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WHO WAS THE PATRON OF VASUBANDHU?

BY D. R. BHANDAKAR, M.A., POONA.

M. M. Haraprasad Shastri was the first to draw attention to the hemistich occurring in Vāmana's Kṛśṇapāda-sūtra-vṛtti, which speaks of a son of Chandragupta. In the last June number of this Journal, Prof. K. B. Pathak has brought the same passage to the notice of scholars, apparently not knowing that it had already been done, but his paper is interesting because the view he therein sets forth is different from that of M. M. Haraprasad Shastri. The interest of this subject was increased by the letter of Dr. Hoernle, which has appeared in the last September number. In this number has been published another letter on the same subject, viz., from M. M. Haraprasad Shastri, in which he defends the view originally propounded by him. As the whole discussion has become very interesting, I feel tempted to state here my own view of the matter. In fact, the more I think of the hemistich, the more it appears historically important to me.

In the first place, it is of paramount importance to settle the correct reading of the explanatory note which Vāmana adds to the hemistich quoted by him. According to some MSS. it is एकंत्र: कृष्णपादलिङ्गस्य भुजुल्लोकियाद्वयोपालसाधिनामाः। According to others it is exactly the same, but, instead of Vasubandhu, they have cha Subandhu. And so the question arises: which is the correct reading? In my opinion Vasubandhu is the correct reading. For if we suppose for the moment that cha Subandhu is the correct reading, the word cha becomes devoid of any significance. The passage cited above is followed by Vāmana's further note: एवं स्वितिकाविलाके कथापं गुणविदेशः। एवं गुणविदेशः इत्यं गुणविदेशः यथं सायनमपि ध्यानात्म। Here also the word cha occurs, but here this word is perfectly appropriate and intelligible, as it obviously joins this sentence to the preceding. But it becomes meaningless in the first passage, if we suppose that cha Subandhu is the correct reading. I have, therefore, no doubt that Vasubandhu represents the correct reading. And as Subandhu, being a Brahmanic poet, was better known to the scribes than the Buddhist monk Vasubandhu and as the form of the letter व is even to this day found extremely similar to that of च in old MSS., it is perfectly intelligible how Vasubandhu came to be written cha Subandhu. There is another consideration also which supports the reading Vasubandhu and not cha Subandhu. In the tenth of the prefatory verses of the Vīra-vadānta, Subandhu wails that on the death of Vīkramādiṭṭha, love or poetry was gone. But he speaks of Vīkramādiṭṭha in such a way as to clearly show that the former was never a contemporary of the latter but that the latter was so much prior to the former that he had come to be looked upon as the traditional patron of poets. The wail is exactly like that which was given expression to by much later poets. This, on the contrary, is strong evidence, in my opinion, for putting Subandhu not earlier than A. D. 500, i.e., at least a hundred years later than Chandragupta II, if we suppose with Dr. Bhandarkar and others that he was the traditional
Vikramāditya. I therefore firmly believe that Vasubandhu and not cha Subandhu must be the correct reading. And the objection that "a Buddhist monk would not accept office" can very well be answered by saying with Dr. Hoernle that the term śāchīrya does not necessarily refer to the ministerial office but may simply mean "companionship" or "friendship."

In this connection it is important to read the following, which has been gleaned by Dr. Takakusu from Paramārtha's Life of Vasubandhu.—"King Vikramāditya of Ayodhya, North India, was first a patron of the Sāṃkhya School, but afterwards a patron of the Buddhism on account of Vasubandhu's success in religious activity. He sent his Crown Prince (Bālāditya) to Vasubandhu to learn Buddhism, and the queen too became one of his disciples. When he came to the throne, king Bālāditya, in conjunction with his Queen-mother, invited Vasubandhu to Ayodhya and favoured him with special patronage." Now, who were this Vikramāditya and his Crown Prince Bālāditya? Dr. Takakusu takes Vikramāditya to refer to Skandagupta, and says simply that Bālāditya was his successor, whosoever he may be. Mr. V. A. Smith identifies them with Skandagupta and his nephew Bālāditya, known as Narasiṁhagupta from the Bhūtari seal, thus setting aside the distinct statement of Paramārtha that Bālāditya was the son and not nephew of Vikramāditya. Prof. Pathak agrees with both Dr. Takakusu and Mr. Smith in taking this Vikramāditya to be Skandagupta but regards Bālāditya whom he, like the latter, identifies with Narasiṁhagupta, as the immediate successor of Skandagupta, setting aside Paragupta, father of Narasiṁhagupta mentioned in the Bhūtari seal. I think it is not justifiable to accept Paramārtha's testimony only partially, or to frame any theory contrary to the evidence of the Bhūtari seal. In my opinion, the Vikramāditya alluded to by Paramārtha can be no other than Chandragupta II. Srandagupta was not the only Gupta prince who bore the title of Vikramāditya. Chandragupta II also was styled Vikramāditya. And that he is the Vikramāditya referred to by Paramārtha is rendered certain by the hemistic quoted by Vāmana and the note appended to it by him. For Vāmana distinctly gives us to understand that the patron of Vasubandhu was a son of Chandragupta. Thus we require a king, who, according to Vāmana, was Chandragupta, and, according to Paramārtha, Vikramāditya. The Chandragupta II only can answer to this description, as he is Chandragupta and had, we know, the title Vikramāditya. Any other conclusion would lead us to confusion as Prof. Pathak's, I am afraid, does. For, following Dr. Takakusu in taking Vikramāditya to be Skandagupta, he accepts Vasubandhu's date, viz., A. D. 420-500, proposed by the former and yet says with Vāmana that the son of Chandragupta, who is represented to have just ascended the throne and who according to him is Kumāragupta, was also the patron of Vasubandhu. Kumāragupta, we know from the Bilsaj inscription, must have come to the throne not later than 5 c. e. 96-414, the date of this inscription, i.e., Vasubandhu had distinguished himself as a literate six years earlier than A. D. 420, the date of his birth, according to Dr. Takakusu, which Prof. Pathak accepts. The conclusion, in my opinion, is therefore irresistible that the Vikramāditya mentioned by Paramārtha is Chandragupta II, and not Skandagupta. And the question now arises: who was the son of this Chandragupta-Vikramāditya, who has been referred to as Bālāditya by Paramārtha? Can it be Chandraprkāśa? After having seen that he is of the Gupta family it will not be difficult to reject such a supposition. Knowing as we do what the names of the imperial Guptas were like, it is inconceivable that Chandraprkāśa could have been the proper name of any Gupta sovereign. Can it then be Kumāragupta? This question, I am afraid, cannot satisfactorily and with certainty be answered. But I think he was probably not Kumāragupta. For he is already known to us as Mahendrāditya and cannot in all likelihood be Bālāditya. Who can this Bālāditya then be? In this connection it is worth while to turn our attention to certain inscribed clay seals, which the late

1 Jour. R. As. Society, for 1905, p. 44. 2 Early History of India, pp. 92-3. 3 Corpus Inscriptionum Indicorun, Vol. iii, p. 42ff.
Dr. Bloch discovered during his excavations at Basarh, the ancient Vaisali, nearly eleven years ago. The most important of these seals bears the following inscription:

1. Mahārājādhirāja Śrī-Chandragupta
2. patni Mahārājā-śrī-Govinda-gupta
3. mātā Mahādevī śrī-Dhru-
4. rāmedūminī.

Here the great queen Dhruvasvāminī is mentioned as the wife of the Mahārājādhirāja Chandragupta and mother of the Mahārāja Govinda-gupta. The names Chandragupta and Dhruvasvāminī are an unmistakable indication of their being Chandragupta II and his wife Dhruvadevi, whose names we find mentioned in the Gupta inscriptions. As the names of both Chandragupta and his son Govinda-gupta are mentioned in the seal, both must be supposed to be living at that time if the seal is to be supposed to have any significance. Every queen belonging to a dynasty in power is the wife of one king and mother of another, and there is nothing special in the fact if both did not live and were not kings at one and the same time. I am therefore inclined to believe that Chandragupta and Govinda-gupta were both living when the seal of Dhruvasvāminī was impressed on the clay piece. Chandragupta, as he is called Mahārājādhirāja, was, of course, the paramount sovereign, and Govinda-gupta was holding some province under him, probably the district about Basarh, as the title Mahārāja shows. But let us proceed a step further and ask why, if Kumāragupta was also a son of Chandragupta and Dhruvadevi, his name is omitted and that of Govinda-gupta alone mentioned. The name of the latter only is specified because I think he was Yuvāraja. For in the seal of a queen it is natural to expect the names of her husband the king and her son who is heir-apparent to the throne.

Now, it is worthy of note that none of the seals found at Basarh speak of any place or district except Vaisali and Tirabhuṣki, the district of which Vaisali was the headquarters. It is therefore difficult to avoid the conclusion that the seals were not attached to letters come from outside Basarh, whatever Dr. Bloch has said to the contrary. Again, if they had really come from other districts, they would not have been all found together in one room, as was actually the case, but would have come to light in the different parts excavated. I suspect that the place where the seals were found was that of a potter who was, perhaps, the only person entrusted in Vaisali for preparing seals. When these seals were prepared, he must have naturally caught hold of some stray pieces of clay and impressed them with the seals to test them. This explains, I think, why some clay pieces have more than one seal impressed on them, which are apparently unconnected with one another. That this place belonged to some potter, receives confirmation from the fact that “the seals were found mixed up with fragments of pottery.” I have, therefore, no doubt that the seals here found all belonged to officials and private individuals connected with and residing in Vaisali.

Some of the seals of the former class have the following on them: Sri-Yuvāraja-bhattraeka-padiya-kumārāmātya-dāhikaranasya—“Of the office of the Kumārāmātya of His Highness the Crown Prince” and (2) Yuvāraja-bhattraeka-padiya-bal-dāhikaranasya—“Of the Military office of His Highness the Crown Prince.” This shows that the district of Tirabhuṣki with Vaisali as its capital, was held by the Crown Prince during the reign of Chandragupta II, to whose time all the seals belong, as Dr. Bloch rightly supposes. This also is quite in keeping with the supposition made above that Govinda-gupta’s name is mentioned in his mother’s seal also, because he was the ruler of the province round about Basarh. All things considered, Govinda-gupta appears to be the Chandragupta-tanaya alluded to in the verse quoted by Vāmana and also the Bālāditya, son of Vikrama-ditya (Chandragupta II), mentioned by Paramārtha.

The latest date for Chandragupta II is A.D. 305-308, and the earliest date for Kumāragupta is, as stated above, A.D. 414. Govinda-gupta-Bālāditya has, therefore, to be placed between A.D. 411-14. It is difficult to say why he had such a short reign. He may have been ousted by his brother Kumāragupta or he may have died a natural death and without any heir.

PERSIAN GRAMMAR IN Sanskrit.

BY PROF. V. S. GHATE, M.A., POONA.

Two treatises bearing the name of Pārasi-prakāśa have been already noticed. One is the Pārasi-prakāśa of Vedāṅgariya dealing with astrological topics, such as the methods for converting Hindu into Mahomedan dates and vice versa. The book is apparently intended for astrologers knowing Sanskrit but not Persian. It is dated 1565 Śaka = A.D. 1643, and was written to please the then Moghul Emperor Shah Jahan.¹

Another book of the same name but by a different author deals with Pārasi words explained in Sanskrit. The author is Viḥārī-Srī-Kṛṣṇa-dāsa-Miśra, who wrote the work for the Moghul Emperor Akbar.² The same author wrote another treatise bearing the same name, but dealing with the grammar of the Persian language.³ The colophon at the end of the MS. runs thus:

Iti Śrī-mahā-mahendr-ākara-Śrī-kṛṣṇa-dāsa-krite Pārasi-kārttaka-bhāshāydh Prakāśa kṛt-prakaraṇam samāptam. The same colophon with the different names of the prakaraṇas or chapters is found at the end of the corresponding chapters in the work, except at the end of the chapters on Indeclinables, where we have . . . . . . viṁśi-kṛtā Dāma dāsa-viraṅchite . . . . which must be very probably the scribe's mistake. Kṛtā dāma is very probably Kṛṣṇa.

That this Akbar, for whom the work was written, cannot be any other than the great emperor, follows from the fact that he was reputed to have encouraged Sanskrit learning and Sanskrit Pandits, and in his reign many translations of Sanskrit works into Persian were made; while nothing like this is known regarding the second Akbar, one of the nominal emperors succeeding to the throne after the death of Aurangzeb. The point is, however, quite settled by the date of the MS. I have before me, which is Saṁvat 1582 or A.D. 1717; whereas Akbar II ruled from A.D. 1806 to A.D. 1837.⁴ The same is confirmed by the following internal evidence. On page 7 of the MS. in the chapter on Syntax, the author gives two illustrations—'E' Hasarote Śrī Jaiḷuddāna dasta-gīra Sara merd dar dinadunā (Oh, Akbarshah, the glory of religion, be the supporter of my hand, here and in the next world). A few lines below, we have Śrī Jaiḷuddāna azadhālaḥkūdu Kaliyugāḥ Satyaṇyogā Karīḥ (King Akbar, the glory of religion, turned the Kali-yuga into the Satya-yuga, by the force of his justice). Now, here, the author must be referring to the emperor by whom he was asked to write the work; and the title Jaiḷuddāna or the glory of religion has been applied to none but the great Akbar, who was conspicuous by his toleration of all religions and sects.⁵

This work is evidently written for the use of Sanskrit Pandits not knowing Persian. It aims at enabling the Pandit of the day to have some elementary knowledge of the language just sufficient for the purpose of ordinary conversation and other practical purposes.⁶ This is quite clear from the cursory and slipshod manner of dealing with the different topics and the choice of instances from words of everyday use. The author being himself a Sanskrit Pandit and writing for men of the same class, makes use of the technical terms of Sanskrit grammar, not employing even a single Persian term. He remarks to the same effect just at the beginning of the work—'na atra sāhjāḥ—praḥāḥ kvaśchid-apekṣhāya sanskritā-saṁjñāya eva kāraṇya-viśeṣaḥvakhyāmanātītāt.' (No technical terms

¹ See Dr. Bhandarkar's Report on the Search of Sanskrit MSS. for 1882-83 The MS. is, at present, in the Deccan College Collection of MSS.
² See Dr. Petamon's Report for 1884-86. The MS. is preserved in the temple of Sāntinātha, Cambay.
³ A MS. of this I have recently secured from Mr. Gopal Moreshwar Sathe of Poona, on which my observations are based.
⁴ See p. 329 of The Mahomedan Dynasties, by S. Lanespoole.
⁵ See Elphinstone's History of India, p. 536; also Blochmann's Ainsi Akbar, Vol. i, p. 183. This reference I owe to Prof. Shaliok of the Dēkkan College, to whom I am also indebted for the meanings of several Persian words.
⁶ The first leaf of the MS. has on its blank side a title in Persian characters—'Sarpornāko prahāṣā prakāśa.' (A light of Persian assistance and syntax.)
are required to be understood here, as our purpose is served, where necessary, by the Sanskrit technical terms.) The author is not content with showing his Sanskritism in this respect only. In the main arrangement of the subject, also, he follows the order of Sanskrit grammar (as we have it, for instance, in Bhaṭṭojī Dīkshita's Siddhānta-buṣṭumādi). Thus the first topic is the Saṇḍhi, which he has disposed of, with one remark, Na saṇḍhiḥ kāryaḥ Pārāsikā-bhāṣydhānaḥ, which is followed by artha-pakṣa tiṣṭhauti iśī prakṛti-sandhiresa atra bahūvam, all this meaning that there is no saṇḍhi, as such, in the Persian language, or in other words, the hiatus prevails. As for visarga-saṇḍhi, the author remarks that there is nothing like visarga in the language.

Two points are noteworthy as regards the method of treatment. First, the author imitates Sanskrit writers in first giving very short statements corresponding to sūtras or aphorisms and next their full explanations followed by illustrations. Thus, in the chapter on declension, while explaining the form of the nominative plural, the author proceeds thus: ápāṭaḥ jas iśī sthita “jaso ha” Pārāsikā-saṅbhātā parasya jaso ha-dīdē bhavati ápāṭaḥ. (We have the noun ápāṭaḥ ‘the sun’ + the termination jas; then the rule is ‘ha takes the place of jas’; i.e., after a noun in the Persian language, ha is substituted for jas. Thus the form of the nominative plural of ápāṭaḥ is ápāṭaḥa.)

The second point to be noted is that the author, all through the work, takes the Sanskrit language as the basis, as it were, and attempts to derive everything Persian therefrom. Thus, as the illustration above shows, the author would not give all the terminations of declension in the Persian language and say that a noun is thus declined, but he takes his stand on the Sanskrit termination jas, and says in Sanskrit technical terms that ha is substituted for jas. This procedure he follows everywhere, and though in some cases ridiculous, it becomes very interesting and instructive in certain cases, where a striking analogy between the two languages is easily marked. Thus, for instance, in the chapter on numerals, the author says: “ekasya yaka,” ekā-kabdaya yaka iti dīdē bhavati Pārāsikā-bhāṣydhāṃ (in Persian, yaka is substituted for eka). So also, for deśa (two), we have dā; for tri (three), se (perhaps analogous to ṣivi); for chatur (four), chāhar or chār (which is exactly the Marāṭhī word for four); for pañchā (five) paṇḍ; for shesh (six) kās; for sapta (seven) kāphta; for astha (eight) hātra; for navan (nine) muk; and so on.

After having disposed of the saṇḍhi, as said above, the author deals with the following topics in order: numerals (saṁkhyā-prakaraṇa), declension of nouns (nabda-prakaraṇa), indeclinables (avyaya-prakaraṇa). After this, he remarks, Pārāsikā-bhāṣydhāṃ śrī-pratigyaḥ na drīṣteṇa (in Persian, there are no terminations to form feminines). Then he proceeds to syntax (kāraṇa-prakaraṇa), in which he illustrates the various meanings of the cases. In connection with the Instrumental Case, he remarks: Pārāsikā-bhāṣydhāṃ kartārī tīrīyāḥ na drīṣteṇa i satyakartaru-bhāṣydhāṁ uta kartārī prathāmā vibhaktireṇa bhavati (in Persian, we never have the instrumental used to denote the agent, as the agent or doer of the action is never indirectly expressed; and as for the directly expressed agent, the nominative is always used). And to the same effect we find the remark made towards the end of the same chapter, Pārāsikā kārmaṇi dīkhyata-pratigyaḥ na drīṣteṇa (no verbal termination of the Passive is met with in Persian).

Next comes the chapter on compounds, which he mentions to be six, i.e., Aavyayībhedā, Tatprabha, Deanda, Bahuṛti, Karmadhraya, and Drīyu. In Persian, as in Sanskrit compound words, case-terminations are omitted. Thus, ‘Akbarīkharī hukum-hukum-eskharī’ (Akbar's order). Here also the dissolutions of the compounds are given in Sanskrit. Thus, bad feal yasa sa bad-feal dāh-karma iti arthāḥ (one whose actions are bad). So also nek-anal means ‘one whose actions are good.’ No Deanda (copulative) compound as such is met with in Persian. An instance of the Aavyayībhedā compound is jīyebhagōs (Sanskrit) nīr mukhākāhū, which means ‘a place without even a fly.’
Then comes the chapter on Tad-dhita or secondary suffixes, wherein we come across many interesting words. The author begins thus:— "Apatyeydah 1 namsam apatyrth eva bhramat Paraiva-bhuhdiya 1 dhanyap apatyarin Saha-zdah (the termination zdah is added to nouns, to denote a son. Thus Saha-zdah = a son of the emperor). The termination t is added in the sense of 'born therein'; thus we have, Kãhut, Gandhãri, Róm, Arabi, Pherahti, Christ, Hindustâni, and so on. The same termination is also added in the sense of 'following the religion laid down by'; thus we have Mahamadhi (= Mehmadmeh pratyakto dharma ayya iti), Dûdi (following the religion of Dûd or David), Ísîy (from Isâ = Jesus), Mûsâdi (from Mûsâ = Moses), and so on. The termination tân is added in the sense of 'the protector of'; thus, jilãda (elephant-keeper), guravâna (a cow-herd), bãryâ (a garden-keeper). Many more suffixes are mentioned with illustrations and their Sanskrit equivalents, but, for want of space, I must be content with mentioning only a few more interesting words. Thus, dûni-mand (learned), hunar-mand (accomplished), gil-b (earthman), hdda-i (dusty, cf. Sk. Vata), dhon-i (of iron), chob-i (wooden), jamidd-dt (minerals), nabǳ-dt (vegetables), hau-vi-dt (animals), sar-gar (goldsmith), dhan-gar (ironsmith), subz-faro (vegetable-seller), Pahkan-faro (one who sells saddles), sang-a-tar (one who works in stone), lut-tar (one who makes idols), sanz-dchah (a small box), deh-chah (a small cooking pot), sanz-k (a contemptible woman), rind-k (a contemptible fellow), deru-tar (later), ـrind-tar (sooner), khud-tar (more beautiful), mulâyân-tar (softer), subuk-tar (lighter). The chapter is closed with the remark yathâ-drâma eva Tad-âka-pratyeydâh vidheydâ (the secondary suffixes are to be made use of, as they are met with).

Then comes the chapter on verbs. There is no dual number in Persian, says the author, as already remarked by him in connection with nouns. There is no Âtmanepada also. Here, also, he gives the Sanskrit terminations, tip, ânti, etc., and then says that these are changed to the corresponding terminations in Persian. So also with regard to the roots. He first mentions the Sanskrit root and then remarks that it is changed to the corresponding root in Persian. Thus, bhâ-dhâso iva iti ñdeso bhavati varâmûnâdau vihaktâv parathi (bhâ is changed to kavat, when followed by the terminations of the present tense, etc.). In giving the Persian equivalents for Sanskrit roots, the author has sometimes not been very careful. He gives Persian dhimad for Sanskrit pd; but I think it more corresponds to Sanskrit ad-chan in form as well as in meaning. So also ninaad more corresponds to ni-siad than to upa-siad, whose equivalent it is stated to be by the author. In one place, the author has committed a grammatical blunder which would not have us entertain a high opinion of his knowledge of Sanskrit. Persian gapht is the equivalent for Sanskrit brâh. Then explaining the future form, he says, kâhadr-gupht bravishyati iti arthah, forgetting that bravishyati is not allowed by Sanskrit grammar. In some cases the resemblance between Sanskrit and Persian roots bearing the same sense is interesting. Thus:

Sk. lâh = Per. lid Sk. kâd = Per. khorad
Sk. grah = Per. girad Sk. â-yd = Per. yad
Sk. vas = Per. basd Sk. mri = Per. mirad
Sk. chi = Per. chinad Sk. ksha = Per. kasha
Sk. bandh = Per. bandad Sk. tap = Per. tâbad, and some more.

In this chapter on verbs, the author has given a long list of roots with their forms in the different tenses, and here, too, the principle which has guided him in the choice of roots is practical utility. One point to be noted in this connection is that the prefix of the present tense is always given by the author to be m instead of mi; thus we have mskavat, mpiristabd, etc.; m is the older and more Persian way; while mi is more Indian; and this is as we should expect in the case of the writer of this book.

1 Cf. the Sanskrit suffix, kain a similar sense. 2 Cf. the Sanskrit 'tara' forming the comparative degree.
3 Cf. Sanskrit 'ubhaya-tara.'
The next and the last chapter deals with krit or primary suffixes. Thus, the termination ah (ahā stated in the sūtra by the author) is added to roots to form nouns denoting agent. Thus:—Per. kuvanādha = Sk. karitd (doer), Per. Šinuvandha = Sk. śrotā (one who hears), and so on. So also we have, ādam-khor (ādomā mokhara = one who eats men, i.e., a demon), khol-khor (lit. one who eats what is lawfully obtained), kardm-khor (lit. one who earns his livelihood by unlawful means), and so on. The chapter and the treatise are closed with the remark, yathādārāṇanāḥ pratyay-dgama-dīśā-vāra-vāra-nāśa-vāparyaya-vādhanā-vādhanā-vādhanā-vādhanā-nāśi (sānkhya) ābā ādāya-kāraka-sandesa-taddhi-ākhyata-kriṣṇa yathādārāṇanāḥ kalpaniyād, which means that suffixes, augments, substitutes, and other changes are to be understood everywhere, as they are met with in the language.

DAKSHINI PANDITS AT BENARES.

BY MAHAMAHOPADHYAYA HARBAPRAASAD BHASTRI, M. A., C.I.E., CALCUTTA.

Benares is in Northern India, yet the Pandits of the South have the greatest influence there, and this influence they are not only exerting at the present moment but have exerted for centuries past. Benares is the home of Kauñṣī and Sarbarīya Brāhmaṇas but their influence in the city and its environs does not count for much in matters relating to religion and culture. This appears to be rather strange and the riddle quite worth solution.

If anyone examines the manuscripts available at Benares,—and these count by thousands and tens of thousands,—he will be struck not only by the enormous quantity of modern Sanskrit literature but also by the fact that most of this was written at Benares, and by Pandits from the South, specially by a few distinguished families of Mahārāṣṭra Brāhmaṇas.

To trace the origin of this influence of the South at Benares would really be the history of Sanskrit literature for the last four centuries in all provinces of India with the exception of Bengal and Eastern India, which have a history of their own. The great Pandit who infused southern ideals at Benares in all matters relating to Hindu life and Hindu religion in preference to northern ideals current in Kauñṣī, Kāśi, Mithilā and Bengal, was Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa, an intellectual giant who not only wrote a vast number of Sanskrit works but organised the colony of Southern Brāhmaṇas at Benares, travelled far and wide and founded a family of Pandits who hold their pre-eminence even up to the present moment. An authentic history of Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇa's family is likely to clear much of the obscurity in which the history of Sanskrit literature during the Muhammadan period is now involved. Rao Sahib Vīṣṇu Nārāyaṇ Māṇḍalik has done a great service by publishing in his edition of the Vyaṇhāra-mayākha a genealogy of this family. But genealogy is not history, and it is well known that historical works are very rare in India. Though histories are rare, biographies of historical persons rarer, and biographies of scholars rarer still. In the present case we have got a history of this family written by a distinguished member of the family themselves. The work is entitled Gāḍhīkamāduncharitam and the author is Śaṃkara Bhaṭṭa, the second son of Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa and a man as distinguished in learning as his father. By the courtesy and good offices of my late lamented colleague Mahāmahopādhyāya Gōvinda Śāstri of Benares, I have a copy of that work made for me. The first leaf is missing and the work comes abruptly to an end. It is full of inaccuracies and omissions. The abrupt closing does not detract much from its historical value, for in the last chapters, Śaṃkara was indulging in grief over the loss of a promising nephew, but the loss of the first leaf is a serious one as it prevents our seeing the real founder of the family.

But this loss has to a certain extent been made up by Māṇḍalik, who says in his Upādiḍāta:—

The revised version of the Sanskrit text is incorrect and should be:—

By the courtesy and good offices of my late lamented colleague Mahāmahopādhyāya Gōvinda Śāstri of Benares, I have a copy of that work made for me. The first leaf is missing and the work comes abruptly to an end. It is full of inaccuracies and omissions. The abrupt closing does not detract much from its historical value, for in the last chapters, Śaṃkara was indulging in grief over the loss of a promising nephew, but the loss of the first leaf is a serious one as it prevents our seeing the real founder of the family.

But this loss has to a certain extent been made up by Māṇḍalik, who says in his Upādiḍāta:
Māṇḍalik got this from Ṛṣyotishāmadhimukti by Rāmakṛishṇa. So Gōvinda-Bhaṭṭa, belonging to the Gāḍhī or Viśvāmitra Gotra and a Rigvedi Brāhmaṇ studying Āvalīyana śākhā, was a Paṇḍit well known in Southern India, but his fame did not spread in the North. We also note from Nārāyana’s commentary on Vṛttaratnākara written in a.d. 1545 that Gōvinda’s father was Aṅgadeva-Bhaṭṭa and his father Nāgapāṇa. Gōvinda flourished about the middle of the 15th century when the Bahmanis were fighting hard with the Hindu empire of Vidyānāgar (Vijayanagar).

But his son Rāmeśvara flourished in troubled times. The Bahman empire came to an end and was parcelled into five different sultanates during the eighties of the century. Rāmeśvara was a young man then, just finishing his education. The second leaf of the Gāḍhivamāṇucṛīta opens with a panegyric on Rāmeśvara Bhaṭṭa. He was handsome in appearance, bold in speech, patient, pious, charitable, affable, and very learned. He was strong in Mimāṃsā, in Grammar, in Logic, and in Philosophy. He wrote a poem entitled Rāmakutākha in order to eclipse the fame of Sṛṣṭhala’s Naṇḍīslayana. The book has not yet been found. Aufrecht does not speak of any other work by Rāmeśvara. But Rāmeśvara had a number of very distinguished pupils of whom I will speak later on. He seems to have written other works as hinted in an obscure passage in Gāḍhivamāṇucṛīta after speaking of Rāmakutākha. The passage is given in exactly this form in my manuscript:

सामान्यतः पराणिकतायां बहुतांक न चिन्द्रानि नि: तु कतः किषकाविन मुद्रास्वरोऽविनि मार्गापूर्विन || २४ ॥

A great opportunity presented itself to Rāmeśvara in early life, of teaching the various Sāstrī. There was in his neighbourhood a learned Saṃyakṣeṣhaṭṭa, who taught many pupils. His name was Sri-Kṛṣṇaśāstra. But he was raised to the dignity of the mahant or the head of the monastic establishment to which he belonged. His multifarious duties now interfered with the study of his pupils, and they flocked to Rāmeśvara for their education, at Pratishthāna or Pāthān on the Godāvari. Rāmeśvara’s College on the sacred river, the poet says, looked like a camp of Rāma; for the poet throughout speaks of Rāmeśvara as an incarnation of Rāma. Rāmeśvara was very strict in his observances of caste rules. He introduced the Rāmamantra in Brāhmaṇic worship. His influence increased in the country and the Sultan of the newly formed Nizam Shah Dominions was anxious to secure him to his side by granting him rights, privileges, and other favours.

Learned Paṇḍits always claimed the power of working miracles, and the claim was accepted not only by Hindus but often also by Muḥammādans. Zafar Malik was at this time an influential officer in the Ahmadnagar State, and his influence was the greatest in the district of Pratishthāna. One of his youthful sons was suddenly smitten with leprosy. Medical aid of all sorts was invoked, but was of no avail. The young man was seriously thinking of committing suicide by a fall from a height when some one advised him to take the broken victuals of Rāmeśvara. Rāmeśvara was at first very unwilling to offer him such things without a command from the High; but that command soon came in the form of a dream. Rāmeśvara made the young Muḥammadan observe Hindu regulations and gave him what was considered a medicine. The young man recovered and the fame of Rāmeśvara was at its height. Nizam Shah wrote under his golden seal a letter to Rāmeśvara, inviting him to court. The messenger arrived at Pratishthāna and Rāmeśvara though unwilling, at last consented to go. But the result of the interview is not given. But the fact that he did go appears from a description of his journey to Kolhāpur in order to worship the great goddess Māha-Lakshmi. On his way he had a great adventure with the ghost of a learned Brāhmaṇ, whom he subdued and who escorted him to Kolhāpur, the condition being that Rāmeśvara would burn a blanket belonging to the ghost and the ghost would become his son. The pilgrimage to Kolhāpur being over, Rāmeśvara journeyed to Vidyānagar, then under the rule of the famous Kṛṣṇarāya. Rāmeśvara lived at the house of Kṛṣṇa-Bhaṭṭa on Ṛṣyotishāmadhī, a class friend of his and a spiritual guide of the Rāja. The Rāja hearing from all sides of the learning of Rāmeśvara was anxious to make
a gift of elephants, horses, etc., to him, but Râmeśvara knew that a gift of elephants and horses is not allowed in Śastras. Unwilling to accept it, he left the place one fine morning for a pilgrimage to Dvârakâ. On the way a son was born to him in the month of Chaitra in the Saka year 1435, i.e., March 1514. This boy later on became famous as Nârâyana-Bhâta. Râmeśvara lived for four years at Dvârakâ, teaching Mahâbâdhya and Suceśvaradvîrtha. Then he came back to Pratiśthâna where he was given a great ovation. He lived there for four years and then left it for good for Kâśi. A second son Sridhara was born on the way and a third at Benares. All the three were married at Benares. Râmeśvara was advanced in years when Nârâyana was born; so when he came to Benares, he was a pretty old man.

His principal students were:

(i) Ananta Bhâta, Chittavo of Konkan.
(ii) Dâmôdara Sarasvatî.
(iii) Mâdhava Sarasvatî.

The last two were great travelers and great teachers. Mâdhava was the teacher of Madhusûdana Sarasvatî.

(iv) Mahaśa Thâkkur, an inhabitant of Tirhoot or Mithilâ, wrote a commentary on Pakshadharamiśra's works entitled Tattva-chinâdânya-dhiksa-dar-paṇya. He is the founder of the present Darbhanga Râj family. It is said that he got the Râj as a gift from the last king of Mithilâ belonging to the Bhârâma dynasty of which the first king was Kâmeśa. The grant is said to have been confirmed by Sher Shah and Akbar. A letter written by Mahaśa Thâkkur to Târkika Chûdâmani, which is another name of Raghumâtha Siromâni, is to be found in a copy of Vaiśnavata  sûdhibhâna, composed at Nâdia in a.d. 1529 now deposited in the library of the Asiatic Society of Bengal. His mother was Dâhrâ, his father was Chandrapati, and his elder brothers were Mahâdeva Bhagiratha, and Dâmôdara. He was the leading spirit of Mithilâ in the 16th century.

(v) Govinda Dvivedi of Gujârât. He studied the Mahâbâdhya along with Sridhara, second son of the teacher.

(vi), (vii) Achaîrya Bhâta Talasi and Viśvanâtha Talasi. Both became teachers of Vaidûta, in Southern India.

(viii) Sankara Miśra Sarmâ of Kanauj. Commented upon the Gita-Govinda at the request of Sinânâtha, perhaps another commentator. The commentary was entitled Rasamañjari. (See Anreith's Cat. Cat.)

Besides these, Râmeśvara had students from Dravida, Gujâra, Kânya-kubja, Western India, Mîlava, Braja, Mithilâ, Himalayan regions, Kârâta, Utkala, Kaunîka, Gauḍa, Andhra, Mathurâ, Kâmarâpa, and other parts of India.

Râmeśvara died in good old age and his wife became a Satt.</DOCUMENT>
He was a Banerji. His father Vidyāvāchaspati is described as one whose feet were constantly rubbed by the crown jewels of Rājās. Vidyāvāchaspati's sons were all well-known Paṇḍits. His second son was the author of Bhādāparīvīcchheda, a standard work of Nyāya all over India. His third son was in high favour with Bhāva Simha, the son of Mān Simha of Amber. Even Vidyāvāchaspati had to yield his palm to Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇa and the point at dispute was one of vital importance to modern Brāhmaṇism. The ancient Rishis declare that at the performance of a Śrīdāha, live Brāhmaṇs are to be fed with the cooked food offered to the manes. Bengal holds that this is impossible in the Kaliyuga as there are no Brāhmaṇs worthy to feed. And so they feed symbolical Brāhmaṇs (Brāhmaṇs made of kuśa—grass). The southern people hold that the injunctions of the Sūtras should be respected, and live Brāhmaṇs are to be fed.

Among his principal students were:—

Brāhmendra Sarasvatī and Nārāyaṇa Sarasvatī. The first presented an address to Vidyānādi Kaviṇḍra (of whom later on), about 1640. The latter wrote many Vedaṭā works about the end of the 16th century (See Cat Cat.).

Nārāyaṇa wrote two great works on Smṛiti. One is Dharma-Pracīrtī, current in Southern India, and the other, Prayogaratna, current in Northern India. He wrote a commentary on Vṛttavaritākara in 1545 (see Ind. Of. Cat., pages 303-4) and not in 1680, as Anrechts says. He wrote an independent work on prosody entitled Vṛttavaritāndali and also a Prakṛta Vīrīti of Abhijñāna Sākuntala. Besides these already mentioned, Cat. Cat. registers 28 other works, some of which are undoubtedly parts of Tīrthita-setu and Prayogaratna. Among these are Māndāla, works a commentary on Sāstra-Dīpikā and Kārikās on Mādhavāchārya's Kaṇṭhinirṇaya. He wrote on a variety of topics in Smṛiti, such as consecration of gardens, tanks, wells, etc., phallic emblems of Śiva, images of gods, and so forth.

As a Gṛhaṅīta he seems to have been peculiarly averse to the renunciation of the world. Though a teacher of Vedaṭā, he often had disputations with celebrated monks. He is said to have defeated in arguments, Nyāsināśrama, the writer of so many Vedaṭā works, Upendrāśrama who was universally regarded as the first man of his time, and even Madhusūdana Sarasvatī, whose fame rests on his successful assualt of the Naiyāyikas. Paṇḍits all over India looked upon him as their patron, and he spared neither money nor pains to help them. This position was held for a long time by his son Saṅkara and after Saṅkara, by Vidyānādi Kaviṇḍra, Tradition says that he often worked miracles. Once upon a time, there was a severe drought in India, and at the request of the Great Moghul he brought down rain in twenty-four hours. The Great Moghul pleased with his wonderful powers granted him permission to re-erect the temple of Vīvēsara at Benares destroyed about 100 years before. The spacious and beautifully ornamented temple destroyed by Aurangzeb's Subahdar about 1670 and converted into a mosque is pointed out as the temple erected by Bhaṭṭa-Nārāyaṇa. Māndāla supports this tradition, but the Gīdhi-vand Anucharita is silent on the point.

Not only was he a voluminous writer, but he was a great collector of manuscripts. Manuscripts copied by him and copied under his directions are often found in different libraries. He died at a ripe old age, leaving three sons well established in the world, and a number of grandsons, many of whom became famous writers in the 17th century.

Nārāyaṇa's eldest son was Rāmakuṭha, who wrote Nīve-pitṛkā-nirṛtya, Kāti-haṃdi-pattāha, Aśv-stuti-vyākhyanā (Gīdhvināucharita), Jyotishțo-paddhatā (Māndāla), Ananta, virat-otṛgḍa-praṛgya, Māṭi-haṃdi-nirṛtya, Sivalīṅga-pratimī-stā-viśhi, Vedaṭī-ḍati-praṛgya and Rudra-vatī-paddhatā (Anrechts). His principal student was Trimalla Bhaṭṭa. He died at the age of 82, leaving three sons, Dinakara, Kamalikara, and Lakṣmanag. His wife Uma died a suff.
The third son of Nārāyaṇa was Govinda who died at the age of 48. He was very fond of his mother, whom he served all through life, following her shortly after her death. He left four sons:—Lakshmi Bhāṭṭā, Indra Bhāṭṭa, Rāma Bhāṭṭa and Brahma Bhāṭṭa. The second son of Nārāyaṇa Bhāṭṭa was Saṅkara Bhāṭṭa. His disciples were:—

(i) Mallarī Bhāṭṭa
(ii) Bhāṭṭoṭi Dikṣhitā, the author of the Siddhānta-Kumudī. He taught through his son Dāmodara:—

(i) Kōlaṭbrāhārāma
(ii) Abhayāṅkara
(iii) Viśvanātha Dānte

He wrote Dharmadāvata-nirṇayachandāṅkikā, Mīmāṃsā-bīdaprakāśa, Viśī-ṛaṣṭṛyya-nālakṣaṇa Vratamayuktā, Sātra-bīdī-Prakāśa, Sarva-dharma-prakāśa and Siddhā-kalpa-sūtra. Of these Devalnirṇayaka is very well known. Saṅkara does not speak much of himself in his work. He simply says that in his old age he was very much distressed by the loss of a dear nephew of his. The book as a matter of course does not record his death. That he was a very prominent figure at Benares is evidenced by Kavindra-chandrodāyā. It calls him the head of the Paṇḍit community of India and a great patron of learning. We do not know when he died,—we know from Prīṣṭaśrī Ṛṣīkāla of his son Nilaṅkaṇṭha that he had four sons, Dāmodara, Āgriṣṭha, Nilaṅkaṇṭha (all of whom he mentions in his Gāḍhi) and Raṅganātha. Perhaps Raṅganātha was dead when the book was written.

Leaving the Gāḍhi family now to pursue their career of authorship with the greatest vigour in the seventeenth century, I now proceed to give an account of the man who wielded the greatest influence in India during the middle of the seventeenth century. This is Viḍyānāthī Kavindra. He was a Saṅgītā, but he was a very rich man. He had a Bhāyīḍrī or treasurer named Kṛṣṇa-Bhaṭṭa. Both the master and servant were good poets and men of the highest Hindu culture. They migrated from the banks of the Godāvari, perhaps owing to the annexation of the remnant of Nīzān Shāhī dominions by the Great Moghul Shah Jehan. Kavindra is mentioned as wielding the highest influence after Bhāṭṭa Nārāyaṇa and Saṅkara for the good not only of Paṇḍits and Brāhmaṇas but of Hindus in general. Shah Jehan gave him the title of Sarva-vīṇī-vīṇī-vīṇī. So he is known as Sarva-vīṇī-vīṇī-vīṇī-Kavindra-Sarvatī. He was a great collector of manuscripts. It is not known how many thousands of manuscripts he collected, but all the manuscripts of his library bear in large, bold, and beautiful Devanāgarī character his signature Sarva-vīṇī-vīṇī-vīṇī-Kavindra-Sarvatī. That signature is a guarantee for the correctness and accuracy of the manuscript. It is not known when and how the library was broken up, but the manuscripts of his library can now be procured in Benares, and they are preferred by all Paṇḍits to other manuscripts.

At that time Hindus suffered great hardship owing to the exaction of a pilgrim tax from all votaries that came to Benares and Prayāga. Kavindra, as the acknowledged head of the Paṇḍits of Benares, was greatly moved by the hardship of his co-religionists. He journeyed to Agra with a large following and proceeded to the Dwānām, and there he pleaded the cause of the Hindu pilgrims with so much force of eloquence that all the noblemen of the court from Irān, Bādakshān, Balkh, Kabul, Kandahār, Kashmir, Panjab, and Sindh were struck with wonder. Shah Jehan and Dara Shikoh relented and abolished the tax. That was a day of great rejoicing throughout Hindu India. It was on this occasion that the title of Sarva-vīṇī-vīṇī-vīṇī was conferred upon him. When he came back to Benares with his new title and with the prestige of success, addresses poured upon him from all parts of India. About a hundred of these in Sanskrit were collected together by his Bhāṇḍārī, who also presented one with 36 verses; and two copies of
the collected addresses are to be found in the Asiatic Society’s Library. The addresses are both in prose and poetry. Some are long and some are very short. One of the most notable persons in presenting an address was Visvanatha Tarkapanchatanana. Another address was by Ganesa of the Dharmadikari family of Benares. Brahendra Sarasvati was another. Bhaiya Bhaṭṭa was a fourth. Paṇḍit Viresvara of Kürmāchala also presented an address.

These addresses set forth the excellences of Vidyānidhi. Some praise his liberality, some his eloquence, some his boldness, others again his deep knowledge of the Śāstras. One sets forth the various Śāstras he had studied, and another the various acts of charity to which he contributed. The most touching of the addresses is that which was presented by the students at Benares who looked upon him as their Earthly Providence.

After Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇa, Sāṅkara and Vidyānidhi, the man who exerted his influence all over India was Gāgā Bhaṭṭa or Vīśvesvara Bhaṭṭa. He came at a time when the Marāṭhās were a fighting and rising nation. The political importance of the Marāṭhās had its reflex influence on the colony of Paṇḍits of the Mahārāṣṭra country at Benares. The Marāṭhā peoples looked upon them as their law-givers and they also felt a pride in their being of the Mahārāṣṭra extraction. Gāgā-Bhaṭṭa was the son of Dinakara Bhaṭṭa and grandson of Rāmakṛishna Bhaṭṭa and great grandson of Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa. His father and his uncle wrote many books specially in Smritis. His cousins, too, were writers of note, but he outdid them all. He completed a series of Smritis works, left unfinished by his father Dinakara Bhaṭṭa. He wrote a commentary on the Jaimiti Śāstras. Kumārila wrote his commentary on Sabara-Bhāṣya, in verse, for one quarter of the first chapter only. Gāgā-Bhaṭṭa continued the work, and wrote a commentary in verse for the whole work. This commentary is entitled Śāddṛkodyaya. But Gāgā-Bhaṭṭa is not so much known for his erudite works as for the influence he exerted on Society. He it was who restored Śivaṅi, the founder of Marāṭhā greatness, to the Khastiya caste and performed his Abhisheka ceremony as an independent sovereign, Śivaṅi greatly revered him for his learning and piety. He it was who first raised the question of caste elevation, which at the present moment is exercising the minds of all Hindus. He had a loud voice and his eloquence was greatly admired. He was a Mīmāṃsaka of the first class and a great writer on Smritis. He wrote on Almukdāra and even on Vādānta.

His great successor was Nāgojī Bhaṭṭa, who lived to a great age and whose influence over the people of Benares was very great. There is no branch of Sanskrit literature in which he did not distinguish himself as a commentator. His commentaries on works of the Pāṇini School of grammar are of the highest authority. He wrote on Almukdāra. He wrote on the Tīrthas. He wrote on tiḥi. He wrote on Ṭīrthas. He wrote on Almukdāra. He wrote on Mimāṃsā. He wrote on Rāmāyaṇa. He wrote on Śāntihyya. He wrote on Vādānta. He always encouraged students, and stories of Nāgojī’s encouragement of students may yet he heard in Benares. Even at his old age he enjoyed life heartily and mixed with all classes of men. He died about the time when Benares came under British Protection by a vote of majority in the Governor-General’s Council about 1775. The Rājā of Pratāpgarh in Oudh gave him his livelihood and he gratefully acknowledges his obligation to the Rājā in the opening verse of every one of his works.

His pupil and successor was Vaidyanaṭha Pāyagunḍa, otherwise called Ananṭ Bhaṭṭa, also a voluminous writer on Vidyāpūrṇa and Smritis. His commentary on the Vyavahāra-Kāanda of Mādhukarīd is still the standard work of the Benares School of Smritis, and as such very much respected in the civil courts of British India.

In 1791 the Benares Sanskrit College was established and the Dakahīṁ Brahmānas were its principal professors. Even at the present moment the Dakahīṁ element preponderates in the staff of that College.
The seven Dakshíqi families that swayed the Hindu Society at Benares during the last four hundred years are:

(i) The Śeṣha family—though they came from the Tailanga country they are to all intents and purposes now Mahārāṣṭra Brāhmaṇas.

(ii) The Dharmādikā family which appears from the genealogy given by Maṇḍalik to have come to Benares about the same time as the Gādhis.

(iii) The Gādhi or Brāhṇa family, of which Bāmeśvara came to Benares in 1522 and about whom and whose family something has been said in the first part of the paper.

(iv) The Bhārandā family.—The founder of this family was Mahādeva, the son-in-law of Nilakaṇṭha Brāhṇa, son of Sāndara Brāhṇa. He was the author of Dinakari, the commentary on Siddhānta-Muktavali. It is not known when they came to Benares, but since Mahādeva’s time they always held a high position among the Puṇḍits of Benares, the last representatives being Mahāmabhāpyāya Dāmodara Sāstrī of the Benares and Mahāmabhāpyāya Govinda Sāstrī of the Calcutta Sanskrit College.

(v) The Pāyagnā family, of which Vaidyanātha was the most prominent figure.

(vi) Chaturdhara or Chowdhari family, which did much in advancing the cause of Hinduism at Benares. Nilakaṇṭha Chaturdhara wrote a commentary on the whole of the Mahābhārata.

(vii) The Puntamkar family.—Mahādeva of this family wrote a large commentary on Bhāvaanda Siddhānta-vāgīśā, commentary on the Dīdhṛti.

It would be interesting to collect all the Sanskrit works written by different members of these six families for the last four hundred years.

They will be an extensive library—they will show the direction in which Hindu Society moved, and they will also incidentally give us much information about the political history of India from Hindu sources, which is not much available at the present day.

THE ORIGIN OF THE BHAKTI SCHOOL.

[This following is a very brief summary of the lecture delivered by Dr. R. G. Bhāndarkar in July last at the Literary and Philosophical Club, Poona. The views herein expressed have been set forth at full length and with all the necessary evidence in the introductory part of the Vaishnava section of his work on the Bhaktimārga, which he has recently contributed to the Grundriss der Indo-Arischen Philologie und Altertumskunde.—D. R. B.]

The ancient Vedic hymns containing prayers to the different gods were in later times succeeded by others in which the poets endeavoured to grapple with the problems about man, the world, and god. Speculation of this kind was continued in the times of the Upanishads and the main doctrines arrived at concerned the freedom of the human heart from passion and the existence of the supreme Lord of all possessing personality and of Brāhma which was the impersonal essence of all things. The first part in later times developed itself into Buddhism, Jainism, and such other atheistic systems setting forth mere moral elevation or righteousness as the goal to be attained. The second part was taken up by the Bhakti or Bhāgavata School. We have epigraphical evidence of the existence of the school during the three or four centuries before Christ. The age of inscriptions is determined by the form of the characters in which they are engraved. The earliest inscriptions known to us are those of Aiśoka, who ascended the throne about 258 B.C., as is determined by the occurrence of the names of five contemporaneous Greek princes. The first of the inscriptions indicative of the existence of the Bhakti School must have been engraved about the beginning of the second century before Christ. It speaks of a piṭā stone wall (śilā-prākāra) for the worship of Bhāgavat Sānkharāna and Vāsudeva.1 Another, a few years later, mentions the erection of a flagstaff with an image of Garuḍa at the top in honour of Vāsudeva, the god of gods, by Heliodora (Heliodoro) a resident of Takshasthila, an ambassador of

1 The stone is now in the Victoria Hall, Udaipur, but it was found at Gauspūl, to which place it was removed from Nāgar, where it is believed to have been originally lying (Jour. Beng. As. Soc., Vol. I, Part I, p. 77 n.).
Antalikita (Antalkia) who was a Bhagavata, i.e., worshipper of Bhagavat or belonging to the Bhagavata School. A third inscription of about the beginning of the first century before Christ existing at Nārāyanacātaka contains an adoration of Sāndarshana and Vāsudeva. Patañjali, the author of the Mahābhāṣya on Pāṇini, who wrote about 150 before Christ speaks of Vāsudeva as the worshipful one. A Buddhistic work of the third century before Christ mentions Vāsudeva and Vāldeva as the deities worshipped by specific sects. The Mahābhārata is a work containing a collection of pieces of varied antiquity, some pre-Christian and others post-Christian, and it is difficult to determine the age of any particular piece; but, with the help of the dates supplied us by the inscriptions and the two books mentioned above, we are in a position to determine when a certain specific religion that it speaks of in a section of the 12th book arose. That religion is the Vaiśnavism or the religion of single-minded devotion or monothemism. It prevailed among a tribe of the Pandavas known by the name of Sātavatas. The origin of this religion is traced to certain Rishis, and from them it was transmitted to others until it reached Brhadapati, who had for his pupil a prince of the name of Vasu-Uparichara. This last instituted a horse sacrifice in which Brhadapati was the priest. No animals were killed on the occasion, and the oblations were prepared in accordance with the precepts of the Upanishads. Hari was the god worshipped. He took away the oblation offered to him without showing himself to Brhadapati. He was, however, seen by Vasu-Uparichara. Brhadapati was angry, when three persons explained to him that Hari was to be seen only by those who adored him and were devoted to him. They themselves had once gone to the White Island (Sveto-devīya) to see Hari or Nārāyaṇa, performed austerities for a hundred years, but were told that Hari was not to be seen by them, as they were not his devotees and performed only austerities. This story shows that a new reformed religion had sprung up, which, like Buddhism, condemned animal sacrifices and the practice of austerities, but, unlike it, set forth the adoration of God as the way to emancipation. Then Nārada is mentioned as having gone to the same White Island; and, as he was a devotee, Nārāyaṇa showed himself to him and explained the Bhagavata religion, which prevailed among the Sātavatas. The Supreme God according to this faith is Vāsudeva; from him sprang Sañkarshana or the individual soul; from him Pradyumna or the mind; and from him Aniruddha or egoism. By certain devotional practices, men attain Vāsudeva through the intermediate stages of Aniruddha, etc. This Vaiṣṇava religion was, it is further stated, revealed in the Hari-śīla or the Bhagavad-gītā, at the time when the armies of the Pāndavas and Kurus stood face to face and Arjuna’s heart failed him. The Vaiṣṇava-dharma of the Sātavatas was, therefore, the system taught in the Bhagavad-gītā; and the theistic reform we have spoken of as opposed to the moral reform of Buddha is that effected by that work.

The main problem of this work was how to achieve freedom from passion. A man is born to act. He acts with certain desires; these desires become strengthened in him by frequent actions and he becomes a slave to them. Therefore Gītā teaches that actions should be done, not from the desire of attaining any fruit from them, but because the Brahman or the universal order requires him to do them, i.e., the action should be performed as a duty or it should be dedicated to God and performed to propitiate Him.

Now to perform an act because it is a duty or to please God is a matter of the greatest difficulty to an ordinary man who is full of desires and passions, but he is able to conquer these by the grace of God when he adores Him incessantly by bhakti or devotion. Bhakti or devotion to God is, therefore, the way to attain God and serenity or freedom from passions.

The Vāsudeva religion or the Pāṇiṣad-dharm system, as it was afterwards called, was based on the Bhagavad-gītā. Megasthenes mentions Heracles as the god worshipped by the Saurases, in whose country was situated Methora or Mithunā and the River Jofare or Jamna flowed. The Saurases correspond to Saurasenas, i.e., here the Sātavatas, and thus Vāsudeva to Heracles; and thus the religion of Vāsudeva flourished on the evidence of Megasthenes, in the fourth century before the Christian era.

3 Arch. Surv., Wes. India, Vol. v, p. 66.
Soon after, Vasudeva was identified with Krishna whose name had been handed down as that of a holy seer and who was the founder of a Gotra or family. In later times, he was identified with Nārāyaṇa who had become an object of worship as the source of all Nārāyaṇas or men and as lying on the primeval waters; and in still later times, with Viṣṇu, who was originally a solar deity but had afterwards acquired the attributes of supreme godhead. About the first century of the Christian era, the boy god of a wandering tribe of cow-herds of the name of Ábhiras came to be identified with Vasudeva. In the course of their wanderings eastward from Syria or Asia Minor, they brought with them probably traditions of the birth of Christ in the stable, the massacre of innocents, etc., and the name Christ itself. This name became recognised as Krishna, as this word is often pronounced by some Indians as Krishto or Kushṭo. And thus the traditional legends brought by the Ábhiras became engrafted on the story of Vasudeva-Krishna of India. These are the five elements that constitute the Vaishnavism of modern India.

MY DEAR MR. BHANDARKAR,

Many thanks for your drawing attention to my notes on the dates of Subandhu and Dinnaga and sending me an advance proof of Dr. Hoernle's letter dated 13th June 1911. Dr. Hoernle says, "I have no prints or manuscripts of Vaman's work at hand, but it would seem that M. M. Haraprasad's reading of Subandhu is a more acceptable conjecture, not supported by any manuscript evidence." When I wrote the note, I had the Kāvyavāsanī edition of the Kāvyadānīkāraśāstra of the former before me. That edition is based on two manuscripts, one from Jaipur and the other from Benares. The Jaipur manuscript had Vastubandhu, while the Benares manuscript had Subandhu. So in my note I said, "there may be an objection to this that in some manuscripts the word is not 'Subandhu' but 'Vastubandhu.'" Thus I had some manuscript evidence to support me when I wrote that paper. Since the appearance of Mr. Pāṭhak's paper on 'Kumāragupta, the patron of Vasubandhu,' I have consulted the only manuscript available in Calcutta, namely, the Sanskrit College manuscript Alankāra No. 21. It has Subandhu with a little wavering at the lower end of the right hand vertical line which I take to be the subscript U; though in the same page there is an instance of a more pronounced subscript U. In Anandarāja Baruśa's edition it is Vastubandhu. The Vidyāvīlāsa Press edition of Vāman's work, published at Benares under the supervision of Dr. Thibaut, it is Subandhu. The edition is based on three manuscripts, though differences of reading are not given. The three manuscripts are: the two learned editors and the third to Vatya Sandarbhārśya of Viṭṭhalapāla. So I have five manuscripts to support the reading Subandhu. I have not seen the Vaniṭṭhāsa Press edition used by Mr. Pāṭhak. It would be interesting in this connection to consult other manuscripts of the work which are to be found in other parts of India and Europe. Mr. R. Narasimhaiah of Bangalore says, in his letter to me dated the 28th October 1911, that with regard to Dr. Hoernle's letter in the Indian Antiquary for September, he had referred Dr. Hoernle to some manuscripts in which the reading Subandhu is clearly given.

Reading carefully the verses which preface Subandhu's story of Vāsavadattā, it appears patent to everyone who is acquainted with Subandhu's punning style that he himself mentions Chandrāprakāśa in its śīta form Hinakarāgaṇḍa in the 5th verse. For in that verse he says that the good man, who makes other people's merits appreciated, becomes more fortunate and popular. The moonshine, which makes the kumbhā flower blossom, bears enhanced beauty. Now moonshine Hinakarāgaṇḍa is Chandrāprakāśa. So it is a proper name, and I am glad that Dr. Hoernle agrees with me.

Dr. Hoernle has done a service in pointing out that the hemistic, in Vāman's work must have been written shortly after the death of Chandragupta, that is, about A. D. 413, though I think shortly before, as a reigning prince would not be described as Chandragupta. In that case, by the showing of Dr. Takakus, the hemistic cannot refer to Vasubandhu who lived for 80 years between A. D. 420 and 500, and Mr. Pāṭhak depends on that eminent Japanese Scholar for referring the verse to Vasubandhu.

Dr. Hoernle doubts that there was a civil war after the death of Chandragupta.

But the prefatory verses of Vāsavadattā give a support to my contentsions. In the sixth verse Subandhu is very bitter against khalas—the wicked—who are more mischievous than snakes. In his usual punning way he says that serpents are nakkale-mandari—enemy to weasles; at the same time sa-kulamundari—not envious to the family; while the wicked are Sukale-mandari—hard even to the family of their victims. In the seventh he
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 compares the wicked with owls, who have an eye even in the darkest of darkness. Then again in the eighth, he says that the wicked though they destroy the merits of others become the more sinful; just as clouds which cover the rays of the moon become darker thereby. What do all these signify? The word Sáchī in the eighth verse again means Chandragupta, though the unhistorical commentators do not say so. The tenth verse is well known throughout India and is in the mouth of every Pañjītī. It says that on the death of Viṣṇumātī, love of Art and Poetry is gone. Upāstara are flourishing; everybody's hand is on his neighbour's throat. What does this mean, unless it means a revolution in which the author did not fare well on the death of Chandragupta-Viṣṇumātī?

I agree with Dr. Hoernle that history does not speak of such a revolution. But does history record all the revolutions in India? Has the history of India advanced so far? If not, may not these wailings of a sensitive poet signify a change for the worse? Read the hemistich with the prefatory verses of Vīsamūdhā, and the inference is irresistible that the changes of the times were ruinous to Subandhu and his party.

The word Sáchī may have a derivative meaning of companionship or friendship, for the word comes from Śácha, meaning sáha, a word common in the Vedas. So the word Amūdi also comes from Amūṣa. But the radical meaning was long lost sight of. Kālidāsa, who flourished within a century after Subandhu, uses the word Sáchī always in the sense of ministers.

Tena dhoṣa-prada gurum ca saucīva uchikshāp.1
Grāhī saucī saucīhi saucīhi, etc.

Mr. Fáleshk translates dīshyā kritāthārama as deserving congratulation on the success of his efforts. If it were the phrase dīshyā varāhā, it would have meant congratulation; but simply dīshyā means "fortunately." He was successful in his endeavour, not in obtaining sovereignty, because that is not the subject treated of here; but he was successful in giving encouragement to literary men, that is, in being dāvaraś to kṛtačāryaḥ or men of talent.

Calculta.

Haraprasad Sastri.

BOOK NOTICE.

Kāya-pārakāśā with Prādiḍa and Udyyota edited by Vasudev Sastri. Anandārama Sanskrit Series, Poona, No. 60.

Slowly and steadily has the Anandārama Press been putting forth its work, at so much a day, and already our shelves are groaning with the weight of the volumes it has published. We have used the word "groaning" intentionally. The varieties of types in which the volumes are printed are often rather too big and make the volumes more bulky and heavy than they ought to be, and, therefore, less handy. The Sastri and the Pañjītī might perhaps be thereby enabled to swallow a part of spectacles for some time longer than they would otherwise be, at least in reading these volumes. But their case is different. They have got only a few books to possess. Other scholars already feel the want of shelf-room for the numerous books they are obliged to have in these days of multiplication of books.

The present volume is the latest in the Anandārama Series. Kāya-pārakāśā is a classic of Alaukikā literature and there has been no end to the writing of commentaries on it. Yet only a few years ago there were no good editions of either the text or of good commentaries on it available in print. Mahēśēchandra's first edition, satisfactory as it was, was then out of print. Kamalakāri, a not very satisfactory commentary, was available only in a lithographed edition. The only edition which students of the work could avail themselves of was the one with Mahēśēchandra commentary. But the commentary was far from satisfactory. Then followed Vāmanāchārya's edition, in which the text was, as in a variorum edition, smothered in the excerpts from various commentaries.

Perhaps the best commentary on the Kāya-pārakāśā is the Prādiḍa with its two commentaries, the Prādiḍa of Vaidyānātha and the Udyyota of Nāgoji-bhāṣa. The Nirāsya-sāgar Press gave us some time ago an edition of the

Prādiḍa with the Pañjītī, but unfortunately without the Vṛtti or the explanatory prose portion of the text. Of Nāgoji-bhāṣa's commentary only the portions dealing with Ullīsas I, II, VIII, and X were available in the editions of those Ullīsas published by the late Prof. Chandorkar for the sake of the B.A. students of Bombay University. The present edition, therefore, of the Kāya-pārakāśā with the Prādiḍa and the complete Udyyota is quite welcome. It would have been still more welcome had Mr. H.N. Apte, who has got the management of the Series in his hands, seen his way to include explanations of the instances cited in the text from the Ullīsas published by him, so that the Udyyota could be used as a complete text from which students could learn.

In the publications issuing from the Anandārama Press, critical introductions by the editors, dealing with such matters as the date and position of a book and its author in the literature to which they relate, are not to be looked for. But it is better to have no such introduction than to have an unscholarly or uncritical one. The present editor does not seem to be aware even of the fact that the Kāya-pārakāśā was left incomplete towards the end by MARAMA and was completed by Rājānakā Allāta. But a correct text, correctly printed, of a work not already printed at all or printed incorrectly, is what we have a right to expect from the Press; and we have certainly got that in the volume before us, and that in itself is a great deal. For the sake of correctness of spelling, however, we would have wished that the word "Udyyota" had not been printed as "Udyya," as it has been in so many places.

(Or both Rācchadāvī, in Veda, pp. 101-2, Z.D.M.G. XLVIII). The list of Errata (suchand) too is not as complete as it should have been.

Sheshadhar R. Bhandarkar.
Bombay.
A translation, without a transcript, of this inscription by Captain E. Fell has been published in *Asiatic Researches*, Vol. XV, pp. 443-6, and a summary of it with full and elaborate remarks thereon by Lieutenant-Colonel Tod in the *Transactions, Royal As. Soc.*, Vol. I, p. 154. But none of these attempts has proved successful, and a correct and accurate account together with a transcript of it is still a desideratum. No excuse is, therefore, needed to publish this record.

The inscription was originally found at Hānsi in the Panjab, but regarding its exact original find-spot there, Tod says as follows: "The inscription, which I obtained through the kindness of my friend Colonel Skinner, had been saved from the general wreck of these hells, by the materials being taken to erect a small Musliman place of worship; and this slab was built into the wall in a reversed position. It was afterwards presented to Marquis Hastings; but as it reached this nobleman at a very busy period of his career in 1818, I know not what became of it."

The inscription stone, strange to say, is now lying in the Royal Scottish Museum at Edinburgh. Two excellent photographs of it had been sent four years ago by a person connected with the Museum to a Parsi gentleman in Poona, called Mr. Frenchman, who made them over to me. And it is from these photographs that I edit the inscription.

The inscription contains 22 lines of writing. The characters are Nāgarī. Attention may be drawn to the sign for इ occurring in eṛikṣa-yūtha-puṭikṛh, line 12. The language is Sanskrit; and the inscription is partly in prose and partly in verse. The verses are numbered, but very great carelessness is shown in this respect. It is full of solecisms. We thus have raṅḍi instead of raṅḍnī in line 2, viḷṭāya-vra-karēḥ instead of viḷṭāya-vra-karīṣaḥ in line 8, and so on. In respect of orthography, the only points that call for notice are: (1) the use of e for ē and (2) the doubling of a consonant in conjunction with a preceding r. With regard to lexicography we have only to note the deś word adha employed in line 11.

The record opens with an obesiance to some goddess whose name is unspecified. This shows that the inscription slab was originally in the temple of a goddess. Then follows a verse which invokes the blessings of the god Murāri. Verse 2 informs us that there was a king of the Chāumphāna lineage called Pritvīvīrāja and his maternal uncle was one Kīlhaṇa, who, according to the next verse, belonged to the Guhilant dynasty. The verse following tells us that thinking of Hāmrira who had become the cause of anxiety to the world, the king put Kīlhaṇa in charge of the fort of Āśikā, doubtless Hānsi. From verse 5 we learn that Kīlhaṇa erected a pratoti, i.e., a fort, or gateway which with its flags set Hāmrira as it were at defiance. And near the gateway were constructed two koshṭhakas or granaries (verse 6). Then we have a prose line (lines 9-10) speaking of a letter sent to him by Vibbhīśana. Verse 7 with which the letter begins, says: "the lord of demons (Vibbhīśana) who has obtained a boon from Rāma, the crest-jewel of the lineage of Raghu, respectfully speaks thus to Kīlhaṇa staying in the fort (gaḍha) of Āśi."

The next verse says: "In the work of building the bridge we both assisted the leaders of the monkeys and bears. And you yourself (Kīlhaṇa) have written that to you the lord of Pāmchāpura, a string of pearls and this city had been given by the Omni-present (Rāma)." In the verse following Pritvīvīrāja is compared to Rāma and Kīlhaṇa to Hanūmān. In verse 10 Vibbhīśana bestows nothing but conventional praise on Kīlhaṇa. Verse

---

11 refers to his having burnt Pañcchapura, and captured but not killed its lord. Verse 12 again is simply eulogistic, but, in the verse following with which the letter ends, Vibhishana requests Kihana to accept the string of pearls or even Lāukā but promise safety to him. Then again follows a prose line (lines 19-20) which by the way informs us that this string of pearls was presented by the ocean to Rānabhadra when he was intent upon constructing the bridge. Verses 14-15 state that there was one Valha who belonged to the Doja race and who was a subordinate of Kihana and that his son was Lakshmana under whose auspices the prāñasti was composed. This is followed by the date which is Thursday the 7th of the bright half of Māgha of the (Vikrama) year 1224.

It will be seen from the above account that this inscription is a prāñasti or panegyric, and its object is to describe Kihana's conquest of Pañcchapura and its chief. Kihana was a maternal uncle and feudatory of the Chāhamāna sovereign Prithvirāja. This Prithvirāja is not the celebrated Prithvirāja who fought with and was captured by Shiāhun-d-Din Ghūr in A.D. 1192, as Tod supposes. Because, for this Prithvirāja we have dates ranging only from A.D. 1182-92, whereas the date of our inscription is V.E. 1224 = A.D. 1167. Prithvirāja of this record must therefore be the same as the Prithvirāja who preceded Someśvara. Kihana, we are expressly told, was put in charge of the fort of Āsi or Āsiḥa, i.e., Hānsi, to check the progress of Hāmathra, i.e., of course the Muhammadans, there be no doubt that the Muhammadans were at this time attempting to pour into India. This is also clear from the Delhi-Siwalik pillar inscription of V.E. 1220 = A.D. 1164 wherein the Chāhamāna Visaladeva is represented to have exterminated the Mlechchhas and made Aryavarta what its name signifies, i.e., an abode of the Ārya. It was, therefore, urgent necessity to put a stop to this by appointing a brave and clever personage to the charge of the Hānsi fort, especially as it was on the route to India. Tod says: "Asigach or Asī lurg is celebrated as the scene of contest between the Hindas and early Muhammadans. It was by this route, that most of Shāhābadin's attempts were made to wrest the throne of Hind from Prithviraj; and often did the warriors of the mountains of Cēbūl find their graves before Āsi. Even now it presents the appearance of a great sepulchre all around but especially to the west. The route was by Pēchapattan, the town of parity, on the Sutlej, to Bhāner and Pach-dīdī, to Āsi and Delhi."5 From these words of Tod's the importance of fortifying and maintaining the fort of Hānsi towards the close of the Chāhamāna supremacy is quite clear; and what is equally clear is the necessity of keeping a strong hold on Pēchapattan on the Sutlej mentioned by Tod, which can be no other than Pañcchapura of our inscription. Probably the chief of Pañcchapura about this time did not owe fealty to the Chāhamāna dynasty, and it was, therefore, absolutely indispensable to put him down and take possession of his city. This explains why the capture of Pañcchapura and its chief is considered so important in the inscription.

The prāñasti was composed by one Lakshaman, who was, we are told, a Doja by race. The Dojas have been given a place by Tod in his list of thirty-six royal races of Rājasthān, but he tells nothing about them. I believe they are the same as the Doñas or Dojías, a clan of the Paramānas. The province in Rājputāna now called Hādoī was originally held by them and was wrested from them by the Khelhs of Gagroan, who in their turn had to give it up to the Hādjas after whom the province was so called. In the time of Mahmud Ghazni, Merat, Baladexthr, etc., were held by the Dojas, of whom Haradatta was the most pre-eminent. Dojas are now found as Jāyirddrs near Lāvā in Tonk.

Text.

1. अः \[\text{Read} \, \text{सुहृद्}\].
2. वधस \[\text{Read} \, \text{वधस्}\].
3. \text{Read} \, \text{बिषम}.
4. \text{Read} \, \text{बिषम}.
5. \text{Read} \, \text{बिषम}.
6. \text{Read} \, \text{बिषम}.
7. \text{Read} \, \text{बिषम}.
8. \text{Read} \, \text{बिषम}.
9. \text{Read} \, \text{बिषम}.
10. \text{Read} \, \text{बिषम}.
11. \text{Read} \, \text{बिषम}.
12. \text{Read} \, \text{बिषम}.
13. \text{Read} \, \text{बिषम}.
14. \text{Read} \, \text{बिषम}.
15. \text{Read} \, \text{बिषम}.
16. \text{Read} \, \text{बिषम}.
17. \text{Read} \, \text{बिषम}.
18. \text{Read} \, \text{बिषम}.
19. \text{Read} \, \text{बिषम}.
20. \text{Read} \, \text{बिषम}.
21. \text{Read} \, \text{बिषम}.

\text{From a photograph.}

\text{Expressed by a symbol.}

\text{Read} \, \text{सुहृद्}.

\text{Read} \, \text{सुहृद्}.

\text{Read} \, \text{बिषम}.

\text{Read} \, \text{बिषम}.

\text{This ought to be विषम, but will not suit the metre.}

\text{The meaning of this line is not clear to me.}

\text{Read} \, \text{पापसूता} \text{and} \text{सत्त्वा}.

\text{Read} \, \text{सन्निधिः}.

\text{Read} \, \text{सन्निधिः}.

\text{Read} \, \text{सन्निधिः}.
4.—Anāvāḍā stone inscription of Sāraṅgadeva [Vikrama]—Sanvívat 1348.

This inscription was found early in 1904 when some excavations were being carried on by the Irrigation Department of the Baroda State at Anāvāḍā, the old Anaphilapātaka, nearly three miles from Pātaṇ in the Kaṅjī division. It is now deposited, I am told, in the bāchērī of the Vahivāṭāḷār.

The record consists of twenty-four lines covering a space of 1' 4½" broad by 1' 5¼" high. The initial letters of the first seven lines have peeled off, but in all other respects the stone is very well preserved. The characters are Nāgari. The language is Sanskrit, and excepting the verse at the commencement the whole of the record is in prose. As regards orthography it is sufficient to note (1) that a consonant following r is doubled and (2) that the sign for r is employed for b only once in ōm = ubhībrate in line 1. In respect of lexicography may be noticed the words: (1) prekṣhaṇa(na)ka and (2) sthitaka both occurring in line 7, and (3) syakti in lines 9 and 21. The first means “theatricals,” the second “a grant in perpetuity,” and the third “specification of details.” In lines 7, 9, and 10 occurs the word palamāna, the meaning of which is uncertain. It occurs in other inscriptions also, e. g., in a Chaulukya copper-plate grant of v. s. 1280 (above, Vol. VI, p. 157, Plate II, line 5), where it appears to be equivalent to pāra-pradatta of the other grants of the same dynasty. Is palamāna, therefore, a mistake for pāryāmāna?

The inscription opens with the well-known stanza with which Jayadeva’s Gita-Govinda commences. Then follows the date, which is Sunday the 13th of the bright half of Ashadhā in the [Vikrama] year 1348. At that time Mahārājādhirāja Sāraṅgadeva was reigning at Anahilpātaka; his Mahārājādhirāja Mahāmāyā Madhusudana was doing all the business of the seal, relating to the drawing of documents, etc., and the Panch (Paṇchakulas) consisted of Mahādeva Pothaṭa, and others, Pothaṭa being appointed by the king as keeper of the seal at Pātaṇapura (Pālaṇpur). The inscription then proceeds to record the gifts that were made on the aforesaid date as well as previously, for the worship, offering, and theatricals before the god Kṛśna. The previous grants are first specified. They are: (1) drāmas 180 in perpetuity by Kariṇa, (2) drāmas 72 from the customs-house in perpetuity, (3) drāmas 72, (4) drāmas 86, and (5) drāmas 48, four being for each amāvat day by Śeṭh Devala, accruing from his Sikiri (?). The new gifts were made by the five-fold people of the town (pāṇiḥamukha-nāparu) consisting of (1) the Panch, (2) the Bhārmaṇas who are called Purohitas here, (3) the Mahājanas, of whom some were Śaḍhu (Śaḍhūkār), some Śreṣṭhi (Śeṭh), Thakura, Soni (goldsmiths), Kaṁsāras (braziers), and so forth, (4) Vaiṣṇavākṣas (Vaiṇjarās), and (5) Nau-vittakas (ship-owners). The new grants were: (1) half a dramma paid by the seller on one dhādd of madder (mānasjīthḍaḥ), (2) one dramma paid both by the seller and buyer on one dhādd of soolum Melongena (Hingudī), (3) some portion from each cart filled with grain, the nature of which is not clear, and (4) one pal from a ghadd or jar of ghī by the seller.

It has been stated above that our inscription commences with the initial beneficatory stanza of the well-known Gita-Govinda. The Gita-Govinda, we know, was composed by Jayadeva, who is supposed to have flourished in the last quarter of the 12th century and lived during the reign of Lakṣmaṇa (10). And the fact that the stanza is quoted as the invocatory verse in our inscription shows that “the work had already within a century become quasi-sacred.” Again, it appears from our inscription that there was a temple of Kṛśna existing in Anāvāḍā long before the time of king Sāraṅgadeva to whose reign it refers itself and who no doubt belonged to the Vaiṣṇava dynasty. This is worthy of note, as we have not yet found any ancient temple dedicated to Kṛśna and hardly any reference given to such a one in old inscriptions. The only reference I know of is furnished by a Harasūkṛā stone inscription of Devapāla of Dīhāra dated v. s. 1275, which speaks of an image of Kṛśna being put up by one Kesava near a temple of Saṁbhū (11).

---

TRAVENOORE ARCHAEOLOGICAL SERIES.

BY K. V. SUBBAHMANYA AIYER, B.A., OOTACUMUD.

In the native state of Travenoore in the Malabar Presidency, the Archaeological Department has been in existence since the days of the late Professor Sundaram Pillai, who published some of the inscriptions of the Veppal kings in the Madras Mail and eventually in the pages of this journal. After his death, the Archaeological Survey does not appear to have come to an end. From Mr. Nagamiah's Manual of Travenoore, pp. 176-7, it is clear that all the inscriptions of the State, which are 450 in number, have been already examined in a rough way.

When Mr. Gopinatha Rao was appointed Superintendent of Archaeology in the State a few years ago, it was thought he would direct his energies to the publication of accurate transcripts and translations of the inscriptions of the State which had all been tentatively examined before his appointment was contemplated. We shall now see how he has discharged the duties entrusted to him. Eleven numbers of the Travenoore Archæological Series have already been issued and more are promised. So that, judging from the quantity of work turned out, his achievement is certainly commendable.

24 Read "texte.
25 From the original stone.
26 Read "naye.
27 Read "naye.
28 Read "naye.
29 Read "naye.
30 Read "naye.
31 Read "naye.
32 Read "naye.
33 Read "naye.
34 Read "naye.
35 Read "naye.
36 Read "naye.
37 Read "naye.
38 Read "naye.
39 Read "naye.
40 Read "naye.
Let us now examine the quality. In the first place as regards transliteration, an epigraphist is free to choose any system he likes, provided, he uses it throughout. In this publication, proper care does not appear to have been taken to correct the diacritical and printer’s mistakes. I have been able to notice a number of instances where distinction has not been made between i and j; r and r; it, u, n, n, and n. It may be thought that these are minor points which one need not trouble oneself about. The importance of a correct system of transliteration has been recognised by scholars, and it cannot be over-estimated. Epigraphical publications, to be of any real value, should, as far as possible, be free from errors of this kind. Else they mislead the readers instead of helping them.

A perusal of these publications will convince any one that their editor has criticised the views of others, very often without proper grounds. I propose to consider some of the arguments with which he assails the opinions of others.

On page 180, Mr. Gopinatha Rao writes, ‘Mr. Venkayya has separated the compound tiruvaiyaru vadyakavudaiya pirattiyar, found in several inscriptions which describe the mother of Uttamaśāladeva into tiruvaiyaruvedikya and Udayapirattiyār. By itself the first part means practically nothing and the second has introduced a fictitious queen in South Indian history. The mistake is perpetuated in his Annual Report, year after year, by his successor, Mr. Krishnasāstrī who also believes that the name of the mother of Uttamaśāla was Udayapirattiyār. Such an expression vayikravikavudaiya occurs in many places in Tamil literature, as for example, Rama is called Kovilaiyaṉ muni-vaiyuru vayittavanē by Kulaśekhara-Perumāḷ in his Perumāl Tirumoiy.”

The charge here made against Mr. Venkayya is certainly clear enough, and no one can mistake it. It is, that he has by an unwarranted separation of the words tiruvaiyaruvedikya vuyaiya pirattiyar introduced into the history of the Cholas a fictitious queen. In so doing he did not even perceive that the first part had no sense whatsoever. I admit that the charge would be a grave one if it were true and Mr. Venkayya deserves to be taken to task for it. On the other hand, if it could be satisfactorily proved that the charge is a false one, I think it is the duty of Mr. Gopinatha Rao to acknowledge his blunder.

The passage referred to by Mr. Gopinatha Rao occurs in the inscriptions of the 11th century A.D., and it is impossible even for a beginner in South Indian Epigraphy to confound ka and ta in these records. The passage which actually occurs in the inscriptions examined by Mr. Venkayya is Uttamaśālādevra-varai-tiruvaiyaru-vayutta Udayapirattiyār Sembiyān māddivāyān. Unfortunately for Mr. Gopinatha Rao, the records that mention the mother of Uttamaśālādeva are not few. All these numerous records, without even a single exception, read as stated by me just now; and its meaning has been taken by Mr. Venkayya to be “Udayapirattiyār Sembiyān māddivāyān, the mother of Uttamaśālādeva.” To be more literal, it only means “Udayapirattiyār Sembiyānāmāddivāyān who had obtained in her blessed womb Uttamaśālādeva.” It is this reading and this translation that are being “perpetuated” by Mr. Krishnasāstrī in his Annual Reports. I doubt if any one would say that a meaning other than what Mr. Venkayya has given to the passage is possible.

If we separate the phrase as suggested by Mr. Gopinatha Rao into tiruvaiyaruvedikya vuyaiya and pirattiyar, the first part must necessarily go with Uttamaśālādevra which precedes it and the second with what follows. The meaning would then be “Pirattiyār Sembiyānāmāddivāyān who would have to obtain in her blessed womb Uttamaśālādeva,” a statement of what is to happen and not what has already occurred.

1 A few of the mistakes in diacritical marks and types are pointed out here. The n occurring in Pavanāmaṇi (p. 162), Rāmāśāstrī (p. 159), Tandā condu (p. 168), ought to be ṇ and the n in Pāṇgulu (p. 155), a d sāvaka (pp. 158-176) ought to be sā. The f of Jatila (p. 155) pirattiyar (p. 162) should be f. The lengths of vowels in Anaimalai (p. 153), Pūrṇāśāstrī (p. 157), and in several other words in pp. 162, 164 and 167 are not properly indicated. Teygālā (in p. 167) must be teygaal kāda.

2 The words in italics are transliterations of passages given by Mr. Gopinatha Rao in Tamil.
In pp. 168-69 of his Travencore Archaeological Series, Mr. Gopinatha Rao publishes, with a short introduction, a fragmentary inscription from Kanyakumari, with text and translation. Here the king's name has been read as Rājakēśarivarman Rājarājēśa, and this king has been identified with Rājrāja II. The date assigned for the record is A.D. 1167.

The preserved portion of the inscription commences with the words *perumbuğaḻ Kheirdja-kēśarivarman, etc.*, which is invariably how the historical introduction of Rājādhirāja I beginning with *Tīmalikērana* ends. The geographical terms occurring in the record also furnish some internal evidence as to its date. The high regnal year must also have been utilized in arriving at the date of the king. The fact that the watershed erected during the king's reign was called after Jayāṅgoṇḍa-Chōla is another point which an epigraphist would not omit to consider. It may be said here that the surname Jayāṅgoṇḍa-Chōla was first borne by Rājarāja I and after him by Rājādhirāja I. Besides, there is a considerable difference between the characters of the time of Rājādhirāja I and those of Rājarāja II. All these must have been taken into account in fixing the approximate date of the king. But we have direct evidence to show that the record does not belong to Rājarāja II but only to Rājādhirāja I. The very same inscription was copied in 1826 by Dr. Hultzsch, the Madras Government Epigraphist and in the list for that year the king's name is correctly given as Rājakēśarivarman Rājādhirāja with *āṇī* in brackets which goes to show that the syllables *āṇī* are mutilated. Having suspected that the king's name had been misread, I solicited the permission of the Assistant Archaeological Superintendent, Southern Circle, to have a look at the impression of this inscription. On comparing the published transcript with Dr. Hultzsch's impression, I found that they are both identical, as the text of Mr. Gopinatha Rao from the west wall of the temple is identical with Dr. Hultzsch's No. 96 of 1826 which is also on the same wall. The only difference is that the words *ni Yuan alaiāṅkaḻ[la] kha-hēd chēn-g* are omitted in Mr. Gopinatha Rao's text out of carelessness or oversight. It must be said that the passage is incomplete without these words and that the words *pamūrūkīl nilaṇaṁ* have no connection whatsoever with the western boundary with which they are forced to go in the translation.

When Mr. Gopinatha Rao identified the king with Rājarāja II, it must have struck him that the latter was a Parakēśarivarman and not Rājakēśarivarman as given in the record under notice. The difference surely called for some remark which we do not find in his introduction. Lastly, assuming that the record is one of Rājarāja II, he assigned A.D. 1167 for it. Now this yields A.D. 1136 for the accession of Rājarāja II. It may be pointed out that this date is again ten years earlier than the actual date of his coronation.

No. VII of the Travencore Archaeological Series is, according to the editor, one intended to supply the want of Vaṭṭeluttu inscriptions with plates. Here, he has, by the mere identity of the name Mārā萘alaiyan occurring in the four records, viz., the Āpinaḷai inscription of A. D. 760-70 the Madras Museum plates of Jālavarman and the Tirupparaṅgūnai and Travancore Museum epigraphs, arrived at the conclusion that all these must be referred to one and the same king. On page 165, he says that if the table given above, i.e., that furnished by the Simanāṉūr plates is examined closely, it becomes apparent that the Pāṇḍyas alternately bore the names Māravarman and Jālavarman (Saḍaiyaṉ), just in the same way the Chōla kings called themselves Rājakēśa and Parakēśari. In my opinion, the available facts do not warrant such a surmise. It is a well-known custom in Hindu families, observable even at the present day, that the eldest son takes the name of the grandfather. But if a king had two or more sons who ruled one after the other, it seems unlikely that the names Saḍaiyaṉ and Mārāṇ could have been borne alternately. In the very list referred to by the editor, we find that No. 6, Māravarman Srvallabha had two sons: No. 7 Varagaṇa and No. 8 Parāntaka II. These reigned one after another. According to Mr. Gopinatha Rao, No. 7, the immediate successor of No. 6, should have been a Saḍaiyaṉ and his younger brother No. 8 Parāntaka II, a Māravarman and the latter's son No. 9 Rājasimha, a Saḍaiyaṉ. But the plates report that No. 8 was a Saḍaiyaṉ and No. 9 a Māravarman, and this completely upsets the

8 Other minor differences are that while all the r's in Rājakēśarivarmanas and Rājarājēśa occurring in line 1 and the r's in Āpinaḷai inscription (lines 1 & 6) are in Grantha in Dr. Hultzsch's impression, these are represented in Tamāī in Mr. Gopinatha Rao's transcript. A k is also omitted at the beginning of line 5.
theory advanced by the editor. The only way now to get out of the difficulty is to suppose that all the sons of a Mārvārman called themselves Sādaiyaṃ. But this, it must be observed, is contrary to Indian custom. At any rate, the instance pointed out clearly shows that we are not warranted to postulate that every alternate Pāṇḍya sovereign had the same title.

There could be no difference of opinion on one point, and this is that there were more kings than one of the name Mārvājaḍaiyaṃ and Sādaiyaṃ in the Pāṇḍya genealogy. I may also say that this is admitted by Mr. Gopinatha Rao when he attempts to account for the fact in his theory. The identity of Mārvājaḍaiyaṃ of any particular record with any king in the Pāṇḍya pedigree should therefore be based on either internal evidence or by the mention of known events in the records. I take it that this is exactly what prevented Mr. Venkayya from identifying the Mārvājaḍaiyaṃ of the Tirupparangunram record with Jāṭhavarman of the Madras Museum plates. I perceive no ambiguity in his language when he states that the identification of Mārvājaḍaiyaṃ must be based upon better evidence than the mere identity of the second portion of the two names, though Mr. Gopinatha Rao confesses that he does not quite grasp the reason set forth in this. Now, with reference to the Tirupparangunram inscription, even admitting that the name Mārvājaḍaiyaṃ (which is only a title or surname if it is similar to Rājakēśari or Parakēśari) was the proper name of the king, yet because it was the proper name shared by several kings of the Pāṇḍya genealogy, the name alone does not in the least help us to identify him with a particular Mārvājaḍaiyaṃ in the list, unless there be some other evidence to support the identification. It may be that Mr. Gopinatha Rao has "no difficulty whatever in accepting the identity of the king mentioned in all the three inscriptions, the Madras Museum plates, the Tirupparangunram and the Trevandrum Museum stone inscriptions with the king of the same name found in the Ānaimalai record," for the reason that "the latter half of the name Mārvājaḍaiyaṃ is the proper name of the king in all these." When the inscription itself is not dated in any known era and does not give sufficient clue to the identification of the king mentioned in it with any in the list of Pāṇḍya sovereigns belonging to the same period and having the same name, the identification must be made by excluding all the other possibilities; else the identification is not worth the name. I do not find how Mr. Gopinatha Rao has excluded other kings bearing the same name from being identical with the Mārvājaḍaiyaṃ of the Tirupparangunram record.

It is worth while to go into the grounds which, as he says, enabled him to satisfactorily refer all these inscriptions to one sovereign. They are (1) paleography and (2) the name Mārvājaḍaiyaṃ. The second having been disposed of, it only remains to see the validity of the first. If a number of inscriptions in Vaṭṭelutta characters of unquestionable date referring to this period had been obtained and their paleography studied, we would be at liberty to adduce that as a ground for placing a record in a certain period. Paleography by itself can only indicate the approximate period and not the exact time. So far as I am aware, except the four records under reference, none belonging to any king earlier than the time of the Chōḷa Rājarāja I have been printed excluding the Ambasamudram inscription of Varaguna-Mahārāja. Such being the case, there is not much force in the argument that paleographical indications show that a Vaṭṭelutta inscription belongs to A. D. 770 or thereabout. If at least we are assured that Vaṭṭelutta paleography was different 25 years before and 25 years after A. D. 770, the reason may carry some weight. As we have already seen that Mr. Gopinatha Rao's knowledge of the paleography of Tamil inscription has not prevented him from mistaking an inscription of Rājadhirāja I for one of Rājarāja II in spite of other conclusive evidence to the contrary, we naturally lose faith in his paleographical comparison of the fewer and more complicated Vaṭṭelutta inscriptions. Besides, the letters of the Ānaimalai record assume a slanting position, while those of the Trevandrum inscription are straight. The latter present some resemblance to the Varaguna-Mahārāja record of Ambasamudram. These three are available for comparison, as they are reprinted with plates.
The way in which Mr. Gopinatha Rao creates a queen for his Mārāṇaḍaiyaṇa seems to be very queer. I use the word "creates" because the record itself does not warrant his conclusion. His whole argument hangs on what he believes to be the use of the honorific plural form of the third personal pronoun aravkku in the Tirupparangunram inscription. His argument may be stated thus:

Sattan Gaṇapati, the minister of the king, is referred to in this inscription in the third person singular. A certain Nakkaṇ Korri is mentioned as the wife of a person whom the record introduces with the "honorific plural" aravku. She cannot, therefore, be the wife of Sattan Gaṇapati, who is always referred to in the record by the third person singular. The only other possibility is that she must be the queen of Mārāṇaḍaiyaṇa, and for him the "honorific plural" is appropriate.

It is easy to prove that Nakkaṇ Korri is the wife of Sattan Gaṇapati and not the queen of Mārāṇaḍaiyaṇa. Her elevation to the rank of a Pāṇḍya queen is due to Mr. Gopinatha Rao's misconception that aravku is the honorific plural of the third personal pronoun. I have only to show him that the word aravku is the mere third personal pronoun singular. It is made up of arāṅ.

Third personal pronoun singular + Dative sign ku.

Rules of grammar require that when these two combine without the intervention of what are called idriyai, the compound assumes the form aravku, the consonant ɣ changing into r.

Similar instances are:

\[ eṇ + ku = ečku \] (first person singular).
\[ niṣ + ku = niṅku \] (second person).

The dative case of nouns is also formed similarly, e.g.:

\[ vārugaṇ + ku = vārugaṅku. \]
\[ pāṇaṇ + ku = pāṅarku. \]
\[ nakkaṇ + ku = nakkaṅku. \]

If the idriyai intervenes, the form becomes quite ordinary, as:

\[ arāṇ + ku = arāṇ + u + ku = arāṅukku. \]
\[ vārugaṇ + ku = vārugaṇ + u + ku = vārugaṅkku. \]

The honorific plural is formed as follows:

\[ ar + ku = ararkku \] (without the intervention of idriyai).
\[ ar + ku = ararkku \] (with idriyai).

\[ vāruga + ku = vārugaṅkku \] (without idriyai) = vārugaṅkku (with idriyai);

Similarly, for pāṇaṇ or pāṇar, idītaṇ or idītār, nakkaṇ or nakkar or nakkaṇār.

It must only be pointed out that the spelling of the dative of the honorific plural of the third personal pronoun is ararkku with single r and double k and that the spelling of the third personal pronoun, singular, dative is ararkku with r and single k.

The inscription has the form aravku with ɣ and single k and as such it is only the dative of the third personal pronoun, singular arāṅ. There is absolutely no difference between the two singular dative forms aravku and aravukku. And as Mr. Gopinatha Rao seems to concede that if the third person singular is used, Nakkaṇ Korri would be the wife of Sattan Gaṇapati, I think I have satisfactorily shown that she is not the queen of Mārāṇaḍaiyaṇa. That this mistake should have been committed after the inscription has been correctly read and translated previously, perhaps shows that the editor takes a peculiar pleasure in differing from others. One other point that could have been considered is that if Nakkaṇ Korri were the Pāṇḍya queen, she would have been termed Pāṇḍumādiyar, Nambiratīyār or Dēviyar. Nakkaṇ Korriyār as is quite common in inscriptions.
THE VEDIC CALENDAR.

BY R. SHAMASAHTRY, B.A., M.R.A.S., M.B.A., MYSORE.

The Intercaity Month.

The term "Vedic Calendar" may appear at the outset to be an anachronism, for the reason that there are no clear references to any kind of calendar in the Vedas proper. Even in the Brāhmaṇas, references to a calendar are so vague that it is hardly possible to form a clear conception of the precise nature of the calendar that was in use. But coming to the Śūtras, especially those of the Śānava, we find precise data to determine the various systems of calendar in observance during the Śūtra period. One might, therefore, be led to think that the term "Śūtraic Calendar" would be preferable to that of "Vedic Calendar." But it should be borne in mind that the various systems of calendar described in the Śūtras are not the result of an observation of the heavens in a day, but are the outcome of the experience gained and adjustments made by many successive calculators of time. Nor are allusions to a calendar altogether wanting even in the Vedas. The description of the New Year's Day as occurring on the Ėkasāṭaka day, i.e., the eighth day of the dark half of the month of Māgha (corresponding to December-January) in the times with which we are dealing, as well as the distinct references to a thirteenth month which must necessarily have been an additional month intercalated for the purpose of keeping the beginning of the year more or less close to its natural time, go a long way to prove that the Vedic poets kept a systematised calendar based upon scientific principles. The beginning of the year on the Ėkasāṭaka day is thus described in the Athārva, III 10:—

"(1) She first shone out; she became a milk-cow at Yama's; let her, rich in milk, yield (duḥ) to us each further summer !

"(2) The night which the gods rejoice to meet as a milch cow coming unite them, which is the spouse (patā) of the year, let her be very auspicious to us !

"(3) Thou, O night, whom we worship as model (pratima) of the year, do thou unto our long-lived progeny with abundance of wealth.

"(4) This same is she that first shone out; among these other ones she goes about, having entered; great greatnesses are within her; the bride (rahitā), the new generatrix hath conquered.

"(8) Hither hath come the year, thy spouse, O sole Asāṭaka; do thou unite our long-lived progeny with abundance of wealth !

"(13) Thou whose son is Indra, whose son is Sūma, daughter art thou of Praja-pati; fully thou our desires; accept our oblation !"

A similar hymn with important variations is also found in the Yajurveda, Taittirya-Sāmbhata, IV. 3.11:—

इवेब्रव दाख यद्यन्त्र वृहद्रेत्राति निर्णयितातिनिर्धारित.
पुरुस्त्रस्नान नवमाछास्थि वच इवां वैभवनारसापदे || १ ॥
प्रशोदयण उपरणां प्रभुरस्मान सपमान स्वतंत्रमुस्मापे || २ ॥
सूक्ष्मक्षण विश्यतः प्रजाणार्के केति द्वृष्णवपे अधारे मुर्देशसा || ३ ॥
वृहद्रेत्राति श्रवणवपे अवसी वहां निर्णयितात निर्धारित.
प्रजानां कर्तव्यमाणां तत्तदकार स्वतंत्र रेणदानान || ४ ॥
'तुरुपोण मनवस तुंया यत्र स्त्राय वत्सलाय नवानिता || ५ ॥
सावधाविन जगात्मानुनु नृस्वक इंयानां: सुरुसरस्वत || ६ ॥
प्रवेंद्रनिधिन्निविश्वासिन्निदचिन्तास्त स्वसुस्वानात वध े वध े || ७ ॥
तासाते वेति प्रवेंद्र श्रव स्नात वसाहतमान कादिः स्त्राय || ८ ॥
विवेध्यपाल स्वर्य विनित निन्नित स्नाने केति प्रतिभुषमासायः || ९ ॥
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1. It is she that first shone out; having entered into this (earth), she goes about; (like) a bride, newly married (to the New Year), she has become the generatrix (of the days that follow); three are the great lights that associate with her.

2. Extolled in metres, these two shining dawns, coming out of the same womb, and being the wives of the sun, go about all-knowing, making a flag, free from old age, and impregnated with abundant seed.

3. Three dawns have reached the path of the sacrifice; three lights [the fire, the sun, and the moon] have also approached it; of them, one protects the offspring, one the vigour, and one the rite of those who like to please the gods.

4. She who is the fourth has passed into the four sets of Sāma-chants [nine-versed; fifteen-versed, seventeen-versed, and twenty-one-versed chants], maintaining the two wings [halves] of the sacrifice [i.e., the year] as known to the sages, and giving rise to the Great Litany composed of Gāyatṛi, Trishtubh, Jagati, and Anushtubh metres; and she has preserved this heaven [the solstices].

5. With five (days) the Creator has made this; he has also created five and five sisters of them; taking various forms and being clothed in sacrificial splendour, five of them run with great speed.

6. Thirty sisters [days] partake of the rite, spreading out the same flag; they make the seasons; being wise and all-knowing and resounding in the metres, they go about with great splendour.

7. Clothed in splendour, this shining night takes to herself the rites addressed to the sun above; even the various kinds of beasts, on awakening, see her on the lap of this mother [the earth].

8. This eighth day, bearing the troubles of pregnancy, has brought forth this great Indra; with his help the gods repelled the enemies; in virtue of his own might, he has become the destroyer of the Asuras.
"(9) O sole Aśṭakā, ye gave a sister to me hitherto without a sister; ye speak the truth; listen to this prayer; just as ye are pleased with the beholder of this (Indra), so may ye be pleased with mine; do not send me away to any one else!

"(10) This all-knowing dawn stepped into my mind and has taken a firm hold of it; just as ye are pleased with this (Indra), so may ye be pleased with me; do not send me away to any one else;

"(11) The five mornings, the five milkings, and the five seasons follow the cow with five names; the five quarters regulated by the fifteen-versed chant and possessed of the same characteristics as the five mornings follow this single light [the dawn].

"(12) (Of the five mornings) the first is the womb of the dawn; one bears the magnificence of the waters; one presides at the rites addressed to the sun; one presides over the heat; and one the sun controls.

"(13) She that first shone out has become a cow at Yama's; let her, rich in milk, yield to us each further summer!

"(14) Foremost among the lights, clothed in brilliant splendour, has arrived this illuminating dawn with various colours, like a flag of the sacrificial fire; O ever-youthful dawn, conducive to the performance of unchanging rites, and grey with old age, thou hast arrived!

"(15) The wife of the seasons, the first (dawn) has arrived, leading the days and being the mother of creatures; though one, thou hast become many; free from old age, thou causest the rest to grow old."

Likewise the Tāṇḍyamahābhāṣaṇa describes the Ekāśṭaka as the wife of the year:—V. 92.

What is called the Ekāśṭaka (dawn) is the wife of the year; when the night of this day arrives, Prajāpati lies with her. Hence, commencing with the (true) beginning of the year, (sacrificers) observe the rite of initiation."

The important points to be particularly noticed in the above passages are (1) the beginning of the year, probably solar, on the eighth day of the dark half of the month Māgha; (2) the designation of this day by such names as 'a cow,' 'dawn,' 'Prajāpati's daughter,' and 'Sūryā'; (3) the association or a kind of secret marriage of the dawn with three lights, the fire, the moon, and the sun, as pointed out by Sāyaṇa in his commentary on verse 1; (4) the birth of the days of the following year or cycle of years, as well as of Indra and Sūryā from the marriage of the dawn with the sun; (5) the celebration of the dawn by the four well-known Sāma-chants; namely, the nine-versed chant, the fifteen-versed chant, the seventeen-versed chant, and the twenty-one-versed chant, each of which is, as we shall see, intended to signify as many intercalary days as the number of verses contained in it; (6) the destruction of enemies and Asuras brought about by Indra, the son of the dawn.

As regards the first point, it is true that we are told nowhere in the Vēdas themselves that the word Ekāśṭaka means the eighth day of the dark half of the month of Māgha; still, on the authority of Āpastamba and other Sūtra-writers, who have defined it as such, we may take it to mean that particular day.

From the next three points we have to understand that, at the commencement of every year or cycle of years, it was the usual custom with the Vēdic poets to celebrate a symbolical marriage of the New Year's Day with the sun in order to enable the new year to beget its 720 children,1 i.e., its days and nights, or, in other words, to perpetuate an auspicious flow of time for themselves. This seems to be the sun and substance of the celebrated marriage hymns,2 in which the marriage procession of Sūryā or the dawn to be wedded to the sun is

---

1 R. V. i, 164 10, 11.
2 R. V. x, 85; and A. V. xiv, 1, 2.
the subject of a long and mystic description, and which are even now recited on the occasions of marriages performed as a rule after the winter solstice and before the summer solstice. The recognition of the dawn first by Sāma, the moon, next by Gandharva, a one of the 27 nukshatras, then by Agni, and lastly by men, seems to signify the association of the dawn first with the synodic lunar year of 354 days, next with the sidereal lunar year of 351 days containing 13 months each of 27 days corresponding to the 27 nukshatras or Gandharvas, then with the Sāvana year of 360 days, dedicated to the sacrificial fire-god from whom the dawn or the twenty-first day, based upon the difference between the Sāvana year and the Julian solar year of 365 ¹/₄ days, is believed to have come under the protection or observance of men. The fact of making the dawn the object of praise in the Chatushtōmas or four acts of Sāma-chants seems to render probable the above explanation of the two obscure verses of the marriage-hymn. The five mornings which are said to precede the brilliant dawn in verse 11 seem to be five days added after the end of the Sāvana year. As regards the destruction of enemies and Asuras by Indra, we shall presently see that they are not real enemies or Asuras, but intercalary days regarded as such.

Thus, while the Yajurveda connects the mornings and the mystic cows with the Chatushtōmas, thereby implying the final number of intercalary days to be twenty-one, their number is distinctly stated as three times seven in the Sāma-vēda.

**First they (the sages) came to know the sacred name of the cows; they came to know the sacred names to be three times seven; knowing them, they extolled the morning (jāshāh): then the red cows became famous.”**

There are two more verses which express the same idea:

**“He, being purified, hath made the mornings shine; and it is he who gave the rivers room to flow; making the three times seven pour out the milky stream, Sōma, the cheerer, yields whatever the heart finds sweet.”**

**“The three times seven milk-kine in the loftiest heaven have for this Sōma poured the genuine milky draught; four other beauteous worlds hath he made for his adornment when he waxed in strength through holy rites.”**

---

1. *Vājasaneyasūtrasḥī 18, 40; and also Taittirīya I, 7, 7.*
2. *R. F. x, 55, 40-41; A. V. xiv. 2, 3, 4.*
For reasons to be pointed out further on, I presume that the four worlds referred to in the above verse are four solar years, and that the twenty-one cows or mornings are the intercalary days made up of the four times five days and a quarter which is the difference between a Sāvana and a solar year. I do not, however, contend that it is clear from the above passages themselves that the twenty-one cows or mornings are intended to signify so many intercalary days and intercalary days alone. Still, I believe that scholars will agree with me in holding that, so far as the beginning of the year on the Ekāśṭaka day is concerned, these passages leave no doubt whatever. The Ekāśṭaka day is clearly a lunar day; and the year that was practically observed by the Vedic poets was the Sāvana year of 360 days. The number of days from one Ekāśṭaka or the eighth day of the dark half of the month of Magha to the next Ekāśṭaka is 354. Accordingly, if the Sāvana year of 360 days, having once begun (on the Ekāśṭaka day, is to begin again, on that same day, there must necessarily be an adjustment of the difference of six days between the lunar and the Sāvana years by the addition of one month to the lunar year in every five years. If instead of the Sāvana year, they adopted a solar or a sidereal year, even then they must necessarily have adjusted the respective differences between the lunar and the solar or between the lunar and the sidereal years by intercalation in the form of days or months. Accordingly, we find clear references to a thirteenth intercalary month not only in the Yajurveda and the Atharvaveda, but also in the Rgveda. The Rigveda 1, 25, 8, thus alludes to the intercalary month:

वेद मातो धन्यस्तो हर्षव प्रजयत:। देवा य उजायते ॥

"He, who, accepting the rites (dedicated to him), knows the twelve months and their productions, and that which is supplementarily engendered."

In his translation of the Rgveda, Professor H. H. Wilson remarked as follows:

"वेद म मुद्रायुस्था, who knows what is upa, additionally or subordinately produced. The expression is obscure, but in connection with the preceding, वेद मातो नालसः who knows the twelve months, we cannot doubt the correctness of the scholiast's conclusion, that the thirteenth, the supplementary or intercalary month of the Hindu luni-solar year, is alluded to; that the thirteenth or additional month which is produced of itself in connection with the year, विकल्पयोगो विस्मित्वा वा जन्तुसंसारस्वते संवर्गतत्त्वत:। The passage is important, as indicating the concurrent use of lunar and solar years at this period and the method of adjusting the one to the other."

Notwithstanding Sāvana's interpretation of the word upajāyate in the sense of 'a supplementary month,' it is doubtful whether the word indicates a complete intercalary month or an intercalated period less than a month; for we shall presently see that before the custom of adjusting the lunar and the solar reckoning by the addition of a complete month came into vogue, the usual practice was to adjust them by adding as many days as formed the difference between any two kinds of years or sets of years. Still, it is certain that some sort of intercalation, either in the form of a month or in the form of a period less than a month, is what is implied in the above verse of the Rgveda. But coming to the Atharvaveda, we see therein a clear description of a thirteenth intercalary month:

अष्टादशैवैत्निन्त विस्मित्वा वा तथा नासो न निमित्तमि।

तस्य वेदस्य कुज्जत्तायो व एव विनिन्तवा वातायनः किनारसि ॥

"He who measures the thirteenth month, fabricated of days and nights, having thirty members—against that god, angered, is this offence." A. V., XIII, 3. 8.

समावेश सामान्यः

चतुर्थो वर्गं मात्र संहितं गुहः ॥
"Weakling by name art thou, the thirteenth month, Indra's house." A. V., v. 6. 4.

In the Krśṇa-Yajurveda, i. 4, 14, the twelve months together with a thirteenth intercalated month are thus enumerated:—

"Thou art the month of Madhu, the month of Mādhava, the month of Sukra, the month of Suchi, the month of Nabhas, the month of Nābhasya, the month of Iśa, the month of Uṛja, the month of Sahas, the month of Sahasya, the month of Tapas, and the month of Tapasya; and thou art caught hold of in a wooden vessel; thou art the month Saṁsarpa [a creeping month]; and thou art the receptacle of sins."

The Brāhmaṇa portion contained in the Krśṇa-Yajurveda, vi. 5, 3, 12, comments on this passage as follows:—

"Clearly does the Adhvaryu first go to the south; clearly the Pratipratsthātri priest to the north. Hence does the sun go to the south for six months; and to the north for six months. He says: 'Thou art caught in a wooden vessel'; thou art Saṁsarpa [a creeping month] and a receptacle for sins. They say that there is also a thirteenth month; it is that thirteenth month which he pleases thereby."

The symbolical practice connected with this passage is this:—The Adhvaryu priest fills thirteen wooden vessels with Sūma-juice; and with the help of another priest, called Pratipratsthātri, he makes offerings therefrom to the seasons. While performing the rite, the Adhvaryu goes to the south and the Pratipratsthātri to the north, imitating the southern and northern movements of the sun respectively. As will be seen, it was in the middle of the year, during the summer or the winter solstice, according as the year began with the winter or the summer solstice, that the intercalary period was inserted, delaying the sun's turning movement so long and occupying that period in performing the initiatory rites. Hence the reference in this passage to the sun's northern and southern movements, and to the thirteenth month during which the commencement of those turning movements is delayed. The fact of representing the months by Sūma-vessels is clearly stated in the Mātratyāṅgla-Saṁhitā, iii, 10, 4, 5.

"Twelve are the vessels; the pressing stone, called Upāsasadāna is the thirteenth; the discussion they hold, by asking whether there ought to be a vessel or no vessel (to represent a thirteenth month), is a discussion as to whether there is a thirteenth month or no thirteenth month."

Regarding the sacrificial function observed during a thirteenth month, the Tāṇḍyamahā Brāhmaṇa, x, 8, 2, says:—

"The months observed the vow of Upāsada [sessions] with the intention that their father [the year] might prosper. They, however, prospered merely by observing the initiatory rites, and initiated the thirteenth month during the period of the vow of Upāsada [sessions]. Therefore the thirteenth month became their follower. Hence whoever undergoes the rite of initiation during the period of the vow of Upāsada [sessions] becomes the follower (of the rest of the priests). Accordingly they declare a thirteenth month as existent and also as non-existent."

* Madhu corresponds to Chaitra; Mādhava to Vaiśēkha; and so on.
Again, the Maitrāyanīya-Samhitā 1.5, 5.6, says:—

"The thirteenth lunar day is to be propitiated by the immolation of a beast sacred to Agni and Soma. There is the thirteenth month; it is that thirteenth month which he catches hold of by this offering."

These and other references to the New Year's Day and the thirteenth month intercalated solely for the purpose of keeping the seasons or the months in their proper places in the year, are enough to show that the Vedic poets kept a calendar with far more scientific precision than we are pleased to credit them with. Whether we will or no, the fact cannot be denied that the idea of a thirteenth month, i.e., an intercalated month, could not have dawned upon the mind of the Vedic poets unless they had been quite familiar with the true lengths of several kinds of years. There is also reason to believe that, before the system of adjusting the difference between any two kinds of years by the insertion of an intercalary month was begun, the practice was to adjust them by adding sets of intercalary days, such as 9, 11, 12, 21, and so on. That such was the custom, is clear from the following passage of the Kathāsākhā-Bṛāhmaṇa, quoted in the Sṛṣṭi śāstra.8

"Being at a lower level [i.e., being less than a month], the half-months desired that they might grow into months. They approached the twelve days' sacrifice. Having appointed a Brāhmaṇa as a thirteenth priest [in addition to the twelve priests] and having washed off (the sins) on him, they got up. Hence it is that he [the thirteenth month or the priest who represents it] is homeless and dependent for his existence upon others. Hence there ought to be a thirteenth Brāhmaṇa priest in every twelve days' sacrifice. This is a passage from the Brāhmaṇa of the Katha School.

"This passage is thus commented upon by Jayāsvāmin:—Having represented the thirteenth, 'dirty,' month by a Brāhmaṇa priest, those half-months collected the twelve-days' sacrifice, [i.e., converted it into a month's sacrifice]. Having washed off in that 'dirty' month,—if it is asked what was that which they washed off on the 'dirty' month, we have to understand the word arditi, 'enemies';—having washed off the enemies, i.e., the sins, they got up, i.e., they rose up free from the burden of sin. From the descriptive statement of washing off the sins, it follows that the sacrificial performance which can possibly be observed in the subsequent month should neither be undertaken during the 'dirty' month nor be given up. The inference of a rule from a descriptive statement is reasonable inasmuch as the sense of the descriptive statement can otherwise have no application whatever. Hence the performance of obligatory, casual, expiatory, and other religious rites is prohibited in a 'dirty' month. 'It is homeless': i.e., like Chaitra and other months, it has not a fixed place of its own in the year. 'Dependent for its existence upon others,' i.e., the thirteenth month comes into existence owing to the waxing and waning of the moon in the intervals of months."

(To be continued.)

---


9 Here the rule is that the sacrifice should neither be performed in the 'dirty' month nor be given up, but should be performed in the subsequent month. The statement is that of washing off the sins in the dirty month.
LAUKIKANYAYANJALI " TWO HANDBULS OF POPULAR MAXIMS CURRENT IN SANSKRIT LITERATURE, COLLECTED BY COLONEL G. A. JACOB.

BY PROF. VANAMALI CHAKRAVARTI, M.A., VEDANTATIRTHA; GAURATI.

Colonel Jacob is a good worker in the cause of Sanskrit studies. His 'Concordance to the principal Upanishads and the Bhagavad-Gita' will ever remain a monument of patient industry. His editions of the Vedanta-sutra and the Eleven Upanishads are equally well-known. He is never satisfied with an untraced quotation, and he is doing yeoman service by publishing the results of his studies, now and then, in the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society. When such a man compiles a book on the popular maxims current in Sanskrit literature, it deserves to be studied with all attention. Indeed, the author has begun a most useful work as a pioneer of the subject of maxim-hunting, and it is with the hope of rousing the attention of the Indian Sanskritists to this subject, that I write this review.

The first 'Handful' seems to have been excessively well received by the learned world in England. For the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society says in its July number, 1901—"The modestly styled 'Handful' is only one more example of the laborious care and love of accuracy for which the author is distinguished."

The author begins by criticising the work of his predecessors in the same field. These predecessors were the illustrious Tarānātha, who is said to have given a list of 151 Nyāyas in his Vīchārapāta Encyclopaedia and Satyavratasāmārami, the celebrated Vedic scholar of Bengal [cf. pp. ii (preface), v, 2, 14.]. These scholars did not give detailed references to the books in which the maxims occur, and undoubtedly Colonel Jacob deserves our sincere thanks for giving them. He has also pointed out some real mistakes in Tarānātha. We are grateful for this too. But we are really sorry that he should have thought it fit sometimes to use too strong language of abuse, for such language about one scholar from another serves no useful purpose; it looks too much like prejudice. Prof. A. Venis renders a maxim wrongly (p. 31, Vol. I); the author simply points out the mistake. Tarānātha commits a mistake and he says his explanation is rubbish and nonsensical.

We shall now point out a few inaccuracies and mistakes into which Colonel Jacob has himself fallen with the hope that these will be corrected in subsequent editions.

P. v., Vol. I.—

In explaining the निवृत्त्वक्यं जनानन्याय, the author quotes Bhādmāti (pp. 380-1, Bibliotheca Indica edition) 'परलं कार्यक: अनन्तकर्य इति युनोदविनामपी ययावृत्त: नात् न द्वारी कार्यत् प्रस्तुतकालम् इति' and adds in a footnote "The printed text wrongly reads 'कार्यकः.'" We submit that the suggested correction is uncalled for and that the true reading must be either (1) प्रतयेक कार्यकः (Bibliotheca Indica) or (2) प्रतयेक कार्यकः: (Sanskrit College MSS.) or (3) प्रतयेक कार्यकः: (Asiatic Society's MSS.). We would prefer the reading of the Sanskrit College MSS., which keeps the कार्य observed in अज्ञान: and अकृत्वक्यः. We wonder that Colonel Jacob should have omitted to mention the MSS. that authorised him to make the emendation; for, surely, the critical Western savant cannot be supposed to have corrected जनानन्याय into जनानन्याय in the fashion of the uncritical Indian scribe.

Vol. I, pp. 11 and 12.—

In explaining the वायुप्रायन्त्ययाय, the author says, "A crow alighted on a Palmyra tree, and at the same moment some of the fruit (sic.) fell on its head and killed it." We have seen plenty of भाग trees in Bengal, but we could scarcely understand how a तदला fruit may fall upon the head of a bird, that has alighted on the tree. Of course, the true explanation of the Sanskrit text quoted seems to be that the crow came and alighted on the ground, at the foot of the tree, and then the fruit fell and killed it.
Again p. 12—

"The Marāṭhī pandits in adopting the Nyāya have changed its meaning." The explanation given by Molesworth (i.e. the Marāṭhī pandit's explanation), is the explanation prevalent in all parts of Bengal. It is identical with the 2nd explanation given by निलक्षण (Nilakaśtha).

Principal V. S. Apte explains it as follows:

"It takes its origin from the unexpected and sudden fall of a palm-fruit upon the head of a crow (so as to kill it) at the very moment of its sitting on a branch of that tree...

(Sanskrit-English Dictionary, p. 651.)

Prof. Bidhubhusan Goswami has copied this incorrect explanation in his notes on the Kirdīta, Cantos 1 and 2.


श्रीरं विषयरीयोषियस्त्रय सौररथनिमुखसति

The maxim ought to have ended with भ्रष्ट in the first case-ending (cf. pp. 32, 38 where the compiler rightly rejects the word "अनुरुत्ति"). Here is Colonel Jacob's translation of the maxim: "Leaving the milk suitable to the dyspeptic, he enjoys the sour gruel." This is wrong. The real translation would run as follows: "Just as a man suffering from loss of appetite may prefer sour gruel to milk."

It means that when a man prefers the lower pleasure to the higher, he must be supposed to be in an abnormal state of mind, like the patient who prefers sour gruel to the sweet milk.

This maxim occurs also in the Atmatattvaviveka; as, "श्रीरं विषयरीयोषियस्त्रय सौररथनिमुखसति" (p. 41, Madanmohan's edition Samvat 1906, Calcutta).

Vol. I, p. 32—

गुप्तक्रियाकल्पनस्त्रयानि निविद्याखंसति

The Colonel's explanation is merely a reproduction of Gough's rendering of the maxim in the Sarvadārakamastūkara, and it must be said that Gough seems not to have understood the thing clearly. Here is the explanation: "Cutting off the tongue while trying to get a fine plantain." This gives no meaning, at least the wording does not. The correct explanation would be:

"Cutting off the tongue with the desire of eating a large plantain [which on account of its great size, could not be contained in the mouth if the tongue were to remain intact]."

Vol. I, p. 46—

अवबद्धाश्च: सम्पकालस्त्रयीयस्त्रयशस्ति

"The strength of a community is greater than that of a member of it." The real meaning may be thus expressed:—The meaning (lit. force) of the whole word is stronger than the meaning (lit. force) of the component parts thereof. This is not a नौकंक्वमा in the sense in which Colonel Jacob takes the word. It applies to interpretation of texts. It directs that in finding out the meaning of a text, we are to prefer the ordinary meaning of the word to its derivative meaning, of course if there be nothing in the context repugnant thereto. cf. क्षिरोक्षु ममप्रति (Vol. II, p. 39). (In Vol. III of the 'Handfuls,' this mistake has been corrected).

Vol. I, p. 47—

"If I am right in supposing Anandagiri to have been a disciple of the great Śaṅkara who died about A.D. 820, then the early part of the eighth century would be the latest date that could be assigned to Amara."

Anandagiri, or Anandajñāna, as he more frequently styles himself, was a disciple of Sudhānanda. Anandajñāna says in his introduction to his commentary on the Śdrīraka-bhāṣya (from which Colonel Jacob is quoting):—

श्रीरकभाष्यगुरुस्म्यत् ज्ञानांनं हरसुरेन्द्रनाम:
In the colophons of the same work we read: "शिला भीवयायमस्यप्रतिष्ठायाय वर्षशीरसम्। तद्यथा विनायकस्य। 
संबंधे वर्षाब्दप्रतिष्ठायाय वर्षशीरसम्।" Moreover, Anandajñana says that 
the Śāntikunḍalika of Sankara had many commentaries in his time; he actually quotes three or 
four interpretations of Sūka 2 of the introduction. Thus, this Ānanda can never be identified with 
Ānanda, the disciple of Saṁkara.

It is strange that exactly twenty years before Colonel Jacob's publication, Mr. Kailaschandra 
Singha had committed the same mistake with reference to the identity and time of Ānandajñana 
(vide his Cited Introduction).

Vol. I, p. 48—

नाही भवति कृष्ण वार्ष्य।

In 1900, Colonel Jacob was "not quite clear as to the drift of the saying." In 1902, he became 
wiser, and wrote, "It means that the Palasa tree is not cleft when the axe is applied to the Khadira 
tree," and is used to indicate that the two objects are essentially distinct, and stand on separate bases " 
(p. v. Introduction, Vol. II). Colonel Jacob's translation is all right, but his explanatory note 
is rather vague. The maxim is meant as an illustration of the well-known doctrine of the 
सामानायकस्वरूप of cause and effect.

Vol. I, p. 48—

नाही भवति कृष्ण वार्ष्य।

Colonel Jacob "should like more light on this saying." We give below what little light we 
can. The ब्रह्म is the jujube fruit and कृष्ण here means a vessel containing the jujube fruit. The 
कृष्ण (कृष्ण) is an आचार (i.e., a place where something is kept) and the jujube is the आचार 
(i.e., a thing which is kept in something). The principle means that you cannot put the आचार 
and the आचार in the same case. There could be no सामानायकस्वरूप in such cases.

Vol. I, p. 49—

वास्तविकता क्षणिकाय।

This also is a maxim of which the meaning is unknown to Col. Jacob. We give the meaning 
below:

A lady borrows some ornaments from another and thereupon decorates her person. A third 
party on seeing her, will say that she has (i.e., is the owner of) these ornaments. Similar is 
the case with the expression वास्तविकता क्षणिकाय, for an action or क्रिया has no विषय; it is only शान्ति. द्रष्टा, कृष्ण (including मृदुल), इत्य जो वहा सृष्टि है. तो न गृहीतस्य आयनस्यक्रम "is wrong. But it is justified on the वास्तविकता क्षणिकाय. The action has borrowed, 
so to say, a विषय from that मृदुल which produced the action, and as a lady in borrowed ornaments 
is supposed to be in possession of them similarly the action of आयन also may be supposed 
to have the 'cow' for its विषय; though the cow was really the विषय of the मृदुल that produced 
the आयन.

Vol. II, p. 10—

वास्तविकता क्षणिकाय।

This maxim is very well known to those who have read any Sanskrit grammar written in 
Sanskrit. Colonel Jacob seems to have misunderstood it. Kiellhorn thus translates it rightly:—

That which has undergone a change in regard to one of its parts is by no means (in consequence 
of this change) something else (than what it was before the change had taken place)—(Paribhāsh- 
en Jūñēkhara p. 179.)

Vol. II, p. 12—

कारणस्य श्रवणानाः

"The maxim of the reproduction in the effect of certain qualities, in the proportion in which 
they exist in the producing cause." That portion of the above translation which we have printed 
in italics seems to be redundant. I do not know whether the word गृहीत in Nrisimha Sarasvatī's 
explanation or the word श्रवण in the original suggested this import of foreign matter into the 
explanation of the maxim.
Vol. II, p. 15—

**गने प्रहुकान्यावः**

Colonel Jacob rejects the explanation given by the native scholar Raghunāthavarman in his *laukika-nyāya-saṅgraha* as “extremely far-fetched and unsatisfactory.” We, however, think that Raghunāthar is nearer the truth. The Bengalis have a similar idiom. It means that you put your feet (covered with shoes), on the neck of your opponent and thus compel him by sheer force to come to your side. The real point in the comparison is the utter impossibility of escape, रन्यन्याय in the words of Udayana. The opponent has no alternative to fall upon.

