūl.\(^{10}\)

On the fourth day the fort capitulated.

190 Pāṇī rā jyā jhārṇā, rot chhuṭt chhuṭt.\(^{10}\)

Said Hāmiyā,\(^{12}\) (Thākur) of Sainj, to Kamālā his minister\(^{13}\) :—

"The enemy has surrounded us, and we must make good our escape."

She was given barley mash to eat.

195 Ghuṭo khe de-ghāllā\(^{17}\) sau rā jartā,

"Tayā dowā,\(^{18}\) chākro, bege lāṅgā miḥā."

195 She was given barley mash to eat.

Sidhi Koṭo re Ṭhākṛre, lāṅ rāṅko boi :—

"Ṭu budāwe thā, Hāmiyā, Sainjo rā Rāṅā;

Bharie dharātie, pāṅkti ro āṅa."

195 She was given barley mash to eat.

Sidhi, Thākur of Koṭ, said sarcastically :—

"Thō wæst cælā, Hāmiyā, Rāṅā of Sainj;

Yet at midnight thou hast been caught and brought hither.

200 Dekhe bhāle ni, Hāmiyā, bāre Rāje re chāṣe :

Phūkht ghāli teri Sainjo, chhīnchhīr re jye nāše.

200 Thou didst not know the power of the great Rāja, Hāmiyā.

Teri Sainjo re pāṭher ṭele keh nā ṭāpe."\(^{19}\)

Thy Sainj has been burnt, like chhīnchhīr straw.

Hādt lāṅ Sidhi Ṭhākur, śapāne jye dhabe :—

"Phūkht ghāli ter Sainj, abe ubhe chiplū\(^{20}\) kabe?"

205 "Dekhi bhālin’t tūwe ni Nup Saino re chāṣe.

205 (Hāmiyā replied) :— "Thou hast not yet seen the might of (Rāṅā) Nūp Sain.

Chiplū pāṁō\(^{21}\) Sainjo, tere Koṭo re nāše.

I shall be able to re-build Sainj, when thy Koṭ is in ruins.

Rāṅā ṭwāne de\(^{22}\) Deshūc, Koṭ jāḷā ḍhāli.

Let but the Rāṅā come to Deshu, and thy Koṭ will be burnt.

Khanāl lāṃō\(^{23}\) jhoṭo dī, lāṃō Girī khe rāṭī.

205 (Hāmiyā replied) :— "Thou hast not yet seen the might of (Rāṅā) Nūp Sain.

It will be demolished from its foundations and cast into the Girī river."

1 I. e., the garrison of the fort.
2 Chhuṭt, chhuṭt; doubled for emphasis.
3 Garh govā chhūt, the fort was taken. From chhīṭi-jāṣd; to be taken.
4 Hāmiyā: the then Thākur of Theog.
5 Mantri, a Pahari term for wāṭr or chief minister.
6 Gheri-ghāllā: am surrounded. From gheri-ghāllā: to be surrounded.
7 De-ghāllā: was given. From de-ghāllā: to give away.
8 Dowā: give; imperative of deṣa: to give.
9 Nā-ṭāpe: did not suffice. From nāṭāpe: to suffice.
10 Chiplū: will erect. From chhipū: to erect or to build.
11 Chhoṭi pāṁō: will be able to build. (First person singular.)
12 Rāṅā āwāne de: let the Rāṅā come. From āwāne de: to let (him) come.
13 Khanāl lāṃō: I will cause to dig.
SOME ANGLO-INDIAN WORTHIES OF THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY.

No. III.

AMBROSE SALISBURY.

BY LAVINIA MARY ANSTY.

(Concluded from p. 298.)

In January 1673 there was much correspondence about the obstructions met with in sending off the saltpetre. The iniquities of the "Peeter men" and the connivance of the governor were the chief subjects of complaint. The want of appreciation of his efforts still rankled with Salisbury and resulted in his outbursts of the 14th and 15th January. On the 20th he apologised for his hasty words and resumed his usual humble attitude. The Masulipatam Council graciously accepted the apology and added a gentle ad\'monition.

Extract from "Metchlepam General to the Fort. Mr. Salisbury hath found many obstructions in this Imploy for the provision of Peeter. Ho gives us hopes to expect fire hundred Candys. When it will arrive is uncertain, having received none from him since the copy of this now sent, though we have writ severall to him and advised of the shipp's arrivall and the prejudice that may insue (sic) to the Honble Company by their detention. 2 January, 1672-3."

"Mr Richard Mohun Etca. Frinde, I now send you two boats of Peeter with what Dungarees arrived, which my Servant had sent you many daies since, had not your difference with your Governour prevented, which am glad to hear composed. I received 3 boats of my owne for this Occasion, and the Governour hath in my absence sent one of them to Metchlepam. In my Judgment it would bee more convenient and less chargeable to load the Peeter in this Bay. To send it to you will bee tedious and much more charge. The Peeter had bin with you long since had not the Peeter man obstructed, but now the Ox people being returned, it will bee I suppose 10 daies before all will arrive, about which time, if a Ship arrive here, all hast possible shall bee made in it. If you pleas to delayne the Ship for your occasions, shall advise when the Peeter is arrived and ready. I remain Your assured friend, AMBROSE SALISBURY.

Petipole, January 8th, 1672-3."

"Mr Richard Mohun Etca. Counsell, My last acquainted you 600 bags of Peeter with 779 Patch of Dungarees sent on two boats, have orderd to board the first English Shipp, therefore, you may please to order the Shipp that is to receive them. I am now sending 580 bags of Peeter, which is all at present arrived, hope the remainder with your Dungarees will speedily be here having sent severall to hasten. Had not the Peeter man obstructed, you would have had timely Compliancy. My Endeavors I hoped would have found better Success. Soe soon as other Peeter arriveth, shall immediately advise you and hasten it all that I am able. I remain, Your Freind, AMBROSE SALISBURY.

Petipole, January the 10th 1672-3."

"Mr Ambrose Salisbury, Youngs of the 10th. Current have received and are very sorry to hear you meete with such obstructions in your Businesse, however came seke noe Remedy. The Shippes Being all dispatched and under saile this morning, therefore desire you will please to hire what Boates may Be sufficient, and send away the Peter you have in readiness to the Fort with all Expedition possible. Your two boats we hear are arrived to New [?Dis.] Point, where we have ordered the shippes to take in the Peter. M. MAINWARING; GEO. CHAMBERLAINE."

Metelepam, 14th January 1672-3."

Mr. Richard Mohun Estra Council, Esteemed friends, I have sent you on towe boates 1050 bags of Peeter and dayly expect Peeter to make up three hundred Candy, which is all will arrive for this occasion. I write you for fifty pagos. for Charges but since a Peeter brought mee 24 pagos. which I sent for Peeter. I find you are angry. If not, you would give some friendly answer to the many Letters writ you. In my Judgement it appeared something unfriendli that after I have past soe much danger and Trouble and endeavored my utmost in the Peeter; to meet with such acceptance will discourage mee for the future from being the least concerned in Sale Peeter. Had you sent the

I desired of you I am very confident I had prevented obstructions the Peeter men have made, but you writ the fifty Peons not able to resist the smallest Towns, but it was your misapprehension, for I well know many of those towns will, upon a just occasion, oppose 1000 of the best men you can procure, but very few [of] them will engage in a quarrel for the Peeter men, who are known Rogues all the country over. They have spent 100 pagos. in Peons and brodes and now fall out and quarrel with themselves about each present proportion. If you speedily procure Mahmud Mynus [Muhammad Amin] Letter to the Governor of Cundeesare to deliver up the Peeter men who have thus abused the Company may freely implore whom they please, and the Bawmcorrell Nawges [bānagar Naik's] shall not oppose or obstruct. When the Letter arriveth if you please to send mee 40 of your Bandarees [banjāras, carriers], I will make a Journey for the Peeter remaining in severall places. If you shall not speedily procure the above Letter and send mee the help of your Servants, I doe hereby declare what damage the Honorable Company shall sustaine will bee required at your hands and not from Your Assured Freind, AMBROSE SALUSBURY.⁶

Pettipole, January 14th, 1672-3.⁷

"Mr. Richard Mohun Estra Council, Esteemed Freinds, This morning I received the Inclosed receipt for 600 bags of Peeter and the Boatmen informed mee the Ships were under Sail, 450 bags advised you sent on two boates. I thought it would have bin noe way prejudicial to the Honble, Company for a Ship to have taken the Peeter on bord in the Rode, but you have not thought fitting to give any kind of answer to any of the Letters have writ you since my returne. I advised you the Peeter remaining at severall places, and sent you a Letter of the Chief Peeter man, who said the King should detain it for the Kings use. It will bee a great dishonour and loss to the Honble Company to have the Peeter and Cloth remaine where it now is, which leave to your Consideration. However you are displeas'd with mee, I assure you my Endeavors have not bin wanting, and had not the Peeter men obstructed, I should have complied with time, but since my trouble and paine to noe effect I presume I shall bee esteemed an unprofitable Servant, therefore shall speedily discharge the Honble Company of the expenses I am now att for servants, and see soon as I have received the accounts shall send them you. The Honble Company have lost considerable Summes by this Peeter business, and if the same persons employed, the loss will be greater, for they take protection and will never comply with Contract, therefore desire to be noe more concerned in it. The Peeter Brammoney hath bin the occasion of these obstructions. I am now sending your Gunnees to the Fort. I remaine, Your Assured Freind, AMBROSE SALUSBURY.

Pettipole, January 15th, 1672-3.⁷

[Enclosed in the letter of the 15th January, 1672-3.]

"Herein send you the Peeter mens Engagement given at my coming away to pass the Peeter, but soo soon as I was come away they againe put Chop on the Peeter and abused my Servants. The Chief of [the] Peeter men received 500 pagos. old of Mr Johnson or 1000 pagos. old, and

⁶ The bānagar are people who have the right to make fireworks for temples and nobles, and would want the Peeter.


immediately takes the Protection, which caused Mr Johnson to make a journey, but returned without satisfaction. Your lawas [kāsū, clerk, as learnt from Tamil lips] will inform you. My Servants are all coming away and leave the Peeter to the Peeter men, see that you do so well to write speedily to Golcoudah and procure Mahmud Mynas letter if you cannot procure a Phirmand, if both, it will be much to the Company's honor. The Company were much better send Effects to the Day to provide Peeter sufficient for their occasion. I have very certain advice your Brammoneys Kinsmen, the Peeter Brammoneys hath advised the Peeter men to ruin my business that I may bee out of the Company's favor, and that you may give him the Employment, but if ever I light on him I am resolved to make an Example of him. Whether I ever meddle with the Peeter employment or not I value not a rush, nor had I now but that I hoped to doe the Company good Service, which I had, if the Brammone had not prevented, but if I can light on him, he shall repent and pay dearly for this action. The Brammoneys sent to mee twoe Letters to send him money, being in want, but I excused sending till my business was compleated."9

"Mr Richard Mohun Etca. Counsell, Esteemed Freinds, Yours of the 14th this night received. I have at large advised you of the unjust actions of the Peeter men, and it will bee needless to trouble you more with them. The Brammoneys Mr Jearsey employed hath advised the Peeter [men] to act what they have done, hoping thereby I shall bee out of the Company's favor and againe [in] the Agent and your displeasure, by which means hee is in Expectation of the employment. I shall, in few days, send you attestation from several Eminent Persons that the Brammyn and Peeter men have consulted to ruine my business. The Peeter men want not Encouragement, they being of themselves ready to accept any opportunity for their unjust designs and want not the Brammoneys assistance. Mr Fleetwood can informe you of them. Indeed is hath bin some trouble to mee, for I esteem it to reflect on my honor to promise more then I am able by their disappoinment to comply with. According to your orders, shall send what Peeter remaining for the Fort with all Expedition. I remaine, Your assured Reall Friend, Ambrose Salusbury.9

Petipolls, January 16th, 1672-3."

"Mr Ambrose Salusbury, The many letters which you mention to have sent us which you never received answer to as you say, which was two very short ones, which see speedily did not require any, but we have long since sent you an acknowledgment of the receipt of them and the 600 baggs of Peter. The other we hope you have dispended to Madder Hastings according to our advice. Your declaration in making us liable to respond for what damage shall accrue to the Honble. Company will not prejudice us or Bare you harmless upon the examination of the Businesses, which unkind charges be moved. For the future we desire none, unless better grounded. Your owne letters are sufficient to testify you had noe occasion for those Rashboots you nowe seem to want, neither will you advise us what Boats you want to carry the Peeter to Madder Hastings where we have two and are now getting what Rashboots procurable 98 . . . . M. Mainwaring; Geo. Chamberlaine.10

Mitchlepatam, 16 January, 1672-3."

"Mr Ambrose Salusbury, Wee have this instant received yours of present. Wee are sorry to read of the obstructions you meets with in the Peeter Businesse. Wee have advised Mr Mohun & sent him coppyes of your letters that hee may fully understand the Business & wee doubt not But that hee hath endeavoured the procury of a Phirmand from Mahmud Amin [Muhammad Amin], which but lately that you wrote for. However wee continue it will tend little to purpose, Being an

old custom to serve the King first occasioned Mr Jearsey to procure that Phirmand. Wee would gladly understand what encouragement you would or expect to receive from us. Wee would, if wee knew how, give you all Immaginable for our Employers Interest, having herewith sent you 30 Rashboots [राष्ट्रपति, i.e., soldiers or guards]. But wee desire you to use that mediation with you that noe complaints are made to the prejudice of the Honble. Company. Wee have paid them one months pay Pr. each at 4 Rupees Pr. month . . . M. MAINWARING; GEO. CHAMBERLAIN.

Metchlepam, 16th January 1672-3."

"Mr Ambrose Salisbury. Wee wish wee could any wayes remedy those dayly affronts and cheats put upon you By those knavish salt Peeter Men, occasioned partly, as you seem to suggest by a Mutiny the Bramine he designed therby to engross the whole Imployment to himselfe. Wee cannot remember that hee was ever yet Imployed in that Business, But upon the Recommendations of Mr Fleetwood. However, to divert him from those his unwarrantable proceedings, wee have now wrote him to advertiset him by way of charge that we are fully informed he hath endeavourd & is the person that hath ruined the Compagnys Affairs Under your Managery, from whom wee expect satisfaction unless the presently desists from his practices & becomes instrumentall to Brig those people to a faire complaynt. Wee did yesterday omitt to advise you that the Companies positive orders were for their whole Fleete to keepe Company, and therefore not to be seperated, otherwise a shipp might have been spared to have taken in the Salt Peeter. Last night arrived the two boats who could not proceede for Madder as without anchors. Wee have gave them leave to returne to you to supply themselves, & soe to proceed. This day wee had given money in hand for two Boats more to come to you. Not mentioning any want of them in yours of the 16th, received this day, wee have received the money backe & discharged them. Your Rashboots were speeded last night, M. MAINWARING; GEO. CHAMBERLAIN.

Metchlepam, 19th Jan. 1672-3."

P. S.—Herewith wee send you a hundred and fifty pagodas for your occasions."

"Mr Richard Mohun and Counsell, Esteemed Freinds, I answered your two letters of the 18th about three hours since, and now is returned some of the People employed in the Peeter business and have narrowly escaped with some money. The Peeter men take all they can light on and keep a good number people and have some of Mahmud Annis [Muhammad Anin's] servants with them. I assure you the danger and trouble I have past in this business exceedeth my expression, and had I not bene more then ordinary carefull the Honble. Company would not have a Candy of Peeter for theire money, but you are something displeased with mee after all my Care and trouble which hope you will bee soe freindly to consider with Charitable thoughts. If the Honble. Company deals in this Comodity in these parts and employ the same Persons they will have greater losses. I advised you in the other above named to send mee Rashboots for it must [be that] Mauhd. Annis letter must free the Peeter (sic). With kind respects, I remaine Your assured Freind, AMBROSE SALISBURY.

Pettepoles, January the 20th, 1672-3.

Mr. Mohun enordered mee to send what Cloth procureable to the Fort, but upon Mr. Fleetwood's and Mr. Hatton's information of a great danger of the Dutch which I did not apprehend therefore [delayed] sending the Goods. Pray immediately advise in it. I hear you are now sending boats of Goods. Id. A. S."
"Mr Richard Mohun Etoa, Counsell, Esteemed Freinds, I have received yours of the 18th. The Peeter being such a great vexation and remaining in this nature, caused mee to write you in that manner. I cannot express the trouble I have had. This day have received perfect advice that Mawmud Myyn hath sent a vessel to the Governour of Cundaveare to stop all Peeter for the King, and therefore desire you to forbear sending any Rasbootes. I did suppose when I writ for them that the Governour of Cundaveare had made this trouble by the Peeter mens occasion. Now it cannot bee done by violence, onely by letters from Mawmud Myyn, which please to procure. I expect every day Peeter to make up 300 Candy which I ordered not to come nigh Cundaveare. I have sent 150 bags, which, with 1050 bags sent to you, is all arrived. Here's some Dungarees arrived, which pray advise immediately if you will have sent to Madaraass or to you. There is six overdrawing of Dungarees detaine with Peeter. I was much troubled at the time writte you, which pray excuse and esteem me for Your assured Freind, AMBROSE SALUSBURY."

Pettepolee, January 20th, 1672-3."

"Mr Richard Mohun Eto, Counsell, Esteemed Freinds, Yesterday writte you in answer to yours of the 18th. My last desired your advice and Order concerning sending the Cloth I have in a Readiness to the Fort for Acompt of the Homble Company. If it should miscarry by the Dutch seizure, or otherwise, I am not able to judge the Danger, living without news. I should think Mr Mohuns Order is sufficient 1000 times the vallow, but know not whether his other business might cause hurte in writing that Order. I must really assure you that the Peeter Journey hath done mee so much prejudice that a greater vallow then all the Peeters amount will not restore mee to the former Condition I was in before. And indeed I did purpose not to have engaged myself in Peeter more. Those Peeter men have abused Mr Winter, Mr Johnson and many other as Paupa [the bâhù] can informe you, and they will not doe other. Give them 50 Pago, per Candy they shall abuse you the more. I have in this, Journey endured more then my body was able, hoping to doe the Company such service as might be acceptable, but I dare not undertake a new Journey, therefore pray send mee Rasbootes. I remaine, Your assured Freind, AMBROSE SALUSBURY."

Pettepolee, January 21st, 1672-3."

"Mr Richard Mohun & Council, Esteemed Freinds, I have received yours of the 18th and this Instant is arrived yours of the 19th with the Rasbootes, but, as advised you, I had last night about ten persons returned, who acquainist me the Kings De Roy is put upon the Peeter by some of Mahmud Annis Servants, and the Ox people deny to take up the Peeter soe long as the Chop and Kings De Roy continues upon it, therefore returns your people. I am from good hands informed that Annis hath lately sent and received letters from the Peeter men, and hath a hand in this action with them last night was informed that he's now at Cundaveare. I shall in few daies send you that satisfactory sufficient to make appear Amint under-hand dealings. Your letter shall now send him, and am of the minde it will cause him to remove the Obstructions, I most faithfully assure you I hoped to doe the Homble Company good service in the Peeter and was in a faire way for it. Had I not met with such Obstructions the Peeter and Cloth Had bin with you in good time. Had I knowne of such opposition, should not have engaged in the Peeter for more than its amount. The full quantity of Peeter arrived is 256 Md. I expected about 50 Candy which gave orders to come another way, but I fear the Peeter men have sent to stopp that also. I hear not of itt. If the Homble Company give time and price they may have the Peeter delivered here notwithstanding Mawmud Annis Ruccaes and all the Peeter men can doe. The two Boates are not fitting to goc to Madarass being not in repaire, therefore must send other when they arrive.

Please to forbear more mony having received some from the Peeter Country, and desire noe more untill have given you the amount of the former, but thank you for your readiness, and with kindes respects, Remain[y], your assured Real Freind, AMBROSE SALUSBURY.  

Pettepollee, January 21th 1672-3."

"Mr Ambrose Salisbury, Your two severalls of the 20th. Instant are arrived by which wee find that nothing will free the Pester But Mahamud Amnes order which wee are very dubious he will not easily grant. Tis noe otherwise now then formerly, therefore the less to be admired at. They will undoubtedly respond that the King must be served first. Wee have alwas hitherto advised you wee are very sensible of the trouble you underwent in the Businesse, but that it should see vex you to occasion you to charge us with the obstruction or neglect whereof it lay, it seemed something strang to us. However wee willingly passe by all and desire Nothing so much as a Friendly and amiable correspondence, which proves Always the best in the occurrence of the Honble Companies Affairs. Wee canne advise you nothing to the cloth, having never heard any thing about it in General. Neither doe you give us any notice for whose account it was provided or the sortments or amount, But believe it may come to late for the shipping if not already sent away.

M. MAINWARING; GEO. CHAMBERLAIN.

˚Mᵉᶜʰⁱᵉⁿᵖᵃᵗᵃᵐ 23rd Jan. 1672-3.

P. S.—The Boats would not goe hence without a month pay." 17

From January until July 1673 there is a gap in the records. Then we find Salisbury, in spite of all his protestations, still engaged in the Petre investment. His strength had now become seriously impaired and he was troubled with a "raine in his left side." However, in August he was better and had "hopes" of his "health again." When sending in his accounts, he dwells on the services he had rendered the Company in the "peeter business" and declared that any other, in his place, would have left "both Peeter and money doubtfull."

"Mr Richard Mohun and Counsell, Esteemed Freinds, Last night had news of Peeter, which may expect to morrow if your Gouernyor Obstruct not; see soon as arrived and weighed, the account shall send you. In all this time you have not advised the price of the broadcloth received from you, nor the quantity of Dungarees you Received long since. Here's 725 Baggs of Peeter, besides 80 Baggs, Remains of the Factory at Careare [Karedu] 450, delivered on board 600 Bales. What this will bee I daily expect, know not but hope the account will not much differ from the price formerly made, the first per Candy excepted, for the Charges are great, that together wish it come at the price expressed. Here's also packing Trade and Dungarees which desire to hasten, but with the Capon [enmuch] go, and Remaine, Your assured Real Freind, AMBROSE SALUSBURY.

I purpose now to send for the Peeter which is arrived near this place, some Persons here having inform'd the Capon of mee, that hee's well pleased, and I presume will not Obstruct mee in any Business. AMBROSE SALUSBURY.  

Pettepollee, July 9th, 1673."

"Mr Richard Mohun & Counsell, Esteemed Freinds, My last advised you that I shall not bee able to send you the Goods here in a readiness, soc long as the Capon Governour continueth. Yesterday Morning hee sent a French letter which hee would have mee open and send him its
contents in Genuine [i.e., Telugu], but I returned the letter as received, and that should I open it, cannot read one word in it, which would be no satisfaction to them. He desired me to come to him, which excused, having a paine in my side. Hee desired to know if the letter [were] directed to Metehlepatam, which sent him word it was. News was brought him of 5 English shippes were this point. Hee sent to know their business here and that hee supposed they waited for to take the Dutch ships. I sent him word I knew not of any Ships here onely of those at Metehlepatam. Hee saith hee heareth wee have nine Ships or Ten near Porto Novo, and that Side Meanpaffar [Sayyid Mir Jâfir] hath advised him the English there have reported the French will have 20 Shippes speedily at Metehlepatam. Hee alsa demanded if wee have news of a peace to bee shortly with the Dutch. I sent him in reply that have not heard of any Ships arrived at Porto Novo nor what the French expect, but that wee hope a peace is made with the Dutch and more to this effect, by which I finde his Master is freind to the Dutch and that he is offended with us upon the Dutch accownt, and if any Obstructions, that is the Cause. In some monethes since gave you my Judgment how convenient Mountepalli [Motupalle] is for the dispose and provision of Goods19 and for the Ships to Lade and receive Goods, but your answer was (if mistake not) that Agent and Counsell would deliberately Consider of it, therefore did not think to write you more of it. But Considering how affaires now at present stand, and in a Ready way to be much worse, its my Judgement the Agent and Counsell cannot doe a better acte more profitable to the Company then presently to Order One Hundred pagos, to build a warehouse, and question not a little time will give encouragement for the making other accommodations, and Rest, Your assured Reall Freind, AMBROSE SALSBURY.

Pettepolis, July 11th, 1678.

Postscript. Pray give your Order for sending the Peeter and Packing to you, and it shall speedily bee effected. I am doubtfull these may bee Dutch Shippes. The Capon hath sent for the Old Governor, who is expected to Morrow. About 5 miles hence is arrived the last Peeter, which lett continueth till the Capon goe, when hope shall have noe Obstructions. Id., A. S.20

"Mr Mohun Etc. Counsell, Esteemed Freinds, I expected by this to have had the Peeter on bord with respect to the Boates here, which having caesed to be arrivers are found insufficient, therefore have now sent to Dew [Diu] for two large Boates, One Boate have advised sent for Packing Trade to supply your Occasion. Here's 13000 Gunnyes which with the Rope and Twine at Cancare is the value of the 500 Pages, you enordered for the Fort. Pray advise if you will have the Gunnyes sent to you or Remain to bee sent from hence to the Fort. The Peeter advised you arrived near this place, expect to Morrow if faire Weather, when shall speedily weigh and send you the Account. I remaine, Your assured Freind, AMBROSE SALSBURY."21

Pettepolis, July the 18th, 1678."

"Mr Richard Mohun, Chrift Etc. Counsell, Esteemed Freinds, Last night Advised you that in pursuance of your Order have used all means to hasten Boates for the Remaining Peeter and Packing Trade, but when expected to Lade the Goods, the Boates were found insufficient, there (for) as advised you, have Sent to Dew, which if not procureable there, shall acquaint you that Boates may bee sent from you. The last Peeter, and all to bee expected, is now weighing. The Governor doth not way Obstruct. The Accounts shall bee sent you the beginning of next week. I hoped to doe it this, but the Peeter arriving this day, which is now spent, and therefore cannot now bee done. You did formerly Order not to make Bookes, but to send the Accompts as hitherto have don, which Order have Observed. My last to you desired your Advice and Order for the Gunnyes provided for the Fort which are in the Companys Factory, and that I have sent a Boate with

---

19 See ante, p. 238.
Packing Trade for your Occasions, which may daily expect. Observe the time you are to expect the Ships to return for the Goods you shall provide, which, in my apprehension, will be difficult to go to the Fort and return so speedily to you. By Gods Blessing you shall have those goods in good time, they only wait for Boates, which if this place did afford, you should have had the goods with you now. I present my hearty Service and remaine, Your assured reall Freind, Amßroß Salusbury.

Pettapelle, July 19th, 1673.

"Mr Richard Mohun Etca. Councill, Esteemed Freinds, This Evening have answered yours of the 16th and Just now have news at Dew, Boates not at present procurable, therefore you may please to send Boates for Eight hundred and fifty Baggs, the Peeter not all weighd but supposed the whole will bee soe much or more. Here's abowe thirteen thousand Gunneys, which if you will not have sent from hence to Madras, you may please to send for. I have three Boates, but One is at Carcare, and one goeing now to you with packing Trade, the other on Shear, and her's but one Small Boate which will not carry above 150 baggs, and being Old, I am not willing to hazard the Company Goods on her. This, with my hearty Service, is all at present from your assured Freind, Amßroß Salusbury.

Pettapelle, July 19th, 1673.

The Dungarees at 7 patch per pague, as I bought them, thought might Serve your Course Goods as well as better. Id. A. S."

"Mr Richard Mohun Etca. Councill, Esteemed Freinds, My last acquainted you Boates are not here procurable and that the Peeter here will qt. neat 550 baggs, all being not yet weighd, cannot exactly know it. In my Judgement the Boates you send were better delivered the Goods on Board as the Ships pass this place, Or if you think its most Convenienc they were better to continue untill the Ships returne from the Fort then to be Landed in Metchlepam and againe Shipped to Send on borde. Which you shall judge best for the Honble. Companys profit, please to advise, and your Order shall be obeyed by Your assured Freind, Amßroß Salusbury.

Pettapelle, July 21st 1673.

"Mr Ambroß Salusbury, Wee have now Before us yours of the 19th. & 21th. which advise us your want of Boates to Bring the Peeter & packing trade for this place, in reference to which wee have this day hireed 4, who to Morrow will be ready to saile towards you. The tonnage of those goods with you wee have computed & find that lesse will not serve the turne. Upon their arrival, wee desire you to lade & dispatch them to us as soon As conveniently you canne since time is precious & will not at present admit of delays, What you mention in yours concerning the detaining of the said Boats untill returne of the ships from Madrasse & so to put the Peeter &cc. on Board them without landing here, wee cannot approve, since it will not only create a trouble But be also uncertaine. Wee therefore againe desire you that you will send them directly unto us, which upon the approach of the Fleets shall be laden Before our Bale goods, which is the needfull at present.

R. Mohun &cc.

Metchlepam, 23 July, 1673."

"Mr Richard Mohun, Cheife Etca. Councill, Esteemed Freinds, I have received yours of the 21th and 23th instant with the paper expresssing 55 Bales sent by you to Carcare. I was informed from a Peon of yours when Mr Mohun male this his way to Madras, that the Cloth of yours at Carcare was 55 parcellse made up in Dungarees but not imbeled, which pray advise, that I may speedily
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send a Person to make the Boates ready. The two Boates sent from hence remaine there, but you advise not that Potrzez Pattassa [Poturiza Patava] there, if not one must be hired, if: all sent at once, or one must make two turns, which will cause the Ships stay the Longer, to which please to advise. The four Boates you express are not yet arrived. When they are, they shall bee immediately Laden and returned you. The accord shall be sent you when the Goods are all on board. I have some time bin troubled with a paine on my left Side nere my Stomach, that I cannot list to write without much trouble, and you enordering my Accompts as formerly without Bookes, desire you not now to expect them from Your affectionate freind, AMBROSE SALSBURY. 

Pettipolle, July 25th 1673.

"Mr Richard Mohun Etca. Counsell, Esteemed freinds, I expect your answer to my last and Order concerning Goods at Carcare [Karedu]. The Catwall [catwul, magistrate] of this place confidently reported the Dutch had 25 ships arrived at Metchlepam and that the English and Dutch ships were Engaged and many Guns fired, which supposed truth, and therefore write you was sorry for the loss the Company might Sustaine their Stock being againe sent on borde, but your Silence confirmes the Catwall's news a Storye, for that I hope the ships will not meet with any opposition from the Dutch. Inclosed send you the Accounts which had bin with you some daies sooner had I not stayed for the Boate of Packing Trade, being not able to make them up without it. I hope they will give you the same Satisfaction as if they were in Bookes, the Investment being soe inconsiderable. Had I not met with such Obstructions, the Peeter had come at a cheaper Rate then now it doth, and I presume had any other Person mett with such troubles, both Peeter and Money would have bin left doubtfull to recover, as it hath hitherto, assure you have taken great care and trouble in it more then I know how to Express, hope my Endevours will find your good acceptance, and if you please to examine former Accounts, you will not find any Peeter the Company ever received from this place to come soe cheap as this now provided. If the Agent and Counsell would take my advise in provission of Peeter, the Company shall surely find itt theire great profit. The whole qts. [contains] 1872 Baggs and Old Remaines 30 Baggs which had by this time bin all lost, had I not removed it. You may remember Advised you One Boate up with Armagon which Sir William[20] Ordered to returne hither. With hearty wishes for your health, Remaine, Your affectionate freind to serve you, AMBROSE SALSBURY.

Pettipolle, July 28th 1673.

Three of your Boates this morning arrived. Pattassa boates not yet come. The Capon Governour is returning by way of Gundepolles. Untill hee gone Cooleys not procureable. Have delivered Matt to cover the Boates and to morrow purpose to lade them. I have appointed two Boates to receive 300 baggs of Peeter each, and upon the Peeter the better to preserve itt, each Boate 3000 Gunneys, and Pattassa [Patavanaugh] boate must receive 252 Baggs Peeter and 4000 Gunneys, which maketh 852 Baggs Peeter and 13000 Gunneys, as advised. The Boatmen say that Lading is more then they are able to receive, therefore send to you. Id: A. SALSBURY."[20]

"Mr Ambrose Salisbury. Yours of the 25th come to hand the 28th following, Advising us of the receipt of ours of the 21 & 23 Instant. The Goods of our Masters mentioned to be at Carcare [Karedu] are Bales 55 Marked and Numbered as already acquainted you, concerning which wee desire your care that you will have Boats and People there in a readiness to attend the returne of our Fleete, that the land Bales may with what possible speed be put On Board them, so as not longer to hinder their coming towards us than there is an absolute Necessity for, which wee. Mind you May be done at once. Therefore, let Not Boats sufficient be wanting to effect it, which

---

[20] The Patavinas are one of the seafishing castes of the Madras Presidency.


wee referre to your care, since time will Not admit of delays. Those 4 Boats wee sent you from hence [for] Peeter &ca. wee hope care this are arrived with you, and that you will, as advised, Returne them againe with what Possible speed, your accounts the same. Wee are very sorry for your present indisposition. Wishing you health, doe conclude . . . R. Mohun &ca.31

Metchlepataam, 29 July, 1673."

"Mr Richard Mohun Etoa. Counsell, Esteemed Freinds, Yours of the 29th last night came to hands, and in performance of your Order shall send to Carrear soon as Boatsmen are procured, for they must goe from hence to put the Goods you express on board the Ships that they may not bee delayed, but I am not certaine to doe it at once. I have laden on two of your Boates 400 Baggs of Peeter and the third 54 baggs, which to day had compleated, had not Rayne prevented. To morrow night the fowre Boates shold have laden and returned you, but they will not receive more then Peeter, and I think not secure to force more upon them then they are willing to receave, for should any ill happen, they will impute the same to me. The Gunneys will remine for Boates from you. One large one will serve. Had those bin large they would have receaved all and saved the trouble of other. I praise Almighty God I find some hopes of my health againe. I Remaine, Your assured Freind, AMBROSE SALISBURY.32

Petlepolese, August 1st, 1673." "Mr Ambrose Salisbury, From yours of the first Instant, which late the last Night came to hand, wee are advised of your receipt of ours of the 29th. past, wherein wee observe your intentions for the sending persons to Carrea where, with Boats, shall attend the returne of our Fleets to lade those goods there in a readinesse for them, which wee hope will take effect, only agruing your quicke dispatch that there be noe delay therein. Wee take Notice that you had laden two of those Boats sent from hence with Peeter & that the other two had beene the same, had not rain prevented you, which wee hope care this is over & that you have despeed it all towards us. God send them safe. For the Gunneys wee shall send you other Boats, since these Not able to take them in, which is what wee have to acquaint you with. . . . R. Mohun &ca.33

Metchlepataam, 5 August, 1673."

"Mr Ambrose Salisbury. Wee have two of yours of the 2nd. and 5th. Instant, which came to hand the 9th., and with following wherein you advise that you had laden the 4th. Boats with Peeter & dungsarees, & that you had needed 2 Boats more for the Gunnees, which yet Remained with you, which wee this day send you, desiring your quicke dispatch in their lading & returne to us, since that now hourly expect the arrival of our Fleets with us. The 4 prementioned Boats are now arrived with what mentioned which shall be continued on Board them for the quicker dispatch of our Ships, which wee hope will not after arrival here require more than two days stay, since what wee have to lade upon them Being in the like readiness. Wee wish your Boatsmen &ca. sent to Carrea may be timely for the lading those goods upon our Ships in their returne hither. More at present wee have not to communicate only wish you health. . . . R. Mohun, &ca.34

Metchlepataam, 11th August, 1673."

For two years, from August 1673 until July 1675, the records are silent with regard to Ambrose Salisbury. If he remained at Peddapalle, he could hardly have been occupied in the Company's business, since, in a "Generall" from Fort St. George to the Court of Directors, dated 30th November 1674, is the remark, "The Factories of Verasam and Pettipolese are both laid down and of no further charge; Metchlepataam is the place for business.35

In July 1675, Salisbury was once again implicated in the misdemeanours of his superiors.

Extract from "Mr. Matthew Mainwarings Charge in the Honble. Company's Behalfe against Mr Richard Mohun. Syr. That Mr Salbury provided a Parcell of Goods to the amount of 1058-12 which he thrust upon the Company without consent of any of the Counsell for want of money to comply In more Proper Returns." 36

In the following month an extract from the Diary of Major Puckle shows Salisbury in his old quarters.

"Mr Salbury at Pettopoly Ordered to come to Metchlepam to receive instructions about red Sallampores [chintz] and Morees [musl, blue cloth] to be sent to Bantam and to bring masters and prizes of the same. Metchlepam, 10 August, 1675." 37

"Mr Ambrose Salisbury, Sir, There being an Investment to be made in the Honble. Company In some commodities which we understand are to be had in your parts, we therefore desire and order you to come to us forthwith to receive directions about the same, not else to trouble we remaine &ca. M. Mainwaring &ca.

Wee desire you to enquire what Quantities of Lead [red] Sallampores [and] red Morees are to be had in your parts and to bring us Masters of each. 38

Metchlepam, 10 August, 1675."

In accordance with these directions, Salisbury promptly repaired to Masulipatam.

"Mr Matthew Mainwaring and Counsell, Worthy Friends, In obedience to your desire and order shall hasten my Repair to you. The want of boys will detain me, they being taken up by the Govr. &ca. I shall bring with me a Master of red Sallampores and Morees. Although but little of either at present procurable, which with my humble Servis conclude, Your most humble servant, Ambrose Salisbury." 39

Pettopoly, 16 August, 1675."

The result of Salisbury's interview with the Counsell at Masulipatam— is briefly chronicled in Major Puckle's Diary, "Mr. Salbury came to the factory, saith the Dutch have taken up and besoke all the red Cloaths, But he could furnish with such sorts as the Merchants have already undertaken. Metchlepam; 25 August, 1675."

Salisbury was bitterly disappointed with his reception at Masulipatam. On his return to Peddapalle, he voiced his grievances in the following letter:

"To Mr Matthew Mainwaring &ca. Counsell; Worthy freinds, By the Blessing of Almighty God, iame this instant safely returned, being Saturday noon. I apprehended by your Generall there was an Investment to bee made by the Honorable Company in the Commodities of those parts as you expressed, but you are pleased now to say You have contracted with your Merchants for the Sorts those parts afford. Had you been pleased to reserve for me a small matter you should by Gods blessing have found punctual compliance at the prices you receive from your Merchants, which presume could bee the same to [the] Company and noe lesse to you to Receave goods from me as you doe from other persons. But that you should expect more from me in the Investment than from the Country Merchants that have constant Imprests is to be admired. When you have answer from the Agent and Counsell to the Letter you have writ I desire you to consider mee, desiring but Five thousand pagothaes.

You may also please to take into consideration my Sallary.—12 years, two years allowance, Servants dyet, &c., and nearest 70 pa. repayment of the Factory, all which Referre to your Charity and my two Journeyes to Metchlepam, being sent for, pagothas 23.8l., there being noe person in the Honorable Companys servis but hath allowance only my selfe. By the bearer pray Remit what you please, being in want of money for my expences, Not else at present, remaine, Your humble Servant, Ambose Salisbury.41

Petepole, the 28th August, 1675."

The Council at Masulipatam sent a curt reply to Salisbury's list of complaints. If he could provide suitable goods, they would pay for them. Meanwhile, he was ordered to draw up an account of the effects of the Company then remaining in his hands. The question of salary and allowance was ignored.

"Mr. Ambose Salisbury, Sir, Wee are Debtors to yours of the 28th ultimo. and assure you to the best of judgements wee have in all things consulted the Honble. Company's advantage, which did out of our money to [? obey] our Instructions for goods they would contract with us for, which wee tooke [? look] upon to be much the Securers [? securest] way. You now talk of and [? an] Investment. You can make up in Sallampores to the amount of pas. 10,000, but when you were here you told us you could procure none of that sort, and wee believe you are now mistaken. If in time you send in any of Lengths, Breadths and goodness you speak of, there shall be punctually paid you, which is all we have at present. But to deliver [? desire] you Pr. first opportunity to remit us an account of remaines of that Factory, as debts, house moveables, &c. . . . M. Mainwaring &c.42

Metchlepam, 7th Sept, 1675."

To this letter Salisbury retorted that he was better qualified to undertake the Company's investments than many who had been preferred before him, and that if 1,000 pagodas were delivered to him, he would engage to make a profitable use of them.

"Mr. Mathew Mainwaring &c. Counsell, Worthy freinds, You were pleased to order my coming to receive directions for an Investment for the Honorable Company. But at my arrivall acquainted mee that you had given orders to your merchants for said goods, and that you have yet remaining great part of the Honorable Companys stock. Since you are not certain of the Investment that may bee made about Neglawance43 as also towards Gingerlee,44 that if the stock you have sent to them parts should not bee fully disposed of, it will prejudice the Honorable Company, and much the more if its not to bee done by the Fort, time being short to compleat that work for the timely Returns of the Honorable Companys Shipping. Therefore, I conceive, since you have part off the Estate by you and are certaine of the Investment of that sent abroad, you will doe well to consult your Honorable Companys advantage. For, should part of that money bee brought againe and having yet part of the Stock by you, if the Fort not able to supply the defect, I wish you to Judge how great a damage the Honorable Company will sustain by your neglect of time for its Investment.

That the Honorable Company may know how much they have suffered by preferring persons that have not had knowledge of their Service before mee, I hereby engage myselfe to make them a temly Investment of Tenne thousand pagothas in Sallampores of full demensions, which being sorted and valued at the price your Merchants Receive, I will allow Five Per Cent, which being Five hundred Pa. is worth your Observance and I presume, if denied, will be Required at your

43 Nagalwanga in golconda, where the Dutch had a factory.
44 The coast line between the Godavari estuary and the Jagannath Pagoda.
hands by the Honourable Company, which I refer to your Consideration, and that you send effect[s] with speed to procure the Honourable Company’s interest and preserve them from damage, promising by God’s permission punctual compliance. And had you given me effects when you delivered your Merchants, I should have provided the amount of Twenty Thousand Pagotahas upon the same terms, which is all at present from your humble servant, AMBROSE SALISBURY.45

Peterspol, 2d. September 1675.”

With the despatch of this imperious letter, Salisbury’s temper cooled, and, as usual, after his occasional outbursts of self-assertion, he became compunctious and quickly changed his tone. His next two letters are humbly apologetic.

“Mr. Matthew Mainwaring &c. Commissioners. Honoured freinds, I acknowledge my error in pressing you for an Investment since you contracted with your Merchants and crave your pardon, knowing the Agent and Council referre all the affairs off these parts to your disposal, therefore wish I had not given them any trouble, and question not the Honourable Company’s advantage in delivery off your mony to your Merchants, But should your occasion require the amount off the sum expressed, pagotahas 10000, in fine goods, should not doubt its procuring, but of the other sorts not any. The account you desire off the Factory’s debts &c. shall bring with mee, which hope more satisfactory then to send it, With my servis, subscribe, Your real freind and servant, AMBROSE SALISBURY.46

Peterspol, 12th September, 1675.”

“Mr. Matthew Mainwaring &c. Commissioners. Honored freinds, I laste night paid Palankeen boyes with purpose to set out this morning but am unfit for travell in the rains, having taken cold therefore send you the Account off debts and remaines belonging to this Factory as you enquirer. The debts great part belonged to your Factory and partly returned from the King and about 200 pagotahas in Mr. Daniels time, which only belong to this Factory. If you shall please to send 1800 pagotahas, I will send you 80 Corge off Sallampores at 15 and 17 pagotahas per Corge [score] the price I give, which doubt not to your good liking which being the needfull, I Remaine, Your real freind and servant, AMBROSE SALISBURY.47

Peterspol, the 13 September, 1675.”

The Council at Masulipatam paid no heed to Salisbury’s demands for money for an Investment and they were equally impervious to his threats. Of his apology they took no notice. On the 14th September, Salisbury again asserted his claims to equal advantages with the rest of the Company’s servants.

“Mr. Matthew Mainwaring &c. Council, Honored freinds, I omitted to acquaint you the Honourable Company’s house was Robb and four pewter pans and the rest of Copper and Brass household stuffs carried away. When I heard of it, which was many months after, acquainted the Governor, and the persons being found, was beat and kept in Irons some time, but not confessing was released, since one dead and the other run away. You are pleased to Present ill my proposal concerning cloth Investment which should not have made had I any allowance from you, therefore you have noe reason to bee displeased Since you all have from the Honourable Company sufficient allowance, I will oblige myselfe, may I have the allowance that you have, that my servis shall be faithful and as profitable to the Honourable Company as any person in their servis, May I have Investments. It shall appear I have given a small matter in part for the Cloth expressed in my last, which iff you accept not, pray advise. If you will promise my Salary and allowance due to mee and allow mee according to my time and right and send mee mony for 8000 pieces of

Sallampores at 5 pa. and 12½ pa. per Corge, I will engage they shall be so well bought that they shall equal your Merchants cloth of 18 and 20 pa. per Corge, if not exceed it, which I hope will be approved by you. Had you given me any thing to subsist upon when you went away, I should have advised you thus much before. But to send for me & put me to expense and return me in dishonor hath very much troubled me since. Desiring your speedy answer, I rest, Your assured freind, AMBROSE SALISBURY. 48

Pettapole, September 14th, 1675."

Ill and disappointed, it is no wonder that Salisbury keenly felt his position. He had been in India for seventeen years and had spent nearly the whole of his time at a little insignificant factory. Now, after this long period of service, he found himself in a far inferior position to those who had come out from England many years later. Matthew Mainwaring, who had succeeded Mohun as Chief at Masulipatam evidently bore no love to Salisbury and his influence most probably had weight with Major Puckle, the Company's Supervisor, who thus alluded to the unhappy factor — "Here is also a letter from Mr Salisbury, a most pitiful impertinent piece of morrislith that doth daily follow us with letters that we understand not, and therefore lesse concerned to answer them." 49

Metchlepam, 20 September, 1675."

For the next three months there is no allusion to Salisbury. The cold that detained him at Peddapalle in September was the beginning of the end. He seems to have repaired to Madapolam the usual health resort, and to have been received by Richard Mohun, the disgraced Chief of Masulipatam. After an illness of twelve days, Salisbury ended his unsatisfactory career on the 21st January, 1676. His death was noted in Major Puckle's Diary.

"Mr. Ambrose Salisbury dyed Intestate, having laid sick at Mr. Mohun's house about 12 days. Sent Peons to Pettipole to secure his Estate there and Mr. Heathfield and Mr. Crawley appointed to go and Inventory and bring away what he hath left to Metchlepam. 50 Metchlepam, January 3d, 1675-6."

For a person who died intestate and with very little property, the amount of correspondence that ensued about Ambrose Salisbury's affairs seems ridiculous and disproportionate. As late as 1682 his accounts remained unsettled.

"Mr. John Heathfield and Mr. Robert Crawley, Weu enorder you both to go immediately to Pettipole and there to secure what goods &c. of the Honble. Company's or Mr. Salisbury's you shall find in the Honble. Company's factory or elsewhere, and to take a particular account of his papers, money and all other things of value, bringing with [you] what else conveniently, you can to Metchlepam, the remainder to seal up and leave peons to guard it. . . .

M. MAINWARING &c. 51

Metchlepam, 3 January, 1676."

On the 28th February, 1676, Richard Mohun, who was then at Fort St. George, wrote to the Council as follows: — "The death of Mr. Ambrose Salisbury I suppose you have been long since acquainted with all, that he dyed in my house intestate and left his Books with me, which I rendred to the Commissioners in Metchlepam, provided they would give me their Joint receipt for my discharge which was denied by some of them. I now do the like to your Worship and Council upon the same terms, that they may no longer lie in my custody, but that you, for the satisfaction of his freinds, may be acquainted with what he has left of an estate and accordingly take it into your Possession." 52
For six months nothing seems to have been done with regard to Salisbury’s affairs. Then, on the 11th August, at a Consultation at Masulipatam, there is the following entry, “Joseph Arnold excepts against looking after Mr Ambrose Salusburys estate and Mr John Crandons, being other were concerned therewith before he arrived at this Coast.”

On the following day, the 12th August 1676, at a Consultation held at Masulipatam, Strynasham Master, who was making a tour of inspection of the factories subordinate to Fort St. George, “having enquired why the Estate of Mr Ambrose Salisbury who some months since deceased, was not taken care of by the Councill here, he dying as is said Intestate, It was answered that they were unwilling to concern themselves further than to secure the Companies Interest, by reason his Creditors upon his decease made several Demands, As a Moore Merchant produced a Bill under his hand for several goods and Mr Chamberlaine a Bond for Rs. 885-15 cash, Principal dated March 28, 1667, to pay Interest at 2 p. c. per Mensem and in default of payment after 6 mos. at 3 p. c. per Mensem. . . . P. S. — Concerning Mr Ambrose Salisbury’s Estate, and Mr John Crandons, Joseph Arnold always excepted against others having intermeddled therein before his arrival at this Coast.”

On the 20th September 1676, administration of Ambrose Salisbury’s effects was granted to “Susanna Salisbury, mother and lawfully assigned guardian to Susanna and Anna Salisbury, minors, nieces and next of kin to Ambrose Salisbury, bachelor, who died in the East Indies.”

Salisbury’s affairs in India, however, remained unsettled. On the 22nd February, 1677, the Council at Fort St. George wrote to Masulipatam, “We have Information that there are effects of Mr Ambrose Salisbury deceased in the Custody of some persons of that Factory and Debts of his unpaid, concerning which the Honourable Company having given express orders for the sale thereof, payment of debts, and bringing in the surplus into their Cash for friends use; we have only to Conforme the same unto you as we doe hereby.”

On receipt of these orders, the Council at Masulipatam took the following steps:

“Att a Consultation.—In pursuance of an order from the Agent and Council of the 22d February 1676-7 concerning the Estate of Mr Ambrose Salisbury deceased, It is Ordered that Mr John Heathfield doe bring in and deliver to the Commissioners whatsoever he had in his Custody appertaining to the said Mr Salisbury, and the same be received by Inventory in the presence and under the Attestation of all the Honourable Company’s Servants resident in this Factory, and that whatsoever else of the said Mr Salusburys Estate shall be found in any other place, that the same be also under the like Caution and circumstances receiv’d and Registered and the whole disposal by public Sale or Outcry, and the proceed brought into the Honourable Companys Cash for account of the true proprietors. Particularly That Mr George Chamberlaine be desired to give in an Accompt of what money he has received and possessed himself of belonging to Mr Salusbury since his decease, that so the Accompt between them may be adjusted with the more facility.

Joseph Arnold excepts against meddling with Mr Ambrose Salusburys Estate more then a witness of what may hence forward come to his knowledge, other persons being concerned therewith before my Arrivall on this Coast to the rest of this Consultation I subscribe, JOSEPH ARNOLD.”

Masulipatam the 6th April, 1677.

“In pursuance of an order of Consultation dated the 6th instant, directing Mr John Heathfield to bring in and deliver to the Commissioners whatsoever he had in his Custody of the Estate of Mr Ambrose Salisbury deceased, And that whatsoever of Mr Ambrose Salusburys Estate should be found in any other Place shoull in like manner be brought in and delivered to the Commissioners, as more at large per the said Consultation doth appeare.
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In Compliance whereunto, the said Mr John Heathfield having this day brought in and delivered to Us whatsoever appertained unto the said Mr Ambrose Salisbury in his Custody, wee do now think convenient and Enorder, according to the Tenor of our aforementioned Consultation, That Henry Croon Colbourne and Samuel Wales, Writers and servants to the Honourable Company, doe Journey to Pottipolle and that they repair to the Honourable Companies Treasury in that place, and doe bring or send by hand from thence into this Factory whatsoever they finde of the said Mr Ambrose Salisburyys Estate in that place, And for their so doing this Our Order shall be their sufficient warrant.

And Wee doe Enorder that their necessary Expenses for their Journey thither, during their stay there and returne to this place be defrayed and allowed them, MAT. MAINWARING; CHRISTOPHER HATTON; GEORGE CHAMBERLAIN.

Metchlepam the 14th April 1677.

"WHEREAS John Heathfield Chirurgeon and Robert Crawley Writers, by vertue of an order from the Commissioners of the 3d of January 1676/7 directed to Journey to Pettipollee upon the Decease of Mr Ambrose Salisbury, as well for securing the honourable East India Companies Estate in that Factory under the charge of said Mr Salisbury, as also the proper Estate of said Mr Salisbury according to the honourable East India Companies Orders in such Cases provided, In observation thereof did proceed and there taking an Inventory of what was there to be found, brought with them such Part thereof as then was conveniently portable, leaving the rest there under Scale, Since which the said Robert Crawley deceasing, and the Commissioners by important Affaires of the Honble. Company diverted from proceeding farther therein, but more especially upon notice that Mr George Chamberlaine had singly taken upon him to seize and take into his possession, without acquainting the Commissioners therewith, part of the aforesaid Mr Ambrose Salisburyys Estate in money from his Debtors and otherwise, upon a pretence of money due unto him on a Bill of said Mr Salisburyys to Mr Benjamin Broad deceased, for which reasons the Commissioners considered it requisite to forbear farther to meddle therein untill by especial Orders from the agent and Counsell required for the Enquiring after and disposing of the said Mr Salisburyys Estate, This Day taking into their custody such part of the said Estate as the aforesaid John Heathfield and Robert Crawley brought with them from Pettipollee as aforementioned, according to an Inventory thereof taken in the presence of the Honble. Companies Servants therunto subscribed.

We the said Commissioners doe hereby Quitt and discharge the said John Heathfield and Robert Crawley for the aforementioned particulars received of the said John Heathfield according to the Inventory aforesaid and do allow of affixing their Scale on what left behind, it being designed for the security thereof. In witness whereof we the Commissioners aforesaid have hereunto sett our hands this fourteenth day of April 1677 In Metchlepam. Signed and delivered in the presence of Joseph Arnold, Peter Radcliffe. MAT. MAINWARING, CHRISTOPHER HATTON.

Metchlepam, 14th April 1677.

The Council at Fort St. George approved of the action of the Council at Masulipamat. In May 1677, they wrote, "It is very well that you will make Enquiry into the Estate of Mr Ambrose Salisbury deceased, and proceed to payment of his debts, the rest to be made good to the Cash of the Honble. Company for the rest of his Relations at home."

** Factory Records, Masulipamat, Vol. 1. **

See ante, p. 322.

Again, on the 5th July, 1677, the Council at Fort St. George wrote to Masulipatam, "It is very well that you have proceeded to get in Mr Salisbury's remains bringing them into the Honble. Company's Cash. We have given Order to Seeke out for that same Dass lately his servant to be sent unto you."723

On the 4th August, 1677, the Council wrote in the same strain, "It is well that you proceed to get in the Remains of Mr Ambrose Salisbury deceased, and paying of his Just Debts to the Country to carry the nett proceed into the Cash of the Honble. Company for the use of his Friends at home."723

Salisbury's "friends at home" were getting impatient at the long delay in forwarding what was due to them. At a "Court of Committees," held the 31st October, 1677, "Mr Allerman Bathurst and Mr Sambrooke are desired to state the account of Mr Ambrose Salisbury deceased and report the same."723

Further, in their "General Letter to Fort St. George" of the 12th December, 1677, the Company wrote, "The Administratrix of Mr Salisbury sends orders to her Attorney about getting in his Estate, whose wee would have you assist what in you like, and doe the like concerning Samuel Smiths Estate, and to send us their accounts as they stand in our Bookes."724

Before these instructions reached India, Mr. Chamberlaine had made an application for the amount he considered due to him from Salisbury's effects.

"To Mr Matthew Mainwaring, Mr Christopher Hatton, Mr Joseph Arnold, Mr. John Field, Commissioners for the Honourable East India Companies Affairs in their Factory at Metchlepamatam, Sirs, It is now seven months since the Agent and Council acquiesced to the payment of Mr Ambrose Salisbury's debts in their General from the Fort. I am one of his Creditors [ for ] a very considerable Summ as will appear by his Bond. The produce of what he left hath for some moneths remained in the hands of Mr Henry Crown Colbourne, as I am informed, much to the prejudice of the deceased's Creditors as you well know. I now desire you will please to order the payment of it to me that no prejudice may accrue to the Honble. Company in regard of my want of it. The detention may hinder me from voyaging to the Fort as Enordered. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . G. CHAMBERLAIN.725"

Metchlepamatam, 24 January 1677-8."

In reply to Mr. Chamberlaine's demand, the Council at Masulipatam wrote, "Sir, We have received yours of this date demanding payment of what Mr Salisbury stands indebted to you, which you not having expressed, We desire you state the Account between you and deliver it in signed by you, that wee may consider thereof and thereby know what answer to return you."726

Metchlepamatam, 2 Jan. 1677-8."

The following day Mr. Chamberlaine stated his account as requested.

"Mr George Chamberlaine having this morning sent in an account containing the state of his demands upon Mr Ambrose Salisbury deceased, it is Ordered that the same be registered in the Consultation Bookes.

Wee find the said Account consists of rupees 886½ by a Bond to Mr Benjamin Brood, dated March the 8th 1667, with a Condition of Interest at 2 and 3 Per Cent [Per] month to Commence six months after the Date thereof.

Wee find also on the Cr. of said Account that he has received Pagos. 566 which, at 3½ rupees the pago., amounts [ to ] 2051 rupees which contains above twice the principall.

---

The Tottall of Interest to Sept. 18th 1677 he computes and charges Rupees 3676; which appearing a litigious matter such as will require a judicall determination between the Executors or Administrators of said Mr Ambrose Salisbury deceased and Mr. Chamberlaine and wee not being qualified or invested with any Authority to act in matters of such a Nature must refer Mr Chamberlaine to the Agent and Counsell for advice or decision of the case, That Counsell being the only constituted Court of Judicature for our Nation in these parts of India.

Consultation, Mitchlepatam 3d January, 1677-8."

In England, Salisbury's affairs again occupied the attention of the Court in 1678.

