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THE RAMACHARITAMANASA AND THE RAMAYANA.
BY L. P. TESSITORI; UDINE (ITALY).
(Continued from Vol. XLI. p. 386.)

Ayodhyākāṇḍa.

(10) The supreme desire of the old Daśaratha is that he may see Rāma’s coronation in his lifetime:

C, II, 1, 36-37 (B, II, 1, 19):
atha rājō bebhēvaiva vṛtthāṣaṣṭa chitrājvināḥ | pṛṣṭi esaḥ kathām. Rāmo rājā sāyā mayi jīvati || 36 || eṣā hy asya pariṣṭi hiṛidi samarpavartate | kadā nāma sūtaṃ dhrākṣhāmy abhishiktam ahaṃ priyaṃ || 37 ||

R. C. M., II, 1, 10:
(saḥa ke uṣa abhīlāhau asa... 1)
āpu aṣṭakata jujvā̄ja-paṇḍu Rāma-hiṃ deu naresu ||

R. C. M., II, 4, 30:
mohi aṣṭakata yahu hoi nohhāhah ||

Tulasī Dāsa, in the first of the two quotations given above, ascribes to all the citizens what Vālmiki had ascribed to Daśaratha, but the substance is the same. The central point of the comparison is represented by the phrase mayi jīvati, which has been literally translated into āpu aṣṭakata and mohi aṣṭakata, and the correspondence is made still more persuasive by the fact that āpu aṣṭakata in the first quotation from the R. C. M. is quite superfluous and unjustifyable.

(11) Men and women in Ayodhyā, eager to see Rāma’s coronation, look impatiently for the morning:

C, II, 5, 19 (B, II, 4, 19):
tadā hy Ayodhyā-nilayaḥ sastrāmālākulo janaḥ | Rāmābhīshekamākāṅkhanaṁ ākāṅkhanaṁ udayaṁ ravaḥ || 19 ||

R. C. M., II, 11, 35-40:
kaḥānī parasaṃpara loga logāl | kāli lagana bhali keṭika bārā ||

16. 6):
sakala kaḥānīṁ kaba, hoī kālī ||

(12) Vālmiki, in order to depict Manthara’s passion, makes use of the metaphor: daḥyamāndā brodha (C, II, 7, 13) and daḥyamāndā nalaṇeva (ibid., 21), which might have been the origina of Tulasi Dāsa’s expression: (Rāma-tilaka suni) bhā ura-dādha (II, 13, 2).

(13) It has always been a rule in the Solar race that the eldest son should be king and his younger brothers obey his commands. This argument, which Vālmiki puts forth several times in his Ayodhyākāṇḍa in favor of Rāma’s coronation, is picked up by Tulasī Dāsa and caused to
be uttered by Kaikeyi, when she is trying to convince Manthara that it is quite right that Râma should be made king:

C, II, 73, 20:22 (B wanting):

asmin kule hi sarveshâro jyestho râjye bhishichyate | apare bhrârâras asmin pravartahe samâhithâ || 20 || satatah râjasputreśha jyestho râjâ bhishichyate | râjânam etst samâm | tat syâd Iskhâkâkârâṁ vipeshahatâ || 22 ||

R. C. M., II, 15, 3:

jeṭha svâmi sevaka laghu bhál || yaha dinakara-kula riti suhâî ||

C, II, 79, 7â (B, II, 86, 10):

jyesthaaya râjatâ nityam uchitâ hi kulyasa naḥ ||

R. C. M., II, 25, 9:

parasata pâśi . . .

C, II, 102, 2 (B, II, 111, 2):

śrīvato 'yan saśa dharmah śhito 'smaśu . . . jyesthe putre sthite râjâ na kanâyân bhavenn nripaḥ || 2 ||

(14) Daśaratha stoops over Kaikeyi, who is lying on the ground full of anger, and touches her with his hands:

C, II, 10, 27â (B, II, 9, 6â):

parimrîjya cha pâśibhyâm . . .

R. C. M., II, 26, 1-2, 5:

anahita tora priyâ kei khâh || kehî dui ira kei Juma chaî linhâ || kahu kei râkha kei karâkî naresû || kahu kei nripaî nîkâsaîm devâ ||

(15) Daśaratha asks Kaikeyi who has dared to vex her and what he is to do in order to punish the offender, and says that he himself, as well as all his family, is at her disposal:

C, II, 10, 31 and 8. (B, II, 9, 10 and 8.):

( . . . yâdhitum âchaksha bhâminī || kaśya vâ 'pi priyam kâryam kena vâ vipriyam kritam || 31 || kahu priyam labhatam adya ko vâ sumahad apiyam || . . . . . . . . || 32 || avadhya vadhâyatam ko vâ vadhâyah ko vâ vinuchyatam || daridraḥ ko bhaved ādhyo dravyâvâ || 'py akâkechanaḥ || 33 || aham cha hi mâyâh cha sarve tvam vaçṣa'nuṅguḥ . . .

The passage is quite identical, even in form, in both the poems.

(16) Kaikeyi insists on demanding that the king should keep his promise and alleges the examples of others who gave their life and property to keep their word. This we find in both the poems, only the examples quoted differ, as Vâlmiki (C, II, 12, 43 and 8. C, II, 14, 4 and 8. F; B, II, 11, 4 and 8.) quotes those of Cibi, Alarka and Sâgara, while Tulsâd Dâsa (II, 80, 7, quotes those of Cibi, Dattabhikâ and Bâli). The example, of Bâli, however, has a correspondence in the R.

(17) Daśaratha wishes the day of Râma’s banishment would never break:

C, II, 13, 17â (B wanting):

na prabhâtam tvaye 'chchhâmî niçe sakshatra bhrâhshâhite || 17 ||

R. C. M., II, 37, 2â:

(bhuâhù) . . . bhûlaya mañûva bhoran jani hof . . .

(18) On the morning of the day fixed for the coronation, Râma is called to the king’s presence, where, seeing his father lying on the ground in a miserable condition and not being addressed by him, he begins to suspect that the king must be angry with him, and asks Kaikeyi what is the offence which has made his father angry:

C, II, 18, 11 (B, II, 15, 18):

kachchhin mayâ na 'paradhâhnam ajânanâd yena me pîtâ | kupitas tan mamâ 'chakshhâva . . .

R. C. M., II, 42, 7-8:

bhâ mo hi tema kachhu bañça aparâdhù || tà te mo hi na kahista kachhu râù || mori sapatha tohi kahu sati-bhâû ||
(19) In the R. C. M. (II, 44, 9-10) Daśaratha prays Gīva that Rāma may disregard his command and refuse to go to the woods. The same wish Vālmiki ascribes to Daśaratha in the R. (C, II, 12, 86).

(20) Rāma, in order to dissuade Śitā from her resolution to follow him to the exile, draws a sketch of the hardships of the forest, insisting particularly on the following points: (1) sleeping on the bare ground; (2) wearing bark-garments; (3) living on fruits, bulbs and roots and fasting occasionally when that natural food is scanty:

\[ C, II, 28, 11 \] boyante pārīṣayayāsu svayambhāyaśu bhūtale ... || 11 || ahaśratraṃ cha samtoṣhaḥ kartavyo nīyatātmantaḥ || phalair vīkṣhitvarpatitaḥ ... || 12 || upavāsāḥ cha kartavyo ... || 12.11 || jaśābhāraṇaḥ cha kartavyo vālkālambaramaṃ dhāraṇam ... || 13 || ... || 11 || yathālādhēna kartavyaḥ samtoṣhaḥ ... || 17.11 || yathā hārair vancharaiḥ

... || 22||  

The last point is better developed in:

\[ B, II, 28, 22 \] (C wanting):

vaneshv alabhyamāne cha yaye múlapalde punaḥ || bahūny ahāni vastavyaṃ nirāhāraṃ vanśprayaṃ || 22||

(21) Śitā answers that a layer of grass will be for her the most delightful bed and that fruits and roots will be as sweet as ambrosia, provided she be near Rāma:

\[ C, II, 30, 14-15 \] (B, II, 30, 16-17):

cādvalaṃḥ yadā ċītṛye vānānāravanojcharaḥ || kuthāstaraṃ naṃkeṣṭhaṃ kūṃ syāt sukhastaraṃ tataḥ ... || 14 || patram múlap phalāṃ yat tu apiṃ vā yadi vā bahu vā dāsyaṃ svayam ākṛtya tan me 'mrītaraṃpaṃmaṃ ... || 15 ||

and protests she will never get weary on the way:

\[ C, II, 30, 11a \] (B, II, 30, 12a):

na cha me bhavīta tatra keśitaḥ pathiṃ pariṣṭramah ||

(22) After Śitā has been given permission to follow her spouse, Lakṣaṃśa grasps his brother’s feet, wishing to be allowed to accompany him:

\[ C, II, 31, 1 \] and 4(2, II, 31, 4 and 4):

svan ċrutva sa samvādaṃ Lakṣaṃśaḥ pūrvam āgataḥ ... || 1 || bāhzaparyākalamukhaḥ ċoṣaṃ sudham śekvanam ... || 1 || sa bhṛtuḥ śaraṇaṃ gāḍaṃ nīptiḥ Raghunandanaḥ ... . .

(23) In the R. C. M. Sumitra instructs Lakṣaṃśa to take heed that Rāma and Śitā live happily in the woods and forget their father, mother, friends and relations and the pleasures of the city. This can be traced back to a passage in the R. where Śitā says she will never think, while in the woods, of her parents, nor of the palace, which she has renounced:

\[ C, II, 30, 15 \] (B, II, 30, 15):

na mātṛ na pitṛ na tatra smarisyāmi na veṣṭmaṇah ||

... || 25||  

... || 27||
(24) Sumitra instructs Lakshmana to regard Rama as Daśaratha, Sita as herself and the forest as Ayodhya:

C, II, 40, 9 (B, II, 39, 11-12*):
Rama Daśaratho vidhī māṃ vidhī Janakātmasajām
Ayodhyāṃ api vidhī.

(25) The citizens accompanying Rama into the exile awake in the morning after the first halt, and, not seeing Rama any more, burst into lamentations, and cursing their lives bereft of Rama, pray to die:

C, II, 47, 7 (B wanting):
īha' va nidhanaṃ yāma mahāprasthānam eva 'va R Venezuela
rahitānāṃ no kim arthaṃ jīvitaṃ hitam || 7 || iti 'va
... vilapanti ...

(26) Rama, when taking leave of Sumantra, implores him to do everything in his power so that the king may not grieve on his account:

C, II, 52, 22* (B wanting):
yathā Daśaratho rājā māṃ na gochēt tathā kuru || 22 ||

(27) Sita's prayer to the Gaṅgā:

C, II, 52, 23* and f. (B, II, 52, 17* and f.):
Vaiḍēhi prāṇajalirbhidvā tām nadīm idam abravīt || 82 ||
putra Daśarathasya' yaṃ mahārājasya dhīmataḥ || nīdeṣāṁ
pālayatv enaṃ Gaṅgā tvadabhirakhitāḥ || 83 || chaturdaṣṭa
hi varahiḥ samaghrāṇy uṣyā kānane || bhrātrā saha mañjā
chā' va punah prastyāgamahyati || 84 || tatas tvam āmūy
subhage kṣaṃeṇa punar āga Ṭaḥa yasya pramudita Gaṅgā
sarrakāmasunīdhrīyān || 85 || ... punar eva
mahābhūr mañjā bhrātrā cha saṃghaḥ || Ayodhyāṃ vanavā-
sūt tu prāśāvat ānāho 'naghe || 91 ||

(28) Sumantra, on his return after having accompanied the three exiles to the woods, relates to Daśaratha Rama's and Lakshmana's messages:

B, II, 58, 22* and f. (C, II, 58, 21* and f.):
... vaktavyo Bhurato vachanān mama || 22 || tvayā
cūrūṣabhyaṃ māṃ na gochhita yathā nāpi māna
arhaḥ tathā kartum iti api niṣṭhayam || 23 || sāmāṃ
mārīṣuḥ sarvāvṛtā vartetā iti cha' braviḥ || ... || 24 || 25 ||
iahadroha parītas tu Saumitrīr idam abravī ...

As regards Sita, both in the R. and in the R. C. M., Sumantra says she was so moved that she could utter no words. The correspondence is so much the more significant as neither Vālmīki nor Tulsī Dīkṣā had mentioned Sita when describing Sumantra's taking leave from the exiles. Had
not Tulasi Dāsa kept strictly close to the R., it would be difficult to explain as a mere chance that he should have made the same omission as his predecessor had:

| B. II, 58, 24 and s. (C II, 58, 24 and s.) | R. C. M., II, 152, 9-10: |
| Jānakī tu vinīavyasa bāşpačhannaśvarā niśpa | kahi pranima kachhu kahana liya |
| bhūtpaśājītācchite'y vikshāmāñā samantatah || 34 || | Siya bhai sithila sancha | thakita banna bhanche lochana sajala palaka-palla-vita |
| adhyāta-pūr-vayyana rājaputri yācaśvini | deha || |
| paryaośvadaśā dīna nai'va māṁ kipchid ašvarī || 35 || udikshāmāñā bhartarān |
| mukhena pariśvayatā | munoche kavala bāśpaṁ māṁ nivrīttam aʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌʌ附加值: áhata-prabhā dyaur ibhāskaraṁ viṇā... | rarāja sā nai'va bhričaṁ mahāpurī... |
| B. II, 68, 25 (C II, 68, 25) |
| narāc cha nārya; cha bhričārmanāsā vīgarhayaṁto Bharatasya mātaram... |
| (32) Bharata’s hasty travel from Rājag ratio to Ayodhyā, which is described at length by Vālmiki (B. II, 73; C II, 71), is condensed to less than within only half a chaupdi by Tulasi Dāsa: |
| R. C. M., II, 158, 1 |
| chale samra-bega haya bāṁke | nāgaha saśita saila bana bāṁke |
| but that half chaupdi contains a complete summary of what Vālmiki says in his fuller account, where Bharata is likewise represented as crossing rivers, forests and mountains, fatiguing his horses and rying in speed with the wind. As to this last point, namely, the comparison of Bharata’s
speed to that of the wind, I think it is sufficient to prove that Tulasi Dāsa, when writing his *chāle samāra-bega*, had in mind the following ṣlokā of the *R.*:

\[ B, II, 73, 7 \] (C, II, 71, 8):

\[ rājaṇapuro mahābhāum atitkhanopaśobhitam ]

\[ bhadraṃ bhadreṇa yānena Mārutaḥ kham ivā "bhayaśit" || 7 || ]

(33) Tulasi Dāsa relates how Kaikēyī, seeing Bharata greatly disconsolate on hearing of Rāma’s banishment, tried to console him with words, the only result of which was to exasperate him more and more, like salt applied to a burn:

\[ R. C. M., II, 161, 1: \]

\[ bikala biloki satahi samujhāvati | manahūṁ jare para lona lagāvati | \]

Now the example of the salt applied to a wound to indicate pain added to pain is found in the *R.* in Bharata’s talk to Kaikēyī; in fact, in both poems it occurs in the same situation, just as in both it refers to Bharata’s grief:

\[ B, II, 75, 154: \]

\[ vraja kahāraṃ vinikshiptam duḥkhe duḥkham nipātavitam | \]

\[ (C, II, 73, 82: \]

\[ duḥkhe me duḥkham akaror vraja kahāram va ‘dādāh | ). \]

(34) Tulasi Dāsa relates how Bharata in the couch of *lūga*, on which Rāma and Sītā had slept under the tree at Čṛīgavera, discovered some *kanakabindavaḥ* from Sītā’s ornaments and placed them reverently upon his head. The same discovery Bharata makes in the *R.*, and it is noteworthy that the two poems agree not only in that particular, but even in the use of the same term: *kanakabindu*:

\[ B, II, 96, 18 (C, II, 88, 14): \]

\[ manye sābharāṇaśauptā yathā svabhavane purā | tatra tatra ki drīryante cīrpaḥ kanakabindavaḥ || 16 || ]

(35) Vālmīki says that Bharata, on his way to the woods to take back Rāma, in the *maitrāmuḥurta* (viz. in the third *muḥurta* from the rising of the sun), along with his retinue entered Prayāga after having crossed the Gāgā. From this statement it can be inferred that the crossing of the river lasted two *muḥurtaṇas*. Tulasi Dāsa keeps strictly close to Vālmīki’s computation of the time:

\[ B, II, 97, 27 (C, II, 89, 21): \]

\[ sā sarvā śhavajint Gāgāṃ dāsaśa sansārītā | tātrē muḥurte prayayau Prayāgavanam uttamaṃ || 27 || ]

\[ R. C. M., II, 199, 5: \]

\[ kanakabindu dai chārika dekhe | rakhe sila Sīta sama lekhe | \]

(36) Tulasi Dāsa narrates how Rāma, at the sight of the sadness of the citizens in Bharata’s retinue, took pity on them, and by embracing them all removed their grief; and then admonishes his readers not to marvel at the Lord’s power to embrace in a moment such an immense multitude (*R. C. M.*, II, 244, 1-4). Even this particular, pervaded as it seems by Tulasi Dāsa’s peculiar mannerism, can be traced back to the following passage of the *R. :*

\[ B, II, 111, 51 (C, II, 103, 47): \]

\[ tām narāṃ bhaṇapurāṇkhaṃ samkalayā cha sudhukhitān | paryashvajata dharmajñāṇaḥ pitrīvaḥ mātirvach cha saḥ || 51 || ]

\[ R. C. M., II, 202, 92: \]

\[ daṇḍaḥ chāri mahan bhā bābā pārā | \]

\[ R. C. M., II, 203, 92: \]

\[ Bharata tiṣare pahare kahāṃ kīhā | prabha Prayāga | ]

\[ *A. daṇḍa* is about 56 minutes, i.e., half the time of a muhūrta, which is about 48 minutes.*
(37) The words with which Rāma is informed of Daśaratha's death are qualified by Tulasī Dāsa as *bhuśa-kāthāra... katu bhānī* (R. C. M., II, 247, 58): Vālmiki in the corresponding passage has the same image of the thunderbolt, only more developed:

*B, II, 111, 9-10* (C, II, 103, 2-3):

tan tu vajragn īvo terāsabhām abāve Daśarārāṇī |
vägrajrām Bharateno 'tman amanojñām niṣayā tu ||
prāgībhya bāhū Rāmo 'tha pūshpīturā drūmo yathā |
vane pārañkunā kṛttas tathā bhūnau pāpita saḥ || 10||

(38) Bharata before taking any deliberation consults Rāma's sandals:


&tatas tu Bharataḥ cīrām abhishechayā råjyāddue sa kālavay-
jaanām tatra dhārayāmsa cha svayam || 16 || pādue tr
abhishchayātha Nandigrāme purottame, | Bharataḥ cīsanām
sarvām pādākhyām nyāvedayat || 17 ||.