Vol. II, p. 19—

**तथ्यनियमसमूही गृहमणि पाल्यक्षे गुप्तप्रतिविर्भाषणैः कनककुणालां गयानां मेलो श्रमिक करार्यी**

This maxim has been taken from the *Atmatattvaviveka* of Udayana, a book which is written in the most difficult philosophical language and which even the erudite native pandits find it difficult to understand. We cannot withhold our genuine admiration from a European scholar who can hunt up a maxim in a book like this, of which the contents, from the nature of the case, must present almost insurmountable difficulties to him. This is patient research and surely here we have to learn from our western contemporaries. Colonel Jacob’s translation is given below—

“...Thou ridiculou the man who taking his gold ties it up in a corner of his garment and then thyself taking the gold tie it up in the skirt of the sky!” This, of course, is wrong. For *taking read throwing away (अन्नीय) and omit it and in.* The reference is to a foolish man who laughs at another fool because the latter ties up a knot in the garment after he has thrown off his gold (for the safety of which the knot is made) though he himself ties up the gold in the sky, *i.e.,* fancies that the sky is a safe place for the deposit of the gold; provided only he makes the movements of making a knot in the air.

Vol. II, p. 24—

**न यदि मिष्रितशुष्क-गुप्ते सुढुपे तवप्रव्ययमः**

“A thing does not become imperceptible, because perceived by one who has ascended a mountain peak.” The language used by the compiler is not very clear. We should rather say—

A thing is not to be regarded as imperceptible, because it could be perceived only after ascending a mountain peak, *i.e.,* because certain conditions must be fulfilled before it is perceived.

Vol. II, p. 25—

**नरसिम्हनयावः**

Colonel Jacob says: “The maxim of the union of man and lion.” He apparently does not remember the reference to the नरसिम्ह अवतार of Vishnu. The body of नरसिम्ह is partly human, partly leonine.

Vol. II, p. 27—

**न होशपत्र प्रसवः प्रकाशवर्तयानि**

“The lamp will not throw light on an object before it is [lighted and] brought in. Perhaps equivalent to ‘catch your hare before cooking it.’” We give the correct translation below—

A lamp cannot illuminate an object, before it is brought in connection (contact or relation) with that object. This is a philosophical maxim.

Vol. II, p. 34—

**मूल्यकर्मलितार्यावं वर्तमानप्रमानन्**

“This seems to belong to the same category as the कामकायनीया. The कान्तकायनीयाय points out the want of adequate motive or प्रयोजन; but the present Nyāya points out the utter impossibility of a thing.

Vol. II, p. 37—

**व: कार्याचित् करिष्येन**

“He who causes a thing to be done by another is himself the real doer of it.” For himself the read surely a.
Vol I, pp. 36-37

ASOKA’S BHABRA EDICT

Asoka’s name is derived from a root, meaning to worship. वश is thus literally an object of worship—a god. “As is the god, so is the offering.” Compare the Bengali proverb যেন হেতু যেন নিজিয়া. Thus it is not the same as “tit-for-tat” or “Roland for an Oliver.”

This review has been written mainly with the intention of drawing the attention of the Indian Sanskritists to the useful subject of maxim-hunting. It is a field for patient and honest research. Let our countrymen, who are now engaged in teaching Sanskrit in our Colleges, apply themselves to this task, and their labours will be amply rewarded.

ASOKA’S BHABRA EDICT AND ITS REFERENCES TO TIPIKAKA PASSAGES.

BY PROF. DHARMANANDA KOSAMBH, HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

In the Bhābra edict king Aśoka suggests certain sacred texts (dhamma-paññāya) as good to be studied not only by monks and nuns, but also by lay-brothers (upāsakā) and lay-sisters (upāsikā). These texts are, according to the readings of Émile Senart (Les inscriptions de Piyadasi, 2, 199, Paris, 1886), as follows:

1. Vinaya-samukṣa;
2. Aliya-vasāṇā;
3. Arāgha-bhavāṇi;
4. Muni-jātakā;
5. Moneya vīte;
6. Upatissa-pañña;
7. Laghuñālūde.

Considering the great antiquity of the edicts of Aśoka, it is evidently a matter of much interest and moment that the above mentioned texts should be surely and correctly identified with the specific passages of the canonical books.

Number 1 has not been identified, and I am unable to offer any useful suggestion regarding it.

Numbers 2-5. With the help of the previous studies of Senart and Oldenberg, Professor Rhys Davids gives the desired identification of numbers 2-5 in his Buddhist India (London, 1903), at page 169. Using the Pāli text Society’s editions of the Nikāya Texts as the basis of reference, the intended identifications are as follows:

2. Ariya-vasāṇā = Sangiti-sutta of the (then unpublished) Dīpaka-nikāya, Vol. 3;
4. Muni-gāthā = Sutta-nipāta, stanzas 207–221, p. 36;

Number 6, the questions of Upatissa (= Sāriputta): he does not attempt to determine precisely, since many passages might justly bear that title.

Number 7. There are two Rahula-sutas, both in the Majjhima-nikāya, namely, the one at Vol. 1, pages 414–420, and the other at Vol. 1, pages 420–426. The words of the edict expressly state that the admonition uttered by the Exalted Enlightened One to Rahula concerned itself with the subject of falsehood (Laghulovāda muddhādām adhigīchya Bhagavatīd Buddhena bhadseat). Now it is precisely a falsehood or muddhāda, of which the opening paragraphs of sutta 61 treat (see p. 414, 1, 10, p. 415, 1, 19), and it is accordingly clear that sutta 61 is the one intended by Aśoka. It was thus identified by Oldenberg and Senart.

With regard to numbers 4 and 7, I see no reason to differ from the views above stated.

There remain therefore numbers 2, 3, 5 and 6 to be discussed.

Number 2, Aliya-vasāṇā. The first question to settle is this:

Shall Aśoka’s aliya-vasāṇā be equated with ariya-vāsād, “the holy ways of living”, or with ariya-vasād, “the lineages or traditional ways of the holy”?
Now we find described in the Saṅgīti-sutta, not only the dasa ariyavāsā (Dīgha, Vol. 3, p. 269), but also the cattāro ariyavāsā (Dīgha, Vol. 3, p. 224). And since this sutta is in fact (like aṭṭhāna 33 of Udāgā-sagga of Mahā-buddha, Vidūrīna) a true 'One-more' or 'Āṅguttara' sutta, we may properly expect to find both descriptions in the Āṅguttara nikāya; and so indeed we do find them—the dasa ariyavāsā in the Dāsaka-nikāya, Vol 5, p. 29, and the cattāro ariyavāsā in the Chitukkā-nikāya, Vol. 2, p. 27. The Saṅgīti-sutta is put into the mouth of Sāriputta (see Dīgha, Vol. 3, p. 209), while both Āṅguttara-suttas are put into the mouth of Buddha. Whichever way we decide our first question, the identification should be—not with one of the Dīgha passages, but—with one of the Āṅguttara passages, since the edict implies that the aḷīya-rasāṇī is the words of Buddha.

Prof. Rhys Davids in 1898 (J. R. A. S. 1898, p. 640) says: "No. 2 is no doubt the passage on the ten Ariyavāsā;" but in 1899 (Sacred Books of the Buddhists, Vol. 2, p. xiii) he equates it with "Ariya-vasāni" probably not having in mind our present difficulty; and in his Buddhist India (1903) he prints the title "Ariya-vasāni."1 Vincent A. Smith in his Asoka (2nd ed., Oxford, 1909, p. 154), reads the title by The Supernatural Powers of the Āryas, following Senart's suggestion given at Vol. 2, p. 208 (cf. p. 205). Senart gives it with all due indication of his own doubts, thus: "les pouvoirs surnaturels (?) des Āryas." Perhaps he had vaguely in mind the rāja or mysteries. But to read an exhortation to the study of acquiring powers like magical powers or the like into an edict of Asoka would be entirely out of keeping with the spirit of the edicts as a whole, for these in general are the simplest expositions of matters touching the very fundamentals of the moral law.

But even if we take aḷīya-rasāṇī as meaning the dasa ariyavāsā or 'ten holy ways of living' (of Āṅguttara, Vol. 5, p. 29), it would seem that these "ways" are too numerous and artificially elaborate to be suitable for Asoka's purpose. They involve matters quite beyond the laity, and the tenth (suvimutta-pañña) implies nothing less than Arhatship. The Dīgha text later on (Vol. 3, p. 291) recurs to the ten ariyavāsā, and calls them 'hard to master' dappata-risijihā; although this, I admit, may be said of the simplest essentials of morality. The four ariyavāsā (of Āṅguttara, Vol. 2, p. 27), on the other hand, are in the highest degree worthy to be recommended by the Emperors as fit subjects of study for all, both monks and laity. The text applies to ariyavāsā, the adjectives 'noble,' 'ancient' (aggaṇī, panañjī); and others. And the Āṅguttara commentary (Colombo ed., 1898-1909, p. 530, 1. 31) glosses the word Rasāṇa by tantin, 'lines'; by pasepiyā, 'successions' or also 'old customs'; by aṣṭa, 'straight roads or ways (to the goal of the religion)'; and by pātumāni, 'courses': according to which 'väsa' might mean either 'ancient and noble family' or also 'time-honoured course of conduct.' If vāsamā means 'family' then it seems to carry nearly the same meaning as 'household' in the English version of St. Paul's phrase, 'them who are of the household of faith' (Galatians vi, 10). The practical use of āsā in this sutta is to designate four households or else four courses of conduct, as typical illustrations of which the sutta gives four descriptions of a monk; to wit, (1) a monk who is content with simple clothing, (2) one who is content with the simplest food got in a proper way, (3) one who is satisfied with the humblest habitation, and (4) one who delights in meditation.

1 The Pāli ṛasaṁ, like the Sanskrit rasaṁ, is masculine. But of heterogeneous nouns there are not a few in Pāli. Thus in this very edict we have ñāṇaṁ-paliyagdena as equivalent to the usual masculine plural paryyaj; at Dhammapada, stanza 188, occurs pabhati vandan aidhi; and in the Patimokkha (the numerous archaisms of which deserve a careful study) we actually find, at 1.84 chattā: ariya-navāsanī the precise equivalent of the form which appears in the Bhāra edict. As for the lack of the unetre in aḷīya-rasāṇi, it may be a dialectical peculiarity; or it may be set down as a stonecutter's blunder (see Senart, 2, 349, 331, and the end of Book-edits, No. 14).
The foregoing considerations justify us in equating Ariyavardhini with the chattaro ariyavardhini (or better, with the chattari ariyavardhini, as the Patisambhidda calls them) rather than with the dasa ariyavardhini. But this justification is reinforced by a weighty consideration, and that is the importance and distinction, which attached to the ariyavardhini text, or to the substance of that text, at so early a time as the reduction of the Patisambhidda, and which the text continued to enjoy down to the time of Buddhaghotha (say A.D. 410) and his successors. In the Patisambhidda (1:84), these four ariyavardhini are set down with the four satipatthana and other famous fours. Buddhaghotha, in his Anguttara commentary, devotes almost ten full pages (521 to 531) to this sutta, and begins (p. 521, l. 34) by calling it the Great Ariyavardhini-sutta and saying that it was preached by Buddha himself to an assembly of forty thousand monks at Jetavana.

Buddhaghotha had previously made several allusions to the Ariyavardhini in his Visuddhimagga. The Sayā to Pye has published the text of this work, and also Dhammapāla's commentary thereon, at the P. G. Maudrye Press (Rangoon, 1909-1910), and to his editions the following citations refer. Thus at the very beginning of the chapter on the Pure Practices or dhātāyas, he gives the advantages of following them, and among them this, that a man gets a firm footing in the ariyavardhini (text, p. 59, l. 7). The commentary (p. 22, l. 23) reflects distinctly the phraseology of the Anguttara text. At p. 54, l. 5, the text says that simplicity of clothing puts a man in the first ariyavardhini, according thus with the text of the Anguttara passage. At p. 56, l. 11, the text gives a little story beginning, "In a certain village there was preaching on the Ariyavardhini" (so the comm., p. 88, l. 1). And at the end of the exquisite story translated in H. C. Warren's Buddhism (p. 434) under the Biblical title, and hate not his father and mother, p. 79, l. 15 of the text, the admiring mother is represented as saying that the Buddha must have had in mind just such a monk as her son when he preached the Ariyavardhini course of conduct. Without implying that Buddhaghotha wrote the Ādaka commentary, we may add that this same famous course of conduct is mentioned as something which Upananda preached but did not practice in Ādaka, Vol. 2, p. 441, and Vol. 3, p. 332. In short, the evidence is ample to show that the text about the four ariyavardhini was one of great distinction and very wide notoriety.

Number 3, Angāta-bhayādī. Four suttas with this name appear in the Anguttara-nikāya, namely, sutta 77-80 of Vol. 3, pages 100-110. The first of these (No. 77) is a series of admonitions to lead a heedful and strenuous life in view of five possible kinds of danger, and is meant for the monk who is a forest hermit. The second (No. 78) is a series of admonitions to the same effect, in view of the coming on of age, disease, famine, war, or schism. The third (No. 79) is a prophecy of the dangers to arise in the future, with suitable admonitions to the monks to be on their guard and strive earnestly to avoid them. One of these dangers is that incompetent monks might attempt to teach the higher doctrine (abhidhammakathā), — a strange sutta for Aśoka to urge upon the attention of lay sisters. The fourth sutta (No. 80) is like the third, except that the dangers to the religion concern luxury in clothing, food, and dwellings and the promiscuous living together of monks and nuns, and so forth. This last danger makes it unsuitable as a discourse to the laity.

Professor Davids picks out third sutta (No. 79) for identification with Aśoka's Angāta-bhayādī. For the reason indicated in the previous paragraph, this seems to me wrong. And the like holds for the fourth. The first sutta (No. 77) is meant for a forest hermit and so I think that it is not intended by the author of the edict. There remains, therefore, only the second.

Number 5, Moneya-sīlā. This, Professor Davids, identifies with the Moneya-sutta which is found in the Anguttara-nikāya, Vol. 1, p. 273, and (with much less satisfactory detail) also at Itivuttaka number (not page) 67. The kīya-moneya and vachī-moneya are quite in accord with what we expect to find in the edict; but it is not so with the mano-moneya, which implies attainments quite beyond the laity.

I would identify Aśoka's Moneya-sīlā with the Nīlaka-sutta (iii, 11) of the Sutta-nipāta, pp. 128-134 of Pausboll's edition. Stanza 1-20 are a mere setting or narrative introduction.
At stanza 22, Nālaka says to Buddha:

"O wise one (muni), to me declare thou, being asked,
The state of wisdom (moneyya), the highest state."

Upon which Buddha proceeds to set forth to Nālaka the factors of the simple life, simplicity in food and dwelling, chastity, harmlessness—the very things, in short, which constitute the fundamentals of the morality, which Ásoka enjoins. In this same sūta, the word moneyya recurs in stanzas 20, 23, and 38; and muni, at 20, 25, 30, 33, and 45; and moneyya is found at 40 and 45. The discourse is preached to Nālaka and at his request, and is therefore called Nālaka-sutta in the text; but it was doubtless called also by the name of its subject, that is to say moneyya.

Examples of such double names for a single text are by no means rare, and a systematic search would probably reveal many. Several may be given. At Visuddhi-magga, p. 279, l. 26, Buddhaghosa cites some clauses from a sūta of the Sānāyutta, Vol. 5, p. 115-121, which, in the colophon, at p. 123, is called Metta-sutta; but Buddhaghosa calls it Haliddarāsana-sutta, because it was preached at Haliddavasana, a town of the Koliyas. Again, at page 193, lines 7 and 13, he cites two passages from sūtas in the Āguttara; at Vol. 3, pages 312 and 314, which, in the colophon, at page 329, are called, the first, from its subject, Anussati, and the second, from the preacher, khuddukkha. Buddhaghosa calls them respectively Gedha-sutta and Sambuddhārāsana-sutta. These names are taken from words that figure prominently in the sūtas, and were quite likely older and more widely known than those of the artificial and bungling colophons. Other examples have been noted by Professor Lanman, in the proceedings of the American Academy for 1909, Vol. 44, p. 670, under the heading Pali Book-titles. Thus the story which is called Āsikkhā-sutta in Fauskell's text (Vol. 1, p. 285), and the scene of which is sculptured on a medallion of the Bharhut tope, is named "Yam brahmano aragesi jatakam" upon the medallion, the name being taken from the first line of a stanza of the Jātaka (p. 298, l. 28).

Finally, in Buddhaghosa's beautiful story (at Visuddhi-magga, p. 79, l. 15) to which we have already referred, this Nālaka-sutta is coupled with other sūtas, the Rathasānta, the Tawañcaka, and the Mahā-Ariyavāna. The first is presumably the text at Majjhima-nikāya, Vol. 1, p. 145; and the second is the text at Sutta-nipāta, p. 170. The Ariyavāna is, as we saw above, a sūta of great distinction; and the putting of the others with it clearly implies that they too were well-known texts. This consideration is therefore one of weight in favour of our identification.

Number 6, Upatissa-pāsine. The Questions of Upatissa. Since Upatissa is a name for the great disciple Sāriputta, this title would be a fit one for any text which answers questions put by Sāriputta. Now sūta IV. 15 of sutta-nipāta (p. 176) consists of eight stanzas addressed by way of question to Buddha by Sāriputta, and of thirteen addressed by Buddha to his chief disciple in reply. Questions and answers alike concern the simple and righteous life, are free from abstract matters, and are wholly appropriate for the purpose of the edict. In the text the sūta is called Sāriputta-sutta, that is, it is called, like Nālaka-sutta, after the name of the man to whom it is addressed. As we saw above, this fact does not in the least militate against our identifying the text with that which the edict calls Questions of Upatissa. The Sutta-nipāta, mostly in verse, is a very old and illustrious text, and it thus meets well the conditions of the problem. But I do not put forward this solution as a final one.

The identifications, as revised to date, accordingly, are:

1. Visaya Samukses;
3. Anûgata-bhayâni = Anûgata-bhayâni, Aţuttara, Vol. 3, p. 103; sutta 78;
4. Muni-gadhâ = Muni-sutta, Sutta-nipâta, i. 12, p. 36;
5. Moneya-dâte = Nûlaka-sutta, Sutta-nipâta, ill. 11, p. 131-134;

My best thanks are due to Prof. C. R. Lanman of Harvard University who has revised the English of my paper and the order of the arguments and has made some additions.
CONTRIBUTIONS TO PANJABI LEXICOGRAPHY.

SERIES III.

BY H. A. ROSE, I.C.S.

(Continued from Vol. XL, p. 310.)

Lathayit: a synonym for thuładār q. v. (used by the Jāts in the south of the District.)


Lēthin: a crevasse in a glacier.


Lēkh: chokkā: accounts, e. g., lekhā jokhā.


Leva: a cotton cover for night. Sirmūr trans-Giri.

Lha: (1) a scar or slit on a hillside; (2) in Tibetan, a demon or local divinity = gār.

Lipti: wild thyme. Simla S. R., 1883, p. 44.

Lishak: adj. bright.

Lishakā: to lighten (of cloud).


Lōhā: the valley beyond; us rīrī ki, lohe men, beyond that ridge, in the dip behind it.

Kangra Gloss.

Lōhūla: a plough share.

Lōhka: small.

Lōhrī: a festival held on 1st Magh, at which lighted torches are carried about. Chamba.

Lōhrī: thief; cf. nauria rāla. Bauria argot.


Lōkrou: a jackal, see lōrī and cf. lonkri, fox: Bauria argot. Ex. Lokrou mār āyīgu. ‘Let us kill a jackal’.

Lōli: a curl or ringlet of hair.

Lonāī, lūndū: reaping.

Lonā, lonāda: a reaper.


Lonri: dog. Bauria argot.


Lonth: branches of trees cut with the leaves on for making a dam in a stream or canal.

Kangra Gloss.

Lōp: adj. hidden, disappeared.


Lōwata: shoes with leather soles and woollen tops, also called chūnjār. Simla S. R., 1883, p. xlv.

Ludī: a big kite.


Lunga: a mode of culture, which consists in steeping the seed and forcing it under warm grass to germinate. The seed, with the tender shoots is then thrown into the soil, which has previously been flooded to receive it. Cf. much. Kângra S. R., p. 26.

Lunâl: reaping = londâl.

Lut: hirpes, ringworm: Jullundur, see P. Dy., p. 690.

Lutia lotri q. v. Sirmûr cis-Giri.

Lwola: afternoon.

Mâ: ase—in imperatives: Bauria argot: as bol md. 'Do not speak.'


Mâdhari: = dhûyûlûq q. v.


Mâgut: see Utaravan. Festival in honour of ancestors in Pângi: held on 1st Mâgh. They give roti to the Hâlis in the name of a deceased son.


Mahan: a male buffalo.

Mâhi: a heavy horizontal block of wood, drawn by oxen to smooth the surface of a field.

Kângra S. R., p. 29.

Mâhlûndhî: see mûlûndî.


Mahr: a collector of revenue, for a village. Bâlâspur.

Mâllânî: the money paid by land-owners for the sheep's droppings when folded on their land.


Mâin or Jhôl: a cload-crusher—the maira of the Punjûb plains. Simla S. R., 1883, p. xlv.


Maja: a small outlying hamlet in the village area in which are settled cultivators who till the surrounding land. Cf. garkh. Karnâl S. R., p. 76.

Makâl: an altar built by the sugar press where ß ganderû and a little of the first juice expressed and ß seers of the first gur made are offered up, and then given to a Brâhman. Karnâl S. R., 1872-80, p. 182.


Makkar sankrânt: the 1st day of Mâgh. Chamba.

Makol: white clay—see golond.

Makrâb: a grass — with a blossom like a wood-louse. Rohtak.

Mâkri: a flat piece of wood with a socket in its highest end to which mânak is tied. Karnâl S. R., 1872-80, p. 161.

Mâlâb: the material from which drained sugar is made. Hoshiarpur S. R., p. 92.

Maloksh: a devil = dāint, a devil regarded as impure. Chamba.
Mālernā: to manure. Kangra Gloss.
Mālik kandah: ‘master of the flock’, = mahlūndhi; see mālundi.
Mālmala mawūsh: Rohtak.
Māl undo: the captain or leader of a flock, a term used by Gaddi shepherds.
Māru: Quercus dilatata, its leaves are cut in winter as fodder: hard wood, and used for charcoal. Simla S. R., 1883, p. xliii.
Mān: (1) chastity: if a betrothal is broken off by the boy he must pay the girl Rs. 6 for her māna: (2) reconciliation, so a due or fee of Rs. 6 paid (a) by a man to his first wife on taking a second and (b) to a wife who is divorced. Pāngī.
Mānd: ground-floor: also used trans-Gīrī.
Mangalā mukhi: a ceremony corresponding to the baptism of the Sikhs and Bishnols.
Mannī: a high stony ridge near the end of the Siwalik range in the Dasāya tahsil.
Hoshiarpur S. R., p. 4.
Māni: the big flat stone in front of a baulī where people stand to draw water, bathe, etc.
Mānj: a ladder, see sāng.
Mantori: (Kullā) a burning ghāt—see tirath.
Mānu: a man as distinguished from an animal, a form of manukh.
Manukh, a man: Kangra. Cf. manakh and mānu.
Marabin: a large and sweet mango fruit, with a small stone. Used principally for making preserves (maraba). Hoshiarpur S. R., p. 15.
Marali: adj. savage.
Margoza: see ak-bâh-mána.
Mâri nakhna: to beat. Bauria argot.
Mârtal: see tirath. Cf. mûrthál.
Mârthál: a place where corpses are burnt: mantoru torn in Kullâ.
Mase kiwên: with some difficulty.
Muser sasâ: mother-in-law’s sister: wife’s maternal aunt.
Match: (si) (much) a kind of harrow without teeth, used to make soil into soft mud before sewing rice. Kângra Glos.
Matha: s. m. forehead; mathé kajjî, modest (of a woman): mathâ teknâ, to bow.
Mathik: the bank over which water is to be lifted. Karnâl S. R., 1872-80, p. 171.
Mâtri: ‘motherly;’ a title of Devi Adshakti at Kacheri. Matri Deora is another temple on the ridge above Kacheri village called Tikkar in Chamba.
Matti kâdâna: a form of worship which consists in scooping out a little hollow in the earth by the shrine and flinging the soil on to a heap. Karnâl S. R., 1872-80, p. 145.
Matwâla: sweet—of water, which causes a crop to fill profusely, but with a weak stalk. Rohtak.
Matwâla: hard, a sort of water, the crops irrigated by it are generally good. Gurgaon S. R., 1872-83, p. 8.

(To be continued.)

MISCELLANEA.

MOORE’S HINDU PANTHEON.

The author of the Hindu Pantheon (1810) rightly deemed his Plate XVII, a representation of Mahâkâos and Parvatî, to be the gem of his book. ’The painting or drawing from which Plate 17 is engraved is, I think,’ he wrote, ’the most beautiful and highly finished thing I ever saw. I purchased it at Poona for forty rupees (five pounds), but for some time the seller demanded a hundred (twelve guineas) for it.’

That painting was exhibited as No. 1163 a, the Indian Court of the Festival of Empire, 1911, by Major E. C. Moor of the Rosary, Great Bealings, Ipswich, the author’s grandson, who also showed a number of objects, the originals from which the plates of images, etc., in the Hindu Pantheon were engraved.

The mythological collection is for sale and might be purchased for a museum.

V. A. S.

NOTES AND QUERIES.

SHAH JAHAN TRANSLATED AS KING JOHN.

A GOOD ‘HOBSON-JOBSON’.

1634. ‘And that we might leave nothing undone, which might advantage his resolutions, according to the order of the late Mogul, he changed his name from Currene [Kurram] to Shaw Jahan, or King John, thinking by that, in some sort, to appease the people’s hatred.’

Herbert, Description of the Persian Monarchy, now being the Orientall Judges, p. 31, in the course of a very inaccurate account of the Emperor Shah Jahan.

R. C. Temple.
THE VEDIC CALENDAR.

BY R. SHAMASHASTRY, B.A., M.R.A.S., M.B.A., MYSORE.

(Continued from page 32.)

The meaning of the above passage is this:—Giving up a practice of adding twelve days to the synodic lunar year of 354 days in order to adjust it to the sidereal solar year of 366 days, the Vedic poets allowed the twelve days to accumulate to the extent of a month in the course of two and a half years, and then performed their sacrifice at the close of the thirteenth month with thirteen priests, of whom the thirteenth priest represented the thirteenth month, the "dirty" month, and took up the sins of the sacrificer for the gold that was presented to him.

In the Aitareya-Brâhmana, i, 12, the thirteenth priest is called Sûma-vikrayin, 'seller of Sûma.' This passage, with a brief commentary upon it by Raghunandana Bhaṭṭāchāryya, the author of the Smrītiśattra, runs as follows:—

मात्रेय विनायक: तथा सोमभवां नामां मायां नानाविषयं पति सोमभवानिषयं भवानवण्येण।
सोमविनिर्भरतो महाविनिर्भरतो न दोषा पुष्पाविनिर्भरतो सोमविनिर्भरतो अविनिर्भरतो।

"The gods bought the king Sûma in the eastern direction. Thence he is (generally) bought in the eastern direction. They bought him from the thirteenth month. Thence the thirteenth month is found unfit (for any religious work to be done in it); a seller of Sûma is (likewise) found unfit (for intercourse), for such a man is a defiler." The meaning of the passage is this:—"Because the intercalated month is the seller of Sûma, therefore it has no proper existence like other months. Although it has its own existence, it is yet regarded as having no proper existence inasmuch as no rites are performed in it. The seller of Sûma is like other priests employed for the performance of sacrifice."

As regards the sinful nature of intercalated months, the author of the Smritiśattra, quotes the following passage:—

सोमविनिर्भरतो निर्भरतो महाविनिर्भरतो न दोषाविनिर्भरतो।
सोमविनिर्भरतो अविनिर्भरतो महाविनिर्भरतो न दोषाविनिर्भरतो।

"(The intercalated month) contained in the body of the year, is sinful, is destructive of the good results of sacrifices, is infested by Nairṛta, Yaṇudhāna, and other evil spirits, and is of a disagreeable name. This and other passages are found in astrological works. The word vindmaka means 'that which has a disagreeable name'; for it has Malimukha and other (disgusting) names."

The three passages quoted above throw a flood of light on the nature of the conception which the Vedic poets entertained regarding the intercalary days and months. We have to understand the three important points specified in these passages:—

1. At first the Vedic poets used to adjust their lunar year with the sidereal solar year by adding twelve days to the former, but in the course of time they gave up that custom and began to intercalate one month to every third lunar year.

8 Smritiśattra, p. 732.

(2) Instead of performing any sacrifice during the intercalated period, they spent that period in performing such accessory rites as are called Upâsâd or sessions and Dikshâ or rites of initiation.

(3) They regarded the intercalated days as being infested by evil spirits and enemies. It is therefore probable that the apparent acts of sorcery undertaken in connection with every kind of sacrifice in order to drive out or to destroy 'those who hated the poets and whom the poets hated', are acts intended to symbolise the fact of getting rid of an intercalated period. Since an intercalated period is regarded, not only as being burdened with dirt or sin, but also as being infested by Varuṇa, Nirṛiti, and other good or evil spirits with nooses in their hands to bind their victims, it is probable that, during an intercalated period, the Vedic poets regarded themselves, not only as being burdened with sin, but also as being bound with the noose (pdâa) of Varuṇa or Nirṛiti. It also follows that the removal of sin or of Varuṇa's fetters at the close of a period of twelve or twenty-one days, is a technical expression of the Vedic poets implying the intercalary nature of those days. The removal of guilt at the close of the twelve intercalated days is thus referred to in the Aitareya-Brâhmaṇa, IV. 4, 24:—

ब्राह्म या एवं तद्व्रहा आयोवस्यमहाराहाविपले वशारावाणी वशारावाणी वशारावाणी वशारावाणी वशारावाणी वशारावाणी वशारावाणी वशारावाणी वशारावाणी वशारावाणी वशारावाणी वशारावाणी वशारावाणी

The Dvâdâśâha consists of thrice three days together with the tenth day and two Atirâtra days. After having undergone the ceremony of initiation during twelve days one becomes fit for performing the sacrifice. During the twelve days he undergoes the Upâsâd or the vow of fasting. By means of them he shakes off all guilt from his body. He who has such a knowledge becomes purified and clean, and enters the deities after having, during (these) twelve days, been born anew and shaken off (all guilt) from his body. The Dvâdâśâha consists (on the whole) of thirty-six days.

The thirty-six days referred to in this passage are three sets of twelve days each, constituting the difference between three lunar and three sidereal solar years. The Atharvâvâda = (Bûg. v. vii. 103. 1.) IV. 15. 13, also speaks of the twelve days' vow as follows:—

कंस्लारे वशारावाणी वशारावाणी प्रशायकाने: लक्ष्मी प्रसब्धिनिहितोऽत्प्रायवंति: !

"Having lain for a year, (like) Brâhmans performing a vow, the frogs have spoken forth a voice quickened by parjaṇya [the raining clouds]."

So also the same says IV. 11. 11:—

ब्राह्मणा तद्व्रहा राविकारावाणी आह: प्रजापतिः: ||
सलोकय सो ब्रह्म तथा अवस्थानुसूर प्रमुख: ||

"Twelve, indeed, they declare those nights of the vow of Prajāpati; whose knows the Brâhman within them—that verily is the vow of the draught-ox."

The release from Varuṇa's fetters at the close of twenty-one days is thus referred to in the Atharvâvâda, iv. 16. 6:—

वे ते गरावा वहन सम सम वर्गेश तिरिक्तिति तिरिक्तिति हक्कव: !
सिस्तु वेण अवस्थान्ति वृषस्य प्रमुख: ||

"What fetters of thine, O Varuṇa, seven by seven, stand triply relaxed, shining—let them all bind him that speaks untruth; whose is truth-speaking, let them let him go."

I presume that the expression of three times seven milch kine pouring their milky draught, as referred to in the two verses of the Sûdraâvâda quoted above, implies the same idea as that of an intercalated period of twenty-one days. From the consideration of these and other similar passages too numerous to be quoted here, we may conclude that expressions such as 'the milking of the kine,' 'the destruction of evil spirits or of enemies,' and 'the release from the fetters of Varuṇa or of Nirṛiti,' are Vedic expressions implying the passing off of an intercalated period,
I think that the symbolic acts of cutting off the branch of a Paliá tree, and of separating the calves from the cows for the purpose of milking them during the night, and of destroying the evil spirits and enemies, as described in the very beginning of the Black Yajurveda, are also meant to signify the passing off of an intercalated period. Among the Chinese the twelve months of the year are called the twelve branches; and it is probable that the Vedic poets, too, called the months, whether ordinary or intercalary, by the name of śādhās or branches. As already pointed out in the above pages and also in my essay entitled Gauvān-Ayana: the Vedic Era, published in 1908, the term 'cow' is a name given to the New Year's Day as well as to the intercalated day; and her 'calves' must therefore mean the days of the subsequent year or cycle of years. We have also seen how the symbolic act of burning the evil spirits and enemies signifies the passing off of an intercalated period. Accordingly the first two Anuvāks or paragraphs of the first kāvyā of the Black Yajurveda may possibly refer to the cutting off of an intercalated branch or month, and to the separation of some New Year's Days or bisexuils intercalated days, termed 'cows,' from their calves or the consecutive days of the subsequent year or cycle of years. In order to see whether the passage gives this meaning or not, it is necessary that we should examine the interpretation given to it by Bhaṭṭa Bhāskara and other commentators. The passage runs as follows, i. 1. 1:

In accordance with the commentary of Bhaṭṭa Bhāskara and others on these passages, they can be translated thus:

"O Branch, thou art for iṣṭha [food], and for ūrja [strength]; O calves, ye are swift runners like the wind, and ye come back again; O cows, may the bright sun lead you for the purpose of our best sacrificial rites; O inviolable cows, yield the share of the gods, ye who are possessed of strength, milk, and calves, and who are free from consumption and other diseases. May the thief have no power over you; may the slayer not touch you; may the thunderbolt of Rudra quit you on all sides; be ye firm in the possession of this cowherd; preserve ye the numerous cows of the sacrificer; O sword, thou art the announcer of the sacrifice; burnt is the devil and burnt are the enemies."

Here the sacrificer is required to repeat the first four words of the original, and to cut off a branch of the Paliá tree for use in the sacrifice. The next four words are addressed to calves which are to be separated from their mothers, the cows. The following sentences up to 'burnt is the devil' are addressed to cows. Then comes the symbolic act of burning the evil spirits and enemies. These symbolic acts, which are usually performed by sacrificers in connection with all full-moon and new-moon sacrifices, appear to render the explanation of the commentators plausible and perhaps representative of the only meaning intended by the poet. But when we try to make the detached thoughts and acts into a connected whole, we feel the difficulty. So long as we accept the interpretation of the commentators, we fail to understand the aim of the poet who gave expressions to these thoughts and devised the symbolic acts: the thoughts and acts are so disconnected that they appear to have originated in some disordered mind. But if we take the 'branch' in the sense of an intercalated month which is to be placed between the months of Isha and Urja (Āśvina and Kārttika) and is to be symbolically burnt as an evil spirit and an enemy, and if we take the calves as the days of an ordinary year whose wife is elsewhere said to be the eighth day of the dark half of the month of Māgha and is called a cow bringing forth the days or calves of the next year, the disjointed thoughts arrange themselves into a connected whole. It is probable that it was the lack of proper astronomical terms to designate the various parts of the year that led the Vedic poets to talk of them in terms of the branches of a tree and cows and calves.
Whether or not the meaning of the first two paragraphs of the \textit{Krishṇa-Tajurveda} is, as I have presumed it to be, this much is certain, that the Vedic poets were quite familiar with various kinds of years and knew how to adjust them with each other, and that the detailed description of calendars given in the Śūtras is but a copy of Vedic calendars and not a later invention.

**II.—The Calendar.**

Having thus proved the existence of a calendar during the Vedic times, I may now proceed to frame that calendar and its various forms out of the materials scattered here and there in the Śūtras and Brāhmaṇas. The general name by which the various forms of the Vedic calendar were known seems to have been Gavām-Ayana. It is only one of many forms of the Vedic calendar that I attempted to explain in my essay entitled \textit{Gavām-Ayana, the Vedic Era}, published in 1908. Therein I have pointed out: (1) that the word \textit{gā}, 'cow,' means the intercalary day, \textit{i.e.}, that day which is the product of the four quarter-days at the end of four successive solar years, each of 365\(\frac{1}{4}\) days; (2) that the term Gavām-Ayana or 'Cows' Walk' means a series of such intercalary days, on each of which the Vedic poets regularly performed cyclic sacrifices; and (3) that in the Mahād-Ukttha or Great Litany of Rīgvedic hymns they kept a record of 460 or 465 intercalated days as having elapsed.

As the evidence I adduced in support of this theory is of an indirect and hypothetical nature, scholars have hesitated to accept it, and have opined that the passages which I explained in the light of this theory could bear other and perhaps more rational interpretations, and that my theory was rather an ingenious contrivance than a discovery of the real design of the Vedic poets. Probably no theory that is not based upon direct evidence is ever accepted; mine can be no exception, and would share the fate of other theories if, like them, it had no direct evidence to support it. But the \textit{Nīdāna-Sūtra} of the Śāma-veda seems to supply the want. From this Śūtra we learn that Gavām-Ayana is a name given to the year which contained some intercalated days inserted either in its middle or at its close. It appears that the number of days intercalated differed with different schools of Vedic astronomers, and depended upon the difference between any two kinds of years selected for adjustment with each other. The school which had adopted the synodic lunar year of 334 days and the sidereal solar year of 366 days seems to have added to every lunar year a \textit{dvādāśāsāha} or period of twelve days, during which they performed a sacrifice with recitation of a Śāma-chant of twelve verses on the last day. With the school which had adopted the sidereal lunar year of 351 days, \textit{i.e.}, the year of thirteen months of 27 days each, and adjusted it with the Śāvana year of 360 days, the number of days added was nine. Those who had adopted the Śāvana year of 360 days and adjusted it with the solar year of 365\(\frac{1}{4}\) days, seem to have been adding 21 days to every fourth Śāvana year. In this way there seems to have been during the Vedic period a variety of different astronomical schools, whose chief religious function was the performance of a grand sacrifice during each period of their respective intercalary days. A regular account of the 'cows' or intercalary days which each school counted and observed is found preserved under the general title of Gavām-Ayana, "the walk of cows or intercalary days." The term Gavām-Ayana seems to have been originally intended to be a name of only two intercalary days; but in the course of time it appears to have also been used to signify that year which contained intercalary days added to it, no matter whether the number of days so added, or counted as having been added, amounted to a year or more than a year. These and other important points connected with the Vedic calendar are clearly explained both in the \textit{Nīdāna-Sūtra} and in the \textit{Srauta-Sūtra} of Lātjāyana; and it is a matter for regret that, important as these works are for elucidating the much- vexed question of Vedic chronology, they have so long escaped the notice of oriental scholars. It is true that the Śūtras in general abound in elliptical and technical obscurities which sometimes render their meaning uncertain and vague; still, so far as their main idea or purport is concerned, they leave us in no doubt whatever.
The passage of the *Nirdhā-Sātra* in which a few forms of Gavān-Ayana are defined, runs as follows, v. 11, 12:—

10. अध्यापनस्वस्त्वरा बालंति पंचमवर्षवर्य वागः. 11. तेषु भोरे परिनव्यम अन्यन व्यवस्था विवाह संभोग न एक अन्तःनिवিন

10. अध्यापनस्वस्त्वरा बालंति पंचमवर्षवर्य वागः. 11. तेषु भोरे परिनव्यम अन्यन व्यवस्था विवाह संभोग न एक अन्तःनिविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविविवিন

10. अध्यापनस्वस्त्वरा बालंति पंचमवर्षवर्य वागः.

Then the years of the classes: 11 the classes (are) of five years. In them the sage by his wisdom will know the sessions of the ritual, 13 and the basic forms (of the sacrificial rites), 13 and the vows or ceremonies (to be observed) in them.

---

10. अध्यापनस्वस्त्वरा बालंति पंचमवर्षवर्य वागः.

11. अध्यापनस्वस्त्वरा बालंति पंचमवर्षवर्य वागः.

12. उपसात: सा ' : the sitting down, waiting for the arrival of the final sacrificial day.'

13. सहस्तः: ' : a staying or abiding together.'
"(The year) which is less (than the Sávana year) by 36 (days); that which is less by 9 (days); that which is less by 6 (days); then the Sávana year (of 360 days); then the year which is greater than the Sávana year by 18 days. The sidereal year (of 351 days) has a thirteenth month (of 27 days). Then the two kinds of years: the lunar and the Sávana. Then the year which is greater than the Sávana year by 18 days: one has to observe (it) on every 38th or 37th full-moon.

He has to know the four forms of Gavám-Ayana. Of them, the sidereal year (of 384 days) is the first; its months are of 27 days each, because there are 27 nakshatras. The mode of observing it (is this): in the place of each first [period of six days called] Abhiplava (of every month of 30 days) before the central day (of the year), one should observe [a period of only three days known as] Trikādṛuka;¹⁴ (likewise is the place) of each last (Abhiplava) after the central day. Some say that they (the Trikādṛuka) days are so devised as to be of the same form as the Abhiplava days; they have their place here: nor is their observance opposed to that of the Abhiplava days. It is also known that, like the Svarasāman days,¹⁵ the unit of three days [the Trikādṛuka days] is devised as a special period of three days. The three Trikādṛuka days, as well as the five days of the six Abhiplava days are observed together in the sacrificial session of seventeen nights.¹⁶ Others say that the Trikādṛuka days are the same as the Svarasāman days. And thus the usual form of the calendar days and their rites is not lost; for the Trikādṛuka days have their own independent place in all sacrificial sessions.

"Then (the year of 351 days) which is less (than the Sávana year) by nine days:¹⁷ thus it has thirteen months (each of 27 days). He has to omit nine days in the two intercalary months [sahāthyya;¹⁸ i.e., the sixth and the seventh month, each of 30 days]; four days [are to be omitted] before the central day of the year, and five days after it. This is how it is done: in the place of the first Abhiplava (of the sixth month of 30 days) before the central day, only two days known as jyotis and go are to be observed; and in the place of the last Abhiplava (of the seventh month) after the central day, only one day, known as jyotis, is to be observed. No central day occurs in the year (of 351 days); for it is counted in its latter half.

"Then the Lunar years (of 354 days) which are less (than the Sávana year) by six days:¹⁹ in the first half (of this year) there are six months, beginning with one which is full [i.e., consists of 30 days] and ending with one which is defective [i.e., contains only 29 days]; in the latter (half there are six months), beginning with one which is defective and ending with one which is full. This is how it is observed: in the defective months before the central day, in the place of each first Abhiplava one should observe (only) five days of Abhiplava; (likewise in the place) of each last (Abhiplava) in the defective months after the central day.

¹⁴ Trikādṛuka is the name given to a unit of three days, of which the first day is called jyotis, "light", the second go, "cow", and the third days, "life". Abhiplava is the name given to a unit of six days, of which the first three days are named like the Trikādṛuka days and the last three days are called go, agus, and jyotis.
¹⁵ Svarasāman is a name given to the three days before and after the central day of a sacrificial session. Special Sāma-chants are sung on these six days. If the Trikādṛuka days were considered as identical with the Svarasāman days, which are strictly observed immediately before and after the central day of a sacrificial session, the other days of the session would be counted in periods of six days each. This appears to be the meaning of "an independent place for the Trikādṛuka days."¹⁶
¹⁶ The 17 nights seem to me to be the nights of 6 Svarasāman days plus 6 Trikādṛuka days plus 5 Abhiplava days.—J. F. Fleet.
¹⁷ See Calendar, Form II. below.
¹⁸ [I do not see how sahāthyya can be fairly rendered by 'intercalary'. It means 'that which may be brought together', and seems to mean, rather, 'the two months which are susceptible of contraction by shortening'—J. F. Fleet.]
¹⁹ See Calendar, Form III. below.
The Sāvana year (of 360 days)20 has been explained. It is this same sidereal year of the sun.21 The sun is known to pass through (each of) the nakshatras in a fixed number of days: he remains in each nakshatra for thirteen and thirteen days, together with a third part of a day and two out of nine kālās or parts of a day-and-night [i.e., of a whole day]: these kālās or parts amount in a year to 54, and are equal to six times nine kālās [i.e., 6 days]: thus it consists of 366 (days) as contrasted with the (Sāvana year) consisting of 360 (days). There are two verses about this:

"Twenty-seven are the mansions in the king's [i.e., the Sun's] dominion: thirteen and thirteen days he resides in each nakshatra: thirteen days and one-third of a day; thus dividing four times ten days into three (equal) parts, he traverses the broad and ancient path of three nine stations in the course of forty periods, each of nine nights."

Then the year of the Sun (of 378 days)22 which is greater (than the Sāvana year) by eighteen days; this indeed is made by his transverse motion;23 it is well known that the sun always goes to the North for six months and nine days, and likewise to the South. Accordingly there are the following verses:

Who knows that year in which the solar, the lunar, and the sidereal months are not lost, who knows that? In the year measured by 37 or 38 (full moons), the solar, the lunar, and the sidereal months are not lost. The sun goes to the South for twenty-seven times seven days, and likewise to the North for twenty-seven times seven days.

This is how this year is observed:—In the two intercalary months,24 one should intercalate eighteen days; nine days before the central day of the year and nine days after it; three Trikādraka days and six Abhiplava days before the central day, and six Abhiplava days and three Trikādraka days after the central day."

Similar forms of calendar, together with some more varieties, are also described in the Śrāulā-Stūtra of Liṭāyānaya, iv, 8, 1-7. This is what he says:—

"Varieties of the movements of the heavenly luminaries. In the calendar pertaining to these movements, that which is observed at the beginning (of each month) before the central day, is observed at the close (of each month) after the central day. In the place of the first six Abhiplava days in each month, only three Trikādraka days are observed. Thus this sidereal lunar year in less (than the Sāvana year) by 36 days, since its months consist of 27 days each.

"In the place of the first six Abhiplava days of the sixth month (of the Sāvana year), there are observed only two days, known as jyotis and gô; and in the second part of the year, which is

---

20 See Calendar, Form I., and for the year of 365 days, see Form IV., below.
21 The text treats here in a somewhat obscure manner of both the Sāvana year of 365 days and the sidereal solar year of 366 days. The latter is not mentioned as one of the five classes of years in the beginning of the passage. The text seems to suggest that the Sāvana year, before being regarded as = 30 days \( \times 12 \), was a sidereal year of 37 \( \times 13 \) days, and that the year of 365 days, = 37 \( \times 13 \), was a refinement of it, as a result of experience showing that the sun required \( \frac{1}{3} \) of a day more time to pass through each nakshatra.—J. F. Fleet.
22 See Calendar, Form IV., below.
23 The motion from South to North and back again, which the sun seems to have in passing from solstice to solstice, is transverse, at right angles, to his actual motion from West to East through the nakshatras.—J. F. Fleet.
24 See Note 18, above.
merely a repetition of the first part, only one day, known as *ṣvetās*, is observed in the place of the last six *Abhiplava* days (*of the seventh month*); thus it is less (*than the Śāvuna year*) by nine days, and is a sidereal year having a thirteenth month.  

"In the place of the first six *Abhiplava* days in all the even months, only five *Abhiplava* days are observed; this is less (*than the Śāvuna year*) by six days, and is lunar."

"In the beginning of the sixth month, one should intercalate three *Trayodraksa* days and six *Abhiplava* days; thus it is greater (*than the Śāvuna year*) by 18 days, and is productive of a full-moon; and it is caused by the transverse motion of the sun."

Besides the three forms of calendar mentioned above, which are similar to those described in the *Nīdīna-sūtra*, a few more varieties also are noticed in the *Lāṭyāyana Srauta Sūtra*. As some of these varieties are referred to, though only briefly, in the *Krishna-Yajurveda*, it need not be said that they existed during the Vedic period, and that they are not the later contrivances of Śūtra writers. It is therefore necessary that we should understand them as clearly as possible.

The *Lāṭyāyana-Sūtra* continues in iv. 8, 8-20:

> उस उन्नती मार्ग विस्त मार्ग : यथाभासः एवान्यांतरानावतीत्। तस्मान विरुध्द्धाणिं विनातिमुद्यकोऽपि।
> सत्तानां वदधृतुस्ममिनिवाच धातुयः प्रदाते प्रज्ञानिः।
> पन्न्युद्धं सत्तानां वदधृतुस्ममिनिवाच धातुयः प्रदाते प्रज्ञानिः।
> धातुयः वदधृतुस्ममिनिवाच धातुयः प्रदाते प्रज्ञानिः।
> "Omissions (of days) month after month."

Just as the last day (*in each month in the first half of the year*) is omitted, so the first day (*in each month*) in the repeated part of the year [*i.e., the second part*] is omitted. Having treated as *Ukṣhya* days the sixth day in each of the three *Abhiplava* periods of six days, they observe the sixth day of the last *Abhiplava*, [*i.e., the fourth *Abhiplava*] as an *Agnishtoma* day.

"On the sixth day of the fourth *Abhiplava* period of each month, they have to recite a set of Śāmā-verbs called *Ekatrika*. In view of immolating a sacrificial animal, they make the last (*i.e., the fourth*) *Abhiplava* consist of only five days, and immolate a sacrificial animal on the sixth day. Having made the first *Abhiplava* consist of only five days, they immolate a sacrificial animal at the close of the month. Some teachers make all the months deficient by one day: they make the first *Abhiplava* of each month consist of only five days. At the junction of *Abhiplava* and *Pratikṣhāya* days, they reckon the last day of the (*fourth*) *Abhiplava* period and the first day of the *Pratikṣhāya* as one day [*i.e., they treat the two as a single day*]. In the last month [*i.e., the twelfth month*], they make the last day of the last but one *Abhiplava* the first day of the last *Abhiplava*.

---

25 See Calendar, Forms I and II.
26 Ibid., Form III.
27 This is nine days before the central day and nine days after it. See Calendar, Form IV.
28 See Calendar, Form IV.
29 This is what is called *usargiyām āyanaḥ*, which is described in the *Krishna-Yajurveda*, VII, 5, 6.
30 It should be noted here that according to this school a month is made to consist of four *Abhiplava* of six days each and a *Pratikṣhāya* of six days closing the month. According to the commentary of *Agnisavāna* on this Śūtra, it is the *Ukṣhya* days that are omitted. Accordingly, three days are omitted in each month, thus making it consist of 27 days. See Calendar, Form V. below.
31 *Agnisavāna* quotes a passage on the authority of which the day with the *Ekatrikā* is omitted. Hence, according to this school, the month seems to consist of only 29 days. See Calendar, Form VI. below.
32 See Calendar, Form VII. below.
33 Like *Abhiplava*, *Pratikṣhāya* is also a name given to a period of six days which are called: (1) *Rathāśāstra* (2) *Bṛhaṭ*, (3) *Vairāśa*, (4) *Vairāja*, (5) *Śāvuna*, and (6) *Braṇava*, after the names of the Śāvuna-verbs recited on those days. In some schools, the last six days of each month are observed as *Pratikṣhāya*. 
**Abhiplava.** If so [i.e., if they omit one day in each month of the year], they should undergo the vow of initiation for their sacrifice on the eleventh day of the bright half of the month, and spend thirteen days in vow (before they perform their sacrifice on the fourteenth, i.e., the *Ekaśtaka* day of the dark half of the month). Or they have to spend seventeen days in vow.35

**Calendar—Form I.**

[Abbreviations: J = *jyūtis*; G = *gā*; A = *āyus.*]

Sāvana Year of 360 Days.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st Month.</th>
<th>J.</th>
<th>G.</th>
<th>Ā.</th>
<th>G.</th>
<th>Ā.</th>
<th>J.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abhiplava I</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2nd Month.</th>
<th>J.</th>
<th>G.</th>
<th>Ā.</th>
<th>G.</th>
<th>Ā.</th>
<th>J.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abhiplava I</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

34 The twelfth month, when recast in the form of Gavām-Ayana, consists of three *Abhiplava* of six days each and a period of *Daddha* or twelve days. In order to make this month also consist of 29 days, they make the last day of the second *Abhiplava* the first day of the third *Abhiplava*. See Calendar, Form VIII.

35 As each month of the year is made to consist of 29 days (total 348), the deficiency in the year amounts to twelve or seventeen days according as we take the Sāvana year of 360 days or a solar year of 365 days for comparison. It is clear, therefore, that the twelve or seventeen days regarded as *Dikha*-days are no other than intercalary days required to make up the year in observance. Compare *Āsturya-Bṛhāmaṇa* iv, 4, 24; an *Āśārvāda*, iv, 11, 11; iv 15, 19; and iv, 16, 6, quoted above.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>3rd Month</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J.</td>
<td>G.</td>
<td>Ā.</td>
<td>G.</td>
<td>Ā.</td>
<td>J.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abhiplava I</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>„ II</td>
<td>7 8 9 10 11 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>„ III</td>
<td>13 14 15 16 17 18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>„ IV</td>
<td>19 20 21 22 23 24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>„ V</td>
<td>25 26 27 28 29 30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4th Month</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abhiplava I</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>„ II</td>
<td>7 8 9 10 11 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>„ III</td>
<td>13 14 15 16 17 18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>„ IV</td>
<td>19 20 21 22 23 24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>„ V</td>
<td>25 26 27 28 29 30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>5th Month</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abhiplava I</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>„ II</td>
<td>7 8 9 10 11 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>„ III</td>
<td>13 14 15 16 17 18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>„ IV</td>
<td>19 20 21 22 23 24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>„ V</td>
<td>25 26 27 28 29 30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# THE VEDIC CALENDAR

6th Month.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>J.</th>
<th>G.</th>
<th>A.</th>
<th>G.</th>
<th>A.</th>
<th>J.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abhiplava I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3*</td>
<td>4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7th Month.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>J.</th>
<th>G.</th>
<th>A.</th>
<th>G.</th>
<th>A.</th>
<th>J.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abhiplava I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8th Month.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>J.</th>
<th>G.</th>
<th>A.</th>
<th>G.</th>
<th>A.</th>
<th>J.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abhiplava I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* In order to convert this year into the sidereal lunar year of 351 days, the days marked with an asterisk in the 6th and 7th months are omitted; see also Calendar, Form II.

† This is the Vishvat or central day of the year.

N.B.—Instead of being called Abhiplaves, the last week in each month seems to have been called by others, as Prtikhyas, the days being named Brhati, Vairupa, Vairaja, Skvra, and Raivata respectively.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abhiplava</th>
<th></th>
<th>J.</th>
<th>G.</th>
<th></th>
<th>A.</th>
<th>G.</th>
<th>A.</th>
<th>J.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th Month</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abhiplava</td>
<td></td>
<td>J.</td>
<td>G.</td>
<td></td>
<td>A.</td>
<td>G.</td>
<td>A.</td>
<td>J.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th Month</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abhiplava</td>
<td></td>
<td>J.</td>
<td>G.</td>
<td></td>
<td>A.</td>
<td>G.</td>
<td>A.</td>
<td>J.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11th Month</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 12th Month

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>J.</th>
<th>G.</th>
<th>A.</th>
<th>G.</th>
<th>A.</th>
<th>J.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abhiplava I</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Calendar -- Form II.

**Sidereal Lunar Year of 351 days.**

#### 1st Month

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>J.</th>
<th>G.</th>
<th>A.</th>
<th>G.</th>
<th>A.</th>
<th>J.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abhiplava I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2nd Month

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>J.</th>
<th>G.</th>
<th>A.</th>
<th>G.</th>
<th>A.</th>
<th>J.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abhiplava I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J.</td>
<td>G.</td>
<td>Ā.</td>
<td>G.</td>
<td>Ā.</td>
<td>J.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Abhiplava I</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Abhiplava I</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Abhiplava I</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 6th Month

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>J.</th>
<th>G.</th>
<th>Ā.</th>
<th>G.</th>
<th>Ā.</th>
<th>J.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abhiplava I</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7th Month

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>J.</th>
<th>G.</th>
<th>Ā.</th>
<th>G.</th>
<th>Ā.</th>
<th>J.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abhiplava I</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 8th Month

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>J.</th>
<th>G.</th>
<th>Ā.</th>
<th>G.</th>
<th>Ā.</th>
<th>J.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abhiplava I</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J.</td>
<td>G.</td>
<td>A.</td>
<td>G.</td>
<td>A.</td>
<td>J.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Abhipava I</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Abhipava II</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Abhipava III</strong></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Abhipava IV</strong></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>J.</th>
<th>G.</th>
<th>A.</th>
<th>G.</th>
<th>A.</th>
<th>J.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Abhipava I</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Abhipava II</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Abhipava III</strong></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Abhipava IV</strong></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>J.</th>
<th>G.</th>
<th>A.</th>
<th>G.</th>
<th>A.</th>
<th>J.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Abhipava I</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Abhipava II</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Abhipava III</strong></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Abhipava IV</strong></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 12th Month

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abhiprava I</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abhiprava II</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abhiprava III</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abhiprava IV</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abhiprava V</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Calendar—Form III.

**Synodic Lunar Year of 354 days.**

#### 1st Month

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abhiprava I</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abhiprava II</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abhiprava III</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abhiprava IV</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abhiprava V</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2nd Month

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abhiprava I</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abhiprava II</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abhiprava III</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abhiprava IV</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abhiprava V</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J.</td>
<td>G.</td>
<td>Ā.</td>
<td>G.</td>
<td>Ā.</td>
<td>J.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Abhiplava I</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>V</strong></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>J.</th>
<th>G.</th>
<th>Ā.</th>
<th>G.</th>
<th>Ā.</th>
<th>J.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Abhiplava I</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>V</strong></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>J.</th>
<th>G.</th>
<th>Ā.</th>
<th>G.</th>
<th>Ā.</th>
<th>J.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Abhiplava I</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>V</strong></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 6th Month

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>J.</th>
<th>G.</th>
<th>Ā.</th>
<th>G.</th>
<th>Ā.</th>
<th>J.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abhiplava I</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7th Month

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>J.</th>
<th>G.</th>
<th>Ā.</th>
<th>G.</th>
<th>Ā.</th>
<th>J.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abhiplava I</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 8th Month

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>J.</th>
<th>G.</th>
<th>Ā.</th>
<th>G.</th>
<th>Ā.</th>
<th>J.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abhiplava I</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th Month.</td>
<td>J.</td>
<td>G.</td>
<td>Ā.</td>
<td>G.</td>
<td>Ā.</td>
<td>J.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abhiplava I</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10th Month.</th>
<th>J.</th>
<th>G.</th>
<th>Ā.</th>
<th>G.</th>
<th>Ā.</th>
<th>J.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abhiplava I</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>11th Month.</th>
<th>J.</th>
<th>G.</th>
<th>Ā.</th>
<th>G.</th>
<th>Ā.</th>
<th>J.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abhiplava I</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## The Vedic Calendar

### 12th Month

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>J.</th>
<th>G.</th>
<th>A.</th>
<th>G.</th>
<th>A.</th>
<th>J.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abhiplava I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Instead of being called Abhiplava, the last period of six days in each month seems to have been observed by others as Prishihya days.*

*Note: Apparently the months 7 to 12 should run 29, 30, 30, 30, 30, 30, 30, 30, 30 (not 30, 29, 30, 29, 30, 29)*

---

### Calendar—Form IV

**Sidereal Solar Year of 366 days with an Intercalation of 18 days.**

#### 1st Month

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>J.</th>
<th>G.</th>
<th>A.</th>
<th>G.</th>
<th>A.</th>
<th>J.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abhiplava I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2nd Month

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>J.</th>
<th>G.</th>
<th>A.</th>
<th>G.</th>
<th>A.</th>
<th>J.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abhiplava I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J.</td>
<td>G.</td>
<td>A.</td>
<td>G.</td>
<td>A.</td>
<td>J.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abhiplava I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J.</td>
<td>G.</td>
<td>A.</td>
<td>G.</td>
<td>A.</td>
<td>J.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abhiplava I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J.</td>
<td>G.</td>
<td>A.</td>
<td>G.</td>
<td>A.</td>
<td>J.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abhiplava I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Month</td>
<td>J.</td>
<td>G.</td>
<td>A.</td>
<td>J.</td>
<td>J.</td>
<td>G.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th Month</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abhiplava I</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th Month</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abhiplava I</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th Month</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abhiplava I</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J.</td>
<td>G.</td>
<td>Ā.</td>
<td>G.</td>
<td>Ā.</td>
<td>J.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abhiprava I</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>J.</th>
<th>G.</th>
<th>Ā.</th>
<th>G.</th>
<th>Ā.</th>
<th>J.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abhiprava I</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>J.</th>
<th>G.</th>
<th>Ā.</th>
<th>G.</th>
<th>Ā.</th>
<th>J.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abhiprava I</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12th Month.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>J.</th>
<th>G.</th>
<th>Á.</th>
<th>G.</th>
<th>Á.</th>
<th>J.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abhiplava I</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(i) The asterisk in the sixth month marks the Vishuvat or central day of the year.
(ii) Here, also, Prishthya days may have been substituted for Abhiplava days at the close of each month.

### Calendar—Form V.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abhiplava I</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>J.</td>
<td>G.</td>
<td>Á.</td>
<td>G.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prishthya I</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>R.</td>
<td>B.</td>
<td>V.</td>
<td>Vr.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.*—Similarly the other months, only Prishthya, taking the place of the first Abhiplava in the second half of the year.

### Calendar—Form VI.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abhiplava I</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>J.</td>
<td>G.</td>
<td>Á.</td>
<td>G.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prishthya I</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>R.</td>
<td>B.</td>
<td>V.</td>
<td>Vr.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This day is not counted; similarly the other months.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calendar—Form VII.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abhiplava I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>À</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>J</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>À</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>J</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>À</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; IV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>J</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>À</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prishthya I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>Vr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calendar—Form VIII.</th>
<th>Month 11.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abhiplava I</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; II</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; III</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; IV</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prishthya I</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calendar—Form VIII.</th>
<th>Month 12.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abhiplava I</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; II</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; III</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; IV</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Dvādasāha

C₁ to C₄ = Four Chandra days; M = Mahāvrat; U = Udayanīya day.
Calendar—Form IX.

The śivana year with twenty-one intercalary days inserted between the sixth and seventh months.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6th Month.</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>Ā</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>Ā</th>
<th>J</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abhiplava I</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prishthya days</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7th Month.</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>Ā</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>Ā</th>
<th>J</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abhiplava I</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prishthya days</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Names for the different kinds of years as suggested by Dr. J. F. Fleet:

324 = 27 x 12 .... .... "Sidereal lunar year of 324 days."
351 = 27 x 13 .... .... "Sidereal lunar year of 351 days."
354 = 30 x 6 + 29 x 6 .... .... "Synodic lunar year."
360 = 30 x 12 or 27 x 13 2 .... .... The best possible term for this is the original one, "Sāvana year."
366 = 27 x 13 2 .... .... "Sidereal solar year"
378 = 189 + 189 .... .... "Pseudo-solstitial year of 378 days."
365 .... .... .... .... .... .... "Vague solar year."
365½ .... .... .... .... .... .... "Julian solar year."—This term involves an anachronism, but it is customary and explains at once what is meant.

(To be continued.)
MISCELLANEA.

THE ANTIQUITY OF THE KANARESE PRACTICE OF TAKING SIMPLY THE NAMES OF PLACES AS SURNAMES.

We have a copper-plate grant from Haidarabad in the Nizam’s territory re-edited by Dr. Fleet above, Vol. VI. pp. 73-4. It is dated Saka 534 expired, and refers itself to the reign of the Chalukya prince Pulakesin II. Lines 14-15 speak of the grantee as follows:—

 añyān gāyau kṣīmāvāh pāravābhāvanī
cyūrācyāsvavāh kṣütalāvah vahyayavah

Here the most interesting point is that the family name of the grantee Jyestha is given. It is Umbarkheda. Umbarkheda is unquestionably the name of a village, and this reminds us of the practice of the Kanarese Brahmans of adopting, as family names, the names of villages and towns, without the addition of any termination such as kar or vallada, which is employed in Mahrārāstra or Gujarāt and which signifies “(originally) residing in.” This is highly important, for we can now definitely say that this practice which is prevalent to this day in the Kanarese-speaking districts can be traced back to the beginning of the 7th century A.D.

Now this Umbarkheda, I think, is most probably Umarkan, a part of the Parbhani district of the Nizam’s territory, where an old stone and mud fort, partly ruined, still exists.1 Tagara, where the grantee lived, and which is referred to in ancient inscriptions and the writings of foreigners, has been identified by Dr. Fleet2 with Ter, 30 miles east of Ebari in the Sholapur district. Both Ter and Umarkan are in the Nizam’s dominions, and are not more than 80 miles distant from each other.

D. R. Bhandarkar.

RAJPUTS AND MARATHAS.

I have read with interest Mr. R. E. Entwhone’s note ante, Vol. XL. p. 280, and write to endorse what he states therein. I have ere this made enquiries at many of the Marāṭhā centres in the South of India, and I have always been impressed with the fact that Kunbi is an occupational term and does not represent a caste or tribe. Kunbi is, I think, the contracted form of Kuṭumbi, a family-man. Molesworth does not, unfortunately, derive the word Kunbi, but I have little doubt it is the shortened form of Kuṭumbi. It is possible that the word is from kuḍi, a hut or cottage. The analogons Tamil word is kuḍi or kuṭiyánவan, both of which are current. The former means (according to Winckler) a household, or a family, and the latter, a householder or cultivator, an agriculturist, hence a subject, and is synonymous with andithoṭhannākārana. The eighteen servile castes dependent on the kuṭiyānvarans are called kuḍiṇākkal, and include the washerman, the barber, the potter, the goldsmith or silversmith, brazier, mason, blacksmith, oil-monster, carpenter, salt dealer, betel-seller, garland maker, the chank-blower, the pājāri, the tailor, the fisherman, the palli (agricultural laborer) and the grave-digger. The barber is, in a special sense, termed kuḍiŋōgana. In the Mysore State, the terms rakkal and rakkaldava are used in a similar manner. In some Telugu districts of this Presidency, the term ramōrī (lit., family-man) is used in a like sense. The term kuṇbi and its Dravidian analogues may, therefore, I think, be appropriately translated into the English word ‘husbandman’, the word husband itself coming (according to Webster) from hus, house, and buvunțı, dwelling, and hence one inhabiting a house.

C. Hayavadana Rao.

MADRAS.

7th November, 1911.

NOTES AND QUERIES.

POSTHUMOUS TITLES.

Posthumous honorific titles are still commonly given to deceased personages of high standing in Indian literary works and are extended occasionally even to very well-known Europeans, e.g., the title of the late Queen Victoria, after death, is Malika-i-Maghfira Anjāhā. Will some Indian scholar kindly supply other instances in the case of Europeans?

R. C. Temple.

1 List of Remains in the Nizam’s Territory, p. 25.
2 Jour. R. As. Soc. for 1901, July number.
SIR ABRAM ABRAHAM SHIPMAN,
The First Governor of Bombay.

BY COL. J. BIDDULPH.

A mong the shadowy figures that flit across the early pages of our Indian history, few are more shadowy and less substantial than that of Sir Abraham Shipman. The Dictionary of National Biography knows him not. His name is forgotten. Yet he was a brave soldier of some merit, whose unmarked grave is in Indian soil; of sufficient distinction to be selected as the first Commander-in-Chief of royal troops in India, and the first Governor of Bombay, though he did not live to take charge of his Governorship.

Abraham Shipman was a younger son of the family of that name, seated at Scarrington in Nottinghamshire through the whole of the 16th and 17th centuries. He was the younger brother of William Shipman who held Scarrington in the reign of Charles I, and who was one of the knights and gentlemen of the county who signed an address to the county representatives in Parliament (1st July 1642) concerning the differences that had arisen between the Parliament and the King. We may be pretty certain that the two brothers were present at the raising of the Royal Standard at Nottingham (22nd August 1642), as the family adhered to the royal cause throughout the Civil Wars. One of the family, John Shipman, was Mayor of Nottingham in 1705, and again in 1714.

We first hear of Abraham Shipman in 1636, when he was concerned, as his brother's agent, in a scheme to grow madder in Malvern Chase; for which William Shipman held a royal license. The undertaking was probably unsuccessful, as three years later, we find Abraham Shipman adopting the profession of arms.

In 1638 Charles I became involved in his quarrel with the Scotch General Assembly about the Prayer Book. In March 1639, the Covenanters under Leslie seized Edinburgh, Sterlings and other royal castles by surprise. Charles marched to the Border with an English force. A negotiation took place on the banks of the Tweed, in June, when it was agreed that the castles should be restored to the King.

In the following January, Captain Abraham Shipman, with one hundred men, was despatched from London, in Captain Slingsby's ship, to reinforce the garrison of Edinburgh Castle, then held by Patrick Ruthven, Lord Etticken, for the King. A few weeks later we find the King writing to Lord Etticken suggesting that Shipman should leave his men at Lord Etticken's disposal and come away, as affairs appeared to be settling down. To which Lord Etticken replied, beseeching the King to leave Shipman with him, "for if there should be occasion of service I might find the want of such as he is: for I find his judgement and behaviour so far exceeding ordinary worth that I shall account it a great unhappiness to part with him in these times of danger." To which the King replied that Captain Shipman might remain in Edinburgh, and receive the same pay as other Captains there.

In September, the townsmen rose and blockaded the castle, forcing the garrison to surrender for want of water. Sir Patrick Drummond in a letter to Sir John Hay relates that the General, David Scrimgeour and Captain Shipman, had gone by coach to Berwick. The rest of the garrison were allowed to march out "with drums beating and colours flying, and so to Leith (to embark) guarded by 600 Scotsmen, otherwise those of the good town would have torn them to pieces. They all showed much resolution but marched with feeble bodies, all the garrison so spoiled for want of drink that most of them can never be men again; Lord Etticken is extremely extenuated, but Shipman in very good case."
In the following year, Shipman, waiting on the King to ask for service, was knighted by mistake in the following curious manner: Thomas Smith, writing to Algernon, Earl of Northumberland (August 1641), says, "Captain Shipman who went to Edinburgh last year is also knighted by mischance: for the King being moved by some friend of his in the Bedchamber to grant him the making of a Knight, his Majesty coming forth and his head, as it seems, troubled with business, Shipman knelt down to kiss the King's hand; the King drew out his sword and knighted him, whereat the poor man was not a little troubled, and his lady is since among her musk melons." Whatever this allusion to the melons may refer to, it shows that Shipman was married at this time.

In the following year, the war broke out between the King and Parliament, and Shipman joined the Royal Army. His name appears among the Captains in Sir Nicholas Byron's regiment, and he was, no doubt, present at Edgehill where Byron was wounded. In the same regiment was his younger brother John Shipman, as Ensign. John Shipman had served on the Irish expedition of 1640, as Ensign to Colonel Charles Essex; but, on the outbreak of the Civil War, he refused to follow his Colonel and joined his brother with the Royal Army. Essex was killed at Edgehill on the Parliamentary side.

How Shipman fared during the war does not appear; but when the war was over and the Commonwealth was busy hunting down the more prominent supporters of the royal cause, he was summoned before the Council of State, and committed to the Tower (April 1651). After a year's imprisonment he was released on bail, and we hear no more of him till the restoration of the Monarchy was regarded as certain. In April 1660 he petitioned Charles II. who was at Breda, to be granted the office of Chief Armourer of the Tower, then in possession of one Ansley, a fanatic. He stated that he had served the late King and his Majesty through the late wars, and had had great losses and hardship. This petition met with a speedy response from the King, still in Holland, in the shape of a warrant, granting to Sir Abraham for thirty-one years, the reversion of the keepership of the lighthouse at Dungeness, when the fifty years lease granted by James I. to Sir Edward Howard should expire. In the following January the grant was confirmed.

About this time Shipman married Marie, 5th daughter of Montagu, afterwards Earl of Lindsay¹ and widow of Dr. John Hewett who was executed by Cromwell in June 1658.

On the marriage of Charles II. to the Infanta of Portugal, an expedition was prepared to take over the island and harbour of Bombay which formed part of the Infanta's dowry. In March 1662 the expedition, consisting of five men-of-war, under James Loy, 3rd Earl of Marlborough, sailed with four hundred soldiers, exclusive of officers, under Sir Abraham Shipman, who was nominated Governor and Commander-in-Chief, and reached Bombay in September. The soldiers were divided into four companies, respectively commanded by Sir Abraham Shipman, who was to receive £2 per day; Colonel John Hungerford at twelve shillings a day; Captain John Shipman and Captain Charles Povey each at eight shillings a day. The Portuguese disputed the meaning of the treaty, and of the orders sent from Lisbon, refused to cede the island.² The Earl of Marlborough therefore conveyed the troops to Surat, and put them ashore at Swally, but their presence occasioned so much apprehension, that Sir George Oxenden, the East India Company's representative at Surat, persuaded Marlborough to re-embark them. Shipman and his men were therefore landed on the barren, uninhabited island of Anjediva near Carwar, pending settlement of the question about

¹ See Clarendon.
² See Pepys's Diary, 15th May 1663.
Bombay, while Marlborough and the men-of-war returned to England. In his attempt to leave the men at Surat, Marlborough mentioned that they were daily dying for want of refreshment, and a number of the force had perished before they landed on Anjediva.

All through the years 1663, 1664, Shipman and his men remained cooped up on this wretched spot, gradually succumbing to want of provisions, bad water, exposure, disease, and their own intemperance. Towards the end of 1663, Shipman visited Goa to negotiate the surrender of Bombay, but without success. With equal ill-success he tried to induce the East India Company's officials at Surat to take over the King's rights to Bombay. On the 6th April 1664 he died.

Just before his death he received from England a commission from the King, dated 23rd November, 1663, notifying a settlement of the dispute with Portugal, and authorizing him to take possession of Bombay. In it he is styled 'Knight of the Golden Ensign, and Gentleman of our Privy Council.' His last act, the day before he died, was to sign a formal commission constituting his Secretary, Mr. Humphry Cooke, Vice-Governor, the other Captains of Companies being already dead.

On the 14th January 1665, the Portuguese Viceroy signed a treaty with Cooke for the surrender of the Island of Bombay, shorn of the dependencies mentioned in the marriage treaty, and on the 18th February, Bombay was handed over to Mr. Cooke. A muster of the troops taken on the 3rd March showed that one ensign, four sergeants, six corporals, four drummers, one surgeon, one surgeon's-mate, two gunners, one gunner's-mate, one gunsmith, and ninety-seven privates alone survived. The rest had left their bones in Anjediva.

Shipman's will, executed just before leaving England, was proved on 18th July 1665. In it he left to his two children, William and Elizabeth, the reversion of the charge of the Dungeness lighthouse. But William was apparently dead before this, as the will was proved by Elizabeth only. He had apparently taken some money with him to India, as, during his stay in Anjediva, he engaged in a trading venture. One of the first acts of Sir Gervase Lucas, who had been appointed by the King in place of Cooke, who was deposed for making an improper treaty with the Portuguese, was to force Mr. Cooke to surrender Shipman's estate that he had taken possession of, and to refund the sum of £663 which he had charged the executrix with, as commission. Nine years later (May 1674) we find Elizabeth Shipman petitioning the King, complaining that she was still kept out of the enjoyment of the lighthouse, in spite of the King's grant to her father and his assigns.

Principal Authorities:

Calendar of State Papers (Domestic); Thoroton's History of Nottinghamshire; Army Lists of the Roundheads and Cavaliers, 1649 (Chatto & Windus, 1874), Bruce's Annals of the East India Company; a description of the Port and Island of Bombay, 1724.

---

A SHORT NOTE ON THE HINDUIZATION OF THE ABORIGINES:

THE SWELLING OF THE CHANDALA CASTE.

BY PROF. VANAMALI CHAKRAVARTTI, M.A., GAUHATI.

(i) The Popular erroneous view that Non-Hindus cannot become Hindus by Conversion.

The common folk in this country entertain the belief that the Hindu religion and society have always been a closed community, into which no non-Hindu might ever enter. A Hindu must be born, and not made by conversion.
(2) A less erroneous view that Non-Hindus may become Hindus, but they must form new and separate Castes.

According to a more moderate form of this view shared by many educated people, each separate recognised caste is a closed body, into which no outsider may enter. It is acknowledged that Hinduism was a proselytising religion in its palmy days, but this assertion is qualified by the remark that whenever a non-Hindu or non-Aryan element entered the fold of Hinduism, it invariably formed a separate caste; the old recognized castes would never admit new members. The people like the Ahoms of Assam, the Kachhars of Kachhur and the Koches of the various parts of Eastern Bengal and Assam are well-known instances in which the newly converted tribes have formed new castes.

(3) The true view that Non-Hindus might become Hindus by Conversion and be incorporated into the recognised Castes.

Yet the truth seems to be that Hinduism was fully a proselytising religion and that the caste was more elastic and accommodating in earlier times. It is borne out by ethnological and epigraphical, besides other kinds of evidence, that sometimes the barbarians or Mechchhas were admitted into the recognized castes of the Hindu religion and society. Mr. D. R. Bhandarkar has brought together very valuable testimony to this effect in his learned article on the "Foreign elements in the Hindu population" in a recent issue of this Journal.

Medhatithi supports the third view.

In this short note, I shall bring forward a passage from Medhatithi's Manu-bhashya which supports this view and which has hitherto escaped the notice of scholars and ethnologists. It runs thus:

वदि कातिश्व शतितिमार्गजातिविश तार साभारस्वी लोक चढ़ा उजबेक चावलेर्द्वे कालाचे बालज्जळे
लेखांचे तारावोचै हव चटपटावले वस्तुवोवले शी मच्चिं मच्चिं वती न घुंघि: वती
मुखा पंचांगावः या तृच्छाति——Manu-bhashya, II, 28.

"If some pious king belonging to the Kshatriya or some other caste should defeat the Mechchhas (barbarians, aborigines) and establish a settlement of the four castes [in their territories] and accept the Mechchhas, thus defeated, as Chandellas [as a part of the Hindu Society] as is the case in Aryavarta, then that country also becomes fit for sacrifices. For no land is impure of itself. A land becomes so only by contact."

This passage is not only important from the historical and ethnographical points of view, but it is also remarkable for its liberal spirit, which became so rare in subsequent Smriti literature. It is curious that Herr Julius Jolly should have failed to realize the true value of this passage and consequently considered it unfit for insertion in his Manuskripta-agaha. Here Medhatithi explicitly states it as a matter of history, well-known in his days, that some Mechchhas were actually converted to Hinduism and recognized as members of a well-known caste (Chandella) in northern India.

The majority of the Chandellas of South-Eastern Bengal were originally Non-Aryan Converts to Hinduism.

It may be mentioned in passing, that it is only on the theory of the conversion of non-Aryans into Hindus of the lower castes, that we can satisfactorily account for the great preponderance of the Namahpadra (Chandella) population in some of the south-eastern districts of Bengal (vide B. C. Dutt's Civilization in Ancient India, Vol. III, Bk. IV. Ch. 9, pp. 155-157, where a similar view is taken).
THE VEDIC CALENDAR.


(Continued from p. 71.)

"The school of Sālaṇkāyānīs observe full and deficient months alternately in the first half of the year, and deficient and full months alternately in the second half of the year."

These are some of the forms of the calendar kept by the Vedic poets. Of these: (1) the sidereal lunar year of 351 days, with 9 or 15 days intercalated according as it was to be adjusted to the śāvṇa year of 360 days or to the sidereal solar year of 366 days, (2) the synodic lunar year of 354 days, with 12 days intercalated to adjust it to the sidereal solar year, and (3) the cycle of three śāvṇa years each of 360 days, with 18 days intercalated in every third or fourth śāvṇa year for the purpose of adjusting it to the sidereal solar year of 366 days, are the principal forms which deserve our attention. The rest of the forms noticed in the Sāraṇa-Sūtra of Lāṭyāyana differ from each other in the rituals assigned to the days of the month.

The most important of these three principal forms is the synodic lunar year of 354 days, with the 12 intercalated days, or the Drādasāha period as it is usually styled in the Vedic literature. Regarding this addition of 12 days to the lunar year the Nidāna-Sūtra VI. 6, says:—

सत्वेस्त्रतत्तनिहि तत्र शनीस्त्रियेत्वा हस्तवाहिः सुप्रविधः गौतमोपति संस्कृतत्तत्तिः क्षेत्रो द्रास्तशाहा

As regards the gift of the entire property of the sacrificer:—These functions [i.e., the gifts of the entire property] are the marked features of the period of twelve days; for Gautama says that it is here (in the period of 12 days) that the year is attained. And Dhānānājaya says that after the lapse of the twelve days the functions of the (new) year are begun."

This intercalary period of 12 days seems to have been inserted by some in the middle of the year and by others at its close. From the famous Atharvaveda, verse IV 15. 8 (see p. 3 above), it is clear that the period of 12 days, or the vow of 12 nights as it is styled therein, was added at the close of the year. As regards its insertion in the middle of the year, the Sārta-Sūtra of Lāṭyāyana IV. 5, 3-5, furnishes clear proof: the passage runs as follows:—

अपि भवतिस्वेष्वर्त्व वस्त्रामिनिश्चत्र मयायापन्नः सुस्थितिं भवति व गौतमोपतिः पूर्वानिश्चिति

An Atirātra day on which twenty-four Śāma verses are recited, then the period of nine days, then the day of Mahāvrata, and then the fifth Atirātra day, are severally observed in their respective places (in the year); the rest of the days of the year are observed in the Jyotishchāma way. Or one may insert the twelve days by treating two days as the days termed go and dyus, and by observing the period of ten days as made up of six Prāshṭhāya days and four of the six Abhispāca days. This period of twelve days is what is generated by the year. Its birth is proclaimed by blowing a conch-shell."

What is meant by the above passage is this:—The first day of the twelve days is observed as an Atirātra day, with the recitation of twenty-four Śāma verses, in the beginning of the year; the period of nine days is inserted in the middle of the year; the remaining two days are observed as the day of the Mahāvrata or great vow and as a final Atirātra day at the close of the year. This is what is meant by observance of the twelve days in their respective places. Others seem to have been observing the same period by treating two days as go and dyus, six days as Prāshṭhāya days, and the remaining four days as the first four days of the six Abhispāca days. The blowing of a

26 Those who observed the twelve days in this way seem to have been adding them at the close of the year.
conch-shell seems to have been to inform the people of the arrival of the twelve days of vow, when it was obligatory for each sacrificer, and perhaps for the people also, to observe the rites of Diksha or initiation, in order to get rid of the sins of the year.

It is true that it is not clearly stated in the above passage that the period of nine days was inserted in the middle of the year; still, from the names given to the nine days and from the commentary of Agnivāmin on Lātyāyana-Sūtra-Sūtra IV 6. 12, we can clearly understand that nine out of the twelve days were inserted at the middle of the year; the commentary says:

**Agnivāmin's commentary**

“The day called Abhijit, three Svarasāman days, the central day, the three Svarasāman days again repeated in the reverse order, and a Viśvajit day, constitute the period of nine days.”

It should be noticed here how the central day of the year is plainly stated to form part of the nine days. It follows, therefore, that the period of nine days was inserted in the middle of the year. It must also be borne in mind that whenever a day or days is or are called Abhijit, Viśvajit or Svarasāman, it or they must be regarded as falling in the middle of the year.

Again, the other sūtra, in the commentary on which Agnivāmin distinctly says that the period of nine days was inserted in the middle of the year, is one which deserves our particular attention. It is also desirable that we should consider the chapter in which this sūtra occurs together with the chapter which precedes it. In these two chapters (IV, 5, 5-6) Lātyāyana describes the various forms of the rites and recitations assigned to the days of Gavām-Ayana. While describing the form of the rites to be performed on the Svarasāman days which form part of the period of nine days, he refers to a school of sacrificers who are said to have been observing twenty-one days instead of nine days in the middle of the year. This sūtra IV 6. 12, with Agnivāmin’s commentary on it, runs as follows:

**Agnivāmin’s commentary**

“Instead of the period of nine days, which is spoken of as a period inserted in the middle of the year and which is composed of one day called Abhijit, three Svarasāman days, one day termed Dīndkārtyya [i.e., the central day], again three Svarasāman days, and one Viśvajit day, other insert twenty-one days: after the Abhijit day and before the three Svarasāman days, they insert six days known as Prīshithya days; again after having observed the three Svarasāman days (after the central day) they insert six Prīshithya days before the Viśvajit day. Also they treat the Svarasāman days in the Ukthya way. This matter is found discussed in the Brdhmaṇa:—They debate as to whether the Svarasāman days are to be treated in the Ukthya way or in the Agnihṭoma way. After saying that, the Brdhmaṇa goes on to state:—They say that the fulcrum-like support of the year is the central day which is treated in the Agnihṭoma way, and the two days called Abhijit and Viśvajit which are also treated in the Agnihṭoma way. The other days are

---

27 Agnihṭoma and Ukthya are two forms of sacrifices: the former is a simple one-day sacrifice in which a he-goat, sacred to Agni, is immolated and twelve hymnal verses are chanted; the latter requires the immolation of a second victim; a he-goat to Indra and Agni, and the chanting of fifteen verses.
observed in the Ukthya way. Others say that all the days should be treated only in the Agniṣṭoma way.—By the word ‘only’ used in the statement, it is the Agniṣṭoma way that is ruled in preference to the Ukthya way. The rule being thus stated, there still arises the doubt as to whether the Svarasūman days are to be observed only in the Agniṣṭoma way or in either of the two ways, the Agniṣṭoma and the Ukthya ways. It is not, however, a rule that the Svarasūman days are to be observed only in the Agniṣṭoma way; nor is it an alternative that they may be observed either in the Agniṣṭoma way or in the Ukthya way. But it is a matter differing according to different schools: those who intercalate twenty-one days observe them in the Ukthya way, while those who insert nine days treat them only in the Agniṣṭoma way. The author of the Nidāna-Sūtra also says (V. 7): “Then the Svarasūman days; those who insert nine days treat them in the Agniṣṭoma way; while those who intercalate twenty-one days observe them in the Ukthya way. Whoever treats them otherwise is to be regarded as a man devoid of knowledge.”

The essential points that we have to consider, setting aside the other details discussed in the above passage, are the intercalation of nine days and that of twenty-one days in the middle of the year. The period of nine days has already been shown to be a period which forms part of twelve days inserted either in the middle of the year or at its close. But we are not expressly told of the particular form of the year which with the addition of 12 or 21 days would, as stated by Dhamanājapa (see under Nidāna-Sūtra VI. 6), results in a Samvatsara or true or almost true year. Still from the consideration of the data contained in the sūtras themselves, it is easy to determine them. We know the purpose of intercalation is to adjust any two kinds of years so that the seasonal and other characteristics are as well defined in the one as in the other. We also know that, of the various kinds of years, those which were the first to be recognised were such as consist of twelve or thirteen months, each of which is well marked by the recurrence of certain celestial phenomena. The sidereal lunar month of 27 days, for example, seems to have been adopted because it is marked (though not quite exactly) by the moon’s completion of a round through the heavens. Likewise, the synodic lunar month of 29½ days is marked by the occurrence of full or new moon. It is the consideration of the recurrence of seasonal characteristics that led the ancients to assign to the year twelve or thirteen months, during which they expected, in virtue of long experience, a complete round of all the seasons. But it is well known that neither the sidereal lunar year of 351 days, nor the synodic lunar year of 354 days, nor even the sāvana year of 360 days, is in exact agreement with the round of the seasons. Hence it is that the ancients seem to have been led to discover the sidereal and the solar years, in the course of which the seasons fairly will complete a round, and that they began to adjust the years of their first selection with the sidereal solar year. Now, we may confine ourselves to four of the five and know that there are four kinds of years mentioned in the Nidāna-Sūtra: the sidereal lunar year of 351 days; the synodic lunar year of 354 days; the sāvana year of 360 days; and the sidereal solar year of 366 days. Of these, it cannot be the year of 351 days to which the Vedic poets added 12 intercalary days; for, with the addition of 12 days, it amounts to only 363 days, which is less than a true year, while with the addition of 21 days it gives 372 days which is more than a true year. It is true that the so-called Gavām-Ayana year described in all the Brauṭa-Sūtras consists of 360 or 361 days, in the middle of which were put nine days bearing the same names with the nine days which formed part of the Dwāsdaha or period of twelve days. Hence we might be led to think that that year in which twelve days were intercalated might be a vague year of 348 days, which, with the addition of 12 days, would make a year of 360 days termed Gavām-Ayana. But no year of 348 days is mentioned in any of the Brauṭa-Sūtras. And as regards the school of Vedic poets who, according to Lūṭjāyana IV, 8. 15, adopted a month of

---

28 See Calendar Form IX., p. 71 above. 29 There is also a fifth, of 324 days; see p. 59 above.—Dr. Fleet.
29 days and a year of 348 days, we are told by Lātiyāyana himself that they were observing 17 Dikṣṭha days or days of initiation, before they commenced their sacrifice on the New Year’s Day. Also, the so-called Gavān-Ayana year is not, as I have pointed out in chapter III of my Vedic Era, a true year, but an imaginary year, made up of all those twenty-first days in a cycle of four sāvana years which had been so far counted as often as they occurred. Hence it cannot be the sāvana year in the middle of which nine of twelve days were inserted. It follows, therefore, that it is the synodic lunar year of 354 days to which the addition of 12 days must have been made, in order to adjust it with the sidereal solar year of 366 days. As regards the year to which the addition of 21 days was made, it appears to be a cycle of three sāvana years each of 360 days, followed by a year of 360 – 21 = 339 days, with the result that four sāvana years, each of 360 days, with the addition of 21 days, were rendered equal to four Julian solar years each of 365½ days. That the Vedic poets had been observing such a cycle of years with 21 intercalary days is almost expressly stated in the following passage of the Nidāna-Sutra, X, 1:

“On the day immediately before the twenty-first day, they sit at their sacrificial session. On the following day they put the last day [i.e., the 21st day] in its entirety. The period of 21 days and that of 12 days are varieties (of adjusting the years). The last [i.e., the 21st day] is based upon the period of five days; the original periods of five days are accompanied by an odd portion (of a day). Lo! I shall observe only five days; by my doing so the parts of the year are undisturbed.”

In another place the Nidāna-Sutra, VIII, 11, says that the odd portion of a day accompanying the five days is neither more nor less than a quarter of a day. The passage in which this idea is implied runs as follows:

"A night observed as part of the sacrifice performed during the Seasonal Six days? Saucrerikishi says that it need not be observed, for the reason that its origin is such. Also, it is inferred rather than prescribed in the Kalpa texts. How then are the Abhina days to comingle with the night? Verily it is merely on account of its completion that the night has to be observed here, for the period of six days has become complete. Also it is the one-fourth part of the night that has grown (into a whole day). Gautama says that it is to be observed and that it is prescribed in the Kalpa texts. The night forms part of the sacrificial days which constitute the Abhina period; the sixth day arrives at the close of the night."

From these passages it is clear that the Vedic poets were quite aware the facts of a solar year being greater than the sāvana year by five days and a quarter. This they seem to have found out by closely observing the fluctuations in the seasons, which they must have necessarily experienced so long as they had used a year of only 354 or 360 days. It is this inevitable change of the seasons in the lunar and the sāvana years that is implied in the term Ritu-śaḍa, meaning the six days capable of keeping the seasons in their proper places in the year. It should also be noted how the sixth day of the Seasonal Six days is termed an abnormal growth of a quarter of a day in the

---

An Abhina sacrifice extends as far as 11 days, and sessional sacrifices from the 12th day onwards: Nidāna, ix, 5; on the 11th day the night falls: Nidāna, ix, 6.
above passage. There is also a passage in the *Krāṣṇa-Yajurvēda* in which it is clearly stated that the five days after the close of the sāvana year are such as have the power of creating the seasons. The passage, VII. 1. 10, runs as follows:—

संवत्सरी वा इत्यकं ज्ञातिः। सुकम्बंवधृतृमेवेष्टि। स एवं विन्यास्यायं बनंते येव ज्ञाति। स अत्रवधृतृ न ज्ञाति त एवं विन्यास्यायं दमावत। नायतं तत् सति । तत् हे वेद तावहत। य एवं विन्यास्यायं बनंते वि पन्न्या भ्रातृपायात। सार्ववेष्टि। इत्यकं अवधृतृमेवेष्टि। स एवं विन्यास्यायं बनंते य अद्य पद्धतिः। वबः भ्रातृपायात् कायम् भ्रातु त्यावहत। तस्ति वे स च ज्ञाति। हे तथा नायत। एवं विन्यास्यायं बनंते पद्धतिः। अभ्यो एवं विन्यास्यायं बनंते पद्धतिः।

"The year (of 360 days) was of yore undifferentiated; it desired that it might create the seasons; it saw the five nights, caught hold of them, and sacrificed by them; then it created the seasons: whoever with this knowledge sacrifices by the five nights becomes endowed with children. The seasons, once created, did not regularly return again; they saw the five nights, caught hold of them, and sacrificed by them; then they regularly returned: whoever with this knowledge sacrifices by the five nights gets rid of his sins, his powerful enemy [i.e., the intercalary days burdened with sin]. Saunęya, the son of Sarvasena, desired that he might be possessed of cattle; he caught hold of the five nights and sacrificed by them; then he obtained a thousand head of cattle: whoever with this knowledge sacrifices by the five nights obtains a thousand head of cattle. Babara, the son of Pravaha, desired that he might be possessed of eloquence; he caught hold of the five nights and sacrificed by them; then he became an orator: whoever with this knowledge sacrifices by the five nights undoubtedly becomes an orator; him they call the lord of speech. Four nights are less; six nights are more; the sacrificial period of five nights is neither less nor more: whoever with this knowledge sacrifices by the five nights acquires the merits of a sacrifice performed neither in less nor in greater time. Five are the nights and five are the seasons which compose a year: (whoever observes them) gets a firm footing in the seasons of the year."

If we read the above three passages along with Agnivamini's commentary on Lāvyāṇa's aphorism, IV. 6. 12, and the two verses of the Sāmañvēda, II. 1. 17, 3, and VI. 2. 2. 7, together with the verses of the Atharvāveda, IV. 15. 13, and IV. 16. 6, all of which are quoted above, we can clearly understand that, when the Vedic poets recognised the failure of the synodic lunar and the sāvana years to keep pace with the course of the seasons, some of them seem to have discovered the sidereal solar year of 366 days, and regarded it as capable of agreeing with a round of the seasons. Others, with more accurate observation, seem to have been divided in their opinion, and to have taken a vague solar year of 365 days according to some, and a more true solar year of 365 1/4 days according to others, as the one fairly agreeing with the course of the seasons. Those who observed the synodic lunar year of 354 days seem to have been passing 12 days in Dikṣat or vow of initiation after its close and before the commencement of the sidereal solar year. Of those who followed the sāvana year of 360 days, some seem to have been adjusting it with a solar year of 365 days by adding five days to it, as exclaimed by the speaker in the Nidana-Sûtra: "Lo! I observe only five days, thereby making the two wings of the year undisturbed." But those who were still more accurate in their observation appear to have framed a cycle of four sāvana-and-solar years, and to have adjusted the sāvana year with a solar year of 365 1/4 days by adding 1/4 x 4 = 21 days to every fourth sāvana year. As we have already seen, this period of 21 days has been called by various names: some called these days the thrice seven milk-kine pouring their genuine milky draught for the nourishment of Soma, the moon; others seem to have regarded them as the 21 fetters of Varuna, to be got rid of by the observance of the rites of
Dikṣāḍ and Upaniṣad. There is no reason to doubt that it is these twenty-one days which, as stated by Agnivesvinin, were inserted in the middle of the year as an alternative for the twelve days inserted by others. We may therefore take it for granted that the statement of the Tadyamaḥādhārakmaṇa, xxv. 18.1, that “five times fifty periods of 21 days make one thousand years of the Viśāvēyki,” is one which was based upon an actual practice, and was not a mere theoretical problem as has been held by one critic of my views. 41

Besides the period of 1000 years, the Tadyamaḥādhārakmaṇa mentions three minor periods, naming the priestly astronomers who observed them. Prajāpati seems to have been the first to observe for verification three cyclic years with twenty-one intercalary days in the course of twelve solar years. The passage in which this is mentioned, xxv. 6.1.2, runs as follows:—

“Three sets of nine, three sets of fifteen, three sets of seventeen, three sets of twenty-one, made up the period of twelve years for Prajāpati. With this (observation), Prajāpati attained the means of producing all (the years). Those who follow this procedure will have the means of producing all (the years).”

Likewise, the period of 36 years which the school of the Sākyas are stated to have observed is thus described in the same work, xxv. 7.1.

“Nine sets of nine, nine sets of fifteen, nine sets of seventeen, nine sets of twenty-one, made up thirty-six years for the Sākyas:—

Likewise, a third minor period of a hundred years of the Śādyas is thus described in the same work, xxv. 8.1.2:—

“Twenty-five sets of nine, twenty-five sets of fifteen, twenty-five sets of seventeen, twenty-five sets of twenty-one, made up the one hundred years of the Śādyas. The Śādyas were gods earlier than other gods; they observed this session of one hundred years; they prospered thereby; and they all attained the heavenly world with their cows and men. Verily do those who observe likewise reach the heavenly world.

So far as numerical riddles are concerned, there is no difference between the above three passages and the one in which the period of a thousand years of the Viśāvēyki has been described in the Tadyamaḥādhārakmaṇa. Hence the above three passages may be interpreted in the same way as I have explained the last passage in my Vedic Era. Three, nine, or twenty-five sets of nine periods of five days each or of forty-five days, which form the difference between four lunar and solar years, are equivalent to 12, 36, or 100 solar years respectively. Similarly, three, nine, or twenty-five sets of such 15 days as remain after we deduct a month from 45 days in every cycle of four lunar-solar years, are equivalent to 12, 36, or 100 years respectively. Likewise, three, nine, or twenty-five sets of 17 days which form the difference between four of Jupiter’s years and four solar years, are equivalent to 12, 36, or 100 years respectively. 42 Since twenty-one days form the difference between four Śāvana years and four solar years, three, nine, or twenty-one times twenty-one days are equivalent to 12, 36, or 100 solar years respectively. 43

---

42 It is practically, impossible that there can have been any Jupiter’s years in Vedic times. Much better omit this, which seems quite superfluous. If there were any Jupiter’s years then, they would be the heliacal-rising years, each of 399 days.—Dr. Fleet.
43 These cyclic periods are also mentioned in almost all the Grautsa-Sûtras; see, B稳定ya, iii. 28. 5-6.
It should be noted how the periods of 12, 36, 100, and 1000 years are connected with Prajāpati, the Sākyas, the Śādhyas, and the Vṛṣaṇikas, respectively. If the above four passages had been meant to be mere formulae rather than traditional statements of the actual practice of Prajāpati and the three priestly schools, then there would have been no necessity to mention them. There is no reason why the author of the Tātrikamahābrāhmaṇa should go so far as to connect a formula, if it was a mere formula at all, with the Śādhyas, whom he has clearly described as a school of ancient priests. It follows therefore, that the periods of 12, 36, 100, and 1000 years are years of the Vedic era, actually counted by Prajāpati and the three successive priestly schools in terms of the number of times they intercalated twenty-one days or cows. It is thus clear that the Vedic poets were quite familiar with the true solar year of 3651 days and were adjusting the śāvana year to it by adding 21 days once every four years, and that they kept an account of the number of intercalations, calling it the Gavām-Ayana or "Cows' Walk." If there is still any doubt as to the precise significance of the term Gavām-Ayana, it will be removed by the evidence which I may perhaps set forth in a subsequent article on the Vedic era and chronology.

III.—The Ayanas or Satras.

The word Ayana literally means 'going, movement'; and when combined with such words as gaṇa, 'of cows,' and jyotiṣṭhaṁ, 'of lights,' it means 'the movement of cows' and 'the movement of (the heavenly) lights.' We have already seen how the Vedic poets used to call the first day of their Śaṅgaha or six-days' period by the name jyotiṣī, 'light,' and the second day by the name gaṇa, 'cow.' It follows, therefore, that the terms Gavām-Ayana and Jyotiṣṭhaṁ-Ayana mean 'the march of days.' The question is: what days? Ordinary days or special days? Almost all oriental scholars seem to regard the days as ordinary ones. And the sacrificial year of 360 or 361 days described in all the Srauta-Sūtras under the name of Gavām-Ayana, with special chants, recitations, and rites for each day, has been accordingly taken by them to mean an ordinary year.

But there is evidence to indicate that this is not the sense in which the Vedic poets used the term. We have already seen how, in describing the four forms of Gavām-Ayana, the author of the Nidāna-Sūtra has specified the suppression and intercalation of days as the chief feature of the Ayana. We are told to suppress or omit nine days from the śāvana year of 360 days in order to form a sidereal lunar year of 351 days, which is a year of 13 months each of 27 days. We are also told of the sidereal year of 334 days with an impulsion of 12 intercalated days, and of the cycle of 37 or 38 months with 18 intercalated days, towards their adjustment with the sidereal solar year of 366 days. We are not told, however, the precise meaning of the term Gavām-Ayana. From the way in which the author of the sūtra has explained the four forms of Gavām-Ayana, we may interpret it in three different ways: we may take it to mean the four ordinary years, the sidereal lunar year of 331 days, the sidereal solar year of 354 days, the śāvana year of 360 days, and the sidereal solar year of 366 days; or we may take it to mean the suppressed period of nine days, and the intercalary periods of 12, 18, and 21 days, of which the intercalary period of 21 days is, as we have already seen, mentioned in a later chapter of the same sūtra. But Liṅgāyana seems to take the term in the sense of an intercalary period: in chapters 5 to 7 of the fourth book of his Srauta-Sūtra, he proposes to discuss the varieties of Gavām-Ayana, and describes the rites and recitations pertaining to the periods of 12 and 21 days; while in the 8th chapter of the same book, he proceeds to discuss the varieties of Jyotiṣṭhaṁ-Ayana, and enumerates the various kinds of years and the intercalary days necessary to adjust them. From this it is clear that of the three terms, Satvātara, Jyotiṣṭhaṁ-Ayana, and Gavām-Ayana, the first means an ordinary year of 351,

---

44 It is probable that though based upon different units of intercalary days, these three cycles are here expressed in terms of the unit of twenty-one intercalary days, as though these cyclic years were consecutive years.

45 See Chapter II, above.
354, or 360 days, the second the year with an intercalary period, and the third an intercalary period made up of any number of intercalary days. That the terms Saṁvatsara and Gavām-Ayana are by no means synonymous, is also clear from what Sāṅkhārya says about the repetition of Gavām-Ayana. He says (xiii. 27, 5)—अनवालो बहुध्वरकः ग्रावमवर्षसः "when the number of years is great, repetition of Gavām-Ayana is to be observed." It is clear that, if the terms Saṁvatsara and Gavām-Ayana had been synonymous, there would have been no necessity for such a remark. I need not point out how the sūtra would be meaningless if the two terms Saṁvatsara and Gavām-Ayana were taken synonymously. Nor can we take the term Gavām-Ayana in the sense of a year with an intercalary period; for in that case the sūtra would mean that, when the number of years is great, all those years with their intercalary periods should be repeated,—a statement which is unpractical. It follows, therefore, that the term Gavām-Ayana means an intercalary period and an intercalary period alone, no matter what may be the number of days constituting that period. For the formation of Gavām-Ayana, two units of intercalary periods seem to have been selected: they are (1) a period of 11 or 12 days inserted at the close of every year, and (2) a period of 21 days inserted in the middle of every fourth year. The sacrifices that were performed during either of the two intercalary periods are called Sutras or sessional sacrifices. It appears that when such sessional sacrifices were not performed,—say, for about a hundred years—a sacrificial session extending for 100 × 11 or 100 × 12 days, or 25 × 21 days, was held once for all. We shall see presently that, instead of holding the session during as many days as constituted the intercalary periods left in abeyance, they seem to have limited the number of days by substituting one day for each intercalary period. Thus a session of 100 days or of 25 days seems to have answered the purpose of 100 × 12 days or of 25 × 21 days in a hundred years. Also it appears that when one or more such single intercalary days were being celebrated, all the past intercalary days were recalled and celebrated along with the new ones, and that the whole session was termed Gavām-Ayana. Those who had different units of intercalary days seem to have followed the same procedure, with the difference that, instead of substituting single days for their units of intercalation, they used to hold their sacrificial session as many days as there were in all their units of intercalation. The three sacrificial sessions of the Tapaschitis, for example, consist of four, twelve, or thirty-six years corresponding to the 360 days composing a Gavām-Ayana year. These three sessions are so arranged that twenty-four, seventy-two, or two-hundred and sixteen months form the first half of the session, and the same number of months form the second half. This is what the Niḍāna-Sūtra, X. 9, says about them:—

अनवालो बहुध्वरकः ग्रावमवर्षसः भवानि कीर्तिसः

This is what they call the major session of the Tapaschitis. Four years are spent in performing the initiatory rites; four years in Upasads; and four in pressing the Soma plant. Its arrangement is thus:—They may repeat the Gavām-Ayana four times (for each of the three sets of four years making twelve years); or else the two wings or parts of the original Gavām-Ayana may be so lengthened that twenty-three Ayana months fall in the first wing or part of the session and twenty-two months in the second part."

"(To be continued,)"

46 See Niḍāna-Sūtra, x. 1, quoted above.
47 These forty-five months, together with the sixth, the seventh, and the last (i.e., twelfth) month of the original Gavām-Ayana year inserted in all such cases, amount to forty-eight months or four Gavām-Ayana years.—Gargya-aranyān's Commentary on Aśvalayana, xii. 5, 14.
MANGLANA STONE INSCRIPTION OF JAYATRASIMHA;
(VIKRAMA-)SAMVAT 1272.
BY PANDIT RAMA KARNA, JODHPUR.

The stone bearing this inscription was originally found near a step-well situated outside the village of Mangla, 19 miles west of Maroli, the principal town of the district of the same name, in the Jodhpur State. Thence it was brought to the Historical Department of the State, and was, with the kind permission of the late Maharaj Sahib of Jodhpur, sent to the Ajmer Museum, where it is at present.

The inscription is incised on a marble stone, and covers a space of 2' 3" high by 1' 31/2" broad, containing 15 lines of writing. The average size of the letters is 1/4". The characters are of the northern class of alphabets. The language is Sanskrit which is grammatically inaccurate, and terms of local dialect have also been used in some places, e.g., daumdra (l. 5.), kura (l. 7.). Its text is a mixture of both prose and poetry. The first line contains a verse, and then comes in a prose portion, which continues till the 9th line. In line 10, one-half of an old verse is quoted. Line 11 contains a verse from the Pañcachandiśa, while there are two newly composed Arya verses in 12th and 13th lines. These verses are in Prakrit language which is also grammatically incorrect. Rules of metre have also been violated. Then again the prose portion comes in till the 14th line. The last line, or line 15, contains a verse from the well-known Mangalāśakha, sung at the time of marriage, etc. With respect to Orthography, the following may be noted. The sign for and has been used throughout for those of both and . In some places has been used for , for , and for . Attention may also be drawn to the old and rare forms of the two vowels i and e and the consonant th. Consonants following th have in some places been doubled, while in others they have not been so done, e.g., "corvartha (l. 1.), Durjodhāna—phāreca (l. 5.), but not in maryādd (l. 7.), karsa (l. 8.), etc.

The inscription records the fact of a step-well having been constructed and certain cesses levied in connection therewith by Jayatrasimha (corrupted form of Daitrasimha) of the Dādhishas, i.e., Dabiyā, family, during the reign of Vallana Vadera, lord of Ranthambhor, when—Shamsud-Din Altamash of the Slave dynasty was ruling over Delhi from A.D. 1211 to 1236.

The inscription opens with a verse expressing obeisance to the god Nrisimha (l. 1). Then it is mentioned a goddess named Sri-Kerāya-māta. There is a temple dedicated to this goddess and situated on a hill adjacent to the village named Kinsariya in the Parbatgarh district. In the city of Jogi, now known as Delhi, there ruled an emperor named Samasadana (Shamsud-Din) of the Gora (Ghur) family, lord of Garjana (Gazni) and bearing the title of Hamra. At that time Vallana Vadera held sway over the fort of Raatamahapura (Ranathambhor) (l. 2-3). Under him there lived in Mangla, the great Rājput (mahād rājputra) Mahāmangalesvara Sri-Jayatrasimha Vadera of the Dādhishas (Dabiyā) family, son of Padmanath Vadera and grandson of Kadavarjā. He caused a step-well to be built in the Daundera-bhumi and to the east of a locality called Hari-Durjodhāna. Daundera is a term of the local dialect. In Mārwār, scarcity of water is called dundera, so the term Daundera-bhumi undoubtedly refers to the country of Mārwār or the land of water-scarcity. Hari-Durjodhāna is at present called Hariyānu a village nearly four miles from Mangla. The words used in the text are indicative of the fact that no monetary aid was availed of, i.e., no subscription was called in, for the purpose of constructing the said step-well (l. 4-6). He levied the following cesse, dharmārtha (i.e., for the sake of charity) on each plough used and oil-mill worked within the limits of village Mangla—

1 set of kara corn on each plough and
1 kara of oil on each oil-mill.

Set and kara are measures of weight equivalent to nearly 15 seers and 1 talla, respectively. The term kara is again borrowed from the local dialect. In Mārwār munga (Phaseolus mungo).
mitha (Phaseolus aconitifolius), chand (gram or Cicer arietinum), and gavà (Cyanopsis psoralioides) are called korada. The object in levying these cesses appears to be to provide food in charity (suddhara) to the hungry passers-by and light to the wayfarers (II. 6-7). With a view to its continuity in future, the management of these cesses was placed in the hands of the pañcha or trustees of the village. Their names are:—Jajaya, Lohara, Alha, Bhupatiya, Devadha, etc. These were most probably the headmen of the village at that time (I. 8). Then follow the imprecatory and beneficent words, which are followed by the date: Sunday, Asvinu-nakshatra, the 11th of the dark half of the month of Jyesha of the V. S. 1272 (= a. d. 1215) (I. 10). In line 13 we are told that the step-well was constructed by the sutradhara (mason) Asala, and the stones were worked and shaped by the mason Jaha. The praśasti was composed by Kāyastha Sūhā of the Naigama lineage (I. 14). The inscription closes with an invocation to the rivers Ganga, etc., for our good.

We thus see that at the time when this inscription was incised on stone, Shamsudd-Dīn was ruling over Delhi from A.D. 1211 to 1236 as has been noted supra. He was brother-in-law to Arām Shāh. Arām Shāh had hardly ruled over Delhi for one year when Shamsudd-Dīn usurped the throne. It is stated that Shamsudd-Dīn was bought by Qutb-ud-Dīn for a thousand of rupees. In this inscription Delhi is called by the name of dogini or Yogiṇipura. The same name is met with in Dīnsala-bhadha (or unpolished language) poetry. In the Hammira-mahakālya of Naya Chandrasūri, the same name vis., Yogiṇipura is found used for Delhi, e. g., in the verse:

प्रभुविशदैतीर्थान् वैराज्यसिद्धि नामिनि।
विस्त्र गार्हावङ्गिः विभव भोगिनीपुरस्सु।। ४ । १०९ ॥

In Mārwār, y is often used for y, e. g., jogi for yogi.

The name of the ruler of Rathambhor is given as Vallanadeva, but no mention is made of the race to which he belonged. We know from other sources that the descendants of the famous Chāhamāna Prithvīraja were holding sway over Rathambhor during that period. So the said Vallanadeva must have belonged to the Chāhamāna race. The genealogy of the rulers of Rathambhor is described in the Hammira-mahakālya referred to above. The name of Prithvīraja's son Govindāraja is first given and then the name of the latter's son Vallanadeva¹ is mentioned. This is evident from the following verse occurring in that work:

गोविन्दसमुदयो विविधमन्यां चारुबन्धाय।
दास्तनं चाक्रवर्तिः भोगिनीपुरस्सु।। ५ । १२ ॥

The time when Bālana of the Hammira-mahakālya flourished exactly coincides with that of the Vallanadeva of our inscription. No doubt can, therefore, be reasonably entertained as to Vallanadeva of our inscription being a Chāhamāna and a grandson of the celebrated Prithvīraja.

We also learn from this inscription that the dominions of Vallanadeva extended from Rathambhor to Manglaṇa in Mārwār. Jayatraśiṇha (or Jaitraśiṇha), the hero of our inscription, was a Dādhecha Kshatriya by caste, which is now-a-days known as Dhaiyā. Another inscription of the Dhaiyā Kshatriya has been found in the temple of Kevāya-mati in Kiṃsariyā, as already noted above, and a paper on the same has been sent by me for publication in the Epigraphy Indica. The Dhaiyā Kshatriyas recognize Dādmat-devi as their family-goddess, just as the

¹ Mr. Nilakantha Janardana Kirti, in his introductory note on the Hammira-mahakālya, published in 1879 by the Education Society's Press, writes thus:

"After Govindārāja, Bālana succeeded to the throne." Mark the minor difference between Bālana and Bālhaṇa.
Dāhīnā Brāhmaṇḍas do, whose temple is situated near the two villages of Gotha and Mānglod in the Nāgor district of the Jodhpur State. In this temple also an old inscription of Gupta-Saṃvat 289 (equivalent to A.D. 607) has been discovered and sent for publication by me in the same journal.

In this inscription Jayatrāsinī is styled as Mahāmaṇḍalīvaram, which epithet goes to prove that he was Chābanāna Vallagravāna's feudatory. The Dāhīvā Khatriyas held feudatory lands in the Parbatsar district in V. S. 1053 or thereabout. They were in flourishing condition till V. S. 1330. When thereafter, they were deprived of their land is not known. Now they hold no land and are Āḍā or ordinary Rājputs. They have also fallen in status on account of marrying their widows and they are consequently called Nāṭṛgyatās.

3. It is represented by a symbol.
4. Read: नितिविक्षिप्तयात्राग्राहाः।
5. Read: नितिविक्षिप्तयात्राग्राहाः।
6. Read: नितिविक्षिप्तयात्राग्राहाः।
7. Read: नितिविक्षिप्तयात्राग्राहाः।
8. Read: नितिविक्षिप्तयात्राग्राहाः।
9. Read: नितिविक्षिप्तयात्राग्राहाः।
10. Read: नितिविक्षिप्तयात्राग्राहाः।
11. Read: नितिविक्षिप्तयात्राग्राहाः।
12. Read: नितिविक्षिप्तयात्राग्राहाः।
13. Read: नितिविक्षिप्तयात्राग्राहाः।
14. Read: नितिविक्षिप्तयात्राग्राहाः।
15. Read: नितिविक्षिप्तयात्राग्राहाः।
16. Read: नितिविक्षिप्तयात्राग्राहाः।
17. Read: नितिविक्षिप्तयात्राग्राहाः।
18. Read: नितिविक्षिप्तयात्राग्राहाः।
19. Read: नितिविक्षिप्तयात्राग्राहाः।
20. Read: नितिविक्षिप्तयात्राग्राहाः।
21. Read: नितिविक्षिप्तयात्राग्राहाः।
22. Read: नितिविक्षिप्तयात्राग्राहाः।
23. Read: नितिविक्षिप्तयात्राग्राहाः।
24. Read: नितिविक्षिप्तयात्राग्राहाः।
THE AJIVIKAS, A SECT OF BUDDHIST BHIKSHUS.

BY K. B. PATHAK, B.A., HUBLI.

The Buddhist emperor Asoka and his grandson Dhararatha dedicated certain cave-dwellings to the sect of the Ajivikas. Mr. V. A. Smith, in his Early History of India, p. 156, tells us that the members of this sect went about naked and were noted for ascetic practices of the most rigorous kind. In his opinion the Ajivikas had little or nothing in common with the Buddhists and were intimately connected with the Jainas. It will, therefore, be very interesting for Sanskrit scholars to know what a distinguished Digambara Jain author, who lived at a time when Buddhism still prevailed in Southern India, has to say regarding this sect.

The Jainah work entitled Achāryāra, which is in verse, and its Kannada commentary which is in prose, were both composed by Viranandi on Monday the first of the bright half of Jyestha in the cyclic year Shrimukha 1076, as we learn from the colophon:—

There are numerous references to Buddhism in the Āchārasūtra. This clearly shows that in the Kanarese country there were numerous followers of Buddha in Saka 1076. We read

| अधिकार | अधिकारानुष्ठान | संबंधित संदर्भ उपयोग नहीं मिले॥
|----------|-----------------|----------------------------------|
| अधिकार | अधिकारानुष्ठान | संबंधित संदर्भ उपयोग नहीं मिले॥

*Āchārasūtra* III. 46

The most interesting fact preserved for us by Vārānandī is that in his time there was a very influential sect of Buddhist mendicents called Ājīvaka, who subsisted on kūñji, and whose intense severe austerities called forth the admiration of their Jaina contemporaries. Though wanting, as Buddhists, in righteousness as defined in the Jaina scriptures and thus incapable of attaining nāivedya in the Jaina sense, the Ājīvakas were nevertheless considered by the author of the Āchārasūtra so great as to be able to reach the heaven called *Sahasrāra-kalpa* in Jaina cosmography. Vārānandī says—

| वाराणान्दीकरणां आश्चर्यानुभवानां संवदनां अवश्य।
|----------------|----------------|
| वाराणान्दीकरणां आश्चर्यानुभवानां संवदनां अवश्य।

*Āchārasūtra* XI, 127.

**Commentary.**

*Parijātā* parivārájaka Brahmakālp-dhātā, Brahmakālp-āśirvadā, aly-ugra-dhāraṇā, api bhātāt ampa negatīyaṁ uttamā ādīṣṭatā ājīvakaṁ Baudhikhaśā-bhāṣām ampa kūñji Bhikṣuṁ Sahasrāra-kalpa-dhāntaṁ, sahasrāra-kalpa an-āśirvadāṁ darśaṁ—ajīvakaṁ sāmjarakīnam ilācum yāti pākshīntaṁ.

**Translation.**

An ascetic, though practising very severe austerities goes up to the heaven called Brahmakalpa. An Ājīvaka, a Bhikṣu of a Buddhist sect, subsisting upon kūñji, goes up to the heaven called Sahasrāra-kalpa [in Jaina cosmography].

There are two paper manuscripts of the *Āchārasūtra*. One belongs to the Lakshmīśwara Matha at Kolhapur and is dated Saka 1692; and the other is the property of the Jaina community of Siroli in the Kolhapur State, and was copied by a famous Jaina nun named Anantamati in Saka 1666. Both manuscripts are written in Old Kanarese characters. The form Ājīvaka occurs in both. The correct form should be Ājīvaka, a believer in the non-existence of the soul, from a-śiva, of Śiśukula and Śrīkaś. (Tāpini IV, 469). Anantamati's manuscript reads kūṣaḷ for kūñji, Baudha, for Baudhika and pākshīnta for pākshīnta. The reading kūñji is supported by the authority of Madhavachandra, who in his comments on the 545th Gāthā of the *Trilokā-sūtra*, says—

| नमस्ते अनंतभाइ | अन्वयनकर्त्तव्यं गर्भयो नस्ते उपरि। कृपया विनोभित्व भाज्या अन्वयनकर्त्तव्यं गर्भयो नस्ते उपरि।
|-----------------|----------------|
| नमस्ते अनंतभाइ | अन्वयनकर्त्तव्यं गर्भयो नस्ते उपरि। कृपया विनोभित्व भाज्या अन्वयनकर्त्तव्यं गर्भयो नस्ते उपरि।

The *Māyānandaśrīdeśa-dhāraṇā*, which belongs to the middle of the 18th century speaks of the Buddhists as meat-eaters who defended their practice by saying that what is dropped in a plate is holy and sanctified by the Sūtras:

*Pārāśītā pattaṁ paritām sūrāchaṇaṁ id māna Baudhikaḥ adagāyaṁ śūraḥ.*

Māgh., Chap. VI, Siroli MS., p. 714b.

As regards the Ājīvakas, we are told that they will be born as inferior gods in the heaven called Achiṣyuta-kalpa.


The *Māyānandaśrīdeśa-dhāraṇā* is frequently quoted by Padmaprabha-traiśrividya, who may therefore be assigned to the end of the 13th century. In the last chapter of his Viṁśatipraśāpana, Padmaprabha thus explains the first part of the Gāthā in the *Trilokā-sūtra*, referred to above:

| यदा यदिः प्राप् श्रेयस श्रीविषयास्ति अन्युि परिवर्तति साधा वामन।
|----------------|----------------|
| यदा यदिः प्राप् श्रेयस श्रीविषयास्ति अन्युि परिवर्तति साधा वामन।

Ājīrā, umā-śodana utsarasa Achiṣyuta-pallitat Achiṣyuta-kalpa-paryayanā [m] pūṣṭarasa.

The Ājīrās, eaters of kūñji food, will be born in the Achiṣyuta-kalpa.
The conclusion, that we can safely draw from the passages cited above, is that the Ájīvakas were well-known to the Jaina authors of the later Chālukya and Yādava periods as a sect of Buddhist Bhikshus who lived solely or chiefly on kānyā.

[All references to Ájīvakas have been culled together in my paper on this sect (Jour. Bomb. As. Soc., Vol. XXI, pp. 403-5). The Jains have no doubt called them to be a sect of the Buddhist Bhikshus, as Professor Pathak has conclusively shown us. But the Buddhists also appear in their turn to have shown them to be Nirgranthas, for the latter have actually been once called Ájīvakas in the Divyāvadāna (Cowell and Neil, p. 427). The truth of the matter is that they were neither Buddhists nor Jains even in much later times, but formed a distinct sect; and consequently Professor Hultzsch is not correct in taking Ájīvakas mentioned in some of the South Indian Inscriptions to be Jains (Vol. I, pp. 86, 89, 92 and 108).—D.R.B.]

BHĀMAHA AND DANDI.

BY R. NARASIMHACHAR. M. A., M. R. A. S., BANGALORE.

It may not be generally known that I was the first to give publicity to the discovery of Bhāmaha's work on Rhetoric known as Kāvydīnakāra. In the introduction to my edition of Nāgavarman's Kāvyāvadīnakānam, a Kānāja work on poetics composed by a Jaina author in the middle of the 12th century, which was published in 1903, I wrote as follows:—

"We shall next proceed to consider the Sanskrit writers on poetics whom Nāgavarman took as his authorities in writing the Kāvyāvadīnakānam. In verse 961 he supplies us with the important information that in writing his work he followed in the footsteps of Vāmana, Rādra, Bhāmaha and Daqīl. . . . . . . Next to him [Bharata] in point of time comes Bhāmaha, whose priority to Daqīl is proved by the latter criticising his views in the first chapter of the Kāvyadikāra. He is one of the greatest authorities on poetics, his views being quoted by almost all the subsequent writers of note on the subject. His work has not, however, been hitherto discovered, though Sanskrit scholars have made every effort to trace out a copy of it. In fact, Dr. Bühler believed that the work was lost, and other orientalists have also been under the same impression. In these circumstances, it will no doubt be welcome news to students of Sanskrit literature that Professor Bangacharya, M. A., of the Madras Presidency College, has had the good fortune to come upon a manuscript of this valuable and long-sought-for work. At my request he was so kind as to lend me the manuscript for a few days, and I take this opportunity to thank him heartily for his kindness and courtesy. The manuscript contains some mistakes and there are also a few gaps here and there. In the opening verse the author calls the work Kāvyadīnakāra. It is a short treatise consisting of about four hundred verses, mostly in the Anushtubha metre, and is divided into six parichchhādas or chapters, the subjects treated of being—kinds of composition and their peculiarities, rhetorical ornaments, faults in composition, and some points in logic and grammar, a knowledge of which is indispensable for correct composition. The only information that the work gives about the author is that he was the son of Rakula-Gomīn. According to Dr. Bühler, he was a Kāshmirian. The work bears no date, but the author probably belongs to the early part of the 6th century."