"At a Court of Committees holden 14 August 1678. . . Mr. Letten and Mr Sambrooke are desired to examine the account of Mr Ambrose Salisbury deceased and to report the same." 67

"At a Court of Committees holden 27 November 1678. . . Mrs Susan Salisbury petitioning the Court that the account of her Brother, Ambrose Salisbury, late Factor at Mysulpas, may be stated and that a final end may be made thereof, she being willing to acquiesce in such determination as the Court shall please to make therein, It is ordered that it be referred to Mr Sambrooke and Colonel Clerk to examine the account and to adjust the same between the Company and the Petitioner as they in their Judgement shall finde to be equall and to report the same unto the Court." 68

In addition to the above resolution, the Court wrote as follows in their "Generall" to the Agent and Council at Fort St. George:

"Paras. 71. — 'Wee are desired by several of the Relations of our deceased Factors to write unto you on their behalf for your looking after the recovery of what may be due unto them from any one in the Country, and also upon Accont of their Inventory, and in particular by the Freinds of Mr Ambrose Salisbury and Mr John Crandon. Therefore, wee would have you to use your utmost endeavour therein, and to see what due unto them be duly paid into our Cash. And wee cannot but much blame Mr Mainwaring and the rest of our Factors at Mitchlepatam for being omissive herein, for wee doe finde by their Order according to the Original Note under their hands (Copy of which wee sent you herewith) That Mr John Carpenter did Anno 1675 pay unto Henry Croone Colborne the Summ of 111. 11s. 6d. which wee doe not finde brought into the Credit of the Said John Crandon in our generall Books, and wee doe also finde in the Consultation Book of Mitchlepatam that £110 18s. 6d. was paid into our Cash for Accont of Mr Ambrose Salisbury which is also Omitted to be brought by them into our Mitchlepatam Books, both which are much to the prejudice of their Relations here. Wee would therefore have you for the future to bring into our Cash and Generall Books whatever you receive belonging to deceased persons at the time when received, and if there be any Debts owing by them in the Country, which to you shall appear to be justly due to any one there (regard being had to any debt or claims in the first place that wee may have upon them) that then, out of what you shall have received for their Acconts, you doe discharge the same, and by your next Books send us their Acconts rightly stated, that so wee may pay the Balance unto their Relations here; but after you have sent us their Acconts, you are not after that to pay any further Debts out of their Creditts to any one in the Country, and in particular, wee are desired by the Relations of Mr Salisbury and Mr Crandon to order you to recover in what due unto them and bring it into our Cash, which wee require you to doe with all care and diligence. . ." 70

London, 3rd January, 1678-9."
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Upon receipt of the above instructions, the Councill at Fort St. George wrote to Christopher Hatton, who had succeeded Matthew Mainwaring as Chief at Masulipatam, telling him to "especially give us an account of Mr Ambrose Salisbury deceased." This order was dated the 10th July 1679. On the 17th July, at a Consultation held at Masulipatam, we read, "The Councill have examined the Accounts of Mr Ambrose Salisbury and Mr John Crandon deceased as they stand in the General books, and doe finde them to be right entered, and the Sums brought to their Credits to agree with the Summa paid into Cash by the steward, Their distinct accounts traced all along from their Commencement are ordered to be transcribed and inclosed in the packet to the Fort for the Agent and Councillors perusal." Before this statement reached England Ambrose Salisbury's accounts were once again brought before the Court.

"At a Court of Committees held on 28th November, 1679 ... It is ordered that it be referred to Mr Herne and Mr Sambrooke to examine the account of Mr Ambrose Salisbury and to report the same." Also, in paragraph 5 of their "General" letter to Fort St. George, of the 31st December 1679, the Company wrote still more emphatically with regard to the estates of deceased persons in general and to that of Ambrose Salisbury in particular.

"We have frequent and continued Complaints by the Relations of several of our Agents deceased in India, for want of a true account and due care taken in the recovering in of their Estates, and in particular by the Relations of Mr Bagnoel, Mr Salisbury, Mr Covell, Mr Lanston and Mr Crandon and wee cannot but much blame those our servants who were so neglectful not to say dishonest therein ... it was made appear ... That £110 18s. 6d. was received of the Estate of Mr Salisbury, nothing of which is as yet brought into our books. Wee cannot but highly disapprove of any such doings, whereby the dead should be any wise wronged or their Relations in being detained so long time out of what is their due, and must impute it to the unjust practises of our Factors that have the management of receiving in the Estate of persons deceased by making use of their monies (under a pretence of not bringing it into our books of Accounts until the whole be received) unto their owne private advantage. We would therefore have you strictly to examine those particular factors and give us a full account thereof why the said money or any part thereof have been so long detained in those hands who received the same and were not by him delivered unto his respective Chief that it might have been immediately brought into our Cash and books, that so wee might have paid it unto their Relations and thereby have avoided a great deal of clamour and ill surmise from them of our Factors dealings so unjustly by them, Mr Mainwaring affirming that he did not receive the aforesaid ... £110 18s. 6d. of the Estate of Mr Salisbury out of the hands of Mr Henry Croome Colborne untill the of February 1677 and are the last books that we have had from Metchlepatam ... and Mr Mainwaring doth also affirm that ... said soms were brought into our Cash by him as aonse as received by him from the said Mr Colborne and were made good by him to us in those books Letter which are yet wanting here and not sent home by you, which if not already sent, we inorder to Ballance and send us by the first [conveyance], and wee doe require you, as a standing Rule, that whatsoever soms is received by any of our Factors of the Estate of any persons deceased that it be immediately brought into our Cash and posted into that years books and that upon no pretence whatsoever the Steward or any other doe keep it in their hands without giving the said Person deceased Credit in our books for the same..."

The delays in getting in Salisbury's debts appeared interminable. In March 1680, another debtor made an application.
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Fort St. George, Thursday, the 4th March, 1679-80. At a Consultation. Mr Nathaniel Cholmley having presented a paper to the Agent and Councillor, dated this day, wherein he requests the payment of 800 Rupees out of the estate of Mr Ambrose Salisbury deceased brought into the Company's Cash as being owing to him upon Bond, it is thought fit to give him for answer that when all Mr Salisbury's debts are known, some of the Creditors not having yet made demands of theirs, it will be taken into consideration to satisfy them all as far as the estate will go. 76

Streynsham Master, the then Agent at Fort St. George, referred to Masulipatam for information as to Mr. Cholmley's claim. Christopher Hatton replied on the 5th May, 1680, as follows:—"In your General of the 22 April, you are pleased to say that altho' I have not seen any accounts between Mr Salisbury deceased and other persons, yet I may have some other collateral knowledge of debts or demands between them, whereof you are pleased to desire an account. I do remember that Mr Nathaniel Cholmley several times signified unto me that Mr Ambrose Salisbury owed him money on Bond or bill and if my memory fail me not, that Mr Ambrose Salisbury in his lifetime did own himself indebted to said Mr Cholmley but made delays of payment upon some bad market a parcel of Thea of his found in England, that Mr Cholmley has several times since Mr Salisbury's death made demands for his debt of the Commissioners and myselfe I doe very well remember." 77

Cholmley's claim was settled the same month.

Fort St. George, Thursday, 27 May, 1680. At a Consultation. Upon reading Mr Nathaniel Cholmleys second request for the payment of a Bond of Mr Ambrose Salisbury's to him for 800 Rupees due the 1st March 1666 [1676], after perusal of the Honourable Company's order in their letter of 3d January 1678 [1679] and Mr Christopher Hatton's letter of the 5th received the 17th instant, it is resolved and ordered to pay the said Bond at the rate of 319 Rupees per 100 Pogas, as the Rupees of Mr Salisbury's were sold the last year is Pogas. 250.25 which summe is ordered to be charged to Mr Salisbury's Account in the Company Books.' 77

Nothing more is recorded with regard to George Chamberlain's claim against Salisbury's estate. The next reference to the deceased factor's accounts is in September 1680, when, on the 11th of the month, Messrs. Field, Colebourne and Wales wrote from Masulipatam to Streynsham, Master at Fort St. George, "Henry Croon Colebourne . . . hath sent copies of the account of Mr Ambrose Salisbury . . . so far as passed thro' his hands whereby you will see that the money was paid into the Honble. Company's Cash, and as to Mr Salisbury, he had nothing left save a parcel of old letters, his books being left at Mr Mohun's house sealed up when he departed this life." 78

The last allusion to Salisbury in the "Factory Records" is in the "Fort St George Generall to the Company" of the 29th December, 1680. In para. 75, the Council wrote, "Monies paid to Mr Salisbury's Administratrix was before paid into Company's Cash and therefore shall deliver up Mr Mainwarings bond." 79

In February 1682, probably in consequence of the statement from Fort St. George, the Court of Committees, on the 22nd of the month, once more gave an order for two of their number "to state the account of Mr Salisbury and to report the same." 80 Then Salisbury finally disappears from the pages of the Company's records, having made no more stir after his decease than he ever did in his life.
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GAZETTEER GLEANINGS IN CENTRAL INDIA.

BY CAPTAIN C. E. LUARD, M.A.,
Superintendent of Gazetteer in Central India.

(Continued from Vol. XXXVII, p. 119.)

A FAMINE SONG.

The Chhapaniā or "Samvat 1956."

The song given below was composed and sung in Western Mālwa in the great famine of Samvat 1956 or 1899-1900. This famine was the first that had attacked this favoured tract within the memory of living man, and it found the inhabitants quite unprepared to meet it. The song is composed in the rough rustic form of the Garbā, popularly known as Mārwāri Git. I am indebted to Mr. Vakil, Gazetteer Officer of the Ratlām State, for writing down the vernacular version.

Text.

I.
Ghare ghare bakrī, ne ghare ghare ūnt.
Chhapaniyo phir gayo chārl khunnt.

Tek : — Chhapaniyā-re sāl, pher matē āwī bholi duniyān men.

II.
Bājrā re bājyo, masākert dār.
Paraṇyio chhoḍ gayo ghar ki nār.

Tek : — Chhapaniyā, etc.

III.
Kāli, kāli bāllī paqiārī būgd.
Gārī, gārī lugāyārī jhar gāi dāgd.

Tek : — Chhapaniyā, etc.

IV.
Bājrā ki rōṭī, ne tel ki paro.
Chhapaniyā utpar biḷli paro.

Tek : — Chhapaniyā, etc.

Translation.

I.
In every (city) home a goat is found, and (in many even) a camel.¹
The Chhapaniā has travelled into the remotest corners of the land.
Refrain : — O cursed Chhapaniā, return no more to this innocent land.

II.
No bājrā cakes, no pulse of māsūr (can be found in the house).
So the husband has deserted the wife (he cannot support).
Refrain : — O cursed Chhapaniā, etc.

III.
Black, black clouds (are overhead), but only a small drop falls.
The (once) well-nourished women are now grown thin (and weak).²
Refrain : — O cursed Chhapaniā, etc.

IV.
O! for (some) bread of bājrā and a spoonful of oil.³
May lightning blast the cursed Chhapaniā.⁴
Refrain : — O cursed Chhapaniā, etc.

¹ I. e., the country people were forced to sell their cattle to the townsfolk, who had grain to feed them with.
² I. e., "56" for Samvat 1956 or 1899 A.D.
³ Līt., the pot-bellies (śud) of the women have diminished.
⁴ Bājrā bread is only palatable when eaten with ghū, but not even oil, a poor substitute, can be had.
⁵ Note the use of the word chhapaniā; (1) as the famine of 1956; (2) as one stricken by the famine; (3) as the year 1953.
V.
Chhapaniyā kī māsās rāngṭi dār.
Chhapaniyo kūde nawa nawa tār.
Tek :— Chhapaniyā, etc.

VI.
Lāuje-re godārī, pālān jere ṭūş.
Chhapaniyo phir gayo chārī kh ṭūş.
Tek :— Chhapaniyā, etc.

VII.
Bājrā ki roṭi, ne bhēna ko dahi ;
Chhapaniyā ne kājo pachli gali.
Tek :— Chhapaniyā, etc.

VIII.
Tūṣī milchhī, ne tūṭoso bāg ;
Chhapaniyo sūto khūngtī tān.
Tek :— Chhapaniyā, etc.

IX.
Tūṣī gūṛī, ne būṣa-sā bel ;
Banā mokāwe wegi gel.
Tek :— Chhapaniyā, etc.

X.
Bājo bājo, ne wegya moṭh ;
Bhūkhi sāsū khagai hōṛt.
Tek :— Chhapaniyā, etc.

XI.
Chhapaniyā-re hāt me gulāb kī chhari :-
Chhapaniya kardīyo dhān dhari.
Tek :— Chhapaniyā, etc.

The famine-stricken (child’s) mother has found and cooked (a morsel) of dāl,
And (in his joy) he leaps nine cubits (off the ground).
Refrain :— O cursed Chhapani, etc.

VI.
Go fetch the quilted saddle and bring the camel’s pack.
The Chhapaniā has penetrated into every corner of the land (and we must fly).
Refrain :— O cursed Chhapani, etc.

VII.
Bring bājrā bread and curds of buffalo’s milk ;
So shall the Chhapaniā be driven out by the back-way.
Refrain :— O cursed Chhapani, etc.

VIII.
A half-broken bedstead with broken tapes (is all he has) ;
Yet the famine-stricken one sleeps soundly stretched at full length.
Refrain :— O cursed Chhapani, etc.

IX.
A half-broken cart and broken-down bullock
(bring the wedding party),
And the bridegroom is very quickly sent back home.
Refrain :— O cursed Chhapani, etc.

X.
Bājrā was sown but moṭh has appeared ;
The hungry mother-in-law is at her wits’ end
(for food).
Refrain :— O cursed Chhapani, etc.

XI.
(My lord) Chhapaniā holds a thorny rose branch in his hand,
And (with a wave of this sceptre) has raised
the price of grain to five sers a rupee.
Refrain :— O cursed Chhapani, etc.
XII.
Bândhlivi pürgi, saqswâliyâ pech,
Mânejî kâhayagâh bûñjî ne bech.
Tek : — Chhapaniyâ, etc.

XIII.
Tû ga tâkî, bañh takrî yâ bât ;
Chânîlî kâ bâñyâgî ke hogayâ thâth.
Tek : — Chhapaniyâ, etc.

XIV.
Patî râjî tâkî jîme chamikê târâ.
Chhapaniyâg âdâ margayâ, bânsûjîyâ me sârâ.
Tek : — Chhapaniyâ, etc.

XV.
Patî râjî tâkî lâmbî kheçghi ghûnt.
Chhapaniyo phîr gayo chirî khuñt.
Tek : — Chhapaniyâ, etc.

XVI.
Patî roûl, pipal jaşâ pâû.
Jamaî kâhayâ sâsûjî kâ kûn.
Tek : — Chhapaniyâ, etc.

XVII.
Log, lugûge gele jaye
Roûjûg-rû lebû kartû jaye.
Tek : — Chhapaniyâ, etc.

XVIII.
Sâsû poche, suro khaû ;
Balû sapûte gânti jaye.
Tek : — Chhapaniyâ, etc.

XII.
The uncle has renewed his turban and decorated its folds,
But (to do so) and get food he sold his niece.\(^\text{13}\)
Refrain : — O cursed Chhapaniî, etc.

XIII.
The balance of the merchant broke and the weights were scattered,\(^\text{14}\)
But he is rolling in wealthy splendour.
Refrain : — O cursed Chhapaniî, etc.

XIV.
The porridge is so thin, so thin, that the grains in it are (far apart) like stars in the sky.
Now in 1956 half (of us) are (already) dead, by 1962 we shall all be gone (if this want continues).\(^\text{15}\)
Refrain : — O cursed Chhapaniî, etc.

XV.
Thin as his porridge is, (the famine-stricken one) yet gulps it down at a draught, (as if it were amrita).
Indeed no corner has escaped the (dread) Chhapaniî.
Refrain : — O cursed Chhapaniî, etc.

XVI.
The bread is as thin as a pipal leaf,
And the son-in-law has deafened\(^\text{16}\) his mother-in-law with his importunities.
Refrain : — O cursed Chhapaniî, etc.

XVII.
As they walk along the road, men and women (Carefully) count each loaf (they eat).
Refrain : — O cursed Chhapaniî, etc.

XVIII.
The mother-in-law bakes bread,\(^\text{17}\) the father-in-law eats it:
(While) the "dutiful"\(^\text{18}\) daughter-in-law counts (minutely each mouthful swallowed).
Refrain : — O cursed Chhapaniî, etc.

\(^\text{13}\) To loss or be without a turban is a sign of great disgrace.
\(^\text{14}\) Owing to his excessive trade in grain.
\(^\text{15}\) An obscure verse of which no one seemed to understand the allusions.
\(^\text{16}\) Kâa khand, an ordinary idiom meaning to make deaf by continued request: to worry. Cf. kâa phurnâ.
\(^\text{17}\) Poche from poû : to bake.
\(^\text{18}\) An ironical use of the word sapûte = a dutiful daughter (Sk. su-pûtrî.).
MISCELLANEA.

I also wrote two short articles in German on archeological objects in Zangskar, noticed on a journey to that country in 1905. (See Z. D. M. G., Vol. LIX., p. 645 ff., and Vol. LXI., p. 645 ff.) In these articles I tried to show that a few dates are known with regard to the history of Zangskar. Tradition tells us that Zangskar was first of all in the hands of an Indian (perhaps Buddhist) tribe, and the most ancient sculptures may go back to those times. Between 600 and 1000 A.D., the country was conquered by the first West Tibetan king Nyima-mgon, and Zangskar became the heritage of that king's third son, IDe-btsun- (btsun-f-) mgon, although authorities are at variance with regard to the extension of the others' heritage. Thus whilst the Ladangs-rgyal-rabs and the dPagan-beam-ljons-bang (edited by Sarat Chandra Das), apparently agree on Zangskar being IDe-btsun-mgon's portion, the Ladangs-rgyal-rabs makes Guge and a PURANGS the portion of the second son, bKrashis-mgon, and the dPagan-beam-ljons-bang makes aPURANGS the second son's portion, and gives Guge to the third son, IDe-btsun-mgon. That Guge later on was actually the property of IDe-btsun-mgon's descendants, is asserted also by other authorities, which speak of the erection of the famous monastery at mTho-gling in Guge by one of his descendants. My opinion is that as nothing seems to be known of the second son bKrashis-mgon's descendants, we may assume that Guge, and perhaps aPURANGS too, were ruled over by IDe-btsun-mgon's descendants, after bKrashis-mgon had died without issue. At any rate, it was the Zangskar kings who ruled at mTho-gling in Guge and became famous through their connection with Atsä. During Atsä's time, the smaller stone images of Zangskar may have been erected, although the historical records have no note about them.

The image shown to the right of the stone wall on Mr. Upton's photo, is that of a plain Buddha. The other image, to the right of the first, reminds me of the commemoration tablets to the dead, as we find them in the Upper Chandra-bhāga Valley. A similar custom may have prevailed in Zangskar in its Mon (Indian) days.

It is interesting that the most ancient sāti stones in Kulu are of the same type as the commemoration tablets of the Chandra-bhāga Valley. "Gardens" of sāti stones are found below Naggar Castle, and between Sulānpur and Katrain, in Kulu.

REMARKS ON A PHOTOGRAPH, NEAR ATING, TAKEN BY THE HON. ERIC UPTON, DURING A TOUR IN ZANGSKAR IN 1907.

Note by the Editor.

Mr. Upton and my son, Mr. R. D. Temple, both of the 60th Rifles, went on a shooting tour in Kashmir territory, in 1907. In the course of the tour, many interesting photographs were taken by each of them, and among these photographs that one which is the subject of this article is of antiquarian interest. The following is the itinerary of the tour:

Itinerary.

Srīnagar to Išāmābdād.
Išāmābdād via Sinthou Pass (14,200 ft.) into Kāshtwār.
Kāshtwār to Bagna and Chihei Nūllah.
Bagna to Atholi in Padar.
Atholi to Chihehoti.
Chihehoti to Bujēwaś.
Bujēwaś via Umāri Pass (17,300 ft.) to Ating in Zangskar.
Ating via Padam and Thondo to the Zangla (17,500 ft.)
Zangla over the Hills to the N-E. (18,000 ft. and over) to Namši Nūllah (Lādākh).
Namsi Nūllah back to Zangla.
Zangla via Karthū (16,400 ft.) to Ating.
Ating to Bok.
Bok via the Pense Pass (14,000 ft.) to the Gonpa Monastery at Taisongai.
Taisongai to Gīrwār.
Gīrwār via Purkutse to Sūrī.
Sūrī to Dūmāla (Bhotkol).
Dūmāla via Bhotkol Pass (14,800 ft.) to Suknes.
Pailgām to Išāmābdād.
Išāmābdād to Srīnagar.

Remarks on the Photograph by Mr. Franck.

The stone sculptures shown on the plate attached, belong to that type of art which was treated by me, ante, Vol. XXXVI., p. 85 ff., where I tried to fix a rough date for such sculptures. I arrived at the conclusion that the year 1000 A.D. may be taken as an approximate date.
Indian Antiquary.

ANTIQUITIES IN WESTERN TIBET.

Sculptures at the Seni Gonpa in Zanskar between Ating Village and Padam (Spadum).

Hon. Eric Upton, Photo.

W. Griggs.
null
The dPal-bzang-ljon-bzang contains a longer list of lDe-bzang-mgou’s descendants, than that of Schlagintweit, given in his Kôôge von Tibet. Whilst Schlagintweit gives only eight generations of the lDe-Dynasty of Zhangkar-Gage, in the dPal-bzang-ljon-bzang, we find thirteen generations of the same dynasty, after which the rMal Dynasty sets in. This rMal dynasty hardly has anything to do with Zhangkar proper, for, as I have shown in my article mentioned above, archaeology appears to show that in Zhangkar proper the lDe Dynasty lasted down to the seventeenth century when traces of the Ladakh rNam-rgyal Dynasty suddenly appear. The rMal Dynasty may have existed in Guge or dPurang.

A. H. FRANZKE.

THE GHÔDA OF CHIMÛR.

Chimûr is a village in the Waróra Tahsil of the Chándâ District in the Central Provinces, thirty-five miles north-east of Waróra, and forty-two miles north of Chânádâ. It has a population of 4,000 souls and is one of the few big villages in the Chándâ District. It was the head-quarters of a khánîhâd during the Bhonsâl rule, and also of a British tahsil for two or three years on the formation of the Chándâ District. The village is situated on the bank of a sandy stream called Bâlîgangan, marked on the topographical maps as Chimurmâl, on the right-bank of which there used to be a small mud fort, which is now gone, but the site is conspicuous by its being on much higher level than the rest of the village. On this site are now built the Government buildings, viz., the school, the dispensary, the post office and the police station. Near the post office there is a small flat-roofed Chaumukh temple, that is open on all sides, the roof being supported on four massive pillars of sandstone fashioned in the Hêmâl-pantí style. Underneath are placed statues of a cobra, two Ganpatis, a Mahâdeva liṅga, a Pârvati and two Nandis, forming a Sîra Panchâyatana. On the bank of the village tank there is another old temple, which is a little larger than this. It is closed on three sides and has a pyramidal roof, but it curiously faces the west instead of the usual east. A liṅga is enshrined inside and outside there is a figure of Mahâdeva with Pârvati on his lap, which seems to be as old as the temple.

But what invests Chimûr with importance is the modern temple of Bâlîjî and the ‘Ghôda’ Ceremony connected with it. This temple was constructed about 150 years ago, apparently from old materials of other temples, obtained locally or from the neighbouring villages, such as Ner, which has a good specimen of a medieval temple. This has been partially imitated, especially in the matter of the overlapping roofs and ornamentation of capitals usually met with in the temples of the Hêmâl-pantí style. The statue of Bâlîjî was found by a Kunbl named Bhîkâ, while digging for the foundations of a cattle-shed. It is exquisitely carved on a black shining stone, with various figures of gods and goddesses on the spare back-ground. The height of the stone is about a yard, while the figure of Bâlîjî in relief is about two feet high. It really represents Vishnu holding the conch, the mace, the discus, and the lotus, in his four hands. Two other smaller statues, said to be Rishis, were also found along with it.

The Kunbl let it remain on the spot where it was found and commenced to worship it. He was a poor agricultural labourer, but after he began his worship it seemed to him that his condition partially improved. He finally entrusted the worship of the god to a poor Brâhman named Devâjî, who took service under a local rich Brâhman, whose estate he managed well. This attracted the attention of the Bhonsâl king of Nâgpur, who took him into his own service. Devâjî soon rose to a high rank, which he contributed to the favour of Bâlîjî, whom he now worshipped with greater ardour than before, and caused a temple to be built over the statue, endowing it with some rent-free land and cash, now turned into promissory notes, producing an annual income of Rs. 500.

In addition to all this, Devâjî instituted what is known as the Ghôda Ceremony, which takes place annually on the 13th of the bright fortnight of Mâgh, when a wooden horse is carried in procession on a wooden chariot drawn by men. This rûha has a circular top piece which revolves on a pivot, whereby the head of the horse can be made to point in any direction. The horse is painted white and has its front legs raised as if in the act of running away. Two wooden images of grooms hold the bridle, one on each side, while two others stand behind, one of which holds an abdāgif. The other image was, apparently, intended to carry a whisk, but this is now carried by a descendant of Bhîkâ, who squeezes himself in before the now superfluous wooden-man. The rider is a wooden representation of Bâlîjî carrying a couch and a discus in two of his four hands, and holding a whip by the two ends in the other two. It is a privilege of the Kunbl family to wave a whisk over him on this occasion.
Before the horse starts from the temple, a hole is dug under the chariot and a saucer made of kneaded flour, containing oil and burning wicks, together with cooked rice and curds, are placed in it. This is called balidda, and is supposed to be a substitute for a human victim. The horse is supposed to trample on it, and thus to secure his safe journey to the town.¹

No one knows why a horse was selected as Bahlija’s conveyance. My own idea is that it may be due to Devaṇṭ being a cavalry officer, in which case the horse would be a special object of esteem for him. His surname Chorghode seems to support this view. This was the name for the reserve horse in the Bhonsal army, the literal meaning being the chief or hidden horse.

The only other places where a similar horse ceremony is performed are Bela and Umre in the Nagpur District, and Girder in Wardha, and they have been started in imitation of the Chimār ceremony. But the assemblage is not as great as at Chimār.

I witnessed the ceremony on the night of February 1908, when the spectators were close upon five thousand. The fair lasts for a fortnight, though the ceremonies are finished in four days, the last one being known as Gopākāla, in which a pot of curds is broken, and the assembled people rush to get a little of it, as they believe that it secures prosperity in the coming year.

Among the privileges which Bhikṛ Kumbi’s family enjoys, are the cleaning and sweeping of the temple and its compound, which must be done by a female of that family and not by a servant appointed by it. It has been impressed on their minds that service by proxy is not acceptable to the god, nor does he relish any offering other than that obtained from that family. Once it so happened that the priest found a grain of cooked rice in the curds supplied by this family. This was pollution; so he stopped taking the offering from them. In about a month he, however, discovered that the god was not satisfied with the offering he made; so he reverted to the old procedure, in spite of a possibility of the oblations being impure, as it was of no consequence when the god was so disposed. Of course, the supply from the Kunbi family was free of charge, but when that was discontinued the priest had to pay for the offerings he daily brought. The displeasure of the god was notified to all concerned, and it was ruled that if the Kunbi family should have no milk cows, they should purchase the offering and present it to the god, since the latter would not accept anything, except through them. On festival days no medium is, of course, required, and the god gladly accepts all offerings made to him, as they are much more valuable on such occasions than on ordinary days. In spite of all the menial services extracted from these Kunbis, they are not allowed to enter the sanctum or to touch the idol, which their ancestor Bhikṛ daily washed and worshipped, except for one day in the year as a special grace. This day is Gokula Ashṭami, the anniversary of the birthday of Krishna, which falls in the month of August. This privilege is, apparently, allowed to keep the family in good humour.

HIRA LAL.

THE ANTARALLAS OF MALABAR.

Those who are below the Brahmins and Kshatriyas and above the Sudras in caste status are designated Antarallas (Intermediate Castes). They may be broadly divided into three sub-groups, viz., the Nāmpidis, the Ambalavasis, and Samanthas.

I.

Nāmpidis. — These are regicide Nambūdris, whose ancestor assassinated a Perumal or Viceroy of Kārala, as desired by the Brahmins. They are, therefore, considered to have lost their social status as Brahmins, and are now classed along with the Antaralla castes. They wear the thread and repeat the Gāyatri. The Nambūdris officiate as their priests at marriage ceremonies, siddhas, and purification at the end of birth and death pollution, which lasts for ten days. The Nāmpidis follow the maramakkathayam (matriarchal) law of inheritance. Their girls are married after puberty. The tali is tied by their own castemen. Nambūdris or their own castemen may unite themselves in Sambentham (irregular marriage) with the women of this caste. Their women are called Manōlpads.

¹ Compare the Baljā practice of human sacrifice which Mr. Gai has described as follows:— In former years it was a custom amongst them, before starting out on a journey, to procure a little child and bury him in the ground up to his shoulders and then drive their loaded bullocks over the unfortunate victim, and in proportion to the bullocks thoroughly trampling the child to death, so their belief in the successful journey increased: ante, Vol. VIII., p. 219.
Regarding the origin of the name, the following legendary account is given by Mr. M. Sankara Menon in his Report on the Census of Cochin in 1907:

"One of the Perumals, or Viceroy's Of Kērala, having proved troublesome, the Brahman resolved upon his removal. In the struggle that followed, the Perumal was killed by the Brahman. When those who had slain him returned to the place where the Brahman had met in solemn concourse, they were gladly welcomed and asked to sit in the midst, but feeling that they had committed a heinous crime and thus disqualified themselves to sit along with the Brahman, they volunteered to sit apart on the thresholds of the Council-room, by saying 'Nāmpadilm' (we on the threshold), which fact is supposed to account for the origin of their name Nāmpadī, short for Nāmpadilm.

2.

Ambalavāsīs, or temple residents, are those who have by birth the privilege of doing service in temples. They are classified under twelve heads according to the Jāthirāṇa. Most of these castes have grown out of sexual relations between members of higher and lower classes, and are, therefore, known as Anuḷomājā and Pra-thiḷomājās. They may be divided into two broad heads, viz., those who wear the thread, and those who do not wear the thread. To the first of these divisions belong the Ātikāl, Cākkāyā, Nāmbīyā, Nāmbiṣiyan or Pashpakian, Pathil, Nattupattan or Pāṭarumāthu, Pithamṛtiyan and Pithumār; while the Cākkāyā Nāmbīyā, Pīshā-rūṭi, Vāriyan, Pathilvāl, and Mārār belong to the second division. The Kārikākku are also regarded as Ambalavāsīs, but are confined to Travancore, and belong to the first division.

2a.

Ātikāla. — The people in this sub-division of the Anuḷomājā Ambalavāsīs are supposed to have been originally Brahman and suffered social degradation by having officiated as priests in Bhadrakālī temples and worshipped the goddess with offerings of flesh and liquors and partaken of the same. It is also said that the exorcism and the worship of evil-spirits practised by them also contributed towards their degradation.

The word ātikal or adīgal means, literally, slaves or servants. In the Travancore State Manual, Mr. Nagamani records the following legendary account regarding their origin: — "The tradition regarding their origin is very interesting. It is said that Sri Sankarachārya, to test the fidelity of certain Brahman to the established ordinances of caste, went to a liquor-shop and drank some stimulants. Seeing this, the Brahman who accompanied him made this an excuse for their drinking too. Sri Sankarachārya thereafter went to a foundry and swallowed a cup of molten metal and handed another to the Brahman, who had apparently made up their minds to do all that might be done by the Achārya. The poor Brahman begged to be excused and apologised to him as adīgal, or humble servants, and accepted social degradation in expiation of the sinful presumption."

Ātikāla officiate in Bhadrakālī temples. They practise upanayana and they repeat the Gūḍaṭri. Their own caste-men officiate as their priests. Their birth and death pollution lasts for eleven days. Their women are called Atiyammas. They follow the māru maṭkattiyar (matriarchal) system of inheritance.

2b.

Cākkāyā, Slāghīyā (men of respectability) or Slāghīvāk (short for Slūghīvākākār, meaning those gifted with excellence in words), are names for a sub-division of the Anuḷomājā Ambalavāsīs. These are said to be the descendants of Nambūdris that were formerly excommunicated for certain sexual offences. It is asserted that Cākkāyās were originally Parādēsīs and belonged to the Suta caste, which sprang from a Kshatriya father and a Brahman mother; that a family of this caste migrated to Kērala in early times, and that the issue of an adulterous woman born during the period of her illicit intercourse with other castemen, but before detection, was adopted into the family, the members of which were thereafter regarded as a separate caste.

When a Nambūdrī woman is found guilty of adultery by the caste assembly, the children born after the commencement of her criminal intimacy with other castemen are looked upon as children conceived and born in a polluted womb, and are declared to have forfeited their caste. Of the boys, if any, those whose upanayana had already been performed, are affiliated to the class of Cākkāyās, and those boys who have not been invested with the sacred thread, join the class of Nāmbiṣiyan. The girls, if any, join either class.

The Cākkāyās study the Purāṇas and Itihāsas, and expound the same by delivering lectures known as cākkāyā-kāthā. These lectures
are delivered as desired by votaries in fulfilment of vows made and during festivals in most of the temples in Malabar. A portion of the temple is specially dedicated to the chakkiyar-kuth, and is called the kuthamba-law. "The Chakkiyars then enjoy a freedom of speech which is hardly allowed to any other person or to themselves at any other time or place. They criticise men and measures without reserve, and custom allows them to enjoy complete immunity from retribution or punishment." Their women are called Illatumais. The Chakkiyars practise vidYarambh, chaulyam, and upadyaya. They repeat the Gâyatri and wear the sacred thread. Their birth and death pollution lasts for eleven days. They follow the specular rule of inheritance. Their occupation is chakkiyar-kuth (dancing and reciting stories from the Ramayana, Mahabharata and the Bhagavata Purana).

2 c.

Nambyyar, Namibissar or Pushpakan are divisions of the Anulomajá Ambalavasis. According to tradition, a Brahman suspecting his wife's fidelity during her pregnancy, 'outcasted' her. She was subsequently delivered of a female child, which was brought up by Parashurama. As the child was conceived and born during the period of her adulterous intercourse, the girl and her descendants became a separate caste.

There is another popular version regarding the origin of this caste. The Pushpakans are said to be the descendants of a Nambodri woman, who, while in her courses, had connection with her husband and became pregnant. They and their children became a distinct class and were called Pushpakans. The Puppalli belong to this subdivision. The general term for the Namibissar, Pushpakan, Puppalli and Nambyar subdivisions is Uru. Their occupation is to perform certain duties in temples. The women are professional singers at marriages in Nambodri illams and Nayar houses. The Pushpakans practise chaulyam. They have no regular upadyaya, but most of them go through that ceremony between the ages of 8 and 16. They wear the thread and repeat the Gâyatri. Their girls are married to their own castemen between the ages of 10 and 20. Their own castemen or Nambodris unite themselves in sambantham with the women, who are called Pushpinnis or Brahmanis. Their houses are known as pushpakins or madams. They observe birth and death pollution for eleven days, and follow both forms of inheritance. The duties of a Pushpakan are to sweep the inner premises of temples, clean utensils, gather flowers, and make garlands for daily worship.

2 d.

Thiyattuntas or Thiyattu Nambyyar, a subdivision of the Anulomajá Ambalavasis are degraded Brahmans and are lowered in the social scale on account of their pursuits in life. It is said that Siva was frightened at the dreadful sight of Bhadra Kali fresh from her bloody victory over Darikasura, and asked one of his attendants to appease her by propitiatory hymns. The Thiyattuntas are believed to be the descendants of this attendant of Siva, and hence their traditional occupation of thiyattu, a ceremony of leaping through the fire in Kali temples, painting the image of that goddess and chanting songs and performing pûjas. They wear the thread and practice upadiyana. Their girls are married both before and after puberty. Divorce is permitted. Their own castemen officiate as priests. Nambodris perform all the purificatory ceremonies. They have birth and death pollution for ten days. Brahmans and their own castemen consort with their females. They are mostly patriarchal by inheritance.

2 e.

Natupattans or Pattarunis, a subdivision of the Anulomajá Ambalavasis, are a degraded class of Atikals. The tradition regarding their origin is that "formerly in the house of one of the Ashtagrathars Adyaniyars (Brahmans of eight houses), there was an unmarried girl of eighteen, who fell in love with a foreigner, or Paradish Brahman, attached to her illam. This love was reciprocated, and they were married. When the woman subsequently became pregnant, the couple fled to the southern country for fear of being detected and punished. From this originated a separate caste called Pattaruni, meaning a Pattar-child." Their own castemen perform the priestly duties. Their purificatory ceremonies are performed by the Nambodris. They wear the thread and repeat the Gâyatri. Their duties are to perform worship in Kali temples, using flesh and liquor. They also sweep and make garlands for worship in temples. Their death and birth pollution lasts for thirteen days. They follow the marumalkathayam law of inheritance.
Pitāramār, a division of the Anulomājā Ambalavāsīs, are also a degraded class of Atikals, and their duties are similar to those of the Nattupattans, whom they resemble in manners and customs.

Kurukkals (Gurukkals), who are Ambalavāsīs of Travancore, are degraded Brahmans. They are immigrants from the Tamil country and are of Tamil origin. They used to be Saivas and performed pūja in temples dedicated to Śiva. It is said that, in early times, no Vāriyans or other temple servants in Malabar, were available for service in the temples in South Travancore, and that a few families from the Tamil Districts consequently were imported from among the 48,000 Tirumadams of the Tamils, for service in temples there.

Their dress and ornaments are similar to those of the Nāyars. Their houses are called vidus and sometimes madams. Their own castemen officiate as their priests, and perform purificatory ceremonies. They claim social precedence over the other classes of Ambalavāsī. They practise tonsure and upandiyama, and repeat the Gāyatri. The tālketta takes place between the ages of 8 and 12. They even practise patikadhi, as do the Nāyars. Their birth and death pollution lasts for twelve days. Inheritance is in the female line.

Pisharótis, a sub-division of the Prathilomajā Ambalavāsī. It is said that a Nambūdri desiring to become a Sanyāsī is required to serve one for three years as a disciple and then go through the ceremony of ordination on an appointed day. On that day, at the appointed hour, the candidate has to cast away his sacred thread and his tuft of hair has to be removed. But he should take care to retain three hairs on the crown of his head. He should then plunge into the tank stark-naked, and while under water should pluck out the three hairs, with his own hand, one at each plunge in the presence of his preceptor, who whispers into his ears some mysterious formula, which he repeats and then gets out of the water and runs off towards the north. A Pattar Brahman engaged for the occasion meets him and waylays him, and asks him to receive a cloth and accept a meal. He complies with the request and returns to the Sanyāsī’s abode. Now the tradition is that once on a time a Nambūdri was a candidate for the order of Sanyāsīs, but he plucked out only two of the three hairs that remained on the crown of his head and ran off thinking that all the three had been removed. The gūra, or preceptor, found out the mistake and exclaimed; ‘Pisharótis,’ i.e., the disciple ran away. The disciple was now neither a Brahman nor a Sanyāsī. He was accordingly excluded from the order, rejoined his wife and had children by her. He and his descendants are said to be the Pisharótis.” In memory of their ancestor, who, as an ascetic, had to be buried in salt in a sitting posture, they are buried in that posture and are not cremated. Pisharótis are said to be Vaishnavas. Their duties are similar to those of the Pushpakans. Their women are called Pisharotyārs and their houses pisharoms. They observe birth and death pollution for twelve days. They follow the marumakkathayam law of inheritance.

Vāriyans, a division of Prathilomajā Ambalavāsī. Five different traditional derivations are given of this name. The most accepted is that they are the descendants of a Brahman married to a Śūdra wife. The term vāriyan is a corrupt form of paraswam, i.e., the son of a Brahman by a Śūdra woman in accordance with the Yajusnavalkya Samhitā. Their occupation is similar to that of the Pushpakans and Pisharótis. The duties which they perform are called karam, and their customs and manners are similar to those of the Nāyars. The Nambūdris can cook and take meals in the houses of Pushpakans, Pisharótis, and Vāriyans.

The system of inheritance obtaining among the Vāriyans is complicated. They generally follow the marumakkathayam rule of inheritance, but in some places both forms of inheritance prevail. The inheritance depends upon the nature of the sambantham ceremony, which is of two kinds, viz., the ordinary sambantham, and that ceremony accompanied by what is known as kuttekkal or kutipikal (settling in one’s family). In the case of kuttekkal the woman is taken to her husband’s house, and she, thereafter, becomes a member of her husband’s family, and her children inherit the property belonging to that tarvand. If the woman becomes a widow after she is taken to and settled in her husband’s house, she may re-marry, and her children by the second husband also inherit the property of her first husband.

Nambiyārs are a division of Prathilomajā Ambalavāsī who do not wear the thread. These are, as already observed, the sons of
a Nambūdrī woman born during the period of illicit intercourse with other castemen, whose upadhyāya had not been performed. They assist the Chakkāyā in his dances, and their duty is to beat the drum while the Chakkāyā dance. The women are called Naṅtārā, and play on cymbals during the dances.

2 k.

Puduvāḷ, a division of the Prathilomāja Ambalavāsīs. The name is supposed to have been derived from pudu-dāl or pudu-ḍāl, meaning “new-man,” “common-man,” respectively. He is the watchman and steward in temples. He is called Pora Puduvāḷ (outside Puduvāḷ) in contradistinction to Aka Puduvāḷ (inside Puduvāḷ), or Mūthathu. The Pora Puduvāḷ has generally charge of the stores and provisions of the temple. He also collects flowers and makes garlands for daily worship. The women are called Puthuvārāsayaṇa. They observe birth and death pollution for twelve days, and follow the marumakkathayam rule of inheritance.

2 l.

Mārās, a division of the Prathilomāja Ambalavāsīs. These are Sādhus, but, by necessity, taken into the temple service. They are musicians and storekeepers. In some places they are known as Kuruppas. The Mārās assert that they are Ambalavāsīs, and superior to the Nāyars. It is also said that there are two classes of them. The one serving in temples, the other not. The former are said to have social precedence over the latter. In the matter of marriage, period of pollution, inheritance, etc., they follow the Nāyars. In some places, Nāyathus officiate as priests for them, in other places, their own caste-men perform the priestly duties. The talikettu is performed by Tirumalpāḍa in some places, and by Enangara (castemen) in others. Their own caste-men or Brahmans unite themselves in sambantham with the women. The purificatory ceremonies are performed by the Chithiṣas or Nāyar priests. The inheritance is in the female line.

3.

Sāmanthars claim to be of Kāthatriya origin. They are said to be the descendants of the children of the Pernāis, or the elective kings of Kērala, and their Kāthatriya followers by Nāyar women. The several castes that make up the present body of Sāmanthars are (1) Erāḍi, (2) Nēndungāḍi, (3) Vellōḍi, (4) Unnithirī, (5) Atiyōṭi, and (6) Nambiyār.

The primary meaning of the word sāmanthar is given by Dr. Gundert as “the chief of a district.” The Sāmanthars themselves assert that they are the descendants of the Kāthatriya who fled from the wrath of the renowned Pāṇaśū Rāma, and divesting themselves of the sacred thread, lived in jungles or wandered abroad without performing sandhyavandanam and other rites: whence their name of Sāmanthar or those without mantra. They had only tantras.

The customs and manners of the Sāmanthars are similar to those of the Nāyars, but they are generally considered to hold a higher position in the social scale.

Some of them, who own no lands or have no tribal government of their own, but possess only certain privileges, are known as Pāṇḍalas, Unnithiris, Unyathiris and Kārthavus. Others, who do not possess even these, are known by the names of the dēṣa in which they reside, as Erāḍi, Vellōḍi, Nēndungāḍi. All these call themselves Sāmanthars now, and these last three divisions are closely allied, the names being local and denoting settlement in Eṛnād, Nēndunāgū, and Walluvāndi. The Zamorin of Cālicut and his family are said to belong to the class of Erāḍis, and the Raja of Walluvāndi is a Vellōḍi. The ceremonies attending on birth and death are similar to those of the Nāyars. Their marriage ceremonies are also divided into talikettu and sambantham. The talu is also tied by Tirumalpāḍa. As for sambantham in the families of the Zamorin of Cālicut and similar chiefs, the husbands are exclusively Nambūdrīs. The women are called Kolpādas or Kovallamas.

Among the Sāmanthars do not wear the sacred thread, all their ceremonies are performed without mantra. Nambūdrīs officiate as priests among them. They observe birth and death pollution for eleven days. The inheritance is in the female line. The Sāmanthars and Ambalavāsīs do not eat together.

3 a.

Atiyōṭi, a sub-division of the Sāmanthars. This is the caste to which the Raja of Kāthatriya in North Malabar belongs. In customs and manners they resemble the Erāḍis and Nēndungāḍis.

3 b.

Unnithirī, a sub-division of the Sāmanthars. The Raja of Cīrakkal is said to belong to this class. The customs and manners of the Unnithirīs are similar to those of the Erāḍis. The women of this caste, other than those of the reigning families, are called Pillayadhīris.

N. Subbaraya Iyer.
BOOK-NOTICE.

ÜBER SONDERSPRACHEN UND IHRER ENTSTEHUNG.
VON DR. RICHARD LASCH. (Separatabdruck aus Band XXXVII (der dritten Folge Band VII) der Mitteilungen der Anthropologischen Gesellschaft in Wien.) Wien, im Selbstverlag der Anthropologischen Gesellschaft, 1907.

In the above-mentioned paper Dr. Lasch deals with an interesting linguistic phenomenon. It is well known that language often exhibits in a marked degree a tendency towards specialization with reference to some particular sphere of subjects or circumstances. One is familiar, to some extent, with the technical jargons of different trades, professions, forms of sport, and the like; and such deviations from ordinary speech hardly strike us as strange. But in some stages of culture the differentiation is even more marked than it is amongst ourselves. Then, too, with us the use of a special terminology, when it is not imposed by the actual necessity of employing technical terms for which ordinary language possesses no synonyms equivalents, is generally either a mere matter of habit or an affectation of special knowledge. But in many cases, where a specialised jargon is used by races in other stages of culture than our own, other motives come into play.

Dr. Lasch has gone very thoroughly into the bibliography of his subject, and his article contains an astonishingly large number of references to the various and diverse authorities. He has gathered his facts from almost every part of the inhabited world and has thrown them into a more or less systematic order, for which his readers may be grateful to him. Nevertheless, so multifarious are his sources that in the narrow space (of 36 pp. 4to) to which his paper is restricted, it has not been possible for him to go very much into detail. Whoever wishes to investigate the minutiae of the subject must still refer to the original authorities on whom he relies for his information; but in such researches, the references he has collected will be of the greatest service.

Dr. Lasch classifies the peculiar jargons which form the subject of his article under the following main-heads and sub-divisions, etc.—I. Women's talk. II. Magic and spirit jargons, including (a) jargons of fishermen and sailors, based on superstitious ideas; (b) the taboo jargon of campers; (c) that of eagle-watchers; (d) harvest jargons; (e) jargons of gold and tin-miners; (f) war jargon; (g) jargons specially appropriated by priests and sorcerers; and (h) jargons peculiar to secret associations and the like. III. Jargons of social origin, including (a) court language; (b) the jargon of thieves and other criminals; (c) jargons of traders and merchants; (d) jargons of artisans, students, soldiers, and the like. IV. Sportive jargons, made up by children or adults in a spirit of mere caprice, without any ulterior objects.

This is not a very perfect classification. In point of fact it takes for its class (II) the motive underlying the special jargon as its principle of division, but for its class (III) it takes the social environment in which the jargon has developed and is used: thus shifting the point of view from the subjective to the objective side, as it were. This would logically lead to cross-divisions: practically it sever the "high chief" jargons or court languages of Indonesia and Polynesia, which both in their origin and in the motive actually underlying their use to this day, are essentially Taboo Languages (i.e., based on a sentiment of religious awe), from the other Taboo Languages which Dr. Lasch has grouped under his class (II). However, no one is likely to remain in doubt as to their character, which is quite correctly described by him; and perhaps the classification, though not strictly scientific, may be justified on the ground of convenience.

The truth is that it is by no means easy to find a principle of classification for this subject. Dr. Lasch remarks on the singular uniformity of the methods employed in the construction of these artificial jargons, no matter in what part of the world we find them. He enumerates these methods under the following heads:—(1) Descriptive Periphrasis and Metaphor; (2) Loan-words from foreign languages; (3) Archaisms; and (4) Artificial Modification of the form of common or everyday words. This is almost identical with the analysis that I had arrived at from the consideration of some of the peculiar jargons of the Malay Peninsula and the Archipelago (particularly the one that is used by the Jakus of Johore while searching for camphor-trees in the jungle). As my account did not appear till the autumn of 1906 (in Pegum Races of the Malay Peninsula), whereas Dr. Lasch's article is an amplified version of a paper read by him in the spring of 1905, of which, however, I had not heard till now, it seems that the results of our independent enquiries corroborate each other; a fact on which (while not presuming to congratulate Dr. Lasch) I am glad to felicitate myself.

A purely linguistic basis being, therefore, inadequate for purposes of classification, some other principle had to be sought for, with the results stated. Dr. Lasch also endeavours to explain the origin and underlying causes on which these special jargons are based. He sees in them the result of several distinct factors, social, economic, and religious, as well as the mere spirit of caprice and childlike play. On the whole, while not losing sight of the other motives, he appears to attach a considerable importance to the element of caprice. For my part, I think the religious (or what we should call superstitious) element is by far the most prevailing one, and
I incline to the view that it runs through nearly all the different forms of these peculiar modifications of speech, except in so far as it can be shown that they serve a partly utilitarian object or have grown up as a mere matter of habit. Dr. Lasch hardly gives sufficient place, in my opinion, to the sentiment of religious awe and fear.

I would also put in a caveat against the loose use (in which Dr. Lasch, with so many others, indulges) of the expression "Naturvölker." Error is inherent in such highly general terms. Apart from the fact, which I will not pedantically insist on, that no race or community is really in a state of nature (all having been humanised, more or less, by the influence of some amount of tradition), this term "Naturvölker" has often been much misused. It has been made to cover some scores of distinct stages of cultural development differing very profoundly from one another. As a matter of fact, it is not among the most really primitive of the so-called "Naturvölker" that the special jargons which form the subject of Dr. Lasch's paper tend, as a rule, to arise. On the contrary, it is amongst races that have already made a considerable advance in social and political organisation (the formation of a distinct class of chiefs and rulers), religious ideas (the establishment of professional sorcerers and priests, a definite cult of the souls of the departed and the spirits of natural objects), and even some differentiation into crafts and occupations (with technical jargons appropriated to them). So, too, Dr. Lasch's idea that, among the "Naturvölker" generally, there is a very strict separation of the sexes is a generalisation derived from particular stages of culture, and those not the most primitive. In fact, this separation is rather a characteristic of some of the relatively higher stages of development (especially, in Asia, those that have been affected by Hinduism or Islam). I can hardly imagine that he can be right in ascribing the custom (found amongst Zulus and elsewhere) of the avoidance by the wife of words resembling the names of her father-in-law, etc., to the idea that women are regarded by "Naturvölker" as being magicians "par excellence." Surely, it is simply an instance of the principle that the name is a part of, and gives a hold over, the person or thing named; such a hold as a woman (in that stage of social evolution) has no right to assume over the family of her husband, of which she is a subordinate, and not an original, member.

Dr. Lasch is not only inclined to assume that wilful caprice has been the leading factor in the creation of these special jargons, but seems even disposed to extend this principle to cover the differentiation of language generally. If that be so, then good-bye to anything like linguistic science: for there can be no science of a subject-matter which varies irrespectively of any ascertainable laws. This appears to me to be going too far. Language has its self-determining element, no doubt; but it is also largely a matter of habit. This is the case to a very great extent, even in these special highly artificial jargons; in ordinary speech it is so to an overwhelming extent. Analogy is the great unifying principle of language. I pass briefly over the obiter dictum that mixture of races and communities has had relatively little influence on the differentiation of languages; it is not much in point in a paper dealing with special jargons, and is certainly very far from the truth as applied to language in general. Even as regards special jargons, instances to the contrary can be adduced, e.g., the "high language" of Bali is based on Javanese, simply because in the 14th century the Javanese conquered and civilised Bali.

There is one notable lacuna in the materials on which Dr. Lasch's article is based: India receives very little mention; I can find only some half-a-dozen references to it. Whether such material has not been collected in India, or whether, if collected, it has escaped Dr. Lasch's conscientious scrutiny, I have no means of ascertaining at present. But surely the Indian Empire should be a rich field for such enquiries; and if the material has not yet been collected, the sooner it is done, the better.

I may, perhaps, be allowed to add a few remarks on details of which I happen to have some personal knowledge. The Camphor Language of the Johor Jakuns is primarily used by Jakuns, not Malays, and therefore the old Jakun words that occur in it must be classed as archaisms, not as foreign loan-words. As a matter of fact (as Dr. Lasch justly observes), foreign and archaic words play but a very subordinate part in practice, in most of these special jargons; and this fully applies to the Jakun Camphor Language. The Malay for "white beetle" is kumbang (not kumbang) puteh, and, in the Malay war jargon this expression means "bullet," not "dagger." Dr. Lasch on several occasions attributes remarks of mine in Pagan Races of the Malay Peninsula to my collaborator Mr. W. W. Skeat, who must not, however, be held responsible for the linguistic chapters of that work. In particular he imputes to him the idea that a tendency to make up special jargons is a peculiar characteristic of the Malayo-Polynesians. But if he had read a few pages further, he would have seen that I spoke of this tendency as being "perhaps inherent more or less in all races," a view which agrees entirely with his own, and in which I am confirmed by the perusal of his article. In fact, just for this very reason, the study of these jargons is a matter of world-wide interest and should appeal to all who are interested in the science of language. Dr. Lasch has contributed a valuable piece of work to this branch of research, and his paper should aid and stimulate other workers in this field.

C. O. BLAGDEN.
THE DATE OF BUDDHA.

BY V. GOPALA AIYER, B.A., B.L.

In the history of the world, there is no chapter of human thought and activity of greater effect on modern civilisation than that relating to the life and work of Gautama Buddha. He was born in an age when the world was in great need of earnest teachers to divert its attention from traditional groves of thought and religious beliefs to new spheres of ideas and moral convictions. The philosophy of the Upanishads and the Sankhya doctrines of Kapila had already made the way clear for him; but the authority, example and influence of a born spiritual selfless leader of men was required to carry on the reformation against the conservative tenets of ritual-loving Brahman orthodoxy. Indeed, but for his propaeganda, the Vedanta school in India could not have attained the pre-eminence it subsequently acquired, and possibly the Western world might have been denied the privilege of the consoling gospels of the Sage of Galilee. The advent of Jesus in the West and of Sankara in the East, was, in a large measure, rendered possible by the large-hearted sympathy and the sublime teachings of the highest and the most benificent personality in the history of thought. He it was that zealously preached the benign counsel of Love and Service, a doctrine till then but imperfectly understood, but which, carried by a band of earnest missionaries to the extreme confines of the then known world, was destined, in the march of events, to have a far-reaching influence over the hide-bound dogmas of bygone civilisations. The torch of modern enlightenment was lit up from the lamp of Dharma, which, having been set alight nearly twenty-four centuries and a-half ago, still illumines the lowly hearts of over 500 millions in Northern and Eastern Asia. More than all, the missionary aspect of religion, which till then might be said to have been tribal and exclusive, the earnest endeavour to carry to all, even to those outside the place of one's tribe, caste or persuasion, tidings of peace and goodwill among men was first inculcated to the world by Gautama, when he said, on sending out his disciples: “Let not two of you go the same way. Preach O Bhikkus, the doctrine which is glorious”; and the world has since been influenced by the preservating zeal of one creed or another, of Jesus, Muhammad, Rámaújña or Nának. In short, the history of the world would have been a good deal different from what it is but for the event of Kapilavastu, alas, so soon forgotten in the land of its origin. How pregnant with world-wide effect and importance is the appearance of a single individual on the stage of history!

This period of Buddha’s activities is interesting in more than one direction. At the time when the Tathágata was setting in motion the wheel of the New Dispensation, Mahávira was laying in India the foundations of the Jaina Religion. Then it was that Confucius awoke China with his code of morals, and Greece began to develop philosophy as a distinct branch of study, and was destined, soon after, in the Age of Pericles, to attain in many departments of human activity a state of progress, still an object of envy and admiration to the world. Rome always intent on civic advancement and political liberty was then transforming itself into a Republic, and the Persians, having overthrown the empire of the Medes, set up a monarchy of their own, and having subjugated Babylon and Egypt, turned their eyes towards India and Greece.

“...In each of these widely separated centres of civilisation,” says Professor Rhys Davids (Buddhist India, p. 239), “there is evidence, about the sixth century B.C., of a leap forward in speculative thought, of a new birth in ethics, of a religion of conscience threatening to take the place of the old religion of custom and magic,” which circumstance may be said to constitute “the best dividing line, if there was any, between the ancient history and modern, between the old order and the new.”

1 A lecture delivered before the South Indian Association, Madras, on 1st March 1908, being the 3rd Chapter of the author’s Chronology of Ancient India, 2nd Volume.
The date of Buddha’s Nirvana thus comes to be of more than passing importance. It forms a significant landmark, at all events, in the history of India. In that year was held the first Great Buddhist Council at Rajagriha, the then capital of the Magadhan Empire, under the distinguished presidency of Asoka. It was the eighth year of the reign of Ajaśatru, king of Magadha, son of that Bimbisara of the Saindhava Dynasty, who stopped a great sacrifice he was then pompously celebrating at the gentle bidding of Gautama, when he spoke:

"Of life, which all can take but none can give,
Life, which all creatures love and strive to keep."

The epoch of the Nirvana gradually came to be the commencement of an era, adopted by Asoka in some of his inscriptions and by the chronicles of the Southern Buddhists. It was prevalent in India even in the days of the great astronomer Vriddhagarga, who is known to have flourished in the second century B.C. The era became so universal during the period of Buddhist supremacy in India that the word śāha or śāhada, originally intended to denote the era of Śākyas’ Nirvana, came subsequently to signify any era. Thus it will be readily seen that it is desirable to fix this epoch for a proper understanding of the history and chronology of Ancient India.