(39) The scratching of the ground with one's toes, which Tulasī Dāsa more than once mentions as a token of grief, is also found in the *R*. I quote for the comparison two passages from the Aṣṭādhyāyī:

*B, II, 80, 15* (C wanting):

tam avākṣirasaṁ bhūmiṁ charāṇagreṇa Rāghavam | 
mahi nakha likhana lagim salu
vālikhantam uvāčā rtaṁ Vasahātho bhagavān ribhim || 15 ||

R. C. M., II, 325, 9-10:

nita pujata prabhupāṇivat priti na
ḥṛidaya samālai māṁ māṁgi māṁgi
āyaśu karata rāja-kāja bahu bhām-
ti || .

Aranyakaṇḍa.

(40) Tulasī Dāsa begins the Aranyakaṇḍa by saying that he has already sung the great affection shown by the citizens and Bharata, and that he will now forward sing the act that Rāma wrought in the forest. No doubt Tulasī Dāsa refers here to the *sarga* 105 of the Aṣṭādhyāyī in *B*, where Vālmiki describes Rāma's and Śītā's pastimes in a cave of the Chitrakūṭa and then the episode of the crow. Tulasī Dāsa joins the two parts together, condensing the first part within a single *chaupdī* and describing the second one at some length, but with great alterations. Here is the *chaupdī* replacing the first part of the *sarga*:

*R. C. M., III, 1, 34*:

eka bārā choni kusuma suhayē | niya kara bhūshana Rāma bāṣayē |
Śītāhā pahāryē prabhū suķāra | bālīte phāṭikā-sīla para suṇdate |

With the few touches above Tulasī Dāsa sums up imperfectly the whole substance of the verses *B, II, 105, 1-36*, in which it is described how Rāma, after showing Śītā the Chitrakūṭa and the Mandakini, entered with her into a cave in the mountain, sat down upon a rock (*gīlavatā, gīla*) to take rest, and then placed the *tālaka* on her with his finger, which he had rubbed on a piece of arsenic, and adorned her with flowers.

The second part of the *sarga*, namely the episode of the crow (*B, II, 105, 38-53*), is narrated somewhat differently by Tulasī Dāsa. The crow for Tulasī Dāsa is none else than Jayanta, Indra's son, in the disguise of a bird. There is no mention of Jayanta in *B, II, 105*; but in another passage of the *R* (common to *C, B*), where the same episode is repeated, we find Tulasī Dāsa's version, which is certainly a later interpretation of the episode:

*B, V, 68, 9* (C, V, 67, 10):

sūtāt kila sa Čākrāya vāyaśah patatāṁ varah |

Tulasī Dāsa maintains the point of the loss of one eye, but does not explain it as Vālmiki does, so that the fact looks strange and obscure in the *R. C. M.*, as a reader who is not acquainted with
the R. will not be able to see the precise reason for which the crow had to be deprived of one eye, but
will think it a punishment in open contrast with the Lord’s mercy, to which the crow had just
appealed.

(41) In the R., after Carabhaings’s ascent to heaven, a great multitude of ascetics flock to Rama
from every side and implore his protection from the rdeskhasas who are infesting the forest. And in
the course of their appeal they say to him:

R, III, 10, 17b-18a (C, III, 6, 16):

chī paṇe caīrāṇi muṇāṇaḥ bhāvitatmanām || 17 ||
hatāṇaḥ Rama rakshobhir bahunāṇaḥ bahūdhā vane |

Tulsī Dāsa catches the allusion given by Vālmiki, and vivifies the image by making Rama
actually see heaps of bones in the forest and ask the ascetics in his company about them:

R. C. M., III, 11, 6:

asti-samāha dekhi Bhagurayā | puchhā muninha lági ati-dāyā ||

(42) Agastya advises Rama to take up his abode in the Pañchavaşı in order to protect the
ascetics there:

B, III, 19, 21b = C, III, 13, 20b:

āpi chā ‘tra vasaṇā Rāma dāpasaṇā pālayishaya || 21 || |

R. C. M., III, 15, 17:

bāsa karabu tahaṁ Bhaghu-kularāyā | klīya sakala muniha para
dāyā ||

(43) Cūrparaṅkhā presents herself to Rama after having assumed a beautiful form and ad-
dresses him with a gentle smile:

B, III, 23, 25 (C wanting):

sā śīganyā mahātāhun bhūtā va kāmarūpīṇī | strisva-
bhāvaṁ puraskṛtya saṃsitaṁ vākyam abhavā || 25 ||

Mark how literal Tulsī Dāsa’s rendering of the passage is.

(44) Tulsī Dāsa goes on to describe how Rama, upon hearing Cūrparaṅkhā’s proffer
of herself, looked at Sītā, and then in reply advised the rdeskhasa to court Lakshmanā, who was
still a bachelor. Though Rama’s act of looking at Sītā might admit of various explanations,
even without referring to the R. (see Baija Nātha’s commentary), yet there is no doubt that
Tulsī Dāsa has borrowed it from Vālmiki’s corresponding passage:

B, III, 23, 45 (C wanting):

etat tu vachanaṁ pratvā rākṣasyāḥ hy atīdaṛuṣam | klīyaṁ
chakve tadā Sītām Lakṣmanāṁ cha maḥābhubhājaḥ || 45 || |

R. C. M., III, 19, 11a:

Sītāḥ chitai kahl prabhu bātā ||

(45) According to the R., the rdeskhasas make two expeditions to avenge the disfigured
Cūrparaṅkhā: the first one of 14 men, the second one of 14,000 men. Tulsī Dāsa fuses
both expeditions together into a single one of 14,000 men. Seeing the big rdeskhasa army
nearing, Rama enjoins his brother to take Sītā into a cave. Lakshmanā obeys and starts at
once with Sītā, taking his bow and arrows in his hand:

B, III, 30, 16 (C, III, 24, 12):

śuṅg utkās tā Rameṇa Lakṣmanāḥ saha Sītyāḥ | caūn
ādāya chipaṁ cha guhāṁ durgāṁ upāsrayay || 16 || |

R. C. M., III, 20, 12:

rahehu sajagā suṇi prabhu kai bānī | chale sahita Čri sarā-dhanu-
pāṇī ||

Then Rama arms himself. Vālmiki says he puts on his armour and therewith shines like
the rising sun which has dispelled the darkness. Tulsī Dāsa has the same image of the
rising sun, but does not explain it, i.e., does not tell the reason of Rāma's being compared to the sun:

\[
B, \text{III}, 30, 18 (C, \text{III}, 24, 17):
\text{sa teṣā āgnikāpam ca váchena vibhūṣitaḥ | rāja Rāmas tīrthe nīpitaḥ kavaśaṁ tātāḥ | iño vākiṣṭha | iño vākiṣṭha | iño vākiṣṭha | iño vākiṣṭha | [18]}
\]

The rākṣasas become quite parализed with amazement at the sight of Rāma's majesty:

\[
B, \text{III}, 28, 35 (C, \text{III}, 24, 17):
\text{dṛṣṭāravānu māvāsā dharmadharmadhā | sātītē parvatāsaṁkāgārya paramān viśmayaṁ gataḥ [35]}
\]

The 14,000 rākṣasas rain upon Rāma weapons of every description:

\[
B, \text{III}, 31, 6 (C, \text{III}, 25, 7):
\text{tatas taṁ bhīmakarmānām kruddhāḥ sarve niścāryāḥ | āstārān nānāviddhākāryān abhyavaśaṁ sudurjayaṁ [6]}.
\]

(46) Tulasi Dāsa goes on saying that the rākṣasas stricken by Rāma's shafts fell to the ground like mountains. However natural may be the comparison of the monstrous bodies of the rākṣasas to mountains, and however common it is both in the R. and in the R. C. M., yet it seems to me that in the present passage of the R. C. M. such a comparison looks rather unjustified, and is not clear except by a reference to the corresponding passage in the R., from which it is certainly derived:

\[
B, \text{III}, 31, 25-26 (C, \text{III}, 25, 7):
\text{keśid bāṣāpavageśaṁ tāṁ nirbhīmavacchā ṛṣe | sākāra gacchati aśiṣvya tato gacchhantyā rāṣṭrālin [26] | mahādiści-kārān anīśaṁ abhyavaśaṁ sudurjayan [26].}
\]

(47) Before describing the fight with the rākṣasas, Vālmiki says that the gods were in fear for Rāma on seeing him facing 14,000 foes alone. Tulasi Dāsa maintains that particular, but puts it quite out of place, as he mentions it at a time when Rāma has already nearly completed the destruction of the rākṣasas:

\[
\text{tato devaśaṁcandhaṁ baktīṁ saha śāhāṁcandhaṁ | śucitaḥ paramāmasamrūṣaṁ guhyakāyaḥ saha parāśāyāṁ [20] | chaitrāścān sabhāśaṁ rākṣasaṁ bhlīmanām | ekaḥ sa Rāmo dharāṁtūṁ kathāṁ yuddhaṁ bhavāyati [21].}
\]

(48) According to Vālmiki, Rāma hurled upon the rākṣasas the gāndhārvastra, which had the effect of dementing them in such a way that everyone saw the image of Rāma in each of his comrades, and so they all perished killing each other. Tulasi Dāsa closely follows Vālmiki's narrative:

\[
\text{tatas te rākṣasaṁ tatra gāndhārvastrāvaḥ mohitaḥ [46] | aṣṭaṁ Rāmaś tv aṣṭaṁ Rāmaṁ tatu kālāna choditaṁ | anyonymaṁ samarā jagnjun utpāya paramāyudhāḥ [47].}
\]

In the above passage from the R. C. M. it is said that the rākṣasas die crying: Rāma! Rāma! Now if one looks at the Hindi text only, one will not be able to find out the exact reason
of the rākṣasas's crying: Rāma! Rāma! To ascertain it one must refer to the parallel passage in the R., where it is plainly said that the rākṣasas, believing that they saw Rāma in everyone of their companions, rush upon another crying: *ayaṁ Rāma! yāṁ Rāmaḥ!* (**this is Rāma! this is Rāma!**). That the Hindi passage is not clear without a reference to the R. is sufficiently proved by the fact that Mr. Growse quite misunderstood its meaning in his translation, which runs as follows: "the Lord . . . having power over all illusion, wrought a prodigy and while they were yet looking at one another he finished the battle and the army of the enemy all perished fighting crying 'Rāma Rāma' as their soul left their body; they thus attained beatitude,"

(49) Rāvana wants to secure Mārīcha's help for carrying off Sītā, but Mārīcha tries to dissuade him from provoking such a tremendous hero as Rāma; and says he has already tasted in battle his strength as, when smitten by a single arrow of Rāma, he was driven to a distance of a hundred yojanas; from that time on he has lived in continuous apprehension of Rāma's appearing and wherever he looks he sees his terrible foe:

B. III, 43, 22-34 (C. III, 39, 15-17):

api Rāmasahhaṁ bhūtaṁ pa-yāmi Rāvaṇa | Rāmabhūtaṁ
daṁ sāram aranyam pratibhāti me || 32 || vṛṣkeśe vṛṣkeśe
capāyāni dhīrakṛṣṇaṁ jātāham || sarachāpūrahāṁ Rā-
maṁ pācahaśam īva 'nātakaṁ || 33 || Rāmaṁ ēva 'nāpāyāṁ
rāhitēśva śākulaṁ cha | dṛṣṭvā svapnagato Rāmaṁ udbhra-
māṁi nīchetanāṁ || 34 ||

(50) In the R. Rāvana menaces Mārīcha with death, who declines to help him out of fear of Rāma, and gives him to a choice: either a probable death at the hands of Rāma, or a most certain death at his own hands, in case he should refuse to obey:

B. III, 44 51, (C. III, 40, 27):

āsūyey tam jīvitāsaṁcayoḥ va mṛtyur dhruvaṁ te 'dya mayā virāditya | evam yathārād viga
śaya buddhāya yad rochate tat kuru yach cha pathyam || 31 ||

It is clear that Tulasi Dāsā had before his mind that alternative, when he wrote that Mārīcha resolved to obey, after having seen that either way he must die:

R. C. M., III, 28, 5:

ubhaya bhāṁti dekkha nīja maranā | taba tākeśa Raghunāyak-saranā |

(51) 'The apparition of the golden deer in the hermitage, Sītā's longing for its skin, Rāma's pursuit of it, the flight and death of the deer and its calling out 'Lakṣmaṇa! Lakṣmaṇa!' at the moment of dying, are narrated in quite identical terms both in the R. and in the R. C. M. As a specimen of Tulasi Dāsa's close dependence on Vālmiki's narrative in this episode, I quote the parallel passages, describing the trick of the deer of keeping itself now near, now far, now in sight, now hidden, in order to take Rāma lure away:

B. III, 50, 4-7:

sa cha Rāmabhāyayaśvino Mārīcho Daṇḍake vane || 4 || babhū-
vāṁ nātarhītaṁ tatra kṣatryaṁ puruśa adṛśyata | esā 'yaṁ yāṁ
eti' ti vṛṣavarṇa Rāghava yaya || 5 || mūryāt eva dārito
dūrām na prakṣāye | atirīṭaṁ ishānāśīl lohbhyan sa Rā-
ghūṭam aṁ || 6 || kvacchād dhīrtāṁ kvacchām naśāṁ kvacchā
trāśīh cha vidṛtāṁ | . . . .

(52) Tulasi Dāsā's description of the beauty of the Pampā forest in the spring and of its
effect on the mind of Rāma, bereft of Sītā (III, 40-41), is derived from Vālmiki's *sarga* B, III,
79 (C, IV, 1). In this surga Vālmiki, 30, describes the beauty of the spring in the forest, where all nature loves and invites to love, whilst Rāma’s mind becomes more and more sad at the sight:

_R, III, 79, 2-10* (C, IV, I, 22-29*):
vasāntakālaḥ prāptāḥ yaṁ nāṁvīhagakūjitaḥ  
vipīlavāhā nāṭkālaṁ sāgaraṁ vyottānāhā  || 9  
Sauvitrā māṁ uci kār̥tam saṁtāpayati Manmathaḥ || .  

Tulasi Dāsa takes up this hint from Vālmiki, and develops it by representing that the God of Love himself finds Rāma tortured by separation, and encamps against him with his army; and this gives him an occasion for describing at full length Love’s army impersonated in spring (R. C. M., III, 41).

(53) According to Tulasi Dāsa the Pampa is a lake, not a river. Tulasi Dāsa lauds the purity of its water, agreeing thereby with Vālmiki, who gives the Pampa the constant epithets of _gubhajala, ranyavāriah, citajala_, etc.

**Kishkindhākanda.**

(54) Rāma presses to his bosom Śīta’s upper garment (uttarpā) picked up by Sugrīva:

_R, IV, 5, 16 (C, IV, 6, 18):
ḥridi kriyā tā bahuḥcātam āśvāvat sūryavasāṇaḥ  
eha bahuo bhujanga īva roṣitaḥ  || 16  || .  

(55) In the R. C. M. Vālin reproaches Rāma of having killed him by surprise, as the huntsmen kills his game:

_R. C. M., IV, 10, 5b:
maśeṣu mohi byāhāti kī nātin || .

No doubt the comparison has been suggested to Tulasi Dāsa by the following passage of the R., where Rāma explains to Vālin that, since he was nothing but a monkey, it was right on his part to kill him, as the huntsmen kills his game:

_B, IV, 17, 16-19* (C, IV, 18, 37b-19*):
vaśīrābalī cha pāṇiṣṭa cha kētāṣa cha virādhaḥ sarāḥ  
pratiṣṭhanta cha ṣrīyāsaḥ cha nighnantī maṁ bahūṁ mṛgān  || 16  ||  
pradhāvāntāni viṣṇavāntāni apy aśīrātaḥ  
prasātāni apradāpāṇi cha ghunantī māṁśārthino mṛgān  || 17  ||  
yānti rājasā⁻ṛṣyaḥ cha’tra mṛgāṇāṁ dharmakṣvaṇāḥ  
līḍyante na cha doṣena nighnanto ’pi mṛgān bahūn  || 18  ||  
tasmāt tvam niḥato yuddhe mayā bāγena vānarā  
ayudhāy pratiṣṭhitaḥ vā naśyāc caḥkāryoḥ hy asi  || 19  || .