Since the above was written, several scholars have given expression to their views about Bhāmaha and his work. Mr. M. T. Narasimhiengar 3 has mentioned some points which, he thinks, "clearly establish his contention that Bhāmaha should be placed after Daqīl." Missara Kane 4 and Pathak 5 have expressed the opinion that Mr. M. T. Narasimhiengar has conclusively proved that

---

2 Ibid. 1908, p. 845.
Bhāmaha is later than Dauḍī. On the contrary, Mr. K. P. Trivedi, Professor Rangacharya and Pandit Anantacharya held the same view as myself with regard to the priority of Bhāmaha to Dauḍī. These scholars have anticipated me in mentioning several points which, I also thought, tended to prove that Bhāmaha was anterior to Dauḍī. Without entering into any discussion of the arguments advanced for and against by the scholars in the works referred to, I shall content myself at present with giving the opinion of one of the old commentators on Dauḍī's Kīvydārāśa with regard to the question at issue. In his edition of Kīvydārāśa, Professor Rangacharya has given two commentaries on the work, one anonymous and the other by an author of the name of Taruṇavāchārapati. Though the latter does not furnish any clue to his period, still there can be no doubt that his commentary is at least several hundred years old. His opinion, as embodying the tradition prevailing at his time, ought to carry considerable weight. His commentary on I. 29, II. 235 and IV. 4 of Kīvydārāśa runs thus:—

(a) कीव्यदाराशा रश्मिकादेवीयता।
रामचरितमाला गद्य नै सैनीक प्राप्त मुँह। || I. 29

(b) हेतु न नृलक्ष्मी स्त्री माणुस्त्रीमनुष्य।
कार्यकालीय कृती तो वामिकविविध स्थाप || II. 235

(c) नृलक्ष्मी नसनेनाश्च सनातनानां रामचरितमाला स्त्रीः—
प्रतिबन्ध हृद अनुप्लादिते। || IV. 4.

(h) अनेकार्थें न नृलक्ष्मी नसनेनाश्च सनातनानां रामचरितमाला स्त्रीः।—
हे चेति, तत्कालिनीति ||

We thus learn that Taruṇavāchārapati was clearly of opinion that Bhāmaha preceded Dauḍī.

I would add here a word about the Nyāsikātra alluded to and criticised by Bhāmaha. Professor Pathak thinks that the Nyāsikātra referred to by Bhāmaha is no other than Jīnendrabuddhi, the author of the Kīkākīvarṇārapārāśī, and concludes that Bhāmaha lived after Jīnendrabuddhi about the middle of the 8th century. But in the quotation that he gives from Jīnendrabuddhi's work there is no reference at all to the word Vṛttakānta to which Bhāmaha takes exception (कृतवदायतां कृतमार्गितां). There is enough evidence to show that there were other early Nyāsikātras besides Prabhāchandra, the author of the Sāhityāya-nayika, and Jīnendrabuddhi. In the very Nyāsikātra inscription quoted by the Professor on page 22, we are told that Pājyapāda wrote a Nyāsa on Pājāni—पाजीयादास पाजानीं साधारण साधारणं वर्णकर्षणम् पाजीयादासासी। This statement is borne out by Vṛttatilāra, a Kumaraj author of the middle of the 13th century, who says that Pājyapāda wrote a śikha or gloss on Pājāni—पाजीयादास पाजानीं साधारण साधारणं वर्णकर्षणम् पाजीयादासासी। The period assigned to Pājyapāda by Mr. Rice is the close of the 5th century. There is nothing improbable in supposing that he might be the Nyāsikātra referred to by Bhāmaha. Unfortunately, a copy of this Nyāsa has not yet been met with. Further, a Nyāsa is alluded to by Bāṇa in his Harsha-carita. As Bāṇa flourished in the early part of the 7th century, the Nyāsa referred to by him could not be Jīnendrabuddhi's. If the date assigned to the latter by Professor Pathak, namely, A.D. 700, is to be acceded to. It will thus be seen that Professor Pathak's argument for placing Bhāmaha in the middle of the 8th century is not quite conclusive.

In this connection I would also say a word or two about Dauḍī's time. Most scholars are agreed that Dauḍī flourished in the 6th century. In commenting on

नामकरणस्य रसिकानिर्माणिनिष्क्रियम्।
अर्थात् नामकरण स्थापनानि कुष्ठाम्: || III. 114.

the well-known instance of prabālā or enigma in Dauḍī's work, Taruṇavāchārapati explains it as meaning Kīkākīvarṇārapārāśī over the Pallava kings. As we know from inscriptions that the

8 Introduction to Pratāpadatoskārāṇa, p. 32 ff.
9 Introduction to Kīvydārāśa, p. 6.
10 Issues of the Brahmanda, for 1911.
12 Ibid., p. 94.
Pallavas were the paramount rulers of Southern India up to the middle of the 8th century, there is nothing improbable or fanciful in the explanation given by Tarabāvīchārācārī. It may therefore be taken for granted that Dāṇḍī flourished during the period of the Pallava supremacy. The next point that has to be determined is, in which Pallava king's reign did Dāṇḍī probably flourish? I venture to think that Dāṇḍī has reached us to us a clue to the solution of this question. In II. 279 of Kāvyadāra he mentions a Saiva king of the name of Rājavarman who, judging from the way in which he is introduced, must have been a contemporary of the author. Among the Pallava kings of Kāñchī, Narasimhavarma II had another name Rājasimhavarman. He is represented as a devout Saiva and as a builder of several Siva temples. His period is the last quarter of the 7th century. I would identify the Rājavarman of Dāṇḍī with this Pallava king. Rājasimhavarman. Professor Rangacharya also mentions, in relation to I. 5 of Kāvyadāra, a tradition which says that the work was composed by Dāṇḍī for giving lessons in rhetoric to a royal prince at Kāñchī. This prince was probably Rājasimhavarman's son. If the above identification is correct, Dāṇḍī's period would be the last quarter of the 7th century instead of the usually accepted 6th century.

CONTRIBUTIONS TO PANJABI LEXICOGRAPHY.

SERIES III.

BY H. A. ROSE, I.C.S.

(Continued from p. 47.)


Mogha: rain, used generally by Gaddis who distinguish steady drizzle or fine rain as jharī or sagī and light passing showers as burāk.

Meh, mehī: the female of the kurī, q. v.

Mehāra, mohnāra: a place where buffaloes are tied up in the jangi sometimes applied to the grazing ground.

Mehīrā: a headman's circle: Mahlog.


Meī punna: to make friends.


Mēr: floor of the ground floor.


Mēn: a flat heavy piece of wood with which land is gone over. Gurgaon S. R., 1872-83, p. 69.

Miūrā, māt: a big field roller, the sōrdas of the plains.

Middhā: to trample, crush.

Minjī: me, me. In Kūn mōme, to me; mōme, from me.
Minna: a ceremony at weddings, performed by the bride or bridegroom's mother; she takes a 5-wicked lamp made of flour, places it on a tray, and while her brother stands on a stool, waves it up and down his body from head to foot. Cf. ára. Karnál S. R., 1872-80, p. 129.


Mítri: a large mango fruit, sweet as sugar (mítri). Hoshiarpur S. R., p. 15.

Mítháuna: a place where clay is dug—seen solend.

Mírtá uráná: to give an oracle. Jubbul.

Moda: the produce of cultivation of the preceding year. Mahlog.


Mohita chháti: an unirrigated land capable of being watered by a well. Ludhiana S. R., 1878-83, p. 95.

Mohra: a man who pulls out the canes on the other side and passes them back. Hoshiarpur, S. R., p. 82.

Mohu: a tree, a kind of oak: found between 5,000 and 8,000 feet above sea-level. Chamba.

Mohu: a fish, found after the rainas. It runs up after the heavy floods in the rain, and grows to a large size. Very commonly found 5 lbs. in weight. It has a curious habit of rising constantly to the surface of the water, and turning over, showing its very broad silvery side. Ludhiana S. R., 1878-83 p. 17.

Mok: the freight for carrying grain from one place to other by boats. Sirsa S. R., 1879-83, p. 190.


Mol: a long pestle for pounding rice in the ool or wooden mortar. Kangra Gloss.


Móna: the system of leaving the roots of the cane in ground where fresh alluvial deposits can be depended on, and so produce two or three and sometimes more years in succession. Hoshiarpur S. R., p. 81.

Morgafa: a large mital plate. Sirmur.


Mor or sira: a wedding cap. Sirsa S. R., 1879-83, p. 166.

Mori: window. Sirmur.


Motí: the same as the mairas land, but with a larger proportion of clay; it gives wonderful crops with good rain, but is liable to fall in dry years. It is, in fact, much the same as the rohi land. Cf. roha and pathiali. Hoshiarpur S. R., p. 70.


Mud: a curved heavy piece of wood, like the māthī, but used only on muddy lands.

Mudah: (2) a mode of culture, see lungā.

Mudakhora: a cess—a fee of Rs. 5, paid at each daughter's wedding. Cf. thānapatti.

Mudāyari: a tenant who pays a fixed share, muda of grain as rent, whatever portion may be agreed on. Muda is also applied to the money payment by a tenant when the rent is paid in cash. Churah.


Mund: the youngest son's share in the inheritance, i.e., the family house. Churajāl.

Mundā: a square ham (q.v.) = 22½ square yards.


Mundī: a beardless red wheat with a slightly higher stalk and a larger grain than the common kind. Ludhiana S. R., 1878-83, p. 113.

Mundā: a square ham (q.v.) = 22½ square yards.


Munā: fem. musi = Jāsūt.

Mur: adv. again.


Naktā: the Spiti name for the wild sheep; in books commonly called burlū. Kāngra Gloss.

Nāchār: a break or rush of water from one field to another. Kāngra Gloss.

Nakhor: water which escapes out of one field into a lower one. Kāngra Gloss.

Nak: marsh and cultivated with rice; see johār.


Naddilu: woodcock—see jālātāri.


Nagdi: the placing of an offering with a lighted lamp on it on some moonlit night while the moon is still on the wax at a place where four roads meet. Cf. langri. Karnal S. R., 1872-80, p. 146.
Nagpan: prickly pear. Rohtak.
Nakkjind honā: to be worried, distressed.
Nakorh: a vent or passage for water from a field. Kāngra Gloss.
Nāl: a bamboo stem or pole. Kāngra Gloss.
Nāl or nagalthi=lāthī: q. v. Sirmūr cīs-Girl.
Nāl: a species of bamboo, found in upland villages: its cylinder contains ḫanslochan.
Kāngra S. R., p. 20.
Nāla: a sacred coloured string, which the father of the bridegroom sends to the bride's house with other things for tying her hair up. Karnál S. R., 1872-80, p. 130.
Nareli: the nanāl pheasant: see nīlīr.
Nari dāndi: lit. horned wheat; a bearded wheat having whitish ears from three to four inches long; its grain also is white, thick and soft. Sirsa S. R., 1879-83, p. 285.
Nāsana: to run away. Bauria argot.
Nasonoh: unmixed, pure (of oil or other things). Kāngra Gloss.
Nāun: a bath or made reservoir, a spring. Kāngra Gloss.
Naurī, thief; see tohri.
Neota: a custom by which all the branches of a family contribute towards the expenses of a marriage in any of its component households. Karnál S. R., 1872-80, p. 135.
Newur (?): a tree not bearing fruit. Simla S. R., 1883, p. 43.
Niāli: the manured land near a village-site or in the neighbourhood of outlying houses or cattle pens. Of. lahri. Hoshiārpur S. R., p. 69.
Niaúna: to send on duty; used of chaúrá, begúri, kullis, etc. Kangra Gloss.
Nidál: weeding.
Nighar: used by shepherds to describe the grassy slopes on the high Himalayas above the line of forest, or a sheep-run in such a locality: = kover, opposed to gáhr, q. v. Kangra Gloss.
Nip: sight.
Nikar: adj. disdainful, unappreciative.
Nikhorná: to separate.
Nil: the mandí pheasant: see nilgir.
Nilgir: Lit. blue king; the mandí pheasant, also called nil only, or naret. Kangra Gloss.

Rohak.

Nirna: breakfast (eaten at 6 a.m.); adv. without taking food. Keonthál.
Nowari: early breakfast, see under datidá.
Nálin: a system of cultivation, in which a spring crop, usually wheat, is taken, then the ground lies fallow for nearly a year, during which it is repeatedly ploughed and rolled. Cf. sánum and nálin. Jullundur S. R., p. 118.

Nuris: the fairies, a somewhat vaguely-defined class of malevolent spirits, who attack women only; especially on moonlit nights, giving them a choking sensation in the throat and knocking them down. Karnál S. R., 1872-80, p. 162.

Narlín: a system of cultivation, in which a spring crop, usually wheat, is taken, then the ground lies fallow for nearly a year, during which it is repeatedly ploughed and rolled. Cf. sánum and nálin. Jullundur S. R., p. 118.

Nyaini: a basin into which the end of the higher channel is discharged. Karnál S. R., 1872-80, p. 171.

Orá: cow-shed: the people keep their cattle in the lower storey of their houses, and live in the upper. Chamba.
Obri: an inner room as opposed to orátn, q. v.
Oddá: the bark of a creeper used as string to fasten on slate roofing, etc. Kangra Gloss.
Odén: land in the shade of trees in which little or nothing grows. Kangra Gloss.
Oos: the mouth or opening into a duct from a bál (canal). Kangra S. R., p. 92.
Ogal: a wooden bar used to barricade the door from inside: also used trans-Giri.
Oghárna: to uncover, remove, a lid. Kangra Gloss.
Ogáli: a store-house on the ground floor with a stone floor and walls and without any door, grain is poured into it through a hole, called báli, in the roof. Sirmúr.
Ogrākhar: a collector of debts, revenue, etc. Kāngra Gloss.
Okal: a long pestle: see mol.
Okhwal: a paved way: see shandī.
Olum: to mix (as rice and dāl) before eating. Kāngra Gloss.
Onehru: to overturn, pour out. Kāngra Gloss.
Ongala: the consideration paid to the owner of plough oxen lent on condition of payment of so much grain by the borrower out of the harvest. Kāngra Gloss.
Opat: the whole of anything, often applied to the gross produce of a field. Kāngra Gloss.
Oprāhu: up, above. Kāngra Gloss.
Oprerma: to wave over the head; at marriages, or when a man comes home after a long absence, his relations do this with pcv which they give to a kāmin, or in the case of a sick man, with bread which they throw to dogs, etc. Kāngra Gloss.
Orā orl: (1) mustard: (2) see also under orl (2). Kāngra S. R., p. 24.
Orl: (1) a nursery of rice before it is planted out: (2) a shed for sheep and goats. Kāngra S. R., p. 44: the real orl are small huts with a yard in front, built by samindārs for Gaddis to put up in winter for the sake of manure. An orl is a small place built of few stones in the Dhālas in which the young lambs or kids are kept. Kāngra Gloss.
Orra: the putting of the grain to be offered to the malignant deity by the head of the sufferer during the night and offering it next day. Karnāl S. R., 1872-80, p. 146.
Oru, aur: the receipt which the samindārs used to get from a kādrā for revenue.
Ots: dim. of t; a small screw or partly wall. Ambila.
Ovān: an outer room, the door of which leads outside. Opp. to obrā. Kāngra Gloss.
Pabhan: much the same as jabar (moist low-lying land, very good for sugarcane and rice).
Pachchot: 5 thinis per topa; a cess taken from a tenant by the proprietor in some parts of Pālam. Kāngra Gloss.

Pagvand: a rule of inheritance, whereby all the legitimate sons of one father get equal shares without reference to the number of sons born of each wife or mother. Cf. mund-e-vand. Kangra S. R., p. 98.


Paill: s. f., a cultivated field.

Pâind: the bottom of a field, as opposed to the tupdi where the water enters. Kangra Gloss.


Paintals pachwanja: rent paid in kind; the proprietor taking 45 and the tenants 55 maunds in the 100. Hoshiarpur S. R., p. 60.


Pajri: a place made of wooden planks on which idols are placed in a row opposite to the singhasan which is of metal: also called pird or piiri.


Pakka pâr: the hole in which the cylinder of the well is to be sunk, dug in stiff soil. Jullundur S. R., p. 100.


Pala, pera: a large wicker bamboo receptacle for grain, cask-shaped.

Pala: fodder of the jhar.

Pala: the broken leaves of the jharokri tree, which form a very valuable fodder. Karnal S. R., p. 12.

Palan: the string round the spindle of a spinning wheel.


Paleo: the irrigation of the land for ploughing, or sowing, or both, when there has been no rain. Karnal S. R., 1872-80, p. 170.

Pallewalâ: a wealthy person, a man of means.


Palsara: a man appointed by a râjâ to the charge of the whole administration of a kothi.

Kangra S. R., p. 80.


Panchi: a bird; pakru is also common. Kangra Gloss.

Panchotra: see kardâ.

Panchopaya: a large mango fruit, said to weigh five quarters of a kacha ser, equal to one pozad Avoidnupia. Hoshiarpur S. R., p. 15.

Pand: matting of bamboo or date leaves. Kangra Gloss.

(To be continued.)
MISCELLANEA.

THE PLANETARY ICONOGRAPHY OF THE SIPSÁN, ACCORDING TO THE DABISTÁN.

That curious work—the Dabístán or 'School of Manners'—was translated into Gujarati and published at Bombay in 1815 under the imprimatur of Mulla Fráiz, the notable Parsi scholar of that time. In the first section (nafrā) seven copper-plate figures are inserted in spaces left for them in the type. These are the regents of the Planets, among the Sipsáns, a sect of Iránians, the author says. As Shea and Troyer's translation is not very well known, the following extract, describing these figures, may interest some readers:—J. Burgess.

"It is stated in the Akharistán that the Sipsáns' tenets were, that the stars and the heavens are the shadows of the incorporeal effulgence; on this account they erected the temples of the seven planets, and had talismans formed of metal or stone, suitable to each star; all which talismans were placed in their proper abode, under a suitable aspect; they also set apart a portion of time for their worship and handed down the mode of serving them. When they performed the rites of these holy statues, they burned before them the suitable incense at the appointed season, and held their power in high veneration. Their temples were called Falkistán, or 'image temples', and Shidistán 'the abodes of the forms of the luminous bodies.'

"It is stated in the Akharistán, that the image of the regent Kaíván (Súri) was cut out of black stone, in a human shape, with an ape-like head; his body like a man's, with a hog's tail, and a crown on his head; in the right hand a séeve; in the left a serpent. His temple was also of black stone, and his officiating ministers were negroes, Abyssinians and persons of black complexions; they wore blue garments, and on their fingers rings of iron; they offered up stones and such like perfumes, and generally dressed and offered up pungent viands; they administered myrobalans in similar gums and drugs. Villagers and husbandmen, who had left abodes, nobles, doctors, anchorites, mathe-

maticians, enchanters, seers, and persons of that description lived in the vicinity of this temple, where these sciences were taught, and their maintenance allowed them; they first paid adoration in the temple and afterwards waited on the king. All persons ranked among the servants of the regent Kaíván were presented to the king through the medium of the chiefs and officers of this temple, who were always selected from the greatest families in Iran. The words Sháh and Timár are appellations of honour, signifying dignity, just as Sri in Hindi, and Barrāt in Arabic.

"The image of the regent Hormuzd (Birñaspati) was of an earthy colour, in the shape of a man, with a vulture's face; on his head a crown, on which were the faces of a cock and a dragon; in the right hand a crown or turban; in the left a crystal [bottle or] ewer. The ministers of this temple were of a terrene hue, dressed in yellow and white; they wore rings of silver and signets of cornelian; the incense consisted of laurel-berries and such like; the viands prepared by them were sweet. Learned men, judges, imáms, eminent vaizás, distinguished men, nobles, magistrates and scribes dwelt in the street attached to this temple, where they devoted themselves to their peculiar pursuits, but principally giving themselves up to the science of theology.

"The temple of the regent Bahrám (Mangal) and his image were of red stone; he was represented in a human form, wearing on his head a red crown: his right hand was of the same colour and hanging down; his left, yellow and raised up; in the right was a blood-stained sword, and an iron verge in the left. The ministers of this temple were dressed in red garments; his attendants were Turks with rings of copper on their hands; the fumigations made before him consisted of sandarach and such like; the viands used here were bitter. Princes, champions, soldiers, military men, and Turks dwelt in his street. Persons of this description, through the agency of the directors of the temple, were admitted to the king's presence. The bestowers of charity

1 Three volumes, Paris, 1813. In the following extract, I have substituted, in most cases, the vernacular names of the planets, for the European. J. B.

2 Kerúz, a bird feeding on carcasses, and living a hundred years.

* Bahrán is also called Manísrám.

4 The drawing shows a short beard and moustachos.
dwelt in the vicinity of this temple; capital punishments were here inflicted, and the prison for criminals was also in that street.

"The image of the world-enlightening solar regent was the largest of the idols; his dome was built of gold-plated bricks; the interior inlaid with rubies, diamonds, cornelian and such like. The image of the Great Light [Åfâb] was formed of burnished gold, in the likeness of a man with two heads, on each of which was a precious crown set with rubies: and in each diadem were seven sârân or peaks. He was seated on a powerful steed; his face resembling that of a man, but he had a dragon's tail; in the right hand a rod of gold, a collar of diamonds around his neck. The ministers of this temple were dressed in yellow robes of gold tissue, and a girdle set with rubies, diamonds, and other stones: the fumigations consisted of saandal-wood and such like; they generally served up acidulous viands. In his quarter were the families of kings and emperors, chiefs, men of might, nobles, chieftains, governors, rulers of countries, and men of science: visitors of this description were introduced to the king by the chiefs of the temple.

"The exterior of Nâhib's [Sûrâ's] temple was of white marble and the interior of crystal, the form of the idol was that of a red man, wearing a seven-peaked crown on the head: in the right hand a flask of oil, and in the left a comb before him was burnt saffron and such like; his ministers were clad in fine white robes, and wore peaked golden crowns, and diamond rings on their fingers. Men were not permitted to enter this temple at night. Matrons and their daughters performed the necessary offices and service, except on the night of the king's going there, as then no females approached, but men only had access to it. Here the ministering attendants served up rich viands. Ladies of the highest rank, practising austerities, worshipers of God, belonging to the place, who came from a distance, goldsmiths, painters, and musicians dwelt around this temple, through the chiefs and directors of which they were presented to the king; but the women and ladies of rank were introduced to the queen by the female directresses of the temple.

"The dome and image of the regent Tir' (Buddha) was of blue stone; his body that of a fish, with a boar's face; the right arm black, the other white; on his head a crown: he had a tail like that of a fish; in his right hand a pen, and in the left an inkhorn. The substances burnt in this temple were gum mastic and the like. His ministers were clad in blue, wearing on their fingers rings of gold. At their feasts they served up acidulous viands. Varis, philosophers, astrologers, physicians, farriers, accountants, revenue-collectors, ministers, secretaries, merchants, architects, tailors, fine writers and such like, were stationed there, and through the agency of the directors of the temple, had access to the king; the knowledge requisite for such sciences and pursuits was also communicated there.

"The temple of the regent Mâh (Chandramas) was of a green stone; his image that of a man seated on a white ox; on his head a diadem in the front of which were three peaks: on the hands were bracelets, and a collar round the neck. In his right hand an amulet of rubies, and in the left a branch of sweet basil; his ministers were clad in green and white, and wore rings of silver. The substances burnt before this image were gum arabic and such like drugs. His attendants served up salted viands. Spies, ambassadors, couriers, news-reporters, voyagers, and the gentility of travellers and such like persons resided in his street, and were presented to the king through the directors of the temple. Besides the peculiar ministers and attendants, there were attached to each temple several royal commissioners and officers, engaged in the execution of the king's orders, and in such matters as were connected with the image of that temple. In the Khuristan or 'refectory' of each temple, the board was spread on the whole day with various kinds of viands and beverages always ready. No one was repulsed, so that whoever chose partook of them. In like manner, in the quarter adjacent to each temple, was an hospital, where the sick under the idol's protection were attended by the physician of that hospital. Thus there were also places provided for travellers, who on their arrival in the city, repaired to the quarter appropriated to the temple to which they belonged." 8

The Sipâsâns are represented as an early Persian sect, styled also Yassadân, Abâddân, Hushân, Anushkân, Arâhi, and Arâliân.

---

8 The figure represents Sûrâs, Pers. Åfâb, with two tails, and his foot like a claw; the horse has the usual tail.

8 Nâhib appears also under the name of Ferehengobram.

8 Tir, also Temiriz, Pers. 'Ukhrad.

THE CASTES IN INDIA.

BY E. SENART OF THE INSTITUT DE FRANCE.

(Translated in part from the French)

BY REV. A. HEGGLIN, S. J.; BOMBAY.

[In the following pages we give to the readers of the *Indian Antiquary*, the translation of part of a work on Caste which is justly entitled to particular notice. The title of the work is: *Les Castes dans l'Inde*. Emile Senart, Membre de l'Institut, Paris, Ernest Leroux, Editeur, 28, Rue Bonaparte, 28, 1886.

The author is a great and enthusiastic French Orientalist, well known by a series of original works on topics drawn from the Pali and the Sanskrit. His book, *Les Castes dans l'Inde* containing 22 pages of preface and 297 pages of text, is divided into three chapters, each subdivided into paragraphs. The first chapter, inscribed *Le Présent*, treats the caste-system in its present features; the second entitled *Le Passé*, shows the system in the light thrown upon it by the standard works of Sanskrit literature. These two chapters form the basis on which the author builds up his theory on the origins of the caste-system in the third chapter. For European readers, who have never been in India, they are most instructive, and, we think, even indispensable; but Indian readers, who are either members of castes themselves, or are at least familiar with the working of the caste-system and with the traditional views of the past regarding it, will have no difficulty in finding their way through the third chapter, without having read the preceding two.

We, therefore, confine ourselves to a translation of the third chapter which is headed *Les Origines*, and in which the chief interest of the book lies. The solution of the riddle of the caste-system as a historical institution, which Monsieur Senart sets forth in this chapter, has certainly the charm of originality, if not of an all-round satisfactory and final explanation, as far as such can be reached in so complex a problem.

With these few remarks of introduction, we now give the translation of the third chapter.—

Ed.]

Chapter III.—The Origins.

I.—The systems of explanation. The Traditionalists.

II.—Profession as the foundation of Caste. Mr. Neefield and Mr. [Sir Denzil] Ibbetson.

III.—Race as the foundation of Caste. Mr. [Sir Herbert] Risley.

IV.—Caste and the Aryan constitution of the family.

V.—Genesis of the Indian Caste.

VI.—General survey, Caste and the Indian mind.

From the day when it aroused the attention of men of an inquisitive mind, the problem of the origin of the castes has often been treated and from various standpoints. Many systems have been set forth. I think, I may shorten their list without much scruple.

I leave aside from the very beginning those explanations which are too general, or too hasty, or which are not based upon close study, nor do sufficiently master the ground occupied by the problem.

Various groups may be formed amongst those attempts which are recent enough to be completely informed, it will be sufficient to fix their tendencies by examples. This will not be a matter of mere curiosity. This summary view will furnish the occasion of clearing the ground, and we shall come nearer probable solutions, even if it were only by way of successive elimination.
I.—The Systems of Explanation.

If the Hindus have mixed up the two notions and the two terms of class and caste, their erroneous views have been followed amongst us with sad docility. I mean foremost the Indianists. Representatives of the philological school as they are, they obey an almost irresistible tendency in viewing the problem under this traditional aspect. The Brahminical theory is, as it were, their proper atmosphere. The literary chronology is their invariable starting point.

Faithful to a principle which, it seems, works a priori, but the dangers and weakness of which in its application to India, I have already indicated, must have, in fact, admitted that the series of the literary monuments must correspond with the historical evolution and exactly reflect its phases. The Brāhmaṇas, which, in the order of time, are more closely connected with the hymns, cannot contain anything which is not the prolongation, or normal development of the data contained in them. Hence this dilemma: Either the existence of the castes is attested in the Vedas, or—in the contrary supposition—they were necessarily established in the period which separates the composition of the hymns to which they would be unknown, from the composition of the Brāhmaṇas, which suppose their existence, to which is added this corollary, always implied, yet always active, that their origins must be justified by means of elements expressly contained in the hymns.

Nobody, as far as I know, or almost nobody, has freed himself of this postulate. They thought, they were bound to consider as the certain starting point the divisions which, in the opinion of all, are exhibited in the Vedas, and which, according to some, were complete and real castes, according to others, social classes. The former were all the more eager to find the castes in the hymns, as they justly felt how difficult it is to ascribe to them, according to the ordinary method too recent an origin; and the latter concluded from the silence of the hymns, that the epoch, to which they go back, did not know anything of them, and that, therefore, the genesis could begin only later. But both are agreed to consider as primitive and indissoluble the tie which connects the four varṇas with the very rising of the institution of the castes.

Under this impression they are fain to believe to have done enough, when they have drawn a reasonable explanation from general considerations supported by approximate analogies. From the pretensions and the interests of the priestly class, aided by an alliance with the secular power seen also elsewhere, they have originated, through the working of a clearer design carried on with perseverance, this state of division into factions maintained by severe regulations as they appear through the prism of the law-books. The lines of such constructions are commonly somewhat indistinct; they may be seductive by their regularity, by the convenient appeal which they make to current notions. But so much clearness is not without danger.

Being masters of the analysis which derives the whole Indo-European vocabulary from some hundreds of roots, certain explorers of the language really thought, they were touching, in those languages which have preserved most of etymological transparency, the first stammerings of human speech. They estimated that the distance to be covered from there to the source, was not, or almost not worth considering. Among the explanations to which caste has given rise, there are some which remind one of this easy optimism. It has exerted its ravages even upon such minds as seemed to be perfectly armed against them.

Mr. Sherring, for instance, has devoted vast labours to the direct study of the contemporary castes. When, one day, he thought of settling his general views on the matter, of summing up his opinion on the 'Natural History of Caste,' he set down the terms of the problem with a firmness which was not such as to discourage the hopes roused by the very title of his work. It is strange that a preconceived system should have been able to render so many observations and so

1 Tābā and Caste in Benares.
2 'Natural History of Caste,' in the Calcutta Review.
much learning sterile. Mr. Sherring has shown us in the caste only the result of the cunning policy of ambitious priests, manufacturing all anew the constitution of the Hindu world and modelling it to their own profit.

The comparison of the Jesuits and their theocratic aims plays, as a rule, a really excessive part in these explanations. We find it even with one of the latest representatives of the philological school. Mr. von Schroeder, at first, does not seem to be inclined to exaggerating the Brahminical system; he feels that the quadruple division into priests, warriors, etc., can only correspond to a distinction of classes. Nevertheless, he derives the castes from them and, above all, from the particular constitution of the Brahmins. If we were to believe him, the regime would be connected with the victorious reassertion of Brahmanism against expiring Buddhism. Its formation, therefore, would thus be brought down to the period in which there appeared the man in whom that movement, very hypothetical as it is, personifies itself, down to Sankara, the orthodox philosopher of the eighth century.

These are the systems which I shall call traditionalistic. They repeat themselves, transform themselves without a great effort of renewal. However ingenious they may be in some of their parties, their analysis could scarcely be productive of a result. Roth, for instance, has explained the first progress of the ascertal caste by the importance which the purush, or domestic chaplain of the chieftains acquired little by little. Whilst spreading in the plains of India, the Aryan tribes would split themselves into numerous factions, they would be broken up; by this the royal families would have lost both in power and in authority; they would sink down to the rank of a simple nobility; the Kshatriyas would be the bullion of ancient kings. Their weakness would have created the empire of the Brahmins. All the views of so excellent and well-informed a mind have their value. But this is of interest only for the history of the classes, not for the genesis of the castes.

To mix up the classes with the castes is, in my opinion, to bring confusion into the whole question. I have given several reasons for it. Class and caste correspond neither in their extent, nor in their characters, nor in their innate tendencies. Each one, even amongst the castes which would be involved in the same class, is dearly distinguished from its relatives; it isolates itself with a roughness which is not softened by the feeling of a higher union. The class serves political ambitions; the caste obeys narrow scruples, traditional customs, at most certain local influences which have, as a rule, no connection with the interests of the class. Above all, the caste aims at safe-guarding an integrity, the preoccupation of which shews itself suspicious even with the lowest. It is the distant echo of the struggles of classes, which, transmitted by the legend, resounds in the tradition. The two institutions may have become linked together by the reaction of the systems upon the facts; they are, none the less, essentially independent.

The hierarchic division of the population into classes is an almost universal fact; the regime of the caste is a phenomenon, that is unique. That Brahminical ambition may have profited by it in order the better to establish its domination, is possible—it is not evident. Theocracy has not for its necessary basis the regime of castes. If theory has mixed up the two origins of ideas this is a secondary fact; we have seen it by the very criticism of the tradition. To understand the historical development, it is necessary to distinguish them carefully, reserving, of course, the inquiry how the two notions could finally have been linked together. Priestly speculation has placed an artificial system between the facts and our vision. Let us be on our guard not to take as the sight the curtain which is hiding it from us.

It may appear very simple to derive, after the Brahminical fashion, an infinite number of groups from a successive division of large primitive categories. How is it not seen, that this parcelling

---
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out draws its inspiration from interests and inclinations directly opposed to the class-spirit which ought rather ever to tighten the union? Ruled by varying principles of unification: geographical, professional, sectarian, etc., caste invariably shows itself insensible to considerations of a general nature. Class-spirit does not account for any one of those particularities, for any one of those scruples, which make the originality of caste, and which even between groups that, after all, would be traced back to one common class, raise up so many and so high barriers.

These systems, therefore, put the question wrongly; they start from an arbitrary principle which they do not prove, and which, on application, reveals an evident insufficiency. Nor is this all. Their excessive respect for the pretended testimonies of literature forces them to bring down the beginnings of the regime to too late a period, when everything indicates that the life of India was already strongly established on its final footing. A new improbability! An institution so universal in Hindu society, gifted with a vitality so supple as to appear indestructible, cannot fail to be connected with the very roots of national development. If it had sprung up late, it would, being destined to so large a sway, have left at least more definite traces of its beginnings.

One feature is common to all systems of this category, they lose sight too much of the real facts; they deprive themselves of the comparisons and ideas called for by the life of populations which are imperfectly, or recently assimilated with dominant Hinduism.

This preoccupation, on the contrary, takes a place of honour in works which follow other directions, and which start either from sociological doctrines, or from anthropology.

II.—Profession as the Foundation of Caste.

Mr. Nesfield is led by views of general ethnography; his belief in positive classifications is of a rigidity which is surprising in a time so rid of all dogmatism. Yet he has at least a perfect outspokenness in his conclusions; if one can hesitate to follow him, at least every one knows where he is going.

The communion of profession is, in his eyes, the foundation of the caste; this is the hearth round which it has taken shape. He does not admit any other origin; he deliberately excludes all influence of race, of religion. To distinguish in India the currents of different populations, Aryan and aboriginal, is to him an illusion, pure and simple. The flood of invasion has lost itself early in the mass; union was brought about very fast; the process was already accomplished more than a thousand years before the Christian era. The constitution of the caste alone could throw into it a solvent by means of professional specification.

The castes, moreover, have been developed—in his view—according to an absolute order; it is the order which follows the march of human progress, in life, in agriculture, in industries; the social rank assigned to each man was precisely that which the profession to which he gave himself, possessed in this series. Thus he discerns two great divisions between the trades-castes: the first corresponds to the trades which are anterior to metallurgy, it is the lowest; the second which is higher, represents the metallurgical industries, or is contemporaneous with their flourishing.

He has spent a singular ingenuity to establish on analogous grounds—with in the interior of the groups to which it belongs—the superiority of each caste, as fixed, according to him, by Hindu usage. The castes thus rise one above the other accordingly as they are chiefly connected with hunting, fishing, pastoral life, landed property, handicrafts, commerce, servile employments, priestly functions. To make use of his own words: "Each caste, or group of castes represents the one or the other of these progressive stages of culture, which have marked the industrial development of mankind, not only in India, but in all countries of the world. The rank which
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each caste occupies, high or low on the ladder, depends on the industry which each one represents, according as it belongs to a period of advanced, or primitive culture. In this way, the natural history of human industries supplies the key for the hierarchy as well as for the formation of Hindu castes.  

Proceeding from there, Mr. Nesfield shows to us the different professions issuing from the tribe, in order to constitute themselves into partial unities, and these unities rising on the social ladder in conformity to the trades on which they live. Sprung from the tribe the fragments of which it re-constructs according to a new principle, the caste has preserved persistent recollections of its origins. It has borrowed from the ancient type of the tribe the narrow rules of marriage and the severe prohibition of every contact with similar groups.

The caste, therefore, would be the outcome of the regular evolution of the social life taken at its lowest level and followed in its slow progress. I do not pretend to clear up how he can reconcile this thesis with the relatively late date to which, by the way, he refers the constitution of castes. What probability is there that, one thousand years before our era, the Hindus were still barbarians, destitute of the most humble elements of civilization?

Still less can I understand how Mr. Nesfield manages, from this point of view, to reserve to the Brahmans so decisive a part in this genesis. In fact, he asserts that "the Brahmans was the first caste in the order of time; all the others were formed after this model, gradually extending from the king or warrior to the tribes given to hunting and fishing, the condition of which is scarcely above that of savages." The exclusiveness of all the castes takes its inspiration from the Brahmans, by the contagion of example, by the necessity of self-defence. The Brahmans is the founder of the system. The Brahmans has invented, to his own profit, the rules which alone perfectly constitute the castes, the rules which prohibit to marry a woman of another caste. This is a singular contradiction to what he says later, when he derives the marriage regulation from the traditional usages of the tribe.

He is, however, no dupe of the dogmatism of Brahminic books. In his eyes, "the four castes have never had in India another existence than to-day; as a tradition that makes authority." Borrowed from the Indo-Iranian past, it has scarcely any other merit but that of connecting the variety of castes with the differences of occupation. The Vaishyas and the Sudras in particular, have never been anything more than some sort of rubric destined to include a mass of heterogeneous elements. But evidently, and although not being able to resist the seduction which the positivist constructions exercised upon his mind, Mr. Nesfield has really felt that his theory—for want of a corrective—proved too much and would have to be applied to all countries. There is also no doubt that, notwithstanding his natural indepedence, he was influenced by the prestige of tradition. At any rate, the concession which he makes to it, far from being inherent in his system, disturbs its whole arrangement. The originality of his thesis lies elsewhere. If others had before him assigned one part of action, in the genesis of the castes, to professional specialisation, nobody had so deliberately reduced it to the whole evolution. He has, likewise, more than anybody else, connected its characteristic details with the reminiscences of the tribe. In taking his stand on the new ground of ethnography, he has enlarged the perspectives and prepared a wider foundation for interpretation.

Several of the views, which he has sown incidentally, could disappear without leaving a perceptible gap. The fusion of the different elements of population was, according to him, accomplished at a very early age, the perfect unity of the whole was assured from an ancient period.
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His conviction, on this point, however ardent it be, might of course give rise to many objections and restrictions, but it is not at all connected indissolubly with his opinion on the professional origin of the caste. The same may be said of the etymological deductions of the legendary facts in which he pretends to lay hold on the history of many of the castes, from its very beginning, in the exact moment in which they separate in successive swarms from the original tribes. The information is here more varied, and the combination more brilliant, than the method rigorous.

Perhaps Mr. Nesfield has too much studied the caste from its outward and actual aspect. He has commenced with daily experience; this is an advantage, it is also a danger. His theory has so much taken possession of his mind that he has been naturally carried away to present it to us in a deductive explanation, rather than to follow the demonstration, step by step. Will he convert many inquirers to a thesis which derives so peculiar a historical phenomenon from such general speculative constructions?

In giving the first place, on one hand, to the profession, on the other, to the organization of the tribe, he has at least faithfully summed up an impression which manifests itself in most observers of contemporary life. All are struck by that entanglement of more or less extended ethnical groups, of which I have sought to give some idea, and of which it is important that neither the complication, nor the mobility, should be lost out of sight. They see them how they in number less gradations, approach more or less the type of the caste, how they approach it the nearer the more completely the community of profession has been substituted for the bond of origin; and, naturally, this double observation reflects upon their theoretical conclusions.

Less decisive, less minutely worked out than that of Mr. Nesfield, the thesis of Mr. D. Ibbetson is based upon the same data. Being of less systematic turn of mind and more impressed by shades variable enough to discourage general theories, he wraps himself up with reservations.

Still he sums up his views, and stages which he discerns in the history of the caste are as follows:—(1) the organization of the tribe, which is common to all primitive societies; (2) the guilds founded on the heredity of occupation; (3) the exaltation peculiar to India of sacerdotal ministry; (4) the exaltation of the lexic blood by the importance attached to heredity; (5) the strengthening of the principle by the elaboration of a series of entirely artificial laws, drawn from Hindu beliefs, which regulate marriage and fix the limits in which it can be contracted, declare certain professions and certain foods impure and determines the conditions and the degrees of contacts allowed between the castes.

We see which place is also here taken by the profession and the constitution of the tribe. Only, this time, the part of the Brahmins has been inverted. Anxious to consolidate a power which, at first was founded on their knowledge of religion, but for which this foundation was becoming too weak, they found, according to Ibbetson, a valuable hint in the division of the people into tribes, in the theory of heredity of occupations which had sprung from it; they made their profit by it. From it they drew this network of restrictions and of incapacities which entangle a high-caste Hindu from his birth. Thus the Brahmins are represented as dependent upon the spontaneous organization of the country.

This system may appear more logical than that of Nesfield; more still, perhaps, it proceeds from a quite gratuitous conjecture which is not supported by any attempt of proof. And what shall we say of such a conception of the most essential and most characteristic rules of the caste? These rules which are so strict, which exercise so absolute a dominion on conscience, would be nothing but an artificial and late invention contrived with a party-spirit.
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The edifice is faulty in its very basis by the unmeasured importance which Mr. Ibbetson, on this point in accord with Mr. Nesfield, attributes to the professional community. If the castes had really in this its primitive bond, it would have shown less tendency to break up and to dislocate itself; the agent which would have unified it at the beginning, would have maintained its cohesion.

Experience, on the contrary, shows how the prejudices of caste kept at a distance people, whom, the same occupation carried on in the same places, should bring together. We have seen what a variety of professions may separate members of the same caste, and this not only in the lower, but even in the best qualified classes. The giving up of the prevailing professions is by itself in no way a sufficient cause of exclusion. The occupations are graduated upon a ladder of respectability, but their degrees are fixed by notions of religious purity. All professions which do not entail pollution, or at least an increase of impurity, are open to every caste. Mr. Nesfield states himself that one can meet Brahmans who practise all professions, "except those which imply a ceremonial defilement, and, consequently, loss of caste." If the most despised castes split themselves into new sections which disdain the primitive stock, the reason is not, because these sections adopt a different occupation, but it is simply, because they renounce such detail of their hereditary occupations, as, according to the prejudices in vogue, bring on defilement. Such is the case for certain groups of sweers.

It is true that many castes pay some kind of worship to the instruments appertaining to their profession. The fisherman sacrifices a goat to his new boat; the shepherd besmears the tails and horns of his animals with ochre; the labourer spreads an oblation, mixed with sugar, ghṛ and rice upon his plough at the spot where it turns the first clod; the artisan consecrates his tools; the warrior pays homage to his weapons; the writer to his pen and to his inkstand. Curious as they may be, what do such usages prove? Given to various occupations, people of the same caste may render this sort of respect to the most diverse symbols.

Many castes borrow their name from their principal occupation; but it is nothing more than a general denomination; its extension does not at all necessarily answer that of the caste. Bania merchant is, like Brahmin, or Kshatriya, a term in which one may only very improperly see a caste-name. In the same province it will comprise many different sections, which, having the right neither of intermarrying, nor of eating together, form the real castes. The cultivating castes count by tens in the same district, and the Kṣatriyas, or writers of Bengal, in spite of a common professional name, are in reality divided into as many castes, distinguished by geographical, or patronymic names, as there exist among them groups bound to particular usages and a special jurisdiction. It is the same everywhere.

It may be that, in certain cases, a professional local title embraces a group altogether united into one single caste. This will be the exception. The bond of profession is frail in the extreme; unity is dislocated by the action of the smallest trifles. The pivot of the caste is not there.

Sprung from the speciality of occupations, it would not be more than a guild, as the guilds of the middle age, or those of the Roman world. Who could mix up these two institutions? The one, being limited to artisans alone, enclosed in a regular system, confined in its action to the economical functions, the necessities, or interests of which have created it; the other, penetrating the whole social condition, regulating the duties of all, intruding itself and acting everywhere and at all levels, governing private life even in its innermost machinery? That castes and ancient guilds have certain points in common, nothing could be more plain, both are corporations. Nobody denies that community of profession has contributed to unite or limit certain castes of labourers or artisans. One may certainly see sometimes individuals drawn within the orbit of a new
caste, and new small divisions evolved under the influence of profession. But how many other factors have, in a similar way, exercised like action?

There exist in certain Slavonic countries, in Russia and elsewhere, or at least, there were existing still at a recent date—village-communities exclusively given to a single profession—villages of shoemakers and villages of blacksmiths, or leather-dressers, communities of joiners and potters, even of bird-catchers and beggars. Now, these villages are not assemblages of artisans who have melted into a community, but communities that exercise the same industry. It is not the profession which ends in a grouping, but the grouping which ends in the community of profession that has suggested it. Why should it not be the same in India?

To assign to community of profession its place among the factors that have acted on the destiny of the caste, and to make of it the unique and sufficient source of the regime, are two things. As much as the first proposition is at first probable, the second is inadmissible.

A Hindu, a judge who has the living sense and familiar practice of the situation, Guru Prashad Sen, in trying to sum up the permanent features of the caste, has been able completely to neglect profession. Where shall we look for the essence of caste, unless in the rules, the absolute maintenance of which secures its perpetuity, the infringement of which, even if it be light, entails loss of caste for the individual and dissolution for the group? These rules have no connection with the profession, or only an indirect one through the medium of scruples of purity. The soul of the caste is elsewhere.

III.—Race as the Foundation of Caste.

This soul of caste, Mr. Risley is seeking in the race, in the oppositions that arise from racial diversity; he is thus in direct contradiction with Mr. Nesfield. To believe him, the actual hierarchy would be the social consecration of the ethnographical scale, from the Aryans that remained pure in their highest castes down to the humblest aborigines that are penned up in the low castes. This time race is substituted for profession as the generative principle. “The nasal index” is the formula for the proportions of the nose; this, it appears, is the most certain criterion of the race. Mr. Risley ends with this affirmation which looks strange, apparently, at least: “It is scarcely an exaggeration to set down as a law of the organization of the castes in the East-Indies that the social rank of a man varies, in the inverse ratio of the size of his nose.”

Who would not remain a little sceptical?

I do not pride myself to discuss the measurements and classifications of Mr. Risley. At least it must be confessed that up to the present the theories which have pretended to outline the ethnographical situation in India, have sunk into the quicksands of inextricable contradictions and difficulties. This is quite enough to set the ignorant at defiance. So perfect a harmony, there being given the deep and very accidental mixtures of so many elements, and Mr. Risley himself would really be marvellous. Mr. Nesfield is no less decisive on the rigorous concordance which he discovers between the social rank and the supposed series of industrial evolution. By what miracle would the two principles, sprung from absolutely different sources, fit together so perfectly? I let them grapple with each other. I can do so the better, since neither the one nor the other, in the theory of their able advocates, really bears upon the fundamental question; they touch less the origin of the castes than the rule of their hierarchy.

Alleging as an authority the ancient use of the word varna and the signification which is usually assigned to it in the more modern classical language, Mr. Risley sees in the inborn opposition between the conquering and the conquered—the white and the black—race—-the germ of a distinction
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of castes. The endogamous laws are the foundation of the regime. In the presence of a despised population the Aryans would have erected this rampart, in order to protect the purity of a blood of which they were proud. The caste is for Mr. Nesfield an affair of profession, for Mr. Risley an affair of marriage. Analogy, imitation of this primitive grouping, spreading from place to place with the authority lent to it by the sanction of the leading classes, would have multiplied to no end the ramifications, derived alternately and in accord with the cases, from diverse causes, or occasions: as community of language, neighbourhood, identity of profession, beliefs or social relations.

If by a round-about way, he finally falls back pretty closely to the orthodox system of the Brahmins, the predominance step by step acquired by the priesthood would be the principal source of the whole evolution. Although vitiated by simplification carried to the extreme, the theory of the mixed castes remains for him a precious testimony of that incessant crossing of populations, the mixing of which in varying degrees is the capital cause which to his mind has multiplied the splitting into minor sections.

If strictly speaking, the endogamous rule of the caste belongs properly to India, the exogamous rules, the parallel action of which we have stated, are much more general. In unequal degrees and under varying forms, exogamy is an universal law. Under shifting names the exogamous groups appear on the summit and at the basis of Hindu society; eponymic gotras with the Brahmins, class united by the totem with the aboriginal populations, meet, take strength from, and sometimes melt into each other; the inferior classes are ever eager of assimilating their old organization to the Brahminical legislation, the adoption of which becomes for them a title of nobility.

At this point we find with Mr. Risley, as with Mr. Nesfield, a very keen sense of the action which the traditions and customs of autochthonous tribes have exercised on the final condition of the castes. But if they agree in deriving numbers of castes from the successive dismemberment of autochthonous tribes, the part which each of them assigns to the institutions of the tribe, or more exactly, of the aboriginal tribe, is singularly unequal; Mr. Nesfield draws from them the original source of several of the laws which regulate the caste, the rule of endogamy for instance; Mr. Risley seeks in them almost only curious analogies with the customs which the Aryan element on its side has brought with it, such as the exogamous restrictions; but facts so universal fail to mean or prove anything.

Too timid theories which do not dare to emancipate themselves from Hindu tradition, remain powerless. We must be no less on our guard against theories which are too vague, too comprehensive. If community of occupation were sufficient to found the regime of caste, it ought to be in force in many other countries besides India. The objection is obvious. It condemns no less the system which is satisfied, without historical concatenation, in a general way to characterize the laws of caste as a survival of the ancient organization of tribe or clan.

Shall we appeal to the common features of an organization which is so natural to the archaic periods of human sociability that is found with the most different races? We remain in the vague—we prove nothing. If we think exclusively, or even principally of the organization of the aboriginal tribes of India, if we admit that it has reacted with so decisive a force upon the general condition of the Hindu world, that an ambitious class of priests would have seized upon it and made of it a weapon for fight, we upset the probable course of history and ascribe to factors which are too minute, a power out of proportion. Everything indicates that the determining action in the march of Indian civilization belongs to the Aryan elements; the aboriginal elements have only exercised a modifying, partial and subordinate action.

Does that mean that this connecting of caste with tribe is sterile? I see in it, on the contrary, a new, a capital, idea provided that the facts are grappled with somewhat closely, and that the dazzling effect of commodious generalities does not make us lose sight of the necessary concatenation of historical realities. So I feel dispensation from entering into the detail of speculations which recent researches on the primitive legal organization have incidentally devoted to caste. Even those which have wisely confined themselves to the Aryan domain,²⁴ being too summary, have scarcely entered into the quicksand of evolution. We shall make use of them occasionally. But we wanted before all to point out the danger of too abstract statements.

Caste exists only in India. Therefore we have to look for its key in the situation which is special to India. Without closing our eyes to other information we must seek light from the facts themselves, from the analysis of the characteristic elements of the régime, such as observation exhibits them in the present and helps to reconstitute in the past.

IV.—Caste and the Aryan Constitution of the Family.

Caste is the frame of the whole Brahminical organization. It is in order to come within the pale of Brahminism that the aboriginal populations constitute themselves in caste and accept the strict regulations of caste, and the phenomenon goes back high into the past. Now, Brahminism may have taken up foreign elements, it may in the course of history have had to undergo exterior influences. It remains on the whole the representative in India of Aryan tradition. Without excluding in any way the eventuality of subsidiary actions, we are justified first to look out for Aryan sources of an institution which appears to us so closely blended with Brahminical doctrine and life.

The history of the old Aryan societies rests on the evolution, varying according to the places, of the ancient family constitution, such as its physiognomy may be guessed from the comparison of features scattered in the different branches of the race.

By the notion of kinship which penetrates it, by the jurisdiction which regulates rather tyrannically private life, marriage, food, ceremonial usages, by the customary practice of certain particular worships, by its corporative organization, caste, in fact, recalls to our mind the family group, such as may be dimly discerned in its various degrees in the family,—the gens and the tribe. Its original features are no less pronounced. There are, however, on closer inspection, hardly any of them of which we do not perceive the germ in the past, even if the common elements have not developed elsewhere in the same line, or spread equally far. At bottom this is the same phenomenon of which India gives us many other examples. In almost all the matters which call forth comparison with the kin branches of the Aryan stock we strike, at the same time, against minute coincidences and deep divergencies. Kinship is seen even in elements which, evidently have been cast here in a new mould.

Of the rules which control marriage in caste, the exogamic laws which exclude every union between people belonging to the same section, gotras or clans of different sors are marked by their rigour. These rules have exercised a wide influence in all primitive societies. It quickly dwindled down in those surroundings where a more advanced political constitution was flourishing. The principle was certainly familiar to the Aryan race as to others. According to the testimony of Plutarch,²⁵ the Romans in the ancient period never married women of their blood. Amongst the matrons who are known to us, it has been remarked that actually none bears the same gentile name as her husband. Gotra is properly Brahminical; the part which it plays, is certainly ancient. The exogamic rule is rooted, one cannot doubt it, in the remotest past of the immigrants. It is
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so really primitive, under this form of gotra, that it is anterior to caste, it extends beyond the caste-frame, the same gotras go through a number of different castes. The regime of the caste, therefore, has been super-added to it. The two institutions have been melted together as well as possible; they in no way belong necessarily together. This is exactly what happened at Athens, when the establishment of 'demos' assigned to different districts families which belonged to one gens, to one single genos.

The endogamic law, however, strikes us most, the law which only authorizes a union between betrothed of the same caste. It is hardly less spread than the exogamic law in the primitive phases of human societies. It has left very apparent traces far beyond the range of Aryan peoples; it is linked with a whole array of facts and sentiments that reveal its origin.

At Athens at the time of Demosthenes, it was necessary, in order to belong to a phratry (phratria), to be born of a legitimate marriage in one of the families which made it up. In Greece, at Rome, in Germany, the laws, or the customs grant the sanction of the legal marriage only to a union contracted with a woman of equal rank, who is a free citizen.26

Everybody has present in his mind the struggle which for centuries the plebeians had to maintain at Rome in order to conquer the jus communis, the right of marrying women of patrician rank. It is currently taken for a political conflict between rival classes. It means quite another thing. It is not merely from pride of nobility, but in the name of a sacred right, that the patrician gentes, being of pure race and having remained faithful to the integrity of the ancient religion, rejected the alliance of impure plebeians who were of mixed origin and destitute of family rites. The patricians were guided by the same principle which, in a new frame, inspires to-day the endogamic law of caste. But in India, under the regime of caste, it is always aggravating itself and narrowing the avenues; the strife of classes at Rome, under a political regime, lowers the barriers; it soon widens the circle to the whole category of citizens without further distinction. At this point and even in so opposed conditions, analogy continues in curious prolongations. The communis goes beyond the city; it is granted successively to several friendly populations. Is this not, in the main, the exact counterpart of what happens in India, when sections of caste accept or refuse marriage with other sections? When this circle varies, according to localities and circumstances, with a facility which seems to ruin the rigour of the general precept? A late parallelism which, in two currents, else so divergent as the Hindu caste and the Roman city, seems to attest the kinship of the origins.

Even in theory, a man of higher caste may marry women even of the lowest caste. It was not otherwise at Rome, or at Athens. The duty of marrying a woman of equal rank, did not exclude their unions with women of an inferior stock, strangers, or freed women. Quite similar is in the Hindu family the case of a Sudra woman. Excluded by the theory, she is not excluded in the practice, but she cannot give birth to children that are the equals of their father. We know why. On both sides there is between husband and wife, an insuperable obstacle—the religious inequality.

According to Manu 27 the gods do not eat the offering prepared by a Sudra. In Rome the presence of a stranger at a sacrifice of the gens was sufficient to give offence to the gods.28 The Sudra woman is a stranger; she does not belong to the race, which, by the investiture with the sacred thread, is born to the fulness of religious life. And if it is permitted to higher castes to marry a Sudra woman at the side of the legitimate wife who possesses the full right, the union must be celebrated without the hallowed prayers.29 In the Aryan conception of marriage, husband and wife form the sacrificing couple attached to the family altar of the hearth. Upon this common conception the endogamy of the Hindu castes rests ultimately just as the limitations imposed on the classical family.
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It is prohibited to eat with people of another caste, to use dishes prepared by people of a lower caste. This is one of the oddities which are surprising to us. Its secret is not impenetrable. We have to think of the religious function, which, at all times, was assigned to the repast by the Aryans.  

As a produce of the sacred hearth, it is the exterior sign of the family community, of its continuity in the past and in the present; from this come the libations, and in India, the daily oblations to the ancestors. Even there where, by the inevitable wear and tear of the institutions, the primitive meaning could be weakened; this significance remains clearly alive in the funeral repast, the *perideignion* of the Greeks, the *silicernium* of the Romans, which, on the occasion of the death of relatives manifests the indissoluble unity of the lineage.  

Proofs are abounding that the repast has preserved with the Hindus a religious significance. The Brahmin neither eats at the same table, nor from the same vessel, not only with a stranger or an inferior, but not even with his proper wife, nor with his own sons that are not yet initiated. These scruples are so really of a religious nature that it is prohibited to share the food even of a Brahmin, if for any reason, even an accidental one that is independent of his will, he is under the ban of some defilement. Even a Sūdra cannot, without contamination, eat the food of a defiled twice-born.  

Impurity communicates itself; it, therefore, excludes from the religious function of the repast. And this is the reason why, by sitting down at a common banquet with his caste-fellows, the sinner who has been excluded temporarily, consecrates his rehabilitation. It is owing to the same principle that, on the solemn marriage of the Romans, bridegroom and bride divide a cake in presence of the sacred fire; the ceremony is essential; it establishes the adoption of the woman into the family religion of the husband. Let us not see in this an isolated whimsical custom; it could be rightly said that the repast made in common was the characteristic act of religion in the worship, which united the *curia* or the *phratria*.  

The Roman repasts of the *Caristia*, which united all the kindred excluded not only every stranger, but every relative whose conduct appeared to make him unworthy. The Persians had preserved similar usages. The daily repasts of the *Prytanies* had remained with the Greeks one of the official religious rites of the city. But its menu was not indifferent. The nature of the viands and the kind of wine which had to be served in them were defined by rules which could depend on various causes which it is not the place here to investigate. In excluding such or such articles of food, India did nothing but generalize the application of the principle; it did not invent it altogether. This principle, too, has its analogies and its germs in the common past.  

A strange thing! The Hindus, who, under other aspects, have preserved more faithfully than anybody else, the signification of the common repast, and who, it seems, have extended it, have receded, more than others, from the primitive type in the liturgical form of the funeral banquet, the *Sāddha*. According to the theory, instead of assembling the relatives, it is offered to Brahmins. But they are put forth as representing the ancestors, and receive the food in their name. Even so, he who offers the sacrifice, must, symbolically at least, associate with them after the manner of the ancestors themselves. This is indeed, in spite of the new ideas which the developed ritual has been able to introduce, the ideal-prolongation of the family repast.

---

24 Hearne, p. 82; *Pastel de Coulanges*, p. 182.
25 *Mansi*, *Dh.* IV, 45, Apoc.* Dh.* II, 4, 9, 7 and the note of Böhler.
26 *Fischera Sarithi*, xxii, 9-10.
The Brahmins that are invited, must be selected with care which reminds us of the law of purity imposed on the primitive guests. If Brahmins are substituted for relations, the novelty is sufficiently explained by the encroachment of sacerdotal power. Do not the commentators prescribe in the same way that the fine for a murder must be paid to the Brahmins? Yet if it had been paid, in the Aryan past, most certainly to the family of the murdered person. The way in which the law-books insist upon reserving the Svādhas to the Brahmins betrays the tendency which they obey. One place always remains eventually reserved to relations. It is visible, it springs from the very restrictions that in the current practice, the Svāddhas were the occasion of true common repasts. The Hindus distinguish various kinds, which are in no way connected with funerals. Such a 'purificatory Svādha' (goshthi Svādha) really appears to be the ritualistic reflection of that caste repast which celebrates the rehabilitation of a culpable member. In incorporating it in the series, they remembered that a close relationship connected its meaning with the ancient family repast.

It derives its sacredness from the sanctity of the domestic fire. In Roman antiquity the exclusion from the religious and civil community is expressed by 'the interdict of fire,' but also and at the same time by 'the interdict of water.' It seems, likewise, that in India, the association of an extraneous fire and of polluted water renders the food, offered, or prepared by an unworthy hand, particularly impure. I have related that higher castes accept grain roasted by certain lower castes, but on condition that it contains no admixture of water; that the Hindus who accepted pure milk from certain Mussulmans, would reject it with indignation, if they thought that water was added to it. In the rites which accompany the exclusion from caste they fill the vessel of the culprit with water, and a slave upsets it, with the formula: 'I deprive such a one of water.' We see that these notions have, in Aryan life, distant connections and curious analogies. They explain, moreover, how certain texts which belong to the ancient period of sacerdotal literature, place in the same rank the admission to the communion of water and to marriage.

The sense of the common repast and of the correlative prohibitions is so forcibly marked in the manners, that it is surprising to the contemporaneous observer who is free of every archaeological bias. "The communion of food," says Mr. Ib lettuce, "is used as the exterior sign, the solemn manifestation of the communion of blood." The relations assemble round the same table.

The same principle, applied inversely, prohibits sharing of the same repast; and, more generally, every contact with people who have no share in the same family rites. This tradition has left traces not only in India, but also elsewhere. The jus osculi, the contact by embrace, proves kinship. The germ, therefore, is ancient also in this point. The impurity even of the corpse, is, no doubt, explained in part by this consideration that death forcibly excludes the departed from the rites. It therefore places him outside the family; his contact, his presence defiles the relations in the manner of an outcaste. Let us remember that exclusion from caste is, by the ceremonial itself, likened unto death; for both the cases funerals are celebrated. The impurity which stains relatives on the days of mourning is a conception common to the whole Aryan antiquity. Impurity is transmitted by contact. From the man it spreads to the woman and to the servant. It is therefore necessary to avoid carefully every staining touch, every contact with people, who, if they do not fall under the influence of an accidental defilement, are impure by the fact, that they do not belong to the communion of the same fire and the same water. The development of this law in the caste is perfectly logical.

---

38 Mānava Dh. S. iii. 132 ss.
39 Mānava Dh. S. op. cit., loc. cit. iii., 254.
40 Neufeld, s. 93.
41 Indische Stud. vii. pp. 77, 78.
44 Mānava Dh. S. op. cit., loc. cit. iii., 148.
45 Neufeld, s. 109, 110.
46 Gautama Dh. S. xx. 2 ss.
47 Ib. p. 135.
48 Leist, Graeco-Roman. Rechtgesch. p. 34 ss.
Even the tribunal of the caste, with its limited jurisdiction, is not without antecedents. The ancient family has a council which in Rome, Greece or Germany, surrounds and assists the father on important occasions, notably when it is the question of judging a culpable son.\textsuperscript{42} The exclusion from the family is a parallel to the exclusion from the caste. On both sides it is equivalent to an excommunication which, under its most dreaded form, is expressed in Latin with the qualification of saecer.\textsuperscript{50} It produces, with the Romans, a religious and civil situation very analogous to that of the outcaste, of the patita Hindu. The Latin gens acknowledges a chief who judges the quarrels between its members. Similarly to the caste, the gentes take decisions which are respected by the city;\textsuperscript{51} just like the castes, they follow particular customs which are binding upon their members.\textsuperscript{52}

On their part, some Vedic families are distinguished by certain ceremonies, by a predilection for certain divinities,\textsuperscript{53} in which there seems to be a survival of that religious particularism which reserved for the classical family, for the gens, special worship and exclusive rites.

Though in several cases the veneration of a common ancestor or of an official patron suggests in India the Graeco-Roman worship of the eponymous heroes, it cannot be said that this is a salient trait in the caste. Owing to the more free course of speculation, religious individualism has made advances in India which elsewhere have been checked by the coming into power of a political constitution, decidedly opposed to every innovation of the cult. In India, religion could become localized, split into endless divisions, and, on occasion, mobilized with a liberty unknown on classical ground. It is mostly through its practice, through its customs and their direct kinship with most antique conceptions that the continuity of tradition is evidenced in the caste.

(To be continued.)

MORE ABOUT GABRIEL BOUGHTON.

BY WILLIAM FOSTER.

Since writing, in the number for September last (Vol. XI, p. 247 f.), an account of Gabriel Boughton, the doctor whose name is associated with the opening-up of English commerce in Bengal, I have unexpectedly come across a hitherto unnoticed letter from him, which adds a new and interesting fact to the little that is known of his career.

This document exists only in the form of a transcript, entered in the Surat Factory Inward Letter Book, Volume I (1646-47). The volume forms part of the Bombay records, but, owing to its having been sent home temporarily for calendaring purposes, I have had the opportunity of examining it fully. It has suffered much from damp and decay, and, although it has been skillfully repaired, many of the letters are wholly or in part illegible. This applies especially to the copy of Boughton's letter, which comes first in the volume; at least half of it has perished, including the greater part of the signature. There can, however, be no doubt as to the latter; the GH and the final N are plainly visible, as well as the top of the B, while there is a postscript with two initials, the first of which is clearly G, while the second looks like B. Further, in the same volume is a copy of a letter of November 28, 1646, from Bbânâ (near Agra), likewise received at Surat on the 22nd of the following month, which refers to (and apparently encloses) one from 'Mr Boughton.' Evidently the two writers travelled down together from Agra.

The date of the letter is the next point to be considered. The transcriber has unfortunately omitted the month; and all that we have to go upon is that it was written upon the 4th—


\textsuperscript{50} Lact. Graeco-vol B. p. 319.

\textsuperscript{51} Max Muller, cited by Hearn, p. 181; Ind. Stud. X., p. 88 sqq.

\textsuperscript{52} Becker-Marquards. Rom. Alterth., ii., p. 49.
and received at Surat on December 22nd, 1646. It commences, however, with a reference to a previous letter of August 9th, and, allowing for the time taken in transit (via Agra), I conclude that October 4th is its probable date. Had it been written on September 4th, Boughton would most likely have said 'ultimo' instead of 'August' in mentioning his previous communication.

The letter is dated from 'Baluch', and the contents make it clear that this is Balkh, in Afghan Turkistan. It may seem somewhat surprising to find two Englishmen (Boughton and the companion he mentions) in such an out of the way place as Balkh, which had surely never before been visited by any of their fellow countrymen; but there is really no mystery about it. The reader will remember that Boughton had been sent up from Surat to the Court of the Mogul Emperor for the purpose of acting as physician to Asālat Khán, who was the Mir Bakhsi and an especial favourite of Shâh Jahân. Now, at this very time the imperial forces had conquered Balkh and were endeavouring to make themselves masters of Badakhshân, though they were being strongly opposed by Abdül-Aziz, the son of the fugitive ruler of that country. Asālat Khán had evidently been sent to take part in the operations, and Boughton, as his body physician, would naturally go with him. It is less clear what Barnes, the other Englishman, was doing in those parts. There is no one of that name in the contemporary lists of the East India Company's servants, and indeed the fact that Boughton mentions Barnes's desire to be granted a salary shows that he was not a recognized member of the service. Possibly, he may have been the (unnamed) trumpeter who, as reported in an Agra letter of November 12th, 1645 (O.C. 1661), had been sent up from that place to the court at Lahore on the 29th of the preceding month.

After this preface we may proceed to examine the letter itself, premising that the words between square brackets are conjectural insertions to carry on the sense where gaps occur in the original. It begins as follows:

"Worpl. etc.,

Since my [last unto ] you, dated August the 9th, by a Dutch [man] whom Asâla[t] Kounèe licensed to dep[art for] his count[ry], hath not hap[p]ened any[thing] worthy [your Worps. persons]; only th[inkle]t requisite [to] acquaint you how that in [my for]mer unto you I did write that Assala[t] Kounèe had granted mee leave for four or fie[m]onths with his brother, Keyling Oka[w]ne, to goe to the Kinge and make an end of [the trouble]some businesse formerly by your W[ords] as in letter specified; since which hee ha[th] changed his mind and will not permitt my self [departing], leastwithstanding my earnest intreaty; yet promises me[sans] how it shall be don[e] [if theire p[ ]sent."

The rest of the page is practically illegible. In many cases the beginning and end of the line can be read, but the loss of the central portion renders it impossible to make out the sense. We gather that Sadullah Khán has departed for Kâbul, after writing to some official (apparently Mirzâ Amin, the Governor of Surat) to treat the English better; and that the Emperor has ordered Asâlat Khán to remain in Balkh as Governor during the winter, promising to recall him in the spring. The letter proceeds:

"This hee hopes (as doe wee); but [is] uncertaine, by [reason] of the Kings wavering mind, which, like a west[her] cocke, turns with the wind. But this I am certaine, [that] it is one of the unwholesomest countries that e[ver I] was in in my life, for never since my en[trance] into this citi can I bee in perfect health; [also]"
Mr. Barnes, who desires his service to be presented, with remembrance of some salary, what your Worp etc. shall think fitting; and by so doing you shall oblige him to pray for your Worp etc. professors. The King is now journeying towards Pissoure, where report says he stays this winter; after which he means to return again to Cabull, if not to Balluck; in which place he intends his residence until the taking of Bukkarrath, the which is 250 or 300 miles from this place."

Once again the letter grows unintelligible. Something is being said about the preparations for the Spring campaign, including the construction of a bridge of boats across the Oxus: mention is made of the rebel Prince (Abdu'-Aziz) being at Bokhara with a strong force; and there appears to be a reference to some drastic executions by which Asalat Khan maintained order in his district. Then the writer concludes with assurances of his willingness to comply with any wishes of the Honble. Company my masters. The postscript already mentioned is practically illegible.

It will be noticed that Boughton refers to some troublesome business which the President and Council at Surat had asked him to settle, and which was of sufficient importance to warrant his making a special journey to court, if he could get leave from Asalat Khan to do so. Its nature we can only conjecture; but my own guess would be that it related to the recovery of the cost of some tapestry, belonging to Sir Francis Crane, which had been sold in 1630 to Rao Ratan Singh Harâ, Râja of Bûndi. This debt was still outstanding, as the Râja's grandson and successor, Chhatarsâl, professed his inability to discharge it. The Surat factors were continually being pressed by the Company to realise the money; and in a letter dated January 25th, 1647 (O. C. 2023) they replied:

"We cannot yet recover any part of it, by reason of the King's remote distance, who hath many months spent his time in the conquest of the kingdom of Bullock [Balkh], a part of Tartaria, and is at present very intent thereon; so that nothing can be done in the business until his return, Raja Chuttersall being empioled in that service. But from him we must never expect payment nor ought but delays and delusions; as we have sufficiently experimented by the last express order (suddenly after we had presented the King) given him to satisfy the debt; which he then fairly promised should be done at his return into his country; whither he went not long after, accompanied by two of our house servants, unto whom he promised payment of the money; who continued with him many daies, entertained with fair hopes of satisfaction, but urging him more importunately to discharge his engagements, he positively affirmed that he had nothing remaining but his sword and his horse, and that what before he pretended was only to please the King and content us for that time; wherupon, all other means having failed, we resolved to sell his debt to the King, who only can discomfit it out of his service; wherein we moved Assalatt Ckaun, who promised us his assistance therin, but (as said) the Kings absence hindreth our further progress in the business."

There is no mention here of Boughton's help having been sought; but it is quite probable that he was asked to assist, especially as his patron, Asalat Khan, was to be the intermediary in the matter.

---

1 Peshawar.
2 Bokhara.
THE VEDIC CALENDAR.

BY R. SHAMASASTRY, E.A., M.E.A.S., M.R.S.A., MYSORE.

(Continued from p. 34.)

"Or else the minor session of a year of the Tapaśchis'ts may be repeated four times, so that with three such sessions the major session of twelve years is completed or else they may observe the session in the Jyotishtoma way (i.e., the Gavām-Ayana); or else they may hold their session in each year saradātim (gavāmsaradātim kaḷpa)."

"Then the sacrificial session of thirty-six years of the Sāktyas. The foodstuff used in this sacrifice is flesh instead of cooked rice; for the Inner Man is the food-giving deity of this sacrifice. Usually these two foodstuffs, flesh and rice, are the sacrificial offerings.

"These long sessions are meant only for gods, for the gods (alone) are long-lived. Others think that they are possible also for men; according to them, many persons, such as sons, grandsons, and sons of grandsons undergo initiation successively and press the Sūma-plant. These Atirātra days are not accompanied by the central day of the year and constitute what is called Utarkštra or lengthened year.' If the Atirātra day or the central day is celebrated (one after another), then the desired ascending order (in the era or years) is secured. No rule about these sessions is laid down in the Kaṇapas or in the Brāhmaṇas. Still they teach us this ancient doctrine (namely the Gavām-Ayana and other varieties). Of all the unite of intercalary days celebrated by chanting as many Sūma-verses as the number of days in each unit, the unit of twenty-one intercalary days is the last."

The most important points that are to be particularly noticed in the above passage are: (1) the duration of the session of the Tapaśchis'ts as compared with that of the Gavām-Ayana; (2) the spreading out of the session; (3) the question raised by the author of the Nidāna-Sūtra as to the possibility or impossibility of all the sessional sacrifices being observed by a single man, however long-lived he might be; and (4) the absence of the central day of the year in these sessions. We shall presently see how in the place of twelve days celebrated by others, probably at the close of every fourth year, some celebrated only a single day. It follows, therefore, that if the latter counted 360 such single days, the former would count twelve times as many days. This is what appears to have been meant by the statement that the twelve-years' session of the Tapaśchis'ts is equal to twelve times the duration of the Gavām-Ayana. In his commentary on the Śravasti-Sūtra of Āśvalāyana, Gṛgyna-nārāyaṇa has clearly stated that the twelve-years' session of the Tapaśchis'ts may be so spread out that seventy-two months shall fall in the first half of the session and the same number of months in the second half. Likewise, the session of thirty-six years of the Tapaśchis'ts or of the Sāktyas. This amounts to saying that, just as twelve or twenty-one days are inserted in the middle of an ordinary year, these sessions of four, twelve, or thirty-six years are also inserted in the middle of an ordinary year. It is clear, therefore, that all these sessions are intercalary periods, not ordinary years. Had these and other sessions been ordinary years, the question raised by the author of the Nidāna-Sūtra about the possibility of all the sessional sacrifices being performed by a single man would not have cropped up at all; for it is quite possible for a man to live for 56 or 60 years, so that he may commence a sacrifice in his 20th or 24th year and bring it to a close after 36 years. It follows, therefore, that these sessional days are not ordinary consecutive days, but periodical intercalary days. We shall see that the Vedic poets knew that the solar year differed from the synodic lunar year by 114 days.

48 This seems to refer to the intercalation of five days to each year: see Nidāna-Sūtra, x, 1. For other varieties of the session of the Tapaśchis'ts, see Gṛgyna-nārāyaṇa's Commentary on Āśvalāyana-Śravasti-Sūtra, xii, 5, 14.
49 Āśvalāyana, xii, 5, 14.
and that the Śāvāna year was less than the solar year by 5½ days. When these 11½ days made a twelfth day, as they would in every fourth year and when the 5½ days amounted to 21 days in the course of every four years, the Vedic poets performed their sessional sacrifice on the 12th or the 21st day and counted these days apart under the name of Gavām-Ayana. Accordingly a Gavām-Ayana of 360 days is equal to 360 × 4 = 1440 years. If, instead of counting the 12th day apart, all the 12 days were counted apart, as the Tapāśchts seem to have done, even then the session of 12 years would still be equal to 12 × 360 × 4 + 12 = 1440 years. It is clear that no man can possibly live for 1440 years and perform the sacrifice of so long a session. Similarly, for each day counted by the followers of the Gavām-Ayana, the Sāktyas seem to have counted 36 days in every cycle of four years, and to have thereby counted 36 years in the course of 1440 years. Clearly, then, the performance of all these sessional sacrifices and the counting of each great period of years, was the work, not of one man, but of generations consisting of sons, grandsons, and sons of grandsons and others, as stated by the author of the Nidāna-Sūtra. It follows, therefore, that Jaimini's interpretation of the 250 twenty-one days' session, or of the thousand years' session of the Viśvaśrīks, in the sense of a session of 1,000 days, in order to make the performance of all the sessional sacrifices possible for a single man, is entirely wrong, and quite against ancient tradition as set forth in the Nidāna-Sūtra. Scholars who have been entertaining doubts about the Vedic chronology should pay particular attention to the statement of the author of the Nidāna-Sūtra, that these sessional days are all Atirātra days with no central day, and that, if the Atirātra day or the central day is counted apart as is stated, the desired ascent (śvādāḥ bhāhā) in time is secured. This is clear proof that the Vedic poets kept an era of their own in terms of Atirātra days or of central days.

In explaining the above passage, I stated that, corresponding to the celebration of a single day by the followers of the Gavām-Ayana, others, like the Tapāśchts, celebrated twelve intercalary days at the close of every fourth year. This statement requires proof; and that proof is contained in the following passage of the Nidāna-Sūtra, IV, 12:

अथातां गणानवर्गः तदेक एकावथरास्तितिति व्याचित्रितेः. अथवेकं अतिराचन्तीसयर्षीला रात्रि कथा व्याचित्रितिनिमें संस्कृति. अथवेकं गोवान्वयी वर्षामाणिकस्तितेः. एते संस्कृतर्वयां इत्याचिति संस्कृतिः।

Then as regards the Gavām-Ayana:

Some celebrate it in one day in the Jyōtishtōma way; others spread it also in the Jyōtishtōma way over twelve days, of which the first day is an Atirātra day with the recitation of 24 verses, followed by nine days, the day of Mahā-Vrata, and a final Atirātra day; some others hold it for twelve days made up of a period of two days termed gō and gynus, and another period of ten days. This period of twelve days they call 'the growth of the year,' and celebrate it by blowing a conchshell.

From the Nidāna-Sūtra, X, 1, we have learnt that the periods of 12 and 21 days are two intercalary units. From the above passage we have learnt that the session of the Gavām-Ayana may be celebrated in one day, viz., the 12th day or the 21st day, or during all the twelve days. It appears that like the twenty-first day, which is, as we have already seen, the product of four quarter-days at the end of four solar years, the twelfth day is also the product of the same four quarter-days. That it is the product of four quarter-days, seems to be implied in the following passage of the Nidāna-Sūtra, IX, 6:

अथात् एकावथरास्ति एकावथरास्तिति अविश्वास्यमूलीनि सत्यानि. किन्नेकं श्यानवंतिरास्तिति वेदावाधृराच्छ तनसीति.
Then as regards the eleven nights:

The *Ahina* period does not extend beyond eleven nights. Sessional sacrifice is continued from the twelfth day and onwards. He observes the *Ahina* period only for eleven days, lest he might encroach upon one place (one day) more.

The above passage clearly shows that the difference of eleven full days between the lunar and the solar years constitutes the period of *Ahina* sacrifices, and that the twelfth day is an extra day, scrupulously excluded by the sacrificer from the *Ahina* period. By way of distinguishing between the two kinds of sacrifices, the *Ahina* sacrifices and the *Sattra* sacrifices, the author of the Nidāna-Sūtra says in IX., 9:

अयां द्राक्षास्त्रैः अन्तः बीतिः न सत्त्वितः।
अन्तः अतियस्थापः एकः दृष्टे लितः।
धारणेषुतितकालः हानितबालयः
सर्वः समाहितायतः।

चाहे अन्तः हि त्व भयं भयोः
युक्तां भयोः अभिनातीं।
अवः अवेत्वताः अविदायः
परं द्वितीयं नकारातीं।
अन्तः हि न किंचिन्तक्षे कर्म हीर्यत हि।
हुः हुः अन्तः हि न किंचिन्तक्षे कर्म हीर्यत हि।

Dhīrāśaṇḍikāya says that there are three forms of *Ahina* sacrifices: (1) an *Ahina* sacrifice of one day; (2) an *Ahina* sacrifice continued for several *Ahina* days; (3) *Ahina* sacrifices taking the form of sessional sacrifices. An *Atriṭa* sacrifice with the recitation of sixteen verses, performed in the Jyotishtomā way, is an *Ahina* sacrifice of one day; it is so called because none of the rites usually performed in a single day are neglected here. The twelve-days' sacrifice constitutes the *Ahina* sacrifice of several days; it is so called because none of the days constituting the *Ahina* period is here lost. Gavāṃ-Ayana forms the *Ahina* form of the sessional sacrifices; it is so called because none of the sessional days is here lost (*hina*).

This apparently meaningless discussion about the distinction between the *Ahina* and *Sattra* sacrifices ends in the same conclusion that the word *Ahina* means the absence of the loss of a day or part of a day, and that it is applicable to all kinds of sessional sacrifices in which neither a day nor part of a day is omitted. It seems probable that the eleven full days, which form the difference between the lunar and the solar years, were originally called *Ahinas* or 'not-incomplete' ones, for the reason that those eleven days are not as incomplete as the one-fourth part of a day at the end of every solar year. It is clear, therefore, that a series of the intercalary period of ten days, or a series of the twelfth *Atriṭa* days, is taken to constitute a *Sattra* called Gavāṃ-Ayana. Similarly, a series of the intercalary periods of twenty-one days, or a series of successive twenty-first days, is taken to constitute another form of the Gavāṃ-Ayana. As the 12th and 21st days are the product of the four quarter-days at the close of any four consecutive solar years, the interval between any two successive twelfth days or twenty-first days must necessarily be four solar years. That a sacrificial session is made up of a series of such 12th or 21st days, is clearly stated in the Nidāna-Sūtra, III., 7:

अयां द्राक्षास्त्रैः हृतः हतः भयं नति।

The assemblage of the single days closing the *Ahina* period constitutes sacrificial sessions.

That a series of successive twelfth days are termed *Atriṭas*, is implied in the following passage of the Nidāna-Sūtra, ix., 10:

अयां द्राक्षास्त्रैः निम्नः निम्नः तत्र सत्कितः।
अहि एव उपस्थते अतियस्थापः च द्वितीयं च।
बवेकेनद्यैव भवति अन्तः सर्वस्य वक्ष्यते।
भवेन गो अतुपितत्तमः।
"Then the Sástras:—Among them the period of 12 days is the first (unit of a session). In that period are observed all the functions of sessional sacrifices. There are two distinguishing features of it: between the two Ātirātra days, one at the commencement and the other at the close, comes the period of ten days. When the purpose of the sessional sacrifice is served only by a one day’s rite, the sacrificer should perform it in the form of the Mahādevata day, for it is seen to serve the purpose of a single day: that place which such a single day has in the body of the year is its true place. When he has to observe two days, he should celebrate such days as are known by the names gī and āyus; the very place which the two days have in the body of the year is their true place. When he has to observe three days, he should celebrate the three days known as Tribhūdrākas (I jyotis, 2 gī, 3 āyus). For four days, he has to observe four Mahādevata days. For five days, he should observe the first five days of the six Abhipitaka days. For six days, there come the six Abhipitaka days. In accordance with this principle, the period of sacrificial session progresses by the addition of single days up to forty nights. When the number of days is on the increase, the increased number of days is observed in the same ascending order. This they call the principle of sessional nights (ṛātri-sātra-nyāya).

It is highly necessary that we should take into full consideration all that has been stated in the above passage. We know that a sacrificer proceeding to perform a sessional sacrifice may hold it either for twelve days or on a single day. Now we are told that, when he wants to finish it in one day, he should treat the day as the Mahādevata day, which is the eleventh among the twelve days. By saying that the very place which it has in the body of the year is its true place, the author of the sūtra seems to imply that, when a single day is celebrated, it should be counted as the last but one day of the year. Since this day is also one of the days which constitute Rātrisātra or an Ātirātrasātra, ‘a session of excessive nights,’ it is also called Ātirātra like the twelfth day. For purposes of ritual convenience, the eleventh day seems to have been selected and termed the twelfth day. Next we are told of the ceremonial forms in which two days, three days, and so on, are to be celebrated. That these days, from two to forty and from forty and upwards, are not the days of the ordinary year, but are successive twelfth days treated as the eleventh or the last but one day of the cyclic year, is clear from the sessional name of Rātrisātra or Ātirātrasātra, ‘session of excessive nights,’ which those days go to form. Also from what the author of the Nidāna-Sūtra says in another place, we can clearly understand that the days constituting the Rātrisātra are not the consecutive days of an ordinary year, but are such eleventh or twelfth days of the cyclic year as were once identical with new or full-moon days. In discussing the various forms of sacrifices and recitations to be performed in the sacrificial session of 33 days, the author of the Nidāna-Sūtra distinctly says that the days constituting a sacrificial session represent several full or new-moons, and indicate the lapses of several years. In order to understand the meaning of the passage, it is necessary that we should know the different plans of arranging the 33 days with their technical names for sacrificial purposes. According to the Kṛishṇa-Yajurveda, the period of 33 days is split up into an Ātirātra day, followed by three groups of five days each and the central day followed by fifteen days. But the author of the Nidāna-Sūtra makes the Viśvājīta day or the central day to occupy the 26th place in the series as shown in the adjoining table. On this central day, the priests have to recite all the six prishtha-sūtras and
all the ten ṛūmas or collection of verses, such as nine verses, fifteen verses, seventeen verses, twenty-one verses, twenty-seven verses, thirty-three verses, twenty-four verses, thirty-six verses, forty-four verses, and forty-eight verses. We can now proceed to interpret the passage, which runs as follows:

According to the Krishna-Yajurvéda.

\[ J = jyāṣā ; G = gṛ ; A = dyus. \]

### 1, Atirātra day.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>J.</th>
<th>G.</th>
<th>A.</th>
<th>G.</th>
<th>A.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 17, Viśvajit day.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>J.</th>
<th>G.</th>
<th>A.</th>
<th>G.</th>
<th>A.</th>
<th>G.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 29-32, Chhandéma days.

### 33, Atirātra day.

According to the Nidāna-Sūtra.

### 1, Atirātra day.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>J.</th>
<th>G.</th>
<th>A.</th>
<th>G.</th>
<th>A.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 27, Viśvajit day.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>28</th>
<th>29</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>31</th>
<th>32</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 33, Atirātra day.
Then these rites of anointing the eyes and other members of the body are intended to secure Prajapati [Father Time]. On this day the priest recites all the Stobhas or systems of chants, for this day must not be wanting in its Stobhas, its basic forms of sacrifices, and its recitations called Prashthyas. This day occupies the 28th place [leaving the Atitara day out of count] in the session, and does not therefore fail to represent the day of full or new-moon (Parva). Are the last two of the three Abhiplava [of five days each in the first part of the session] repeated, in the second part ?, or are they not repeated ? Sauchiyavkshi says that they are not repeated, insomuch as their repetition is nowhere prescribed, and the central day, which with its recitations usually occupies the middle place (in sacrificial sessions), does not take this central place in this session. But Gautama says that they are repeated. On this day of the session which is intended to secure a firm footing for the sacrificer, the priest will be engaged in performing what has already been accomplished. As regards the statement that the repetition of the Abhiplava days is not prescribed, it is true that it is nowhere prescribed, because their repetition is merely a mental work. As to the celebration of the day in a place other than the central place in the session, it is merely to represent by it the Parca-day [i.e., the new or full-moon day with which it was once identical]. Also we have seen the celebration of the central day outside the central place, as for example in the session of thirteen days, 61 corresponding to a number of years. Prohibiting the recitation of twenty-five verses, he has enjoined the recitation of nine verses on the first day; for it is prescribed for a known day and the first day is a new initial day. Others say that the chant of twenty-four verses is merely a variety, and that it may be recited on the first day as usual. Accordingly the Brihmanaga says that these nights are intended to secure the year, and that these days of the session are exactly such as once constituted the year. Should he recite the Sama-verses known as Ishvaridhya and Samanta on the third Abhiplava days, or should he not? They say that he should not recite them, for they are recited at the junction of Abhiplava and Prashthya days (at the end of a month); and here in the session of thirty-three days, there are observed no Prashthya days. Others say that they are to be recited because they are intended to signify the continuous succession of various Parva-days, and because the succession of several (ahargana

\[\begin{array}{c|cccccccc}
\text{Atitara day} & \ldots & \ldots & \ldots & \ldots & \ldots & \ldots & \ldots & \ldots & 1 \\
\text{Six Prashthya days} & \ldots & \ldots & \ldots & \ldots & \ldots & \ldots & \ldots & \ldots & 6 \\
The central day with its recitations & \ldots & \ldots & \ldots & \ldots & \ldots & \ldots & \ldots & \ldots & 1 \\
\text{Four Chandöma days} & \ldots & \ldots & \ldots & \ldots & \ldots & \ldots & \ldots & \ldots & 4 \\
\text{A final Atitara day} & \ldots & \ldots & \ldots & \ldots & \ldots & \ldots & \ldots & \ldots & 1 \\
\end{array}\]

15 days

Krišna-Prajñadvipa, VII, 33.
means a total sum of days) or of a one single day and is intended to signify various Persa-days (that had already passed). Thus it is that the manifold functions of several years are inseparably brought into a connected whole."

Again, after discussing the necessity of reciting or not reciting the Sâma-Verses known as Yaśva, Apatya, and Śikṣavarnārtha, on the Abhislava days forming part of the session of thirty-three days; the author of the Nidāna-Sûtra says:

अयोध्य व शरणोऽभस्वलालीकृत्र इति मन्दुरुपयाति.

X, 3.

"Thus it (the year or era) is to be attained. The manifold functions of several years are thus brought into favorable consideration."

Again, in connection with the session of sixty-one days, the Nidāna-Sûtra says:

अनेकस्यहितावसं शरणलालिके:प्रविलध्वाचारयेऽभमानकरोति. पदेष्ये शरणलालिके:प्रविलध्वाचारयेऽभमानकरोति.

X, 4.

"Then the session of sixty-one nights symmetrically corresponds to or implies a series of years. In the arrangement of the days of this session, the period of nine days is followed and preceded by six Prāshṭhā days. Thus all the functions of the years (era) are brought into consideration."

From the statement that the 12 or 36 years of the Tapaśchita's cover so great a period of time that no man in his life-time can hold a sessional sacrifice during it, and from the statement that the sessional days represent various full or new-moon days and thereby imply a series of years, we can clearly understand that the Gavám-Ayana and other sacrificial sessions are all based upon different systems of intercalary days. We have already seen that the two important units of intercalary days are the periods of 11 days and of 21 days. Accordingly the Nidāna-Sûtra says that at the end of each year the sacrificer should celebrate eleven days, so that all the days of the year are thereby represented, and that this process should be repeated again and again. The passage in which this idea is conveyed runs as follows:

अयोध्य व शरणोऽभस्वलालीकृत्र इति मन्दुरुपयाति.

X, 5.

"Then how are the sessional days treated whose ritualistic arrangement is not known? They say that they are to be arranged following the principle of excessive nights constituting a session. Or else by celebrating at the close of the year ten days together with a Mahāārvrata day, he should perform the sacrifice, so that all the days of the year are thereby recalled. This process he should repeat again and again."

From this it is clear that the Vedic poets were celebrating 11 days at the end of each synodic lunar year of 354 days. From the Nidāna-Sûtra, X, 5, quoted above, we have learnt that there were others who were celebrating 5 days at the close of each Sāvana year of 360 days. Again, from the same passage we can understand that the periods of 12 and 21 days were taken as different units of intercalary periods. It follows, therefore, that there were four schools of astronomers during the Vedic times; a school who observed 11 days at the end of each synodic lunar year; a second school who celebrated 5 days at the end of each Sāvana year; a third school who observed 21 days, of course at the end of four consecutive Sāvana years; and a fourth school who celebrated 12 days at the end of every fourth synodic
It is clear, therefore, that the statement made at the close of the Taittiriyabhāṣya, that 230 times 21 days denoted 1000 years for the Viśvaśrīka, is not a theoretical formula, but a result arrived at by regular counting made by successive generations of priests. Scholars may doubt the conclusion at which I have arrived in my Vedic era, that the Vedic poets kept an era and counted 1840 years in it. But there is, at any rate, no reason to doubt that the Vedic poets had their own era and counted 1000 years in terms of 250 intercalary units of 21 days each. It remains to find out the terminus a quo of these 1,000 years and settle the chronology of the Vedic period.

OUTLINES OF THE HISTORY OF ALAMKARA LITERATURE.

BY P. V. KANE, M.A., LL.B.; BOMBAY.

Section I.—The Development of the Alamkārāstra.

Poetry is as old as the human race. The oldest literary monuments possessed by mankind are poetical. Figures of speech are of rare occurrence in the most ancient writings; still even in the oldest of them, the simple figures of speech, such as simile and metaphor, are now and then met with. Without these two figures no language can advance. As Carlyle has profoundly remarked, metaphor has exercised a vast influence in moulding the growth of languages.

The simple figures of speech are met with even in the Vedic literature. This verse contains the figure of Atiśayakī. But between this rare and rather unconscious employment of figures of speech and their elaborate definitions and classifications in later days, a vast period of time must have intervened. When a large mass of poetical material had grown up, speculation was naturally turned in the direction of laying down the canons of poetry and defining the ornaments of it. We shall briefly indicate the existence of secular poetical material before the Christian era and in the centuries that immediately followed it.

The Maithreyāsya-Sāhitya, however, refers to the existence of two more astronomical schools of a different kind. The Sāhitya calls them Bīsāyakī and Chāturbhibyakī. The passage in which they are referred to runs as follows:

With each oblation, he suppresses twelve and twelve nights. They (the oblations) are as many, when counted, as there are nights in the year. He suppresses the year from the enemy. With Viśvādeva sacrifice he suppresses (intercalary months); with Varunaprabhaśa the next four: and with Śakambarita the next four. These are what he suppresses from the enemy. He who sacrifices for the seasons is a sacrificer of one kind, while he who sacrifices for a set of four months is a sacrificer of another kind. He who knows that what the spring became the rains (which in turn became) the autumn (and so on), and who accordingly sacrificed for them, this sacrificer is one who is called to be a sacrificer for the seasons. He who gains the thirteenth month and sacrificer for the thirteenth month is one who is said to be sacrificer for the four months. Having Sacrificed during three ordinary (Vaśā) months, he should omit the fourth. Then having sacrificed during (the next) two ordinary (months), he should omit the third. As to the three years there are, in them there are thirty-six full moons, as to the two, in them there are twenty-four. As to those (days) which except (an intercalary month) in the thirty-six full-moons, he takes them to those latter twenty-four months. This is very the thirteenth month. He gains it and sacrifices for it.

1 Abbēatūro pātrāni et pratiḥ tortiḥ gāthāsāmya saṃaye. Āhdvadānām | Jñātām paśya vate tate tate | Viśveśvaro ni riṣiki aṣati || Rig I. 134. 7.

2 Abbēatūro pātrāni et pratiḥ tortiḥ gāthāsāmya saṃaye. Āhdvadānām | Jñātām paśya vate tate tate | Viśveśvaro ni riṣiki aṣati || Rig I. 134. 7. This verse contains four similes. Dēh-sūpatyā pratiḥ tortiḥ gāthāsāmya, riṣikesānām sarvānām kārayatādi | Teyoradāni pātraṇāni śuddhīyāsāṃ samaye. Āhdvadānām | Rig I. 164. 20. This contains the figure Rūṣaka. Āhātārī pātraṇāni śuddhīyāsāṃ samaye. Āhdvadānām | Viśveśvaro ni riṣiki aṣati || Rig IV. 58. 3. This verse contains the figure Atiśayakī.
Pāṇinī himself appears to have been a poet. We are told by Kṣemendra in his Surṣṭita-
ālaṇa that Pāṇinī excelled in the Upajāti metre. Namisādhū, when commenting upon Rūdraśa's
Kītyāyikā details us to see Pāṇinī composed a Mahākahya named Pādīlaśayā. He then quotes
some words from that work, and gives a whole verse from Pāṇinī. The Śāṅkvartha-paṇḍita
and the Subhādityedrā both ascribe a number of verses to Pāṇinī. It is curious that many of the
verses ascribed to Pāṇinī in the above two anthologies as well as the verse quoted by Namisādhū
are in the Upajāti metre. Great caution is necessary in admitting the evidence of writers belong-
ing to the 11th century A.D. with respect to Pāṇinī who flourished at least five hundred years
earlier. It is possible that the poet Pāṇinī may be quite distinct from the grammarian Pāṇinī.
But as long as no positive proof of this is forthcoming, we may provisionally say that Pāṇinī,
the grammarian, was also a poet, the more so because a number of critical writers like Kṣemendra
and Namisādhū refer to him as such.

The Vārtikas of Kātyāyana furnish us with positive proof of the fact that the class of com-
positions known as Kātyāyikā was much in vogue in his day or even earlier. Although the identity
of Varaṇccha and Kātyāyana is not beyond the pale of discussion, still it is highly probable
Patañjali speaks of a Kātyāyikā composed by Varaṇccha. A number of verses are ascribed to
Varaṇccha in the Subhādityedrā. So in the fourth century C.E. Sanskrit poems had been composed.

In the time of Patañjali (i.e., 2nd century n.c.) poetical activity appears to have been very
considerable. While commenting upon the Vārtika 'Lubhābhāṣyikā', Patañjali mentions
by name three works belonging to the Akṣara class of composition, e.g., Vasanādatta,
Sumanottara and Bhairavārā. Patañjali seems also to refer to two poems dealing with the
death of Kāmarāja and the humiliation of Bāli. Besides, the Mahābhāṣyā contains a large number
of quotations drawn from the works of poets and writers that were prior to him, some of which
possess great beauty and historical interest. A few of the most interesting quotations are given
below.

---

8 Śrīla-vanayana-charitam Pāṇinī-vaśālīkhaḥ | Chānaka-karaśikāsākhaṇḍäm-udvārayaṇa jātikhām | Sravita
III. 36.

9 Tadhā hi Pāṇinīḥ Pādīlaśayā Mahākāhyā-śandhyadikāḥ gṛhyā kareṇa iṣyatā gṛhyāyāti tāt parah bhadraḥ
on Rūdraśa II. 3.

10 Tadhā saṅgataṁ kāhyā-Γeta ṣādhuṁ āparīmā samānanāḥ gacchanti vart pravṛttāḥ kāvyāyāṁ jajagyāyāṁ
vijnānam ete saṅgataṁ kāhyā yām vajracinī samānanāḥ padeḥ kāvyāyāṁ jajagyāyāṁ on Rūdraśa II. 8.

11 See Prof. Pielarz's Introduction to Subhādityedrā, pp. 54-55. The verse 'Vaśālīkhaḥ Mahākāhyā-śandhyadikāḥ,
naḥ, occurs in the Dharmakāya, p. 35, and the verse 'Aitreya-dharmaṇāḥ pādāpamāḥ gṛhyāyāṁ' occurs in the Kītyāyikā-
ālaṇa-sūtra of Vāmanī IV. 327 (under Ākṣara).

12 As the poet Pāṇinī in the two verses quoted by Namisādhū on Rūdraśa II. 8. uses ungrammatical forms
(pārṣāt and pān), it is almost certain that he cannot the grammarian Pāṇinī.—D.B.B.

13 The Pārṣātka 'Lubhābhāṣyikā' bhadram on Pāṇinī IV. 327.

14 The Bṛhadāraṇyaka identifies the two—Tusugamam Vasanādattamāḥ Śrutābhāṣyaḥ-kāhyāḥ | Kātyāyana
Varaṇcchanā-charitam-udvārayaṇa jātikhām | I. 2-15.

15 Tathā tātrā śandhyadikāḥ | Mahākāhyā II. p. 315 (Kleinhorn).

16 'Aukāhyikā kṛṣṇā-gāyikā gṛhyā navānāḥ bhaktānām lubāvantānām | Vasanādatta Sumanottara | Na


19 Jāgākṣaṇa किन् Pāṇinīnām | Vasanādattanām | Vāmanādattanām | Vāmanī IV. p. 119; Jādūrāsūtrā-sūtrā-sūtrā surā on Vol. I. p. 145; Priyām
mayām kṛśṇā-gāyikāḥ | Kāhyāḥ bhadram | Mahākāhyā II. p. 315 (Kleinhorn).


21 Mahākāhyā kṛṣṇā-gāyikāḥ | Kāhyāḥ bhadram | Vāmanī IV. p. 327 (under Ākṣara).

22 Of these 'eti, etc. occurs in Rūdraśa's 

23 Kūpapāṭha-kāhyā (129.2), which it referred to as a popular verse (laukkī gātha). The last quotation is ascribed
to Kūpapāṭha, who might have been prompted by the same desire that produced the Pārṣāt-kāhyāya.
Next to Patañjali we may mention the Rāmāyaṇa and the Mahābhārata. Although the greatest divergence of opinion prevails as to the dates of these two epics, we shall not be far wrong if we say that the two epics date in their extant form from at least the beginning of the Christian era. Both of them contain here and there highly poetical passages. Many verses are quoted from the Mahābhārata by writers on poetics, such as Ānandavardhana. The Rāmāyaṇa specially abounds in elaborate descriptions and long-drawn metaphors. In this connection, the highly poetical description of the sea in Yuddha-kāṇḍa (IV, 110 ff.), the imaginative description of the sky in Sundara-kāṇḍa (LVII, 1-4) and the elaborate Rāpaka in Ayodhya-kāṇḍa (LIX, 28 ff.) may be noted. The muse of such masters of classical Sanskrit as Kālidāsa and Bhavabhūti drew her inspiration from the two epics. It is not an empty boast that the Mahābhārata makes when it says that 'the imagination of the poets is fired by this best of Itihāsa' or that 'the best of poets depend upon this story.'

We find the Dāsārāma advising the authors of dramas to borrow their plots from the Rāmāyaṇa, the Brīhat-kathā and other works.

Recent epigraphical researches have shown that in the first centuries of the Christian era, India produced highly elaborated Sanskrit prose as well as poetry. One of the inscriptions from Girnar belonging to the 2nd century A.D., contains a piece of prose, which not only exhibits very long compounds, but also Anuprāśa and various kinds of Upamāṇa and Rāpaka. In that inscription, Mahākāraṇa with Radhādeva is praised as one who had completely destroyed all varieties who did not submit to him through pride caused by the fact that they were described as heroes in the presence of all Kālaśāyas and as one who obtained much fame by his mastery of the sciences of Grammar, Mīmāṃsā, Music and Logic. In the same inscription a reference is made to prose and poetry which were full of figures of speech, which looked fine on account of containing poetical conventions and that were clear, to the point, pleasing, striking and charming. An inscription belonging to the 4th century A.D. contains a prose which rivals the style of Bāṇa and in which king Samudragupta is praised as one to whom the title 'Kavi-rāja' was applied on account of the composition of many Kāryas that were the source of inspiration to learned men. In the same inscription Samudragupta's fame is compared to the white waters of the Ganges running quickly when freed from confinement in the matted hair of Siva.

From the foregoing statement it will be clear that in the centuries preceding and immediately following the Christian era a vast mass of poetical material had been accumulated in Sanskrit for the cultivation of the science of poetics. We shall presently see that the elaboration of the canons of poetry and the figures of speech commenced with the beginning of the Christian era or even earlier. The composition of new poems and the evolution of rules of poetry henceforward proceeded hand in hand.

---

13. *Hasentam-ica phenaaghair=nitiyyam=iva chorestibhih i 'eti.*
18. *Svātantra-śaṅkara-chīrasvā-kānaḥ saḥaśāya-vādār-dalakṣaṇā yaṣyaḥ padya... (the rest is destroyed)* -1, 14.
The earliest extant definition of any figure of speech is perhaps that of **Upamāna (simile)** contained in the **Nirukta of Yāsaka.** This definition of **Upamāna** is as good as that of **Mammeṣa**’s, viz., **Śiddharmam = Upamā bhide.** It is a general rule that the **Upamāna** (standard of comparison) should be more well-known and possess more qualities than the **Upameya** (object of comparison) and it is a blemish if the **Upamāna** is much inferior to the **Upameya.** Yāsaka refers to the general rule in the footnote in the words: ‘**jñāyathā, etc.**’ and points out that in the Vedas the **Upamāna** is often much inferior to the **Upameya.** He instances **Rigveda X. 4. 6,** in which the **Āśvins** are compared to thieves.23

Pāṇini often refers to **Upamāna, Upameya and Sāmānya (common property or ground of comparison).** 24

In the **Vedánta-sūtras** of Bādarāyaṇa we find that **Upamāna and Rāpaka (metaphor)** are mentioned by name.25

In the **Nāga-Sūtra** of Bharata we are told that there are only four ornaments of poetry, viz., **Upamāna, Rāpaka, Dīpāka and Yamaka.** We shall see later on when we come to the chronology of **Alabhadra writers** that Bharata’s work cannot, at all events, be placed later than 150 B.C.

The **Buddha-charita** of **Asvaghosha** appears to have been written at a time when some theory of poetries must have been already in existence. Each canto has at the end of it a verse or verses in a metre other than the prevailing one. The author everywhere makes frantic efforts at a jingle of words; gives us such examples of alliteration as **Hari-tura-va-tura-vhata-tura-vhāoḥ** (V. 87); and is very fond of the figure **Yathādhanusya.**27 The **Buddha-charita** must have been written not later than the 6th century of the Christian era, as it was translated into Chinese in the 5th century A.D. and into Tibetan in the 7th or 8th century (Preface, p. v).

Subandhu in his **Vānsadattā** has a number of allusions to an art of Poetry and to the figures of speech. He boasts of his skill in employing a **Ślesha (pun, paronomasia)** in each letter.28 He speaks of the soul of poetry; of the composition of an excellent poet in which the expletives **tu** and **ah** do not occur and which is divided into sections called **Uchchhadās** and skillfully employs **Ślesha (pun)** and the metre called **Vaktra;**29 and of the figures **Śriñkūla-banda (of words), Utprekaḥ and Akṣheya.**30 Subandhu is not later than the 6th century A.D., as he (p. 331) is quoted by Vāmanas in his **Kāvyalakṣaṇa-sūtra-eritī (I. 3. 25)** with very slight variations and is referred to by Bīṣa in his introduction to his **Harshacharita.** So, long before the 6th century A.D., such figures as **Ślesha, Akṣheya, Utprekaḥ, Śriñkūla-bandha** had been named and defined.

In the days of Bāṇa rhetoric appears to have made great strides. In the **Kālambari** he speaks of such puzzles as the **Abhāsāchārya** Vāmana, **Kāṭhāchārya, Bindumati, and Prabhelika.** Bāṇa knows the difference between **Kathā and Akhyāyikā.** He speaks of writers of **Akhyāyikās, which were divided into Uchchhadāsa and contained Vaktra metres here and there.** He speaks of a number

---

27 **Ala-dāna=Upamā yadavatāt tān-saṁkrta-samitī Gṛhyama=taia-dānaḥ karma jñāyathā va guṇena pravahyādyāya-vvam ad kṣamajñāno va prabhya-dantu vā upamānto, athāpi kṣamajñāno pravahyādyāya Nīrīkṣa III.**

28 **Tadāvagyena tarkād vamanād rājendhra-dānakhirāvhyādhāttām I.**

29 **Mark the following Sūtras of Pāṇini:—Upamāntāni Sāmānya-vrata-nyāsa (II. 1.55); Upamāntāni rūpikā- **nāma-sāmānya-prāpiṣāya (II. 1.55).**

30 **Aśvaghosha,samayānyamahāyaktāḥ Śrīnām-riṣṭa-vṛtta-rāṣṭra-vṛtta-grihaḥ kartavyam itatāḥ (I. 4.1); Alasa et ch-opamād tāvānadhā (III. 2.18).**

31 **Upamā viṣṇapūraṇaḥ caturānti rūpakaḥ yamakaḥ tathā | Kasya-vyapā-ramakarmikāḥ kāthā hātāḥ Nāiga-hārā (16.41).**

32 For example, V. 42: IX. 16.

33 **Pratikāyaḥcīvakāya-vyayā-prakāya-vyayā-sāmānyā-varhā-yā-nūdīghvar cīvakāya-varhāyā-nūdīghvar cīvakāya-counterpart (p. 238).**

34 **Śriñkūla-bandha varṣa-pratikāya Utprekaḥ-ākṣheya phāṣaḥ kāvyā-kāvyā-kāvyā-kāvyā-kāvyā-kāvyā-kāvyā (p. 146).**

35 **Uchchhadāsāḥ puṃ-śhīnām ya vāktra yenā gamer Sarasvatī | Kāthām-akhyāyikāhā sa te vadyāḥ kāśikāh (11.)—Harshacharita.**
of figures of speech such as Upamā, Dipa, Ślesha, Jāti (or Svabhāvabūti), Usprekhā, etc. We know that Bhasī lived in the first half of the 7th century A.D.

The Bhāṭṭikīsya devote four sargas (10-13) to the illustration of topics that rightly belong to the art of poetry. The author gives examples of two Alakahās of word, viz., Asnapura and Yomakha and of thirty-six Alakahās of sense. He must have had before him some work defining the figures of speech. He tells us that he lived under king Dharasena of Valabhi. We know four Valabhi kings who bore the name Dharasena. Therefore Bhasī must have flourished at some time between 500 and 650 A.D., the dates of the first and the fourth Dharasenas.

In this section we have tried to prove that the simple figures of speech, such as Upamā and Dipa, were named and defined long before the Christian era and that the centuries immediately following that era witnessed the evolution of a number of figures of speech. From the 7th century onwards we have a host of writers on the Alakahā-Sūtra, whose dates can be obtained with great exactness.

**To be continued.**

**MISCELLANEA.**

**INDIAN AND CEYLONSE BRONZES.**

The six fine bronzes from the Tinnevelly District, Madras, exhibited in the Indian Court at the Festival of Empire, 1911 (case 69, Nos. 438-443) by Lord Amphilh throw light on the origin of the remarkable set of similar images found in 1907 and 1908 by the Archaeological Survey, Ceylon, in a trench outside the Siva Dewalī at Polonnāruwa. Those images evidently belonged to the Saiva temple, which is abundantly known as the Daḷāḷa Māligawa, or Shrine of the Tooth Relic, and had been hidden in the ground outside on the occasion of some revolution (Hist. of Fine Art in India and Ceylon, p. 51, note 2). They have been fully described by the Honourable Mr. P. Arumachalam, in Spolia Zeylanica, Sept. 1909, and selections from the find have been published by Dr. Cōomaraswaamy and the writer of this note.1 They are heavy, massive castings, the largest being three feet high, and the best are of high artistic quality. Lord Amphilh’s set is exactly similar to the Ceylonese images and, like the Polonnāruwa find, includes a spirited Dancing Siva (Natarāja) and figures of Tamil saints.

When the Ceylonese bronzes were discovered the question naturally arose whether they had been executed in the island or on the mainland.

Dr. A. Willey, F. R. S., sometime Director of the Colombo Museum, declared that they are Polonnāruwa bronzes for better or for worse, and certainly not imported from India, but unfortunately did not assign reasons for his strongly expressed opinion. On the other hand, Mr. H. C. P. Bell, the experienced Archaeological Commissioner of Ceylon, is convinced that the Polonnāruwa bronzes came from India. The discovery of Lord Amphilh’s set in the Tinnevelly District strongly confirms Mr. Bell’s view, and it may well be that the Polonnāruwa castings were produced in that district. The Saiva religion is a Tamil importation into Ceylon, and it is antecedently more probable that costly and artistic Saiva images should have been made on the mainland rather than in the Buddhist island.

**BOOKNOTICE.**

Ta Tang-Hsii-yü-čhi, Original text, with preface and variants collected from ancient manuscripts and modern texts. Two Vols. in Japanese and Chinese characters. College of Literature, Imperial University, Kyoto, Japan.

Two small, but very well printed and nicely bound volumes contain the original ancient text of the Ta Tang-Hsii-yü-chi or in Japanese, the Ta-Te-Sci-i-khi, being the first publication of the Faculty of Letters in the Imperial University of Kyoto. The work is in two parts, the first containing the text with a preface in Japanese, and the other all the variants, which the Editors have been able to find from the collection of the oldest MSS., which exist in the ancient monasteries of Japan, with text already published up-to-date in China, Corea, and Japan. The second volume contains identification of personal and place names by Beal, Julien and Watters. The object of the work is to preserve this ancient text. We congratulate the University on the appearance of what the Editors call “this modest fruit of our labour.”

R. C. Temple.
THE CASTES IN INDIA.

BY E. BENARD, OF THE INSTITUT DE FRANCE.
(Translated in part from the French)

BY REV. A. HEGGLIN, S. J., BOMBAY.
(Continued from p. 114.)

V.—Genesis of the Indian Caste.

We are approaching the knotty point of this research. The similarities which I have recorded have been, for the most part, already recognized and noted. They are only examples—indications. Their number could be easily enlarged. The essential thing is to weigh their signification.

Every evidence is leading us back to the old family constitution; the true name of caste is jati which means 'race'. However, we must state the matter more exactly. The family was not the only social organism, at the time when the Aryans of India went apart to follow their own destinies. It was comprised in larger corporations: the clan, the tribe. Their existence is certain, though the facts, variable and vague, are not easily brought under strict definitions.

Discussions have been going on, and this rather in a confused way, on the reciprocal relation of the different groups, on the order in which they have been formed. One thing at least is clear. These concentrical circles which include an area ever widening are conceived in the Aryan world after one and the same type. Thus it could be held that the clan and the tribe, whatever their names be in the different countries, are only the enlargement of the family; they copy its organization while extending it. Their genealogy, in reality, concerns us little. The fact is, that their respective constitution is strictly analogous. In speaking of the family constitution I have the constitution of the tribe and of the clan equally in view.

The terms, here in use, agree very well: gens, cuncta, tribus, in Rome; family, phratria, phyle, in Greece; family, gotra, caste, in India. It is the more instructive, because, in the origin, if we judge it by all analogies, the most essential difference between clan and tribe, as between section and caste, amounts to this, that the group which is more restricted, is exogamic; the group which is larger, endogamic. The political organization, at the pretty late time in which the classical countries are well known to us, has only shaken, or displaced certain customs; and for instance, in the case of the endogamic law, replaced the one tribe by the whole of the city. What is surprising is to find that the directing principles, on both sides, have survived, in so visible traces, the separation—which, therefore, must be very old—of the ethico-national branches in which we follow severally their destinies.

If the caste covers exactly the whole domain of the old gentile right, this can be neither a fortuitous agreement nor a modern resurrection. Still less is it due to chance that its practices have exact relations with the primitive notions and continue their spirit. The whole is complete, well connected, closely soldered with the past and in a matter which supremely rules life and the most private concerns. It, therefore, is an organic institution which draws its sap from very deep sources.

The guilds of the middle ages remind us, by more than one custom, of the known traits of ancient organization. Who would dare to assert that they are their direct heirs? Customs, which under the sway of new ideas and a complete moral revolution, could only have survived by losing in the public consciousness, their signification and their proper life, may have found their way into them again through more or less obscure windings; I am willing to admit that the patronage of a saint is the reflection of the eponymism of the antique heroes, that the repast which, on certain
feast-days, united their members, may be a remembrance of the family repast; but with all that there exists apparently no continued transmission from one type to the other, no immediate filiation. Nothing in the guilds corresponds to the solid cohesion of a family corporation. They are not only open to every new-comer, if he but fulfills the requisite condition, they impose no fetter upon the civil and private life of their members. The resemblances are, in some way, accidental and fragmentary. It is likely that the repasts at which, in our country districts, even nowadays, the relatives and friends of the departed person meet after a burial, are not without connexion with the funeral repasts of antiquity. What does it matter, if in this long way, the custom has lost its original meaning?

Of quite another order is the relationship which connects the caste with the ancient system of the family community. There is from the one to the other a real continuity, a direct transmission of life.

Does this mean that India has simply preserved a primitive type of the Aryan constitution? Such, assuredly, is not my thought. The premises being the same, if caste could spring from them in India, there sprang up quite a different regime in the classical countries. But caste has remained thoroughly impregnated with notions which fasten it to the Aryan background. How could they fail to expand into an original institution, under the unique conditions in which they happened to be transplanted on the soil of India? Their physiognomy has been so much altered, as to render the more primitive types at first unrecognizable in the caste; it is, nevertheless, their legitimate heir. But we have done nothing, as long as we have not laid hold of the mechanism which brought about this transformation.

The Vedic hymns are too little explicit on the details of exterior and social life. But, at least, we notice in them, that the Aryan population was divided in a number of tribes or peoples (janae), subdivided into clans united by ties of relationship (vijas), which again were broken up into families.

The terminology of the Rig-Veda is, in this regard, pretty vague; the general fact is clear. Sujata, i.e., relative, or 'companion of ātri,' of race, appears in the Atharva-Veda to designate the companions of clan (vij). Jana, which assumes a wider signification, reminds us of the Avestic equivalent of clan, the Zantu and of the ātri, or the caste. A series of terms, e.g., vrijiya, vrija, vṛida, seem to be synonyms or sub-divisions, it may be, of the clan, or of the people. The Aryan population, therefore, lived at the time to which the hymns belong, under an organization which was ruled by the traditions of the tribe and of lower or similar groupings. Even the variety of the names indicates that this organization was rather floating; hence it was the more pliable to adapt itself to the definite forms into which the circumstances in India chanced to model them.

It is easy to discern several of the factors, which have contributed, each on its part, to push it into the road on which it has been developed.

The life of the invaders necessarily remained, in the course of their slow conquest, if not nomadic, at least very unstable. There are tribes, the wanderings of which we can follow. This mobility was very unfavourable to the organization of a political rule, but very favourable for the maintenance of old institutions. The hazards of local strife, moreover, could not fail to react on the condition of the hordes. In many cases they were dislocated.

Whilst guarding the tradition of inherited customs, the fragments were reconstituted under the action of new necessities and of new interests, topographical, or others. The exclusive rigidity of the genealogical bond had thus to suffer some harm. The door was half opened to variable principles of grouping.

*8* Of Zimmer, Altind, Leben, p. 158 ss.
The population in the East has rarely that degree of fixity to which we have been accustomed by the experience of the West. In this matter the absence of a strongly established state is in succession cause and effect. India has preserved, down to our days, something of this mobility. At all times, towns have been an exception there. It is natural that we scarcely get traces of them in an ancient period. Even later, the large capitals which were founded in India, had no strong roots; they have often lived an ephemeral existence.

The village, the grāma, from the Vedic hymns down to this time, has been almost the only framework of Hindu life. As it appears in the hymns, it is rather pastoral, than agricultural. Synonyms, as vṛijana, which cannot be separated from vṛaj, a pasturage, conjure up the same images. And likewise gotra. The word is not used in the Rāg-Veda, except in its etymological sense of stable. If yet we find it afterwards regularly denoting the eponym clan, this use is, without doubt, ancient. The Rāg-Veda makes no allusion to it; this simply proves once more what perilous illusion it is to draw positive conclusions from the silence of the hymns. This application of the word, however, is only justified by an intermediate stage. Very near to vṛijana by its primitive meaning, it must have passed through an analogous evolution; it, too, must have been a synonym, at least an approximate one, of grāma or village.

The Hindu village has an altogether autonomous life. In several countries, it is actually a corporation, and its territory common property: an organization which has given rise to frequent parallels with the village communities of the Slavs. Some have been led to look upon the village as the equivalent of the primitive clan; under a more fixed form it would have perpetuated the community of blood, the community of goods and jurisprudence. I do not decide, whether the village communities are of ancient origin everywhere in India, whether they have not in many cases and under the sway of special conditions accidentally reconstructed a primitive social type. They, at least, are witness to a powerful tradition of corporative life. Similarly, there reigns over a vast region, the system of those family communities (jāt family), where several generations remain grouped without division and under a patriarchal authority. The Indian mind is stubbornly conservative of old institutions. This is not all. I have spoken of those Russian villages, where the community of property and the living together on the same soil have had as their result the professional community. The same fact has happened in India, too. This cannot be doubted, when we think of the numerous villages of potmakers, of leather-dressers, of smiths, to which literature, especially Buddhist literature, makes so frequent allusions. The community of profession could the better propagate in this way, if a bond of consanguinity originally united the members of the village. Now Brāhmaṇ villages are always mentioned. Parentage, therefore, influenced the groupings, at least often; for, certainly for the Brāhmaṇ, parentage was the essential tie, not identity of profession; they lived far less on their ritual functions, than on agricultural and, especially, pastoral industry. This does not stand in the way that their example should nevertheless, through a superficial analogy, favour round them the community of profession in less noble and less respected groups.

The mass of Aryan immigrants, therefore, settled in closed villages, ruled more or less, by a notion of real or supposed parentage, in any case forming a corporation in which the clan survived in a modified frame. The more general this organization was, the more, also, was it sure to countenance an equivalent constitution for the bodies of the tradesmen themselves. Little numerous and little specialised in the pastoral life, these were called to a necessary growth by the economical development and the advance of culture. The representatives of the mechanic professions, necessarily scattered amongst the people who claimed their services, could not, in the midst of a universally corporative organization, be assured of a tolerable existence, unless adapting themselves to the common type.
It is here that the religious ideas intervene. Scruples of purity did not allow the inhabitants of the Aryan villages to pursue certain professions nor even to receive, in their communion, compatriots who were pursuing them. Amongst these excluded, the same necessities, establishing a scale of impurity between different trades, were tending to multiply the partitions. The religious sentiment made them the more insuperable, the more carefully it was fostered. The Brahminic theocracy provided this with an energy and a perseverance that are unique. In admitting that the priestly class, at first, has not established the absolute formulas of its dominion without some protest, it certainly has early laid their foundation. From the highest periods of literature its pretensions are set forth in exalted terms.

The hierarchy of the classes could not create all anew the régime of the castes: this is derived from a more spontaneous division and corresponds to a partition into much smaller groups—it could help it on. It had given the example and spread the custom of a division, which, if larger, was in certain respects, scarcely less rigid. It had, especially, two indirect consequences: by the domination which it granted to the Brahmins, it preserved for religious scruples a rigidity which re-echoed in the severity of the caste rules; it served as a basis to that hierarchy which has become an integral part of the system and facilitated its establishment by lending singular strength to the notions of purity which, on the whole, state the degrees of social rank.

If the triumphant theocracy fixed the régime of the caste in its systematic form, the caste borrowed its cause of existence and the mechanism of its genesis directly from the very elements in which this theocracy itself originated. Thus the scale of castes, determined, or at least inspired by the Brahmins and maintained by them, could take the place of the ancient state; the less precise organization of the classes was absorbed into the new régime.