Many fanciful dates have been ascribed for the epoch, which need not here be seriously discussed. The Northern Buddhists give dates ranging from 2422 to 546 B.C., and the Afn Akbari of Abul Fazal fixes 1246 B.C. for the event. The Tamil Mantippalam gives the year 1616 of some unknown era, probably of the Kali, and the Buddhists of Ceylon, Burma and Siam have uniformly been regulating their calendars on the basis that the Nirvana occurred in B.C. 543. The Western scholars are likewise as much divided in their opinions, though their dates range only from 544 to 370 B.C. Professors Rhys Davids and Kern give 412 and 388 B.C., respectively, for the Para-Nirvana, whereas Max Müller has maintained that 477 B.C. was the correct date. Dr. Flett considers the event to have taken place in B.C. 482, and Professor Oldenberg and M. Barth fix it in 480 B.C. Mr. V. A. Smith has given us three different dates, B.C. 508 in his Asoka, 487 in his Early India, and 480 to 470 B.C. in a recently published article. It is my present purpose to consider whether, with all these discordant and divergent opinions before us, we cannot yet discover a date in thorough accord with the materials available to us; and should we be able to deduce such a date, my purpose is also to find out why the Southern Buddhists have, for a long period of time, uniformly accepted 544-3 B.C. for the epoch.

For the purpose of such an enquiry we have first to determine the epoch of the Maurya Era, which again can only be fixed by a discussion of the dates of Chandragupta, the founder of the Maurya Dynasty, and of his grandson Asoka-vardhana, who made a world religion of the creed of Buddha. This Asoka is different from Kallisuka of the Ceylonese Chronicles, who has been identified with Mahapadma Nanda of the Pardnas, and in whose reign the Second Buddhist Council is reputed to have been held at Vaissali, under the presidency of Ratha, after the lapse of a century from Buddha’s Nirvana. According to the Ceylonese Chronicles, Asoka-vardhana Maurya, on the other hand, was converted to the Buddhist faith in the fourth year after his accession and formally crowned soon after in the same year. He is therein stated to have held the Third Buddhist Council under Tushya in his eighteenth regnal year, 235 years after the death of Buddha.  

\[J. E. A. S., 1906, pp. 179 and 289.\]  
\[Indian Review, Vol. VIII, p. 561.\]  
\[For these and other particulars, see Turnour’s Mahawansa, edited by Wijesinha; Oldenberg’s Dipavamsa, and V. A. Smith’s Asoka, pp. 159-174.\]
In a Rock Edict of his thirteenth year (and Asoka always counts his years from the time of his coronation), Asoka says that he made war with Kalinga in his ninth year and that, as remorse came upon him in consequence of the immense destruction caused during the war, he resolved thenceforth to give up military conquests, and he then proceeds to say:

"And this is the chiefest conquest in His Majesty's opinion, the conquest by the Law of Piety, this also is that effected by His Majesty both in his own dominions and in all the neighbouring realms as far as six hundred yojanas — even to where the Yavana King named Antiyoka dwells, and, beyond that Antiyoka, to where dwell the four Kings severally named Taramaye, Antikina, Maka, and Alkassandare, and in the south, the Kings of the Cholas and Pandyas and of Sinhala."

The Yavana Kings have thus been correctly identified:—Antiyoka with Antiochus (These), who ascended the Syrian throne in 261 B.C. and died about 246 B.C.; and the farther kings Taramaye, Antikina, Maka and Alkassandare, respectively, with Ptolemy (Philadephus, King of Egypt from B.C. 285 to 247), Antigonus (Gonatas, King of Macedon from B.C. 278 to 242), Magas (King of Cyrene who died in 238 B.C.), and Alexander (King of Epirus from B.C. 272 to 258). It is thus evident that the missionaries, sent by Asoka to these kingdoms between the ninth and the thirteenth year of his reign, reached them between B.C. 261 and 258, the dates, respectively, of the accession of Antiochus These and of the death of Magas, King of Cyrene. As the missionaries might most probably have reached the Greek Kingdoms about a year after the conquest of Kalinga, we may safely infer that the tenth regnal year of Asoka corresponded with B.C. 260 or 259, or, in other words, that his coronation was celebrated about the year 269 B.C. And as, according to the Chronicles, the coronation was in the fourth year after his accession to the throne and the reign lasted for over 37 years after the coronation, we may regard Asoka's reign to have extended from about B.C. 273 to 231.

We have next to determine the date of Chandragupta. The Ceylonese Chronicles tell us that Chandragupta reigned for twenty-four years, and that his son Bindusara reigned before Asoka for a period of twenty-eight years. The Vidy Purâga gives the same period for Chandragupta, but assigns a period of twenty-five years for Bindusara, which may be incorrect, as the total of the periods of the individual reigns of this dynasty fall short of the total period given for the whole dynasty by about four years. Following the chronology of the Ceylonese Chronicles, the evidence of which, in this case at any rate, there is not much reason seriously to doubt, we get 273 plus 52, or 325 B.C., for the beginning of the Maurya Era, dating from Chandragupta's accession to the throne of Magadha.

We have now to see if there is anything in the Greek accounts of this period of Indian History to militate against the correctness of the above date. In speaking of the report brought to Alexander that the Gangaritans and Presians (i.e., of the Prachi or Magadha Kingdom) were prepared to meet with a huge army the attack of the Greeks, in consequence of which Alexander was made to retrace his steps, Plutarch, who lived about the beginning of the Christian Era, says (Life of Alexander, 79):—"For Androcottus, who not long after reigned in those parts . . . with an army of 600,000 men, subdued all India . . . Androcottus, then a youth, saw Alexander there and is said often afterwards to have been heard to say that he missed but little of making himself master of these countries; their king who then reigned, was so hated and despised for the viciousness of his life and the meanness of his extraction."

We may infer from this extract that Androcottus, or Chandragupta, was at the time sufficiently influential and mature to be able to meet Alexander in the Panjab, and that the time was then favourable for the overthrow of the Magadhan King, as Chandragupta himself found soon after, when he supplanted the Nanda Dynasty.
Quintus Curtius Rufus and Diodorus Seculus of about the first century of the Christian Era, corroborate Plutarch as regards the wickedness and low origin of Nanda, the then reigning King of Magadha, who is variously called Agrammes, or Xandrames, or Nandrus.

Justin, probably of the 5th century A. D., but whose materials are drawn from Pompeius of the first century, says:—"Seleucus Nicator after the partition of Alexander's Empire, took Babylon, passed over to India, which after Alexander's death, as if the yoke of servitude had been shaken off from its neck, had put his prefects to death. Sandrocottus was the leader who achieved this freedom; but after his victory, he forfeited by his tyranny all title to the name of liberator, for he oppressed with servitude the very people whom he had emancipated from foreign thraldom. He was born in humble life, but was prompted to aspire to royalty by an omen significant of an august destiny. For when by his insolent behaviour he had offended Nandrus and was ordered by that King to his death, he sought safety by a speedy flight. It was this prodigy (of a lion licking him) that first inspired him with the hope of winning the throne, and so having collected a band of robbers, he instigated the Indians to overthrow the existing government. When he was thereafter preparing to attack Alexander's prefects, a wild elephant approached him and receiving him on its back fought vigorously in front of the army. Sandrocottus, having thus won the throne, was reigning over India, when Seleucus was laying the foundations of his future greatness."5

It has been the fashion to infer from the above extracts that Chandragupta ascended the throne of Magadha after Alexander's prefects were put to death, i. e., at about 321 B.C. according to certain recent scholars, or 315 B.C. according to the late Professor Max Müller. But neither of these dates, it is submitted, can legitimately be referred from the extracts given above. It is clear from the statement of Justin that Chandragupta prepared himself to attack Alexander's prefects in the Panjab (who were put to death soon after Alexander's death in B. C. 323), only after the overthrow of the Nanda Dynasty. And this is only what ought to be expected under the circumstances. Banished from Magadha by the last King of the Nandas, Chandragupta sought refuge in the Panjab, where he met Alexander and his army in 326 B.C. He profited by the lessons of Alexander's intrepid marches and military tactics, and knowing that the then King of Magadha was hated on account of his wickedness and mean origin, and taking advantage of the confusion prevailing in Northern India by reason of Alexander's conquest, he secured the assistance of certain tribes, invaded Magadha and succeeded insetting himself up on the throne. This may be considered to have taken place soon after Alexander left the Panjab, or in 325 B.C. Having firmly established himself in the sovereignty of the realm and made himself secure against internal enemies, he turned his attention to the Panjab at the right moment when news was received of Alexander's death, and overpowering his prefects, added it to the domains of Magadha. Consequently, Chandragupta was already ruling a great empire when Seleucus was but laying the foundations of a greatness, which was consummated by the establishment of the Seleucidian Era of 312 B.C.

In this opinion, we are also supported to some extent by the details of the Mudrā Rākshasa, a remarkable drama of Viśākhadaśa of the "early part of the eighth century," and of the commentator's introduction thereto. We are therein informed that the "evil-hearted" sons of the old Nanda King became envious of Chandragupta, who was then in command of the army. Chandragupta consequently left Pātaliputra, the capital of Magadha, and under the advice of the Brahman Chānakya, sought the help of a Mlechcha General. By liberal promises this Mlechcha was induced to assist him in laying siege to Pātaliputra. It was eventually taken; and the Nandas having been put to death, Chandragupta ascended the throne, no less by the craft of his wily minister than by the prowess of his arms.

5 For this and the previous extracts, see Invasion of India by Alexander the Great, by J. W. McCrindle.
6 Telang's Introd. to Mudrā Rākshasa, p. xxvi.
Thus the accession of Chandragupta to the throne of Magadha, which is the epoch of the Maurya Era, has to be placed in 325 B.C., whether as the result of an examination of the Greek and other authorities of the West, or on a consideration of the data available with reference to Asoka. The dates, 325 B.C. for the commencement of the reign of Chandragupta, and 289 B.C. for the coronation of Asoka, are of immense importance for the fixing of the date of the Nirvana of Gautama Buddha; for, as according to the Ceylonese Chronicles, the accession of Chandragupta and the coronation of Asoka took place, respectively, after the expiry of 162 and 218 years after the Nirvana, this last event may be considered to have taken place in 487 B.C. These statements of the Chronicles are accepted as correct even by the late Prof. Max Müller (Ancient Sanskrit Literature, p. 299), and, in fact, they have been remarkably corroborated by certain Inscriptions of Asoka, which have recently been discovered.

The Inscriptions of Asoka, which have been found from Gujarât on the west coast to Orissa on the east, and from Afghanistán in the north to Mysoor in the south, are remarkable as giving us an insight into the wide range of the dominions of the Mauryan Dynasty, whose first King Chandragupta is reported to have brought the whole world "under one umbrella." They are also of unique importance in the history of paleography for having furnished the genius of Pumpe with the clue to the decipherment of the earliest known Indian Alphabet, — the same service which the bilingual inscription of Malta, the Rosetta stone and the Rock of Behistun have rendered to the study of cuneiform inscriptions and Egyptian hieroglyphics. Of these Inscriptions, the so-called Minor Rock Edicts of Sahasráṃ in Bengal, of Rûlpáth in the Central Provinces, of Bairât in Râjputâna, and of Siddâpura, Jâtunga Râmesâra and Brahmagiri in Mysoor, are of immense help in the fixing of the chronology of Asoka, and of Buddha's Nirvana. All of them contain variant recensions of practically the same text; but those at Brahmagiri and Rûlpáth are the best preserved.

The Brahmagiri text is thus translated by Mr. Vincent Smith (Asoka, p. 140): — "By order of the Prince and Magistrates at Suvarnagiri, the Magistrates at Isila, after greetings, are to be addressed as follows: — His Majesty commands: — For more than two years and-a-half I was a lay disciple without exerting myself strenuously. A period of six years, or rather more than six years has elapsed since I joined the Order and have strenuously exerted myself; and during this time the men who were, all over India, regarded as true, have been, with their gods, shown to be untrue. For this is the fruit of exertion, which is not to be obtained for himself by the great man only; because even the small man can, if he choose, by exertion win for himself much heavenly bliss. For this purpose has been proclaimed this precept, namely, ‘Let small and great exert themselves to this end.’ My neighbours, too, should learn this lesson; and may such exertion long endure! And this purpose will grow — yea, it will grow vastly — at least half as great again will be its growth. And this precept was proclaimed by the Departed. 256 (years have elapsed since then?) . . . Written by Pada, the Scribe."

The Rûlpáth text has also been translated thus by the same learned author (Asoka, p. 138): — "Thus saith His Majesty: — For more than two years and-a-half I continued to be a hearer of the Law without exerting myself strenuously. A period, however, of more than six years has elapsed since I joined the Order and have strenuously exerted myself. The gods, who at that time, all over India, were regarded as true gods have now become untrue gods. For this is the fruit of exertion which is not to be obtained by the great man only; because even the small man can by exertion win for

1 Mr. V. A. Smith writes to me under date 7th October 1906: "It is possible that you may be right in antedating Chandragupta to 325."

2 Sanskrât. Some scholars would take this word to mean one year. But in the face of the corresponding words satvachale (and = 6) and chandrasâra (ohs = 6) used, respectively, in the Sahasráṃ and Rûlpáth versions, such interpretation seems incorrect. Mr. Smith adopts Dr. Bühlcr's rendering, and I agree with them.
himself much heavenly bliss. And for this purpose was given the precept, 'Let small and great exert themselves.' My neighbours, too, should learn this lesson; and may such exertion long endure! For this purpose of mine will grow its growth — yea, it will grow vastly, at least half as large again will be its growth. And this purpose has been written on the rocks, both here and in distant places; and wherever a stone pillar exists, it must be written on the stone pillar. And as often as a man seasons his cooked food with this condiment, he will be satisfied even to satiety. This precept has been given by the Departed. 256 years have elapsed from the departure of the Teacher (?)

No serious objection can possibly be, nor has been, raised to the correctness of this translation, except in regard to a few particulars. The period given for the interval when Ashoka was a lay disciple and the numerical figures in the last paragraph have been differently interpreted by different authors. As regards the numerical figures, the Brahmagiri text reads thus:— "Iyam cha sadane sad v (d) p (i) te Vyuṭhena 256 sce." The Rūpamā text runs thus:— "Vyūṭhena sadane kṣaṇa 256—Neta viśedt ta." We find the following at Sahasrām: "Iyam (cha sadane) viṇuṭhena dvācā sampawālāti sada viṇuṭhā ti 256." The various renderings of this puzzling passage have been collected by Dr. Fleet in the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society for January 1904. M. Senart considers that the words refer to the "256 settings out of missionaries," and Professor Oldenberg, to the number of men who taught on earth. But the most rational interpretation hitherto attempted is the one given by Dr. Bühlcr and adopted by Mr. Smith in the translation given above. "Dr. Bühlcr who first brought the contents of the edict to public notice in 1877, maintained from first to last that the words and the numerical symbols are a date and that the passage means that the edict was promulgated when 256 complete years had elapsed, and in the course of the 257th after the death of Buddha." That the figures 256 represented a date is also the opinion of Cunningham, Max Müller, Kern, Pischel, Boyer and Rhys Davids, though the last named Professor considered the figures to represent the number of years elapsed since the great Renunciation of Buddha in the 29th year of his age. In endorsing the view that the figures represent a date and that they are reckoned from the Death of Buddha, Dr. Fleet pointedly mentions that there is no word used in the Brahmagiri text "to give how 256 is to be applied. This is instructive, for the idea of date can be inferred, but not of persons." He therefore translates the Sahasrām text as follows, "And this same precept was composed by the Wanderer: (of) centuries two (hundred) and fifty-six (years) have elapsed since the Wanderer; or in figures 200 (and) 50 (and) 6." The Rūpamā text is thus translated: "(This same) precept was composed by the Wanderer; (of) centuries 200 (and) 50 (and) 6 (years have elapsed) since (his) wanderings." And the Brahmagiri inscription is translated thus: "And this same precept was incised by the Wanderer; 200 (and) 50 (and) 6 (years have elapsed since then)."

There can be no doubt that both Dr. Bühlcr and Dr. Fleet have correctly surmised that 256 is a date, and that it begins in the year of Buddha's death. But with the greatest deference to their very high attainments, I must humbly submit that they are wrong with reference to the person denoted by the word 'vyūṭha' or 'vyūṭha' which simply means 'departed.' I consider that the precept is of Ashoka himself, given almost on his deathbed, that

12 Mr. V. A. Smith, to whom I sent an advance copy of this paper, kindly draws my attention to an article by himself and Mr. F. W. Thomas since published in the Indian Antiquary, wherein Mr. Thomas says: "But according to one text the sādane is kṣaṇa, 'made,' and this seems to imply rather a newly-composed, than an ancient, precept. The actual tenor of the precept confirms this theory. . . . The lesson, therefore, which he would inculcate is a new one, an outcome of a recent personal experience. . . . The author of the precept . . . is Ashoka himself. Mr. Smith adds in a footnote to the copy of that article kindly sent by him to me: 'V. Gopala Aiyer agrees and I am pretty sure that this is right.' But Mr. Thomas takes 'vyūṭha' to mean Ashoka's missionary travels. This appears to me to be incorrect. Mr. Smith himself says in another footnote to the same copy with reference to this interpretation of Mr. Thomas: 'This, I now admit, is doubtful.'
probably he gave instructions to "the prince and magistrates of Suvarnagiri", where he seems to have lived in religious retirement, to engrave his last commands in all parts of his dominions, and that possibly before his instructions could be carried out, he departed from this world. If this precept were to be considered as that of Buddha, scholars ought to have, but have not, been able to point out among Buddha's sayings the teaching herein engraved, namely, "Let small and great exert themselves." Nor does this find a place in the list of the passages, which Asoka calls from Buddha's sayings and publishes for the edification of the monks of Magadha in the Bhārā Edict, famous for its clear showing of Asoka's adherence to the Buddhistic faith. Moreover, the words under discussion, namely, Jyam cha śāvone... 256 sa in the Brahmagiri text, and Vyutthad śāvone... vivās ta in the Rūpātā text, no more belong to the body of the text than the words "Paṇa līkhitam tīpi kareṇa" (written by Pada, the Scribe), which we find at the end of the Brahmagiri, Jatunga Rāmesāra and Siddhāra inscriptions. Just as the Scribe immortalized himself by adding his name at the end of the inscription, so even the Prince and Magistrates of Suvarnagiri, who published this inscription, began it by proclaiming that it was at their instance that it was published, and ended it by appending hereto its date in the years of the Nirvāṇa. The term 'vyūtha' was applied by them to Asoka, who had probably just then departed to the other world, and, as it was no longer possible, on account of his death, to adhere to the practice of dating the Inscriptions of Asoka in the years of his reign, this inscription had to be dated in the years of the Nirvana of Buddha. The Brahmagiri text may therefore be translated thus: "This teaching was proclaimed by the Departed (Asoka) in the year 256." The Rūpātā and Sahasraṃ texts have, in addition, the following words respectively, namely, "256 Saṭa vīyed ta" and "Saṭa vīyed ti 256." Dr. Bühler correctly translates 'Saṭa' 11 as 'Teacher' and considers it refers to Buddha; and in my humble opinion these words mean "in (the year) 256, since the departure of the Teacher (Buddha)." I therefore consider that the precept was perhaps the last admonition to his people of Asoka, who departed.

Like some full-breasted swan,
That, fluting a wild carol ere her death,
Ruffles her pure cold plume, and takes the flood
With swarthly webs.

The next point to be considered is the period given in the inscription for the interval when Asoka was a lay disciple. The exact word used in the Rūpātā inscription for this period is adhitisāni, whereas the Brahmagiri text has aśuddhitisāni. Dr. Bühler translated this Magadhi word in the columns of the Indian Antiquary for 1877 (p. 256), as meaning thirty-two and a-half years. But Dr. Bühler subsequently gave up this construction, and he states in the Epigraphia Indiae, Vol. III (p. 134), that the word means two and-a-half years, an interpretation which, though wrong, has been adopted by Mr. Smith in his Asoka, and by Mr. B. L. Rice, the discoverer of the Mysore Edicts, (Ep. Carnaticæ, Vol. XI, p. 4.)

Mr. V. A. Smith says: "We have Asoka's own authority for stating that in the ninth year of his reign, for the reasons above explained, he joined the Buddhist Community as a lay disciple." 12 I submit that we have no such authority. The reasons advanced by Mr. Smith are almost the same as those relied on by M. Senart and are based on the thirteenth Rock Edict. Asoka says therein that he conquered the Kalingas in the ninth year of his reign, that he was greatly affected by the horrors of war and that ever since he had zealously protected the law of Piety, had been devoted to that Law and had proclaimed its precepts." I think that it is wrong to draw from this statement that Asoka was converted only then for the first time. It simply shows that the bloodshed caused in the

---

11 Skt. Saṭa, a name of Buddha. See Amarabāsi, I, 14.
12 Asoka, p. 18.
Kalinga War opened his eyes to the iniquity of military conquests, and that he resolved thenceforth to be zealous in the discharge of religious duties. It means that he then became, what in modern language may be called, regenerated. The absence of any specific statement in this long and biographical record that he was only then converted, shows, on the contrary, that he was a Buddhist already. Again the statement made in the eighth Rock Edict on Pious Tours, to the effect that in former times Kings used to go out on tours for purposes of pleasure, but, in the eleventh year of his reign, "he went on the road leading to true knowledge, whence originated tours devoted to piety," during which pious men were seen, and largess bestowed,—this statement—has been interpreted by Prof. Rhys Davids and Mr. Smith, as showing that Aśoka became a monk in the eleventh year of his reign by taking the eightfold path. This idea, I venture to express, never entered into the mind of the pious monarch. What he clearly intended to proclaim was that, whereas former Kings went out only for purposes of mundane pleasures, he, on the other hand, toured in his provinces only for the purpose of acquiring spiritual merit. As a matter of fact, we have evidence of his pious tours in the numerous stūpas and pillars, which he erected in holy places in various parts of his dominions is memory of his having visited them.

It is clear to anyone conversant with even modern Prakrit vernaculars that agha means two and-a-half, and its means thirty, and that the word consequently signifies thirty-two and-a-half years. This interpretation is also supported by the following considerations. If aṅkhiśādapi meant two and-a-half years, then as Aśoka was certainly a Buddhist in the year after the Kalinga War, he must have been a monk in the 13th year of his reign at the latest; but no inscriptions of his, of that or of any later year, including the pillar edicts of the twenty-seventh and twenty-eighth years of his reign, make any mention of his having joined the Order, which must, therefore, have occurred at a much later date.

Secondly, the Rupnāth version of the Edict under discussion states that Edicts had already been inscribed on rocks and pillars. As we do not find any pillar edict prior to Aśoka's twenty-seventh year, this inscription must certainly be later and cannot belong to the eighteenth year of his reign, as was supposed by Mr. Smith. 13

Thirdly, in this inscription strenuous exertion for a short period as a member of the Order is contrasted with, and considered superior to, the moderate exertion of a layman for a longer period. It is absurd, therefore, to contrast strenuous exertion for the longer period of six years with moderate exertion for the shorter period of two years and-a-half.

Fourthly, we find in this inscription the first and only glimpse of an intolerant spirit ever exhibited by Piyadasai. Even as late as the 28th year of his reign, he says, in the Sixth and the Seventh Pillar Edicts, 'I devote all my attention to all communities. All sects have been revered by me.' "He also arranged that censors should be occupied with the affairs of the Buddhist clergy, as well as with the Brāhmaṇs, Jains, Ajjāvakas and, in fact, with all the various sects." The Twelfth Rock Edict of about the fourteenth year of his reign is devoted solely to the subject of Tolerations, and Aśoka declares therein: — "A man must not do reverence to his own sect by disparaging that of another man for trivial reasons. Depreciation should be for adequate reasons only, because the sects of other people deserve reverence for one reason or another." He recommends charity and respect to Brāhmaṇs in many of his edicts and bestowed certain caves on the members of the Hindu Ajjāvaka Sect. If we compare these splendid acts of toleration with the fanaticism of the inscription in question, there can be no doubt that Aśoka was in his dotage when the latter was issued. For he says therein that during the six years he had

13 Aśoka, pp. 138—140.
been a monk, "the men who were all over India regarded as true (meaning thereby, Brāhmans) have been with their gods shown to be untrue," a statement more worthy of an intolerant old bigot than of a wise statesman that he till then had been. It stands to reason, therefore, that it must have emanated long after the Pillar Edicts of his twenty-eighth year.

Filthily and lastly, the interpretation herein attempted also agrees with the chronological details of the Ceylonese Chronicles in a remarkable manner. As we have already seen, they declare that the King joined the Buddhist faith in the fourth year after his succession to the throne, and celebrated his coronation soon after in the same year, i.e., 218 years after the death of Buddha and that he died thirty-seven years after his coronation. The Suddarāna Vīhāra, which was translated into the Chinese in 489 A.D., also agrees in giving 218 A. B. for Aśoka. From these statements we may draw the obvious inference that Aśoka was a Buddhist for about thirty-eight years and that he died in the year 256 after the death of Buddha. This result exactly tallies with the details of our Inscription, which was proclaimed in the year 256 after Buddha's death and according to which Aśoka was a Buddhist for 32½ + 6 or 38½ years.

We have already fixed the date of Aśoka's death in 231 B.C. This inscription which may be fittingly styled as his last swan-song is, therefore, of that date. On the authority then of the available inscriptions and of the tradition as recorded in the Ceylonese Chronicles, the date of the Nirvāṇa of Buddha is found to be 231 + 256 or 487 B.C.; and as tradition assigns eighty years as the period of his life, he may be considered to have been born in the year 567 B.C.

Curiously enough, the date we have arrived at is corroborated by testimony from an independent quarter. It appears that there is in China a Dotted Record "which was attached to the Vinaya Pitaka, and every year at the end of the vassa ceremony, the presiding priest used to add a dot to it. This process is said to have been kept up till 489 A.D., when Sanghabhadra added the last dot after his vassa residence at Canton in China." The Record is stated to have "indicated 975 dots (years) from the Nirvāṇa to 489 A.D." If this statement is found to be correct, then we have one more reason for considering the Nirvāṇa to have occurred in 487 B.C.

We have lastly to consider how it is that the Ceylonese tradition, as recorded in the Chronicles, which, as we have seen, is not without its great value for historical and chronological purposes, has all along been that Buddha attained Nirvāṇa in the year 543 B.C. I am aware that scholars like Max Müller and Mr. Smith unceremoniously brush aside all the chronological particulars of these Chronicles prior to 160 B.C. as unreliable, while others go so far as to condemn them wholesale. But as Professor Rhys Davids says: "It jars upon the reader to hear the Chronicles called the mendacious fictions of unscrupulous monks. Such expressions are inaccurate; and they show a grave want of appreciation." Dr. Fleet goes even so far as to say that 543 B.C., the date according to the Chronicles as interpreted by the editors Turnour and Wijesinha, "is not asserted by or supported by anything contained in Dipavamsa or the earlier part of the Mahāvamsa, but was simply invented, as far as I can see my way, in the 12th or 13th century A.D." But this is certainly a mistake, for as Bishop Bigandet points out: "There is, perhaps, no

---

14 Mr. V. A. Smith writes to me under date 7th October 1906: "I am fully persuaded, with Senart, and against Dr. Fleet, that all the inscriptions (of Aśoka) are Buddhist." I agree; but I venture to consider also as correct the statement of the Ceylonese Chronicles that Aśoka was converted to Buddhism very shortly before his coronation.


16 Buddhist India, p. 274.

single point in the whole history of India on which the chronicles of Ceylon and further India are so
distinct and unanimous than that Buddha died — or as they express it, attained Nirvana — at
the age of eighty years in the year 548 B.C., or in the year 148 of the Eetzana or Anjana epoch."

I believe that the erroneous idea regarding the value of the Ceylonese Chronicles is due to
a certain extent to the circumstance that no explanation was forthcoming why the Ceylonese
date for the Nirvana should be nearly six decades anterior to the one which may be inferred from
reliable data. This antedating of the Era of the Nirvana injuriously affected to a certain extent the
correctness of the chronology of the Dipavamsa and the Mahavamsa. Turnour accepts 543 B.C.
for the Nirvana, but supposed that the date of Asoka was carried back by a period of sixty years for
the reason that it was thought expedient for the good of religion that the landing of Vija, the first
Buddhist missionary to Ceylon, should be coincident with the death of Buddha.

But this far-fetched explanation cannot be accepted for the simple reason that it assumes a wrong
date, namely, 543 B.C. for the Nirvana of Buddha. On the other hand, the real reason for
the antedating by the Chronicles of the Nirvana by a period of 58 years, the difference
between the Ceylonese date 543 B.C. and B.C. 487, the date advanced herein, must be
sought for elsewhere. I believe that it is due to an erroneous belief entertained by early
Buddhists that the Maurya Era began with Asoka, the Constantine of the followers of
Gautama. They ignored the possibility of the era commencing with the accession to the throne
of Magadha of a non-Buddhist King, namely, Chandragupta, who did not loom so largely in public
estimation. They knew that Asoka dated his edicts by the years elapsed since his coronation, and
naturally supposed that the Maurya Era, which was current in the third and second centuries
before Christ as can be inferred from the Hartigampha Inscription dated in the year 150 of the
Maurya Era, began with the coronation of their greatest Emperor. Asoka's coronation was thus
placed 58 years earlier, the interval between the Mauryan epoch of 325 B.C. and 269
B.C., the correct date of his coronation. And as Buddhists believe that he was formally
crowned "after 218 years had elapsed since the death of Buddha," the Great Sakyamuni was erroneously supposed to have passed in the year 325 + 218 or 543 B.C. "unto Nirvana, where the
Silence lives."18

18 In two communications from Dr. Fleet, since published in the J.R.A.S. for 1908, pp. 486 and 815, he
accepts the statements of the Dipavamsa that Asoka reigned 37 years after his anointment in the 218th year
after Buddha's death, but rejects the other statement that Asoka was converted to Buddhism in the 4th year
after his anointment to the throne. Dr. Fleet takes a.603.131 to mean 21 years and says: "Asoka was con-
verted to Buddhism and became a lay disciple about half-way through the 26th year after his anointment.
A little more than 21 years later... he formally joined the Buddhist Sangha. A little more than 5 years
after that, early in the 36th year, he took the vows of a monk, perhaps installing Dabaratha as his
successor..." From that retirement, 1 year later, early in the 36th year, he sent forth this notification
(one of the rock edicts of Brahmagiri, etc.) "I respectfully submit that it is against the tenor of Asoka's
edicts and the Ceylonese Chronicles to suppose that Asoka was converted to Buddhism only so late as the 38th year
after his coronation. Asoka would not have "set up" the Rummindis Pillar in his 21st year in memory of
Buddha's birth and done "reverence to Buddhism Sakyamuni" and called him "Bhagavat," unless he had been
a Buddhist already. His enlargement, for the second time, of the stupa of Buddha Konakamunu in the 15th year
of his reign as recorded on the Nigiliva Pillar, his constant references in his inscriptions to Dhamma, the Buddhist
word for Religion, the circumstance that he does not mention in any of his inscriptions any of the Hindu deities
which would have been impossible in a Hindu as pious as Asoka, the evidence afforded by his 126th rock edict of
his missionary zeal which must certainly have been in the cause of some proselytizing religion like that of
Buddha, and not merely for the incitement of the primary duties of man which all men recognised, his opinion
that the best of all deeds is the proclamation of Dhamma (Rock Edict IV), his condemnation of animal slaughter,
his directions for the convoking of the General Assembly once in every 5 years for proclaiming Dhamma and his
reference in his third rock edict to the clergy (period) for teaching the same to others, the definitions given in his
inscriptions of true ceremonial and true charity, and above all, the clear statement of the Ceylonese Chronicles that
he was converted in the 4th year after his accession to the throne, all go to prove that he joined the same Buddhist
faith as a layman in which 321 years later he was confirmed as a monk.
ANCIENT HISTORY OF THE NELLORE DISTRICT.

BY V. VENKAYYA, M.A., RAJAHADUR.

(Continued from p. 294.)

Pallava Expansion in the Tamil Country.

Early in the 7th century A.D. the Pallavas were apparently driven out from their northern possessions and the splendour of the lord of the Pallavas, who had opposed the rise of his (i.e. Pulikēsin’s) power was obscured by the dust of his (the latter’s) army and the former was forced to vanish behind the walls of Kānchipuram. The kingdom of Vēṅgi was subsequently founded and Kuba-Viṣṇuvardhana, the younger brother of Pulikēsin II., was appointed to govern the province sometime before A.D. 632. In defining the boundaries of Vēṅgi, Dr. Fleet gives the river Krisāṇa as its southern limit, but subsequently remarks that the more northern portions of the Pallava dominions appear to have been quickly absorbed into the Eastern Chalukya country. We may, therefore, suppose that, soon after the Eastern Chalukya kingdom had been founded, the northern portion of the Nellore District was annexed by it, while the southern portion continued under the Pallavas and was accordingly included in Toṅgai-nāḍu. This name was eventually altered into Jayāṅgona-Chēla-marudalam, which, as will be shown later on, extended at least as far north as the Atmakūr tāluk. Where exactly the boundary line lay between Vēṅgi and Toṅgai-nāḍu cannot be ascertained at present. In the Tēki plates of Chōdanga, dated in A.D. 1086-87, the river Mannēra is said to be the southern boundary of the Vēṅgi kingdom. It is not unlikely that this river formed the boundary between Vēṅgi and Toṅgai-nāḍu even in earlier times. That portion of the Nellore District, which was subject to Eastern Chalukya domination, naturally adopted, from its frequent contact with the Andhra country, Telugu for its vernacular, while in the southern portion, which was governed by the Pallavas of Conjesveram, Tamil seems to have prevailed until the Vijayanagara conquest.

Though the Western Chalukya king Pulikēsin II. drove the Pallavas out of the Telaga country, yet, towards the close of his reign, the latter became powerful and actually defeated him and seized his capital Vatāpi, i.e. Bādami, in the Bombay Presidency, about A.D. 642. But his son Vikramaditya I. conquered the Pallava king Paramāvaravarman I. and probably led an expedition against Kānchh. The Pallavas apparently lost, at least temporarily, a portion of their dominions. About the same time there was a powerful coalition to uproot the Eastern Chalukya Indra-Bhāṭṭāraka, who is said to have reigned for seven days in A.D. 663. It is not known whether the Western Chalukya Vikramaditya I. took any active part either in favour of or against his cousin or not. The Talaṇāchi plates (OP. 24.), dated in A.D. 669, belong to his reign, but as the village granted has not yet been identified, the inscription cannot be taken to prove that the dominions of Vikramaditya I. extended into the Nellore District. At any rate, the grants of Viṣṇuvardhana II. (A.D. 663 to 672) and Maṅgi-Yuvardha (A.D. 672-96) found in the Nellore District may be taken to prove the restoration of the Eastern Chalukyas in Vēṅgi. Viṣṇuvardhana III. (A.D. 709–46), who

---

61 Ep. Ind., Vol. VI, p. 11.
63 Ante, Vol. XX, p. 93.
64 About A.D. 510, when the Chinese pilgrim Hien Taeng visited Southern India, there was a kingdom called Dhanaṇakαyaka or Mahā-Andhra, whose capital seems to have been Bevada. Dhanaṇakαyaka was 1,000 li or so south of Andhra and was 4,000 li in circuit (or twice the extent of Andhra); Bell's Buddhist Records of the Western World, Vol. II, p. 211. The northern portion of the Nellore District was probably included in Dhanaṇakαyaka.
66 Ibid., p. 312.
67 Ibid., p. 354 below.
70 Ibid., p. 97.
71 Ante, Vol. XX, p. 97.
72 Ep. Ind., Vol. IX, p. 98. The king granted the village of Elasattu to the north of Koloṭhunum to his Brāhmaṇa preceptor Śrīmānḍhalekhaṇya of the Viṣṇuvardha gōra. The writer of the grant was Vajrayravarman of the Vaidya family.
73 Two copper-plates grants of Viṣṇuvardhan I. and two of his son Viṇayaditya have been discovered in the neighbouring district of Karāhi.
74 Ante, Vol. XX, p. 98.
75 Ep. Ind., Vol. VIII, p. 266.
succeeded to the throne after ejecting his younger brother, seems to have become a subordinate of the Pallava king Nandivarman, whose general Udayachandra is said to have ordered the Nishada chief Prithiviviyagha out of the district of Vishnura, which he subjected to the Pallava. The only Pallava stone inscription found in the Nellore District is built into the floor of the Subrahmanya temple at Mallam in the Guhur temple (G. 54). It is dated in the 15th year of the reign of the Pallava king Nandippottarasa, and seems to register a grant to the shrine of the god Subrahmanya (at Tiruvanam) made at the request of an Álava chief, the executor being the Chañukya king. Both the Álava chief and the Chañukya king — very probably the Eastern Chañukya Vishnupadhan III. — were evidently Pallava feudatories, and it is interesting to note that the worship of the god Subrahmanya dates from such an early period as the 8th century A. D.

The Gaṅga-Pallavas in the Nellore District.

Nandivarman Pallavamalla is believed to have been the last powerful king of the Pallava dynasty. About the middle of the 8th century A. D. they ceased to be the ruling power in Southern India and their place was taken at least in a portion of the Pallava dominions by the Gaṅga-Pallavas. The inscriptions of the latter found in the vicinity of Kālañatha raise a presumption that their dominions might have extended at least into the southern portion of the Nellore District. Guhur 63, of which Mr. G. Venkoba Rao has furnished an impression at my request, confirms this presumption. It belongs to the 20th year of the reign of the Gaṅga-Pallava king Sri-Kampavarma and appears to record some gift to a goddess (bhādri).

The Eastern Chañukyas of Vēṅgi in the Northern Portion of Nellore.

The decline of the Pallavas and the almost synchronous disappearances of the Western Chañukyas of Bādāmi must have made the Eastern Chañukyas of Vēṅgi more powerful than before. The Rāṣṭrakūtas of Mālkēdh, who took the place of the Western Chañukyas, and the Gaṅga feudatories of the former were constantly at war with the Eastern Chañukyas. Vijayāditya II. of Vēṅgi (A. D. 799 to 843) is said to have fought for twelve years, by day and by night, a hundred and eight battles with the armies of the Gaṅgas and the Raṭaras and built the same number of large temples of Siva. His grandson Vijayāditya III. (A. D. 844 to 888) was another powerful king. According to the Malīyaṇḍa grant (CP. 19) he bore the title Parachakrārama, while Guṇaga or Guṇaka was his surname according to other copper-plates. Challenged by the lord of the Raṭaras he conquered the unequalled Gaṅgas; played the game of ball with the head of Maṅgarā on the battlefield; burnt Chakrakūta and frightened Saṅkila residing in Kīrana and joined by Krishnā. From the Malīyaṇḍa grant we learn that Maṅgi or Maṅgarā was a Noḷamba king. The general who gained most of these

---

63 Mr. Butterworth very kindly placed at my disposal impressions of about 800 stone inscriptions from Nellore. The number of impressions actually printed in the volume is 921. In the following pages, the variations from the names or dates found in the Nellore volume are based on the revised readings of them, which I have accepted after studying the impressions received from Mr. Butterworth. In those cases where impressions have not been available, I have made use of the text printed in the Nellore volume.
64 As traces of later Nāga rule are found in the south of the Nellore District, it is not altogether impossible that this Álava chief was a Nāga. In the Bombay Gazetteer, Vol. I, p. 281, footnote 3, Dr. Fleet remarks that the Sundrakas and the Ájumās may possibly have been Nāgas.
67 At Nalājanamāpūr in the Kauñiga tāluk is a somewhat damaged but archaic inscription of a king, whose name is not fully preserved, but who calls himself Pavanatādeva and bore the title Paṇḍādaḷā (KG. 25).
68 Above, Vol. XX, p. 101. If this be true, a few at these 108 temples ought to be in the northern portion of the Nellore District, which, as I have already pointed out, was included in Vēṅgi.
69 The surname Guṇakinnalāṭa occurs in an archaic fragment found in the town of Kandakur (KG. 8 and KB. 3) and Guṇakinnalāṭa in a similar fragment at Dhamnavaram in the Onkogū tāluk (O. 39).
70 Mr. Hirata has pointed out (Ep. Jot., Vol. IX, p. 179) that Chakrakūta has to be looked for in the Bastar State of the Central Provinces.
72 Ibid, Vol. IX, p. 48. Perhaps Maṅgi was a familiar form of the name Maṅgala, which was borne by the first Noḷamba king Noḷambādhīrā; see Mr. Rice's Epigraphy Carnatic, Vol. XII, p. 5.
victories was Pāṇḍaraṅga's whose name figures in one or two of the lyricic fragments in archaic characters published in the Nellore volume. The same general figures as the executor in the Maṇlapāṭam plate of Vījayaḍītya III, while Kāḍajārāja, mentioned in the Bevāḍa plates of Chāḷukya Bṛhma I., was his grandson.

On the death of Amma I. in A. D. 925 the succession was disputed. Vījayaḍītya V., also called Kaṇṭhikā-Vījayaḍītya, reigned 15 days; Tāḍapa, 1 month; Vikramaḍītya II., 11 months; and Bṛhma III., 8 months. Then followed a period of confusion when, according to the Mālyapūṇḍi grant, Rājamārtanda, Kaṇṭhikā-Vījayaḍītya, Yuddhamalla and others were fighting for the throne opposing the subjects like rākṣhasas, and the strife is said to have lasted five years. Other princes also seem to have taken part in the war and to have harassed the country. Chāḷukya Bṛhma II. killed Rājamārtanda and drove Kaṇṭhikā-Vījayaḍītya and Yuddhamalla out of the country. The Kalhehumbara grant refers also to this calamitous period in the history of Vēṅgi and mentions the names of the other kings who took part in this war. Chāḷukya Bṛhma II. is said to have surpassed the epic hero Bṛhma in strength and majesty:—having, unaided, slain the glorious Rājāmaṇya, and Dhaḷaja, who excelled far and wide, and the fierce Tāṭabikkha, and Bīja who was (always) ready for war, and the excessively powerful Ayyapa, terrible and savage, and the extremely great army sent by king Gōvinda, and Lōvabikka, the ruler of the Chōla, and the valorous Yuddhamalla. This glorious Rāja-Bṛhma II. gave encouragement to those who were frightened, protected those who came to the excellent refuge which was afforded, and removed troublesome people.

The description given in these two grants of the state of the country cannot be altogether fanciful, and therefore it may be supposed that the province was actually devastated by this war. The end of the reign of Chāḷukya Bṛhma II. takes us to about the middle of the 10th century A. D. After a short period of peaceful progress came the interregnum in the Vēṅgi country lasting more than a quarter of a century. According to the words of the poet, "a feverish desire to obtain a suitable lord consumed the earth which was without a leader." What actually took place during this interval is not known. The Rāṣṭrakūṭas of Mālikāhūj collapsed in consequence of their defeat at the hands of Siyaka-Harsa of Malwa and the plundering of their capital, and the place of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas was taken by the Western Chalukyas of Kalāyānī.

17 At Addakhi in the Ongole taluk is a fragment which records a gift of land by Pāṇḍaraṅga to a temple (O. 8). The name Pāṇḍaraṅga occurs also in an archaic fragment at Dharmavaram in the same taluk (O. 39), which refers to a certain Ayyarpāṇa and his younger brother Bejeypāṇa. A descendant of Pāṇḍaraṅga was Durgarāja (Ep. Ind., Vol. IX, p. 49) who might be identical with Durigrāṇa mentioned in an archaic inscription at Pelletu (Kī. 67).


19 Ibid., p. 121. At Rōḍipāḷayam in the Gōḍur taluk in a hamlet named Paṇṭanāgum, is a temple called Paṇḍaraṅga in its inscriptions. The earliest record in the temple belongs, however, to the reign of Vikrama-Chōḷa, while mention is made of Kuḷottunga I. in another epigraph of the same temple. Paṇṭanāgum was known in ancient times as the great city of Kākāndi in Kāṭalpoḍu-Pavattirikōṭtam, a district of Bāḍinda-Chōḷa-mapalām (G. 87 and G. 94). Kākāndi was another name of Kāvirippaṇgam (Maṇṭalai, xxii, 11, 37-38) mentioned in ancient Tamil poems as the capital of the Chōḷas. Kāvirippaṇgam was submerged in the ocean during the reign of the Chōḷa king Nejummutikkilai. The district in which Paṇṭanāgum or Kākāndi was situated was Kāṭalpoḍu-Pavattirikōṭtam 'Pavattirikōṭtam submerged in the ocean.' Though we have no reason to suppose that the Kākāndi mentioned in early Tamil poems has to be looked for in the Nellore District, it is a strange coincidence that a portion of that district was also submerged in the ocean in historical times. As regards the name Paṇṭanāgum of the village, we cannot be quite sure if the Eastern Chalukya dominions extended so far south as the Gōḍur taluk and as the volume before us furnishes no information as to the architecture of the temple, we cannot venture to connect the hamlet and the temple with the Eastern Chalukya general.

20 The Vikramadītya-Mahārājī of the Chalukya family mentioned in D. 2 must be Vikramadītya II., if he was an Eastern Chalukya at all, because Vikramadītya I. of that dynasty did not reign; see also above, p. 201.

21 Rājamārtanda is, according to Professor Holtasch, the same as Rākṣasya of the Kalhehumbarā grant.

22 He was also known as Bēḷa-Vījayaḍītya and founded a separate line of kings, who held the Vēṅgi country later on. He was anointed to the throne while still a child. If the Mālyapūṇḍi grant is to be believed, he fought for the crown even after he was dethroned. As he seems to have been a child when the war took place, it may be that his cause was taken up by his partisans.


24 Perhaps some of the monuments of the northern portion of the Nellore District came to grief about this time.


The Chōḷas in the Southern Portion of the Nellore District.

In the south, about the time of which we are speaking (i.e., the second half of the 9th century A.D.), the Pāṇḍyas, who had been powerful, were gradually declining. As the Chōḷa king Āḍitya I. conquered the Gaṅga-Pallava Aparājīta and annexed his dominions and as inscriptions of Parāntaka I. have been found in the vicinity of Kāḷahasti (which is not far from the Nellore border), it may be supposed that the Chōḷas had extended their dominions into the southern portion of the Nellore District and become practically neighbours of the Eastern Chalukyas of Vēṅgli. The Chōḷa Parāntaka I. claims to have conquered the Bāṇas, who had been feudatories of the Gaṅga-Pallavas, and some of whom figure in inscriptions at Gaṅgāmalla near Kāḷahasti. Perhaps it was this defeat that led them to seek their fortunes beyond the limits of the Chōḷa dominions. We find a Bāṇa king, named Aggapaṟaṟu, in the north of the Nellore District (P. 39) about the middle of the 10th century and another named Chūṟabaliliruṟu at Koṇidena in the Guntur District about the middle of the 12th century A.D. About A.D. 950 the power of the Chōḷas was checked temporarily by the Rāṣṭrakūṭa occupation of a portion at least of the Chōḷa dominions though it may be doubted if this in any way affected their domination in the tract of country with which we are at present concerned. It is, however, necessary to note here that the interregnum in the Vēṅgli country referred to in the previous paragraph could not have been brought about by the Chōḷas. The lawlessness consequent on the interregnum must have disturbed the southern portion of the district, which had probably passed into the hands of the Chōḷas soon after the downfall of the Gaṅga-Pallavas. Perhaps, it was the fear of this lawlessness spreading into his own dominions that led the great Chōḷa king Rājarāja I. to despatch an army early in his reign into Vēṅgli and to restore order and peaceful government in the province. What the other considerations were, if any, that led him to take this step we do not at present know. At any rate, the southern portion of the Nellore District was apparently under Chōḷa rule and was included in the province called Tōṇjai-nāṟu or Jayaṅgoṇa-Chōḷa-amanjalam as testified to by a number of inscriptions in the volume before us, while the northern portion continued under the Eastern Chalukyas.

Paucity of Early Records in the South of Nellore.

The Pallavas and Gaṅga-Pallavas are represented in the Nellore District each by a single stone inscription found at Mallam in the Gaṅgūr āṇčuk. And Chōḷa dominion in the south of the district, which we have been trying to trace and which must have continued from the time of Parāntaka I. (A.D. 907 to 946), has curiously enough left very few traces, to judge from the volume of Nellore inscriptions published by Messrs. Butterworth and Venugopala Chetty.

---

87 See my Annual Report on Epigraphy for 1902-03, para. 10.
89 Their territory, called in inscriptions Perumāḷaṟṟu, seems to have extended as far north as Tirupati in the North Arcot District; see my Annual Report on Epigraphy for 1904-05, para. 30.
90 Annual Report on Epigraphy for 1899-1900, para. 85.
92 The interregnum must have lasted from A.D. 972 to 966-9 (Ep. Ind., Vol. VI, p. 340). It is a curious fact that the reign of the first king Taila II., of the revived Western Chalukya dynasty corresponds to about the same period. Consequently, it looks as if he had something to do with the interregnum, though no statement to that effect is made in any of the numerous records which mention the event. If he had actually subdued the country and was ruling it, the records would not characterise it as a period of anarchy. During the period of confusion consequent on the collapse of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas of Mālkēḻ and the rise of the Western Chalukyas of Kāḷyṇi, some unscrupulous feudatories or military officers of one or the other of these powers probably assumed temporary sovereignty and harassed the people. It may even be that there was a regular fight between two or more such feudatories all through the period of 27 years. This interregnum might also have contributed to the disappearance of monuments in Vēṅgli.
93 It was apparently the Chōḷa invasion during the reign of Rājarāja I. that put an end to the interregnum; see Ep. Ind., Vol. VI, p. 340.
94 This province seems to have extended as far north as the Āḻakūr āṇčuk. The village called Chiramasu (Ṣīyamunai in A. 21) was situated in Jayaṅgoṇa-Chōḷa-amanjalam.
95 The intermarriages between the Chōḷas and the Eastern Chalukyas, which took place during the three successive generations, must have served to strengthen the latter even against foreign invasions.
Chōla kings commencing from Parāntaka I. have left a rich legacy of temples and inscriptions in the Tamil country. It is worthy of note that not even a fragment of an inscription of any of the Chōla kings from Parāntaka I. to Kulōttungā I. has been found in that part of the Nellore District where they may reasonably be supposed to have held sway. Neither are there any ancient temples which may be ascribed to them. This again is significant and cannot be passed over without comment. The tract of country with which we have to deal is peculiarly devoid of ancient places sacred either to the Saivas or to the Vaishnavas. “It is possible,” says the Madras Manual of Administration, “that the tract was to a certain extent uninhabited till a comparatively recent period, and like the Cudāpah, Bellary, Anantapur, and Kurnool districts formed part of the so-called desert of Dandaka.” Under the heading ‘Physical Geography’ of the Nellore District the same authority remarks: “Its general aspect is forbidding . . . . The soil is not naturally fertile, nor are means of irrigation readily at hand. Scarcely one half of the total area is cultivated.” These causes must have been at work to prevent the foundation of temples and the establishment of large Brahmanical colonies. The amalgamation of the Chōla and Eastern Chalukya kingdoms during the reign of Kulōttungā I.; the wave of Vaishnav revival during the time of Rāmānuja and its spread from Conjeevaram into the north; and the foundation of local feudatory families in several parts of the Telugu country towards the close of Kulōttungā’s reign and after his death—these were probably some of the causes which led to the gradual colonization of the barren and unproductive parts of the Nellore District. With this occupation commenced the building of the temples now found in the district, which are all later than the time of Kulōttungā I. In fact, most of the stone inscriptions included in the Nellore volume belong to the period subsequent to the reign of Kulōttungā I. There are no records, either on stone or on copper, in the volume, for the elucidation of the history of the district, from the close of the interregnum to the reign of Kulōttungā I., as far as the northern portion is concerned. As regards the south, there are only two inscriptions which are prior to the time of Kulōttungā.

Kulōttungā I. and His Successors.

Thus far the history of Nellore has had to be made out mainly from records found elsewhere. The later periods may be worked out from the inscriptions of the district, which Messrs. Butterworth and Venugopau Chetty have made accessible to the antiquarian public with characteristic disinterestedness. The Chōla king Kulōttungā I. is referred to in a Gòdūr inscription under the name “Kulōttungā-Chēlādeva, who abolished tolls” (G. 87), while his son and successor is represented by a single Tamil record in the same tāluk (G. 94). The accession of Kulōttungā II. is fixed by A.D. 1182–83 by O. 142 aad and by a few epigraphs from the Guntur District in the Government Epigraphist’s Collection. He reigned until at least A.D. 1148–49, while his Chellur plates are dated by A.D. 1143. The initial date of Rājarāja II., cit. 1146, calculated by Professor Kielhorn from astronomical details furnished in Tamil inscriptions of his reign, is confirmed by O. 51 and O. 59 and by a number of records from the Rāpātha in the Guntur District. He must have reigned until at least A.D. 1171–72. The absence of epigraphs of Kulōttungā II. and Rājarāja II. in the southern portion of the Nellore District may be taken to show that

---

86 In the Ongole tāluk a comparatively ancient Haibaya inscription (O. 123) has been found. It is, however, undated and fragmentary, and no king’s name has been traced in it. Perhaps it belongs to some ancestor of the Kōm chief, who claimed to belong to the Haibaya family and to be lords of the city of Mānishāmat. In the 12th century A.D. the Kōm chief were residing the Cōdīvam delta as feudatories of the Vaiṣṇavē family (Ep. Ind., Vol. IV, p. 90).

87 O. 74, which contains some of the brāhmas of Kulōttungā I. and of Vikrama-Chōla, has perhaps to be assigned to the latter or to some descendant of either of them. The king’s name is mentioned and the name Vra-Chōla, which does occur, cannot be taken to denote the Eastern Chalukya viceroy of that name, because the titles given to the king were not ordinarily used by the rulers at Vṛāgī.

88 Nos. 172, 173, 174, 176, 180, 185, and 223 of 1897.


90 Ibid., Vol. VIII, p. 2.

91 Nos. 187, 188, 189, 191, 192, 193, 211, 215, 216, 231, and 232 of 1897. The sovereignty of Kulōttungā II. and of his successor Rājarāja II. appears to have been merely nominal in the Telugu country. Theses inscriptions have also been found at Drakshērima in the Godavari District. No. 154 of 1897 belongs to the 23rd year of Rājarāja II. and to Śvēnu-Sañvēnu 1264 = A.D. 1171–72. Subsequently, another branch of the Eastern Chalukyas seems to have ruled Vṛāgī, or at least a portion of it, for a short time.
their dominions were probably limited to the northern part of the district. The next Chōla king represented in the volume before us is Kulōttuṅga III, whose accession took place in A.D. 1178 and whose records are found in the Nellore, Rāpūr, and Gūḍur tālukās, in the Sūlūpet Division, and in the Veṅkaṭaṅgi Rāmānanda. A. 18, A. 26, and A. 43, dated, respectively, in the 36th, 18th, and 39th year of Kulōttuṅga may also be attributed to him. The latest date of Kulōttuṅga III is apparently his 39th year corresponding to A.D. 1216-7. Towards the close of the same year his son and successor Rājārāja III. ascended the throne. The latter is represented in the Gūḍur, Nellore, and Rāpūr tālukās, Sūlūpet Division, and the Veṅkaṭaṅgi Rāmānanda. The latest date of his reign is the 37th year in an inscription at Kanuṅapāṇḍu in the Nellore tāluk (N. 27), which mentions a Jaina temple called Karikāla-Chōla-Jinālāyā and a certain Mātisāgara, apparently a Jaina teacher. If this date has been correctly read, Rājārāja III. and his successor Virarājendra-Chōḷaḏēva must have been co-regents. Inscriptions of the latter have been found in the Gūḍur and Udayagiri tālukās (G. 39, G. 85, G. 90, and U. 48). He may be different from Rājendra-Chōḷa III., who, according to Professor Kielhorn, ascended the throne in A.D. 1246. The initial date of Virarājendra-Chōḷaḏēva is A.D. 1244-5 according to G. 90 and U. 48. The former is represented at Tripuraṇaṅga in the Kurnool District by a Tamil inscription, while the latter seems to have been ruling over a small portion of the Nellore District until at least A.D. 1262-63 (G. 85 and G. 90).

Later History of Nellore.

Thus, while the earlier Chōla kings are altogether unrepresented in the Nellore volume, Kulōttuṅga I. probably ruled over the whole of the Nellore District, because he was the sovereign both of Vēṅgi and of the Chōla dominions. He has, however, left no unmistakable monuments. As regards his successors, their sovereignty seems to have been merely nominal, while the feudatories to be mentioned presently appear to have divided the country into several portions and to have governed them as semi-independent chiefs. This state of things probably continued all through the 12th century. Towards the close of that period, the Kākatiyas of Orangal became powerful and seem to have secured a portion of the Vēṅgi kingdom. A number of inscriptions of the Kākatiya king Gaṇapati have been found in the Ongole tāluk (O. 17, O. 28, O. 45, O. 86, O. 88, O. 89, O. 139, O. 143 and O. 150), and in the Darśi (D. 25 and D. 27) and Podili divisions (P. 7, P. 10 and P. 11). Probably, the northern portion of the district acknowledged the Kākatiya supremacy, while the south remained subordinate at least in name to the tottering Chōḷas. About the middle of the 13th century, the Pāṇḍyaśuṣ, who had become supreme in the Tamil country, extended their conquest in the north and actually captured Nellore. Jaṅavārman Sundara-Pāṇḍya I. (A.D. 1231 to at least 1261) boasts of having defeated the Kākatiya king Gaṇapati and of having performed the coronation of heroes at the town of Nellore. Though the actual extent of...

---

2 I am unable to decide whether G. 78 has to be assigned to Kulōttuṅga III. or Rājārāja III. It is dated in the 18th year of Tribhuvanachakravartin Śrī-Rājārājadēva, “who took Madura and the crowned head of the Pāṇḍya.” It is very unlikely that Rājārāja III. is meant, because he could not have conquered Madura. But it may be contended that he simply inherited the title from his father Kulōttuṅga III., in which case it must be remarked that this title occurs nowhere else in connection with Rājārāja III. It occurs most frequently as a bīruda of Kulōttuṅga III.