(51) After killing Vālin, Rāma declines to enter Kishkindhā, on the ground that he has promised not to enter any city or village for fourteen years. Then he enjoins Sugrīva to enter the city and make Aṅgada yudrīja; as for himself, he will take up his abode on the mountain close by and remain there till the rainy season, just commenced, is over:

_B, IV, 25, 9 and ff. (C, IV, 26, 10 and ff.):
ohaṭorāṣṭaḥ saṁyāya graṁmaṇī vā yadi vā puram | na pravekṣhaḥyām Hanunmāna pitar ideṇa esha me  || 9  || 10  ||  
evam uttvā Hanunmantam Rāmaḥ Sugrīvaṃ abratvā  
enam apya Aṅgadāya rājau yavarājya ’bhūṣeṣchaya  || 11  ||  
prathamo vārshikō māsāḥ Črāṇaḥ saṁkālpatuḥ | pravṛttaḥ  
saṁyāya chaṭavāro māsāḥ cha vārṣikāḥ ēme  || 12  ||  
nāyam udgaṇasamayā pravītaṃ tvam purīm imām | ih vatsyāmy  
ahaṃ saṁyāya pārveṣa niyānandriyaḥ  || 13  || .  

_R. C. M., IV, 13, 7b-:
kaḥa prabhu suṇu Sugrīvaṁ hari-sā | pūna na jaunī dāsa chāṅi bariṣa  
gata grīṣamaḥ bārāha-ṛiṇā āl | rahitaṃm nikata sāla para chāṅi  
Aṅgada saṁita karaṇu tuṁha- 
rājā || .
(57) Next comes the description of the rainy season, both in the R. and in the R. C. M. (B, IV, 27; C, IV, 23; R. C. M., IV, 14-16). The phenomena of nature at this time of the year give Vālmiki an opportunity for some beautiful similes between them and the persons in his poem; the same is the case with Tulasī Dāsā, only his similes are moral and theological. For example the lightning flashing amidst the clouds appears to Vālmiki as Sītā being carried off by Rāvana, whilst to Tulasī Dāsā it looks like the friendship of the vīra, which never lasts. Next comes the description of the autumn (B, IV, 29; C, IV, 30; R. C. M., IV, 27-18).

(58) In the R. C. M. (IV, 25, 1) we find the statement that the monkeys sent in search of Sītā, wherever they met a rākṣasa, killed him with a single buffet of their hand:

kataubhi hoi nīsihara som bhojbā | prāna lehim eka eka chahepā |

No doubt Tulasī Dāsā generalizes here the fact of the rākṣasa killed by Aṅgada in a mountain-cave with a blow of the palm of his hand (‘talen ‘bhījaśāna’ B, IV, 48, 21; C, IV, 48, 20); in the R. there is no mention of the monkeys’ coming across any rākṣasa on their way.

(59) Having failed to get tidings of Sītā, Aṅgada declines to turn back saying: “Should I return home without news of Sītā now that the term fixed for the return is over, Sugrīva would certainly put me to death. He has been my enemy for a long time and would be glad to profit by that transgression in order to take his revenge; it is not Sugrīva who made me yuvardha, but Rāma.” Such is Vālmiki’s meaning in this passage, which Tulasī Dāsā reproduces quite unaltered as to the substance, though more concisely as to form:

B, IV, 53, 12-14 (C, IV, 53, 17-21):
na chā’haṃ yavavāryāye vai Sugrīvēṃ’bhījaśchitaḥ | nar-| endre na ‘bhījikto haṃ Rāmēṇa viditātmanā || 13 || sa pirvavādha vāmī mām dhīṣṭā rājā vyati kramam | ghātayishyati ikṣhena daṇḍena ‘tichirārd gatam || 14 || |

R. C. M., IV, 27, 45-5:
uhāṃ gaye mārihi kapirā || pitā badhe para mārata mohi || rākṣa Rāma nihora na ohī. 

(60) The monkeys shed tears at hearing from Aṅgada that there is no escaping from death:

B, IV, 55, 17 (C, IV, 55, 17-18a):
tasya śruti vachas tatā karnaṃ vīnarahabhāḥ || nayane bhayas tu sasrjar netrajām vāi dukhhitāḥ || 17 || |

R. C. M., IV, 27, 7:
Aṅgada-bhacana suṣṭa kapi-birā | bolī na sakahiṃ rayana baha nīrā. 

(61) At the sight of Sāmpāti, Aṅgada, thinking his life lost, accounts Jāțāyū blessed for having given up his life in Rāma’s service and gone to heaven:

B, IV, 56, 12-13a (C, IV, 56, 13):
sukhitō gṛiṭhrārjas tu Rāvaneṇa hato raṇe || 12 || muktaḥ cha Sugrīvabhaḍāy gataḥ cha gatim uttāmaṃ. |

R. C. M., IV, 28, 73:
kha Aṅgada bhirāri manā mahim’ dhanya Jāțāyū sama kon nāhīn || Rāma-kīṣa kārana tuṇyāgī || Hari-pura gayāś parama-baḍa-bhāĝ | || 

(62) Sampāti says to the monkeys: “Take courage, according to Niçākara’s prophecy, you will succeed in finding Sītā. The restoring of my wings is the best evidence in favor of the truth of that prophecy”:

B, IV, 63, 15 (C, IV, 63, 15-16):
sarvāṭhā kriyātām yatāh Sītām adhipagamāyatha [pakṣa-| lombhe māmāyaṃ vah pratya kṣaṇaṃ saṃvidarśītāḥ || 15 ||] |

R. C. M., IV, 30, 2:
mohi bīlokī dharaṇu manā dhrāj Rāma-kīṣa kasa bhayaś sarirā ||.
(63) The deliberations of the monkeys on the leaping across the Ocean (B, V, 1; C, IV, 64-65) are faithfully reproduced by Tulasi Dasa with his usual conciseness. Jambavan regrets his old age and mentions a great achievement of his youth. Aghada says he would leap across the hundred yojanas, but doubts as to his being able to leap back. Jambavan replies he is quite certain Aghada would be equal to the feat, but it is not becoming to the chief to absent himself. Then Jambavan turns to Hanumat and asks him why he, being the son of the Wind and equal in strength to his father, keeps sitting apart silently instead of rising up and offering himself to accomplish the task:

C, IV, 66, 2b and ff. (B, V, 2, 2b):

Narashimha ekantam ahyita Hanuman kip na jalapasi || 2 ||
Hanuman harirajasa Sastrivasya samo hy asi || . . . . ||
Mara]yasraya rasya putras tejasah cha'pi tattama|| tvam hi
vayusuto vatsa plavane cha'pi tattama || 30 ||
Sundarakanda.

(64) Hanumat thinks to himself: it will not be possible for him to enter the city, so well guarded by the rikhs]asas, in his natural form: he must enter it by night after having assumed a more diminutive form:

C, V, 2, 31 and ff. (B, V, 9, 31b and ff.):

Anasa rupa maya na sakya rakahasham puri pra}veshtam,
riksha]sa] gupta krurai balasamanavita|| 31 ||
Laksh]yalkhashena rupa] matri Laksh puri maya||
prapakalam pra}veshtam me kriyam sidhayitum mahat|| 33 ||
The form assumed by Hanumat according to Tulasi Dasa is that of a gnat (ma]aka), and thus is afforded another argument in favor of those who take Vaimiki's atishadangika in the parallel passage of the B (C, V, 2, 47) to mean "gnat," differing thereby from Ramanarman who takes it to mean "cat." (Mrdjra).

(65) When Hanumat tells Sitâ he is Rama's messenger, Sitâ wonders how such a union between men and monkeys could ever take place:

C, V, 35, 2b (B, V, 32, 2b):

Vana]ngam nar]angam ca katham i]st samagama|| 2 ||

Rama gives order to set fire to his tail, a member monkeys are most proud of:

C, V, 53, 3b (B, V, 49, 3b):

Kapilam kila longalam ishtam bhavati khus]khamam ||

(67) The citizens of Lanka, terrified by the conflagration roared by Hanumat, cry out and call to each other:

C, V, 54, 40 (B wanting):

Hata hata patraka kanta mitra hajivite]ng]a hatam su-punjam|| rakahobhir evam bahudha bruva]bhah cabdah
krite ghotarabah subhita|| 40 ||
and say "this is no monkey, but some god in monkey disguise";

C, V, 54, 35-33 (B wanting):

Vajr Mahendras trida]ce]varo va sak]hahd Yamo va Varuna
'nilo vao] Raudro'gar Arko Dhanad] cha Somo na vana-
ro'yap svamy eva Kalah || 35 || kimp Brahmana sarva-
peryahsya lokasya dhanah chaturTimasasya || iha'gato
vannarupadahari rakshopasamabhakarakara prakopah || 36 ||
kimp Vaishnavam vao... ddai.

17 Note how the b]anara]upa dha}re perfectly agrees, as in the [vamara]rupadahr.

R, C, M., IV, 31, 3-4a.
R, C, M., V, 3, 24a-
pura rakshva]k] dekhi bahu kapi
Mama kinta bihura[ atti lahu rupa
Dharama nisa nagara kariun pai-
sara ||

R, C, M., V, 13, 17a:
Nara b]anara] sa]g] aha kaha kaise ||
After having set Lakṣāṇa on fire, Hanumāt throws himself into the sea to extinguish his flaming tail:

C, V, 34, 49 (B wanting):

Nāmākṣām samastāṁ sampradāya lāṅgūlagñijnā mahākāpiḥ
nirvāpayamāśa tadi samadre haripuṇgavāḥ || 49 ||

All the above particulars are wanting in B, where we miss the verses C, V, 54, 31-50.

(68) Sītā sends word to Rāma that away from him she may live another month, but no longer:

C, V, 38, 64-69 (B, V, 36, 69):

idaṁ brūyāc cha me nāthaṁ pūrṇaṁ Rāmaṁ punaḥ punaḥ
jīvanām dhārayishyāmi māsaṁ Daśaratham ājñā || 64 ||
urdhvaṁ māsan na jīvyanām satyaṁ brahmaṁ rāvämi te ... .

(69) Rāma clasps to his heart the jewel that Sītā has sent him through Hanumāt, and bursting into tears asks the monkey what is Sītā’s message to him:

C, V, 66, 18 and st. (B, V, 67, 14 and st.):

tapa maṁ prāgā ḍṛīḍaṁ trītiva rūrada sabaṅkāhām || 1 ||
tap tu-drīḍhaṁ maṅglaṁ ḍhiṅkhaṁ Rāvaṅaṁ ḍoṣakaṁ ṇaṁchitaṁ |
netrābhyām aṣṭarpaṁṛṛhāṁ Svargaṁ idāṁ abhivyakti || 3 ||

Rāma regrets; he is not able to adequately compensate Hanumāt for his great service:

C, V, 70, 11st (B, V, 71, 12st and st.):

ekaṁ tu mama dīnaṁ mano bhūyaṁ prakaraṇaṁ |
yad ayaṁ priyaṁkhyāne na karomi sadārśa priyam || 11 ||
evam samphitiya bhūtāḥ Rāguvaḥ prītanārāhāḥ nirikṣyaṁ
dūrītritvaḥ prītya Hanumantam uvača ha || 12 ||

The comparison with C is less persuasive, a fact which is quite exceptional; for, as we have seen, Tulasi Dāsā never follows two recensions at a time.

(71) Viśhṇu takes refuge with Rāma. Sugrīva (and others, according to Vālkiṇī) advises Rāma not to accept him, for he must certainly be a spy from Viśṇu. But Rāma replies that he cannot reject any one taking refuge with him, however guilty he might be:

C, VI, 18, 3 (B, V, 90, 33):

mitrabhīvena samprāptaṁ nityajayaṁ kathācchanaṁ
doḥo yady api tasya satām etad vairahitam || 8 ||

he has made a vow to protect all suppliants:

C, VI, 18, 33 (B, V, 91, 14):

savānd eva prapannya tavā śūlaṁ cha yācetaṁ
dhṛtyaṁ sarvāṅkṛte bhū Datum etad vrātam mama || 33 ||

and on the other hand, even supposing that the Viśhūṣṭa Viśhṇuḥ had been sent by Viśṇu, with hostile intentions, why should Rāma fear him?

C, VI, 18, 22-23 (B, V, 91, 23):

sa dūtuṁ vāpy adusūto vā kīṁ eva rajasaṁbharaḥ || sūṣṭham

C, VI, 19, 1 (B, V, 93, 1):

koṭi bīpra-badhī lāgaḥ jāhū ||

C, VI, 19, 2 (B, V, 93, 1):

mama pana-saranāghata-bhaya-hāri ||

C, VI, 19, 3 (B, V, 93, 1):

bheda lanaṁ pāthāva Dāsasā ||

C, VI, 19, 4 (B, V, 93, 1):

tabhuṁ na kacchī bhiṣaṁ hāni

C, VI, 19, 5 (B, V, 93, 1):

kapsā ||jaga mahuṁ saṁkāh niśā
dhāram jīte ||

C, VI, 19, 6 (B, V, 93, 1):

Lachhimanu hānā
niṁśa mahuṁ tete ||
Here Tulasi Dāsa substitutes Lakshmīna for Rāma in the last part of the passage, but the meaning is the same.

(72) The Ocean apologizes for its delay in obeying Rāma, by laying all the fault upon the inertia of the five elements

\[ \text{C. VI, 22, 23 (R, V, 94, 5):} \]

\[ \text{prthivī vyāyū akṣiṣam āpo vyūthī cha Rāgabhāva | svabhāve saumya tiṣṭhaṃti cāytratam mārgam ācītāḥ || 23 ||} \]

\[ \text{R. C. M., V, 39, 2:} \]

\[ \text{gagana samśra anala jala dharaṇī | inha kai nātha sahaja jāda karāni ||} \]

Yuddhakānāda,

(in the R. C. M.: Lāhukāṇḍa.)

(73) In the R. C. M. (VI, 9, 89) Prahasa admonishes Rāvāna not to listen to his counsellors, who, to please him, give him pernicious advice, and quotes a saying, which is found in a quite analogous passage of the R., where Vibhīsana gives Rāvāna the same admonition

\[ \text{C, VI, 21 (R, V, 88, 10):} \]

\[ \text{suñyathā puruṣa rājana satataṃ priyāvādīnaḥ | aprīya-} \]

\[ \text{sasya cha pathyaśya vaktā crotā cha durlabhāḥ || 21 ||} \]

\[ \text{R. C. M., VI, 9, 89:} \]

\[ \text{priya-bānti jye sunahma jeh kahahām | aise nara nikāya jaga ahaḥḥām ||} \]

\[ \text{bāhanā parama-hita sumata ka-} \]

\[ \text{ṭore | suñyahām jeh kahahām te nara} \]

\[ \text{prabhu thore ||} \]

(74) At the moment of narrating how the monkeys’ host crossed over on the bridge, Tulasi Dāsa says that Rāma mounted a height and thence gazed upon the vast sheet of water, whereupon all the living beings of the sea came to the surface to behold the Lord (R. C. M., VI, 4). Shortly afterwards Tulasi Dāsa relates that Rāma pitched his tent on the opposite shore of the Ocean and told the monkeys they could go and feed on fruits and roots (R. C. M., VI, 5). Both particulars fail in the R. and look as if they had been entirely invented by Tulasi Dāsa. If we examine attentively the parallel passage in the R., however, we shall find there two particulars, which might well be presumed to have given Tulasi Dāsa the idea of his invention:

\[ \text{C, VI, 22, 74 (R, V, 95, 43):} \]

\[ \text{dadrīṃuḥ sarvabhūtāni sāgara setabhādanam |} \]

\[ \text{C, VI, 22, 93 (8 wanting):} \]

\[ \text{vāṅgarāṇaḥ hi sa śīra vāhini Nalasūruṇā |} \]

\[ \text{tīre nivīruḥ rājāḥ bahumālaphalodake || 83 ||} \]

I see no difficulty in considering that Tulasi Dāsa derived the first of the two above innovations from Vālmiki’s statement that all the marine beings beheld the building of the bridge, and the second from the epithet of bahumālaphaladaka given by Vālmiki to the opposite shore of the Ocean.

(75) Tulasi Dāsa (VI, 11-13) relates that Rāma ascends the Suvela, where looking towards the east he sees the moon, and asks those who are around him their opinion concerning its spots. Then, turning to the south, he has the illusion of seeing a mass of clouds with flashes of lightning and thunder; but Vibhīsana explains to him that there is nothing of the kind: what he takes for clouds is the royal umbrella of Rāvāna, who is sitting on the top of the palace; what he takes for flashes of lightning are the flashes of Mandodari’s earrings; and what he takes for thunder is the sound of the drums. Rāma fits an arrow to his bow and strikes down Rāvāna’s umbrella and crowns along with Mandodari’s earrings. Any reader, however well acquainted with the R., will hold that there is nothing like this in it. In a passage of the Yuddhakaṇḍa, however, I have succeeded in discovering the source of this
innovation by Tulasī Dāsa. It is the sarga C, VI, 40 (failing in (A), B), where Vālmiki inserts an episode which, though appearing at first sight to greatly differ from that of Tulasī Dāsa, yet has a very close analogy with the latter. Rāma ascends the Suvela with his retinue (C, VI, 40, 1) and thence turns his eyes to the ten cardinal points (40, 2) and sees Lakšī, above which Rāvaṇa is sitting on the top of the gopura (40, 3).

The first epithets with which Vālmiki describes Rāvaṇa here are: gretachāmadaraparyanta and vimayachchihatraagobhīta (40, 4), next come also the epithets: nilajīmūtasamka c hemasamchādi-tāmbara (40, 5), and lastly the simile:

samdhāya-pena saṃchhanam megharāgīm ivā 'mbare || 6 ||

In my judgment there can be no doubt as to Tulasī Dāsa's having derived from the above description by Vālmiki the first part of his innovation, viz., Rāma's illusion of actually taking Rāvaṇa and his umbrella for a mass of clouds.