In classical antiquity the slow fusion of the classes is, at the same time, the stimulant and the result of the civil and political idea which is springing up. In India the theocratic power puts a stop to any such evolution. India has risen neither to the idea of the state, nor to the idea of the fatherland. Instead of extending, the frame is contracting. In the republics of antiquity the notion of classes has a tendency to melt into the wider idea of the city; in India it asserts itself and tends to confine itself in the narrow partitions of the caste. Let us not forget that the Aryan immigrants were spreading in India over an immense area; groupings too widely scattered were doomed to crumble. From this circumstance, the particularistic inclinations were drawing an increase of strength.

I cannot persuade myself that the caste has sprung from the autochthonous tribe. Its régime has been too keenly patronised by the Brahmins; they raised it to the height of a dogma. To all its constituent elements the other Aryan branches, offer striking analogies, some of them all the more decisive, as the similarity is not so prominent in the outward aspect as in the affinity of leading ideas. When aboriginal tribes enter the Brahminical frame, and however apt their rather unsettled organization might make them to fit new exigencies, we see how they are forced in the passage, to submit to many a touching-up. For a long time they keep their mark of origin. One may discern persevering in them more than one element of foreign origin, which is a little jarring on the whole, for instance, the clans with a totem. How can we believe that the Brahmins should have borrowed from the vanquished population for whom they never ceased to manifest the most humiliating contempt, the complicated rules of purity in the name of which they show themselves so particular both as to food and as to personal intercourse? That they should have so willingly appropriated a social organization not spontaneously sprung from traditions of their own?

It sometimes, has been too easily granted that the natives were by themselves in possession of this whole system. They could, by origin, possess certain of its features; still it is
necessary not to forget, that we are here exposed to more than one misunderstanding. The imitation of the Brahminical rules has filtered through even into populations which have, otherwise, remained very barbarous. They show a very strong inclination towards adopting them. Whilst keeping the least orthodox customs, they endeavour to obtain a clergy of Brahmins, which is very much despised for the help it gives them, and very disdainful itself towards its sheep, but the patronage of which they hold in high esteem, in spite of all. The Brahminical marriage rite has been implanted even in tribes, which do not call Brahmins to their ceremonies. So very low a caste, as the Ramushis, in which the exogamic limit is marked by the totem, has, nevertheless, borrowed from the Brahmins not only its genealogical legend, but also the prohibition of the marriage of widows. To ascribe to the aborigines the fathership of such restrictions is to upset the terms. In the primitive stages organization and custom look easily alike from one race to the other; the social mechanism is too rudimentary to be much diversified. We have carefully to be on our guard, lest we take late borrowings for an inherited good.

Everything, however, induces us to anticipate that the vicinity, the intermixture of the aborigines has not been without some influence upon the establishment of the caste, an indirect influence it may be, but a strong one. The collision of the Aryans with populations which they despised for their colour and their barbarity, could not but enhance in them the pride of race, strengthen their innate scruples with regard to degrading contacts, double the rigour of the endogamic laws, in a word, favour all the usages and all the inclinations which led to the caste. Among these I want to include that spirit of exclusiveness and hierarchy which crowns the system, and which properly transfers it from the family ground into the social and semi-political domain.

Too numerous to be entirely turned into slaves, the ancient masters of the soil had to submit to the ascendancy of the more gifted conquerors; but even there, where they completely lost their independence, they preserved, in the main, their native organization. Enveloped in a sort of transformation, rather than reduced by a centralized power, they certainly contributed to maintain, in the whole of the country, this so peculiar character of instability and fluctuation. The tribes continued jostling each other, as so many half-autonomous little nationalities. The aboriginal population, thus opposed to the formation of an organised political regime, an enormous obstacle which has never been surmounted; by its examples it served the cause of archaic institutions; in every way it thus favoured the upkeeping of the social condition under which the conqueror had first pushed on his expansion.

Later on, the mixture of the two races could not but act in the same direction; it lent the strength of habits and of hereditary instincts to these preceedents. Did not the old frame become stronger in proportion as the doors of Hinduism opened by and by to a greater number of new-comers? Although modified into a system of castes under the impulse of special conditions, which I am endeavouring to set forth, the tribal organism remains in their respective state of culture, a rather natural meeting point for both the conquerors and the conquered.

Nowhere in antiquity have the Aryans shown much taste for the manual professions. The Greeks and the Romans left them to the slaves, or to intermediate classes, freed men and simple domiciled. Settled in villages, that first followed entirely pastoral pursuits, the Aryans were in India still less induced, than elsewhere, to take to manual professions. These had, in general, to remain, the allotment, either of the aborigines or of populations, which their hybrid, or suspected origin, relegated to the same level.

---

In becoming trades-people, both brought with them their traditions and the desire of assimilating themselves to the analogous organization of the superior race. The fear of defilement closed a number of professions to the Aryans; this fear was penetrating and became generalized in this inferior population under the religious influence of the immigrants and their priests. It could not fail to multiply amongst them small divisions, scaled after the degree of reputed impurity ascribed to their occupations; this is the very thing which happens still now before our eyes. Thus the aborigines, too numerous to fall individually, at least as a general rule, into the condition of domestic slaves, and confined by the circumstances to the manual professions, were led, both by their own tradition and by the ideas which they received from the Aryan influence, to unite in new groupings of which profession appeared to be the bond.

This movement accentuated and completed the parallel movement, which, under different conditions, though under the sway of several common ideas, must, as we have seen, have arisen amongst the Aryans themselves. On neither side was community of profession, the principle of aggregation; we see how it could assume this appearance not only for us, but little by little, even in the eyes of the Hindus. It is useless to add that, when come to this point in the age of secondary formations, when the wear and tear of evolution obliterates the oldest ideas and the first motive powers, or is dulling their consciousness, a deceitful analogy could really develop it into an autonomous factor of grouping. But that was only the last terminus of a long course; it had sprung from quite different sources.

Outside the natural action of exterior social or historical elements, we must take into account moral agents, primitive inclinations, and essential beliefs. Unhappily, springs of so subtle a nature and of a continuous, but not well determined influence, cannot be easily set forth.

I have touched some of them by the way. The Hindu mind is very religious and very speculative; an obstinate guardian of traditions, it is singularly insensible to the joys of action and to the solicitations of material progress. It offered a ground predisposed for a social organization, made of very archaic elements, which would pay obedience to an overpowerful priestly authority, and which consecrated immutability as a duty and the established hierarchy as a natural law.

This régime especially fits in a striking way with the most popular, perhaps, the most characteristic, and certainly the most permanent, of the dogmas, that rule the religious life of India, with transmigration. The immobility of the frames, within which caste confines life, justifies and explains itself by a doctrine, which is founding the terrestrial condition of each one upon the balance of his anterior actions, good and bad. The destiny of each man is fixed by the past; it must, in the present, be determined and immovable. The scale of social ranks faithfully corresponds to the infinite scale of moral merits and moral deficiency.

All, or almost all sects, sprung from Hinduism, have accepted metempsychosis as a certitude that admits of no discussion; all, or almost all have accepted caste without revolt. Buddhism makes, from the standpoint of religious profession, no difference between the castes. All are admitted without difficulty, and without distinction into the body of monks, all are called to salvation. Logically these premises ought to end with the suppression of castes. But it is not so. The direct polemic arises only slowly and then—for instance in a book entirely devoted to this subject, in the Vajrasāthā—it takes the special form of an attack levelled against the privileges of the class of the Brahmans. It is a strife for influence between two rival clergies, not a systematic protestation against a régime without which even the Buddhists did not conceive the social existence.

Several ascetical sects, likewise, suppress caste practically; they admit and bring together, without reserve, all postulants in their religious order. With several this equality is symbolized at the consecration of the adepts, by the solemn destruction of the sacred chord. How could the
suppression of every family-tie and the renunciation of the world. be better expressed? This is the
equivalent of those funeral ceremonies which, as I have said, signalize the exclusion from the caste.
And though, what they aim at is, not to overthrow a system which is the very foundation of the
national life, but to create, in the interior of this immense circle, a more or less extended group of
saints, who escape from the world and break all its ties. For the mass of the adherents, caste
subsists uncontested; in a number of cases the new community of faith operates as a lever for the
creation of new sections.

We are no longer in those times in which it could be allowed to represent Buddhism or
Jainism as attempts of a social reform directed against the régime of the castes.58 The
illogical resignation, with which they have submitted to it, shows, on the contrary, how at the
period of their foundation, it was deeply rooted in the Hindu conscience, wedded to those
beliefs, those elementary notions, as the doctrine of moral merit, of metempsychosis, of final
liberation, the inheritance of which they received without protest.


For a long time it has been believed, on the testimony of Plato and Herodot, that Egypt had been
ruled by the system of castes. This view has now been given up by the best authorized judges.
It appears that it is decidedly contradicted by the indigenous monuments. The Greeks, little
accustomed to vast hereditary organisms tied together by the privilege of rank, or the community
of occupation, could easily exaggerate their importance, or their extent, where they met with
their more or less strict types. Up to the present, India alone has shown a universal system
of castes, in the sense in which we have stated and defined. At best, one may find elsewhere
accidental traces, germs of analogous institutions; they are nowhere generalised, or arranged
in a system.

Greece has known, in Lacedaemon and elsewhere, several cases of hereditary functions
and trades. Notwithstanding the uncertainties which obscure their interpretation, the names
borne by the four Ionian tribes (phyle) of Attica, are really professional names: soldiers,
goatherds, artisans. 59 These are assuredly no castes. The example, at least, proves that the
Aryan tradition could, under the influence of a favourable situation, incline towards caste. It
is good to retain this lesson. A social fact, which sways an immense country, which is wound
up with its whole past, has necessarily more than one cause. If we mean to confine it in one
single too precise deduction, we are sure to go astray. Currents so powerful are formed
of numerous affluent. The true explanation, I am convinced of it, must assign its part to
each one of the agents, which, one after the other, have been pushed to the front in too
systematic and too exclusive a spirit. There have been many other countries in which an
immigrant race has found itself in juxtaposition with occupants, whom it has vanquished and
dispossessed, and this situation has not given there rise to caste. Other populations have
known strong distinctions of class, and caste has remained unknown to them. Thesocracy has
grown in other grounds also. The régime must therefore in India result from the combined
action of several factors. I hope that I have discerned the principal ones. Let us endeavour
to take in, with one glance, the epitome of this history.

We take the Aryans at their entry in India. They live under the sway of old laws,
common to all the branches of the race. They are divided into tribes, clans and families,
more or less large; the groups are equally governed by a corporative organization, the general
features of which are identical with all, the bond of which is consanguinity more and more

narrowing down. The age of pure and simple equality between clan and clan, tribe and tribe, is gone. Military prestige and priestly prestige have commenced their work. Certain groups, raised by the splendour of warrior powers, proud of a more brilliant or better ascertained descent, enriched, more than others, by the fortune of arms, have joined together in a class of nobility which is claiming the power. The religious rites have become complicated so as to require a special ability and a technical preparation, both for the carrying out of the ceremonies and for the composition of chants; a priestly class has arisen, which bases its pretensions upon, more or less, legendary genealogies, connecting its branches with illustrious sacrificers of the past. The rest of the Aryans are mixed up in a single category, within which the different groups move with autonomy, and according to their corporative laws. Religious notions rule the whole life from the beginning; priesthood, already powerful, is here increasing the prestige and vigour of the religious scruples.

The Aryans are advancing in their new dominion. They come into collision with a dark-coloured race, inferior in culture, which they drive back. This opposition, the care for their security, the contempt of the vanquished: enhance in the conquerors the inborn exclusivism, exalt all belief and all prejudices, that protect the purity of the divisions into which they are split. The autochthonous population is thrown into one confused mass, which only ties of subordination of a rather loose nature connect with their masters. The religious ideas, brought by the invaders, penetrate, more or less, into this mass, but never sufficiently to raise it to their own level. Still in spreading over vast areas, where their settlements are seldom enclosed by any natural limits, the invaders become dispersed; shaken by the hazards of the struggle, the primitive groups are severed. The rigour of the genealogical principle, which united them, is thus compromised; to form anew, the scattered parts follow geographical proximities, or other conveniences.

Slowly the necessities of a less movable existence begin to be felt. Life becomes more sedentary in villages of pastoral and agricultural industry; and these, at first, are founded according to relationship; for the laws of the family and of the clan preserve a sovereign authority; they continue to observe the traditional customs that are sanctioned by religion. The more fixed habits develop the needs and the professions of a civilization, which has got ripe for more refined exigencies. The workmen of every description are, in their turn, caught in the network, be it that the community of residence brings on the community of occupation, or, that the scattered representatives of the same profession, in places sufficiently near to keep some contact, obey an imperious necessity in modelling themselves upon the only type of organization known around them.

With time two facts have asserted themselves: more or less acknowledged mixtures have taken place between the races; the Aryan notions of purity have found their way into this hybrid population and even into the purely aboriginal tribes. From this rise two orders of scruples which multiply the sub-divisions, according to the more or less pronounced impurity, either of descent, or of professions. While the ancient principles of family life remain in force, the factors of grouping are diversified: occupation, religion, neighbourhood and others still, at the side of the primitive principle of consanguinity, the mask of which they more or less put on. The groups are increasing in number and intersecting. Under the double action of their own traditions and of the ideas which they borrow from the Aryan civilization, even the aboriginal tribes, as they by and by give up their isolated and savage life, accelerate the influx of new sub-divisions. Now caste exists. We see how—in its different gradations—it has slowly substituted itself for the family regime of which it is the heir.

A political power could have subordinated these organisms to the domain of a regular system. But no political constitution does dawn. Even the thought of it does not appear. Why should we wonder at this? The priestly power cannot be favourable to it; for it would be the loser by it
now its action is very strong and very steady; it paralyses the exercise of power even in the military aristocracy. The configuration of the country does not create natural nucleuses for concentration; every boundary there is floating. Pastoral life has long maintained a spirit of severe tradition; no ardent taste for any action impairs it. The vanquished population is numerous; more repressed, than absorbed, it is slowly invaded by the sacerdotal propaganda rather than subjected by a rude conquest. With some temperaments, it preserves much of its ancient organization, especially there, where it is confined and isolated. By the masses which it interposes, by the example of its very rudimentary institutions, even by the facility with which these institutions are melting into the still rather rudimentary organization of the immigrants, it opposes one obstacle more to the constitution of a true political power. Therefore, there is no beginning of a state.

In this confusion the sacerdotal class alone has preserved a solid esprit de corps; it alone is in possession of an altogether moral, but very efficacious power. This power it uses to strengthen and to extend its privileges; it further makes use of it to establish some sort of order and of cohesion under its supremacy. It generalises and codifies the state of fact in an ideal system which it is endeavouring to pass as a law, the legal régime of the caste. It amalgamates in the caste the actual situation with the tenacious traditions of the past, when the hierarchy of classes laid the foundations of its power, since then so largely increased.

Sprung from a mixture of arbitrary pretensions and authentic facts, this system becomes, in its turn, a force. Not only the Brahmins carry it as a dogma into the parts of the country, the assimilation of which takes place at a later date; it, everywhere, is reacting by the ideas upon practice, owing to the immense authority attached to its patrons. The speculative ideal tends to impose itself as the strict rule of duty. But there was too great a distance between the facts and the theory, as that they ever could be brought completely to fit together.

What interests us, is to trace the way, which the institution has followed in its spontaneous growth. I, therefore, may stop here.

Caste, in my opinion, is the normal prolongation of the ancient Aryan institutions as remodelled by the vicissitudes into which they were involved by the new conditions and surroundings they met in India. It would be inexplicable without this traditional basis, as it would be unintelligible without the alloys, that have been mixed with it, without the circumstances that have knitted it.

I should like to be understood well. I do not pretend to assert, that the régime of castes, as we observe it at present, with the endless sections, so different in nature and cohesion it includes, contains nothing but the logical, purely organical development of primitive Aryan elements only. Groups of varied origin, of variable structure, have entered the caste régime at all times, and still are multiplying in it: clans of invaders, that mark the route of successive conquests; aboriginal tribes, come forth late from their wild isolation; accidental fractionings, either of proper castes or of similar groups. More still: such mixtures, which, complicated by multiple combinations, give so disconcerting, so shadowy a physiognomy to the caste of our days, undoubtedly, happened, already quite early. If they have been going on asserting themselves more and more, they have begun from the period, when the régime was forming. I have already said it; I repeat it with a purpose: by condensing a general conclusion in a brief formula, you run the risk of appearing to exaggerate your principle, you run the risk of falsifying a thesis in itself. Just by stretching it to the extreme, be it by an effort to precise too categorically, or by a desire to lay more stress on views, you consider now. I should not wish to be suspected of any such enticement, being strongly on my guard against it.

What I think is this, that the Aryans of India, whatever influences they may have undergone from outside, whatever troubles the hazards of history may have brought with them, have drawn
from their own ground the essential elements of caste, such as it has been practised, conceived and finally put into a system. If the \textit{regime}, under which India has lived, is neither a purely economical organization of trades, nor a barbarous chaos of tribes and of foreign and hostile races, nor a simple hierarchy of classes, but a mixture of all these things, united by the common inspiration that rules the working of all the groups by the common set of ideas and characteristic prejudices, which connect them, divide them, fix between them the precedences, it is explained by the fact, that the family constitutions, surviving through all evolutions, ruling the Aryan first, then growing with their influence, and imposing itself even upon the groups of independent origin, has been the pivot of a slow transformation.

I am not heedless enough to forget that it has been penetrated by heterogeneous elements. Moreover, after being once completed in its essential features, it has no doubt undergone the action of analogy, like all systems, which are growing old, and in which tradition does not longer imbibe new strength from a living consciousness of the beginnings. Besides the various principles which have been severally considered as the springs of caste, even arbitrary change disguised under false pretences has done its work. Though accidental or secondary, such alterations have not failed to throw some trouble into the physiognomy of the facts. Still I do not insist upon them. If there be need, their sources will be found in some of the details, which I have had the opportunity of setting forth by-the-by.

Even to limit ourselves to the period of formation, how much we should like to settle dates! What I have said on the literary tradition, will explain that I have no precise dates to offer. Ancient institutions become impregnated with a new spirit only by insensible advances; movements, which, according to circumstances, go on at an unequal pace, in different regions, are not manifested in the evidences, until the preceding condition of things has become entirely unrecognizable. They are obscure, because they are slow. They do not admit of any rigorous dating. At most one might flatter himself to determine, at which moment the Brahminical system, which rules the caste theoretically, has received its last form. Still even this pretension would be over ambitions. We may console ourselves, we should not be much more advanced, by that, if it is true, the system is summing up the ideal of the dominant caste rather than reflecting the real situation.

Even as far as regards the \textit{Veda}, the value of the hints it affords is anything but definite. It would be necessary to know whether it really exhausts the whole of contemporaneous facts, whether it presents them completely and faithfully. I do not think at all, that we may be at any certainty. What is sure, is that we discover in the Vedas still standing out in full relief that hierarchy of classes which was later on resolved into the \textit{regime} of the castes. Still it is undoubted that, in the Vedic period already the causes had begun to act, which \textit{by} their combined and continued working had to graft a new order on the old Aryan trunk.

The Aryans of India and the Aryans of the classical world start from the same premises. How different are the consequences on one side and on the other!

At the beginning the same groups exist on both sides, governed by the same beliefs, the same customs. In Greece and in Italy, these small societies combine to an organized whole. They rise, one above the other, in a regular system. Every group preserves its full autonomy in its sphere of action; but the higher federation which constitutes the city, comprises the common interests and regulates the common action. The chaos takes shape under the hands of the Greeks. The disjointed organisms are melted into a larger unity. In proportion as it is getting formed, the new idea which is its hidden soul, the political idea appears in outline. As the caste, the "city" has sprung from the common primitive constitution, cast in the mould of the same religious rules, of the same traditions, but inspired by new necessities, it puts forth a new principle of organization. It shows itself capable of growing, of doing without the barriers which have supported, but also confined its first steps. Later on, it will, whilst transforming itself, supply a frame wide enough for giving room to the deepest revolutions in ethics and in power.
In India the caste continues the ancient customs; it even in several respects develops them in their logical direction; but it loses something of that impulse which had created the primitive groups, and does not renew their spirit. Different ideas mix with—or take the place of the genealogical bond, which had knit together the first societies. In modifying themselves, in becoming castes, they do not find a directive principle in themselves; they cross one another, each remaining isolated in its jealous autonomy. The frame is immense without distinct borders, without organic life; a confused mass of small independent societies bent under a common level.

The classical language of India is distinguished from the kindred languages, by a striking singularity. The finite verb holds hardly any place in the sentence; the thought is developed by means of long compounds often vague in their relation. In place of a solid syntactical construction, the lines which are set forth clearly, in which the incidents detach themselves in nearly set clauses, the sentence knows only a loose structure, where the elements of the thought, being simply in juxtaposition, are wanting in relief. The religious beliefs of India scarcely present themselves as positive dogmas. In the fluctuating lines of an ill-defined pantheism, the oppositions and divergences rise one moment to sink down again, like a shifting eddy, in the moving mass. Contradictions quickly resolve into a conciliatory syncretism wherein the vigour of schisms loses its nerve. An accommodating orthodoxy is covering all dissent with its wide cloak. There is nowhere a categorical, united, intransigent doctrine.

On social ground an analogous phenomenon appears to us in the caste system. We have everywhere the same spectacle of a want of plastic power.

Whatever sap it may have borrowed from exterior and historical circumstances, this is indeed the fruit of the Hindu mind. The social organization of India stands in the same relation to the structure of the Hellenic "city," in which a Hindu poem stands to a Greek tragedy. The Hindu genius no less in practical life, than in art, rarely shows itself capable of organization, i.e., of measure, of harmony. In caste, all its effort has been devoted to maintain, to strengthen, a network of closed groups, without common action, without mutual reaction, finally recognizing no other motive power, but the unbalanced authority of a priestly class which has absorbed the whole direction of the minds. Under the levelling hand of Brahmanism the castes are moving, as the episodes are joineting in disorder in the vague unity of the epic narrative. It seems sufficient if an artificial system theoretically marks such incoherence.

The destinies of caste, if well looked at, are an instructive chapter in the psychology of India.

MAYURAJA.

BY BHATTANATHA SVAMIN; VIZAGAPATAM.

Māyūrājā is the Sanskrit poet of whom the Catalogus Catalogorum speaks as being a poet mentioned in the Sāktimuktāvalī. Mahāmahopādhyāya Pandit Durgāprasād quotes the following verse in his elaborate preface to the Karpūromājuri:

मायूरसमी ज्ञेयं नामः करण्डम अः कविः ।
उज्ज्वलसः सङ्तन: कविः या निरिन्दा: ॥

"No other poet of the Kamchuli family was born equal to Māyūrājā. How many moons have come out of the ocean?"

1 Prof. Peterson in quoting from Haridārāṇī or Saddhākṣāndesāvī gives a different version of this verse in his second Report, p. 92.

मायूरसमी ज्ञेयं नामः कुलविच्छिन्न: कविः ।
उज्ज्वलसः सङ्ग्राम: कविः या निरिन्दा: ॥

If in the first line मायूरसमी were the reading, as in the above verse, then ज्ञेयं in the second line would entirely lose its force. I doubt that a poet named Kulethuri who is related to Māyūra ever existed. The reading of Haridārāṇī as given above, must be a mistake. In the following pages of the Report, Prof. Peterson translates the above verse thus: "But from Mayūra there sprung (as his pupil) the poet Kulethuri, a single birth which were rivalled the countless moons that night after night rose out of the ocean." I fear this is not the meaning of the verse even according to his reading.
The authorship of this verse is attributed to the poet Rājaśekhara. Probably this is the verse of the Sākṣi mogulītā referred to by Prof. Aufricht in his Catalogus Catalogorum.

In the same preface, Pandit Durgāprasad cites the following verse of Māyūraṭa from the Sākṣi mogulītā:

गणपतिपितांदिके दुर्भिकर्षेऽपरकं दशनमायीयातिमाताम्
हलऽकर्णांचन्द्राकां चतुर्विन्यवक्त्तमातुमातुमायीयातिमाताम्।
पीतांत: स्वामिनावः श्रीविनायकसागरमात्राः प्रज्ञानमाताम्.

३९४ दामूलक परव स्तति द्वारात्स्तविकाश्चित्तुमाताम्।

From this and other verses found in the anthologies, the Pandit concludes that Māyūraṭa must have been the author of a drama with the story of the Rāmdyaṇa for its plot. But he was not able to ascertain the name of the drama.

Now, realising the importance of the contribution made by this old poet to Sanskrit literature and attracted by the notable style of the poet found in anthologies, I greatly wished to find out the name of his work, and thus to bring to light this hidden portion of the treasure of Sanskrit literature. For this purpose I ransacked all the works on rhetoric, notably, Daśarūpāvaloka Sarvasatikāntabharana, Sāhityadarpāṇa, etc. In the course of my search I noted down the names of all the Rāmdyaṇa dramas. I give their names in the following table in alphabetical order. Against the name of each drama, the name of the work in which it is referred to is also given.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Work.</th>
<th>Referred to in.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Anarghārāghava</td>
<td>Sāhityadarpāṇa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Uttarānacharita</td>
<td>Daśarūpāvaloka.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Udātārāghava</td>
<td>Daśarūpāvaloka and Sāhityadarpāṇa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Kundamālā</td>
<td>Sāhityadarpāṇa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Kṛityānvaṇa</td>
<td>Do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Chhalitarāma</td>
<td>Daśarūpāvaloka and Sarasvatikāntabalāraṇa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Jānakitrāghava</td>
<td>Sāhityadarpāṇa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Nirdosahadāśaratha (?)</td>
<td>Sarvasatikāntabharana.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Bālārāmāyana</td>
<td>Sāhityadarpāṇa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Mahāvīracharita</td>
<td>Daśarūpāvaloka and Sarvasatikāntabharana.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Rāghavābhuyada</td>
<td>Sāhityadarpāṇa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Rāmābhīnanda</td>
<td>Do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Rāmābhuyada</td>
<td>Daśarūpāvaloka and Dhvanīaloka and Lochana.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Vālīvada</td>
<td>Sāhityadarpāṇa.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 See preface to Karpūramāhārī, p. 9 (Kāyamālā).
Of these dramas we know that Anarghârdghana was written by Mûrârî; Uttarâdâmacchita and Mahâdeviracharita by the illustrious Bhavabhûti; Bîlarândâga, by Râjâsekha; and lastly, Râmâyugyudaya by the poet king Yaśovarman. The authorship of the remaining dramas is clouded in mystery. One of these, Udâttârâdhava, is unhesitatingly attributed to the poet Bhâsa by some learned men of Southern India. In his History of the Classical Sanskrit Literature, p. 67, Mr. M. Krishnamâcharya, M.A., B.L., M.B.A.S., says “At least the names of three of his [Bhâsa’s] works we have known on reliable authority. The Udâttârâdhava develops the eminent side of the character of Râma. The Swapnaudâsaavadatta occupies itself with the story of Udayana’s marriage with Vâsavâdatta. The Kiranâvali is said to be a Nâtyâd in the mode of the Râmâvali.” Here the author says that “on reliable authority” he has known the names of the three dramas of Bhâsa. But at the same time he does not mention who is his “reliable authority.” We can however accept Bhâsa’s authorship of Swapnaudâsaavadatta on the authority of Râjâsekha.

Moreover, Dhvanyâlokâlochana quotes from this drama. As to Kiranâvali, I very much doubt that a drama of the name of Kiranâvali by Bhâsa or any other poet ever existed.

Now as to the third drama, Udâttârâdhava, the attribution of the authorship of this drama to Bhâsa is not supported by any evidence. Though a drama of that name is quoted in the work on rhetoric, we do not find a single statement in support of Bhâsa’s authorship thereof and in fact, we find a statement in contradiction to it. Even in the Catalogus Catalogorum the name of the author of the drama is not given, but the name only of the work in which it is quoted. In a lengthy discussion on the subject, in his preface to Priyâdârika, Pandit R.V. Krishnamâcharya says, “Hârâma, Sarvasûhâsya Mahârana, Nârâyanâbhiradgâunyâda Sridhârânyâda, Nârâyanâbhiradgâunyâda, Nârâyanâbhiradgâunyâda, Nârâyanâbhiradgâunyâda, Nârâyanâbhiradgâunyâda, Nârâyanâbhiradgâunyâda, Nârâyanâbhiradgâunyâda.” “In works like Sâhityâlarpâna, only the name Udâttârâdhava is heard of; but the author is not mentioned.

But from the ordinary works on rhetoric it can be shown that neither the author of the History of the Classical Sanskrit Literature nor the editor of the Priyâdârika is right. Moreover,

[XXV, 74]

And he is not quoted or referred to by Bhâja in his Sarvasûhâsya Mahârana nor by any author previous to Bhâja. So Mûrârî may be assigned a date between A.D. 1050 and 1135.

Pandit Durgâpârasad says that Mûrârî lived before the middle of the 9th century and gives the quotation from Haringâya as referring to Mûrârî.

[XXXVIII, 68.]

(See Introduction to Subhâshîtâvâna, p. 51 and Anarghârdghana, p. 1, note.

Durgâpârasad thinks that here the word मूर्ति has two meanings. It is not so. The poet compares Mûrârî with Vishnu the author of a bad drama—the hero destroyed by the hero Hiranyakasipu in his ashes or lap, and the latter exhibits the murder of the hero in an act. In Mûrârî’s drama, the death of the hero does not take place in any act. Mûrârî cannot, therefore, be the poet referred to in the verse. The commentator Alaka also says that there is a pun on the words सुगुर्द and उष्मावक only, and not on मूर्ति.

* See Dhvanyâlokâ, p. 143 (Commentary). Yaśovarman is the patron of Bhavabhûti and Vâkapatiśâkha, a Prakrit poet; cf. Introduction, Subhâshîtâvâna, p. 95.

* This verse is taken from Sâkisuddhâvâla. See preface to Karpâranâjâr, p. 7. [Note, above Vol.xil, p. 29—D.R.B.]
It seems remarkable that the following statement in the well-known work Daśarūpāvaloka has not been noticed.

"For example, the unlawful killing of Vālī is dropped by Māyūrāja in [his] Uddāttarāghava."

Thus, by a simple reference to Daśarūpāvaloka, we learn that Uddāttarāghava was written by Māyūrāja. So we see that Pandit Durgāprasad was right so far as he went. From the commentary on Kaṇṭhīśvarasumaṇa of Hemachandra p. 335, Māyūrāja seems to be the author of a Kāvyā also.

Now let us consider some points first about the author Māyūrāja, and then about the work itself.

We have already shown that Māyūrāja was a Rajput of the Kalachuri clan. We know that the Kalachuri princes ruled the Chedi country. This Chedidasā is at present identified with Berar and the northern part of Central Provinces. The capital of the country was at first Mahishmati or the modern Mahēśvar. Afterwards the town named Tripura was made the capital. This Tripura is now identified with Terur near Jabalpur. So Māyūrāja might have been a king of Chedi country with its capital Mahēśvar. Unfortunately, the history of the early Kalachuris is a blank in Indian History, and we know nothing about the princes between A.D. 580 and A.D. 875. So one must await future research for additional information about the personal history of our poet king.

Now, as regards the work itself, it will help us in fixing the approximate date of the author. As the work is not found anywhere, we have to rely on the quotations in the Sāhityadarpāna, Daśarūpāvaloka, etc. Daśarūpāvaloka quotes Uddāttarāghava in six different places, while the other work Sāhityadarpāna has quotations from it in only five different places, which include the four of Daśarūpāvaloka. From these quotations we learn that the story of the Rāmāyaṇa forms the basis of the plot of the drama. We also learn that the poet did not closely follow it, but changed the original as he pleased. The first deviation is:

\[ \text{लिखकम्:} \quad \text{कृपया स्म मात्र धुणि परीक्षणात् कविता} \]

\[ \text{लिखकम्:} \quad \text{गृहोदित्त ग्रंथम् स्थितम् कदाचि न व:} \]

\[ \text{वीरं नैसर्षा तेस सम्मो नृत्यम् संघस्वर्यम्.} \]

In the story of the hunt of the māyūrāja, Lakṣmaṇa is made to go first in pursuit of the game. Then, when Rāma was informed by the disguised Rākṣasa that Lakṣmaṇa was in danger, he went to save his brother, when Sītā was carried away by Rāvana.

Secondly, we have in the Daśarūpāvaloka:

"विधा द्रवणा विलिणो नाथुण वेदोहनारण्यो परिलक्षणः"

From this we learn that Māyūrāja omitted the story of the unlawful killing of Vālī. Here the word द्रवणा (unlawfully) seems to be used for explaining the poet's object in omitting the story. The poet perhaps wished to bring out the character of Rāma without any defect.

Now the verse द्रवणा, etc., quoted above, is said in the Daśarūpāvaloka to belong to Uddāttarāghava and in Sāhityadarpāna to Kulapālajāhī. It appears, therefore, that the act

---

9 Preface to Karpīraṇaṭājīrī, p. 6.
11 This verse is also quoted in Sarvaśaktiśākhuṣṭha (Baroh, 2nd Edition), p. 330.
12 Daśarūpāvaloka, pp. 110, 111. Kāvyakutāmaṇa of Hemachandra, p. 57.
13 This statement is corroborated by Sāhityadarpāna (p. 275 of the N. S. Press edition).
14 Daśarūpāvaloka, p. 100.
15 Sāhityadarpāna p. 323.
dealing with \textit{Sītāpaharaṇa} in the \textit{Udīttrādhāva} is named \textit{Kulapayyaka}. The quotation \textit{वहि कुलपायकु राजस्वाज्ञानकतः} also leads to the same conclusion.

The above facts show that the plot of the \textit{Udīttrādhāva} deviates much more from the story of the \textit{Rāmāyaṇa} than the plot of Bhavabhūti's \textit{Virāchārīta}. We find as a matter of fact that the later a \textit{Rāmāyaṇa} drama is, the more does the story deviate from the original. The story went on altering till in the \textit{Jñānakāraṇa} and \textit{Abhūtaśarpaṇa} the original story can scarcely be recognised. Bhavabhūti seems to have been the first to dramatise the \textit{Rāmāyaṇa}, as he successfully worked up a greater part of the story into drama, and as he does not, like Murāri, Rājaśekhara and Jayadeva, refer to previous authors on the subject. So \textit{Māyuṣa}, the author of \textit{Udīttrādhāva} cannot be in my opinion, earlier than Bhavabhūti, whose time has been fixed by Dr. Bhandarkar to be the first half of the eighth century A.D. That he was not later than Rājaśekhara is obvious from Rājaśekhara's own verse quoted by me at the beginning of this article. Rājaśekhara's date has been fixed on definite grounds by Pandit Durgāprasad in his preface to \textit{Karpūranaśāstra} to be between A.D. 854-859. So \textit{Māyuṣa} must have flourished somewhere between A.D. 750 and 880.

I give below the passages of \textit{Māyuṣa} from \textit{Udīttrādhāva}, which have been quoted in the works on rhetoric, omitting the quotation, which has already been given in the course of the article. These passages may help the public to form an opinion about the style of the author of the yet unknown drama:

\begin{quote}
रामो गृहि निवास कालवनसा कालमण्डलनां सुरेशवक्तया नरेन राजमहिलाकारा गाय तात्त्विकस्वरूपः

पौरुषं फैलति ना निलं न निलं परं संसारं चिन्तनं भाग्यान्वयनं भाग्यसदृशम्

\textit{[Dāśrāpāka, p. 76 ; Sāhityādharpana, p. 265.]}\end{quote}

2. जीवनाली साहित्य-ग्रंथ प्रसारितः कविभाषणानां कला तत्त्वार्थम् कन्याकाव्यानी ।

\textit{[Dāśrāpāka, p. 79 ; Sāhityādharpana, p. 310.]}

3. राजस:-

\begin{quote}
राजस कालवनसा निर्धारणः केवल राजसः

वेदो गृहिणी गोस्वामिनिः

हितीयम्-पुरोपूर्वां नाभिकरणः

प्रधानः-विनाशिकन्तयेः

हितिर्गीतिः-अपूर्वम: प्रवचनः सवऽ तत्त्वार्थमनुष्ठानः

सुवर्णमुखिः-निःसर्ग अक्षुककुंकुलः

कवित्वम्-केवल वानस्पतिज्ञ निर्माणः

प्रधानः-प्रवचनः तत्त्वार्थमनुष्ठानः विचारः

\textit{[Dāśrāpāka, pp. 102 and 103.]}\end{quote}

7. प्रवचन विवेकसः संबंधानी च वाण:---महाराण, एवं ज्ञातप्रकटकम् श्रावण पलित…………………..

\begin{quote}
विवेकोत्तरः विज्ञानवस्त्र विहितहितो महाराणः

\textit{[Dāśrāpāka, p. 111.]}\end{quote}

---

\textsuperscript{16} Sāhityādharpana, p. 281.

\textsuperscript{17} A drama by Rāmaḥbāradhākṣita who was (according to his \textit{Jñānakāraṇa}) a contemporary of Nālaṅkhāḍikṣita, who composed his \textit{Nālaṅkhāḍikṣita} in 1657.

\textsuperscript{18} A drama by Mahādeva, son of Krishṇapriya and pupil of Bālaṅkṣita the teacher of Rāmaḥbāradhākṣita Mahādeva was, therefore, a contemporary of Rāmaḥbāradhākṣita.

\textsuperscript{19} The author of \textit{Prasannārdhāva}, son of Mahādeva of \textit{Kuṇḍalakṣita} and Sūmitra. Besides \textit{Prasannārdhāva}, he wrote \textit{Okandakāla} and a commentary on \textit{Kuṇḍalakṣitaśāstra}. He is quoted in Sāhityādharpana (p. 199). Bahu Mon Mohan Ghokakar assigns to Sāhityādharpana a date not later than the 14th century A.D. See J. A. S. E., Vol. LXII, part I, p. 146.

\textsuperscript{20} See Introduction to \textit{Māyuṣa-Mādhava}, Bombay Sanskrit Series.

\textsuperscript{21} See preface to \textit{Karpūranaśāstra}, p. 2.
KARIKALA AND HIS TIMES.

BY K. V. SUBRAHMANYA AIYER, B.A.; COTACAMUND.

One of the oldest cities of Southern India is Kāvīrippāmputṭiṇam. It is situated on the sea coast, 12 miles south-east of Shiyali in the Tanjore district. In ancient times it also bore the name Pugār. That it was near the mouth of the river Kāvhē and had in it the temples of Sāyivaṇam and Pallavanāvaram are recorded in the Dīvānīmanta songs. Ancient Tamil literature abounds in references to this old city and these show that it was a place of considerable size and importance in early times. Excluding the authors of the Dīvānīmanta, the poets that give a glowing description of the place, the wealth of the town, the pleasures and pastimes of its inhabitants and the busy trade which it kept up with the outside world and the inland countries, are not few. Chief among them may be mentioned the Chērē prince Ilāṅgāvadigaḷ, the author of Sitappatigāram; Sittalai Sāṭṭaṅgār who composed the Maṇimēgalai; Rundaṅganaṅgār and Nappūdangaṅgā, the authors of three of the poems in the collection known as Pottappāṭṭu. There are evidences in these writings to show that some of the authors visited the place which they described, while others were its inhabitants.

Not long after the time of the Saiva saints, Nānasambandar and Appar, who are assigned to the middle of the 7th century A.D., the sea washed away the whole town with its boasted splendour and glory. It was about this time that the Chinese pilgrim, Huen Thiang, visited many of the important places of Southern India. This town should certainly have been one of them if it had then been in existence, but its identity with the southern Charitrapura, as some take it, is doubtful. There are grounds to suppose that even in earlier times, there was an encroachment of the sea on this portion of the east coast, when other places seem to have been submerged in the ocean. We may perhaps trace an allusion to such an inundation in the name Tōṣiṟpuram by which the town of Shiyali was known in early times. In their hymns on Tirukkalumalam, Nānasambandar and Appar state in clear terms that it once floated like a boat in the water of the sea. Several villages were destroyed, but Tōṣiṟpuram is said to have survived the effects of the event. The foundations of the original city of Kāvīrippāmputṭiṇam must have been laid long after the first inundation but when it was founded, how long it thrived as the principal town of the Chōja empire and who the sovereigns were that ruled over it, are facts yet to be ascertained. The Greek geographer, Ptolemy, who flourished in the second century A.D. speaks of Chōbari Emporium and this has been taken to refer to the port of Kāvīrippāmputṭiṇam. After the destruction of the city by the encroachment of the sea, perhaps at the close of the 7th century A.D., it seems to have been refounded and been-again

1 Sewell's Lists of Antiquities, I. p. 272
2 The references that 'Pōṇi kāgaramatru Sāykkādu,' i.e. Sāykkādu (Sāyivaṇam) at the place where the Pōṇi (Kāvhē) joins the sea; 'Vāyiri matiru Sāluram yon-Pōṇi molē pulti vengal sjulē poindru; Sāykkādu' and 'Pōṇi-Pallavanāvaram' occurring in Nānasambandar's hymns and Pōṇ-Pōṇi-Cēkkādu and Kāvīrippāmpatīru-Sāykkādu found in the hymns of Appar make it clear that both Sāykkādu and Pallavanāvaram were in Kāvīrippāmpatīru and that the town was near the sea. It is worthy of note that Sāykkādu and Sāyivaṇam are synonymous. It may also be pointed out that Sundaramurti-Nāynār who in later than the other two Saiva saints has not contributed any hymn on the temples at Kāvīrippāmpatīru, though he has visited places near it and composed hymns on them.
3 The expression 'Kadakaraṇaśālā kālākote mīdakku mālumanāvagur' occurring in one of the hymns of Nānasambandar; 'dālāyan peruvellatu-sārā mānunē Tōṣupuram' and 'mamunē māndunē' found in the verses of Appar and 'Kadak-kōla mānunē kālumālalumā vēnēgur' in the songs of Sundaramurti furnish evidence on the point. One other reference in Appar's Deśāram which says that four of five birds are supposed to have borne the burden of the feet of god at Shiyali on the day when the sea encroached on the land is also of interest,
a place of importance till the 15th century A.D. Then it ceased to be such, partly owing
to the silting up of the Kaveri4 and partly also to some other causes. The sandy mounds
found scattered over several places near the villages of Talaiyam, Shiayali and
Mêlaipperumpaljam amply testify to the inundations of the sea. The fragments of brick
and tile strewn over the fields near the now insignificant villages round the ruins of Kâvieri-pa-
țaṇam indicate the remains of the town founded in later times. Colonel Yule identifies
Paṭṭinaṇam with Fattan of the Muhammadan historian Rashiquddin. If anything like the
remains of the original city referred to by Ptolemy in the 2nd century A.D. and said to have
been destroyed five centuries later, is to be traced at all, it must be by the axe and spade. In
other words, it is only excavation on a large scale conducted in a scientific and systematic
method, a thing much to be desired, that would enable us to have a peep into the past great-
ness of the city.

The name Pallavanisvaram, by which one of the temples at Kâvierippumpaṭaṇam was
called in the middle of the 7th century A.D., suggests that it should have been either built
by a Pallava king or that it came into existence during the time of a Pallava, whose away was
acknowledged in that part of the country where the village was situated. It is even probable
that the temple was founded sometime earlier, and in this case, it must have existed
in an insignificant form before its construction on a grander scale was undertaken by the
Pallava king. We do not know to which of the Pallavas the construction of the temple of
Pallavanisvaram should be ascribed, but we can assign it with a good deal of probability
to Narasimhavarman I, the contemporary of Nânasambandar, because excepting him none
other of the line claims to have conquered the Chêlas.

Such have been the fortunes of the city, which, at the time of Karikâla, one of the greatest
sovereigas of the Chêla dynasty, became the principal town of the empire. This king was not
unaware of its advantageous position for trade. Accordingly, he appears to have improved it
to a considerable extent by building warehouses and appointing officers to collect the dues
government on the articles exported from and imported into the country. It is not unlikely
that the seat of Government was removed by Karikâla to this place from Uraiýûr, which he is
said to have abandoned, finding perhaps that it was not a central place and had not so much in
its favour to be the capital of the empire as the flourishing port of Kâvierippumpaṭaṇam.
Karikâla was certainly one of the most powerful Chêla kings that ruled from the city and his
name is even to the present day known throughout the Tamil country, and even in the Telugu
districts of that a great monarch who looked to the welfare of the subjects entrusted to his
and as a patron of letters.

Inscriptions that mention him are indeed very few, but certainly not fewer than those
that refer to the other great kings of the line. Except for the mere mention of him, Chêla
inscriptions do not throw much light on the events connected with his reign. This is because
we have not as yet obtained any copper-plate grant relating to the dynasty to which
Karikâla belonged, all the charters discovered hitherto being only those of the revived Chêla
line started by Vijayalaya in about the 9th century A.D. Nor are we in possession of the facts
which brought an end to the earlier line. It is not even known who the last great sovereign
was. But there is not much doubt, however, that the Pallava expansion in the south and the
establishment of the Châlukyas were some of the causes which might have contributed to this
end, not to say the effeminacy and weakness of some of the Chêla kings, who do not appear to have
persisted in maintaining their ground against the advancing northern powers. The
Udayândiram plates of the Gaṅga-Bina king Prithivipati II. Hastimalla place Karikâla

* Above, Vol. VII p. 49.
* See Pattapparai.
between Kili and Kachechegangan, while the Leyden plates mention him prior to Kachechegangan and Kili. Both the Eastern Chalikyas and Telugu Cholas, whose copper-plate charters are not few, claim descent from Karikala and the importance of these will be discussed later on. Though the materials furnished by inscriptions regarding his reign are scanty, yet there is no room for complete disappointment, for the literature of the early Tamils has on record many a reference, which could be of use to the students of history.

The exact time when this king flourished is not given either in the copper-plates which mention him or in the Tamil works which describe his times. Scanty as the materials are for settling the question of his date, the approximate period to which this king should be ascribed can fairly be made out by a consideration of certain facts and events connected with his reign. These are:

1. The battle at Vivil, where Karikala defeated the Cheera and the Pandya kings.
2. Karikala ruled from Kuchi, which he made new with gold.
3. The fight with Trilochana-Pallava, whom he is said to have defeated.
4. He brought a number of families from the Ganges valley and settled them in the several districts of Toṇḍai-maṇḍalam.
5. Karikala was an ally of Avanti and an overlord of Vajra and Maghada.

Copper-plate charters of the Telugu-Chola chiefs attribute to Karikala the building of high banks to the Kaveri river and the conquest of Trilochana-Pallava. It may be stated that the former of these events is mentioned in the Tiruvallanga grant. The statement that Karikala ruled from Kuchi made it new with gold might be taken to show either that the Pallavas had not settled themselves yet at Kuchi, or that the Chola king’s conquest of them gave him its possession. The conquest of Trilochana-Pallava attributed to Karikala suggests that the latter is more probable. It is not known, however, which king among the Pallavas bore the surname Trilochana. Whoever he was, he is also said to have been defeated by the Western Chalikya Vijayaditya, who, in spite of the victory, is reported to have lost his life in the encounter. As Vijayaditya, with whom the Pallava contemporary of Karikala had to fight, is considered to be the immediate predecessor of Pulakesin I, and as the initial date of Pulakesin is fixed at A.D. 550, Vijayaditya has to be assigned to the earlier half of the 8th century A.D. And this must also be the time, when the Chola king Karikala flourished. It may be noted that Vijayaditya was a king of northern India and came from Ayodhya in quest of a dominion in the south. We are not informed if Trilochana-Pallava met his two opponents in the same battle or in different encounters. If the Tamil work Tondamandalamam can be relied upon, we may perhaps infer that Karikala had something to do with the kings of northern India, whence Vijayaditya also came. Here we find that Karikala brought a number of Sudra families from the Ganges valley (and on that account said to belong to the Ganga-bula), settled them in the 24 districts (bittam) of Toṇḍai-maṇḍalam, and bestowed on them rich gifts. This fact and the subsequent settlement of the Western Chalikyas in southern India on a more or less firm footing might perhaps be adduced to show that Trilochana-Pallava had to meet the combined forces of Karikala and Vijayaditya, and that the two last were on some terms of alliance, which are not quite plain. It is not unlikely, that some of the northern powers joined one side or the other. In this connection it is worthy of note that Karikala is represented in the Tamil work Silappadikaram as an ally of Avanti, which is Ujjain in Malwa, and as the overlord of Vajra and Maghada. It looks as if Karikala was

\[1\] P. 17 of the Annual Report on Epigraphy for 1900.
\[4\] Magadha denotes Southern Bihār in Lower Bengal.
instrumental in permanently settling the Western Chalukyas in southern India. The defeat of
the Chera and the Pandyas on the plains of Vepil, and the confederacy of nine potentates and
the Pallavas in some unnamed places should have left Karikala as the undisputed lord of the
Dekkan. The Chera king defeated by him was Srumam Perumacheral Athan. He received a
wound on his back and is said to have sought a voluntary death rather than being a monument of
disgrace to his family. That even the people of the Telugu districts acknowledged his sway is
gathered from the fact that Karikala figures among the early ancestors of the Telugu Chola chieftains
and the Cholas. Inscriptions of the Cholas are found in the Cuddapah and Bellary districts.

If the date we have now arrived at for Karikala prove correct, it will be seen that
Kanakasabhai Pillai was wrong in identifying him with Killi who died at Kurappalli. His
identification was based on giving Perumacherali as a surname both of Karikala and Killi.
Perumacherali means the great Chola and as such it might be applied to any monarch of the
Chola line. To show the incorrectness of the identification, we have only to point out that
Kurappalli-Hunaja-Killi was a contemporary of the Pandya kings Nedanjelivan and Ugra-Perum-
vaджд, who died at Madura and appear to have lived nearly a century later. It is also
worthy of note that none of the poets who were contemporaries of Karikala figures among the
contemporaries of Kurappalli-Hunaja-Killi, Ugra-Perumvaджд or Nedanjelivan.

A word about Karikala's paraje, which deserves to be mentioned here. He was the son
of Ilaigetchenpi called also Ilaijenpi or Ilayen. This name means "the young Chola" or "the
young prince." He was perhaps the heir apparent to the Chola throne and hence was known
by that appellation. It may be noted that Ilaijenpi or Ilayen is something similar to
Ilajell, guvaraj or Ilaraj. There is nothing to warrant our presumption that Ilaijetchenpi
was a king of the Chola dominions. He seems to have distinguished himself in the wars
undertaken by the reigning king who, we might suppose, was his elder brother. The title
Urappaheri, which we find prefixed to his name, shows that he resembled a lion in prowess.
Sometimes the name Ilaigetchenpi is connected with Neydalauanat which perhaps denotes
that the tract of country over which he was the lord, bordered on the sea and it was, most
probably, near the mouth of the Kaveri river. He married a daughter of Alandur-val.
Alandur is perhaps identical with Ter- or Tiruv-Alundur near Mayavaram. He is credited
with having defeated in battle the Chera king of his day and taken from him a place called
Pamajur. Kadukko-Nedanjelival Athan might be the person vanquished by him as we know
that he was his contemporary.

From what has been said above, it will be evident that the accession of Karikala to the
Chola throne is not quite regular, as he had no claim to it, if the reigning king had any issue.
There are also grounds for inferring that on the death of Karikala's predecessor, there were
several claimants to the Chola throne and Karikala succeeded in getting it through the aid of
his uncle Irumbiar Talayar. The story that an elephant from Tirukkalamalam put a garland
on Karikala's neck, carried him on its back and placed him on the Chola throne when he was
stationed at Karuvur perhaps tells the same fact. It is worthy of note that this story is
quite similar to another recorded about Murti-Nayajar, one of the Saiva devotees who was
raised to the rank of a Pandya king, when the Pandya country had no sovereign. If the
interpretation of the name Karikala is "scorched leg", it is not unlikely that in the endeavour
to get the kingdom, Karikala happened to meet with an accident in which one of his legs
was scorched. Karikala married the daughter of a Veilir chief of Nainigar. A village of this
name is celebrated in the Vaishnavavam work Nalliyinaprabandham. Inscriptions state that it was

12 The poets Kalatalayi and Vepsi-Kuyattiyar refer to this king in Parangatukas, stanzas 55 and 57.
13 From Vol. XX, pp. 544 ff., "Date of Maduraikkali and its hero."
14 From, stanzas 10 and 263.
15 Another way of interpreting the name is "he (who is) death to the elephants (of his enemies)." "In this case
the name shows how powerful he was. If Kalikala is the name, it means 'the destroyer (of the elephant) of the Kali
(age)."
the headquarters of a subdivision is ancient times. Tiruvengadu and Kavirippampattinam were places situated in it. It seems, therefore certain, that Kil-Nangur in the Shiyali taluka is identical with it. It is, therefore, no wonder that Karikala had a special liking for Kavirippampattinam, that it was only three or four miles from Nangur whence his queen hailed.

He might probably have witnessed the annual destruction which the Kaveri river caused when it overflowed its banks during high floods and it may have led him to undertake the stupendous work of constructing high banks to the river to prevent the recurrence of the evil. By the way, it may be said that the irrigation of the Kaveri delta had engaged the attention of early Chola kings. Of the several branches which this river has, the Vennar and the Arasil date back to times earlier than Karikala and most of the others are attributable to some of the members of the Chola dynasty whose names they bear even at the present day. The course of the river seems to have changed at an early date giving rise to a new source of irrigation to the country. Palakkaveri was the name by which the original river was known to distinguish it from the new, but it is not known if this diversion of the river was due to natural causes, or if it was the work of any particular person. Palakkaveri and Kollijam were in existence prior to the 7th century A.D. In spite of the diversion of water in these branches, the Kaveri seems to have carried much water and caused damage to the country during floods. Karikala's services to the country in undertaking to build high banks and in opening new channels to improve the irrigation of the land, cannot be over estimated. The banks are said to measure 1,080 feet in length, 40 to 60 feet in width, and 15 to 18 feet in height. They successfully prevented annual destruction for nearly fifteen centuries by the mere inertia of the storage of materials. It is not unlikely that the bunds constructed by him were improved periodically. In all probability the ancient custom of parcelling out a few acres of land irrigated by the source among a few families who were required to take out fixed quantities of mud or sand from the bed and throw them on the bund every year, was followed in the case of the Kaveri also.

We have already referred to the impetus given by Karikala to commerce and trade and this will appear in better light from the translation of Paṭṭinaṭalai appended below. The poem was composed by Kadugur Ramaranganar, who is reported to have received the munificent gift of sixteen lakhs of gold pieces as reward for his composition. We have also mentioned that Karikala's contact with the northern powers gave him an opportunity for settling a number of people in the south. The growth of civilisation during this period seems to have assumed a different turn. The impulse given to art and trade is specially noteworthy. The condition of the people improved to a considerable extent and every effort was made to increase their happiness and prosperity.

Extract from Paṭṭinaṭalai.

The Chola country was irrigated by the Kaveri river which never failed in its supply even when there was no rain. The fields yielded sugarcane from the juice of which jaggery was prepared; big bunches of plantains, cocoanuts and arecanuts. Mango and palm trees abounded. There were also flower gardens covering large areas. The tanks of the country had high bunds resembling the form of the constellation Makha. Fragrant flowers of a variety of colours were produced near them.

The villages in the country adjoined each other and the houses had large compounds in front where they dried paddy. Here children amused themselves by dragging three-wheeled little cars. The doors of the houses bore tiger marks. The royal palaces were white but soiled by the dust raised by cars and horses which were ever moving in the streets.

16 The names Vepiluyathi and Arulillai assumed by persons indicate the existence of the two branches of the Kaveri.
17 It may be remarked that Vizhavan, Kirtimirdiyan (Kirtimira), Uyyakudian and Madugudiyan are the surnames of some of the Chola kings of the 10th and 11th centuries.
18 Several inscriptions mention Palankavari. This and Kollidum are referred to in the Divyaam songs of the 7th century A.D.
There were big alms houses where large quantities of rice were cooked and served to people resorting to them. Also places where small tanks were made and grass served for cattle. Jainas and Buddhist temples were found in one quarter of the town while in another the Brahmanas with plaited hair performed sacrifices and raised volumes of smoke. The Paradavar living near the sea-coast ate iñal fish and boiled flesh of tortoises, wore the flowers of adamba and adjati and indulged in setting goats to fight in the open and spacious court yards. In the pertikheri, i.e., the quarter outside the town low-class people reared pigs and fowls.

On holidays the Paradavar of Pugår abstained from going over the sea to catch fish, allowed their nets to dry on the white sand in front of their low-roofed houses which were built on the sea-shore. They wore the télai flowers and garlands, drank toddy drawn from the palm tree and paddy and amused themselves in dancing around a post in which they invoked the presence of god. Accompanied by their wives they bathed in the high waves of the sea to expiate their sins, then in the fresh water of the river to remove the salt, made images and had other enjoyments throughout the day. And in the night they abstained from drinking, stayed in their high palaces, heard music and witnessed dramatic performances, spent some time in the moonlight and retired with their wives to rest, removing the silk cloths which they wore and putting on thin white robes. Just before the dawn of day they slept on the sands of the shore.

Near the wide streets of the Paradavar and on the sea-shore where the télai flowers abounded there were warehouses with good guards. Things poured in here from all quarters for being stored eventually to be shipped. These, when removed from the warehouse, were stamped with tiger-marks and issued out on payment of a duty. Things landing from ships were similarly stamped with tiger-marks and duty charged. The officers who raised taxes on exports and imports were ever busy in their work.

In the upper stories of their houses, ladies of great beauty gathered near the windows with folded hands and joined palms to witness the festivities made for gods like mura, etc., which passed in the streets of the bazaars, to the accompaniment of music sounded by the kulal, pul, malam, mura, etc. Their houses were storeyed, had raised pails and large court-yards where cattle played freely. At the gates and on the tops of buildings flags were put up. Men of learning and reputation also put up flags inviting combatants to challenge their skill. Attached to the masts of ships, in the port of Pugår, there were other banners. In the toddy shops in front of which fish and flesh were spread out to dry, there were flags seen hoisting.

To the city were imported horses of good gait, in ships which were propelled by the wind; diamond and gold from Mount Mēru; sandalwood and ngi from Coorg; pearls from the southern ocean, coral from the eastern sea; the wealth of the Gangetic region; food-stuffs from Ceylon; castables from Burma and incense from other places. Thus, the streets of Pugår literally bore the burden of rich merchandise which were imported from several quarters. Here were also streets inhabited by people of various creeds and tongues who had abandoned their towns and settled in this city where they formed new acquaintances and relations. The rēṭilōr who cultivated the land and who were the source of prosperity to all classes of people, lived in great numbers.

Not satisfied with the wealth of his own country and what was paid to him as tribute by the feudatory chiefs, the great Chōla, i.e., Karikāla whose kulal touching the crowns of other kings made them bright, and in whose chest the sandal paste was rubbed out by the embrace of his wife and children, started on a tour of conquest with his elephants, horses, etc., destroyed his enemies' regions and killed their army in great numbers. He made the arnēlōr obey his commands and the northern kings wither, caused trouble to the budōre, cut away the progeny of podōre and destroyed the Irmōqē. He destroyed the forests in the Chōla country, inhabited them, converting them into habitable lands, increased the wealth, abandoned Urandsi with its brilliant palaces, built temples, set up families, opened small and large gates in the huge walls of the city, stored bows and arrows and showed his anger against the Pandyas who was powerful in arms.
CONTRIBUTIONS TO PANJABI LEXICOGRAPHY.
SERIES III.

BY H. A. ROSE, I.C.S.

(Continued from p. 70.)

Pangharnā: v. n. to melt.
Pānhrā: the masonry apron of a well on which a man stands to pull out the bucket: Karnāl S. R., 1872-80, p. 161.
Pāni: see gurāvra.
Pānhrā: a water-fountain, in Chamba.
Pānhrā: the kirīa karm day. Churāk.
Pāni-wata: warts. Lahore.
Pānja dālnā: a game in which the fingers are interlocked and one player tries to twist round the hand of the other. Jailandur S. R., p. 65.
Pānja jins: the right of the State to buy up grain at harvest at fixed rates. Kuthār.
Pānna: a ward of a village community, the branch of a family descended from a common ancestor, sometimes including strangers settled by it, if not numerous enough to form a pānī of their own. Karnāl S. R., p. 92.
Pāntr: a plank to turn off water from the channel of a water-mill. When not wanted, called shādol by Gaddis. Kangra Gloss.
Pānvarā: the man who looks after the channel and lets the water successively into the irrigation beds. Karnāl S. R., 1872-80, p. 169.
Pānvarī: a broad cutting blade of wood passed through the same mortice with the coulter used for stiff soil. Karnāl S. R., 1872-80, p. 162.
Pāppan (Gōdi): a rainbow. Cf. dihānak.
Pāpṛi: a kind of sweet. Hissār.
Parāčh: also called kōdār, grain, e.g. wheat, barley, maize, bathu and kanpā or any of these in small quantities, offered to a deva on the Shankrānti days by his devotees. Kōltā, nānā, urūi are not included in a parāčh.
Parāl: (1) rice straw. (2) the outer door of a house, leading from the dagon or inner yard.
Kangra Gloss.

Paras: the common room in a village in which a traveller, who has no friends, puts up (used in the south of Karnāl. Cf. chaupāl). Karnāl S. R., p. 106.
Farchānnā: to divert, turn away from, mix up, satisfy, pacify.
Parādān: adj., chief, principal.
Paran: a goad for driving bullocks, etc. Kāngra Gloss.
Pāri: a slip with two knots into which a seed cane is cut. Karnāl S. R., 1872-80, p. 181.
Pariband: a bracelet with a hinge and bar fastening.
Pārōnā: to thread (a needle).
Pārr: an open grassy slope. Cf. phāt.
Pārsān: a ladder: see sāng.
Parwa: the east or cold damp wind, which is the abomination of the cultivators. Karnāl, S. R., 1872-80, p. 167.
Pāssi: a soil in which the sand is very near the surface. Ludhiana S. R., 1878-83, p. 94.
Pāsu: s. m., cattle.
Pāt: a young female goat: pātlu, a young male—up to 2 years old—see under bakrī.
Pātāknā: to clean, sift anything. Kāngra Gloss.
Pataṅ: a place of ambush, in which to sit at night, to shoot game on a tree or in a pit, Kāngra Gloss.
Pataṅ: a stretched string which the watchers of the fields of the great millets jerk so as to swing the great plants about and frighten the birds. Karnāl S. R., 1872-80, p. 172.
Pātijīnā: s. m., a fire-fly.
Pāthā: a thick, round, conical-shaped continuation of the nose let into a notch in the latter, and secured by the coulter, which passes through it. Karnāl S. R., 1872-80, p. 162.
Pāthān lag-gaya: "the good foundation of the well has been reached". Ludhiana S. R., 1878-83, p. 98.
Pāthār: a mango fruit, supposed to be like a stone (pathār) in weight and the hardness of its skin. Hoshiarpur S. R., p. 15.
Pāthākāl: the same as the māira land, but with a larger proportion of clay; it gives wonderful crops with good rain, but is liable to fail in dry years. It is, in fact, much the same as the rohī land. Cf. motī and rāra. Hoshiarpur S. R., p. 70.
Pattli: a camal ailment; the nose gets filled with blood so that the animal cannot breathe properly. Sirsa S. R., 1879-83, p. 506.
Patrihâta: a ceremony observed on the completion of a house in Kangra.
Pattroru: (1) a round cake made of flour and water with salt and cummin and spices spread on bhajji or leaves (Colocasia antiquorum); (2) a festival held on 1st Bhûden at which pulse and bread are eaten, with patroru: Churia. Flour and water with salt, spices, etc., mixed are spread on leaves, which are then folded and the whole is eaten on the patroru ki sankrânt in honour of ancestors.
Patta: the money taken by the bride's relations from the bridegroom's father, out of which the village menials then and there receive their fixed dues. Karnál S. R., 1872-89, p. 132.
Patta chogal: lit. 'leaf-cropping'; the term applied in Bara Banguhal to the tax paid by shepherds for their sheep-runs. Kangra Gloss.
Pattu: a small field. Cf. pattî.
Pattá-vand: see taraophâd.
Patyâri = subha. Koti.
Póina: p paina: a quarter of a bher, q. v.
Peindi: a stepping-stone = chdra.
Peed: the seedlings of rice taken by Jhîmaus and Chamdrâs for planting after the subha has worked up the mud into a fine pulp. Karnál S. R., 1872-80, p. 185.
Perea: a small and very sweet mango fruit, supposed to be in shape and taste like the sweet meat pera. Hoshiarpur S. R., p. 15.
Peria: the man who feeds the press with cane, opening out the canes in the press with an iron spike, and driving new canes well in by beating them on the top with a leather glove faced with iron. Karnál S. R., 1872-80, p. 182.
Peru: see pel.
Persi: a small cake of gur. Jullundur S. R., p. 120.
Phação: the gums.
Phalîna: v. n., to spread.
Phakkku: threshing floor; the word is also applied to the fees of the chaukiddar, carpenter or blacksmith given thence.


Phali: door panel. Sirmur cis-Giri.

Phalta: a path or passage through the hedge round a house.

Phalna: to give a he-buffalo to a she-buffalo. Karnal S. R., 1872-80, p. 195.


Phaman: a very tall variety of wheat growing to a height of 4 or 5 feet in good well laid. The grain is large but said to be hard and not good for flour. Cf. batikanaal. Ludhiana S. R., 1878-82, p. 118.


Pharkhion: wooden floor of the first storey. Sirmur trans-Giri.

Pharni: to catch, seize.

Pharjana: to go away. Bauria argot.


Phargha: adj. twisted by warping (of wood).

Phat, parr: an open grassy slope on the side of a big mountain.


Phera: a handful of corn in the ear, which a blacksmith gets every time he goes out to the fields at harvest time to sharpen the sickle. Hoshiarpur S. R., p. 61.

Phera-ghera: bringing home the bride for good and all to her husband's house (the unclad of the plains). Kangra S. R. (Lyall), p. 70.


Phraggara: light, adj. as of dawn, or of a candle in a dark room. Kangra Gloss.


Phuk-pholuk: a tenant, probably so-called because his tenancy only afforded livelihood for a single soul: Palam, athola, Kangra S. R. (Lyall), p. 44.


Phulam: a kind of grain Churah.

Phulgir: lit. king of flowers, the pheasant, commonly known as the argus. In Kulu he is called the jijurdas, lit. prince of animals.

Phulhar = {Siul: a kind of grain and some other grains. (Indian corn)

The grain is roasted and eaten on fast days by Hindus. Churah.

Phuri: consent or assent, to betrothal. Phabbi diti=has given a promise. Pangwali.


Phurakna: the first mouthful of rice milk, spit on the field of cotton towards the west by the women who go round it for picking. Karnal S. R., 1872-80, p. 183.


Pichwara: the back of a house opposed to churi.


Pîla : the privilege of driving cattle to another village for making them drink water from its pond or well. Sirsa S. R., 1879-83, p. 302.

Pîj : the Himalayan chamela; in books called gural. In Kulu it is called gurad. Kangra Gloss.

Pila : a variety of wheat; the best of all. Karnal S. R., 1872-80, p. 169.

Pîlak : a very coarse eakay soil, almost barren and worse even than sand. Ludhiana S. R., 1878-83, p. 94.

Pîll : a variety of jouadr; it gives a sweet large grain, but is delicate. Cf. alapâri. Karnal S. R., 1872-80, p. 186.


Pîrondâ : a silk cord used for tying a woman's hair. Sirmur.

Pîştînâ : v. n. to be beaten.


Poli : unleavened bread; see under bhatora.


Poshâkî : an annual allowance of Rs. 20 to 30 given to a selected lambardâr. Ludhiana S. R., 1878-83, p. 81.


Prikamma : circum ambalating an amrit Tree from left to right in Phagun: Karnal S. R. 1872-80, p. 157.

Pukarnâ = pakarnâ : to help.

Pûl : grass of the sav.


Pulan : a kind of grain = phulan. Churâb.

Polâ : a bundle of corn (about 8 more kocca) given to karnâs at reaping time.


Punda : a heavier description of begir or corvee than the satbâk (q. v.).


Punia : full moon - usually a fast. Chamba.


Rahn, râhi : ploughed.

Rahn : indigestion. Hisul.

Rajáoli jatra: a jātra held only once in the life-time of a chief, when he ascends his ancestral gaddi. Kot Ishwar Deota is taken all over Kumbhásain and stays in each paraganā for 3 or 4 days. He does not go to paraganas Kandru and Sheon but in all the other paraganas from village to village the deota is taken for a Rajawali jatra. The Jawālā Jatra is held in Shadoch only. See Jawālā Jatra.


Bakhawar: kept, opposed to biutar, q.v. a mistress, a woman living with a man as his wife without marriage.

Bakkar: stony or hard dry land.

(To be continued)

MISCELLANEA.

MÉLANGES D'INDIANISME

Professor Sylvain Levy stands in the forefront of Indianists. His masterly Theatre Indien has long been out of print. His Doctrine of Sacrifice in the Brihadāra will not soon be superseded. In the province of Buddhism few can speak with greater authority. His great achievements lie in Chinese Buddhism, of which he has shown the signal importance in his brilliant critique of the Śāstraśāstra and a number of essays in various magazines; some of which, like the formation of the Divyāvadāna and Notes Chinoises sur l'Inde, are of most striking originality, demonstrating the necessity of examining the Chinese translations of Sanskrit Buddhist works. As his own pupil, Huber, has proved, it is not seldom that the much-vaulted antique Pali literature finds not only its complement, but often its corrective in the huge mass of Chinese writings.

On the completion of the twenty-fifth year of his connection with the École pratique des Hautes Études, his pupils and friends recently offered Professor Sylvain Levy, a Miscellany of papers on India and Further-India, all of which are of special interest to us in India. Dr. Miss Bode, the author of the Pali Literature of Burmah, contributes a study of the legend of Ṛathaśrama in the Pali Apanāna and Buddhaghosha commentary. Jules Bloch treats of the Greek equivalents of Indian proper names and names of things, and explains the difference in the Greek modes of transcription by the proved supposition of numerous dialects in India. There is a suggestive demonstration that Kāthiavrata was more conservative in its language than the Deccan. Blonay has a brief paper on the Buddhist deity Tārā. Grammont gives us a very interesting essay on the metathesis in Pali and shows the diversity of the various dialects grouped together under the general name of Pali. The relationship between the Slavonic and Iranian languages is touched upon by Cuny, and one looks forward to further contributions on the subject from the author. On the same lines is the inquiry pursued by Ernout, who brings out the affinity of the Indo-Iranian and Italo-Celtic tongues. Social India, according to the Sākhā-pāres, is shown us by Roussel. The section on women presents a picture hardly to the taste of those who sigh for the golden age of the past. The Bengali translator has not strayed over the Slokas. I have elsewhere shown the injustice of charging the Mōlas with the introduction of the Zenaana system into India. Either Draupadi's lament was untrue or in ancient India a pārda system was in force, the vigour of which it is difficult to speak with exaggeration. Perhaps the most fascinating paper in the collection is the one entitled Raqano Rāo, by Ghoshthiot, who traces through pages of sustained brilliance, the origin of the Buddhist title to the Achaemenides King-of-Kings. Incidentally, we learn the importance and extent of Pahāvī as used by the Indo-Scythian rulers like Kanishka, who was to judge from his religious symbolism was as much an Irānian as a Buddhist. The Divyāvadāna will continue to engage the

1 Indians of the old school, like the present writer, find it hard to adapt themselves to the new-fangled Pāṇin and dāśa. It is not advocated that the nominative singular form should be rigidly adhered to; the unfamiliar base form is almost, though not quite, as fantastic as the favourite Pāṇī of some puritanic Pāṇīs.
attention of scholars till we get a reliable translation of it in a European language with the help of the Tibetan. Cowell and Neff, the Cambridge editors of this beautiful collection of early Buddhist stories, were alive to its importance, which had first been put in a clear light by Burnouf. It was reserved, however, for Sylvain Levi and Huber to convince us of its uncommon interest as a fragment of the enormous Visnudharmottara of the Sarvastivadins, so richly represented in Chinese and irrevocably lost in the original Sanskrit. J. and E. Marouzeau discuss the use of the verb “to be” in the Divyavadana. Finot’s contribution to the study of some Indic-Chinese traditions testifies to the continued interest evinced by the French in the by-gone civilisation of their Asiatic possessions, and the elucidation of inscriptions in Cambodia by Coedes is evidence at once of the extent and duration of Hindu culture in the Far East, and of the scholarship of France.

Buddhist archaeology, and iconography in particular, owes perhaps more to Foucher than to any one individual investigator. It was he who placed his finger on the spot where excavation, conducted by Marshall and Spooner, revealed the relics of the Buddha near Peshawar. His study of the Chhandasha-Jataka, in the present volume, further traces the history of this curious Buddhist legend, where Feer left it. Of particular value are his animal versions of the loose conglomerations of the Pali Pitakas and the dubious worth of the Jataka stories (the atharvasenas) as distinguished from the Gathas. Chronologically, the six-tusked elephant, of which the mother of the Buddha dreamt, appears first in the Jajaka stanzas and disappears with the fading fresco of Ajañchi. Submerged but not extinguished under the weight and prestige of the dominant Sanskrit, there has always been, in India, a rich Prakrit literature, best known to us in its religious aspect of the Pali of the southern Buddhist and the Ardhan-Maghdi of the Jains. Its popular phase is represented by the immense collections of romances and stories. Few have carried the researches into the latter further than Lacote, who offers here a deep and exhaustive study of the Indian origin of Greek romance. It would appear to be one piece of evidence of the influence or reaction, however slight, exercised by India on Hellenic culture. Despite the late Peterson’s beautifully limpid analysis of the romance of Kādambarī, its labyrinth of a plot was never more lucidly disentangled than by Lacote. In a half dozen, all too brief pages, Huber examines the Tibetan version of some of Bharata’s stanzas. “Of all the sections of the Paiśchotantra found in India in the sixth century by the agents of Shah Khurshid Neshirwan the Susnān, the chapter on sage Bilar (Bharata) has undergone the most singular vicissitudes.” The fascinating little study is a worthy continuation of the Migration of Fables. There is scarcely an essay by any one of the twenty-three distinguished collaborators of this book, which does not bear witness to the profound and varied erudition of Prof. Sylvain Levi, eminent as a Sinologue and Indianist and unsurpassed as an authority on Buddhism.

RANGOON.

CORRESPONDENCE.

KALIDASA AND KAMANDAKI.

With regard to Mr. P. V. Kane’s interesting Note, ante, Vol. XL., (1911), p. 286 on “Kālidāsa and Kāmāndakī,” the writer’s attention may be drawn to a paper by Professor Carlo Formenti, read to the XIth International Congress of Orientalists in Rome (Alcune Osservazioni sull’Epoca del Kāmāndakī Nātīsira, published separately in Bologna, 1892), in which the Professor shows Kāmāndakī to have lived in the time of Varāhamihira (A.D. 505-587), or rather somewhat earlier. Professor Jacobi, in a very important paper, contributed to the Prussian Academy of Sciences in Berlin, on the early history of the Indian Philosophy (Zur Frühgeschichte der Indischen Philosophie, in Vol. XXXV of the Sitzungserichte, 1911, pp. 732-743), also refers to Kāmāndakī, who, he says, may be placed as early as the 3rd or 4th century A.D. In that case the relative positions of Kāmāndakī and Kālidāsa would be the reverse of what Mr. Kane assumes to have been. Kāmāndakī would be the earlier of the two. For my part (Journal, RAS, 1909, pp. 11ff.), I am disposed to agree with Professor Kern (Weber’s History of Indian Literature, p. 204, n. 211) that Kālidāsa was a contemporary of Varāhamihira, in the sixth century A.D.

OXFORD.

A. F. RUDOLF HOERNLE.
CONTRIBUTION TO THE STUDY OF ANCIENT HINDU MUSIC.

BY RAO SAHIB PRABHAKAR R. EHANDARKAR, B.A., L.M. & S.; INDORE.

THE subject of ancient Hindu music does not seem to have received that attention from Indians which it deserves. More than a century ago Sir William Jones, Francis Fowke, J. D. Paterson, etc., made attempts to elucidate Hindu music. But those were days of pioneering work, when very little was known of Sanskrit literature to European scholars, and the Siddhanta-Kavva-mudri was considered to be the title of the grammatical work of Puṣṭi and Kallinātha passed for a right. Since that time no attempt has been made to interpret Sanskrit treatises on music. Thus, Rája S. M. Tagore, who has done so much to attract attention to Hindu music, and has compiled a small Sanskrit book on the subject, almost invariably follows the authors just mentioned; and Captain Day, who has rendered such a great service to the present-day Karnātik system of music, has simply contented himself by quoting from the writings of the Rāja and the previous writers, when treating of the theory and old practice of Hindu music. The only exception is that of Monsieur J. Grosset, who has not only gone back to original Sanskrit authors, but has been the first, as far as my knowledge goes, to study the most ancient of them, viz., Bharata. Unfortunately besides the various disadvantages under which a foreign scholar, living outside of India, naturally labours in a work of this sort, Monsieur Grosset manifests too much faith in the writings of Rāja S. M. Tagore. The necessary result of this has been the propagation of errors originally made by the pioneers named above. Thus one finds them in Carl Engels's writings, Ambros's Geschichte der Musik and Helmholtz's Sensations of Tone, to mention only the most important works. It is hoped that the following essay will help to correct these errors.

There are other serious defects also in the writings of Sir W. Jones and his contemporaries. Thus, the authors have no first-hand knowledge of some of the Sanskrit works on music they mention. For instance, Sir W. Jones attributes various things to Bharata, which do not occur in that author's work. Indeed, Sanga-īta-Prabha and Somanātha's Rāga-vibhaṭha seem to be the only treatises of which he has a direct knowledge, and even then he has not discovered the date of the composition of the latter, though it is given at the end of that book, and simply remarks that “it seems a very ancient composition.” This tendency of referring everything Hindu to the hoary past is a characteristic fault of writers of this period, and is, of course, quite excusable, considering the limited knowledge of Indian matters at the time. It is regrettable, however, to find it in later writers, as for example, when Rāja S. M. Tagore, a century later, refers Hindu musical notation to “an age anterior to the commencement of the authentic history,” and produces in support of his statement nothing older than the facsimile of an air from Somanātha's work (A.D. 1609), which had originally appeared with Sir W. Jones' paper.

In the following essay, pains have been taken to indicate the probable period of a particular stage of Hindu music under discussion, which, it is hoped, will incidentally show the unsafeness of the common argument of “the well-known hatred of change of the Hindus,” so often called into requisition when definite knowledge fails.

I have taken the following Sanskrit treatises on music to serve as sign-posts in the development of that art:

This choice has been determined by the fact that all these works have been printed and are thus easily available.

1. **Bhāratya-nātya-āstra.**—This is the oldest Sanskrit work which treats of music, among other subjects. It is useless to try to determine the date of the author, even if it were possible to do so, because the present text is evidently the result of many re-handlings even in comparatively recent times. Thus, certain verse quoted from Mātrigupta's work and the Nātyalokāchāra, by Rāghavabhaṭṭa in his commentary on the Śākuntala, are found in the present-day text of Bharata. Again, probably there came into existence various recensions of the work, as for example, the Nandi-bhārata, or Bharata according to Nandī. Nay, it would further appear that the term bhārata came to mean "dramaturgy" generally, as shown by the title Mataṅga-bhārata, a work by Lakṣhmaṇa-Bhāskara, for though this work is not yet discovered, in no other sense can the writings of Mataṅga be called bhāratam. In contradistinction to these later bhāratas, as it were, Rāghavabhaṭṭa mentions a work called Ādi-bhārata. A manuscript with this name exists in the Mysore Oriental Library, but a cursory examination of the chapter on music corresponding to the 29th in the published edition does not show any more marked difference than is found in other manuscripts, bearing the ordinary name.

It will thus be evident that the facts that Bhavabhūti refers to Bharata as tātya-trikā-sāraka (composer of the rules of the three arts of dancing, singing and instrumental music), and that Kālidāsa also mentions him as a muni (ancient sage), simply show that a certain work by Bharata was known to these poets. What portions, if any, of the present text formed a part of the original, it is impossible to say. Nor is the argument derived from the mention of the Pārvaṭavās (Pehlavi) in a book of such a composite nature of any value in determining the date of the author, for, taking an extreme view, the fact can legitimately be said to throw light only on the date of the composition of the particular verse in which the word occurs.

It becomes necessary, therefore, to try to ascertain, if possible, the probable date of the composition of the various chapters, and sometimes even of the particular verses. At present we are concerned with the chapters treating of music. Even a cursory reading of these, as given in different manuscripts, shows the enormous re-handling which the text has undergone. Thus a passage written in prose in one manuscript is found versified in another, and certain passages referring to the same matter read so differently in different manuscripts, that they must be looked upon, not merely as various readings, but as different compositions, though very often the meaning of the passages is the same. At times, however, a later interpolation is seen to be in disagreement with other parts of the work.

Under these circumstances an effort was made to find out whether there were any references to music in Kālidāsa's works, which, by their discrepancy with the alleged work of Bharata, could suggest a priority of either. Unfortunately, I have not yet been able to find any such discrepancies, except the doubtful one contained in the 30th ślokā of the Rājapurāṇa, canto I, where the shadja note of the gamut seems to be referred to as being of two varieties. The commentator Mallinātha explains the two varieties as being either (a) śuddha and viśrīta or (b) chhuta and akṣhuta. If this explanation is to be accepted, it is evident that the stage of music represented by Bharata's work must be looked upon as earlier than that of Kālidāsa's time, for, this distinction of the shadja note is not found there,—at least not under those terms,—and only occurs in later writers.

---

1 See the end of the Bhāratya-nātya-āstra, Kāryamālā series.
2 I have consulted four MSS. (1) A of MM. Paul Regnard and J. Grosset, very kindly put at my disposal by the latter gentleman, (2) G. of the same authors, (3) P1 and P4 from the Deccan College Library, being copies of a Bikaner manuscript, (4) M. a manuscript from Mysore.
There is, however, no obligation to accept Mallinatha's interpretation, as the two varieties of the note, viz., (1) skha and (2) skulja-kaladhana, mentioned in Bharata, are quite sufficient to explain the passage. Though the attempt to find out the priority of either of these works has thus failed, a comparison with the *Amarakosha* is apparently more successful. In Bharata occurs the word *kutapa* (a band of musicians), but it is not found in the *Amarakosha*, though one might expect it, if it were in existence, along with the terms for specific collections (vindabhedha) given in *lokas* 41 and 42, *Kasha* II. 5, e.g., *vengha, sangha*, etc. The word *mrdjana* occurs in Amara, but the technical meaning of it, as used in Bharata, viz., 'a mode of tuning the triad of drums' is not given. But still more to the purpose is the occurrence of the word *kalki* in the *Amarakosha* among the musical terms, but without the specific signification of 'the note between the nishada and the skulja,' which is assigned to it in Bharata and all later treatises on music. It would thus appear that probably the portion of the *Bhadratya-ndiga-śāstra* under consideration is of a later date than the *Amarakosha*. Unfortunately, the date of this lexicum cannot be ascertained, and the opinions of scholars differ. Thus Weber assigns it to the 11th century A.D., whereas Prof. A. A. Macdonell, with more show of reason, says that it was 'not improbably composed about 500 A.D.' But one of the words given above, viz., *mrdjana*, occurs in *Kalidasa* in the technical sense, but not in the *Amarakosha*, and if there be any force in the argument used above, the lexicum must be looked upon as prior to *Kalidasa*. Perhaps a slightly added strength is given to this view by the occurrence of the word *marchhand* both in *Kalidasa* and Bharata, and its absence from Amara, though it may be urged that one has not got the same right to expect this word in that lexicum as the other word *mrdjana*. According to the well-known tradition, Amara was the contemporary of *Kalidasa*, who lived about the end of the fourth century, and this is the earliest date at present assigned to Amara. Even putting the date a century further back in compliance with this argument, the portion of the *Bhadratya-ndiga-śāstra*, which deals with music, cannot be assigned to an earlier period than the 4th century A.D. and may indeed be of a later date. This of course does not mean that the music described in that work did not exist at an earlier period.

2. Sārāgadēva's *Samyuta-ratndhara*.—There is no difficulty now in fixing the date of this work. It must have been written between A. D. 1210 and A. D. 1247.

Sārāgadēva mentions a large number of writers on *samyuta* (dancing, singing and instrumental music) between Bharata's and his own times, but their works are no longer extant, and one has to be content only with the few quotations found in the writings of the commentators on Sārāgadēva's own work. This is very much to be regretted, because the period between Bharata and Sārāgadēva was a very long one—seven or nine centuries—and music had undergone a very great evolution, which it is impossible for us to follow without the missing links. Sārāgadēva's work itself, though extremely valuable otherwise, gives but little assistance in such a study, on account of the commonly accepted precept, that whenever there is a discrepancy between a *śāstra* (ancient rule) and a *lakshya* (actuality or actual practice), the former should be interpreted so as to tally with the latter (vi. S. R. Adhy. vi. 331-341). It must be mentioned, however, that at times such discrepancies are noted by the author.

---

4 R. G. Bhandarkar—*A Poo into the Early History of India*, p. 45.
5 R. G. Bhandarkar—*Early History of the Dakkan* (2nd ed.), pp. 111-112. Here also occurs the following remark:—There is a commentary on this work, attributed to a king of the name of Siinga, who is represented as a paramount sovereign of the Aadhra circle. This Siinga appears in all likelihood to be Singhapura; and the commentary was either written by him or dedicated to him by a dependant, as is often the case. The fact, however, that this commentary mentions another, viz., that by Kallinatha, circa A. D. 1469, goes against this conjecture. Further, it may be noted that in the portion of Sinhabhdpāda's commentary published at Calcutta, there is no mention of the author being the paramount sovereign of the Aadhra circle as in the manuscript referred to in the *Early History of the Dakkan*. 
Of the many writers on music mentioned by Sāṅgadeva, Kohala was perhaps chronologically the next great author after Bharata, for, at the end of the Bh, we find the prediction that “Kohala will tell the rest” of the nādiya.5 Matanga seems to be comparatively a recent writer, and, to judge from the available quotations, appears to have rendered the same service to music in his own time as a compiler, which Sāṅgadeva himself did at a later period. Thus he is found to quote Bharata, Kohala, Kāśyapa and Durgāśakti7 and reconcile different opinions.

3. Somanātha’s Ṛṣiśīvikaṭha—The date of composition of this treatise is given at the end by the author himself as Saka 1531 i.e., A.D. 1609.

4. Ahobala’s Sampīta-pārijata.—This work was translated into Persian in the year 1197 A.H. or A.D. 1724.8 It will be seen hereafter, that this work represents a later stage in the development of music than the last treatise, and I have assigned it, therefore, to the latter half of the 17th century approximately.

Preliminary Remarks.

The following elementary considerations, though they ought to be well-known to students of the theory of music, do not seem to be recognised by many of the authors, who have written on the subject of Hindu music, and this is my excuse for introducing them here.

The modern European diatonic scale recognises two modes, the Major and the Minor:

The major mode: c d e f g a b c

\[ \begin{array}{ccccccc}
1 & 9 & 5 & 4 & 3 & 5 & 15 \\
8 & 4 & 3 & 2 & 3 & 8 & 2
\end{array} \]

The minor mode: c d e f g a b c

\[ \begin{array}{ccccccc}
1 & 9 & 6 & 4 & 3 & 5 & 15 \\
8 & 5 & 3 & 2 & 3 & 8 & 2
\end{array} \]

If the vibration frequency of the note c be represented by 1, the vibration frequencies of the other notes are represented by the numbers written under them.

The interval between any two notes is expressed by the quotient of their vibration frequencies and not by their subtraction; thus the interval between f and a is \( \frac{5}{3} - \frac{4}{3} = \frac{1}{3} \). Indicating the intervals between successive notes, the major mode may be written as follows:

c d e f g a b c

\[ \begin{array}{ccccccc}
9 & 10 & 16 & 9 & 10 & 9 & 16 \\
8 & 9 & 15 & 3 & 9 & 8 & 15
\end{array} \]

---

1 Bh. p. 445, śloka 18, where कॉलाहल: कवित्वत्वि ought to read कॉलहल कवित्वत्वि. Also p. 446, v. 24, where कोषाणपारचये is a misreading for कोहाणपारचये. M3 A confirms these corrections. This prediction, viz., that the rest not dealt with here will be treated by Kohala, plainly shows that this recasting of the Bh. was done after Kohala, a later author, had written his work.

2 It may incidently be mentioned that in Sāṅgadeva’s enumeration of writers on music (S. R., pp. 5-6) the name दुःसात्यिन्किः occurs, which is the name of a single man (S. R., p. 164). As printed in both editions of the S. R., the reader is apt to imagine दुःसात्यिन्क्ति as a single woman. Similarly, the S. P. notwithstanding, perhaps दुःसात्यिन्क्ति of S. R. is the name of a single individual, but I have no evidence, as in the other case, to support the conjecture.

3 Antecdotes of Indian Music by Sir W. Ouseley, reprinted in Rāj S. M. Tagore’s Hindu Music from Various Authors (1882).
Each of the intervals \( \frac{9}{8} \) and \( \frac{10}{9} \) is called a tone. The former, which is the greater of the two, is further designated as a major tone and the latter a minor tone. The difference between the two is \( \frac{9}{8} - \frac{10}{9} = \frac{81}{72} \), which is called a comma. The interval 15/15 is called a semitone, or more strictly a diatonic semitone. Accurately speaking, it is slightly greater than a half tone, since two semitones \( \frac{16}{15} \times \frac{16}{15} \) are somewhat more than a tone \( \frac{9}{8} \). The minor tone \( \frac{10}{9} \) = \( \frac{16}{15} \times \frac{25}{24} \), that is, it consists of a diatonic semitone \( \frac{16}{15} \) and a somewhat smaller semitone \( \frac{25}{24} \), which is called a chromatic semitone. When a note is raised or lowered by a chromatic semitone, it is said to be made sharp or flat respectively. Thus if the vibration frequency of \( c \) be taken as 1, \( d = \frac{9}{8} \) sharp \( d = \frac{9}{8} \times \frac{25}{24} = \frac{75}{54} \), flat \( e = \frac{5}{4} + \frac{25}{24} = \frac{6}{5} \), etc. Sharp \( s \) and flat \( f \) signs are indicated by the signs \( \# \) and \( \flat \) written after the notes, thus \( d \# \) is sharp \( d \), and \( e \flat \) is flat \( e \).

It is a well-known fact that the vibration frequency of a note (on which depends its pitch), obtained by plucking a thin string, is inversely proportional to its length, other things remaining the same. If the length of the string producing the note \( c \) be taken as unity, the lengths which produce the different notes of the major mode will be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>( c )</th>
<th>( d )</th>
<th>( e )</th>
<th>( f )</th>
<th>( g )</th>
<th>( a )</th>
<th>( b )</th>
<th>( c' )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Length of string</td>
<td>( \frac{1}{2} )</td>
<td>( \frac{3}{4} )</td>
<td>( \frac{3}{4} )</td>
<td>( \frac{3}{5} )</td>
<td>( \frac{8}{10} )</td>
<td>( \frac{3}{5} )</td>
<td>( \frac{1}{5} )</td>
<td>( \frac{1}{2} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here again, as before, the difference or interval between two notes is represented by the quotient of the corresponding numbers and not by their subtraction. Thus the interval between \( d \) and \( e \) is \( \frac{4}{5} - \frac{8}{9} = \frac{9}{10} \) (which means that the length of the string giving the note \( e \) is \( 9/10 \)ths of that giving the note \( d \), other things being the same), and not \( \frac{8}{9} - \frac{4}{5} = \frac{4}{45} \). This is such an elementary matter that some readers are apt to wonder at the insistence with which it is presented here. But, as will be shown in the sequel, this error was actually made originally by J.D. Paterson, Rājā S. M. Tagore drew up his instructions for the division of the finger board of the Śrūṭiśāna in accordance with it, and Captain Day (to mention only the most important writer) gave further publication to it.

There is another and more convenient method of expressing the intervals between the different notes of a scale. On examining the scale given above, it will be seen that the interval between the fundamental note and its octave is divided into five tones and two semitones. Each tone is approximately equal to two semitones, and the interval of an octave may, therefore, be

---

* Though this can be experimentally demonstrated pretty accurately (exact precision is impossible) on a properly constructed monochord, for more than one reason errors are inevitable in an attempt to make the demonstration with the help of a fretted instrument like the \( \text{\textit{sinh}} \) or \( \text{\textit{sitar}} \).
considered as equal to twelve semitones, and the intervals between the successive notes of the major mode may be roughly given in semitones as follows:

Notes: ... ... ... c d e f g a b c
Intervals in semitones: ... 2 2 1 2 2 2 1

This is evidently only a rough statement, as, strictly speaking, the interval between c and d is not equal to that between d and e, nor is either of them exactly double of that between e and f. But let us now suppose that the interval of an octave is subdivided into twelve *exactly* equal intervals, which we shall term 'equal semitones' (E. S.). Then evidently the interval of an octave $2 = (E. S.)^{12}$, or one E. S. $= \sqrt[12]{2}$. Taking this as our unit, we can express any interval in terms of it.

Thus the interval between c and d expressed as a quotient is $\frac{9}{8}$; and if we want to find the number of equal semitones $x$ in the same, we have the relation $12 \cdot 2 \cdot x = \frac{9}{8}$, which gives $x = 2.04$ nearly. To avoid decimals, we may put one *equal semitone* = 100 cents, and say that the interval between c and d is 204 cents, instead of 2.04 equal semitones. The pitch of the different notes of the major mode may now be expressed as follows:

Notes: ... c d e f g a b c
Cents: ... 0 204 386 498 702 884 1088 1200

and the intervals between successive notes thus:

Notes: c d e f g a b c
Cents: 204 182 112 204 182 204 112

One convenience of this method of expressing the value of musical intervals is readily seen, viz., that they can be expressed by means of differences instead of by quotients. Moreover, a comparison of different systems of dividing the octave is thereby rendered easier.

The Notes of Hindu Music.

From the S. R. I. iv. 38 and Náradī-Sūkhā I. i. 2-3, it would appear that a *pík* was chanted in monotone, a *gāthā* to two notes, and a *sáman* to three notes. A scale of four notes also seems to have been in use and was called *svarāntara* (Vern. *sursrta*). In what relations of pitch the notes stood in the last three cases it is impossible to say, though at first in reading Náradī-Sūkhā I. i. 9-13, and I. v. 1-2, one entertains a hope of being able to make a guess.

We are also ignorant of the stages by which the three notes of the *sáman* chant rose to the number of seven, nor can we say, with certainty, what relation these seven *sáman* notes bore to the later seven notes of music. The former were named *krūtha, prathama, dvitiya, tertiya, chaturtha, mandra* and *atīdrā*.

It is certain that these are in descending order of pitch, but in what exact relation, it is impossible to say. The Náradī-Sūkhā does indeed in one place say:

(Translation—The first note of the Sāman chanters is the *madhyama* of the flute, the second is the *gāndhāra*, the third is known as the *risāhā*, the fourth is called the *shadja*, the fifth is the *dhavāta*, the sixth should be known as the *nāshāda*, and the seventh the *pānchama*.)

---

10 See also S. R. (Colamba), p. 70, II. 17 et seq.
But it will be noticed that this nomenclature is different from the one which has just been referred to as being given in another part of the same work. As a matter of fact, the names of the seven notes of the sāman have varied from time to time and in different parts of the country, the enumeration and notation by the first seven numerals being more modern. A. C. Burnell professes to have identified them by means of a standard pitch-pipes with f, e, d, c, B, A, G, and adds that "it is also the doctrine of the Nāradīśekhā" according to oral information and quotes the first of the two ślokas given above. He further remarks that "the common Hindu scale corresponds with the European key of C." But it is easy to show that Dr. Burnell is certainly wrong (1) either in his identification of the seven notes with f, e, d, &c., or (2) in supposing that this identification is borne out by the Nāradīśekhā. For, though the author is quite correct in saying that the common Hindu scale (that is, of the present day) corresponds with the European key of C, it does not follow that the common ancient Hindu scale was the same as to-day's. As a matter of fact, it will be shown in the sequel that if c be taken as the shadja, the gandhāra and the nishadā as given in all Sanskrit treatises on music, will be represented by e f and b ɡ, and not by e and b as is the modern Hindu practice in northern India. Moreover, Dr. Burnell evidently had not before him the second of the two ślokas quoted above; otherwise he would have seen that though the order was smooth up to the fourth note which was identified with the shadja, it was no longer so with the remaining notes, the fifth, sixth, and seventh, being the dhaivata, the nishadā and the pañchama respectively, and not the nishadā, the dhaivata and the pañchama, as one would expect if the enumeration of the notes had proceeded in the descending order of pitch. From all this it is evident that Dr. Burnell's identification of the seven notes of the sāman, even if it be correct, is not in accordance with the Nāradīśekhā, and it is very desirable that an expert should ascertain the relations of the notes of the sāman, while it is still possible to find Brāhmaṇas who can chant it.

Though we do not know all we desire about these notes, we can gather some information about the scale from their names. Thus it would appear that there was a time when only four notes were used, which were designated by the names the first, the second, the third, and the fourth and formed a descending scale, that at a later time the scale was extended below and upwards by the notes mandra and krushṭa respectively, and that atīvantā was the last addition to its lower end.

In music proper, designated by the term gandhāra, seven notes are recognised and named shadja, riśabha, gandhāra, madhyama, pañchama, dhaivata, and nishadā (sometimes also called saptapada or the seventh), and represented by the syllables sa, ri, ga, ma, pa, ḍha, and ni respectively. The earliest mention of these is found in the Anugītā and the Garbhopanishad. Telang assigns the former to the third or fourth century B.C., and the scale must be assumed to have dated from that period. How long before, the sāman scale of seven notes was in existence and whether it was identical with this one, are questions on which I am unable to throw light. In Greece, Pythagoras (flourished 540-510 B.C.) is said to have been the first to establish the seven complete degrees of the diatonic scale.

As regards the meaning of the names of notes, it is easy to see that the madhyama is so called because it forms the middle note, the pañchama because it is the fifth, and the saptapada (another name for the nishadā) because it is the seventh note, in the shadjagrāma. The various derivations of these and the remaining notes given by different writers and quoted in the commentaries on the S. B. by Kallinātha and Śrīhābāhpāla are simply fanciful, and need not be mentioned here. It may be noted, however, that one of the attempts, which interprets the name shadja as meaning 'the producer of the (other) six' (notes), besides being opposed to ordinary grammar,
is based on the idea that it is the fundamental or keynote of the scale, which is incorrect; for,
as will be shown hereafter, though śadja is the name of the keynote of the present Hindu scale,
such was not the case in former times. The other explanation, viz., the note derived from the
(other) six' has the advantage of being in better agreement with grammar, and it is not impos-
sible (though I do not consider it probable) that it might have been the last addition to the scale.
The term gādhāra was evidently taken from the country of that name, noted for its musicians.
The derivation of nishāda is stated to be from ni+i+ẹc, the note being thus named because "the
notes 'sit down' i.e., end in this one." This may be right, but I think it at least quite as likely
that it was so called, because in the old Hindu śadja (see below) the string on which it was played
was the lowest, or as it were 'sat down.' The term nishādāvān is also sometimes applied to this
note instead of "nishāda."

On the 'śvaras' and 'śrutis.'

In the Bh. there is no confusion or want of clearness about these. But some of the later
Sanākrit authors have introduced difficulties unnecessarily, which the reader will find discussed in
Kallinātha’s commentary (S. R. pp. 34-36). Thus Viśrāvaṇa says that śrutis are of two kinds,
śra, (1) those on which the notes are located, and (2) those which intervene between two notes;
for example, in the śadja-grāma the fourth, seventh, ninth, etc., śrutis will be said to belong to the
first class, and the first, second, third, fifth, sixth, eighth, etc., to the second. Some mention
sixty-six śrutis, i.e., twenty-two for each of the three octaves, and have even gone to the extent
of giving names to every one of these, others contesting themselves with naming only the twenty-two.
In the Bh. the śrutis have not been designated by proper names at all. Some maintain that the number
of śrutis is infinite, which statement, if it refers to the interval of an octave and is not merely
an extension of the last view of sixty-six śrutis to the infinite number of octaves that are conceiv-
able, simply means that the interval of an octave is divisible into an infinity of minute parts. Though
this is true, it does not follow that one is not at liberty to divide it, if it suits one’s purpose, into
a desired number of parts. A straight line may be divisible into an infinite number of extremely
minute parts, but it may be suitable for our purpose to divide it only into two or four. Kallinā-
tha’s objection to the view of infinite śrutis is that the ear is incapable of appreciating such infinit-
tesimal śrutis. Though this argument is quite valid, it does not strike at the root of the question.
It may still be asked:—Why just twenty-two śrutis, and not twenty-four or twelve, each of which
is quite as appreciable by the ear as one of the system of twenty-two? The only complete reply
would be:—Simply because the system of twenty-two suits best the purpose in hand, which is to
indicate the relations of the various notes in the grāma.

One more view requires notice. Kallinātha says “Other sages, like Viṣṇa, consider a śruti
to be of nine sorts." Thus, for instance, “At the holes of a flute wise men should produce notes of two,
of three, and of four śrutis.” Bharata also has said. The notes in a flute should be known as of
two, three, and four śrutis, (produced) by shaking (of the finger), by half opening (a hole), and by
fully opening (it). Thus have I mentioned nine correct śrutis.” I need hardly remark that it is
arrant nonsense to speak of śrutis being of nine kinds, because there are notes of two, three, and
four śrutis, and two, three and four together make nine! Further it must be added to the credit
of the Bh. that the lines, which say so, though alleged to be from that work, are not found in any
of the manuscripts I have consulted.

(To be continued.)

13 S. R., Vol. L, p. 49, II 3-4 (Kallinātha’s Comm.)
14 S. R., p. 32. नरलोकायुक्ती—कर्तिक्क्रियायुक्ती लोकयुक्ती सन्दर्भतः स्वस्तिः: कर्मभोणायुक्ती निष्काकाक्षेत्।
किथतः: || रूप साधनाय चिन्तनः सहितः: नृत्योढ़ कद || इत्य || वल्लककास्य च इच्छार्थ च is a better reading.
The II. द्रष्टि etc., do not occur in any of the MSS. of the Bh. I have consulted.
16 In later verses in the Bh. it is explained that the notes obtained by these processes are of three, two,
and four śrutis, respectively.
FOUR VILLAGES MENTIONED IN THE NASIK CAVE INSCRIPTIONS.

BY Y. R. GUPTA, B.A.; NASIK.

1. — Sāmalipada or Sāmalipada,

'Sāmalipada occurs in inscription 3, line 13:

[18] गानी सामालिप श्रवणे इत्यादि स्थानस्थानन भोजना, भगवानुसार लेखन परिसंपर्ये सज्जनादेस्वजने स्थानस्थान अर्थ सामालिप समस्या अर्थ सामालिप समस्या अर्थ सामालिप से. (विशद).

This village was granted to mendicants of the Bhandāryānīya sect, in lieu of another, viz., Sudisana, which they rejected. The former is said to be situated within the subdistrict of Govardhana on the eastern road. 'गानी सामालिप ' पणक्रि ' can hardly mean to the east of the town of Govardhana, though the Bombay Gazetteer is not clear on the point. It obviously would mean on the east limits of the subdivision. But the reading पणक्रि itself is incorrect. On personally examining the stone, I find that Mr. E. Senart's reading पणक्रि is beyond doubt. The inscriptions accompanying it will make this clear. Sāmalipada can easily be identified with the modern Sāmangao, about eight miles from the Trirāmi Hill and in the eastern direction. The Sanskrit form is Sāmalipadra, consisting of two parts: Sāmalī and padra, of which Sāmalī (or rather the Prakrit form Sāmali) has evidently been corrupted into Sāmāgra (I and II being very often interchangeable), padra is the same as gone, both signifying a village, and being added on to the names of hamlets. From other identifications it seems more than probable, that it lay to the east of the then Govardhana subdistrict, but within it. It appears that the river Darna formed the eastern boundary of the subdivision up to Sangavi and this is natural.

2. — Pīśājipadaka or Pīśāchipadaka.

Pīśājipadaka [for (Sanskrit) Pīśāchipadaka] occurs in inscription 2, line 11:

[19] एक्षर च वेत्तत्व स्थितामुनिति महादेवीय अवकाश स्वाभानी स्वतानां व नस्तो.. [विशद] पैगम्बरी चिन्तुमयो भगवानुसार नारायण गान नियतवाचस्त्र अर्थार्थुपयोग नियमवाचिति स्वाभानी गादीनिति.

This village was mentioned for नियमवाचिति (II) [विशद], that is for painting, or in a more general sense, for ornamentation. It is said to be on the south-west of the Cave Hill. We can identify it with the modern Sāngajao or Sāngajao (as the agriculturists call it), which is just to the south-west of the hill in the Igatpuri taluk, the distance being 14 miles. Pīśājipadaka is made up of Pīśāj+padaka or padaka, which is in modern times replaced by gone. Pīśāj can easily take the form of Pasāj, and the latter can further become Sānaj or Sānje, with the initial p dropped, as is not infrequent. The whole name we thus obtain is Sāngajao or Sāngajao, as it is generally written. It should be noted that the peasants have retained the more primitive form.

3. — Kanphahini.

Kanphahini occurs in inscription 9, line 2:

[?] उपस्तात बुद्धे भागवान लोकस्वर्ग महादेवीय कर्त्तव्य अंगम्या वेँटोंता व्यक्तिकार प्रभारत. It is called 'अंगम्या (मु.Join) ' or 'अंगम्यामा' that is, on the west, if the interpretation put by Pandit Bhagwanlal is to be accepted. He infers that this means 'west of the Cave Hill.'

3 For dadra a technical territorial term, vide Dr. Fleet's Gupta Inscriptions, p. 177 note, and of the Alinā grann of Dharasena II: Above, Vol. VIII, p. 72.

3 Vol. XVI, vide p. 699.

4 To be extremely fastidious, a very little above the straight line drawn from the Cave Hill towards the direct east, the angle being of less than 35 degrees—and therefore to speak commonly and plainly in the eastern (not in the north-eastern) direction. Further more, the village would be very nicely on the eastern road of the hill and in all probability of the then Govardhana subdistrict. The reading is — and not — and attention is especially invited to it.

5 Ep. Ind., Vol. VIII, p. 64.
There is no village which corresponds in name in the direction. But we can identify Kaṅhahini with the present Kārnā, which is south-west of the Cave Hill, the distance being 18 miles. Two explanations are possible:

(a) There might have been two portions of the village—one eastern and the other western, and the latter only referred to in the inscription by saying अपरिकथाय (ृ). In other words, western Kaṅhahini appears to have been alluded to and not the western direction of the Cave Hill.

(b) A second explanation is to take अपरिकथाय as the name of a field as suggested by M. Senart.5

I add that I cannot help thinking that in Kārnā, we have some trace of Kaṅhahini. The latter must first have been corrupted into Kaṅhai, and afterwards into Kārnā. It is locally considered to be a place where the great sage Kapila practised penance. Now it must be admitted that this is impossible. But it seems that it must have been a place of some religious importance and of considerable antiquity.

4.—Aparakakhaḍi or Kakhāḍi.

Aparakakhaḍi occurs in inscription 4, line 2:

[१] आनवकान्ति गायचे अवर विवेकासत्ते गामे अपरकखाडीं मध्ये भाषकान्तिः उपनावात सुभाषितसमुदाय विषयात

Gautamiputra Sitakarni gave a field in this village to Buddhist mendicants. But after a time another was exchanged. The Bombay Gazetteer remarks:—"This village has not been identified. The old name Aparakakhaḍi may be with reference to some other Kakhāḍi to the east of it, or if there is a mistake in the text, it may be Aparikkakhaḍi." There might have been two villages or two or even more portions of the village referred to in the inscription. One was called Aparakakhaḍi in particular, but sometimes for shortness simply, Kakhāḍi. It may fairly be identified with the present Avalakheḍa, a village in the Ikatpuri talukā and south-west of the Cave Hill, about 25 miles from it. Another field is said to be given as the village was deserted. It is not very clear whether this means partial or complete desertion, especially as it is plainly noted that, 'the lands were then cultivated.' Probably partial desertion is meant, the people removing to the neighbouring suburbs or eddits, perhaps because the original place was malarious and unhealthy. This can be guessed even now. There are about 10 or 12 suburbs of this small village, and it can be surmised that the original one must have been abandoned. If Sānjigaon and Kārnā are situated in the Ikatpuri talukā, we can, I think, safely look for Aparakakhaḍi in the same subdistrict, and naturally in their neighbourhood.

The two components of Aparakakhaḍi are Apara and Kakhāḍi, the former now corresponding to Aʿara and the latter to Khaḍ. Aʿara and apara mean the same thing: both meaning western. The former also means lower or mean and would be fitly applied to a village worth abandoning. ए and इ are interchangeable. Aparakakhaḍi would thus naturally give place to Avalakheḍa.

[b] Aparakakhaḍi is likely to assume the form Parakheḍa or Palakheḍa. We have one Palakheḍa in the Dindori talukā and another in the Niphad talukā, the distances from the Cave hill being 23 and 25 miles respectively, and the latter being east of the former. I, however, for reasons given above, am very much inclined to believe that the ancient Aparakakhaḍi must be the modern Avalakheḍa.]

KING LAKSHMANA SENA OF BENGAL AND HIS ERA.

BY PROF. NALINIKANT BHATTASALI; COMILLA.

The account of the termination of Sena supremacy in Bengal has received wide notoriety from the writings of Minhāju-d-Dīn Sarāj, the author of the celebrated historical work Tābqāt-i-Nāṣirī. Every school-boy of Bengal knows how the daring Muhammad, son of Bakht-yār, fell upon Nadīa with a party of seventeen horsemen, and how the aged Rai Lakhamanabhāb slipped off through the postern gate. There was a fresh stir in Bengal about the matter by the publication of a picture some years ago, entitled "The Flight of Lakṣmāna Sena"—by the late lamented artist Surendranath Gangulī. Minhāj's statements were sharply criticised recently, after the publication of the picture; all the historians in Bengal setting themselves in right earnest to disprove Minhāj's statements. The most important effort in this direction has been that of Babu Rakhaldas Banerjee, M.A., of the Indian Museum in Calcutta, who submitted a paper to the Asiatic Society of Bengal and also delivered a lecture on the subject in the first monthly meeting of the 16th year of the Bangiya Sahitya Parishat (Bengal Academy of Literature) of Calcutta. In these he attempted to prove that the reign of Lakṣmāna Sena ended long before the raid of Muhammad Bakht-yār and consequently that it could not by any means be Lakṣmāna Sena who fled from Nadīa.

His arguments are as follows:—Four inscriptions, he says, are at the root of the present agitation

(i) The Gayā inscription, bearing the name of Aśokavalla.—dated 1813, Nirādha era.\(^1\)

(ii) The Buddha-Gayā inscription of Aśokavalla dated thus:—

"Śrīmat-Lakṣmānapasasneśa-atita-rājye Suh. 51 Bhādradine 29."\(^2\)

(iii) Another Buddha-Gayā inscription of Aśokavalla dated thus:—

"Śrīmat-Lakṣmānapadādeva-paddānām-atitarājye Suh. 74 Vaśikha-rādi 12

Guru."\(^3\)

(iv) A third Buddha-Gayā inscription of Aśokavalla. It is not dated, but it serves to prove that king Aśokavalla mentioned in all these four inscriptions is one and the same person.\(^4\)

Mr. Banerjee has rejected the date of the first inscription as being uncertain and useless. His discussion centres round the dates of the second and third inscriptions. He accepts Dr. Kielhorn's view that the era of Lakṣmāna Sena began in A. D. 1119-20; and then he seeks to explain the word atita in the two dates by quoting Dr. Kielhorn. That eminent scholar wrote (\textit{Ante}, Vol. XIX, p. 2, note 3)—"During the reign of Lakṣmāna Sena the years of his reign would be described as Śrīmat-Lakṣmānapasasneśa-paddānām rājye (or pravardhamāna-vijayardhye) Samañvat; after his death the phrase would be retained, but Atita prefixed to the word rājye, to show that, although the years were still counted from the commencement of the reign of Lakṣmāna Sena, that reign itself was a thing of the past." Now, the second inscription of this series bears the date 51 of atita-rājya. Therefore the reasonable conclusion is that Lakṣmāna Sena must not have reigned for more than 51 years. The Lakṣmāna Sena era began in A. D. 1119-20, and Mr. Banerjee has tried to prove that the era began from the coronation of Lakṣmāna Sena. Therefore Lakṣmāna Sena could not have reigned beyond 1119+51=A. D. 1170. Muhammad Bakht-yār on the other hand raided Nadīa by A. D. 1290. Therefore the raid of Nadīa happened long after the death of Lakṣmāna Sena. This is the main drift of Mr. Banerjee's argument.

---

\(^1\) \textit{Ante}, Vol. X., p. 341. \\
\(^2\) \textit{Jour. Bomb. As. Soc.}, Vol. XVI., p. 359. \\
\(^3\) \textit{Ante}, Vol. X., p. 348. \\
\(^4\) Cunningham's Mokhaddshi, p. xviii. c.
The subject is interesting, and truth must be ascertained at any cost. I venture to lay before the public the results of my investigation for what they are worth.

Modern historians have been to an undue degree prone to discredit the narrative of Minhāj. They have completely ignored the fact that Minhāj was almost a contemporary author, and, moreover, he did not rely upon information collected by himself alone. He is rather disposed to cite authorities and begins his account of the Sena kings thus:—“Contemporary historians, on whom be the peace of God, have thus related.” Another proof of his trustworthiness is that his statements accord exactly with the facts established by Dr. Kiellhorn by independent research. Minhāj declares that Rai Lakhmaciāh lived and reigned for 80 years and that Muḥammad Bakhtyār sacked Nadiā, in A. D. 1200. Dr. Kiellhorn also found out that the era of Lakṣmaṇa Sena began in A. D. 1119-20, and there is exactly an interval of 80 years between this date and A. D. 1200. The conclusion is, therefore, irresistible that the era of Lakṣmaṇa Sena ran from the year of his birth. Let us investigate this matter a little further.

I. We get the following information about Lakṣmaṇa Sena from Minhāj’s book, the reliability of which is above inferred:
   (i) Lakṣmaṇa Sena was in his mother’s womb when his father died.
   (ii) His mother died in the course of delivery.
   (iii) He was set upon the throne by the royal officers just after his birth.
   (iv) He lived or reigned 80 years.
   (v) He was very old when Muḥammad Bakhtyār sacked Nadiā.

From quite a different source,—that of the Lāghubhūtrata, a Sanskrit historical treatise which seems to record genuine historical traditions,—we get the following similar pieces of information about Lakṣmaṇa Sena.

   (i) Ballāla Sena, father of Lakṣmaṇa Sena, was absent on a war in Mithilā when Lakṣmaṇa was born in Vikramapura.
   (ii) False news about the death of Ballāla in the Mithilā war spread abroad.

Combining the information gathered from these two different sources, we may conclude that Ballāla was actually absent on war in Mithilā when Lakṣmaṇa Sena was born in Vikramapura. False news about the death of Ballāla reached Vikramapura and the royal officers placed infant Lakṣmaṇa on the throne. The queen died in childbirth. It is just possible that to commemorate all these important events, Ballāla introduced the new Lakṣmaṇa Sena era. It should moreover be borne in mind that if this account of the birth of Lakṣmaṇa Sena be true, the birth and the coronation may be taken in one sense to have happened at one and the same time, as Lakṣmaṇa Sena was placed on the throne just after his birth, though by mistake.

II. Nadiā was sacked in A. D. 1200. Minhāj says that Lakṣmaṇa Sena was 80 years old when the sack of Nadiā took place. Therefore he was born in 1200—80 = A. D. 1120, which year is fixed upon by Dr. Kiellhorn as the beginning of the Lakṣmaṇa Sena era.

III. Let us now consider the four inscriptions of Aśokavalla. As we have already stated, three of the four inscriptions are dated,—the first in 1813 Nīruḍnya year, the second in 51 Aṭṭa-rājya year, and the third in 74 Aṭṭa-rājya year. Unfortunately Mr. Banerjee has completely ignored the first date on the ground that there was no concurrence of opinion as regards the date of Mahāparinirvāṇa among the Indian Buddhists when Hiuen Tsang visited India. He ought to have considered that the difference of opinion prevailing in the 7th century might have been settled...
down in the course of six centuries and the Nirvāṇa era as used by the Buddhists of the 13th century might be a fixed and definite one. He might also have inquired among the modern Buddhists of India whether they still use that era.

We inquired among some Buddhist friends of ours, and they assured us that the Nirvāṇa era is still very widely used in the Buddhist circles, and that the present year 1912 of the Christian era corresponds to the year 2456 of the Nirvāṇa era. Hence we see that the year 1813 of the Nirvāṇa era corresponds to 1269 of the Christian era. But we know that the year 1813 of the Nirvāṇa era, the years 51 and 74 of Ātta-rāṣṭra must be very near to each other, being years in the reign of one and the same king Aśokavalla. But Mr. Banerjee has concluded that 51 Ātta-rāṣṭra is equal to A.D. 1170, which is far removed from 1813. The truth is that the word Ātta-rāṣṭra was not rightly interpreted by Dr. Kielhorn. It really means—Rāṣṭra ātta sati—after the reign has been a thing of the past. The reign of Lakshmana Sena passed away in A.D. 1200. Therefore A.D. 1269 = N. E. 1813 = 59 Ātta-rāṣṭra year, which falls conveniently midway between 51 and 74 of the second and third inscriptions.

Here a question may arise. Are the years 51 and 74 years of a distinct era counted from the end of Lakshmana Sena’s reign? We should answer in the positive. We can gather from the writings of Minhaj, that Lakshmana Sena was an extremely popular king. As an era was counted from the year of his birth, so was an era counted from the year of the loss of his kingdom. That era was still very widely used in Vikramapura in the time of Nawab Alivardi Khan. With the ascendancy of the English that era had to make room for the Christian era and vanished altogether. An old document printed by Jogendra Nath Gupta in his History of Vikramapura (Bengali, page 511) is dated 1153 Bangald 545 Parganditt. We possess similar old documents of the time of Nawab Alivardi Khan. They relate to slavery. One of them is dated: 1151 Bangald, 543 Parganditt sam. Another, “1158 Bangald, 550 Parganditt sam.” The present Bengali year 1318 (A.D. 1911) and by calculating with any of these three documents we find that the first year of the Parganditt era corresponds to A.D. 1200-1. The suffix atta is clear, but how the word Pargand came to be incorporated into the name can only be conjectured. One thing is, however, certain: the valiant sons and grandsons of Lakshmana Sena, who retained their independence in Vikramapura for a century or more after the fall of Lakshmana Sena, did not forget the wrongs of their ancestors; and the wide popularity of the era is a positive proof that the people of Vikramapura did not forget their beloved sovereign even many hundred years after his reign became a thing of the past.

[Prof. Bhattacharjee is probably not aware of the paper called Chronology of the Sena Kings of Bengal written by Mr. Nagendranath Vasu and published in the Jour. Beng. As. Soc., Vol. LXV, p. 16 ff., wherein he has already been set forth much of the matter herein given about the Lakshmana Sena era. But the conclusions drawn by Prof. Bhattacharjee are different from those of Mr. Vasu, who regards A.D. 1119 as the initial year of the Lakshmana Sena era, but as the year of Ballala Sena’s coronation. Mr. Vasu, again, on the authority of the Daṇḍasāgara, cites Saka 1091 as the date of its composition, whereas Dr. Rajendralal Mitra (Notices of SK. MSS., Vol. I, p. 151) has assigned it to Saka 1019 on a quite different authority. Can the words sāja-nava-dāsaimite, from which the date 1091 is deduced by Mr. Vasu, be read as nava-sāja-dāsaimite which would exactly bring us to Dr. Mitra’s date? —D. R. B.]

6 Princep has shown conclusively that the Nirvāṇa era was widely current in India, Burma and Ceylon and that it began in 544 B.C. Vidal his Useful Tables, page 154.

7 It is quite possible that inscriptions dated in the early Ātta-rāṣṭra years 3, 4, 5, 6, etc., may be discovered in future.
XII.—Sahasrām-Rūpāth-Brahmagiri Edict of Asoka.

There are two knotty passages in this edict which have for long been the subject of much discussion among scholars. Great interest in this matter has recently been awakened by two articles published in the *Journal Asiatique*. One of these is entitled "Les Vivāśāh d’Asoka" by Dr. F. W. Thomas (May-June, 1910, pp. 507-22) and the other "Vṛṣṭheṇa 256" by M. Sylvain Levi (1911, Part 1, pp. 119-26). I crave indulgence to lay my views before the scholars interested in Asoka's inscriptions.

I.

The first passage is as follows, in accordance with the three recensions of this edict:

Rūpāth: —Yd indya kālāyā Jātakupari amīśa dera ḍrṣu te dāni mīśa kajā.
Brahmagiri: —Tṃānī dera saṃhāta amīśa samāṃ muniśa Jātakupari dera kajā.

The words mīśa and amīśa occurring in these sentences had so long been taken to be equivalent to the Sanskrit mṛśaḥ and amṛśaḥ. But M. Sylvain Levi has now shown that they stand for māśa and amāśa. The Pāli form of māśa would be māsa and not mīśa. And secondly in the Sahasrām recension we have the forms ahmisaṃ and muniśa, which can correspond only to amīśa and muniśa. Again, munisa-māśa of the Sahasrām text is a compound which can only be dissolved as manuṣhyām māśa. Mṛśaḥ has absolutely nothing to do here with māśa. It is also now agreed by most scholars that the words dera and muniśa are to be taken in their usual sense of 'gods' and 'men.' So the question now arises: what can be the actual meaning of the three sentences? Asoka says that for more than two years and a half he was a lay-follower, and did not exert himself strenuously, but for more than a year that he was in the Sāṅgha he did exert himself strenuously. And what was the result? The result was that the gods who were so long unminged with men were minged with them. He, therefore, advises the people to put forth strenuous exertion. This will, he says, enable even a lowly person to attain the great heaven. Thus the fruit of exertion is expressed in two different phrases: (1) by the commingling of men and gods and (2) by the attainment of heaven (svarga). The two things are thus identical, and consequently the first phrase must be interpreted in the light of the second. What, therefore, the first passage in my opinion means is something like this. Asoka has explained to his people what dākṣa is, The performance of dākṣa leads to puṇya (spiritual merit), and the accumulation of puṇya to the attainment of heaven. Gods were formerly aloof from men and men from gods, because there were no men who had hoarded so much of puṇya as to vie with them. But now through the teachings of Asoka men have become so much puṇyaṃ and consequently such equals of gods that the old gulf no longer existed between them and they have become one another's associates. But this puṇya (and through it svarga) can be secured only through parākramā (strenuous exertion). And hence it is that he exhorts men to exert themselves strenuously. That the performance of puṇya leads to the attainment of heaven was formerly as it is now the accepted belief of all sects, (compare, e. g. Te tan bhukti śvarga-lokaḥ rājāṃ raktāṃ punye mārtya-loke viṣānti—Bṛhadāranyāk, Chap. IX. v. 21; and also the words of the Buddha sače kho pañca evaḥ dhīthi kasti: iminda'haṃ sīlana vā vaṭana vā tapena vā bāhmacariyena vā devo vā bhaṃnāto devo dhātāra vā, &c. occurring in the Majjhima-nikāya, sutta 57). This idea is also not foreign to the inscriptions of Asoka, as we shall shortly see.