3 Ep. Ind., Vol. VII, p. 8. During the interval between the death of Rājārāja II. and the accession of Kulōttuṅga III, the northern portion of Nellore probably passed into the hands of the Vēṅgi chōḷa chief, who were actually governing Vēṅgi as feudatories of the Chalukya-Chōḷa kings. The southern portion of the Nellore District must have continued under the Chōḷas.

4 This is evident from V. 16, where the year next to the 39th of Kulōttuṅga is described as the 2nd year of Rājārāja. The double date of N. 37 is due to a mistake, which is apparent already in the published transcript. The impression shows that a portion of the inscription was copied twice, and one of the copies was pasted by the side of the other.


6 The chiefs mentioned in A. 37, dated in the cyclic year Vyāsa, bear Pāṇḍya names. But the inscription seems to be a comparatively modern one.

7 Above, Vol. XXI, p. 121.
the Kākatiya dominions during the time of Gaṇapati is not known, there is, no doubt, that he penetrated as far south as Conjeeveram, where an inscription of his is found dated in A. D. 1249. And it became the interest of the dominant Pāṇḍyas to drive him back. That the Pāṇḍyas did gain at least some temporary advantage over the Kākatiyas is proved by a mutilated Tamil inscription of Sundara-Pāṇḍya in the Brahmagirāya temple at Nellore (N. 61). We have at present no means of ascertaining how long the Pāṇḍya king remained in Nellore and how he was driven back. But the Kākatiya dominions seem to have extended as far south as the Kāvalī taluk during the reign of Gaṇapati’s successor Rudrāmba, called in inscriptions Rudrādeva-Mahārāja (KV. 48). One of the Kākatiya feudatories, Kākatiya feudatories named Ambadēva-Mahārāja of the Kāyastha family claims to have established at Vikramasimhapura (i.e. Nellore) a certain Manmagāyagālā, who had been deprived of his dominions. It may therefore be supposed that the Kākatiya dominions (or, at least their influence) extended at the time over the greater portion of the Nellore District, though not in the extreme south of it. Rudrāmba’s successor, Pratāparudra, seems to have been a powerful king. During his time, too, the Kākatiyas were ruling a considerable portion of Nellore and an expedition was despatched against Conjeeveram. His general, Muppidi-Nāyaka, or Muppidiindrā, who is also mentioned in several Nellore inscriptions (A. 56, KR. 84, N. 89, and O. 87), captured Conjeeveram in or before A. D. 1316-17. A somewhat mutilated record of Pratāparudra is found at Jambukēdavaram, near Trichinopoly. The circumstances that led to the invasion against the Tamil country are not known. An adventurous Kērala king, named Rāvivarman, appears to have taken advantage of the confusion that prevailed in Southern India consequent on the Muḥammadan invasion in A. D. 1310. He conquered the Pāṇḍya king and advanced as far north as Conjeeveram in A. D. 1317. It may be that Pratāparudra’s invasion against the Tamil country was in support of some Telugu-Chōdha chief against the Kērala adventurer. Pratāparudra’s latest sure date is [Saka Saṅvat 1246], the cyclic year Rudhirāgdāri (D. 10) corresponding to A. D. 1323-24. He probably died in A. D. 1325. What became of his dominions after his death is not known. An inscription at Upparalle in the Cuddlapah District refers to a son of Pratāparudra named Jañjaya. Sir Walter Elliot mentions Vīrabhadra as Pratāparudra’s successor, while Mr. Sewell says that his son “Krishna succeeded him, but with a much reduced kingdom.” The absence of inscriptions of either Kṛṣṇa or Vīrabhadra is significant, and may be taken to show that the Kākatiya dominions were in a state of disorder, like the rest of Southern India, in consequence of the Muḥammadan invasions.

(To be continued.)

8 Ibid., Vol. XXI, p. 292 and No. 358 of Professor Kilburn’s List of Inscriptions of Southern India published in the Epigraphia Indica, Vol. VII.
9 Inscriptions of Jaṅjāvarman Sundara-Pāṇḍya I. and of Jaṅjāvarman Sundara-Pāṇḍya II. (A. D. 1276 to at least 1290) have also been found at Nandākura in the Cuddlapah District; see my Annual Report on Epigraphy for 1907-8, Part II, paragraphs 44 and 47.
10 Perhaps the Chōda and Kākatiya feudatories combined together in this attempt to drive out the invading Pāṇḍyas.
11 In the sequel, more will be said about this chief.
12 See my Annual Report on Epigraphy for 1905-06, Part II, para. 44.
13 The extreme south of the Nellore District was probably subject to the Telugu-Chōdha of Nellore.
14 In the Nellore District his inscriptions have been found in the Ongole (O. 40, O. 83, O. 58, O. 65, O. 87, O. 96, O. 129, and O. 149), Kandurtur (KR. 71, KR. 73, KR. 46, KR. 54, KR. 55, and KR. 84), Ātnakūr (A. 51), Nellore (N. 80) and Kāvalī talukks (KV. 33) and the Dāri (D. 10, D. 12, D. 26, D. 33, and D. 70) and Podili divisions (P. 6).
16 Ep. Ind., Vol. VIII, p. 8. Inscriptions of this king have been found so far at Conjeeveram (ibid., Vol. IV, p. 145), Bhrāntagām (ibid., p. 148), and Tiruvndai (South Arecot).
19 The editors of the Nellore volume assign KR. 28, CP. 21, and CP. 22 to the Kākatiyas. But these inscriptions seem to belong to the Gaṇapati of Orissa.
21 Coins of Southern India, p. 84. Pratāparudra’s son is here said to have retired to Kōployṇa.
22 Coins of Southern India, p. 84. Pratāparudra’s son is here said to have retired to Kōployṇa, as the son of Pratāparudra.
THE RELIGION OF THE IRANIAN PEOPLES.

BY THE LATE C. P. TIELE.

(Translated by G. K. Na'imam.)

(Continued from Vol. XXXV., p. 203.)

7. The duties of the faithful.

A complete system of religious ethics is as difficult to deduce from the scanty remnants of the most archaic hymns of Zarathushtra as a complete code of the religious doctrines themselves. The salient thoughts, however, which regulated the moral life of the devout Mazdayasnians, and which are more fully dilated upon in the younger Avesta find expression in the Gathas. The dominant note is struck by the triad that it is not enough to practice good in acts and to combat the evil, but that we should equally consider sentiments and words. This injunction is enjoined in a variety of ways in the Gathas. In lieu of sentiments, we have wisdom, and the latter is further subdivided into will, inclination, choice or belief; but the later formula "in thoughts, words and deeds" is also employed. And the thoughts or the mind was subordinated to the guidance of Mazda, the omniscient, the deeds to that of Asha, the genius of righteousness, order and the cult, and the words to that of Sraosha, the heavenly listener and speaker.

But, however great the value attached to words, the prophets before all laid stress on deeds, in that the mind reveals itself in them much more manifestly than in speech. Action stands at the head of everything Zarathushtrian. Man must seek his livelihood in his personal merits. He that soweth not the soil diligently, nor extendeth Mazda’s domain by promoting the settled mode of life, is not his true worshipper. The doctrine of absolving prophets rests in a certain sense on a philosophical basis. But the prophets do not demand that man should give up the workaday existence for solitude and retired meditation, or that man should renounce the world with its joys and obligations. All asceticism is foreign to the Mazda creed. In a reform, which was of a social as well as religious nature, and which so intimately united moral piety with the cultivation of the soil, nothing else could be expected.

This appreciation of energetic activity did not exclude sympathy for the indigent. The pious insignificant individual is more honoured than the opulent miscreant of importance, for it is incumbent on the faithful not only to devote himself to Mazda and to abjure the dvaras and the human hrostevas, but in his integrity and benevolence to maintain the "Mazda’s poor." I cannot but suggest that by these "poor of Mazda" is implied, not what Louis the Saint called le mema peuple de notre Seigneur, but rather in the first instance the minstrels, preachers and priests, who must support themselves on the largesses of the faithful, chiefly royalties and magnates.

Had the stanzas, which deal with the nuptials of Pauruchihti, the prophet’s daughter, not been so corrupt, and therefore hard to elucidate, we should be able to affirm with greater certainty what the Zarathushtrian reformers thought of conjugal alliance. What admits of no contradiction is that, in their view, religion must consecrate marriage, that the wife should respect the husband as one pure person does another, that she is bound to lay to heart the evangel of the prophets, and thereby to seek to study "the life of Vohumano." Love each other in Asha, in righteousness and devotion, which will make your home happy," is the admonition to the bridegroom.

---

49 Yama 48, 4, ahy caavahy uhtish varang; yama 31, 21, chisti instead of manangha; yama 33, 14 and 15, 2, manangha ukhadhaek shyaotka naikha.
50 Yama 31, 15; 31, 5. Here the agriculturist (nastrya) by "just deeds," possessing a good understanding for prayer, and having hukhratish nemangha, is a sort of a type of the pious
51 Yama 55, 3-5.
In vain we look into the Gathas for the khovatnādu, the principle of the next of kin marriages, as being the one invested with the greatest sanctity. The saints of the past, Zarathushtra, Frashoshastra, Do Janaspas, married into families other than their own. Consanguineous connubium is neither Zarathushtrian nor Aryan. It must have been a local usage, which in time crept into the Mazdaan faith; or, if that is not so, a measure invented with a view to conserve the purity of blood of a small Aryan minority, or a few noble gens.

Love of one's enemy and forbearance were not included in the category of virtues which the apostle of Mazda's persuasion preached to his audience. On the contrary, to harbour or succour them was held to be prejudicial to the good cause. He that is the best disposed towards the godly (ashano), be he kinsman, servant, or friend, and looks energetically after the earth (gavoi, the kino), he is reckoned among the people who are after the heart of Asha and Vohu Mano. But it is a duty, and one well-pleasing in the sight of Mazda, to do an evil turn by word, intent or action to the wicked. No clemency to them. The adorer of the Falsehood, who consigns house, hamlet, district, and country to misery and death, "him let mea correct with the sword." The destruction designed by the enemy recoils on himself, so that a wretched existence shall be his doom. In a word, the proper mission of the faithful is to smite the evil. Should he fail in it he has approved himself well-affectd to the brotherhood of Mankadacity, and so is one of them. If he omits to assail the field, when it is in his power so to do, he is himself on the way to the abode of the Fiends. In those times of fierce struggles, every act of compromise with the adversary was regarded as tantamount to treachery. It could hardly be regarded otherwise. The crusade that was the mission of the reformers, and the persecutions to which they were exposed, at least account for their intolerance. Unfortunately the religion they founded carried down to remote posterity the impress of this lack of forbearance.

If, on the one hand, we cannot deny the ethical nature of the Zarathushtrian discipline, it is self-evident on the other that, for a religion of antiquity, the moral element is not elevated above endaimonism. The mandatory ordinances are ever accompanied by the mention of the reward, which awaits the faithful here below as well as hereafter, while menaces of terrible penalties in store for the evil-doers in the inferno of the Drukshe are reiterated. The mood of the virtuous, a favourite theme, consists in mundane felicity and vigour, and, as has been already indicated, in salvation and a life without death in heaven. The pious are satisfied that they have earned kudos by their sacrifices, in acquitting themselves of their duty towards Mazda.

This accords with the peculiar development of the doctrines of dualism and retribution among the Zarathushtrians, and is a logical sequel to them. And if the recompense, as a rule, is made to depend on sanctity and righteousness, it is in consonance with the commandment that the highest good is appointed for those who offer the largest number of sacrifices, whilst the worst lot is reserved for such as bring nothing to Mazda (or his priests?).

But here and there we get a gleam of a loftier plane of thought. If the pious are enjoined to adore Mazda with prayers with the single object of winning his favour, there are also extortations to the saintly urging them to bring their souls into union with Asha and to

---

53 Yasna 25:2; 31:18; 43:8; 43:2; Yasna 46:2; 5 and 6 lay down that a ruler shall publicly accuse anyone, who has been disobedient to him, and him who is untrue to an agreement entered into.
54 Yasna 24, 15; 50:5; 50:6 refers to the hymns pronounced to acquire blessings (pásâ in ya fravarte (be)dâ). In 51, 22, the living, not less than the heroes of the past, Zarathushtra, Vishnavas, Frashoshastra, Jamaspas, and Maldyomnangha mentioned in the preceding strophes, receive the bliss (raâtéyem) for the offering they bring. Yasna 34, 1 is a difficult passage, but this much is clear that the return for religious acts, words and prayers is immortality, justice and the possession of abundance, the first fruits of which belong to Mazda.
55 Yasna 51, 5.
56 Yasna 24, 2. The good mind and the actions of the beneficent men (pâ¥eha¥a ne¥ra) are Mazda's.
endeavour by acts to be comparable to Mazda, and to some extent to be his terrestrial embodiments. Whoever violates the moral law, the true doctrine by which the world is rendered blissful, and which was revealed first by Mazda to Zarathushtra and then by Zarathushtra to the world at large, feels guilty towards Mazda and the Ahuras and implores his forgiveness for "that deed whatsoever it may be." And what is placed so often in the foreground in the younger books is prominent here too, namely, the idea that the life of a true Mazdaian is a life dedicated to the service of Mazda, attuned to his eternal ordinance, a struggle on his side and in accordance with his ways against the dominion of darkness and mendacity.

Naturally, the Gāthas furnish no detail regarding the cult. Such prescriptions belong to a law-book. The cult is touched upon only here and there. From what little is positively said, it is manifest that in the main it was not different from what was in practise at a later period. In the cult, the prime position was occupied by "the red-hot fire of Mazda." The sacrificial offerings consisted of flesh, 89 sacred cakes, hauremat, and probably a certain beverage which symbolically represented Anerat. In course of time the latter yielded its place to Homa.90 At these sacrifices the mantras were recited and sacrificial litanies intoned. The priest charged with this function was, as we saw, the Zostar, the Indian Hotar, and probably the supreme sacerdotal head was denominatated Zarathushtra, as in later ages. Mazda, instructs him in what is agreeable to himself with reference to songs of praise and the cult, and in Asha he learns to know God's own path. Mazda teaches him, as one friend would another as to how he should be adored with a prayer worthy of himself. The true Zarathushtrian gives himself up to his God, surrenders to him his soul, or his life-energy; in a word, life, but wholly for his service. From those who heed not Asha, which is to say, who fail of their obligations to God and man, Vohumano remains afar,—Vohumano, the beneficent Mind, the cherisher of the godly. And further, as he shuns the wild transgressors, Asha shuns those who, by denying Vohumano, offend against Araman, knowing full well Mazda's love for her;—those, in other words, who do not observe the second principal duty imposed upon the righteous,—the sowing of the earth.

Practical so far, if the cult of the Zarathushtrian is in reality not unfrequently a service rendered for the sake of kudos, we do not miss in it altogether a purer and more elevated view; and many an utterance is characterised by a genuine religious spirit.

(To be continued.)

CONTRIBUTIONS TO PANJABI LEXICOGRAPHY.

SERIES I.

Industrial Technicalities.

BY H. A. ROSE, I.C.S.

Introductory Note.

The existing dictionaries of Panjabi are very far from complete. The work of Bhāi Māya Singh1 is largely based on an old Panjabi Dictionary compiled by Janvier and published at the Ludhiana Mission Press about 1850. It also draws upon O’Brien’s Multāni Glossary for Multāni words. Jukes’ Western Panjabi and English Dictionary2 also draws upon O’Brien’s work, as well as upon Wilson’s Grammar and Dictionary of Western Panjabi.3 O’Brien’s Multāni Glossary has now been re-edited by Mr. Wilson and Pañḍīt Hari Kishan Kaul.4 Diack’s Kūṭa Dialect of Hindi also contains a Glossary of Kūṭa (Pahārī) words.5

---

1. Yoruba 31, 1919.
7. This conjecture has already been spoken of.
8. Munshi Gulab Singh and Sons, Lahore, 1895.
But in addition to these regular dictionaries many official publications, especially District Settlement Reports and Industrial Monographs, contain words or even lists of words which have never been drawn upon as materials for a complete lexicon of the Panjabi Dialects. These sources, however, are used in the following Series, the first of which comprises words to be found in the Monographs. Hence, most of the words in this Series (i) are technical terms. Series II. will contain words from a number of Settlement Reports and Gazettes and dealing with a specified part of the Punjab. Series III. will deal with another part, and so on. One Series at least will be devoted to words from unpublished sources.

These Series are designed to be contributions to a lexicon of the dialects spoken in the Punjab, as well as of those used in the North-West Frontier Province which are not Urdu or Pashto. As they do not form a dictionary, but merely raw materials for a dictionary, only the bare definitions are given, but the *源泉* of each merely local word is added, when known, as well as the source from which it is taken. The Panjabi dialects have an extremely rich vocabulary, and have borrowed from (and quite as probably lent to) languages like the Balochi and Pashto, which are spoken on their borders. The object in view is to make the collection as comprehensive as possible.

The words collated from published sources cannot, as a general rule, be given with diacritical points; nor can their accurate transliteration be guaranteed for the present, many of the older Settlement Reports, etc., having been printed before the Hunterian system was introduced. Due allowance must also be made for possible mistakes and misprints. Nevertheless, the value of these sources cannot be denied. E. g., a considerable number of words have been culled from *Maclean*’s *Gazetteer of Multán* (1901—2) and *Dick*’s *Gazetteer of Dera Ghází Khán*, which are not traceable in *Jokes*, and from works like *Tapper*’s *Punjab Customary Law*, Vol. II., which contains Kuldh words not given in *Dick*’s *Kuldh* Dialect of *Hindi*.

It is intended to collect and print the material available for a Lexicon of Pañjábl and its Dialects in the form in which it now exists, and eventually to obtain corrections and additions to that material. This task, as pointed out by the Rev. T. Graham Bailey in his preface to *The Languages of the Northern Hindustans* (now under publication by the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain), will require the enthusiastic toil of many collaborators.


**Adhaur**: a hide, of an ox or buffalo. *Cf. dhaur*, chartah. Mono: Leather Industry, p. 15.


**Adhita**: a cloth containing 250 threads to three-fourths of a yard. Mono: Cotton Manufactures, p. 4.


**Aga**: the process of purifying gold. Jhelum. Mono: Gold and Silver Work, p. 22.

**Agardán**: a vessel for burning incense. Mono: Pottery and Glass Industries, p. 11.


**Ahan**: the Himalayan nettle (*Urtica Heterophylla*); Kangra. Mono: Fibrous Manufactures, p. 3. *Cf. jaraha* and *kdráh*.

**Aiinthtl**: a small wheel. Mono: Fibrous Manufactures, p. 12.


**Ajótā Gāgrasháth**: a kind of silver; Kullú. Mono: Gold and Silver Work, p. 6.


Akhri: a star affixed to an ornament. Mono: Gold and Silver Work, p. 25.


Amrat: an ornament. Mono: Gold and Silver Work, p. 34.


Anchhā: ribbon which is more than two unjals or fingers in width. Mono: Gold and Silver Work, p. 28. (Cf. Platts, p. 89.)


Ankalā: *Calotropis gigantea* = *ak*. Mono: Fibrous Manufactures, p. A-i.

Ankri: an iron rod about a foot long with a curve or hook at the end. Cf. kundī. Mono: Pottery and Glass Industries, p. 24. (Cf. Platts, p. 94.)


Aṭhāst: a cloth containing 800 threads to the three-quarters of a yard. Mono: Cotton Manufactures, p. 4.


Atēna. Cf. *burghi* (both in Peshāwār).


Bābriwanak: gold containing one-twelfth alloy; Muzaffārgarh. Mono: Gold and Silver Work, p. 4.


Badhā: odd rupees over Rs. 100; Hissār. Cf. badzur. Mono: Gold and Silver Work, p. 5.

Badlā: plain flattened wire; Delhi. Mono: Gold and Silver Work, p. 27.

Badlaur: odd rupees over 100; Kohāt. Cf. badhā.


Bāl, bāla: an arm ornament. Mono: Gold and Silver Work, p. 33. (Platts, p. 163.)


Bant: an ornament. Mono: Gold and Silver Work, p. 32.

Bauknal: a blow-pipe, smaller than the adl and curved at one end. Mono: Gold and Silver Work, p. 18.


Bīrā: a crucible in which kān-h is melted. Mono: Pottery and Glass Industries, p. 4.


Balayā: a gold and silver thread-maker. Mono: Gold and Silver Work, p. 27.

Bati: a synonym for pidi (sup); Bannī. Mono: Pottery and Glass Industries, p. 9.

Battak: a surāḥi with flattened sides and fitted with ears, to allow of its being slung on a traveller's back. Mono: Pottery and Glass Industries, p. 8.


Bend: a forehead ornament. Mono: Gold and Silver Work, p. 32.

Benj: see jangli ḍhaṅ. Mono: Fibrous Manufactures, p. 4.


Bhai bharā: to cross parallel sets of strings behind each strand of the woof. Mono: Fibrous Manufactures, p. 11.


Bharrī: a sheaf, which the sepi gets at each harvest. Mono: Leather Industry, p. 5.


Bhāunār: the Himalayan nettle (Urtica heterophylla). Cf. ahrān.


Bhīrnī: a kind of wheel used in twisting fibre; Dera Ismāll Khān. Mono: Fibrous Manufactures, p. 12.

Bhodāl: a plate of mica or talc. Mono: Gold and Silver Work, p. 18.

Bhorā: a wide hole in the ground in which a potter deposits prepared clay as stock. Cf. ghambaṅil. Mono: Pottery and Glass Industries, p. 3.


Bīchhīl: an ornament. Mono: Gold and Silver Work, p. 34.


Borlá: a head ornament; Gurgaon. Mono: Gold and Silver Work, p. 32.


Budki: see butki.


Bandí: the points at the heel and over the instep of a shoe. Mono: Leather Industry, p. 33.

Bundá: the tassel of a silver pendant; Kullú. Mono: Gold and Silver Work, p. 35.


Bushára: see nágar bhus. Mono: Fibrous Manufactures, p. 4.


Chaggal: an ornament. Mono: Gold and Silver Work, p. 34.


Chakkandā: see dandā.
Chaketa: see dandā.
Chakki: a large shallow vessel in which grindstones are placed, and which serves to collect the flour. Mono: Pottery and Glass Industries, p. 11.
Chaklai: see danda.
Chākvaṭi: the round piece of stone let into the potter’s wheel. Mono: Pottery and Glass Industries, p. 4.
Chalakara: see danda.
Chan: (1) a head ornament, Shāhpur; (2) a bracelet, Ambala. Mono: Gold and Silver Work, p. 32.
Chandna: gold containing from 2 ratis to 1 masha of alloy to the tola; Sālkot. Mono: Gold and Silver Work, p. 4.
Chandra: Cf. chandīna.
Chankangan (? chun-?): a bracelet with pendants; Shāhpur. Mono: Gold and Silver Work, pp. 32 to 34.
Chantārā: a head ornament. Mono: Gold and Silver Work, p. 32.


Chara, charā: an ornament for the foot; Lahore. Mono: Gold and Silver Work, p. 34.


Chatarā: a brush used in applying *hani* or other colouring matter to earthenware. Cf. *chatrīn*. Mono: Pottery and Glass Industries, p. 5.


Chātī: an extra piece of leather covering the whole heel. Mono: Leather Industry, p. 28.

Chatrīn: see *chatrani*.

Chau: a tall, blue-stemmed variety of wild bamboo; Simla. Mono: Fibrous Manufactures, p. 4.

Chauk: a gold ornament worn by Hindī women. Mono: Gold and Silver Work, p. 24 (for *syaśa*, cf. p. 32.)


Chauṣati: a cloth containing 400 threads to ½ yard. Mono: Cotton Manufactures, p. 4.


Chaurā: a kind of hammered brass. Mono: Brass and Copperware, p. 3.


Chollī: a foot ornament; Delhi. Mono: Gold and Silver Work, p. 34.

Chhaj: a measure; the length of a man's forearm, square (sic). Mono: Leather Industry, p. 33.


Chhib: a tassel pendant; Spiti. Mono: Gold and Silver Work, p. 36.


Chhin: a string used to separate the moulded portion of the clay from the rest of the lump on the wheel. Cf. chitwan. Mono: Pottery and Glass Industries, p. 5.

Chhinka: a net suspended from the roof as a receptacle for clothes, food, etc., in the east; also the cattle muzzle used at the threshing floor in Karnal. Mono: Fibrous Manufactures, p. 14.


Chilni: an iron blade or scraper used to smooth earthenware. Mono: Pottery and Glass Industries, p. 5.


Chirna: a saw. Ivory-carving, p. 11.


Chitwan: see chhin.


Chotipul: a silver ornament worn on the head by Hindu females. Mono: Gold and Silver Work, p. 25.

Chuhan: a kind of grass; Shahu pur. Mono: Fibrous Manufactures, p. 2.

Chulkiyan: an ornament for the foot; Delhi. Mono: Gold and Silver Work, p. 34.

Chut: a grain sack; Gurdaspur. Mono: Fibrous Manufactures, p. 10.
Dab: the fibre of the *poa cyanosuroides* used for making ropes and string. Mono: Fibrous Manufactures, p. 4.
Danda: the stick by which motion is imparted to the wheel (*rām chāk*). Cf. *chaket*, *chakla*, *chālīdanā*, *chālakdra* and *sotli*. Mono: Pottery and Glass Industries, p. 4.
Darl: a kind of silk mixed with flax imported from Italy. Mono: Silk Industry, p. 15.
Darmāl: a necklace. Mono: Gold and Silver Work, p. 35.
Daropa: the three seers of grain which the *sepī* gets from every heap on the threshing floor. Mono: Leather Industry, p. 5.
Dānunah: a finger ring. Mono: Gold and Silver Work, p. 34.
Dowla, Deola; a small chirda specially used, by Hindús only, for illumination during the Diwālī festival. Cf. Platts, p. 560. Mono: Pottery and Glass Industries, p. 11.

Dova; a kind of wheel used in twisting fibres; Lahore. Cf. bhīsī. Mono: Fibrous Manufactures, p. 12.


Dhāga; a head ornament. Mono: Gold and Silver Work, p. 32.

Dhairni; a beaded perforated with holes used in twisting fibre, Montgomery. Mono: Fibrous Manufactures, p. 13.


Dhāltiṇa; a clamp. Cf. khādi and chāmp.

Dhanak; a narrow kind of tilai gota or gilt ribbon. Mono: Gold and Silver Work, p. 28.

Dhandū; an ear ornament. Mono: Gold and Silver Work, p. 33.

Dhanī; a hand urf or spindle (see ara). Cf. urf. Mono: Silk Industry, p. 17.


Dharsan; an ear ornament. Mono: Gold and Silver Work, p. 33.


Dharmara; Shahpur. Cf. dharama.

Dhaunoch; a kind of shoe; Peshawar. Mono: Leather Industry, p. 29.

Dhauṛī; Cl. adhaurī.

Dhedū; a small silver ring with a ball-shaped pendant, worn in the ear. Cf. titi and dhedū. Mono: Gold and Silver Work, p. 35.

Dhedū; see dhedū.

Dhelū; see konera; Deraṭāṭ.

Dhernā; an instrument used instead of a spinning wheel; Kullū. Cf. tāhlī. Mono: Woollen Manufactures, p. 5.

Dhol; the middle piece of a shoe. Mono: Leather Industry, p. 25.


Dhīla; a rash. Mono: Fibrous Manufactures, p. 11.

Dīlitāna; a kind of silver; Kullū. Mono: Gold and Silver Work, p. 6.

Diwālī; a plain, rather broad, wire; Delhi. Mono: Gold and Silver Work, p. 27.

Dǒḍā; the husk of a pod. Mono: Cotton Manufactures, p. 2.

Dēmāḷ; a necklace. Mono: Gold and Silver Work, p. 35.

Dokara: an alloy of gold containing a mālaka of silver and one of copper to one tola of gold; Dera Ismail Khān and Sālkōt. Cf. dorasa. Mono: Gold and Silver Work, p. 4.

Dokart: an alloy of silver with zinc and copper; Lahore and Sālkōt. Mono: Gold and Silver Work, p. 5.


Dolmāna: a waist ornament; Jhang. Mono: Gold and Silver Work, p. 34.


(To be continued.)

THE EARLY HISTORY OF INDIA,

2ND EDITION.

A REPLY.

Although, as a rule, an author does well to abstain from replying to his critics, Dr. Sten Konow's review of my book (ante, pp. 178-80) deals with so many matters of fact, and with a large proportion of them so unsatisfactorily, that I think it better to break the rule and ask space for a reply. I accept the reviewer's assurance that his remarks are 'offered in a perfectly friendly spirit,' but, nevertheless, some of them are inapplicable and inaccurate.

He quotes as an example of a 'hard judgement' my remark that M. Senart's brilliant treatise on the Asoka Inscriptions is 'largely obsolete,' and the reader of the review is left under the impression that I treated an eminent scholar with disrespect. What I actually said is: 'But since then (1886) several new inscriptions have been discovered, and perfect reproductions of those known to M. Senart only in extremely faulty copies have been prepared and published, with the result that M. Senart's book, Les Inscriptions de Piyadasa, is now largely obsolete, notwithstanding its many high merits.' That statement of fact is perfectly accurate. I have lately read again M. Senart's work, and there is no doubt that a great part of it has been superseded by subsequent researches during twenty-two years. The publication of correct fac-similes has proved that the license of emendation assumed by the learned author is not warranted by the facts, as Bühler pointed out long ago. But the admission of this truth does not involve any impertinent censure on M. Senart or any disrespect to his profound learning.

The other example of a 'hard judgement' cited is my expression of opinion that Bāṣa's simile describing Skandagupta's nose 'as being as long as his sovereign's pedigree' may be considered 'the most grotesque simile in all literature.' I am not disposed to withdraw that opinion. The text goes on to say that another passage of the same writer, 'although not in perfect good taste, unmistakably bears the stamp of power.'

The complaint is made that 'the treatment of the different parts is very uneven.' Unfortunately, the materials are very 'uneven,' and it is impossible to write history when the materials are lacking. Tastes differ, and some readers find the full treatment of Alexander's campaign the only interesting part of the book.

I am accused of often making categorical statements without quoting authorities or weighing opposing arguments. This serious charge is supported by references to my treatment of the question of Greek influence on the drama, art, and architecture. As to the drama, exact references are supplied, and both text and notes plainly state that the view of Weber and Windisch, to which I still adhere, is opposed by 'most scholars,' as the note puts it, or 'acute and learned critics,' as the text has it. What more could be said? If I had time to take up the question good reasons for my belief could be adduced.

So, with reference to relief sculpture, the only reference possible is given in another publication of my own. I have much material on the subject collected, but it is impossible to fill the
pages of a political history with treatises on controverted topics in the history of art.

As to the Gândhâra sculptures, that is a big question. The references given are sufficient to put the student in the way of forming his own opinion.

The point of the remarks about ‘Greek architecture,’ which the reviewer deems ‘superfluous,’ is that there was Greek architectural ornament, but not Greek architecture in India, a distinction rather neglected in Cunningham’s treatment of the subject. As to ‘cosmopolitan Grecco-Roman art,’ that, of course, is only a late development of Greek art. I think that if the reviewer looks up the Mathurâ sculptures, he will find that many, at all events, of the best examples of the Gândhâra school belong to the time of Kaniśka and Huvishka, whatever that may have been. The numismatic evidence that Kaniśka is not earlier than Augustus has been well summarized by Boyer.

I gratefully acknowledge the service done by the reviewer in pointing out the strange case of Choḍaganga and his four sons in Orissa, whose reigns apparently cover a period of, at least, 131 years, not 130 as stated in the review. It seems to show that the tradition about the Nine Nandas may be less incredible than I supposed.

As to the Shâh-jâmi-Dheri at Peskâwar, I necessarily followed M. Fouche. The correction announced since the publication of my book was duly noted some time ago.

The reviewer finds fault with me about the disputed site of Brâvasi. If he will do me the honour of looking up the arguments which seem to prove that the inscribed statue came from elsewhere, he will probably agree that the umbrella came along with the statue. The recently-discovered copper-plate was dealt with in my article on Kanauj in the J. R. A. S., 1908, p. 792.

The review closes with a list of alleged ‘nasty misprints’ or blunders, which I am bound to notice.

Kushân.—This form was adopted advisedly as being that made familiar by Cunningham and probably representing the real pronunciation. It occurs on certain Sassanian coins, and its use was justified by the note in J. R. A. S., 1903, p. 289. The Kharáštít alphabet, which gives the form ‘Kushana,’ does not ordinarily distinguish between short and long s, and the Chinese forms of the word suggest the long vowel.

Kautalya.—I am aware that most people write Kautilya or Kautilya, but I deliberately followed Mr. R. Shamsastry, who used MsS. and writes Kautalya and Kautoliya (ante, Vol. XXXIV, p. 5). The reference was duly given. Since the publication of my book I have received Prof. Hillebrand’s valuable paper Über das Kautilīyāśāstra (Breslau, 1908), which shows (pp. 1, 3) that the patronymic may be written optionally as either Kautilya or Kautalya.

Kâuva—should be Kâuva, as written by Bhandarkar.

Shâstra.—I wrote shāstra, which is the ordinary pronunciation in Upper India.

Vâsieṭha—in the compound Vâsieṭha-gotra (p. 197), the vowel might be either long or short, but the short vowel is preferable.

Kâ-γyur.—I followed Hardy’s spelling in Eastern Monachism. Other writers spell Kâg-γyur. Tibetan scholars must decide which is right.

Jaya-kandhâvâra—The accidental misprinting of the hyphen is rectified in the Corrigenda at the end of the book. The interpretation, as noted, is D. R. Bhandarkar’s. The reference is to ‘Epigraphic Notes and Questions,’ p. 16 of reprint from J. Bo. Br. R. A. S., Vol. XX. See also Kielhorn in Ep. Ind., V, 239.

That is the complete list of so-called ‘nasty misprints.’ The reviewer then proceeds to deal with certain ‘etymologies’ and other trivial matters.

Kharwâr-Gahâwâr.—I never derived the one word from the other. The Kharwâr descent of the Gahâwâra rests on tradition, for which the reference is given.

Thânâsar-Thâvâvâra.—A special note is devoted to the matter on p. 309 of the Early History, and more fully, ante, Vol. XXXV, p. 125.

Chada.—This Andhra (not Andhra) name will be cleared up when Prof. Rapseon’s forthcoming catalogue of Andhra coins appears.

Rudradâman.—Could anybody suppose that the Rudradâman of the fourth century was identical with his namesake of the second century?

Harsha’s signature—I see no difficulty in believing that the elaborate signature was the king’s own handwriting, of which a specimen was kept in the Secretariat to be copied in documents.

VINCENT A. SMITH.

Cheltenham, 18th Oct. 1908.
THE NARAYANIYA AND THE BHAGAVATAS.

BY GEORGE A. GRIERSON, C.I.E., Ph.D., D. Litt.

(Continued from p. 262.)

Mokshadharma Parvan of the Santi Parvan of the Mahabharata.

Contents of some of the Introductory Chapters.

(The Adhyaya numbers are those of the Santi Parvan).

(Adhyayas 174-181, not important for our present purpose.)

Adhyaya 182. Conversation between Bhrgu and Bharadvaja. Birth of mahat from the eternal manasa, and thence ahamkara. The Lord (Prabhu) creates ether, from which comes water, from which comes fire and air, and from these two, earth. The Self-born One creates the lotus-born Brahma, who creates the firmament.44

183. Process of creation.
185, 186. The vital fire and the vital airs.
187. Indestructibility of the soul.
188. Order of Brahma's creation.
189. To the north, beyond Himavat, there is a country (evidently the White Continent, see below), where all are pious, etc. (7010—16). Contrast with 'here.'
190. On the Adhyatma.
207. On the nature of Narayana, who is the Male (Purusha). List of nations who are sinners. In the South: Andhrakas, Gnas, Pulindas, Sabaras, Chuchukas, and Madrakas. In the North: Yauanas, Kambojas, Gandharas, Kiratas, and Varvaras (7559). The universe developed by Krishna. Even Narada admits that he is the Supreme Deity.
210. Description of the supreme yuga which leads to moksha. Adhyatma = Vasudeva = Narayana. Repetitive account of the Samkhya principles.
218. Prakriti, Purusha, Prakriti, Khetrajna, yoga.
219. Explanation to Janaka of the Panchashikha doctrine as to existence after death. Moksha is not extinction, but is absorption.
246. On the jiva (soul) and the gujha-jiva.
247—249. On Adhyatma (the Supreme Self), the five mahabhutas (gross elements), and manas, buddhi, and khetrajna.
252. On the mahabhutas.
253. On yoga, and the power of seeing the jiva (soul) and the lingakarira (subtle body, or personal character).

44 This will be further developed in the Narayaniya section. At present we may state, that in the Bhagavata doctrine, manas or manas corresponds to Pradyuma, and ahamkara to Aniruddha. Usually the gujas, or constituents, corresponding to Brahma, are stated to spring from ahamkara-Aniruddha.
254. On *karma* (desire), and its results.
269—271. Kapila discusses the comparative merits of the religion of works and of *yoga*.
275. *Yoga*, the path which leads to *moksha*.
276. Conversation between Nārada and Asita-dēvāla (cf. 12987 in 341, below) on this.
Repetition of the principles of Sāṁkhya (and of Pañchāśikha).
286, 287. Further account of *Adhiyātma*.
302. Discussion on the differences between the Sāṁkhya and *Yoga* systems of philosophy.
Both are approved.
303. The principles of Sāṁkhya described. Condition of the released soul (11177).
304—306. On the *aśkara* (undecaying) and the *keśara* (decaying).
309. On *vedā and avidyā*. Sāṁkhya and Yoga compared.
310. On *budha* and *abuddha* (the Supreme Soul, and the *jīva* connected with *Prakṛiti*).
Creation and dissolution.
316. On the three constituents (*guna*).
317. On the *nirguna* and *saguna*.
318, 319. The principles of Yoga described.
320. Pañchāśikha on the immortality of the soul.
321. Janaka misunderstands the Pañchāśikha doctrine, and is enlightened by Sulabhā.

The Nārāyanīya.

336. Yudhishthira asks Bhishma who is the greatest God, the Deity of deities. Bhishma
relates the conversation between Nārada and the earthly Nārāyaṇa on the subject. This
Nārāyaṇa, who was the deity Nārāyaṇa in earthly form and under the same name, lived with
his brother Nara (also an incarnation) at Badarikāśrama. Nārada, filled with *bhakti* for the
deity Nārāyaṇa, finds them worshipping the deities and *pitris*, and asks who was the object of
worship on the part of him who was really the Unborn, the Eternal. The Adorable One (*i.e.*
Nārāyaṇa, the earthly) replies (12678):—

The universal soul, or Male (*Parusha*), is known by the name of Kaḥṭrajan (the *kennard
of the body*). From Him is sprang the indiscrete Prakṛiti possessed of the three constituents
(*guna*)* of conscious existence (*sattva*), energy (*rajas*), and inertia (*tamas*), and the source
(*yoni*) from which we two are sprung. It is this Universal Male (*Parusha*) that we worship
in these rites that we nominally perform in honour of the deities and *pitris*.

337. Nārada determines to repair to the White Continent in order to behold Nārāyaṇa’s
original nature (*iddya prakṛti*). Being endowed with the power of *yoga*, he soars to the top of
Mount Mṛcu, and turning his eyes towards the North-West beholds a wonderful sight. Towards
the North, in the Ocean of Milk, is the large White Continent. Here follows a description of
the inhabitants. Amongst other wonders, their complexions are white, they are clean from
every sin, and blast the eyes of sinners that look at them.

---

43. See Bhag. Gītā, xiii, and also many passages below, especially 13744.
44. Regarding this translation of the word *guna*, see Garbe, Die Sāṁkhya Philosophie, pp. 13 ff. For the other
translations, see Hopkins, Great Epic, 119.
Yudhishthira interrupts Bhishma to enquire further about these people. Bhishma replies (1271): In former times there was a king named Uparichara (Vasu), who was devoted to Nārāyaṇa Hari. Following the Sātvata (i.e., Pāñcharatra) rule that had formerly issued from the mouth of Śūrya (the sun), he used to adore the Lord of gods (dēvā, i.e., Nārāyaṇa) and, with what was left over from his oblations, the grand sires. Adopting the Sātvata ritual, he performed all the optional and necessary sacrificial acts. He considered all that he possessed as Bhagavata, i.e., as coming from the Adorable One (Bhagavat). Many leading men connected with the Pāñcharatra cult used to eat the food offered to the Adorable One in his house. He never uttered an untruth, or had an evil thought, or committed even a mote of sin.

(12722) This supreme scripture (i.e., the Pāñcharatra scripture) was compiled and uttered by the seven Chitraśikanḍin Rishis and Maṇḍu Śvāyamānu, after worshipping Hari Nārāyaṇa for a thousand years of heaven. Then they read it to Nārāyaṇa, who praised it and certified it to be in complete accord with the four Vedas. He also prophesied that it would be the basis of the teaching of Uśanas and of Brahma. The latter would teach it to king (Uparichara) Vasu.

398. After the expiry of a mahākalpa, Brahma is born in the race of Aṅgiras, and instructs Uparichara Vasu. Uparichara Vasu studies the doctrine of the Chitraśikanḍins, and performs an aivamādha sacrifice. (1273) Amongst those present are the maharṣis, sons of Prajetā, viz., Ēkata, Dvita, and Tṛita, who act as overseers (sadasya). Brahma is the hṛiti. The Adorable (Bhagavat), the God of gods, the ancient one, being invisible, takes the offering and carries it off without being seen. Brahma is in wrath flings the sacrificial ladle to the sky, saying “here I place his share, the god (dēva) must take it away before my eyes.” (12768) Vasu and his overseers pacify Brahma, explaining that the god is incapable of being seen. That man only can see Him, on whom He has shown His grace (prasāda). Ēkata, Dvita, and Tṛita then explain how, in their desire to see Nārāyaṇa, they have travelled to the White Continent, the inhabitants of which are devoted to Nārāyaṇa, the Supreme Male (Purushottama), and are bhaktas.

[Here follows the oft-quoted account of the White Continent (Svēta-dvīpa). It is so well-known that a few brief notes will suffice.] (12781) “The inhabitants worship only the one god (ākānta). Blinded by his glory we could not see Him, the Male (Purusha). Believing that this was due to insufficient penance, we performed austerities for a hundred years. We then saw them silently worshipping Brāhma (neut.), turned towards the East and the North. Hari became pleased with them.” (Then follows a description of their worship.) (12795) The deity is addressed as Hṛishikēśa (Lord of the Senses), Mahāpurusha (the Great Male), Pūrvajā (First-born). These men, endowed with the highest (parama) bhakti, entirely devoted to Hari, knowing the Pañcharatra (= Pāñcharatra rules, see note 83 below), were worshipping with mind, word and action. The God (dēva) certainly appeared in that place, but we could not see Him. We were informed that the Adorable could only be seen by those who had faith (bhaktas). We then returned to our desired places.

“While we failed to see Him after severe penances, can you expect to see Him? Nārāyaṇa is a Mahā-bhūtān, the Creator of the universe, without beginning, without end, indiscriminate.” (12812) Pacified by these remarks of Ēkata, Dvita and Tṛita, Brahma

84 For a long account of Uparichara Vasu, who was king of Chēdi, see MBh., I, 2384 ff.
84 Apparently the mahāpradēśa, or sacramental meal of the modern Vaishnavas.
84 A collective name for the Rishis Marlohi, Ati, Aṅgiras, Pulastya, Pulaha, Kratu, and Vaiśhātha (cf. 13040, below). It will be observed that, in opposition to Śaṅkara, the orthodoxy of the religion is insisted upon.
85 The name Vasu is important in connection with the fact that the Pāñcharatras worship the Adorable under the name of Vasa-đēva.
86 P. C. Roy translates this word “a Great Being.” The meaning is not clear to me. One is reminded of the Śaṅkhya Mahābhūtās, or Grosser Elemenre, but such a translation does not suit the passage. In the original, the word is neuter singular.
completes the sacrifice. Uparichara Vasu thereafter ruled rightfully. Owing to the curse of a Brāhmaṇa he subsequently fell from heaven into the heart of the earth. There he worshipped and meditated upon Nārāyaṇa, and through His grace (prāddha) was once more restored to heaven, and obtained release (pāryāti).

339. Yudhishṭhīra asks how, as Vasu was a Bhāgavata, he was cast down from heaven to the heart of earth.

Bhishma explains. The gods once had a discussion with the Rishis, the most excellent of the twice-born, as to whether offerings should consist of animals or of grain. The Rishis argued for the latter. They appealed to Vasu, who, addressing them as devītattvam, gave his opinion that sacrifices should be of animals. Enraged at his decision, the Munis cursed him to sink below the earth, and so it happened. The gods wished to release him, because he was a bhakta of the Brahmaṇa-dēva. He will rescue thee as soon as the effects of the curse of the Brāhmaṇas are exhausted.” They arranged for his sustenance while in the cavern, by making over to him the streaks of clarified butter (hence called vasu-dhārd) poured along the walls by Brahmaṇas at sacrifices. (12845) Vasu commenced to worship Vishvakṣēna and sang the prayers (japya) that issued from the mouth of Nārāyaṇa. Although in the cavern, he sacrificed to Hari the five sacrifices at the five times. Then the Adorable Nārāyaṇa Hari, the Adorable Vishnu, being pleased with his bhakta, sent Garuḍa, as soon as the effects of the curse had worn off, to bring him up to the sky. Garuḍa did so, and he entered the Brahma-loka in bodily form.

Bhishma continues: — I now proceed to tell how Nārāyaṇa went to the White Continent.

340. Nārāyaṇa goes to the White Continent to see Nārāyaṇa. He raises his arms (in yōda) and sings a prose hymn, addressing the deity as Nirṛtī, Kṛṣṇa, Purushottama, Anantapurusha, Maṇḍa-puruṣa, Trīṇa-pradhana, . . . Śaṅkara-yājña, Pañcha-kala-karttri-pati, Pañcha-rātri, . . . Hauṣa, . . . Vindu, . . . Mahā-bhrasṭa . . . Śūkṣya-yoga, Sākhyamūrti. . . . Abhinav-yoga . . . Vāsuvēṇa . . . Bhaktā-vatasa. Nārāyaṇa concludes, by saying that he is the deity’s bhakta. (This chapter is entitled the Mahāpuruṣa-stava.)

341. The Adorable, pleased with this hymn, shows himself to Nārāyaṇa. Description of his appearance, in the course of which he is named Hari Nārāyaṇa. He addresses Nārāyaṇa, “Ekata, &c., could not see me, but thou, being a monochrome (kālakāra), hast succeeded. Ask a boon.” Nārāyaṇa replies that he has already received the highest boon by being permitted to see the Adorable. The Adorable praises the people of the White Continent, who are bhaktas. “Being free from inertia (tamas) and energy (rajas), they will enter me. (12889) He, whom having entered, the best of the twice-born become in Him (īka) released, is the Eternal Supreme Self (paramātman), to be known as Vāsudēva.”

---

20 See note 8 on p. 232, ante. With this legend we may compare Abel’s offering of animals which was accepted by Yahweh, while Cain’s offering of fruit was rejected.
21 The chief of the Adorable’s pārahads or archangels. Here used for the Adorable Himself. Cf. 1847.
23 The five times (ākāla) at which these five sacrifices are performed recalls the name Pañcha-rātra, literally a period of five nights. Various meanings are given to this compound. The Nārāyaṇa-Pañchārtha says that rātra is equivalent to jñāna, or knowledge, and that the five ‘knowledges’ are two śādītikas, a saṁyjika, a rājāsik, and tāmasa. For further particulars, see Sādūkhyādhyān, s. v. Har is one of the Bhāgavata incarnations of the Adorable.
24 According to the modern bhakta theology, the Adorable had twenty-four, not ten incarnations. One of these was that of the Hauṣa, or Swan.
"At the dissolution of the universe, the Earth is absorbed into the Water; the Water into the Light; the Light into the Air; the Air into the Ether (śa); the Ether into the Intelligence (manas); the Intelligence, which is a parāman bhāta, into the Indiscrete (anyata, i.e., Prakṛti); and the Indiscrete into the actionless Male (Parusha). There is nothing beyond the Male (Parusha), the Eternal. He, Parasah Vāsudēva is the only Eternal. Vāsudēva is the Sulf (ātman) of all elements (bhāta). The five great elements (mahāātman) are earth, air, ether, water, and light. These combined form a body (kāraṇa). (12897) He who then enters it, is invisible and of little power. He is the Lord (prabhu), and thus becomes born and endows the body with action. Without the combination of the elements, the body cannot be, and without the living soul (jīva), the vital airs (vyāna) cannot endow it with action. This living soul is specified (parināma-khyāta) as Śēṣa, as Sāmkarṣaṇa, and as the Lord (prabhu). He who becomes Sānakumāra, issuing from Sāmkarṣaṇa by his own act, and in whom all created things merge at the universal dissolution, is the Manas, Intelligence, of all created things, and is named Pradyumna. From Pradyumna is born he who is the Creator (kāraṇa), the Cause (kārya), and the Effect (kārya), from whom everything movable and immovable is produced, namely Aniruddha, the Lord (śeṣa), the Indiscrete (anyata) in all his works. (12904) When Vāsudēva, the Adorable, Kāśēṭaṇḍa, devoid of constituents (yuga) is a living soul, he is Sāmkarṣaṇa. Pradyumna or Intelligence, is born from Sāmkarṣaṇa, and from Pradyumna is sprung Aniruddha, or consciousness (ahankāra). "I, Vāsudēva, am the Male (Parusha), the actionless, the Twenty-fifth. I am without constituents (yuga), without parts, indifferent to alternatives, without ownership. I am Īśa, the preceptor of the world. That which thou beholdest is not me, but illusion (vyāna), created by me. Thou shouldst not know me thus, endued with the constituents of all created things, for I am omnipresent, the inner self (antarādiśa) of all living creatures, yet when their bodies are destroyed, I am not destroyed. Brahma is my chief overseer. Radha, born of my wrath, is sprung from my forehead. . . . . (12924) Brahmā was created by me, and himself sacrificed to me. I made him my son at the beginning of the man (kārya), and endowed him with the overlordship of the world, and with consciousness (ahankāra) suggesting the identification of things (atma-prāpya vichāra). . . . . After granting these boons, I became inactive (abhanit-paramā bhavaḥ). (12944) After a thousand ages (yuga) I shall withdraw the universe from myself, and shall remain alone with Wisdom (vidyā), with which I shall emit the universe again as before. (12936) It was my fourth form (that of Vāsudēva) that created Śēṣa or Sāmkarṣaṇa. He produced Pradyumna, and in turn Pradyumna produced Aniruddha. From the lotus sprung from Aniruddha's navel was produced Brahmā. . . . In

55 Manas is not here the Manas, or mind, which is the eleventh organ of sense and action, derived from Ahākāra, or consciousness, of the Sāñkhya principles. In this place it is the Bhāsāvata synonym of Ātma or Mahat, i.e., Intelligence, the second of the Sāñkhya principles, which is produced from the indiscrete Prakṛti or Prakṛtā. Manas is given as a synonym for this in the Sāñkhya-krama-dipikā. See Garbe, Die Sāñkhya Philosophie, p. 214. Parāmanātha, the Supreme Element, seems to mean the Ultimate Discrete, beyond which all is Indiscrete. Cf. 12906, and also 13035 and note thereon, below.

56 This is all Sāñkhya-yogā Purusha or Bhūta. See Coleman, Essays, I, 255 ff. Vāsudēva corresponds to the Sāñkhya-yogā Purusha or Bhūta.

57 Here we begin to meet the vyāsa doctrine of the Pāśupatīs. Śēṣa is here only another name of Sāmkarṣaṇa, as Sānakumāra is of Pradyumna. As explained ante, p. 381, the process of evolution of the universe is by vyāsa as is follows:—From Vāsudēva, or the Adorable, are evolved a being named Sāmkarṣaṇa and Intelligence (Manas or Mahat). From the combination of these two are evolved Pradyumna and Indiscrete Matter (Prakṛti or Prakṛtā). From the combination of these two are evolved Aniruddha and Consciousness (Ahankāra). From the combination of these two are evolved Brahmā, the Fashioner, and the Elements (Mahābhūta), out of which he fashion the universe. For another system, with only a single vyāsa (Aniruddha), see note 66 on 1383 i ff.

58 The meaning of all this is that Vāsudēva, by dividing himself became (with the three others) four beings by successive production.

59 Purusha is the last of the twenty-five principles in Sāñkhya-yogā.

60 Cf. the Logos doctrine, and 1382, 1386, below.
each son I shall become incarnate as the Boar, as the Man-lion, as the Dwarf, as Parasurama. At the junction of the Tréta and the Dwápará ages I shall become incarnate as Ráma, the son of Daśaratha. The saints already mentioned as the sons of Prajápati (12757), viz., Ekáta and Dvita, shall become incarnate as apes, in punishment for an injury done to Tréta. They shall, in that form, be allies in my work. When the Dwápará age is passing into the Káli age, I shall become incarnate as Krishná. (Krishna's exploits detailed.) (12965) Having thus relieved the burden of the earth, according to my will, I shall cause a terrible destruction (pralaya), surrounded by knowledge of the Supremo Self (ātman), of the principal Sátvatas and of Dváraká, and shall go to my own worlds (sudá lóká), which are honoured by Bráhmaṇas. (Later on, in 12968, the term śútata is employed as synonymous with the name Krishná.) [Next (12967) comes a recapitulation and fuller list of the incarnations. It is the ordinary well-known list of ten, except that Buddha is omitted, and Hársha is substituted, being put first of all. After Hársha comes the Tortoise, then the Fish, Boar, Man-lion, etc.] (12971) Now, Nárada, thou hast seen Me in visible form, a thing which has not been permitted even to Bráhma."

Bhishma continues: — "The Adorable Dêva then disappeared. This great Upanishad which is associated with (samavrita) the four Védas, made by Sámkhyá-yóga (Sámkhyá-yóga-kritos), was named by Nárada 'Pañcharátra,' and was heard by him from the mouth of Náráyaṇa Himself, and was repeated accurately by him in the abode of Bráhma."

Yudhishthira asks why all this had to be told to Bráhma. Surely he knew it all before. Bhishma admits that the objection is a sound one. Nárada did not tell it to Bráhma, but to the saints (siddhas) assembled there. Súrya (the sun), having heard it on this occasion, repeated it to sixty-six thousand Rishis in his train. (12987) They told it to the deities assembled on Mount Mêru. These told it to Asita, who told to the Fathers (pitrás). The Pitri Sántanu, my father, told it to me, and I tell it to thee. It is only to be told by thee to him, who is a faithful one (bhrata) of Vásu-deva. Benefits of reciting it described. May the eternal Adorable, Janárđana, be pleased with thee.

Vaisampáyana narrates how Yudhishthira and his brethren, on hearing Bhishma's discourse, all became devoted to Náráyaṇa. Their continual cry was "Victory to that Adorable Male (Bhágavat Purusha)."

342. Saunaka asks how it is that Bhágavat (the Adorable), the Bhágavata Prabhu, who Himself has laid down the rules of action (nirártti), has created gods who partake of sacrifices which involve action (práfrártti) and others, of contrary mind, who follow the rule of inaction.

Saunaka replies by telling what Vaisampáyana said to Janamájaya on this subject, having heard it himself from Kársha Dváipáyana. (12834) The Supreme Self (paramátman) of Sámkhyá-yóga takes the name of Maháparusha,—or the Great Male,—by his own act. From Him is sprung the indiscreet Pradhána. (12936) From the Indiscrete, who is Jávaya, was produced, in order to the creation of the world, the Discrete, — Aniruddha, who is known among men as

31 They threw him into a well, in order to get his property. Not very saintly conduct.
32 Hársha is the fourteenth in the modern bhakti-cult list of twenty-four incarnations. The Bhágavata Puráṇa calls this incarnation Nárada.
33 Bráhma was Nárada's father.
34 Asita Dvávala, the Rishi of Rig-Veda, IX, v, 24. Note that he was also the Simeon of Buddhism, who took the young child Siddhárya into his arms and blessed him. To the Buddhists he was an exemplary Rishi, though following heterodox rules. See Kern, Manual of Buddhism, p. 68.
35 In Sámkhyá-yóga also called práfrártti.
He whose self is Intelligence (mahat)⁶⁵. He is also Consciousness (ahankåra), and being vested with discreteness he created the Grandfather (i.e., Brahmå). From it also, in its capacity of consciousness, are sprung the five grosser elements (mahåbhuja), earth, air, ether, water, and light. Having created the grosser elements, he also formed those qualities (idda gundå)⁶⁷. Eight beings were produced by the combination of the elements, viz., (13040) Marichi, Angiras, Atri, Pulastya, Pulaha, Kratu, Vasishtha, and Manu Sråyåbhuvå (cf.12722). These are known as the eight Prakritis. From these eight was the whole universe born, while Brahmå formed the Védas, sacrifices, &c., Rudra was born, having anger for his Selves (rådhimaka), and himself created ten others, and these eleven are called ishåra-purushas or males (purushas) by production⁶⁸. All these ask Brahmå for definitions of their respective duties. He takes them off to quench from the indiscreet Great Male (Mahåpurusha), who dwells on the north shore of the Ocean of Milk (i.e., presumably, in the White Continent) (13054) They engage in austerities, and after a thousand celestials years, the Adorable directs them to perform a sacrifice in His honour. They do so. (13065) Then the Adorable gives them the privilege of enjoying the fruits of sacrifices made by them (this is action, pravritti) and of receiving a share of the sacrifices offered by men. Strengthened by these sacrifices they are to tend the worlds. So strengthened, they will strengthen Him. (13082) Different creatures are intended for different purposes, some for action (pravritti), some for inaction (niyåti). (13075) Marichi and the others (Manu’s name omitted) will be teachers of the Védas, and hence of action. (13079) The seven mind-born sons of Brahmå: Såna, Sanatsajåta, Sansåk, Sanandana, Sanat Kumåra, Kapila, and Sanåtana, will be teachers of Sånkhya-yogå, and apostles of inaction. They are foremost of those who know Yåga, and are skilled in the Sånkhya philosophy (jåna). (Pradåhåna is) that from which consciousness (ahåm) is sprung, and, before (consciousness), intelligence (mahat)⁶⁹, indiscrete with its three constituents (yogå). Beyond Pradåhåna is that which is called Kåhårajåta, who is I Myself. This consciousness is the path of those who follow action, and is fraught with return.