Then Vālmiki goes on saying that Sugrīva, as soon as he saw Rāvaṇa, leaped upon him and tore the crown from his head and dashed it to the ground:

itya ukta sahaso 'ptaya puplure tasya cho 'pari |
ākṛṣṭhayā mukutam chitraṃ pātyāmāsa tad bhuvah || 11 ||

And this is certainly the source of the second part of Tulasī Dāsa's innovation, viz., of Rāma's striking down with an arrow Rāvaṇa's umbrella and crown (along with Māndodāri's earrings). Tulasī Dāsa, who always strives to exalt Rāma as much as possible, has deemed it convenient to ascribe to him even this feat, which in the R. is performed by Sugrīva, and in consequence has been forced to change the particular of the leap and wrestle (convenient for the monkey, but not for Rāma) into that of the arrow.

As for the ascension of the Suvela mountain and the consequent view of the rising moon, I think both of them are derived from sarga C, VI, 38 (B, VI, 14), where Vālmiki, too, describes the ascension of the mountain and the fall of the night illuminated by the full moon (C, VI, 38, 13; B, VI, 14, 24).

(76) Māndodāri tries to persuade Rāvaṇa to give up fighting against Rāma:—it cannot be an ordinary man that slew Virādha, Kārana, Tripiīras and Kānbha and killed Vālin with a single arrow:

B, VI, 33, 23 and 11 (C wanting):
Kharṣa cha nihaṭaḥ saṃkhyeyā tadā Rimo na manusah || 26 || Tripiīra cha Kānbha cha Virādham Daṇḍake hataḥ | gareṇa 'kena Bāll ca tadā Rimo na manusah || 27 ||

(77) Rāma laments over Lakṣmaṇa, whom he thinks to be dead, whilst he has simply fainted, and says:—other wives, other sons, other kinsmen can be easily procured, but another uterine brother cannot be found in the world:

B, VI, 24, 7, 58 (C wanting):
yatra kvachid bhaved bhāryā putro 'nye 'pi cha bāndhavah || 7 || taṃ tu deśaṃ na paśyamsi yatra sodaryam āpnaṛyām 1 1...

R. C. M., VI, 36, 14-15:
badhi Birādha Kharā Dūkhanakīm= līlā hateu Kānbhā | Bāli ēka sara māreṇa tehi jānaḥ Dasakanda-dha ||

R. C. M., VI, 61, 7-8:
suta bita nāri bhavanā pariṇāvarā | hohiṁ jāhiṁ jaga bārhiṁ bāra 1 1 |

milai na jagata sahodara 18 bhṛttā ||

18 Even if Tulasī Dāsa should have derived it from some of his secondary sources, rather than from the R. directly, the passage in the R. in question must be looked upon as the ultimate source.

19 Mark the correspondence: sodaryam sahodara.
Then Ráma asks himself:—what answer shall I give Sumitrā, when she asks me about Lakśmaṇa on my return to Ayodhyā?

B, VI, 24, 12\(^*\) (C, VI, 49, 8\(^*\)):
Sumitrāñ cin nu vakisñámi putradarçanálasám || 12 ||

R. C. M., VI, 61, 16\(^a\):
| utaru kāha dāilhaum tehi jai |

(78) In Kumbhakarṇa’s episode Tulasi Dāsa follows Vālmiki very closely. Leaving aside the parallel of the particulars of the narrative, I limit myself to quoting only two parallel similes, which for us are much more significant, inasmuch as Tulasi Dāsa generally disdains to avail himself of the same similes as have been used by Vālmiki.

Tulasi Dāsa compares Kumbhakarṇa, when roused, to a personification of Kāla:

R. C. M., VI, 62, 7:
| jágā nisichara dekhiya kaisā | mānauñ Kāla deha dhari baisā |

The same comparison we find in the R., where it is said that the gods stood amazed before Kumbhakarṇa, taking him to be Kāla himself:

B, VI, 38, 11 (C, VI, 42, 11):
| cuḷapāśinam āyāntaṃ Kumbhakarṇaṃ mahābalam |
| hantum na ṣekus tridadāḥ Kālo ‘yam iti mohitāḥ || 11 || |

The situation is somewhat different, but the image is the same. The second simile, common to Vālmiki and Tulasi Dāsa, is the comparing of the bleeding Kumbhakarṇa to a mountain overflowing with streams:

B, VI, 46, 75 (C, VI, 67, 89):
| karṣaṇaśāvihina tu Kumbhakarṇo mahābalaḥ | raraṇa čogitośaeka īrī prasravaṇaṁiva || 75 || |

R. C. M., VI, 69, 7:
| sonita kravata soha tana kāre |
| jauñ kajjila-giri geru-pañäre || |

(79) The spear, with which Rāvaṇa throws down Lakśmaṇa, striking him full in the breast, is described by Vālmiki as:

B, VI, 46, 108\^-109\(^a\) (C, VI, 67, 121):
| sa bāsair ativeddhāgah kshatijena samukṣhitaḥ || 108 || |
| rudhirāṇ pariśravā īrī prasravaṇaṁiva || . . . |

(80) In the R. Hanumān falls upon Rāvaṇa, who is trying to carry away the unconscious Lakśmaṇa, and strikes him with his fist, as if with a thunderbolt. Tulasi Dāsa maintains the particular of the fist and amplifies the simile of the thunderbolt:

B, VI, 36, 91 (C, VI, 53, 112):
| Lakśmaṇaṃ tu taṭaḥ črimum jīgyāṣṭhātāṃ sa Māruttih |
| ājaghāno’raśi vyūdhē vajrakalpena mūshṭinā || 91 || |

R. C. M., VI, 84, 2:
| muṣṭikā eka tāhi kapi mārā |
| pareu saila janu bajra-prabhāra || |

(81) The gods are anxious on Rāma’s account, seeing him on foot whilst Rāvaṇa is driving his chariot, and Indra despatches to him his own chariot guided by Mātali:

B, VI, 86, 87 (C, VI, 102, 5 and 6.\(^*\)):
| bhūmaṇa sthitāṣya Rāmasya rathasthāṣya ca rakhṣaṇāḥ |
| na saṃṣaṇa yuddham ity āhur deva-gandharvadānāvah || 6 || devatānām vachāḥ śrutvā Āṣṭakatur anantarām |
| preṣhayāṃśa Rāmāya rathāṃ Mātali-sāryathim || 7 || |

R. C. M., VI, 89, 1-2:
| devanabha prabhuhimation payāde dekhā |
| upajā ura ati-chhobha bisekhā |
| surapatī nija-ratha turata paṭhāra |
| harasha-sabita Mātali āvā || |
(82) After slaying Rāvana, Rāma thanks the monkeys and bears, and says it is only through their help that he has succeeded in defeating his enemy; the renown they have acquired in the enterprise will last for ever in the world:

B, VI, 92, 74-78 (C wanting):

uvrēche'da'ṇa' tada sarvan Rāgava madhuraṃ vachā || 74 ||
bhavatām bāhuṣṭīryaṃ vikramena balena cha | hato rākṣasa-
sarīyo' yaṃ Rāvago lokāraṇaṇaḥ || 75 || atyādbhutam idam
 karma bhavatāṃ kṛttivardhanam | kathayishyanti purunāh
yāvad bhūmir dharisyati || 76 ||

R. C. M., VI, 106, 9-10:
kiye sukhī kahi bāuli sudhā-sama
bala tumbhāre ṛipu haya | pāyo
Bibhishana rāju šīhuṃ pura jasa
tumbhāro nita haya ||

(83) The description of Sītā's return from Lāṅkā and of the eagerness of the monkeys and bears to see the beauty, that had been the cause of so great a war, is completely identical in the R. and in the R. C. M. (B, VI, 99; C, VI, 114; R. C. M., VI, 108). Tulaśi Dāsa's close dependence on Vālmiki in this part of the poem is manifest not only from the faithful reproduction of every particular in the narrative, but also occasionally from the reproduction of the very words or epithets that have been used by Vālmiki in the corresponding passages. I pick out the most striking coincidences between Vālmiki and Tulaśi Dāsa in this part of the poem.

Vibhishana orders rākṣastā ladies to attend Sītā to the bath and to adorn her with rich ornaments. Then makes her mount a beautiful palanquin:

B, VI, 99, 12 and ff. (C, VI, 114, 14 and ff.):
tatāh Sītām cilasaṃātāṃ yuvatibhir alaṃkāritām | mahāharā-
bharaṇopastāṇāḥ mahāharāmbharaṇadānātāṃ || 12 || āryopra
gīvīkaṃ divyaṃ...

R. C. M., VI, 108, 7-8:
bahu prakāra bhūshana pahirāye |
sibīka rāchire sāji puni lāye | tā
para harashi chaḍhitai Baidehi ||

In the R. C. M. Sītā proceeds, escorted by guards armed with canes:

beta-pāni raccchhaka, (R. C. M., VI, 108, 9)

who are none else but the guards:

vetrajaḥhrapāṇañayā (B, VI, 99, 23rd; C, VI, 114, 21rd)
of the parallel place in the R.

The monkeys and bears flock to see Sītā, but the above-mentioned guards push them back (B, VI, 99, 14-15 and 23-25; R. C. M., VI, 108, 19). Rāma disapproves of such treatment towards his dear helpmates and orders Vibhishana to bring Sītā on foot, so that the monkeys may look at her, as at their mother:

B, VI, 99, 32rd and ff. (C wanting):

paṣyantu mātāram tasmād ime kautuḥalāvivātāḥ || 32 ||
... || visṛṣya pīvīkāṃ tasmāt padbhām eva samanavya-
sampiṃ mama Vaidehiḥ paṣyantu enaṃ vanakasāḥ
|| 36 ||

R. C. M., VI, 108, 11-12a:
kaha Raghubhira kahā mama
mānahu | Stahim sakha payāde
ānahu | dekhaiḥ kapi janani ki
nātīn ||

(84) When Sītā asks Lakṣmaṇa to prepare the pyre for her, Lakṣmaṇa hesitates and looks at Rāma; even, interpreting Rāma's wish from the expression of his face, complies:

B, VI, 101, 22-24 (C, VI, 116, 20 and ff.):
evam uktas tu Maithilīyā Lakṣmaṇaḥ paravirahā | vimar-
shaśvāsam āpanno Rāmānanam uādaikaṇta || 22 || sa viṣ-
āyava mataḥ tat tu Rāmaśā kārāsūchitam | chitaḥ chakara
Saumitrīr māte Rāmāyaṃ vīryāvān || 23 || na ki Rāma
mātā kaṣcit krodhaśokakaraṇāṃ gatam | anumetum atho
vaktum drasṭum vāpy thaḥ cakunāvan || 24 ||

R. C. M., VI, 109, 3 and ff.:
suni Lakṣhaṃa Sītā kai bāni ||| lochana sajala jori kara duś | prabhia
sana kacu kahi sakata na o||
dekhi Rāma-rūkha Lakṣhaṃa
dāye | pāvaka pragraṣi kāṭha bahu
lāye ||
THE ADITYAS.

BY R. SHAMASAstry, B.A., M.R.A.S., BANGALORE.

(Continued from Vol. XLI. p. 296.)

From what has been said above, it is clear that the three good twin sons brought forth by Aditi in consequence of her eating the remnant must necessarily be the three pairs of intercalary months occurring in the course of three luni-solar cycles of five years each in consequence of the difference, or remnant as it is called, of twelve days between a lunar and a sidereal year. There is a sufficient clue in the passage itself to interpret the story of Aditi in this way. We are told in the passage that the sacrificer should omit or intercalate a year, and that then he should set up the sacred fire anew. From the Maityrṣyāgī ṣaṅkhātā I. 10, 7, we also know that the rite of setting up or churning the fire anew was performed at the end of the third intercalary period of four months at the close of thirty years. We are told in the above passage that the sacrificer had to omit twelve days every year and that the embryos developed in the course of the (intercalated) year were born. In the parlance of the Vedic poets, embryos or children are, as already pointed out, days of the year, either ordinary or intercalary. If, then, the twelve days at the end of the sidereal year are, as implied in the above passage, the embryo, which, when developed and born, the sacrificer is called to set up, it follows that the remnant which gave to Aditi a pair of sons is the same period of twelve days, giving rise to two intercalary months in the course of five luni-solar years. If this meaning is true, it follows that the three other pairs of Aditi's sons must also be three other pairs of intercalary months, occurring in the course of fifteen luni-solar years. If this is true, it is clear that what are called Dhūtā, Aryāmā, Mitra, Varuṇa, Aśvā and Bhaça, are the gods of the six intercalary months occurring in the course of fifteen luni-solar years. The only riddle that remains to be solved in the above passage is that connected with the birth of the fourth pair of sons, of whom one, called Indra, is said to have been fully born while the other, called Mātrāṇa, is said to have been half-born. If we paraphrase the Vedic language in our modern language, and say that three pairs of intercalary months and a seventh one were full and the eighth intercalary month was a broken month, we know where to seek for an explanation of this break. We know that the only year which can keep the seasons, especially the commencement of the much-desired rainy season, in their usual position, is the solar year of 365 1 4 days, but not the sidereal year of 366 days, which is evidently too long by three-fourths of a day. This excess will amount to $\frac{3}{4} \times 20 = 15$ days in the course of four cycles of five years each or in twenty sidereal years. Accordingly if this greater cycle of twenty years, with eight or rather seven and a half intercalary months to be intercalated at the end of the twenty years, had begun to be observed, as the Vedic poets seem to have done, then the beginning of the year would fall back, not by eight months, as the Vedic poets first supposed, but by seven and a half months; or in other words the Hindu lunar year which begins with Chaitra would then fall back and begin at the middle of Srāvana of the rainy season, instead of at the end of Ashāṣṭra, as the poets seem to have expected it. How the poets found out the error, is a question with which we are not concerned here. It may, however, be suggested that the existence side by side of a different school of priestly astronomers who observed the solar year of 365 1 4 days may have led them to detect the break in the eighth intercalary month. Whatever may be the way in which they detected the break or error, the only explanation that can possibly be given for the half-birth of the eighth intercalary month or son, seems to be the one I have given above. This theory of intercalary months explains the

---

10 But it is only in the latter calendar that we have a Chaitraṇa year. In the Vedic period the year and the cycle began with Māgha—J. P. F.
simultaneous arrival of the 'seven streams' of the rainy season, of the demon, Vṛtrā, and of Indra, the god of the seventh intercalary month, for the destruction of the demon of the intercalary months.

The Vedic poets seem to have entertained two kinds of conceptions about the intercalary months; one evil and another good. Indra, Mārtanda, and other sons of Aditi seem to have represented the good side of the months, while Vṛtrā, Sambara, and other demons are regarded as the personification of the evil nature of the intercalary months. If there still remains any doubt about this point, the following passage of the Mātrīdyātīya Sūkṣmād (II. 4, 3, 4) will probably help to remove it:—

ततो यस्योत्तरतिः तन्नमया बुधमयासदस्योः स्वामित्वविद्वाहिन्योः शास्त्राध्यात्मिकोऽवत्क्रिया शास्त्राध्यात्मिकोऽवत्क्रिया।

Then what Sūma there remained, he poured it into the fire, and said rather in favour of Indra than Agni: 'Grow with Indra as thy enemy.' He wanted Agni to be Indra's enemy; but he made Indra the enemy of Agni: for his expression itself came out (with that meaning). Both the Sūma he pressed and the Sūma he put into the fire became the two deities Agni and Sūma, and also the two vital airs, Prāṇa and Apāṇa (air inhaled and air exhaled). No sooner did this dual god with his arm raised up attempt to strike Indra, then he himself fell down. Whether when the dual deity fell down, or when he was inside the fire (it cannot be said)——be, however, began to grow breadthwise by the measure of an arrow in the course of a day, and also lengthwise by the measure of an arrow in the course of a day. They say that day and night themselves grew breadthwise by the measure of an arrow and also lengthwise by the measure of an arrow. They say that then the half-months (grew); then the month; and then the year. Then this dual deity lay covering all these streams. Indra became afraid of him; Trāśāṅk also feared him. Indra requested the help of Tvaśāṅk. The latter promised help: he sprinkled the thunderbolt (with water) for him. Tapas [the month so called] is, verily, the thunderbolt. Indra could not raise it. Then there was another god, Viśāṅk, near. Indra said: 'Come, Viśāṅk, let us catch hold of this by which this (is done). Viśāṅk stretched his body in three directions, one-third portion on the earth, one-third in the air, and one-third in the heaven, so that Indra might get rid of his fear from the universal growth of the dual deity. Followed by Viśāṅk, Indra raised the thunderbolt against the one-third part of the dual deity lying on this earth. Seeing the thunder-
bolt raised, he became afraid of it, and said: 'There is in me some power and I shall give it to you. Do not kill me!' He gave it to Indra, and the latter took it, and gave it to Vishnu saying 'keep it for me.' Vishnu took it and thought: 'May Indra put vital force into us; may Indra bring prosperity to us; may there be blessings upon us; for there is internal power in him.' Followed by Vishnu, Indra raised the thunderbolt against the one-third part that lay in the air. Seeing the raised thunderbolt, he became afraid of it, and said: 'There is some power in me and I shall give it to you. Do not kill me!' He gave it to Indra, and Indra took it and gave it to Vishnu, saying 'keep this for me a second time.' Vishnu took it, thinking: 'May Indra put vital force into us; may Indra bring prosperity to us; may there be blessings upon us; for there is internal power in him.' Followed by Vishnu, Indra raised the thunderbolt against the one-third part that lay in the sky. Seeing the raised thunderbolt, he became afraid of it, and said: 'There is some power in me and I shall give it to you. Do not kill me; let us make peace: I shall enter into you.' Indra said: 'If you enter into me, of what use will it be to me?' He said: 'I shall brighten yourself; I shall enter into you for your own enjoyment.' (So saying) he gave it to Indra, and Indra took it and gave it to Vishnu, saying: 'Keep this for me a third time.' It (the power) is, verily, a thousand of what are called Tridhâtu (three elements). He gave it to Vishnu. The Riks, the Sâmás, the Yajus, and whaterer else there is, all that belongs to the three elements. Hence he obtains cattle alone.'