In order to understand this edict better, it is necessary to compare it with Rock Edict X., a passage from which is as follows:

Yah tu kihāci parākrama Devānām (piyā) Priyadāsī rajā ta saṃhā pārākrama [?] kihāti
[?] sahaḥ apāpariśvave asa.

1 I am sorry to say that not knowing French I have not the good fortune of knowing the views of these scholars first-hand.
Here Aśoka says that he exerts himself strenuously (parākrama). But with what object in view? He replies: pātrikīdyā, i.e., with reference to the next world. But for whose sake? He answers: sahāde aparāparivara asa, i.e., in order that all men should be free from parāpariva, which he further explains by aparicīya = saṁ. Similarly, when in the S.-R.-B. edict Aśoka says that for the period of more than a year that he was in the Sāhyāśmi, he exerted himself strenuously (bdīkṣaṇa padaś), we must understand that it is not for himself that he was unflaggingly zealous but for others, or rather for the welfare pertaining to their next world. And consequentally when he says that he made gods commingled with men and men with gods, this must be interpreted to mean that he made men like gods aparāpariva, i.e., free from all aparicīya (saṁ). It is only by interpreting the passage in this way that the full significance of the words bdīkṣaṇa padaśa vāpitum saṣe saṣe dṛḍdakāyeva which occur in and which form the main purport of the S.-R.-B. edict is brought out. This edict, in fact, is such a close repetition of Rock Edict X that there is a perfect harmony even in their concluding portions, which insist upon parākrama being put forth both by the great and the lowly.

The same idea we find expressed in Rock Edicts VII and IX. A passage from the first of these is:


Here also Aśoka informs us that the object of his strenuous exertion is to make people happy in this world and enable them to gain heaven in the next. It deserves to be noticed that the word puraratā here distinctly refers to saṣe (heaven). In Rock Edict IX Aśoka compares ordinary maṅgala-s (auspicious rites) with dhiṣṇa-maṅgala, i.e., the auspicious rite consisting in the performance of dhiṣṇa. He says that the performance of ordinary maṅgala-s is of doubtful efficacy. It may or may not fulfill the desired object. But the practice of dhiṣṇa, even if it does not lead to the attainment of temporal object, is sure to breed endless merit in the next world (pālasā̄ṇaḥ anāhuṇāḥ pūṣhāṇaḥ pāṣaṇī). If we thus compare Rock Edicts VI, IX, and X with one another, we find that, according to Aśoka's theology also, the performance of dhiṣṇa leads to punya or aparāparivara, and the accumulation of punya to the attainment of saṣe or sanca. What, therefore, Aśoka means by saying that he made gods and men commingled with one another is that by teaching dhiṣṇa to people he has rendered them punya and made them like gods svarājāhikārīṇā, claimants of heaven, and consequently one another's compers.

II.

The second passage that we have to deal with runs thus in the three different recensions.

Sahasrām: —Iyaṁ cha śāvane viśrutena duve sapaṁdilāt saṭṭa viṇuthā ti 256.
Rūpāṭhā: —Vyāstūṇda śāvane hāte 256 satāvinīśā ti.
Brahmagiri: —Iyaṁ cha śāvane sādopyte vyāstha 256.

The latest interpretation that has been proposed of this passage is that by Dr. Thomas. And this has been accepted both by Dr. Fleet and Prof. Hultzsch. He has shown that the passage contains not the slightest allusion to Buddha’s death and that it makes mention, not of years, but of 256 nights, duve sapaṁdilātata (of the Sahasram text) during which Aśoka was away from his home. I wonder how it is possible to maintain this interpretation in the Rūpāṭhā text, where the word saṭṭa of satāvinīśā must correspond to satā of ṅati-satā in the Sahasram as Dr. Thomas understands it. The Rūpāṭhā text at best can be interpreted to refer to not 256 but only 100 nights, supposing that the word ṅati is here understood. Again, what can be the meaning of the words ṅati-satā viṇuthā? Can viṇuthā be here taken in the sense of “departed from home”? I am afraid, not. For what can be meant by saying that 256 nights departed from home? Prof. Hultzsch has no doubt seen through this difficulty and proposes to take viṇuthā as an ablative singular. But then I fail to understand how even this ablative can give the sense of “after (the king) had left home.” It can only mean “from the viṇuthā, i.e., (the king) who had left home.” These are some of the difficulties to which the new interpretation in my opinion gives rise.

In interpreting this passage we must never forget the suggestions given us by such an authority on Asoka’s inscriptions as M. Senart. The first is that Satā viṇutha of Sahasrām cannot possibly be separated from, and consequently must be taken to exactly correspond to, sāta-viṇūṣā of Rūpāṇa. The second is that viṇūṣa and viṇūḍa, wherever any one of these words occurs, must bear one and the same sense. Now, most scholars are agreed that the forms viṇūṣa and viṇūḍa are to be derived from the root vi-su, ‘to dwell abroad,’ to depart from home.’ That this is the natural correct sense to take will be seen from what follows. The word sāta I take with Dr. Ollendorf and M. Senart to stand for sātuu, ‘a living being, soul.’ But dve sāpanāmdīti I take with Bühler as equivalent to dvē sahā-paśūdād-ati. Obviously the word sāta in the sense of sātuu has been inadvertently omitted after ati. It is a well-known fact that at the time of copying a document when a word is followed by an exactly or almost exactly similar word, one of these is sometimes dropped. If any instance is needed, it is supplied by the Gāndhārī text of Rock Edict X. After yah tu kiṁci pariśamate, we have devanam Priyadārśi rājād instead of devanam priya Priyadārśi rājād. A similar thing has happened in the Sahasrām text, and hence after dve sāpanāmdīti, instead of sāta sātuu viṇūḍh, we have simply sāta viṇūḍh. So the Sahasrām text might be rewritten as follows: 1 iyān cha avadane viṇūthana [1] dve sāpanāmd-āti-sāta sāta viṇūṭhā ti 256. It may be rendered as follows: “And this sermon has been delivered by Viṇūṭhas (officials who have gone forth on tour).” (The figure) 256 indicates that two hundred and sixty souls (i.e., officials) have gone forth on tour.” The Rūpāṇa text may also be similarly translated: “(This) sermon has been delivered by Viṇūṭhas (officials who have gone forth on tour).” (The figure) 256 indicates that there have been settings on tour by (as many) souls (i.e., officials).”

The word vyāṭha or viṇūṭha I take to refer to Asoka’s officials. This is clear, I think, from etinā cha vaga(h)janena yadakaka aṭṭhā satā satā viṇūṭhavippati of the Rūpāṇa recension. The same formula occurs in the Sānika edict, and it will be patent to any one who reads it that this injunction is issued by Asoka to Mahāmātras, his own officials. I have, therefore, little doubt that in the Rūpāṇa text too the same injunction is meant by the monarch to be conveyed to his officers. And what is the injunction? “Go ye forth on tour (viṇūṭhatāya) with these words (i.e., with this sermon of mine) everywhere in your district.” The word dhāra again is noteworthy. It frequently occurs in case inscriptions and in the sense of “district.” In other words, these officials appear to me to be the pradeśikas of Rock Edict III who have been ordered by Asoka to go forth on tour every five years together with yutas and Rajukas and perform the work of preaching in addition to their office duties. So if the word viṇūṭhatāya refers to Asoka’s officials, the word viṇūṭha which is another derivative of vi-su must necessarily refer to them and them only. This fact that viṇūṭhena is instrumental singular and not plural as it ought to have been if it referred to Asoka’s officials does by no means militate against our view. Because the word viṇūṭha is here used collectively (compare dhāhima-yuta of, e.g., Rock Edict V). Now in the Brahmagiri text vyāṭhena is immediately followed by the figure 256, without a word of explanation. This explanation is, however, given by the Sahasrām and Rūpāṇa inscriptions, in the former of which it is full and lucid. And this is given only to inform us for what the figure stands. The figure 256, says that record, indicates that two hundred and fifty-six souls have set out on religious tour. In short, what Asoka means is that he has sent out 256 officials called vyāṭhas or viṇūṭhas to preach his sermon.

M. Senart has called our attention to the fact that Pillar Edict VII presents very close analogies to our edict of which we must take the fullest advantage in interpreting it. Here too Asoka speaks of having caused dhāhima-avedanas to be heard. His exact words are: etīyame atiḥya dhāhima-avedanaṁ sāpyādi dhāhima-avedanaṁ viṣaṭhāni śāyānti yathā me pūnāti pāhano janani dyāt ete pāliṇoḍhīsati-pi pānīḥāsīsati-pi. It is thus plain that Asoka preached

---

1 There was very little difference between the letters t and s in Asoka’s time. Several were probably written on the rock, but the engraver mistook t for s and so engraved this last letter.

many religious sermons (dharma-dhvanas) through his officials. There is thus a remarkably close correspondence between this passage and our edict. I even proceed a step further, though I do so with some diffidence. In the passage just quoted, the letters ya and thd are indistinct and the following three have peeled off. Bühler reads the first two as yathd, and restores the lost ones to me puli. I confess, no good meaning is possible if yathd is read. The word yathd has no propriety here. Nor is M. Smart’s restoration yathd-visayd-pi an emendation, because some word signifying ‘officers’ has to be understood. Besides the last two letters are distinctly ‘sd-pi’ as Bühler has correctly read them, and not ‘yd-pi’ as deciphered by him. I think we must read some other word in place of yathd. I have just said that both ya and thd are not sufficiently distinct. The first letter may be ya though it looks more like vu, and as yathd gives no intelligible sense, I venture to read vyathd. Thus the whole sentence will run: vyathd (me puli) sd-pi bahuns janasa vaytha, which I believe yields perfectly good sense. In Pillar Edict VII in which Asoka gives a resume of the work he has achieved and in which he says what officials did what part of his work, it is natural to expect which class of his officials promulgated his dharma-dhvanas. He tells us what Rajendras and Mahamattas did, and this exactly agrees with what is stated about them in other records. The name, however, of the officials who were entrusted with the dissemination of dharma-dhvanas remains unmentioned in the edict. But if we read vyathd instead of yathd, it leaves nothing to be desired and this perfectly agrees with the S. R. B. edict.

XIII.—A new Kshatrapa Inscription.

The fragmentary inscription, whose transcript is given below was discovered about a year ago when some digging was being carried on in connection with the Shapore-Kutiyan Railway near Vanthali, the ancient Vamanasthali, in the Junagadh State. It refers itself to the reign of the Kshatrapa Rudrasinha, son of Jivadama, and is dated [Saka] 228 Vaishaka Sud 7. This inscription is of no particular interest as the name of this Rudrasinha has already been known to us from his coins, and with dates ranging from 227-231 (see Ranson’s Catalogue of Indian Coins, p. 170 ff.).

Transcript.
1 (Sv)adha(sh) rdvinah Kshatrapasya j(i)vadmaputre(s)ya
2 Rui[dr]a[ts]hayya varsha kata[gra]ye ashtha
3 vishtare 200 208 Vaishakha sva[ata] katha sa[lapam][sth].

THE TOWN OF HANJAMANA, REFERRED TO IN THREE SILAHARA GRANTS OF THE 10TH AND 11TH CENTURIES.

BY JIVANJI JAMSHEDI MADI, B.A., BOMBAY.

The following three Silahara grants, found in Konkan during the last century, refer to a town, named Hanjama or Hanumama (द्वारकाधुर or द्वारकाधुर).

1. The grant of king Arikasari-deva, dated Saka 939 (A.D. 1018).
2. The grant of Chinatarajadeva, Mahamandalesvara of Konkan, dated Saka 946 (A.D. 1026).
3. The grant of Mahamandalesvara, King Anantadeva, the Emperor of Konkan, dated Saka 1016 (A.D. 1094).

The first grant was found at Thanap, and it was translated in Vol. I of the Asiatic Researches (p. 357) by Pandit Ramachar.

The second grant was found at Bhagdp near Thanap about 1836, on the family property of a well-known Parsee family, known as the Ashburner family. The copperplate belonged to Mr. Hormusjee Cursetjee Ashburner. The text and translation of the grant were given by the late Dr. Bühler, ante Vol. V, p. 276 ff.

The third grant was also found in Konkan. Its text and translation have been given by the late Mr. Justice Telang. (Ante, Vol. IX, p. 33 ff.)

I give below, as found in the above journals, the translations of those passages of the grants, wherein the word Hanjama or Hanumama occurs.

1. "The fortunate Arikasari Deva, . . . . . . . Sovereign of the great circle thus addresses even all who inhabit the city Sri Shambha, his own kinsmen and others ther
assembled, princes, counsellors, priests, ministers, superiors, inferiors, subject to his commands, also the lords of districts, the governors of towns, chiefs of villages, the masters of families, employed or unemployed servants of the king, and his counymen. Thus he greets all the holy men and others inhabiting the city of Hanjamanas. (Asiatic Researches, Vol. I, p. 361).

2. "The great provincial chief, the illustrious Chhitaraonadeva addresses with salutations, worship, and respect all the assembled men of royal caste, ministers, Purohitas, counsellors, chief and minor officials, whether connected with himself or strangers, as well as the lords of rashiras (zillas), the lords of visayyas (taluqas), the lords of towns, the lords of villages, officials, and non-official persons, servants of the king, and raiyats, likewise the citizens of the town of Hanjamanas, belonging to the three (twice-born) castes and others as follows..." (Ante, Vol. V, p. 280, Col. 1).

3. "Illustrous Mahamandalevara king Anantadeva, announces with salutations, honour, respect, and directions, to all princes, counsellors, priests, ministers, principal and subordinate officers, both those connected with himself and others, as also all heads of rashiras, heads of visayyas, heads of towns, heads of villages, royal officials, specially appointed or not, country people, as well as townpeople of the town Hanjamanas of the three classes and so forth..." (Ante, Vol. IX, p. 38).

The learned translators of the three grants do not say what Hanjamanas or Hanjamanas is. Pandit Ramachandran and Dr. Bühler, the translators of the first two grants, say nothing about the word. Mr. Telang says of it: "I do not understand this." Further on he adds: "I can say nothing about Hanjamanas." 1

The Bombay Gazetteer in the Volume 2 on Thanga refers to these Silhara grants, and says that the town of Sanjan, which is about ninety miles from Bombay, on the Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway, is probably referred to under the name of Sahjanam. The writer does not give his grounds of probability. I fancy that the fact of the three copperplates being found in Konkan, wherein Sanjan is situated, and the fact of some similarity between the names "Hanjamanas" and "Sanjan" were his only grounds. The object of this paper is to supply two or three facts, giving some further grounds of probability, amounting well-nigh to certainty.

"Firstly, the donors address the tenor of their grants in general terms to all the people of the country, to members of the royal family, to their high and low officials, to officials and non-officials, to all their raiyats, and then make a special reference to the people of the town of Hanjamanas. Why were these people not included in the general terms of the address in the general term raiyat? What was the reason of separately addressing the people of the town of Hanjamanas? Did not the people of that town form a part and parcel of the raiyat of the donor-princes?" 3

The answer to all these questions is, that the town of Hanjamanas, though ruled by the donor-princes, was a separate colony of people, who formed a "foreign element" in the midst of the great Hindu people. It was a colony of the descendants of the first Parsee emigrants, who had come to India from Persia at the end of the 8th century and had settled at Sanjan in A.D. 735, with the special permission of the ruler of the land. They had continued to live as a "foreign element" following their own Zoroastrian creed, manners and customs, even retaining their own autonomy.

The Khosi-Sanjan, i.e., the story of Sanjan, a Persian poem, written in A.D. 1009 on the strength of authentic oral tradition, gives a pretty full account of how they came to Sanjan, how they corresponded with the ruling Rajas, how they explained to him their religion and customs, and how they, at last, got his permission to found a separate colony of themselves at a place which they named Sanjan. For an account of all these subjects I would refer my readers to my book entitled A Few Events in the Early History of the Parsees and their Dates.

The poem says: "A place in the desert was accepted. The ground was excellent and they made it their place of abode. The place was acceptable to all persons. A city was created, where..."
there was formerly a desert. All the young and the old landed there. When the Dastur saw this good place, he found it to be a proper place for abode. The Dastur gave it the name of Sanjan, and it was made prosperous like the country of Iran.

The Parsee emigrants had come from Khurjān, where there is a town of the name of Sanjan. So, perhaps, they called their new colony in India, Sanjhān, just as many modern colonists name their new colonies after their favourite towns in the old country, e.g., New York.

The three grants refer to the people of the town of Hamjamana as “the holy men and others inhabiting the town of Hamjamana,” “the citizens of the town of Hamjamana” belonging to the three (twice-born) castes (वैभव) and as “the townpeople of the town Hamjamana of the three classes.” The reference to these people as “the holy men,” shows that they belonged to the priestly class. In the Avest a also, we find the Atharvans (the priestly classes corresponding to the Brahmanas) called Thrayavan, i.e., of the three religious orders. This word corresponds to the Trisautrīya of the grants. The Parsee emigrants were mostly of the priestly class.

The Parsees have preserved among themselves sixteen Sanskrit śloka, referring to the fact of their explaining to the Indian Rāja, their religion and customs. The last of these śloka supports the Kisa-i-Sanjān, and says that the Indian Rāja gave the Parsees a separate tract of land in his country.

According to the śloka, the Rāja said to the new-comers: “O Parsees! May God grant you a progeny of children. May He grant you success and victory. May the immortal Fire grant you victory. May you be free from sins. May you always be holy. May the Sun be suspicious to you forever. Always reveres the Sun. May your desires be fulfilled. Take whatever land you desire in my country. May your respect and honour increase. O Parsees! If any ignorant people will look at you (with an idea to injure you), I will smite them. May you be successful over them. May riches be your lot.”

All these facts tend to show that the Parsees had a separate colony of their own, ruled over by themselves. There is another fact that leads to that there was such a colony which acknowledged allegiance to the Hindu Rāja. According to the Kisa-i-Sanjān, the country of the Indian Rāja, of which the town of Hamjamana (Sanjhān) formed a part, was, after a long time, invaded by Mahomedans at the direction of Sultan Mahmud. The Rāja of the day, being hard-pressed, asked the assistance of the Parsees, reminding them of the hospitality extended to their ancestors, the first emigrants, by one of his predecessors. A brave Parsee named Ardeshir led an army of Parsees and assisting the Rāja repulsed the Mahomedans. After a short time, the invaders, recouping their lost forces, made another invasion which turned out successful. The Rāja was defeated and killed and the Parsee army was annihilated.

This fact shows that the Parsees had formed a separate independent colony, especially in the matter of their social and religious affairs. Had it not been so, the Rāja would not have asked for their assistance. They had a town of their own, the town of Hamjamana referred to in the three copperplate grants—with what may be necessary apparatus—military or political, social and religious—of a self-governing ce allegiance to the Indian Rāja.

The question now is: What is the word Hamjamana, which the learned translators of the three grants have passed over, and of which Dr. Téleng said that he did not understand it, and could say nothing about it? In other words, why was the Parsee colony called “Hamjamana”?

The word hamjamana is an Avestic term, which has latterly become anjumān in Persian. As anjumān, it is common among the Parsees even now. It comes from Avestic...
han, Sanskrit sam or sah, Latin con meaning "together," and Avestic jam, Sanskrit gam, "to go." So, literally, it means "a place where people go together or meet." The Parsees even now speak of their large communal meetings as the Anjuman (Hamjamana) Meeting. So, perhaps, the early Parsees themselves called their colony Hamjamana, or their Indian brethren, hearing them use this word for their large communal gatherings, named it Hamjamana for them.

CONTRIBUTIONS TO PANJABI LEXICOGRAPHY.

SERIES III.

BY R. A. BOSE, I.C.S.

(Continued from p. 155.)

BAKTRI: a black woollen thread, with a small iron ring and some yellow cloth and betel-nut tied round the left ankle of the boy after his first bān (ceremonial oiling). Karnāl S. R., 1872-80, p. 128.

Bakhol: a tree, useless save for fuel; its leaves are also used as fodder. Simla S. R., 1889, p. 43.

BALA: thief. See lohri.


Banga: a great mountain range.


Bānūn: to plant out the bān, q. v.

Baughar: a disease in which the pain extends from the haunch to the heels on either side.

Gurgoan.


Bān: a dry and thirsty land; it generally has kaunbar cropping up in it and bears grass and moth well in propitious years. Cf. raur. Hoshiarpur S. R., p. 69.

Bara: the same as the mātra land, but with a larger proportion of clay; gives wonderful crops with good rain, but is liable to fail in dry years. It is in fact, much the same as the rohi land.

Cf. mōti and pathrāli. Hoshiarpur S. R., p. 70.

Bāran: a small and sweet mango fruit; in size like the fruit of the kāthā. Hoshiarpur S. R., p. 15.


Basān: an earthen vessel = kauri.

Basū: a cook-house. Sīrmūr.


Bātū: a second class rice. Hoshiarpur S.

Bātī: a red bean.

Baun: a place by a house where cattle are tied up.

Bāunj = nimbār.


Bāur: very dry and thirsty land; it generally has kaunbar cropping up in it and bears grass and moth well in propitious years. Cf. raur. Hoshiarpur S. R., p. 69.

Bāut: contr. chaubāra.

Rawar: a cave.

Rawar or dawar = don or shetha: a cave. Simla Hills.


Rēra or kaunta: the cones of the cedar and pines. Simla S. R., 1888, p. 44.
Borka: see. hausd.

Berrnâ: to exasperate; cf. rewa or rerkd, a quarrel.

Rotar: sandy land.

Resah: (remsa, in Kulâ) a small tree (Cotonaster oblonga), valued for sticks and goads.

Simla S. R., 1878, p. 42.

Bewa: a fish having a curious habit of swimming about in companies on the surface with its mouth out of the water during the late autumn and spring. Ludhiana S. R., 1878-83, p. 13.


Rova: a piece of cloth given in token of betrothal by the girl's people to the boy's. Ludhiana S. R., 1878-83, p. 290.

Bhun, ron (Gâjâ): the dark hanging forest seen on high ranges, perhaps from reh, the commonest tree in such localities. Kângra Gloss.

Rihâli: the 1st day of Sâwan, but the people in different parayanus observe the Rihâli on different dates in that month.

Bâna: steep, as of steep hill sides, snow slopes, or precipices. Kângra Gloss.

Rundi: ventilator. Sirmûr.


Ringsarwâ: pain in the legs, etc. Cf. ranghar. Gurdaspur.

Rirâ: a grazing ground round a village—see dotli.

Ririr, rirrah: a small ridge.


Rissâla: a kitchen=cholyAppâl.


Rohilâ: bread rokhid. q. v. Ex rohil la diya 'bring bread.' Bauria argot.

Roi lerna: to weep. Bauria argot.


Rorâ: fixed assessment, a lamp sum.

Rot: a ceremony performed by the Sultâni families once a year on Friday; a huge loaf of one maund (katcha) flour and a quarter maund (katcha) of gur, is cooked. The âharû attends and beats the drum, and sings the praise of the saint (Sakhi Sarwar Sultan) while this is preparing, and receives one-quarter of the bread, the other three-quarters being eaten by the family. Ludhiana S. R., 1878-83, p. 55.

Rowîr (Kulâ): a cave under a rock. Cf. guphâ.

Rub: a sheep over two years old; one over a year old is doga; a lamb in Kulâ is gab.

Rubban: quicksand (dal-dal).

Runghar: a Mahammadan Rajput; so styled by other castes. Karnal S. R., p. 89.

Runna: irreg. past part. of rûnd, 'weep' (WJ).

Rurl: a heap of threshed rice.
Rurpāl: an extra perquisite, realised by the proprietor, generally at one thimi in the topa, in
the gross produce.


Rūt manāl: a kind of marriage ceremony; four or five men go from the bridegroom
house to the bride’s house, dress her, put a cap on her head, and bring her home to the bridegroom.
Kāṅgra S. R., p. 98.


Sag: a watering, usually applied to the one before ploughing for the Rabi and the last one in
the Kharif. Kāṅgra Gloss.

Sāgār sidhi: a game in which three boys stand one behind the other while three others leap
on to their backs from behind. Sirsa S. R., 1879-83, p. 206.

Sāga: drizz (GāḌī). Cf. mēph.


Sahara: father-in-law, Pārāgī.

Sāhū, sāhū: good. Bauria argot. Ex. thāndār sāhū: ‘the thāndār is a good man.’

Sat: earnest-money, paid to a tenant on engagement. Kāṅgra S. R. (Lyall), p. 44.

Sairī: autumn harvest, Kāṅgra Gloss.

Simla: a tree of fair size, leaves fed to sheep and goats, growing low down in warm situations
Simla S. R., 1883, p. 44.

Sajja: a bedstead and bedding, a complete suit of clothes, some vessels, and such other parts
of a complete outfit given to a Brahman at the first anniversary of the death of a person. Karnāl

Sajja: a sharer or a share in a dāna. Karnāl S. R., p. 112.

Sahara: the opening from a chālīa or canal dūl into a field. Kāṅgra S. R., p. 62.

Sahij: the wife’s brother’s wife. Cf. sahaj, sāhī, sahī, sāhī, sahī and sahī. Gurgaon

Sahij: the wife’s brother’s wife. Cf. sahij.

Sahāra: s. m., a swallow.


Sāhī: the wife’s brother’s wife. Cf. sahij, sahaj.

Sāhī: the wife’s brother’s wife. Cf. sahij, sahaj, and sahī.

Sāhī: the wife’s brother’s wife. Cf. sahij, sahaj, and sahī.

Sālānī, Sālīnī: a place where the dead are burnt; also called maṭalī, tīraṇ, etc. Kāṅgra
Gloss.

Sālā: s. f., wife’s younger sister.

Sāliā: the wife’s brother’s wife. Cf. sālājī, sāliājī, sāliājī, and sāliād.

Sāliā: the wife’s brother’s wife. Cf. sālājī, sāliājī, sāliājī, and sāliād.

Sāliā: the wife’s brother’s wife. Cf. sālājī, sāliājī, sāliājī, and sāliād.

Sāliā: the wife’s brother’s wife. Cf. sālājī, sāliājī, sāliājī, and sāliād.

Sāliā: the wife’s brother’s wife. Cf. sālājī, sāliājī, sāliājī, and sāliād.

Sāliā: the wife’s brother’s wife. Cf. sālājī, sāliājī, sāliājī, and sāliād.

Salakrī: a pājā held on any auspicious (mahāra) day in the month of Baśakā before Kāli
to avert sahā, ‘hailstones,’ in order that they may not destroy the crops.

Salri: a name applied to long strips of field lying low, Kangra Gloss.
Sampn: complete, finished.
Smuta: a f., reconciliation.
San: like, resembling, t. q. sini.
Sandali: a small window. Sirur Trans-Giri.
Sandh see next
Sandh, (sandh) a level place near a village where cattle stand or sit in the heat of the day.
Sang: a ladder; also called pandh or mandj. Kangra Gloss.
Sanghara: those who apply the torch to the pyre at a funeral. Churah.

(To be continued)

NOTES AND QUERIES

PROGRESS REPORT OF THE LINGUISTIC SURVEY OF INDIA, UP TO THE END OF THE YEAR 1911.

The following is a list of the volumes of the Survey, showing the state at which each has arrived:

Vol. I.—Introduction. This cannot be touched until all the other volumes have been printed and indexed.
Vol. II.—Makhor and Tai families.
Vol. III.—Tibeto-Burman family. In three parts.
Vol. IV.—Munda and Dravidian families.
Vol. VI.—Indo-Aryan languages, Mediate group.
Vol. VII.—Indo-Aryan languages, Southern group.
Vol. IX.—Indo-Aryan languages, Central group:

Part I.—Western Hindi and Panjabi. In the press.
Part II.—Rajasthani and Gujarati.
Part III.—Bihli languages, etc.
Part IV.—Himalayan languages. In the press.
Vol. X.—Eranian languages. The greater part in type. A small portion remaining to be written.
Vol. XI.—Gipsy languages. This has been prepared by Dr. Konow, and is ready for the press.

It will thus be seen that the Survey, save for the Introductory Volume, is nearly completed. Only a few months' work remains. As for what has not already been published, the following remarks may be of interest:

Vol. VIII. covers the whole of North-western India, and deals with Sindhi, Lahndi, and the Pishcha languages (including Kashmiri) spoken between the north-western frontier of India proper and the Hindustan. With the exception of Kashmiri, all the Pishcha languages have

1 Vols. II to VII, have all been printed and published.
2 Vol. IX, Parts II, and III have been printed and published.
been disposed of, and the section dealing with them is in type. Lahndi, by far the heaviest section, is completed, except for a couple of dialects, regarding which it has been found necessary to make reference to India. Sindhi, which will require but a short section, has not yet been touched. All, therefore, of this volume that remains to be done is Sindhi, two dialects of Lahndi, and Kashmiri.

As regards Volume IX. (Ernanian languages) two forms of speech remain untouched, viz., Bilohi and Ormxri. The latter is a most interesting, but little known, language spoken in Waziristan. I have been fortunate enough to obtain excellent materials, and hope to be able to give a fairly complete account of it. I have already drafted a grammar and vocabulary. Although distinctly a member of the Ernanian family it also shows points of agreement with the Pisola languages of the Hindâ Kush country. It may here be remarked that Khâtrâ, a dialect of the Indo-Aryan Lahndi, also shows signs of similar agreement. The rest of this volume, dealing with the Ghulchah languages, Pashto, and some local varieties of Persian, has long been in type.

As regards Volume IX, the parts dealing with Râjasthân, Gujrat, and the Bihl languages have already been published. The part for Western Hindi and Panjâb has been ready for the press, but difficulties connected with the preparation of special Oriental type have delayed its appearance. Part IV. has lately been completed in MS., and gone to press. It deals with the Indo-Aryan languages of the Himalaya from Darjeeling, in the east, to beyond Chambâ, in the west. These have been divided into three languages, or groups of dialects, which (proceeding from east to west) I name, respectively, Eastern Pahâri or Naipâli, Central Pahâri and Western Pahâri.

These Pahâri languages exhibit points of great interest, both to the ethnologist and to the philologist. In Eastern Pahâri we have an Indo Aryan language spoken by a dominant class, comparatively few in number, amidst a population whose speech is Tibeto-Burman. In such a case we should expect to find many instances of Tibeto-Burman loan-words, but this does not occur to any large extent. On the other hand, the grammar is greatly influenced, and we find this Indo-Aryan language adopting a system of conjugation and rules of syntax which are essentially Tibeto-Burman. For instance, as in Tibeto-Burman, there is a special impersonal conjugation of every verb, giving an honorific sense; and the subject of a transitive verb in any tense (not only the past tense) is put into the case of the agent.

Central Pahâri is the language of Kumaun and Garhwal. The many dialects can conveniently be grouped under the two language names of Kumaun and Garhwal. The speakers of Eastern Pahâri call themselves "Khas," and the principal dialect of Kumaun is called Khas-parcha, or "the speech of the Khas people." The main cultivating population of Kumaun and Garhwal belongs to the Khas tribe. Western Pahâri is the name given to the group of dialects between Garhwal, on the east, and Jâmna and Kashmir, on the west. It includes the vernacular language of the country round Simla.

The tract over which Central and Western Pahâri are spoken closely corresponds to the ancient Sapdâlaksha, the country from which in old times the Gurjaras migrated to populate north-eastern Râjputâna (Mewâli and Jaiâpur). D. R. Bhandarkar has shown that the Râjpûtas are the modern representatives of ancient Gurjaras, who adopted the profession of arms, the remainder, who adhered to the tribal pastoral life, retaining the old name of "Gurjara," or, in modern times, "Gâjar."

The Khas tribe of the Central Pahâri tract represents the ancient Khâsas, regarding whom much has been written, but little definitely proved. The cultivating population of the Western Pahâri tract calls itself "Kanî," or "Khas;" but the Kanîs are divided into two classes, one of which, the lower in status, bears the name of "Khas." The other class, of higher status, calls itself "Râo," and claims, as the name implies, to be of impure Râjput descent.

The language spoken in the three Pahâri tracts is, as is well known, connected with Râjasthân, and when the Pahâri volume appears it will be seen that it agrees most closely with the dialects of North-Eastern Râjputâna—Mewâli and Jaiâpur. But throughout there are traces of another form of speech belonging to the North-Western group, which I call "Pišcha." These traces are slight in Eastern Pahâri, strong in Central Pahâri, and very strong in Western Pahâri.

3 See D.R. Bhandarkar, ants, XL. (1911), 88. The name still survives in the "Sawâlakh" Hills.
The state of affairs is further complicated by the fact that in the extreme north-west, amongst Pashto-speaking peoples—in the distant hills of Swat and Kashmir—there are at the present day wandering tribes of Gôjjar cattle tenders and shepherds, who have a language of their own quite different from that of the people among whom they dwell. This language also closely resembles the Râjasthâni of Mewâr and Jaipur.

Although it is unsafe to base ethnological theories on linguistic facts, I think that when Part IV. of Volume IX. of the Linguistic Survey is published, it will be seen that the following theory is at least not inconsistent with the linguistic facts as we now observe them.

I suggest that the earliest known Indo-Aryan, or Aryan inhabitants of the Himalaya tract, known as Sapâdalaška, were the Khasas. These spoke a language akin to what are now the Pîsâcha languages of the Hindû Kush. They are now represented in the Western Pahârî tract by the Khas clan of the Kanêtas, and in the Central Pahârî tract by the Khas tribe, which forms the bulk of the cultivating population.

In later time the Khasas were conquered by the Gurjaras. The Gurjaras are now represented by the Râjpûts of the whole Sapâdalaška tract, and also by the Râj clan of the Kanêtas, which represents those Gurjaras who did not take to warlike pursuits, but remained cultivators. Hence, their claim to be of impure Râjpût descent. In Garhwâl and Kumaun, where (for our present purposes) there are only Râjpûts and Khasas, the cultivating Gurjaras became merged in the general Khasa population. Over the whole of this Sapâdalaška tract the Gurjaras and the Khasas gradually amalgamated, and they now speak one language, mainly Gurjâri, but also bearing traces of the speech of the original Khasa population.

As D. R. Bhandarkar has shown, many of these Sapâdalaška Gurjaras migrated into Râjpûtâna, carrying their language with them, which there developed into Râjasthâni. In the subsequent centuries there was constant communication between Râjpûtâna and Sapâdalaška, and, under the pressure of Moghul domination, there ultimately set in a considerable tide of emigration back from Râjpûtâna into Sapâdalaška. These immigrants were received with all the prestige of the high position to which they had attained in the social system of the Indian Plains. The foundation by them of various Hill States is a matter of history and need not here detain us, but, from a linguistic point of view, the important fact is that they still further strengthened the Râjasthâni element in the Pahârî dialects.

There remain the nomadic Gôjjaras of the north-western hills. Their presence is accounted for as follows:—We have seen that those Gurjaras who did not take to warlike pursuits, but adhered to their pastoral occupation, retained the name and social status of Gurjaras or Gôjjaras. During the period in which Râjpût rule became extended over the Panjab, the Râjpût fighting men were accompanied by their humble pastoral brethren, and we now find a line of Gôjjar colonization running from Mewâr (the “Gurjânt” of Albirûnî) up both sides of the Jamnâ valley, and thence following the foot of the Panjab Himalaya, right up to the Indus. Where they have settled in the plains they have abandoned their own language and speak that of the surrounding population, but as we enter the lower hills we invariably come upon a dialect locally known as “Gôjjarî.” In each case this can best be described as the language of the people nearest the local Gôjjaras, but badly spoken, as if by foreigners. The further we go into these sparsely populated hills, the more independent do we find the Gôjjar dialect, and the less is it influenced by its surroundings. As length, when we get into the wild hill-country of Swât and Kashmir, the nomad Gôjjaras are found still pursuing their pastoral avocations, and still speaking the language—touched by their ancestors, brought with them from Mewâr—but in this case largely modified by the Jamnâ or Pânjûb dialect, and separated from the Jamnâ by the wide plains of the Panjab, over which either Lâhadî or Pânjûbî is the universal tongue, speak a language, which though nearly the same as Mewârî, also contain, like flies in amber, odd phrases and idioms belonging to the Hindûstânî of the Jamnâ valley. These they could not have taken from Puhštî or from Pîsâcha. These are strange alike to Lâhadî and Pânjûbî. These do not occur in Mewâr, and they clearly show that the Gôjjaras, on their way to Swât and Kashmir, must, at one period of their wanderings, have lived in the Jamnâ valley.

GEORGE A. GRIEBSON.
Camberley, 8th February 1912.
BOOK NOTICES.


The idea of writing a guide of Ajmer was suggested to the author more than twenty years ago by Mr. F. L. Reid, late Principal of the Ajmer Government College, but it was only in 1909 when Ajmer was plague-affected that he could possibly take up the work in right earnest. As material accumulated, the author decided to write a more detailed history of the city than was permissible in a guide. But this ambitious object had to be postponed and the present guide to be prepared and published for Her Imperial Majesty and the Royal Party that visited Ajmer in December last. The book is dedicated to Sir Elliot Colvin, K.C.S.I., Agent to the Governor-General for Rajputana, and a happier choice it is impossible to imagine, knowing, as we do, what he has done for the improvement and well-being of Ajmer.

The guide is both descriptive and historical as it professes to be, and the descriptive and historical parts are so arranged that neither preponderates over the other. This is just the thing needed though it is seldom accomplished. The author has spared no pains to make his book as accurate, full, and reliable as it was possible for him to do. One has only to read a chapter to be convinced of this fact. The reader is specially requested to read Chapter VIII, which deals with an account of Khoja Muinuddin Chisti, the presiding genius of Ajmer, and he is sure to be amazed at the mass of information so critically collected and so interestingly set forth. It is, however, Chapters VII, XII, and XIV, which concern the antiquarian most. The first gives a description of Aḍḍhāl-dīn-kā-Jhonpā. The author proposes a new explanation of this name. "The name Aḍḍhāl-dīn-kā-Jhonpā was given to it," he says, "as fakirs began to assemble here in the times of the Mughals (latter half of the eighteenth century) to celebrate the Urs anniversary of the death of their leader Panjaba Shah, which lasted for two and a half days." He is perfectly correct when he says that here was the original site of the temple of Sarasvatī and the college house built by the Chahān king Visaladeva just as the Kamālmanā mosque at Dār represents the original place where a similar temple and college were constructed by the Paramāra sovereign Bhojadeva. But he is certainly wide of the mark when he tries to show that if we but omit the screen wall, front-arches, Mihrāb, and Minbar of the prayer-chamber of the Aḍḍhāl-dīn-kā-Jhonpā, we have the whole of the building as it actually stood in Visaladeva's time. Can Mr. Sarda point to any non-Muhammadan building in plan exactly like a mosque as Aḍḍhāl-dīn-kā-Jhonpā undoubtedly is? In fact, no Hindu or Jain temple has yet been found, whose parts are arranged like the prayer-chamber and side cloisters of a mosque. Besides, in the body of old masjids built by demolishing ancient temples the pillars consist of two or more Hindu shafts superimposed, one on the other. Such stilted pillars are conspicuous by their absence in old Hindu structures, but are found in all old mosques as in Aḍḍhāl-dīn-kā-Jhonpā. These considerations strongly militate against the view that this last building in its present plan was originally some Hindu temple. The inscription slabs that were unearthed here in 1875 were for some time deposited in the Lucknow Museum and have now been brought back to Ajmer and kept in the Rajputana Museum there. The author says: "These inscriptions are of the greatest importance to the historian, and it is hoped that Government will see their way to taking in hand regular excavations in the Jhonpā, with a view to recover, if possible, the remaining portions of the important inscriptions."

They were published by the late Prof. Kielhorn in this Journal, Vol. XX, p. 201 ff., and Mr. Sarda has given a succinct summary of what the former wrote regarding them. In this summary mention is made of a place called Vavarā, where Vigrāhārājā alias Visaladeva was encamped while he was preparing himself to give battle to the Hāmalā, i.e., the Muhammadan king who was advancing against him. This place Prof. Kielhorn was not able to identify nor has Mr. Sarda suggested any identification. There can, however, be no doubt that it is to be identified with Varvarā by which Rūpāgar was known before it was so named after Rūpayāna of the Kishangarh dynasty (Ann. Prog. Rep. West. Circle for 1911, p. 49).

Chapter XIII gives an account of Pushkar, seven miles west of Ajmer. It is one of the most sacred places of the Hindus in India. It is also one of the most ancient places in India. All references to Pushkar whether in epics or inscriptions have been culled together by Mr. Sarda in this chapter. Of particular interest is the reference to Pushkar found in the Nasik cave inscription. It tells us that Ushavādā, son-in-law of the Mahākaviatra Nāhāpāna, had first gone to give aid to the Uttamabhadras who were harassed by the Mālavas, who in ancient days-
were settled in the central and southern parts of Rājputāna. After defeating the Mālavas, Usha-
vaḍāta, we are told, went to Puskar. The word
actually used is Pokhārānī, the plural and not
singular of Puskarā,—a point not noticed by
Mr. Sarda as he ought to have done. Even to
this day, not one or two, but three, Puskaras
are known—jyestha, madhya, and kaṃshika, all
situated within a circuit of six miles. Ushava-
ḍāta again is represented to have bathed there
and given three thousand cows and a village
to the Brāhmaṇas. This shows that even in
the first century A.D. Puskar was a centre of
Brahmanism. Mr. Sarda has also referred to
the inscription of king Durgarāja, found at
Puskar, a summary of which has been published
by me in the Ann. Prog. Rept. West. Circle
for 1910, p. 59. But he is not correct in saying
that A.D. 925 is the date of the king furnished
by the inscription. It really gives two dates: (1)
A.D. 925 for the grant of Mahāna, and (2) A.D.
930 for the confirmation of it by Durgarāja.

The author has also narrated some of the
interesting and important legends connected
with Puskar. One of these is of the Pādevāra
king Nāhād-rāv, who bathed there and was cured
of leprosy. This Nāhād-rāv figures greatly in
the Mārvār legends also. The question arises:
who was this Nāhād-rāv? Mr. Sarda apparently
takes him to be Nāgabhāṣa I., of the imperial
Pratihāra dynasty. But I think that he is in all
likelihood Nāgabhāṣa of the feudatory Pratihāra
family, that reigned at Manḍor and Meṭā. There
is no legend about Nāhād-rāv anywhere in
Rājputāna beyond Ajmer and Mārvār. Jina-
prabhaśūri in his tirthakalpa speaks of Nāhād-
rāv as king of Manḍor. This shows that he
cannot belong to the imperial dynasty which
reigned at Kamaj. The Ghaṭiyaḷā inscription again
says that he established himself at Meḍantaka
(Meṭā). And as Meṭā is not far off from
Puskar, this explains why legend has associated
his name with this sacred place. About the end
of this chapter Mr. Sarda gives us the interesting
information that the town of Puskar is divided
into two parts: (1) Ohoṣṭi Baslī and (2) Baḷji
Bastī and that the Brāhmaṇas of the former
allege that the Brāhmaṇa of the latter are not
true Brāhmaṇas but are Sākṣadvi Brāhmaṇas or
Maṇgas (Maṇji of Persia) and that they began to
call themselves Paṇḍāra Brāhmaṇa after having
been admitted into the fold of Brahmanism.
This, it is said, was discovered by Raja Jai Singh
II. of Jaipur himself.

Chapter XIV. gives both the ancient and
modern history of Ajmer in a very lucid manner.

So far as the former is concerned, the author
seems to have been guided by Pandit Gauri
Shankar Ojha, though not without independent
judgment. Thus, instead of Jayadeva, Mr. Sarda
has Ajayapāla, as the son of Śambadaeva and
regards him as the founder of Ajmer, and not
Ajayatīraja, son of Pṛthvīrāja I., as Pandit Gauri
Shankar does. It is very few other respects
the author's account differs from that of Mr. Ojha
given in his Hindi translation of Tod's Rājasthān.
Both make the first four kings of the dynastic
list, connected with one another as father and
son. But no authority is cited by either. So
far as our knowledge goes, this relationship is
not supported by any published records or
accounts. The reference to the coins of Ajaya-
deva and Somaladevi is interesting, as they have
not yet been recognised by the numismatists.
A paper on this subject will soon appear in this
journal. Some inscriptions describe Chohāna
as belonging to the solar and some to the lunar
dynasty. Amongst the latter Mr. Sarda in-
cludes the Hānst inscription of A.D. 1167. But
this is a mistake, for this record in no place even
hints that the Chohānas belonged to the lunar
race (above Vol. XXI., p. 17 ff.). Again, Mr.
Sarda says: "whether they belong to the solar
or the lunar race, they assuredly do not belong
to the Agnikula, as they now wrongly claim to
do." But if some records say that Chohānas
were Sāravansis and some that they were
Somavansis, there is no reason why there should
not be other records calling them Agnikulis
and why therefore these records should be set
aside. The truth of the matter is that a Rājput
tribe with a foreign origin was always in need of
such a pedigree when it became Hinduised, and its
divisions, often separated from one another by
great distances, traced their descents separately,
some from the sun, some from the moon, some
from the fire, and some from the earth.

The book is not without a few misprints, but
considering the haste in which it had to be print-
ed they are few. There is, however, a mistake
which is not so excusable. The name of the late
Prof. Kielhorn is everywhere spelt Kielhorn and
not Kielhorn as it ought to be.

I have thus touched upon the points where
difference from the author's views is possible,
but in other respects it is impossible to disagree
with him, and such points are by no means few.

The reader, in fact, cannot leave the book aside
without being impressed that it is in every way
a very useful and valuable production.

D. R. B.

Those who are interested in the study of Indian Medicine may like to hear of the publication in India of this very useful compilation on the indigenous drugs of that country. Its author is Kaviraj Bhiraj Charan Gupta, who describes himself as the "Rajvaidya," or Court Physician, of the Native State of Cooch Behar. The first volume appeared in 1868, and the second in 1869. The structure of the work is as follows. The drugs, i.e., the articles on them, are arranged alphabetically, in the order of the Sanskrit alphabet; thus commencing with *Ajugura* and ending with *Hamvocheki*. But the names of the drugs, beginning with *B* and with *V*, are all given promiscuously after those beginning with *P*, instead of their proper places. There is also an Appendix (*Parishkala*) to the second volume, pp. 355 ff., giving a small number of additional drugs, arranged similarly. As a rule, the articles are made up in the following way.

First, we have quotations from old Sanskrit authorities, such as Dhvanvantariya and Raja Nihaanta, Bhava Prakasha, Charaka, Susruta, Vagbhatta and others, on the qualities, actions, uses, etc., of the drugs, printed in Nagaari characters. Then follows a kind of Bengali commentary on those quotations, apparently written by the author himself, printed in Bengali characters.

Finally, there come some English notes on "Constituents, Actions and Uses", quoted from various sources, principally from Dr. R. N. Khory's *Materia Medica of India*. All this is excellent, and reflects much credit on the range of reading and the industry of the compiler. The latter are well shown also by the author's introductory chapter, which gives an interesting survey of the ancient medical literature of India. This chapter is followed by a series of shorter notices of medieval Sanskrit and modern English works on Indian *Materia Medica* (*Nighanta*). To the second volume there are appended other two useful dissertations on food stuffs in general (*Kshadya*), and on what is suitable or unsuitable in certain diseases. Finally the work is provided with three elaborate lists; viz., (1) of drugs, the names being given in Sanskrit, Bengali, and Cooch Behari; (2) of diseases; and (3) of Latin names. The first and second of these three lists are printed in duplicate, that is, in Bengali and in Nagari characters. This apparently superfluous duplication is, no doubt, due to the fact that the work is primarily intended for the benefit of the indigenous doctors (*Kaviraja*) of Bengal, who, as a rule, do not seem to be very familiar with the Nagari characters.

For the same reason, the dissertations and introductory chapters above mentioned, are written and printed in Bengali. But though principally intended for Bengali practitioners, the work is well worth the attention of all medical men and others in and out of India, who are interested in the indigenous Indian system of Medicine. The second list will probably be found particularly useful by the general practitioner. It enumerates in alphabetical order, all the well-known diseases of the Sanskrit medical texts; and under each disease it names the drugs suitable to it.

The weak point of the work is in its English portions, particularly the Latin botanical nomenclature. The English quotations abound in misprints. A conspicuous example occurs in the extract printed in *Vol. II*, pp. 102, 163. Here in 18 lines of print, there are no less than eleven gross misprints; e.g., "approodicie" for aphrodisiac; "vatile" for volatile; "deobstrunct" for deobstrunct, and so forth. Botanical names are often blundered; thus *gigantes* for *gigantea*, I, 32; *flavona* for *flavonos*, I, 51; *subelatum* for *subulatum*, I, 124; *philippensis* for *philippinensis*, I, 153; *smpervirens* for *smpervi*, II, 19; *logopoides* for *logopoeidas*, II, 85, etc., etc. *Anisphilusum Rumpfii*, I, 140, appears to be intended for *Anisophilum Rumpfii*, but no such combination can be traced. The botanical rule as to the use of initial capital letters is very often neglected; thus we find *Peronea Elephantum*, for *elephantum*, I, 119; *Botella Tinctoria* for *tinctoria*, I, 153; *Urxia Picta* for *picta*, II, 85; *Ficus Bengalensis*, *P. Indica* for *bengalensis*, *indica*, II, 104, etc., etc. These errors are repeated in the lists appended to the two volumes. Another botanical rule, according to which the name of the author of the species should follow after the specific name, is invariably neglected. It is a pity that there should be these blemishes in a work, otherwise so excellent. Though they will not seriously interfere with its usefulness for the Kaviraja, the author will do well to attend to their removal in a second edition, for which it may be hoped, the occasion may soon arise.

A. F. RUDOLF HORNBLL.
CONTRIBUTION TO THE STUDY OF ANCIENT HINDU MUSIC,

BY RAO SAHIB PRABHAKAR R. BHANDARKAR, B.A., L.M.A.; INDORE.

(Continued from p. 164.)

BUT if the śruti have received such bad treatment from some Sanskrit authors, they have had a still worse fate at the hands of modern writers. Thus Sir W. Jones says:—"If I understand the native musicians, they have not only the chromatic, but even the second, or new, enharmonic, genus; for they unanimously reckon twenty-two śruti, or quarters and thirds of a tone, in their octave; they do not pretend that those minute intervals are mathematically equal, but consider them as equal in practice, and allot them to the several notes in the following order: to sa, ma, and pa, four; to ri and dha, three; to ga and ni, two; giving very smooth and significant names to each śruti. Their original scale, therefore, stands thus:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{sa,} & \quad \text{ri,} & \quad \text{ga,} & \quad \text{ma,} & \quad \text{pa,} & \quad \text{dha,} & \quad \text{ni,} & \quad \text{sa}, \\
4 & \quad 3 & \quad 4 & \quad 4 & \quad 3 & \quad 4 & \quad 2 & \quad 4
\end{align*}
\]

"The semi-tones accordingly are placed as in our diatonic scale; the intervals between the fourth and fifth, and between the first and second, are major tones; but that between the fifth and sixth, which is minor in our scale, appears to be major in theirs; and the two scales are made to coincide by taking a śruti from pa and adding to dha, or, in the language of Indian artists, by raising Svaraṇārāṇḍa 18 to the class of Śatā and her sisters; for every śruti they consider as a little nymph, and the nymphs of the Pashama, or the fifth note, are Mālinī, Chapalī, Lōhī and Svaraṇārāṇḍa, while Śatā and her two sisters regularly belong to Dhipiśa; such at least is the system of Čōrālap, one of the ancient bards, who has left a treatise on music."

"Śoma seems to admit, that a quarter or a third of a tone cannot be separately and distinctly heard from the Vind; but he takes for granted, that its effect is very perceptible in their arrangement of modes; and their sixth, I imagine, is almost universally diminished by one śruti; for he only mentions two modes, in which all the seven notes are unaltered. I tried in vain to discover any difference in practice between the Indian scale, and that of our own; but knowing my ear to be very insufficiently exercised, I requested a German professor of music to accompany with his violin a Hindu lutist, who sang by note some popular airs on the loves of Cirehna and Rādhā; he assured me, that the scales were the same; and Mr. Storre afterwards informed me, that, when the voice of a native singer was in tune with his harpsichord, he found the Hindu series of seven notes to ascend, like ours, by a sharp third."

Now I can well believe the inability of Sir W. Jones to discover any difference between the Indian and European scales, and the German professor's confirmation of their unity. For, practically, the present-day Hindu scale 19 may be considered indistinguishable from the modern European scale, and Mr. Shore is quite right when he says that it ascends, like the other, by 'a sharp third' (major third). But that is about the only correct thing in this passage, almost all other assertions being errors, which have since been repeated by other writers, who have accepted them without examination. It is necessary therefore, to point them out, as 'errors' of Typesetting:

(1) In the first place it must be obvious to the reader that no one has a right to assume that the scale mentioned in Sanskrit treatises is the same as that of the present day. As a matter of fact, it will be shown in the sequel that they differ.

---

17 On the Musical Modes of the Hindus (Works Vol. IV.)
18 The names of the śruti given by Sir W. Jones differ from those commonly found in Sanskrit treatises. Were they taken from Sāmpya Ṣāṅgīya?
19 Whenever the present-day Hindu scale is referred to in this essay, it should be clearly understood that the present Hindustani system of music is in view, and not the present Carnatic system, unless the contrary is expressly stated.
(2) Secondly, it is wrong to infer that the Hindus had the enharmonic genus of the Greeks or anything similar to it, because they unanimously reckon twenty-two śruti in their octave. In the Preliminary Remarks above, the European scale is given in cents, twelve hundred being reckoned in the octave; but it would be absurd to argue therefrom that the Europeans have a genus in which the notes ascend by single cents.

(3) Thirdly, (a) thinking that the scheme of the scale as given by Sanskrit authors was

\[
\begin{array}{cccccccc}
sa & ti & ga & ma & pa & dha & ni & sa \\
4\delta & 5\delta & 8\delta & 2\delta & 4\delta & 4\delta & 3\delta & 2\delta \\
\end{array}
\]

which is an error, as we shall be shown presently, and (b) finding the prevailing Hindu scale and the modern European major scale indistinguishable, and (c) noticing three sorts of intervals in the classical Hindu scale, and (d) observing them (owing to his erroneous scheme of the scale) to occupy, as regards their comparative magnitudes, the same places as the major tone, the minor tone, and the semitone in the European scale, except in one instance (viz., the interval between the fifth and the sixth), Sir W. Jones naturally succumbed to the temptation of looking upon the two scales as quite identical, and made the assertions that the four-, three-, and two-śruti intervals were respectively the major tone, the minor tone and the semitone. But the three-śruti interval was a stumbling block. As this interval was identified with a tone, a śruti had to be considered as a third of a tone; at the same time, the four-śruti interval being looked upon as a major tone, a śruti had also to be supposed to be equivalent to a quarter of a tone. If the value of a śruti, however, be admitted to be thus uncertain, of what use could such a variable standard be? If an inch be sometimes a twelfth of the foot and sometimes only a sixteenth, how could it ever be of use as a measuring unit? Sir W. Jones seems to have thought that he had effectually got out of the dilemma by saying:—“they do not pretend that these minute intervals are mathematically equal, but consider them as equal in practice.” He seems to be unconscious of the fact that we cannot possibly consider a quarter-tone and a third of a tone as equal in practice, and choose either indiscriminately as the equivalent of a śruti in the classical Hindu scale and yet make the scale coincide with the European. Thus, if we suppose a śruti to be a quarter of a major tone, i.e., 51 cents (see above), the value of the three-, and two-śruti intervals will respectively be 153 and 102 cents, that is, even though the two-śruti interval may be allowed to pass as practically equal to the diatomic semitone of 112 cents, the three-śruti interval cannot be taken as equal to the minor tone of 182 cents. On the other hand, if we take a śruti as a third of a minor tone, i.e., 61 cents, the four- and two-śruti intervals will respectively be 244 and 122 cents; and here again even though we considered the two-śruti interval as practically equal to the diatomic semitone of 112 cents, the same cannot be said of the four-śruti interval and the major tone of 204 cents. But the amount of error becomes still more pronounced, when we remember (as will be pointed out later on) that the old Sanskrit musicians were much more concerned about their just fourths and fifths than about their seconds, and when accordingly we find their value on the hypothesis of Sir W. Jones.

---

20 I have allowed the two scales to be practically the same, but when anybody wishes to establish the identity in detail, as for instance with regard to major and minor tones, he must produce stronger experimental evidence than Sir W. Jones has done.

21 Hereafter I shall use the name ‘classical Hindu scale’ to mean the Shudra scale given in Sanskrit treatises. The term ‘ancient or old scale’ is not suitable, for even in modern Sanskrit books it occurs as the standard, though there is reason to believe that it was not the prevailing scale, which in its turn could, of course, be expressed in terms of the standard. I know of Sanskrit books on music composed in the last few years in which the classical Hindu scale is taken as the standard, though it is no longer the standard in practice.

22 As will be seen hereafter, the fact is that a śruti must be looked upon as practically invariable, like all other standards, with the result that the classical Hindu scale cannot be the same as the European one, even allowing that Sir W. Jones’ scheme of the former as given above is correct.

23 All the fourths and fifths of the classical scale are not just, only those with the intervals of nine and thirteen śruti respectively being allowed to be so (vide sup.).
A glance at the table shows that whereas in the Hindu system of 22 śrutiś in the octave, the error amounts to only 7 cents or about a third of a comma, on Sir W. Jones' assumptions it is six to twelve times as great.

(4) So great is the anxiety of Sir William to establish the identity of the classical Hindu and the European major scale that, though in accordance with his (erroneous) scheme of the former he is forced to admit that the interval between the fifth and the sixth in that scale is a major tone whereas it is a minor tone in the other, he proceeds to add—'their sixth, I imagine, is almost universally diminished by one śruti!' [thus making the two scales coincide]; 'for he [Somanātha] only mentions two modes, in which all the seven notes are unaltered.' Now even admitting that according to Somanātha, there are only two modes in which all the seven notes are unaltered, how does it follow that in almost all the remaining modes the sixth is altered? To take an extreme view, the statement of Somanātha can be quite correct without a single one of the remaining rāgas having an altered sixth, the alterations being confined to one or more of the other notes. Sir W. Jones' imagination that the sixth of the classical Hindu scale is 'almost universally diminished by one śruti,' is a mere assertion, which he makes in order to uphold his preconceived notion of the identity of the two scales, but for the support of which he has produced no evidence.

(5) Lastly comes the most serious error of all, which is in fact the source of all the others. Sir W. Jones would have found, if he had been a little more careful, that he had made a mistake in assigning proper places to the groups of śrutiś. All Sanskrit treatises clearly give the following as the scheme of the shadja-grāma:

\[
\begin{array}{cccccccc}
{ni} & sa & ri & ga & ma & pa & dha & ni \\
4 & 3 & 2 & 4 & 3 & 2 & 4 & 2
\end{array}
\]

Correct scheme of the shadja-grāma.

But Sir W. Jones made the mistake of putting after the notes the different groups of śrutiś attached to them, whereas according to rules they ought to have been put before them. Thus he wrongly represented the scheme as follows:

\[
\begin{array}{cccccccc}
sa & ri & ga & ma & pa & dha & ni & sa \\
4 & 3 & 2 & 4 & 3 & 2 & 4 & 2
\end{array}
\]

Sir W. Jones' incorrect scheme of the shadja-grāma.

This great error together with the others mentioned above, of which it was the source, has found its way in the writings of all subsequent authors, among whom are Sir W. Osiele, Mr. J. D. Paterson, W. C. Stafford, Capt. Willard, Col. French, Carl Engel, Rājā S. M. Tagore, J. Grosset, A. J. Ellis,26 A. W. Ambros27 and Capt. Day, to mention only the most important. This propagation of error was quite natural, as most of the writers were ignorant of Sanskrit. But they re-iterated the words of Sir W. Jones with so much force and perseverance, and with such an appearance of independent research that a conscientious scholar like M. J. Grosset, who was the

26 Somanātha defines only two rāgas viz. maṇḍari and tārāvādā with all seven notes unaltered (R. V. iv. 8), but he admits the existence of other rāgas with similarly unaltered notes (R. V. iii. 22). At the same time the student of the R. V. will easily see that the unaltered notes according to Somanātha are quite different from those according to Sir W. Jones.
27 In the correct scheme of the classical Hindu scale given below, it will be seen that the interval between pa and dha is only three śrutiś and not four as Sir W. Jones made out.
28 In his translation of Helmholtz's Sensations of Tone, 3rd edition, p. 521.
first to go back to the most ancient of Sanskrit treatises on music, was actually misled by them. This was very unfortunate, as he thereby missed the opportunity of correcting the prevalent error, and actually thought Bharata to be wrong in certain places, where he was quite correct. Thus finding the order of śruti in the Bh. different from that given by Sir W. Jones, he thought that the discrepancy was probably due to the exigency of the metre. The first person to detect the error was Rāji S. M. Tagore, who had himself previously given currency to it in his own writings. But, unfortunately, instead of acknowledging it as such, he tried to defend it and in doing so falls into fresh errors. Thus he says: "In the arrangement of the śruti, modern usage is diametrically opposite to the classical one; the latter placing them before the Notes to which they respectively belong, while the former fix their position after the Notes. Supposing a cypher to represent a śruti, the classical arrangement would be like this:—

\[
\begin{array}{cccccccc}
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
sa & ri & ga & ma & pa & dha & ni
\end{array}
\]

The modern arrangement is as follows:—

\[
\begin{array}{cccccccc}
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
sa & ri & ga & ma & pa & dha & ni
\end{array}
\]

"It is difficult to determine when or by whom the alteration in the arrangement was effected. The arrangement of the frets on the Vina and other stringed instruments accords with the modern acceptance of the principle. It will be seen from a look at these instruments, that, in them Gamārā and Nishādā, each of which has two śruti, and is called in European music a semitone, have, between themselves and the succeeding notes, half the space that is allotted to those having four śruti; and following the same method, Rishabha and Dhairāra, have, with reference to the next succeeding Notes, each a fourth less than that of Shadja, Madyama, and Panchama (each of which has four śruti). According to a rule laid down in the classical treatises, the disposition of the notes is reversed in the case of Dīrāra (literally, wooden, i.e., stringed) instruments, and out of this reversal arrangement, perhaps, the modern theory about the arrangement of the position of the śruti has been evolved." Then in a footnote he adds: "Capt. Willard, Sir W. Jones, and other eminent writers, who had carefully studied the principles of Indian Music and were practically acquainted with it, adopted the modern disposition of the śruti."

Now in this passage the only statements which are correct are (1) that the classical arrangement of the śruti in the śruti yadu is as given there, and not as was given by former writers and by the Rāja himself in his previous works and (2) that in the classical arrangement the semitones were between ri and ga, and between dha and ni, and that in the modern arrangement they are between ga and ma, and between ni and sa. All else is wrong. He had no right to assert that the erroneous scheme was 'the modern acceptance of the principle,' without quoting his authority for it. Then he adds that the modern arrangement of the frets on the śruti and other stringed instruments accords with it, for, he says, that if the space between the frets sa and ri, ma and pa, and pa and dha be taken as four units, that between the frets ri and ga, and dha and ni is three, and that between ga and ma, and ni and sa two. I need hardly remark that all this is quite

---

28 J. Gresset—Contribution à l'Étude de la Musique Hindoue, p. 84, notes 27 and 28.
30 'Hindu Music' 1874; Six Principal Ragas, 2nd edition, 1877.
31 Musical Scale of the Hindus, 1884, pp. 93-94.
32 The reader should note carefully that I say that the semitones were between ri and ga, and dha and ni, and not between the second and third notes, and the sixth and seventh notes, respectively, because, as will be pointed out hereafter, the classical sa was not the first of the scale in the same sense as the present day sa is.
wrong, as anybody with some acquaintance of the elements of acoustics can easily see. The same sort of gross mistake had been committed previously by J. D. Paterson, with this difference that this writer saw that even with his naive rejection of fractions, which he resorted to with apparent success in the first tetrachord sa—ma, he could not get anywhere near the numbers he desired in the case of the distances between successive frets of the second tetrachord pa—sa, and had recourse to the very ingenious suggestion that "as they considered the second tetrachord as perfectly similar to the first, they probably made use of the same numbers to express that similitude." Verily scholarship must have been comfortably unexact in those happy old days!

There is thus absolutely no basis for Rājā Ś. M. Tagore's fancied modern arrangement of the śruti, there being no authority for it. Nor does the observed difference in the position of the semitones in the classical and the modern scales stand in need of such an hypothesis, as it is capable of more than one other explanation as will be seen hereafter. But in putting forward a probable explanation of the supposed displacement of the śruti, the writer says: "According to a rule laid down in the classical treatises, the disposition of the notes is reversed in the case of Dāravī (literally, wooden, i.e., stringed) instruments, and out of this reversed arrangement, perhaps, the modern theory about the arrangement of the position of the śruti has been evolved." As usual the Rājā does not quote his authority, but it seems certain that he is referring to the lines

---

33 If we suppose with the Rājā the length of the string producing sa to be 30 inches, then theoretically the lengths giving the succeeding seven notes of the octave (on the Rājā's assumption about (1) the disposition of the śruti in the modern Hindu scale and (2) the values of the three sorts of intervals being a major tone, a minor tone and a diatonic semitone) will be 30, 72, 67, 60, 53, 45 and 42 inches respectively, and the difference in lengths of strings will be as shown in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4 śruti</th>
<th>3 śruti</th>
<th>2 śruti</th>
<th>1 śruti</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A mere glance at the table shows the error of the Rājā's statement. The fact is that there is a radical error in representing musical intervals by differences in the lengths of strings producing the notes. The correct way to represent them is by means of quotients of the respective lengths. Thus the 4-śruti intervals above are

\[
\begin{align*}
4 & = \frac{72}{60} = 1.20 \quad 3 & = \frac{48}{45} = 1.07 \quad 2 & = \frac{24}{24} = 1.00 \\
4 & = \frac{72}{60} = 1.20 \quad 3 & = \frac{48}{45} = 1.07 \quad 2 & = \frac{24}{24} = 1.00
\end{align*}
\]

See the Preliminary Remarks.

34 On the Grundmas or Musical Scales of the Hindus (Asianic Researches, Vol. IX), reprinted in Tagore's Hindu Music from Various Authors, and quoted in Capt. Day's The Music and Musical Instruments of S. India and the Deccan. What J. D. Paterson says amounts to this:—The madhyama-drṇam is formed from the shadja-yadraṇa (see Sir W. Jones' scheme above) by flattening dha by one śruti, which thus becomes identical with the major mode of European diatonic scale (of course, according to the wrong notion of that author and Sir W. Jones). Now take a sounding string 44 units in length between the nut and the bridge; then half the length or 22 units will give the octave of the open string, representing the 32 śruti. The lengths for the different notes will theoretically be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Note</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8 or octave</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Length of string</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference in length of strings of successive notes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reject the fractions of the first three differences, says Mr. Paterson, and you have the figures 4, 3, and 2 respectively, the number of śruti supposed to be there by the Hindu musicians. But the remaining figures do not fit in, even with the extreme liberality with which the reader has been asked to reject fractions, and the author has, therefore, recourse to the ingenious suggestion given above. Not to mention the haphazardness of fractions omitted, it will be at once seen that the writer's way of representing musical intervals is radically wrong (see the last footnote).
It simply means that in the case of the 'body-visa' the pitch rises as you go higher and higher (thus it is low in the chest, middle in the throat, and high in the head), whereas it is just the reverse in the case of a wooden speech, that is to say the pitch rises as you go lower and lower on the instrument. The reader will at once see that this has no connection whatsoever with the supposed sliding of the śrutis.

Again, when the author proceeds to defend 'Capt. Willard, Sir W. Jones, and other eminent writers' by saying that they 'adopted the modern disposition of the Śrutis', he is not adhering to facts; for a reference to the writings of Sir W. Jones will show that he was writing on the authority of Sanskrit treatises, none of which speak of the so-called 'modern disposition of the Śrutis'.

Lastly, it is curious to note that even when the Rāja has made the discovery of the correct arrangement of the śrutis in the classical scale and published it in his Musical Scales of the Hindus, he gives in the Supplement to the same work a drawing, said to be executed for him by a European friend, which, though labelled 'The Primitive Sanskrit Sharja-grāma', is nothing more or less than Sir W. Jones' original misinterpretation of that scale.

In all this confusion of assumptions and assertions without authority or evidence, it is a relief to find one writer take a correct view of the nature of the śrutis. Mr. B. H. M. Bosanquet reveals a wonderful clearness of vision when he writes:—— Are the śrutis all equal in value? The native writers say nothing about this, but the European ones for the most part suggest that they are not. For instance, an English reviewer recently wrote, 'A śruti is a quarter tone or a third of a tone according to its position in the scale.' This appears to be a misapprehension arising from the modern idea that each interval of a tone in the scale is necessarily the same. But the language in which the different forms of the scale is [are] described distinctly indicates that a note rises or falls when it gains or loses a Śruti; consequently we may infer that the Śrutis are intended to be equal in a general sort of way, probably without any very great precision. But so great was the influence of the writings of Sir W. Jones (probably because he was a Sanskrit scholar) and Rāja S. M. Tagore (probably because he was a Hindu writer) that one need not be surprised at the following criticism on his paper by Capt. Day, who happens to be neither:—— 'This calculation of Mr. Bosanquet's was made on the assumption that all the śrutis were equal. That such could not have been in reality the case, or that the employment of the system of twenty-two never entered practically into Indian music, would seem to be from all evidence almost certain.

Of course, this is the Hindu belief, according to which low-pitched notes proceed from the chest, those of middle pitch from the throat, and those of high pitch from the head.


The perfect truth of this inference will be evident in the sequel, where it will be established on the authority of Sanskrit treatises.
'This will be more evident by a reference to the following comparative diagram of the primitive Sanskrit shadja-gamana and the European diatonic scale, as drawn for the Raja by Sir S. M. Tagore, and published in his work upon the "Musical Scales of the Hindus" from data supplied by the ancient treatises, the measurements being those of a string 90 inches long.'

'The only difference, it will be seen, is in the fact that the sixth is in the European diatonic scale flatter than in the ancient one; so that the ancient Sanskrit sixth had apparently the same ratio, theoretically, as the Pythagorean sixth of the Greeks.'

Of course, Capt. Day is under a delusion when he says that the Raja's diagram was drawn 'from data supplied by the ancient treatises.' It is, as I have said above, nothing more or less than Sir W. Jones' original misinterpretation of the shadja-gamana.45

Capt. Day was not the only person who was thus misled. Others were similarly led into error, the most notable of whom was Mr. A. J. Ellis, who writes as follows[^2]:—[Scales]

'Nos. 73 and 74 are an attempt to represent the Indian Chromatic Scale from indications in Raja Sourindro Mohun Tagore's Musical Scales of the Hindus, Calcutta, 1884, and the Annaire du Conservatoire de Bruxelles, 1878, pp. 161-169, the latter having been drawn up by Mons. V. Mahillon from information furnished by the Raja. As regards the 7 fixed notes (prakritas) of the C scale (sharp ga), C, D, E, F, G, A (a comma sharper than our A), B, there seems to be no doubt of the theoretical values. As to the 12 changing notes (vibritos), the values given can be considered only as approximative. The division of the intervals of a major Tone of 204 cents into 4 degrees (srutis); of a minor tone of 182 cents into 3 degrees; and of a Semitone of 112 cents into 2 degrees, as indicated by the superscribed numbers, is also certain. But whether the 4 parts of a whole Tone were equal and each 51 cents, and the three parts of a minor Tone were also equal and each equal to 60½ cents, and the two parts of a Semitone were also equal and each therefore 56 cents, is quite uncertain.' Mr. A. J. Hipkins, who worked with Mr. A. J. Ellis in examining an Indian vinda, and the sruti-vinda imagined by Raja S. M. Tagore, shows a clearer insight into the matter, when, in a communication to Capt. Day, he remarks that the Indian scale intervals ought to be understood as they are explained by native writers—namely, as a tone, a ⅔-tone and a ⅔-tone, composed of 4, 3 and 2 srutis respectively.46 Besides Mr. Bosanquet he seems to be the only person who grasped the truth amidst groundless erroneous assertions. Unfortunately as regards the disposition of the srutis in the scale he is unaware of the mistake made by previous writers, to which I have so often referred, and accepts it, together with its unfailing accompaniment of a dha, sharper by a comma than the A of the European scale of just intonation.

[^2]: I have omitted the diagram.

[^3]: In justice to the Raja himself it must be admitted that he does not claim that the diagram was drawn 'from data supplied by the ancient treatises', and in equal justice to Capt. Day it must be remarked that the Raja unfortunately writes in a manner, which suggests that he has not the ancient Sanskrit treatises at his back in what he has to say. Thus in the present instance the adjectives 'Primitive Sanskrit' applied to the scale probably misled Capt. Day.


[^5]: The reader will at once recognize in this the same ghost, which was originally raised by Sir W. Jones and subsequently owned and exhibited, by Raja S. M. Tagore, only clothed in language of apparently greater precision. For, Sir W. Jones thought the interval between ps and dha to be a major tone, whereas that between G and A (to which they were supposed to correspond) is a minor tone, the difference between the two being a comma.

[^6]: This again is simply a reiteration of Sir W. Jones' error which has been exposed above.

[^7]: The Music of Southern India, p. 21.

[^8]: Subject to a correction (which will be explained below) based on the authority of Sanskrit writers themselves.
To sum up, we have:

(1) The erroneous inference that the Hindus had the enharmonic genus, because they reckoned twenty-two śrutiś in the octave.

(2) The original error of Sir W. Jones in placing the various śrutiś (in the shadja-grāma) after the notes, instead of before them, as required by the Sanskrit treaties on music.

(3) Sir W. Jones' groundless identification of this erroneous scale with the European Diatonic Scale of just intonation, with the exception of dha which was supposed to be a śruti sharper. Sir W. Jones further thought, on mistaken grounds, that probably even this difference in the two scales did not exist in practice.

(4) As a result of these errors the two statements made by the writer (1) that a śruti was sometimes a quarter tone and sometimes a third of a tone, and (2) that the śrutiś were equal in practice, without perceiving the contradiction involved therein.

(5) Acceptance of all these erroneous statements by subsequent writers without examination. Only the suggestion that probably the sixth notes even were in practice identical in the two scales was neglected, and the supposed augmentation of dha in the shadja-grāma was so often reiterated that it came to be believed in as though based on Sanskrit texts. Similarly, the equality of the śruti in practice, vouched for by Sir W. Jones, was lost sight of and only his other statement, viz., that at times a śruti was a quarter tone and at others a third of a tone continued to be repeated.

(6) Mr. Paterson's and Rajā S. M. Tagore's mistaken notion that intervals in śrutiś between two notes were proportional to the difference in the sounding lengths of the string producing the notes.

(7) Recognition by Mr. Bosanquet and Mr. A. J. Hipkins that the śrutiś were intended to be equal in a general sort of way.

Lastly, in this connection I may mention that quite recently a Hindu writer has been seriously maintaining that a śruti is not a unit of measurement at all!

Amidst all this confusion let us see what Sanskrit treaties on music, beginning with the oldest, viz., the Bhāratīya-nātya-ādītara, say in the matter.

At the very outset it may be remarked that, as noticed by Mr. Bosanquet, even with the information available in his time the śrutiś must be regarded as 'equal in a general sort of way, probably without any very great precision.' As shown above, it is as absurd to speak of a śruti being sometimes a quarter-tone and at others a third of a tone as to say that an inch is sometimes a twelfth of a foot and sometimes a sixteenth. It is possible that quantities to be estimated may be such that they cannot be very accurately measured with the standard unit chosen, but the intention is clear that the standard unit is to be looked upon as invariable. Even Sir W. Jones, with whom originated the notion of the variability of a śruti, admitted that the śrutiś were considered 'as equal in practice.' It seems strange, therefore, that the writers who followed him should have accepted just the wrong notion and ignored the other one. But if anybody be still in doubt about the śruti being a unit of measurement and consequently possessed of a fixed value, it ought to be removed by the explicit statement to that effect in the Bhā. After giving the constitution of the shadja-grāma as follows:

\[
\begin{array}{cccccccc}
\text{sa} & \text{ri} & \text{ga} & \text{ma} & \text{pa} & \text{dha} & \text{ni} & \text{sa} \\
3\hat{1} & 2\hat{1} & 4\hat{1} & 4\hat{2} & 3\hat{3} & 2\hat{4} & 4\hat{5} & 3\hat{3}
\end{array}
\]

it adds "But in the madhyam-grāma the paścama should be diminished by a śruti. The magnitude of a śruti is the interval due to the sharpening or flattening [produced] by the augmentation.
or diminution of the paṅchama by a śruti. Mataṅga, a much later author, also says the same—46 What indeed is the magnitude of a śruti? I tell you. The paṅchama, now, as belonging to both grāmas is known to all. The interval due to the sharpening or flattening by its augmentation or diminution is the magnitude of a śruti.47 Bharata, moreover, proceeds to an exposition of the śrutis by means of an illustration, in which he asks the reader to get two exactly similar vīṇās, tuned to the shadja-grāma, and having the same succession of seven notes (तुलनाः); then 48 Making one of the two vīṇās madhyamgrāmikā (i.e., converting its tuning to that of the madhyamgrāma) lower the paṅchama by a śruti,49 Under the influence of the (lowered) paṅchama (i.e., keeping it unchanged) make the very same (vīṇā) shadja-grāmikā (tuned to the shadja-grāma).50 Thus one śruti diminished. Once more do the lowering just in the same way; so will the gāndhāra and the nishdha enter (i.e., come to be in unison with) the rishabha and the dhaitava (respectively) in the other (vīṇā), owing to their being two śrutis higher (than these). By lowering again just in the same way, the dhaitava and the rishabha enter (i.e., come to be in unison with) the paṅchama and the shadja (respectively), owing to their being three śrutis higher (than these). It (the vīṇā) being again lowered in the same way, the paṅchama, the madhyama and the shadja will enter (i.e., come to be in unison with) the madhyama, the gāndhāra and the nishdha (respectively) in the other (vīṇā), owing to their being four śrutis higher (than these). Thus by this illustration (or proof) should be understood the twenty-two śrutis in the two grāmas.51 From all this it ought to be perfectly

46 मातांगां तु शुद्धमुद्राः पञ्चम: कार्यः । पञ्चमक्षुरस्यात्वकपरेषां वर्तन्तरः मातांगायात्वकस्यात्वकार्यस्य सर्वार्थाः सत्यति । A. If मातांगाः is 'flattening' and आवस्थानम् is 'sharpening,' the arrangement of these words in this quotation as well as in the next (see footnote below) ought to be reversed. The former word occurs again in the Bh. (p. 306, l. 14), and in a quotation from Mataṅga's work in Simhabhadrapāla's oecum. On the S. E. (Calcutta edn., p. 68), where it clearly means 'flattening,' and the modern usage is also the same. But in the Bh. p. 329, śloka 39, we have आवस्थानम् नीचीर्ग्रामस्य तत्सूचना तु विभाजनः । तत्सूचना तु विभाजनः । The same śloka with a slight variation occurs in the Nārāyaṇīya, and the corrections in the rectangular brackets are according to that authority. The verse, as occurring in the Bh., is out of place and is not found in A. and G.; but according to it, मातांगाः and आवस्थानम् would mean 'sharpening' and 'flattening' respectively, i.e., just the opposite of what is given above as the meaning. But I have nowhere else found the term मातांगाः used to signify 'sharpening.'

47 तु: प्राप्तांगमुद्रां तवक्षे । तु: तु: कार्यः । पञ्चमक्षुरस्यात्वकपरेषां वर्तन्तरः मातांगायात्वकस्यात्वकार्यस्य सर्वार्थाः सत्यति । (Simhabhadrapāla's comm. on the S. E., p. 85, Calcutta).

48 This could be easily done by making the paṅchama consonant with the rishabha (i.e., a just fourth), which it is not in the shadja-grāma (see below for consonance).

49 Of course, by lowering the pitch of the other strings.

50 To start with, both vīṇās A and B were tuned to the shadja-grāma. The tuning of one of them B was changed to that of the madhyamgrāma by simply lowering its paṅchama by the necessary amount (viz., to make it the exact fourth of the rishabha). This amount of flattening is to be called a śruti. Keep this pitch of the paṅchama constant and convert the tuning of B to that of the shadja-grāma, which of course, will have to be done by lowering the other notes by the necessary quantities. It is evident that the whole vīṇā B is now tuned a śruti lower than A. Repeat the operations once more, i.e., convert the tuning of B to that of the madhyamgrāma by lowering the paṅchama, and then keeping this paṅchama constant once more convert the tuning back into that of the shadja-grāma. It will be again necessary to lower the other notes by proper amounts, and the whole vīṇā B will now be tuned two śrutis lower than A. But at this stage it will be discovered that the notes produced by the gāndhāra and nishdha strings of B will be in unison respectively with those produced by the rishabha and dhaitava strings of A. Thus it is proved that the gāndhāra and the nishdha possess each of them two śrutis. Similal reasoning will prove that the rishabha and dhaitava possess each
clear that a śrutī is a measure of musical interval, and all śrūtis were intended to be equal. The illustration by means of two śīnd, one with fixed notes and the other with variable ones, given in the S. R., though defective from another point of view, also proves the same thing.31

In the Bh. the twenty-two śrūtis have no distinctive names. In later works we find them named, the most commonly accepted names being those given in the S. R. The Sangita-samayasa, quoted by Simhakhdapāla, gives a name to each of the sixty-six śrūtis comprised in the three octaves.52 Similarly there is no mention in the Bh. of the so-called five kinds (jūti) of śrūtis, viz., dipā, āyatā, karand, mitha, and madhyā, found in later writers. What was intended by this classification of śrūtis I am unable to say. The S. R. gives no explanation, but the Nārādi-sikṣāḥ contains some verses in this connection, which I give below without pretending to understand them to any great extent. The notes are those used in śāman chants and mentioned above.

Lastly, in the Bh. we find no mention of the following characteristics, attached by later writers to the various notes:—

(1) Division into (a) uddita (nishāda and gandhāra), (b) anuddita (trishnaka and chaturata), and (c) svarita (shadja, madhyama and panchama). This classification occurs in Ydānavalikā-sikṣāḥ and in metrically defective verses in the Pasjintya-sikṣāḥ, neither of which are probably very old. It is easy to see that this classification has no merit. There happened to be three kinds of notes, viz., with two, three and four śrūtis respectively, and these were joined together.

of them three śrūtis, and the panchama, madhyama and the shadja four each. Thus there are altogether 2×2+2×3+3×4=22 śrūtis in a prāna. 

The third correction is self-evident.

(2) Classification—according to supposed descent from various families, viz., (a) from the deros (shadja, gandhara and madhyama), (b) from the pitris (pañchama), (c) from the rishis (rishabhaka and dhairata), (d) from the asuras (nishada).

(3) Castes—(a) Brahmanas (shadja, madhyama and pañchama), (b) kshatriyas (rishabhaka and dhairata), (c) vaisyas (nishada and gandhara), (d) vidras (antar and kākāt). Here again it is easy to see that the position of a note in the caste system depends upon its richness in ārūditā. Antaras and kākāt (explained in another part of this essay) being only intercalary notes are classed lowest.

(4) Colours.—The colours of the seven notes, as mentioned by Rājā S. M. Tagore⁵⁵, 'according to Sanskrit Authorities,' differ from those given in the S. R., which are respectively as follows:—(1) lotus red, (2) pījara (pale yellow—Simhabhūpāla), (3) golden, (4) kumāla white, (5) black, (6) yellow, (7) variegated. Certain authors look upon these as examples of 'photisms.'⁵⁴ If so the Hindus must be regarded as having not only their sense of vision thus affected by various musical notes, but also their senses of family descent, of caste, of birth-places, of god-fathers (rishis), of presiding deities, and of metre! For, they attach all these characters to the musical notes.

(5) Birth-places. The seven devitas correspond to an equal number of notes, and hence this idea,

(a) Rishis or god-fathers.
(b) Presiding deities.
(c) Representative Varieties of Metre.

For all these the reader should consult the S. R.

(To be continued.)

KUMARAPALA AND ARNORAJA.

BY HAR BIDAS SABA, B.A., F.R.S., M.R.A.S., AJMER.

The Gujrat Chronicle mention only one war between Kumārapala, the successor of Siddharāja-Jayasimha, king of Ashilvārya and Argoraja, king of Sāpadalaksha, as the kingdom of Ajmer was then called. Recent research, however, shows that two distinct wars, separated from one another by several years, took place between the two combatants and that the incidents of the war mentioned by the Gujrat writers belong some to the first and some to the second war.

The Prabandha-chintāmāni of Merutunga and the Deyārāyamahāchārya of Hemachandra place the war they describe at the beginning of Kumārapala's reign. The Prabandha-chintāmāni says that prince Bāṃḍha, son of Udayana, who had been adopted by Siddharāja-Jayasimha as his son, desiring Kumārapala, made himself a soldier of the king of the Sāpadalaksha country. He, desiring to make war on Kumārapala, having won over to his side all the officers in those parts with bribes, attentions and gifts, bringing with him the king of the Sāpadalaksha country, surrounded with a large army, arrived on the borders of Gujrat.¹

The Deyārāyamahāchārya of Hemachandra says that the Rājā of Sāpadalaksha, whose name was Anna when he heard of the death of Jayasimha, though he had been a servant of that monarch, now thought the time was come for making himself known. Anna began to make friends with Ballāla the king of Ujjain and the Rājās of the country on the west of Gujrat, holding out threats to them as well as promises. Kumārapala's spies made known to him that Anna Rājā was advancing upon the western frontier of Gujrat with an army.²

---

¹ Probandha-Chintāmāni by Tawny, p. 121.
² Forbes' Rāmaśālā (p. 143), which gives Deyārāyamahāchārya's account of the war.
Both writers are agreed that the aggressor was Arporaja of Ajmer and that the war took place soon after the ascension to the throne of Kumaraepala, which event took place in SAMVAT 1200 (A.D. 1143.)

The Deviprayera, in verse 84 of Canto XVI, mentions Vikramasimha as being the Paramara Rajah of Abul, and he is further on stated as having led the men of Jalor and followed Kumaraepala's esteemings that Raja as his lord.

Jina Sanghana in his Kumaraepala-charitra states that Kumaraepala while returning to Gujarat from the war with Arporaja deposed Vikramasimha the Paramara ruler of Abul as he was disloyal to Kumaraepala and placed on the throne in his place his nephew Yasodhavala.

The inscription dated Magha sud 14th S. 1202 (A.D. 1146), recently discovered by P. Gaurishankar Ojha, the learned Superintendant of the Rajputana Museum, Ajmer, in Ajari (Sirohi State), 4 miles from Piandwair, and now in the Ajmer Museum, shows that Yasodhavala was king of Chandrawati (Abul) in that year (i.e., in Samvat 1202). This Ajari inscription coupled with the statement of Jina Sanghana about Yasodhavala's coming to the throne of Abul fixes the date of the war between Kumaraepala and Arporaja in which Vikramasimha was present as a vassal of Kumaraepala sometime between S. 1200 and S. 1202.

Now, the Chitor inscription of Kumaraepala dated Samvat 1207 (A.D. 1149-50) on a stone in the temple of Mokalji, the object of which is to record Kumaraepala's visit to Chitor or Chittrakuta, distinctly states that when this king (Kumaraepala) had defeated the ruler of Sakhambhari and devastated the Sapadalaksha country (line 11), he went to a place named Salipur (line 12) and having pitched his camp there, he came to view the glorious beauty of the Chittrakuta mountain;

Kumaraepala was delighted with what he saw there and having come to a temple of the god Samidheshvara, he worshipped the god and his consort and gave to the temple a village, the name of which has not been preserved (line 26) etc.

From Chitor, Kumaraepala entered Mewar, visited the temple of Mataji in the village Pali near Morwan, a few miles west of Nibhahera, and placed an inscription there dated Pausa, Samvat 1207. This shows that Kumaraepala was at Chitor in Pausa or Mangalachar, and that the war with Arporaja took place in the month of Kartika or Avasina of that year, i.e. S. 1207.

The causes of the two wars appear also to have been distinct. The first war evidently took place because Arporaja, who had married Siddharaja-Jayasingha's daughter, Kanchanadevi (vide Prithviraja-vijaya, Canto VII), espoused the cause of Siddharaja's adopted son Bahaḍa and wished to place him on the throne of Gujarata in place of the usurper Kumaraepala. The result of this war appears to have been indecisive, as Kumaraepala hastened to make peace with Arporaja in order to be able to take the field against the Malwa king Ballala who had succeeded in winning over Kumaraepala's two generals set against him, and was advancing from the east towards Anhilwair.

The second war of S. 1207 appears to have taken place in consequence of Arporaja's ill-treatment of his queen Devaladevi, sister of Kumaraepala. Jina Sanghana in his Kumaraepala-prabandha says that Kumaraepala was incited to undertake the expedition against Arporaja by Devaladevi, who had been insulted by Arporaja and when threatened by her with the wrath of her brother, "the demon for kings," was kicked by Arporaja and told to go to her brother and tell him what she liked. Kumaraepala invaded Arporaja's country to avenge this insult. And as Devaladevi must have been given to Arporaja after the first war with Kumaraepala, this campaign of Kumaraepala against Arporaja must have taken place some years after the first war between them. All these things therefore point to the fact that there were two wars between Kumaraepala and Arporaja, the first of which took place sometime between Samvat 1200 and 1202 in which Arporaja was the aggressor, and the second in Samvat 1207 in which Kumaraepala invaded the territory of Arporaja.

1 Ibid, p. 143 (edition A.D. 1878.)
2 Now called Salerk, about 4 miles from the foot of the hill on which the fortress of Chitor stands.
CONTRIBUTIONS TO PANJABI LEXICOGRAPHY.

SERIES III.

BY H. A. BOSE, I.C.S.

(Continued from p. 179.)

Sanwák, samák: a grass which bears a small grain collected in times of famine (Panicum coloratum): Rohták? =sânwák, P. D., p. 1011 or sadímak, wild rice, p. 998.
Sanwé: land which has been lying fallow. Lúthiáná S. R., 1878-83, p. 101.
Sânwín: a system of cultivation, in which a spring crop, usually wheat, is taken, then the ground lies fallow for nearly a year, during which it is repeatedly ploughed and rolled. Cf. ñátinha and ñárín. Jullândur S. R., p. 118.
Saphalí: adj. fruitful.
Sappar: a rock or small precipice of rock; shâfu in Kúlú. Kangrá Gloss.
Sarana: a platter, made of pottery, used once at feasts and thrown away. Cf. kasora and sarai.
Sargudhí: an inferior form of marriage: Churâh for widow remarriage usually, but sometimes for virgins when the parents are very poor—called garî-chåra. Chamba.
Sâriyá: the wife’s brother’s wife. Cf. sâliyá, sâliyá, sâliyá, sâliyá and sâliyá.
Sarkha: a post-position: 'like, even.'
Sāru: a small mango fruit that very quickly rots (*sarjota*). Hoshiāpur S. R., p. 15.


Sāsān: village service land, amounting generally to 5 or 10 acres, and enjoyed by a headman as remuneration for his duties. Kāngra S. R., p. 34.

Sāshu: mother-in-law, p. 244.


Sat: the Rājā's share of the produce, as opposed to *karat*. Kāngra S. R. (Lyall) pp. 44 and 51.

Satānjīv: 'live a hundred years' said by the friends of a man when he sneezes. Karnāl S. R., 1872-80, p. 155.

Satbāhak: a lighter description of *coriace* than the *pund* *begdr*, consisting in carrying messages, letters, or light parcels. Kāngra S. R., (Barnes) p. 68.

Satbāhuk: a man excused heavy *begdr*, but bound to carry messages, etc. Kāngra Gloss.


Sath: the share of grain taken from the cultivator by the State or a landlord. Kāngra Gloss.

Sethoi: a man who appraises the *sēth*, or landlord's share of the grain.

Sāṭin: the *swāstika*, Gurgaon.


Satt paṭaunā: to be confounded, taken aback.


Saw: the stack in which the great millets are stood up to dry. Karnāl S. R., 1872-80, p. 172.

Sawāl: a method of charging interest; two annas in the rupee are charged for each harvest. Jullundur S. R., p. 72.


Sawāra: cook-house. Sirnūr.


Sek: the land appertaining to a bucket or wheel when there are two wheels or buckets on the same well. Cf. *adda*. Karnāl S. R., 1872-80, p. 169.

Sen: moisture.


Soo: a bridge, chiefly used by Gadds or Kanets. Kāngra Gloss.

Sook, sawak: a man appointed by a Rājā who managed and distributed the *begdr* or forced labour in a *kothā*. Cf. *bhutangrā*. Kāngra S. R., p. 80.

Secri: a small allowance of grain from the threshing floor given to a Gujrath Brahman at harvest. Karnal S.R., p. 88.
Serabah: a charge which the creditor charges the debtor in the case of his selling goods elsewhere; it amounts to one anna in the rupee or a standard ser per rupee. Jullundur S.R., p. 72.
Sewal: a fish. When in condition one of the best fish for the table. Several varieties are found. Its appearance changes greatly with the season and the water it is found in. It spawns late in the year, and the young may be seen in countless numbers in pools at that time. Ludhiana S.R., 1878-83, p. 17.
Sewal: a ceremony at weddings performed by the bride or bridegroom's mother; she picks up her petticoat and touches the bridegroom's body all over with it. Karnal S.R., 1872-80, p. 129
Shafa: a rock (Kulu); see sappar.
Shahzia: a large mango fruit, sweet as honey (shahid). Hoshiarpur S.R., p. 15.
Shajhera: to purify, a man, a deota, a temple, a place, etc. Chamba.
Shanan: (S. enana) A bath or bathing. Jubbal.
Shant: a religious ceremony performed shortly before the marriage. The nine planets (including the sun and moon) are worshipped, and Brahmins are fed. Jullundur S.R., p. 65.
Sharb: a water rate levied by Firoz Shah (10 per cent, on the yield of the irrigation) Karnal S.R., p. 17.
Sharana: the full moon (puras madhi) day in Bhadan: also called Rakhrunio. Simla Hills.
Shel: a quarter of a ser of flax per rupee paid as a tax. Kuthar.
Shibbo-katha: a celebrated shrine sacred to saint Gugga in the Kangra district.
Hoshiarpur S.R., p. 33.
Shihun: a.m. a tiger.
Shirli: a ladder. Sirmur.
Shok: grief, anxiety.
Shorach (Shivratri): a fast held on varying dates in Magh or Phagan in the Sakh-pargana of Pangri.
Sian: a figure, representing Radhaká, wife of Krishna. Gurgaon.
Sidiá: Rs. 12 paid to the father and Rs. 3 to the mother of the bride at a betrothal in Pangri. The name Sidiá is applied to the first named payment, and the second is called guami.
Sidri: a store room on either side of the tamsāl (open yard). Karnāl S. R., 1872-80, p. 120.


Sīl: the 7th of Chet on which day enormous crowds collect at the shrines. Cf. sāl sālten and Sīlā’s 7th. Karnāl S. R., 1872-80, p. 150.


Sīlā sālten: the 7th of Chet on which day enormous crowds collect at the shrines. Cf. sīl and Sīlā’s 7th. Karnāl S. R., 1872-80, p. 150.


(To be continued.)

MISCELLANEA.

CAN WE FIX THE DATE OF ŚĀMKARĀCHĀRYA MORE ACCURATELY?

It is a well-known fact that in his gloss on the Vedānta-sūtras Śaṅkarāchārya makes mention of some kings who are supposed to be his contemporaries. One of these is Balavarman, who is twice alluded to by the philosopher, once in his Bhāṣya on Śūtra IV. 3, 5 and once on Śūtra II. 4, 1. This Balavarman has not yet been identified, but he seems in all likelihood to be the prince of that name referred to in the Kadaj copper-plate charter of the Bāhaftāra king, Govinda III. It records the grant of a village by this king to the Jaina muni Arakakriti, in remuneration for his having warded off the evil influence of Saturn from Vimalāditya, the governor of the Kunungil district. Vimalāditya’s father was Yasovarman and his grandfather Balavarman. They claimed to belong to the Chālukya family. Now, the date of the Kadaj charter is Śaka 735 = A. D. 813, when therefore, Vimalāditya was living. Supposing that at that time Vimalāditya had resigned for 10 years and assigning a period of 15 years to each one of his predecessors, we find that Balavarman was reigning from A. D. 767 to 785. This brings us exactly to the time when Śaṅkarāchārya is shown by Prof. K. B. Pathak to have flourished. He says: “Bhartṛihari is criticised by Kūmaṇīla who in his turn is criticised by Śaṅkarāchārya; Bhartṛihari died in A. D. 650, and became famous throughout India nearly half a century later as Ṭīṅg assures us. Kumārīla, who must have criticised Bhartṛihari after the latter had become famous, of course belongs to the first half of the eighth century;”

Śaṅkarāchārya must for a similar reason be assigned to the latter half of the same century. And Balavarman mentioned by the Kadaj plate must have been ruling precisely in the second half of the 8th century, or, as we have calculated, from A. D. 767 to 785. There can thus be little doubt as to this Balavarman being the contemporary prince of that name alluded to by Śaṅkarāchārya.

This conclusion receives a remarkable confirmation from another source. Sir Ramkriṣṇa Bhandarkar says: “At the end of a work Saṅkṣepaśākrata, the author Sarvaśāktaṃ, the pupil of Śrīvāra, who himself was a pupil of the great Saṅkarāchārya, states that he composed it while the prosperous king of the Kāhartriya race, the Aditya (Sun) of the race of Manu whose orders were never disobeyed, was ruling over the earth.” This description, as the same authority tells us, would apply with propriety to a king with Aditya as a component of his name and belonging to the race of the Chālukyas, who, as the inscriptions inform us, were of the Māunuṭya gotra. And whom can this description fit better than Vimalāditya mentioned by the Kadaj grant referred to above? Vimalāditya was a Chālukya, as the same inscription tells us, and Aditya of course forms part of his name. What is more, he is son’s son of Balavarman just as Sarvaśāktaṃ was pupil’s pupil of Śaṅkarāchārya. Vimalāditya is removed two generations from Balavarman just as Sarvaśāktaṃ was from Śaṅkarāchārya whose contemporary was Balavarman.

D. R. BHANDARKAR.

1 Gaṇḍāvade (BO. SK. Series), Intro., p. xciii and ff.
3 Early History of the Deccan, p. 80.
SOME UNPUBLISHED INSCRIPTIONS.

BY D. B. BHANDARE, M.A.; POONA.

5.—The Bānswarā Plates of Bhojadeva; [Vikrama-] Sa harvesting 1076.

The copperplates, on which the subjoined inscription is engraved, were originally in the possession of a woman of the Thāṭhāra (copper-smith) caste living in Bānswarā in Rājputānā. They were afterwards bought for, and are now placed in, the Rājputānā Museum, Ajmer. I edit the inscription from a photograph kindly supplied by Pandit Gaurishankar Ojha of Ajmer.

The record contains thirty-one lines of writing. The characters are Nāgārī. The language is Sanskrit. In respect of orthography, attention may be drawn to (1) the use of v for b and (2) of the palatal s' for the dental s.

The inscription is one of the Paramārā king Bhoja, or, as he is here called, the Paramārā Mahārājaśāhriṣṭi Paramesvara Bhojadeva, and records that after bathing on the festival day (pravara) in consequence of the conquest of the Konkan, he granted a hundred māvartanas of land on the borders of the village of Vatapadra in a Brāhmaṇa called Bhāila, son of Yāman, who belonged to the Vaiṣṇavā Vaiśāyaṇa āśrama of the Vaiśāyaṇa gotra, which had only one pravara. Vatapadra in itself was situated in the Bāñgradāra district (bhoga) of the Shālikha province (māṇḍala). The date, which is given at the end, is the 4th of the bright half of Māgha of the year 1176. Both the plates bear the sign-manual of the king.

So far only one record of Bhoja is known to us: viz., the Ujjain copperplate charter of V. S. 1078 = A. D. 1021. Our inscription is another and is only two years earlier. Its importance lies in the fact that it speaks of the conquest of the Konkan by Bhoja, which certainly must have occurred just before the date of our plates. The full significance of this fact will be clear when we compare it with the Balasānave inscription of A. D. 1019, which describes the Chālukya king Jayasimha as a moon to the water-illy that was king Bhoja (i.e., taking away the glory of Bhoja) and as putting to flight the confederacy of Mālwa. It thus appears that Bhoja had put himself at the head of the Mālwa confederacy and invaded the territory of the Chālukya king Jayasimha, commencing with seizing the Konkan shortly before our grant was issued. But this confederacy was soon broken by Jayasimha and no permanent conquest appears to have been achieved by Bhoja. The latter may perhaps have made this expedition to avenge the execution of his uncle Vākpati-Muṇja by Tailapa, a dramatic play representing which had been acted before him, as the Prabandha-chintāmaṇi informs us.

Text.


1 Above, Vol. V, p. 17. 2 From a photo supplied by Pandit Gaurishankar Ojha. 3 Expressed by a symbol. 4 Read क्त्त्तीत 5. 5 Read सुधापत्त. 6 Read स्त्रायणो 7. 7 Read स्त्रायणो 8. 8 Read स्त्रायणो.
10. bharadwāja: हृदयाक्षणमनायकम् ुनवमया श्राद्वयुक्तम् मगवर्त्य मादामयम्
11. त्रापकेश्वरी सार्वभवानि श्राद्वयुक्तम् प्रतापसानिकम् प्रतापसानिकम्
12. जगन्नाथ किवकनित्वोः प्रणालीविषयलिङ्गायते । तल माणि ( १ ) धमः सता
13. परम्परागताशालाय जिओर्गिया मित्रम् । जान वेब
14. हड्डियां प्रवाहानि परं पलन् । [१६] सति मगगति विनाशक श्राद्वप्रकाशविशेषः
15. [व्युस्तियोः भोगीज़यशवर्]

Second Plate.

15. विशिष्ठमात्रानुविद्यानांतर्तेन [१६] च पृथ्वी वसन्तोपथायायापूतिपतिः हिरण्यः
16. शास्त्रांगरेण सन्नानोऽधृतार्चो शास्त्रानुविद्यानांतर्तेन सतीमुनिकालास्
17. सतीमुनि श्राद्वप्रकाशविशेषः विनाशक श्राद्वप्रकाशविशेषः तलमाणि ( १ ) धमः सता
18. जान वेबकिवकनित्वोः प्रणालीविषयलिङ्गायते । तलमाणि ( १ ) धमः सता
19. श्राद्वप्रकाशविशेषः मगगति निवाशविशेषः मगगति निवाशविशेषः मगगति निवाशविशेषः
20. विनाशक श्राद्वप्रकाशविशेषः मगगति निवाशविशेषः मगगति निवाशविशेषः मगगति निवाशविशेषः
21. श्राद्वप्रकाशविशेषः श्राद्वप्रकाशविशेषः श्राद्वप्रकाशविशेषः श्राद्वप्रकाशविशेषः
22. श्राद्वप्रकाशविशेषः मगगति निवाशविशेषः मगगति निवाशविशेषः मगगति निवाशविशेषः
23. श्राद्वप्रकाशविशेषः मगगति निवाशविशेषः मगगति निवाशविशेषः मगगति निवाशविशेषः
24. श्राद्वप्रकाशविशेषः मगगति निवाशविशेषः मगगति निवाशविशेषः मगगति निवाशविशेषः
25. श्राद्वप्रकाशविशेषः मगगति निवाशविशेषः मगगति निवाशविशेषः मगगति निवाशविशेषः
26. श्राद्वप्रकाशविशेषः मगगति निवाशविशेषः मगगति निवाशविशेषः मगगति निवाशविशेषः
27. श्राद्वप्रकाशविशेषः मगगति निवाशविशेषः मगगति निवाशविशेषः मगगति निवाशविशेषः
28. श्राद्वप्रकाशविशेषः मगगति निवाशविशेषः मगगति निवाशविशेषः मगगति निवाशविशेषः
29. श्राद्वप्रकाशविशेषः मगगति निवाशविशेषः मगगति निवाशविशेषः मगगति निवाशविशेषः
30. हम मगगति । [१७] मगगति निवाशविशेषः मगगति निवाशविशेषः मगगति निवाशविशेषः
31. श्राद्वप्रकाशविशेषः मगगति निवाशविशेषः मगगति निवाशविशेषः श्राद्वप्रकाशविशेषः

6.—Nādol Plate of Pratāpasimha; [Vikrama] Samañvat 1218.

This plate, like those of Kiritpāla (Aste, Vol. XLI., p. 144), was in the possession of the panchadīyat of the village of Nādol in the Desārt district, Jodhpur State. When I visited the place in 1908, all the members of the panchadīyat, fortunately for me, were present, and the plate was shown to me, though on the day I had to leave the place. There was no time to take an inked impression, and so I had to satisfy myself only with making a transcript of the inscription.

The record contains 13 lines of writing, which cover a space of 9½" broad by 6½" high. The Characters are Nāgari. The language is Sanskrit, and excepting a benedictory verse about the end, the whole inscription is in prose. In respect of orthography it is sufficient to note that (1) a consonant following t is doubled; (2) that the dental s has been twice substituted for the palatal s; (3) that the sign for n is also used for h, and (4) that avavagraha has been twice employed, once in l. 7 and another time in l. 8. As regards lexicography attention may be drawn to purīya prefixed to Vodāna in l. 5. Purīya seems to stand for purāṇiya, an ungrammatical form derived from purāṇa. The word trikāṭa occurring in l. 10 is also worthy of note. It appears to denote some variety of a rupee.

* Read सर्वा.
10. Read "तुषार" and बिषुः.
11. Read शिवकः.
12. Read दुर्गा.
13. Read दुर्गा.
14. Read दुर्गा.
15. Read दुर्गा.
16. Read तुषार.
17. Read तुषार.
18. Read तुषार.
19. Read तुषार.
20. Read तुषार.
21. Read तुषार.
22. Read तुषार.
23. Read तुषार.
24. Read तुषार.
25. Read तुषार.
26. Read तुषार.
27. Read तुषार.
28. Read तुषार.
29. Read तुषार.
30. Read तुषार.
31. Read तुषार.
32. Read तुषार.
33. Read तुषार.
34. Read तुषार.
35. Read तुषार.
The inscription opens with the date: Friday, the 1oth of the dark half of Mārgaśīrṣa in the [Vikrama] year 1213, when 'Kumārapādaṇḍa was the paramount sovereign and Vīhāraṇaṇa, the great minister, was doing all the business of the seal, relating to the drawing up of documents, etc. It then speaks of a grant made by his feudatory, Mahāmāṇḍapaṇḍa Śrī-Pratāpapāṇa, who, as we are told, was a son of Vatsaraj and grandson of Yogarāja and belonged to the Vāda family of the eastern section. Vēdāṇa is the name of a Rajput clan, which is now well-nigh extinct. It is, however, mentioned in an inscription found at Bērlu, 34 miles north-east of Jodhpur. The grant consists of a rupee per day allotted from the custom-house (māṇḍapikā) of Bada. It was made for the benefit of three Jain temples, two of which were of Mahāvīra and Arishṭanemi, situated in Nāḍulājāigikā, and the third of Ajasrāṇi-deva in Lavaṇḍājī.

Of the locations herein specified, Nāḍulājāigikā is of course Nāḍulāj, as is clearly proved by Inscriptions Nos. VIII and XI published in my paper "The Chāhāmūnas of Marwar" (Ep. Ind., Vol. XI., pp. 36 and 43). Inscription XI also speaks of Bada, which has been identified with Bērlu, 8 miles north of Nāḍulāj. Lavaṇḍāji I am unable to identify. The two temples of Nāḍulāj referred to in our inscription still exist at this place. The temple of Mahāvīra has now been dedicated to Ajasrāṇi, but the Inscription No. XI found here distinctly shows that it was originally a temple of Mahāvīra. The temple of Arishṭanemi mentioned in our inscription is doubtless the temple of Nāḍulāj, locally known as Jādrāji, situated on a small hill to the south-east of Nāḍulāj. It was here that Inscription No. VIII was found, and in it the name of the god, Nomināda, is clearly specified.

Text.

1. या [1] च १९१३ वेय (II) सम्मय वर्ति ९० वहरे || भीमनकालिकाओऽ || श्रीमान्तालिकाओऽ || समस्तधारकीय- 2. मलंकुतर-प्रकाश-समर्पनकालस्त्रिवा भगवानस्त्रिवा भक्तिश्रावन्तिप्रकाशस्त्रिवा । 3. द्वारानिर्बलिकास्त्रिवा द्वारानिर्बलिकास्त्रिवा । द्वारानिर्बलिकास्त्रिवा । 4. झम्ममाण्डपिकास्त्रिवा तत्परस्त्रिवा महानाव-भीमाण्डपिकास्त्रिवा । झम्ममाण्डपिकास्त्रिवा । 5. संस्करणां द्वारानिर्बलिकास्त्रिवा । 6. महानाव-भीमाण्डपिकास्त्रिवा । 7. संस्करणां द्वारानिर्बलिकास्त्रिवा । 8. संस्करणां द्वारानिर्बलिकास्त्रिवा । 9. संस्करणां द्वारानिर्बलिकास्त्रिवा । 10. संस्करणां द्वारानिर्बलिकास्त्रिवा । 11. संस्करणां द्वारानिर्बलिकास्त्रिवा । 12. संस्करणां द्वारानिर्बलिकास्त्रिवा । 13. वीराणन्ते ॥ काश्यप प्रियदेवं प्रीतसंपरिते शासनमिति शिक्षितं ||
OUTLINES OF THE HISTORY OF THE ALAMKĀRA LITERATURE.
BY P. V. KANE, M.A., LL.B.; BOMBAY.

(Continued from p. 128.)

Section II.—The meaning of the word ‘Alamkāra.’

This is the most appropriate place to discuss the meaning of the word Alamkāra. The latter has at least two generally accepted significances, one a wider one and the other, a narrow and more prevalent one. The word is used in a wide sense when it means ‘charm’ or ‘beauty.’ It then includes everything that makes poetry attractive. This is the meaning of the word when it occurs as the title of works on rhetoric, e.g., the Kavyadānakāra of Rudrata, the Kavyalakāra-sūtra of Vāmana, etc. Vāmana in his Kavyalakāra-sūtra (I, 1. 2) defines Alamkāra in this way, viz., "Saundaryam-alamkāra." The narrower meaning of the word is ‘figure of speech.’ This is the sense in which the word is most often used. In the present essay we generally stick to the narrower meaning of the word and shall give detailed accounts of those writers only who treat of figures of speech. In a few cases, writers on topics other than figures of speech have been dealt with, because their works have some bearing on the art of poetry, of which figures of speech form only a part. In many catalogues of Sanskrit MSS, such works as the Kāmasūtra of Vātāyana are classed under the heading Alamkāra. We shall abstain from dilating upon such works, as can by no stretch of language be included under Alamkāra-sūtra.

Section III.—The position of figures of speech.

Let us now consider the place that should be assigned to figures of speech in the whole machinery of poetry. There is a great divergence of opinion on this point. The ancient rhetoricians attached to Alamkāras an importance which was out of all proportion to their proper worth. Daṇḍin’s Kavyādāra, though it bears a proud title, is mostly taken up by the treatment of figures of speech. Daṇḍin does not dilate upon the soul of poetry, and appears to be unaware of the threefold division of Kavya given by later writers. He defines figures of speech as ‘those attributes which produce charm in poetry.’ In one place he appears to regard the Guru called Saṃādhī as the all-in-all of poetry. It cannot be said, however, that he is quite in the dark about rasa, the soul of poetry according to Ānandavardhana and all later Alamkārikas. Daṇḍin in one place says that all Alamkāras endow the sense with rasa. He gives some prominence to rasa, by defining the figure of speech called prayag and rasaṇa. Similarly Bhāmaha nowhere speaks of rasa as the soul of poetry and gives the greatest prominence to Alamkāras. He is cognizant of rasa, bhāva, etc., but assigns to them a subordinate position, as Daṇḍin does, by speaking of them under rasaṇa and prayag. The same remark applies to Udhamata. We can never affirm about the abovementioned three writers that they never dreamt of a suggested sense (vyākhyā artha) in poetry; for they define Saṃādhi, Vidyādha, Aprastutoprasaṇa, etc., in which some suggested sense is always present. In Parārthika they (especially Bhāmaha and Udhamata) included what by later writers was called dvāsa. But with them the suggested sense is only an accessory to the expressed sense (vyākhyā artha); they did not assign the position of honour to the vyākhyā sense as Ānandavardhana and his school do. The same remarks apply to Rudrata. In the figure Bhāva as defined and illustrated by him (VII, 38-41) there is a good deal of suggested sense. According to Vāmana

---

83 The writer in this is Alamkāriti-alamkāra | Karatā-vyākhyātāt vyākhyā-alamkāra-śabdam | Kārangādānka
84 Kavyādānakāra | Śrīdrīnāma-alamkāra-pracakhākate | Kavyādāra II, 1
85 Tattvata kavya-nirvāhanam sanādikirnāma 99 guṇah | K. D. I, 100
86 Kāram āhūtā-alamkāra rasaṃ-arthe nābhivyākhyāte | K. D. I, 62.
the soul of poetry is a style of composition, which is nothing but a peculiar arrangement of words. His definition of Alakādāra is different from that of Daṇḍin. He says "Guanas are those attributes which produce charm in poetry; while figures of speech enhance it (charm)." Daṇḍin speaks of Alakādāras as those attributes which produce charm in poetry; while this function is assigned to Guṇas by Vāmana. Daṇḍin's treatment is a crude one; he does speak of Ritikār (styles), of Guṇas and Alakādāras; but he nowhere assigns to each its proper position. Vāmana is more scientific. He distinctly tells us what the soul of poetry is, and then says that ten Guṇas pertain to this soul of poetry (just as bravery, etc., are the qualities of the human soul) and that the business of Alakādāra is to enhance the charm of poetry. Vāmana thus advances one step further than Daṇḍin and adumbrates the theory of rhetoric completely promulgated later on by Ānandavardhana. Vāmana also is quite aware of a suggested sense in poetry; but he assigns to it a subordinate position by including it under the figure Vakrēkī, which he defines as 'indication based upon resemblance.'

It was Ānandavardhana who first assigned to Alakādāras their proper place and elaborated a complete theory of rhetoric. He established in a very subtle and suggestive treatise called the Dhvanyāloka that suggested sense is the soul of poetry, that Guṇas (Madhurya—sweetness, Ojas—strength, and Prasāda—perspicuity) are the properties of the soul of poetry as bravery is a property of the inherent mind, and that figures of speech are purely ornaments which set off to advantage the inherent charm of poetry, as ornaments of gold set off the beauty of the person. He divided poetry into three varieties: Dvāni (in which the vyākhyā sense is most prominent, see Dhvanyāloka-kārīka I. 16), Guśṭhāvāyvyākhyā (in which suggested sense is not the most prominent, Kārīka III. 35, p. 205), and Cūtra (in which suggested sense is not manifest, Kārīka III. 42-43, p. 220). After establishing that poetry is suggested sense, a question naturally arises: "by what process is this suggested sense obtained?" Ānandavardhana tries at great length to show that suggested sense is due to a function of words called Vyañjana, which is apart from Abhidhā and Lakshana. Most writers on Alakādāra such as Maṇmaṇa, Viśvanātha, Jagannātha follow the lead of Ānandavardhana, and speak of three functions of words, Abhidhā, Lakshana and Vyañjana. But it must be borne in mind that many other schools of philosophy, especially the Tārikiya, speak of only Abhidhā and Lakshana, and include Vyañjana under Abhidhā or under Acandana (Inference). To the modern mind, it would appear that the two functions, Abhidhā (primary power) and Lakshana (indication), are quite sufficient to account for all the meanings of words, and that the Alakādārikas invented unnecessary intricacies by admitting the Vyañjana-vṛtti. But it appears to us that from the fact of the word taken up by Ānandavardhana that Vyākhyā sense is the soul of poetry, he had no other alternative but to admit Vyañjana-vṛtta. The Vyākhyā sense cannot be conveyed by Abhidhā; for if it were so, it would cease to be Vyākhyā and would be Vṛddhyā (expressed). Nor can Lakshana operate; for it is a secondary power of words, while the Vyākhyā sense is the one most prominently conveyed by words and because suggested sense exists even when Lakshana is absent and vice versa.

In connection with the theory promulgated by Ānandavardhana there are one or two points which deserve consideration. In our opinion Ānandavardhana, in advocating that rasa is the soul of poetry, was profoundly influenced by the Nitya-bāstra of Bharata. Bharata laid down with all the weight of his authority that the business of the drama is to evolve one or more of the eight

---

81 Bhūtir-ārūpa Kārāṇya, Pātāla-prachanda śīla | Kāvyālakākera-virta I. 1. 5-7.
83 Kāyāsāra-śīla, Vakrēkī | Kāvyālakākera-virta IV. 3. 2.
84 Vyākhyā-sūtra-sāra-sāra ye śārgama te Guṇām amṛtaḥ | Abhidhāna-dvāra-dhivādāra mūtyaḥ Salaḥkhādaṇa
Dvārikā II. 7. p. 78.
85 Vidū Tarkā-dīpa "Baṣki-Lakshana-antarākāra | Alakādākāra cha amukānān-ānyaḥ-śīla-viddhā"]
The Indian Antiquary

Section IV.—The basis of division as regards figures of speech.

The most ancient basis of classification appears to have been very simple. Figures of speech were divided into two classes: those that depend for their charm on words alone and those in which the beauty is seen in the sense alone. This division of the figures of speech is the only one that is found in ancient writings on Alankāra. Bharata does not speak of it in his Nātyaśāstra. Daśgīṅa tacitly recognizes it, inasmuch as he treats of Arthādikākdras in the second Parichheda and of Sabidhākdras in the third. Both Bhūmāṣa and Udbhāṣa do not explicitly divide Alankāras into two varieties, but they seem to have had the twofold division in mind; for Bhūmāṣa first speaks of Anuprāsa and Yamaka and then of figures that are regarded by all as Alankāras of artha; Udbhāṣa similarly speaks of Panaruktavādābhāsa and Anuprāsa first and then of Arthādikākdras. Vāmāna speaks of Sabidhākdras in the fourth Adhikāra (1st Adhikāya) of his work and of Arthādikākdras in the second and third Adhikāyas of the same Adhikāra. Rūdrāṇa, Māmāṭa, Bhyāka, and some subsequent writers recognize this twofold division of figures of speech.
Some writers, however, propose a division which is a little more elaborate. *Alankāras*, according to them, are either of *śādīda* or of *artha*, or of both. Bhūja in his *Sarasvatikāndhakāraṇa* enumerates twenty-four *Alankāras* of each. It is worthy of note that he regards Upāma, Rūpaka, etc., as *Alankāras* of both *śādīda* and *artha* (and not of *artha* alone, as said by almost all other writers). Strictly speaking, all figures are really *Alankāras* of both *śādīda* and *artha*, as no *Alankāra* is possible without both of them. The reason why a particular figure is called an *Artha- 

The number of *Suddālāmākāras* is never been very large. Most writers, such as Dāṇḍin, Bhāmaha, Udhhata, speak of two or three. The largest number is that mentioned by Bhūja, viz., 24. The ancient works on *Alankāra* paid a good deal of attention to *Suddālāmākāras*, but as critical insight grew, the *Alankāras* of words dwindled into insignificance.

Section V.—(1) The number of *Suddālāmākāras*.

*Yamaka*—*Yamaka* came very early into prominence. The *Rāmāyaṇa* contains a few *Yamakas* here and there. It is most likely that they are later additions. Even Kālidāsa yielded to the charms of *Yamaka* and employed it in the ninth *sāga* of the *Raghuvaṇī*. Varāhamihira in his *Bṛhatasthāṅkita* has a beautiful *Yamaka*. *Bṛhatasthāṅkita* in his *Nātya-kāstra* gives ten varieties of *Yamaka*, and is followed very closely by the *Agniparāja*. Dāṇḍin speaks of *Yamaka* at very great length, his treatment being perhaps the fullest that we possess. Bhāmaha speaks of five varieties only, and says that others are included in them. Vāmana gives a tolerably full treatment. But it is remarkable that Udhhata omits the treatment of *Yamaka* altogether. Rūḍraṇa ranks next to Dāṇḍin in the thorough treatment of *Yamaka*. Māmāṭa and other later writers, perhaps following the dictum of Ānandavardhana that, as *Yamaka* requires a special effort on the part of the poet, it is in no way necessary to *rāsa*, allude to *Yamaka*, but dismiss it in a few words.

*Anuprāsa*—*Anuprāsa* is naturally charming to the ear; but when indulged in to excess one becomes disgusted with the jingle of words. The poets of every country resort to this device. We saw above that in the inscription of Rudralāman st Gīmār (A.D. 150), *Anuprāsa* is employed at every step. Kālidāsa also, who is certainly earlier than the famous Madasor inscription (A.D. 472), is very fond of *Anuprāsa*; but he never uses it to excess. It is to be noted that Bhrata does not refer to it at all. Dāṇḍin also seems to look with disfavour on *Anuprāsa*, says that the southern poets do not employ *Anuprāsa* and that the Gauḍa school of poets is very fond of it. Bhāmaha speaks of two varieties of *Anuprāsa*, while Udhhata speaks of Chhekānuprāsa, Vṛtti-nuprāsa and Lājānuprāsa. Vāmana, Māmāṭa and other subsequent writers treat of it. The Dharmādīkara states that *Anuprāsa* is of no use is suggesting *Sringāra*, when the latter is principal.