(13088) Descriptions of the four ages (yogå). In the Kali age, when only a fourth part of righteousness (dharma) will remain, (13095) ye are to go to places where the Védas, sacrifices, austerities, truth, self-restraint, accompanied by mercy, still flourish. They all go away, except Brahmå, to whom (13099) the Adorable shows Himself in the form of Aniruddha, with a horse’s head (hayahtåra), bearing the triple staff (trådåya) and an ascetic’s pitchfork (kåmañåla), and singing all the Védas. He lays the burden of the world on Brahmå, promising to become incarnate when necessary, and disappears. Brahmå adopts himself the path of inaction, but ordains the path of action for others to give picturesqueness (chåtråt) to the world. (13108) Vyåsa’s song in praise of the Adorable. (13122) Benefits of hearing or reciting the above.

343. Janamejåya naka Våisåmpåyan the meaning of the names employed for the Adorable in Vyåsa’s hymn. Våisåmpåyan quotes the reply of Kåśava (i.e., the incarnate Adorable) himself to a similar question put by Arjuna.

---

⁶⁵ Here, as in 1346 ff., the vådås Śaṅkaråha and Prådhåmåsa of the full list in 12904 ff. are omitted, and Aniruddha performs their functions as well as his own. This is expressly allowed by 13092. Mahat is here the equivalent of the Båhåvåta manas, or Intelligence, corresponding to the Sånkhya-Yåga buddhi or mahat. The usual stages of evolution are (1) Śaṅkaråha-Prådhåna (or PråÄkrtt), then (2) Prådhåmåsa-Manas, thenes (3) Aniruddha-Åhåkåra, and thence (4) Brahmå and the elements. But here (1) Aniruddha-Prådhåna produces Mahat (i.e., Manas); (2) Aniruddha-Mahat produces Ahamkåra; and (3) Aniruddha-Åhåkåra produces Brahmå. The word yogå cannot hardly mean the yuga, or constituents, of Sånkhya, for they are not subject to creation. They exist from eternity, even in Prådhåna. P. C. Roy interprets the word yogå as meaning the attributes of the elements. They were created, and then their attributes, and, though this again is not Sånkhya, he is evidently right. In this passage all mention of the Sånkhya laks-måtras, or subtle elements, and of the ten organs of sense and manas, all of which are derived from consciousness, is omitted.

⁶⁶ See 13140 ff., below. Rudra was born from Nådåya’s wrath.

⁶⁷ Våkåra is the Sånkhya technical term for the production of Buddh from Prådhåna, and so on.

⁶⁸ The meaning of the original is not clear, but this seems to be the sense.
There are many names of Me in the four Védas, Purāṇas, Upānīṣad, in astronomy also, in the Śûkya, in the Yajñaveda, and in the Ayur- Veda. (13140) Salutation to Nārāyaṇa, who is the universe, devoid of constituents (guṇa), and yet their Self (guṇatman). From His grace (prasadā) is sprung Brahmā, and from His wrath (brādhā) is sprung Rudra. He is the source (yūs) of everything movable and immovable. That which has eighteen attributes (guṇa) is Conscious Existence (sattva). It is the supreme Origin (prakriyā) the Self (ātman) of the worlds (lōka). From it come all the changes of creation and absorption. It is austerities, the sacrifice, the sacrificer, the ancient Male (Puruṣa), Virāj. As a male being it is Aniruddha. By His grace (prasadā) towards the wane of Brahmā’s night, Brahmā was born in the lotus. Towards the wane of Brahmā’s day, Aniruddha became subject to anger (brādhāsṛṣṭa), and Rudra (Śiva) was born from his forehead. Thus, of these two great Viṣṇudas, one was born from his grace, and the other from his wrath. Under his directions, these two create and destroy in turn. Rudra, also called Kapardin, &c., is to be considered as having Nārāyaṇa for his Self. Whoever worships him worships me. I am theSelf of all worlds, and therefore I worship Rudra, as really my Self. If I did not worship Ś́āna (i.e., Rudra), no one would worship my Self. The standard (pramāṇa) which I set is followed everywhere. Standards are to be worshipped, and therefore I worship him. He who knows him knows Me and vice versa, Rudra and Nārāyaṇa are one being (sattva) divided into two. He alone can grant me a boon. Long ago I once adored him to gain the boon of a son. In doing so, I only adored myself. For there is no other deity whom Vaiśṇava adores.”

(13161) There are four kinds of people who are faithful to me (mama bhakta). The first and best are those that are devoted to one god (ekānītā), i.e., to me alone. The remaining three include those who do good works for the sake of their fruits.

(13167) Explanation of the names Nārāyaṇa, Vāsudēva, Dāmādara, Priśnagarbha, Kēśava, Gūtama, Hṛṣīkēśa. The explanation of the name Vāsudēva is (13169) “As the sun with its rays, I cover the whole world, and am called Vāsudēva because I am the one that dwells above (āthvād) all creatures.” (13180) [Commencement of the explanation of the name Hṛṣīkēśa. Agni and Śoma have a common source (yūs)].

344. The Adorable explains to Arjuna why Agni and Śoma have a common source. He first relates an ancient story sprung from the energy (tiṣya) of His Self. When at the end of four thousand ages (yuga), there occurs a universal dissolution; when everything merges in the Indiscernible; when there is a blank inertia (or darkness, tāmas) without light or earth or air; when the world is one sea of water and is known as ‘Brahma-Māta,’ without a second; when there is neither Night nor Day; when nothing exists or does not exist; when there is neither Discrete nor Indiscernible: then the eternal Male (Puruṣa), the immutable Hari

---

11 Sattva, which is itself one of the three guṇas of the Śūkya Pradhāna, has itself, as here stated, eighteen guṇas, which here mean ‘attributes’ or ‘properties.’ A list of these 18 guṇas of sattva is given on p. 215 of Professor Garbe’s Die Śūkya Philosophy. A slightly different list is given in Nilakaṭṭha’s commentary to this passage, viz.:—

Pṛitiḥ prakāhyam udrāḥ
adṛṣṭam anānāṁ rakṣaḥ
kauśāṁ bhrī-ahūkṣaṁ cha
devo jñānti amalātā tyāgam

In Mādh. xi, 11288 it is stated that there is another list of the guṇas of sattva, but giving 31 not 18. Cf. Hopkins, The Great Epic of India, pp. 119, 129.

17 Here Prakṛti or Pradhāna is apparently equaled with the Adorable, from whom it proceeds. The whole passage seems to mean that Aniruddha, as descended both from the Adorable, and from Prakṛti, represents them both. Regarding the identification of Puruṣa with Prakṛti or Pradhāna, cf. note to 13702, below.

18 All this glorification of Śiva is evidently an insertion by the writer of the latest additions to the epic (what Hopkins calls the ‘pseudo-epic’) in which no god is equal to Śiva. So also the concluding part of the next adhyāya. Cf. Hopkins, Great Epic, p. 124.

19 Tamer here means Prakṛti. See note to 13465, below.
becomes revealed from the inertia (or darkness, tamas), which is endowed with the constituent of Nārāyaṇa (Nārāyaṇaydāraya), immortal, without senses, inconceivable, without origin, true, merciful, with a mark upon his forehead, impelling in various manners, without hate, death, decay, or form, all-pervading, maker of all things. Then, on the revealing of this Male (Purusa), sprung from tamas, having Brahma (nurt.), for his source (gūna), namely on the revealing of Brahma (mas.), the Male (Purusa), being desirous to create offspring, created Agni and Soma from his two eyes. Description of the deity of Agni. Description of Brähmans and their powers. Stories of several Rishis.

(13224) Agni and Soma are regarded as the joy (kätha) of the universe. Hence I am called Hriṣhilka. Continuation of the explanation of the names in Vyäsa’s hymns. Ritadhäma, Sripvishta, Aja, Satya (13235-7) Sättvata (sic) (because I am full of sattva), Krishna (because I plough, krishkami, the earth, and am of dark (krishna) complexion), Vakrathä, Aychuta, Adhökshaja, Ghritärchis, Tridhätu, Vrisha, Vrishikapi, Anädi, Amadhyya, Ananta, Suchihrävas, Ekäsiräga, Trikädud, Vrîchäka, (13251) Kapila (by the followers of Sämkhya), (13255) Hirañgyartha (by the followers of Väga, cf. 13793), the four different Védas Dharmäja, Nara and Naräyaṇa, Khañçalaparanä. Legend of the origin of the last name and of the battle between Rudra and Nara-Naräyaṇa. Brahma intervenes and pacifies Rudra, who acknowledges Hari’s superiority. Hari addresses Rudra after the reconciliation (13293): — “He that knows Thee, knows Me; He that follows Thee, follows Me; There is no difference between us two.” I have now told this story. (13309) Rudra is the deity sprung from my wrath (krädda). End of the Adorable’s speech.

315. Státa relates to Sannaka, Vaisampâyana’s account to Janamäjya of Nätarä’s adventures after seeing Näräyaṇa. (13314) Näräda goes to Badari and there meets the Rishis Nara and Naräyaṇa. He tells them what he has seen in the White Continent. (13353) Bhagavat the Adorable, is dear to Bhágavatases. (13370) I am here under Hari’s instructions, and shall in future dwell with you two.

346. Nara and Näräyaṇa address Näräda. He is highly honoured by having been permitted to see the Lord (Prabhu). Not even Brahma has seen Him. “No one is more dear to Him than His bhaktin, and therefore He showed Himself to thee. We two are the only ones who have access to the place where He performs austerities. (13376) From Him springs mercy (kshatram), which is connected with the earth; savar (rasi) attached to water; heat (bēnas) attached to the sun; tangibility (sapräs) attached to the air (vedya); audibility (obada) attached to the ether (adhä); and mind (mnas) which is attached to the moon. That place, where He dwells, with Wisdom (vidya, cf. 12935 and 13467) for His companion is named by the Veda ‘Sat,’ the existing, the productive cause of things created (bhäta). (13388) The perfect who are free from actions, whether good or bad (puñya-papā-viçarjita), go thither. They first enter the sun (ālitya) as the door. There their bodies are consumed and they become atomic entities (aparämäya-bhūta). Thence they enter that God (name not mentioned), and then, freed from him, they stand in the body (tana) of Aniruddha. Then having become mental entities (manahbhūta) they enter Pradämunna, the best Brähmaṇa (vipra-pravara) and Sämkhya, with the Bhágavatases, enter Sañkaräsha, who is living soul (jiva). Thence, void of the three constituents (taittik-hina), they instantly enter the Supreme Self (paramätman), the Kshetrajña, Himself without constituents, (13388), who is Väsudäva, the abode of all things (sarvvedha). We were born in the house of Dharma, and live here to hail the various manifestations of the deity in the three worlds.” (13397).

Näräda remains with Nara and Näräyaṇa for a thousand celestial years.

347. Origin of the oblations to the pitiṣ explained in a conversation between Näräda and Näräyaṇa, the elder of the two sons of Dharma.

17 Here we leave the Sämkhya-yoga, and find ourselves among the Brähma speculations of the Upanishads.

18 P. C. Roy says he is Näräyaṇa, which is impossible. I consider that it refers simply to the Sun. Being consumed they enter him as the door.
348. I have told you the word of Nārāyaṇa as it was spoken to Nārada, and as I heard it from Vyāsa. It was obtained by Nīrada from Nārāyaṇa Himself. It has once before been concisely told in the Harītīda (i.e., the Bhājya-vi Gītā). (13441) The Sūtra tells Saunaka that he has now told him the story (dīkhyāna) entitled the Nārāyaṇya. Praise of Nārāyaṇa by the Sūtra, and list of His attributes. He is . . . (13447) The Witness, of the Worlds (lōka-sūhūshṭha) (cf. 13743), the Unborn (aja), the Male (Puruṣa), the Ancient One (Purāṇa) . . . . . . . . . . He is adored with their understanding (budhi) by the Sāṃkhya-yogins.

349. Saunaka asks why the Adorable appeared to Brahmā with a horse's head (hayaśīrṣa), (see 13032 in Adhyāya 342). The Sūtra tells how Vaiśāṃpāyaṇa explained the point to Jnanēṣvēryāṇa. (13462) Description of the dissolution of things. The earth (dharaṇī) becomes absorbed (śūla) into water (āpas), the water into light (śvīrī, light into air (udāya), air into ether (ādīst), ether into intelligence (manas), intelligence into the Discrete (vyakta), the Discrete into the Indiscrete (acyut), the Indiscrete into the Male (puruṣa), and the Male (puruṣa) into the All (svarga). Then the All become only inertia (tamas). Inertia is in its essence primeval immaterial (vālāndṛiti-lakṣmaṇa). From it was sprung (sānāda) Brahmā (neut.). It had for its aim the conception of a universe, and so took a form evolved from the Male (puruṣhīn tāmā), (13468). As a male, this form is called Aniruddha, and, as a neuter, it is also called Pradålā. It is Indiscrete and possesses the three constituents (śrīga). He is the deity with Wisdom (vīdi, cf. 12936 and 13832) for his companion, Vishvakāra, Hari, the Lord (prabhu). He became subject to Yāga-sleep, and lay upon the waters only. There he meditated upon creation, and while meditating remembered intelligence (swat), which was his own self (ādaya, cf. 12936), and from it was born consciousness (abānādha), which is Brahmā, also called Hiraṇyagarbha, sprung from Aniruddha in a lotus. Seated upon the lotus he saw the universe consisting of nothing but water. Adopting the constituent of Conscious Existence (avicca), as Paramāṣṭhrin (ācā), he began to create the elements (bhūtāgāra). Nārāyaṇa had also created (kūśita) two drops of water on the leaf of the lotus. One became Madhu, born of the constituent of inertia (tamas). The other became Kaṭṭhabha, born of energy (rajas). They watch Brahmā seated on the lotus and emitting (ṣṛjana) the four Vēdas. They seize the Vēdas, and carry them off to the bottom of the Ocean. Brāhma appeals to the Lord (Īśāna), called Hari. (13486) Brahmā's hymn . . . (13487) Thou art the receptacle of Sāṃkhya-yoga. . . . Thou art the maker of the discrete and of the indiscrete . . . without source (aṅgājīta). (13489) I was born from Thy grace (prajñā). My first, or mental, birth was from Thee. My second, or mental, birth was from Thee. My third, from Thy mouth, my fourth from Thine ear, my fifth from the nose (nādaya), my sixth from an egg, and this my seventh from a lotus. All these births were from Thee. The Vēdas are my eyes. They have been taken away, and I am blind . . .

(13496) The Adorable Male (Puruṣa) resolves to rescue the Vēdas. He takes a form with the head of a horse (hayaśīrṣa). (13507) In this form He finds the Vēdas, and returns them to Brahmā. (13520) He slays Madhu and Kaṭṭhabha. Aided by Hari, Brahmā creates the universe. (13534) Hari subsequently, on another occasion, again assumed the same form for the sake of the religion (dharmas) of action (prakṛti, see Adhyāya 342). The Horse's Head is a primary (prakṛti) form. Benefits arising from the recitation of the story.

77 The Discrete is Aniruddha of the Bhāgavata single-yogita system of evolution. But it is Aniruddha in process of evolution, combined in turn with Pradāna, Mahat or Manas (Sāṃkhya Buddhism), and Abhāsana. Cf. 13033, and note 46 thereon.
78 This is, of course, one more additional name for Prakṛti. With the reference to tāmas, above, we may note that this word is also used in Sāṃkhya as synonymous, or rather equivalent, of Prakṛti. See Garbe, Die Sāṃkhya Philosophie, p. 265.
79 In intelligence (mahat or manas) is the second of the Bhāgavata principles, and Consciousness (abānādha) is the third. The evolution described here, with Aniruddha alone, is the same as that described in note 46, above, to 13034 ff.
80 Compare the parallel account in Bhāgavata Purāṇa, viii, 24.
81 According to 13530, above, this birth was from Nārāyaṇa's mouth.
(13528) Whatever forms the deity assumes, He does so by His own power (kṛvadāh svarāyañ dānām dānam dānam). He is the receptacle of the Vedas and of austerities. He is Yuga, or Śākhyya, or the foremost Brahma (neut.), and the infinite (vibhu) Hari.

The religion, in which rebirth is impossible (i.e., nirvāṇa, see Adhyāya 34), has Nārāyaṇa as its object, and so also the religion, which has pratyāhāra for its distinguishing mark, has Nārāyaṇa for its essence. Smell, the attribute of earth; taste, that of water; touch, that of air; sound, that of ether; mind (manas), of which the attribute is indescreteness (anyatā-samādukeśā); time; Kṛiti, Śrī, and Lakshmi; Śākhyya and Yuga; all these have Nārāyaṇa for their Self (ātman). (13537) As the Male (Purusha) He is the Cause, and as Pradhāna He is also the cause. . . . He, Hari Nārāyaṇa is the one real principle (tattva). He, Kēśava, knows the thoughts of Brahmā, of the Rishis, of the Śākhyyas, of the Yugas, of the Yatis who know themselves, but not they His. All acts performed in the gods are really devoted to Vishnu. He is called Vāsudeva, the abode of all beings and actions (sarpa-bhūta-kṛtva-vada, cā. sarvāhāvā, in 13538, above).

350. Jñanābhyāya says:—The ordinary good man, free from both merit and demerit, reaches the Male (Purusha), through the three stages (of Aniruddha, Pradyumna, and Sākharaṇa); but those who are monotheists,—devoted to one God (ekānta) reach the Male (Purusha) at once. To my mind the latter is the preferable religion. Who taught it first?

Vaiśampāyana says:—It was stated by the Adorable Himself to Arjuna (i.e., in the Bhagavad Gītā). As then stated it was difficult to understand. Nārāyaṇa subsequently explained it to Kṛiṣṇa Dvaitapāya, who explained it to me. Nārāyaṇa's account of the mode in which the religion was taught was as follows:

(13559) When Brahmā was mentally born from Nārāyaṇa's mouth, the latter imparted it to the Vaiṅkhanasas, who drank foam, and they to Soma, and then it disappeared.

(13562) At the second birth of Brahmā, from Nārāyaṇa's eye, Brahmā received it from Soma and gave it to Radha, who, in the Kṛiṣṇa age, gave it to the Vālkhālīya Rishis. Then it again disappeared.

Vibhu, as a Bhāgavata technical term, means 'infinite,' as opposed to apu, 'finite.' The word here possibly means 'a developed, or secondary, form of the Adorable.' According to the Bhāgavatas, the Supreme Deity exists in five different forms.

1. The first is that of the Adorable Himself, the Bhagavat, in this conception styled 'Parātapa' or 'The Supreme,'

2. The second consists of the four vyāhās or evolved forms of the Adorable, viz., Vāsudeva, Śākhyya, Pradyumna, and Aniruddha, with all at length in the Nārāyaṇiya.

3. The third is that of a Viśvāva, or secondary form of the Deity. There are five kinds of Viśvāvas viz.:

(a) A Viśvāva Āstātra, or complete incarnation, such as that of Bāma, Krishṇa, or the Māliion.

(b) An Anūta Āstātra, or major Partial incarnation, in which only a portion of the Deity became incarnate, such as those of the Fish, the Tortoise, the Dwar, or the Kapila.

(c) A Kālā Āstātra, or minor Partial incarnation, in which the Deity is not present to so great an extent as in the preceding. Such is Parasū-Māma who, in the Aṅgīrā, is not referred to as an incarnation at all. It will be remembered that he was a Brāhmaṇa, who was conquered by Bāma, a Kāhastriya incarnation.

(d) A Sakti Āstātra, or an Incarnation in Mith, such as those of the Adorable as Śiva or Brahmā who, according to Bhāgavata theology were but forms of Him.

(e) A Viṃūḍha Āstātra (Incarnation of Power) or Kṛṣṇa Āstātra (Incarnation for a Purpose). This is a temporary or occasional manifestation, such as that of the Adorable as Mūki at the springing of the ocean. Every Bhāgavata who preaches the doctrine of his religion is, for the time being, a Viṃūḍha Āstātra.

4. The fourth form in which the Supreme Deity exists is that of the Antargśa (or Inward Restrainer), i.e., the God in the soul of every animate being.

5. The fifth and last form is that of an Archā Āstātra, or Incarnation for Worship, i.e., the Deity inherent in every idol or other representation of God. An idol is merely a mūrti, or image, till it is solemnly consecrated (pratīkṣā) according to the rules laid down in the Nārāyaṇa Jārakāstra. It is then no longer a mūrti, or image, but is an Archā Āstātra.

For most of the above, I am indebted to Śrī Sītkāmānāraṇa Bhagawān Prasāda, the esteemed editor and translator of the Bhāgavat-mañ.}

Of 13549, above.
At the third birth of Brahmā, from Nārāyaṇa's voice, Nārāyaṇa Himself gave it to the Rishi Suparṣu, who recited it three times a day. Hence it is called Trisuparṣu. Suparṣu gave it to Vāyu, who gave it to the Rishis, who ate the residues of oblations. They gave it to the Ocean (mahākāla), and then it disappeared again and became merged in Nārāyaṇa.

At the next birth of Brahmā, from Nārāyaṇa's ear, Nārāyaṇa ordered Brahmā to receive the religion under the name of Sāvṣa, and by its means to create and arrange the Kṛta age. Brahmā received the religion, with its mysteries, its abstractions (saṃgrahā) and its dravya, as it issued from the mouth of Nārāyaṇa. He then created the worlds. The first age was the Kṛta age, which was auspicious, as much as the Śāvia (sūtra) religion was established and pervaded the world. Brahmā taught it to Manu Svārōṣī, who taught his son Svāruṣā, who taught his son Svāruṣā, when the Trāṇa age came, it again disappeared.

In the birth of Brahmā from (Nārāyaṇa's) nose (nādaye jñānani), Hari Nārāyaṇa recited it Himself to Brahmā, who taught it to Sanatkumāra, who taught it to Vira, the Prajāpati, in the Kṛta age, who taught it to Raibhya, who taught it to his son Kukkhi. It then disappeared.

In the next birth of Brahmā, from an egg born of Hari. Brahmā received it from Nārāyaṇa's mouth and communicated it to the Barhāstād Munis, they to a Brāhmaṇa (deva) conversant with the Jyēṣṭhaśīla Śāman and with the Vādāta, whose name was Jyēṣṭha who gave it to King Aśoka. It then disappeared.

At the seventh birth of Brahmā, that from the lotus, Nārāyaṇa taught it to Brahmā, who taught it to Dakṣa, who taught it to the eldest son of his daughter, Advent, who was older than Saviṣṭra, and from whom Vivasvat received it. In the beginning of the Trāṇa age Vivasvat gave it to Manu, who gave it to his son Ikṣvāka, by whom it was spread abroad over the earth. At the dissolution of the universe, it will again go to Nārāyaṇa.

This, which is the religion of Yasins, has been already compendiously told in the Harīṇī (i.e., in the Bhāgavat Gītā). Nārāyaṇa got it with its mysteries and abstracts from Nārāyaṇa Himself. It is difficult of comprehension and performance, and is always maintained by Śāvia (sūtra).

By some Hari is worshipped under one manifestation (vyāha) (i.e., Aniruddha cf. 15055 and 15466), by some under two (i.e., Aniruddha and Pradyumna), by some under three (i.e., Aniruddha, Pradyumna, and Saṃkarṣa, cf. 12697 ff.), and by some under four (i.e., Aniruddha, Pradyumna, Saṃkarṣa, and Vāśūdēva, cf. 13762). Hari alone is the Kṣaṭra, without egoism (nirvikāra) and without parts (nīṣkala). He is the Living Soul (jīva) in all beings with attributes (dharma-bhūta), transcending the five elements (bhūta), and He is intelligence (manas), setting in action the five senses (indriya). He is active and cause, and effect, and, as the Male (Purusha), the Immutable. He sports according to His desire. Such is the religion of devotion to the one God (ekābhāntikā), as I heard it by the favour of my preceptor. It is hard to be understood by those of undisciplined self (akṣītyābhya), and it is hard to find many men who are devoted to one (ekābhāntikā). My preceptor heard it from Nārāyaṇa. Those who are devoted to Nārāyaṇa go to Him, who is the supreme Brahmā who is white in colour, and brilliant as the moon.

Janamejaya asks why different persons follow different religious practices.

Vaisampāyana explains that men's natures differ. Some are subject to sattva (conscious existence), others to tāpa (energy), and others to tamas (inertia). It is the nature of those of the first class that leads to emancipation. (15061) The religion of devotion to Nārāyaṇa is equal to Śākhyā-yoga. He who follows it is endowed with sattva because Hari looks upon

---

86 I. e., the present 'dispensation.'
87 The well-known five elements of Śākhyā: ether, air, fire, water, and earth. So the five senses are sight, hearing, smell, taste, and touch.
88 Here we see the influence of the Brahmanical theory of sādā. 
89 Here we see the influence of Brahmanism.
90 Hopkins (Great Epic, pp. 99, 100) here justly points out that it is stated that the Bhāgavata religion is as good as Śākhyā-yoga, not the same as it.
him. He is awakened *(pratibuddha)* by Hari looking upon him. No one can be awakened by his own will.  

(13628). When a man's nature is mixed, and is subject to both *rajas* and *tamás*, he has *pravṛtti* (the way of works) as his characteristic, and it is not Hari, but Brahmā, who looks upon him. The deities and *Rishis* themselves are certainly in a state of *sattva*, but it is not *sattva* in its subtle (śūkhsma) form, and therefore they are still subject to change (śākārika).

Janamējaya asks how a being thus subject to change can reach the supreme Male (*Purusha*). He also asks for further information regarding *pravṛtti*.

Vaiśampāyana explains:—The soul (*purusha*) or twenty-fifth (principle of the Sāṁkhya), which is actionless (i.e., performs no works, good or bad), goes to the Male (*Purusha*), who is very subtle, who is enlivened with the (twenty-five Sāṁkhya) principles (*sattva-saṃyukta*), and with the three letterā (a + u + m). The Sāṁkhya-yoga, the Vēdas and Aranyakas, and the Pañcachārtā (*sic*) are mutually related and are really and only one. This is the religion of those who are solely devoted to *Ākāśa* to Nārāyaṇa alone. As waves issue from the ocean only to re-enter it again, so do these waves of the ocean of knowledge again re-enter Nārāyaṇa. This is the *Sātvata* (*sic*) religion, the immutable monotheistic (*Ākāśa*) way of the white men and of Yatis. It was taught by Nārāyaṇa to Vyāsa, my preceptor, and by Vyāsa to me. Vyāsa also taught Yudhishthira. It is difficult to follow (*āśācha*). Others become as much puzzled by it as you; for Kṛṣṇa alone is the teacher and the perplexer of the universe, its destroyer and its cause.

351. Janamējaya asks:—Are the Sāṁkhya-yoga, the Pañcachārtā (*sic*), the Vēda-Aranyaka separate courses of duty (*nīśtha*) or one course? Also, explain *pravṛtti*.

Vaiśampāyana:—(Episode of the story of the birth of the Vyāsa, Kṛishṇa Dvaipāyana, with an account of the origin of the Vēdas.) (13702) There are these five different philosophies, (*jāna*), viz., Sāṁkhya, Vyāsa, Pañcachārtā, Vēda, (*i.e.*, Vēda-Aranyaka), and Pāṇḍava. Kapila declared the Sāṁkhya. Hiranyagarbha (cf. 12855), and no other man of old, was the teller (*of Vyāsa*). Apāntaratamas, also called Prāchīṇagarbha, was the teacher of the Vēdas. Siva, the Lord of Unā, Skṛta, the son of Brahmā, spoke the Pāṇḍava lore. The Adorable, Himself is the knower (*svetā*), of the entire Pañcachārtā (*sic*). In all these, according to the scriptures and philosophies of each, the Lord Nārāyaṇa is the object of worship (*nīśtha*). Those that know the Pañcachārtā, who are devoted to monothism (*Ākāśa-hādaya*) enter Hari. The Sāṁkhya, Vyāsa, and Vēdas are primary (*sāṅkṣetra*). In all, the worship is directed to Nārāyaṇa.

352. Janamējaya asks if there are many males (*purushas, i.e., souls*) or only one. What is the source of all things?

Vaiśampāyana replies:—In the opinion of the Sāṁkhya-yoga there are many males in the world. Nor do their followers admit that there is only one Male. But as much as one soul (*soni*) of the many males is declared, therefore shall I describe that one Male (*Purusha*) who is above constituents (*yavādikā*) as the All. This Purusha-sāṅkṣetra (*Rīg Vēda*, X, 90) is celebrated in all the Vēdas as right (*rīta*) and true (*satya*). Treatises, with general rules and exceptions, have been declared by Rishis, beginning with Kapila, in their contemplation of the Highest Self (*adhyātma*), but the doctrine of unity of the Male (*Purusha*), which was declared by Vyāsa, as he heard it explained by Brahmā to Mahādeva, is what I now proceed to tell. (13732) There are

---

82 Here we have the germ of the "cat" or "irresistible grace" school of the Bhakti cult. The Deity is represented as taking up the soul of him who is to be saved, as a cat takes up its passive kitten, in opposition to the "monkey" or "cooperative grace" school, which holds that the soul must cling to the Deity, as a young monkey clings to its mother.

83 I. e., they have a happy future life, but when the fruits of their works are exhausted they are liable to rebirth.

84 It has been explained in the epilogue (18697) that Apāntaratamas was born again as the Vyāsa, Kṛishṇa Dvaipāyana. Hopkins, Great Epic, p. 97, note 3, suggests that it is possible that in mentioning Hiranyagarbha (and no other,) the verse is a refutation of the claim of Patañjali to be author of the Yoga system.

85 For an account of the Pāṇḍava scriptures, see Colebrooke, Essays, II, 468 ff.

86 Cf. Bhāsya 644, viii, 1.

87 Here, as Hopkins, Great Epic, 123, 134, points out, we have the Sāṁkhya doctrine of the plurality of souls proclaimed of old by Kapila, who is represented as the first of all the Rishis in time, and condemned in favour of the Yuga doctrine of a Universal Soul or Male (*Purusha*) from whom the many souls (*purusha*) of Sāṁkhya take their rise.
many males (purushas) and one Male (Parusha), who is their source (yôni).

333. Brahmâ continues his explanation commenced in 13737: — The universality and invisibility of the Male (Parusha). Without a body, yet dwelling in all bodies. Though dwelling, in bodies (sêrâta) He is not affected by their acts. He is my inner self (antarâdham) and thine. (13749) He is the Witness of all who possess bodies (dôka) (cf. 13447). He is incomprehensible. The universe is His head. The universe is His arms. The universe is His feet, eyes, and nose. One He wanders at His will in the kôhêtra. Kôhêtra (or 'field') means 'body' (sarâva). He knows all kôhêtras and their seed (i.e., actions), whether it be good or bad, and therefore He Whose very self is Yôga, is called the Kôhêtra-jîva, or 'The Kenner of the Field.' His not-going and His goings are unknown. (13746-47) I have studied His goings, in order, according to Sâmkhya and according to Yôga, yet I know them not, but according to my knowledge I will tell thee of the primeval Male (Parusha), of His oneness and of His greatness. He is recorded as the One Male (Parusha). That primeval One bears the name of the Great Male (Muhô-parusha).

Just as fire is one, but glares everywhere; just as the sun is one, but is the universal source of heat; just as air is one, but blows everywhere; just as the ocean is one, but is the source of all the waters; so the Male (Parusha) is one, void of constituents, having for His form the Universe. By casing aside everything that has constituents, every act, whether good or bad, by abandoning truth and falsehood, so does a man become without constituents, and enter Him. He who, knowing the inconceivable, humbly contemplates the quadruple subtle entity, goes to that auspicious Male (Parusha). (13753) Some learned men prefer to consider Him as the Supreme Self (Paramâtman) and others as the one Self, which is Self (âdâmam aâmam).

According to the former opinion that Supreme Self is without constituents, and is to be known as Nâráyaça, the All-Self (sarvâdman) the Male (Parusha). As the lotus-leaf is not affected by a drop of water, so He is not affected by the fruits of actions. But the other Self, the active self (karmâtman) is confined by the bonds of salvation (môkaôa) and also (in the state of the tiêga sarâra) by the seventeenth rope. (13740) It is owing to the existence of this tiêga sarâra that it is (errorously) said that the Male (Parusha) is manifolds. But (there is only one, Who) is the abode of the world-ordinances, the highest object of knowledge, the knower and the thing to be known, the thinker and the thing to be thought, the eater and the thing to be eaten. . . . (13748) the everlasting immutable Praadhâna.

. . . (Repetition of what has been said several times before) . . . (13762) The Male (Parusha) is in His four-fold manifestation sports (âcôàdâî) as He wishes. He is the Adorable instructed by His own knowledge.

In this manner have I taught you, as is told in the Sâmkhya philosophy (jûdâna) and also in the Yôga. 1

95 Here the alleged Yôga is getting mixed up with Brahmânism.
97 Aniruddha, Pradyumna, Sâmkarshaya, and Vâmôvâ.
98 This is the translation preferred by Hopkins, Great Epítc, p. 145, note 1. The two systems contrasted are Yôga and Brahmânism. The author here holds to the first. The commentator makes âdâmam refer to Sâmkhya, and âdâmam to Brahmânism.
99 Hopkins, Great Epítc, p. 167, suggests that we should read môkaôa, instead of môkaôa, 'confined by the bonds of delusion.' This gives much better sense.
100 In Sâmkhya, karmâtman is the epithet applied to mahôkshara, or consciousness, when in a state of production, whether of mind (manas), of the senses (ôdôdiya), or of the subtle elements (tiêduddrâ). See Garbe, Die Sâmkhya Philosophie, p. 249.
101 According to the Sâmkhya-pravachana-bhâûya on Sêûra, III, 9, which quotes the present passage with approval the reference here is to the tiêga-sarâra, personality or character, as distinct from the soul (parusha). This tiêga-sarâra is made up of seventeen constituents, viz., the mind, the ten senses, and the five subtle elements, together with buddhi and sâmâkshâra coupled together as one. Karmâtman is therefore here equivalent to the tiêga-sarâra. It is this personality or character which accompanies the soul and leads it wandering through transmigrations. Not till the soul is freed from it does it obtain môkaôa, 'release.'
1 Again a reference to the Brahmânist âdâa.
2 As Hopkins, Great Epítc, p. 125, justly remarks, a great deal of what has been said is not Sâmkhya-yôga at all. For instance the identification of Pradhôôa with Parusha, as here and elsewhere in the Sâmkhya, is radically opposed to Sâmkhya-yôga dualism.
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Ankā Pir, Muhammadan saint, tomb of ... 109
Ankar, revenue in kind... 75
Anna, St., sepulchre of, etc. ... 157
Anna, palace of ... 157
Antarallas of Malabar, The, by N. Subbaraya Iyer ... 334 ff.
Antarvādi, Doab ... 144
Antigonus, Gonatas k. of Macedon, the Antikina of Asōka’s Edict ... 343
Antigonus, Satrap of Phrygia ... 25
Antimachus, Greek prince, coins of ... 26
Antiochus Theos, k. of Syria, the Antiyoka of Asōka’s Edict ... 343
Antiochus the Great, invaded India ... 25
Antiochus Soter ... 25
Antiochus Theos ... 25
Antoninus Pius, Emp. of Rome, date of ... 73
Anułomajā, subdivision of the Ambalavais ... 335 f.
Anuruddha, Buddhist monk ... 3 n.
Aparntaratamas, or Prāchhinagarbha, teacher of the Vādas ... 385 & n.
Aparjāita, Gāngā-Pallava k., conquered Asātya ... 354
āpantu, a sage ... 69; 231 n.
Apollodotos, 'Conqueror' of India ... 27; 32; 64
Apostles, in Gethsemane, 156; creed of ... 158
Ara inscrīptā ... 46; 57 f.; 64, 67, 73
Arabs and R. Bell, 162 f.; 165 f.; victorious over the Chinese ... 181
Arachosia, co. ... 249
Armanit, goddess ... 360
Aravah, or Apakhātações, a class of Buddhist monks, 100 and n. 101, 103
Araš, cap. of the Irīnuñḍā family ... 230
Ardeshir-babakan, founder of the Sassanian dynasty in Persia ... 74
Ar 배, sanctity ... 10 n.; 11 f.
Aria, or Herat, colony from Nisibis planted in ... 78 n.
Arikēsarin, Parāñùkasa Mārcavarman, alias, Mārcan, Pandya k. ... 197
Ariphil Kilār, Tamil poet ... 239
Ariṣṭa, liquor ... 95 n.
Arjum Gaur, chief, under Asāka ... 153 f.
Arjuna, Pandu hero ... 379 f.; 383
Arjuna Kačchhappaguhāta, aśvajayapāla ... 123
Arjunakas, followers of Kriśna ... 253
Armagon, Arumugam, on the coast, north of Madras, a factory ... 317
Armenia and Rome ... 72
Armenian kings in Nisibis ... 78 n.
Arnold, Mr., E. T. Co. servant ... 236; 323 ff.
Arrian, on the Nysaioi ... 73 and n.
Arronina, St., for Veronica ... 157

Aρακός, Parthian k. ... 27
Aρακίδες, their coins and those of Gondophernes ... 48
Artabanos II. of Parthia, dates ... 69
Artabanus III. of Parthia, 69; wars with Tiberius ... 71
Artaxus, satrap ... 71
Ar'yana, civilization north of the Hindu Kush, extinction of, 69; army conq. nered by ... 211
Nedum Chešiyān, 236; 242; peoples in the Gangetic Valley, 231 ff.; settlements ... 231
Arzava, tablets from El Amarna ... 111
Asad Beg, author of Wābdīya, on tobacco ... 210
Asāf Khān, Muhammadan chief, and the Chau-dela ... 146
Asāravā, Chandellas queen ... 126, 128
Āśā, juice of flowers, etc. ... 95
Asēcism, and the Mazda Creed ... 358
Āśa, Genius of righteousness ... 358 f.
Asēhoko, the godly ... 359
Ashagrabhatthā Adhyayinara, a Brahman section ... 336
Ashatirthas, in Rāmtāk ... 205
Asia, 26; and tobacco ... 210
Asita, a Hīndu, and the Bhāgavata creed ... 254
Asita-dēvala, a Rāhi ... 374, 373 and n.
Asāka, Life of, 11 n.; Edicts, readings, ed. ... 26; and the Greeks in India, 25; death of, 69; Edicts and Inscriptions, 30; 60; 73; a new edition in preparation, 178 and n.; ... 211; and Tamil powers, 241; inscriptions ... 246; 278, f.; 291 and n.; 342 f.; 346 ff.; 350 and n. 371
Aspavaža, subordinate to Azea ... 70
Aśva, liquor made without decoction ... 95 n.
Assaka, kingdom ... 80 n.
Assam, Pragjyotisha ... 80
assara, 'apra, Assara, Moorish call to prayers, 161 and n. or Hdr'dahar ... 164
Aśvaghōsa, Buddhist saint, and Kanishka ... 57; 212
Aśvaghōsa, called 'king' in Sārnath inscrīptas ... 278
Aśvaghōsa, a Bējun, probably feudatory chief under Huvishka ... 60
Aśvaghōsa, subordinate k. of Benares ... 73
Aśvamādika, sacrificer ... 282
Aśvapati, Khatāriya k. of Kaikēya ... 252
Aśvatthāman, ancestor of the Pallavas ... 239
Aṭikālas, aṭiyāla, subdivision of the Anułomajā. Ambalavāsī ... 335 ff.
Ating, vil. in Zangzakar ... 332
Aṭiśa, k. of Zangzakar ... 332
Aṭīyōti, a Sāmanthar caste ... 338
attāḥkā ṛṣṭīdaḥ, inferior land ... 76
Āṭmākūr, in Nellore Dist. inscrīpta from, 200; 351; 354 n.; 357 n.
INDEX.

Atri, a Rishis .... ... 375 n.; 379
Arunagîb, k. of Delhi, in Pañjab legends, 154 f.; 243; or Oram Zeab .... ... 296
Augustan age of Tamil literature .... ... 228
Augustus, his coins and those of Kadphises L, 28; 33; in Syria .... ... 71; 249
Australia, home of a species of tobacco ... 210
Avalokiteśvara, a Bôdhisattava .... ... 179
Avalokiteśvarā, Kâsârpana, Mahâbodhisattva, and Nâgârjuna .... ... 207
Avânī Nâraṇa, a surname of Nandi.... ... 173 f.
Avânī-Nârâyaṇa-chaturvedimangalam, alias of Kâvâdipakkam .... ... 172
Avanti, Kingdom, 82 and n.; or Mâlava .... ... 242
Avâsa? confvents .... ... 81, 100
Avâvakappo, a Buddhist rule .... ... 98 f., 99
Avatâras, five .... ... 383 n.
Acesa, the .... ... 358
Avikalpana, k. .... ... 284
Avâśâtas, the Indestructible .... ... 259
Avâśyaka, a ylid .... ... 82
Avâvimalai, hill near Dharmapuri .... ... 229 n.
Avâvîyar, poetess, sister of Tiruvañcumar .... ... 223 ff.
Aya, Aces I .... ... 54
Aydâthia, and Râma, 202; and Suryavanash kings .... ... 203
Ayyapa, a hero .... ... 353
Ayyapaşâjû, name in the Dharmavaram in-scrip .... ... 855 n.
Avâsas, 47; II., nominal k. of the Pañjab .... ... 76
Aces, Sûrya prince, 27; his titles .... ... 40
Aces I, Aya, a Sûryan prince .... ... 64
Aces II. .... ... 54, 58; 82
Atilises, Sûrya prince, 27; his titles .... ... 40
Atilises, a Sûryan k. .... ... 54; 70
Baalâm, Mr., and R. Bell .... ... 162 f.
Babar, Emp. .... ... 32
Bâdu, or Pâwâ .... ... 811, 313
Bâbylon, and the Jews 156; 159; conquered by Persia, 841; and Seleucus Nicator .... ... 344
Bactria, lost to the Greeks, 25; Ta-hia, 26; 32; 83; and the Yû-chi, 69; reconquered by the Syrians .... ... 79
Bactrian Greeks, invaded India, 25; and the Yû-chi, 32; in Sogdiana .... ... 79
Badamì Cave inscrip. of the Châlukya Man-galâsa contains the earliest mention of the Saka era, 53; Vâtâpi, Châlukya cap., destroyed 243 or Vâtâpi, and the W. Châlukyas .... ... 352
Badarî, c. .... ... 381
Badarikâśrama, abode of Nâyana .... ... 374
buddha .... ... 261
Badoli Kanets .... ... 78
Bagdad, Bagdat, tû .... ... 185
Bagbâr, Sighampur-Baghâr, near Mahbâb, inscrip. at .... ... 123; 129; 134
Baghâr, a Hill State .... ... 304 and n.; 306
Baghîbâr, near Arâ .... ... 58
Bagnoîl, Mr., E. I. Co.'s, servant .... ... 327
Bahâdur Aghâ, servant of Hasan Khan, k. of Kashmîr .... ... 191
Bahâ-ud-din, Maîik, for Bâma-ud-din .... ... 145 n.
Bahârum Khan, a son of Zainul-Abîdin .... ... 189
Bahûr plate inscrip. and Dantivarman .... ... 173 f.
Bahûravatiyas, a sect .... ... 81 n.
Baijnath Prâsastî inscrip.; earliest Laukika date .... ... 32
Bairagí, on the Betwa, a battlefield .... ... 145 n.
Bairam Khan, fought at Panipat .... ... 52
Bairat (Bhabra) Edict. .... ... 1; 345
Bala, a friar .... ... 53 f., 54
Bâlâjî, Vishnu, modern temple in Chimbir. 333 f.
Bâlâkunârâ, father of Kanaka and Vîjaya, 236; 241
Bàllavarmâ, Bâr Brahm, Chandell prince .... ... 126
Balîçchâ, income tax .... ... 75
Balîddu, offering at the Ghôjâ ceremony .... ... 334
Balihi, Bihari, in Jabalpur Dist. .... ... 182 and n.
Bâlîd, of the Hâkîls of Gujârât in the Pañjab, by H. A. Bose .... ... 209
Balîts, conquered by Tibet, 181; 187; in Kashmîr .... ... 192
Balîtisân, 189; Skardo, or Little Bhoça-land, 191; independent in the 16th century .... ... 192
Bâlîm-khâr inscrip. and Khîrîsâng-Ide btsan. 161
Bamiyan, in Persia .... ... 80
Bam-Yik, variety of the Tibetan alphabet, probably connected with Bamiyan .... ... 80
Bâqa, historian, his Hârsha-Charita, 258; and Skandagupta's nose .... ... 371
Bâqa, kings, subject to Nandi, 171; 173; con-quered by Parântakâ I. .... ... 354
bandâ-khâr, bloodshed, plunder .... ... 75 n.
Bânâgar Naiks, Bawnacorrel Nawans, and Amb. Salisbury .... ... 310 and n.
Bânânda, a Sâkyaputra .... ... 23 n.
Bânâpâhâr, Mahbâb clan .... ... 38
Bânâsî, in Bundelkhand, 180; coin from .... ... 143
Bangasâhât, or Upper and Lower Bangâsah, 174; 211 n.
Baniyas, a caste .... ... 131
Banjârâ, caste, or Bundar, 234; 296; and human sacrifice .... ... 334 n.
Bannian men, merchants .... ... 164 and n.
Bantam, E. I Co.'s, trade with .... ... 269; 319
Bâpâta? Battapunde, 275; record from .... ... 305
barâ, wedding procession .... ... 144
Bar Braham, Bâlavarman .... ... 150
INDEX.

Bârî, vil. in Bath pârgaâ ... ... 137
Barkishad Munis ... ... 384
Bârî, tn. sacked by Mahmûd of Ghazni ... ... 142
Bârgârh, Chandî fort ... ... 132; 136
Baran, an oath ... ... 77 and n.
Barâb, riv ... ... 275 f.
Barâbâ, in Gujrat ... ... 209 and n.
Barnet's, Prof., Bhagavad Gitâ ... ... 261 n.; 261
Baro, in Gwalior, temple in ... ... 108
Baraâ tank, at Pahra ... ... 138
Barth, M. and the Buddhist rule, 16, and n.; 342
barôjodh, land held free of rent ... ... 76
barô, munâ, grant free of revenue ... ... 75
Bâsâ, Pathânâ, Rajâ of Nôrpfû ... ... 149 and n.; 160 f.
Battapund, perhaps Bâpata 275; or Battapund ... ... 276
Bates, Capt., Dyer, and R. Bell ... ... 162; 166
Bâthimâla (Bhâtimâla) cap. of a Hindu State ... ... 139, 140 n.
Bathurst, Alderman, and A. Salisbury ... ... 325
Battapându, vil. in Nellore Dist. Tamil inscip. ... ... from
Battle of Actium ... ... 71
Battle of Philippi ... ... 270
Bawarcoll Naghes, bânągar Naika ... ... 310
Bay, Bengal, E. I. Co.'s factories on, 213, 217, ... ... 220, 224 f.; 226, 275 f.; 290, 293, 311
Beal, and the Buddhist Councils ... ... 1 n.
... 4 n., 5 n., 59 n.
Beattapund, Battapund, perhaps Bâpata, 276, 285
béydr, the corre ... ... 76
Béfaz, Mr. J. D. and the Chandî dyn ... ... 114
134 f., 136 and n.; and Râmte ... ... 262 f.
Béhâr, and the Mughals, 32; part of the ... ... Kuçana Empire, 60; Magadha ... ... 79
Bejeyunâ name in the Dharma ... ... 353 n.
Bel, in Nâgpur Dist., and the Ghôdî ceremon ... ... 334
Bel, R., Travels of, q. v. ... ... 165 f.
Bélo Brâhman, Bêlavaran, Rajâ ... ... 144
Belô Chandî, Rajâ, and Singa ... ... ... 114
Benares, and Mathur, bounded the conquests of Kanishka, 44; 50; ancient Kàtákà, 117; ... ... 141; and Madanavaran, 144; and Buddha, 277; and Kanishka, 273; old road ... ... 280
Bengal and the Mughals, 52; and the E. I. Co., 214; Bay of ... ... 215, 217; 229; 224 f.; 283 f.; 286; 275 f.; 290 f.; 311
Benar, ancient Vidarbh ... ... 208
bêr, a refuge ... ... 75 n.
Bénâ-Vijayâdîtya, or Kântikâ Vijayâdîtya, k. of Vêngî ... ... 333 n.
Beteluhâ, Oringall, origin of the term ... ... 148
Báthbela, pool of ... ... 157 and a
Bethlehem, gate of Jerusalem ... ... 157 f., 159
and n.; 160
Bathphage, Bathage ... ... 138
Bayrou, Byruna, Berout, Barute ... ... 161 and n.
Bezkâ, supposed cap. of Dhanakâ, 351 n.
plate inscrip ... ... 353
Bâkâr, Bâirat, edict ... ... 20; 38
Bâdhrâ incarnation ... ... 8 n.
Bâdhrâkîl; goddess, temples served by the ... ... Atkâl caste ... ... 335 f.
Bâdhrâvatî, tn. and Bâhândak ... ... 208 n.
Bâdhrâvarâ, Siva ... ... 208 n.
Bâghavân, Bûdha ... ... 380 n.
Bâghavât, 5 f.; 14, 16; 81, 83; 96; 97 n.; 223 f.; 229 n.
and n.; 260, 261 and n.; 272; 375, 378, 381; 383 n.
Bâghavâta Purâna among the Châkîyâs ... ... 336
Bâghavâtas, and the Nârâyânyâ, q. v. 261 f.; 370 f.
Bâghorâ Brâhman of Mailâg; legend of ... ... 78
Bâgwanlal Indrâjî. Dr. on inscrip. 30 n., 40 n., 49, 55 n.; 60; 63; 245 and n.; 246, 247
Bhât Mâya Singî's Pârâbî Dictionary ... ... 390
Bhâirâva ... ... 211
Bhâirâva Darvâzî in Râmte ... ... 203; 205
Bhilô, hereditary Kôtâvî of Benaras ... ... 210
Bhûrîvâl, on the略 ... ... 159
Bhûpur, flight to avoid being plundered ... ... 75 n.
Bhûharî, vil. in the Simla Hill States ... ... 78
Bhûkâ, mîl, Bâghavât work ... ... 254
bhûtas, believers ... ... 375
bâkati, faith in a personal god 251, 253
and n.; 254, 259; 374
Bânkâ, religion, its development in N. India ... ... 258; 259 and n.
Bâkati-marga, sects ... ... 251
bâkati yâm ... ... 250 f.
Bâhândak, probably cap. of Mahâ Kośala ... ... 291, 258 and n.
Bâhândârkar, Mr. D. R. on the dates of ... ... Kushân inscrip. 27; 31; and the Sâka Era 33; inscriptions published by, 88 f., 41 ff.; 48; 51; 53; and the Scythians, 51; on Sujás, 50 f.; 114; 131 n.; his 'Gûrjaras' 188 n.; and the Sâtakâmîn dyn. 243; 250; 251 n.; on the Bâghavât religion 259 n.; 257; 263 n.; 257
Bhûd, an Indian measure ... ... 76 and n.
Bhûradvâjî, Bâjî ... ... 379
Bhûrâ-vâl, a work by Pârâvânâr ... ... 173
Bhûrî Chand, son of the Rajâ of Nâhân ... ... 299
Bhûre, a clan, and the Chandôs ... ... 130 n.; 156, 158 f.
Bhûsâvat, Bhûka or Bhûlå ... ... 141
bhatangrâ, an official in the Highlands of Kûlô. 76
INDEX.

Bhatinda, Bāthinda, q. v. ... 132, 140 n.
Bhattiprolu, inscriptions ... 281
Bhattotpala, writer ... 29
Bhauttas, Bhūtās, q. v. ... 181 ff.
Bhāvadhāra, and the Niccibhi ... 79
Bhaya and the Great Schism ... 90 n.
Bhāvānī, goddess ... 149
 bhādārī, granary officer ... 77 and n.
Bhāra Chāṭ, temple, near Jabalpur ... 132 n.
Bhikshu Bala, of the Sarnath inscription ... 65
bhikshus, Buddhist monks ... 101 and n. 103
Biil = Villavar ... 180
Bhilo, Bhēla or Bhēsvat, tn. on the Bētawa ... 141
Bhūma, Pāndava hero ... 308 n. 333
Bhima I, Chālukya k. ... 333
Bhima II, E. Chālukya k. ... 333
Bhima III, E. Chālukya k. ... 333
Bhīmaḷa, son of Skandhārj, a reputed author ... 143 n.
Bhishma, son of 'Śantau ... 374-376, 387
Bhōja I, k. of Kanauj ... 138
Bhōja, a pretender ... 138
Bhōjadeva, Paramāra k. of Māla, and k.
Vṛhūdrāha ... 143
Bhōjadeva I, the Gaurjana-Pratīhāra k. of
Kanauj, coins of ... 147
bhūjanīja, soft foods ... 90, 92 f., 93, 94 n. 103, 107
Bhōjaharman, Chandēlla Prince, 123 ff. 120, 132, 135, 146
Bhōnāla rule in Nāgpur ... 335 f.
Bhōpal, S. boundary of Vāsudeva's kingdom ... 61
Bhōta, co. ... 116
Bhottas or Bhauttas, references to, in the
Rājaṭarangini of Kashmir ... 131 ff.
Bhrigu, a Rishi ... 252, 273
Buddha's inscriptions ... 131
Bhūma, Khaṭhatā Satrap of W. India ... 70
Bhūmipālā, alternative for Kṛttivarman or
Dēvarman ... 129
Bhūta Pandyan, whose wife was a Sati ... 238
Bhūtya, co. or Bhōta, and Adam Khan, 189;
Little and Great = Bāltstan (Skardo) and
Ladakh ... 191
Bhuvanadēvi, Chandēlla Queen ... 126, 128
Bichar, in Sīmūr ... 303 and n.
Bugander, Bishop, on the date of Buddha's
death ... 349
Bihār, under Tukumala ... 75
Bijāpur, and tobacco ... 210
Bijaygarh, old Bhar settlement ... 130 n.
Bijja, a hero ... 356
Bihari, in Bundelkhand, 130; or Bihari,
foundation of ... 143 f.
Bimarā inscription ... 31
Bimbisāra, Saisunāga k., and Buddha ... 342
Bina-ud-din, a Muhammādān, fought against
Samaijā, 135, 145; or Bihār-ud-din. ... 145 n.