"Vîtra is the belly; and sin is hunger, the enemy of man. When man obtains Tapas, he rends the sin, the inimical hunger. This is what the heavenly utterance said: 'Both of them conquered, but never sustained defeat; and no one defeated either of them (Indra and Vishnu).

We are told in the above passage that Vîtra grew out of the remnant of Sôma and that he grew first in the form of a day, then of half a month, then of a month, and at last of a year. Thus Vîtra is clearly identified with Time. Special attention should be paid to those sentences of the passage which clearly declare: 'Vîtra began to grow breadthwise by the measure of an arrow in the course of a day and also lengthwise by the measure of an arrow in the course of a day. They say that day and night themselves grew by the measure of an arrow, and became half-months, months, and a year.' It is clear therefore that Vîtra is a demon infesting the intercalary months, or rather of the eighth intercalary month, since Indra who destroys him periodically is, as we have seen above, the god of the seventh intercalary month of the luni-solar cycle of five years. Since Vîtra is made to 'enter into Indra himself,' it is clear that he is the broken eighth month coming after the seventh month.

I have pointed out in my Vedic Calendar how the Vedic poets regarded the intercalary days as being sinful and inimical to man. In the above passage Vîtra is spoken of as a kind of sin and enemy to man. We have already seen how Agni and Sôma are considered as the gods of the light half of an intercalary month. In the following passage of the Taîtārīya Samhitâ (II. 5. 2) Agni and Sôma are clearly described as the life-principles of Vîtra. It follows therefore that Vîtra must be the light half of an intercalary month. Since Vîtra is periodically destroyed by Indra, the god of the seventh intercalary month, and since he is made one with Indra himself, it is also clear that Vîtra is the first half of the broken eighth intercalary month. The reference to cold and fever in the passage seems to indicate the arrival of the rainy season. The passage itself runs as follows:-

\[\text{Text content continues...}\]
वे वृष्ण स्त्र इत्यादि गद्दी मान-स्त्राणनि। ती सीताबाबू नाम-स्त्राणनि। तन-शालकालीय विविध संस्कृतियानुसार पूर्ण धारण प्राप्तपुरस्। भाषाकलापरिवर्तनी वे सो पूर्ण धारण प्राप्तपुरस्। भाषाकलापरिवर्तनी नाम-स्त्राणनि। तन-शालकालीय विविध संस्कृतियानुसार पूर्ण धारण प्राप्तपुरस्। भाषाकलापरिवर्तनी नाम-स्त्राणनि। तन-शालकालीय विविध संस्कृतियानुसार पूर्ण धारण प्राप्तपुरस्। भाषाकलापरिवर्तनी नाम-स्त्राणनि।

"Trashtri whose son was killed (by Indra) began to perform a Soma sacrifice without inviting Indra to it. But Indra wanted to be invited to it. But he did not invite Indra, because he stepped over, and purified his son. But Indra drove the Soma by force after obstructing the sacrifice. Trashtri poured (pradaraana) into the fire what Soma here remained, and said (addressing the fire): 'Grow with Indra as thy enemy.' Vṛitra [the demon that rose from the fire in consequence of the above libation] is so called, because the act of pouring down Soma into the fire is from the root Vṛīt. Since he said: 'Grow with Indra as thy enemy', Indra became his enemy. While coming out of the fire, he (Vṛīt) became Agni and Soma. By the measure of an arrow, he grew on all sides and pervaded these three worlds. Because he pervaded them, he is called Vṛīt, 'pervader.' Indra became afraid of him, and going to Prājapati, said: 'there has arisen an enemy to me.' Having sprinkled the thunderbolt with water, he gave it to him to kill the demon. Indra advanced with the thunderbolt. Then Agni and Soma said: 'Do not kill; we are within (him). Indra said: 'You are for me; and so, come to me.' They asked for a share (in the sacrifice). Indra promised to them a cake on eleven pot-sherd, to be offered to them every full-moon. They said: 'We are bitten (by his teeth), and cannot come out (of his mouth). From Indra created out of his own body cold and fever. This is how cold and fever came into existence. Whoever knows this origin of cold and fever, will not be attacked by cold and fever. Indra transferred cold and fever to them (or to Vṛīt). When he (Vṛīt) began to shiver, Agni and Soma came out; it is pṛāṇa (air inhaled) and apāṇa (air exhaled) that left him, Prāṇa is Daksha and Apāṇa is Kratu. Hence the sacrificer should begin to shiver and say: 'Daksha and Kratu are within me.' Thereby he will have Prāṇa and Apāṇa in himself, and live the whole length of life. Having released the gods from Vṛīt, Indra offered an oblation at the full-moon on account of his slaying Vṛīt; for they kill him at full-moon, and revive him at new-moon. Hence a Rik-verse about the slaying of Vṛīt is recited at full-moon, while another about his revival is sung on the occasion of new-moon. Having offered an oblation for slaying Vṛīt, Indra again faced Vṛīt with his thunderbolt. Then the Sky and the Earth said: 'Do not kill him, for he is lying upon us,' And they said again: 'We request a gift (if he is to be killed); I shall like to be decked with stars—so said the Sky; and I shall like to be variously formed,—so said the Earth.' Hence the Sky is decked with stars, while the Earth is variously formed. Whoever knows this gift of the Sky and the Earth will have the same gift. Having been born out of these two (the Sky and the Earth), Indra killed Vṛīt. Having killed Vṛīt, the gods asked Agni and Soma to carry their oblattions. They said: 'We have lost our energy; for it is in Vṛīt.' The gods inquired among themselves, saying 'who can secure that energy?' Some replied: 'The cow (can do that); for the cow is the friend of all.' The cow said: 'I shall
request a gift: you live upon the two things that exist only in me.' The cow secured that energy. Hence they live upon the two things that exist in the cow alone. What is called gift is the energy of Agni, and what is called milk is that of Soma. Whoever knows thus the energy of Agni and Soma will be energetic. The Brahmadînas debate: 'of what deity is the full-moon?' One should reply: 'Prajapati.' Hence Prajapati gave to Indra, his eldest son, a firm footing. Hence men give to their eldest son a firm footing by bestowing upon him a large portion of wealth.'

The following passage of the Taîtirîya Sanhitâ (VI, 5, 1) seems to furnish additional evidence about Vîtra being a half month:

`Indra raised the thunderbolt against Vîtra. Then Vîtra became afraid of this raised thunderbolt; he said: 'Do not kill me; there is some power in me; that I shall give you.' So saying he gave Ukthya (Fifteen) to Indra. Indra raised weapon against him for a second time. He said: 'Do not kill me; there is some power in me; that I shall give you.' So saying he gave the latter the same Ukthya (Fifteen). Then Indra raised the weapon against him for a third time; then Vîshnu followed Indra, saying 'kill him.' He said: 'Do not kill me; there is some power in me; I shall give you that.' So saying he gave the same Ukthya to Indra. Indra then killed this guileless demon. It was, verily, the sacrifice which was his guile.'

We are told in the above passage that while breathing out, Vîtra gave Ukthya to Indra. Ukthya is a word used in the Vedic literature in the sense of 'fifteen.' The word Vajra, the weapon of Indra, is also used in the same sense. Accordingly the wielding of Vajra or 'fifteen' by Indra, as well as the gift of fifteen by Vîtra to Indra, clearly means the growth of fifteen days over and above the seventh intercalary month.

Contemporary religious records also furnish evidence that the Adityas are the gods of intercalary months. It is known that the Adityas are the sons of Aditi. Aditi in the Rigveda (X. 100 I. 94) is requested to protect the poets from Amhas, ‘sin.’ She and her sons also are requested to release the poets from guilt or sin (R. V. I. 24; II. 27; VII. 93; I. 162; VII. 87). I have shown in my Vedic Calendar how the word Amhaspatya is used in the sense of an intercalary month and an intercalary month alone. There is no doubt that this word is philologically identical with the Zend word Ameshaspenta. The number of Ameshaspentas is also seven. Prof. Macdonell says (Vedic Mythology, P. 44). "It is here to be noted that the two groups have not a single name in common, even Mithra not being an Ameshaspenta; that the belief in the Adityas being seven in number is not distinctly characteristic and old; and that though the identity of the Adityas and Ameshaspentas has been generally accepted since both's essay, it is rejected by some distinguished Avestan scholars."

Whatever might be the reason of the Avestan scholars for rejecting the identity, this much is clear, that the words Amhaspatyas and Ameshaspentas are identical; and that when the former word is invariably used in the sense of an intercalary month in the Yajurveda, there is no doubt that the forgotten meaning of the latter word must also be the same; and that when the Ameshaspentas are seven, the number of Amhaspatyas must also be and is, as we have already seen, seven. As regards the difference in the names of the Ameshaspentas and of the Adityas, it does not appear to be of much importance, for the seven Amhaspatyas or intercalary months are found variously named both in the Rigveda and the Atharvaveda.

12 See Thi. Sam, VII. 2, 3, 17. 13 See ibid. VII. 3, 6, 15; 4, 7, 35. 14 See Macdonell’s Vedic Mythology, p. 121.
The following are some of the passages of the Atharvaveda (VIII. 9) in which the seven Adityas or the gods of intercalary months are called in various ways:

"Six they call the cold, and six the hot months.
Tell ye us the season, which one is in excess; seven eagles, poets, sat down; seven metres after seven consecrations." 17

"Seven are the offerings, the fuels seven, the sweet things seven, the seasons seven; seven sacrificial butters went about the existing thing; they are such as have seven heavenly birds, so have we heard." 18

"Eight are born the beings first born of Rita; eight, O Indra!, are the priests who are of the gods; Aditi has eight wombs, eight sons; the oblation goes unto the eighth night." 21

"Among the seers, eight are with Indra, and six are in pairs; they are seven-fold and seven; waters, men, and herbs,—over these the five (years) have showered." 23

In verse 17 the poet clearly mentions the intercalary months (Atirikta Rita) and numbers them in various names as seven. The expression 'seven seasons,' when taken with the expression 'the excessive season,' leaves no doubt that they are intercalary months and seven in number. In verses 21 and 23 the poet refers to the story of Aditi, and seems to hesitate to count her sons as eight, though that was the number fixed at first. In the following passages of the Atharvaveda (IX, 9, and B. V. I. 164) the seven months are called seven horses and seven sisters:

"Seven harness a one-wheeled chariot; one horse, having seven names, draws it. Of three naves is the wheel, unwasting, unassailed, whereon stand all those existences. 2

"The seven that stand on this chariot, seven horses draw it, seven wheeled; seven sisters shout at it together; where are set down the seven names of the kine?"

"The twelve-spoked wheel,—for that is not to be worn out,—revolves greatly about the sky or Rita, there, O Agni! stood the sons, paired, seven hundred and twenty." 13

"The unwasting wheel, with rim, rolls about; ten paired ones draw upon the upper side (uttende); the sun's eye goes surrounded with the welkin in which stood all existences." 14

"Of those born together the seventh they call the sole-born (single-born); six, they say, are twins, god born seers; the sacrifices of them, distributed according to their respective stations and modified in form, move to the one permanent (sthatre)." 16

(To be continued.)
EPIGRAPHIC NOTES AND QUESTIONS.

BY D. R. BHANDARKAR, M.A.; POONA.

(Continued from Vol. XLII., p. 178.)

XIV.—The Fourth Rock edict of Ashoka.

There is one passage in this edict which has very much exercised students of Ashoka’s inscriptions. It is this, according to the several recensions:

Girnar:—Tā ajd devānāh priyāsa Priyadasina rāja dhammacharagena bherīghosha aho dhammaggosho vimānakasand cha hastidasand cha agihkāndhāna cha aśāndi cha divyāndi rūpdīnī dasayitippānāh.

Kālī:—Se ajd devānāh priyāsa Priyadasine lājine dhammachalanand bherīghosho aho dhammaggosho vimānakasand hāthini āsikāndhāna aśāndi cha divyāndi rūpdīnī dasayitippānāh.

Dhauli:—Se ajd devānāh priyāsa Priyadasine lājine dhammachalanena bherīghosan aho dhammaggosoh vimānakasann hāthini āsikāndhāna aśāndi cha divyāndi rūpdīnī dasayitippānāh munīsānāh.

Shāhābāgharī:—So ajd devānāh priyāsa Priyāśrasa rāja dharmacharagena bherīghosha aho dharmagghosho vimānāsān dhārānaḥ āstraṁ jotiḥkāthi aśāndi cha divānī rupānī dasayitippānāh janasa.

Mansehā:—Se ajd devānāh priyāsa Priyāśrasa rane dharmacharagena bherīghosha aho dharam goshe vimānakasann āstraṁ aśāndi aśāndi cha divānī rupānī dasayitippānāh janasa.

This passage has been variously interpreted, but these interpretations may be divided into two classes according as they are taken to refer to terrestrial objects or atmospheric phenomena. The first kind of interpretation has been favoured by M. Senart and Prof. Bühler and the second by Professors Kern and Holtzsch. I confess, the first interpretation commends itself to me as being more natural. But the actual sense I deduce from the passage differs from that of M. Senart or of Prof. Bühler, and I give it here for the kind consideration of the scholars, who are interested in the matter.

In the first place, it is highly important to understand the syntax of the passage. The word aho I take with Professors Kern and Holtzsch as equivalent to abhanṭ. Vimānakasand of the Girnar and Kālī texts corresponds to vimānakasand of the Dhauli and vimānakasand of the Shāhābāgharī recension, and must, therefore, be supposed to stand for the Sanskrit vimānādarāndāni. The same remark applies to hastidasand of the Girnar text.

This may then be literally put into Sanskrit thus:

Tālēyā devānā-priyāsa Priyāśrasa rāja dharmacharagena bherī-ghosha-bhava-ghosha vimānā-darāndāni cha hasti-darāndāni cha agni-darāndāni cha anyādī cha divyāndi rūpdīnī dasayitippānāh janasa.

And it may be translated into English as follows:

“But now in consequence of the practice of righteousness by king Priyaśrasin, beloved of the gods, the sound of the drum has become the sound of righteousness, showing the people the spectacles (darāna), of the palaces of gods (vimāna), and of the (white) elephant, masses of fire, and other divine representations.”

Now, what can be the meaning of this passage? In my opinion, what Ashoka means is that with him the drum has become the proclaimers of righteousness. The sound of a drum invariably precedes either a battle, a public announcement, or the exhibition of a scene to the people. But since Ashoka entered on his career of righteousness, it has ceased to be a summons to fights, but invites people to come and witness certain spectacles; and as those spectacles are of such a character as to generate and develop righteousness, the drum has thus become the proclaimers of righteousness. This appears to me to be the natural sense of the passage. And now the question arises: what scenes or spectacles did Ashoka show to his subjects? Obviously they are the vimānas, hastis, agnihotras, and so forth. These terms must, therefore, be so interpreted as to show that they could create and foster righteousness. But it must also be borne in mind that the sense we attach to them must not be different from that ordinarily assigned to them. So to begin with, what does Ashoka mean by vimāna? According to M. Senart it denotes here “processions of reliquaries,” and, according to Bühler, “cars of the gods.” Bühler, I think, comes very near the proper sense though he misses the full significance of it. Now, Pali scholars need not be told
that there is a work in the Pāli literature called viṁḍana-vattthu. It has been edited for the Pāli Text Society by Mr. E. R. Gooneratne. The introduction of this book opens with the following paragraphs:

"The viṁḍana-vattthu is a work that describes the splendour of the various celestial abodes belonging to the Dewas, who became their fortunate owners in accordance with the degree of merit they had each performed, and who therefore spent their time in supreme bliss.

"These Vīmānas are graphically described in the little work as column-supported palaces that could be moved at the will of the owners. A Dewa could visit the earth, and we read of their so descending on occasions when they were summoned by Buddha.

"The lives of the Dewas in these viṁḍnās or palaces were limited, and depended on the merits resulting from their good acts. From all that we read of them we can well infer that these abodes were the centres of supreme felicity. It is doubtless with much forethought that peculiar stress is laid, in our work, on the description of these vīmānas, in order to induce listeners to lead good and unblemished lives, to be pure in their acts, and to be zealous in the performance of their religious duties.

"Stories from the Vīmāna-vattthu are not unfrequently referred to in later doctrinal works, when a virtuous career in life is illustrated. Thus Maṭṭakaṇḍall and Sirimā Vīmāna are referred to in the Dhammapada Athakatha; Chitta, Guttula, and Rewati are quoted in the Sutta Sangaha."

Anybody who reads the above extract will be convinced that this must undoubtedly be the viṁḍnās referred to by Asoka. He seems to have made representations of them and paraded them in various places. His motive in doing so we can easily surmise. As viṁḍnās are palaces of gods who became their owners in consequence of the pure unblemished lives they led on earth, it was natural that he should show their representation to the people in order to induce them to practice righteousness and become possessors of such celestial abodes. That this was the sole object of the work Vīmāna-vattthu is clear from the words of Mr. Gooneratne quoted above in bold type. Asoka is very fond of telling us that the performance of dharma produces merit (puṇya) which in its turn conduces to the attainment of heaven (swarga). It is, therefore, quite intelligible that he might have shown to his subjects the palaces of the denizens of heaven of which they became masters through the righteous deeds performed by them while on earth, in order to impress on their minds that the same by similar virtuous courses could become owners of them.