---

49 Tālā cārdrā cāvaśībhāvabhāvāt adhīnāh yadumāhādāh parījataḥ-stūtra mahāsādhārādhumādāh pratyekucālāh tārān ca adhīnāhḥ āhāvabhāvāt Sundarakāndagāe V. 15-17.
50 Yena cāmbukhurasaṇa śīpi vidurūṃbhāvabhāvāt uṣṇāsāvābhāvāt | Nīrttātā-śāhuragaiś ca ādūṣanāḥ \textit{Sāgara} kāndikataram virādulāt | Bṛhatasthāṅkita, 13.2.
51 Yamāntakāmāhā de prābhāsya-yatnāvānā sāfastābhaṇī | Sākṣa-pī paśuṇātām nāmaśādāh na vidyāte \textit{Dhāmasīkikā} II, 20; see also II, 16.
52 Itcīrām mādhitāna Gauδān-ānuprāsianāthatāya | K.D.I. 54; Ati nāvamo-anuprāsānum diśkālpādābhyāḥ prasyātayā | K. D. I. 60.
53 *Sringāra*-śāhīna yamāntakāmāhā prābhāsya-yatnāvānā | sākṣa-pī paśuṇātāna anuprāsānum prabhāsākāh \textit{Dhāmasīkikā} II, 16.
Chitra.—Bharata, Bhāmaha and Udhaśa do not refer to Chitrabandhas at all. Daśā is a reluctant definition of Chitra, but he dilates upon some of its varieties, such as Gomūrihā, Sarasvotobhadra, etc. It is by no means to be supposed that these tricks with words were favourite with later poets. Many of these Chitrabandhas occur as early as Bharavi, who cannot be later than A.D. 600, as he is highly praised together with Kālidāsa in an inscription dated A.D. 634. Māgha also indicates that in his day a Mahā-kādyā was expected to show such Chitrabandhas as Sarasvobhadra, Chakra, Gomūrihā, etc. Māgha cannot be later than A.D. 750, as he is quoted by Vāmana in his Kṛṣṇāyodhānā-sāstras (under IV. 3. 10, the verse Uṇaṇaṇa, Māgha III. 8). It is in Rudraśa and Bhūṣa that we have perhaps the fullest treatment of them. The Kṛṣṇāyodhānāsena of Vāghaśa and the Vīṭhāriyodhānāsena give a pretty full treatment of Chitrabandhas. Māmās and Ruyiyaka refer to them, but dispose of them in a few words.

Section VI.—The number of Artha-tāṇḍāsas.

Unlike Sāhādānās, the number of Artha-tāṇḍās has generally been large and has been subject to great fluctuations. We may safely affirm that as a general rule, the more ancient a writer is, the fewer is the number of figures treated of by him. Bharata speaks of only four Alakāraṇās. Daśā, Bhāṣṭi, Bhāmaha, Udhaśa, and Vāmana treat of from thirty to forty figures. Māmās speaks of more than sixty, while Ruyiyaka adds a few more. The Chandogya-sūtra (13th century) speaks of a hundred figures of speech, to which the Kāvyalāyana adds about a score more. This is the highest number known to us. Jagannātha prefers a smaller number of figures, although he is later than the author of the Kāvyalāyana. If for some slight difference a different figure of speech were to be defined, there would be no end of figures, as remarked by Daśā.64

Section VII.—Basis of Division.

In the ancient writers there is no basis of division. Daśā, Bhāmaha, Vāmana and Udhaśa give no classification of the figures of sense. They generally first speak of Upamā and some other Alakāraṇās based upon it and the rest are treated of at random; e.g., Daśā puts Viśālayā between Vyaśāreka and Samaśekti. It is Rudraśa who first gives a fourfold division of Artha-tāṇḍās.65 Māmās seems to have had in view no scientific basis of division. The Alakāraṇā-sāstras give, first of all, the figures based upon auśa (resemblance); then those based upon viroṣṭha (contradiction); then those based upon ērya (chain), such as Kāraṃpāya, Mālāpāya, Ekaśa; then the figures based upon tastrāya, kāya-nyāya, and ita-nyāya; then the figures based upon the apprehension of a hidden sense; and lastly those based upon the combination of figures such as Sāhākara and Sāhārishti. The Ekāra, the Pratāparudra and the Sāhātāparudra generally follow this classification. Jagannātha also speaks of figures based upon auśa, viroṣṭha, and ērya-kāya. From Kṛṣṇāyodhānā downards he does not mention any express basis of classification; but appears to have followed in the main the Alakāraṇā-sāstras.

In the limited space at our disposal it is not possible to enter on a historical treatment of even a few figures of sense. A volume will have to be allotted to this purpose. It should be noted that, although by A.D. 600 about thirty figures had been named and defined, there is a good deal of divergence as to the exact scope of each figure. The nomenclature of the Artha-tāṇḍās shows great variations. Šabāvokti is also called Jāti by some; Yathāśaṅkhya is called Krama; some figures such as Niṣpa (mentioned by Bhāṣṭi), Leśa (mentioned by Daśā) are rarely defined by other writers. The Viśeṣhokti of Vāmana is quite different from the same figures as defined by others. Very divergent views were held as regards leśha. We pass over the full examination of such points; because otherwise we shall have to enter into minute technicalities of the Alakāraṇās, which it is not our present purpose to do.

64 The Aṅhoja Inscription; see Ep. Ind., Vol. VI, p. 7.
65 Vīśakṣaṇa Sarasvotobhadra-chakra-gomūrihā-sāturī; Ślokārāvās mādhavavam nityāna-tadānānām-kalasām; Sīhà XXI, 41.
66 With regard to Māgha’s date, see now the Yasa-sūna inscription of Varmikī (Ep. Ind., Vol. IX, pp. 190-91);—P. B. B.
67 To chādhāya viśālayā kṣetra kāryaṇa vājayati;—K. D. II.
68 Arthā-sāturī Vālavaṃ-svapnyam-sthitayā-sthitayā.
COINS OF AJAYADEVA AND SOMALADEVI.

BY PANDIT GAURISHANKAR HIRACHAND OJHA; AJMER.

(1) Coins of Ajayadeva.

Silver and copper coins of Ajayadeva with an effigy of a seated goddess on the obverse, and the inscription 'श्रीचन्द्रजय' on the reverse, are frequently met with in Rājputānā, Mathurā, and other places. Prinsep, General Sir A. Cunningham, Captain W. W. Webb, and others have published facsimiles of them and have tried to show to what king they belong; but, in my opinion, their efforts have not been successful.

Ajayadeva's coins are held by Prinsep¹ to be the coins of the Rāthōras of Kanaūj, but as there has been no king of the name of Ajayadeva amongst them, he tries to get out of this difficulty by making an assumption, for which there is hardly any justification. Speaking of these coins he says: "One of our coins undoubtedly belongs to the former prince (i.e., Jayachandra) and it may perhaps be allowable to give the last two, figs. 7 and 8, to Jayachandra himself, whose proper name may have been Ajaya Chandradeva; the family name Chandra being frequently omitted both in writings and inscriptions."²

Prinsep was the first to hold Ajayadeva's coins to be those of the Rāthōras. His principal reason for this opinion evidently is that these coins bear an effigy of a seated goddess like the coins of the Rāthōras. This, however, is hardly sufficient to assign these coins to the Rāthōras; for we find an effigy of a seated goddess on the coins of many dynasties besides the Rāthōras, such as Tomaras, Kalachuris of Dāhala, and Chandels of Mohnbā. Moreover, there is no authority whatever for holding Jayachandra and Ajayadeva to be one and the same king, or for holding that Chandra was the family name of these kings. In no inscription of the Rāthōras (Gāhārvālā) of Kanaūj do we find the name Ajayadeva for Jayachandra. In these circumstances there is no reason whatever to assign these coins to the Rāthōras.

Relying on the authority of Prinsep, Captain W. W. Webb³ and General Sir A. Cunningham⁴, holding Ajayadeva to be the same person as Ajaya-Chandra (Jay-chand),⁵ have also assigned these coins to Jayachandra.

As a matter of fact Ajayadeva was a great Chauhān king, who founded the city of Ajmer, and his coins are found in various places in Rājputānā, which were under the rule of the Chauhān kings of Ajmer. Ajayadeva's silver coins were current⁶ in the realm in the time of Ajayadeva's grandson, king Somesvara, as appears from an unpublished inscription⁷ of [Vikrama-] सैनवत 1228 = 1171 A.D., existing on a pillar in the राजस्थान Rāṣṭṛ Rāṇa's temple at Dhoḍ, in Jāhānapur District, Mewār. They are also mentioned in the Menāl (in Mewār) inscription of [Vikrama-] सैनवत 1225 = 1163 A.D.⁸

Owing to these reasons in A.D. 1906, while editing the Hindi translation of Tod's Rājasthān, I assigned these coins to the Chauhān king Ajayadeva of Ajmer in my notes, p. 400.⁹ A perusal of प्रतिभाज्या-प्रेम, the historical poem of the Chauhān, has confirmed me in this opinion, for we...

find the following verses in regard to the silver coins of Ajayadeva in the account of that king in Sarga V of the poem:

सुर्यागीतश्च तद्यथा: परमं पुरस् ।
हं सुर्यागीतश्च काव्यम् पद्मसुरस्वाम ॥
कौलसु व वर्तमानानि भैरवं मेघ ष्टदिशे ।
परीतांगायानां हृद रक्तजयं वशये॥

"He (Ajayadeva) filled the earth with rāpakas (coins) made of durvarṣa (silver), but the poets filled it with rāpakas (dramas) composed in suvarṣa (good letters).

"He took away the fame of the existing [kings] by soldiers fond of victory (jaya), but the fame of past and future [kings] he took away by rāpakas (coins) dear to Ajaya."

The verses quoted above leave no doubt that these coins belong to the Chauhān king Ajayadeva of Ajmer.

(2) Coins of Somaladevi.

Silver and copper coins of Somaladevi are frequently met with in different places in Rājputānā. But the question as to whose queen this Somaladevi was has not yet been settled.

The silver coins of Somaladevi, which are rare, bear on the obverse a degraded representation of type 'King's head', commonly known as Gadhidā-paisā type, and on the reverse, the inscription श्रीश्रीनारायण or श्रीनारायण in Nāgarī characters. Her copper coins have on the obverse the effigy of a hussar, which generally appears on the coins of the Chauhān kings of Ajmer, and on the reverse the inscription श्रीबाली or श्रीबाली.

Prinsep for the first time published facsimiles of one silver10 and five copper11 coins of Somaladevi, but he read the inscription on the silver coin 'श्रीसा...नारायण'10 and that on the copper coins 'श्रीबाली...हु,'11 and remarked: "A scrutiny of the whole series (some not included in the plate) has elicited the letters श्रीसा...हु; the blank may be filled up with the letters नारायण, making the whole title sri Sāmanta Pāla-deva; or if it be thought that there is not room for other letters, it may stand as sri Sāmala-deva."13

Prinsep thus supposed these coins to belong to a prince called Sāmanta-pāla-deva or Sāmaladeva, which was due to the fact that the inscription was not properly deciphered.

In A.D. 1894, General Sir A. Cunningham, in his Coins of Medieval India, published two good specimens13 of the silver coins of Somaladevi, but reading the inscription on them as Sīr-Somaladeva,14 assigned them to a king of that name. This reading of General Sir A. Cunningham was also incorrect.

Later on in A.D. 1900, Prof. E. G. Rapson read the inscriptions15 on the two silver coins published by General Sir A. Cunningham as श्रीबाली पालिक15 and श्रीबाली पालिक17 respectively. This is the correct reading, but the question as to who this Somaladevi was remained unsettled. The learned writer stated: "It seems, therefore, that we have here the coins of a queen. Who this queen was we cannot yet determine. We can only note that we know of a queen Somaladevi, wife of Jajaladeva II, one of the Kala-caris of Mahākośala (Bhāhāyās of Ratnapura), whose Mahā inscription is dated [Cedi-] Saṁvat 919 = A.D. 1167-68. The arrangement of the inscription on these coins of Somaladevi, and the style of the Nāgarī characters are certainly those of the

* Janardana's Commentary: [Verse in Sanskrit]

13 Ibid., p. 53.
14 On No. 10.
known coins of the Kalacuris of Mahākosalā, which belong to a period extending from c. A. D. 1060 to c. A. D. 1140 (Cann., Coins of Med. Ind., p. 76; cf. pl. vi, 10, with pl. viii, 6-11); but it would be rash to make this suggested identification of the Somaladevi of the coins on this evidence alone. 2

No advance beyond this stage was made. The facts (1) that the inscription of [Vikrama-] Saṁvat 1225 (of the time of the Chauhān king Somēvara) engraved on a rock near Bijōli in Mowār gives the name of the queen of the Chauhān king Ajayadeva of Ajmer as Somaladevi (नामकोनी: नामकोनियः), (2) that these coins are generally found in places which were under the sway of the Chauhāns, and (3) that the copper coins bear an effigy of a horseman on the obverse, led me in A. D. 1906 to hold in a note in my edition of the Hindi translation of Tod’s Rājstāhā (p. 400), that these coins belong to Somaladevi, queen of the Chauhān king Ajayadeva of Ajmer.

This view receives full support from the celebrated poem Prithērāja-vijaya; for, speaking of Somalēkha (Somaladevi), queen of the Chauhān king Ajayadeva, the poet says:—

कुलेश्वर मदनसंगम पदसेव अपूर्वः

(Sarga V.)

“Also his (Ajayadeva’s) dear consort Somalēkha, though she made new rāpakas (coins) every day, was not touched by kalahs (dark spot).”

This verse immediately follows the verse किं ते स वर्षान्तानां etc., given above in part 1 of this article, and clearly shows that these coins belong to Somaladevi (Somalēkha), whose name in the Bijōli inscription is given as Somaladevi, the queen of the Chauhān king Ajayadeva of Ajmer.

These coins are the only known coins of a queen in India, and I had first thought that Somaladevi probably became queen regent after Ajayadeva, and these coins related to the period of her rule. And in the note 3 in which I assigned these coins to Somaladevi, I also said that probably she had succeeded Ajayadeva as ruler of Ajmer during her son’s minority. I now find, however, that the Prithērāja-vijaya makes no mention of such an event. It only says that she was very dear to her husband (Ajayadeva). The king therefore may have allowed her to strike coins, out of love for her, as she was very fond of designing them.

It may also be mentioned that we often get coins of Ajayadeva and Somaladevi in the same collection. About 20 years ago, Rāo Ratansinh of Parsoli (in Mowār) found an earthen pot containing 20 copper coins, all of Ajayadeva and Somaladevi only, which the Rāo handed over to me intact. These coins of Ajayadeva and Somaladevi found together, unaccompanied with those of any other ruler, also confirm my view.

The silver and copper coins of Somaladevi are of different designs, and they both differ from those of her husband in type; this is probably due to the fact that the Hindus were never very particular about the designs of their coins and did not attach so much importance to them as is done now. Even the Guptas, who were more particular than the others in this matter, after their conquest of the kingdom of the Western Kṣatrapas, allowed the design of the Kṣatrapa coins to stand in their new silver coins struck for the newly conquered territory, in so much that no change was made on the obverse of these coins, the inscription on the reverse alone having been changed.

Moreover, we find that the coins introduced in the 6th century A. D. by the Hūnas, now known as the ‘Gadhā coins,’ remained current in Rājputānā, Gujarāt, etc. (the designs became debased as time passed), but none of the rulers, who flourished in these regions from the 7th to the 11th century, designed coins of his own till the time of Ajayadeva and Somaladevi, even the latter, on her silver coins, has allowed the ‘Gadhā-paśa’ type to remain on the obverse.

20 Tod’s Rājstān, Hindi, p. 400.
CONTRIBUTIONS TO PANJABI LEXICOGRAPHY.

SERIES III.

BY H. A. ROSE, I.C.S.

(Continued from p. 200.)

Sūn: a boundary; tārsān, the trijunction point of three villages.


Singhī: a fish not very common, and very repulsive looking, very dark purple or red. Said to be a good table fish; but its looks rather keep people from trying it. Ludhiana S. R., 1878-83, p. 18.


Sir: a small running spring; in distributing canal water the word is used to express a measure of water about 4 inches square.


Sioul: a kind of grain parched and eaten at fasts. Churāh.

Sīyān: any ploughing after the second (fr. svā); see under kohārā.


So: he; tere, of him; chhi, to him; ehna, from him; plural, te, tishtra, inoob, inonūd (Kudī).


Sōg: mournmg; bandhād, bhanna, to break, to end the mourning. Churāh.


Sōnā: a figure drawn in red on houses on the Salone day. Probably to represent the Shrawana nakshatra. Gurgaon.

Sōnchi: a game played throughout the Punjab: one man runs backward, and two fellow and try to catch him, he pushing them off with open hands. Ludhiana S. R., 1878-83, p. 70.

Sōnchi pakkti: a game in which one player walks backwards and strikes another, who follows him, on the breast with the open hand, while the other tries to catch his hand. Jullundur S. R., p. 65.


Sat lekā: the carrying the plough to and from the fields, by hanging it over the yoke between the bullocks. Karnāl S. R., 1872-80, p. 168.
Sówará: a small plot of land in front of a house; if behind it, it is called pichará. Káŋgra Gloss.
Suárti: self-seeking.
Subh chörta: well-washer.
Sucháj: a.m. f. i., adj. clever, capable, a good manager.
Suchóha: when all the milk of a village is devoted to the local Nág, in Páng, and other parts of the Chandra Bág valley of Chamba, during a part of (or even the whole of) Sáwan it is called suchóha, and is not drunk; though it may be churned and made into ghí, the buttermilk being stirred and used at festivals held on certain days throughout the month.
Sudhá: a.m., correction.
Sugá: a spring. Cf. suhrá.
Suhra, suhr, or sugal: a spring of water; in Kúdh, jíhrá. Káŋgra Gloss.

(To be continued.)

MISCELLANEA.

ON SOME MATTERS CONNECTED WITH THE LAUKIKANYAYANJALI.

My attention has just been directed to a criticism of my Laukikanyayanjali, ante, p. 33 ff., and I write at once to crave a little space for some remarks thereon.

I thank Prof. Chakravarthi for his appreciation of my labours (extending over half a century) in the delightful field of Sanskrit literature, and for his friendly criticism of the work under notice. It is unfortunate, however, that he should have made use of the old edition (Part I having appeared in 1900, and Part II in 1902); for had he been in possession of the later one he would have known that I had myself corrected some of the mistakes which he points out, and had also offered an explanation of similes in regard to which I was previously in doubt. He would have found, too, that the naughty word "rubbish," which had been applied to a definition furnished by the learned Taryātha Tarkavāchaśāpti, had disappeared from the book! I need scarcely say that I have the highest respect for the learned writings of that great scholar; but, as pointed out by

Kumāría (in Tādravātri,1 pp. 200, 201), even great grammarians, authors of śūtras, vṛtikas, and bhāṣyās, have made mistakes, and errors abound in Bihśeśa and Purāṇas. The man who has never made mistakes has yet to be discovered!

I gladly accept the Professor's fuller interpretation of the śūdras vāṇa bhūvanāka ṣadvya, inadequately rendered by Prof. Gough, and also that of the saying commencing with the words ṛṣabhaṁ yathāpañcītām, in respect of which I myself went somewhat astray; but I am not yet prepared to abandon my view of the general purport of the śūdras vāṇa bhūvanāka ṣadvya, for does not the fact, that Vāchāpati Mīśra quotes it (as I have pointed out) in conjunction (and, apparently, as synonymous) with the saying भवः वाणाः बालरुपम्, furnish fairly good ground for attaching to it the meaning of "tīrīk-tā?"

As to the माहें तपाया भुद्र्य, my objection to Baghunāthavarmman's interpretation was owing to the ridiculous setting in which he placed it. There was no need of dragging in a फ्री in order to illustrate its meaning, and I am quite ready to adopt the Professor's explanation as perhaps
more suitable than that of Mr. Arthur Venis on which I relied.

I must join issue, however, with my learned critic in regard to his remarks in connection with the āṭkōṭkōṭkālaṃvāya. In explaining it I quoted a passage from the Bib. Ind. edition of Bhāmatī, part of which stands thus—वि प्रस्तुतं यथा समाप्तं सन्तोषमिति विवेचनं स्वाभाविकता विचारं चै च। न ति प्रस्तुतं कार्यक्षेत्रस्थलं। तथा निपापायिता ज्ञानकारं। शत्रुः भक्तः। न ह्यति कार्यक्षेत्रकारकं। एवं कार्यक्षेत्रे। केनकारकं सुखं हितं मनुष्यधारा नामवृत्तां सुन्दरं स्वाध्वरं। न ह्यति। कार्यायनक्षेत्र कार्यक्षेत्र हितं। Now it is not at once apparent that the final clause of the two preceding sentences and that instead of कार्यक्षेत्रे, we need either कार्यक्षेत्रे; or the alternative expression न कार्यक्षेत्रे? One's critical instinct demanded such a reading, and I candidly admit that, on my own authority, but not "in the fashion of the uncritical Indian scribe," I adopted the former of the two, and notified the same in a footnote. But what about the MSS? Do they bear me out in this? The Professor tells us that, in place of the प्रस्तुतं कार्यक्षेत्र of the Bib. Ind. edition, the Sanskrit College MSS. read प्रस्तुतं कार्यक्षेत्र, whilst those of the Asiatic Society have प्रस्तुतं न कार्यक्षेत्र. Of the four in the Indus Office Library, one has the former, and two have the latter, of the above readings; whilst the remaining one (No. 1879, comprising the text of the Kaipatara as well as that of the Bhāmatī) supports the printed text. The negative form of the expression may, therefore, be confidently accepted as the right one, and the Professor himself approves of that found in the College MSS. Why, then, does he regard my alteration as "uncalled for"? It is true that the particle ति should have been eliminated, but that is a comparatively small matter.

I fear that I may have no opportunity of utilising the useful material now placed at my disposal, since there is little likelihood of a demand for a third edition of the Similes during my lifetime; moreover, at the age of 73 one must prepare to quit the field altogether. I hope, however, that I have aroused interest in this much-neglected, but fascinating, branch of study, and that younger men may be led to take it up.

G. A. JACOB.

SOLEICISMS OF SAMKARACHARYA AND KALIDASA.

The Sanskrit language of Samkara, the founder of the Advaita school, is considered to be so chaste and idiomatic that it is inconceivable, nay sacrilegious, to think that he has committed any solecisms. Yet the following forms which occur in his gloss on the Chhandogya-Upanishad cannot, I am afraid, be defended by any rules of grammar. Thus in his comment on Adhyāya I, Khaṇḍa 6, v. 1, Samkara says: Yathācch Rik-adharmā n-dityantā bhūme. According to Pāṇini, V. 4, 77, instead of Rik-adharmā we should here have Rik-adharmā. Similarly in his Adhyāya on A., VIII, K. 8, v. 4, he uses the form gachchhātyādām instead of gachchhātyātām. Lastly, the ungrammatical form marisyās occurs at the very beginning of his gloss on A., VIII, K. 12, v. 8, which is prohibited by and ought to have been marisyās in accordance with Pāṇini I. 3, 61. These solecisms are by no means surprising when they are found even in the composition of the most renowned poet, Kālidāsa. Thus in Kūmara-sambhava I. 35 and Rāghu-vaṃśa XIV. 23, the form aṣa is used, which is not justified by Pāṇini II. 4, 52. Similarly, in Rāghu-vaṃśa V. 34; V. 61; XIX. 59, the forms jagmīda, tasātīda and Kamayāna have been employed by him which cannot be correct according to Pāṇini III. 2, 107 and III. 1, 30.

D. K. BHANDARE.

A GUPTA-VAKATAKA COPPERPLATE GRANT.

I have lately discovered an interesting copperplate grant. It consists of 2 plates, each plate being inscribed on one side only. The characters of the grant resemble those of the Early Gupta inscriptions. The legend on the seal reads thus:

शाक्ताक-तलामवनम्
काृत-पाणि-चुप्पि:..
अनुक्रण-पत्राचारय:.
शाशर्यज-निपुधानां।

The genealogy of the Guptas given in the grant is as follows:

1. Guptādāraja.
2. Śrī-Guṇatīkāchāra.
3. Mahārāja Śrī-Chandragupta I.
4. Mahārājādhirāja Śrī-Samudragupta.
5. Mahārājādhirāja Śrī-Chandragupta II.
We are further told that Chandragupta II. married Kubera-nâga. Their daughter was Śrī-
Prabhâvatī who was the crowned queen of Śrī-
Rudraema, the great king of the Vâlāpaka.
Her son was the Yuvarâja Śrī-Divâkarasena.
During his minority, as is evident from the
legend on the seal, the present grant was issued
by his mother the queen regnant Prabhâvatī.
In another Vâlāpaka copperplate she is spoken
of as the daughter of Devagupta. Is it possible
that Devagupta was another name of Chandra-
gupta II?
Poona. K. B. PATHAK.

BOOK NOTICES.

THE RELIGION OF THE IRANIAN PEOPLES, by C. P.
The Parsi Publishing Co.

Mr. G. K. Nariman has rendered a notable
service to his countrymen by the publication of the
translations contained in this little book.
It is of great consequence to the reading portion
of the Parsi community that they should have
at ready command the results of the learning and
research of such scholars as Thiele in a language
which they understand as well as Englishmen
themselves. It is, therefore, very gratifying to
all interested in the welfare of the Parsis to find
that there are amongst them those who can supply
their wants in this direction, for not only has Mr.
Nariman translated the work of Thiele
from the original German, but he has added to
that great service by another in supplementing
it with Goldziher's Influence of Persian on
Islam and Darmesteter's Persia, a Historical and
Literary Sketch from the French. Further he has
given, as an appendix to Thiele's work, a
series of most useful and interesting parallels
from Buddhistic writings.

Work of this kind is beyond question of great
value to the community to which Mr. Nariman
belongs, and one cannot help hoping that he
will continue to select and translate European
books and articles by writers of the first class.
He can rest assured that the pages of this journal
will always be open for such work.

R. C. TEMPLE.

NAMALINGAMUKHANA (Amarakosa) of Amaranîhâ,
with the commentary (Amarakoshodhâtanâ) of
Kahira-svâmin. Part I, edited by Kharishnâ Govind
Oka. Printed at the Law-printing Press, Poona.

Of all the Sanskrit lexicons Amarakosa is
considered to be the best. Every Brahman boy
who learns Sanskrit has to get this Kosha by
heart, in whatever part of India he lives. Its
popularity is further evidenced by the number of
commentaries that have been composed on it and
that form a literature by itself. So far as my
knowledge goes, we have two very good editions
of this work printed in Bombay, one with a
commentary called Amarakosha of Mahârâsa, edited
by Vâmanâchara Jhalakâra, and the other with the commentary of Bhanuji Dikshita
entitled Vâdhyâdasanâ, and published by Pandit
Sivadatta. We have thus a critically edited text
of the Amarakosa presented to us. These
commentaries too have their own uses, and are, as
such, perfectly welcome. But the most ancient
and important of them all is that of Kahira-svâmin
known as Aamarakoshodhâtanâ. An attempt
had been made by the Bengal scholar Anun-
doram Borooh to edit it together with that of
Râyanukta. But hardly two-thirds of the first
Kânda had been published when his untimely and
greatly lamented death occurred, and a complete
and reliable edition of this commentary continued
to be a great desideratum. This arduous work
has now been undertaken by Mr. K. G. Oka.
Part I of it, which contains the first two Kândas,
is already out, and Part II is in the press, and is
expected to come out in three or four months'
time. This last will contain the third Kânda to-
gether with a paper on Amaranîhâ and Kahira-
svâmin, a list of works and authors quoted by
the latter, a glossary of words and so forth.

The importance of Kahira-svâmin's commentary
will be patent to anyone, who reads Anun-doram
Borooh's preface to his partially published edition
of the Nâmalingmukhâsanâ. The list of the
lexicographical, medical, and other authorities,
which the commentator quotes, is as invaluable
as it is extensive, and shows the depth and versa-
tility of his knowledge. His critical scions
also are perceptible in the places where he sets
right the errors not only of Amaranîhâ but also
of other lexicographers. Thus on Amara II. 4, 59
he says: धार्मिको बताय: कर्मव्रती इतिर्भवत: श्रीस्वामी
निवायुलितास्या द्वितीयादितिः भवानस्तिः। वृक्षमृगीयः।
On Amara II. 4, 146, he has
the following: गुणोद्योग। चालीमा नामानि। पण्डः-
him, occurs in the *Amarakosa*, but not in the technical sense assigned to it by the *Bhairatiya-śāstra*, but this word occurs in its technical sense in *Kālidāsa*. Amara was thus prior to *Kālidāsa*, i.e., prior to A. D. 400, the time of Chandragupta II, who is now taken by several scholars of repute to be the patron *Vikramaditya* of *Kālidāsa*. This view exactly tallies with what Kahravāmin insinuates, viz., that Amara was earlier than Chandragaronin.

The importance of Kahravāmin's commentary does not end here. One of its unique features is the quotations it gives from the works of Sanskrit poets. To take one instance, in connection with the word *hādhaḥ* occurring in the *Amarakosa* I. 7, 10, he cites the following verse: गुप निकाले गायीयां तीनीया अवां गाईयायिनम्। इस verse is easily perceived that this verse is met with in Bharatīhari's *Śrīsāgara-Śatāka*. But it is worthy of note that all the printed editions of this Āṭakas have गुप निकाले गायीयां अवां गाईयायिनम्, but this verse is actually found in the *Sanātarāmasa* of *Avaghosha* in almost the same form in which it is cited by Kahravāmin, the only difference being that the printed text has गाईयां instead of गायीयां.

We are thus very glad to find that the edition of *Amarakosa* together with Kahravāmin's commentary has been undertaken by Mr. Oka. So far as Part I, which is out, is concerned, he seems to have done his work, on the whole, satisfactorily. His edition contains very few misprints, and is free from the errors which are discorible in what little of this commentary was published by Anundoram Borooah. Mr. Oka has also succeeded in tracing many more quotations in the original works of Sanskrit authors from which Kahravāmin has cited them. One defect may, however, be mentioned. In tracing the quotations he has mentioned only the names of the author and his work in which they occur, without also specifying the number of the chapter and verse. It is sincerely hoped that this defect will be remedied in Part II, at any rate in the case of the quotations which are not well-known and cannot be at once found out even though we are informed in which works they occur.

D. R. B.

---

1 Jour. R. As. Soc. for 1906, p. 45.
2 Max Müller's *India: What can it teach us?* p. 228.
3 *Ganto VIII*, verse 33. (The work has been edited by M. M. Narasimha Shastrī in the Bibliotheca Indica Series).
THE CHOLAS AND THE CHALUKYAS IN THE ELEVENTH CENTURY.

BY BHATTANATHA SVAMIN; VIZAGAPATAM.

It is well-known from epigraphical records that the line of the Eastern Chalukyas was absorbed in the Chola family about A.D. 1070. As soon as the Eastern Chalukyas gained supremacy in the Chola kingdom, they assumed the titles of the Chola kings, perhaps because, they had regarded the Cholas with admiration and been anxious for a long time to attain to their status and titles. But how the Eastern Chalukya princes were able to occupy the Chola throne is a problem which has not yet been solved.

The Eastern Chalukya king Vishnuditya began to reign, as stated in his Rana-stipundi grant, in A.D. 1011. He married Kundavā, daughter of Rājarāja I of the Chola family, and her son was named after the maternal grandfather. He is the well-known Rājarāja Narendrav of Rājamundry. It appears that Vishnuditya and his successors of Veṅgi became feudatories of the Cholas, for the Korumill inscription of Rājarāja Narendra undeniably acknowledges the supremacy of the Cholas. Ammanāḍi, daughter of Rājendra Chola I, Gāṅgaikonda, was married to Rājarāja Narendrav. He ascended the throne on the sixteenth of August A.D. 1022 and ruled forty-one years. The famous Telugu poet Nannayyabhaṭṭa lived at the court of this king and dedicated his Telugu Bhāratam to him.

After the death of Rājarāja Narendra, Veṅjaditya, another son of Vishnuditya, ruled over the Veṅgi country for fifteen years from A.D. 1062 to 1077. In the year A.D. 1062 Virarajendrav, the last son of Rājendrachola I, Gāṅgaikonda, ascended the throne of the Chola country. An inscription of his second regnal year refers to a battle where he defeated an army which was sent into Veṅgi by Vikramāditya VI of the Western Chalukya family. This battle can be, hence, dated about A.D. 1062-1063, i.e., soon after the death of Rājarāja Narendrav. Probably Vikramāditya wanted to wrest Veṅgi soon after Rājarāja Narendrav died, but apparently Virarajendrav helped Veṅjaditya of the Eastern Chalukya family to succeed to his brother's throne.

Veṅgi was again plundered by Dhārā-Janamātha and others about A.D. 1067, for this event is mentioned in the inscriptions of the fifth and subsequent years of Virarajendrav's reign. In an inscription, Vanapati, the minister of the Kaliṅga king Rājarāja, (who ruled for 8 years from Saka 951 or A.D. 1069 to Saka 958 or A.D. 1076) is said to have fought with the army of the Cholas and to have defeated the ruler of Veṅgi. This battle seems to be the same as that mentioned in the inscriptions of Virarajendrav. Mr. G. V. Rāmagūḍī Pantulu also thinks this Veṅgi king to be Veṅjaditya VII. In Anantavarma's grant of Saka Samvat 1040 Rājarāja of Kaliṅga is said to have defeated the Druvālas and to have thus helped Veṅjaditya of Veṅgi. Now, Vanapati's inscription and Anantavarma's grant refer to the same fact, but seem to contradict each other, because one makes the Kaliṅga king Rājarāja the enemy of the king of Veṅgi and the other makes him the friend of Veṅjaditya, the lord of Veṅgi. This apparent absurdity will be removed if we assume that the grant of Anantavarma refers not to the king of Veṅgi but to Vijayaditya, brother of Western Chalukya Vikramāditya VI, who also bore the
title of Lord of Vēṇgi.\textsuperscript{15} Apparently the latter Vijayāditya wanted to take possession of Vēṇgi with the help of the Kālliga king Rājarāja, but was defeated. In the inscriptions above referred to of Vīrārajendrachōla also refer to the same fact, we may infer that Dhāra-Jananāṭa also helped the Western Chālukya Vijayāditya and that Vīrārajendra helped his relative Vijayāditya, the Eastern Chālukya king of Vēṇgi, and defeated Dhāra-Jananāṭa and Rājarāja of Kālliga. Prof. Hultzsch is disposed to identify Vijayāditya of Anantavarman's grant with the Eastern Chālukya ruler of Vēṇgi and the Chōla who threatened to absorb his dominions with Rijēndrachōla II, \textit{alias} Kulōtungachōla I,\textsuperscript{16} but this cannot be justified at all.

Another event mentioned in the inscriptions of Vīrārajendrachōla is the treaty with Vikramāditya VI.\textsuperscript{17} The earliest known reference to this event is found in the inscriptions of the fifth regnal year of Vīrārajendra, and hence it may be dated A. D. 1067. This treaty resulted, about 1067, in the marriage of a daughter of Vīrārajendra with Vikramāditya VI, which is described in \textit{Vikramāditya Bhādesacharita}.\textsuperscript{18}

Vīrārajendra seems to have died in his 8th regnal year or A. D. 1070,\textsuperscript{19} when, according to \textit{Vikramāditya Bhādesacharita}, a rebellion arose in the Chōla country to prevent the succession of his son Adhirajendrachōla. This rebellion seems to have lasted till the end of the year A. D. 1072, for we do not find any of Adhirajendra's inscriptions of that period. Vikramāditya VI heard the news and coming to Gāṅgaikōṇa jachōlasparam secured the kingdom for his brother-in-law,\textsuperscript{20} about the end of the year A. D. 1072. Mr. Krishnaswami Aiyangar thinks that Rijēndrachōla II, son of Rājarāja Nārēndra, who afterwards became Kulōtungachōla I, must have organized this rebellion,\textsuperscript{21} but there is absolutely no evidence for this. In A. D. 1074 there was another rebellion of Adhirajendrachōla's subjects against him, in which Adhirajendrachōla lost his life.\textsuperscript{22} Adhirajendra was succeeded by Rijēndrachōla II in A. D. 1074-75.

The early history of Rijēndrachōla II will be now discussed. He, like Adhirajendra, was a descendant of the great Chōla king Rijēndrachōla I, Gāṅgaikōṇa, the latter being his son's son and the former his daughter's son. Rijēndrachōla II was the rightful heir of the Vēṇgi country, and he should have succeeded his father Rijēndrachōla Nārēndra in A. D. 1072. But, instead, the kingdom passed into the hands of his uncle Vijayāditya, already referred to, and we shall discuss how this could have happened. Prof. Hultzsch supposes the rightful heir Kulōtungachōla to have been ousted by Vijayāditya with the help of Vīrārajendra.\textsuperscript{23} If Rijēndrachōla, \textit{alias} Kulōtungachōla I, was so treated by Vijayāditya, the former would have overthrown the latter soon after attaining supreme power in A. D. 1074-1075 as shown below. But such a thing did not take place. On the contrary, the inscriptions of Vēṇgi and Rājarājachōljagāṅga state that Rijēndrachōla II himself appointed his uncle Vijayāditya to govern Vēṇgi.\textsuperscript{24}

It is apparent from \textit{Avatāram} (the tenth canto) of \textit{Kulōtungachopāni} that Rijēndrachōla II remained in the house of his maternal grandfather till A. D. 1070. It appears from the same work that this was due to the partiality of his granamother, Gāṅgaikōṇa's wife.\textsuperscript{25} Further, Madharāntaki, daughter of Rijēndrachōla Nārēndra, son of Rijēndrachōla I, Gāṅgaikōṇa, became his wife.\textsuperscript{26} Thus he was related as son-in-law, besides as grandson and grandson's son to the Chōla family. These continuous relations and association in an early age with the Cōlōas

\textsuperscript{15} Dr. Fleet's \textit{Kamesara Dynasty}, 2nd edition, p. 454.
\textsuperscript{16} \textit{South Ind. Ins.}, Vol. III., pp. 128 and note 11.
\textsuperscript{17} \textit{Ibid.}, pp. 69 and 203.
\textsuperscript{18} V. 28 to VI. 3.
\textsuperscript{19} This is the latest known regnal year of this king. \textit{South Ind. Ins.}, Vol. III., p. 122 Table.
\textsuperscript{20} \textit{Vikramāditya Bhādesacharita}, Vol. 6 to 25.
\textsuperscript{21} \textit{Ancient India}, pp. 125 and 50.
\textsuperscript{22} \textit{Vikramāditya Bhādesacharita}, canto VI. verse 25.
\textsuperscript{23} \textit{Sth Ind. Ins.}, Vol. III, p. 123.
\textsuperscript{24} \textit{Ante}, Vol. XIX., pp. 431 and 435, and \textit{Ep. Ind.}, Vol. VI., No. 35, v. 11.
\textsuperscript{25} \textit{Kulōtungachopāni}, canto X., v. 8.
\textsuperscript{26} \textit{Ante}, Vol. XIX., p. 430.
induced him, perhaps, to settle in their country and to be styled a member of their family. It may be with this desire he left the Vēngī country in the charge of his uncle Vijayāditya. Moreover, a portion, most probably the eastern one, of the Chōla kingdom seems to have been allotted to Rājendrachōla II when Vīrarājendrachōla died. Rājendrachōla II seems to have been installed as the ruler of the "Eastern country" which included the portion of the Chōla Empire allotted to him and the Vēngī country. This event must have taken place in A.D. 1070, the first regnal year of Rājendrachōla II. 27

Rājendrachōla's inscriptions in his fourth regnal year have a detailed historical introduction which is given below in support of the above statement. "With his arms which resembled two mountains (and between) which the goddess of prosperity rested and shone, and with (his) sword as (his) only help, (the king) overcame the treachery of (his) enemies; carried off many herds of elephants at Vairāṅgāram (Vaijąkāra); and was pleased to levy tribute (which) illuminated (all) directions from Dīrāhāra Arasā (Dhāravañcā) at the rich Sakkarakōtā (Chakrakōtā). He gently raised, without worrying (her) in the least, the lotus-like goddess of the earth residing in the region of the rising of the sun,—just as (the god) Tirumāl (Viśnū), having assumed the form of the primaval bear, had raised (the earth) on the day when (she) was submerged in the ocean (by the demon Hiranyākṣa),—and seated (her) under the shade of his parasol, (where (she) experienced delight. (He) made the wheel (of his authority) and the tiger (his banner) go in every direction and established (his) fame and justice in every country. While valour, liberality, pride and compassion, as (his) intimate relatives, were resplendent on the undisputed earth, he took his seat (on the throne) with (the goddess of) victory and put on by right the jewelled crown of (his) family. While rulers of the earth bore his feet (on their heads), he wielded the sceptre in every (quarter of the) beautiful continent of the nāral tree." 28

From this it is plain that Rājendrachōla II had been by this time lord of east for three years, i.e., he had been lord or governor of the Eastern Chōla country and lord of Vēngī since 1070. The inscriptions of Rājarājachōla agrāgā and Vīrachōla inform us that Rājendrachōla II was crowned first as king of Vēngī, 29 and this confirms a part of our inference. Rājendrachōla's early inscriptions found in the Tamil country also prove that he had a portion of Tamil country under his rule. We may assume that Adhirājendra appointed him governor of the Eastern Chōla country as soon as he became king; this Adhirājendra was likely to have done, because he himself was confronted with rebellions and would have been glad if his cousin governed a portion of his land. The following fact further supports this inference. A certain Śrēndpatī Rājarāja Paranājīīrākshasa, alias Vīrāla Iśāgīravēlār, the headman of Nadū in Tirumurūnādu, a subdivision of Uyyakunārvalantarādu, got two inscriptions cut, one in the dominions of Rājendra-

chōlaśeva II in the second regnal year of that king, 30 and the other in the dominions of Adhirājendra in the third regnal year of that king. 31 In these inscriptions the rulers of these countries are spoken of in terms of equal respect. An officer of one dominion respecting the king of another dominion clearly shows that the rulers of these two dominions must have been great friends. Otherwise he would not have been allowed to cut such inscriptions in both the countries.

The theory that Rājendrachōla II was crowned king of Vēngī in A.D. 1070 conflicts with the statement of Vīrachōla's inscriptions, already referred to, that Vijayāditya ruled over Vēngī.

28 Prof. Hultsch takes "Dhāravañcā" to mean "the king of Dhārā." But Mr. Hiralal is right in identifying Dhāravañcā with Dhāravañcā of the Sinda family. Ep. Ind., Vol. IX., p. 172 and note 2.
30 South Ind. Inst., Vol. III, No. 64.
31 South Ind. Inst., Vol. III, No. 64.
from A. D. 1062 to A. D. 1078, but as it has been already proved that Rājendrachōlā II appointed Vijayāditya as his viceroy, there is no real contradiction to be explained. We must include the first four years (A. D. 1070 to 1074) of Rājendrachōlā II's reign in the fifteen years' reign of Vijayāditya as a governor of Vēṣāgi, otherwise Virachōlā's accession in Saka 1001 is impossible.33 In the early years of his reign Rājendrachōlā II was engaged in wars in the Central Provinces as they are called now. Hence he could not come to help his sovereign Adhirājendrā at the time of the above mentioned rebellion in 1070-71. Besides he could not rule Vēṣāgi himself and intrusted it to Vijayāditya.34

Vijayāditya was firmly established in this office in A. D. 1074 when the subjects of the Chōla empire rebelled a second time and killed their king Adhirājendrā as already stated. Even then Rājendrachōlā II was not able to go in time to save his sovereign, but went to the place after Adhirājendrā's death and occupied the vacant throne, as stated in Kalingattupparaṇi,35 and assumed the title of Kulottungachōlā. There being no enmity between the two we have no reason to suppose that a war between Rājendrachōlā II and Adhirājendrā had taken place in A. D. 1074 as is said in the Annual Report on Epigraphy for 1904 (page 12). Divyastūrucharita of Gauravavāhana Sātvās, which, as I understand it, supplies a detailed account of Adhirājendrā's death, also supports my statement that Adhirājendrā died in a rebellion. I quote below that portion of the work completely, as orientalists have not looked into it as yet, though it was written by a contemporary disciple of the well-known philosopher Rāmānuja.36

Divyastūrucharita, canto XVIII, vv. 71-89.

Then began to rule a cruel Chōla king, who brought disgrace to his family and who was like a collection of evils caused by Kali. Intending to destroy his family, a Pāṇḍya converted him to Saivism.

Following the advice of his cruel preceptor, the evil-minded Chōla destroyed the principal shrine at Chitrakūṭa (Chidambaram) dedicated to Viṣṇu, the Lord of the three worlds, and threw it into the waters of the ocean.

35 This work is printed in Mysore (10th Apr'1 1885). A critical edition with an introduction has been issued by me.
36 Printed copy reads 'सतिव'.
37 MS. copy reads 'बुद्धपंपण' Ramānujayādīvyaścharita reads 'बुद्धपंपण न'.
38 'भागिनु' B. D. C.
39 'केडलर' MS.
He summoned the Vaishnavas of his country and forced every one of them to write on a paper "सिंहस्तरस्तम्नालि (There is none higher than Siva)" and present it to him before an assembly of all pandits.

When the great sage (Rāmānuja) heard of the harsh behaviour of the Chōla king, he disguised himself in white attire and started from Srīraṅgam, saying to the god "O Thou, Lord of Srīraṅgam, protect thy shrines and religion," and left Kūrattālvan behind (to look after Srīraṅgam).

On his way the great sage saw, while passing through a desert, a body of soldiers, sent by the Chōla king to obstruct (him and his disciples); he then ordered his disciples to throw charmed sand in the path of the army to stop it (and pursue his way).

At every halt in his way, though with a heavy heart, Rāmānuja protected the natives of the country, pleasing even females and Sūdras by his sight, and by showing his glory and at last reached Tirumārāyappuram.

Being obstructed by the charmed sand caused to be poured in the way by the great sage, the army turned and led Periyānambī (the teacher of Rāmānuja) and Kūrattālvan, disguised as a sanyāsin, to the royal palace from Srīraṅgam.

On the advice of his preceptor, the Chōla king asked them to write "शिवास्तरस्तम्नालि" on the paper in the presence of pandits assembled there, but they proclaimed the truth as follows:

---

45 'स्रोतत' MC. 44 'स्रोत' Pr. 44 'स्रोत' Pr.
43 'स्रोत' Pr. 43 'स्रोत' Pr.
42 'स्रोत' Pr. 42 'स्रोत' Pr.
41 'स्रोत' Pr. 40 'स्रोत' Pr.
40 'स्रोत' Pr. 39 'स्रोत' Pr.
"There is no reason to suppose any other than Hari to be supreme." Having said this, they took the word 'Siva' to mean a measure, and wrote "हृण्मस्ति चल: परस्य (There is drāğa, which is higher than that)" on the paper, which was put before them by the order of the king.

The king saw what was written and was informed of the deceit of Kurattālvān by Nālārān. Thus the enraged king got the eyes of Kurattālvān plucked out, which seemed to be an atonement for Kurattālvān’s seeing such a bigoted Saiva king.

Periyamanambi died in the very assembly, being severely beaten by the king’s attendants. And these two, Kurattālvān and the body of Periyamanambi, who proved to be the robbers of king’s life and wealth, (for the king lost those two soon after) were expelled from the capital.

Kurattālvān performed the funeral of Periyamanambi with (the help of) the Brahmins of the village Parantaka and then returned to Srirāgavan, whence he sent word to the great sage (Rāmanuja) by a spy.

The glorious sage, who heard this horrible news from the spy, poured some water in libation to Vēṇkaṭēśvara, in addition to the usual libation to Savitri, at the time of libation (i.e., Sandhyā) and began a snake sacrifice for the destruction of the Chōla king.

---

61 'सामान्यं विशिष्टं माहार्ष्यस्रितेऽ' Pr.
62 'मुहूः' MS.
63 'ਸूर्यो' Pr.
64 'ग्रहणेऽ' MS.
65 Kamalālaya is the Sanskrit name of Tiruvārur. See South Ind. Inv., Vol. II, p. 113, note 3. Now the name is restricted to the tank near the shrine of Siva. 'कमलालये' Pr.
Tyāgarāja, the Siva god of Tiruvārur, the pre-eminent devotee of Vishnū, made an incorporeal sound from the top of the Cōkaṇa: "Now, I have closed the rule of the kings of the Chōla family."

The god Vēṅkaṭēśvara, being urged by the libation of the learned Rāmānuja, stabbed the king with a weapon when he was asleep and thus resembled Narasimha, who, out of love for Prahlāda, destroyed Hiraṇya (—kaiṣṇa).

Numerous worms sprang from the hole of the wound which was made in the Chōla's neck by the weapon of Vēṅkaṭēśvara and which could not be cured by many drugs and charms. On that account he bore the name Kriṣṇaśya as a mark of his sins.

From smells risen from the sacrificial fire, which were like to those of burning hair, Rāmānuja knew that the Chōla's body was burnt in the blazing fire of a funeral pile. Then he finished the snake sacrifice and waited for a disciple who was to bring the news of the Chōla's death.

The disciple came and related how the Lord of the mount Vṛishṇi (i.e., Vēṅkaṭēśvara) wounded the Chōla king and how the Chōla king died of the growth of worms in his neck. The great sage pleased to hear these tilīṇya, initiated him in the Devayantra as a Pūrṇāśītra.

Afterwards Rāmānuja made an image of Vishnū called Selavappilai, instituted it on the banks of the tank called Kalyāṇa at Tirunārāyanapuram and left fifty-two of his disciples to worship it there.
If we identify the Chola king of Dirghasricharita with Adhirajendra deva, we can easily reconstruct from this story the real history of Adhirajendra's death. In his Ancient India, Mr. Krishnaswami Aiyangar identifies the Chola opponent of Ramanuja with Kulottungasola I, otherwise called Rajaendra Chola II. But according to Guruparampararadhabha, the Tirunarlavyapura temple was built in the cyclic year Bahudhanya, Thursday, the 14th day of Makaramasam with Pushya-nakshatra, but the Sakha year corresponding to this is stated to have been subsequent to Sakha 1012. Hence it must have been either Sakha 1020 or A.D. 1088. 1088 was the 28th regnal year of Kulottungasola I, alias Rajaendra Chola II. Dirghasricharita states that the temple of Tirunarlyapa puram or Melkota was built after the death of Krimikantha. If we identify Krimikantha with Kulottunga the temple must have been built after 1119, the latest known date of Kulottunga. The year Bahudhanya subsequent to A.D. 1119 is 1158. But Ramanuja, the founder of Tirunarlyapa puram temple, died in Sakha 1059 or A.D. 1137. Therefore Kulottunga cannot be Krimikantha. If Krimikantha or the Chola king of Dirghasricharita is identical with Adhirajendra there is no difficulty. Moreover the expressions tadevamaheshwaryavara and Chakalavanayamadesahhipatyanumadri in Dirghasricharita clearly state that a family ended with the royal opponent of Ramanuja. Kulottunga I is the founder of the new Chakravarta-Chola dynasty whose descendants ruled the Tamil country for more than five generations. This fact supports the identification of Krimikantha with Adhirajendra Chola deva with whom the original Chola family ended.

In Mysore Archological Survey Report for 1907-8, the account of Ramanuja's visit to Tirunarlyapa puram is stated to have been due to wrongly identifying Yadavapura (Tonnur) with Tirunarlyapa puram, which is Yadavagiri; the date of erection of Tirunarlyapa puram temple was interpreted to be that of Ramanuja's visit to Tondanur or Tonnur, where Ramanuja met Vishnuvardhana, or Vithala, and, according to Guruparampararadhabha, converted him. It is further written in the Report: "Either there must be some mistake about the date or we must suppose that Vishnuvardhana had also taken up his residence at Tonnur when his brother Ballala I was on the throne" for the year Bahudhanya, corresponding to A.D. 1099, does not fall within the reign of Vishnuvardhana. But Dirghasricharita clearly states that Ramanuja visited Srinarlyapa pura or Tirunarlyapa pura and built the temple of Selvappiilai or Sampaadatmaja. No mention is made of Vishnuvardhana's conversion in Tondanur in this work, which being contemporary evidence, is more authoritative than Guruparampararadhabha and Ramanusfarya-dirghasricharita. The two latter works often quote from Dirghasricharita. We cannot take, therefore, Vishnuvardhana's conversion by Ramanuja at Tonnur as a fact; but if his conversion is a fact, we shall have, then, to identify the former with a Vithala who was ruling the district of Tirupati many years before Ramanuja's visit to Tirunarlyapa puram, and who was seemingly converted by Ramanuja during his visit to Tirupati. The following verse of Dirghasricharita may be quoted in this connection:——

|| D. S. C. XVIII, 22. ||

---
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72 See pedigrees of the Cholas in Ancient India.
73 Mysore A. S. Report for 1907-8, pp. 9 and 10.
74 Guruparampararadhabha, p. 199.
75 Guruparampararadhabha, p. 340.
76 See Dirghasricharita, canto XVII. v. 57.
Having reached Tirunati, the ornament of the foot of the hill named after the lord of the serpents (i.e., Śhastaśaila or the Tirunati hill) be (Rāmānuja) got an agrahāra from the king Viṭhala, who worshipped his feet, and established three hundred of his famous and principal disciples in it.”

This might have happened during the time of Vishṇuvardhanā’s father Ereyanga (about A.D. 1062), who is said to have made conquests in the north. The current form of the story of Rāmānuja’s visit to south-western India (which is elaborately described in Gurusparāmāprabhā) seems to be the invention of a later person, most probably of the author of the Yuddavayrimāhāmja. Therefore about A.D. 1074 Rāmānuja visited Tirunārayanagurum and not Toṇḍanur, and this was owing to the hostility of Adhirājendra and not Kulōttunga I.

Now, the reason why Adhirājendra destroyed Chidambaram temple must be explained. In that village, the Vishṇu temple caused some kind of obstruction to the Tiruvālidhi festivals of Siva. Moreover only the Vishṇu temple had a mukhamandapa and there was no room for building another mandapa for the Siva temple. This gave a greater importance to the Vishṇu temple which was disliked by the orthodox Saivas. Even now this difficulty exists and the Saivas are trying to remove the Vishṇu temple from the premises of the Siva temple. It seems Adhirājendra had this in view in destroying the Vishṇu shrine of Chidambaram.

Not being able to go against the Saivas by reconstructing the Vishṇu shrine at the same place, Rāmānuja instituted the images at Tirunati as stated in Dīvyaśurīcharita and other works. But the intended extension of the Chidambaram Siva temple did not take place at that time owing to the untimely death of Adhirājendra. Kulōttunga II, the grandson of Kulōttunga I, who ruled from about A.D. 1126 to A.D. 1146,7 had fulfilled the desire of Adhirājendra by constructing a mandapa in the front of the temple. It is this fact that is mentioned in Oṭakuttān’s Kulōttungaṭhālanūd and Tadhayāgapparanāra. Mr. Krishnaswami Aiyangar ascribes the destruction of the Chidambaram temple of Vishṇu to Kulōttunga II.7 Besides Dīvyaśurīcharita and Rāmānudhyayavaiṣhadanda the following verse quoted by the learned Aiyangar from Prapanāmitya states that it was Krimikāṭha that destroyed the Gōrindarāja shrine at Chitrakūta.

I translate this verse in the words of Mr. Aiyangar. “He (Mahāchārya) wished to restore the temple of Gōrindarāja at Chidambaram (Chitrakūta), which had been uprooted by the Chōla Krimikāṭha.”79 It is impossible to identify Krimikāṭha with Kulōttunga II, for he survived Rāmānuja by nine years; and the statement that Rāmānuja returned to Srīrāgam after the death of Krimikāṭha is erroneous on this view.

Now, to return to our subject. I hope I have proved that the story narrates in Dīvyaśurīcharita shows Adhirājendra’s death to be due to the dislike of his subjects. In this way we can clearly explain the 27th, 28th and 29th verses of canto X of Kalīngottuppāraga70 and the expression ‘prakritiivirōdhahātanya (of Chōla’s son who was killed owing to his enmity with the subjects)’ in Viṅkramākaṭādevačarita.71 The word ‘Chōlasūnyō’ is used to denote that Adhirājendra died too young to have any children to rule after him. It cannot be called usurpation, therefore, if Kulōttunga I, viśa Rājendra II, a grandson of the Chōla family, ascended the Chōla throne after Adhirājendra.
After the death of Adhirajendra, Vikramaditya VI as well as Rajendrachola II apparently wanted to occupy the vacant throne of the Chola, but the latter quickly fulfilled his object. The other being disappointed wanted to fight with Rajendrachola II, but the latter withstood him, finding an ally in Somesvara II, elder brother of Vikramaditya VI and the then reigning king of the Western Chalukyas (A.D. 1069 to 1075). A battle was fought between the contending parties, but Rajendrachola II could not be dethroned though, as a result of the battle, Somesvara II was overthrown by Vikramaditya VI. The latter ascended the Kuntala throne in A.D. 1076 whence started the Chalukya Vikramavarna era. Inscriptions of the fifth year of Rajendrachola II's reign refer to this battle, stating "(He) unshackled (his) sword, showed the strength of (his) arm, and spurred (his) war steed, so that the king of Kondala (Kuntala), (whose spear had) a sharp point lost his wealth. Having established (his) fame, having put on the garland of (the victory over) the Northern region, and having stopped the prostitution of the goddess with the sweet and excellent lotus-flower (i.e., Lakshmi) of the Southern region, and the loneliness of the goddess of the good country whose garment is Ponni (Kaneri) he put on by right (of inheritance) the pure royal crown of jewels, while the kings of old earth bore his two feet (on their heads) as a large crown."184

I have already stated that after his coronation as the ruler of the Chola country he bore the title Kulottunga, which means "highest in his family," and which is found only in his inscriptions subsequent to the fourth regnal year. This implies that the independent rule of the united empire of Vengi and the Chola country was attained by him alone and not by his predecessors, and not before 1074-75, even by him. This cannot mean that he was called a Chola after attaining supreme power, for he was already styled a member of the Chola family in A.D. 1071-72, as stated by Prof. Holtzach. Kaligatupparani says "As a young prince of the Lunar race, as an infant lord of the Solar race, he grew up the joy of the kings of both races, like the fruit of the virtuous deeds of his ancestors." Vikramaditharatna styles our prince Rajendrachola II as 'Chola Raja' in one place (VI. 38) and 'Rajiga Venginatha' in another place (VI. 26). He was Ubbhayakulottama29 (the best of the two races), therefore, even before he was crowned as ruler of the eastern country.

According to Mr. Krishnaswami Aiyangar, Adhirajendra ascended the throne in A.D. 1070 and ruled only part of a year, for Rajendrachola II also ascended the Chola throne in the same year; the capture of elephants at Vairagarvan and the capture of the fortress of Chakrakottam mentioned in his inscriptions as deeds of his heir-apparentship imply that he distinguished himself in the expedition sent out by Virarajendrava. In a.D. 1067; Kulottunga's having uplifted the lotus goddess in the direction of the rising of the sun would only mean that Rajendra Kulottunga distinguished himself as a prince in the eastern exploits of his grandfather, either during Rajendra Chola's, or under Virarajendra when he re-conquered Kadaram.28 In my opinion the above statements are not well founded. If the above-quoted inscriptions of Rajarajachodangana29 and Virachola30 are taken into consideration we must conclude that the coronation of Rajendrachola II with the title Kulottunga as a ruler of the Chola country took place some time after his coronation as ruler of the eastern or Vengi territory. The earlier Tamil inscriptions styling him Rajendrachola refer to his coronation as ruler of the eastern country; for they describe his crown as 'Kula-
BRAHMAN IMMIGRATION INTO SOUTHERN INDIA.

BY A. GOVINDACHARYA SVAMIN, C.E., M.B.A.S., M.B.S.A., M.M.S.; MYSORE.

The word 'immigration' has here been purposely used by me; for until comparatively recently no settlements on a large scale were made in the south by the northern Aryans, as a result of pre-meditated and well-concerted action on the part of a whole class or tribe, directed by the efforts of the king. The Áryan tribes seemed to have at first pressed forward from north-west to south-east, urged by natural causes over which they had no control and against which they could make no stand until they reached the plains of Hindustan where they seemed to have found a peaceful settlement for a long period of time. But soon the impulse to go farther came upon them, due to various causes, and as there was no longer any ground on the south-eastern side they seemed to have bent their steps westward and southward, overrunning Central India and Southern India. The militant policy adapted to constant warfare and constant pressing forward until the extreme south-east limit of their line of march into India from the north-west was reached, is well reflected in the hymns of the Rig-Veda. The peaceful establishment and consolidation of states in

---

92 Kaliyaguptupparani, X, 23 and 34.
93 Early History of India, 2nd edition, p. 422.
Central India is described in the works of the Sūtra period. The next onward march, impelled by other than mere natural forces, is described in the epics of the Āryan land; the Rāmdīyagāra, describing the earliest movement, and the Mahābhārata, the ambitious conquering march of the Āryan kings of the north. By the term 'Southern India,' I understand what is commonly known as the Deccan, which we may take as signifying the whole land to the south of the Vindhya Mountains known as Pāriyātra in olden times, i.e., the limits of travelling. These mountains first formed an effective barrier on the forward pushing Āryans; and by the wild animals that infested their intractable wilderness and by the wilder aboriginal tribes peopling their slopes, the progress of the northerner towards the south seems to have been checked for a long time. So much was the loss of life and property that they had suffered at the hands of the agencies that were at work to the south of their settlements in Āryavarta, that they ever after came to identify the south with death and called it Yādugūri or Yama-dīk, or that which points to the abode of death. We also see that their favourite line of march leading to the point where they met with the least resistance - they called Agnaya, from Agni, whom they took for their lead. They called Agni, purohitī; referring by this symbol either to the use of fire in clearing forests that were ahead of their advance, or to the warmth, the quest of which must have determined their line of pressure. The latter seems to me to be the true symbol, considering how they must have been pressing forward in the glacial epoch from the Arctic regions where must have been their primitive home, only under the sun's lead of the quest of warmth. In the shape of high floods and storms, destruction must have then come to them from the south-west, which direction they therefore called Nairṛtya, from Nirṛtī, i.e., destruction. These lines of pursuit and avoidance seem to have been symbolised in the tantra that is used in sacrifices: नायत्तवातार्थव्यातानां, नैन्यत्तातीतानां नात्तानां. Agreeably to this surmise we find that in the Śānticechana, गृहीतान्तरत्नम्, तुर्थसिद्धांतम्, etc., that is made in the purificatory ceremony, the liturgical formula includes आयत्तवातार्थव्यातानां, नायत्तवातार्थव्यातानां. This indicates that their advance was towards the south-east; because the prayer is addressed for the removal of the evil at the south-east point; and all trouble or misfortune is sought to be thrown into the north-east.1

Before the settlement of the Āryans in India was effected, the low-lying plains of the great rivers had been inhabited by the Dravidian race, and the first conflict of the Āryas and the Dravidians appears to have taken place in the extreme west and north of India.

That the Dravidians had planted their settlements so far up in the north and west is borne out by the fact that several Dravidian dialects, such as Brāhui, Vili, and Suntāl, are found stranded in the midst of other tongues in Baluchistan, Rājputānā and Central India. But as the centre of gravity of the Dravidian peoples, as determined by the density of their population, lies somewhere about Mysore, we must take the south of India as the home of those peoples whence they might have spread to the north. There is evidence for this in the literature of the Tamil. It is said that long ago, the land had stretched farther south from Cape Comorin and all that region had belonged to the Pāṇḍiyan king. But at one time the sea gained over it, submerging many mountains and rivers, of which त्रयोदशम हरे (17-22).

1 The countries to the north-east of their settlements they called apurīṣita, i.e., unconquered or unsubdued.
It is said that during the time of Nilantara Tiruvil Paṇḍyan, the submergence of the land took place and Ugra-Paṇḍya, his successor, vowed that he would make amends for it by annexing the land to the north as far as the Ganges and the Himalayas. Perhaps it was in consequence of this resolve, he led his expedition into the north and there encountered the Āryans, who had then been pouring into India through the passes of the Himalayas.

In their first conflicts the Āryans seem to have called these Daṇyas and Paṇiś, as evidenced by the Rig-Veda. Daṇya (thief) was very likely the name given to one section of this Dravidian race known as the Chōlas or Chōlis, from which the Coromandel coast derives its name (Chōla, Chōli). Chōla is the Tamil word Čāṇḍa, a softened form perhaps of Čāṇḍa. That the country itself was once called Čāṇḍa is evidenced by the fact that the original name of the Chōla capital, Uraiya, was Čāṇḍa, from which also was derived Čāṇḍa-Caṇḍa (Calcutt of our English geography) perhaps a west coast settlement from the Chōla land, when, in the 11th century, that kingdom gained its lost power, and led by Rājaraja, Ko-para-kesari, and others, extended its dominions on all sides. The name Čāṇḍa itself was perhaps given to the land by the people from the shelly nature of its beach, deriving it from Čāṇḍa-Caṇḍa i.e., to have a shore in gentle waves. But the Āryans must have mispronounced Chōla as ‘chōra,’ and misunderstood it as meaning thief, perhaps led into that misunderstanding by the raiding propensities of those peoples; and consequently re-named them Daṇya in unambiguous Sanskrit. As for the word Paṇi it is nothing but the Dravidian name Čāṇḍa reserved in words like Čāṇḍaśa, Čāṇḍaśa, which means toddy; Čāṇḍaśa or Paṇis means a native of the toddy country or the toddy-bibber. Čāṇḍaśa might have been a later adaptation of that word after closer contact with the Āryans of the north. Thus we see that even during the Rig-Vedic times the Āryans and the Dravidians have come in contact with each other; it was, however, chiefly with the Daṇya that the Āryans had to fight and the Rig-Veda speaks of many hundreds of Daṇyas sent by Indra and many forts (99) belonging to them destroyed by the advancing Āryans. It was the Daṇyas or the Chōlas that formed the more advanced northern wing of the Dravidian race settled along the east coast and penetrating even into the plains of Hindustan through the low-lying lands of the Gangetic delta. Masulipatam, known as Masoli to Ptolomy, Strabo and other classical geographers, bears clear testimony to the northward expansion of the Chōlas in early times. Hionen Thang, writing as late as in the 7th century A.D., places the Chōlas to the north of the Dravīḍas, the latter having Kāṇchi for their capital; perhaps he refers by this term to the Pallava power in the ascendent in Kāṇchi in those times; while the Chōla country itself is described by him as deserted and wild. Perhaps the modern industrious habitants of the Northern Circars and a good portion of the ceded districts and the Nizam’s dominions as far up as the Central Indian States, might have been the product of the intermingling of the advance Dravidian wing in the Chōlas and the Kolarians, whereof the Oddhāras seem to be an offshoot. From the numerical superiority of the Oddhāras, the name Andra, which can be easily equated to Andhra, might have been given to this mixture of the races. In those days the differentiation of Telugu and Tamil does not seem to have taken place. And the Chōlas must have spoken a tongue which was the parent of modern Telugu and more akin to Tamil. It was, in fact, the Tamil of the first Sangham of the Tamil land. The name Dravida, given in common to all the languages of the south, shows that at the time when that name was given, Tamil must have been the common tongue. For Dravida is nothing but an Āryanised form of Tamil, the local name for the language meaning nice or sweet—the linguistic equation being Čāṇḍa = Čāṇḍa = Čāṇḍa = Damida = Damida = Dravida = Dravida, from which Dravida was derived. As a consequence of these early contests and the resulting intermixture of the two races, the Āryans very early became
united with the Dravidas in the larger sense and seem to have adopted also some of their culture into their religion. Agastya, a Rig-Vedic sage, is said to have introduced the worship of Marut along with that of Indra. Now Marut, son of Rudra, was also a god of the Dravidians known as Marudai, afterwards included in the Puranic pantheon as Subramanya, son of Siva, who was identified with the Vedic Rudra. The country of the Pāṇīgas was Marudai, (an agricultural soil) called so after their god, and it perhaps became Aryanised into Madhurai when closer contact was effected in subsequent times. With the closer mingling of the two races after the first contests had subsided, many of the customs belonging to the Dravidians were apparently borrowed by the Aryans. For the immigrant Aryans seem to have soon learnt the great ethnic law that an emigrant from northern latitudes had no chance against the most vigorous tropical races unless the stock was maintained by constant streams of emigrants from the parent-land. But as this could not be done, they seem to have chosen the next best alternative—of strengthening the Dravidian soil with the Aryan seed, and devised proper marriage laws by which this was systematically effected. Thus a Brāhmaṇa was allowed to marry from all the four castes—in the language of the later code; all the children of such a union were considered as Brāhmaṇas according to the rule in vogue in those early days, formulated in a Brāhmaṇa as upadāyitah putroḥ: the son belongs to him who sows the seed, i.e., he belongs to the same varṇa or race, i.e., caste, in the latter sense of the word, as the father.

In this manner an intermingling seems to have taken place between the Aryans and the non-Aryans, so much so that the Aryan became, in the words of an English historian, “absorbed in the Desya as the Lombard in the Italian, the Frank in the Gaul, the Roman (of Roumania) in the Slav, etc.” This conclusion rests on the evidence of anthropomery, which establishes the substantial unity of the present-day Hindu race, especially in the North.

As a consequence of this early intermingling, the Aryan had to give up his ancient language of common life and adapt the languages of the races with whom he mingled. Thus the children speaking the mothers’ tongues originated the various Prākrit dialects which had thus sprung into existence even before the time of Buddha in the 6th century B.C. When all Hindustan had become Aryanised, Bandhāyana, who seems to have lived in Kaśi, belongs to the 7th century B.C. Even in his days the north and the south had differentiated themselves, in point of manners, customs, etc. It is only in this way that we can account for the remarkable fact that the Brāhmaṇas, living in various parts of the country, though priding themselves on having descended from the same identical Rjeṣṭa, though following many common customs, still speak diverse tongues. The mother’s tongue and the father’s religion seem to have become the law of the land.

This surmise gains in strength if we remember that emigration or change of habitat does not of itself create a change in the spoken language of a people or a tribe or a family: for instance, a Mahārāṣṭra, a Karnataka or a Telugu family or tribe settled in Tamil or Kannada lands, is, even now, after the lapse of several centuries, found to cling to its mother tongue. Therefore to explain the origin of Telugu, Kannada or Tamil Brāhmaṇas we must accept this rule and infer that the earliest settlements of Brāhmaṇas must have been made in the Rig-Vedic times when it was not unlawful to take native women as wives, and the children born to them were readily accepted as equal in rank to the fathers. These Aryanised Dravidas must have lived chiefly in Kaśi, near modern Orissa, etc., i.e., in the Telugu land, long before the 7th century B.C., as evidenced by the fact that great smārakāras like Bandhāyana and Apastamba hail from that region. But farther south the Aryan do not seem to have largely spread in those days. For Bandhāyana says: अनप्लांकुशःऽद्यन्धः

From this we learn that those countries were lying on the out-skirts of Aryan settlements, and we may also infer from the manner of the expression that the Brāhmaṇas themselves used to go into them for various reasons, though not settled in them in large numbers. Pāṇini’s acquaintance with
the geography of southern India seems to be very meagre; for he makes no mention of Pañdya, Chola, etc., which names however are added by Kātyāyana in his Vārttikas and are distinctly described by Patañjali. Asoka's edicts, the Mahābhārata and the Rāmāyaṇa all show their full acquaintance with the south. Hence we have to conclude that the complete Aryanisation of the south must have taken place after the 6th and before the 3rd century B.C. In fact those were the times when Buddhism had grown into a powerful proselytising religion, sending missionaries to all parts of the world. Certainly south India must have very early enough become subject to the influence of the new religion. Jainism, which there is reason to believe was even anterior to Buddhism, seems to have first made the southward march and brought down more Aryans of the north into the Carnatic and Tamil lands, having been pressed out of its home by the spread of the Buddhist sect. For we find from the Sravana Belgola inscriptions that Bhadrabahu, who was the reputed spiritual guru of Chandragupta, came and settled here in 297 B.C. Perhaps some of the Brāhmaṇas also who were disturbed in their old homes in the north pressed towards the south and settled in various places all along their route in those days. For we find that Tamils works which are known to belong to the 1st century A.D., at the latest and which may be referred to the 1st century B.C., speak distinctly of Brāhmaṇas and Brāhmaṇa institutions of sacrifice, and even refer to the heroes of the Rāmāyaṇa and the Mahābhārata. Thus in Tirumurugappadai, one of the ten idylls, we find the terms ग्राम व यात्राम and गुरुवाल meaning 'brāhmaṇa' and 'sacrifice', which distinctly refer to the presence of Brāhmaṇas in the district of Madura (the native place of the author of the work वरसाकेरित) and their uninterrupted performance of sacrifices. In another place he refers to them as एकुण एकुण एकुण, a Tamil translation of the word ēvakā, a Tamil translation of the word एकुण, a Tamil translation of the word एकुण. In another work एकूण एकूण एकूण, clear reference is made to Bhima, brother of Arjuna, who burnt the forest of Kāṇḍāvana. Cittappadhiṭṭharam, which from clear internal evidence of the poem, belongs to the 1st century B.C., has एकूण एकूण एकूण एकूण एकूण एकूण एकूण एकूण एकूण 'like Ayodhya bereft of the great Rāma.'

It appears there occurred twelve years' famine in Hindustan in the 3rd century B.C., and a large number of people emigrated from the north in consequence of it. It is said that Bhadrabahu foretold the occurrence of the famine and led out the emigrants from Ujjain. This tradition is attested by the Jainas inscriptions at Sravana Belgola. Perhaps he brought with him numerous Brāhmaṇas families also. There is nothing unreasonable in such a supposition, because in those days there seems to have been very little difference between the Jainas and the Hindus in point of belief or ritual. Only the Jina-dikṣa of the ascetics was a distinguishing feature of the religion. In that repugnant to the Hindus. For even so late as A.D. 1863, in the time of Vira-Bukka-rāja, the king is said to have brought about a union between the Jainas and the Śrīvaishṇavas by making the leader of the latter faith living in Kāṇchi (Koil), Śrīraṇgam, and Tirunārāyanapuram (Melkote) sign a document stating that the Jainas must not be looked upon as in a single respect different from them in point of doctrine or ritual. If such could be said of two extreme forms of Hindu religion at such a late period as A.D. 1863, we may understand how many Brāhmaṇas in the 3rd century B.C. could have easily called Bhadrabahu their guru. Evidence for such a large immigration is found in an unexpected quarter. Among the Dravidas (Tamil) Brāhmaṇas we have a section of people called Ṛṣabhas, the Great Immigration, who themselves are subdivided into Mazhanadu (mazhaññā) and Mūlī, probably from the names of the provinces where they made their first settlements. Bṛhat and Caranaṇam mean the great migration, and must refer to a large southward movement caused by some such disaster as famine. mazhaññā = mazhaññā is the archaic form of mazhaññā; perhaps mazhaññā is the same as the Telugu Muḍikī nāḍu. The Mazhanadu section is itself subdivided into Kanda-mātikī, Māṇḍi, and Sathiamangalam, etc., all villages along the Western Ghats; for, following the examples of all colonists in tropical lands, they must have
naturally clung to the highlands and populated the skirts of the present province of Mysore, the districts of Malabar, Coimbatore and Madura, and spread out towards the west coast as far as Magadi, which Mr. Venkayya identifies with Vēndi, the Chera capital, and considers it as lying near the modern Cranganore in Malabar. One section of them were called பாலூர் (派出) from the 8000 land which they occupied—being perhaps the same as the Ashagram division of Mysore. Another section, the Molugu, I am unable to identify; they may be the settlers in the dry districts of Bellary and Anantapur. At the time when these settlements were made, Kannada does not seem to have distinguished itself from Telugu or Tamil. Throughout the period of time when the Konga kings ruled, the language seems to have been Tamil and the literature of the period belonged to the Chera kingdom with the capital at Vēndi, i.e., Cranganore, on the west coast. It was only during the rule of the Chālukyas and the Yādavas of Devagiri that Kannada became a separate tongue by differentiation from Telugu on the one hand and Tamil on the other.

Moreover, of this twelve years' famine, which seems to have led to the great southward movement from the north, we have evidence of a peculiar kind, in one of the stories of the Pancha-Tantra. The whole story seems to be a satire on the leadership of the Jaina guru Bhadrabahu, who led the colonists southward only to expose them to sufferings of various kinds, among which may be included starvation and death, voluntarily sought by some in the orthodox Jaina fashion which is technically called स्नेत्स। For we read in the Sravaṇa Belogola inscriptions how troops of his followers exposed themselves to slow death by starvation on the bare hill in that place. It is exactly like the crane decoying the fish away in the story only to expose them on a bare rock. There seems to have occurred many such prolonged droughts in the past, during one of which the sage Vīvāmitra and his family are represented as helped to bits of beef by Trisākha, who had become a Chandāla by reason of his sins. The Chāndogya Upanishad also makes mention of a famine caused by drought in the land of the Kuru. But these famines do not seem to have led to any great emigration to the south.

But from all these we must not conclude that prior to this period there were no Brāhmaṇas at all in the south. Tamil literature of the 3rd Sangam period, which we must take as referring to the period between the 1st century B.C. and 1st century A.D. (because Gajābha of Ceylon, who is represented as a contemporary of the author of one of the classics of that period, viz., Śītappadhikārī, is known from the Mahāvīhara to have ruled towards the end of the 2nd century B.C.), bears ample traces of Sanskrit influence upon itself and upon its language. Nay, Tamil tradition makes Agastya, one of the Aryan sages, the founder of its language and literature, meaning thereby that he was the first to systematise the language. There is a tradition among the Aryans that this Agastya crossed the Vindhya and went to the south, and there is also an answering tradition among the Tamils that he did come among them and became the father of their literature.

(To be continued.)

DANDIN, THE NYASAKARA, AND BHAMAHA.

BY PROF. K. E. FATHAK, B.A.; POONA.

Mr. Kane has contributed a paper on Nyasakara, Vāmana and Māgha to the Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, for 1909, p. 94. In this paper he says: "The Harsācharita clearly alludes to the Nyasa in the expression न्यासस्य स्वतंत्रता: as the commentator Saṅkara, who appears to be an early writer, explains न्यासस्य स्वतंत्रता: as कुल श्रावस्ती सुहृत्र गुणवन्ति न्यासस्य स्वतंत्रता: : Śrīhārshācharita, chap. III, p. 96, Nirṇaya, 1st Edition." On looking into the Nirṇayasaṅkara Edition of this work I find the reading to be not गुणवन्ति न्यासस्य स्वतंत्रता: but न्यासस्य स्वतंत्रता:. Dr. Führer's most valuable and critical edition of the Hārṣācharita, based on many manuscripts, also reads, on p. 183, न्यासस्य स्वतंत्रता: It is evident, therefore, that Mr. Kane
has changed this reading into वृक्षिववरण्य से omitting the reph on वि. His opinion about the date of the Nyāsaśāstra being unsettled is, on this account, not entitled to consideration. But the word व्रक्ष is frequently used in the sense of a grammatical treatise or commentary. It occurs in the following verse in this sense:

व्रक्ष कैलापलं शास्त्रार्थम् पालिनिष्ठस्त्रयोऽस्यः
व्रक्ष शास्त्रार्थम् निष्ठितिः पौराणिकवर्णां च कुला
रत्नाः रत्नार्थं ब्राह्मणवर्णी कृता भवस्याः
प्रस्तुताः प्रकटाः नृप्याः वृक्षायाः तत्र ब्राह्मणाचार्य.


Mr. Narasimbachara quotes from this verse the words पालिनिष्ठस्त्रयोऽस्य शास्त्रार्थम् and would have us believe that the second word व्रक्ष in this verse is the name of Pūjyapāda's commentary on Pāṇini. This view is amply refuted by the Hebbūr plates, which describe king Durvinda:

शास्त्रार्थकार-रे-भारतेन्द्र्यिन[भ]ेज-भृगुधर्म.


"He who was restricted to the path of eminence by the words of Deva [Devanandin] the author of the śabdāvatāra."

In my paper on "Pūjyapāda and the authorship of the Jaimindra-Vyakarana" I have shown that Pūjyapāda wrote the Jaimindra-Vyakarana and that his other name was Devanandin. I have also given Vṛttavigāsa's verse saying that Pūjyapāda also wrote a commentary on Pāṇini. But Vṛttavigāsa does not give the name of this commentary. In the passage quoted from the Hebbūr plates, the word 'Deva' stands for 'Devanandin.' Jinasena speaks of the author of the Jaimindra-Vyakarana as Deva:

केहीं कैलापलं किरसरं सम्बन्धिते
विद्वानं वाहतुक्तिभिर्लिन्ते वशः केतामयं

Adīpurāṇa, chap. I, 52.

It is thus clear that Pūjyapāda is spoken of in the Hebbūr plates as śabakāraka and not as व्रक्षिववरण्य. It follows, therefore, that in the other Mysore inscription quoted above, the words पालिनिष्ठस्त्रयोऽस्य शास्त्रार्थम् कुला mean "having composed a commentary called सम्बन्धिते on Pāṇini's work." It may be stated here that Pūjyapāda is never spoken of as Nyāsaśāstra in Jaina or Brāhmaṇical literature. Vardhamāna refers to him thus:

सामुन्द्रवर्णक: अर्थविद्वत्तनेन।

Gaṇarathnamahadadhi, Benares Ed., p. 196.

The terms व्रक्षिववरण्य and जिनिन्द्रब्रज्ज्ज्ञ are reserved for the Buddhist commentator of the Kāśikā:

विरसमुक्तस्वादवृत्ती न्यासालक्षमतान.

Idem. p. 269.

अन्त: पशुपतिश्च अभातमक: अर्थ जिनिन्द्रदुर्मित्तम।


I shall now proceed to deal with the objection urged by Mr. Trivedi against the identity of Bhamaha's Nyāsaśāstra with the Buddhist commentator of the Kāśikā. Mr. Trivedi says: 'Prof. K. B. Pathak brought to my notice that he had found the reference alluded to by Bhamaha, viz., the justification of the compound वृक्षिववरण्य, in Jinendrabuddhi's Kāśikā-vivaraṇa-pañjikā. I thereupon
tried to verify the reference in question, and I am indebted to the learned Sāstri A. Anantāchārya for an extract, which shows that there is no reference to बुध्धस्या in it." It is obvious that Mr. Trivedi understands Bhāmaha to say that the Nyāsakāra justifies the compound बुध्धस्या. That this is not the correct interpretation of Bhāmaha's words, I shall try to show. I shall give below Bhāmaha's verses, together with the passage containing the Nyāsakāra's jādūpaka, as the extract supplied to Mr. Trivedi from Mysore is most corrupt.

रत्नोपनामविच न्यासकारानलय ए।
तुषा समानसाहित्यं न कार्यमिनिविद्या॥
वृष्टात्मकस्मिन वृष्टन्ता बालिकरित।
अनवेन च न कृत्वा वृत्ति तत्त्वको बयो॥

Bhāmaha VI, 36 and 37.

The Nyāsakāra-mata, or the doctrine propounded by the Nyāsakāra, by deducing a sāstra from Pāṇini's sūtra [II, 2, 15], alluded to by Bhāmaha, is as follows:

अर निःस्वः सत्यवन्द्यमयोपवेदन। तुषा सिद्धवधः।
यैसरस्त। तत्तथोऽद लोकविषयसा भविष्यते।
तत्तथादेव शास्त्रोऽद निःस्वः सत्यवन्द्यमयोऽद निःस्वः।
सत्यवन्द्यमयः तत्तथादेव शास्त्रोऽद निःस्वः।

Kāśīwarṇa-pañjikī or Nyāsakāra.

The substance of this passage is thus given by Sārānadeva, who wrote in Saka 1095:

कार्य निःस्वः कुमारः न नात्मकाः \( \text{न} \) सिद्धवधः।
तत्तथादेव तुषा सिद्धवधः।
न च न लोकविषयविनिविद्यते (2.3.69)
पश्चादेवः।
सत्यवन्द्यमयः (2.2.15) सत्यवन्द्यमयः।
तत्तथादेव तुषा सिद्धवधः।

Durghatavṛtti, p. 37.

For a detailed explanation of the Nyāsakāra's passage, I refer the reader to my paper on Bhāmaha's attacks on Jindeṇa-buddhī. It will be sufficient for my present purpose to point out that in the verses cited above Bhāmaha condemns all genitive compounds like बुध्धस्या and तस्मात्कां as ungrammatical, and says that such compounds should never be employed by young authors aspiring to literary eminence. When he contrasts the शिष्यविबधाण्ड with the शिष्यविबधाण्ड, he does not mean to say that this particular compound बुध्धस्या is used by the शिष्य or justified by the Nyāsakāra. Bhāmaha mentions this word बुध्धस्या as an illustration of the class of genitive compounds justified by the Nyāsakāra. This is simply proved by the expression इस्मिण्डमायाम in the sentence शिष्यविबधाण्ड: कुमारः नात्मकाः तृयस्मात्कां, and by the शास्त्रा discriminating between तुषा and तस्मात्का, which applies to all genitive compounds like बुध्धस्या. This interpretation of Bhāmaha's words which perfectly harmonizes with the sense intended by the Nyāsakāra himself, is upheld by such a competent authority as Bhaṭṭoji Dikshita in an interesting passage in the Praudhamanorand. In his Siddhānta-bhaumani, under Pāṇini II, 2, 15, we read कथा शास्त्रयानमं निरङ्कृतः: निकुलदलिताभिषेक \\


Bhaṭṭoji's grandson Hari Dikshita explains the words बुध्धस्याम् as विस्त्रविचारिकस्याम् in the following words: तस्मात्कां न तस्मात्कां निम्नविकारस्याम्: निम्नविकारस्याम्।

This passage in the *Praudhamanarand* serves as an illuminating commentary on Bhāmaha's verses. The word निष्ठ is used by Pāṇini himself, who uses the compounds अनिष्ठु and निष्ठ्ययत्. But it is worth noting that Bhāttoji's *Nīsakāra* justifies the word निष्ठावतिहान; the *Kūtikā-Nīsakāra* justifies निष्ठावतिहान; while Bhāmaha's *Nīsakāra* justifies निष्ठ्ययत् by one and the same राज्यक. And thus if we were to accept Mr. Trivedi's interpretation, we should be compelled to recognise three different *Nīsakāras*, all commentators on Pāṇini, and all justifying genitive compounds in निष्ठ्य by the same method. Even then our difficulty would not end. For Bhāttoji assures us that he applies the term न्यासाकार to the *Kūtikā-Nīsakāra*:

> पूर्वीः स्थितिः [VIII. 2, 1] सचे काशिकार्यं वहे: काशिकाणरिपुं पाठिः। भृतिदेवसुशहस्य निसाधितज्ञ से औषधिभिद्यकारं। सत्न्य स्थायिकता वै कृतस्य विदितवर्धने न्यासाकार इति न्यासाकारः।


And yet Bhāttoji's *Kūtikā-Nīsakāra* justifies the word निष्ठावतिहान, while the real *Kūtikā-Nīsakāra*, as we have seen, justifies the compound विकृतस्य विदितवर्धने. Bhāttoji Dikshita certainly was not so inconsistent as to recognise two *Kūtikā-Nīsakāras*. The distinguished author of the *Praudhamanorand* obviously understands the Buddhist commentator of the *Kūtikā* to justify, by his न्यास, all genitive compounds in निष्ठ्य including निष्ठावतिहान and निष्ठावतिहान, when the latter says वैकुण्त: निष्ठावतिहान निष्ठावतिहान निष्ठावतिहान. It is thus manifest that Bhāttoji's interpretation of the *Nīsakāra*'s words is the same as that which Bhāmaha puts upon them. As the *Nīsakāra* lived about A. D. 700, Bhāmaha must be assigned to the eighth century.

Bhāmaha was the son of Rakrilagomin. Mr. Trivedi says that *Gomin* is explained by *Naṅghantakas* as a contraction of *Gordamin*. This is not correct. The real explanation of *Gomin* is given by Vardhamāna at the beginning of his Ganarathamahodadhi:

> शालगुर्विक गुरुकरणु च श्रम्य गोर्मिति।
> पूणवकारण: पुरुषोली। "गोर्मित न्यूकय" इति।

Here Vardhamāna quotes a well-known *sūtra* from *Chandra-Vyākaraṇa*:

> गोर्मित न्यूकये। [IV. 2, 144]

> गोर्मिति न्यूकवे रितिवाच गोर्मित इत्यादि: गोर्मिति अयः।

*Chandra-Vyākaraṇa*, German Ed., p. 74.

Rakrilagomin was Reverend Rakrila, a Buddhist, and his son Bhāmaha was also a Buddhist. Pāṇiapāda is never called *Praudham* but always *Praudhīna*. When Mr. Trivedi says that "many Nyāsakāras are mentioned in the *Dhātuvāc* of Mādhavīchārīya: *कपेन्द्र* *वन्दयोऽस*, न्यासेवात्र बोधिसाध वाचलकवाचलयाः," he tells us something less than the truth. The *Mādhaviya-dhātuvāc* frequently mentions the *Nyāsakāra*.

> न्यासेवात्र: "व विभाष्यः प्रेमाद्वाय से वाचलकाः तथा हि न्यासेवात्र बोधिसाध वाचलकवाचलयाः" हि:।


> न्यासाकारसी चित्त इति गाया निरवर्जितानानुप्रतिफल नन्यामितः।


> न्यासाकारसी चित्त इति गाया निरवर्जितानानुप्रतिफल पहनानितः।


> न्यासाकारसी चित्त इति गाया निरवर्जितानानुप्रतिफल पहनानितः।

"अत एकचारि" स्वय [कायिका VI, 4, 126] हृद माननु अमृतिन्ति पुज्जायेस्वतमपन्यायमिन्ति-
"अन्तानुराधि इति न्यासकारिण्यानि।"

Mdh-dhātu, Benares Ed., p. 311.

From the last instance it is clear that the term Nyāyakāra, used by itself and without any
prefix, always denotes the Buddhist commentator of the Kādākāra.

Bhāmaha, who attacks this Buddhist commentator, must be assigned to the eighth century.
In the following verses, Bhāmaha attacks the Kāryādāra. I quote from Mr. Trivedi’s text:

भद्रकालीयां कन्यां विद्वादेशस्माद सामाधानमि:
विद्वानहन्त विद्वानहन्त विद्वानहन्त:
सामाधानमि विद्वादेशस्माद सामाधानमि:
मालीपमि विद्वादेशस्माद सामाधानमि:

Bhāmaha’s Alakāra II, 37 and 38.

Translation.

Some great authors have divided उपाख्यान into three kinds on the basis of विद्वान, विद्वान and
अविद्वानार, such as निरपेक्ष, परायण, and अविद्वानार. Our criticism is that the three kinds
may well form one group under सामाधान and that the proximity of मालीपमि and other varieties, far
from being good, is useless.

The expression अविद्वानार is very important. It is often used by Saṅkarācārya.
Anandajñāna says that it introduces a refutation of an opponent’s view set forth in the preceding
passage:

सामाधानमिकतिपिरिविकायकस्य सामाधानमेक्य भजायुयुगमन्तिरमिन्ति। अविद्वानार: व: न करमन्त्र:

Śrītrāka-Pālhaṇa

परम्परानां प्रविष्टानि नेति


The author criticized by Bhāmaha, in the verses quoted above, recognizes विद्वान, विद्वान, and
अविद्वानार, मालीपमि and other varieties of उपाख्यान so numerous that Bhāmaha is heartily sick of
them. Who is this author? We read:

पर्य जगवववां शरीर संवां तथान: रुपम
सामाधानमिक्तिन्ति विद्वानमप्यत्रूपम

Kāryādāra II, 30.

श्रवणस्थितिः परायणम: श्रवणस्थितिः
तौ तत्त्वो तत्त्कृतादिततं श्रवणस्थितिः


इद्ध्रेण विद्वानम: श्रवणस्थितिभाष्याय से मनः
स दूषी बालसत्व दूषवान्यमिक्तितवै

Idem. II, 32.

विद्वानम: श्रवणस्थितितवै मालीपमि मतः

Idem. II, 42.

In addition to these four kinds Daṅḍin enumerates twenty-nine other varieties, which, in the
opinion of Bhāmaha, are perfectly useless. As regards the first three cited above, it is suggested
that this is a distinction without a difference, as all the three can be grouped into one class under
सामाधान. The justice of Bhāmaha’s criticism will be at once admitted if we reflect that these
numerous varieties are not recognised by Sanskrit writers on Alakārā, who succeeded Bhāmaha.
Nor can it be urged against this view, that Daṅḍin copied these thirty-three varieties from some
previous author, since such a presumption is rebutted by the fact that Nṛpatungha has admitted
most of these उपाख्यान into his Kaivṛṭjacārā I, 59-85.

Having proved that Bhāmaha criticises Daqūq, I shall proceed to discuss the date of the Kṛdeḍārīa. Patañjali in his comments on Pāñcini (I, 1, 7) says: न वै निकालनेवपात्मनात्मसः।

Daqūq says that this authoritative statement of Patañjali is entirely disregarded by those who wish to find an example of उपमा in the well-known line from the Mṛchchhāvīkaṭṭhaka तत्त्वावलम् etc., merely because the word इत्ययते occurs in it, though in reality it is an illustration of उपमा properly so called

कष्टभारासि तत्त्वावलम्।

Kṛdeḍārīa II, 225

Kṣetradhāna II, 226

Idem, II, 227.

In his comments upon Pāñcini (I, 4, 49) Patañjali does not divide कष्टम् into different
deficiencies have been supplied by Bhartrihari whose classification has been adopted by the
authors of the Paḍamājāri and the Mādhavaṛṣya-dhīṭurītī. Bhartrihari says:

निर्मितिः व विकारेः व प्राचे अन्तते विपर्ययुः।

तत्त्वावलम् कष्टम् च चुणीयस्य च कर्मलम् II 45 II

अवस्थितम् देशम् च कर्मदृष्टिविद्यम्।

तत्त्वावलम् विषयम् च विषयकार्यम् II 46 II

यो हस्ताद्वित्तीयम् कष्टम् च कष्टम् III 46 II

तत्त्वावलम् कष्टम् च कष्टम्।

प्राचे विषयकार्यम् कष्टम् च कष्टम्।

तत्त्वावलम् कष्टम् च कष्टम्।


Haradatta says:

एष सङ्गमं तत्त्वावलितम् ज्ञात्वस्य-विकारेः-प्राणे निनेस्यम् कष्टम् च प्राणे निनेस्यम् कष्टम्।

Idem, p. 216.

Haradatta says:

एषां विकारम् कष्टम् च विकारम् कष्टम् प्राणेः निनेस्यम् कष्टम्।


The Mādhavaṛṣya-dhīṭurītī says:

तथ आदाय [ हृदयंनिर्मितिः कष्टम् ] कष्टम्, तत्त्वावलितम्, ज्ञात्वस्य-विकारेः

and then cites Bhartrihari’s verses.

Mādhavīdhāra, Benares Ed., p. 12.

This threefold division of हृदयं is not mentioned by Patañjali under Pāñcini (I, 4, 49).
The commentators Harārāja and Bhūtirāja assure us, by using the expressions प्राणेः निनेत्रितम्
and Prāṇaḥ that this threefold division of हृदयं was evolved out of the śūtra by the genius of
Bhartrihari himself. This view is endorsed by Kaikala in his remarks on the Śūtra कष्टम्.

We need not be surprised if Daqūq, who quotes Patañjali, and calls him Īṣṭa, shows his
familiarity with the Vidyapadīya and borrows these technical terms:

निर्मितिः व विकारेः व हृदयं तत्त्वावलम्।

प्राणेः निनेत्रितम् निनेत्रितम्।

प्राणेः निनेत्रितम्।

Kṛdeḍārīa II, 240 and 241.

Bhartrihari died in A. D. 650. It is thus evident that Daqūq flourished in the latter half
of the 7th century. And Bhāmaha, who attacks the views of Daqūq and of the Nyāsaḥ, must be
assigned to the 8th century.
AN ACCOUNT OF THE EXPEDITION TO THE TEMPLES OF SOUTHERN INDIA UNDERTAKEN BY MARTIM AFONSO DE SOUZA, THE 12TH GOVERNOR OF PORTUGUESE INDIA.

BY W. R. VADE-VALVLIKAR, BOMBAY.

Gaspar Correa, the author of the *Lendas da Índia*, in his narration of events that took place during the administration of Martim Afonso de Souza, gives an account of the expedition undertaken by him to some of the rich temples of Southern India. Among other things, the said narration contains a graphic description of one of the festivals of the Temple of Tremello, which is very amusing and reads like a romance.

Martim Afonso assumed the reins of government in May 1542. He had already made himself famous as Captain-in-chief of the sea (Capitão mar do mar) on account of his bravery and warlike qualities, before he was appointed Governor of Goa. He was a great favourite with the clergy, and the Jesuit author of the *Oriente Conquistado* showers high encomiums on him. His administration shows that he did not hesitate to perpetrate any atrocity under the pretence of religion. He was, therefore, quite an apt man to undertake a predatory expedition to the *peyodas* of the *Gentoos* of the South.

Martim Afonso had received special orders to fit out this expedition from king Dom João III, who had received reports from some of the Portuguese residents in India of the great wealth to be found in certain temples in Southern India. On assuming the reins of office, his first care was to fit out a fleet for the projected expedition, and he carried out the preparations for the same with the greatest secrecy. As soon as the fleet was ready for sail on the 27th of August 1543, he sent ahead four vessels under the command of four captains, under sealed orders, with special injunction that the said orders were not to be opened until the vessels were twenty leagues away from the bar of Goa. This proceeding excited the curiosity of some of the *ralpós* with the result that they importuned him to be admitted into the secret of the expedition. He, therefore, gave them to understand that he was going to Pega to assist the king of the place against the Bramas (Burmese) and that he was promised a great treasure for the king of Portugal in return for his services.

On the 1st September, the Governor left the city of Goa for Pega, and the next day he started with a fleet of 45 sail, 3,300 cavalry, 3,000 seamen and soldiers and a lot of musketry.

The fleet went to Cochin, where the object of the expedition, so far kept secret, leaked out. There it came to be known that the Governor was going to rob the very rich Temple of Tremello situate in the port of Paleacate (Pulicat), in the dominions of Bisnega (Vijayanagar); that further, in order not to leave anything belonging to the Portuguese exposed on the whole coast of Paleacate, the Governor had already sent orders to the inhabitants of São Thomé (near Madras), to seize to the ground the church of the apostle, to take steps to save the holy relics, and after pulling down all other habitations, to embark with their goods in the big vessels that lay there at anchor for that purpose. The object of these orders was plain enough in as much as after the committal of the contemplated robbery, retaliation was certain, in which case, nothing would escape the vengeance of the people of the land.

It will be sufficient to give an idea of the great wealth of the Temple of Tremello to state that at the time of the civil war in the kingdom of Bisnega (about 1535), the legitimate heir to the throne, on applying to the managers of the temple for help, when he desired to take...

---

1 *Oriente Conquistado a Jesus Christo, Conquista 1, distrito 1, parágrafos 28, 29, 30.*
2 *King of Portugal, 1531-1557.*
3 *Portuguese grandees.*
4 *Lendas da Índia, Vol. IV, Lenda de Martim Afonso de Souza*, chap. XXX.
5 *Ibid. ch. XXXIII.*
possession of his kingdom and expel the usurper, was assisted with gold coins laden on a hundred bullocks.\footnote{\textit{Lendas da India}, Vol. IV, \textit{Lenda de Martim Afonso de Sousa}, chap. XXI.}

The Temple of Trenelle is no doubt the same as that of Tirumala about which the \textit{Imperial Gazetteer of India} gives the following information:—\textit{"Tirupati, in the taluk of Chandragiri, in North Arcot District, Madras, is celebrated throughout Southern India for the temple on Tirumala, the holy hill, 2,500 feet high. This place, often known as Upper Tirupati, is six miles distant from Tirupathi town and situated in 13° 41' N. and 79° 21' E. The shrine is dedicated to Venkateswara, an incarnation of Vishnu, and is considered so holy that formerly no Christian or Muselman was allowed even to ascend the hill . . . . From all parts of India thousands of pilgrims annually flock to Tirupati with rich offerings to the idol. Up to 1843 the temple was under the management of Government, which derived a considerable revenue from these offerings; but now they are made over to the mahant (trustee) . . . . . During the first six years of British rule the income of the temple averaged upwards of two lakhs . . . . The hill on which the temple stands possesses a number of the usual holy bathing places, some of which are picturesquely situated."} \footnote{\textit{Imperial Gazetteer of India}, Vol. XXIII, p. 393.}

Correa says that the principal source of the immense wealth of this temple depended on the charity offered by pilgrims who flocked there by millions on festive occasions, the chief amongst which fell on the full moon day in the month of August. A fair was held every year on this occasion in front of the temple, when the kings of Bisnega, from remote times, gave free access to all kinds of merchandise without any duties whatsoever.\footnote{\textit{Lendas da India}, Vol. IV, \textit{Lenda de Martim Afonso de Sousa}, chap. XXXI.} He then describes this festival as follows:—

"I saw this festival and the fair, which is held on that day. The temple stands on a large plain (campe). The people begin coming to this place with their baggage a fortnight earlier. At this time, there will be seen three to four hundred thousand of horses. Here people of all the nations of the world are to be seen and all kinds of merchandise which can be named and all the things of the world—the whole universe—are to be found in great abundance. All the coins of the world are current at this fair.

"The plain which is full of people, covers an area of about eight leagues interspersed with a great number of small tents, where anybody can kill, with impunity, a thief caught in the very act of stealing.

"The pilgrims, before going to the temple, wash their bodies, apply sandal paste, dress themselves gaily and adorn themselves with ornaments of gold.

"The male pilgrims shave their heads clean with razors with the exception of a thin lock on the top of the head which they twist and tie beautifully. It is said that this lock is of much use to the fighting men, in so much as when they fall on the battlefield, it serves the purpose of carrying them by their heads hung by it instead of by their ears, nose or beard, which is considered a great dishonour. There is a sufficient number of barbers who sit apart under the shade of some big trees and shave each head for a single copper coin called caixa.\footnote{\textit{Caixas} is a corruption of cash or kas, 50 of which make 1 fanam or panam: 42 fanamas make 1 stg. pagoda, which was 194 carats fine and intrinsically worth 7s. 6d. These coins were formerly used in the Madras Presidency.} It is highly surprising to see the heaps of cut hair which fill the space under the trees as well as over them. This hair, however, is not allowed to run to waste. There is a dealer who buys it from the barbers for a thousand
pardoas10 or more; he gets them twisted and made into thick or thin cords, puffs for women and many other things, out of which he makes a lot of money by selling them at the same fair.

"On the eve as well as on the day of the festival and throughout the night, the pilgrims, according to their means, present offerings to the deity, always accompanied with some coins. The rich sometimes offer from one to five thousand pardoas; the quantity of gold coins thus offered and lying before the temple is so great that it equals a heap of about 215 bushels (ten moises)11 of wheat.

"Near the temple there are four big wells full of water. Besides these, some of the merchants open wells for their private use. There are other wells opened by poor men to sell water. Rich men open wells out of charity and count it a meritorious act just as we do with our alms, and in this way, there is to be found an ample supply of water. Estables of all kinds in the world are to be had here in plenty and dishes of every sort that one can desire are to be found here. She-goats, sheep, lambs, kids and more than a million of recos12 are sacrificed in front of the temple and after their blood is offered to the deity, the carcasses are given away in charity to the poor who sell them to butchers; thus there is a great abundance of meats of all kinds to be had at this fair.

"The king of Bissnega comes to this festival accompanied by about 10,000 cavalry, 200,000 infantry, and a hundred to two hundred ladies attached to his person. The latter are conveyed in locked palanquins elegantly gilt inside and fitted with a very fine silver net through which they unseen could see all that passed. The vehicles are so constructed that the ladies can sit, sleep and perform their functions (podem fazer seus feitos) in them. A narration of their customs, the opulence of their ornaments, food and lodging would be an endless story, almost incredible. The king, while travelling, halts at several places and at each of them he is received and lodged with all his retinue and the great lords who accompany him, in a house specially built for the occasion by the principal man of the place, even if the king were to pass there a single day or night. The house consists of walls of clay covered with tiles; its inner roof is artistically overlaid and the whole thing is painted and finished with great perfection; it is provided with tanks and gardens full of aromatic herbs. It is so beautiful and comfortable that even the great king of Spain would be much pleased to stay there for a long time. The king with all his retinue is served there with daintiest dishes and there is so much abundance and plenty, that the host who entertains the king a single night spends more than 50,000 pardoas. The house is pulled down as soon as the king goes away; for nobody can live in the house where the king has once lodged. In this way, new houses are built every year for the reception of the king; this gives rise to competition and rivalry among the hosts of several places, every one amongst whom tries his utmost to surpass the rest in point of perfection and abundance; for the host who gives the best reception is highly praised and honoured by the king. On the other hand, the host who, in spite of his opulence, is careless in according to the king a reception befitting his dignity and pomp, is ordered to be tied to four stakes and whipped barebodied, with his belly towards the ground!"13

10 "And if any one does not know what a pardoas is, let him know that it is a round gold coin, which coin is not struck anywhere in India except in this kingdom (Vijaya-Nagar); it bears impressed on it on one side two images and on the other the name of the king who commanded it to be struck; those which this king (Krishna Deva) ordered to be struck have only one image. This coin is current all over India. Each pardoa, as already said, is worth three hundred and sixty reis." (A Forgotten Empire, Narrative of Domingo Paez, p. 282.) The Pardoa was worth about 1s. 6d.

11 The moise is a measure of capacity used in Portugal for corn, barley, etc. It contains sixty alqueires. One alqueire holds 1 peck, 3 quarts and 1 pint. 12 Beasts of pasture such as sheep, oxen, etc.

13 Lendas da India, Vol. IV, Lenda de Martin Afonso de Sousa, chap. XXXII.
At Cochin the Governor resolved to go to the port of Palecatoe and thence to proceed to the Temple of Tremelle with 400 cavalry, 2,000 musqueteers and 2,000 slaves; the latter were intended to get together the riches of the temple and carry the same every one of them a sack on his back. Accordingly, he steered towards Cape Comorin, doubled the same and went along the coast up to Beadala (Vadanlay), where he took some native pilots on board and reached the island of Vagas. There he remained for some days awaiting the arrival of a catur which he had sent to Palecatoe to get some information about that port. The catur brought news that there was not sufficient water in the river of Palecatoe and that only a small ship could enter it with spring tide. Furthermore, the Governor came to know that the news of his expedition had already reached the Court of Binsega, who were well prepared to defend the temple at all risks, and that even in spite of this, if he were to go there with two to three thousand well armed men and ten thousand musqueteers, not one of them would escape the people of that place who, for their multitude, could, with handfuls of earth bury alive any number of Portuguese troops. The prospect of a big haul was thus frustrated, and one of the holiest and the richest shrines of Southern India was saved from the iniquitous designs of Martim Afonso de Souza.

The Governor then retreated to Quilon. In the neighbourhood of this place, at a distance of about a league, in the interior, there was a rich temple, the riches whereof consisted chiefly in precious stones. The king Dom João III, having learned of this fact from his captains at Quilon, had instructed the Governor to sack the temple. The time seemed very favourable to the plunderer, as one of the jangadas of the temple had gone with a force of 10,000 men to Cape Comorin to assist the king of the place against the much suspected Portuguese invasion.

The Governor accompanied by his men crossed the river that lay between Quilon and the temple and went along a narrow way that led through woods and palm groves. The natives of the place knowing his object, offered him 50,000 pairados and requested him to withdraw; but he refused their offer and proceeded on his way and having missed it at some point, reached the temple late in the evening.

Near the temple, there were some huts thatched with grass. Here was a great deal of merchandise of all sorts, especially white linen manufactured at Cape Comorin.

A high enclosure of stone wall surrounded the temple, within which the Governor rallied all his troops and gave them strict orders not to step out of it. The natives, armed with bows and arrows and some muskets, gathered fast outside the wall, but they could not resist the plunderers who far outnumbered them. The Governor entered the temple with some men of his choice and having fastened the door behind him, learnt from the black men of the temple where the treasure lay; he then ordered his slaves to dig the particular spot and after some big stones were removed, he dismissed them; next, he gathered all that was found in the hole and put it into two big barrels and wrapped them up with cloth. By a stratagem the barrels were made to drip to make the people believe that they contained nothing but water; but the people knew full well that the contents were such as could not be damaged in spite of their being in water.

The next morning, the Governor ordered the place to be set on fire. He did not suffer his men to rob anything; for he did not want them to be overloaded with heavy burdens that would prevent

---

14 A port of the ancient kingdom of Vijayanagar, on the Ramnad coast, Madura district.
15 Near Cape Comorin.
16 A small ship of war with oars.
17 Lendas da India, Vol. IV, Lenda de Martim Afonso de Souza, chap. XLIII.
18 The kings and the chiefs of the land appoint, according to their usage, two respectable gentlemen as captains to guard their temples. They are called jangadas. They have many men under them and perform the duty of counsellors and administrators of the temples. They get their living out of the revenue of the temples and are discharged by the king at his will and replaced by others. (Lendas de Martim Afonso de Souza, chap. XLIV).
19 Lendas da India, Vol. IV, Lenda de Martim Afonso de Souza, chap. XLIV.
them from marching quickly; some of his men wanted to take away the copper tiles with which the roof of the temple was covered; but they were not allowed even to touch them.

The Governor then ordered the troops to return by the same way they had come. He caused the two barrels to be hung on poles and carried alternately by eight slaves under the strict vigilance of Gracian de Sá.

Just at the time when the troops began to move, a rich Nair (the composer of the fangade who had gone to assist the king of Cape Comorin), wearing gold bracelets and earrings and armed with sword and target, made his appearance on the spot accompanied by about a dozen Nairs finely dressed and well armed. Unmindful of their small number, they all made a daring attack on the Portuguese and died a heroic death without retreating even an inch. In spite of this misfortune, the native archers pursued the Portuguese on their way through the woods and harassed them to the utmost. At last, in the afternoon when they reached some open fields free from any woods, the archers left them. Then the Governor and his troops took rest near a fountain of excellent water and had some refreshment.

At about three o'clock in the afternoon, the Governor marched again with his troops quite in a different direction and went to another big temple which was also covered with copper tiles. He found in it a big stump of wood which was said to contain plenty of money. The Governor ordered it to be rooted up and loading it on the shoulders of some black men, carried it to the bank of the river, whence they passed to an island. There, in the presence of all his men, he broke it open, and found in it a number of silver coins of little value, which he threw among the troops who scrambled for them. 20

The Governor then publicly expressed his regret at undertaking this expedition which, as he said, put him to much expense and gave much trouble to his troops and brought no gain in return except a gold vessel worth about two thousand pards. He added that the king his master was greatly deceived by the men in India in making him believe that great wealth would be found in that temple. His men, however, did not believe his tale, which they thought to be a gross lie invented to avoid making payments to them. They, therefore, bore a grudge against him and cursed him bitterly.

The Governor fell ill at this island and was bled three times. When he got better he went to Quilon and thence to Cochin with his whole fleet. From Cochin he proceeded to Goa.

CONTRIBUTIONS TO PANJABI LEXICOGRAPHY.

SERIES III.

BY H. A. ROSE, I.C.S.

(Continued from p. 213.)

Sūkhlāt: viscous extract of the bark of a hill-tree, generally the pūla, bahāl or ṣhālu used to bring the scum to the top of boiling sugar-juice. Jullundur S. R., p. 120.


Sūlar: leather-trousers, commonly worn by Bajpāṭs, etc.; also called chamān. Kangra Gloss.

Sūltān: a well that reaches the real spring water. Khānūl S. R., 1872-80, p. 159.

Sūrī: snuff; a class of men, generally holy faqīrs, who are believed to be able to smell sweet water below ground. Siras S. R., 1879-83, p. 175.


Sunjī, ki-rōti: supper; see under datīlā.


20 Lentus da India, Vol. IV, Lenda de Martim Afonso de Sousa, chap. XLIV.
Sunnah: to hear, to listen.
Surta: a variety of sugar-cane, having a long, soft, thick, white cane; the best of all, but somewhat delicate, and especially fancied by jackals. Cf. sotha. Karnal S. R., 1872-80, p. 190.
Sus: a hare. See danti.
Susar: the wife’s father’s family. Cf. susral.
Silawar: trousers = suthna: Sirmur cis-Girl.
Swant: wife = vati — used by Rajputs: see lati.
Syana: literally ‘knowing ones; a class of men who exercise the gift of divination under the inspiration of some deity or other, generally a snake-god or Saiyad. Karnal S. R., 1872-8, p. 145.
Tahav: branch of a tree.
Takka: a unit of assessment, payment being made partly in cash and partly in kind.
Kutha? (Simla Hills.)
Tal: a tarn or lake; dal is commoner. Kangra Gloss.
Tali: upper storey; but in trans-Girl it means the house of an ordinary man, i.e., ghar.
Talna: to pick out, as weeds, etc. Kangra Gloss.
Tamsal: an open yard in a house. Karnal S. R., 1872-80, p. 120.
Tambia: a cooking pot, of another kind. Sirmur trans-Girl.
Tandan: ice or icicle. (Gadi).

(To be continued.)
ON BUDDHAMITRA, THE TEACHER OF VASUBANDHU.

Dr. Takakusu says that Vindhyavasī was successful in a dispute with Buddhāmitra, the teacher of Vasubandhu. Vindhyavasī lived in the middle of the tenth century after the Buddha's Nirvāṇa or about A.D. 450. In A.D. 448-49, corresponding to the Gupta year 129, during the reign of Kumāragupta a Bhikshu Buddhāmitra installed an image of Buddha at Mankuwar, and in the inscription on the pedestal of the image tells us that "Buddha was not refuted in respect of his opinions." This shows that this Buddhist Bhikshu was so famous for his learning that no contemporary Brahman scholar, however eminent, could venture to attack Buddhism. I therefore conclude that this Bhikshu Buddhāmitra of the Mankuwar inscription was identical with the Buddhāmitra who was the teacher of Vasubandhu, the latter being contemporary with Kumāragupta, as I have already shown.

Another inference which I draw from the expression avam-dvirduddhasya applied to Buddha in this inscription is that the religious controversy, in which Buddhāmitra was so signally defeated by Vindhyavasī that the reigning sovereign Vikramāditya transferred his patronage from Buddhism to Brahminism, could not have taken place in the reign of Chandragupta-Vikramāditya; as in that case the statement that Buddha was not refuted in respect of his opinions, would never have been accepted as true by the people in the time of Kumāragupta. We are, therefore, justified in concluding that this religious controversy took place in the time of Skandagupta-Vikramāditya and that Vasubandhu's patrons mentioned by Paramārtha were Skandagupta-Vikramāditya and Narasimhagupta-Bāñāditya.

As regards the son of Chandragupta II, whose patronage Vasubandhu enjoyed according to the interesting half-verse which Vāmaṇa has preserved for us, I have already identified this prince with Kumāragupta. It is thus clear that Buddhāmitra and his famous pupil Vasubandhu were both living in the reigns of Kumāragupta and Skandagupta; while Vasubandhu was contemporary with Kumāragupta, Skandagupta and Bāñāditya, and died at the age of 30, shortly after the accession of the last named prince. The date of Bāñāditya's accession is as yet far from being settled. We are, therefore, not able to say how old Vasubandhu was in A.D. 414, the year in which Kumāragupta ascended the throne. Vasubandhu's literary career, nevertheless, nearly coincides with the first three quarters of the fifth century; while Dignāga, to whom I-asīg refers as being later than Vasubandhu, must be placed in the last quarter of the fifth and the first quarter of the sixth century (A.D. 475-525). Texts of Dignāga's works on logic were in existence in the year A.D. 539, the date of the Chinese mission, and were carried by Paramārtha to China in the year 546, and there translated into Chinese.

K. B. Pathak.

---

BOOK-NOTICE.

Kadambari, by P. V. Karm, M.A., LL.B., Pioadav, High Court, Bombay, Price, Rs.3. Sold by the Oriental Publishing Company, Girgaon, Bombay. This is a students' edition and the editor has spared no pains to make it useful to the students.

The introduction is scholarly and the notes are erudite. It were far better, however, if the notes could have been reduced to one-third its present size.

Pp. xv-xvi. Ādhyātā is referred to as a poet. See, however, Pischel's article on Ādhyātā in the Gottinger Nachrichten, 1901 (subsequently translated into English and published in the Colloquium, 1111-1112).

Notes, p. 32. सौमस्यन्त्रि has been explained सौमस्य मेंन: नेन: एकरिक:; This is how Mallinātha explained the word in the Meghadūta (L. 37). It is covered by Pānini, IV. 3. 112. The second explanation सौमस्य मेंन: नेन: एकरिक: is supported by Bhānuji in his commentary on the Amarakośa. The first explanation, however, seems to be more authoritative. For सौमस्यन्त्रि seems to have been an adjective originally. Compare such phrases as "सौमस्य सौमस्यन्त्रि बधि" and "विद्युत् सौमस्यन्त्रि बधि" in the Bhāgasutra (I. 6. 27; VIII. 8. 8; X. 49. 37). "विद्युत् सौमस्यन्त्रि बधि" occurs thrice in the Rāmāyaṇa and twice in the Mahābhārata. As it was fashionable once to say "red gold" and "baron bold" in English, so it seems to have been fashionable to say विद्युत् सौमस्यन्त्रि or सौमस्यन्त्रि in Sanskrit. The explanation is furnished by Srdhara as follows: सौमस्य मेंन: कादित्व स्वरामिककारे; यो विद्युत् अत्यद्वितीया यो यथा तथातः...

Vanamali Chakravartti,
Principal, Srinagar.
ON THE SESHAS OF BENARES.

BY S. P. V. RANGANATHSAVAMI ABHYAVARAGURU OF VIZAGAPATAM.

I.

Whoever wishes to master the Sanskrit language, must completely understand the grammar of it, for in a language like Sanskrit, in which a great many words in common use have peculiarities of their own, ready-made grammatical forms can carry the student but a little way. Moreover, a scientific study of the grammar of a dead language, which is not learned for use in practical life, is certainly to be preferred to a mere empiric study. Accordingly, the grammarians never resorted to a mere unscientific teaching of the forms as such and mixing them up unconnectedly into a list, for it is said in the Mahābhārata:

एव एव युक्ते सूक्तमस्तिक्षाय निन्य वर्षसंख्यः प्रतिसरणानां शास्त्राणां शास्त्रप्रवर्तनानां प्रोक्ताय नातं ज्ञातं।

[For it is thus heard—Bṛhaspati to Indra expounded, for a thousand years of the gods, the vocabulary of words, uttered word by word, and he did not reach the end. And Bṛhaspati was the expounder, and Indra, the learner, and the time of study, a thousand years of the gods,—and he did not reach the end!—how much less in these days. He who is very long-lived lives but a hundred years . . . therefore in the setting forth of words the recitation of them word by word is inexpedient. How, then, are these words to be set forth? Some criterion, embracing homogeneousness and peculiarities, must be employed whereby with little effort, they (the learners) may learn quantities of words.—J. R. Ballantyne.]

And so they adopted to the method of Rule and Exception. Among the earliest attempts to formulate such rules may be cited the work of Pāṇini, who is also the greatest of grammarians, as his work includes all the forms, both of the classical and Vedic literatures. Varāṇaṇī, while criticizing, enriched it with his ārtikās. Patañjali again wrote a critical commentary on him, and Bhartṛhari wrote a commentary on the Mahābhārata of Patañjali. Kaiyaṭa, in his Bhāṣya-pradīpa, refers to this commentary:

महाभारतम्: कार्यं ग्रन्थालम्:।

वाजनान्तपदर्वं प्रावमिति रिनुनामान्तः।

तथापि हरिन्द्रेन सारण प्रकाशेन।

कपालम्:। कर्म: पारं तत्वेऽपि सारोदितः प्रकटवः।

But Bhartṛhari seems to have commented on the first three pādas only; for, in his Gāṇarāmniśa-mahaladā, Vardhamana, referring to Bhartṛhari as a grammarians, says:

अनूपाक्षिन्धानुचारीया यथावतः वाक्यप्रकटयाति कर्तर्न।

It is owing to this commentary on the Mahābhārata that Bhartṛhari is called Tīkākara. But Ramabhadrakrishna (17th century) of Tanjore, says: दृष्टोज्ज न तस्य नन्दत: दृष्टो न प्रवाही: १, giving, as his reason, Bhartṛhari’s self-conceit.

1. We learn from Vākṣya-pradīpa, that Vyāk wrote a voluminous commentary on Pāṇini, called Saṅgraha, extending over two lakhs of lines, of which Mahābhārata is an abridgment. Cf. Vākṣya-pradīpa, p. 283 f. (Benares Sanskrit series).

2. Patanjali-charita, canto viii, stanza 14 and 15. A fragment of Bhartṛhari’s commentary on Mahābhārata is found in the Royal Library at Berlin (vide Weber’s Catalogue 720; Cambre’s 553).
Another set of commentaries arose on the same aphorisms of Pāṇini, in Kāśīkā and its commentaries, of Padañjari of Haradatta and Vrītīnāsya or Kāśīkā-vāraṇa-paṇīkā of Jīnendrabuddhi. As with the previous set, commentaries again arose on these commentaries; e.g., Anuñāsa or Tantrapratiṣṭha by Maitreya-rakshita. This work has been wrongly identified by some with Dhūtupratiṣṭha by the same author, owing to a mistake in the following verse which occurs at the end of the latter work:

शृणुएयां अभिविद्यकान्ततां मन्थतत्तताम।
वाक्यां नस्तप्रणीती अविच्चलेन भाष्यः।

Here is a mistake for सन्नश्नीय तत्ताम. The verse reads correctly in the copy of Dhūtupratiṣṭha belonging to the library of the Asiatic Society of Bengal (No. 3718). Tantrapratiṣṭha is therefore a different work and is noticed by Rajendralal Mitra, in his Notices of Sanskrit Manuscripts, No. 2076. It is really unfortunate that so valuable a work is not found in any of the public libraries of India or Europe. In these two sets of commentaries there are slight differences of opinion.

Any one, wishing to master the grammar of the language should study completely either of these two sets of works dealing with the Bhāskaravya and Vṛṣṭimata respectively and spend much time in doing so. In fact, it is said that the complete study of the grammar of the Sanskrit language requires a dozen years. Hence arose an impulse to simplify matters and make the people comprehend the grammar of the language in a shorter period. We hear of such an impulse as early as the Kapālāṇavaṇa:

प्रवेण्यभवन कवियस्य वुद्धवान।
भविष्यति पोतिस्वयंतन्वने कवियस्य वुद्धवान || 142 ||

This impulse was met in two ways. Some of the scholars began to prepare new books, which were very concise, and they composed new aphorisms and glosses thereon. Thus arose new schools of grammar, comprising Kātantra, Mūgākha and others. Others, on the other hand, did not like to compose new aphorisms, but retained those of Pāṇini alone, and proceeded in another direction. They classified and rearranged the aphorisms of Pāṇini in the order of their precedence of application with regard to the different sections of grammar. Then they were commented upon and linked together a chain of rules to be applied to the formation of particular words. Thus a number of aphorisms became associated with a particular word and with each other, and enabled the reader to memorise them easily. In this way a new school of grammar arose, including Rāpādatāra, Prakriyādakṣumādi, Siddhāntakaumudi, etc. Among the greatest of the scholars who worked in this direction was Sehaṇa Kṛishṇa, who composed a commentary, Prakriyāprakāśa, on the Prakriyādakṣumādi. Sehaṇa is the family name, and Kṛishṇa the author's own name.

It is of this family of Seshas, whose members are scholars for six or even seven generations that we shall speak in the following pages. The family has a peculiar claim on our attention. Every student of Vydkarana-dstra, nowadays, is ultimately a śhīya of this family, for he will read the Siddhántakumud by Bhaṭṭoji Dikshita, who was a pupil of Vireśvara, son of Kṛṣṇa, mentioned above. He will also read the Subdentusinhara, etc., of Nāgoji Bhaṭṭa, pupil again of the grandson of Bhaṭṭoji Dikshita. We may, therefore, look upon the Sessa family as the ultimate source of the present school of Vydkarana-dstra.