Bindusarā, Maurya k., and the Greeks in
India, 25; date of ... 348
bishop, wazir ... 377 n.
blain, himenthādī, an inferior kāndar ... 77
Blessed Virgin, fountain of ... 156 n., 158 n.
Bloch, Dr., on inscriptions. 33 n., 39, 50 n., 55, 64, 65
Blunt, Mr., a traverler, with R. Bell ... 162
Bodh Gaya image inscrip., 38; 51 n.; of the
Gupta year 57, 75; temple, 60 and n.; and Buddha ... 277, f.
Bodhīśattra, in the Gandhāra inscriptions, 179;
status ... 180
Bohā Chāsīd in Śrīnagar, formerly a Buddhist
temple ... 192
Bokhara and Samarkand, ancient Sogdiana ... 78 n.
Bon religion, said to have originated in Tajik,
Persia ... 80 and n.
Bootschalbā, vil. in Palestine ... 100 n.
Bowrey, Capt., and Am. Salisbury ... 238
Boyer, Mr., and Kanishka's dates, 28; and
the Yue-ch'i, 32; and the Sākas, 259; and the
Brahmagiri inscription ... 346
Brahmā, g., 252 n., 254 n., 257 f., 260 f., 273
and n., 375, 377 and n., 378 n.; his seven
mind-born sons, - Sāna, Sānatanjása, Sana-
ka, Sannandana, Sannatkuşāra, Kapila, and
Samānta ... 379 and n.; 380 ff., 384 ff.
Brahmadēva, Huia-yavanātī, k. inscrip. off. 204
Brahmagiri, Rock Edict of ... 345 ff., 350 n.
Brahmanism in the old Maḥyadeśa co., 251,
254; and the Aryans, 253, 255 and n.; its
effects on the Bhāgvata creed, 257, f.; and
pradeśa, 260; and the Yēgō system ... 366 n.
Brahman, from Malaināţu ... 232, 236
Brahman orthodox, before Buddha's birth ... 341
Brahmaṇas ... 251 f.
Brahmanical record of Sodasa ... 55
Brahmanism, opposed by Buddhism and
Jainism, 201 n.; in S. India ... 242
Brahmapālā, k., defeated by Mahāndō of
Ghaznī ... 140 n., 141
Brahmapāla, g., ... 376
Brahmaputra, the Laṅhtiya, riv. ... 51
Brahmās, 9; or Magas, 42; used lunar dates,
47; in the Pañjāb, 19; and the Bhāgvata
Creeed, 254 f., 257; lost caste, 334 ff.; and
Asokā ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... 348 f.
Brahmany, the and Amb. Salisbury, 266,
366 f., 290, 292, 298, 310 ff.
Brahmi, script in inscriptions, 25, 27, 29, 31;
Kusana inscriptions, showing archaic forms
occurring in them, list of, 23 ff.; 42; 46; in
Scythian inscriptions, 55; in those of
Kanishka, 59; on Castana's coins, etc., 69
ff., 247; 249
Brahmānīs or Pashiṇis, the Pushpakan
women ... 336
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<tr>
<th>INDEX.</th>
<th>393</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brazil and tobacco</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridges, Mr., and Amb. Salisbury</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhadrartha, last Maurya k., date</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brihaspati, g.</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brihat-Samhita, a work by Varahamihira</td>
<td>260 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brond, Benj., and Amb. Salisbury</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browne, Prof. E. G., of Cambridge, and Arab words</td>
<td>165 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Brugga, q. v.</td>
<td>182, 184, 187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brusalah (Gilgit) or Bru-thus, Brus.la or Brusahu</td>
<td>181 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backeridge, Mr., E. I. Co.'s Inspector on the Coromandel Coast</td>
<td>219, 221 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddha, in Nelore Dist., inscription from</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budān, N. of Malābā</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddha, 2 ff.; date, 50; 63; 82 ff.; 90; 91; 96 ff.; image at Bandi, 110 n.; on medals, 179; 180; 188; relics, a cause of war, 235; his creed in S. India, 235; 240, f.; relics of, 246; 251; 255; at Sāmāth, 277, 279; 3-32</td>
<td>284 ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddha, The Date of, by V. Gopal Ayier, B.A.</td>
<td>341 ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhi Konakamana stūpa</td>
<td>350 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhaghosa, Buddhist writer, 10, 13 and n.</td>
<td>14; 81 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhavarman, Vijaya k.</td>
<td>292; 284 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bddhi sāsana, or intelligence</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhism, and women, 12; 14; 16; and Kanishka, 27; in Tibet, 89; in Olthi-chi-t'o, 131; in Burma, 179 f.; and Jainism, opposed to Brahmanism, 201 n.; in Rāmatēk, 206-208 n.; 211 f.; overthrown about the 7th cen. A.D., 239 f.; introduced into S. India, 212; 251; 253 ff.; 257 f.; its birth-place...277 f.</td>
<td>281-282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhist Councils, by Professor L. De La Vallée Pousin. I—The First Two Councils, I—The Second Council...81-106</td>
<td>81-106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhist, inscriptions in Sanskrit, 29; 51 f.; of Mathurā, 59; Council at Vaisali, second, 52; 342; fourth (Mahāsāngha or Mahāsāṅgīti) in Kanisakā's reign, 60; 73; books to China, 56 f.; 71 f.; statues in Khajurāho temple, 133; in Shel, 188; temple, now a Masjid, 192; faith, embraced by Maninēkhāla, 292 f.; 235 n.; times and Tamil literature, 241; iconography 279; creed of Aśoka... 281; 347 ff.; 349 and n.; 350 n.</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhists, 11; and Solar dates, 47; and Mathurā, 245; 248 f.; and the date of the āsaka era... 342</td>
<td>342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bühler, Dr., and the Third Rock Edict of Aśoka 19-21; 23; on inscriptions, 29 and n.; 30 and n.; 33 f.; 33 and n.; 39 and n.; 40 and n.; 43 and n.; 44, 45 f.; 55; 63; 64; 66; 189 n.; 245-247; 250; 346 f.; on the sage Apastamba... 281 n.</td>
<td>281 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulbul Lankar, shrine of a'Buna-lde, k. of Ladakh, his relations with Kashmir...</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bundarees, Banjrā caste</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bundelas, a people of Rājput descent</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bundelkāhān, ancient Jājēkākhandi, and the Chandāla, 114 f., 119; 130; 137; or Vajrañāḍu...</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burgess, Dr., Buddhist Stupa of Amaravati and Jagnyāupos人性</td>
<td>281 n.; 282 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burkitt, Mr., on the Acts of St. Thomas, 48 and n.</td>
<td>342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burmess, Buddhists and the Śaka era</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burslem, M., and the Third Rock Edict</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butterworth, Mr., I. C. S., and Nellore stone inscriptions, 196; 323 n.;...</td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byaraha and Vý̄āla, q. v.</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byland, near Scanderoon</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caddy's, Dr., Loriyan Tungia inscrip.</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cesarean era of Antioch and the Taksit-Bahal inscrip.</td>
<td>48; 63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calais, Gailes</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caiphas, prince of</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caius, his coins and those of Kadophises I, 28; 33; or Caligula...</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caleb</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calabria</td>
<td>167 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culaearaṃga, the</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caillicies, from Petkāpolė</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cailrāvy, Mt.</td>
<td>157 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambay, Gulf of</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell, John; see Travels of Richard Bell, 156 ff., first mention of 186</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campanile, the, of Pisa</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campa Santa, Campo Santo, in Pisa...</td>
<td>108 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camphor language of the Johor Jakuns</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandrāvāna, Chandrasikā, Sānāsikā, various forms of Sānāsāna Sambhata... 82 and n.</td>
<td>82 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candid, Isl.</td>
<td>163, 167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>candies, candy, a weight... 217 and n., 219; 225 ff.; 234 f.; 267, 269 f.; 285 ff.; f.; 309, f.; 314</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candragupta (Chandragupta) Maniya, and Selenos Nikator, 23; his coronation and the Maurya era...</td>
<td>40; 53; 74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candragupta II (Chandragupta) and the Kusana rule in India...</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Comorin, Kumari</td>
<td>171; 232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capha, tn.</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>capon, capan, cunuch</td>
<td>294; 314 f.; 317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caracalla, Emp. of Rome</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carcare (Karedū), a factory</td>
<td>314 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmel, Mt.</td>
<td>160 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenter, Mr., J. E. I. Co.'s servant</td>
<td>326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrhae, scene of the defeat of Crassus</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INDEX.

| Cartellieri, Dr., Chandella words | 114, 120 f. |
| cash, a copper coin | 216 and n. |
| Caštana, father of Jayadána, and the Saka era | 43 |
| Caštana, a governor, 53; probably of Ajmere, under Huvishka | 60; 73 |
| Catherine, Katherine, of Alexandria | 159 |
| Catherine of Sienna | 159 n. |
| Catwall, Rotwál | 317 |
| Cecilia, Sicily | 167 n. |
| Celebrations in Tamil Literature, by S. Krih-naswami Aiyangar, M.A. I—Augustan Age of Tamil Literature | 228 ff. |
| Centurion, H. I. Co.’s frigate | 170 |
| Ceylon, Vaṭṭagamini, 18; 233; and the Nágas, 235 and n.; under Gajañáhu, 239; and the Chóças, 240; invaded by the Tamilis, 241; MS., 280; Buddhists and the Saka era, 342; and Vijía | 350 |
| Chadra, chief minister | 76 |
| Chadra and Chandra | 120; 372 |
| Cháhámána | 128 |
| Cháhámána, Rájá | 122 |
| Cháksi, services in cantonments | 76 |
| Chákkiyár, Slághiyár or Slághityák, a subdivision of the Anulómája Ambalavádis | 333 f., 338 |
| Chákkiyá-kúth, lectures on the Puráṇas and the Itihása | 336 |
| Chakrás, Talão, in Rámték | 204 f. |
| Chakrás, tn. in Bastar State, C. Provinces, burnt by Viśajyáditya III. | 322 and n. |
| Cháliykya, architecture in Kurgode temples, 173; territory, Eastern, 201 and n.; inscrip. at Kandukur, 333 n.; co., absorbed in Yáti | 351 |
| Cháliykya-Chócha kings of Váng | 326 n. |
| Cháliykya, and Ráṣṭrákáutas, 84; Eastern, of Váng, their possible connection with Néllore, 281 n.; 352 f; and the Chóças, 354 and n.; 355 and n. |
| Chamba, State, and titles in | 75 |
| Chamberlain, Geo. E. I. Co.’s servant, and Amb. Salisbury, 286 ff.; 291, 309, 311 f.; 314; 323, 325 f., 326 |
| Chambers, Thos., E. I. Co.’s Agent at Fort St. George | 215; 220 |
| Champá, Dist. | 105 |
| Champáram, and Mahméd of Gháná | 146 |
| Cháňákya, a Bráhman, councillor of Chandragupta | 314 |
| Chán,a’s Mahábá Khánd, 115; and the Chandéls | 133 ff.; 137; 144 ff. |
| Chánás, suggested cap. of Kósa | 298 n. |
| Cháñgardána, Lord of Káčchh, defeated by Ravivarman | 283 n. |
| Chandél or Chandála, see History of Chandél Ráj | 146 ff. |
| Chandebí, in Bundelkhand | 133, 134 and n. |
| Chandiká Devi, temple at Rámték, 204 f.; and Nágárjuna | 907 |
| Chandrabhágá Valley—Upper—commemoration tablets to the dead, in | 332 |
| Chandrádeva, k. of Kanají | 144 n. |
| Chand Ráśá Epic, and the Chandél legends | 134 |
| Chandra Gupta I.—Candragupta, 25; 49; 53; 74; married a Lóchávi princess, 79; founded the Maurya dyn. | 342 ff. |
| Chándella and Chandédéyá, variants of Chandél, 114 n. | 116 ff. |
| Chánna, roofs | 100 |
| Chárhári, in Bundelkhand | 130 |
| Charlton, Mr. S., E. I. Co.’s servant | 214 |
| Chárváka, a character in the Prabhodhánachadáyáya | 252 n. |
| Chaśána, date of, 172; dyn. overthrown by Gótámiputra Sástakarni | 212 n. |
| Chaturbhuj, Rámachandra or Lakshmangí, 71; 133; temple at Kájüráho | 144 |
| Cháudhí | 399 |
| Cháudhári Ahmad Kháán, a Háká | 269 |
| Cháukhándí mound, S. of Sáráthí | 276 |
| Cháulam, among the Chákkíyárs | 326 |
| Chánnuñká temple, in Chímúr | 333 |
| Chañpur, a game | 149 |
| Cháy, the Indian Madder, E. I. Co.’s trade in, 265, 270, 272 f.; 284, 287 f. |
| Chédí, era, and Prof. Kielhorn, 113; 128; kings, 135; 140 f.; 144; or Dáhál, 143; 146 and n., 147 |
| Chéllár plaça, inscrip. of Kúllútāná I. | 355 |
| Chandál grant, of Kumarávishánu I. | 283 |
| Chendhal and the Pallakára kings | 284 n. |
| Chára, kings, and Nándí, 171 f.; 229 f.; fleet, 231; and Karikána, 233; 236 f.; 240; sphere of influence, 242; 243 and n.; and the Pallavas | 284 n. |
| Cháhóp, chop, a stamp | 295 |
| Chhátarpur, State, and the Chandás, 131 f. | 136, ff. |
| Chhátarsá, Rájá, Bundél chief | 139 |
| Chhatátságarh, Mahá Kósa | 304 |
| Chhi-khí, land held in return for menial services | 76 and n. |
| Chhóta Jhánwá, Kot, q. v. | 111 |
| Chichár, a grain collector | 77 |
| Chih-chi tó (Chinese) and Jojóthi, q. v. | 131 |
| Chik bái, register of titles | 76 |
INDEX.

Chiliówłę, and the Hakłas ..... 209
Chilבר, on Buddhist rules ..... 95 n.; 97 n.
Chillé, in the Allahabad Dist., home of Alhá and Udal ..... 145
Chimár, vil., in Warora Tahsil, Chándá Dist., and the ‘Gháá’ ceremony ..... 333
Chins, received Buddhist books, 56 f.; 71 f.; and Kanishka, 59 f.; and the Yue-chí, 69, 71; and Scythia, 72; and Nagárjuna, 206; and tobacco, 219; and Confucius ..... 341
Chinese, historians and the Yue-chí, 26 ff.; 32 f.; 42 f.; 57; conquest of Tibet ..... 181
Ching-tí, emp. of China ..... 71
Chirimana, Sígumálai, vil. in Nellore Dist., Tamil inscrip. from ..... 209; 354 n.
chílak, an Indian weight ..... 76 n.
Chitra, a hero ..... 241
Chitrakúta, visited by Ráma ..... 202
Chitra-súkhánšíni Ráshí, the seven ..... 375
Chitrá, Rájá, chief of Girdmála in the Deccan ..... 151
Chittáur-Chitor-gadh, besieged by Akbar ..... 149, 150 n.
Chádegángá, G. Ganga k., 179; his Téki plate inscription, 331; and his four sons in Orissa ..... 373
Chóma, history, and Prof. Kidwell, 119; kings and Nandí, 171 ff.; power in the Telugu co. 206 and n.; defeats, 229, 233 f.; 235 and n.; 249 f.; 239 and n.; co. invaded by Gajahánu I., 240 and n.; influence, 242 f.; kings, and the Pallavas 284 n.; and Aśoká, 343; temples and inscriptions ..... 355; 357
Chóra's in S. Nellore, and E. Chalukyas, 334 and n.; 355 f., and the Káakhylayas ..... 357 n.
Chólaméy, Nath., and Amb. Salisbury ..... 328
chop, chádp ..... 255 f., 297, 310, 313
Chorasmia, modern Khíva ..... 78 n.
Chorhóde, surname of Devájí ..... 334
Chowang-mo, a Yue-chí principality ..... 23
Christ, crucified ..... 158 and n.
Christians and Turks ..... 160 and n.
Chronicle of the Maúdí State, terms from, 75 and n.
Chronicles, Ceylónes, and Kááláoska. 342; 343; 345, 349 and n., 350 and n.
chók, an oath ..... 77 and n.; 77, 81, and n.; chungsam, or jacean ..... 275 n.
Chúrsháballáírám, Bána k., in the Guntur Dist. ..... 354
Citadella d'Artiglieria, in Pisa ..... 168
Claudius, emp. of Rome ..... 71
Clarke, Col., E. I. Co.'s servant ..... 326
Clifton, Mr. and Amb. Salisbury ..... 219
Coast, E. I. Co.'s ship ..... 266
Coilá, Cuólá, Sodása ..... 247
Coimbatore Dist., temple in ..... 132 n.; 243
coiáge, of the Chandél dyn. ..... 114 ff.
coins, as historical evidence in India, 25; of the Indo-Greek Kings, 26 f.; 30; 38; of Hima-Kadphises and Kanishka, 44; of the Sakas 47 n.; 54; 58 f.; of Kanishka, 60; of Gondophernes and others ..... 62
Colbourn, H. Croom, E. I. Co.'s writer ..... 324 ff.
Cold Waters, a place in Aleppo ..... 162
Colebrooke's Essays ..... 261
Column, dharmainakra, to mark the scene of Buddha's first address ..... 277; 279
Commodus, emp. of Rome ..... 61 f.; 74
Comoros, c. Kamári ..... 171; 232
Compendium of the Wei, and the receipt of Buddhist books ..... 56
Confucius ..... 341
Conjevaram, Kálcí, Pallava cap. 177 ff., 197, 229 n.; 264 n.; 351; 355; 357 and n.
Contributions to Panjáhi Lexicography, by A. H. Rose, I.C.S. Akhórá—Domí ..... 360 ff.
Convent of the Holy Cross ..... 160
Coomarasami, the Hon'ble P., and Karikála. ..... 233; 240
Coomaraswamy, Dr., and Indian Art ..... 289
Corge, a score ..... 321 f.
Coromandel Coast, scene of Amb. Salisbury's labours ..... 213 f.; 221 n.
Corvoí, Isl. ..... 169
Cotton, E. I. Co.'s trade in ..... 282 ff.
Court, Mr., E. I. Co.'s servant at Methîlepatam ..... 214
Couëns, Mr., and the Khajuráho temples, 114; on Rántékt ..... 292
Cowell, Mr., E. I. Co.'s servant ..... 327
Cox's ..... 261
gramana, an ascetic ..... 151
grámanyá, a Buddhist rule ..... 101 ff.; 103
Grandon, Mr., E. I. Co.'s servant ..... 323, 327
Grassus, defeated at Carrhoo ..... 70 f.
Grávasti, c. ..... 105 f.
Grawley, Mr., and Amb. Salisbury ..... 322; 324; 326
Grídevá palaco ..... 3 n.
Sacred, doctrine of non-survival ..... 18 n.
Guyálsa or Cuólás, Sodása, a satrap ..... 247; 250
Guddapah, Dist. ..... 200
Gurálga, Gúlga ..... 295
Gundanore, Cundiveare, Cundanire, ancient name of Karnál ..... 266 n.; 295 f.; 310; 313
Cunningham's, Gen., Numismatic Chronicle, 25 n.; and the Eastern Greeks, 26; on dates and inscriptions, 23 ff.; 39 and n.; on Saka and Kusana, 41 f.; 44 and n.; 47 and n. and 51 and n.; and the Both Gáyá temple, 60 and n.; on the Chandélá, 114 and n.; 118 f.; 129 and n.; 130 ff.; and the Kósala cap. 208 n.; on inscriptions, 245, 246; 278, 279 and n.; 346
INDEX.

Cutch, conquest of ... ... 61, 74
Cyprus, isl. ... ... 162, 157 and n.
Cyrus, k. of Persia ... ... 78 n.
dęphts, those who renderv menial service in ... Kullú ... ... 76
Dáhi, near Bijáwar, inscr. at ... ... 124
déta, potherb ... ... 95
Daksha, k. Prájápatí ... ... 251 n. 384
Dakshamitrâ, daughter of Nahâpanâ ... ... 63
Dákbhârâma, Sâva lâga at ... ... 200
Dalai Lama, uses the deer symbol ... ... 277
Dalaki-wa-Malaki, Bhar chieflain ... ... 136 and n.
Dáhari, Châdli ... ... 143, 146, f.
Dalpat Sâ of Mandâla, a Guó Gâra ... ... 146
Dâmarâs or Lâvanyas ... ... 184 n.
Damascos, gate of Jerusalem ... ... 157 f.
Dâmasena, son of Rudrasinha ... ... 74
Dâmarajâ, son of Rudrâdama ... ... 74
Dâmrâdara ... ... 330
Dâmojâ, formerly included in Bundelkhand ... ... 130, 132
Dandaka, desert of ... ... 355
dangî, d Turnbull, coarse cotton cloth ... ... 264
dândî, a gate-keeper ... ... 75
Daniell, Mr. Wm., E. I. Co.'s Agent at Pet- ... ... 214 f. 272 321
Dântivârman, k. father of Nandi ... ... 172 f.
Dâradas, or Dàrdas, a tribe on the north of ... Kashmir ... ... 181
Dârá Shâkhâ, son of Shâh Jalân ... ... 154
Darbhârûnyâvârâ, Saiva temple ... ... 173
Darâ, Dârjadâr, of Gilgit, conquered by Tibet. ... ... 181 and n. 183
Darikâsura, slain by Bhadrâkâli ... ... 336
Darins, and the use of Šâka, 41 f. ... 250; his ... Indian expedition ... ... 79
dâra (Si drâha), an oath ... ... 77, 78 n.
Darâ, in Nellore Dist., inscriptions from, ... ... 199 n.; possibly ancient Dâsanapura, now ... Darâsi, ... ... 383 and n.; 356, 357 n.
Darâ, inscr. of Lachen-kun-dga-ram- ... ... 191
Das, Mr. S. C., on Nagârjuna ... ... 207
Dâsanapura, Pallava cap., possibly the modern ... Darâsi, Sanskrit charters issued from, 238 ... and n.; in the Telugu co. ... ... 284 n.
Dâsapura, modern Mandâsor ... ... 109
Dâsarama, temple in Râmték ... ... 203; 282; and ... Asâka ... ... 350 n.; 378
Dâsâvâmâdha Baoli, tank at Râmték ... ... 204 f.
Datâ, name in the Kaldarwa inscr. ... ... 46
David, k. his sepulchre, 157; wells ... ... 159
David, Prof. Rhys, on the Buddhist canon, ... ... 1; 2 n.; 7 n.; 14 n., 81 n., 86, 89; 103; 241 n.; his ... Buddhist India, 341 f.; on the ... Brahmâgiri inscr. ... ... 346, 348 f.
Dawes, Mr., and Amb. Salisbury ... ... 217 f.
Daysa Ram, Pandít, found a copper-plate inscr. at Set Mâhet ... ... 159
Dâ-yul, Tibetan province ... ... 58 n.
De, dynasty of Zangskar-Guge ... ... 333
Dead, exposed in Tibet, etc., 80; commemora- ... ... 332
Dead Sea ... ... 156, 158
Deb-ther-sion-po, Tibetan work ... ... 79
De-btsas-(tsan f ?) mgon, Tibetan prince, ... ... 332 f.
Deccan ... ... 82
De-chyé (Sankara), k. of S. India, converted ... Buddhism ... ... 207
deer, symbol, of the Dalai Lama ... ... 277
Deering, Mr., E. I. Co.'s servant ... ... 220
De Jamsâpa, Saint ... ... 359 and n.
De La Noy, De Lannoy, Consul at Aleppo, ... ... 153 and n.
Delhi, and K. Jaípal, 140 and n.; 141; under ... ... 140 ff.
Demetrius, k. of Bactria, 25 f.; and Eukrates ... ... 69
Dêgûtâ, fort in the Lakhpat Dist., inscr. from ... ... 117; 143
De-Hay, dârû, v. ... ... 295
Dêsa-bonjârî, a surname of Nandi ... ... 172
Devâ, temples in Chihi-chi't'o ... ... 131
Devadatta, cousin of Buddha, 16 n., 81 n., ... 91 n., 94, 96 and n., 99 n., 100 and n.; legendary patron of the dreyaka-bhikshus ... ... 101 and n.; 106
Devahûti, mother of Kapila ... ... 251 n.; 255 n.
Devâjí, a Brahman, and the Bâljí temple in ... Chimâr ... ... 333 f.
dêvâkula, temple ... ... 323 n.
Devalabhi Chandrâlê, grandson of Yaśôvar- ... ... 118; 156; 128
Devanagar, a polyglot magazine, notice of ... 212
Devandhî, n., accompanied Kóvalan and ... Kânnâhi ... ... 231 f.
Devâyâlî, k. of Kanaúj ... ... 116; 139
Devapura, dynasty to which Kanishka belonged ... ... 42 f.
Devavâmîn, a Saiva priest ... ... 185
Devavarman, Chandrâlê of Kàñçana. 117; 126, ff.; 143
Devî, goddess, in Pañjâb legend ... ... 149; 203
Devî Jâgadambâ, temple at Khajurâho ... ... 133
Dev, Din, in. ... ... 315 f.
Dewal inscr. ... ... 31, 46, 62, 68
Dhâjâ, a hero ... ... 353
Dhamek stâpâ at Benares ... ... 278
Dhamâlas, and Buddha's begging bowl ... ... 240
dhâma or dharma, 2 f., 5, 9; 341; 360 n.; ... ... 379; 381 f., 384
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDEX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dhammapada, Dutiul de Rhin’s MS. of</strong> 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dhanakatakā, near Gantur, home of the</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Āndhrabhritiyas</strong> 242 n., 231 n., 321 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dhūnyakatakā or Dharmnikōta, later Andhra</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>cap.</strong> 281 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dhanga, Chandellā k., 116 f., 130; 126 ff.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130, 132 f., 140 f., 144 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>dhānat, an Indian measure</strong> 78 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>dhōraptus, assistant clerk</strong> 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dharm, Dhamma, religious conduct, 2 f., 5,</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9, 341, 350 n. ; 379, 381 f., 384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dharmachakra column at Sāmnath</strong> 278 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dharmagupta, sect of Buddhists, 2 n., 3 n., 4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>and n., 5, 6 n., 8 n., 9, 11, 12 n.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dharmāja</strong> 381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dharmapuri (Tāgadēr)</strong> 229 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>dharmatambha, monument of devotion</strong> 245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dharmavaram, in the Ongole tāluḍ, fragment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of inscr. from 332 n., 383 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dharmēśavara Mahādiḍa temple, in Bāṃdṭēs</strong> 203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dhauli, inscr.</strong> 19 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>dhol bahi, domubday book</strong> 76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>dhōne, an Indian measure</strong> 76 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>dhōtaṁ, Hindu title, used for Mughal prince, 154</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dhūṁrēśavara, Dhūṁrēśaka, for Sambuka</strong> 205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>dhōṇi, sacred fire</strong> 110 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dhūnurtahara</strong> 241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dhūṭāṅgas</strong> 16; 82 and n. 101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dhruvaśāṇa I., a Valabhi k., called a Bāḥga-</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>vata</strong> 258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Diack’s Kalā Dialect of Hindi, 260; Gazetteer of Dera Ghiči Khaśa</strong> 381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>dīb, Sk. dīśa, an ordeal</strong> 77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dignāga, writer</strong> 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dīwān, mouthpiece of a āṣva</strong> 77 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Diodorus Siculus, on Nanda of Magadha</strong> 344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Diodotos Soter, k. of Bactria</strong> 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dionysos, the wine-god</strong> 78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dīpaṇevasa, and the Ceylonese Chronicles 349,</strong> 350 and n. 101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dīwān of Kābul, first mention of</strong> 211 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dolb, or Antarvēḍi co.</strong> 144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Domitian, coins of, in the Ashmolean Stōpā</strong> 41; 72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Doomaday Book, dhol bahi</strong> 76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dotted Record, attached to the Vinaya Pītaka</strong> 349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dowson, on inscrs.</strong> 29 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drākhārāma, in the Godavari Dist., Chōla</strong> inscr. at 355 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dramalas, opposed K. Nandivarman—Palla-</strong> 172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>varamallā</strong> 249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drangiana, co.</strong> 249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Draupadi, wife of the five Pāṇḍavas</strong> 254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ekatāśa, monotheist</strong> 375, 380, 383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ekata, son of Prajarāpi</strong> 375 f., 378</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INDEX.

El-Amarna, the Arzava tablets from... 111
Elasatti, vil. of Kolchukonra, Vikram-
ditya's (L.) grant of... 351 n.
Elia, isal... 167
Elia, Prophet... 159 f.
Elizabeth, St. house of... 160 n.
Elliot, on Maumud of Ghazni, 140 n., 141,
142 n., 146 n.
Elliot's, Sir W., Coins of Southern India,
281 n.; his mention of Virabhadra, the
Kakatiya... 357 and n.
Elliot, Capt., on the Hakkás... 210
Elephant, a caste... 338
Endere inscription... 181
England and tobacco 210; 216; 218; 228; 270
English, and French, in E. I. Co.'s
time... 315 and 317
Epander, coins of... 58
Ephraim, riv... 162
Epithalites, or White Huns... 148
Epic of the Anklet, or Siyappadhikaram, 230;
story of, 231; 233; and Karikala Chula,
231; and Sunguttuvan Sera... 233 ff., 240 f.
Erudi, a Sambantar caste... 338
Erakara, Erakara, suggested cap. of Jhouti,
131 and n.
Erumannath Nalliyakkon, a Vellore chief... 239
Esau, Esau, as the ancestor of the Arabs... 164
Esdras, s. of the Pahaj... 26; 32; 33 ff.
Esdras, s. of the Pahaj... 26; 32; 33 ff.
Eumenes, secretary to Alexander the Great...
Eumens, baptized by St. Philip, 166; called
epiphan... 314
Europe, ships... 219
Euchrist, St., sepulchre of... 159 n.
Eucrocia, Euchris, St., sepulchre of... 159 n.
Evel, a Pandya chief... 230; 246
excommunication at Sambath... 277 ff.
Eyll, vil. of S. Arav, Siva temple at... 291 n.

Ficcal and Buddhism... 8 n., 161 n., 242
Ficcal and Prakrty... 208
Ficcal, a coin... 216 and n.
Falky, Mr. E. I. Co.'s servant... 226
Fama, partharm... 215; 233
Fanhong, princip... 46; 64; 68
Fath, k. of Kashmir... 192
Fadhdar, of Bengalar... 174
Ficcal, a coin... 169
Ficcal, Mr. and the Saka, 27; 41; on
Kanishka, 56; and the Koška, cap... 208 n.
Ficcal, and k. Jaipal... 140, 142 n.

Frampton, Mr., parson, and R. Bell... 162 ff.
Framba and Turks... 164
Field, Mr. E. I. Co.'s servant... 263, 270, 325, 328
Fish god, in Gandhara sculpture... 179; 236
Fleet, Dr., and the Vikrama era, 27; on in-
scriptions, 29, 42; 44 and n., 45 ff.; 53, 55 f.,
61; 75; 107 and n.; 109; 179; 245 ff.; 222
n.; 244 n.; on the Nirvana, 342; 346; 349
and n.; 530 n.; and Vengi... 351, 352 n.
Fleetwood, Mr. B., E. I. Co.'s Resident at
Petepolee... 217 ff.; 223 ff.; 272; 311, ff.
Flinders Petrie, Prof., and the Sarnath Lion
capital... 278
Florio, mentioned the bubble bubble... 210
forbearance, in the Mazdasyan creed... 359
Fort St. George and Amb. Salisbury, 214 f.
264, 267, 298 ff., 298, 299 ff., 309 ff.
Foord, Gen., E. I. Co.'s Agent... 230, ff.
Francke, Dr., and the dates of Kaniska, 28;
50; on Zangskar... 332
Frasnshvatra, Saint... 259 and n.
French, traded in Beyrose, 161 and n., 163, 315
Führer, Dr., and Jaina inscrips., 33; his
Progress Report... 38; 61

Gadahlara, Chandella minister, built a tem-
ple... 120
Ghadakallah, k. of Kalmaj... 261 n.
Gahweara, a Rajput clan, and the Chandela,
130 and n., 137
Gajapati, k. of Ceylon, and Sunguttuvan
233; 238 f., invaded the Chola co... 240 f.
Gajabahin... 240 f.
Gajapati, of Orissa, inscrips., of... 351 n.
Gahkoure, and Khokhare... 142 n.
Galba, Emp. of Roma... 73
gamana, villages... 100
Ganaka, an accountant... 20 f.
Ganapati, Kākatiy k., inscrips., of... 336 f.
Ganaha, Chandella k... 125 ff., 133, 144 ff.
Gandavaram, in Nellore, inscrips. at... 283 n.
Gandhara, and the Parthian dyn., 54; and
Kanishka, 60 and n., 82 n.; sculptures
178 f., 312; 185; 232
Ganar, figure at Ajaygarh... 124
Ganga, riv... 251
Ganga, and Kurnode, 173; 230; and
the Pandyas... 243
Gangakonda-Chōla, in Trichinopoly
Dist. temple at... 201 n.
Ganga-Pallava, 172; in the Nellore Dist.,
352; and the Cholas... 354
Ganga Raja, viceroy of Vīshṇuvaradhana
Hoyala, captured Talakshī... 229; 249
Gangarishans and Alexander the Great... 343
INDEX.

Ganges, riv., 154 and n.; as the spouse of Nandí, 171; victory of Senguṭṭuvaṇa Śeṇa at ...
...
236; 241 f., 277
Gangetic Valley occupied by the Aryans, 251
f.; and the teaching of Rāmānuja...
...
256
Ganga coins, and the Chandellas...
...
117
Gāndhāra, Kājak, assumed the title Vikramaditya...
...
146 and n., 147
Gangū, a legend...
...
300
Ganjām, plate of Sāsāṅka, 53; and the E.
Chālukyas...
...
201
Gāndā, or Mārgāvī Gīt., q.v. ...
...
329
Garbe's, Prof. R., Śīloka-Philosophie, 251 n.; and the Bāhāvāta creed, 255 and n.; 256 and n.; 257, 259
Garbhābhādhāna, conception ceremony...
...
248
Gāndāya, an Outland Brahmana...
...
251
Gāndā, in the C. Provinces, Chandell fort, 192; traditional seat of the Gōnd dyn. ...
...
136
Gāndā Mandāl, Gōnd chief...
...
137
gāviḍa ṇāga, militia commandants of Kulī
Bill forts...
...
76
gam ḍā, a form of ordeal...
...
77
Garuda, g. ...
...
375
Gāthas, the, 35; and khaṇḍeṇāṭṭāa...
...
359 ff.
Gauḍas and Yavāsvarmas...
...
140
Gautama, a Brāhmaṇa...
...
232
Gautama Buddha, date of...
...
50; 96
Gautāmiputra Sātākarni's Nāṣik inscrip. ...
...
282
Gāyāpati, a Buddhist monk...
...
3 at., 6 n.
gavo, the king = the earth...
...
339
Gāyāpati, prayer to the Sun...
...
334 ff.
gaz, guzz, Indian yard...
...
229 n.
Gazetteer Glannings in Central India, by
Cpt. C. E. Luard, M. A. I - The Mandalor Pillars, 107 ff.; A Fauninc Song...329 ff.
Genoa, tn. ...
...
169
Genoa, Taka...
...
315
George, St., and the dragon...
...
161
George and Martha, the ship...
...
217
Ghassanians...
...
155
Ghōl Kalā (?), a Gaule Caine, corn market...
...
161
Ghantāi, Jain temple at Khajurāho ... 133 and n.
Gharipur, coins of Wemakadphises at...
...
56
Ghauts, W. ...
...
242 f.
Ghazni, coins of Volumes found at, 54; occupied by Amir Aqthīgī, etc. ...
...
139 and n.; 140 and n.; 141
ghoṅkha, collector of ghi ...
...
77
Ghīva-ud-din, Sultan...
...
145
Ghōḍā of Chīmrī, the...
...
333 f.
Ghōra Áṅgirasa, teacher of Kṛishṇa Dévak-
putra...
...
253
Ghōr Shīkār-ud-din, or Muiz-ud-din...
...
143
ghoṛi, subdivisions of a pargāṇā ...
...
78 n.
Ghātārachia...
...
381
Ghūrīān Sultāns, their dominions...
...
145 n.
Gibeon, Guibneon, mt. ...
...
160
Gilgit, Brusheal, and the Arabs 151 and n.;
Tibetan occupation of ...
...
182
Gingerl.ee, coast between the Godavari
Estuary and the Jagannath Pagoda — and
the E. I. Co. ...
...
320
Ginghmas, E. I. Co.'s trade in them 213;
268, ff.; 285
Girdar, in Wardhā, and the Gōdā ceremony...
...
354
Gīnār, inscrip. ...
...
19, f.; 246
Glutton, the rich...
...
157
Godārī, or Gwalia...
...
114
Godāvari, Dist., and the E. Chālukyas 201;
delta, occupied by the Andhras 251; and
the Pallavas 252; and Kōma chiefs 355 n.
Gogga-śesa (Guge ?) invaded by Zainul-
Bibidīn ...
...
188
Gokula Ashtami, Krishnā anniversary...
...
334
Gokula Darwāzā, gate in Rāntēk ...
...
293
Golāthas, alms fund ...
...
76
Golconda, and Amb. Salisbury 286, 286, f., 311
Golden Gate of Jerusalem ...
...
156, 158
Goler, State, in Kangra Dist. ...
...
301 and n.; 305
Gonakennālāta, Gunakennālāntu, surnames
of Vījayanāḍītya III. ...
...
352 n.
Gonatas, K., Antigonus...
...
343
Gondophernes, Parthian K., 27; or Gudnu-
phars, inscrip. of 30; titles 40; 42; and
coins 47, and St. Thomas 48; 61, f. in
Seistan ...
...
74
Gōrīs, and the Khangāres, 130 n.; as ancestors
of the Chandellas ...
...
136 ff.
gos, gunny, sack, E. I. Co.'s trade in ...
...
264
Goodepeldoe, tn.
...
297
GoodepOWER, (Gundlapallı) and Amb. Salisbury ...
...
296
Goodeslawder, tn.
...
295
Goodlad, Cpt., and the E. I. Co. ...
...
266
Gopāla, Brahmaṇa general under Kirtivarmā ...
...
143
Gopaḷa, Kōvalan, q. v. ...
...
231
Gōryā-kā, a ceremony ...
...
334
Gōryā-kā, a ceremony ...
...
18; 103 and n.; 389
Gōtamiputra, Andhra K., and the Pallavas ...
...
282
Gōtamiputra Sātākarni, Gautamiputra,
Andhra K., defeated by Nahapāṇa 43; and
the Sakas ...
...
242 n.; 282
Golarzæs of Parthia, death of ...
...
73
Gōrvinda, K. ...
...
353
Gōrvinda III, Rāş̄ṭrakeṭa K., contemporary
of Dantivarman ...
...
172
Gōvindarāṇāyaṇa Gāhāḍavāla (Gāhaḍwār) K.
of Kanaṇa ...
...
144 n.
Grahapati, dedicated family images 119, f.
grōṇa, a hamlet, sub-division of a padīf ...
...
76
Greco-Roman, Greco-Roman, world, and
the Chinese 57; art in India ...
...
178 f.; 572
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDEX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greece and Pericles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek, power in India 25, ff.; and the Yuè-chi 32; 34; distinctions between Scythians and Šakas, legend on coins 41; 44; 48; principalities, rule, in Afghanistan 54; divinities 60; 63; dynasty, extinction of 69; f.; origin, of the Indian drama 178, f.; ancestry of the Haklas 209; accounts, of Indian history 343; 345; influences on Indian art, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greeks, Yavanas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growse, Dr., on inscr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gudimallam, near Ka'ahasti Rāma inscr. at</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gudnaphar or Gondopurnes, k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gūjār, Tāluka, inscr. in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guge (?) Gogga-deśa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guge, and the W. Tibetan kings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gukhāvīṃ, connected with the Mathurā Lion capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gūjār tribes of Harāra Dist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gūjārāt, and the Kalachuri era 135; W., or Anhilwāra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guda sugar-cane juice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guṇa, Guṇaka, surname of Vijayaditya III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunakenallūḍu, Gopakennallūṭa, surnames of Vijayāditya III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunda inscr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gundāla Venkatādri, Gundel Acatawaddre, of Metchlepam and the E. I. Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gundepoloea, in Madras Presidency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gundlapali, Goopdepoea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunney, gośi, sucking, E. I. Co.'s trade in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guntur, Dist., and the E. Chālukyas 210; records from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gupta, Sanvat 28; inscrs. 29; 32; 38 f.; 51 and n.; 52; era 63, 63, 74 f.; kings, and the Lichavīs, period, Bodhisattvas of, 179; 180 and n.; 279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gupṭas of Salsette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gūrgi-Masaun, Rehata, q. v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gūra, inscr. from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gūjāra Kingdom = Kauñauj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gūjāra tribes, of foreign origin 138 and n.; and Yāsavarmā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gūjāra-Pratiḥāra, dyn. of Kauñauj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gūrdaspur, and Akbar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gurukkals, Kurukkals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guṇana, for Kuṣāna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>guṇa, gaṇa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwalior 114; 131; or Gopādri 141; and Mahāmāl of Ghaznī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rGyalbu Rinchen, possible identity, with Rīchāna, of Kashmir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rGyal-chag-lwab-līttl-kaṅs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rGyal-rab, the, and Tibetan history</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gyal-rab-sal-waḥi-me-long, a Tibetan work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gyfford, Wm. and Amb. Salisbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habakkuk, Prophet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hades, and the Nāgas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hādi, a Rāni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hadrian, Emp. of Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hāgāna, Satrap of Mathurā, date of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hāgānā, Satrap of Mathurā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hāgāna, a Satrap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haidar, son of Rīchāna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hāibyāvas, or Kalachuris of Čhedi, 137; 146; and Maha Kosalas, 201; inscr., in Ongole taluk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hāibyāvas, kings and the Rāṭmek inscr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hājī Haider Shāh, k. of Kashmir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hājī Khān, a son of Zainuṭ-Tubī-ṭīlīn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hākḷas of Gūjāṛā in the Paṭājāb, ballad of, giving tale of descent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hākṛṣ, 'lost river' of Indian desert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hādāva or Tiruvāṭigāḍal, a Tamil poem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hālebid in Mysore, or Dvaravati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hālicarmansus ions, and those of the Sānaṭh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hālikāshana, or Sallakshanaśvarman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halimus, an inferior kārdā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamirpur, in Bundālkhand, 130; 132; 138; 145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Han dynasties, first and second, histories of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hādūsī, revenue-paying land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanumān, g. image at Khajurāho, 114; 131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanumāṃ, f.; 134; on Chandāli coins, 147; temple at Rāṃṭek, 203; or Anjanēyā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haoma sacrifice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḥāryāṇa, royal kitchen allowance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḣarsa, Ḣarsadhara, Chandāllā k., 116 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḣarsa, a., and the Gupta, 63; on an image,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḣarsahara, founded as era, 43; 53; death of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḣasan Kīyān, k. of Kashmir, his expedition against Tibet, 190 f.; rebuilt the Jama Masjid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḣasan Nizār, author of the Tūj-ul-madgir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḣashstanagar pedestal inscr., 30; and the Selucid era</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḣāthigumpha inscr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hutton, Mr. C., and Amb. Salisbury. 324 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>haurat, sacred cakes ... 397 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḥāvāni, Nisaghā, daughter of Rijāsīva ... 79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḥayasīvasa, a being with a horse's head ... 378; 532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḥuszbār-ad-dīn Ḥasan Arūnī, governor of Kālārija ... 146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kārādi, personal attendance on the nājā ... 76 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heathfield, Mr., and Amb. Salisbury ... 322 ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebron, gate in Jerusalem ... 158, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḥālimbā, hill near Rāmṭek ... 205 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helikles, probably the last Greek king of Bactria ... 26; 32; 54 f. 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen, St., Chapel of ... 138 ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herambapāla, Mahasthāna, probably Kaśitikpāla ... 138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herat, 78 and n.; 79 and n.; conquered by Muḥammad of Ghur ... 209 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herāns, Yin-mo-fu, a Yue-chí, conquered Kipin ... 54; 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermaios, probably ruled in the Kabul Valley ... 51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herne, Mr., R I. Co.'s servant ... 327 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herod, k. prince of ... 57 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herodotus, and the use of Saka ... 41 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haus, or Mānas, a coin of, bearing a Greek legend ... 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hieou-mi, a Yue-chí principality ... 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hill States in the Pañjāb, terms and titles used in ... 75 ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hima-Kadhēsa, Kushān k. 28; or Oseon-kadhēsa, identified with Yen-kō-chieh, 33; his coins and those of Kanishka, 44; or Wema-Kadhēsa ... 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Himalayas, invaded by Baghu, 80 and n.; and the tiger-symbal, 234; the fish-symbal, 236; the bow-symbal ... 207 n.; 289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hīnayāna, Buddhist school ... 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindu, temple in N India, 153; rule in S. India, 243; belief in one god ... 259; 262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindu-Kush, mts. 54; 59; 69; 73; and Baghu ... 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindus, the Chandellas, 131; 135; and Musalmans in the Pañjāb, 139 ff.; under Akbar, 153; selection of ancestral names among, 243; popular beliefs of, 251; 282 and n.; worship Lāt Bhāirava ... 290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindu Śāhīya kings, of Kābul ... 140 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinduvās, conquered by Zainal-Abī-dīn ... 188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiouen-Thang, Hiuen-Thang, 10 and n.; 11 n.; and the Second Buddhist Council, 81 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hirahadaṇḍallī, plate inscr. of Sivasakandavarmāna ... 282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiralal, Mr., and the site of Chakraṭū ... 352 n.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INDEX.

Huvíṣka, a Kusákān k., 27 ff.; coins, titles, etc., 59 ff.; 45 ff.; 50; 59 f.; 73 f.; or Yu-yue-kia ... 212; 372
Huvíṣka Vihāra, monastery in Mathūrā ... 60
Husra, kṣuyā ... 46; 64
Hyunmēs, Jō, E. I. Co.'s servant ... 263 f.; 266 f.

Ibn Batūta, traveller and the kingdom of Ḥijāḥūt ... 100 ff.
Ibrāhīm, minister to k. Fāṭḥ ... 192
Ibrāhīm Husain, Mirza, Husain Sarsī, q.v. ... 149 and n.
Ichchhāwār, Bāndā Dist., inscrip. at ... 121; 129
Ikkivahū, son of Manu ... 282 n.; 384
Iam Chežīyan, viceroy to Korkaī, 236; or Verghēr-Chēžīyan, k. of Madura ... 237; 239
Iam Kīji, k. of Kānché ... 235
Iam Kīrīṭi of Kānché, perhaps Iangō ... 236
Iandirayān, a Tondāmān k. of Kānché ... 234; 239
Iangō, or Iam Kīrīṭi of Kānché ... 236
Iangō, Tamil poet, author of the Śilappadīkārām ... 230; 238 n.
Iangōvādīgāl, Tamil poet ... 238
Ianjēcotēnī, father of Karikāla, 233; or Unravapāsaṭeśar Ianjēcotēnī ... 234; 239
Iāyathūs, a caste ... 336
Illama, villages ... 326
Ilāttammās = Chakkiyār women ... 336
images, stone, in Zangskar, erection of ... 332
immutability of the soul, in the Bhājavata religion ... 260 f.
incarnations, Bhājavata. 260 n.; 376 n.; 378; 383 n.

Index to Prakrit Words occurring in Pischel's Grammatik der Prakrit Sprachen, Appendix ... 133-148

India, second Greek invasion of, 25; or Tien-
tchou, 26 f.; and the Laukika era, 26; inscrip.
of, 29; eras in use, 40; Śaka conquerors of, 41; and Māla-vikrama and other eras, 44 f.; 47 f.; visited by St. Thomas, 48 and n.; N. and W. and the Śaka, 49 ff.; Greek conquerors of, 51; conquered by Yen-kao-ching, etc., 56 ff.; and the Parthians, 60 ff.; Menander's expedition to, 69; and Kanīṣkā, 72; and the Kharaṣṭha script, 74; and the Lichāvī, 73; and Darū, etc., 79 n. and n.; C. Gazetteer Gleanings in, 107 ff.; 229 f.; and Albērānī, 131; 133; and the Mūhāmādas, 140 ff.; and Greek architecture 178; and the Hākla, 209; and Amb. Salisbury, 213, 215, 219, 226; S., later history, 226; 230; 23 f.; 238 ff.; S., and Buddhism, 242 f.; and the Śaka, 245; 248 ff.; language of, 253 f.; 257; and the Bhākti religion, 258 ff.; carving in, 278; art, 280; and Andhra inscrip.
and Prof. Kižer, 113; lists of, 116 ff.; tribe in Zangskar ... 332
Indo-Greek, kings, coins of ... 30
Indo-Sassanian, coins ... 147 f.
Indo-Scythian or Kuṣāna, 33; inscrip. and Greek month names ... 44
Indra, g., 263; 231; and the destruction of Puḥār ... 235
Indra III, Bātṛakāta k. ... 138
Indra-Bhaiṭṭāraka, E. Chālukya k. ... 351
Indus, riv. and the Greeks, 25; and Kanishka, 59; 62; 72; 75; and the Persians ... 79; 247;
250
Indus Valley, Hindu State in ... 139; 140 and n.
In-mu fu, Keraṣ, a conqueror mentioned by Chinese historians ... 64; 70
Indā, a collection of Tamil works ... 230
Innocents, Sepulchre of ... 159
inscriptions, Jangaṇa, 19 f.; of Sāhāra, etc.; 21 ff.; as historical evidence, 25; 27 ff.; Jaina, 38; lists of Brahma Kuṣaṇa, showing archaic forms occurring in them, 35 ff.; in Muchai, etc., 46 ff.; of Scythian satraps, 55; 57 n.; of Huvīṣka 60 ff.; of Mathūrā, 71 ff.; of W. Kātārapā, 109 f.; and Prof. Kižer, 113 ff.; of the Chandāla Dynasty, 116 ff.; 128 f.; 131; 135; 143; of Prithī-
ī, 145; 147 n.; of Nandīpōṭārā, 173; of Sōnīṣā, etc., 179; at Bala-mkhār, 181 f.; of Mulbe, 187; Daru, 191; of Nellore, 199 f.; of the Chōs, 233; of Aśōka, etc., 278 f.; 251 ff.; 342; 345 ff.; Talamaṇḍi plate, etc., ... 351 ff.
Inscription P. on the Mathūrā Lion Capital, by A. Barth ... 245 ff.
Iṣvaṇṭar = āgaparāsa, a Tamil work ... 123 ff.
Iran, trade with India ... 249
Iranian, family, and the Scythians ... 41
Iranian Peoples, Religion of, contd., from Vol. XXXV, p. 203. No. 7.—The Duties of the Faithful ... 358 ff.
Iron Gate, of Jerusalem ... 157
Irugōvē, Paśamāṇi, of Malānāṇa, and the poet Kāpīlar ... 230; 237
Irugōvē, a chief ... 243
Is tobacco indigenous to India? By V. A. Smith ... 210
INDEX.

Isaiah, Isaiah, the prophet, sawn sunder... 150
Isāna, Siva ... ... 377, 380, 382
Isidorus, Isidora, of Charax, geographical writer, and Sakastane ... 49; 249, f.
Išīla, place mentioned in the Brahmagiri inscrip. ... ... 345
Isle of Pines, and tobacco ... 210
Iśvara, g. worship of ... ... 124
I-ta-ting, Chinese pilgrim ... ... 18
Iyūr Mālangijā, Tamil poet ... ... 229

Jacob, house of, 159; pillow ... ... 160, 164
Jagannātha, temple in Puri ... ... 290
Jagut Singh, sātrā at Sāri-āth ... ... 279
Jagūryapita, inscrip. at ... 281 n., 222 n.
Jahangir, emp. ... ... 174
Jahangir, Mārgesā or Mārgapati, acted under Hasan Khān ... ... 191
Jain, inscrips. at Mathurā, 33; 49; 51 f.; 85; 86; 90; temples at Khajurāho, 119 ff.; 129; 131; 133 f.; buildings at Pāta-
puram, replaced by a Saiva temple, 201 n.; temples, etc. at Rāmākot ... 204
Jainism and Brahmanism, 248; founder of, 251; and the Sāṃkhya-yoga ... 256
Jain Khān, Navab, or Zain Khān Kokāltākh, 149 and n.; 150 and n.
Jaina, and Mathurā, 245; and Āśoka ... 248
Jai, k. of Bāthindhā, advanced to Ghazni, 129; or Jayapāla ... 140 and n.; 141
Jājādhist, Jājāhist, Jījhist, forms of Jējā- bhūtika, q. v. ... ... 130
Jājādhist, Kākchuri, k. of Ratnapura inscrip. of ... 118; 128
Jakson of Jobor, a preacher of the Comphor language ... 340
Jāmābād, stāpā near, 41; or Rang-Nihār, 139
Jātōhi, 81; 88; Jātōhi-pūtām ... ... 94 f.; 99
Jama Masjid, suggested founders of ... ... 192
Janbūdāya and Saka-dvāpa ... ... 42
Jambu Dwipa, and Nāgarjuna ... 207
Jambukāśrama, temp. near Trichinopoly, Kākṭya inscrip. at ... 357
aJanb-byan-mam-rgyal, k. and Ali Mir, the Balti k. ... ... 188
James, (Junior), the Less, St. ... ... 156
James, the Apostle, St., tomb of ... ... 157
Jamīl Beg, Commander under Akbar ... ... 160
and n. ... ... 151
Jamna, riv. ... ... 155 and n.
Janaka, a Kṛhattiira, and the Bhāgavata religion ... ... 351
Janaka, k., legendary father-in-law of Rāmacandra ... ... 354; 379; f.
Janmējah ... ... 378 f.; 381, 383
Janīdāna = Kṛishna ... ... 378

Janvier's Panjabi Dictionary ... ... 360
Jāpāk Tank, at Rāmākot ... ... 205
Jādū, a messenger ... ... 76
Jātārāparishta, 81; 87 n.; 88; 89 and n; 98 and n.
Jātārāyan Sundara-Pandya I. and Gaṇapati, the Kākātya, 356; inscrips. of ... 357
Jātārāyan Sundara-Pandya II., inscrips. of ... ... 357 n.
Jatila or Mārān Šaśayān, Pāṇḍya k., date of ... 197
Jātkari, vil. near Khajurāho, temples at ... ... 183
Jāts, or Musūdā, in the Hill States ... ... 78
Jātunga Rāmāśara, Rock Edict of ... ... 345; 347
Jangada inscrip. ... ... 19 f.
Jaumpur inscrip. from ... ... 147 n.
Jāyādāma, father of Rrudrādāma, 43, governor of Rajputana and Malwa 60, Satrap of Ujjaini, date of ... 73
Jāyadeva I. a Licchhāvi k. of Nepal ... ... 79
Jayānā, Konjān, an author ... ... 239
Jayangoda-Chōla-mahāla, or Tondai-nādu, ... ... 200; 351; 354 and n.
Jayantavāran, Pāṇḍya k. ... ... 196
Jayapāla for Jayāl ... ... 140 n.
Jayaśakti, ancestor of the Chandellas, 121; or: Jeja, Jejja ... ... 126 ff.
Jayaśinā, k. ... ... 181
Jayasankhāvāra ... ... 180; 372
Jayastambha, trophy of victory ... ... 245
Jayavarman, Chandell k., 114; 126 f.; 129 f.; 133; coins of ... ... 147 f.
Jayavarman, Paramāk k. ... ... 144 and n.
Jayavarman, k., his Konjamduki plate inscrip. ... ... 282
Jearsey, Wm., E. i. Co.'s servant, and Amb. Saltbury ... ... 228; 216 ff.; 289; 311 f.
Jehoshaphat, Vale of ... ... 156
Jējā or Jayaśakti ... ... 118; 128 ff.
Jēkābhukti, Bundelkhand, 114 f.; kingdom of Paramardi, conquest of, 122; 123 f.; 131; 135; 137 ff.; 113; 145
Jejjāka, Chandella prince ... ... 116
Jeot, a standard holding in Kullāt ... ... 76
Jeremiah, Prophet, grotto of, 157; house ... ... 160
Jerome, Jerom, St., Sepulchre of ... ... 159
Jersey, the frigate ... ... 170
Jesu, jesus, Advent of ... ... 341
Jeth Diba, ruled by the Hindu ... ... 209
"Jewel Belt", the, = Marīmēkhālā, 230; 232; and k. Sengūtūvan Śrī. ... ... 235 ff.
Jiang District, Pālijāb--A Baker's Dees of Catches, from ... ... 174 f.
Jhāna, Lalitpur Dist., inscrip. from ... 116,
120, 122, 123, 130, 135, 145
Jāhāl, vil. in Bohtak District, Pālijāb ... ... 110
INDEX.

Jhínd, on the Indus, in inscription from 68
Jhínná, a satrap, 27; or Zeionis, 54; coins of, 59; date 70
Jijjáyañála, Chandélía K. 126 f.
Jijjóti, Jágáñáti, Jágáñáti 130 ff.
Jina 104
Jímnásth, temple at 116; 133 and n.
Jívádáma, satrap of W. India 74
jídana-yóga, meaning of 256
Jochim, St., sepulchre of 117
jóg, tax for religious purposes 76 and n.
Jógins, the 64, temple dedicated to 132 and n.
John, St., the Baptist 160
John, St., the Evangelist, house of 158
Johnson, Capt., and Amb. Salisbury 214
Johnson, Mr. W., E. I. Co.'s servant at Metcalfeapatam 215 ff.; 298; 310 f. 313
Jónardáa's Rájávaráñivi, its references to the Bhanátas 182 ff.; 187 f.
Joppa, Joppay 159 f.
Jordan, riv. 158
Joseph, St., sepulchre of 157, 159
Joseph of Arimathaea, sepulchre of 158
Joshua 160
Jubbal, Hill State, terms used in 156
Judas, Apostle 76
Jakes, Western Panjabi and English Dictionary 390 f.
Julius César, assassinated 70
Juná, riv. 245, 247
Janákañá, inscription of, Budrádáma 56; 63; 74
juncan, customs, from chuágem 278; 283 ff.
295; 297
Jungá, cap. of Keoníhal 301 n.; 305 n.
Juní, an Indian measure 76 n.
Junnar, inscription of Nahajána at 68; the Saka cap. 242 n.
Juska, k. 42
Justice, Gate of Jerusalem 107
Justin, on Sandracottas 344
Juñátyá, a Káñáiya, k. 357
Jayáthá, a Bráhmana 384
Jyóduñá, suggested meaning of 191
bK-águr, a Tibetan cyclopaedia 188, 187
Kabír, a reformer 258
Kabír Cháböttará, in Rámtek 203
Kabul, and Seléukos Nikator, 25; occupied by k. Kísan-táson-Kio, 26; ruled by Hermáios, 54; and Huyiákas, 69; c2; conquered by Kadphises I, 71; and Akbar, 130; and the súndári of Bangash, 174; Sôbhadára of 211 and n.
Kachchháyana 276
Káulkókúla-Párvattiri-kóttam, Dist. in S. India 355 n.

"Kádambu," the, and Señguttuvan Sêra 236
Kádár-Mallai, Mallai, q. v. 171 and n.
Kadathanád, Rájá, of the Atyioñi (Sáman- thor) caste 358
Kádáiyam, in S. India, the modern Kadáiyam, scene of a battle 194, 198
Kádáyerrá, an officer under Bhumí I. 383
Kadphises I, Kusána K., coins of, 23; 33; titles, etc., 40 f. and the Greek rule in Afghanistan 54; 57; 71, 72
Kadphises II, Kusána K., coins of, 23; 40; 57; conquests of 72
Kálúvañtì, Tamíla-s'éparíyañ, an officer under Nándipá partáar 172
kálóla, cufáulgh, a caravan 295
Kál-gyur, Káhgury 180; 372
kálópeña, a coin 81
Káikyá, co, in the Páñáb 259
káitákerya, waiting upon Bhagávat 261
káló, accountant 76
Kákándi, city in Káulkókúla-Párvattiri-kóttam, Kávíripáñjìman, the modern Pantrangam 353 n.
Kákátyáñ of Orangal, and Véngí, 356; and Nellore 357 n.
Káká Mahá temple in Maháábá 154
Kakustháña-Kákuttátha, riv. 5 n.
kálo... times at which sacrifices are performed 376 n.
Kalachuri, kings, and Kálañjájar, 135; or Háiňaya, 137; 146 and n.; inscription of Bánanu 204
Kaladaranádi, inscription, said to be in Kharoñhi 42
Kaláhasti, Síva línga at, 200; Gángá-Pállava inscription from 352; 354
Kalámanyana, Bhóta princes 182 and n. 187
dalá-bogam=a poetic composition in Tamil 170 and n.
Kaláhaur, and Akbar's army 151
Kálañjar, Bándá Dist., inscriptions from, etc., 118 f.; 122 f.; 125; 128; 132; 134 ff.; 139 ff.
Kalánjára, inscription 206 n.
Kaláj Kíllí 235
Kaláksa, identified with Mahápádá Nanda 342
Kalájáthalájyá, a Tamil poet 230
káloñuñi, a Tamil work 233
Kaládra, inscription of the year, 118, 30; 31 n. 46 f.; 61, 64 ff.; 74
kalá-creepers 183 f.
Kaláñána's Béjávaráñivi, Bhanátas referred to in 181 and n.
Káli, goddess, 191; age, 204 f.; temples, and the thiáyant ceremony 336; 349; 376 f.
Kalídása's (Sk.) Raghuvarnás and the inter-course between Persia and Tibet, 80; Mahádaná, 201; Abhiñána Sañkuptalá, book-notice of, 112; date 113; 212
INDEX.