Now, what can ṣaṭṭi-dārśana signify? Ṣaṭṭi, of course, ordinarily means an elephant. But representations of what elephant did Asoka exhibit to his people? They again must be of such a kind that they could deserve the name dīrīya. I am almost certain that by ṣaṭṭi here we are to understand none but the White Elephant, i.e., Buddha. We know the story of the conception of Buddha. Māyā had a dream in which she saw the Bodhisattva in the shape of a white elephant approaching her and entering into her womb by her right side. We have sculptures of this scene not only at Bharhut but also at Sānchi. Nay, we have incontestable proof that this story was known to Asoka and that he had at least one representation made of him. On the Girnar rock below Rock Edict XIII and separated by an indentation we have the following line: "sa nūto ṣaṭṭi saṇāloka-sukhāhara nama [The white elephant whose name is the bringer of happiness to the whole world]." Prof. Kern was the first to recognise in this an unmistakable reference to Buddha. At Kālāi too on the east end of the rock containing the edicts of Asoka inscribed, we have the outline of an elephant with the letters ṣaṭṭi-tame engraved between his feet. These letters, I think, stand for ṣaṭṭi-tamāḥ, and nobody can seriously doubt that here also we have another reference to Buddha. Most probably there was a similar outline or figure of an elephant in Girnar and also at other places. But it has now disappeared. I have, therefore, no doubt that similar representations of the White Elephant were made and exhibited to the people, most
probably accompanied by oral descriptions as in the dhākṣyadhyāya so as to show clearly to them how Buddha was saha-loka-sukhā-dhāra and thus induce them to imitate his actions in their lives.

There now remains the third word, vic., agnisakha, and I am afraid I cannot give any satisfactory explanation here. The word ordinarily signifies a mass of fire, but this mass of fire must be of such a kind that it can be shown to be connected with a well-known incident and point to a moral. The only story that occurs to me in this connection is that narrated in Jātaka No. 40 (Faure, Vol. I) called Khadira-gītā-jātaka. The Bodhisattva of the story was the Lord High Treasurer of Benares. As he was sitting to take his meal, a Pachcheka Buddha rising form his seven days' trance in the Himalayas appeared with his bowl and begged food. The Bodhisattva asked the bowl to be brought to him and filled it. But Māra wanted the Pachcheka Buddha to die of starvation by preventing the food from approaching him. So in the mansion of the Bodhisattva he created a fire-pit as fearful as in a hell. His cook who was taking the filled bowl to the Pachcheka Buddha saw this blazing fire and started back. The Bodhisattva came to know what had happened and went out in person to hand over the bowl to his guest. As he stood on the brink of the fiery pit, he noticed Māra, but heeded him not. And so he strode on with undaunted resolution to the surface of the pit of fire, and lo! there rose up to the surface a large and peerless lotus-flower, which received the feet of the Bodhisattva. The bowl was given to the guest, and standing in the lotus he preached the truth to the people, extolling alms-giving and the commandments.

Several of the jātaka stories we find sculptured in the Bharahat and Sānchi stūpas. They thus appear to have become popular even as early as the third century B.C.; and there is no reason why one of them should not have been utilised by Aśoka to make visual representations for impressing the people. Besides, the story just summarised must have been thought by him as exactly fulfilling his purpose, because it lucidly illustrates the fruit of alms-giving, of which Aśoka is never weary of speaking in his edicts. If he really wanted to encourage alms-giving, I do not think he could have made a happier selection for making representations of it and showing them to his subjects. The jātaka again appears to have been considered to be a very important one by the Buddhists themselves. For the same tale is re-repeated under the name of Śrīśrīkṣasājātaka in the Jātakamālā of Āryaśātra published by Prof. Kern.

The word rūpa occurs in two ancient inscriptions. Line 2 of the well-known Hāthi-gumpha inscription of Khāravela has the following:—tato lekha-rūpa-as in-vāha-vaidhi-viśvadeva, where the word has been rendered by 'painting' by Pandit Bhagwanlal Indraji. A Pābbāsa cave inscription again reads Śrī-Kṛṣṇa-gopi-rūpa-kartā, where Prof. Bühl rendered it by 'statue'. I confine myself to the generic sense of the word, and render it by simply 'representation'. To this day it is a custom especially in villages, where English education has not spread, to make either paintings or clay representations of mythological scenes and explain to the people in detail what they are intended for. I have no doubt that Aśoka must have done a similar thing. Nobody can, I am sure, object to such rūpas being called dirya, which means not only 'belonging to heavenly regions' but also 'pertaining to divine beings.'

XV.—Talegaon Grant of the Rāshtrakūta king Kṛṣṇa I.

My friend, Sirclar K. C. Mehandale, Secretary of the Pāhlātitiḥā-sahākhodhik-mandot, has kindly sent to me for decipherment a set of copper plates recently brought to light at Talegaon (Dhamhurcha's) in the Poona district. It registers a grant issued by Kṛṣṇa I. of the Rāshtrakūta dynasty. Most of the verses descriptive of the genealogy are found in other Rāshtrakūta records. And the three or four new verses that are for the first time met with in this grant teach us nothing new excepting that in one stanza we are told that his son was called Prabhū-tunga. This must evidently refer to his son Govindarāja, at whose request, as mentioned further in the inscription, the grant was made.

The charter was issued on the occasion of a solar eclipse which happened on the new moon day of Vaiśākha of Saka 690 when Pralaya was the cyclic year. At that time Kṛṣṇa I's

* My attention to this Jātaka was drawn by Prof. Dharmanand Kosambi.
* The solar eclipse in question occurred on Wednesday the 23rd March 798 A.D.
victorious campaign against the Gaṅgas was, we are informed, stationed at Maṇḍapaṇḍaga, obviously the same as Maṇḍapura where the royal residence of the Gaṅgas was fixed in the 8th century, and which has been identified with Maṇḍap, north of Nelamangal in Mysore. The grantees were the Brahmāgatas living in the Karahāta Ten-thousand and one Bhaṭṭa-Vaśudevā, to whom two parts only were assigned. The village granted was Kūmārigrāma, and we are told that this village was given at the request of two persons called Vāsishṭha-Sṛkumāra and Jaiśvantī-Paṇdiya. Along with Kūmārigrāma four more villages seem to have been granted. They were Bhāmarāpūra, Āraḷuva, Śindigrāma and Tāḍavale. All these places are expressly stated to have been comprised in the Pūnakā district (vishaya). Their boundaries also have been specified. To their east were Khaṇḍabhagāra, Voraigrāma and Dājimagrāma. To the south were the Khdiirājāna hills. To the west were Alandigrāma and Thiragrāma and to the north the Mūla river. Almost all these localities can be identified on the survey of India Atlas Sheet No. 39. Thus of the villages granted Kūmārigrāma is Kāreghaon, Bhāmarāpūra Bowrapoor, Āraḷuva Ooroollee, Śindigrāma Seendownee, and Tāḍavale Turudee. Of the villages situated on the east, Khaṇḍabhagāra is Khaiagaon, Voraigrāma Borre, and Dājimagrāma Dalchemb. Khdiirājāna, the name of the hills to the south, cannot be identified, though of course these hills are there as specified. Of the villages on the west Alandigrāma and Thiragrāma are doubtless the well-known Ālandi and Theur, the first better known as chördicī Ālandi and the second as the favourite resort of Mādhavāḷa Peshwa who died there. The river Mūla obviously corresponds to the present name Mūli of a river which joins the Mūthā near Poonah, their conjoint stream flowing afterwards eastwards and passing by the north of the villages mentioned. And it is this conjoint river that appears to have been known in those early days by the name Mūla, though it is now restricted to one of its feeders. But the most interesting fact recorded in this connection is the mention of Pūnakā as the name of the district wherein the villages were situated, Pūnakā obviously is Poonah. That Poonah is an ancient place has long since been known. It is well-known that the two Shaikhs Salla dargāh on the river bank were built about the close of the 13th century on the site of two old temples called Nārāyaṇaśvara and Pūṇaśvara. Again, the caves near the Fergusson College are another indication of the antiquity of the city. But the most important and ancient monument is the rock-carved temple of Paṇḍavaṇeśvar situated in the Bhāmarāpūra suburb, which has been assigned by archaeologists to the 7th century A.D. We have thus ample and sure proof that Poonah was a very old place. But it was never dreamt that the name Poonah also was equally ancient and that it was the head-quarters of a district in those early times as it now. This, however, is now quite clear from the fact that Pūnakā, which can stand for nothing else but Poonah, is spoken of as the district which contained the villages granted.

MISCELLANEA.

KAKATIKA MONKS.

In J. R. A. S. for January, 1912, Professor H. Lüders, while commenting upon a Brāhmi inscription, in which the word kākatiṃcāna occurs, observes—

'It is more difficult to say who is meant by kāke
tikācāna. I take this to be a proper name, and 'as a cooking place in a Vihāra can hardly be intended for anybody but the monks living there, kākati would seem to be the name of those monks, though I cannot say why they were called so.'

Taking the Professor's assumption that kākati is the name of an order of monks to be correct, may I venture to offer an explanation? To me the word appears to be an apabhraṣṭa from Sanskrit kaukktikā, formed by Pāṇini 4.4.46. Unfortunately, Pataliputra does not comment on the stedra itself explains the formation of 'kukkutīm pāṇgati = kaukktikāh' as sanātyātām, i.e., not in the literal sense of 'one who sees a hen', but as a name, or attributive class-name. The Kāśika illustrates by 'kaukktikāh' bhikṣuh and explains that by 'kukkuti' here is meant, by a transferred epithet, the space over which a hen can fly at one flight. The bhikṣuh who limits his vision over so much of the ground before him as can be covered by (proverbially short) flight of a hen is meant by the word. There must have been bhikṣuh who submitted themselves to this sort of discipline to subdue the sense of sight and to avoid the hindē of small insects. The Buddhists and Jainas set a great store by akṣam, and the sight of a Jainasātī, brushing the ground before him with a silk broom and treading with his neck bent low at a small's pace, is not rare even now in India. If we assume that some bhikṣuh were called kaukktikās after this habit of theirs, we can understand the latter contemptuous sense of 'hypocrite' attributed to this word by the Sanskrit Sūtra. It is with a certain difference that I offer this explanation, but the word 'Sanāṭyātām' in Pāṇini's stedra itself supports my conjecture, I think.

Ajmer.

CHANDRADHAR GULEPH.
THE INDIAN INSCRIPTIONS AND THE ANTIQUITY OF INDIAN ARTIFICIAL POETRY.

BY G. BÜHLER.

[ Translated by Prof. V. S. Ghaté, M.A.; Poona. ]

[The Editors of this Journal are deeply indebted to Prof. H. Lüders for having kindly taken the trouble of securing the permission of the Vienna University to publish a translation of Dr. Bühler's Die Indischen Inschriften, etc. This booklet is so important that a reliable translation was a long-felt desideratum to the Indian scholars. The Editors are therefore highly thankful also to Prof. V. S. Ghaté for having prepared the translation which is being published in this Journal].

Indian Epigraphy which, since the last fifteen years has received a new impulse, and which thanks to the progress of Sanskrit philology as well as to the perfecting of the methods of multiplying the inscriptions, leads to more certain results than in early times, has already provided us with several important particulars elucidating the literary and religious history of that part of the world which is inhabited by the Brāhmaṇas and which wants a history as such. On the one hand, we owe to it particular and very important data, which definitely fix the time of prominent authors, as for instance, recently the time of the dramatic poet Rājaśekhara, whose pupils and patrons, the kings Mahendrapāla and Mahiḍpāla ruled during the last decade of the ninth century and in the beginning of the tenth century of our era, as shown by Mr. Fleet and Prof. Kielhorn. On the other hand, the comparison of the partly insignificant notices in the inscriptions with the accounts of literary tradition or with the (data) conditions of the present day, permits us to have an occasional peep, in the development of all the types of literature and of all the religious systems, a peep whose worth is considerably significant in the absence of really historical details. Such, for instance, is the observation that the tradition about the home of several Vedic Schools and also of the works belonging to them, is confirmed through the statements in the old-land-grants, inasmuch as these mention not only the names of the donees but their secular and spiritual families. Not less significant for the history of the very important though little regarded in early times, religion of Mahāvira-Vardhamāna is the demonstration gradually rendered feasible, that, his followers, the Nirgranthas or Jainas, are mentioned in a number of inscriptions, which runs on from the beginning of the historical period of India, with but rare interruptions, and that the assertions in their canonical works, about the divisions of the Monk-Schools are made reliable to the most part, through writings of the first century of our era. These hitherto published results are, however, only a small part of what the inscriptions may possibly yield to us. An accurate working out and a fuller estimate of the hitherto published materials little in extent though they be, will show that one can procure rich instruction from them, in all the departments of Indian Research; and that their results furnish specially sound proof-stones for the theories about the development of Indian intellectual life, theories which the Indologists, build on very weak foundations, compelled as they are by sheer necessity. The following treatise is a small contribution towards the examination of inscriptions in this spirit. Its aim is to establish firmly these results which the inscriptions yield for the history of Indian Kāvyā or the artificial poetry of the court, as also to demonstrate, how far the same agree with the new opinions regarding the development of this species of literature. My reason for undertaking to treat of this question before other perhaps more interesting and less disputed questions, is the recent publication of the Gupta inscriptions by Mr. J. F. Fleet in the third volume of the Corpus inscriptionum Indicarum. This exceedingly important work offers a larger number of wholly or partly metrical inscriptions with absolutely certain dates. The same, taken together with some documents already made known through reliable publications (editions) allow us to prove the existence of a Kāvyā literature in Sanskrit and Prākrit during the first five centuries of our era, and to show that a great period of literature, which brought into general prominence, the style of the poetic school of Vidarbha or Berar, lies before the middle of the fourth century. They also make it very probable that the year 472 after Christ is to be fixed as the terminus ad quem for the poet Kālidāsa.
Such conclusions would, no doubt, appear quite unimportant and scarcely worth the trouble of a special inquiry to those searchers who busy themselves with the history and the literature of the European peoples. The Indologe, however, is unfortunately not in that happy position to look down with contempt, even upon such general results. Because, the history proper of Indian Artificial Poetry begins not earlier than in the first half of the seventh century of our era, with the reign of the mighty king Haraha or Harashvardhana of Thanesar and Kanauj, who ruled over the whole of Northern India from 606-648 A.D. The works of his favourite court-poet Bana-bhattra who tried to portray the life of his master and of himself in the incomplete historical novel Sri-Harsacharita, and who besides wrote, as we know for certainty, the romance Kadambati, and the poem (song) Chandra-tutuka, and perhaps also the drama Pāravati-parāṇaga, are the oldest products of the Court-poetry, whose composition, no doubt, falls within the narrow limits given above. Before this time, there exists no Kadya as such whose age is hitherto determined with some accuracy and certainty or allows itself to be determined with the accessible documents. Only of one work which shows, throughout, the influence of the Kadya style and which contains several sections entirely written in the Kadya style, we mean, of Varahamihira's metrical Manual of Astrology, the Brähmatantra, it can be said with confidence that it is written about the middle of the sixth century; because Varahamihira begins the calculations in his Pañchasiṣṭhānīkā, with the year 500 A.D.; and he is supposed to have died in the year 587 A.D. according to the statement of one of his commentators. As to when the most celebrated classical poets Kālidāsa, Subandhu, Bhāravi, Pravarasena, Gunādhyya and the collector of verses, Hāla-sātavrāhana lived, we possess no historical evidence. We can only say that the wide spread of their renown is attested for the first half of the seventh century by the mention of their names by Bana and in the Aihoj-Megu inscription of 634 A.D.; as also that some of them, like Gunādhyya to whose work Subandhu does allude repeatedly, must certainly have belonged to a considerably early period. Besides this, there are anecdotes only poorly attested, as well as sayings of very doubtful worth; and the scantly details contained in the poems themselves, which might serve as points (stepping stones) for determining their age, are very difficult to be estimated, because the political and literary history of India during the first five centuries of our era lies very much in obscurity. When the age of the most important poets is so absolutely uncertain, it is but natural that the case should be in no way better with the general question of the age of the Kadya poetry. In the literature, we come across very meagre traces which point to the fact that the artificial poetry was cultivated from earlier times; and to our great regret, even the age of the most important work in which quotations from Kadyas occur, we mean, the Mahābhāṣya, is in no way, above doubt. Thus it is not improbable that these quotations might be left unheeded as being witnesses little to be trusted as some of the most important inquirers have already done, and that theories, not taking notice of the same, might be put forth, which shift the growth of the artificial poetry to a very late age. Under these circumstances it can be easily seen why I make myself bold to claim some interest for the evidence based upon the testimony of inscriptions, in favor of a relatively high antiquity of the artificial poetry.

The materials which the third volume of the Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum offers for this inquiry, are not insignificant, and comprise not less than 18 numbers whose dates are certain or at least approximately determinable, the age of their composition lying about between 350 and 550 A.D. The assiduous labours of Mr. Fleet and Mr. Dikshit, about the astronomically calculable dates of the Gupta-inscriptions, irrefutably show that the beginning of the Gupta era falls 241 years later than that of the Śaka era, and for the reducing of the Gupta to the Christian era, they leave us just the option of adding 316 or 319 years. Mr. Fleet has tried to show that the year 319 or 320 A.D. marks the beginning of the Gupta era. Dr. Bhandarkar, on the other hand, advocates 318 or 319, and for important reasons. For a literary-historical inquiry, it is of course the same (it matters not, it is indifferent which of these suppositions is the right one). The first king who makes use of the Gupta era is Chandragupta I, named Vikramādiyya, whose inscriptions and coins show the years 82-94 or 95, i.e., 400-413 or 401-414 A.D. From
the reign of his father Samudragupta, there are two inscriptions not dated. These belong to the last half of the fourth century and as regards Mr. Fleet's No. I, it can be asserted that it was composed when Samudragupta had already ruled for a large number of years. Because the number of his exploits eulogised therein is very considerable. Mr. Fleet's supposition that this inscription must have been composed after Samudragupta's death, rests, as it will be shown in detail below, on a wrong interpretation of the expression "Samudragupta's glory had gone up to heaven". As for the documents dated according to the Mālava era, the detailed expositions of Dr. Peterson and Mr. Fleet leave no doubt that the era is identical with the Vikrama era of 56-7 A.D. The age of several undated numbers can be determined, as Mr. Fleet has shown, by the comparison of their contents with those of the dated numbers. If we arrange chronologically the numbers important for our inquiry, we may have the following list.—

1. No. I, Harishena's panegyric of Samudragupta, composed sometime between 375-390 A.D., on the Allahabad pillar, consisting of 9 verses and the rest in high, elevated prose, at the close named an Kṣaṇya.