II.

The Seshas were Dākhīṇāyya Brāhmaṇas, and belonged to the Advaita sect. They were at first the inhabitants of the banks of the Godāvarī, but seem to have subsequently changed their residence, and, ever since, to have lived at Benares. They formed a very respectable family, and were called Bhaṭṭa-bhaṭṭābhūtas. Descendants of the family are seen even at the present time at Benares, and are very much respected, though they are not equal to their ancestors in scholarship. In every meeting or sabhā which they attend, they are offered two sambhāranda while others receive only one—a mark of great respect and esteem. They are even now called Bhaṭṭa-bhaṭṭas. The exact time of their removal to Benares is uncertain. In a drama entitled Mudrāvimāṇakā by Kṛṣṇa, it is said that the author is composing it at Benares while his father lived near the Godāvarī.

But Narasimha says in his Govindādvara that he is composing it at the orders of king Govinda-dvānta of Tāṅkava. We may, therefore, conclude that Narasimha was first living near the Godāvarī, and subsequently removed to Benares. The Seshas might have removed to Benares in the first half of the 16th century, since Narasimha belongs to that period, and they have remained permanently there ever since. Probably it is from their residence at Benares that there arose a school of grammar called the Benares School of Sanskrit Grammar.

III.

The genealogical table given at the end requires a few words of explanation. It is based upon facts contained in the works of the members of the family itself. I had traced the line as far back as Rāmacandra, when from a work entitled Govindādvara by Narasimha, I gathered another name, Vīśṇu, who was not the immediate predecessor of Rāmacandra, but was some generations removed from him. This Vīśṇu must have been a very distinguished

The following table will make the statement clearer:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Vīśṇu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Annam Bhaṭṭa</td>
<td>(2) Bhaṭṭoji Dikshita (son)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3) Panditarāja Jagannadha (pupil)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Vīśṇu Dikshita</td>
<td>(2) Bhānuji Dikshita (Rāmādrama) (sons)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hari Dikshita (son)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nāgoji Bhaṭṭa (pupil)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
personage, as he had attained proficiency in and wrote treatises on all the Sūtras. The most important of his works is an elaborate commentary on the Mahābhāṣya:

Vishṇu seems to have been a specialist in the science of Vyākaranasa. This verse is quoted by Seshā Govinda in his commentary on Sarvasiddhānta-saṅgraha. At the same place it is said that some attribute the verse to Krishṇa, reading श्रेयसवर्ण य VEDA in the place of श्रेयसवर्ण.

Vishṇu, therefore, is the first member of the Seshā family as yet known. He was a great scholar and author, and we do not meet with any other member of it until we descend to Narasimha. This Narasimha was a great scholar, and composed the Govindārṇava, as has been said above. He it was who gained for the family the title of Bāṭṭa-bhattacharaka even before he removed to Benares. It was conferred upon him by the pāndita of the court of the king of Vidyanagara (now identified with Bijapur).

This Govindārṇava was a dharmaśāstra work. The author says it was composed at the request of Govindachandra, of the Srivastava family, king of Tāṇḍava, opposite to modern Benares.

There is, however, a difficulty as to the authorship of the Govindārṇava. In the introductory verse, it is stated that Narasimha was the author. But Krishṇa, in his Sādādharmarāmaṇi, claims Govindārṇava as his own larger work on law: where, however, the word śāstra is used.

Mr. S. K. Belwalkar, late Assistant Professor of the Deccan College, Poona, says that "if the statement in Sādādharmarāmaṇi is of any value, it can only mean (a) that Seshā Krishṇa, perhaps at the request of his father, completed the work left incomplete by Narasimha, whatever be the cause that prevented him from completing it himself, (b) Seshā Krishṇa may have written a running commentary on the work." In the Govindārṇava, Narasimha's father is said to be a Rāmachandra, and beyond this the work states nothing about him. We cannot therefore say how Rāmachandra was related to Vishṇu. He is spoken of as a great scholar in the following verses from Govindārṇava:

तदाद्वालोकतमकलास्यमयिकोऽहुः
भीताचार्यविद्वात् परमसंहितां चलाप्रभेदः
वेदविद्वासी विद्वानिजयवर्गीयोऽहुः
तददा धार्यश्रावस्यौरिण्यविद्वानिजयोऽहुः

वेदविद्वासी विद्वानिजयवर्गीयोऽहुः
We have in the Bodleian Library a commentary on \textit{Naishadha} by one Sessa Ramachandra and a commentary on the 14th canto only of the same work in the Deccan College Library, Poona. But it is said that this Ramachandra was the pupil of Sessa Narayana. If this were correct, this Ramachandra must be a different personage from our Ramachandra, and I am unable to trace his connection with the Sessa line given at the beginning.

Narashina had two sons, Krishna and Chintaman. Krishna too was a great scholar—in fact the greatest scholar of the family. He composed a large number of works. Ten of them with short notes on some, are given below:

(1) उपप्रकरणसिद्धांतवाचस्यान्तम्
(2) कोरश्रूम (Printed in the \textit{Kalyanśa}, No. 6.)
(3) परमचित्रक—On the authority of H. T. Colebrooks, it is said, in the catalogue of the India Office Library, that this is a Sanskrit grammar—"chiefly based on the \textit{Sārasvatapraκriyā}.", But the extract from the work given at the same place clearly shows that it is based on Pāṇini only. Moreover, the phrases \textit{या\textunderscore{त}नायिनीविचारं} and \textit{सुवाचासनीयं} on folios 29 and 83 respectively of the M.S., and the rejection of some forms as \textit{अवस्योग} because they are in contradiction to the \textit{Bhāṣa}, support the above statement that it is based on Pāṇini.
(4) पारमाणवपद्यपरमपरमपुण्यम् (Printed in the \textit{Kalyanśa}, No. 14).
(5) परमचित्रक—A commentary on \textit{Prakṛtya\textunderscore{ka}numudī}.
(6) प्रकृतिचित्रक—This is a grammar of the Jaina Prakrit dialects in metre. The dialect Prakṛta, the first of the six dialects, is termed Ārsha in this work, and it does not treat of Apabhṛṣṭha as it is an unimportant dialect:

\begin{quote}
तत्त्वं नागाम् श्रीमानी पैगम्बरी तथा.
शृङ्खलकौशिकानी वाचंपरम्परयो व परम्परम्
\end{quote}

and at the end of the work we have अवस्योग यो भो बेहः पढः सोजः न लेख्ये।
(7) सूत्रिकविवरणाकरणम्.
(8) बहुपूर्वानिचित्रणम्—This is a commentary on the \textit{Prakṛtya\textunderscore{ka}numudī}, as is evident from the following \textit{pratibhā}—द्वे तत्त्व अधि—अधि, प्रस्तुत, सत्य, \textit{वाच्य}स्यां एवम्—कारकाितिः There is not much difference between this work and the portion of \textit{Prakṛtya\textunderscore{ka}numudī} by the same, treating of the same subject. Only the latter is more concise. The author here and there criticises \textit{Prakṛti\textunderscore{ka}numudī}, the commentary on \textit{Prakṛtya\textunderscore{ka}numudī}.
(9) शृङ्खलाकौशिकाकरणम्—An extensive work on grammar of which \textit{Prakṛtya\textunderscore{ka}numudī} is an abridgment, as is evident from the following verse of the latter work:

\begin{quote}
ध्वनि ध्वनिभिर्बलसू\textunderscore{त}नीयम् शृङ्खलकौशिकाकरणम् न स्थितं निविष्टं
उद्वृत्ता सारसप्रकृतिकौशिकाकरणम् न स्वतं निविष्टं न्यायानुसारं निविष्टं.
\end{quote}
(10) शृङ्खलकौशिकाकरणम्—The authorship of this work is still open to question.
(11) स्वतांत्रतम्—It treats of the philosophy of grammar in 22 verses with the author's gloss thereon.

\begin{quote}
शृङ्खलकौशिकाकरणस्वतांत्रतम्। तत्त्वं नागाम् पैगम्बरी। तत्त्वं नागाम् पैगम्बरी। तत्त्वं नागाम् पैगम्बरी।
\end{quote}

\footnote{\textit{Vide Catalogus Catalogorum}, Vol. I, page 306 \textdegree. The name of the commentary is given as Bhāṣāyogotāma.}
The work ends as follows:

The various authors to whom he refers in his gloss show his extensive reading in Sanskrit literature. The author quotes शाराकुलोऽनेष्ठ चक्कारायेः under verse 4; हिन्दुङ्गकाव्य धावसारितिभाषा; महाधार्य: under verse 6; मीमांसायचितिकारायेः; न्यायविद्याकारायेः under stanza 7; प्रभाकारम, under stanza 8; भूताणिः under verse 13; अलंकारकृ णिकारायेः; न्यायसूच द्वितीय: under verse 14; न्यायसूचकाकर: न्यायभाषिकर: लघविश्वि; दिक्षितविद्वाचिन: यतःचितिकारायेः; भार्य: under stanza 19.

Some more works, such as उपालिनः सरद्याभाषिकारार्थ: and सदारामिनास have been given in the Catalogus Catalogorum as having been composed by Seshu Kriṣṇa on the authority of Dr. Oppert, but one cannot be sure about these works till one sees them or gets extracts therefrom.

Kriṣṇa had a pupil named Jayantabhaṭṭa, son of Madhusūdana, a native of Prakṣápura on the river Tapti. He composed only one work, from which I quote the following few verses, relating to his history:

Jayantabhaṭṭa's Tatottachanda, from which the above verses are taken, is a commentary on the Prakṛtya-kauṇḍinya. It is an abridgment of Prakṛtya-kauṇḍinya-sthit called Prakṛtya-prakṛtya by Seshu Kriṣṇa, his guru.

Kriṣṇa had a brother, Chintāmaṇi. But it is curious that they never mention each other in their works, though if Chintāmaṇi were the elder, there is some justification for their not mentioning each other. We cannot on that score definitely say which was the elder. Chintāmaṇi does not seem to be as great a scholar as his brother. Had it not been for Chintāmaṇi's own work, it would have been impossible to know that Narasimha had two sons. Chintāmaṇi was the author of Rasānāṣa-paraścita and many other works mentioned in the Catalogus Catalogorum.

Kriṣṇa again had two sons—Vṛśāvara and Narāyaṇa. These two members of the family were also persons of extraordinary talents. Narāyaṇa wrote a commentary on the Mahābādhāsya called Sūkti rataṇākara. This is a very rare work. Even where copies of it are found, it is incomplete in the beginning. The only known copy that has the beginning is in my Arāha Library and so I give an extract from the work at the end of this paper.

Of the two brothers, Vṛśāvara was the elder. He does not seem to have composed any works. Probably all his time had been spent in giving instruction to his pupils 'Perubhaṭṭa' and Peru-
bhaṭṭa's sons Paṇḍitarāja Jagannātha, Bhaṭṭoṭi Dikshita and Annambaṭṭa who make up for the deficiency of their trairher in literary composition. But some are of opinion that Paṇḍitarāja Jagannātha says that Bhaṭṭoṭi Dikshita was a pupil of Krīṣṇa. He does not, however, clearly say so. His words are: सिद्धतात्त्विक न्यायविवेकितः पूर्वक्रिया: परस्परवासरस्वतिशतनुभावः।| Here the word पूर्वक्रिया betrays the truth. It is usual to call a pupil his guru's padubā, and since Viśeṣvara was also his father's pupil, Paṇḍitarāja Jagannātha used the term for Krīṣṇa's son, Viśeṣvara. Moreover, the present writer is of opinion that the fact of Bhaṭṭoṭi Dikshita's naming his son Viśeṣvara (evidently after his teacher) goes strongly in support of his view.

Viśeṣvara's name is given as Viśeṣvara in South Indian manuscripts, but it can be easily asserted that Viśeṣvara is the correct name for the following reasons. Paṇḍitarāja Jagannātha, who was his pupil, says in his Manorāṇa-kūṭa-mārdana अल्पकृतिवर्णार्थान्ति तत्त्वे. Further it has already been pointed out that Bhaṭṭoṭi Dikshita, to show his gratitude to his guru, named his son after him, and we know full well that Bhaṭṭoṭi Dikshita's son's name was Viśeṣvara Dikshita only. He seems to have been called Viśeṣvara in Southern India by mistake. On this point Mr. S. K. Belwallar, who has kindly supplied me with information on certain points, and to whom, therefore, my thanks are due, concurs with me, and says "Viśeṣvara, to my mind, appears an emendation for which some scribal error is alone responsible."

It seems that Viśeṣvara alone of the two brothers had sons. They are Purushottama and Chakrapāṇi. Purushottama does not appear to be an author. At least, I have not met with any one of his works. His brother Chakrapāṇi wrote a work Paramata-khaṇḍa in answer to Bhaṭṭoṭi Dikshita's Manorāṇa, in which he also criticized the latter work. He wrote another work called Kṛdak-lattra. Chakrapāṇi refers in many places to "my Prakṛti-prāti." But that work is not now forthcoming.

Chakrapāṇi had a son Gopinātha, who had a son named Rāma. This last was the author of Dharmānovandhiśālokanyādhyāna, in which he says:

अष्टकृत्यमणितमप्रतिनिधित्वाय वर्षावर्षमं यो वाक्प्रत्यक्षमयुः

गौतिकान्तमुरुः च कृत्य चाचार्यानित्यमिनांस्तं

कृते राजा वाक्प्रत्यक्षमयुः तस्मिन यौनिशालयार्थम्।

IV.

Now, as regards the time when they flourished, we have not sufficient evidence, and it is really unfortunate that whenever we wish to deal with the dates of the poets of our land we have to confess the want of external evidence. In such cases, we have to rely entirely on internal evidence and probability. Narasimha in his Gosāṅglāṅgana says that he composed that work at the orders of Govindachandra, king of Tāḍāva.

तं स्वयंगौतिकान्तमुरुगौतिकान्तमुरुः स्वायं

गौतिकान्तमुरु गौतिकान्तमुरु गौतिकान्तमुरु ॥

* In his commentary on Amaraśīla, Bhānuji Dikshita says that he wrote a work called Māmārāṃsāppadāna and defended his father against Chakrapāṇi.
And Krishna says in his Padma-kanda that he is composing it at the orders of king Narottama (brother of Govinda-chandra):

So it appears that they were the preëges of the kings of Tāpāja at that time. But unfortunately we cannot identify the town at present, nor can we give the dates of the kings. We, therefore, have recourse to another method of determining their date. Krishna was a contemporary of Giridhara, son of Rājā Todarmal, the financial minister of Akbar the Great. Rājā Todarmal died in 1586. So his son must have lived in the last quarter of the 16th and the first quarter of the 17th century. Krishna thus flourished at the beginning of the 17th century.

In his Prakriyā-prakāsha, Krishna gives the genealogy of the kings of Antvaras (the portion of the land lying between the two rivers, the Jāns and the Ganges) for five generations, the last being Kalyana. At the orders of the last mentioned, the author says, he composed this work. The capital of Antvaras is given as Patrābhunjī. Again Krishna, in his Sūdāchātra-romana, says that he composed this work at the request of Pīlā. Nātyaṇa tells us that he composed his commentary on the Mahabharata at the request of Phirinda (see the extract given below). The Sesa family, therefore, seems to have been introduced by different peoples at different times. But we are strangely ignorant as to the dates of any one of these patrons. Further research may throw greater light upon the Sesa family.

V.

While hunting for information about this family, I came across the following works by persons bearing the surname Sesa. But I have not been able to trace any connection between these authors and the renowned family treated of in the above pages. All these works are commentaries on the originals of other authors. They are:

1. A commentary on Gita-Govinda by Sesha Kamaśākara, son of Menganātha.
2. —— by Sesha Ratnākara.
3. A commentary on Padma-kanda (called Saptapadārthī) by Sesha Ananta.
4. A commentary on Nyāya-siddha-dīna-prabhā by the same.
5. A commentary on Amara-intika by Sesha Ramakrishna.
6. A commentary on Śrava-siddha-dīna-saṅgraha by Sesha Govinda.
7. Jyotishādīka by the same.
8. Agnishtoma-prayoga by the same.
9. Commentary on Saptapadārthī (called Padda-kanda) by Sesha Śrīngadha.
10. Commentary on Lakṣaṇa-vadi (called Nyāya-mukhdvali) by the same.
15. Commentary on Vīda-pajgotika by Sesha Nāga.

Mahāmahopāla Ḍhyāna Pundit Haraprasād Sarasī, on the authority of T. H. Colebrooke, says in the preface to his Nepal Catalogue, that the author of the Prakriyā-kauśalā was of the Sesha

The following genealogy is given in the previous

| Sirsadāsa | Nārāyaṇa |
| Gangaśāsa | Gangādāsa m. Anābhā |
| Maheshadāsa | Virārā |
| Mādhava (descendant) | Kayānā |

Govinda-chandra Kesirāja Narottama.

ⅲ The genealogy is given below:

[Rūpa, hara

[The MSS. are at the British Library.]

Fide Prologue to Kamesaraha by Kesirāja.

The following genealogy is given in the previous
family. Colebrooke got the information from a Biresvara Sesa, reputed to be a descendant of the author of Prabriyā-tamūrdi, who stated his own genealogy as follows:

"Ramachandra pandita, Nrisimha pandita, Narayana pandita, Chakrapani pandita, Biresvara pandita, Sambhu pandita, Gopala pandita, and the Biresvara pandita himself." But I cannot hold this to be authentic information.

VI.

Extract from Sûktsrudākara of Sesa Narayana:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Genealogy of the Seshas.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vishnu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(descendant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramachandra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narasimha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krishna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chintamani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vireshvara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narayana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purushottama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chakrapani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gopinatha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rama</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONTRIBUTION TO THE STUDY OF ANCIENT HINDU MUSIC.

BY RAO SAHIB PRABHAKAR R. BHANDARKAR, B.A., L.M.A., INDORE.

(Continued from p. 105.)

The grāmas.

In the Bh., only two grāmas are mentioned, viz., the śadja and the madhyama. The grāmas came into existence and fell into disuse before Sāṅgadeva, who says that it is described by Nārada (a writer on music) and that it prevails in heaven and not on this earth. This grāma is mentioned in the Pañcatantra in the well-known verse तत सत्तां विशेषां भाषा उपवास्तवम् कविताति। This work was translated into Pahlavi in the reign of the Persian king Chosra Nushirvan (A.D. 531-579). If the verse belonged to the original work and was not introduced at the time of a later recasting, the grāma must be considered as having received recognition before the sixth century A.D. It may also be pointed out that the above verse quoted from the Pañcatantra occurs in the Nāyadī Sīkhaḥ 1. ii. 4, which, though it be not the original work of Nārada mentioned by Sāṅgadeva, is evidently based upon it.

Though the Bh. does not define a grāma, it plainly indicates that the seven notes in particular relations constitute a grāma. The octave being divided into 22 equal intervals, called śruti, the relations of the different notes in the two grāmas is as follows:

- Shadja-grāma: sa ri ga ma pa dha ni [sa]
  - 34 2\frac{1}{2} 4\frac{1}{2} 4\frac{1}{2} 3\frac{1}{2} 2\frac{1}{2} 4\frac{1}{2}

- Madhyama-grāma: sa ri ga ma pa dha ni [sa]
  - 3\frac{1}{2} 2\frac{1}{2} 4\frac{1}{2} 3\frac{1}{2} 4\frac{1}{2} 2\frac{1}{2} 4\frac{1}{2}

- Or more accurately, ma pa dha ni sa ri ga [ma]
  - 3\frac{1}{2} 4\frac{1}{2} 2\frac{1}{2} 4\frac{1}{2} 3\frac{1}{2} 2\frac{1}{2} 4\frac{1}{2}

For, as the type of the shadja-grāma begins with sa, so the type of the madhyama-grāma begins with ma. This is evident both from the order in which the different notes in the two grāmas are mentioned, and also from the 'first' mārāchhand in each. The Sāṅgītā parijātā also says that ma is the note produced by the open string in the madhyama-grāma, though the evidence of this work in matters not personally known to the author is usually of but little value and sought not to be accepted in the absence of corroboration from other sources.

The following are the values of the notes in cents in the two grāmas:

- Shadja-grāma: sa ri ga ma pa dha ni [sa]
  - Cents 0 164 273 491 709 873 982 1200

- Madhyama-grāma: ma pa dha ni sa ri ga [ma]
  - Cents 0 164 382 491 709 873 982 1200

Before we proceed to discuss these scales further, it is absolutely necessary to know which of these notes was taken as the keynote. All modern writers on ancient Hindu music have committed the error of supposing the śadja to have been the keynote of the scale, being misled by the present day
usage. It is easy to see that no note but the madhyama could have been the keynote in the days of the Bri. For, if we examine the hexatonic and pentatonic jatis or modes, we shall find that they are produced by the omission of one or two notes respectively from the complete scale, and all notes are in turn thus omitted except the madhyama. The omission of all notes in turn is allowed in the jatis (modes), but the madhyama should never be omitted. For, in the ordinance of music and also in the smrtis the madhyama is said to be the chief of all notes and non-omissible.

But it is just possible that this may only be a repetition of an old rule which had really fallen into disuse for we meet with such instances in Sanskrit works on music, as will be seen hereafter. We may also consider it possible that though the madhyama might have been the keynote in the madhyama-grdma, the shadj might have been the keynote of the shadjgrdma. But on a careful examination of the jatis we find that even in the shadjgrdma the shadj is at times omitted to obtain the hexatonic and pentatonic varieties. It is thus certain that the madhyama, which in no case omitted, must have been the keynote of both grdmas, exactly as at the present time the shadj, which is omitted from none of the ragas, is the keynote of the scale in use. This fact of primary importance being once grasped, we can proceed to discuss the two grdmas in succession.

For the sake of comparison with modern scales, which are made to begin with the keynote, let the shadjgrdma be re-arranged with its keynote, the madhyama, as the lowest, and we have the shadjgrdma commencing with its keynote.

Table I.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ma</th>
<th>pa</th>
<th>dha</th>
<th>ni</th>
<th>sa</th>
<th>ri</th>
<th>ga</th>
<th>ma</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>873</td>
<td>982</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It becomes immediately evident that this scale is practically the same as

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Cents} & \quad 0 & 204 & 386 & 498 & 703 & 834 & 996 & 1200 \\
\text{Ratios} & \quad \frac{8}{5} & \frac{4}{3} & \frac{3}{2} & \frac{5}{4} & \frac{16}{5} & \frac{1}{2} \\
\end{align*}
\]

which is the European major mode with the exception of the leading note, instead of which we have bb\textsuperscript{56}. The differences between the corresponding notes are 14, 4, 7, 7, 11, and 14 cents, the greatest being 14 cents or two-thirds of a comma, affecting the second note, which is sharper by this amount in the classical Hindu scale. But the fifth is sharp only by 7 cents or one-third of a comma, the fourth is flat by the same amount, and the major third is flat by 4 cents or one-fifth of a comma nearly. Criticising this scale Mr. Bosanquet says:\textsuperscript{57} - The system of 22 possesses, then, remarkable properties; it has both fifths and thirds considerably better than any other cyclic system having so low a number of notes. The only objection, as far as the concords go, to its practical employment for our own purposes, lies in the fifths; these lie just beyond the limit of what is tolerable in the case of instruments with continuous tones. (The mean tone system is regarded as the extreme limit; this has fifths \text{ }\frac{4}{3} \text { or a comma flat}. For the purposes of the Hindus where no stress is laid on the harmony, the system is already so perfect that improvement could hardly be expected.) He then proceeds to point out the deviations of other intervals, some of which, as noticed above, are large. But it is incorrect to look upon the 22-jatis system as exactly representing the Hindu scale. The European scale is described as consisting of twelve

\textsuperscript{56} Bh. p. 310, slokas 72-73.\n\textsuperscript{57} For the notation used Vite Helmholtz's "Sensations of Tone," Engl. Transl., 2nd edn.

For the notation used Vite Helmholtz's "Sensations of Tone," Engl. Transl., 2nd edn.

semitones to the octave, with the intervals of 2, 2, 1, 2, 2, 2, 1 semitones between its successive notes. A scale constructed according to these data would be

\[
\begin{array}{cccccccc}
& c & d & e & f & g & a & b & c' \\
Cents & 0 & 200 & 400 & 500 & 700 & 900 & 1100 & 1200 \\
\end{array}
\]

Here the fourths and fifths are more accurate than those in the 22-swristis scale, but all other intervals show the same or greater deviations than are found in that scale. But on that account we do not say that in the European scale the major thirds are wrong by 3-comma, etc. The only legitimate remark that can be made would be that the expression of the European scale in terms of twelve semitones as given above, is not an accurate one. Similarly, it is quite as probable that the expression of the Hindu scale in terms of 22-swristis is only an approximation. The question then arises—"Do we possess any indications which will enable us to make an accurate determination of the Hindu scale, of which the cycle of 22 swristis might simply be an approximate expression?" To which the reply is, "Yes, for some notes at least."

In the Bh. we are told that notes are consonant or sahādhipī. Two notes with an interval of nine or thirteen swristis between them are consonant with each other. Thus, in the sāhādhipī, (1) sādja and pāčaka, (2) visabhga and dhiśvista, (3) gādhiḍra and nisādha, (4) sādja and mādhyama. So also in the madhyamagāma with the exception of sādja and pāčaka. Here [in the madhyamagāma] there is consonance of pāčaka and visabhga. This at once enables us to write the exact values of all the notes except two, since it is evident that the interval of nine swristis represents the just Fourth, and that of thirteen the just Fifth. Thus we have

\[
\begin{array}{cccccccc}
4\frac{1}{2} & 3\frac{3}{4} & 2\frac{1}{2} & 4\frac{2}{3} & 3\frac{1}{2} & 2\frac{1}{2} & 4\frac{1}{2} \\
\text{Notes} & ma & pa & dha & ni & sa & ri & ga & ma \\
\text{Ratios} & 1 & \frac{9}{8} & \frac{4}{3} & \frac{3}{2} & \frac{16}{15} & \frac{5}{4} & \frac{2}{1} \\
\text{Cents} & 0 & 204 & 498 & 702 & 996 & 1200 \\
\end{array}
\]

Only two notes remain, viz., dha and ri. They are mutually consonant, but neither of them being consonant with a note of known value their own values cannot be determined by this method. But before considering any suggestions as to their probable values, it is necessary to note the difference between the exact values thus obtained of the various intervals, and those calculated from the cycle of 22, which was brought into existence in order to express them.

### Intervals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Exact value in cents</th>
<th>Defective expression of the value by the cycle of 22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major tone of 4 swristis ...</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Third of 6 swristis ...</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just Fourth of 9 swristis ...</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just Fifth of 13 swristis ...</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>709</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

81 This is the well-known equal temperament scale of Europe, and though in extensive use, is not the ideal just scale.

82 Indeed, this ought to be evident a priori. Thus for instance, a note and its fifth or a note and its octave are the actualities presented to us first, and afterwards comes the idea of measuring and comparing them. Now, it is easy to see that we may be in possession of two definite magnitudes, but for various reasons may not be able to express one exactly in terms of the other. The intervals of an octave and a fifth are examples in point. Hence the various cycles proposed, such as those of 12 and 22. It would be putting the cart before the horse to treat the semitone or the swristi as the primary notion and to seek to establish the fifth of a note by going up 7 semitones or 13 swristis.

84 Bh. p. 303. The S. R. means the same thing when it says 'that those notes, in the interval between which there are twelve or eight swristis, are consonant with each other'. But this mode of expression is objectionable for the same reason that it is objectionable to say that between the 1st and 14th of January intervene twelve days, and between the 1st and the 10th eight.
The interval of 8 śruti is of no value for our present purpose, being simply composed of two intervals of 4 śruti. Similarly other available intervals being only defects of these intervals from the octave of 22 śruti, need no separate consideration. From the above table it will be seen that the system of 22 śruti is capable of introducing an error of as many as 21 cents or nearly a comma in an attempt to express by means of it an interval, the value of which is known beyond all doubt by the method of consonances. We can now proceed to discuss some values for the undetermined notes, which offer themselves for consideration, remembering that a deviation to the extent of about a comma need not by itself stamp them as improbable:—

(1) The first value we shall consider will be that suggested by Mr. Hipkins, who holds that the 3 śruti interval must be taken as a $\frac{3}{2}$-tone. We have seen that on the 22 śruti scale the calculated value of the 4 śruti interval is 218 cents, but that the real value was 204 cents. A $\frac{3}{2}$ tone, therefore, must be equal to 153 cents, an interval known to be used in the East. But the substitution of this value leaves 141 cents as the value of the 2 śruti interval between dha and ri, or between ri and ga, and it is impossible to believe that the two intervals of 153 and 141 cents, differing from each other only by 12 cents, should have been expressed by 3 and 2 śruti respectively. We cannot, therefore, look upon the 2 śruti interval as a $\frac{3}{2}$-tone. The same facts may be put in another light. The two intervals of 153 and 141 cents are so nearly equal that each of them may be looked upon as equal to 3 śruti, and it will be found that the whole scale can then be more accurately expressed by means of the cycle of 24 than by means of one of 22, thus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>ma</th>
<th>pa</th>
<th>dha</th>
<th>ni</th>
<th>sa</th>
<th>ri</th>
<th>ga</th>
<th>ma</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scale to be expressed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>855</td>
<td>996</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values expressed by means of cycle of 22 śruti</td>
<td>4 $\frac{3}{2}$</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2 $\frac{1}{2}$</td>
<td>4 $\frac{3}{2}$</td>
<td>3 $\frac{1}{2}$</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2 $\frac{1}{2}$</td>
<td>4 $\frac{3}{2}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values expressed by means of cycle of 24 śruti</td>
<td>4 $\frac{3}{2}$</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2 $\frac{1}{2}$</td>
<td>4 $\frac{3}{2}$</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3 $\frac{1}{2}$</td>
<td>4 $\frac{3}{2}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A glance at this table shows the greater accuracy of expression obtainable by means of 24 śruti scale, if the 3 śruti interval were intended to be a $\frac{3}{2}$-tone as Mr. Hipkins supposes. But since the Hindus fixed upon 22 śruti only, it is evident that they did not intend the 3 śruti interval to be a $\frac{3}{2}$-tone.

(2) Secondly, we shall consider the value of the 3 śruti interval calculated on the basis of 22 śruti to the octave, which is 164 cents. In the first place let it be noted that if this value has a claim on our consideration that claim is shared by the value assignable to dha by a calculation on the same basis, viz., that of 7 śruti = 382 cents, and this we shall proceed to do in the next paragraph. In the meanwhile if we take 164 cents as the value of the 3 śruti interval, the value of the neighbouring 2 śruti interval becomes 130 cents, and the same objection presents itself as before, viz., the improbability of taking the two intervals of 164 cents and 130 cents for a 3 śruti and a 2 śruti interval respectively.

(3) Lastly, let us consider the value of dha obtained by calculating on the same basis as in the last paragraph, which is 382 cents. This gives very remarkable results. The 3 śruti and 2 śruti intervals have now the values of 178 cents and 116 cents respectively, which are almost exactly in the ratio of 3:2. An additional argument for accepting this value is the consideration that the Hindus in choosing the cycle of 22 were more likely to have aimed at securing a greater accuracy in the expression of the relations of the fourth, the fifth and the third than that of smaller intervals like the seconds. It will be noticed that this value of the major Third, viz., 382 cents, differs only by 4 cents from the value of the just major Third which is 386 cents, and there is nothing against the supposition that probably this was the actual value of that interval; the
small difference being due to the unavoidable defect of the system of 22-śrūtis, selected for expressing the relations of the notes in the scale. This defect is shared by all systems, and it can be diminished only by admitting a greater number of degrees.

Finally an express statement in the S. P. gives a death-blow to the 4-tone notion, and indirectly supports the value which we must assign to the 3-śrūti interval as a consequence of the value we have found for the 7-śrūtis interval. With 386 cents for the latter, we have 182 cents (a minor tone) for the former, whereas the 4-tone is only about 150 cents. From the data given in the S. P. for the division of a string the ratio of the 3-śrūtis interval between sa and ri is 3 or 204 cents (a major tone), and of that between pa and dha is 4 or 231 cents. Even allowing for the errors inevitable in determinations of the values of notes by the division of a string in a fretted instrument like the Hindu ṭān, it is evident that a minor tone may be confounded with a major tone, but it is not easy to believe that a 4-tone can thus be confounded. On the other hand it would be quite legitimate to bring forward the objection that originally the 3-śrūtis interval might have had a different value from that which it came to have in the days of the S. P.; but there is no evidence to support this hypothesis.

Inserting the value we have found for the 7-śrūtis interval in the Table A, we have the complete scale as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4ś</th>
<th>3ś</th>
<th>2ś</th>
<th>4ś</th>
<th>3ś</th>
<th>2ś</th>
<th>4ś</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ma</td>
<td>pa</td>
<td>dha</td>
<td>ni</td>
<td>sa</td>
<td>ri</td>
<td>ga</td>
<td>ma</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ratio</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>884</td>
<td>996</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From what has been said above it will be evident that the values of all notes given in this table are perfectly certain, except those of dha and ri which may be looked upon as almost certain.

It is now necessary to notice the following remarks of Mr. A. J. Hipkins: "The Indian scale intervals ought to be understood as they are explained by native writers—namely, as a tone, a 4-tone, and a 3-tone, composed of 4, 3, and 2 śrūtis respectively. With this conception of intervals, and it must be borne in mind the 4-tone is still approved of in the East, a division of the octave into 24 equal quarter-tones becomes impossible. For as it was essential to secure an approximately perfect fourth with 9 śrūtis, and a fifth with 13, the division of the octave by 22 was the only one available. The error in the fourth of 9 equal śrūtis of a 22 division is no more than 6 comma, in melody scarcely noticeable, but the error in a 21 or in a 23 division could not have been easily tolerated." At the outset, in this connection let me ask the reader to recall what I have said above, about the system of 22 śrūtis being called into requisition to express the relations of the notes in an already existing scale and the inherent inability of all systems to express accurately the so-called natural scale unless the octave is subdivided into a very large number of degrees. But this is not all. Mr. Hipkins is actually in error when he supposes that Hindu writers explain the intervals of their scale as being 'a tone, a 4-tone, and a 3-tone.' Hindu writers have never said this; they only say that there are three sorts of intervals, consisting of 4, 3 and 2 śrūtis respectively—in other words in the ratio 4 : 3 : 2. This is very different from what is understood by European writers by 'a tone, a 4-tone, and a 3-tone.' Consider the intervals 200, 150, and 100 cents. European writers will call them a tone, a 4-tone, and a 3-tone respectively, which is correct. But now take the well-known intervals 204, 182, and 112 cents, or a major tone, a minor tone, and a diatonic semitone. These they will forthwith describe as a tone, a tone.

---

80 See below. 81 Capt. Day's The Music of Southern India, pp. 20-21.
and a semitone respectively, which is only an approximation and not accurate, for, the exact ratios are 1:3214 ... : 1:625 : 1, and not 2:2:1. The approximation may be justified thus: 1:3214 ... is nearly 2; and 1:8214 : 1:625 : 1:125 : 1, i.e., 1:1 nearly. But there is another way also of looking at these ratios: 1:8214 : 1:2 : 1 approximately, as before; but 1:625 : 1:5 : 1, more nearly than 2:1; in other words, the three intervals are in the ratio 4:3:2 approximately. It is this approximation which has been used by Sanskrit writers. It will be seen that the two approximations agree as regards the ratio between a major tone and a semitone; and if the European approximation is more accurate as regards the ratio of a major to a minor tone, the Hindu approximation has the advantage of greater accuracy in the ratio of a minor tone to a semitone. The latter possesses the further advantage of indicating that there are three kinds of intervals, whereas the former reduces these to only two. It was probably owing to this European custom of calling the major tone, the minor tone, and the diatonic semitone by the terms a tone, a semitone, and a semitone that Mr. Hopkins overlooked the possibility of the Hindu approximation being quite as good, if not better, for the purpose of expressing the actual ratios, and was led to misinterpret the intervals of the Hindu scale.

Having thus determined the values of the intervals in the Hindu scale, it will be interesting to consider now the converse problem of what cycles can possibly be employed to express the same. The conditions of the problem evidently are:

(1) There must be three kinds of intervals.
(2) The octave to consist of three intervals of the greatest magnitude and two of each of the others,
(3) Integers only to be used in expressing the intervals.

It is easily seen that no cycle of less than 15 degrees can satisfy all these conditions. The cycle of 53 with the three intervals in the ratio of 9:8:5 can express the scale with remarkable accuracy. If we now examine all possible cycles consisting of 15 to 53 degrees, which satisfy these conditions, only the following ones make an approach to the scale for which we wish to find an expression:

Table C.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degrees in the cycle</th>
<th>Ratios of the three intervals</th>
<th>Degrees in the Major Third</th>
<th>Cents in the Major Third</th>
<th>Degrees in the Fifth</th>
<th>Cents in the Fifth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>4 : 3 : 2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>5 : 4 : 8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>6 : 4 : 3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>712.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>6 : 5 : 3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>7 : 6 : 4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>330.4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>8 : 7 : 4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>9 : 8 : 5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>702</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale under consideration 1:8214 ... : 1:625 : 1 ...

Thus the cycle of 22 is the smallest that can be used for expressing the given scale; that of 29 gives the fifth more accurately, but the third is much worse; that of 32 is decidedly worse; the rest are all better, that of 53 being the best. We thus see that assuming the value of the scale, which we have found from other considerations, to be correct, it could not have been better expressed than by means of a cycle of 22, unless the ancient Hindu writers had resorted to 34 degrees or more. This consideration, therefore, gives further indirect support to the value we have assigned to the scale. Why cycles of 34 degrees or more were not used so as to secure a greater accuracy will be discussed presently; but we must first consider an apparently formidable objection. In the section "On the swaras and śruti" it has been mentioned that, according to Bharata, in order to convert the shadjaṇḍā into the madhyamāṇḍā, the paścama must be lowered.
by a śruti so as to make it consonant with the rishabha. But according to the values which we have come to assign to the different notes (see Table B), the necessary lowering amounts to only a comma or 22 cents, which is less than even half of the average value of a śruti, which is 54$\frac{1}{4}$ cents. It is not this discrepancy, however, which is the difficulty in our way, as it is really of no importance. For, it is easy to see (and the reader may convince himself of it by actual trial) that it must necessarily occur in all cycles, whenever it is sought in this manner to find the value of one particular degree, unless indeed the cycle chosen is such that the difference between the major and the minor tone is represented by one degree, and that the value of each degree is as nearly as possible 22 cents, consistently with its giving good values for other intervals. Such a cycle is that of 53 in the Table C above. Why this cycle was not adopted by the Hindus to express their scale, if the latter was really the same as that I have arrived at from other considerations, will be discussed further on. It is sufficient for my present purpose to make the reader understand that the fact of the difference between the major and minor tones being only 22 cents (i.e., very much less than the average value of a śruti) in no way goes against the value we have come to assign to the Hindu scale. Indeed, we can even go further and say that whoever might have originated the cycle of 22 to represent the Hindu scale, Bharata and Mātaṅga were misled into straining it in an unjustifiable way, when they said that the amount of flattening necessary to make the pañchama of the shrudāgraṇa consonant with the rishabha was the measure of a śruti. It will be seen that this error is quite natural, since with the adoption of the cycle of 22 we are forced to represent the major tone by 4 and the minor tone with 3, and the just Fourth and Fifth with 9 and 13 respectively. Now in the shrudāgraṇa the pañchama is not consonant with the rishabha and the interval between the two is expressed by 10 or 13 according to the direction in which you measure. In order to make it consonant (as in the madhyamagraṇa), it must be flattened by a certain amount; but no sooner is this done the interval must be expressed by 9 or 13 (according to the direction in which you measure), since those are the numbers by which we must denote the intervals of consonance in the cycle of 22. In other words, you are obliged to say that the pañchama has been flattened by one unit, however much the necessary amount of flattening may actually differ from the average value of that unit. This apparently correct but really erroneous statement then can in no way go against the value we have come to assign to the Classical Hindu Scale. But the same cannot be said of the experiment described in the Bh, in connection with the exposition of the śrutis (see the section “On the saras and śrutis” above). In this experiment, it will be remembered, we have, at starting, two śrūḍas in unison tuned to the shrudāgraṇa. The tuning of one of them is subsequently changed to the madhyamagraṇa by lowering the pañchama by the requisite amount, which with our present values for the notes of the scale will only be a comma or 22 cents. The remaining strings are now lowered so as to have the shrudāgraṇa tuning once more. Supposing this can be accurately done, every string of this śrūḍa ought to give a note lower by a comma than the note of the corresponding string of the other. Performing this double operation once more, the difference in notes of corresponding strings will be two commas or 44 cents only, and the gandhāra and niśāda strings of the changing śrūḍa cannot possibly give notes in unison with the rishabha and khaṇḍaka of the other. But Bharata says that they do; and there will be the same discrepancy in the rest of the experiment. Now if we believe that this experiment was actually performed by some musician with the stated result, we are forced to give up the values we have assigned to the notes in the Hindu scale and to admit those found by actual calculation on the supposition that the 22-śrutis cycle represented the scale exactly (see Table I). But this necessarily leads to the consequence that we must admit that the Hindu year was so peculiar that when it declared two notes to be consonant they were not so according to our present notions, but that the just Fourth was
constantly flatter by 7 cents and the just Fifth as consistently sharper by the same amount. When we further note, that the values of the Fourth and the Fifth as given in the S. P. are exact, we must make the additional admission that this peculiarity of the Hindu ear had disappeared by the time that that work was written. I think this to be beyond belief, and consider that when the Hindu musicians declared that there was consonance between two notes it was exact consonance as given in the S. P. and as understood at present. The necessary result of this view is that we must look upon the experiment in question as only a paper or imaginary experiment, based on the excusable error pointed out above, viz., that the amount of flattening necessary to make the panchama consonant with the rishabha was taken to be really equal to one śruti, whereas it was so only in name, one being forced to call it a śruti owing to the exigencies of the cycle adopted, viz., that of 22. In confirmation of the imaginary nature of the experiment I may draw the attention of the reader to the fact that in the Bh, we are asked to take two vīṇās tuned to the same māchhand and having strings and dāṇḍa (the wooden bar proceeding from the body) of the same dimensions. It is easy to see that a real experimenter ought to perceive that it is not essential to have the strings and dāṇḍa of the same dimensions. Further, since there are only seven strings in the vīṇā, the tuning of which is kept fixed, a real experimenter would have discovered that as he proceeded with the successive lowerings of the strings of the other vīṇā, there would be no strings in the fixed vīṇā with which some of the lowered strings could be in unison. As an illustration, suppose that the two vīṇās were tuned to the first māchhand, viz., sa, ri, ga, ma, pa, dha, ni, and the procedure of lowering the second vīṇā by a śruti was repeated four times, then the sa and pa strings of this vīṇā would be in unison with the ga and ma strings of the fixed vīṇā; but the sa string of the second vīṇā could not be in unison with the ni string of the first, as stated in the Bh., the latter being an octave higher. A real experimenter would have certainly noticed this.

Having thus disposed of the only objection of some real importance, we must now try to find out why the Hindu musicians did not employ a cycle like that of 53 so as to be able to give an accurate expression to their scale, if it had the constitution which we have found for it. And the reason is not far to seek, if we keep in mind how the śruti interval was determined. Mr. A. J. Hipkins confidently says that: 'There can be no doubt about the origin of the śruti in the measurement of a stretched string,' but has omitted to give the grounds for his assertion. At first sight this assertion does look plausible. For, if we divide a stretched string into two, and subdivide one of the halves into two again and continue the subdivision in this manner, we shall come in due course to the fraction $\frac{1}{5}$; and if the string be damped at this distance from the nut the remaining portion of the string $= \frac{2}{5}$ ought theoretically to give a note which is 55 cents higher than that of the whole string; and 55 cents is almost exactly one śruti ($= 54 \frac{1}{5}$ cents). But if the experiment be actually performed, it would be found that the result is far from accurate.

It is improbable, therefore, that the śruti interval was arrived at by the measurement of a stretched string. There are other considerations also which go against this notion. In the Bh., which mentions the śrutis, there is no reference to the production of higher notes by stopping a string. The Hindu vīṇā in its oldest form had no finger-board which occurs only in more recent forms, and the frets were added at a still later period. Even in the S.R., though fretted instruments were in existence at the time, the 22 śruti are demonstrated not by means of subdivision of a string, but by means of a śruti vīṇā with 22 strings, each having a pitch slightly higher than that

*7 Capt. Day’s The Music of Southern India, Introduction, p. xi.*
of the preceding one so that the fourth gave the śadja note and the last the nishāda. From all this it is clear that the śrutis interval could not have had its origin in the measurement of a stretched string. But even supposing that the value of the interval was thus fixed by subdividing a string into 32 parts, for obtaining the value of 2 śrutis we must take 31 of these parts and divide this again into 32, and so on for larger intervals, with the result that every such successive operation must increase the error, which unavoidably attends the experiment as noticed above. This makes it more probable that the relative values of the different notes in the scale were actually determined by trial by means of the ear with the help of strings rising in pitch step by step, as conceived, for example, by Śāṅgadeva. This I think may also account for the name śruti (something heard) given to the unit of measurement which resulted from such a process. Now, since equal rises in pitch have to be determined only by the ear, it is easy to see that the greater the number of degrees in a cycle the smaller is the value of each degree, and consequently the more difficult it is for the ear to appreciate the equality of each step in the pitch. We need not wonder then that the Hindus could not resort to a cycle like that of 53 and had to stop at one of 22, which, by the way, as pointed out above, cannot be excelled by another of less than 34 degrees.

To sum up, the values of notes in the Classical Hindu Scale (the śadja-grāma) are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>4ś</th>
<th>3ś</th>
<th>2ś</th>
<th>4ś</th>
<th>3ś</th>
<th>2ś</th>
<th>4ś</th>
<th>2ś</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ma</td>
<td>pa</td>
<td>dha</td>
<td>ni</td>
<td>sa</td>
<td>ri</td>
<td>ga</td>
<td>ma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratios</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>884</td>
<td>996</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As previously remarked, the values given in this table, of all notes except dha and ri are absolutely certain, and I believe the evidence I have given is sufficiently convincing as regards the correctness of the values of the latter two also.

Now, we arranged the śadja-grāma thus, with its keynote at the commencement, to enable a comparison to be made with the modern European major scale, from which it differs only in the seventh note being flatter by a chromatic semitone + a comma. The correct way, however, of representing it, is this, viz., with sa as the lowest note:

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>sa</th>
<th>ri</th>
<th>ga</th>
<th>ma</th>
<th>pa</th>
<th>dha</th>
<th>ni</th>
<th>4ś</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

61 S. R. I. i. 12 et seq. The experiment is not as accurately described as one would wish. We are asked to tune the 22 strings each a little higher pitched than the preceding so that between two successive notes produced by them there should not exist an intermediate note. These directions are evidently defective, for we can have notes of intermediate pitch. Then again, it would have been better to have 23 strings with 2 intervals, so that at the fourth lowering of the strings it would have been possible to show that the sa string of the changeable vṛddha was in unison with the ni string of the fixed vṛddha. A similar inaccuracy of expression of the author I have noticed above. But the experiment was probably not quite imaginary like that in the Bh., referred to above. At any rate we are not asked to have the strings and dūṇḍa of the same dimensions but are only required to construct two similar vṛddhas, the similarity consisting in their producing identical sounds—इनपि शब्दांस नक्षत्रां वर्तय नास; सानी नासस. I think Śrinabhūpāla's explanation of this verse is correct, and Kallinātha: is not. The latter says सबूत; the former सबूतो समानो शङकराचार्यो नानात्मकं इत्यादि 'चि यज्ञनास; सानी नास' यज्ञ नास समाज एवं नवनिति I. Indeed one might almost think that the author had before him the expression तथा चिन्त्यकालिकाः पद्यसमानाः of the Bh., and wrote यज्ञ नास; सानी नास as a correction. In passing, it may be noted that this experiment does not go against the values we have come to assign to the Classical Hindu Scale, remembering that the intervals are to be judged by the ear.
This arrangement at once makes clear why the ga of the Classical Hindu Scale differs from, the ga of the modern Hindu scale. In the former, the first tetrachord is really a descending one, whereas in the latter it is ascending. It will be noticed presently that in the Bh. we are told that if the note antara ga (which corresponds to modern ga) is to be used, we can do so only in going up the scale. 

It will be noticed that the arrangement of the shadja-grāma as given above is such as to tempt one to think that it consisted of two disjunct tetrachords; and this is indeed the way in which it came to be looked upon by later writers. But at the time we are speaking of, the octave was not recognised and the grāmas consisted only of seven notes. This leads to the conjecture that the original descending tetrachord ma, ga, ri, sa was, in the first instance, extended not upwards as pa, dha, ni, sa, but downwards as a conjunct tetrachord sa, ni, dha, pa, the common note being sa; the three new notes pa, dha, ni were subsequently transferred (as octaves) above the keynote ma, thus producing the heptachord shadja-grāma. Some further support is given to this view by the quotation from the Nāradī-Sīkṣā given above (ante, Vol. XI, p. 162). Indeed the matter would have been beyond all doubt, if in that quotation the nishāda had been spoken of as the fifth note and the dhaivata as the sixth.

The madhyamagrāma seems to have been a later development in the evolution of Hindu music; for, in defining it, the Bh. tells us how the shadja-grāma must be modified in order to arrive at the former, viz., by flattening the pañchama by one śruti. In this grāma the keynote ma was placed at the commencement (see above). We have, therefore,

The 'madhyamagrāma.'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3i</th>
<th>4i</th>
<th>2i</th>
<th>4i</th>
<th>3i</th>
<th>2i</th>
<th>4i</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ma</td>
<td>pa</td>
<td>dha</td>
<td>ni</td>
<td>sa</td>
<td>ri</td>
<td>ga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reader will at once notice that this grāma is the same as the Seventh of what are known as Ecclesiastical Modes, whereas the shadja-grāma is the Eighth and related to it as a plagal to an authentic one. In India, therefore, it would appear that the plagal mode preceded the authentic one in order of time (Śāman chants, of which we know but little, being kept out of consideration). The contrary, it is stated, was the case in Europe.

Other Notes in the Bhāratiya-nātya-bāstra.

Besides the seven notes discussed above, the Bh. recognizes four more, under the name scara-sādhārana (common note), which is explained to be an antara-svara (an intercalary note). These are (1) kākali-nishāda, (2) antara-gāndhāra, (3) shadja-sādhāraṇa, and (4) madhyama-sādhāraṇa.

The values of kākali-nishāda and antara-gāndhāra can be easily fixed from the datum in the Bh., viz., that they are two śruti's sharper than nishāda and gāndhāra respectively. The former note makes the intervals between dha and kākali ni, and between kākali ni and sa a major

69 It is for this reason that I have placed the 8th note in brackets.
tone and a diatonic semitone respectively; similarly, the latter makes the interval between ri and antara ga a major tone, and that between antara ga and ma a diatonic semitone. These notes, however, were used with great restrictions: (1) They were to be used only in going up the scale, and even then in a passing manner without dwelling on them; (2) they were to be used only in the three jātis—madhyamā, pañchamā, and śadja-madhyā—and even then only if the vṛddhi was sa, ma or pa in the first and third, and pa in the second.

The śadja-sādhraṇa and madhyama-sādhraṇa were notes intermediate between nishāda and śadja, and between gāndhāra and madhyama, respectively; and the difference between them and the corresponding natural notes was so minute that they were designated also by the name kāśikā ('hair-like'). Further, the śadja-sādhraṇa could be employed only in the śadja-grāmda, and the madhyama-sādhraṇa in the madhyama-grāmda. We have no data in the Bh. to enable us to determine the values of these. From the S. R., however, we see that according to later writers they were produced by the following relations of notes:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Śadja-sādhraṇa} & : & \text{dha} & : & \text{ni} & : & \text{sa} & : & \text{ri} \\
\text{Madhyama-sādhraṇa} & : & \text{ri} & : & \text{ga} & : & \text{ma} & : & \text{pa}
\end{align*}
\]

Further, it would seem that though, as in the Bh., madhyama-sādhraṇa was confined to the madhyama-grāmda, there was no corresponding restriction on the śadja-sādhraṇa.

A change had also occurred in the mode of employing kākali-nishāda and antara-gāndhāra. Firstly, one could descend thus:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{sa kākali-ni} & \text{ dha (c B A)} \\
\text{ma antara-gāndhāra} & \text{ ri (f e d)}
\end{align*}
\]

Secondly, one could follow this procedure:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{sa kākali-ni} & \text{ the next higher note available} \\
\text{ma antara-gāndhāra} & \text{ ma the next higher note available}
\end{align*}
\]

By the words 'the next higher note available' is to be understood, 'the next higher note, making allowance for such notes as are required to be omitted in the particular mode to be played or sung.' It will be observed that though the second procedure may be looked upon as in accordance with the teaching of the Bh., the first goes directly against it. It is impossible for us to find out when and how the change came about, as no works on music in the period between the Bh. and the S. R. are extant. The author of the S. R. himself, it must be noted, is not writing from his own knowledge, but on the authority of the writers who preceded him, and whose works were then available. The ancient music had already passed away in the time of Śāṅgadeva, the author of the S. R.

The 'grāmdas' according to later writers.

The structure of the two grāmdas as given in the S. R., which is a compilation made from previous works, is exactly as given in the Bh. But in the S. P., which is a work of a much later period (see above) and when the old distinction of the grāmdas had been completely forgotten, though there is agreement in the structure of the śadja-grāmda, that assigned to the madhyama-grāmda is as follows with ma for keynote:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ma} & : \text{pa} : \text{dha} : \text{ni} : \text{sa} : \text{ri} : \text{ga} [\text{ma}]
\end{align*}
\]

\(^{10}\) S. R. p. 54, śloka 7 and 8, \(^{11}\) S. R. p. 54, śloka 3, 4, 5 and 6.

\(^{12}\) The reader should note that the arrangement of śruti in the madhyama and gāndhāra grāmdas, as drawn up in App. iv of the S. R. Anandaśekha's series, is not according to the text. It agrees with that given in the S. P.

\(^{13}\) S. P. kōṇa 1, śloka 100.
This must be looked upon either as having its origin in the imagination of the author, an occurrence by no means very rare, or as having been quoted from a previous writer, equally imaginative. According to the S. R., however, this was the constitution of the gandhâragrâma of Nârada, which had already fallen into desuetude (see above). For, this authority gives the following arrangement of kritis in this grâma:

The 'gandhâragrâma,'

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
\text{ga} & \text{ma} & \text{pa} & \text{dha} & \text{ni} & \text{sa} & \text{ri} \\
\frac{3}{5} & \frac{3}{5} & \frac{3}{5} & \frac{3}{5} & \frac{3}{5} & \frac{3}{5} & \frac{3}{5}\end{array}
\]

Here it would seem that ga was the keynote, and in that case it is not very difficult to attach an plausible meaning to the scale. For, on comparing it with the shatâgradrâma it will be observed that it is identical with it except for the fact that the interval between the second and the fourth notes, which amounts to \(\frac{1}{4}\) or a minor third, is sought to be equally divided. If this conjecture be correct, it reminds us of a similar division introduced by Zalzal (8th century A.D.) in the Arabic scale and said to be still in use. In India, however, it fell into disuse, which probably gave rise to the myth that it was prevalent in heaven (sarga) and not on the face of the earth. It is said to have originated with Nârada, a writer on music, but there is no inherent improbablity in its having been borrowed by the Hindus from the Persians and Arabs, like so many other things in music (see below).

The S. P., having thus given a constitution for the madiyâmgâma, which according to the S. R. belongs to the gandhâragrâma, proceeds to define the gandhâragrâma as follows with ga for the keynote:

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
\text{ga} & \text{ma} & \text{pa} & \text{dha} & \text{ni} & \text{sa} & \text{ri} \\
\frac{3}{5} & \frac{3}{5} & \frac{3}{5} & \frac{3}{5} & \frac{3}{5} & \frac{3}{5} & \frac{3}{5}\end{array}
\]

No other Sanskrît treatise on music, available to us, mentions a grâma with this structure. If we examine, however, the original gandhâragrâma as given in the S. R. (which is the same as the madiyâmgâma as defined in the S. P.), we find that the seventh note is the just Fourth of the fourth note but is not the just Fifth of the third. In the gandhâragrâma, according to the S. P., it would appear, the seventh note is made the just Fifth of the third note, sacrificing its relation to the just Fourth to the fourth note, the other relations remaining the same.

(To be continued.)

KALIDASA AND THE HUNAS OF THE OXUS VALLEY.

BY PROF. K. B. PATHAK, B.A.; POONA.

Kshâlasvâmi, the well-known commentator on the Amarakosâ, who belongs to the second half of the eleventh century,\(^{1}\) explains \(\text{udhâlka}^{2}\), meaning saffron, thus:

\[\text{शूकल्के दामिन दुहुकलके सांद्राम}^{3}\]

In order to enable the reader to understand the view of Kshâlasvâmi, I shall quote the following three well-known verses of Kalidâsa:

\[\text{राघवनाथ} \text{IV.}\]

---

\(^{1}\) S. R. p. 46, Prakâsa 3, 4, and 5.
\(^{2}\) In the 13th, 14th and 15th centuries, however, Zalzal's neutral third was not in favour. (Prof. Land's Grammar of the Aryan Arâbas).\(^{3}\)
\(^{3}\) S. R. p. 45, Andes 5.
\(^{4}\) If we are to believe, however, that this grâma was in existence in India at the time when the Poâchâlasu-
\(^{5}\) tret was first translated into Pahlavi (see above), the Hindus could not have borrowed it from the Arabs.
\(^{6}\) Mr. K. G. Oka's Ed. of the Kshâlasvâmi, p. 110.
\(^{7}\) S. R. p. 46, Prakâsa 4, and 5.
\(^{8}\) Mr. K. G. Oka's Ed of the Kshâlasvâmi, p. 110.
\(^{9}\) Some manuscripts of Gkaleh's commentary read शूकल्के.
Kahlrasvämi tells us that Raghu encountered the Hūgas in the Vahlka-deśa, where the saffron plant was cultivated. If this view is accepted, the reading लिङ्गादिष्ठ by Mallinātha, a commentator of the fourteenth century and a native of Southern India, must be abandoned. Before examining the other reading वृक्षीर, I shall try to settle the date of Vallabha, who gives this latter reading. On the word āśa occurring in नारायण उपाया, इत्यादि व्याया, (Kumdrasamhāra I, 35), Vallabha remarks:

आशीि वृक्षीर वत्सोऽपि दुर्गमवस्तु कथा वृक्षीर . . . . . . तिरुक्कल्लिपिको निर्धार इत्यादि तथापि नारा- यासानिर्दिश्यन भवमहत्वुः ।

These remarks are thus reproduced by Vardhamāna:

वार्तासां उ हिण्डिकल्लिपिको नित्यारिदिष्टिः इत्यादि तथापि नारायण तिरुक्कल्लिपिकायताः।


Mallinātha says:

वार्तासां न हिण्डिकल्लिपिकनित्यारिदिष्टिः। अस्तित्वादिरिति वक्तव्यं नारायणासयाताः। चित्तुः कर्त्तमाक- य ग्रामाण्य:।

Vallabha, who is quoted by Vardhamāna, mentions Bhīma in his comments on the last verse of Māgha's Kavi-vahāra-cūḍāna in his Śīsudhāradha. On these grounds we may safely assign Vallabha to the first half of the twelfth century. It is a well-known fact that he was a native of Kāśmir. These facts invest his opinion with exceptional importance.

In the above passage cited from Kālīdāsa, Vallabha reads जरुरू and explains it thus जरुरू-नानी न्याय महात्मारार्णी । According to Kahlrasvämi, Vahlka-deśa or Bactria was the country where Raghu encountered the Hūgas, and this region was, in Vallabha's opinion, watered by the river Vaiśākū. In the fifteenth canto of the Rakṣaka-viśākū, verse 89, the towns of Takshaśilā and Pushkalkavatt are mentioned. The last named town was called by the Greeks Peukelaṭīs. In the Greek form of this word the letter s is superfluous, and the letter o corresponds to the Sanskrit va. According to this rule, the Greek word Oxus, the name of the celebrated river, would be वृक्ष in Sanskrit; and in Prakrit it would be spelt वृक्ष and pronounced वृक्ष. The sign for doubling being mistaken for anusvāra, the word would be pronounced Vaikū. The Sanskrit form Vaiśākū, with a superfluous nasal, would be pronounced Vaikūkū. It is thus plain that the Vaiśākū or Vaiśākū river is the Oxus river. It is interesting to note here that the famous Chinese traveller Yün Chwang calls this river Pochu or Pochu. This Chinese name is only a phonetic transcription of the Indian form of the name Vaiśākū or Vaiśākū. Va answers® to the Chinese po or fo, as in Moli-po for Mālava, or in Na-po-ti-po-khu-lo for Navadevaka-lula, while the Indian kha or kha corresponds to the Chinese ch, as in Ta-chi-shi-lo for Takshaśilā or Takšaśilā. Thus the Chinese form of the name of the river Oxus, Pochu or Pochu, presupposes the Indian original Vaiśākū or Vaiśākū, mispronounced Vaikū or Vaikū.

We have thus seen that in the opinion of Kahlrasvāmi and Vallabha, Kālīdāsa makes Raghu invade the northern country and conquer the Hūgas, who had already established themselves on the banks of the Oxus in Bactria. General Cunningham says: "According to the Chinese authorities the white Huns first appeared in the countries on the Oxus in the beginning of the fifth century" and then gives a list of the Hūga kings who ruled on the Oxus. Mr. V. A. Smith, in his Early History of India, p. 297, says that the Huns were in the Oxus.

1 Read वृक्षीर D. C. MS. No. 72 of 1893-84.
2 Some manuscripts of Vallabha's commentary read वृक्षीर.
3 S. P. Pandit's Ed. of Raghu, notes, p. iii.
5 Four D. C. MSs of Raghuśākū and its commentaries read Vaiśākū and two read Vaikūkū.
6 Ephthalites or White Huns, Transactions of the Ninth Congress of Orientalists.
valley between A.D. 455-84. The first invasion of India by the Huns was repelled by Skandagupta-Vikramaditya in A.D. 455. From these facts the conclusion is inevitable that Kalidasa composed the verses quoted above when the Huns were still in the Oxus valley and shortly before they invaded the Gupta empire in A.D. 455. At this time Kalidasa appears to have been very young, as he speaks of his poetic efforts with extreme diffidence and in such depreciating terms as

रागु I. 3.

His masterpiece, the immortal Sakuntala, must have been a later production of his genius. He was thus contemporary with Vikramaditya II of the Gupta Dynasty. This view rests upon the identification of the Vaikû or Vaikhshû with the Oxus river and upon the fact that the Huns first appeared in the Oxus valley in the beginning of the fifth century.

In the last verse quoted above, Mallinatha reads कपोलपद्द्धतिः and explains भृत्समुदुल्लस्मत्वनि अनुवादिते. His reading is well-known in Indian custom:

सतिम्प्रि, न कर्तानादेव गायित्वास्त्रिव युक्ताः: पवीत्रपापिता युक्तः।

On the other hand Vallabha10 reads कपोलपद्द्धतिः and explains कपोलपद्द्धतिः. Châritravardhana and Sumatiyâya adopt this reading, and say हृद्यावति कुष्यपसे विकारितपूर्व हस्तिनिति समांशीतिः.

In Thomas Watters' work on the Travels of Yuan-Chauang, describing the social characteristics common to the tribes and districts between China and India, we read:

"They burn their dead and have no fixed period of mourning. They flay (?) the face and cut off the ears."


"Among some tribes it apparently was the custom to tear or gash the face at the funeral of a parent or chief."

Idem, p. 41.

"We find it recorded, moreover, that when the death of T'ang Tai Tsung was announced, the barbarians sojourning at the capital expressed their sorrow by wailing, cutting off their hair, gashing (?) their faces and cutting their ears, until the blood washed the ground."

Idem, p. 42.

From these extracts it is evident that Kalidasa must have written kapola-pḍâna, 'to tear and gash the face,' and not kapola-pḍâlata, the latter reading being substituted by the Southern commentators like Mallinatha in accordance with Indian notions.

From the two verses discussed above, we learn that Kalidasa was contemporary with the Huns of the Oxus valley, who were defeated by Skandagupta-Vikramaditya in A.D. 455 and who killed the Sasanian king Firoz, in A.D. 484, and that it was the custom, among the Huna women, to tear and gash the face at the funeral of their husbands.

In my paper on Buddhîmitra, the teacher of Vasubandhu, I have shown that Dignaga belongs to the latter half of the fifth century. It is thus clear that Kalidasa and Dignaga were contemporaries and lived in the time of Vikramaditya II of the Gupta Dynasty. This confirms the tradition preserved by Mallinatha.

CONTRIBUTIONS TO PANJABI LEXICOGRAPHY.

SERIES III.

BY H. A. ROSE, L.C.S.

(Continued from p. 243.)

Table: A bowl for keeping sugar, etc. Karnal S. B., 1872-80, p. 121.

Tap, tapiro: the duct or passage by which water enters a field. Opp. to paind, q.v.

D. C. M.S. No. 156 of A. 1893-94.
Tarká rāni: the upper stratum of water of a kachcha well.
Sirsa R. S., 1879-83, p. 178.
Taron: a high stool on which a man stands to winnow corn. Kângra Gloss.
Taropulta: thick or tangled. A word used to describe a division of land by which each party gets a separate share of each field, so that shares are much intermixed. Potta vand and gddu vand mean much the same thing. Tela vand means division into large blocks. Kângra Gloss.
Tarota: a hole in the ground or in a bank where water has forced a passage; dardh is also used for same thing. Kângra Gloss.
Tāt: goat. Bauria argot.
Tata: Panji ḍāch.
Tātān: s., a fire-fly.
Tattī: it consists of four earthen jars pierced and tied together and hung up by a string in the bride's courtyard, and is struck by the bridegroom with a sword. Sirsa R. S., 1879-83, p. 167.
Tehma: a loin-cloth worn by Mussalmans, sometimes not passed between the legs, but usually worn in the Hindu fashion (though they preserve their own name for the garment). Karnâl S. R., 1872-80, p. 124.
Teinta: a term applied in Kulu and Lâhul to a grassy slope or up land above the cliffs or precipitous hill sides which form the sides of a valley. Kângra Gloss.
Tel talwâl: a present given to the barber's wife for rubbing a lock of the bride's hair with oil. Jullundur S. R., p. 65.
Tel-vand: see taropulta.
Telia: an oily kind of water.
Thāo: a plain or level space on the top of a hill or in a high valley. Simla.
Tha: to be born. Bauria argot. Ex. Damkera thâde = a boy is born.
Thakna: to forbid, stop from. Kângra Gloss.
Thâkuri: a weight = 6 chhitâns, Juba.
Thâl: a vessel made of pottery, flatter and smaller than the daggâ (q. v.) with a very wide mouth. Karnâl S. R., 1872-80, p. 121.
Thânapatti: a cess; a fee of Rs. 5 paid at each daughter's wedding. Cf. mutkhêra.
Thand?: search. Bauria argot. Ex. hapâhi thandolu lewâr oue. The policeman is coming to search the house.
Thandāli, thanḍāli: also ghi or any other grease.

Thāngeri: a bird. Probably from its feeding on thāngi or hazel nuts. Pangwāl.


Thāpa: a bloody mark of a hand, which the bride's mother with her hand dipped in henna leaves on the bridegroom's father's clothes. Karnāl S. R., 1872-80, p. 132.


Thāpa khauncha: a conical basket open at both ends which is suddenly plunged to the bottom of a village pond with its big end downwards, any fish that splashes being taken out through the small end. Karnāl S. R., p. 7.


Thok: a sheaf of wheat made up for carriage from the field. Kāngra Gloss.


Thulu: a block of wood which is fitted into an irrigation channel, so that the water flows evenly over it. The water is then divided into several channels by pegs which fit into the block. Kāngra Gloss.

Thomē: deposit of an article left in trust with another. Kāngra Gloss.

Thīrāhī: these. Bauria argot.


Thīla: the money given to the bride’s mother at a betrothal used in Kilar and Darwās. Pangi. Called guḍī in the Sāch Pargana of Pāngī. Pangwal.

Thīla: a vessel made of pottery, smaller than the ghara, for dipping water. Cf. ghariā and dāna. Karnāl S. R., 1872-80, p. 121.


Tibā bangar: the flat tableland on the tops of hills. It requires much rain, but is slightly better than bhet. Cf. pungi. Hoshiārpur S. R., p. 69.


Tīnī: s. l., top (of a tree).


Tingra: a fish. It rarely runs large, yet specimens of 5 lbs. or so are sometimes caught by the fishermen. Ludhiana S. R., 1878-83, p. 17.


Tilla: (1) the peak or point of a hill; (2) the ptarmigan; also called dhār chakru.

Kāngra Gloss.

Tīra: niche. Sirmūr

Tirath: properly a place of pilgrimage, but used for the place for burning the dead, which is also called mallati; in Kulu, mantori. Kāngra Gloss.

Tirchoka: see under bij batdr.

Tītainā: s. m.

Tithun: in that place; jīhun, in the place in which; othun, in that place; kīhun, where.

Kāngra Gloss.

Tīun: still, yet.


Tokhā: a brass pot larger than a tokni. Sirmūr trans-Girl.


Tokni: a large narrow-mouthed cauldron, made of metal, for storing water and cooking at feasts. Karnāl S. R., 1872-80, p. 121.

Tokoni: tokni a large brass pot. Sirmūr trans-Girl.


Tond: spring; i.e., the three warm months before the barādt or rains. Kāngra Gloss.

Topa: a measure of grain; of rice seven maunds and ten sērs kachā, or of wheat ten maunds kachā. Kāngra Gloss.

Topt lāni: name of ceremony for widow remarriage in Pāngti and Lāhul, Pangwāl Mono, 107.

Tor: sowing the seed by drilling it through a tube into the furrows. Ludhiana S. R., 1878-83, p. 105.


Torī: then. Bauria argot.


Totā: a cone of sūbhī (grain parched and ground, eaten with water mixed with it) used at weddings in Pāngti (Sach Pargana) and Chamba Lāhul. Pangwāl Mono, 107.

Towāt: a he-goat—see under bakrī.

Trangāri: a small bridge over a rivulet, called dipī in Lāhul. Kāngra Gloss.


Tujun, tijun: to you; you. In Kulu, tōi, to you; toma or tōhdā, from you. Kāngra Gloss.


Tulah: testing, or settlement of an account of any kind. Kāngra Gloss.


Tumbi, tumbri : a small cucumber or gourd. Kumbri is an earthen pot, a small utensil in which ghī is generally kept. Simla Hills.

Tūng : balcony. Sirimūr.


Ubāran : the ploughing after the seed of charā has been sown broadcast. Jullundur S. R., p. 124.


Ubha thāi jana : to stand. Bauria argot.


Ugāhār : see hōghār.

Ugīlan : the plough in which the boot and the curve of the hai are near each other. Jullundur S. R., p. 109.


Ujeh : above; see under bunk.

Ūkhak : a mortar made of stone or wood in which grain is ground by a wooden staff called musul and its husk separated.


Uprīdā jānā : to go up; see under bunk.

Ur : see or.


Urī : sheep. Bauria argot.


Urī : a lamb under six months of age; see under bhed.


Uṭ nāput jānā : to die without a son. Karnāl S. R., 1872-80, p. 149.


Utkārā : (1) fixed rent or assessment, generally used where it is paid partly in kind, partly in cash. Chakota is another word for the same thing. Kāṅgṛa Gloss. (2) a tenant-at-will.


Vangat : see bangat.


Vill : a kind of rheumatism that is rarely fatal; the animal affected gets stiff and unable to walk. Cf. vidāga. Sirsa S. R., 1879-83, p. 301.

Vīlāya : a kind of rheumatism.

Voti : wife = swāni, used by Rajputs; see lāni.

War: the force which pursues the raiders.
Wama: the waving of the offerings for the malignant deity over the patient's head.
Karnal S. R., 1872-80, p. 146.
Warphor: a ceremony of marriage performed by waving a pot of water over the bridegroom's head and then drinking a little of it and waving a rupee round his head.
Karnal S. R., 1872-80, p. 130.
Watrān: a broadcast sowing; to sow when the moisture has sufficiently subsided to allow of ploughing and sowing.
Watri: cotton sown in June or July.
Wenhī: soon; as wenhi do: come soon. Bauria argot.
Yānu (Kuli): the sardo deer; see god.

MISCELLANEA.

ON 'SIVA-BHAGAVATA' IN PATAÑJALI'S MAHABHASITA.

Much has been written by eminent scholars about the ancient sect of Bhāgavatas. The earliest inscription making use of the word Bhāgavata as an attributive of a follower of a particular sect is that edited by Dr. Fleet in Jour. R. As. Soc., Oct. 1909, in which Heliodorus, son of Dion, of Takhaia, a Yonadatta of king Antialkidas at the court of Trakārājī Kāshipītā Bhagabhadrā, is described as a Bhāgavata. Evidently he was a Vishnu-bhagavata, for the inscription commemorates the erection of a Garuda-dhvaja to devadāsa Vārudeva.

I wish to draw the attention of scholars to the fact that Śiva-bhāgavatas can claim the same antiquity as Vishnu-bhāgavatists. From the very earliest days there were two sects of Bhāgavatas who believed Bhagavat, conceived either as Vishnu or Śiva, to be the supreme cause, and bhakti or devotion to him was of more importance than ritual or sacrifice.

This inscription mentions Antialkidas Nikrophos who, according to Vincent Smith, was a contemporary with the early years of Eucratides circa. 170 B.C. Menander's invasion took place about 150 B.C., only a few years after, and his siege of Sāketa and Majjhamikā is alluded to by Patañjali in words which leave little doubt that the events took place in the lifetime of the great grammarian.

Now, Patañjali mentions the word Śiva-bhāgavata while commenting on Pāṇini V. 2. 76. The passage is as under:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word in Sanskrit</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Śiva-bhāgavata</td>
<td>God, a powerful deity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An explanation of the context is necessary.

Patañjali takes pains to explain that words formed by Pāṇini V. 2. 72, 75 and 76, are not to be taken in a literal sense, but only in a metaphorical one. Thus sītaka, uṣṭaka (Pāṇini V. 2. 72) do not mean 'he who does cold', or 'he who does hot,' for then they might be applied to snow or sun, but they respectively mean 'a person who takes a long time over doing things which has to be done soon,' and 'a person who does a thing betimes.' Similarly, pukrauka (Pāṇini V. 2. 75) does not mean 'he who seeks his ends by the side, for then it might mean 'a king's servant' but it is taken to mean 'one who proceeds to perform in a roundabout way things which can be performed in a straightforward manner.' We now come to Pāṇini V. 2. 76, from which we get the word Ayahāłika. Patañjali asks if this word is to be taken in the literal sense of 'one who goes about,' or seeks his ends with an iron dart? On this he asks, what would then happen? The reply is that then the word would apply to a Śiva-bhāgavata. Evidently, the members of that fraternity must then have been in the habit of going about, or seeking their ends, with an iron āśā in hand. Finally Patañjali says that the word is not to be taken in the literal sense, and, therefore, cannot apply to a Śiva-bhāgavata, but is taken to apply to express one who has recourse to extreme or harsh or rash measures to seek an end which can be secured by milder methods.

Patañjali's denial that the word does not apply to Śiva-bhāgavata is a proof of the existence of the class in those days. They must have used an iron spear as a distinctive mark like modern Jogis who carry an iron trident. Śiva's weapon is śāla or trīkāla, whence his epithet Śāla.

CHANDRADHAR GULERI.

Ajmer.
THE RAMACHARITAMANASA AND THE RAMAYANA.

BY L. P. TESSITORI; UDINE (ITALY).

[The present paper on the connection between Tulasī Dāsa's Rāmcharitamānasā and Vālmiki's Rāmāyaṇa was first published in Italian in the Giornale della Società Asiatica Italiana (Vol. XXIV, 1911), and is now re-published in English at the kind suggestion of Sir G. Grierson and Sir R. C. Temple. The subject is indeed a most interesting one, as it involves a question which has remained sub judice up to the present day.

Many different opinions have been advanced as to the principal source from which Tulasī Dāsa derived his Rāmcharitamānasā, but they have all been mere conjectures, rather than inductions from a sufficient quantity of positive evidence, and, being also very unlikely, have only helped to make the question more intricate instead of solving it. The two extremes have been represented: (a) by the scholars who, being not directly acquainted with the Rāmcharitamānasā, have almost necessarily tended towards conceiving it as a poor and close riefacimento of the Rāmāyaṇa, bearing no stamp of originality; and (b) by the scholars who, being more or less acquainted with the Rāmcharitamānasā, have allowed themselves to be misled by its outward appearance and by the different meaning of the facts in it, and have arrived at the conclusion that Tulasī Dāsa had availed himself of other sources and was not at all or very little indebted to his great predecessor. It is important to determine the right course between the two exaggerations and to give the Rāmāyaṇa its proper place amongst the sources of the Rāmcharitamānasā.

The solution of the problem can be reached only by freeing ourselves from any preconception, or misleading influence of general impressions, and confining ourselves to the impartial examination of positive facts. It is chiefly a work of patience. The Hindi poem must first be compared verse by verse with the Rāmāyaṇa, with the object of ascertaining all points of agreement with the Sanskrit text. Then, by placing agreements and disagreements in the same scale, it must be ascertained whether the former outweigh the latter to such a degree as to permit us to classify the Rāmāyaṇa as the principal source of the Rāmcharitamānasā. The way is however, made arduous by the fact that Tulasī Dāsa does not confine himself to only one recension of the Rāmāyaṇa. This makes it necessary to carry on the same inquiries into both the principal recensions, and ascertain in which places of the Rāmcharitamānasā either of the two prevails. Another difficulty is that of distinguishing between real and apparent discordances, i.e., between particulars derived from sources different from the Rāmāyaṇa and particulars derived from the Rāmāyaṇa itself, but modified either because of their incompatibility with the religious principles of the new poem, or for some other reason. The reader will judge whether the present study covers all the above points and proves sufficiently that Tulasī Dāsa availed himself of the Rāmāyaṇa as a principal source for the particulars of Rāma's life, but at the same time strove with all his power, to keep as clear as possible of Vālmiki's art, so that on the whole the Rāmāyaṇa can only be called his source of information, never his artistic model.

Of course, the fact of having taken into consideration only the Rāmāyaṇa gives the above conclusions a temporary character. We know Tulasī Dāsa availed himself also of the Adhyātma-rāmāyaṇa, a mystic riefacimento of the Rāmāyaṇa, which is included in the Brahmāṇḍapūrṇa. When inquiries are brought to bear on this source, too,—a task which the author of this article may possibly carry out in the near future,—then only can the priority of the Rāmāyaṇa amongst the sources of the Rāmcharitamānasā be definitely established. But on the whole, even if some
restriction is still to be made on the priority herein assigned to the Rāmdyaṇa, our general conclusions are absolutely definite and the present article will always retain its value as a collection of the best proofs in favor of Tulasi Dāsa’s having largely and directly utilized Vālmiki's poem.\(^1\) — L. P. T.

Nandapuryagnimangani samattam yad Rāmdyaṇe niyadidam kecicd anyato ‘pi |
svadhanubhya Tulasi Raghuvardhagnathabhadramah smarananulam itanoti || 7 || \(^2\)

In the above stanza in the Sanskrit introduction to the Rāmcharitamānasa Tulasi Dāsa himself informs his readers of the sources from which he has drawn. In fact he does here avow most explicitly that he has derived from the Rāmdyaṇa, and partly also from other works, all the matter that was conformable to the Purāṇas and to the Holy Scriptures. Leaving aside for the present the question how far the words kecicd anyato ‘pi should be extended, the fact remains that in the above passage Tulasi Dāsa himself does quote the poem of Vālmiki as his chief source, and does declare clearly that he has drawn from it the bulk of that material which he has brought into harmony with his own spiritual ideas and clothed in a pleasant form of poetry. Such is after all the meaning hidden in that testimony, which on the other hand gives us but superfluous information, for every diligent reader of the Rāmcharitamānasa would reach for himself the same conclusion. Tulasi Dāsa has followed the path formerly trodden by Vālmiki, placing his feet upon the very footsteps left by his great predecessor.

If looked upon superficially, such an assertion will no doubt strike one as the absurdest paradox. A bottomless abyss lies between the two poems; in each one breathes a different sir, sees different people living in a world quite apart; the impressions which each makes on the mind of its readers are so unlike that one cannot see at a glance anything but a fancied dependence of the one upon the other. But one must not ignore that objective facts, not aesthetic impressions, are the best criterion for settling any question regarding the dependence of any one work upon another; and it is in the light of that positive criterion that our assertion is to be viewed. The fact is that, as far as Rāma’s life is concerned, the thread of the narrative is mainly one and the

---

\(^1\) At the moment of revising the proofs of the present article, I am kindly informed by Sir G. Grierson that Bhalbhada Prasad Sukla of Ballia, U. P. and three other people are publishing an edition of Tulasi Dāsa’s Rāmcharitamānasa, together with another poem of the same title in Sanskrit Ślokas, which bears such an exact correspondence to it, that it must necessarily be concluded that one is a translation of the other. Sir G. Grierson has seen the Aranyuṣ and Sundarakānda of this edition, and has found that both the versions are practically line for line the same. The editors consider the Sanskrit version to be the original one, basing their opinion on what Tulasi Dāsa himself says in the introduction to the Hindī poem concerning the origin of the story, and particularly on the passage, in which he states that he heard the story from his guru, but owing to his being but a child, he could not understand it, and only afterwards, when he understood it better, he put it down in śādāḥ:

maini puni niṣa guru sana suni kathā su śākara-khetā; 

samjuk mahān taṇa bālapana taba ati rakshān atāta || . . .

tadapi kahi guru bhakṣmān bhāṛa; samjuk pari kachu maṭi-anuṣrā; 

bhākṣa-balaṁkara karaṁ so! more mana prabodha jehi hof || (1, 30-31)

The editors promise a full account of the Sanskrit MS. in the preface to the Bālākṛṣṇa. “Till then—writes Sir G. Grierson—we must wait in patience.” That one version is a translation of the other is perfectly certain, but which is the original it is impossible, at present, to say. The impression conveyed to my mind is that it is the Sanskrit version that is the translation, as it is not so compact as Tulasi Dāsa. The author has to fill up his Ślokas with unnecessary words to make them agree with the Hindī. But, on the other hand, it may be argued that Tulasi Dāsa took a Sanskrit original and improved it by condensing it. In the latter case, it is this Sanskrit Rāmcharitamānasa that we ought necessarily to consider as the first, and perhaps the only, source of the Hindī poem. But, even so, our general conclusion that Tulasi Dāsa’s poem is chiefly based upon the Rāmdyaṇa would by no means be impaired. The only difference would be that the correspondence of the former to the latter ought to be explained simply as a consequence of Tulasi Dāsa’s having translated a work that was chiefly based upon Vālmiki, not as having been intentionally brought about by Tulasi Dāsa himself.

\(^2\) The present and all following quotations from the Rāmcharitamānasa are taken from the edition of the
same in both the poems: Tulasī Dāsa derives from Valmiki all the particulars of the story, shortens or amplifies them as he likes, explains them according to his creed, clothes them in a new fashion, but hardly ever alters their objectiveness, their succession, their historical value. One might be induced to think Tulasī Dāsa firmly believes in the historical trustworthiness of the Ramayana and therefore makes it a point not to mistake the truth, at least as far as that truth does not strike too openly at his ethical and religious ideas. This is why Tulasī Dāsa retains some particulars, which were quite in accordance with the redundant epic style in Valmiki’s poem, but seem mere, and even strange, superfluities amidst the habitual conciseness of the Ramacharitamānasā. This is why Tulasī Dāsa always applies the greatest attention to giving unicumum ipsum; i.e., to attributing every action or speech, however insignificant it may be, to the very persons whom Valmiki has represented as authors thereof. This is why Tulasī Dāsa always makes it a point never to alter the succession of events and goes so far in his scruples that he never fails to replace by a short allusion any episode or important passage of the Ramayana, to which he could not give room in his poem.

This general rule of fidelity to his source finds its greatest exception in Tulasī Dāsa’s sixth book, where the succession of facts is wholly subverted, the particulars of one combat are often mistaken for those of another, and the deeds of one champion are attributed to another; but in this case the exception does not weaken the rule and can be easily explained, if we only suppose that Tulasī Dāsa could not always find his way amidst the bewildering intricacy of Valmiki’s Yuddha-kānda and often lost himself in the labyrinth of events—which supposition is greatly corroborated by our own practical experience of the difficulty of thoroughly mastering by heart the subject of this most intricate book, though nowadays the scholar can reckon upon handier editions and greater helps, than were available to the mediæval poet.

But, leaving aside the Lakkākanda and the few other divergencies from Valmiki, which are interspersed in the other books of the Ramacharita-Mānasā and not always without a reason, the fact remains of Tulasī Dāsa’s strict fidelity to the historical and chronological data in the narrative of the Sanskrit Ramayana; a fidelity of such a nature that, were there no other testimony, it would perhaps be sufficient to show that Tulasī Dāsa, whilst writing, always

---

8 This rule admits of a few exceptions, which are mainly found in the Bāla and Ayodhyākānda. I quote the three which are the most striking in the above two books:

(i) Tulasī Dāsa places Rāma Jāmadagnya’s episode immediately after the breaking of the bow and consequent before Daśaratha’s arrival at Mithilā. [Valmiki represents it as taking place during Daśaratha’s and Rāma’s return to Ayodhyā];

(ii) Tulasī Dāsa makes Viṣṇumitra start from Mithilā along with Daśaratha and sojourn in Ayodhyā for many days. It is in Ayodhyā that Viṣṇumitra’s story is related by Vasishtha and Vāmadeva. [Valmiki makes Viṣṇumitra start from Mithilā before Daśaratha and has his story told in Mithilā itself by Cātānūya];

(iii) Tulasī Dāsa makes Gūha cross the Ganges along with the three exiles and accompany them one or two stages further. [Valmiki makes Rāma dismiss Gūha and Sumantra before crossing the Ganges].

It is most likely that alterations in the order of succession, like the above, crept into the R.C.M. from some of the other sources, which were utilized by Tulasī Dāsa. But that is not perhaps the case with all alterations of that kind. Take the following example: In the R.C.M., Lakshmana bears of Rāma’s banishment only as late as II, 70, 1-2, namely, after the permission given Sītā to follow her husband into the exile. Now it is simply absurd that Lakshmana, Rāma’s inseparable companion, should have heard the news later than the eldren, whose grief had been described by Tulasī Dāsa long before. It is obvious that Tulasī Dāsa, in his overdrawn laconicism had quite forgotten to make any mention of Lakshmana at the proper place, and had to repair its omission when he had to relate how Rāma, after giving Sītā his consent, gave it to Lakshmana too.

4 The first half of the Bāla and nearly the whole of the Uttarākānda, as they have no correspondent in the Ramayana, but are a mere addition to Rāma’s life, are of course beyond the scope of the present article.

9 Possibly the change in the title of the book from Yuddha to Lakkākanda was not without its reason.
kept this source at hand and referred to it whenever his memory was failing him. Any diligent reader, who is patient enough to compare stanza for stanza the two poems, will easily be able to trace back the whole path trodden by Tulsī Dāsa through the forest of Vālmīki’s Rāmdvya and to get a clear idea of his way of proceeding. To prove my assertion let me quote the three following passages of the Rāmcharitamānas, in which Tulsī Dāsa, for accuracy’s sake, retains some particulars found in Vālmīki’s poem, which, though they have their sufficient reason in the Sanskrit original, are not justifiable in the Hindi version, and look strange, or at least superfluous:—

1. In Book II, 10, Tulsī Dāsa, after having told us that Vasiśṭha, in obedience to Daśaratha’s orders, went to Rāma’s house, in order to make him devote himself to the holy practices preliminary to consecration, adds that, having given his instructions to Rāma, Vasiśṭha returned to the king (guru sikhā dei rāja pahān gāyañ, II, 10, 44). This particular, whilst corresponding exactly with Vālmīki’s narrative (C’, II, 5, 51 and following), looks quite superfluous in our poem, and is not in accordance with Tulsī Dāsa’s continuous effort towards being as concise as possible.

2. In Book IV, 27, Tulsī Dāsa relates that the monkeys, having failed to get tidings of Sīśa, do not dare to return to Śrīpelva, but sit down on beds of kusa spread on the shore of the Ocean (bhīṣe kapi suha darbha gāyañ, IV, 27, 105). It is obvious that Tulsī Dāsa has here in mind the prāgopaśma described by Vālmīki in the 50th sarga (C and B’) of the 4th Book, and, as he cannot afford himself to relate it fully and does not wish to omit it altogether, he contented himself with so imperfect an account, that is quite incomprehensible without a direct reference to his source.

3. In Book VII, 15, after having described Rāma’s consecration, Tulsī Dāsa introduces even the phalastuti, which in Vālmīki comes immediately after it (C, VI, 128, 105 and following = B, VI, 112, 12 and following), without perceiving that such a phalastuti, whilst being in its place in the Rāmdvyāna, which originally ended with the Yuddhakāda, is quite out of place in his poem, which is to end only with the Uttarakāda.

Many other examples in corroboration of the above assertion, could be drawn from all those passages, where Tulsī Dāsa indicates by a most cursory allusion a Vālmīkian episode deliberately omitted. Such allusions are often so incomplete and obscure that they seem to bear no meaning to any one who has not in mind the corresponding passages in the Rāmdvyāna, and we cannot understand why Tulsī Dāsa should have thrust them into his poem, unless we attribute to him the scrupulosity of a diligent historian, who feels himself bound to represent the facts in their full completeness and entirety. Here also I shall confine myself to only three examples:

1. The Vīṣvāmitra episode is wholly omitted by Tulsī Dāsa and the following allusion is substituted for the story: muni muna agama Gādhisuta-karaṇī | mudita Bāṣiṭṭha bipula-hāki karaṇī | I, 329, 6, which we find repeated after a few stanzas: Bāmadvā Raṇhukula-guru jñānti | bahari Gādhisuta-kathā bakhānti | I, 361, 1;

Sir G. Grierson, in his notice of the Italian edition of the present article (J. R. A. S., 1912, pages 794-796), finds my assumption, that Tulsī Dāsa had a manuscript of the Rāmdvyāna by him and that he consulted it as he went along, not altogether justifiable. For, he observes, it cannot be thought that an Indian poet would labour on such lines. I feel I must heartily agree with him. My assumption was simply founded on the fact that I was unable to conceive Tulsī Dāsa’s exactness in reproducing step by step and in its right arrangement the entire succession of incidents in Vālmīki’s poem as a mere case of memory.

Following Jacobi’s example (Das Rāmdvyāna, Gesch. u. Inhalt, etc., Bonn, 1868), I represent by C the northern (or commented) recension, by B the Bengalee, and by A the western one.
2. The episode of the blind anchorite’s son, whom Dācaratha killed in his youth, is thus alluded to in passing by Tulasī Dāsa: tāpasa-aniha-stupa sudhi di | Kanṣalīyūhī sabha kathā sudā || II, 155. 4;

3. Sūgrīva’s detailed narration to Rāma of Vālin’s feat on the Dundubhi aṣura and the seven palm-trees (C, IV, 11) is omitted by Tulasī Dāsa and the mere statement is made instead that Sūgrīva showed Rāma Dundubhi’s bones and the palm-trees: Dundubhi-asthi tāla deha ruddye || IV, 8, 12a.

Many examples of this kind, as well as others, could be easily drawn from the Ramācharitamānas as further arguments in favour of Tulasī Dāsa’s strict fidelity to the Rāmāyāna, but it would be superfluous to dwell any longer upon this point here, as the reader will find plenty of such arguments in parallel passages quoted later on. 8 Having thus set the general rule that Tulasī Dāsa, as far as possible, closely follows Vālmiki’s data without altering them, it remains to formulate exceptions and to ascertain out of what motives, extrinsic or intrinsic in the poet’s mind, these have sprung. In what cases does Tulasī Dāsa alter Vālmiki’s narrative? and why?

As regards a good many of the alterations we can give these questions a prompt and most positive answer. Tulasī Dāsa does not write as objectively as Vālmiki did. On the contrary, there is a moral ideal to which all his poetry is subjected, and a particular result which he wishes to bring out by means of his poem. He has to relate facts in such a way as to convince his readers of Rāma’s divinity and to inspire them with faith and devotion. No wonder then that he alters Vālmiki’s facts, when these do not prove conformable to the tenets of his creed, as in that case alterations were an impelling necessity and quite justifiable from his particular point of view. This accounts for the total disguise of Rāma’s personality from the human in the divine; the continual effort towards exalting his greatness and enhancing his virtues; the omission or justification of all the particulars which would seem unbecoming to his majestic power; the exaggrandizing of the devotional feelings of all the people, who surround him or happen to come in contact with him, and the promotion to the rank of Rāma’s fervid votaries of all those who in the Rāmāyāna either do Rāma some great service (Hanumān, Sūgrīva, etc.), or, being his enemies, refrain from fighting against him, be it out of righteousness (Vibhishuṇa), or be it out of fear (Māra, Kālanemi). Particulars incompatible with the principle of Rāma’s divinity are not always silently passed over by Tulasī Dāsa, but in some, indeed in most cases, they are maintained, but softened or explained as being mere illusions brought about by the Lord’s māyā; and this is another argument in favour of our assertion, that Tulasī Dāsa as far as he can avoids altering the sources. 9 In some other cases, where both Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa are concerned, unbecoming particulars are attributed to Lakṣmaṇa only. The same is the case with Śiśu, who—just as Helen never went to Troy according to Stesichoros’ palinode—never went to Lāṅkā, but was absorbed by the Fire, leaving on earth a void image of herself, and was given back by the Fire pure and untouched to Rāma, after his victory over the rakshasas. Śiśu’s repudiation and her being swallowed by the Earth, her mother, are quite naturally wanting in the Rāmācharitamānas.

There are other alterations, which are of a different nature and are not so easy to explain. In many instances it is difficult to make out why Tulasī Dāsa has varied Vālmiki’s narrative

---

* Let me add only the remark that such a correspondence of the two poems to one another is all the more significant, inasmuch as Tulasī Dāsa is by no means a poet wanting in imagination, so that he would not have hesitated to overstep the limits laid down by Vālmiki, had he deemed it permissible and wise.

* To confine myself to a single example of facts of this kind, I may cite Kishkindhākiṇḍa, 10, 4 and following, where Tulasī Dāsa maintains the particular of Vālin’s reproaching Rāma for having killed him by treachery, but takes care to justify it by the remark: “Vālin, though full of affection in his heart, yet with his mouth uttered harsh words...”
when there was apparently no reason for doing so; and we cannot suppose he did it out of mere love of novelty, since the facts examined above bear irrefragable testimony of his respect for the Valmikian tradition. In my opinion these variations, which do not seem to have sprung from the necessity of removing some points in the old epic as being in open contrast with the moral and religious spirit of the new poem, have crept into the Rāmācharitmanasa in sundry ways and are partly voluntary and partly involuntary. I would therefore distinguish:

(a) The innovations, which Tulasi Dāsa knowingly introduced, conforming himself to other sources than the Rāmāyaṇa. A clear allusion to these sources is made by the poet himself with the phrase kvac ca anga 'pi in the couplet quoted at the top of the present article.10

(b) The innovations which Tulasi Dāsa introduced unconsciously without having any intention of swerving from Valmiki's path. These innovations, which, looking at their origin, we might more properly term mistakes or oversights, may be explained: (a) partly by supposing that the poet when composing those particular passages had not an exact vision of the Sanskrit text, but wrote from memory without perceiving that this was wrong; and (b) partly by considering that, in consequence of his continual effort to abridge and condense, when striving to constrain into a few verses the subject of several sargas of Valmiki, the poet may have involuntarily altered the appearance of the facts by relating them too concisely and defectively.

Let me give an example illustrative of this second class of alterations. In Ayodhyākhyāna, 156, Tulasi Dāsa, just after having described Daśaratha's last moments, enters immediately into the description of the bemoanings of the queens, forgetting to remark that they took place only in the following morning, and then goes on to relate the grief of all the servants and citizens, as if all this had taken place during the very night of Daśaratha's death. Then he says: "In such lamentations the night was spent, (till in the morning) all great and learned sages arrived" (156, 8).

Now, according to this description, it would seem that the sages had arrived in the morning subsequent to the night of the king's death, whilst according to Valmiki they arrive, or rather assemble, only in the morning of the second day. That Tulasi Dāsa, when writing this passage, had in mind and was closely following the corresponding passages in the Rāmāyaṇa cannot be doubted, as it is sufficiently proved by No. 31 of the parallel passages quoted later on. It is clear that Tulasi Dāsa simply forgot to mention the breaking of the first day.

In the same class of alterations is to be reckoned that which I would call the omission of the interval, and this is little short of a rule in the Rāmācharitmanasa. Whenever in Valmiki's narrative there are two analogous events separated by an interval of not much importance and having the only effect of retarding the progress of the facts, Tulasi Dāsa passes over the interval and merges the two events. A few examples will explain the matter better:

(a) In the Ayodhyākhyāna (C, 4 = B, 3) Valmiki relates that Daśaratha calls Rāma into his presence, an after having informed him of his intention of consecrating him yuvrājya, enjoins on him the performance along with Śiśū of the fast preliminary to the ceremony (first event). Rāma takes his

10 These sources are not within the limits of the present article. Let me only point out that they are to be looked for especially amidst the Purāṇas, and the Aitihyātmakāryāṇa and the Varāshāstraśāstra are probably two of them. Sir G. Grierson calls my attention to the fact that several commentators point to a Bhāṣāpūrāṇa also as having been largely utilized by Tulasi Dāsa, but this probably refers, as Sir G. Grierson himself seems inclined to suppose, only to the Kākar-Bhāṣāpūrāṇa episode in the Uttarākhyāna, which being not included in Rāma's life, lies outside our subject. On the whole my opinion concerning all these extraneous sources is that Tulasi Dāsa availed himself more of their spirit, and in some cases of their artistic form, than of their substance. In reference to art he utilized also to some degree Kālidāsa's Rāghavaśāstra, as is proved by the three quotations following: Rāgh., XII, 2 = R. C. M., II, 27; Rāgh., XII, 5 = R. C. M., II, 25; Rāgh., XII, 30 = R. C. M., VI, 69, 7.
leave and goes in search of Sītā and Kausalyā, and finds both of them praying for him in the devātāgāra. After having spoken to them, he returns to his own house (interval). Then Daçaratha sends Vasishthā to Rāma to prescribe to him once more the performance of the fasting (C, 5 = B, 4) (second event). In Tulasi Dāsa’s poem we miss every trace of the interval and find the two events blended together, inasmuch as Daçaratha does not himself inform Rāma of the proposed consecration, but from the very beginning sends Vasishthā to give him the information, as well as to prescribe to him the customary fast (R. C. M., II, 9-10);

(c) In Vālmiki’s Aravākṣāda (C, 19-20 = B, 25-26) Cūraṇakāgha, after having been mutilated by Lakshmana, goes in tears to her brother Khara and, being asked the reason of her grief, tells him of the insult she has suffered at the hands of the two Rāghavas. Khara commits to fourteen rākṣasas the task of revenging her; she leads these champions against the Rāghavas, but Rāma destroys them (first event). Then Cūraṇakāgha returns back to Khara and keeps on weeping till he requests her for a second time the reason of her tears. She tells him of the defeat of the fourteen rākṣasas and for the second time begs for revenge (C, 21 = B, 27) (interval). Then Khara sends against Rāma fourteen thousand rākṣasas at the command of Dūṣaṇa (C, 22 = B, 28) (second event). Tulasi Dāsa omits the interval and makes one event of the two; the two expeditions are reduced to one, and this one of course no longer corresponds either to the first or to the second of the two, but is a mixture of both. So Tulasi Dāsa describes his unique expedition as being led by Cūraṇakāgha (like the first one in the Rāmdyana) and as composed of fourteen thousand rākṣasas (like the second one in the Rāmdyana) (R. C. M., III, 20);

(c) In Vālmiki’s Yuddhakarṇa (C, 68 = B, 47) Rāvana laments Kumbhakarṇa’s death (first event). Then comes another terrible fight, in which Narāntaka, Devāntaka, Mahodara, Trīciṣa, Mahāpārvya and Atikāya lose their lives (C, 69-71 = B, 48-51) (interval). This gives Rāvana the opportunity of making other lamentations and getting into despair, till Indračit comforts him with blistering promises (C, 73 = B, 52) (second event). Tulasi Dāsa passes the whole interval over and makes Rāvana lament only once, viz., after Kumbhakarṇa’s death, and at this particular moment be consoled by Meghanadhā (R. C. M., VI, 72).

In the same order of alterations are to be included all the anachronisms proceeding from Tulasi Dāsa knowing already from Vālmiki the result of every particular event, and anticipating by ascribing to the will of his personages facts, which in the Rāmdyana happen only afterwards, either by a mere chance, or as a natural consequence of previous occurrences. Thus he makes Agni himself, when bawling to Daçaratha the impregnating nectar, direct him to divide it into the proper portions (R. C. M., I, 189, 8); Viśvāmitra demand from Daçaratha not only Rāma but also Lakshmana (R. C. M., I, 207, 10); Rāma promise Sūrya that he will slay Viśvāmitra with a single arrow (R. C. M., IV, 7, 15), etc.

Turning to the rhetorical and artistic side of the Rāmācharitāmāna, we shall have to notice the very contrary of what we have observed in regard to its contents. The fact is that Tulasi Dāsa, whilst conforming himself closely to Vālmiki as far as the particulars of Rāma’s life are concerned, directs on the other hand all his efforts towards acquiring an absolute independence from Vālmiki’s style and expressions. He displays the strongest aversion to availing himself of Vālmiki’s artistic resources and continuously takes the utmost care not to slide inadvertently into any image, simile or phrase used by his predecessor. Whether it be the natural pride arising from the poet’s consciousness of his own worth and, his consequent abhorrence of lowering himself to the humble position of an imitator, or whether it be the necessity of giving vent to his poetical genius and to his rich imagination, or even the desire of giving his poem an appearance more in harmony
with the taste of the new times and making it more easily understood and appreciated by the illiterate masses, the fact is that Tulsi Dasa continually tries his best to keep clear of any imitation and to establish his own independence and originality. And he generally succeeds in this effort, so that in this respect he appears as the author of a new and original work, not of a rifacimento, and every one must acknowledge that however much Valmiki has been his source, Valmiki has not in the least been his model.

No doubt a great part of the appearance of originality, which makes the Ramcharitmanasa look so different from the Ramayana, is due to the different religious principles with which it is wholly infused and to the different genius of the language in which it is clothed. I do not mean by this to refer to the general impressions one may derive from reading the poem. I have already pronounced myself in favor of a positive criterion for solving any question of dependence of one work upon another, and accordingly I avoid general impressions here also and confine myself to the comparison of parallel passages of the two poems. It is such a comparison, carried on patiently for the entire length of Ramas's life, that has led me to the abovementioned conclusion: namely, that it is Tulsi Dasa's deliberate wish to keep himself as independent as possible from Valmiki's expressions and that he tries continually to represent the facts in a new light, in order to make new impressions on the minds of his hearers and readers. This conclusion is chiefly deduced from the following observations:

(1) Tulsi Dasa, though generally bent towards summarizing and condensing, dwells, often intentionally, on particulars hastily dealt with by Valmiki, and passes over or refers to by a simple allusion particulars which Valmiki has treated at some length. As an example illustrative of the first series of cases, I quote the episode of Agastya's embassy to Ravana, which is compressed by Valmiki within a few lokas (C, VI, 161 and 162), whilst Tulsi Dasa enlarges it enormously (R, C. M., VI, 17-35). The second series of cases is sufficiently illustrated by all those Valmiki episodes, which Tulsi Dasa omits or mentions by a hurried and obscure allusion, and these have been already dealt with in the antecedent pages.

(2) Tulsi Dasa makes a constant endeavour not to reproduce Valmiki's similes and in parallel passages always replaces them by new ones, mostly of his own making;

(3) Tulsi Dasa generally disdains to utilize words, appellatives or epithets used by Valmiki in parallel passages and substitutes synonyms for them. In spite of his continual efforts to keep clear of any imitation of Valmiki's art, Tulsi Dasa nevertheless falls at times inadvertently into the very traps he wishes to avoid, and reproduces some form of expression from the Ramayana in the very words used by Valmiki, or appropriates to himself some of his predecessor's similes. However scanty may be the number of these Valmiki reminiscences interspersed within the Ramcharitmanasa, and however difficult

---

11 His aversion to dwell upon particulars well known or largely and magisterially described by others is openly avowed by Tulsi Dasa himself in more than one passage. For example, after having rapidly related Sati's suicide, he says: yaha thikiesta sakala jaya jhania (Ibid. mai amichem aukha bhadadhi. (This story all the world knows, therefore I have described it briefly) (R, C. M., I, 46-4). A similar remark may be seen after the allusion to Kàrtikayana's birth and deeds (R, C. M., I, 103, 9-10). Tulsi Dasa's tendency to give his descriptions a different length from Valmiki's had been already noticed by Growse: "In other passages, where the story follows the same lines, whatever Valmiki has condensed—as for example the description of the marriage festivities—Tulsi Dasa has expanded; and wherever the elder poet has lingered longest, his successor has hastened on most rapidly" (Introduction to his Translation, page iv).

12 Though a good many of such substitutions by synonyms may be explained as prosodical necessities, yet it cannot be so in all cases. A few instances illustrative of the different cases are: Brahma-datta for Swayambhuddatí (see parallel passage No. 79), ashtada for sodbhaga (see parallel passage No. 77), drkshala-sara for castrum apyanam (see parallel passage No. 7), Chandravata for Nityabara (R, C. M., IV, 29), Meghanda for Indraji, etc.
may be the task of recognizing them, owing to the great change they have undergone in being transferred to a language so different from the Sanskrit and to a style so different from the rich style of the epic, yet by diligent inquiries they can still be brought to light; and are important in so far as they supply us with the surest evidence that Tulasī Dāsa did actually and directly draw on the Sanskrit Rāmdvya.

Before entering on the exhibition and illustration of the most striking of these Vālmikian reminiscences still to be found in the Rāmdvya, and thereby adumbrating the proofs of what I have been affirming up to now, I deem it necessary to solve the question as to which recension of the Rāmdvya was used by Tulasī Dāsa.

A careful analysis of the Hindi poem has enabled me to conclude that Tulasī Dāsa did not always follow the same recension of the Sanskrit poem, but that, though he usually followed B, he knew and largely followed also C (and may be even A).

Tulasī Dāsa’s inconsistency as regards a model recension becomes apparent at a first glance, if we only look at the limits he has assigned to the single books. After the pattern of the Rāmdvya, the Rāmdtvamanasa, too, is divided into seven kāṣṭhas, but the lines of the partition within the Hindi poem and within each of the three recensions of the Sanskrit poem do not coincide with each other. Tulasī Dāsa, however, does not follow an independent course generally, but conforms himself either to the one or to the other of the recensions, as can be seen from the following synopsis:

Bālākṣṭha: Ends in the R. C. M. as in C, A, and in the main as in B also, for the substance of sargas 79-80, which B adds to the Bālākṣṭha thereby differing from C, A, has not been introduced by Tulasī Dāsa into his poem.

Ayodhyākṣṭha: Ends in the R. C. M. as in B, A; whilst C adds to it five other sargas.

Aranyakṣṭha: Ends in the R. C. M. as in B, A; whilst C falls short of a sarga.

Kishkindhakṣṭha: Ends in the R. C. M. as in C; A adds to it one more sarga, whilst B ends the kāṣṭha four sargas before C.

Śundarakṣṭha: Ends in the R. C. M. a sarga before than in B; A concords with B but adds two sargas which fail in B, C; C adds the kāṣṭha a score of sargas before.

Lāṅkākṣṭha: Ends in the R. C. M. as the Yuddhakṣṭha in A, B, C.

Uttarakṣṭha: Differs entirely in the R. C. M.

By comparing single passages in the Rāmdtvamanasa with their corresponding ones in the Rāmdvya, and chiefly by examining the particulars, exclusive either of B or of C, that have been accepted by Tulasī Dāsa, I have been able to conclude with certainty that Tulasī Dāsa follows C and B alternately, and to fix the limits and recurrence of these alternations as follows:

(1) Tulasī Dāsa follows C from the beginning of Rāma’s life (C, I, 18) till Rāma’s arrival at the Chitrakūṭa (C, II, 56);

(2) Tulasī Dāsa follows B from Sumantra’s return to Ayodhya (B, (C), II, 57) till the end of the Aranyakṣṭha and may be even further on for a good part of the Kishkindhakṣṭha;

(3) Tulasī Dāsa follows C from the beginning of the Śundarakṣṭha till Rāma’s ascension on the Śvēḷa after bridging the Ocean (C, VI, 40);

(4) Tulasī Dāsa follows B from the beginning of the combats with the rakṣasas (B, VI, 17 = C, VI, 42) down to the end of the Yuddhakṣṭha.

Each of the above items represents a conclusion from a series of evidence drawn from examining all passages which are found in only one of the two recensions of the Rāmdvya (B, C) and either have no correspondence at all with the other or differ greatly from it. All this evidence is invariably unilateral within each of the four partitions, i.e., within the limits of the first and
third partition. Tulasī Dāsa follows C exclusively, and within the limits of the second and fourth partition follows B exclusively. These deductions are chiefly derived from the following points of examination:

1: T. D. follows C.

(1) R. C. M., I, 191, 18 = C, I, 18, 38 (B wanting).
   [Rāma is born on the ninth day of the Chaitra-month]. See parallel No. 2, below

(2) R. C. M., I, 210, 46 = C, I, 30, 134 (B differing).
   [Mārīchya is struck so forcibly by Rāma’s shaft that he falls a hundred pāyanas away]
   In B we miss the number. See parallel No. 6;

(3) R. C. M., II, 6, 1-4 = C, II, 3, 6-20 (B wanting).
   [Vasishṭha in compliance with Daśaratha’s request enumerates the customary things
    required for Rāma’s consecration];

(4) R. C. M., II, 37, 20 = C, II, 18, 27 (B wanting).
   See parallel No. 17;

(5) R. C. M., II, 38, 39, 1 = C, II, 14, 38-42 (B differing).
   [Sumantra goes to wake Daśaratha and is commanded by Kaikeyi to fetch Rāma at
    once]. In B, not Kaikeyi but Daśaratha himself, spurred on by Kaikeyi, gives Sumantra the
    order to fetch Rāma;

   [The citizens that follow Rāma to the woods get up in the morning and noticing
    Rāma’s disappearance burst into lamentation; then, being unable to find out the track of his
    chariot, return to Ayodhya]. See parallel No. 25;

(7) R. C. M., II, 124, 5 and CII, 56, 13-17 (B wanting).
   [The three exiles reach Valmiki’s hermitage].

2: T. D. follows B.

(1) R. C. M., II, 152, 38 and 87 = C, II, 58, 39 and 87 (C differing).
   [Sumantra relates to Daśaratha the messages of Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa]. C (II, 58, 39
   and 87) says the same as B, but the reference to B is more persuasive. See parallel
   No. 28;

(2) R. C. M., II, 155, 9-10 = B, II, 66, 67-68 (C differing).
   [Daśaratha breathes his last invoking : “ Rāma! Rāma!” ]

(3) R. C. M., II, 163, 1 and 87 = B, II, 77, 5 and 87 (C, II, 78, 5 and 87)
   [Çatrughna illtreats Mantharā]. This takes place in the R. C. M. as well as in B
   after Bharata’s reproach to Kaikeyi, whilst in C it takes place only thirteen days after Daśaratha’s
   obsequies;

   [On the morning following the day of Bharata’s arrival, Daśaratha’s ministers congre-
    gate the assembly and in that meeting Vasishṭha consoles and admonishes Bharata];

   See parallel No. 39;

(6) In the R. C. M., the Ayodhyakāṇḍa ends at the same point as in B (C adds to it also
    the five sargaś with which the Aranyakāṇḍa begins in B : C, II, 116-119);

   [Description of Rāma’s and Sītā’s pastimes on the Chitrakūṭa and episode of the crow].
This sarga B, II, 105 is quoted by Rāmāvarman in his commentary as a prakṣipta after sarga
C, II, 25;
See parallel No. 43;
(9) R. C. M., III, 19, 11 = B, III, 23, 45 (C wanting).
See parallel No. 44;
(10) R. C. M., III, 21, 1 = B, III, 30, 38 (C wanting).
See parallel No. 45;
See parallel No. 46;
See parallel No. 48;
(13) In the R. C. M., the Aranyakadga ends at the same point as in B. (The sarga which
B considers as the last of the Aranyakadga is included by C in the Kishkindadhakada.)

3: T. D. follows C.
(1) In the R. C. M., the Kishkindadhakada ends at the same point as in C, viz., after the
deliberation on the leaping over the Ocean, (B includes this deliberation in the Sundarakadga);
(2) R. C. M., V, 1, 2—3, s = C, V, 1, 85-87 (B differing).
[Hanumat in his way through the sky meets firstly Mainaka, then Surasga, and finally
Simhikä]. In B the order of succession is changed: Surasga, Mainaka, Simhikä;
(3) R. C. M., V, s = C, V, 3, 29-51 (A), B wanting.
[Hanumat’s meeting with Laksh = Lakšasruradhishadhirdevat) in C; with the
Lakshini rakshali in the R. C. M.]
(4) R. C. M., V, 26, 3 = C, V, 54, 40
R. C. M., V, 26, 4 = C, V, 54, 39-31
R. C. M., V, 26, 8-9 = C, V, 54, 40
{ (B wanting).
See parallel No. 67;
(5) R. C. M., V, 60, 5-8 = C, VI, 22, 27-35 (B wanting).
[The Ocean prays Rama to shoot at the Drumakulya the arrow he has fitted to his
bow and Rama complies with the request];
(6) R. C. M., VI, 13 = C, VI, 40 (A), B wanting.
[Overthrowing of Ravana’s crowns at the hands of Sugriva in the Râmâyana, of Râma
in the R. C. M.]
See parallel No. 75.

4: T. D. follows B.
(1) R. C. M., VI, 6-8
R. C. M., VI, 14-16
R. C. M., VI, 33-37
{ B, VI, 33, 8—34 (C wanting).
[Manodari tries to persuade Ravana to give up fighting against Rama; but he
answers by boasting of his own strength]. This scene is found only once in B, but is repeated
three times in the R. C. M.]
(2) R. C. M., VI, 56-60 = B, VI, 82 (C wanting).
[Hanumat goes to fetch the herb that will heal Lakshmana and meets on his way two
obstacles: Bharata and Kâlanemi. This is according to B. Tulasî Dâsa on the whole keeps close to

13 Tulasî Dâsa varies somewhat the episode, but does not alter it in its general lines. Brahmä’s prophecy
is identical even in the expression both in the Râmchâritâmânasa as well as in the Râmâyana.
B, but makes Hanumat meet firstly Kālanemi and then Bharata, and represents him as being actually brought down by Bharata’s arrow (so !) ;

(3) *R. C. M.*, VI, 61, 7-8 = B, VI, 24, 7-8 (C wanting).

See parallel No. 77 ;

(4) *R. C. M.*, VI, 63, 5-6 = B, VI, 40, 30 and ff. (C wanting).

[ Kumbhakarṇa declares to Rāvana Nārada’s prophecy ;

(5) *R. C. M.*, VI, 106, 9-10 = B, VI, 92, 74-75 (C wanting).

See parallel No. 82 ;


See parallel No. 83.

I regret that the absence of an edition has prevented me from extending my inquiries to the A recension too. The only work on A, that has been accessible to me, is that by Hans Wirtz, 14 which exhibits tables of concordances between A and the two other recensions, but these are too concise and vague to serve for any detailed comparison and to lead to precise results. The only point of connection between the Rāmācharitaṃdāna and A, that I have been able to ascertain, refers to the sarga A, VI, 82, (wanting in B and C) which has its perfect correspondence in *R. C. M.*, VI, 85. The substance of the passage is as follows: “Rāma, informed by Vibhūṣṇa that Rāvana is performing a sacrifice that will make him invincible, despatches Hanumat with other monkeys to interrupt it. These enter Rāvana’s palace and try in every way to distract his attention by provoking him with all sorts of insults, but they do not succeed. At last, seeing no other means, they seize the queens by the hair and drag them away, till the screams of the poor women crying for help induce Rāvana to interrupt his sacrifice and run to their rescue.” Such is Tulasī Dāsa’s narrative, which is in perfect conformity with the summary of the sarga A, VI, 82 as given by Hans Wirtz, pages 35-36. Since this sarga on the Mandodarikeśaprahaṇa is wholly unknown to both B and C, it is beyond doubt that Tulasī Dāsa has derived it either from A directly or from some other source proceeding from A.

Having thus smoothed the way by removing these questions, let us proceed directly to a close view of those Vālmikian reminiscences, which can be still found within the Rāmācharitaṃdāna, and which, considering Tulasī Dāsa’s aversion to imitating his predecessor’s art, are the surest proof in favor of the proposition we have been advancing and maintaining. Of course, it is not so much the single coincidences, which might often be quite casual and insignificant, as the whole of them taken together that may be expected to lend the most forcible argument in elucidation of our assertions.

Bālakīrṇa.

(1) The monkeys, Kīma’s future helpmates, are described with the same epithets in the *R. C. M.*:

| C, I, 17, 23-25 (B, I, 20, 13-14) | *R. C. M.*, I, 183, 4:
| —— giri-taru-nakha-ayudha saba . . . |

| C, I, 17, 24* (B, I, 20, 20)* | *R. C. M.*, I, 188, 5:
| —— giri kānana jahāṁ taṁhaṁ bhari pūrīṁ rahe . . . |

| C, I, 18, 5b (B wanting) | *R. C. M.*, I, 191, 1:
| —— tata ca dvādeśa maśe Chaitra-nāvamikāṁ tithau || 8 ||

| Ravanīstīthi Madhu-māsa punītā || |

14 *Die westliche Rezeption des "Rāmāyana,"* von Hans Wirtz, Bonn, 1894.
(3) Rāma is always in company with Lākṣmaṇa. With him he goes hunting:

C, I, 18, 31b-32a (B, I, 19, 24):

\[ \text{yadā hi hayam āruḍho mṛgīyaṁ yātī Rāghavah || } \text{31 ||} \]

athai ' nam prīṣṭhato 'bhṛṣṭe . . .

in company with him he takes his meals:

C, I, 18, 31b (B, I, 19, 28):

\[ \text{mṛṣṭaṁ annam upāṇitam svañā na hi taṁ vinā ||} \]

Rāma is always obedient to his parents:

C, I, 18, 28 (B wanting):

\[ \ldots \text{piuḷ pūrūṣaṁ reṇuḥ} \]

This last coincidence, which at first sight might look quite casual, becomes important if we consider that it occupies the same and identical place in each of the two poems. Upon the whole there is no doubt that Tulasi Dāsa directly knew and largely utilized Vālmīki's sarga C, I, 18.

(4) In the R. C. M. Viśvāmitra tries to persuade Daśaratha to give him Rāma and Lākṣmaṇa, and protests that this will be beneficial to him and to his sons too. Both these arguments can be traced back to the R.:

C, I, 19, 18a-19b (B, I, 22, 15):

\[ \text{yadī te dharmalabhau tū yuṣṭa cha paramaṁ bhūvi || } \text{15 ||} \]

sthīrāṁ ichhāhaṁ rajendrāṁ Rāmaṁ me dātum arhasi ||

C, I, 19, 10:

\[ \text{tyēṣaḥ chaśmaṁ pradāvyām} \]

\[ \text{(B, I, 22, 11:} \]

\[ \text{vidyā chaśmaṁ prayaśchihām . . .) } \]

(5) Tādjaka's attack is depicted with the same stereotyped expression in both the poems:

C, I, 26, 18b (B, I, 29, 3b):

\[ \text{cyutvaḥ cha bhṛṣṭaṁ kṛuddha . . .} \]

The persuasiveness of this particular parallel is intensified by the fact that suni and kroha kari are not so well justified in the R. C. M. as grūta and kṛūḍha are in the R. In the Sanskrit poem Tādjaka hears the terrible twang (jȳḡhaṁ) of Rāma's bow and, feeling herself provoked by it, gets into a fury; but in the Hindi poem suni has no direct object, and the only obvious object of which it admits, viz., the voice of Viśvāmitra who was pointing out Tādjaka to Rāma, does not seem a sufficient reason for the rikṣaṁ's fierce wrath.

(6) Māriṣaka, smitten by Rāma with an arrow, is driven a hundred yojanas to the other side of the Ocean (in the R., into the Ocean):

C, I, 20, 18b:

\[ \text{sampūrṇaṁ yojanaṁataṁ kaśitaṁ sāgarasamplaṁ || } \text{18 ||} \]

(In B we miss the number).

(7) In the R. C. M. (I, 210, 8a) Rāma slays Subāhu with a pāṭaka-sara, which corresponds to the attram agneyam mentioned in the parallel passage of the R. (C, I, 30, 22; B, I, 83, 19b).

(8) The chief lines in the description of Rāma Jāmadagnya are identical in both the poems:

C, I, 74, 17a (B, I, 76, 18b):

\[ \text{jaṭāmaṇḍajaladhāriṇam} \]

C, I, 74, 19 (B, I, 76, 20):

\[ \text{skandhaḥ cha 'saṁyja paraśuṁ dhanur vidyudgaṇopamam} \]

\[ \text{pragṛhiṇya çaram ugraṁ cha . . .} \]

R. C. M., I, 205, 1:

\[ \text{bandhu sakhā sanā sura bolā ||} \]

\[ \text{bana mṛgīya nita khelāhīm jāl ||} \]

R. C. M., I, 205, 4a:

\[ \text{anuṣa sakhā sanā bhojaṇa karahī ||} \]

R. C. M., I, 207, 12:

\[ \text{dharna sujasa prabhu tuma kauṃ} \]

R. C. M., I, 209, 3b:

\[ \text{suni Tādjaka krodha kari dhīl} \]

R. C. M., I, 210, 4b:

\[ \text{sata jojana gā sāgarā-pārā ||} \]

R. C. M., I, 268, 5a:

\[ \text{alisa jaṭā . . .} \]

R. C. M., I, 268, 8b:

\[ \text{dhanu saha cara kuṭhāra kala kāṃdhike} \]
In the R. Rāma tells Paraśurāma that he spares him only on account of his being a Brāhmaṇa; in the R. C. M. we find the same words uttered by Lakṣmīnāraṇa:

C, I, 76, 6 (B, I, 77, 40):
brāhmaṇo 'tītī pūjyo me . . . taśmā čhakto nā
tē Rāma mokṣtuḥ pṛāṣaham śaram || 6 ||

(9) On the morning after the marriages of his four sons, Daśaratha gets up very early and bestows upon the Brāhmaṇas 400 thousand cows:

C, I, 72, 21-22 (B, I, 74, 27-29):
prabhāte kālaṃ uttāhaḥ chakre godānam uttānam || 21 ||
gavāṇaṃ ca tātāh dharitam cha brāhmaṇe bhayo narādhipaḥ | ekai-
kaṇa daṇḍa rājā putrān udāsya dharitam || 22 || suva-
ngaśraṃgaḥ sampannāḥ svatātāḥ kāyādhaśaḥ | gavāṇa-
ṇaṃ ca tātāh śraddhāṃ chatvāri purṇaḥśarabhāḥ || 23 ||

(To be continued.)