Kāśmīra, Kaniṣka, 43; 57; 60; and the Fourth Buddhist Council ..... 38
Kāśmīra and Yaśāvarman ..... 140
Kāśyapa, Buddhist monk, 2 ff., 11, and n., 12, 14 n., 16, 17, 82, 84 n., 100; legendary leader of the āranyaka bhikṣus, 101 ff., at the first Buddhist Council ..... 342
kākā, tax for religious purposes ..... 76 and n.
Kathāwan, vil. grant of ..... 117
Kalidāristi nāgara, mentions the Turukhā ..... 42
Katherine, or Catherine of Alexandria, Saint and Martyr ..... 159 and n.; 169
Katherne, St., Virgin and Martyr, Church of 169
Kāthāśāwāid, conquest of, 74; and Rudradāman ..... 223
Kātyāyaṇa, Buddhist monk ..... 5
Kauśārī, Baoli, at Rāmatēk ..... 206
Kauśāsā, temple to, at Rāmatēk ..... 206
Kauśāsāmbi, Buddhist monastery ..... 6 n.
Kantāla, Kauṣṭya ..... 190; 372
Kāvāripākkaṇam, Kāvāripākkaṇam, alias Avāṇi-Nārāyana-Chaturvedimangalam ..... 172
Kāvalī tāluk, Kākatiya inscrip. at ..... 357 n.
Kavera, mythicall r. ..... 234
Kāvēri, Ponjir, riv., 171; 229; 231; 233; 247; 248
Kāvāripākkaṇam, Kāvāripākkaṇam, temple at. 172
Kāveripākkaṇam for Puhār ..... 231, 233 f.
Kāvāripākkaṇam for Pukhār ..... 231, 233 f.
Kāvāripākkaṇam for Kākanti ..... 353 n.
Kāyā-sūtra-sāstra, a meditation ..... 3 n.
Kumārī ..... 299; 306 and n.
Kēnala, conquered by Śrīmeśa, 197; 240 n.; and the Antaravas of Malabar ..... 334 f.; 357
Kēravī—Kōgaṇār̥ī ..... 194
Kern, Prof. H., and the Cultus, 2 n.; and the Buddhist Councils, 8 n., and the Third Rock Edict of Asoka, 20; 21; on Buddhist rules, 81 ff.; 89 n.; 93 ff.; and the Bhārat Samhitā, 230 n.; and the Nārāyaṇa of the Buddhā, 312; and the Brahmagiri inscrip. ..... 346
Kerrington, Capt., and R. Bell ..... 162
kēśula ..... 291
khetaniyās, hard foods ..... 90; 92
Khajjraho, in Bundelkhand, temples in, 114 f.; inscrips. from, 116 ff.; 131 ff.; 138 ff.; 139; 141; 148
Khakhara, family, and Gotamiputra Sātākaru ..... 43
Khalki inscrip. of K. Brahmadāta, and the Rāmatēk inscrip. ..... 294
Khandaṉgirī inscrip. ..... 92
khawadkas, collection of works. 86; 91; 100
and n.; 102
Khandaṉgirīs, a low-caste people, and the Bundelas ..... 130 n.
Kharagiri, battle fought by Pārāntaka ..... 187
Kharahostes, a Satrap ..... 27; 56; 69; 71
Kharapālāna, a Mahā-kathārapa, 52, 53, 56; 72; 247 n.
Kharas, M., on Central Asia ..... 67
Khāravela's Udāyagiri inscrip. ..... 49
khārin, grain tester ..... 76
Kharman, cap. of a Bakti tribe ..... 187
Khāroṣṭhī lang., in inscrips., 25 ff.; 29 ff.; 42, 44, 46 ff.; 55, 58, 59, 60, 62 ff.; extinct in India ..... 74; 246 f.; 249
Khārwār, Gahārwār ..... 180; 372
Khass and Yaśāvarman ..... 140
Khāṣṭakas, driven out of Kēla, 174
khēla, to play a part ..... 77 n.
Khilchippa, vil. near Mandasor, earings at. 109
Khiva, ancient Chorasmia ..... 79 n.
Khokbara and Amāndpāl, 114; and the Gakheras ..... 142 n.
Khurāsān, taken by Gang, a Hākla ..... 209
Khotan and Kaniṣka, 44; 57 ff.; 73; a Tibetan province ..... 80 n.
khrosfōtras ..... 358
Khirim (Tib.) and Tīmi, g. n. 184, 185, 187
Khiṅ-ṣrong-dbyer-čen, Tibetan emp. 181
khuddakāṇāṣuddhakās is the lesser and minor details ..... 14 n., 15, 17
khwa-nang = porgoöl ..... 77 n.
Khitām, co., 139; scene of K. Yaṇḍāi's imprisonment, 140 n.; traded with India ..... 149
Khurṣāu, K. of Persia, sent an embassy to Poleškin II. ..... 24
Khurṣāu Malik, opposed Muhammad of Ghor ..... 209
Khyber Pass ..... 249
Kīdāra-Kūṇānas, displaced the later Kūṇānas, 62
Kieou-taśieou-χio, a Konei-chuang prince, conquered the four other Yen-chi principalities ..... 26; 33
Kielhorn, Dr., and the Māvās-Vikrama era, 44 f.; and Kūsana inscrips., etc., 46 ff.; and the Śaṅkāra, 53 n.; and the Bājīnath Prāsasti, 75; and Chandellā inscrips., 114 ff.; and Telugu inscrips., 201 n.; and the Pāṇduvāna Mahābhikṣa kings, 206 n.; on Bākti, 253 n.; and the Udāyendram grant, 284 n.; and Chōla dates, 355 f.; and the Kākatiyas ..... 357 n.
Kielhorn, Franz, by Dr. Sten Konow ..... 113
Kili, a Chōla k. ..... 228; 233 ff.; 238 f.
Kili of Uraiyūr, k. ..... 239 f.
King-Hien or King-In, received Buddhist books from the Yen-chi ..... 56 f.; 71
Kipin, occupied by the Se, 26; or Kāpīsā conquered ..... 54; 69 ff.
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Kumāra, g., and the Ḥraṇg-ṛṇaḥ-sāppōvraḥ ... 192
Kumāra Devi, Liechavi princess, married Chandra Gupta I. ... 79
Kumāra Gupta I., inscriptions of ... 29; 38; 180
Kumāra Gupta II., inscriptions of ... 40; 109
Kumārajīva, translated the Śāradalakāra ... 211
Kumāralamātṛa, translated the Śāradalakāra ... 211
Kumāravishnu I., Pallava k. ... 284 n.
Kumāravishnu II., Pallava k. ... 284 n.
Kumari, Cape Comorin, and Nandi, 171; traditional southern boundary of the Tamil co. ... 199; 232
Kumbhakonam, tn. in the Madras presi-
dency ... 77 f.
Kumbhāraṇa State ... 174; 211 n.
Kupavādi, near Kurur, home of the poet Ḥang ... 230
Kusāla-kālī, a Tamil Buddhist ... 238
Kusālā-Vaṇa-Vihāra, in Kānēṭa (?) scene of the fourth Buddhist Council ... 7
Kunībar, Math., temple at Khajuraho ... 139 f.
Kurēl, tho, a work by Tiravāḷuvar, 228; 236, and n.; 238 and n.
Kurinippāṭṭu, a collection of Tamil works ... 230
Kurram, Kurram, val., battle fought in 140 and n.; formerly included in the Banga
eśat ... 174; 211 n.
Kuru, kingdom in Pāṭhōyā, in India ... 82; 96
Kurugode, Kurugōḍa, old Chālukya cap. on the Ganges ... 137
Kurugode Doḷgā, Kurugode in Mysore, a fort belonging to Tippu Sultan ... 173
Kurukulakāla, Gurukulakāla, Ambalavāsī of Travancore ... 337
Kurukōṭi, scene of a battle fought by Nandi ... 171
Kurrram, or Mārāra, q. v. ... 338
Koṣa, son of Sītā ... 266 n.
kusa grass, used to kill Nāgārjuna ... 207 f.
Kushāṇa, dynasty, coins and inscr., of 27 ff.; or Indo-Scythian, 33; Brahmā inscr., 35 ff.; a branch of the Yue-čhi, 42 fff.; dates, and the Vikrama era, 46 ff.; inscrs. and the Saśa era, 50 ff.; and the Saṅgha periods, 55; grammar, 59; empire and China, 60 ff.; 71; defeat by Panhao, 72;
74; power east of the Indus, 75; 179 f.; the emperors and the saṅgras ... 372
Kuśāṅkarā, tn. ... 2; 7 and n.
kuṭṭāṅgarāddhā, hall of the Belvedere ... 81
Kuṭb-ud-dīn Ḣak (Alībā) and Kālāfājar ... 135; 145 f.
kuthambal-ālam, portion of the temple in which the Chākṣusāṅgar-kūth is delivered ... 336
Kuṭṭhāra State, home of the Mawās ... 78
Kuṭṭhāra, vil. in the Simla Hill Stares ... 78
kutivēkkaḷ or kutǐpōkāḷ = settling in one’s family ... 337

Kuṭṭuvan, person mentioned in a poem by Parār ... 230
Kuvalayamārttaṇjan, a surname of Nandi ... 173
Kuzentura-Kudapēs, or Kozentura-Kudapēs, q. v. ... 33
Kwen-mo, a Wu-sun chief, attacked the Yučhi ... 26; 92; 69
Kydon, brook ... 156

Ladakh, 187; = Great Bhauṭa land, and the Kashmiris ... 191, 192
Ladakh, dynasty, and the Baltis, 187; or rNam-rygal ... 333
Ladakh Chronicles and Ričchana Bhōti, 187; and Kashmuţ, 188, 189 and n.; and k. Luschen Bhāgaṇ ... 191
Lahara, fort and Ričchana ... 183
Lahaul, tn. ... 189
Lahore Museum, inscrs. from 64 ff.; dhō, an Indian measure ... 76 n.
Lakāhamaṇa ... 206 n.
Lakāhara, Chandella k., 116; or Yaśo
darmāṇa ... 136 ff.; 139
Lakāhamaṇa temple at Rāmtek ... 203 f.
Lakāhamaṇa, Chaturbhuj, temple at Khajur
āho ... 116; 131; 133
Lakhuṭh, Dārga or Fāvati, on coins, 147;
170 and n.; temple at Rāmtek ... 203; 333
Lakshmikāraṇa or Karṇa dēvā, q. v. ... 143; 146
Lakshmīvanan, a Paramāra ... 144 and n.
Lākājī, Vīvānāṭh, temple at Khajurāho. ... 139 f.; 153
Lalitāditya-Muktāpāla’s expeditions against the Bhauṭas ... 181
Lalitpur, or Duddali, now Jhānāl, 116 f.; 122,
130, 134, 143
Langhorne, Sir Wm., and Amb., Salisbury, ... 297; 263 and n.; 264, 266 f.; 271; 317 n.
Lanka, Ceylon, and Bāṇa ... 202; 239
Lanester, Sir Ray, on tobacco ... 210
Lanika year 28, A. D. 1452, date of Hājī
Khān’s expedition to the Bhoţa co. ... 189
Lamghān, territory, ravaged by Saubukti,
139; 140 n.
Lawston, Mr., E. I. Co. servant ... 327
Lassen, and the Saśa ... 250
Lāṭ Bhairo, on the Benares Road, worshop-
ped by the Hindus ... 280
Lauhiṣṭha, Brahmaputra, riv. ... 80
Lauhika and the Kauṣān inscr., 27 f.; ... 31 ff.; 51; 63
Lāvar, son of Sītā ... 265 n.
Lavanyas, or Damāras, feudatory barons ... 184
Lawrence, Sir W., his Valley of Kashmir ... 192
Laurau, sepulchre and castle of, 157 and n.; 158
INDEX.

Lazarus, the beggar, in Leghorne, 167 f.
Lazarus, the, in Leghorne, 167 f.
Lecan, m., 161 f.
Le Brouy's *Voyage au Levant*... 163 n.
Legends of Mohan Bari... 110 f.
Legends of the Pañjāb, by Sir R. C. Temple and H. A. Rose contd. from Vol. XXXV., p. 302. II.—Three Legends of the Mughal Court... 149 ff.
Leghorne, city... 167, 168, 1169
Leh, thn... 192
Letten, Mr., and Amb. Salisbury... 326
Lévi, M. Sylvain, and the Rock Edicts, 21; and the *Acts of St. Thomas,* 48 n.; and Kaniaka, 57; his *Le Théâtre Indiens* 143 n.; 212
Leyden grant and Karikāla... 233
Lhachen Bhagan, Ladakhi k. 191
Lhachen-kundgarnam-rgyal's inscrip. at Daru... 191
Lhachen Ngos-grub, k... 187
Lhachen-Gyabla Rinchen, or Prince Rinchen, see Rítchana Bhoti... 182 ff.
Liaka, a satrap... 27; 70
Liaka Kusulaka, father of Patīka, 55; 63; 247 and n.
Lickeyvis, see Persian Affinities of... 78 f.
*šíngsorva,* personality... 373
Lion-capital, at Sāṃath... 278
Lipuri, 191 n.
Li-tsa-byi, for Lichevi, a race to which the Tibetan kings belonged... 79 and n.
BLo-gros-mchog-Idan, Ladakht k... 169
Lohara, m., campaign to... 189
Loka Kāla era, date of use, 32; inscrip. of... 75
Lokottaravādins, a Buddhist sect... 13; 103 n.
London... 169
Loriyan Tāngāi inscrip., Mr. Caddy's... 30;
40; 67; 71
Lövabokk, Chōā k... 353
Lucius, emp., his coins and those of Kādphises I... 28; 38
Lādiās, Dr., on inscrip. 39 and n.; 59
Lumbini, birthplace of Buddha... 10 n.
Lyall, Sir James, on the old administrative system in Kullā... 76

Maccabees, the, sepulchre of... 160
Maccha, kingdom... 82 and n.
Macedonian, Empire, second partition of, 25;
calendar in N. India... 250
Macetas, father of Philip, Alexander's satrap in the Panjāb... 25
Máclagan's *Gazetteer of Multān*... 361
madan, pashpāksha, houses of the Puspha-
kans... 336, f.
Madanapura, tn. grant of... 120, f.

Madanavarman, Chandél k., 118 ff.; 126, 127
and n.; 129; 131 ff.; 144 and n.; 145, 147 f.
Madana Varmmadava... 148 n.
Madan Mahal, castle at Garh... 136
Madanpur, Lalitpur, now Jhansi Dist., inscrip. from... 122; 129; 148
Madan Sāgar, lake at Khajuraho... 134; 144
Madapollam, E. I. Co.'s Factory at, 218; or Mádhavapālem, 263 and n.; 269 f.; 291 ff.; 322
Madārī, Vishnu temple at Mahābha... 134
madar, the Indian species, called chay... 264 n.
Mādharī, k... 228 n.
Mādāhāri, a dancing-woman, mistress of Kōvā-
lan... 231 f.
Madhu, g... 382
madhukapuppha, the Bassia latifolia... 95
Madhusūdana, commentator... 251 n.
Madhūvamśa, Amāntārtha, 238; his birth-
place... 259 n.
Madhyādīśa, co., and Brahmasam... 251 ff.; 257 f.
Madhyamika philosophy, and Nāgārjuna... 206 f.
Madonna, fountain, 156; Church in Sienna... 169
Madrass, fort and Ed. Winter, 230; 267, 270,
274 f.; and Amb. Salisbury, 285; 294; 311
ff.; 316
Madras Merchant, the, E. I. Co.'s ship... 220
Madura, and Sōmasundara, the Siva deity, 190; called Álvay, 194 and n.; and the Śūngas, 229; 230; and Kovalan, 231 f.; 234; and the Pandyas, 236; referred to as Tamil Kūdai, 238; 240; capture of... 356 n.
Madurasikñjuna, a Tamil work by Māngudi
Marudānār... 237
Madurai Kālūvāginta Sattan, or Sitthalei-
chōttānāvān, author of the *Maṃśīkālai... 230
Madurai-Marudānāvān, commentator on the Iṟveysaṅg = *appēppuṟi*... 194 f.
Madura Shalapārana, a Tamil work... 228
Maris, prince of Patalene in Sind... 25
Magdha, conquered, 72; or Behrā and the Persians, 79; and Nāgārjuna, 207; and the Sātakarmin, 242; and Chandraguptra, 343;
347; 350
Maghadhan kingdom, 342; or Frachi... 348
Magas, Maka k. of Cyrene... 343
Magas, the Magi or Brāhmana... 42
Māghe k., date of, by Prof. Kielhorn... 113
Māgbī, priest, accompanied the Lichevis into Tibet 86; cisterns of... 159
Māhā-Andhra, or Dhanakajāka... 351 n.
Mahābālipuram, ancient Mallai, in Ching-
gleput Dist... 171
Mahābhāratas, the, and the denotation of Saks, 42 and n.; on Himalayan tribes, 80 n.; 178; translation of, earliest known Telugu work, 201 n.; 281 f.; 262; on the
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subjugation of the Andhras, 281; among the Chakkijjas, 336
Mahabbandha, a work, by Patajali, Kishorn's edition of ... 113
mahabhdas, gross elements, 261; 373; 375
n.; 377 n.; 379; 383 n.
Mahabodi temple at Bodh Gaya ... 278; 279 n.
Mahabodhiastra, a title of Narayana ... 375
Mahadeva, or Kottisvara, temple at Ramtek, 205; with Parnati, figures in temple at Chimbir ... 333; 335
Mahakassapa, Kasyapa, Kassapa ... 2; 7 n.
Mahakshastra, meaning of, 43, 56; title of
Casta and Rudderaman ... 60 f.; 73 f.
Mahakshatrapas of Mathura preceded the
Kushanas ... 50
mahadas, moldarr, revenue officer ... 387
Mahallaka, subhadra, 2 n.
Mahamadga, k. ... 252 n.
Mahapajapati Gotami, the aunt of Bud-
ha ... 12
Mahapadma Nanda, or Kalaoka ... 342
Mahaparinibbana sutta, the, 14; and the
Liechavis ... 79; 87 n.
mahaprasada, sacramental meal of the modern
Vaisnavas ... 375 n.
Mahardha and Mahardya, titles ... 44
Mahardha-Rajatirishya, title ... 40; 44
Mahadhyaksha, co., and the Sakas ... 242 and n.
Mahashangha, sect of Buddhists, 3 n., 3 n., 5,
8 n., and 9 n.; 13, 15; 17 n.
Mahasangha or Mahasangiti, the fourth
Buddhist Council ... 60
Mahakshiti, statue at Ramtek ... 205
mahat, intelligence ... 373, 379 and n.; 383 n.
Mahadeo, a Buddhist work, 9 n., 12 n., 85.
Mahawansa, the, and Gajahini I. 233, 235 n.
240 n.; 241; and the Ceylonese Chronicles, 349 f.
Mahavira, a Kshatriya, 251; founder of Jainism ... 34
Mahavarna, later Buddhist sect, 3 n.; used
Sanskrit, 29; origin of ... 179 f.
Mahayankika, a Buddhist sect ... 13
Mahendravarman, k., surnames of ... 173
Mahayana ... 131
Mahipala or Hormapala, Kshatrapala, q. v. 138 f.
Mahisasakas, a Buddhist sect, 3 n., 2 n., 4
and n.; 5, 6 n., 9, 11 n.; 81 n.
Mahishasura-mardini, or Kshatrapa, temples at
Ramatak ... 203 and n.; 305
Mahishamati, city, and the Käma chiefs ... 555 n.
Mahiyar, Malhar, N. of Jabaipur, Chandell fort ... 132; 136
Mahomad of Ghausi and the Chandels, 193;
140 f.; plundered Mathrā ... 299
Mahomad Cawne, or Muhammad Khan and
Amb. Salisbury ... 275
Mahomad Mynna, for Muhammad Amin, and
Amb. Salisbury ... 319 f.
Malbā, in Hamipur Dist., Bundelkhand, inscr. from, 114; 115 f.; and the
Chandels ... 131 f.; 144 f.
Malbā Khawja, poem by Chand, on the
Chandels ... 115; 133; 145
Mahomad, or Kanaij ... 138; 140; 147
mahadda, mazender, revenue supervisor, 296; 298
mahādā, marā, an official ... 77 and n.
Maidymongia, a saint ... 359 n.
Mailamm, Mayilai, the modern Mailapurt ... 171
Mainwaring, Matt., E. I. Co.'s servant ... 267 f.;
291, 296; 297 f.; 309, 311 f.; 314, 316 f.;
324, 326 f.
Maittrakas of Valabhi ... 201 n.
Maitrāya, figure, 179; stupa at Sarñath ...
majjhabādo, intoxicating property ... 95 n.
majjhasāmbhabā, elements of intoxication ... 95 n.
Maka, Maghas, k. of Cyrene ... 343
Makka, a people ... 42
rMal, dynasty of Zangskar-Gage ... 333
Malabar, the Antarallas, of, q. v. ... 334 f.
Malainakudhi, hill co. ... 232, 236 f.
Malava, co., and Madamvarman, 144; or
Avanti ... 242
Malavas, used the Vikrama era, 45; and
Yasvarman ... 140
Malava-Vikrama era in North India, 46 f.
and inscrs. ... 47 f.; 53; 63
Malaya, Satakarni territory ... 243 f.
Maldive isles, scene of a wreck ... 214
Malik Kāfar, Moslem invader ... 243
Malik Mirs, Kohat tribe ... 174
Malik Muhammad, and the Yuga system ... 257 n.
Malika, mṛgāsya, feudal chief ... 190
Maliyapde, grant and Vijayāditya III, 352,
353 and n.
Malkhād, home of the Rādhrakūtā, 352
Malikbars, the Natives of the Maldivas ... 354 n.
Mallai, the modern Mahābalipuram, a Pal-
ava cap. ... 171 and n.
Mallum, in Nellore, Subrahmanya Temple in,
352; inscr. from ... 354
Mallot, an Indian tribe ... 35
Malta isl. ... 165
Mālandaya, a surname of Nandi ... 187
Mālva ... 242 f.
Mālā, and Castana, 60; under Rudderaman,
61; conquest of, 73; 114; Satrapa of, 248;
Western, Famine Song from ... 339 f.
Man, Jhansi Dist., inscr. from ... 120
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manabharan, a surname of Nandi</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manabharan, enemy of Ga-jalal</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manadaj, a surname of Nejamur</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manas = buddhi</td>
<td>261 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and n.; mind, eleventh organ of sense,</td>
<td>377 and n.;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manasses, and the Prophet Isaiah</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manayan, father of Kannahi</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manibao temple in Ramtek</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandaragaurava, alias of Rajasimha II</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandalasor (Dasappa) Pillara</td>
<td>107 ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manjil State, Chronicle of</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mangala, Alawayi, Alawayi, Alangdum, in Travancore</td>
<td>222; 236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mangala, Mangiraj, the Nojamba k. and Vijayaditya III</td>
<td>322 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mangalisa, a Chalukya</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mangalur, vil. in the Vengorabha co., copperplate inscrip, at</td>
<td>263; 284 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mangarh, in N. Ilore territory</td>
<td>299 and n.; 300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mangi-Turabai, E. Chalukya k.</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manigrd, village headman</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>madinda, demand for tribute</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mangudi Marudai, author of the Manuvaikkara</td>
<td>237 ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manigul, Satrap of Taxila</td>
<td>54; 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manikalakunda, tank at Ramtek</td>
<td>205 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manimekhaila, The Jewel Belt, a poem by Madurai Kola vangan Sattan</td>
<td>230; 232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manikya, inscrip. date, of 30, and n.; 31;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tope, coins found in, 41 f.; 46 f.; 55; and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaniaka's date</td>
<td>57 n.;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manimegaila, a Tamil work, and the Saka era</td>
<td>342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manimekkaila, possessor of a begging bowl of great virtue</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manisudaka, a Buddhist monk, the double of Yasa</td>
<td>98 f.;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maniya Dev, (? Devi) goddess</td>
<td>136 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maniyanagar, in the Chetarpur State, traditional cradle of the Chandela 132 and n.</td>
<td>237; 238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manikiala, inscrip.</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manmapamichagoplaha, a chief, at Vikramasinhapura</td>
<td>357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manna, riv. S. boundary of Vengi</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manoharag, a surname of Nandi</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manopdasa, the Nampidi women</td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansehra inscrip.</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathabaram Seral Irumporai, Chera k. and the poet Kapilar</td>
<td>231; 237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manu, on the Nichebis</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manu Svarochisha</td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manu Svdyanshhvara or Hiranyagarbha, ancestor of the Khastriyas, 251; 255 n.</td>
<td>375; 379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manucci, and Akbar legends</td>
<td>150 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manumasakila, Brahman Sk. work, mentions the people of Nisibis</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marga, a surname of Nejamur</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maram, alias of Arikasari Parshukusa</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marga Sadaiya, or Jatila</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maragudalaya, alias of Parshukasa</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marga, Kuruppa, subdivision of the Ambalavais</td>
<td>338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marath, arsenal at Ramtek, 203; Empire</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mavarman k., Arikasari</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcus Aurelius, emp. of Rome, 62; eastern campaigns of</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margosa, Margapati, or Malik, a feudal chief</td>
<td>190 ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marichi, a Rishi</td>
<td>375 n.;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark, St. house of</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Antony's Parthian expeditions</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Markottaka Nappasalalayar, a Tamil poet</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mappha Chandell fort in Bauda Dist.</td>
<td>132;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mappidugu, a surname of Dantivarman</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage, and the Zarathushtrian creed</td>
<td>358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall, Mr., Director-General of Archaeology, and the Sarnath excavations</td>
<td>277 ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martha, house of</td>
<td>157 n.;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saramavakathaigans, matriarchal law of inheritance</td>
<td>334, ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland, arb. of poetic composition</td>
<td>329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary, Virgin, sepulchre of. 153 and n.; 157;</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Magdalen, house of</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary and Martha, the ship</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masattavan, father of Kovalan</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>masada, intrigue against the state</td>
<td>75 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masulipatam and Wm. Jemse, 213; 215;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Amb. Salisbury, 216 ff.; 283 ff.; 281;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>284 ff.; 310 ff.; plate inscrip. of Vijayaditya III</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathanadeva's Raja inscrip.</td>
<td>144 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathra, tn. in Gujrat, ruled by the Hakka</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathur, inscrip.</td>
<td>29 ff.;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lion Capital, 49 ff.; 59 ff.; 63;</td>
<td>65;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sculptures</td>
<td>372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matyas, of the S. Pañjab</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maii inscrip.</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maudh, in Hamilpur Dist., a Chandel fort</td>
<td>132; 133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maues, Sok prince, 27; or Moas, 54; or Moga,</td>
<td>58; 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maundrell's A Journey from Aleppo to Jerusalem</td>
<td>156 n.;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n.; 161 n.</td>
<td>161 n.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Maurys, kings, and the Greeks in India, 25; era, 40 and n.; 41; 63; 67; Empire dismembered 69; inscr., 72; era, date of, 342 f., 345, 350

Mauryan rail from Sārnāth ... ... 179
Mauryas and Andhras ... ... 391 and n.
Mau-Sahaniyā, cap. of a Parīhar kingdom, ... 138 and n.

mātā or māktā, an officer ... ... 77
Māvenkā, a Čērā, contemporary of Urga-Perurajudhi ... ... 229
Māviłaiagai, of Erumānāṭṭa Niḷiyakkōn ... 239
Māwāi, Moi, a hill tribe, Jātā ... 78 and n.
Max Mūllār and the Nirvāṇa of Buddha, 342; on Chandragupta, 344 f.; on the Brahma-giri inscription, 346; and the Ceylones Chro-
nicle ... ... 349
māyā, illusion ... ... 258, 261
Māyā Pāṇḍya, k., conquered Śrīmāga ... 197
Mayidavōlā plate inscr. of Sivakandana-
varman ... ... 262
Mayilai, Mailāppār, modern Mailāpur, Pal-
lava cap. ... ... 171
Māzāa, the Omniscient ... 328–360
Māzāi, Māzāc, k., and Gondophernes, 47; and St. Thomas ... 48, 62
mazendar, mahāntādar ... ... 296, 298
McOrinīllo’s Ancient India as described by Ptolemy, and other works, 78 n.; Invasion of India by Alexander the Great ... 344 n.
meẖod-rēn, in Ğiǧiǧī ... ... 183
Mecca, Mekey ... ... 162, 164
Medes, overthrown by Persians ... 341
Medyōtt’s India and Apostle Thomas ... 48 n.
Megasthenes, mentioned the Andhras ... 291
Mihādētā, a work by Kālīdās ... 202 and n.
Menander, “Conqueror” of India, 27, 54; coins of, 58; date ... 69, 179
Mēnānāṭṭa, in the Telugu co., Sk. charter issued from ... 283, 284 n.
meraya, maʊreya, a drink ... 94 and n. 95
Meridionals, Buddhist monks ... ... 67 n.
Meru, mt. ... ... 374; 378
Mesopotamia, conquered by Trajan, 73; Jacob in ... ... 159
Messina, Messena ... ... 167 and n.
Mfān, title of a ruling chief’s brother ... 77
Mians, Hians ... ... 41
Middleton, Middleton, Capt., and R. Bell, 162; 214
Mihirakula, king of the Hīmas ... 167; 183; 183
Milinda, Yavana k ... ... 18, 14 and n. 16
Miller, Mr., of Petepolee ... ... 272
Mināmāa system, 260; and transmigration 260 f.

Minayeff, I. P., and the Buddhist Canon, 1 and n.; 4 n.; 7 and n.; 8 ff.; 17, 18 and n.; 81 n.; 87 ff.; 92 n.; 93 and n.; 95, 97 ff.
Ming-ti, emp. of China ... ... ... 72
Mr ‘Abdullah Bākīr, or Mīr Abdulla Bakeīr ... 184, ff.
Mrpbhār = chief of the Customs ... ... 288 n.
Mīr Mirzahān, Mīrzān Sīr = governor of the city ... ... ... 288 and n.
Mīrān Jāμīl Bāg of Delhī, in Paśū legend ... 149
Mirzāpūr, formerly part of Bundelkhand ... ... 130
Mīsideos, Mīsideus, Mīsaï ... ... 47 ff.
milī, militia regiments ... ... ... 76
Mithilas, and Yaśōvarman ... ... ... 140
Mithridates the Great, of Parthia ... ... 69
Mithridates II, k. ... ... ... 70
Mītra’s (Rajāndra Lāīa) translation of the Yīga-sūtras ... ... 256
mītyā-mūtā = the saved ... ... 261 n.
Meechās, defied or non-Hindu people, 181; a general of whom, helped Chandragupta ... 344
Mōas, MaΜa ... ... 42, 54; 71
Moga k., Maνes ... ... ... 55 f.; 71; 247 and n.
Moggaliputta, Tissa a Buddhist monk ... ... 13
Mohan Bāṇ, v. in Rōkthā, Paṭṭāb, legends of ... ... ... ... 110
Mōhipur, in Sīrmā ... ... 302 and n., 303
Mōhiye ki Hār, or Bar, Chronicle of Eājā Mahī Parkāsh, ruler of Nāhān (Sīrmā)
State, by H. A. Rosse ... ... ... 299 ff.
Mochun, R., E. I. Co.’s chief at Masulipatam ... 266; 266 ff.; 286 ff.; 309, ff.
moi or mōta, q. v. ... ... ... ... 78
mōkha = absorption ... ... 373 f.; 386 and n.
Mōtkhadhamā Parava, the, and the Sāmk-
hyā-Yoga ... ... 266; 373 ff.
molār, māḥādār, q. v. ... ... ... ... 287
Mōlock, temple of ... ... ... ... 156
Molloy, Mr. E., and the Hākās ... ... 310
Molo Nūnov in Genoa ... ... ... 170
Molo Vecchio, in Genoa ... ... ... 169
Mongola ... ... ... ... ... 187
monothelism, in the Bhāgavata creed, 259; in modern Hinduism ... ... 162 and n.
Montefiascone, Monte Fiascone, in Italy, and R. Bell ... ... ... 169
Moor, Muhammad, and Amb. Salisbury, 221 f.; 222, 224, 227 f.; 229
Mora, near Nathura, inscr. from ... ... ... ... 55
mores, mūr ... ... ... ... ... ... 319
Morris, Capt., and R. Bell ... ... ... 162
Moslum invasions under Malik Kāfūr ... 243
Motupalle, Μōttepalle, 283; or Μουτέpαllē, 318
Mudils, of Messina and Genoa ... 167; 169; 170
Mountain of Offence ... ... ... ... 156 n.
Mount Banj inscr. ... ... ... 31; 47 and n.; 62; 66; 74
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Mr. Hamad, temple at Khajur-
ho ... 133 and n.
Mushai, in Yunnan, inscrip. ... 46; 64; 68
Mujahidina Kanyakur, Tamil poet, and k.
Karakili ... 228 ff.
Mudathir Mazrā, Panjya k., patron of the 3rd Sangam ... 228
Mūdul Rākachara, a drama, mention Chandragupta ... 344 and n.
Mughal Court, three legends from ... 149 ff.
Mughals, at Panipat, 32; and the Faujdar of Bangash, 174; in Afghanistan ... 211
Muhammad, the Prophet ... 341
Muhammad of Ghor and the Haklas ... 209
Muhammad Amin, or Mahmud Mynna, and Amb. Salisbury ... 310—312
Muhammad Dāh Shikoh and Kābul ... 174
Muhammad Khan, minister of Hasan Khan ... 190
Muhammad Khān, Mahmud Cawn ... 275
Muhammadan advance against the Rajputs ... 139; 141; Chronicles of Kashmir, and W. Tibetan history, 192; invaders of Sārnath, 278; places of worship, 280; invasion of S. India ... 357 and n.
Muhammadan among the Haklas ... 209 f.
Muhammadans, captured Mandasor, 109 f.; in Kālaṇiṇa, 134 ff.; and Jējakhubuk, 140 f.; 145 ff.; 221
Maiz-ud-din, Shihāb-ud-din, or Ghorī ... 145
muqaddas = the saved ... 261
Muktiśvara temple, in Kāvērijīppakam, inscrip. from ... 172
Mulbe, in W. Tibet, Rock inscrip. of ... 187
Mulzas inscrip., of Rudrāsena ... 74
muṣāli, the tanner ... 230
Mujāhīd, hill ... 221; 227
Mulan, Muhammadan invasion of ... 141
Mulan Dēj Raṣā, dedicated a temple ... 144
Mundīnād, Mundūraṭhtra ... 333 and n.
Muppilī Nāyaka, Muppilīndra, Kāktiya general, captured Conjeevaram ... 357
Murād, the dhotain, son of Shāh Jahān ... 154
murāli, Morees, blue cloth, E. I. Co.'s trade in, 319
Musaṃnās, and Hindus in the Pañjab, 139; 141 ff.; 145
Musikānus, ruler of a kingdom in Sind ... 25
Mōṭhanu, Aka Padavāl, q. v. ... 338
Mu-two-tra-be-si, a Persian sage ... 80
Mysores ... 229; 240; 243

Nagārjuna, alias of Vināyakādeva ... 357 n.
Nagārjuna, Nagawanchi in Golconda, Dutch factory at ... 239 n.
Nagardhan, near Rāmtēk, tanks at ... 293
Nagārjuna, cave at Rāmtēk, 204; and the Madhyamik philosophy ... 206 ff.
Nāga and Nāgārjuna ... 297
Nāga Sākṣiśeṇa, a religious work ... 267
Nāgasena, a Buddhist monk ... 14, 16 f.
Nājōjīhāpā's Parīkhāhēnduḍākharā, Kielhorn's edition ... 113
Nāban, Sīrāmut ... 299 ff.
Nahapāna, a Kāhāharāta, inscrip. of and the Saka era 43; 53; Sārat 63, 70 Saka k., ruled in Mahrāshtra ... 242 n.
Nakkālī, commentator on the Iṣvīyagar-
apagopāṇi ... 194 f.
Nālajamapāṇi, in Kānigiri tāluk, archaic inscrip. from ... 352 n.
Nālā-kīṣi, besieged Amūr Uraiyyūr ... 236 f.
Nālipanta, monasteries at Magadh, and Nāgārjuna ... 207
Nallakandapālem, Nallacundepalles?, salt petre from ... 262
Nālūr, at Kāraikāl in Tanjore, scene of a battle ... 171; 173
Nālūr, in Malainādu ... 237; 243
Nālūrt Natatātanak, author of the Sirupā-
dāryipadāi ... 299 ff.; 238
membiri, nabuttar, a trusty messenger ... 286
Nāmībīrya, various sub-divisions of the Antarallas of Malabar ... 335 ff.
Nambōdīras, subdivision of the Antarallas of Malabar ... 334 ff.
Nāmīpīḍa, sub-group of the Antarallas of Malabar ... 334 f.
Nām-ṛgyal, dyn. of Ladakh ... 191
Nāna, Chandellī miniser ... 125
Nānak, reformer ... 341
Nanda, k. ... 61 n.
Nanda, Gauja, Chandēlī k. ... 128; 142 and n.
Nanda, dyu., 179; overthrown by Chandragupta ... 343, f.
Nandālīt, Cuddapah Dist, Panjya inscrip. ... 357 n.
Nandi, Pallava k., in whose honour the Nandi-ākalambagam was written ... 170, ff.
Nandi-ākalambagam, a Tamil work ... 170 ff.
Nandīśingraha, grant of ... 121
Nāndi-ppōtaraṣā, Pallava k., inscrip. of ... 172 f.; 352
Nāndivarman-Pallavamalla, k. and the Nandi of the Nandi-ākalambagam, 172; date of, 197; 233 n.; 234 n.; 352
Nānjugā, Nāmībīrya women ... 333.
INDEX.

Oldenberg, Prof., on the Buddhist Canons, 1 and n.; 2 n.; 6 ff.; 13, 17 and n.; 13; and the Saka era, 27; on Kāśyapa, 33; 41; 50 and n.; 51; on the Second Buddhist Council, 81 n.; 86 ff.; 89, 96 and n.; 98 ff.; his Life of Buddha, 251; and the Nirvāṇa of Buddha, 312 and n.; on the Brahmagiri inscr. ... ... ... 346

Clearius, mentioned the bubble-bubble ... 210

Ongole Tāluk, Nellore Dist., inscr. from, 199 n.; 357 n.

Ooemo-Kadphises, or Kima Kadphises ... 33

Orau Zeab, Aangangzeb ... 236

Orangal, house of the Kikātryas ... 355

O’ri, a chief ... ... ... 243 n.

Oriental, Buddhist monks ... 83, 84, 87 n.

Orringal, see Orangal... ... ... 149

Orissa, and Chhotangana ... 372

Orodes II., k. of Parthia ... 62

Oungallia, Oringal, Warangal... ... 143

Ocho, emp. of Rome ... ... ... 72

Ozinde, Sir Geo., and Amb. Salisbury ... ... 219

Oxus, riv. of the Yūq-chi ... ... 32

Oxyartes, Satrap of Paropamisudia under Alexander the Great ... ... ... 25

Oxydrake, an Indian tribe in the south of the Pañjāb ... ... ... 25

Oxykanus, Greek king, in Sindh ... ... ... 25


Pada, Scribe, of the Brahmagiri inscr., 345, 347

Pādīkyaputru, a poem by Parānar ... ... ... 239

Pandukhati, Narvar or Narwar ... ... ... 117

pagodas, pagothas, coins, 215 ff.; 236 f.; 263 ff.; 295 f.; 300 ff.; 310, 312 f.; 315 f.; 319 ff.; 325 335

Pa-gam-mon-sang, a Tibetan work ... ... 79

Pāhīla, Pāhīla, donor of temple gifts ... ... 116

Pahlavas, Pahlavas, for Pahlavas ... ... 282 and n.

Pāhira, vil. near Mahābāhā, called Khājurahā, 132 n.; 136

Pa-jā inscr. ... ... ... 49; 64 f.; 68; 74

Pajjā, lieutenant under Pritivirāj ... ... ... 145

Pākṣa, vil. in Nellore, Tamil inscr. from ... 200

Pakhtu, the Afghan ... ... ... ... 70

Pakora, Parthian k., 27; titles of ... ... ... 70

Palayārā, perhaps Pajjāyā, vil. in Tanjore Dist., scene of a battle fought by Nandī, ... ... ... 145

Palakkada, in the Telugu co. S. charters issued from ... ... 238, 284 n.

Palaśa, Persia, a camel pack ... ... ... 300 n.

Pan, Kana, clan ... ... ... 300 and n.; 301

Pālar, riv. S.-E. limit of Aśoka’s power ... 281 n.

Pālaś, tu in the Pañjāb ... ... ... 299 and n.

Palazzo Borghese, palace of Prince Deburgue in Rome ... ... ... ... 169

Palestine, travels of R. Bell and John Campbell in ... ... ... ... 156 ff.

Pallava, dynasty, ruled Tondaiākū, 171; 173; 309 and n.; 291 n.; conquered by Sṛimāya, 197; in S. India, 239; rise of, 243; called Pahlavas or Paḥlavas, 282 and n.; of the Saaskrīta charters, 283, 284 and n.; expansion in the Tamil co. ... 353, 352, 354

Pallavāda, title of k. Paramarākṣēvara, 353 n.

Palna, hills ... ... ... 243 f.

Pālārd, headman of a purgana ... ... ... 70-78

Pāncaṣṭīkākhandaka, or Chapter of the Eavo Hundred, eleventh chapter of the Gullahaggaga, summary of ... ... ... ... 2 and n.

Pānchāla, a people in the Mahābhārata war, 251 f.

Panchao Chinese general, defeated the Yūq-chi, 57 f.; and the Kundās, 72; death of 73

Pāncharātras, a Bhāghavata sect, 253 and n.; 259 n.; doctrines, 262; or Sāyāta rule, 375 n. and n.; 378; 335

Pānchaśikā, doctrine of existence after death ... ... ... ... ... 373 f.

Pandulās, a Sāmanthas subdivision ... 338

Pāndarānga, and Pāndarāngul, Eastern Chālukya general, under Vījāyāditya III., 333 and n.

Pāndarāngul, temple at Pantrāngam in Gudūr Tāluk, Nellore ... ... ... ... 353 n.

Pāndavas, marriage of, 352; 354; and the Andhras ... ... ... ... 231

Pāndjī, Tika Rām Jotāl, on terms used in the Hill States ... ... ... ... 77 and n.; 78

Pāndravānsal, Keshātirya caste ... ... ... 208 n.

Pāndya, history, and Prof. Kiellhorn, 113; kings and Nandi, 171 f.; genealogy, 197; rulers and the 3rd Sāngam, 238 f.; tribe, 233; defeated by Kārīkāṃ, 236; 236; influence, 242; dynasty and the Ganga dynasty and the Ganga, 243; and the Pahlavas, 384 n. and Aśoka, 342; in Nellore, 354; 353 and n.; and the Kākātyas ... ... ... 375 and n.

Pānini, mentioned Bhakti, 253 and n.; 252; 276

Pānijā, battle of ... ... ... ... ... 32

Pānijā, a Greek satrapy, 25; and the Yuq-chi, 26; and the use of the Mālava-Vikrama era, 48; Scythian coins from, 54; and Wema-Kalpishes, 58; part of Vasudera’s kingdom, 60-6; 69 ff.; Parthian conquest of, 74; Notes on Ancient Administrative Terms and Titles in, 75 ff.; populated by Brahmins, 79; Hindu States in 189, 140 and n.; 141; Legends from, 149 f.; “Catchee” ... 209, 253; and Alexander the Great ... ... ... 433 f.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Panjabi, Grammar and Dictionary of Western, Wilson's; and Jukes Panjabi and English Dictionary</th>
<th>360</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Panjabi Lexicography, contributions to, by H. A. Rose</td>
<td>360 ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panjâlî, collector of supplies for the royal kitchen</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panjatar inscription, 30; 31; 42, 44, 46; 47; 61; 68, 74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pan-ku's history of the First Han Dynasty, 26; 32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pannâ, in Bundelkhand</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panîrâ-pâñjîyâl, a Tamil work</td>
<td>170 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pânâsâla, Pânâsâla, kingdom in Pânheyya, India</td>
<td>82 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pantaleon, Greek prince, coins of</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panthagam, vil, the ancient city of Kândali</td>
<td>353 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pâpâppidujna, a surname of Mahândaravarmân</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parachakrârâma, title of Vâjraditya III.</td>
<td>352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paradézi, caste, and the Chakâkâryârs</td>
<td>335 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pârâjâkāsa, the four</td>
<td>3 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parâkramabahu, k., enemy of Gajârahu</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prârama bhatâ—Supreme element</td>
<td>377 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paramâmahâvâra, k. mentioned in a Nalaja-nampâdu inscription</td>
<td>352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parmârâdî, Chandâl k., his Somrâ plate inscription, 120; 121 ff.; called Parmâl and Parmâr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parmânâhu,</td>
<td>123 ff.; 132 ff.; 145; 148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parmânu, hill</td>
<td>230; 237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parmânânu, Parâmbânâdâ, demesne of Vâl-Pâri</td>
<td>230; 237; 243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parmânâthhan</td>
<td>382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parmâvanârvarman I., Pallava k., conquered by Vâkramâditya I.</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parâzar, Tamil Poet</td>
<td>229 ff.; 237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parâkacâshya, a surname of k. Nejumâgha</td>
<td>195, 197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parântaka, alias Mârañjadâya or Viranârâya Pândya k.</td>
<td>197; 239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parântaka I., Chóhâ k., inscription of, 354; temples</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parântaka II., Chóhâ k., fought against Vira Pândya</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pârâsvana, from which is vârîyâ, son of a Brahman and a Sûdra woman</td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pârâsikas, or Parsâs, 42; and Baghu</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pârâs-Râma, g., and the Kâhâttriyas, 222; 336; 338</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pârâttâra, Bhagavat</td>
<td>383 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pârâyana, natural tracts in Kullâ</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pâri of Parâmbânâdâ and Parâmâhu Hill, patron of Tamil literature, 230, 237 f.; 241</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and n.; 243</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Pârîhâra, Prâtîhâra, dynasty connected with the White Huns, and said to have preceded the Chandélis | 138 |
| Parkâsh, title used by the Râjas of Sirâmâr, 302 n.; 303 ff. |  |
| Parmâl, Parmâr, Parmârâdam, q. v. | 126 ff.; 126 |
| Parâ Dharma, the supreme deity | 373 |
| Paropanisadai, a Greek satrapy, west of the Indus | 25 |
| Patâânkot besieged under Akbar | 150 n.; 151 |
| Parthia, lost to the Greeks, 25; invaded by k. Kseou-teseou-kio, 26 f.; coins of, 48; and Seistan, 54; and Kaniška, 60; decay of, 61, 63 and n.; Scythian invasions of, 69; and Rome, 70–74; and Sakastana | 250 |
| Pârvati, Durgâ or Lakshmi, q. v., 147; figure in temple | 333 |
| Pârupatas, Siva-worshippers, 255; philosophy of | 385 and n. |
| Patâlene, delta of the Indus | 25 |
| Pâtalipuram, n. S. Africa | 201 n. |
| Pâtaliputra, scene of a Buddhist council, 8 n. | 15; and Kaniśka, 48; 57; 72; called Vâhâ Kusumapuri, 81 n. and Chandragupta | 344 |
| Patâlajâli, his Mahâbâdhâyaka, Prof. Kielhorn's edition, 113; on Krishna Vasudeva, 283 n. and the Sârakhyâ-Yoga | 255; 385 n. |
| patch, a measure | 264 and n.; 294; 296; 309 |
| pâthâ, an Indian measure | 76 n. |
| Pâtâheyya, one of the four great divisions of India | 82 and n. |
| pathyârâ, tavâdârâ, a receiver | 75 |
| pâtamâr, pattamâr, a courier | 264 |
| Patika, satrap, his Taxila copper-plate inscription | 27; 30 and n.; 55; 63; 71 |
| Patika Kushâlaka, satrap | 247 and n.; 250 |
| Pâtmokkha, the, 14, 16; 85 f.; 88; 90, 91, 96 n. | 99–101 |
| Patânavars, a śaving caste (Poturâsa Patnavã) | 317 and n. |
| pâdâra, vase | 88 n.; 105 |
| Pattarumâ, Nattupattans, a caste | 334; 336 |
| Patârnâppâlai, a Tamil work by Radirângânapûrãn | 238, 234 |
| Pattini Devi, goddess (Kânnâlî), 232; 239; or Kaâvûl | 241 |
| Paula, St., sepulchre of | 159 and n. |
| Paula Romans, or Paola, St., Abbess | 159 and n. |
| Parâuchâthi, daughter of Zaraûshtrâ | 338 |
| Pâvâ, tn. in Bihar | 2 |
| Pawânândimunnâ, author of the Tamil Neethi | 200 |
| Pavas, for bâbù | 311; 313 |
| Peerâpallâ, Nizâpâlâm, E. I. Co.'s factory, 219 f.; 263 f.; 267, 271, 275, 284, 288, 290. | 318 f.; 322 |
INDEX.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Page(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pester, for saltpetre</td>
<td>213; 311 ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Péhan (Vaiyávikkón Perumbâhan), a patron of Tamil literature</td>
<td>290; 297; 243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pethon, son of Agenor, satrap of Sindh under Alexander the Great</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennâzâam, destroyed by Parântaka</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennar, (northern), riv., limit of Aûkása's power</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penteecost</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perâr, riv.</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pericles</td>
<td>341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periplus</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periyârapudâmân, a Tamil work</td>
<td>201 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periyâr, riv.</td>
<td>233; 236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persia, the Sassanian Empire in, 74; intercourse with Tibet, 80; travels of R. Bell and J. Campbell in, 156 ff.; and the use of tobacco, 210; E. I. Co.'s trade with</td>
<td>215 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persian Affinities of the Liochavis, by Prof. S. Chandra Vidyabhushana, M. A.</td>
<td>78 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persian use of the word Asâka, 41 f.; inscrip. recording Humayun's visit to Sârnâth</td>
<td>378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persian Merchant, E. I. Co.'s ship</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persians, Parâkshas, 40; 80; and Kandâhâr, 174; overthrew the Medes</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perumânhâppâdî, the Bâzâ co.</td>
<td>354 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perumânhâppâdî, a work, and the Tondâmân Irandirayan</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perumânhâppâdî, Tondâmân Irandirayan</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perumânhâppâdî, Chera k., 230 n.; defeated, 204; overthrew Tagadâr</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perundâvâjâr, Tamil poet</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perurâvirâlî, Chôla k.</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peshâwar, Purushâpura, 57; and Sabuktîgîn, 110 and n.; besieged by the Afgânas, 174; and Kani-kâ's stâpa, 160; the Shâhji-ki-Dhera at</td>
<td>372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peshâkash, peshâkash, a present</td>
<td>294; 297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter, St., prison of</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pêjdrâi inscrip.</td>
<td>353 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pettipolese, Paddâpalle, 214 ff.; 223, 224 f.; 263 ff.; 285 ff.; 294 ff.; 309 ff.</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phâdáti, subdivision of a kothî</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip, St., baptised the Eunuch</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip, son of Machetâs, satrap of the Pañjâb under Alexander the Great</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philipp, battle of</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phirmennâ, farmâna, 218, 227, 233, 236 ff.; 311 f.</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phor-bu, drinking-cup</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phraates II., k. of Parthia</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phraates IV., k. of Parthia, death of</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phraât, k. of Parthia</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phraât, k. of Parthia</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phraât, k. of Parthia, death of</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phraât, k. of Parthia, death of</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phraât, k. of Parthia</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pîddâ, pyddâ, a peon</td>
<td>77 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pîlavan, valley, N. N. E. of Bêwâ, inscrip. of Gângâyadâya in</td>
<td>146 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pîzza di Spagna, in Rome</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pikura, vill. in Mundâoâraka, copper-plate inscrip. in</td>
<td>283, 284 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pillai, Mr. A. V., and Tamil literature</td>
<td>235 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilli, Damodaran, and the Tolkâppiyâ-porulâdîhârem</td>
<td>193 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilli, Mr. R. K., and The Tamils of 1800</td>
<td>236 n.; and the site of Tagadâr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pillai, the late Mr. S., and Tamil dates</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pillai = P Perumâl = ayyânâr, Tamil poet</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pillayadis, Unnithi women</td>
<td>338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilot, Pylot, palace of</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pirey, Muhammadan governor of Ghazân</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pîthârîj Chauhânâ, Printhêt Râji Châhu- mâna, q. s.</td>
<td>123; 123, 133, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pisa, Pêesa</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piscash, peshâkash, a present</td>
<td>294; 297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pischel, Prof., on the Brahmagiri inscrip.</td>
<td>346; Index to Prakrit words occurring in his &quot;Grammatik der Prakrit Sprachen&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pishâkar, subdivision of the Prathilâmâjî Ambalavâsi caste</td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitâkas, the Buddhist</td>
<td>9 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitamârmar, subdivision of the Anûlâmâja Ambalavâsi caste</td>
<td>357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitîhâpura, seat of the Châlukyas</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piyâdaisi, title of Aûkása</td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plato, Bactrian k., 26; and Seleucidan era, 40; 44; 69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plutarch on Androcóctos</td>
<td>343 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pocock's Travele in the East 156 n.; 157 n.; 153 n.; 159 n.</td>
<td>153 n.; 159 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Podili, in Nellorc Dist., inscrips. from, 199 n.; 201; 336, 357 n.</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Podiyil Hill, in the W. Ghâta</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Podîthâjîna, k. of Aravâyâr</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polekshân II. (Pulekshân), his embassy to Khosrau</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Po-lo-ko-lo-ki-li and Śrîgarvasta</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poṣhî, Kâvēri, riv.</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pora Puduvâl, subdivision of the Puduvâl caste</td>
<td>338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porto Ferrajo, fort feraro, in Elba</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porto Langore, port Langowne, in Elba</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porto Novo, and the E. I. Co.</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese introduced tobacco into India, 210; and the Dutch</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>porul = adigrâm (Tamil) meaning of 193 f.</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purnârâdîwâppâdî, a work by Mûdâthâma Kannîyâr, and k. Karikâla</td>
<td>233 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purnârâdîwâppâdî, a work by Mûdâthâma Kannîyâr, and k. Karikâla</td>
<td>233 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purnhul Ijamgiranâr, a Tamil poet, 231; or Ilam Kirânsî</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pûras, Indian k.</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INDEX.

Prabodhachandradaya, a play by Krishnamurtha, mentions Kiritvarman's conquests... 148
Prachi or Magadha ... 345
Prachinaghartha, Apastaratamas ... 385
Prachhaha, 261; or Prakriti, 377 ff.; 382 and n.; 383; and Purusha ... 386 n.
Pradumnas, conditioned spirit, 261; 373 n.;
Sanatkumara, intelligence, 377 and n.; 370 n.; 381; 383 and n.; Hari ... 384; 386 n.
Prasianis, of the Prachi or Magadha kingdom ... 343
Prasijotisa, Assam ... 80
Pratyabhijita's Adidasa, references to the Bhottas or Bhaatas in ... 141 f.
Prakrit dialects in the Sarnath inscriptions ... 278
Prakrit words occurring in Pischel's "Grammatic der Prakrit Sprachen," appendix ... 133–148
Prakriti, 260 f.; 373 f.; or Prachhaha, 377 and n., ff.; 382 n.; 383 n.
Pranamadala (?) cave in Kashmir ... 183
Prappati-yoga ... 236
Prasada, grace ... 254; 230 and n.
Prasenajit's conversations to Buddhism ... 100 n.
Pratapap, a Chandella k., ... 144
Pratapradra, Kakatiya k., 200; captured Conjeeveram ... 357 and n.
Pratappradriya, a work by Vidyapada ... 200
Prathilomajasa, sub-division of the Ambalavasi caste ... 335; 337
Prathihara, Parihara, a Gurjara dynasty in Kanauj ... 133; 140 f.; 144 n.
Pratimoksha, a Buddhist work, 16, 17 and n.; 85 ff.; 95 f.; 98 ff.
Pravaha, Jaivali, a Paishalha Khatriya ... 252
Pravritti, action ... 373; 378 f.; 382 f.; 385
Prayaga, Allahabad, scene of Dhanga's death, 141
Princop and the earliest known Indian Alphabet ... 315
Prisangadhara ... 383
Prithvi, Prithvi, Raja of Chhahamana, 122;
conquered Jejhabhakti, 129; 133 f.; occupied Mahoba ... 145
Prithivilvyaghra, a Nishala chief ... 392
Prithivirajan, Chandella k., 121; 126 f.; 139 f.; 144; 148
Priyasaha, commentator on the Bhbudai, 282 n.
Proby, Mr. C., E. I. Co.'s servant ... 218
Ptolemy ... 179
Ptolemy, Philadelphia, k. of Egypt, called Turciacao ... 343
publications on Chandella History, by V. A. Smith ... 115
Puckle, Major, and Amb. Salisbury ... 319; 322
Paduvil, sub-division of the Prathilomajah Ambalavase caste ... 333
Puhar, Kaverippumbatthanam, home of Gopala and Kamakshi, 291 f.; destruction of, 293 ff.; 239 f.; 243
Pujj, meaning of ... 248 f.
Pulha, a Rishi ... 375 n.; 379
Pulam, perhaps the ancient Pulandai ... 193
Pulandai, Pulam, scene of a battle fought by Nejumaran ... 196, 198
Pulaya, a Rishi ... 376 n.; 379
Pulekshin (? Polekevin), 24; and the Pallavas ... 351
Pulikudimal, Irungavel ... 230
Pulimaya, Sattakarni, k., ... 242 n.
Punnadha (kottieria tintoria), plant ... 182
Punnar caste and the Hakali ... 209, f.
Puppala Chandella queen, wife of Yasovarman, 126, 128
Puppallis, a Pushpakan caste ... 335 f.
Purana, Purana, a Buddhist monk, 3 n.; 5 and n.; 6 and n.; 16, 17 and n.; 103
Puranam, a collection of Tanjore works, 229 f.; 234 n.; 236, ff.
Puranas, the, and invasions of India, 23; give Andhra names, 281; and the Pallavas, 292; among the Chakkiyaars, 335; and k. Mahak Padma ... 342
Parang, t., ... 193
Parangga, and the W. Tibetan kings ... 332; f.
Puri, temples at ... 260
Purusha, and the Kshatriyas, 251 n.; the Male, 258, 255, 159; Narayana 373; 375, 377; ff.; 383 ff.
Purushadatta, k., inscrip. of ... 292 and n.
Purusapura, modern Peshawar, probably Kanishka's capital ... 57
Purva, the first-born ... 375
Pushkarini, tank at Tanjore ... 205
Pushpakan, subdivision of the Anulomajah Ambalavasi caste ... 335 ff.
Pushpini, Brahmans, = Pushpakan women. 336
Pushyanitra, the Sunga, date ... 69
Pushyauddha, a friar, 32; inscrip. of ... 73
Pathuvavarsa, = women of the Padurul caste ... 338
Pyyadi, piddi, a poon ... 77 and n.
Qandhar, and Seleukos Nikator ... 25
Quilandy, Tomi ... 237
Quilon, cap. of Kerala ... 240 n.
Quintus Curtius Rufus, on Nanda of Magadha ... 341
Rachel's sepulchre ... 159
Radcliffe, Peter, E. I. Co.'s servant ... 324
Baghul's foreign conquests ... 6.
INDEX.