2. No. II., A fragment of a poetic description of Samudragupta, composed sometime between 375-390 A.D.

3. No. IV., An undated fragment of a poetic description of four early Gupta-kings, from the reign of Chandragupta II; Gupta-Saṅvat 82-94 or 95.

4. No. VI., The small, wholly metrical, undated inscription in Vrassena's cave at Udayagiri, from the same period.

5. No. X., The inscription on Dhruvasárman's pillar at Bhilādā, composed partly in high prose and partly in metre, dated Gupta-Saṅvat 96, i.e., 414 or 415 A.D., in the reign of Kumāragupta; Gupta-Saṅvat 96-150, 414/5-448/9.


7. No. LXI., The small metrical inscription from Saṅkara's cave in Udayagiri, dated Gupta-Saṅvat 106, 424 or 425 A.D.

8. No. XII., The undated, partly metrical inscription on the pillar at Bihār, from the reign of Skandagupta; Gupta-Saṅvat 136-149, i.e., 454-467 of 455-468 A.D.

9. No. XIII., The undated inscription on the pillar at Bhitārī, which is partly in high prose and partly in metre, from the same period.

10. No. XIV., The long, wholly metrical Rock-inscription at Junāgadhī, which shows the Gupta year 138-139, 454-6 or 455-7, and is called a grantha.

11. No. XV., The wholly metrical inscription on Madra's pillar at Kāhānu, dated Gupta-Saṅvat 141, 459 or 460 A.D.

12. No. XVIII., Vasābhaṣṭ's wholly metrical praṇātī about the Sun temple at Mandasor, dated Mālava-saṅvat 529, 473/4 A.D.


15. No. XXXIII., Vāsula's, undated, wholly metrical, panegyric of the king Yāsodharman, on the pillar at Mandasor, spoken of as ślokāh, and engraved by the same stone mason as the following dated inscription.

16. No. XXXIV., (?33) The wholly metrical Praṇātī on Daksha's well at Mandasor, composed in the Mālava year 589, 533-4 A.D., in the reign of king Yāsodharman-Vishnavardhana.

17. No. XXXV., (?36) The inscription on Dhanyavishnu's boar-statue at Eraṇ, in the year 1 of king Toramāna, composed partly in verse and partly in high prose.

18. No. XXXVI., (?37) The wholly metrical panegyric on Mātrīcheta's temple of Viṣṇu in Gwalior, from the year 15 of the reign of Mihirakula, who, according to No. XXXIII, verse 6, was a contemporary of Yāsodharman.
It would be perhaps possible to augment this list by the inclusion of some other documents, as for instance, the Meheranall pillar-inscription of emperor Chandra, No. XXXII, and the poetically coloured genealogy of the Maukhari in the Asaṅgha seal, No. XLVII, which, according to the character of their writing, belong to this period. But those already mentioned quite suffice for our purpose. Their number shows that during the period from 350-550 A.D., the use of the kāvya-style in inscriptions, especially in the longer ones, was in vogue and from this very circumstance it follows that court-poetry was zealously cultivated in India. It will be seen further on that this conclusion is confirmed by other indications of no doubtful character. Our next and most important work is, however, to inquire how far the samples of the Kāvya style contained in the inscriptions agree with the works of the recognized masters of Indian poetic art, and how the same are related to the rules in the manuals of poetics. A full discussion of all the numbers mentioned would in the meanwhile be too detailed and of but little use. It would suffice to select a poem that falls in the beginning of the period and another that belongs to the close of the same, as representatives and to go through the same thoroughly. With the rest, only a few important points will be prominently touched upon. On similar grounds, I take up, for purpose of a detailed discussion, No. I—Harshaṇa’s panegyric of Samudragupta and No. XVIII.—Vatsabhaṭṭa’s prasasti on the Sun temple at Daśapura-Mandaso; and immediately turn myself to the latter.

(To be continued.)

THE ADITYAS.

BY R. SHAMASAVERY, B.A., M.B.A. S., BANGALORE.

(Continued from p. 24)

The seven hundred and twenty sons, spoken of in verse 13, are evidently the 720 days and nights of the civil year; and the ten twins on the upper side of the chariot, referred to in the next verse, must necessarily be the 10 days and nights above the 360 days of the year. This shows that the poets were well acquainted with the real length of the solar year. It is the seven Adityas or the gods of the intercalary months, that are referred to in verse 18. The expression that the seventh was single-born clearly shows the break in the eighth intercalary month, as pointed out above.

In the following verses of the Atharvaveda (X. 8) the mention of the number one thousand in connection with seven swans seems to furnish additional evidence that the seven Adityas, eagles, or swans, as they are variously called, are the seven intercalary months.

द्वादशं प्रवाहवेदनां स्वर्ण दस्ममात्रिं क ो तद्विभाजनं \nत्रिभुजं संविवाहिनिः सत्वप्रविभाजनं कविताला अविभाजितं \n\nहर्षविनाविजनानवाह एकनम एकां ।
तुम्मनमाशिराशद्धं य युप्वयी एकां ॥ ॥ ॥
एकाः प्रत्येकं एकनम स्वर्णारङ्गं प्रवर्तं निपद्धं ॥
अर्थं विदेशं अपनं अजनं वर्तञ्जयं क तद्विभाजनं ॥ ॥
शाशकस्य विवाहतुवधं पथमो शाशकस्य पवित्रतस्स्थानं ॥
स्व क्षन्नयं नवस्मापमुद्धरं प्रवर्तस्याश्वतार्थं नृतानि विधानं ॥ ॥

"Two fellies, one wheel, three navies,—who understands that? Therein are inserted three hundred and sixty pins, pegs that are immovable."15 4

"This, O Savitri, do thou distinguish: six are twins, one is sole-born; they seek participation in him who of them is the sole-born." 5

"One-wheeled it rolls, one-rimmed, thousand-syllabled, forth in front, down behind; with a half it has generated all existence; what its other half is,—what has become of that?" 7

"By a thousand days are the wings expanded of him, of the yellow swan flying to heaven; he, putting all the gods in his breast, goes, viewing together all existences."16 18

15 Comp. R.V.I. 154, 45, 16 Comp. A.V. XIII, 2, 38.
In verse 4, the Sāvana year of 360 days is described; and in verse 5, the three pairs of intercalary months together with the single seventh month are referred to. In verse 7, the cycle of 20 years is described as containing a thousand syllables, i.e., days. The question about the other half seems to refer to the loss of fifteen days in the eighth intercalary month. In verse 18, the last cycle of five years with 7½ intercalary months seems to be described as a special period or great year, each wing or half of which is measured by a thousand days. The yellow Swan is the seventh intercalary month. Now, if we expand the wings by putting 1,000 on each, its duration becomes equal to 2,000 days. In 2,000 days there are

\[
\frac{2,000}{945} = 2\text{ days, 12 hours, 45 minutes.}
\]

It is clear, therefore, that by the expressions 'thousand-syllabled chariot,' and 'a wing of thousand days' duration,' the poet refers to the last cycle in the greater cycle of 20 years, in as much as that cycle is approximately equal to five lunar years and seven and a half lunations. It is also to be noted that five lunar years are \(5 \times 354 = 1,770\) days and twenty-times 12 extra days \(= 20 \times 12 = 240\) days. Putting these together, we have \(1,770 + 240 = 2,010\) days, which is greater by 10 days than the duration of 2,000 days, as described in verse 18. We shall see that the same cycle of five years with seven and a half intercalary months is also termed Purusha, 'man' or Saptapuruṣā, 'seven men'. Hence it is probable that the rising up of the thousand-headed, thousand-eyed, and thousand-legged Purusha by 10 aṅgulas or days above the earth, described in the Purushāvākṣa, refers to the same cycle of 2,010 days, which was made equal to 2,000 days. It is probable that the use of aṅgulas to mark days was a common practice among the Vedic poets, as among the Arabs. Regarding the use of fingers by an Arabian prophet to mark days, this is what Alberani says:

"... We are illiterate people, we do not write, nor do we reckon the month thus and thus and thus,' each time showing his ten fingers, meaning a complete month or thirty days. Then he (the prophet) repeated his words by saying 'And thus and thus and thus,' and at the third time he held back one thumb, meaning an incomplete month or twenty-nine days.

In the following verses of the Atharvaveda (XII, 3, 16; and XIII, 2, 24) the same intercalary months are described as seven sacrifices and seven yellow steeds:—

"... Seven sacrifices the cattle obtained; of which some were full of light, and others were pining; to them the three and thirty attach themselves; do thou conduct us unto the heavenly world."  
"Seven yellow steeds, O heavenly sun, draw in the chariot thee, the flame-haired, the out-looking: the sun hath yoked the seven neat daughters to the chariot; with them who are self-yoked, he goeth."

The only point to be considered in this is the number 33. Here, again, the allusion seems to be to the same thousand days by which each wing of the heavenly swan was said to be expanded; for 1,000 is equal to \(\frac{1,000}{30} = 33\) months and 10 days.

In the following verse of the Atharvaveda (X, 8, 7 and 13; and XII, 4, 22) the poets speaks of the same cycle as one of eight wheels or eight intercalary months:—

"... Eight wheels (chariot) rolls, having one rim, thousand-syllabled, forth in front, down behind; with a half it has generated all existence; what its other half is,—which sign is that?"

1 But the Vedic estimate of the synodical lunar month, as shown by the Jyotish Yādāga, was 1830 days divided by 33 lunations = 59 days, 12 hours, 23 minutes...

2 Chronology of Ancient Nations, F. 76; 1879.
In the following passage of the Atharvaveda (IX, 10, 17) the poet counts the intercalary months neither as eight nor as seven, but exactly as seven and a half and calls them embryos:

सत्यमहाभुवननको विपरीता विचित्रानि।
मेते सत्यमहाभुवनको विपरीता विचित्रानि।

"Seven and a half, embryos, the seed of existence, stand in front in Vishnu's distribution; they, by thoughts, by mind, they inspired, surround on all sides the surrounders."

In the following verses of the Atharvaveda (X, 3, 8-10), the poet mentions the thirteenth month, and refers to the seven intercalary months as seven eagles and seven suns, making Kaśyapa the head of them:

अधिकारविनिकेत विधारथं वधोषवं मारं वो निर्मितिः।
सत्य वेदवेत्वं कृत्यवेत्वं अवतार्यः।
कृत्य निवासं हर्षुसम्पूर्णं वधोष वसानं विधात प्रसादः।
त आदिके वेदवेत्वं हर्षुसम्पूर्णं अवतार्यः।
सत्य च वधोषवं मारं वधोषवं साधवं सः च वधोषवं अवतार्यः।
सत्य च वधोषवं मारं वधोषवं सः च वधोषवं अवतार्यः।

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

'Black the descent, the yellow eagles, clothing themselves in waters, fly up to the sky; they have come hither from the seat of Rishi; against that god, angered, is this offence.

"What of thee, O Kaśyapa, is bright, full of shining, what that is combined, splendid, of wondrous light, in which seven suns are set together; against that god, angered, is this offence."

In the following verses of the Atharvaveda (XIX, 53, 1 and 2) the Poet describes the same seven intercalary months as time in the form of a thousand-eyed horse with seven reins, and also as seven wheels:

कालो अध्यायो वस्मजी सर्वाधिकः।
सहस्तः अभ्यस्तः कृत्यसीताः।
सत्यसंस्कृतः कर्मसीतत्सातः कर्म सत्यसीतत्सातः।
सत्य सत्यसीतत्सातः कर्म सत्यसीतत्सातः।
सत्य सत्यसीतत्सातः कर्म सत्यसीतत्सातः।
सत्य सत्यसीतत्सातः कर्म सत्यसीतत्सातः।
सत्य सत्यसीतत्सातः कर्म सत्यसीतत्सातः।
सत्य सत्यसीतत्सातः कर्म सत्यसीतत्सातः।

"Time drives a horse with seven reins, thousand-eyed, possessing much seed; him the inspired poets mount; his wheels are all beings.

"Seven wheels doth this Time drive; seven are his naves, immortality forsooth his axle; he, Time, including all these beings, goes on as first god."

The meaning of a thousand eyes is the same as that of a thousand syllables, or a thousand days, expanding a wing of the heavenly swan, explained above.

In what is called the Aruspashadas of the Taittiriya Aranyakas, the poet describes the same year with an intercalated month (Adhisthambakata), beginning with the rainy season, together with the signs and characteristics by which its arrival was usually found out, so picturesquely and forcibly that one cannot resist the conclusion that the poet refers to the seven intercalary months. Since the Upanishad furnishes additional evidence about the theory I have been setting forth here, some of the passages of it, bearing on the subject, are quoted below, with translation and notes. Owing to the want of the intercalation of 8 or 7½ months, the beginning of the year falls back, and coincides, as pointed above, with the middle of the month of Śrāvaṇa, when the rainy season sets in with lightening and rainbow. Accordingly the poet calls upon the waters to remove the heat and fever of the summer along with the demon infesting the intercalary months, and to manifest the arrival of the Adityas, the gods of the seven intercalary months:

आपनामनागपत्ताः अश्वास्याक्षिषाः।
आपनामनागपत्ताः सहस्त्रनागपत्ताः।
आपनामनागपत्ताः सहस्त्रनागपत्ताः।
आपनामनागपत्ताः सहस्त्रनागपत्ताः।
आपनामनागपत्ताः सहस्त्रनागपत्ताः।
आपनामनागपत्ताः सहस्त्रनागपत्ताः।
आपनामनागपत्ताः सहस्त्रनागपत्ताः।
आपनामनागपत्ताः सहस्त्रनागपत्ताः।
"I have obtained and obtained all waters from this and that side; may Agni, the sun, and the wind make the waters prosperous." 1

"O waters, whose steeds are the (seven) winds, whose lords are the rays of the sun, whose body is formed of shining rays, who are not malicious to anyone, and who are the mothers of all beings, allow me to have sons." 2

"O Waters, who are of pleasing names, who are worthy of worship, who are of shining form, who are productive of food, and who are the mothers of the raining clouds, allow me to have sons." 3

"O Waters, take away the excessive heat and fever, take away the demon, take away the bad smell, and take away our poverty." 4

"O Waters, hold up the thunderbolt, hold up life and all beings; O mothers of gods, hold up the Adityas as well as the goddess Aditi together with her womb (bringing forth the Adityas or intercalary months)." 5

"May the heavenly waters and herbs be auspicious to us, and may they bring happiness to us; O water, thou art the bestower of comforts; I have not seen thy abode in the sky." 6

In the next passages the poet proceeds to define time and its characteristics:

"Remembrance of past experience, seeing with the eyes, tales heard from others, and inference as the fourth,—with all these (four kinds of evidence), the circle of the (seven or eight) Adityas is laid up." 7

"The Sun takes up the water from the whole world; by means of the peculiar and ripe form of the waters (i.e., raining clouds) the characteristics of the times are remembered.

"Just as a river flows from an imperishable source, and just as other streamlets join her, and just as she, growing in volume, never returns, so the moments of various birth are merged in the year, by small bits and big periods; they all form the year; the year being formed of them grows in length and never returns.

"One should understand this as a year with intercalation (Adhikarnavata), and that by means of the characteristics (to be spoken of); formed of small and big bits of time, the ordinary year is visible to the eye; but not so the swollen thing (i.e., the year in which intercalation is to be made)." 12

The poet has defined the year as being formed of a member of small and big moments; and has pointed out the difficulty of seeing the intercalated year. Now he is going to describe those characteristics by which its arrival can be inferred:

"Purânicoschitya, vyâpi, Aditihram samanâm. 13

Svântasattva taih sati tathâjñânam."
"Being covered with (clouds), being damp and tending to wet, and being red (with the rainbow), these are the characteristics of Varuna, the lord of water or the rainy season; when this is seen, there is put in 1,000 (days) ;

"The head is uniform and single; but in its face it (the year) is varied; this is the sum total of the characteristics of the seasons (intercalary). From both sides (ubhayatik), there are seven vital organs; talk alone paints it thus [in reality there is no such thing as the vital organ, &c.];

"White and dark days are on the right and left sides of the year: the following is said about it:

O year, that which is white of thee [i.e., the day, and that part of the year which extends from the winter solstice to the summer solstice] is quite different from what is to be worshipped of thee [i.e., the night, and the part of the year which extends from summer solstice to winter solstice]; thy days are of different form; between them thou art like the sky.

"O year, thou art productive of food; thou possessest all kinds of enchantment; O Protector, may thy gift be good to us.

"No beings here; no god Pushan; no Cattle; no Aditya; there is the year alone; man looks upon it as a dear thing; the form of the year is what is dear to him; hence saying 'Do, thou, this meritorious thing,' one should give gifts when this great thing (the intercalated year) comes into existence.'

As I have already pointed out, the poet speaks of the arrival of the rainy season, when, for the adjustment of 20 lunar years to twenty sidereal years, the last cycle of 5 years in the period of 20 years was divided into two parts, and each part was made equal to 1,000 days. The expression that there are seven vital organs in the face of the year which, as a whole, is uniform, refers to the insertion of the seven intercalary months. As it is necessary to know the two parts or sides of the year when 1,000 days are counted to form each part, the poet has referred to those two sides as being formed of white and dark days respectively. There is no doubt that by the two white and dark sides, the poet refers to what is called the Uttarayana (that part of the year which extends from the winter solstice to the summer solstice) and also the Dakshinayana (that part of the year which extends from the summer solstice, which coincides with the arrival of the rainy season, to the winter solstice). It is well known that it was during Dakshinayana that sacrifices were performed. Hence the poet has called that part of the year as being worshipable. 'The meritorious thing' refers to the gifts made in the sacrifices made at the end of the Dakshinayana.