AṆIVIKAS.¹

BY D. R. BHANDARKAR, M.A.; POONA.

It has been long since recognised that the Ājñikas of Aśoka’s Pillar-edict VII were the same as the Ājñikas of the Jaina scriptures and the Ājñikas of the Buddhist canon. And Prof. Kern was the first to contend that they were an ancient ascetic order, worshipping Nārāyaṇa, i.e., a subdivision of the Vaishṇavas. This view he has set forth in Der Buddhismus und seine Geschichte in Indien, Vol. II. It was countenanced by Prof. Bühler, who in his paper on “The Brahbar and Nāga-junct hill cave inscriptions of Aśoka and Daśaratha”² says as follows: “As Professor Kern’s work will not be accessible to the majority of Indian readers, I shall try to give a brief exposition of his arguments, regarding which he has kindly furnished me some fuller information. Assuming, as must be done, that the Ājñikas of our inscriptions are the same as those named in Aśoka’s seventh Pillar-edict, he translates the words 1. 4-5: kṣamāra eva bhāvanāṃ Ājñikāṇaṃ-pi-ma-
kāte idem viyapanāh kāharat-ti by ‘Likewise I have arranged it that these (Dharma-mahādṛṣṭras) will be occupied also with the Brāhmaṇical Ājñikas.’ With the information thus elicited from the Pillar-edict, he combines the statements of Utpala regarding the Ājñikas, who are mentioned in Varāhāmiśra’s Brihad-Itāka, XV. 1, together with the Vṛddhasāvatvas, the Nirgranthas or Jainas, and other ascetics. Utpala says in his commentary: ājñikā-grāhāṇaḥ cha Nārāya-
ṇa-darśitaḥ, “and the use of (the term) Ājñika refers to those who have taken refuge with Nārāyaṇa,” and in support of this explanation, brings forward two Prākrit passages, introducing them with the words: tathā cha yathā [read tathā cha = aśva] Kālakākāryaḥ—“and thus (says) also Kālakākārya.” In the first of these passages the term evaṁānād, i.e., ākārātyād, “(an ascetic) carrying one staff” (instead of the usual triple staff) is used for Ājñika and in the second a longer explanation is given, which Utpala renders by Bākapārastya-dikṣitah Kārakāsahākṣaḥ Bhavavata ity=arthaḥ.” Prof. Bühler further adds that Prof. Kern’s “confidence in the statements of Utpala appears justifiable, because the latter are supported by so ancient a writer as Kālakākārya. The Kālakākārya, quoted by him, is in all probability the famous Jaina teacher, who is said to have

¹ In June 1903 I communicated a note on the Ājñikas to the Jour. Bomb. As. Soc., which has been published in its Vol. XXI, p. 398 ff. This paper, though it has attracted the attention of some of the reputed scholars, does not seem to have been largely read. I, therefore, reedit it here in a slightly recast form and embodying the latest information available to me.

² Above, Vol. XX, p. 292.
changed the date of the Pajusam festival in the year 993 after Vīra, or A. D. 466. The identification is suggested by the fact that Utpala's Kālakāchārya is the author of a work on astrology and that the Jainas ascribe to their latest Kālakāchārya an innovation which presupposes the study of astronomy. If thus the author, quoted by Utpala, belongs to the fifth century, his statements deserve to be treated with all due respect."

It will thus be seen that, according to Professors Kern and Bühler, the Ājīvikas are Vaishnavas. This view rests on two passages from Utpala's commentary on Varāhamihira's Bṛhajjījātaka. The first passage is: *Ajīvika-grhāṇaḥ cha Nārāyaṇ-dīrītānāṁ*, which Prof. Kern renders by "and the use of (the term) Ājīvika refers to those who have taken refuge with Nārāyaṇa." The second passage is a quotation from Kālakāchārya, which Utpala renders by the Sanskrit *Kesava-mārga-dīkṣitaḥ Kesava-bhaktah Bhāgavata-iṣṭa-orthāḥ* and which, Prof. Kern supposes, shows that the Jain teacher regards Ājīvikas as Bhāgavatas. Now, in the first place, the translation proposed by Prof. Kern for the first passage is not correct. That this is the case will be seen from the following extract from Utpala's commentary on Bṛhajjījātaka XV. 1:

> ... and the following verse, Vijnāna-grhāṇaḥ cha Nārāyaṇ-dīrītānāṁ, which Prof. Kern renders by "the use of (the term) Ājīvika refers to those who have taken refuge with Nārāyaṇa," is, in fact, a quotation from a work of Kālakāchārya, which Utpala renders by the Sanskrit *Kesava-mārga-dīkṣitaḥ Kesava-bhaktah Bhāgavata-iṣṭa-orthāḥ* and which, Prof. Kern supposes, shows that the Jain teacher regards Ājīvikas as Bhāgavatas. Now, in the first place, the translation proposed by Prof. Kern for the first passage is not correct. That this is the case will be seen from the following extract from Utpala's commentary on Bṛhajjījātaka XV. 1:

> ... and the following verse, Vijnāna-grhāṇaḥ cha Nārāyaṇ-dīrītānāṁ, which Prof. Kern renders by "the use of (the term) Ājīvika refers to those who have taken refuge with Nārāyaṇa," is, in fact, a quotation from a work of Kālakāchārya, which Utpala renders by the Sanskrit *Kesava-mārga-dīkṣitaḥ Kesava-bhaktah Bhāgavata-iṣṭa-orthāḥ* and which, Prof. Kern supposes, shows that the Jain teacher regards Ājīvikas as Bhāgavatas. Now, in the first place, the translation proposed by Prof. Kern for the first passage is not correct. That this is the case will be seen from the following extract from Utpala's commentary on Bṛhajjījātaka XV. 1:

Now, with regard to the first passage *Ajīvika-grhāṇaḥ cha Nārāyaṇ-dīrītānāṁ*, it is plain that the word *cha* indicates that it is connected with the preceding sentence, and that consequently the words *pravrajayānāṁ upalakahānāṁ* from the latter, require to be understood after *Nārāyaṇ-dīrītānāṁ* in the former passage. Prof. Kern, however, not perceiving the force of *cha* takes *Ajīvika-grhāṇaḥ cha Nārāyaṇ-dīrītānāṁ* as a sentence distinct in itself. Evidently, therefore, he cannot be right in translating it by "and the use of (the term) Ājīvika refers to those who have taken refuge with Nārāyaṇa." The true rendering of the passage ought to be: "and (the term)

---

*Another reading: Nārāyaṇ-dīrītānāṁ*
Ajivika is used as a mark to denote the monastic orders seeking refuge with Nārāyaṇa. Here
the most important word is upalakṣaṇa, which Prof. Kern has entirely lost sight of. Upalakṣaṇa
means a mark indicative of something that the word itself does not actually express. Sanskrit
commentators often employ the word upalakṣaṇa, when they want a certain word or expression in
the original to denote things, not, truly speaking, signified by that word or expression. And
precisely the same practice is followed here by Utpala. To understand this fully and also the
real significance of the two passages, on the misinterpretation of which Prof. Kern's view is based,
it is necessary to comprehend the gist of Varāhamihira's stanza and Utpala's commentary thereon,
quoted above. According to Varāhamihira, a man turns a recluse when four or more planets are
clustered together in one and the same zodiacal division at the time of his birth and at least one
of them is powerful. And according as this powerful planet is the Sun, Moon, Mars, Mercury,
Jupiter, Venus or Saturn, he becomes a rṣaya, Vṛddha[-āravaka], Sākya, Ajivika, bhikṣu, Charaka or Nirgrantha. Utpala tells us that Varāhamihira has made this enumeration on the
authority of Kālakāchārya. The latter's verse Tdecstio dinaṣṭhē, etc., is then cited, which tells us
that a man becomes a Tāpasiṣka, Kāpālikā, rạṭapata, Ekadaṇḍi, yatī, Charaka or Kahanānaka
when the predominant planet is Sākya, Chandra, etc. The Tāpasiṣka, Kāpālikā, etc., of this verse
are taken by Utpala to correspond to the rṣaya, Vṛddha-āravaka, etc., of Varāhamihira.
How far this procedure of Utpala is justifiable I leave it to scholars to determine. But certain it
is that he would have us take Vṛddha-āravaka and Ajivika to mean Kāpālikā and Ekadaṇḍi.
Now, there is another verse of Kālakāchārya, which also informs us what kind of recluse a man
becomes under precisely these astrological conditions. The list of ascetic denominations mentioned
in this verse agrees with that previously given except in two points. These exceptions are
Harabhakti or Maheśvar-ārīti and Kesava-bhakti or Nārāyaṇ-ārīti, and, as this second verse of
Kālakāchārya says, a man becomes one of these according as the powerful planet is Chandra or
Buddha. But it has been just stated above that in the same astrological conditions he becomes a
Vṛddha-āravaka (=Kāpālikā) or Ajivika (=Ekadaṇḍi). Hence arises the necessity, says Utpala,
of understanding Vṛddha-āravaka and Ajivika of the original stanza as marks (upalakṣaṇa)
denoting Maheśvar-ārīti and Nārāyaṇ-ārīti. Thus, according to Utpala, Ajivika does not
signify Nārāyaṇ-ārīti, Kesava-bhakti, or Bhagavata, as Prof. Kern supposes, but simply
indicates it; and it is equally incontrovertible that Kālakāchārya also never held such
a view. The theory propounded by Prof. Kern and upheld by Bühler that the Ajivikas are
Vaishnavas has, therefore, no grounds at all to stand upon.

It will not be out of place, I think, if a short account of these Ajivikas is given with a view to
point out who they were. My work here will be principally that of bringing some of the scattered
rays to a focus. The founders of this monastic order were Nanda-Vaschhha, Kasa-Sakikshchha,
and Makkhali Gosāla, of whom the last is by far the most famous, as he is one of the six well-
known teachers mentioned in Buddhist scriptures. Buddhaghosha tells us that an Ajivika is
nigga-pabbajito. Ajivikas are also described as achela, i.e., unclothed. And, in confirmation of
this, there are at least two stories forthcoming from the Vinaya-piṭaka. According to the first,
which is in the Mahāvagga, while the Buddha and the Bhikshus were once staying in the
Anāthaπiṣākāra in Jetavana at Sravaṇa, it began to rain all over the world. The Buddha
informed the Bhikshus that that was the last mighty storm over the whole world, and consequently
asked them to let themselves be rained down upon. The Bhikshus accordingly divested them-
selves of their robes, and exposed their bodies to rain. On that very day, Visākhā, mother of
Migīra, was engaged in preparations for a feast to the Buddha and his Bhikshus. When the
preparations were over, she sent her maid-servant to the Buddha to intimate that dinner was ready.

\* Jour. R. As. Soc. for 1898, p. 197. \* Jātaka I. 300. \* M. VIII. 15, 256.
When the maid servant approached the Anáthapiṇḍikásrama, she saw the naked Bhikshus, but concluded from their being naked that they were Ájivikas. The other story, which is from the Nisagára, is, that while a few Bhikshus left Sáketa for Srávasti, they were waylaid by robbers, who deprived them of their robes. Being forbidden by the Buddha to ask for another garment, they went naked to Srávasti to meet the other Bhikshus there, but the latter instead of recognising them as mendicants of their order, mistook them for Ájivikas as they were unclothed.

The Ájivikas covered their bodies with dust, and ate the ordure of a calf. They were noted for ascetic practices of the most rigorous kind. Some of the austerities they practised are mentioned in one Jātaka to have been "painful squatting on heels, swinging in the air like bats, reclining on thorns, and scorching themselves with fire fires." Again, as first pointed out by Prof. Bühler, they braved the hands of their novice with a heated ball. Their doctrine has been admirably summed up by the Buddha in the words n=atthi kammam n=atthi kirijam n=atthi viriyam=n=tī. They were thus complete fatalists.

The Ájivikas appear to have been in existence long before the rise of Buddhism. The most celebrated exponent of their doctrines in the time of the Buddha was Makkhali Gosála. But he was only the third of their teachers, the two preceding ones being Nanda Vachchha and Kisa Saúkicchhi. They seem to have been of some consequence during the Maurya period. The Barisbar and Nágārjuní cave inscriptions show that these caves had been excavated and decorated specially to them by Asoka and his grandson Dassaratha. The Ájivikas are also mentioned in Asoka's Pillar-edit VII, in connection with the religious sects which the Dharma-madhāmrás had been instructed by him to concern themselves with. Then we do not hear of the Ájivikas till the time of Vararáhimalbara (circa A.D. 525) who, as we have seen above, refers to them in his Bihajídtaka. An allusion to them also occurs in the Jñáki-karana of Kumáradása (A.D. 725). In chap. X, v. 76, Rávaṇa is represented to have approached Sítā in the guise of an Ájivika monk. Some inscriptions, found in the Madras, Presidency and belonging to the first half of the thirteenth century, speak of a tax on the Ájivikas which it appears to have been customary in those days to impose on them. It is not clear why they were so much looked down upon. Prof. Hultzsch, who has edited the inscriptions, considers them to be Jainas, but specifies no grounds in support of his position. He is probably led to hold this view because he thinks that there is no evidence to show that the Ájivikas were existing so late as the 13th century. But, as has been recently shown by Prof. Pathak, they were well-known to the Digambara Jain authors of the later Chállakya and Yádava periods and are mentioned as living chiefly on káñji. They, however, mistook them to be a sect of Buddhists Bhikshus. The Buddhists, in their turn, have mistakenly them for Nirgranthas, for the latter have actually been once called Ájivikas in the Divyakrada. The truth of the matter appears to be that they were neither Buddhists nor Jainas even in the later times, but formed a distinct sect.

N. VI. 2.

* Jāt. I. 300; the reading kacchhaka notice in the footnote is obviously the correct one, and not maachhaka adopted in the text.

10 Ibid. I. 433; other ascetic practices to which they resorted, have been set forth in the Mahábhima-Nikáya I. 233, and Digáha-Nikáya. For the translation of this passage, see Bhya Davids' Dialogues of the Buddha, I. 227 ff.

11 Jāt. III. 542.


13 Ante, Vol. XX, pp. 169 and 364.


17 Dipyka-kplar, by Cowell and Nell, p. 247.
The Amarakosha speaks of five kinds of sahnydins, among whom Maskarins are mentioned. It is worth noting that the word maskarin occurs also in Pāṇini's āṣṭra; समकर्मिन्यां वेषपूर्वकान्त्वः (VI. 1. 154). According to Pāṇini, Maskarin was thus a Parivṛttajaka. Patañjali's gloss on this āṣṭra is as follows: nā ye māṃsāra-vāsāntī māṃsāra parivṛttadā . . . kā tāt . . . 

The Krīdā has the following: parivṛttānāṁ द्वार-वृत्तिस्थितेः कतोद्भूतां कला सन्यासाः। 

Kāyānta's Pradīpa on Patañjali's Mahābhāṣya gives the following: nā kṛtāntā artha nā kṛtāntā artha, 

Thus, according to Patañjali, a Maskarin was called Maskarin, because he said ma कृत कर्मिन्यां etc., i.e., "don't perform actions, don't perform actions; quiescence (alone) is desirable to you." Now the only sect of ascetics who believed in the inefficacy of action was the Ājīvika. Their precept: n-atthi karmāṇa = n-atthi kiriyaṁ = n-atthi viriyaṁ has been quoted above. The same doctrine has been set forth at greater length in Sāmaṇḍī-panha suva of the Dhīgha-Nikāya, from which the following may be cited: "The attainment of any given condition, of any character, does not depend either on one's own acts, or on the acts of another, or on human effort. There is no such thing as power or energy, or human strength or human vigour." It will thus be seen that the Maskarins as described by Patañjali can be no other than Ājīvakas. This receives confirmation from two sources. First, Gosāla, one of the founders of the Ājīvaka sect, is in the Buddhist texts called Mahākhaṇḍa, which undoubtedly is the Pāli form of Maskarin. Secondly, the verse from the Jñānak-haraṇa, to which allusion has been made above, runs thus:

Here Rāvaṇa, who approaches Sītā in a disguised form is called both Ājīvika and Maskarin, which must, therefore, be taken to be synonymous terms. In the Bhāṣṭi-kuṭṭayā also Rāvaṇa is represented to have come to Sītā in the garb of a Maskarin. Among the various characteristics mentioned, that of his being a śīkha is specified. From this the commentator Mallînātha argues that he was a Tridaṇḍin, and not an Ekadaṇḍin, as the latter has no matted hair. But this does not agree with what Utpaṇḍa says, for, as we have seen above, he gives Ekadaṇḍin as a synonym of Ājīvika. The word śīkha of the Bhāṣṭi-kuṭṭayā, however, agrees with the uttāṇa-jaṭa of the Jñānak-haraṇa, and as the latter calls an Ājīvika a Maskarin, it appears that an Ājīvika was really a Tridaṇḍin, and not an Ekadaṇḍin as Utpaṇḍa supposes.

THE ADITYAS.

BY B. SHAMASASTRY, B.A., M.R.A.S.; BANGALORE.

The Ādityas play an important part in the Vedic sacrifices and seem to occupy the foremost rank among the Vedic gods. Their exact nature is, however, little understood. Sometimes they are said to be six in number, and at other times seven or eight, the eighth being described as 'half-born.' In the Brāhmaṇas they are said to be twelve month-gods. Whether six, seven, or eight, they are undoubtedly very ancient Vedic gods, for some of them, Mitra, Varuna, and Indra, for example, go as far back as the Indo-Iranian period, and are the gods of the Zend-Avesta. Hence an attempt to find out their exact nature will not be useless.

1 Cap. VII. v. 42. 2 Rhyt Davida' Dialogues of the Buddha, Vol. I, p. 71 ff. 3 Sankhu V. ra. 61-63.
4 B. V. ii. 27, 1. 5 B. V. IX. 114, 3.
6 B. V. X. 72, 8, 9; Tai. Br. I. 1, 9, 1. 7 Sat. Br. XI. 6, 3, 8.
The conception of their being month-gods does not seem to be unfounded. But the months, of which they are said to be lords, are not ordinary consecutive months, but intercalary months of the five-years cycle. To prove this it is necessary to know the nature of the five-years cycle, as explained in the Maitrāyanīya Śāhātī itself. The passage (I, 10, 8) in which it is described runs as follows:—

M. S. I, 10, 8.

"From vital breaths are those creatures born. Vital breaths are these nine oblations, for nine are the Vital breaths. Ātma [the inner man] is the deity. From him (the deity) is (the sacrificer) born. Nine fore-offerings, nine after-offerings, two butter portions, and eight oblations, he puts together for Agni. He makes the oblation of curdled milk (ṣaḍjīna). That amounts to thirty.⁵ The Virāṭ metre consists of thirty syllables. By means of the Virāṭ, he has a firm footing; for Prajāpati created the creatures from the womb of Virāṭ. From this womb of Virāṭ is also the sacrificer born. Thirty and thirty nights are a month. That which is the month is the year. Prajāpati is the year. From the womb of the couple, Prajāpati and Virāṭ, is the sacrificer born. With each oblation he inserts twelve and twelve nights. There are, when counted, as many oblations as there are nights in a year. He separates⁶ the year from the enemy. With the Vaiśvādeva sacrifice he inserts four months; with the Vaiṣṇavaprabha sacrifice, the next four months; with the Śākamēdha sacrifice, the next four. These are the months which he has separated from the enemy. He who sacrifices for the seasons is one, while he who sacrifices for the four-months is another; he who sacrifices for the reason that which was the spring has become the rains, and that which was the rainy season has become the autumn, is a sacrificer for the seasons. But he who gains a thirteenth month, and sacrifices for that thirteenth month, is the one who sacrifices for the four-months. Having sacrificed for three regular (months), he should omit the fourth; and then having sacrificed for the next two regular (months), he should omit the third. What are counted as three years, there are in them thirty-six full moons; what are counted as the next two, there are in them twenty-four. Those (days) which exceed (an intercalary month) in thirty-six full moons, he puts in (the next) twenty-four full moons. This is, verily, that thirteenth month. This is what he gains and sacrifices for. He who is desirous of cattle should observe the Vaiśvādeva sacrifice, but neither the Vaiṣṇavaprabha nor the Śākamēdha. All the Purusha amounts to a thousand when counted together as far as the flesh-oblation (Pārasa). The oblation made in the Vaiśvādeva sacrifice is, verily, the birth (of creatures). The reason for which he sacrifices with the Vaiśvādeva is the birth of creatures, for which he sacrifices with the thought

---

⁵ It is only twenty-eight or twenty-nine if milk is included. The Tai Brahmana (I, 6, 9) counts two Āgdras, portions of clarified butter to make up thirty.

⁶ The root 'yu' means both midrāga and amidrāga, 'insertion' and 'separation.'
that he may attain his own measure. When he comes by a thousand cattle, then he should sacrifice with the Varunapraghāṣa. When he comes by a thousand of this, then he gets rid of his sin by means of sacrifice."

Omitting the sacrificial technicalities with which the above passage abounds, we may confine our attention to that portion of the passage where a distinction is drawn between the Season-sacrificer and the Four-monthly sacrificer, and where the nature of the three Four-monthly sacrifices, the Vaiśnavadēva, the Varunapraghāṣa, and the Śakamēḍha is clearly defined. It is clear from this passage that during the Vedic period there were two important schools of priestly astronomers, the Season-sacrificers and the Four-monthly sacrificers. Of these two schools, one seems to have been observing the lunar year of 354 days without adjusting it to the solar or sidereal year, and to have allowed it to fall back by 11 or 12 days in every year and to regain its original initial point at the close of 32 or 36 years, making a full rotation through the seasons. This is what is meant by the expression that what was the spring became the summer, and that what was the summer became the autumn. The priests who were sacrificing for such rotating seasons are called Ritu-yājana, "Season-sacrificers." The other school of sacrificers called the Chāṭūrmasāyājana, "Four-monthly sacrificers," did not like the Season-sacrificers, allow the year to fall back for want of intercalation, but adjusted their lunar year of 354 days to the sidereal year of 366 days by adding two months in five years or four months in ten years. From the reference made to twelve days in the beginning of the passage, it is clear that it is the sidereal year of 366 days that is taken for adjustment with the lunar year of 354 days. Accordingly the extra days in three lunar years amount to thirty-six days, i.e., one month and six days. These six days, says the author, are to be added to the twenty-four days of the subsequent twenty-four full-moons or two years. From the statement that whoever gains a thirteenth month is a Four-monthly sacrificer, it is clear that the three Chāṭūrmasāyas or Four-months are undoubtedly three intercalary periods of four months each. I have pointed out in my Vedic Calendar how the Vedic poets regarded the intercalary days or months as enemies and as sinful periods infected with demons. This is what the writer means when he says that the sacrificer has to separate the Chāṭūrmasāyas, the Four-months, from the enemy. The meaning of a thousand cattle seems to be this:—In ten sidereal years of 366 days each there are 120 months of 30 days each and four intercalary months of 30 days. Each ordinary month was made to consist of five week-periods of six days each. The days in each such week, except the last in each month, were called gō, jyōtip, Ayus, Ayus, gō, and jyōtip. Of these names, the word gō means "a cow," i.e., "cattle." Since there are two cows in each week, there are eight cows or cattle in each month. Hence the number of cattle in 120 ordinary months will be $120 \times 8 = 960$. In the intercalary months even the last week appears to be counted, as well as the first four weeks. Accordingly, in the four intercalary months there are $4 \times 10 = 40$ cow-days. Hence the number of cow-days or cattle in ten years, when the Vaiśnavadēva or first Four-monthly sacrifice was performed, amounts $960 + 40 = 1000$. This appears to be the meaning of the expression that when the sacrificer counts a thousand cattle after the Vaiśnavadēva period, he has to perform the Varunapraghāṣa. What is meant by the expression that Purusha counts to a thousand will be explained later on.

It appears that when the three Four-monthly periods were got rid of by intercalation, the Vedic poets used to renew their sacred fire by churning anew. This idea is conveyed in the following passage of the Maitreyaṇya Sāmkhit (I, 10, 7):—

चतुर्मासयायाज्ञा च चतुर्मासयायाज्ञा।
संवस्तर्यात् च चतुर्मासयायाज्ञा।
संवस्तर्यायाज्ञानि योगिनि।

"Three are the Four-monthly sacrifices to be performed. To a year (amount the three) Four-monthly periods. In such a year [i.e., once in thirty years] the sacrificer churns the fire [i.e., sets up the sacrificial fire again]."
It is not to be understood that the Vedic poets were adjusting the lunar year to the sidereal year by intercalating four months once in ten years alone. Since a thirteenth month is frequently mentioned in the Vedas, we may believe that they were adjusting the years once in two and a half years, when one intercalary month occurs. It is, therefore, likely that whenever a thirteenth month is mentioned, half a cycle of five lunisolar years is meant. The following passage of the Maitrāyaṇīya Śaṁhitā (I. 5, 6) refers to a thirteenth month and the form of the sacrifice performed in it:—

“... When once set up, he becomes old; for Agni is (like) a beast. Hence he should offer, year after year, these oblations of the Agnyādhyāya rite. He does not thereby grow old. The sacrificer renews him thereby. This (way of renewing the fire) is not well-considered. The sacrificer should simply praise the fire with the Yajña and Anuvāky hymn called Agniya-pavāmiṇi, used in the Agnyādhyāya rite. Thereby he does not become old. Thereby the sacrificer renews him. The sacrificer praises him with twelve verses, for there are twelve months in the year. Thus he catches hold of the year and keeps it. He is to be praised with a thirteenth verse dedicated to Agni and Śoma, for there is the thirteenth month also. With this verse he catches hold of that month and keeps it.”

The last line of the passage given above leaves no doubt that there was also the custom of observing or intercalating a single month. I presume that the Dārac and Pūrṇamāsa or new and full moon sacrifices, described in the beginning of the Yajurvēda, are no other than sacrifices performed during an intercalary month, for the gods worshipped in those sacrifices are the gods that are worshipped during the intercalary month.7 The following passage of the Maitrāyaṇīya Śaṁhitā (I. 5, 7) confirms this view:—

“The light half of the month is to be worshipped with the verse dedicated to Agni and Śoma, for the light half of the month belongs to Agni and Śoma. Thereby he transfers the light half to the dark half of the month. With the verse dedicated to Indra and Agni the dark half of the month is to be worshipped; for the dark half belongs to Indra and Agni. Thereby he transfers the dark half to the light half of the month.”

According to the passage of the Maitrāyaṇīya Śaṁhitā (I. 5, 6) previously quoted above, Agni and Śoma are the chief gods in the sacrifice of a thirteenth month. According to this other passage (I. 5, 7) Agni and Śoma are the gods in light half, and Indra and Agni in the dark half of the month. It follows, therefore, that the month referred to in the above passage must be one of an intercalary nature. Since the same are the gods in the new and full moon sacrifices, we may take these also to be sacrifices performed during an intercalary month. Since the Atharvaveda (V. 6, 4) assigns the thirteenth month to Indra (षोबोधी गाः संदर्भम् अहः — “the thirteenth month is the home of Indra”), we shall not be wrong in considering Indra also as one of the chief deities worshipped in a thirteenth month. The following passage of the Maitrāyaṇīya Śaṁhitā (II. 1, 3) furnishes additional evidence about the same fact:—

1 See Āśvalāyana Brāhmaṇa Sūtra I. 3, 2 and 10; and Śākalya Brāhmaṇa Sūtra I. 3, 14 and 15.
"Indra killed Vītra with the power of Agni and Sūma. Hence he grew with brightness and strength. He saw the power of Indra and Agni also. Thereby he kept brightness and strength in himself."

The connection of Vītra with Agni and Sūma, the gods of an intercalary month, will be explained later on. That intercalary months were being observed, either singly or in sets of two, three, or four months, is clear from the following passage of the Maitrāyaṇīya Sākhīta (I. 11, 10):

"The Vasus conquered the thirteenth month with a verse of thirteen syllables. The Rudras conquered the fourteenth month with a verse of fourteen syllables. The Ādityas conquered the fifteenth month with a verse of fifteen syllables. Aditi conquered the sixteenth month with a verse of sixteen syllables."

Since in this passage a year of 12 months is referred to before speaking of the thirteenth, fourteenth, and other months, I take them to be of an intercalary nature. There is no reason to believe that the Vedic poets were counting thirteen or sixteen ordinary months in a year, though they were acquainted with the lunar-solar cycle of 12 years, as pointed out above. The following passage of the Maitrāyaṇīya Sākhīta (I. 10, 5) leaves no doubt that Indra is a god of an intercalary month:

"The Dēvas and the Asuras were in this world together. Prajāpati desired that he might drive out the Asuras and create children. He looked to the 'Four-months;' for it is by the 'Four-months' that he drove out the Asuras and created children. Whoever, knowing thus, performs the sacrifice of 'Four-months,' will drive out his enemy and get both children and cattle.

"Creating the Vaiśvādēva sacrifice on the model of the Agniḥṣṭoma, Prajāpati created children; and creating the Varuṇa-praghāṣa sacrifice on the model of Ukthya, he put these children under the clutches of Varuṇa. Creating the Śakamāda sacrifice on the model of the Atriḥtra sacrifice, Indra killed Vītra. The children that were created became of one kind, while those that were not created became of another. Then Prajāpati desired that he might create children. The year is the sacrifice, and sacrifice is Prajāpati. He kept in himself this pair, the year and the sacrifice, (like two kinds of) milk, that which is produced from the udder and that which is external. Then to these gods he offered the following oblations as a share, and created children from them: from the seasons were those children born. The seasons are the five oblations."

From this passage we can understand the technical sense in which the words Dēva, Asura, and Prajīś, are commonly used in the Vedas. In the terminology of the Vedic poets the name of the ordinary days of a year is praśaḥ, 'children.' I have pointed out in my notes in the Vedic Calendar, ante, p. 52, how the Vedic poets regarded the intercalary months as Asuras, demons. It follows therefore that the word Dēva as opposed to Asura..."
must mean an ordinary month or days. Accordingly, we may interpret the conflict between the Devas and the Asuras as denoting some inconsistency between the ordinary and the intercalary months. That the words, Devas, Asuras, and Priyaj, have such meanings as the above, is confirmed by the above passage: We are told in the passage that Prajapati or Father Time repelled the Asuras by means of the Chaturmasyas, a period of four intercalary months, as pointed out above—and that having done so, he created children. This evidently means that Prajapati got rid of the extra months by intercalating four months in ten years, and, adjusting thereby the lunar to the sidereal year, brought the seasons and days to their usual position which was four months behind before intercalation. We also learn that Indra is a god of an intercalary month, and that the oft-repeated destruction of Vritra by Indra is an act of getting rid of the sinful and demon-like intercalary months through the worship of Indra and other gods; for we are told in the passage that Indra killed Vritra by the Sākamāliha, or the sacrifice performed during the third period of the four intercalary months, i.e., at the end of 30 or 60 years.

From a consideration of the passage explained above, we learn that Prajapati is Father Time, that his children are the ordinary days of the year, that the Asuras are the sinful intercalary months, and that Indra is a god of an intercalary month. We know from the story of Aditi that Indra is one of her sons. Accordingly, we may take Aditi to mean the cycle of five semi-solar years, bringing forth Indra periodically along with her other sons. The other sons also must necessarily be the gods of intercalary months. This idea is, as clearly as the sacrificial terminology of the poets could permit, conveyed in the following passage of the Maṣṭrāyana Sanhitā (1.0.12):—


During that night on the morrow of which he is going to set up the sacred fire, he should cook four dishes of rice and present them to Brāhmaṇas as fresh rice. Desirous of getting children, Aditi cooked the rice. She ate the remnant (of what remained after the gods partook of the dish). Two sons, Dīhā and Aryanā, were in consequence born of her. She cooked another (dish), and ate the remnant. Two sons, Mitra and Varuṇa, were in consequence born of her. She cooked another (dish), and ate the remnant. Two sons, Amśa and Bhaga, were in consequence born of her. She cooked another (dish). She thought that in consequence of her eating the remnant, two
and two sons are being born of her; and that it would indeed be to her advantage if she would eat it before (presenting it to the gods). Accordingly, having previously eaten it, she offered the remnant (to the gods). The seeds, still remaining in the embryo form, said: 'We shall become what the Ādityas are.' The Ādityas on the other hand looked for a murderer of those two. Aṁśa and Bhaga struck them. Hence sacrificers worship those two in their sacrifices. Aṁśapraśa became the portion due to Aṁśa in sacrifices. Bhaga went to the people. Hence they say that if one is desirous of getting wealth, one should go to somebody among men. That Indra, however, got up and recovered his breath. The other egg appeared as dead. He is, verily, the Mārtanda (broken egg) whose children are men. Aditi then went to the Ādityas and said: 'Let this one be to me, but not the other which has fallen lifeless. They said: 'Then let it be to ourselves, as we say; do not despise us.' He is, verily, the Āditya, the Vivasvat, whose offspring are Manu, the Vaivásya, and Yama, the Vaivasvata. Manu is in this world, and Yama in the other. These are the Ādityas who guard the paths through which gods move. They drive away that sacrificer who sets up his sacred fire without calling upon them: they drive him away from the heavens. The Ādityas are, verily, the portions of the remnant. When a sacrificer puts the sacred sticks into the fire after rotating them in the remnant, then he may be taken to have spoken to the Ādityas of his setting up of the sacred fire. Him they do not throw away from the heavens. He who is going to set up the sacred fire should omit a year (i.e., intercalate a year). He should not bring his fire from a household or from any other place. Embryos [due to the remnant, i.e., the twelve days at the end of the sidereal year of 366 days], developed in the course of the year, are born. When the embryo is born and fully developed, the sacrificer sets it up (while setting up the sacred fire). Twelve nights he has to omit (in a year); for twelve nights are the index (pratima) of the year. Embryos [i.e., the twelve days] developed in the form of months in the course of (the cyclic) year are born. When it is born and fully developed, he sets it up [i.e., intercalates while setting up the sacred fire]. He should omit three; for three are the worlds; these world's he will thereby attain. He should omit one, for one is the Prajāpati.'

(To be continued.)

MISCELLANEA.

A NOTE ON ĀJIVIKAS.

I read, ante, pp. 88ff, the article on Ājivikas by K. B. Pathak, who opines that they are a sect of Buddhist Bhikshus. D. R. B.'s bracketed note at the end of this article that they are neither Buddhist Bhikshus as Mr. Pathak says, nor Jainas as Dr. Huittsch understands, but they form a distinct sect, seems to be borne out by other evidences. We have one given, ante, Vol. XXIII, p. 248, 1894 (which I have quoted in full on page 960, Jour. R. As. Soc., October 1911), of which the following extract is to the point:

"The essentials, however, are stated. They are (1) that the recovery of the Vaibhāsika Dharma-Sūtra permits me to fully prove the correctness of Professor Kern's (or rather Kíklákhárya's and Vípalá's) identification of the Ājivas with the Bhágavatas, and (2) that the sacred books of the Buddhists contain passages showing that the origin of the Bhágavatas was traditionally believed to fall in very remote times, and that this tradition is supported by indications contained in Brahmanical works."

One such passage contained in an orthodox Buddhist book, the Saddharma-Pundaríka, as showing the remoteness of the Bhágavata (i.e., Ājiva) cult, is that where Mahí-Srī is compared to Náráyana. The words run thus:

""... and a body compact as Náráyana's."

A. GOVINDACHARYA SVAMIN, M.R.A.S.,

M.R.S.A., M.M.S.

[Who the Ājivas really were was shown by me ten years ago in a note published in the Jour. Bomb. As. Soc., Vol. XXI, p. 399 ff. The same note has been reprinted in a slightly altered form in this number on p. 286 ff.—D.R.B.]

1 S. J. E. Series, Vol. XVI, chap. XXIII (Gadjada Swara), translated by H. Kern, p. 397.
Maps and Atlases of India.

That we have no recent Atlas or Map of India on a scale sufficiently large to be readily useful in locating most places mentioned in history and the daily newspapers is somewhat strange. There are small maps, as accurate and full as the best cartographers can produce, but on scales too small to afford satisfactory ideas of distances and areas, or to include hundreds of places to which reference may be required.

Among those of recent date, "Thacker's Reduced Survey Map of India," edited by Dr. J. G. Bartholomew, was issued in 1891. The sheet measures 30 by 36 inches and is also available in folded form with an Index to the ten thousand names appearing on it and representing every place mentioned in the second edition of the "Imperial Gazetteer of India" (1885-87). It is a fine piece of cartography to a scale of 69 miles or one degree of latitude to an inch; but the crowding of so many names in so small a space requires so minute etching that it often strains the eye to locate and read them. If we reduce the map of England to the same scale, it measures only 8 inches by 5, and how many of the place names could be entered upon it in legible script? But much of India is more densely populated even than England; hence the inadequacy of so small a scale for a clear and satisfactory map of India, yet this is one of the best of the kind published.

"Constable's Hand-Atlas of India", published 1893, together with some forty-two small maps of physical, ethnological, meteorological and other features, and plans of towns, prepared by Dr. Bartholomew, gave the foregoing map in eighteen sections, together with the Index adapted to them. These sectional maps measure little over 6 by 8 inches each, so that, on the scale of 69 miles to an inch, each of them represents an area of about 560 by 420 miles, or 235,000 square miles, an area that would include the maps of both England and Ireland on the like scale. This volume is so compact and full of valuable details that it is the best as yet available to the student; and the "Hand Gazetteer" of the same publishers supplies the geographical positions of over seventeen thousand place-names.

In the "sixth Century Citizen's Atlas", the same map is again utilized in three sections and a map of Farther India, each map measuring 16 by 12 inches.

An "Atlas of India" containing sixteen maps and an Index of nearly ten thousand names appearing on the maps, with an Introduction by Sir W. W. Hunter, was next published by W. and A. K. Johnston, 1894. The volume measures 12 by 8½ inches and the maps 9 by 12 inches within the borders, providing for a scale of 1 to 3,225,000 or 59.9 miles to an inch. This larger scale gives about twice the area for the same number of names as in the preceding, and district boundaries are well defined. The fourteen principal maps (omitting the Index map and the plans of cities) are not simply "sections" of country, but represent separate provinces and groups of adjoining states.

Following this was the "Map of the Indian Empire" by the late E. G. Ravenstein, on a scale of 1 to 5,000,000 or an inch to 79 miles nearly, and was published by G. Philip and Sons. The sheet, with insets, measured 33 by 39 inches, and was finely engraved, the number of towns and villages entered being considerable. The same publishers also issued "Philips' Gazetteer of India" (1903) by E. G. Ravenstein, containing a list of about 15,000 names of towns, villages, railway stations, valleys, hills, towns, etc., with the approximate geographical positions only to tenths of a degree. This "Gazetteer," we are told was "intended as a companion to the Atlas of India." But this projected Atlas was given up. This map has quite recently been re-issued in two sheets with Index of about 4,000 place names in folding case, as one of Messrs. Philips' Travelling Maps.

The new edition of the "Imperial Gazetteer" was naturally expected to be accompanied by an Atlas planned on a scale more adapted to the area of so populous a territory. Sir W. W. Hunter's "Statistical Account of Bengal" was accompanied by nineteen district maps—some of double size—on a uniform scale of 16 miles to an inch. As many maps on half the scale would have supplied an atlas of all India, showing most towns of importance or historical interest. But instead of such a boon, and simply to make the Atlas range in height with the octavo volumes of the Gazetteer, the eighteen provincial maps are on a scale of 69.1 miles to an inch or one to 4,000,000 and measure only 9 by 7½ inches. To avoid overcrowding, the names on these eighteen and a map of Afghanistan are reduced to scarcely 6,700,—or hardly two thirds of the number in the Gazetteer. With the twenty-eight small physical and other general maps and sixteen plans of towns, no fault is found; they are admirably executed and serve their various purposes instructively. It is the general maps that are altogether disappointing. As a map of England on this scale would measure 6½ by 5½ inches and proportionately might contain only about 300 place names, it would be comparatively
useless,—of what general utility can a map of India be on so very small a scale?

For so vast a territory, a very large scale map or series of maps is not here advocated. For most European countries, maps on a scale of between 30 and 35 miles to an inch are most satisfactory. And so long ago as 1836 the Society for the Promotion of Useful Knowledge had published on a scale of 34½ miles to an inch—"India in eleven parts with an Index Map." These were 'sectional' maps, engraved by the brothers James and Charles Walker, and were beautifully clear and useful. The work seems to have been well received, for a revised edition was issued by E. Stanford, 1842-45, containing some twenty maps,— including surrounding countries; and again, a last and carefully corrected and improved edition, containing twenty-six maps, was published by the same firm in 1861. This useful work continued long in use, and it is to be regretted that such a work was not kept up to date and reproduced. The maps varied little in size from 13 by 10 inches inside borders, and so had the area of those in the new Gazetteer atlas; and the thin bound volume was about 14 inches high by 9½ wide.

Decimal scales are now the fashion for maps, but with our units of the inch and mile, they afford no facilities for estimating distances. The Indian Great Trigonometrical Survey sheets are on a 4 miles to the inch scale, and any map on this scale, or its subdivisions of 8, 16, 32, etc., miles, affords a ready means of estimating distances. Making the scales as measures of a degree of latitude is similarly inconvenient, whilst it is slightly inaccurate, since these degrees vary with the distance from the equator—from 68½ to 69½ statute miles.

It is now understood that the Indian Survey has agreed to proceed in preparing a map, or series of sheets covering India, on a scale of one millionth,—that is of 15 miles 6 furlongs 57½ yards to an inch. But this will take years to complete, and though most valuable for certain purposes, it will fill sixty sheets or thereabouts of 20 by 16 inches and rather expensive and cumbersome for general use. Meanwhile a less ambitious but practically useful work is much wanted in the library and at the desk—for the general reader, the traveller, the secretary and the district official.

Now such an atlas could be constructed on a scale of 32 miles to an inch; the maps would be on the scale of Johnston's and the Gazetteer atlas,—not mere sectional maps, but of provinces or halves of such in some cases. They would fill only eighteen or nineteen double page maps of a size that would bind in a volume about 11 by 16½ inches. The space for names, etc., would be double that on Johnston's and four times that on the Gazetteer maps, thus providing for a very large increase of their numbers. The work might be accompanied by useful small maps of physical, meteorological, ethnographical, and other features, plans of towns, etc., of which the largest would go two on a page. Shall we see such an Atlas?

J. B.

BOOK NOTICE.

HISTORY OF BENGALI LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE
by Dinsh Chandra Sen. Printed by the Calcutta University, 1911.

This is a large work of more than a thousand pages, based on the lectures delivered by the author as Reader in Bengali Language and Literature at the Calcutta University during the months January to April 1909, and deals with the literature of Bengal and the language in its literary aspect down to the middle of last century. It is clear on every page that the work has been one of great devotion on the author's part, and he has made diligent enquiries to trace out all particulars, whether great or small, that might help to increase or elucidate our knowledge of the literature.

One striking feature that he discloses is that the early literature was not the expression of poetical ideas by the then cultured classes, nor was it composed by them for the people at large, because those classes were enthralled by Sanskrit learning and fell afterwards under the influence of the Arabic and Persian literature of their Mohammedan patrons; but it was the welling up of the poetic feelings that swayed the hearts and minds of the populace, feelings that did not flow within classical channels, but arose generally from and reflected home life and daily interests.

In the first chapter the earliest conditions in Bengal are idealised in the belief that pre-historic Bengal was Aryan, a belief for which the author's devotion may merit pardon. Ancient Bengal

1 Scales in millionths are related to the metrical system,—the metre being supposed to be exactly the ten millionth part of the quadrant from the Equator to the Pole. This is now found to be very nearly 10,001,776 metres, so that the metre is shorter than was intended.
really came but partially within the pale of Aryan influence, and that was no doubt the reason why it was treated as foreign in Manu’s Code, and its language regarded as Pāśāchā Prakrit unfit for literary use. The author shows that it was largely through the interest evidenced by Muhammadan rulers that the great Sanskrit epics were translated and appeared in Bengali verse in the 14th century. It was not to Brahmanas nor to Hindus versed in Sanskrit classics that Bengali was indebted for early favours, but the earliest Bengali compositions are attributed to the zeal of Tantric Buddhists to popularise their creed in the 10th and 11th centuries, and they enunciate homely proverbial philosophy in Buddhist form.

Among early compositions are the Dharma-mangal poems, songs recounting the exploits of Lūn Sen and extolling the gud Dharmas, who represented originally the popular idea of Buddha; but when those songs achieved a wide popularity, Brahmanism, after it overcame Buddhism, recast them so thoroughly that they appear now to be devoted to the Śākta cult. The high moral discipline of Buddhism gradually degenerated into general half-sceptical self-indulgence, and indulgence when stimulated by Vaiśnavas views of religion love turned to extravagant courses of licentiousness. This phase in its idealistic and spiritual aspect is illustrated in the poems of Chandī Dās (end of 14th century) which express homely fervour in pastoral guise, and in those of Vidya-pati in Behār in the 15th century. On the other hand, Mahāyānaism conduced to the worship of local deities, and popular feeling turned towards the minor deities and especially goddesses, that were esteemed locally, from about the 9th century, so that their worship soon grew in popularity and found expression in songs that sprang from the people themselves. Many poems were composed in their honour and in after the 12th century Chief among those deities were Manasā, the snake-goddess, who is extolled in the touching story of Behulā in the Manas-mangal composed by Haridatta; and Chandī Devī, to whose power two well-known stories bore testimony, which were narrated in many forms and especially in the 16th century poem, the Chandī-mangal, by Mukunda Rām, whose poetry vividly portrays the domestic life of rural Bengal.

Brahmanism aided this revival from Buddhist degeneracy by adopting those local deities, and stimulated it by reviving the old stories of the ancient Vīshṇu and Śiva, thus regained popular adoration; and the Brahmanas inculcated also the importance of caste. This great change the author calls the Purānic Renaissance, because it expressed itself in the revival of Epic and Purānic stories recast in new poems composed in the veracular tongue to suit popular taste. Such poems were recited through the country by professional singers, the Mangal-gāyakas, who amplified them at times with their own verses. From this period, it seems, may be really dated the rise of Bengali literature.

The Rimāyana with its story of Dāma and Sīth, and the Mahābhārata with those of the Pāṇḍavas and Kṛishṇa, were of course the treasure houses; and those stories were thrown afresh into Bengali verse in many poems from the 14th century onwards. The poets, while handling their themes correctly, yet narrated them with new vitality and embellished them with descriptions and comparisons borrowed from their own land and associations. Among such versions of the Rimāyana the most famous were Kṛitīśa’s and Raghunāndana’s poems, while Śalīśa’s and Kāśi Rām’s compositions best reproduced the Mahābhārata. Two other Sanskrit books freely drawn upon were the Bhāgavata-Purāṇa which described the exploits and majesty of Kṛishṇa as an incarnation of Vīshṇu, and the Chanḍī-māhātmya in the Mārkandeya-Purāṇa which excited the admiration of those who revered Chanḍī. Sīva did not attain the same prominence as Vīshṇu, because, as the author explains, the popular conception of this stern deity did not credit him with any keen interest in his worshippers personally, and in the poems that extolled him he appeared rather with peasant traits amid rural home life.

The author narrates all these stories and gives extracts from the chief poems with English translations, which being in prose naturally lose the spirit of the old Bengali, for the old poetry composed in short rhyming lines often carried terseness to an extreme. He also adds valuable notes, explaining how the Purānic Renaissance enriched the old Bengali by introducing and vernacularising many Sanskrit words, and pointing out grammatical peculiarities and words that have since become obsolete. Much of that old literature fell into neglect and often MSS. were lost or perished; still many poems have been rescued from oblivion and published by the Bāttāl Press.

It is remarkable how closely the old literature is bound up with religion, for it followed and expressed popular religious sentiments as they varied through the centuries; and indeed the
author classifies it mainly according to its religious aspect. Thus he passes next to the Vaishnavas, who exercised a widespread and deep influence among the people, for Mahayanaism encouraged religious devotion and facilitated the conversion of many to the worship of Vishnu, and Vaishnavism infused new vigour into the doctrine of bhakti or loving faith. Chaitanya was the great exponent of this in the early part of the 16th century, and it involved a revolt against the strict system and oppressive ritual which Brahman ascendency had imposed. Puranic ideals lost ground and bhakti became the great vivifying influence. He inspired such veneration in his followers, that many accounts of his life were written in prose, which were the first biographies in Bengali; and among them the greatest was the Chaitanya-charitamrta by Krishna-das. His teachings with Krishna as their subject were popularised in the padas or songs of the Vaishnavas, which portray human actions, feelings and even questionable passions and yet often suggest a spiritual import. The greatest composer of padas was Govinda-das in the 16th century, and he wrote in the Bajubaj dialect, which holds a middle position between Hindi and Bengali, and in which vernacular words were preferred to strict Sanskrit forms. The later writers of the Puranic Renaissance marred the freedom of their poetry with classical Sanskrit phrases, but the new poets gave utterance to natural feelings in simple Bengali, with which they were more familiar than some of the older writers, and espoused the cause of the people with their new Manoharabadi tune. This leads the author to discuss the origin and history of the kirtan songs, and the great importance of the kathak or professional reciters who have existed in India from the earliest times. Their recitations could give a poem wide publicity and permanent fame, and created also a demand for written copies even among rustic folk.

Vaishnava freedom was adverse to Brahmanic formularism and permitted the people with subversive ideas; yet its influence is found in all the literature after Chaitanya's time and even in the later conceptions of Sakta and Sakism. Vaishnavism, however, declined in purity the more it overspread the country, because the passionate expressions used in the songs could arouse human nature without imparting a spiritual meaning; and in the reaction against immoral tendencies Brahmanism reasserted itself when the Muhammadan power decayed in the 18th century. Learning then found patronage at two Courts, that of Raja Krishnachandra of Nadia and that of Raja Rajballabh of Bikrampur near Dacca; but at both poetry fell under the control of courtiers and schoolmen who imitated Sanskrit and Persian models, and it became highly artificial with ornate diction and elaborate conceits. Bharat Chandra obtained great fame with his Annadhatmangal, in which the old-time story of prince Sundara was retold in depraved taste. Jaynathya and his accomplished niece Annamayi were distinguished at Bikrampur; and the Muhammadan poet Alii, who worked mainly in the field of translation, gained the applause of Muhammadans as well as Hindus in his poem, Padmabati, notwithstanding its strong Hindu proclivities.

Rural poetry is discussed in its four divisions, the kirtan songs, the songs of the kavira, which grew out of simple episodes in the yദrָs, the religious songs about Krishna and others, and the songs of the y,unsigned or popular drama.

The author thus reaches the period of English rule and discusses the influences which affected Bengal, directly from the Government and missionaries, and indirectly by its contact with the West, and the effects that have been produced thereby in the elaboration of the language, the altered outlook of the leading writers and the many-sided character and tendencies of the books written. He has endeavoured to weigh all these matters without prejudice and impartially.

This book is the outcome of great research and study, for which the author deserves the warmest praise. He has explained the literature and the subjects treated in it with such fullness and in such detail as to make the whole plain to any reader; and the book would probably gain in usefulness by some compression. The folk-literature, the structure and style of the language, metre and rhyme, and many miscellaneous points are discussed in valuable notes; and specimens of old decorated book-covers and handwriting and some portraits are displayed in coloured plates. The tone is calm and the judgments appear to be generally fair, though it is well-nigh impossible to estimate aright the period of English influence, since the changes have been vast and profounder than in any earlier age and are still in progress. One noticeable blemish appears in the transliteration of Sanskrit and Bengali words and names; no uniform system is observed and the same word even is not always transcribed in the same way.

F. E. P.
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<tr>
<th>INDEX</th>
</tr>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G. F. refers to pages of the Folklore Notes from Gujarat and the Konkan, in the Appendix.</td>
</tr>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Page(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abdu'l-Aziz, and Shāh Jahān</td>
<td>15, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abhipare, unit of six days, 50—57, 77, 120, 122, f.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aborigines, Hinduization of</td>
<td>75, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ābhira tribe</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abū, Chandrāvatī</td>
<td>196; G. F. 43, 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acharaśa, Buddhist title</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Áckārasāra, a work by Viṇṇanandi, and Buddhism in S. India</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achyuta-kāpa, a heaven</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aḏhāl-dīn-kā Jhonprā, in Ajmer</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aḏhirājendra-deva, Chōja k. 218, ff., Krimi-kaṃṭha</td>
<td>233, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aḏhyātmamāyāna, the</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ādhihārata, the MS. of</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aditi, goddess</td>
<td>295, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ādityas, Vedic gods</td>
<td>290, ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advaita, sect to which the Śesha family belonged</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Āṭāb, Surya, the Great Light</td>
<td>100 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agastya, Sage, and Marut worship 230; reputed founder of the Tamil land 232; G. F. 45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aghori-bavas, mon-eating recluses</td>
<td>G. F. 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Āgneya, Āryan line of march into S. India</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agni, g.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agniṣṭhāna, form of sacrifice</td>
<td>76 and n; 79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agnisvāmin, and the Vedic calendar 52 n.</td>
<td>76, 51, 82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agnyādhēya, rite</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agra, and G. Broughton</td>
<td>114, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahābā Pir</td>
<td>G. F. 61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahālyā, wife of Gautama</td>
<td>G. F. 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>akāśa, sacrifices</td>
<td>80 and n, 119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abobala, author of the Sam-gīta-pārījāta</td>
<td>157, 160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abhūms of Assam, Hindus</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aijanger, Mr. Krishnaswami, and the Chōja</td>
<td>218, 224, ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ajāṭā, in Sirohi State, inscription found in</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ajayadeva and Sonaladevi, coins of</td>
<td>209—211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ajayapāla, and Ajmer</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ajayarāja, and Ajmer</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ajīvikas, sect of Buddhist Bhikhus</td>
<td>88—90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ajīvikas</td>
<td>286, ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ajīvikas, a note on</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ajmer, c., a Guide to, book notice, ancient Sāpādālaksha 195, f.; founded by Ajayadeva 209, ff.; museum and inscriptions</td>
<td>85, 201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akbar and the study of Sanskrit</td>
<td>4, 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aladrā vow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alankāra writers</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alankāra Literature, Outlines of the History of Section I—The Development of Alankāra, 124, ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alankāra Literature, Outlines of the History of Section II—The Meaning of the word Alankāra, 134, ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alankāra Literature, Outlines of the History of Section III—Position of the Figures of Speech, 204, ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alankāra Literature, Outlines of the History of Section IV—Basis of Division as regards Figures of Speech, 206, ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alankāra Literature, Outlines of the History of Section V—Number of Śabdālankāras, Historical Treatment of a Few, 207, ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alankāra Literature, Outlines of the History of Section VI—Number of Śabdālankāras, Historical Treatment of a Few, 207, ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alāčal, author of the Padmabhāt</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alana, name in Mangāla inscription</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amarar, writer, date</td>
<td>34, 159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amarakoṣa, the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amaraçoṣa, Sanskrit lexicon, book notice</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambaskamudram, inscription of Varaṇaṇa, Mahārāja</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anu, anud, words in Āśoka edicts</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amāśa, son of Aditi</td>
<td>295, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anālīkīta, Antalkidas</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anālīkīta, Antalkidas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anahilapāṭaka, the modern Anāhāḍa</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anāmaśīa, inscriptions of Sarangadeva (Vikrama) Sahāvī 1348</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancient Hindu Music, contribution to the study of 157—164; 185—195; 254—265</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anukās, suggested origin of</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anjani, mother of Hanumān</td>
<td>G. F. 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anjediva, near Bombay, and the English</td>
<td>74, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anjumān, (Persian) and Hanjamana</td>
<td>173, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna, Rāja of Sāpadalaksha</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>annakā, an offering</td>
<td>G. F. 61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annapāi, or Vaidyanātha Pāyagunde</td>
<td>12; 247, 251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antalkidas, Antalikīta</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>302</td>
<td><strong>INDEX</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>antāra-gūndhāra, note in music ... 263, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Antarvedi Kingdom, genealogy of kings ... 252 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Antialkidas Nikephoros, date of ... 272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Āpāstamba, and the Vedic calendar 28; home of ... 280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>aparājita, Āryan, for unconquered lands ... 228 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aparakakadi or Kakhadji, vil. in Nasik cave inscription, perhaps the modern Avakakheja, 166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>āpuṣya, sin ... 171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ārati ceremony ... G. F. 62, 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Archeological Series of Travancore ... 21, ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arīkesarīdevārāja, k., grant of ... 173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arjun, Mahāvir ... G. F. 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aronāraja, k. of Sapādalaksha, at war with ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kumhrāpāla ... 195, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arthālāmākars, number of ... 208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aryamā, son of Aditi ... 295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Āryans, 18; and caste, 103, f., 108, pp. of India 129, ff.; immigrants to S. India 227, ff.; influence in Bengal ... 298, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Āryavarta, India 18, Hinduized ... 76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Āśāḷa Khān, attended by G. Broughton 115, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Āśvāsas, deities ... G. F. 58 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Āśīkā, Āśī, probably Hānśī ... 17, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aśoka, inscriptions 13, f.; Bhābhas Edict and its references to Tipitaka passages 37, ff.; Pillar edict VII, and the Ājīvikas 88; 286; 289; the Sahasrām, etc. ... 170, ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aśokavalla, inscriptions of ... 167, ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asuras ... 293, ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Āsvaghoṣa, and metre ... 127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Āśvalāyana, and the Vedic Calendar ... 117 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Atharavveda, and the Vedic Calendar ... 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Athens, marriage in ... 111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Atirātra, days ... 77, 117, ff.; sacrifices 294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Atita, a sect ... G. F. 66, f., 64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>atlas and maps of India ... 297, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ātmā, the inner man ... 291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>avaṅgati, degraded conditions of ancestors ... G. F. 33, 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avakakheja, perhaps the ancient Aparakakadi 166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avanti, Ujjain in Malwa ... 146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ayanas or Sattas, sessional sacrifices 88, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ayodhyā, tu., and Vasubandhu 2; home of Vijayaśāitya ... 146; 275 n.; 281, f.; G. F. 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bāhāja, son of Udayana, adopted by Siddharaja-Jayasimha ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bāhrām, Mangal, Manishram, planet, temple of ... 99 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bāktan, an offering ... G. F. 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bāḷāditya, Narasirahāgupta, k., and Vasubandhu ... 2, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bālagānje inscriptions ... 201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bālavarmā, k., not identified, supposed contemporary of Sandarāchārya ... 200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bālkh, Bulecke, in Afghan Turkestan ... 115, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bāllāla, k. of Ujjain ... 195, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bāllāla Sena, k. of Bengal ... 168 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bāṇa, writer ... 127, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Banerjee, Babu Kakhalidas, on Lakshmana Sena ... 167, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bāṃśavarśa plates of Bhaṭṭadeva ... 201, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Barṣbar cave inscriptions, and the Ājīvikas 286, 289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Barīn, N. E. of Jodhpur, inscrip. found at ... 203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Barnes, friend of G. Broughton ... 115, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bāsār, ancient Vaisali, clay seals discovered at ... 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bandhāyana, satrākāra ... 230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beadala, Vudayulay, port in Vijayanagara ... 241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bellary dist., and Chōla inscriptions ... 147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Benares, Dakshinī Pandita at 7, ff.; and the Śesa Family 246, ff.; Kāshipura G. F. 38; 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bengal, and English commerce 114; and Aryan influence ... 298, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bengali Language and Literature, History of, (book-notice) ... 298, ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Berar, Chedi ... 142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bhābhas Edict of Aśoka ... 37, ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bhadrabāhu, purus of Chandragupta ... 281, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bhādrasoma, riv. ... G. F. 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bhāga, son of Aditi ... 295, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bhāgavata, earliest mention of the word 272, g. and the Ājīvikas ... 287, f; 296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bhakti School, origin of ... 13, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bhāmaha, and Daṇḍi 90, ff.; Alakākāra literature 204, 206, ff.; and Daṇḍin ... 232, ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bhandarkar, Dr., and Vikramāditya 1; Dr. R. G. and the origin of the Bhakti School 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bhāndūp, near Thāṅka, Śilhāra grant found near ... 193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bhanuji Dikshita, Śeṣa, Sanskrit author 247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bharata, and Alakākāra literature 127, 205, ff.; and music 157, ff.; 156, and 158, 159, 193, 239, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bharata, Bilar, a sage ... 156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bharata Chandra, author ... 300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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| Bhāratayya-natya-dāstra, oldest Sanskrit work on music 157, ff.; notes on | 263 |
| Bhāravi, early writer, and Alankāra literature 208 |
| Bhāratūtopa | 40 |
| Bhartṛihari commentator, date of 237; called Tīkākāra | 245 and n. |
| Bhīsa, poet, works attributed to him | 141 |
| Bhāṭṭa Bhāskara, commentator | 47 |
| Bhāṭṭa-bhūṭas, title of the Śesha family | 247, f. |
| Bhāṭṭa, Nārāyaṇa, Pandit | 7, f. |
| Bhāṭṭa-nāyaka, author, and Alankāra literature | 296 |
| Bhāṭṭi, writer, and Alankāra literature | 208 |
| Bhāṭṭoḍi Dikshita, commentator 234, f.; 247 and n.; 251 |
| Bhavabhuti, and the Rāmakṛṣṇa etc. | 143; 158 |
| Bhavāṅi, goddess, legend of | G. F. 65 |
| Bhikshus, Buddhist, the Ājīvikas | 88, ff. |
| Bhima, a Pāṇḍava G. F. 44 and n; 56, called Vāyusūla | 57 |
| Bhīma, legends of | G. F. 58 |
| Bhitarī seal inscription | 2 |
| Bhōja, Paramāra k., his Bānawāra plates | 201 |
| Bhūga, writer and Alankāra literature | 207, f. |
| Bhopāṭiyā, name in Mangalāṇ inscription | 86 |
| Bhūṭārā, commentator | 237 |
| Bhāna, near Agra, and G. Broughton | 114 |
| Bhilāna, writer | 266 |
| Bijapur, Vidyānagar | 248 |
| Bijoliā inscription | 211 |
| Bilār, Bharata, sage | 156 |
| Bilād inscription | 2 |
| Bindu, sacred lake | G. F. 42 |
| Bīrēsvāra Śesha | 253 |
| Bismā, a Vījayanagar | 233, ff. |
| Black Art | G. F. 50, 55, 70 |
| Block, Dr. found the clay seals at Bāsarh | 3 |
| Bokkara, Buckratt | 116 and n. |
| Bombay, first governor of | 73, ff. |
| Borīl, Badari | 203 |
| Bosanquet, Mr. R. H. M., on music 190, ff., 255 |
| Brahmagiri Edict of Asoka | 170, f. |
| Brahmapa-kalpa, a heaven | 89 |
| Brahman immigration into S. India | 227, ff. |
| Brahmanas, and the Vedic Calendar 26, 31, 32, 48 |
| Brahmanical theory of caste 102, f., 109, f., 112, f. |
| Brahmanism and Buddhism | 244, 299, f. |
| Brahmanas, feeding of 10; or Brāhmīnus, and caste 102, f., 105, ff., 109, f., 112, f., 132, ff. | 137, ff. |
| Bramas, Burmese | 238 |
| Brihaspati, and Sanskrit | 245 |
| brother, Indian and Ceylonese | 128 |
| Buckkarrat, Bokkara | 116 |
| Buddha 38, ff.; relics near Peshawar 156; 170, f. | 288, ff., 299 |
| Buddha-charita, a work by Āśvaghōsa, date of | 137 |
| Buddha-Gayā inscriptions | 167 |
| Buddhaghosha, commentator | 38, f. |
| Buddhahmitra, tutor of Vasubandhu | 244, 267 |
| Buddhism, and Vikramādiya 2; in S. India 83, ff.; 231; and caste 134; Chinese 158, f.; and Brahmanism | 244, 299 |
| Buddhist, Bhikshu, the Ājīvikas 88, ff., 286, 288, ff., 296 |
| Bührer, Prof., and the Ājīvikas | 286, f. |
| Burma, food from | 149 |
| Burmese, Bramas | 233 |
| Burnell, Dr. A. C., on Hindu Music | 163 |
| caixa, cash, kas, a coin | 239 and n. |
| Calendar, the Vedic 26, ff., 45, ff., 77, ff., 117, ff. | 156 |
| Cambodia, inscriptions in | 112 |
| caristia, Roman repasts | 231 |
| Carnatic, the, and the Āryas | 12 |
| Caste, and Gāgā Bhāṭṭa | 12 |
| cattle diseases | G. F. 68, ff. |
| cattle food | 241 and n. |
| Cave inscriptions, Nasik | 165, f. |
| Ceylon, bronzes, and Indian 128; foodstuff from | 149 |
| Chabrais Emporium, mentioned by Ptolemy, said to refer to Kavirippāmpatigam | 144 |
| Chaitanya, Bhakti leader | 300 |
| Chakrakoṭṭa, Sakkaračṣam | 119, 126, f. |
| Chakralaśa, Śesha, Sanskrit author 201 and n; 253 |
| Chālukya, W., in S. India 146, f.; and Cholās | 217, ff. |
| Chandala, Namaṇḍra Caste | 75, f. |
| Chāndī Dās, Bengali poet | 299 |
| Chāndī Devi, goddess | 299 |
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<th>Page Reference</th>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chandragupta II., Vikramāditya</td>
<td>1 ff. 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Deva Gupta</td>
<td>215 ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandaprapaksa, k.</td>
<td>2, 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandrawati, Abā</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chants, Sāmān</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charadwa, vil, temples, etc. in</td>
<td>G. F. 62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chāritravānadhana, writer</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles, I., II., and the Shipman family</td>
<td>73 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chāturmāsāyajī, astronomitcal school</td>
<td>124 n. 292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chakravartin</td>
<td>G. F. 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chedi, Chedidesa, Berar, etc. and the Kalachuris</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chēlan, meaning of</td>
<td>G. F. 70 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chhākadī, an offering</td>
<td>G. F. 68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chhitarājadra, k., grant of...</td>
<td>173 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chidambaram, Chitrakūta</td>
<td>220, 225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chintāmani, Śesha, Sanskrit scholar</td>
<td>249 f. 253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chiraṣāvīra, an immortal</td>
<td>G. F. 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chitor, Chitrakūta, inscr.</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chitrakūta, Chitor inscr. 196; or Chidambaram, shrine, destroyed</td>
<td>225, 229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chōla, kings, names of 23; and Pallavas</td>
<td>145 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or Chākkutās in the 11th. cen. 217 ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or Chōla, Daya...</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christ and Kṛṣṇa</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>churamā, a sweet preparation...</td>
<td>G. F. 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>city, and caste</td>
<td>138 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cochin, tn. and A. de Souza</td>
<td>233, 241 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohala, bard, wrote a treatise on music</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coins, in Ajmer 183; of Ajayadeva and Somaladevi</td>
<td>299 ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>colours, and music</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comets</td>
<td>G. F. 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>commerce, English in Bengal 114; and Karikāla 149</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comorin c.</td>
<td>141 and n. 142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions to the Study of Ancient Hindu Music</td>
<td>157 ff. 185 ff. 254 ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooke, H., Vice-governor of Bombay under Charles II.</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coorg, sandalwood from</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>copper-plate grants, from Haidarābād 73; Telugu-Chōla</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correa, Gaspar, author of the Lendas da Índia</td>
<td>238 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>corn, as an offering</td>
<td>G. F. 61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covenants, the</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crane, Sir F., and G. Bughton</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuddapah dist., Chōla grants from</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dabāstā, a work published in 1815</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daparatha, Daśaratha</td>
<td>275 n. 276 ff. 292 293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dādhīchā, Dāhiyā family, to which Jayastra-simha belonged</td>
<td>85 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dākshināṭya Bhāmaśā to which the Śeṣhas belonged</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dākshini Pandits at Benares</td>
<td>7 ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dāṇḍi and Bhāmaha</td>
<td>90 ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dāṇḍin, author, and Alāhakārā literature</td>
<td>204 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or Tāvandika, and Bhāmaha 282 ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ddravi, stringed instruments</td>
<td>188 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darsa sacrifice</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daśaratha, k., and the Ājīvīkas</td>
<td>88, 226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dastur Aspandārī, Kāmdu 175 and n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daśaratha</td>
<td>275 n. 276 ff. 292 293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dasyus, thieves, applied to the Chōla</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dāttārāya, sage</td>
<td>G. F. 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dāvalahā Pīr, shrine</td>
<td>G. F. 62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davda, Prof. Raha, and Ṡakko Edicta</td>
<td>37 ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deocaan, the, Pārīṣātra...</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delhi, the Siwalik pillar inscr. in 18, Jogini or Yogiṇipura...</td>
<td>85 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devadhāra, name in the Mangāla inscr.</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devaladevi, q. to Arghora</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devapāla of Dhrārā, his Harṣādā inscr.*</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devanandaṅ, Pāyapāda, author</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devas and Asuras</td>
<td>194 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhrānāśajna, author</td>
<td>77, 79, 119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhrārā Arasā, Dhrāravara, a Sindha</td>
<td>219 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhrārā-Jagāñātha plundered Vēngi</td>
<td>217 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dharasena kings</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dharma and Buddha</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dharmamangal, poemas</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dharmārtha, for charity</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dharmā-Sātra, the, and the Ājīvīkas</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhāryā Pīr</td>
<td>G. F. 40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Dhátā, son of Aditi ... ... ... 295
Dhannā, c. legend of ... ... ... 295, f.
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Dhravadevi, Dhravasvāminī, q. ... ... ... 3
Dhvanvāloka, treatise on Alāmkāra literature ... ... ... ... ... 295
Dhvanvāloka-lochana’s writer ... ... ... 141 and n.
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Dūḍā, Dūḍās, Paramāra clan ... ... ... ... ... 18
Dom João III, k. of Portugal ... ... ... ... ... 288, 284
Dravidas, in S. India 228, f.; and Aryans 229, f.
dramas, on the Ṛṣadīgaṇa, list of ... ... ... ... ... 140, ff.
Drona, mt. ... ... ... ... ... G. F. 56
Durgāprahāl, Mahāmahopādhyaya, Pandit, and the poet Māyūra ... ... ... ... ... 197, ff.
Durgārāja, k. ... ... ... ... ... 188
Durmānta, k. and Devasaṇāṇī ... ... ... ... ... 233
Dvāḍāha sacrifice ... ... ... ... ... 46, 48, 53 n., 77, 79
Dvārakā, tu., and Rameśvara ... ... ... ... ... 9
Dwārakā, holy c. ... ... ... ... ... G. F. 33, 42, 68
Edicts of Āsoka ... ... ... ... ... 37, ff.; 170, ff.
Edinburgh, and Ab. Shipman ... ... ... ... ... 73, f.
Egypt and caste ... ... ... ... ... 135
Ekātādīśa = Ajīvika ... ... ... ... ... 298, 290
Ekāśītakā = Dārma, religion of ... ... ... ... ... 14
Ekāṭikā, Śāma verses ... ... ... ... ... 62 and n.
English commerce in Bengal ... ... ... ... ... 114
Epigraphic Notes and Questions, contd. from
Vol. XL, p. 240—XII. Sahasrān-Rūpānhi-
Brahmagiri Edict of Āsoka 170, ff.; XIII;
A New Kāhatrasa Inscr. ... ... ... ... ... 173
Era of Lakṣhmanā Sena, k. of Bengāli ... ... ... ... ... 167, ff.
fairs ... ... ... ... ... G. F. 63, ff.
famine in Hindustan ... ... ... ... ... 231, f.
Fell, Capt., and the Hānāi stone inscr. of
Prithvirāja ... ... ... ... ... 17
figures of speech in Alāmkāra literature 294, ff.
Fire, domestic ... ... ... ... ... ... 113
Firuz, Sassanian k., and the Hānāis ... ... ... 267
Fochi, Pucho, Oxus riv. ... ... ... ... ... 296
Folklore Notes from Gujarāt and the Konkān,
Appendix ... ... ... ... ... ... 37-72
family, Āryan Constitution of, and caste 110, ff.
funeral, repasts 112, f.; customs of the Hānāis 267
Gāḍhikamātānucharitam, a work by Saṅkara
Bhāṭṭa ... ... ... ... ... ... 7, 8
Gágā, Viśveśvara Bhāṭṭa, Pandit ... ... ... ... ... 12
Garbaradīstum, a charm ... ... ... ... ... 296
Gandīkā, riv. ... ... ... ... ... ... 296
Gāndhāra, c. and music ... ... ... ... ... 164
Gāndhāra, gāndhāra-prāma musical terms
264, 265, f.
geneshṭi, burglar’s instrument ... ... ... ... ... 295
Gāngākūṇḍaclkajolapuram, c. and Vikramaditya,
VI ... ... ... ... ... ... 218
Ganges, riv. ... ... ... ... ... ... G. F. 37, ff., 46
Gangetic region, wealth from ... ... ... ... ... 149
Ganpati, g. ... ... ... ... ... ... G. F. 71
gāthās, an offering ... ... ... ... ... ... G. F. 69
Gārgyāṃśayana, commentator ... ... ... ... ... 117 and n.
Gāuri-puja, holiday kept by women ... ... ... G. F. 49
Gautama and sacrificers 77, 80; 122; and the
Godāvari ... ... ... ... ... ... G. F. 37
Gatamiputra Sātakarni k. ... ... ... ... ... 166
Gātika Ayana, general name for the Vedic
Calendar 47, ff., 53 n., 78, ff.; 83, f.; Jyoti-
sūkṣma ... ... ... ... ... ... 117, ff., 128
Gayā inscr. ... ... ... ... ... ... 167
Gebalasā Aśpur, Shrine ... ... ... ... ... G. F. 61
genological tables, of the Šeṣa family 247
n., 253; of the kings of Antavēda ... 253 n.
gūdriba, measures ... ... ... C. F. 57 and n.
Ghatyālā inscr. ... ... ... ... ... ... 183
ghosts ... ... ... ... ... ... G. F. 40 n. and n.; 43
Girīrdhara, contemporary of Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa ... 253
Girār, inscr. 129; 207; kuṇḍa G. F. 39, 42,
ff., 45
go, cow = intercalary days 48, 49 and n.;
cattle ... ... ... ... ... ... 296
Gobinda-dās, pada writer ... ... ... ... ... 300
goblins ... ... ... ... ... ... G. F. 40 n.
Gōdāvari, riv. and Gautama ... ... ... G. F. 37, f., 45
Godlingas, heroic ... ... ... ... ... ... G. F. 54, ff.
Goṇinātha, Śeṣa, Sanskrit scholar 251, 253
Gorakhdev, g. ... ... ... ... ... ... G. F. 79
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<td>G. F. 44</td>
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<td>Govindachandra, k. of Tântava 247, f.</td>
<td>251, f.</td>
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<td>Govinda Gupta, k. and Chandra Gupta</td>
<td>3</td>
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<td>Govinda, Šesha, commentator</td>
<td>248, 262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gâthâ-shânti, edunav ceremony</td>
<td>G. F. 68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grâma, village</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<td>254, f., 203, 264, f.</td>
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<td>4, ff.</td>
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<td>Greeks, and caste</td>
<td>112, 114, 135, 138</td>
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<td>Groset, M., J. and Hindu music 157, 158 n.</td>
<td>187, 188 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>Hâjot, in Râjputâna, and the Poja</td>
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<td>Haidarâbâd, copper-plate grant from</td>
<td>72</td>
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<tr>
<td>Haliddavasana, tn. of the Koliyans</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanjamana, Hanjamana, tn. referred to in three Śilahâra grants of</td>
<td>173, ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>three Śilahâra grants of the 1oth, 11th, and 12th centuries</td>
<td>173, ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hânsâ, Asikâ, stone inscrip. of Prithvirâja</td>
<td>Vikrama 17, ff., 189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanumân, g legend of, etc. G. F. 44, 54–56</td>
<td>59–63</td>
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<tr>
<td>Haradatta, author of the Puâmanjari</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hârâ, Rao Ratan Singh, Râjâ of Bândi, and Sir F. Crane</td>
<td>116</td>
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<td>Harîdatta, author of the Manasâ-mangal</td>
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<tr>
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<td>234</td>
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<tr>
<td>Harshacharita, the</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harasândâ stone inscrip. of Devaspâla</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hâbhrû plate inscapiens</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hâlirâja, commentator</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heliodoros, Greek ambassador, mentioned in inscrip.</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heliodoros, son of Dion of Taksâhâlîa, a</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhâgavata</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemachandra, on Kumârâpâla</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herodotus, on caste in Egypt</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hidimbâ, giantess</td>
<td>G. F. 44 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hîjâdâ, eunuchs</td>
<td>G. F. 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Himalayas, sacred mts.</td>
<td>G. F. 43, 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindu music, ancient contributions to the study of</td>
<td>157, ff., 185, ff., 254, ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindu Pantheon, Moor's</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinduization of the Aborigines: swelling of the Chandalla caste</td>
<td>75, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindus, and pilgrim tax 11; f. and Mahamadânas 18; and caste 102, ff.; 154, f. 139; 230; and Jains ... 231</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindustan, and the Arâyas 227; and the Dravidâns 229; f. famine in</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hippins, Mr., on ancient Hindu music</td>
<td>191, f., 227, ff., 261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huen Tsâng, in S. Inda</td>
<td>144, 229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of Alânikrâ literature 124, ff.</td>
<td>204, ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoernle, Dr., on the Guptas</td>
<td>1, ff., 15, ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hûna, Gâdiâ, coins</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hûnas of the Oxus Valley</td>
<td>265, ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huser-per shrine</td>
<td>G. F. 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibbetson, Sir D., on Caste 101, 106, and n.</td>
<td>107, 113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joonography, Planetary, of the Sipasians, according to the Dabistân</td>
<td>99, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaîjyûsagi, Iânjeûbi or Iâiyû, father of Karikûla</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>immigration, Brahman, into S. India</td>
<td>227, ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India, and Sacskrit literature 7; S. and Buddhism et al. 88, 90–92; The Castes in 101, ff., 129, ff.; bronzes from 123; visited by Huen Tsâng 144, 229; S. and the W. Châlukyas 146, f.; Progress Report of the Linguistic Survey of, up to the year 1911 179, ff.; Brahman immigration into 227, ff.; S. the Temples of 238, ff.; invaded by the Hûnas 267; Maps and Atlases of ... 297, f.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indra, g. 26, ff.; an Aditya ... 290, 293, 295, f.</td>
<td>297, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jûdrâmahotsava, Ujjjani, festival</td>
<td>G. F. 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inscriptions, some unpublished, contd. from Vol. XI, p. 176—3 The Hânsâ Stone Inscription of Prithvirâja [Vikrama]—Sanvat 1234 17, ff. 4. Anâvâdâ Stone, of Sârángadeva 20, f. 5. The Bâsawârâ Plates of Bhujdeva 201; 6 Naôdô Plates of Prâtapsîmîha ... 202, f.</td>
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<tr>
<td>Index</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inscript. the Mangala stone of Jayatrasimha</td>
<td>85, ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inscriptions, Gupta 2, 3; 214, ff; Asoka 12, 13; 21, ff; of S. India 90; G. Girnar 123, 207; Chola, etc. 146; in Cambodia 156; Nasik Cave 165, ff; of Asoka-valla 167, ff; Sahastran etc. 170, ff; a new Kathapatra 173; of Durgakrāja, in Ajmer 182, ff; Chitor etc. 196; in Dhod temple 209, ff; E. Chāluksya 217, ff; 236, ff; Srauṣṭa, Belgoa 231, ff; Mysore etc. 233; Mankuwar 244; and the word ‘Bhagavata’</td>
<td>272; and the Ajīvikas 286, 289, 299, ff; Iranians, and the planets 99; Irungorai dynasty 149; iṣa, food 47; Italy, and the Aryans 138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jagannātha, rhetorician, and Alankāra literature</td>
<td>206, 208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jain, faith, and the Ajīvikas 88—90, 286, ff, 296, 298; and Oaste 135; and Buddhism 291; temples, grants to 293; Fraktite, grammar of 249; shrines</td>
<td>85, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaitrasyima, Jayatrasimha</td>
<td>85, ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaiyana, named in Mangalā inscription</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jahluludin, title of Akbar I</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jatavas, water festival</td>
<td>41, ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jana and jai</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jangades, temple guards</td>
<td>241 and n, 242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jati, caste</td>
<td>129, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jātāvarman, inscription of</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jayachandra, Rāṣṭra of Kānahu</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jayadeva, author of the Gītā Govinda</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jayadeva, reputed founder of Ajmer</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jayāngoda—Chōḷa, surname of two kings</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jayantāḥāṭṭa, author of the Tattvacandara</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jayasimha, Chāluksya k., and Bhaja the Paramāra</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jayasimha, his Mangalā stone inscription</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jayāṅkṛṣṭha, Bengali author</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jetavāna, goddess</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jhāmpadeva, goddess</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jīnamsā, writer, on Kumārapāla</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jīnevārum, and Bhāmaka</td>
<td>181, 244, 246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jogint, 1 Delhi</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones, Sir Wm., and Hindu music</td>
<td>157, 158, ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jumna, Yamuna, riv.</td>
<td>38, 38, 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jyotischā—Ayana, year with intercalary period</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jyotishpāna, the Gāvām-Ayana</td>
<td>77, 83, 117, ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kachchara of Kachhār, Hindu tribe</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kajab grant of Govinda</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kadambari, by P. V. Kane, book notice</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kadācām, captured by Bājendrabhāla</td>
<td>228, ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalīsā, mti.</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kālvā, Śāri, planet, temple of</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kākhaḍa, Aparaśakhaḍa</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kālschuri, prince of Chedi 142; or Kalschuri of Mahākoḍa, Hāshyas of Ratnapura, coins of</td>
<td>210, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāl-bhairav, g; legend of</td>
<td>70, 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kālākārāya, probably the famous Jaina teacher, and the Ajīvikas</td>
<td>286, ff, 296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kālīdāsa, and Kāmandaki</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kālīdāsa and the Hōnas of the Oxus Valley</td>
<td>262, ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kālidāsa, on music 158, f.; and Alankāra literature 207, f.; and Śaṁkarāchārya, sādhyas of 214; date of</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kālīkā hill, near Girnār</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalinga, and the Āryanised Dravidas</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kallinātha, commentator 165, 164 and n; on music</td>
<td>262 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kālpura vrikṣha, magic tree</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalyāna, K. of Antarvedi, patron of Krishṇa</td>
<td>252 &amp; n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kānulākara, Śaṇha, commentator</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamalālaya, Sk., Tiruvārur</td>
<td>222, ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kan, an evil art</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāmandaki and Kālidāsa</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanarese practice of using place names as surnames</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanarese, co., and Buddhism</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāņchandadevi, wife of Apavāja</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāṇḍhat and Kārikāla 146; and Rānakūja</td>
<td>227; Dravidā cap. 229; or Koil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kānṭa tribe</td>
<td>180, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapbahi, i. vil. in the Nasik cave inscription, and the modern Kāvāi</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanyakumarī, tn., inscription from</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapila, sage</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karikala and His Times</td>
<td>144, ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karnātik system of music</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>karaṇa, measure of one tola</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kārttikeya, g</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasatria, g</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāshī, Kāshīpura, Benares</td>
<td>38, 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāśmīr, home of Vallabha</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāśi, tn. and Rāmāṣṭhara</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāśi Rām, author</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>808</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kātyāyana and Vararuchi’ suggested identity of</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāvērī, Poṇī, riv.</td>
<td>144, ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāvirippamāṇaṇam, ancient Pugār</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kāvīśāīīśa, songs</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāvīṇa, the ancient Kauhahini</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāvyāśāhāra, date of</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāvyādakāra, a work by Vāmāna</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāvyādakāra, a work by Bhāmaha</td>
<td>90, 92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāvyāprakāśa, book notice</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kāvēs, vultures</td>
<td>39 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kērn, Prof., on the Ājīvīkas</td>
<td>286, ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khāndavana, forest, burnt</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kharēṣad, cattle disease</td>
<td>G. F. 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khas, ancient Khasa tribe</td>
<td>180, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kudā, khātutmahur, ceremony</td>
<td>G. F. 41, 68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khetōla, cobra g.</td>
<td>G. F. 61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khodiār Nātā temple</td>
<td>G. F. 67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khojis of Kesōh</td>
<td>G. F. 59, 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khorāsān, home of the Parsees</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>khtirat, temple rectorcy</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khusro Noshirwan, Shah, the Sassanian</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khwāja Muśānuddīn Chisti of Ajmer</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kēllhona, Dr. and the Jena Kings</td>
<td>167, ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kīλhama, Gūhilātu k.</td>
<td>17, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kīrāta, songs</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kīsa—Sanhičchehha a founder of the Ājīvīkas</td>
<td>288, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kīsa-i-Sawīn, Persian poem</td>
<td>174, ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kodolīsa, in Gujarāt, Hanumān temple at G. F. 55</td>
<td>100, 277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kohala, writer on music</td>
<td>100 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kondala, Kondala</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kongu dyn.</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Konkan, land of Silāhāra grants in 170; and</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhōja the Paramārā</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Konkan and Gujarāta folklore notes, appendix</td>
<td>37-72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kārōṣā, term for several kinds of grain</td>
<td>85, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kōra, garment, or earthen jar</td>
<td>60 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kūramūllī inscrip. of Rājaraja Narāndra</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kōśāhābas, granaries</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krimikanātha, nickname applied to a Chōla</td>
<td>223, ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krishīya and Christ 15; temple of 18; 299, 300, 301</td>
<td>G. F. 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krishnachandra, Kājā of Nādiya, patron of learning</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krishṇāśaca, poet</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krishṇa Śesha, Sanskrit Scholar</td>
<td>246, ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krishṇāsrama ‘Sṛl, mahānt</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krishṇa Yajurvedā, the quoted</td>
<td>81; 120, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brownīwāsa, poet</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khaṭṭara inscr., a new one</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khaṭṭariyās, Dahīvā</td>
<td>87, 163, 107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kheṃendra and Pāṇini</td>
<td>125, 256, ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kūdā, kudūṃbavā up, household, family, etc.</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kulēra, an offering</td>
<td>G. F. 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kulottuṇgaḥoḷā I, alaś of Rājāṭaṇḍhāloḥā</td>
<td>II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kumārakāsa, author of the Janaṅkīvānā, and the Ājīvīkas</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kumāragupta and Bālādīya 2, 3; patron of Vaśuṇandha</td>
<td>15, 244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kumārapāla, k. of Anhilwārā, at war with Arunācā, 195, f., Kumārapālaḍaḷa</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kūmba, kūmbi, occupational term</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kūndāḷaṇa, circle</td>
<td>G. F. 55 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kund, sacred</td>
<td>G. F. 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuntala, Kondala, co., and Vikramaḍīya VI.</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kūrattāḷvān and Rāmanāja</td>
<td>221, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kūtāpa, band of musicians</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kūtambī, a family man, and kūmbī, kudī</td>
<td>G. F. 72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lakes, sacred</td>
<td>G. F. 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakṣkīt Pīr, shrine of</td>
<td>G. F. 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakṣhamā</td>
<td>275 n., 277, 279, 282, ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakṣhaman Sen, K. of Bengal, and his Era.</td>
<td>167, ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lāma-dīwā, a lamp</td>
<td>G. F. 50 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lāukā, Ceylan 18; and Sitā ṇitā, 283, G. F.</td>
<td>43, f. 84, 86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lōpī, an offering</td>
<td>G. F. 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lāṭṭyāyana, and the Vedic Calendar</td>
<td>48, 51, 77, ff. 83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lāū Sen, hero</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lāuikōmaṇapāṇjāli 31, ff.; a note on it</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lavānāḍa, unidentified vil., mentioned in grant</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levi, M. Sylva, works by 155; on Assa</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edicts</td>
<td>343, ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ley, 3rd Earl of Marlborough, in Bombay</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leyden plate inscrips.</td>
<td>146, ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lilapūr, vil. legend of</td>
<td>G. F. 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic Survey of India, Progress Report of, up to the year 1911</td>
<td>179, ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature, Alāṅkāra q. v.</td>
<td>124, ff. 204, ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature, Sanskrit, maxims current in</td>
<td>33, ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lohārā, name in Mangālā inscrip.</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lubhā ṛāḥ, desired ascent</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas, Sir Gervase, Gov. of Bombay</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INDEX
300
Lunar years ... 57, ff., 61, ff., 71, 77, 79, ff.  
Luvaria, vil., legend of ... G. F. 62
madder, cultivated at Malvern Chase ... 73  
Madhuria, co., Marudia ... 290
madhyamā, madhyamagrāma, musical term 162,  
f., 189 n., 192, 193 and n., 254, ff., 259, 265, ff.  
Madura, and the Brāhmaṇas ... 231  
Magadi, and Vēgi ... 232  
Mages, Śākadripi Brāhmaṇas ... 183
Māgha, early writer and Alankaṇā literature ... 208; 232
Māghanandi-trāvacākāra, and the Buddhists ... 89
Māh, Chandramas, planet, temple of ... 100
Mādhābhūta’s age of 126; and Aryan in- 
migration ... 228; 230; 299
Mahāvibhata, great Litany of Rāgvedic  
hyms ... 48
Mahākāli Mātā, goddess ... G. F. 44
Mahārāṣṭra Brāhmaṇas, at Benares ... 7, 12, 13
Mahāvīr, Arjuna, names of ... G. F. 69
Mahāvṛata day ... 120, 123
Mahendraitya, Bālāditya ... 2
Mahēsa Ṭhakkur, scholar of the 16th cen.  
9
Mahēvar, ancient Māhishmati ... 142
Mahimabhaṭṭa, writer, and Alankaṇā litera-
ture ... 206
Māhishmati, Mahēvar, cap. of Chedi ... 142
Mahmūd Sultān, raided Sanjān ... 175
Maitreyeya-rakhiṭita, commentator ... 246
Maitrāyaniya-Sāhitya, quoted ... 124 n.
Majjamāk, seige of ... 272
Makkhaṇi Gośāla, a founder of the Ajīvikaś  
228, ff.
Mālavas, and Uṣṭamabhadrās ... 182, ff.
Mahān, his grant ... 183
Mahārāṇa incep ... 210
māliddā, a sweet preparation ... G. F. 56
Malikai-Maghiṭra Anajhāṇi, posthumous  
title of G. Victoria ... 72
Mallinātha, on music ... 158, f., 266, ff.
Malvern Chase, and the Cultivation of madder ... 73
Mālav, confederacy and Jayasimha ... 201
Mammapā, rhetorician and Alankaṇā litera-
ture ... 206, ff.
Manasa, snake goddess ... 299
Māṇḍalik, author of the Upādiḥa ... 7, 8, 10, 13
Mandāśor incep ... 207
Mangal-gāyaka, singers ... 299
Mangalāsa Pīr, shrine of ... G. F. 60
Manishram, Bahār ... 99 n.
Mankuwar, Buddha image at ... 244
Mān-sarvott, sacred lake ... G. F. 39, 42, 60
Manu, the world ... 296
maps and atlases of India ... 297, f.
Mārushajjaiyān, k. ... 24, f.
Marathas and Rajputs ... 72
Māvarman, Pāṇḍya name ... 23, f.
vārṇa, and vārṇak, musical terms ... 159
marriage, and caste 109, ff., 113; G. F. 37 n., 50, 61, 66, 71
Mārdaṇā, broken egg ... 296
Marudia, Dravidian g. and Marut ... 239
Maskarins, and Ajīvikas ... 290
Masulipatam, Masoli, and the Chōlās ... 299
Mataśa, writer, on music 158, 160, 193 and  
n., 269
Matānu-bharatam, a work by Lakshmanaś  
Bhaskara ... 138
Māthurā, Ajayadeva coins in ... 269
Maurya period and the Ajīvikas ... 299
maximus, popular, current in Sanskrit litera-
ture ... 33, ff.
māyā, illusion ... G. F. 58 and n.
Māyūnaja, Sanskrit poet ... 139, ff.
Māzhānada, Brāhmaṇa section ... 231
Mejaṭāka, Meṛā, near Ajmer ... 183
Medhāsthi, author of the Manubhāṣya, on  
Hindus ... 76
Mālākṣeta, in Tirumāṇyanapuram ... 224, 231
Menal, in Māwerp, incep. at ... 209
Menander invaded India ... 272
Māṭe, m., gold from ... 149; G. F. 45, f.
Merutuṅga, writer, on Kumārapāla ... 195
Meṛa, Mejaṭāka ... 183
meteor, origin of ... G. F. 52, f.
Mihāj-ud-Din Saraj, author of the Tabaqi:  
i-Nāṣirī ... 167, ff.
maṇḍ, manḍ, words in Aśoka edicts, note on  
170
Mithišt, tn. ... 275 n.
Mitra, an Aṃdiya ... 290, 295
Mīchchhaṇas, barbarians, as Hindus ... 76
Mōḥmedan, in Sanjān 175; and learning  
in Bengal ... 298, ff.
mohas, form of black art ... G. F. 50
mūla, a measure ... 240 and n.
Mōlagā, Brāhmaṇa section ... 231, f.
Moor’s Hindu Pantheon ... 44
Moslems, and the Zenana system ... 155
mountains, sacred ... G. F. 43, f.
Mōvali, vil., legends of ... G. F. 66
mās, numerous, at Benares ... 7, 11
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index entries</th>
<th>Page numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad Bakhtyar raid Nadia</td>
<td>167f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammadans and Hindus</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mukunda Ram, author of Chaandi-mangal</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muilu Firuz, Parsi scholar</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murari, poet</td>
<td>141 and n. 143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murti-Nayagar, Saiva devotee, and Padma k. 147</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music, Ancient Hindu, Contributions to study</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mussulmans and Hindus</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mysore, Dravidian centre</td>
<td>233; 232; inscrip.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nadia, raided by Muhammad Bakht-yar</td>
<td>167f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nadol plate inscrip. of Prataprasinha</td>
<td>202f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nadulikagik, Nadlal, vil. mentioned in grant</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nagabhati II. and Nahaq râv</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngopanchami, religious holiday G.F. 49 and n. Nagari, where the Śilāprakāra originally was</td>
<td>13n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nagari, characters, in the Hānai stone, and other inscrips.</td>
<td>17; 20; 201f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nagārjuna cave inscriptions, and the Ajīvikas</td>
<td>236, 239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nāgā Śeṣa, commentator</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nagoji Bhāṭṭa, Pandit 12; author of the Sesendudakhara</td>
<td>247 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nahaq-râva, Padhâr k., a leper, perhaps Naga-bhâta II., or Nagabhaṭa, a Prathâra fundatory</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nāhli, Sukra, planet, temple of</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nārisṛthya, from Niśāṣṭhyā, the S. West</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naṣkaras</td>
<td>50, 51 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naṭaka</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naṃabhādrala, Chandāla caste</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naṃḍa-Vaṭclla, a founder of the Ajīvikas</td>
<td>288, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nandibhārata, the</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Namayaḥbhāṭta, Telugu poet</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narada, writer, on music</td>
<td>254, 264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nārādī-Śīkha, a work on music</td>
<td>162, f. 194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narasimha śeṣa, author of the Gouddardāva</td>
<td>247, ff. 253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narasimhagupta, or Bhālāḍītya 2; and Vasubandhu</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narasimhavarma II., Pallava k., Rājasimhavarma</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narasimhavarman I, Pallava k.</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narāyaṇa, g., and the Ajīvikas</td>
<td>286, ff. 296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narāyaṇa Śeṣha, Sanskrit scholar, 249, author of the Śakti-ratnadāra 250; two men of the name</td>
<td>233, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narāyaṇa Bhāṭṭa, Pandit 7; his pupils</td>
<td>10, ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narbada, riv.</td>
<td>G.F. 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narudīkāpa, gujakalpa, a medicine</td>
<td>G.F. 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narottama, k. of Tāṇḍava, patron of Krishna Śeṣha</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narāsinha Mehta, saint</td>
<td>G.F. 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasik Cave Inscriptions, four villages mentioned in 165, f. and the town of Pushkar</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nātraṇas, the Dahiva Kshatriyas</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>navamadhām, preparation of wheat</td>
<td>G.F. 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nesfield, Mr., on caste</td>
<td>101, 104, ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nīdāna-Sūtra, and the Vedic Calendar 48</td>
<td>12, 77, 80 and n. 81, 84, 123, n. 117, ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nīlā-Pir, shrine of</td>
<td>G.F. 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nīlāgirī, and other sacred mts.</td>
<td>G.F. 43, 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nīgarthas, the Ajīvikas 90; ascetics 286, 288, f. Niśāṣṭhyā, destruction</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nirvāṇa Era</td>
<td>165, 169 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nripatunga, author</td>
<td>236 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nyāsakāra, the, and Danḍin q. v.</td>
<td>292, ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oddhras, and Andhras</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ojha, P., Gauri-Shanker, found the Ajārī inscrip.</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oldenberg, M. and Asoka edicts</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osama hill, Gondai dist., famous for temples</td>
<td>G.F. 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orus, Vaiku, Vaikāh, Valley, and the Hānas 256, ff. or Chax</td>
<td>G.F. 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pachapattana, tn. on the Sutlej; and Panchapura</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Padmaprabha, writer, and the Ajīvikas</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pahārī languages</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakristan, image temples</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paitrāṅa, Pratiśhkaṇṭha, tn.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paleacaste, Pulicat and Af. deSouza</td>
<td>238, 241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palītākha, m., and Bhima</td>
<td>G.F. 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pallavanandava, temple in Kāvireppamāṭṭi-ṇa</td>
<td>144, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pallavas, in S. India, 91, f. 299; and Chōjas</td>
<td>145, ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panchapura, 17, and Pachapattana</td>
<td>18 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pampa, sacred lake</td>
<td>G.F. 42 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pāñcharitra system, or Vāsudeva religion</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pančitarṣaṅa Jagannātha, Sanskrit scholar 247, 251</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panḍita Śeṣa, commentator ...</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panḍita, Dakshinī, at Benares</td>
<td>7, ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pāṇḍya kīsag ...</td>
<td>28, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pācini, grammaryan, as a poet 125 and n. 127</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and n.; 223, ff.; and Patañjali 237; 245</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and n. ; commentaries on</td>
<td>236, 249; 290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panis, the Dravīdu ...</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panjaba Shah, fakir leader</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panjabi Lexicography, Contributions to, Series III., contd. from Vol. XLI; p. 310</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41, ff., 93, ff., 150, ff., 176, ff., 197 ff., 212, f.;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242, f.; 267, ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>panotā, civil influence</td>
<td>G. F. 56 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parākrana, strenuous exertion</td>
<td>170, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paramāra inscriptions</td>
<td>2, 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paramāra, and the Guptas</td>
<td>2, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pāratiṣ-śrīkiśā, three treaties of the name</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parīd, a coin</td>
<td>240 and n., 241, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pāruṇa, ancient name for the Deccan</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parsi, settled at Sanjān</td>
<td>174, ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patañjali, commentator 125, f.; and Panjini 237; 245; his Mahābhaveśyā 292; and the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makkarins 290</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pāṭhak, Prof. K. B., and the Gupas</td>
<td>1, 2; 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paterson, J. D., and Hindu music 157, 161, 187, 189 n., 192</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrabhunjā, cap. of Antarvedi</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pāṭṭiṇāppālī, quoted</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pāvaiya sect</td>
<td>G. F. 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>payas, celestial preparation</td>
<td>G. F. 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peridepōs, Greek funeral repast</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periyamamb, tutor to Bhāmāṇuṇa</td>
<td>221, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pēsiān, Grammar in Sanskrit 4, ff.; customs 112</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perubhatā, Sanskrit Scholar</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peshawar, Pisso ré 116 n.; and Buddha relics 156</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purnekalāṭī, Pushkalāvatī, tn.</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prithvīñā, a patron of Nārāyaṇa Śeṣa</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pīlājī, a patron of Kriṣṇa Śeṣa</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pilgrimage, places of</td>
<td>G. F. 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pillai, Prof. Sundaram, of Travancore</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pillar-edict VII of Asoka, and the Ājīvikas</td>
<td>286, 289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pit shrines</td>
<td>G. F. 59, f.; 64, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piśāca languages</td>
<td>179, ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piśājipadāka, Sanskrit, Piśāchipadāka, modern Śāṅkara, vil. in Nasik cave inscrip.</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pisso, Peshawar</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>place names as surnames, a Kanarese practice 27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planetary iconography of the Sipāsians, according to the Dabatān</td>
<td>99, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plato</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pluto, and marriage</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pochu, Fochu, the Vākṣā or Ouxus riv.</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poets, who refer to Kāvirippāmpatīnīn</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polonnarewa, bronze from</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poppa, Kāvēri riv.</td>
<td>144 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>posthumous titles</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prabandha-Chintamaṇṭa, a work by Merutunga, mentions Kumarapāla</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pṛajāpati</td>
<td>36, 2; 7; 82, f.; 291, 292, ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pārākrit, dialects, origin of, 290,; Śāma grammar</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pātāpani, feudatory prince, his Nāsīl plate inscrip.</td>
<td>202, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prañāradhurāja, commentator and Alamkāra literature</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pntantātuhiṇa, Paithan, tn. on the Gōdvāri,</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>site of Dāmeśvara's College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pratisōl, p. gateway</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pregnancy, legend G. F. 61; customs</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>priests, and caste</td>
<td>102, f., 109, 130, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prinsep, on Ajayadeva's coins</td>
<td>209, 210, and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prithivipati II, Gangā-Bhāsa k., inscrips. of 145</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prithvirāja, Čāhāmāna k., his Ḫānī Stone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inscription of [Vikrama] Sanvat 1224</td>
<td>17, ff.; 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prithvi Rāj, Chohāk k., legend of</td>
<td>G. F. 62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>profession as the foundation of caste 104, ff., 109</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pyurias, Greek repasts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ptolemy, supposed reference to Kāvirippāmpatīnīn</td>
<td>144, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puṇāgar, Kāvēripāmpatīnīn</td>
<td>144; 149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pāṭjapāda, name of Devanandin</td>
<td>238, 235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulakesin II, Chalukya prince</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulicat, Palescante</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paga, spiritual merit</td>
<td>170, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parakehēri, the quarter outside the town</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puragupta, k.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pāṃrāma sacrifice</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>porhiṭ, domestic chaplain</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>purhita, Agni</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purushottama Śeṣa, Sanskrit scholar 251, 253</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pushkalāvatī, tn., the Greek Penkalāṭī</td>
<td>290c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pushkar, w. of Ajmer, sacred Hindu town, 182; three places of the name</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pythagoras, and music</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Column 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>312</td>
<td>INDEX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raghunandan, poet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lui Lakhumiah of Nadiā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rain, rains, G. F. 46, ff.; 52 and n., 53, 59, 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rājādhirāja I., surnamed Jayangonda Chōla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rājākēśarivarman Rājarajadeva, k., identified with Rājarāja II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rājānaka Aliaṭa, completed the Kavyaprakāsa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rājarāja I., surnamed Jayangonda-Chōla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rājarāja I., Kalinga k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rājarājachōlagsoula, k., inscr. of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gūḍarāja Narāṇḍra of Rājamundry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rājasokara, poet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rājasūjāvarma, Palla k., identified with Rājavarma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rājasthānī language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rājetsē, female saint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rājañībali, Rāja of Bikrampur, 18th century, patron of learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rājendrabōla I., Gaṅgaśiṅguḷa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rājendrabōla II., alias of Kālēttugacchōla I.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rājputāni, home of the Malavas 183; Ajayadeva coins in 206, and Hōna coins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rājputs and Marathas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rakrīgōmina, father of Bhamaha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rāma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rāmacandra, author 247, f.; two of the name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rāmacaritamānasu, and the Rāmāyaṇa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rāmakrishna Bhaṭṭa, Pandit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rāmakrishna Seha, commentator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rāmaṇja, sage, and the Chōlas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rāmāyaṇa and the Rāmacaritamānasu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rāmāyaṇa, age of 126; dramas 140, 142, f.; and Aryan immigration 228; 230; 296; and Hanumān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rāma Seha, Sanskrit author</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ramakrishna Bhaṭṭa, Pandit 8, his students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raṇastipūndi, grant of Vimalādiya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Radhā, goddess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raṅgacharya, Prof., and the Kṛṣṇaśīhāra 90, ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rao, Mr. Gopinatha, and the Travancore Series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rapson, Prof. on coins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>raṣṭrās, districts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raṭhōḍa (Gāhavāla) of Kāṇauj, their coins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raṅgāka Seha, a commentator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>raṭrī-sattra-nyāya, a session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rāvāna 279, f.; 233, f.; as an Ājīvika</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rayyaka, writer, and Alāṅkāra literature 206, 208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Religion of the Iranian Peoples, book notice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retu shādāha, period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rezes, beasts of pasture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rīg-Veda, and Aryan immigration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rūshī-panchāmi, religious holiday kept by women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Risley, Sir H., on caste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rites, performed by men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rītivājña, astronomical school 124 n.; Rītiyājña</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Romans, and marriage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rudrāhatsheka, Jālājatran ceremony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rudradeva, his Gīrṇār inscr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rudraśīna, a Koṭaṛa, inscr. of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rudraṭa, author, and Alāṅkāra, literature 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and n., 204, 205, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rūpaka, metaphor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rupnagar, ancient Vasera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rūpmaṭh Edict of Asoka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rūṣinsūla, Kishangar dyn., and Rupnagar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Sabdāṅkāras, number, and historical treatment of | ... 527, f. |
| saddēvata, tax to provide food | ... 80 |
| sādhas, magic | ... G. F. 55 |
| Sādhyaśas, and the Vedic Calendar | ... 82, f. |
| Sahasāradā—Rūpmaṭh—Brahmagiri Edict of Asoka | ... 170, f. |
| Sahasārā—kalpa, a heaven | ... 83 |
| sajāta, relative, etc. | ... 130 |
| Saṇḍvīpi Brāhmaṇas, Magas, in Pushkar | ... 183 |
| Saṇḍhakāśa sacrifices | ... 124 n., 291, f., 294, f. |
| Sāketa, besieged by Menander | ... 372 |
| sākūṭas, branches | ... 47 |
| Saṅkaraṇāṭṭam, Chakrakōṭṭa | ... 210, 226 |
| Sākṣiyas, and the Vedic Calendar | ... 82, f., 117, f. |
| Saṅkṣaya, astronomical school | ... 77 |
| Saṅmaḷipadra, Saṅmalipadra | ... 165 |
| sanṛddhi, religious suicide | ... G. F. 41 |
| Saṅmalipada, Saṅmalipada, Sk. Saṅmalipadra, modern Sāmāṇagaon, vil. in Nasik cave | ... 165 |
| inscr. | ... 263 |
| Saṃāṇa chanta | ... 165 |
| Sāmāṇagaon, ancient Saṅmalipada | ... 165 |
| Samghams, Tamil, the first and third | ... 299, 292 |
| Samyita-darpaṇa, quoted | ... 190 |
| Samyita-Nārāyaṇa, a work on music | ... 157 |
| Samyita-pāṭhya, Sanskrit work, and music | 157, 160 and n. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sen, Guru Prashad, and caste</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senu kings in Bengal</td>
<td>167, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senart, Emile, on Asoka edicts 37, 38 and n.</td>
<td>172, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sáraman Veruschchári Áttha, Obéra k., defeated by Káriká</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sésa, of Benares</td>
<td>13, 245, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sésa-saśa, Tivúpati hill</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>settlement foundation ceremonies</td>
<td>G. F. 67, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šaṭāja, note</td>
<td>162, f., 186 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šádha-gráma 187, 189 n., 254, ff., 259, f., 262, 263 and n., 265</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šádha-sídhrávya</td>
<td>263, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sháh Jahan, translated King John 44; and</td>
<td>G. Broughan 115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shámán-d-Din Áltamah, k. of Delhi</td>
<td>85, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shásti, holiday kept by women</td>
<td>G. F. 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shipton, Sir Ab., first governor of Bombay</td>
<td>75, ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shíristán, temples of the planets</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shíshábú-d-Din Ghúr, conquered Prithvíryá</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shíti-, holiday kept by women</td>
<td>G. F. 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shipton, Sir Ab., first governor of Bombay</td>
<td>75, ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shítašá, goddess of smallpox</td>
<td>G. F. 66, 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shítašá-lípuja, holidays kept by women</td>
<td>G. F. 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shráddha ceremonies</td>
<td>G. F. 37, 38, 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shrines, Jain, in Mt. Sétrothá</td>
<td>G. F. 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sidear lunar year</td>
<td>57, ff., 65, ff. 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sétihára grants, three, mention the town of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanjama</td>
<td>175, ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sétprákára, pújá stone wall</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>silti-ceriums, Roman funeral repast</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinhabábopála, on music</td>
<td>194, f., 262 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Síngba, perhaps Sínghána, supposed Andhra k.</td>
<td>169 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Síppánmañá-plate inscrip.</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sínhashta year, auspiscions for marriages</td>
<td>G. F. 37 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sípási, the planetary iconography of</td>
<td>99, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitá, 275, ff., 280 n., 282, 283, 299 ; riv. G. F. 46</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Síva in Bengali literature</td>
<td>G. F. 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Síva-Bhága-vata, in Patanjali's Mahábháṣya, book-notice</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Síva Dewálá at Pólónánwárá, bronzes from</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Síváji, Maráti, and Gágá Bháta</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skandáguptá, Vikrá mañjítyá 2; and Vasú bandhá 244; expelled the Húnás</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Síletha, a pan</td>
<td>127, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>smallpox</td>
<td>G. F. 66, 69, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>solar sidereal year</td>
<td>65, f., 71, 77, 80, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Index Entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td>solecisms, in Sāmkarāchārya and Kālidāsa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>Soma, g.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Soma-vikrayin, thirteenth priest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236</td>
<td>Sōmāsava II, W. Chālukya k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Souraseno, Saurasenas, Satvatas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>Souza, Martim Afonso, de, 12th Governor of Portuguese India, An Account of the Expedition to the Temples of S. India, undertaken by him</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>speech, figures of, in Alankāra literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9, f.</td>
<td>Śravaṇa Belgola inscr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231</td>
<td>Śravantı, tn., and Buddha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288</td>
<td>Srijanaya-mātā, goddess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Srinārāyaṇapura, Tiranārāyaṇapura, tn. and Rāmānuja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234</td>
<td>śrīnākhalbandha, figure of speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>Śrīraṅgām, tn. and Rāmānuja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>ākṣaras, musical terms 164 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>śrīraṁ and marriage etc. 111, f.; settled in Tōndai-Maṇḍal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>sāktimukādā-nil, work which mentions the poet Māyūrāja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>Sāktiratnākara, rare Sanskrit work by Nārāyanāya Seha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>Sūryāni, gordini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Surat, and the English 74, F.; and G. Broughton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>surnames, Kānarese practice of using place names as such</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Śātra, Aṭṭab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>Śāṭrālaṅkāra, a work criticised by prof. S. Levi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>śastra and the Vedic calendar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26, 48</td>
<td>suitse, temple to, G. F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>śastra, and sūtras, and śrutis, musical terms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>svarga, a heaven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>wally, near Surat, and the English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>synodic lunar year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>Tabaq단-ı-Naṣeri and Lakshmana Sesa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Tagara, Ter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>Tagore, Rājā S. M. and ancient Hindu music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>Tailapa, murdered Vākapati-Muñja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>Takakus, Dr., and the Gupta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>266</td>
<td>Takashaśila, Ta-cha-Shi-lo, tn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>272</td>
<td>Tamil, literature and Kāviriṇa-pumppaṭitanam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>146; co. and the Chālukya-Chōlaiya 224; inscr. etc. 226, f.; language, of the first and third Sangham 229, 231, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252</td>
<td>Tāṇḍava, unidentifed tn., 247, f., 251, genealogical table of its kings 252 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>Tapaschita, astronomical school 84, 117 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>Tārā, g.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Tārānātha, and maxims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>Temple, of S. India, an expedition to, undertaken by M. A. de Souza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Ter, Tagara, in the Sholapur dist., tn. mentioned in inscr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>Tevar, Tripura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>Thācā, Sīlākāra grant found near Thomas, Dr. F. W., on Asoka Edicts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245</td>
<td>śita-kāra, name applied to Bhartṛihari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>Timneppula dist., bronze from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tir, Tēmām, Buddha, Uttarīd, planet temple of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Tirabukthi, dist., coal from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tirumala, temple, or Tremelē, in Tirupati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239</td>
<td>Tirunārāyaṇapura, or Mālkota, tn., and Rāmānuja 221, 223, Yādavagiri, Śrīnārāyaṇapura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224</td>
<td>Tirupati, visited by Rāmānuja 224, f.; famous for its temple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239</td>
<td>Tiruparangañgaram, inscr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>Tiruvālāṅgāju grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228</td>
<td>Tiruvārur, sk., Kamalālaya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225</td>
<td>Tiruvāthi festivals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>titles, posthumous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>Tod, Lieut. Col., and the Hānsī Stone inscr. of Prithvirāja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>Tōndai-Maṇḍal, Sādra settlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>Tōndal, Tonner, tn., and Rāmānuja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>totems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>trade, and commerce under Kākāla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travancore Archaeological Series</td>
<td>21, ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tremella temple, raided 238; or Tirumala</td>
<td>238, 241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trevandrum Museum, inscrip. in</td>
<td>23, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trikacakra, period</td>
<td>50 and n., 51, 120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trilochana-Pallava, and Karkala</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tripura, Terur, later Chedi cap.</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triśāṅku, and Viśvāmitra</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulasi Dēs, author of the Rāmācharitamānasa</td>
<td>273, ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyāgarāja, g.</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uchehātan, form of black art</td>
<td>G. F. 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Udāyanādīram plate inscriptions</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Udībha, writer, and Alankāra literature</td>
<td>204, 206, ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ujjāi festival</td>
<td>G. F. 68, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ujjain, tn. in Malwa, Avanti 146; charter</td>
<td>291; tn. and Bhdrabāhu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ujjain, Indramahatava, festival</td>
<td>G. F. 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ukārdi, earth</td>
<td>G. F. 50 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ukthya, form of sacrifice</td>
<td>52 and n., 78 and n., 79, 294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umārkhej, vil. in Parbhāni dist., and the family name Umārakhej</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>upamā, simile, earliest definition of</td>
<td>127, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>upasad, vow of fasting</td>
<td>46, 49 n., 82, 84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uragi, ancient Chōla cap.</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urāndai, ancient Chōla cap.</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>urdhvāghaṇa, lengthened year</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uṛgō-Pāḍyā, and the Āryaṣ</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>urṣa, strength</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ushavatāda, Kāharapana</td>
<td>128, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utpala, on the Ājivikas</td>
<td>236, ff., 290; 296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uprekaḥ, figure of speech</td>
<td>127, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uttamaśādāvā, and the Mālavas</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vāchhād-solanki, vil., legend of</td>
<td>G. F. 64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vadda, an offering</td>
<td>G. F. 48, 56, 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vadaulay, Beadāla</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vāhādadeva, minister of Kumārapālandeveda</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>edhička, saffron</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vahlīka-Desa, Bactria</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaiśān̄kāṭha Payaṅgaṇḍe, Ammaṅ Bhaṣṭa</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaisali, modern Basar</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaisnavas in Bengal</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaiśvādeva sacrifices</td>
<td>124 n., 291, ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaiśvāswat Manu, the first man</td>
<td>G. F. 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaiśyas</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaiṣṇavī, a work dealing with caste</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vakkal, vakkalādeva, (Mysore) household, householder</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vākapati-Moṅka, uncle to Jayasimha, murdered</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vālakha, writer</td>
<td>266 and n., 267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vālana, a Chāhlāna, grandson of Prithvirāja, Lord of Raṅthamboh</td>
<td>85, ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vāmāki, author of the Rāmāyana</td>
<td>273, ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vāmana, author of the Kāvyālakṣakā-statra-vṛitti</td>
<td>1, f.; 127, 204, f., 297, 232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vāmanasthali, modern Vantali</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vānapati, Kalinga, minister, inscrip. of</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vānusahādhi śāraṇa, the Ayurvedic Materia Medica, book notice</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vankā, Vankāha, Ouxus riv.</td>
<td>266 and n., 267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vantali? ancient Vāmanasthali, in Junagadh, Kāharapana inscrip. found at</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vārāśaṇa, barrenness</td>
<td>G. F. 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vāyas, i. a. off S. India</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vārāhamihira, contemporary of Kālidāsa</td>
<td>156, 207; and the Ājīvikas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vāranāchi, and Kāṭyāyana, suggested identity of</td>
<td>125 and n.; 245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vārga, group, class</td>
<td>49 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vārgas</td>
<td>102, 108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vārūṇa, an Ādīśya</td>
<td>200, 294, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vārunapurāṇa sacrifices</td>
<td>124 n., 291, f., 294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vāsīkhaṇḍa, form of black art</td>
<td>G. F. 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vāsāna, sage</td>
<td>G. F. 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vedāna ceremony</td>
<td>G. F. 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vatsubandhu and Subandhu</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vedāna, grahak-hāti ceremony</td>
<td>G. F. 68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vatsu, Mr., Nagendranath, and the Lokahman Sena era</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vatsubandhu, who was his patron</td>
<td>1, ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vāsudeva, or Pāṭhecharitra religion</td>
<td>14, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vāsus, gods</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vatapādraka, vil. mentioned in the Bāṅswāra inscrip.</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vāti, cup</td>
<td>G. F. 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vāṭṭālottu, inscrip.</td>
<td>23, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vāvera, Varvara, modern Rupnagar</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaiyārāgara, Vaiyākara, tn. and Odhira-jāna</td>
<td>219, 226, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaiyāṃsuta, Bhima, g.</td>
<td>G. F. 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vedāngārāja, author of the Pārast-prakāśa, an astronomical work</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vedas, the, and caste</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vedic Calendar, The Intercalary Month 26, ff. 45, ff.; II. The Calendar 48, ff., 77, ff.; III. The Ayanas or Sāstras</td>
<td>83, ff., 117, ff.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INDEX

Vedic, hymns 13, and caste, etc. 130, f., 138; literature, and figures of speech 124; gods, etc., and the Adityas ... 290, 293
Vēṇādi kings, inscr., of ... 21
Vēngi, and the Chālukyas, etc. 217, ff.; 226
f; and Madagi ... 232
Vēṇaśāṭiṣyama, g. ... 223, f.
Venkatesvaraswami, g. in the Tirumala temple ... 299
Venpīḷ, battle at ... 146, f.
Vērachōḍa, inscr. of ... 218, ff.
Vibhāsana, lord of the demons ... 17, f.
Vīgas, relations ... 130
Victoria, q. her posthumous title ... 72
Viṣṇumitra, Viṣṇumitra ... 275 and n., 276, 279, 255
Vidyāśāra, Bijapur ... 248
Vidyānībhi Kavindra, Pandit ... 10, ff.
Vidyāvīvāsana, Pandit ... 0, ff.
Vidyāyāpī, poet ... 299
Vigrahārāja, alias Visāleśava k. ... 182
Viheśīrī—Sri—Krishṇaśāstra—Miśra, author of the Pārśa-prakāṣa ... 4
Vījñādītya, W. Chālukya k., date of ... 146
Vījñādītya, W. Chālukya p. ... 217, ff.
Vījñādītya, E. Chālukya k. ... 217, ff.
Vījñāṣagāra, Bisnāgara ... 238, 240, 241 n.
Vikramadītīya and Chandragupta II. etc. 1,... 244
f.; 16; and Brahmanism ... 244
Vikramadītīya II., contemporary with Kalīdāsa ... 267
Vikramadītīya II., W. Chālukya k. ... 217, f., 226
Vikramapura, birthplace of Lakṣmīnāraja Sena ... 168, f.
Vikramasimha, Paramārā Bājā of Ahō ... 196
vīkatā, changing notes ... 191
villages, four, in Nāsik cave inscrs. ... 165, ff.
Vimālādītīya, E. Chālukya k., mentioned in the Kadaj grant ... 209, 217
Vindhyas, Sacred mts. ... G. F. 43, 45
Vindhyavāsa, Brahman scholar, and Buddhāmitra ... 244
Vīrāndra, author of the Āhāraṇādāra ... 88 f.
Vīrāṇjīndra, Chōja k. ... 217, ff., 226
Vīrēśvarā Saras, Sanskrit scholars 247 and n., ... 250, f., 253
Vīsāladeva, Chāhāmāna k. ... 18
Vīsāladeva, bhaṭhā n. k., alias of Vīrāndra ... 192
Vīṣṇu, in Bengali literature ... 299

Vīṣṇu-bhāgavatās ... 272
Vīṣṇu-Śaṅkara, scholar ... 247, f., 253
Vīṣṇuvardhana, Viṣṇu, converted by Rāmānuja ... 224
Viśāla ... 275 n., 276, 279, 282
Viṣṇuśānti day ... 71, 78, 120, f.
Viśvāmitra, sage, Viśvāmitra, and Trisāṅku the Chandāla ... 292; 275 n., 276, 279, 285
Viṣṇuvātī Rājān Rājā, and the Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇ family ... 7
Viśnusārī, school of astronomers 82, f., 113, 124
Viśvāśu, writer on music ... 164
Viṣṇu, Viṣṇuvardhana ... 244, f.
vīvīra; vīvīra, words in an Aṅkā inscr. ... 172
Vojāna, Rajpūt clan ... 203
vows, woman's ... G. F. 48
Vrīndāvānāsakas, ascetics ... 226, 228
Vṛkṣodara, wolf-bellied, title of Bīmā ... G. F. 57
vṛkṣodharaḥ, musical term ... 153
Vṛṣṭra, g. ... 263, 265
Vṛṣṭra, the, and the Śaṅkara family ... 247, f.
Vṛṣṭram, sage ... G. F. 71

wells, curative ... G. F. 42
White Huns, Hēnas ... 266 and n.

Yādavagiri, tn., Tirumāravampura ... 234
Yāma, the other world ... 266
yamaka, figure of speech ... 127, f., 206, f.
Yamātī, yamātī, S. India ... 223
Yāsaka, author of the Nirukta ... 127
Yāsodhavala, k. of Chandravati ... 196
Yāsīvarman, poet king ... 141 and n.
yātra, songs of ... 300
years, various kinds 45, 48, ff.; Sāvana 53 ff.;
sidereal lunar 57, ff.; synodic lunar 61, ff.;
sidereal solar ... 65, ff., 71, 77
Yogāṇipura, Jogini, Delhi ... 85

Zaheer, 8th. cen., musician ... 265
Zemana system and the Muslims ... 155
Zinzzarwādī, vil., well and shrine at, G. F. 59, 63, f.
Zodiac, signs of ... G. F. 40, f.
Zenzā, Saint ... G. F. 63