Rāchhuji I., Bhouslā k. and the Rāmōk temp-
ples .... 203
Rāchhawālas, a work by Kālidāsa ... 80
Rābī, t ... 145 n.
Rāgbila, Chandāla k. ... 126—127, 127—130, 130,
134
Rākhalavarman (Rahil Bhīhū) and Khajūrāho ... 134
Rākhiya ... 381
Rainbow, E. I. Co.'s ship ... 256
Ramchand Shah, Rīchhana Bhaṅṭṭa ... 192
Rajpur, in Chhattsigarh, probably cap. of
Mahā-kośāin, inscrip. at ... 24
Rāiṇāta ... 85 f.
Rajabāhu, probably Gājānāhu ... 240
Rājagriha, scene of the first Buddhist Coun-
cil ... 2, 3, 5, 7, 17 and n; 18, 107; 180; 312
Rājamārtana, possibly Rājamaṇyā, E. Chā-
lukya k. ... 333 n. and n.
Rājamaṇyā, a hero ... 333 n.
Rājāriya I., Chō' k. and the Yēṅgi co. ... 35
Rājāriya II., date of, etc. ... 355 n. and 356 n.
Rājāriya III., Chō' a k. ... 356 n.
Rājāriya, inscrip. on the Ken ... 139 n.
Rājāṣ, inscrip. on the red sandstone found at ... 49
Rajora, inscrip. of Mahāndeva ... 144 n.
Rajputa, under Jāyadāma, 60; and Rūdrā-
dāman ... 61
Rajputa (Kabṛatriya), the Chandels, 131,
137; or Rashwoods ... 297; 312
Rajuka, word in the third Rock Edict. ... 19, 21
Rajula, or Rājāvala, a strap, 27, 50; 54 ff.; 61; 70
Rājyaśāla, k. of Kānajj, slain, 128; 130 n.
and Muhūnd of Ghazni ... 143
Ram, Rama Euphrates ... 159 f.
Rāma, Rāma, temples at Rāmtēk ... 202 ff.; 378
Rāmāchandra, Chatrājuhi or Lakṣāmanji, 133; in Kashmir, 189 f.; incarnation 254;
269 and n.
Rāmāchandra, Hāshayaśavāmūk k. ... 204
Rāmagiri (of Kalidāsa's Meghadūta), pro-
bably Rāmtēk ... 209
Rāmānanda, propagated the teaching of
Rāmbāra ... 202
Rāmānuja on Brahman, 264 n.; on the Pāṇicha-
rātra cult ... 258; 269 n.; 262; 341; 355
Ramapatam, Ramapatnam, in. and Amb.
Salisbury ... 290
Rāmāyana, the, and Rāma, 202; and the
Chākkījya ... 356
Rāmārī Hill cave inscrip. of the Siṅgēlga
State ... 33
Ramnagar (Akhicchara) inscrip. from ... 33
Ram Rāṣ, his book on Hindu architecture ... 280
Ram Talai, tank at Rāmtēk ... 204 f.
Rāmtēk, in Nagpur Dist., a visit to, by Hira
Lal, B. A. ... 202 ff.
Rāmōk Māhātmya, the, 202 n.; 204; or
Sinduragrī ... 265 n. and 266
Rāsājīt Sinha of the Paṇījāb ... ... 43
Rāṣṭrakujana, a surname of K. Nējumāṇaṣ ... 165
Rāṣṭrakujana, temple at Nellore ... 357
Rākhalpur—Jūral, temple in the Paṭhāna State 132 n.
Rāṣṭrādayaṇī, a surname of K. Nējumāṇaṣ ... 156
Rāsōn, E. J., his Indian Coins, 20 n.; 28;
44 n.; 51; 54, 55 n.; and the Kashaṭrapāla. 246
Rātārī Tālkōra, Tamil inscrip., in 200; and
Chōjā records ... ... 316
rasā, juice of fruit ... ... 85
Rasan, a fort in Bāndā ... 114
Rashwoods, Rāsāṭs ... 297; 311 f.
Rāṭhrākotāṣa, and Chāllukya, 24; and
Kanaṇj 138; of Mallback, at war with the
E. Chāllukya, 332 f.; and the Chōjaja,
334 and n.
Ras Khanzir, Cape Porto, or Cape Hogg,
167 and n.
rasā kānd, kitchen tax ... ... 76
ratā, indecisive fight ... ... 75 n.
Rasāmru, cap. of the Haiyayās, Kālačhuri
inscrip. from ... ... 204 and n. and 206 n.
Rādhas, and the Second Buddhist Council ... 312
Rasāmru, inscrip. of Jājīlaṇaṇa at ... 118; 123
Rāṭṭaṇ, the, and Vijayaśītīya II. ... 322
Raverty, Major, on Ghazni, 139 n. 140 n.;
and the Khōghkhar, 142 n.; and the Chandels,
146 n.; list of works by him, 176 f.; his
Notes on Afghanistan ... ... 211
Rāvarmaṇa, Kumadika k. and the Pallavas ... 357
Rāvarmaṇa, Kśirā k. ... ... 357
Rawlinson, on the decay of Parthia, 61, 62 and n.
Rāyakōṭa, plate inscrip. ... 290
Read, Ed., and Amb. Salisbury ... 217 f.
References to the Bhōṭas or Bhaṅṭṭas in the
Rājāgaṛāṅgaṅī of Kashmir, by Pandit Daya
Ram Sahni and A. H. Francke ... 181 f.
Rēhuta, Ḍūرغī Masūn in Rewā, fort ... 137 n.
Religion of the Iranian Peoples, by the late
C. P. Tiele (con. from Vol. XXXV, p. 193) 7.—The duties of the faithful ... 355 f.
Religion, must consecrate marriage in the
Zarthushidian creed ... ... 358
INDEX.

Remarks, some, on the excavations at Saṁsthā, carried out in the year 1904-5, by F. O. Oertel ... 277 ff.

Rêwa, visited by Sir A. Cunningham, 114; inscriptions at ... 124; 129; 135

Revata, contemporary of Bhārayat 38 and n.; 84 and n.; 95, 98 and n.; 98, 103

Rice, Mr. B. L. discovered the Mysore Edicts of Asoka, 347; his Epigraphia Carnatica, 352 n.

Rijjâvâ, a sage ... 79

Riśhakha Bhâṣuṭha, Ladakhi k. of Kashmir, history of, 183 f.; called Rainaham Shah ... 192

Rishabhadhātta, Uahāradātta, 43; 63; ruled Mahârâshtra ... 212 n.

Rishiṣpatana = a dwelling-place of sages (for Benares) ... 277

Rishis, the seven ... 27

Rishadhāman ... 331

Rock Edict of Asoka, the third ... 10 ff.

Rock Edicts of Asoka and the law of Piety, 343; 348

Rockhill, Mr., and the Buddhist rules, 90; 91 n.; 95 n.; 96 n.; 100 n.; 101 n.; 105 ff.

Rodgers, Mr., and Chandēl coins ... 147 f.

Rome, struggles in, 81; and Armenia, and war with Parthia, 72, 74, 199; becomes a Republic ... 341

Romān, Consular period, 98 B. C., coins of, found in the Mânikyâla tope 41, conquest of Egypt 71, of Nisibis ... 78 n.

Ross, Mr. A. H. and the Khokars and Gakkars ... 142 n.

Rovello, rottelo, rattle, a weight, 161 and n.; 162

Roxana, daughter of Oxyartes, married by Alexander ... 25

Rucca = ruço, a letter ... 284-289; 318

Rudhirôgdârîn, cyclical year ... 204; 208

Rudrâṅgaṇaṁśvar, author of the Puṭṭhāṇap-śālī ... 357

Rudra, g. ... 241; 377; 379 and n.; 380; 381; 383

Rudradâna, Starâpa 43; 56; becomes Mahâ-Âkhatrapa ... 73 f.

Rudrâdâna, Šatrap ... 60, 81, 83; 180 n.; 372

Rudrâdâna, Kâhatrapa k. and the Pâlavas, ... 282; 372

Rudrâmbâ, Rudrâdâva-mahârâja, Kâkatîya k. 357

Rudrâ-sarman, an incarnation of the god Kamâša, story of ... 194

Rûdrāsena, a Satrap, Muliasar inscription of, 74, 180 n.

Rûdrâshâha ... 74

Rummindei Pillar, set up ... 350 n.

Rund, a rebel ... 78 n.

Rûnâbâd, inscription ... 21-23; 316 ff.

Saδâśat Khân, Moghal governor ... 61

Sabakâmîn, Buddhist monk, 84 f.; 95, 96 and n.

Sabina, empress, wife of Hadrian, coins of, in the Aḥīnphosh Śālī ... 41

Sabuktigîn, Amir, captured (Ghazni, 139; and Jau±ā, 140 and n.; 141

Saccrament, the Holy, its institution ... 157

Sâbhâjâya, for Parâṣāhita ... 197

Sâgar in Bundelkhand, inscription in, 130, ff.; 144 n.

Sahadâva, a Pândava, subdued the Andhuras ... 281

Sañjâjâ, city ... 83

Sañtrasâ, rock edict 21-23; 349 and n.; 346

Sâhâ, k. of Kâta ... 116

Sahribahlol, medallions from ... 179

Sâhâya, Sâkârâni territory ... 242 n.

Sâlīd, Sultan of Kashmir, invaded Tibet ... 192

Sâlviâga dynasty ... 342

Sâla, creed embraced by a Jain, 201 n.; worship, and the Vaiśhnavas ... 205

Sâka, era, and Kâniṣka, and Kusâna inscriptions, 27; 30; 31; 32; 41-45; 47-51; 53, 55, 57; 59-64; 67, 68; 72, 75; 230; 342

Sâkadvipa and Jambudvipa ... 42

Sâkâ Muni, inscribed on a red sandstone ... 49

Sâkardara inscription of the year 40 ... 73

Sâka in India before the Kusânas 50, 245, and Gôtânâpura ... 292

Sâkastana, Sakasthana; 98; Sêgestan, and the Mathurâ lion pillar inscription ... 247-249

Sâktas, Siva-worshippers ... 255

Sâkya and Sâka ... 63 and n. 81; 82; 97

Sâlátâb Khân Nawâb, under Akbar ... 152 f.

Sâla, a Bihâshu ... 56

Sâliâmâna, or Sâka era ... 51, 63

Sâlivâhana, era maker ... 206

Sâlivâhanas, Sâlivâhana, the Andhras, ... 231 and n.

Sailakhanyâpâ I., 'Chandêl k. of Mâhâbha ... 148 n.

Sailakhanyâvar, Chandella k. 126 f.; called Hallakhâna, 129; 144; coins of ... 148

Sâllamores, Chintz, E. I. Co.'s trade in ... 319 ff.


Salisbury, Salisbury, Ambróse, of Ravenstone in Leicester and Derby; Hugh; Samuel, E. I. Co.'s Steward, at Surat, possibly relations of Amb. Salisbury ... 213

Salisbury, Anns, niece of Amb. Salisbury ... 213; 323

Salisbury, Susanna, mother, and niece, of Amb. Salisbury ... 213; 325; 326

Salpester, Peter, E. I. Co.'s trade in ... 213; 216 ff.; 235 ff.; 243; 268 ff.; 309 ff.

Sâmâni, dyn., of Persia ... 139
INDEX.

Sañgamaṅga, Sañkara-maṅga, near Cunjeevaram, battle of Arīkēśarīn Parakūpaṇ against Nandivaran ... 197 f.

Sanghabhadra, and the 'Dotted Record' attached to the Visaya Pīlaka ... 349

Sanghabhadra, Sūtrap of W. India ... 74

Saṅghamitra, Saṅghamitra, son of Ananda ... 65

San Gianbattista, St. John the Baptist, a quarter of Genoa ... 169

San Giorgio, St. George, a quarter of Genoa ... 169

Saṅkara ... 341

Saṅkaramanagai, Saṅgamāṅga ... 197 f.

Saṅkhāpāda, son of Svarūpītakah ... 384

Saṅkhya doctrines of Kapila ... 341

Saṅkila ... 352

San Lorenzo, St. Lawrence, a quarter of Genoa ... 169

Saṅkreat, in Buddhist inscriptions, 29; use of Śaka, 42; waning in India, 112; and the Rāmēṅk inscriptions, 204; poetry 212; works on architecture, 280 and n.; charters, and the Pallava kings ... 288 and n. Saṅkhā, Saṅkhā, a deed of grant ... 75

Saṅnatinātha, image of, at Rāmēṅk ... 204

Sapor I, k. of Persia, coins of, 62; defeated Valerian ... 74

Sapor II., k. of Persia ... 74

Saptarṣi, date ... 32

Saptarṣīḷā, or “mound of the Seven Riṣis” near the site of the Mathūr lion capital ... 345

Saptāhi Kal, the Lunāka era ... 25

Saṭāra “lākha, assarh, 164; see Assera ... 161 n.

Saṃsāra, rūv ... 261

Saṅkarasāti or Śrīnātha Devī goddess, temple at Mahīyār ... 136

Saṅnāṭhā, inscrip., 22; 39; 40; 48; 52; 55; 66; 68; 72; 247 n.

Saṅnāṭhā, Maurian rail found at, 179; Gupta Monasteries in ... 190

Saṅnāṭhā, Remarks on Excavations at ... 277 ff.

Sarvakaṇhā, Buddhist monk ... 93; 108, 105 f.

Sarvāstivādin, and the first Buddhist Council ... 9 n.

Sarvāstivādins, Buddhist sect, 1–5; 9; 11 and n. ... 17 n. 246

Sāsākā, Gaṅgā plate inscript. of ... 53

Sasanian, early dynasty and the successors of Gondophernes, 62; in Persia ... 74

Sāsā, Sāsā, name of a Buddhist, 347 and n.

Sāsātha, death of ... 257 n.

Sātakarni of the Matagapurdhā, a dynasty, ... 341 f.

Sātavāhana or Andhrabhṛtya family, inscriptions of, 46; or Sātavāhanas ... 281 and n.

Sāṭha, a sage ... 63.
Senart, M. and the Third Rock Edict, 21 ff.; and Kharoshthi inscriptions, 30 n.; 31 n.; 47 n.; 64; and the Kaldar, etc., 66; 178; 346 f.; 349 n.; 371
Sendalai, scene of a battle fought by Nandipottanar... 173
Sêndrakas, possibly Nâgas... 352 n.
Seigutyavan Sêra, k. patron of letters, 228—
231; 233 f.; his victories, etc., 233—239; invaded the North, etc. ... 241—243
Sennachernih's army ... 159
Sen-rab, a famous bon teacher ... 80
seed, sêst, manager of the bûgar ... 75
Sêngulche, the holy ... 158
Sêka, Sâmkârañha, the living soul ... 377 and n.
Sêhagiri Sêstri's, Prof. M., Essay on Tamil Literature ... 193
Sêkanâga, incarnated as Lâkhamâna ... 206 n.; sêkañâra = theistic ... 256
Set Mâhet, inscr. from, 50; Bêdhisattva statue at ... 160
Sêvîr, probably in S. Timnehly, battle-field, 196, 198
Sewell's, Mr., mention of Krîsha, the Kâkâtyya ... 357
Shahdheri, Taxiia, inscr. ... 67
Shah Allah, Bahadur, and the Sâhabdâr of Kâbul ... 211 n.
Shâbâzgârî inscr. ... 19 f.
Shâkiya, a Türkî family, suggested ancestors of Kañoska ... 41, f.
Shâkiya, Hindu Kings of Kâbul ... 140 n.
Shâh Jahân, emp. of Delhi, in Pâñjâb legend 151, 154 f.; and Kâbul ... 174
Shâkîj-ki-Dhori, at Peshâwar ... 372
Shâh Mir ... 186
Shâhu, Sivâjî's grandson ... 243
Shakardar, (near Campbellpore), inscr. of the year 40 ... 63 f.
Shams-ud-dîn Muhammad Iyâtîmi, ('Alî-\tâmah,' afterwards Sultan of Delhi) invested Kâlahâjar ... 142
Shâhâdra, or Shâstra ... 150; 375
Shepherd, Mr. J., and R. Bell ... 163 f.; 166
Sherghar, in the Adam Khel Afridi country, attacked by the Mughals ... 174
Shering, on Sàrûmah ... 279 and n.
Shîr Shâh besieged Kâlahâjar ... 146.
Shihab-ud-dîn or Gheri, Muizz-ud-dîn ... 145
Shingler, Mr. T., E. I. Co.'s servant at Ped-dapalle ... 214—216
Siâklot, Kot, vil. also called Nâyagôn or Ohhotâ Jâñâwâ ... 111
Sîam (Upper) temple in, containing bas-reliefs, 246; the Buddhist, and the Sêkâ era ... 342
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>423</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sibi, mythical k.</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sicily isl.</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siddapur (Brahmagiri) inscrip. 21–23; 32</td>
<td>245; 247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siddharja—Jayasingha, k. of W. Gujurat, defeated by Madavarman</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siddharta, prince</td>
<td>173; 378 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side Mearpaffier, for Sasyil Mir Jâir</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidon, Sydon</td>
<td>161 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sie, Yu-chi general, and the Chinese</td>
<td>57, 59; 72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sienn, 159 n.</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sihander II, reputed founder of the Jam</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>slabus, anklets</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silapadhiyakram, or The Epic of the Anklet, a work by Harango, 228 n.; 229 n.; 230; 233; 234 n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siloam, Silo, pool of</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sipasasthas, dealing with architecture, etc., proposals for collection and translation of</td>
<td>277; 280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simale Sinhala, words occurring in the</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asoka Pillar Edict V</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinh, Lichavi k. of Varendra</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinhâchâlam, in Vizagapatam Dist, inscrip. from</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simulala, co. conquered by Srimâra, 197; and Aposta</td>
<td>343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinhasa, Sri, perhaps a Hainayanasî k.</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinhavarman, Pallava k. in Sanskrit copper-plate inscrip.</td>
<td>283 and n.; 284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinhavarman I, Pallava k.</td>
<td>284 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinhavarman II, Pallava k.</td>
<td>284 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinla Hill State, State officials in</td>
<td>77, 78 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon, Symon, of Cyrus</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon, Symon, the Leper</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon, Symon, the Pharisee, ho use of</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinai, m. St. Helena's Monastery on</td>
<td>159 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sind, a Greek satrapy</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sindhu, province conquered by Zain-ul-Abibid</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sindora Baoli, at Rântak</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sindurangi, 'The Vermilion Mount,' name of Rântak.</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singa</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singaurgarh, Chandel fort, and Râdâ Bâlî Chandel</td>
<td>114; 144 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singhapur-Baghârî, inscrip. from</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singhpur Darwâsa, in Rântak</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>singilôna, singilôkasoppa, a Buddhist rule, 81, 83, 85, 88, ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinnamâthir, inscrip. and the genealogy of the early Pandyan kings</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sion, Mount</td>
<td>157 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siprâvitha</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siron Khurd, or Sîyanda</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sirgaja State, and the Râmagarh Cave inscrip.</td>
<td>299; 332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sirrâmà, State, or Nâhu</td>
<td>236 f.; 236, 238 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sirrâmâphâ, battlefield</td>
<td>293 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sirusântal, Chirmamana, vil. in Tândî-nâdu, inscrip. from</td>
<td>145 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sirupâmâtpamâtapâ, a poem by Nallur Nat- tattamâr.</td>
<td>229 f.; 229, 238 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sita, goddess</td>
<td>206 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sittthâlai Sâmâtanâr, Tamil poet</td>
<td>238 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sittthâlilâcchîthattanâr or Madurai Kâlavkugan</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sittan, Tamil poet</td>
<td>238 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siva, g, 152 n.; 153; 173; 230 n.; 233 n.</td>
<td>255 n.; 259 f.; 260; 282; 233 f.; 234 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and the Pârâphata philosophy, 335; temples of, 117; 123; 311; 291 n. built by Vijayâ- ditya II, 355; the three Isâgas of</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sivaganga, a Zamindari</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sivâji</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sivamara, W. Ganga k. and Varaguna Pâdyan</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siva Panchâyatanas, in the Chinnâ temple</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siwaddavarmanus, a Pallava k., his Maydınâ plât epigraphs.</td>
<td>282 and n.; 284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siwano, Suena or Sui, riv.</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siwonti, emp. of China</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Si-Yu, the Western Provinces, restored to China</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sjyajânt, or Siron Khurd in Gâwâlî, inscrip. from</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sjyaka-Hara of Malva, defeated the Rash-trakutas</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skandagupta k.</td>
<td>371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skandapura, Kandukur</td>
<td>283 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skandasâbya, Pallava k.</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skandavarman I, Pallava k.</td>
<td>283 and n.; 284 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skandavarman II, Pallava k.</td>
<td>283, 284 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skandavarman III, Pallava k.</td>
<td>284 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skandâs, essential properties of a living body</td>
<td>10n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skardo, Böltistân</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skaradheri (Skaradheri), image inscrip., 31; 46; 62; 63; 74; or Suâs-dheri</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slâghiyâr, Slâghiyâr, for Châkâljâr</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sleenam, Sir W., and Singaurgarh fort, 144; and the Chandels</td>
<td>146 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith's, V. A. (and F. W. Thomas') Asoka Notes, 19 ff. on inscrips., etc., 27 ff.; 42-44; 48 and n.; on Kanika's dates, 51 and n.; 53 n.; on the Sattraps, 54 f.; 57 and n.; on Tibetan Affinities of the Lichchavis, 78; Early History of India, 25 n.; 26 n.; 45 n.; 44 n.; 43 n.; book-notice of Second Edition 178 ff.; 371 f. on Chandella history, 115; on Asoka, 281; and the Pallava's, 283 and n.; on the Nirvâna of Buddha, etc.</td>
<td>342 and n.; 345 ff.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INDEX.

Smith, Sam., E. I. Co.'s servant ... ... 325
Smithson, E. I. Co.'s inspector at Pednapalle ... ... 236
Smyth, Mr. W., E. I. Co.'s servant at Vernahoon ... ... 215 f.
Soğdiana, Soğdiana, a Kushan satrap, 27; 30; inscrips. of, 39; 46; date, etc., 49; 50; 58; probably governor of Mathurā, 56; 59; 63; 71; 247; 250
Soğdiana, Persian province, occupied by the Yos-chi, 32; the modern Samarkand and Bokhara, 78 n.; occupied by Alexander the Great and others ... ... 79
Sot, the Sc ... ... 26; 27; 37
Solar race, the Surya Vaivasa ... ... 79
Soi Raṭṭa, India ... ... 240 and n.
Sojiyaśasāndha Tirukkapanā, (Tirukkēt), a Malayamke chief ... ... 231
Soimon's Temple of Moloch, 156 f.; fountains ... ... 159 and n.; 160.
Sons, g ... ... 380 f.; 383
Somassundara, Siva deity at Madura, reputed author of the Līlagāyatrī=gaṇapūrī ... ... 193 f.
Somēśvara, k ... ... 261 n.
Somēśvara IV., Chālukya k ... ... 24
Sonavhain, Sons ... ... 82 and n.; 103
Sonājasa's Mathurā inscrip. ... ... 178
Sonde, Sonde, vil. in which are the Manda-por Pillars ... ... 107; 110
Sopāddōpanārinva, = Nirvāna ... ... 2 n.
Sophagasenos or Səphagəsənə, Indian chief, defeated by Antioches the Great ... ... 26
Sōptēs, Indian k. of Saubhuta ... ... 83 and n.
Soreya ... ... 83 and n.
Soter Megas, Baktrian K., coins of ... ... 62
soul, immortality and transmigration of ... ... 260 f.
Spain, 170; and tobacco ... ... 210
Spatagadumnes, a Scythian k ... ... 54; 70
Spalirises, a Scythian k ... ... 54; 70
Spence Hardy, on the Buddhist rules ... ... 99 and n.
spathtyavares = beneficent men ... ... 359 n.
Spenser, Dr., and the Bōdhisattvas ... ... 176
Srāvasti, inscrip. 55 f.; 72; in. site of ... ... 180; 372
Sri, g ... ... 383
Sri-Dharmas-pitaka-sampradāyika-nidāna, last Sanskrit work, which mentions Kaniṣka's conquest of India ... ... 57
Srikaśma, in. on the Krishnā, early Andhra cap ... ... 281
Sri-Kampavaram, Ganga Pallava k ... ... 322
Srikaṭha, son of Brahman ... ... 326
Srikkhandran, and the Chālukyas ... ... 24
Srīmā, Pāṇḍya K., other names of ... ... 197
Srīnāgāḥ, Brahmaṇa preceptor of Vikramāditya I ... ... 351 n.
Srīnagar, and Rūshhana, 183; Jama Masjid ... ... 192
Srīnāyana and Paṇḍāhās ... ... 252
Sri Parambi, Tirupparambiyam, a battlefield ... ... 239
Sriravata, hill or river, Nāγājūna, 227; perhaps Po-lo-mo-lo-ki-li ... ... 203
Sri Rāmaṇachandra, name in the Rāmātek inscrip. ... ... 294
Srirāmān, tn., its connection with Kāvalāna and Kān̄gā, 234; Kērala inscrip. at 357 n.
Srisailam, Siva liṅga at ... ... 200
Sri Sankarāchārya and the Brahmans ... ... 335
Sri Simhaṇa Kālopiṇākā, name in the Rāmātek inscrip. ... ... 294
Srīvara's Rājatarangini its references to the Bhuṭṭa or Bhuṭṭas ... ... 188–191
Srāvaṇa, the heavenly listener ... ... 333
Srōng-lde-btsan, king of Tibet ... ... 181
St. Andrew, rape in Cyprus ... ... 167 and n.
St. Barnardo, a quarter of Genoa ... ... 169
St. George, fort, and Amb. Salisbury, 264; 267 f.; 271; 275 f.; 339; 347 n.; 383; 322 f.
St. George, San Georgia, a quarter of Genoa ... ... 169
St. George and the Dragon ... ... 161
St. Jno. de Acra, tn ... ... 161
St. John Baptist, San Gianbattista, a quarter of Genoa ... ... 169
St. Lawrence, San Lorenzo, a quarter of Genoa ... ... 169
St. Peter's, in Rome ... ... 169
St. Simeon, the Stylite, St. Symon, monastery and pillar of ... ... 162 and n.
St. Stephen, martyr, gate of ... ... 156–158
St. Stephen, Santo Stefano di Cavalieri, Knights of ... ... 168 and n.
St. Thomas, and Goudophernes, 47 f.; 62; 156 and n.; 157
St. Thémis, shrine of ... ... 259 n.
Stodd, Mr., E. I. Co.'s servant ... ... 216
Steele, Mr., and R. Bell ... ... 102 f.
Stein's (Dr.) Rājatarangini, 57 n.; 60 n.; Catalogue of Inscriptions 61; reference to Bhuṭṭa-land ... ... 191
Sten Konow, Dr., and the late Pro. Fraz Kielborn, 113; and the Second Edition of Smith's Early History of India ... ... 178 f.; 371
Stiles, Mr., E. I. Co.'s servant ... ... 284
Strato I., a satrap, 54 f.; k. of the Panjāb ... ... 69
Strato II., a satrap ... ... 54 f.; 70
Streymnshon Master, E. I. Co.'s servant ... ... 323; 328
Stromboli, Stamboli, etc. ... ... 165; 167 and n.
Stūpas, at Beavara, 273; at Sārnāth ... ... 279 f.
Surkeles or Dung-gate of Jerusalem ... ... 153
Sūbhādāra, of Kābul, under the Moghals ... ... 211
Subhadda, Subhadra, a Buddhist monk, 2 and n.; 7 and n.; 8 n.
Subhagasesa, Sophagasenos ... ... 26
Subhāṣa, treasurer of Chandella, erected a temple ... ... 125
INDEX.

Subrahmanyā, the deity Kumār: 194; temple, in Mallam, Nellore Dist., contains the only
Pallava stone inscrip... 352
Suchīrasvās... 331
Sudarśana tank... 328 n.
Sudarśana Vīhasā, the, and Asiā... 349
Sūrā, k... 322
Sūrā, Saṃja, a satrap... 30; 247; 250
Suen... 37, 109
Sur-Vihār, copper-plate inscrip., 30 and n.: 31; 47; 53, 56 f.; 72
Sugriva, an ally of Rāma Chandra... 354
Sūhadeva, k. of Kashmir... 182 n.; 192
Sūlakṣṇa, a sage... 374
Sūltān Sād of Kashgar, his invasion of Tibet... 192
Sūltān Shujā, son of Shāh Jāhān... 154
Sūlūrā, div., contains Tamil inscrips... 336
Sumana, a bhikha... 85
Sumati, image of, at Mahābā... 190
Sumerpur, pargāna... 132
Sun, temples of, in Ambalā, in Rāmāk, 203 and n.: 204; and the origin of the Khaṭṭāriyas, 231 n.; worshipped of, and the Bāgavata creed... 263 f.; 41
Sundaramūrti/Nāyānār, Tamil writer... 341
Sundara-Pāṇḍya, k. Tamil inscription of... 357
Sundara-Pāṇḍya Jagatavarman, k., inscriptions of... 357 n.
Sūrīga, kings, 69; Empire, destruction of... 70
Sung-lin, mts... 72
Sūparṇa, winged animal... 384
Sur, a drink... 93 and n.; 35
Sūra, a holy river... 206
Sūrādā, temple in the Pāṭala State... 132 n.
Sūrāsenā... 89 n.
Sūrāṣṭra, co., satrap of... 248 f.
Surat, conquered by Rāṇādāman, 61; E. I. Co.'s factory at... 213 and n.; 214 f.; 219
Śrīsya, the sun-god, married Nikshubhā... 79; 378
Sūrāya Vānas, or So'ar race, of which are the Liochavis, 79; kings in Rāmāk... 203
Śūta... 203
Śūtta, Vīhāra, a Buddhist press... 85; 39; 100 n.
Śūttakhaṇa, a hermit, visited by Rāma... 202
Śūtrālākāra, the... 211 f.
Śuvārṇāśaka, son of Sañjkapāla... 384
Śuvārṇamūrti, mentioned in the Brahmagri inscrip... 245 f.
Śuvīśhaka, a Pallava, minister of Rāṇādāman... 282
Śuṣkī's, M., The First Buddhist Council, 1 n.; 2 n.; 3 n.; 4 n.; 5, 6
Śrāgata, the Venerable, or Suratha, a Buddhist monk... 106
Śrāvaka, and Sāka... 49 f.
Śrāvijit of Gandhāra, a teacher... 232
Śrāvyabhūva or Manu... 375
Śrīta... 241
Śrīta-dīpas, the White Continent... 372-376; 381
Śrīnagar house, captured by Bihma... 208 n.
Śrvān Lēvi, M., on Kāmīts, 28; on Māzand... 47
Synecdotical table of the Scythian period of
Indian History... 69, 72
Syria, became a Roman province, 70; visited by
Augustus, 71; and Egypt's meat supply. 165 n.
Tādāpa, E. Chāluṣkya k... 353
Tagadūr, in Mysore Dist., identified with
Dharavār, cap. of k. Pobuṭṭelina... 353
Te-hia, Bactria, and the Yūn-chi... 26; 32
Tails I., W. Chāluṣkya k... 354 n.
Tālāpa, W. Chāluṣkya k... 24
Tainur, emp... 149 n.
Tātirīya Arāvyakas, a Tamil work... 170 n.
Tajibhaṭṭa, a minister, under Ḥasan Khān, k. of Kashmir... 190
Tajik, Feris, cradle of the Bon Religion... 89
Tāj Khān, or Ṭāsh Bāgh... 150 n.
Tāj-ul-Musīr, the, and k. Paramardi's death... 129
Takabikhi, a hero... 353
Takht-i-Bahāl inscrip. of Gondophernes, 30 f.; 46 ff.; 61 f.; 65, 66; 74
Takṣasilī, or Taxiles in the Pañjab, satrap... 54, 245
Talakār, Chola territory... 340
Talakaṭā, captured by Ganga Rājā... 329
Talāmajjhi plate inscrip... 351
Talayālaṅgāna, scene of a Pandyian victory... 237
táli, marriage sign, 354; or táli-kettu... 357 f.
Tālīj Tirappanmāṭu, a vil. in S. Idua... 236 n.
Tamil, and Telugu, races in Nellore, 199 f.; 281 n.; co., home of the Kurukkal caste... 357
Tālāv, Pandyas, 356; invaded by the Kākāyas... 357
Tamil Historical Texts I.—Nandi-kikalambagam, 171 ff.; II.—Irāyāgar gaḻapporal... 153 ff.
Tamil Literature, Celebrities in... 237-248
Tamil of 1800 Years Ago, by K. Pilis, 193; 236 n.
Tākikr alphabet... 75
Tapōgiri, 'mountain of penance' a name of Rāmāk... 202 f.
Tārānākha, 1 n.; on the Council at Vaisālī. 81 n.
Tārīkhi-Kaṭhārī Aṣamī, Ṭha, and the Jami
Masīj... 192
tarpāgar, service as constable... 76
Tarwār Tilōk Chand, Rājā, governor of
Kanpur, possibly Tilōk (Tilok Sin?)... 149 and n.
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- Tash Beg Khan Mughal (Taj Khan), commander under Akbar ... 160 and n.
- Tahbargul, Buddhadasa ... 14, 15 n.; ... 341
- Tavernier’s travels ... 162 n.; 163 n.
- Tavukh-Rashidi, a work which mentions an invasion of W. Tibet ... 172
- Twaddar, or paathaiva, a receiver ... 75
- Taw Sein Ko, Mr., on Burmese Buddhism ... 180
- Taxila, Tellus’s, Greek Kingdom, 25; 54; 70; ... 77
- Taxila copper-plate inscriptions of Patika, 30 and n. 31; 55 f.; 69; 71
- Teki plate inscriptions of Chobaganja ... 351
- Telinga, co. ... 242
- Tehsul, in N. Arct Dist., scene of a battle fought by Nandi ... 171 ff.
- Telugu, and Tamil, races in Nellore, 199-201; co. occupied by the Andhras, 291, 292 n.; and the Pallava grants, 284 n.; 351, 355 and n.; or Guntur ... 315
- Telugu-Chobaganja of Nellore ... 287 and n.
- Temple, gate of the ... 157
- Ter-esarim, Tannasses and Amb. Salabury ... 219-222
- Tezavar, the Pandyas ... 172
- Tener-kijar ... 194
- Terms and titles, ancient administrative, in the Paishaj ... 75 ff.
- Terry, mentioned the bubble-bubble ... 210
- Tewar, Tripuri ... 141; 143
- Thaklos, a name in the Kaldarra inscription ... 66
- Thali, an oath ... 77; 78a d n.
- Thamno, Dist. and the Kalachuri Era ... 135
- Thand, Dist., and the Kalachuri Era ... 77
- Thanesar, dynasty of Ramayana ... 180; 372
- Theodora, Kaldarra inscription of ... 74
- Theirada, presbyters ... 90 n.
- Thevenot’s A Voyage into the Levant, 160 n.; ... 161 n.; 162 n.; 163 n.
- Thi-je-tan-po, k. of Tibet ... 80
- Thi-srong-de-tsar, k. of Tibet, persecuted the Bon Religion ... 80
- Thiyasamuni, Thiyatuu Nambiyaru, subdivision of the Anuvajjana Ambalavasi caste ... 335 f.
- Mtho-ling, monastery in Guge ... 382
- Thomas, Apostle, and St., contemporary of Gondepherns ... 47 f.; 62; and the Virgin Mary ... 156 and n.; 157
- Thomas, Mr. W. W. (and V. A. Smith), Anoka Notes, by, 19, ff.; on the use of Saka and ‘Seychian,’ 41; and the Thurikas, 42; on inscription ... 49 f.; 63; 75; 346 n.
- Thon-dbang-rnam-rgyal I, k. of Ladakh ... 189
- Tiberius, emp. of Rome, coins of, 23; wars with Artabanus III. of Parthia ... 71
- Tibet, and Lichchavi, 72, 79 and n.; and the Bam-jik alphabet, etc., 89 and n. 181;
- Adam Khan’s expedition to, 189; Hasan Khan’s expedition to, 190; invaded by Saitid Sultan ... 192
- Tibetans Affair of the Lichchavis, by V. A. Smith ... 78
- Tibetans, kings belonged to the Li-tsa-byi race 79 and n.; inscription at Gilgit, 152; in the Juma Manjil ... 192
- Tibetans, and Chinese, 181 f.; in Kolkota ... 188
- Tien-chou, India, conquered by Yen-kao-chin ... 93
- Tilak ( Tilak Sain ), the Kachhwahs, and Tarwar Tilok Chand, rajah ... 149 n.
- Tillasthenam, in Tanjore Dist., scene of a battle fought by Nandippottarasa ... 172
- Timi, Tucka’s brother ... 184 f.; 187
- Tippu Sultan, and Kurnode ... 173
- Tiridates, k. of Parthia, death of ... 73
- Tirujaj-sambanda ... 239
- Tirukkollitur, cap. of Malaimal ... 231; 327; 343
- Tirumalirunjolai, tn. ... 223
- Tirumalipalai, a caste in Malabar ... 338
- Tirumudikandari, ruler of Malaimal and Mullur Hill ... 231
- Tiruvavakkara, an Saiva saint ... 201 n.
- Tirunandun-thangam, a Tamil work ... 171 n.
- Tirupathi, Vengada, in N. Arct Dist., traditional northern boundary of the Tamil co. ... 199 f.; 354 n.
- Tiruppalattutti, inscriptions from ... 173
- Truppparaambiyam, Sri Parambi, near Kumbhakonam, a battlefield ... 239
- Tiruvadi, in S. Arct Dist., scene of a battle fought by Nandippottarasa ... 172; Raja’s inscription at ... 375 n.
- Tiruvallam, inscriptions from ... 173
- Thiruvalluvar, author of the Kural ... 239; 230;
- 236 n.; and n. ... 238
- Tiruvahambur, in Nellore, shrine at ... 952
- Tiruvanamaiyam = kavalam, a work by Pilai ... 170
- Tiruvilayadal, or Hulya, a work which refers to Ugravarna Pandyan ... 229; 236
- Thiyaya, and the Third Buddhist Council ... 342
- Titles and Terms, ancient administrative, in the Paishaj ... 75 ff.
- Titus, emp. of Rome ... 72
- Tobacco, is it indigenous to India? ... 210
- Tolkipiyam, Tamil grammar, Nachetanar Kinyar’s commentary on, 193 and n.; Tolkipiyam ... 199
- Tondainadu, co., ruled by Nandi, 171; or Tondinadu, 173; the Pallava dominions, ancient Jaysangopada-Chola-mandalam, 290 and n.; 351; 354
- Tondamun raja ... ... ... 239
- Tondamunandirayan, of Kanchi ... 234 f-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDEX.</th>
<th>427</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tondi, Quilandy, a Chera possession, 237 f.; an old Chola cap.</td>
<td>242 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toramāṇa’s inscriptions.</td>
<td>131, 183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>toran</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsi, riv., scene of a Šâhīya defeat</td>
<td>140 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trailóyavarman, Chandélía prince 123 f.; 125 f.; 129</td>
<td>called Trailóyamalla 135; coins of, etc. 146 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traipitkāpādhya’s Bala, inscr. of.</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trajan, emp. of Rome, coin of, in the Abhimāna stūpa, 41; his</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expedition to Parthia.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trans-Indus provinces, lost to the Kūsāna Empire</td>
<td>61; 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transmission of the soul, and the Bhāgavatas</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travancore, home of the Kurukkul caste. 335; 337</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travels of Richard Bell (and John Campbell) in the East Indies,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXXVI, p. 179)</td>
<td>156 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troad, an Indian measure.</td>
<td>76 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trevisa, Mr. J. E. L. Co’s chief at Peddapalle 214</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribhuvanahakravartin, Sri-Bājarājadeva, perhaps Rājarāja III</td>
<td>356 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trichinopoly, fort, 201, n.; called Uraiyar</td>
<td>234; 237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tridhātu</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tridakud</td>
<td>361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trilīṅga, derivation of</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trilōchanapāla, a Šāhīya k., defeated 140 n.; 142; read as Tārā</td>
<td>142 n.; 143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jayābāl; 142</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tripoli, Tripeloe</td>
<td>161 f.; 165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tripurārāntakam, in Kurnool Dist., Tamil inscr. from</td>
<td>356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tripuri, Tiwar, near Jabalpur, cap. of Chedi</td>
<td>141; 146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trīta, son of Prajāpati</td>
<td>375; 378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trivikrama, temple at Rāmthēk</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trombetti, Prof. Alf., on the unity of human speech</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyree, the ship</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tahāṅ-kāṅg, salt horn</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunh-ling, mts.</td>
<td>57; 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tukamala, subordinate k. of Bihār</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tukka (‘a Brugpa?)</td>
<td>192, 184 f.; 187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulalā-dāsa, poet</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tummaṇā, vil. in Bilāpur Dist., and the Haihayas</td>
<td>204 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tungabhadra, riv.</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turamaye, k., in an Aśoka edict, identified with Ptolemy Philadelphus, k. of Egypt</td>
<td>343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Türkmenen, Türkmenian</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey, and the use of tobacco</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turka and Christians 160 and n.; 161 and n.; 169 f.; conquered by</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khri-erong lde-btsen, emp. of Tibet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnour’s Mahasana</td>
<td>342 n.; 349 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turuṣka, race, and Kanika, 41; first mentioned in Sanskrit literature</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuvarai= either Dwāraka in Gujerat, or Dwāravati, Dwārasamudra of</td>
<td>233 and n.; 237 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Hoysalas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyre, Tyer</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ubaldo de Lanfranchi, Archbishop, founder of the Campo Santo</td>
<td>168 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Udābhīnāpurapura, Waihind or Ohind</td>
<td>140 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Udal, a Mahībā hero</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Udambara, tn.</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Udāyachandra, general under Nandivarman Pallavamalla</td>
<td>172; 197; 353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Udayagiri inscr. of Kāhāravela</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Udayana, k., named in a Kālanjara inscr. 208 n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Udayendiran grant of k. Nandivarman Pallavamalla and the Pallava</td>
<td>197; 283; 284 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kās; 284 n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uddālaka, a Brāhmaṇa</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Udana, k., and Ānanda</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ujjīpi, near Kajāya, birthplace of Madhvāchārīya</td>
<td>259 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Udayanēdava, a councillor</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ughā, to collect</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ugra=peru=Valudi, Pândya k., 193, 195, 197, 198 n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ugravarma Pândyan, a mythological hero</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ujjain, 131; and k. Anasipāl</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ujjain, cap of Mālāw under Cāṣṭana</td>
<td>60; 73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukkrirama-kōpaṇ, perhaps Ugra-kōpaṇ, a surname of Nandi</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulāg Khān, opposed Dalaki-wa-Maliki</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umā=Pārvati</td>
<td>385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umrē, in the Nāgpur Dist., and the Ghōḍā ceremony</td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Provinces, Chandēl coins in</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniyathiris, a caste</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnī, general term for several Anûlomāja</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambalavāsi castes</td>
<td>335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnithi, a Sāmāntārā caste</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>upādhyāya, a spiritual instructor</td>
<td>39 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upōli, Buddhist monk, 3, 5, 8, 15 n., 16; 18; 101 and n.</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upānayana ceremony, among the Antarallais</td>
<td>335 ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upān̐ikcaktra, philosophy of the</td>
<td>941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upārīcfaka, (Vasu), k. of Chedi</td>
<td>375 and n.; 376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unosatha, bi-monthly Buddhist ceremony, 81;</td>
<td>89 and n.; 105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uparsapalle, Cuddapah Dist., Kākatiya inscr. at</td>
<td>357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upārī-kudā, vil. in Madura</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upārī-kudā Kijār, head-man of Upārī-kudā, 194</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INDEX.

Uraýdr, Trichinopoly... 231; 234 ff.; 239; 242
Urga, seized by Parántaka... 197
Urga-Pândyan, k., 228 f.; 236 and n.; identified with Neum Chéryán... 237 f.
Urga-Peravrājā, Pándya k., patron of the third Saugam... 228
Aryan, a top-knot... 279
Uruvappañār–Darjétōkmēni, father of Kari-
kāla... 234
Uruvupalli, vil. in the Munḍarāsthra, copper-
plate inscrip. at... 233, 234 n.
Usánas, author of the Dharmasāstra... 375
Usāvadāta (Rēhabhadāsita), a Saka satrap, inscrips. of... 43; 46; 63 and n.; 248
U-tēr-vā-saun-kektān, or Usvayavangketān, Himsalaya tribes, and Baghu... 80 and n.
Utira, a Buddhist monk, 84 and n.; 86; 241

Vāda-Viṣṇugā-nādu and the Bānas... 173
Vadīkā, Kiti... 239
Vāniśākastum = bliss... 359 n.
Vācaig, riv. in Madura, battle near... 173
Vaiśkaṇānaas... 385
Vaiśkaṇaas... 381
Vaiśali, Vaiśāli, Vaiśāli scene of the second
Buddhist Council, 5, 15 n.; 16 n.; 17 n.; 52;
81 and n.; 54; 86–90; 110, f. f.; 345; and the Līchhavi; original home of the Lī-ten-yi kings, 79 and n.; exposure of the dead in... 80
Vaiśampāyana, a sage... 291 f.; 293 ff.
Vaiśākhavaram, a creed and Saiva, 205; revival
in Nellore... 355
Vaiyāvikpānā Pūrṇamāna, Pāhan... 230
Vaiṣājāputtasaka, tribe... 17 n.; 81 f.
Vaiṣājāman, captured Gwalior... 141
Vaiṣājāmanju, Bundelkand... 244
svājāman, throne at Bodh Gayā temple... 60
Vaiṣṇavarman, scribe of the Talamaṇḍi plate
inscrip... 351 n.
Vaka, castle near Mulbe... 187
Vākaikā, for Bhāndak, t.n... 208 n.
Vakatanaya, kinman of the Kālamāṇyā 182, 187
Vakkaleri, plate inscrip. of Kirttivarman II... 24
Vākpati, Chandē k... 126–128
Valabhi Sāvatr, the Gupta era... 53
Valāgases 111 ff.
Valāgaseses IV., k... 62
Valakārya Rāshi... 383
Valarian, emp. of Rome, defeated Sapor I... 74
Vallabha, conquered by Srimaśa... 197
Vambārāṇā, vil. in Sdrājā purya, grant of... 118
Vānabī, Nepalese record, and the Līchchavis, 79
Vānāspara, a Kahantra, satrap of Benares... 12 f.; 56; 72; 247 n.

Vānavaṇṭ-Mahālēvi, wife of Parantaka... 197
Vānī Vijyāṇhara, Bāna k. subject to Nri-
patunga... 173
Vañj, Kārūr, Chēra cap. 230; 233; 236, f.; 240 and n.
Vāraṅga Mahārāja, Pāṇḍya k... 197
Vāraṅga Pāṇḍya, fought against Sivamāra... 280
Vāraṅga and the Gaṅgas... 243
Vāraṅgapurvaṅvarma, Pāṇḍya k... 197
Vāraṇamithira, writer on astronomy, astrology,
etc... 28
Vāraṇaṅgan, a surname of Nandi... 172
Vārāhmāṇa, an Arhat... 49
Vārāndī, N. E. Bengal, seat of a Līchhavi k... 79
Vārīyana, (from purāne), a caste... 335, 337
Vārīyana, a surname of K. Neunmāna... 195
Vāsabhaṇāmakī, a Bālikhā... 85
Vāsīkha... 180; 372
Vāsīṭṭha, and Visvāmitra, struggle between... 282; 375 n.; 379
Vāsīṭṭhaṅkutu, Putumāyi's Naik inscrip... 282
Vāsīṣpa, father of Kanika... 59
Vāṣṭījñḍaṇa, word in the Muniśā inscrip... 54
vahsa ceremony... 349
Vāssal, Mr. W. E. I. Co.'s servant... 214
Vāstavāya Kāyasthas, family mentioned in
Chāndē inscrip... 125
vāstroyo, agriculturist... 358 n.
Vāsudeva, a Kusā̃an k., 27–29; titles of, 40,
42; records of his reign, etc., 45–49; 50, 55
f.; or Vānaka, 61 f.; inscrip. of... 64, 73 f.
Vāsudēva, Kāyā, k., dates of... 70; 74
Vāsudeva, Krishna and bharat, 253 and n.; 257–
259; 261 = Nārāyaṇas, 373, 375 n., 376–
378; 380 and n.; 381, 383 and n.; 384; 385 n.
Vasumitra and the great schisms... 90 n.
Vātāpi, Bādāmi, W. Chālukya cap... 243; 351
Vatsaraṇā, minister, erected a phālī, etc... 117; 143
Vāttagānam, Singhalakē k... 14; 16; 103
Vātōṣu, in S. Travancore, battlefield... 196; 198
Vātyu... 384
Vātyu Purāṇa and the Mauryas... 343
Vātānta Philosophy... 145; 258; 261, 262 n.; 241
Vēdas... 385
Vēdic Religion and the Eastern Aryanas... 251
Vēdi-dēsama, Vēnē... 201 n.
Vēgāru, in Nellore, inscrip. from... 283 n.
Vēgāram... 170
Vēlagaru, two rivers of the name, by one of
which a battle was fought by Nandi... 171; 172
Vēllōḍa, a Śāmanthar caste... 338
Vellēr... 229
Vēṭi Pāri, Pāri, chief of Peṇambuṇādu, patron
of Kapilā... 290, 237
INDEX.

Vishnu, g., 143; 155 n.; 173; 198; 198 f.; 236; or Bhagavat, 252 n.; 254; 257 f.; 333; 380; 333; temples of ... 116; 120; 123; 131; 139; 202

Vishnugopā of Kāshī, Pallava k. 239; 243; 282 and n.; called Yacukhīrdīya, 283 and n.; 234 and n.

Vishnusām, Religion of modern Aryan India ... 262

Vishnusūla and the Pallavas ... 332

Vishnunavardhana, Huyālā k. ... 226; 240

Vishnunavardhana, title of the E. Chālukyas ... 201

Vishnunavardhana II., E. Chālukya k. ... 351

Vishnunavardhana III., E. Chālukya k. ... 351 f.

Vishnunvarman, Pallava k. ... 232 n.

Vishnunvarman, śaivaṇa ... 233 n.

Vishvakarman, a saint ... 339 n.

Vishvakāraṇa, g. ... 376; 382

Vishvācitra, and Vasiṣṭha, struggle between, 252

Vivāsmitri, and the Andhras ... 281

Vivānākha, Lākṣāṇī, temple ... 117 f.; 133; 141

Vitisātan, Jēhan, rīv. in Kashmir ... 185

Vitellius, Emp. of Rome ... 72

Vītora, 'vēsta herba,' tn. ... 169

Vivavatārti, Sūrya ... 334

vīvata, vīvata. 21 and n.; 22; 23; 316 and n.; 347

Viṣṇī, a battle-ground ... 236 f.

Vīṣṇapātana, and the E. Chālukyas ... 201

Vogel, Dr. J., and the Rock Edicts, 22; on inscriptions, 30 and n.; 31 n.; 34; 40 n.; 46 n.; 52; 56; 58; 66; 75; 180; 278; on Duṣloka, 183 n.; and the Dāmaras, 184 n.; and Rūcheha, 186 n.; and Zain'il-šibādīn's expedition to Bhōtaśal, 188 n.; Kulōta, 189; 192 n.

Vohumana ... ... 338—390

Volahases Ir., k. of Parthia ... 73

Volahases III., k. of Parthia, 61; (Volahases?) ... 62; 73 f.

Vonones, a Sok, 27; 47; 54; era of ... 67; 71

Vonones II. k. of Parthia, 62; Emp. of Seistan, etc. ... 70

Vṛitiya-kṣatriya, the Nīcèñībi ... 79

Vṛdhā Garga, astronomer ... 28; 342

Vṛiha ... 381

Vṛishākapi ... 381

Vṛijupitra, disciple of Ananda. 17 n.; 84 n.; 99 n.

Vulcan island ... 167 n.

Vyaśa (Bīrāyaka) ... 182; 185; 187

Vyānākāśīa, temple at Edāṭak ... 293

Vyaśna, arranger of the Vedas, 379; 381 f.; 385 and n.

Vyașa, cyclic year ... 365 and n.

Waddell's (Dr.) Kaddarra inscrip. ... 30; 68

Waidhun, U-ähālāśapura or Ohind ... 140 n.; 141

Wārkā, suggested cap. of Kōsala ... 208 n.

Wārākṣu, a work by Āndāl Beq ... 210

Wales, Sam, E. I. Co.'s servant ... 324; 398

Wang Ho-ke, Chinese envoy, and Harah ... 137

Warangal, Guntaka, in Hyderabad ... 148

Wardak Vase inscrip. ... 30 f.; 60; 67; 75

Watters, Mr. T., 23 n.; and the Chandellas, 131 and n.; and Nāgārājuna ... 208

Wassilieff, and the Buddhist Councils ... 1 n.; 93

wazir, minister ... 76; 77 and n.

Wazir Khan, Nawāb, minister, under Shāh Jahan ... 154 f.

Wema-Kalpheises, k., Hima-Kalpines, 41; 50; or Yen-kao-ching ... 56—59; 73

White Hunas, Epithalites ... 62; 148

Windschei, and the Buddhist Canon ... 48

Winter, Sir E., and Amb. Salisbury ... 212 f.; 272

Winter, Thos. ... 219; 315

Wright, Dr., and the Acts of St. Thomas ... 48

Wu-sun, a nomad horde, defeated by the Yu-chi ... 26; 32

Wu-ti, Emp. of China ... 69

Yālavas, among whom arose the unorthodox Bhūgavata religion ... 253 f.

Yālavas, name of a Bakōtek inscr. ... 204

yēnu, milk with rice ... 94

Yahweh, Jehovah ... 376 n.

Yajña Śrī, ruled in Mahākāhṭra ... 242

Yājñavalkya, sage ... 251; 374

Yājñavalkya Smṛtī, a Brahman work ... 337
gītā, Tamil musical instrument ... 251

Yama, g. of death ... 183 n.

Yamunā, rīv. ... 261

Yardand and Kaniška, 44; 57 ff.; 73; traded with the Pañjāb ... 192

Yassas, Yaqūs, an Arhat at the Second Buddhist Council ... 81—98; 96—98; 100; 103; 105

Yāsōdhana Bhaṭṭa, received a grant of a village named Yullī ... 117

Yāsodharman, k., inscr. of ... 107

Yāsōvarman, Chandell k., alias Lakshavarman, 126, ff.; 131; 139; 135; 139—, 141; called Kirtivarman ... 144 and n.

Yasna ... 383—385

Yavannaśēva, owner of the Śyāmakāṛa horse, 208 n.

Yavana = Muhammadan, disturbances in Kashmir ... 183; 188

Yavana, Grockes, ravaged Mathurā ... 247;

and K. Gōtaniputra ... 263; 343

Yen-kao-ching, or Ching, K. 26; 33; or

Wema-Kalpheises ... 53

Yin-mo-fu, Heraisei ... 70
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDEX.</th>
<th>431</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yāga, meaning of, 255 and n.; 258; system of philosophy ... 373 f.; 385, 386 and n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yāgins, devotees ... ... 383</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yogism ...</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yôli, source of existence ...</td>
<td>373; 380 f.; 385 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuan-Chuang or Huen Thang ...</td>
<td>44; 60 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuddhamalla, E. Châlukya k. ...</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yudhishtira, Pandu prince, 374-376; 378; 385</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yu-ô-chi, a Scythian Race, invaded India, 25-27; ceased to be nomads, 32 f.; 41; 42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>principalities, united, 54, 70, 71; gave Buddhist books to King-iu ... 56 f.; 71; 79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuen-ti, Emp. of China, and Yin-ô-fu ...</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yôga ...</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yulîl, vil., grant of ...</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yusufzâi, Muchâi inscrip. from ... 46; 64; 65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuvamahârâja, title of Viśnu-gûpta 283 and n.</td>
<td>284 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yûla, âyukti, words in the third Rock Edict, 19; 21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yu-yuan-kia, Huvishka ...</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zacherias, tomb of ...</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zain Khâ's Kokalisah or Jalin Khâ ...</td>
<td>149 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zainu'l-âbidin of Kashmir, his expedition against the Bhoṭjas ... 183, ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zamorin of Calicut ...</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zamt, E. I. Co.'s ship ...</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zangskar, a tour in ...</td>
<td>332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaqat, Indian Hotar ...</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zarathushtra ...</td>
<td>358-359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zebedee, house of ...</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeda inscrip. ...</td>
<td>30 and n.; 31; 46 f.; 67; 72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zetônias or Jihunnâ, a satrap ...</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoroastrian divinities and Kaniṣka ...</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>