The poet now goes on to speak of the seven Adityas and of the loss of the eighth Aditya:

\[\text{Compare Bhagavadgita, VIII, 24, 25.}\]
"Of those born together, the seventh they call the sole-born; six, they say, are twins, god-born seers; the sacrifices of them, distributed according to their respective abodes and modified in form, move to the permanent."

"O men, tell me who is that friend who, though not vexed, said about his friend thus:—'As a deserter, he wants to fly from us?' Whoever has deserted his friend that knew him will have no share (of offerings) even in talk; if he hears that there is such a thing, he hears what is untrue; for he does not know the path of good deeds.'

The poet says here that while the six sons of Aditi are born in pairs, the seventh became single-born, since the eighth, as he says later on, was half-born and was therefore cast out. It is only for the seven that sacrificial offerings are distributed according to their abodes, but not for the eight, who, though a friend, has fled from the company of his friend, the seventh Aditya. This is what the poet seems to imply when he says that a deserting friend will have not even a promise of a share of sacrificial offerings.

The poet now goes on to speak of the five years' cycle:

"One season, being propelled by another, runs and makes a noise: sixty are the groups of thirty (days); white and dark parts are also sixty in number."

Before going to speak of the deserter, the poet finds it necessary to describe the rotation of the seasons and of the five years cycle. Here the sixty groups of 30 days are evidently sixty months, i.e., five years. In this cycle a season of two months, propelled by other seasons, steps in. The sixty white and dark parts in the last line seem to refer to the greater cycle of sixty years, in which 120 solstices will happen. (60 winter, 60 summer.) It is to be remembered that the cycle of five years closely connected with the cycle of sixty years, which is made of twelve cycles of five years each. There may probably be some reference to the names of the sixty years in the words 'Prabhava,' and 'Akhaya,' used in the beginning of the Upanishad, while comparing the year to a river. After describing the characteristics of the spring and other seasons which are omitted here as unnecessary, the poet goes on to speak of the winter season when the sacrifices in connection with intercalation are completed:

---

30 Prabhava is the name of the first year and Akhaya of the last in the cycle of sixty years.

What is the authority for saying that Akhaya instead of Kshaya, is the name of the last year of the cycle?—J. F. F. Akhaya is the name by which the last year is commonly known in the Southern parts of India; see Essentials of Astronomy, p. 150, Mysore G. T. A. Prass, 1912.—B. S.
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The sources, which are at our command for the ancient history of Burma, are the holy scriptures of southern Buddhists composed in Pali. These were written in India and touch on the history of further India and Burma only cursorily and as a digression. Besides they cannot claim implicit reliance; but implicit reliance cannot at all be placed in Oriental annalists since a simple straight narrative without ornamentation of their own imagining has been always foreign to them.

According to the concordant testimony of all the histories, the Burmans came from the Ganges Valley and their kings were relatives to the Princes of Kosala and Kapilavastu. Of this tradition only this much is true, namely, that the Burmans emigrated no doubt, from the north and possibly in the course of their migration touched the valley of the Ganges. But there can be no possibility about their being related to the Aryans of India; that would be in conflict with their racial peculiarities as well as their language, which, no doubt, belongs to the monosyllabic group. The whole theory of the descent of the Burmans from India was first invented, after the conversion of the country to Buddhism, by court historians, who thereby flattered the reigning kings, inventing for them a kinship with the clan from which the Buddha had sprung.

In another instance the Burmese tradition comes in contact with the history of India, namely, as regards prince Dasaratha. He, too, was a descendant of the Skya dynasty of Kapilavastu to which Gotama belonged, and wandered after renouncing the throne eastwards to Burma, where he founded the so-called second Tagaung Dynasty.

From these repeated attempts of the historians to connect the history of Burma with that of India and especially with Kapilavastu, it follows that at an early date a regular intercourse must have been established between the two countries. Thus, we read in the sacred books of merchants from Ukkal or Savarabhumi (these are the ancient names of Burma) who carried on business in Central India. Two of these merchants came in direct contact with the Buddha himself, as is reported to us in one of the oldest texts. (Mahāvagga, Book I, Chapter 4.) The account is naturally somewhat fantastically embellished, still I assume with certainty that a historical kernel underlies it. It is stated there that the Thātāgata was seated at the foot of the Rijayatana tree sunk in deep meditation, when there came up to him two men named Tapussa and Bhallika from Ukkal bringing to the Buddha rice cakes and honey, offering the same to him as a present from themselves. The Buddha thought that “the Thātāgata do not take any food in their hands; how then shall I receive these rice cakes and honey?” Upon this the four Mahārājas of the four directions produced before him four stone utensils, in which the Buddha received the offered rice cakes and honey. These two merchants thus became the first lay disciples of the Buddha. This account in the Mahāvagga is confirmed by the inscription on the Shwe Dagon Pagoda at Rangoon, which dates from the year 1482 during the reign of king Dhammachi. This king sent out eleven monks to Ceylon to enable them to receive their Upasampadā consecration at the celebrated Mahāvihāra, since their own ordination had become null, as they had not observed the prescriptions of the Vinaya. The pagoda of Shwe Dagon itself is said to have been built in the life time of Gotama; though, of course, this is mere legend. The inscription repeats the account as given in the Mahāvagga and adds that both the merchants received eight hairs from Gotama, which they took back to their country and enshrined in their pagoda on the summit of the Tamagatta Mount, east of the city of Asitanjanagara.
Both these accounts differ only in one essential point. For while in the Mahāvagga, the two merchants came from Ukkalā overland, the Shwe Dagon inscription states that this journey was made by ship. From this it appears that the compiler of the Mahāvagga understood Ukkalā to be Orissa, which is a province of India, from where one could journey overland to the Rājāyatanā tree. Dhammaceti, on the other hand, the author of the inscription on the Shwe Dagon, understood by Ukkalā the territory at the foot of the Shwe Dagon Hill stretching up to the Iravadi, where a number of colonists from further India must have settled at an early date. Hence he makes the two merchants voyage in a ship.

When we look into the later Buddhist Literature we find the history of Tapusa and Bhallika also in the commentary of Buddhaghosa to the Vinaya and to the Anguttara nikāya, which is a production of the 5th Christian century. There also the city from where they came and where they erected the pagoda on their return is called Asitamnana, just as in the inscription on the Shwe Dagon. Accordingly, there seems to be no doubt that Buddhaghosa, too, the most celebrated of the later Buddhist theologians, had in his mind Burma and not Orissa, and that the Shwe Dagon Pagoda was actually built on the spot, where the two merchants buried the hair relics presented to them by Gotama. The name Dagon can be traced to an old Tikumbha "the three alms bowls", and with this is linked the legend that Gotama and his two favourite disciples, Sāriputta and Moggalāna had buried their alms bowls at that place. The name came into use first in the 16th century, while before that time the pagoda was called Singuttaracheti. Buddhaghosa's testimony is, therefore, of special value, in as much as he composed the greater number of his Commentaries in Burma, after he had spent some time in Ceylon with a view to study the sacred scriptures at the latter place. The Burmese historians even assert that he was born in their country. But this is contradicted by the evidence of the Mahāvamsa, which alleges his birth place to be in the vicinity of the holy Bodhi Tree, and, therefore, is not to be accepted as a historical fact. The identity of Ukkalā and Burma, as asserted by Buddhaghosa, is no doubt, (as Kern indicates,) in conflict with the statement of the Lalita-Vistara, which places the home of the two merchants in a country to the north of the Deccan, and it likewise is not in accord with the information of the Chinese Pilgrim Huan-THISANG, who makes the merchants come from BAKTRIA. But the Lalita-Vistara has proved itself in many cases to be an unreliable source and the expression "northern country" is so vague that it might indicate almost any country. As regards Huan-THISANG he is a great authority for Northern Buddhism; but, he has little knowledge of Southern Buddhism, and when his evidence is in conflict with that of Buddhaghosa, we must explicitly give precedence to the latter.

We assume, therefore, that the first two lay disciples of Gotama originally came from Burma; but that is not the same thing as to say that Buddhism had already been introduced into Burma at that time. That event took place after the Council of Pāṭaliputra, which was held under the patronage of king Aśoka. At this Council, at the suggestion of Tissa Moggaliputta, it was resolved to send out missionaries to various directions with a view to proselytise the surrounding countries to Buddhism. Both the children of king Aśoka, Mahinda and Sanghamitta, went over to Ceylon; to Burma went the apostles Sona and Uttara. These two arrived there after a long journey, because the country was at that time in the possession of a sea monster who was working havoc there. The apostles succeeded in destroying the monster and naturally gained unexpected success in their mission of proselytisation. Two-thousand-five-hundred men and one-thousand-five-hundred women forthwith accepted monkhood, and the kings of the country thence-forward bore the name of Sonuttara.

The port where Sona and Uttara landed in Burma was called Golanagara or Golammatikā-nagara, and lay some twenty miles north-west of the capital, Thatī. The late Doctor
Forchhammer, who rendered considerable service to the archeology of Burma, discovered there tolerably extensive ruins which go to prove an old settlement at the place. The name of the city in an inscription at Kalyani belonging to the 15th century is explained so as to suggest that it consisted of earthen houses after the style of those constructed by the Gaula or Gola in India. It was also probably an old Indian colony from pre-Christian times similar to the one mentioned above at the foot of the Shwe Dagon Hill. In the 16th Century the city was called Takkals, and at present it is named Ayeythima. Forchhammer attempted to identify this Golangara with the territory called Kalah mentioned by Arab geographers, and accordingly propounded quite a new hypothesis with reference to a question which had already been taken up by Sir Emerson Tennent and others. The Arabs speak about a kingdom, which bore the name of Zabedj and extended in the 8th and 9th Centuries over the Islands to the south and east of Malacca, and consequently to Java, Borneo, Sumatra, etc. To this kingdom belonged likewise the southern extremity of India and also the country in question called Kalah. This place was the centre of commerce in aloes, camphor, sandlewood, ivory, and lead. The ships coming from the east, China, and from the west, Persia, met at Kalah and exchanged their respective commodities. This Kalah therefore, must have been situated somewhere in the Indian Ocean and the supposition of Sir Emerson Tennent that it would be Point-de-Galle in Ceylon has nothing improbable about it. Even this day Ceylon constitutes the centre of commerce and the meeting point of passengers in the Indian Ocean, and if Point-de-Galle has been replaced as a port in course of centuries by Colombo, it was because the port of Point-de-Galle is in the first place unsafe, and secondly, because, it was the government which directed the intercourse towards the capital Colombo. In the accounts of the Arab geographers we come across a group of islands which must have existed in the vicinity of this ancient Kalah, and this has probably placed us on the right track. Sir Emerson Tennent thinks in this connection of the Maldive Islands but that is scarcely probable, because, the Maldive Islands lie two and a half days' journey west of Point-de-Galle, a situation which must have proved one of great distance for the then commercial circumstances. Perhaps we would be nearer the mark if we understood by Kalah the north-west coast of Ceylon, for, as a matter of fact there does exist a group of islands in close proximity, which constitutes what is called the Adams Bridge, and which was even a connecting link with the main land in pre-historic times. In the immediate neighbourhood of Kalah lived according to Cosmas Indicopleustes the king who had the hyacinth (ὁ εὐαγγελισμένος Ἰονᾶς) which is an attempt at transcribing the precious stone district in Ceylon at present called Sabara Gamuva, and with it was connected the land where the pepper goods i.e. the district between Puttalam and Adams Peak which is known in modern times by the name of Maha Oya. The Arab geographer Abu Zayid further narrates that the country in his time was subject to two kings . . . the one was the Sultan of Zabej whose dominion extended over Malacca, the Sunda Islands, and Travancore, the other was a Singhalese king who lived as a dependent on the Sultan.

Of another opinion is the author of the anonymous work on Ceylon which appeared in 1876 in London under the title, “Ceylon, a general description of the Island, historical, physical, and statistical.” He is of the view that the vessels which plied between China and Persia must have sailed from Cape Comorin straight over the Gulf of Bengal to the Nicobar Islands; they must have touched at the port of Kalah which must have been in that case one of the islands or peninsulas belonging to Hinter India, possibly, the modern Kedah near Penang. There is nothing more to adduce in support of this hypothesis except the more or less questionable similarity of pronunciation between Kedah and Kalah. This hypothesis, however, has more of probability in it than that of Forchhammer, because, the vessels must have sailed past Kedah, while in order
to call a halt at Golanagara, they would have to make a long detour towards the north. I therefore, remain an adherent of the view of Sir Emerson Tennent concerning the situation of Kalah; only for Point-de-Galle I would substitute the north-west coast of the Island of Ceylon.1

We will now leave Burma and the questions connected with it and cast a glance at the Sunda Islands. The date of the first colonisation is here also a matter of doubt, though the place whence the colonists immigrated was in all probability Kalinga, the district to the north of the mouth of the Godavary. The name Kalinga or Kaling, which is the designation bestowed by the Chinese on the Javanese, is no strong proof of this, for, the Chinese so call all the Indians who crossed over the ocean to the Celestial Empire. But it is very likely that they originally came from there, because it was also the provenance of the Singhaese. The Chinese Pilgrim Fa-Hian, who landed at Java about the year 413 on his return voyage from India to China, and sojourned there for a time, found an Indian civilisation in full growth. Brahmins and the so called heretics, as Fa-Hian calls all Shaivites, were in large numbers, while there were few or no Buddhists at all. This is confirmed by Sanskrit inscriptions in western Java and east Borneo, which to judge by the formation of the alphabet must be at the latest as old as the 5th Century. From these inscriptions, which are of a Vaishnavite character, we can conclude that both Java and the east coast of Borneo were Hinduised prior to the 5th Century. Moreover, we learn from a Chinese report that in the year 435 there reigned in Java a prince, whose name was the pure Indian Dhárávarman and his title Śrīplá. We possess documents belonging to Java and composed in its native language, the Kawi from the 9th Century. From this it follows that about that time the country was completely Hinduised and that there were traces of Buddhism in the Maháyāna form. Probably, the Buddhists had immigrated to Sumatra and Malacca in the 5th Century soon after Fa Hian’s visit. This is supported by the Sanskrit inscriptions of Kedah and province Wallesley, as well as of the celebrated temple of Boro Bodor, the most extensive Buddhist structure in existence. According to the opinion of Fergusson and Burgess, the temple was completed in the 7th Century and its construction must have taken somewhere about a hundred years so that its building was probably commenced in the 6th Century.

We find Indian influence equally in Sumatra, although not in such a high degree as in Java and Bct. The alphabet which is used in Sumatra can be traced to an Indian origin, and the language has adopted a number of Sanskrit words. There are tolerably numerous names of places of Sanskrit origin. Buddhism must have flourished there from the 10th to the 14th Centuries, as can be inferred from several inscriptions and ancient buildings. Of all the islands of the Archipelago, Java alone seems to have admitted the division into castes according to the Hindu model, and this is an indication of Brahmanical and not Buddhist influence, for the Buddhist strived to do away with caste. The most prominent Brahmanical sect in Java was the Shaivite. Shaivism and Buddhism were the two officially recognised religions in Java, just as they are in Nepal of to-day where the King and the ruling classes are Shaivites, whereas the mass of the people do homage to the Buddha. We even find a kind of syncretism of both the religions in Java, in so many as the Buddha is regarded and adored as younger brother of Siva. At great festivals like that of Pancha Chalavrana, it so happens that four Shaivites and one Buddhist priests officiate in co-operation. The Buddhist priest turns his face towards the south, three of the Shaivites facing the three remaining cardinal points and the fourth sitting in the centre. We see from this that the Buddhists of the Sunda Islands were far from fanatics and allowed the adherents of other faiths to live there undisturbed. The situation was probably similar to that obtaining in Ceylon though in an inverted order, for the Buddhists were the first to occupy Ceylon, Hinduism having crept into the island only at a subsequent period along with Tamil immigrants. There, too, we meet with, as at Dondra on the southern coast, in one and the same temple images of the Buddha, of Vishnu, of Ganeśa, and the holy Bull from Tanjore, all of them being installed there without mutual disturbance or error in the prayers offered by the faithful of these various creeds.

1 There is much more to be said for Kalinga-Kedah than the author seems to be aware of.—Ed.
PARAMAJOTISTOTRA
An Old Braja Metrical Version of Siddhasenadvakara’s Kalyanamandirasotra.

BY L. P. TESSITORI, UDINE, ITALY.

I found this vernacular version of the famous stotra by Siddhasenadvakara in a Jain MS. pertaining to the Indian Collection in the Regia Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale of Florence. The MS. is registered in Pavolini’s catalogue under No. 674. It consists of 15 leaves, with 12 lines on each page, but it is unfortunately incomplete, some leaves at the end having been lost. As the colophon is wanting, it is not possible to fix the date of the MS., but the general appearance of the paper and of the script are sufficient to show that it was copied at a comparatively modern time. On the cover we read the title, Digambarastotrar, which is quite probably the title we should find in the colophon, if the last leaf of the MS. had been preserved to us. It is, in fact, a collection of stotras, partly in Sanskrit and partly in Bhāṣā, of which only the first four have been preserved. These are the following:—

(a) The Pañchamaṅgala by Rūpachanda, in Old Braja, from page 1b down to page 8a. It contains 25 stanzas in all, divided into five parts named respectively: (1) Pratamamaṅgala, (2) Janamamaṅgala, (3) Tapakalyāṇaka, (4) Jhānakalyāṇaka, (5) Nivedakalyāṇaka. It is a maṅgalagita commemorating the five most salient points in the life of the Trailokyānātha Sudevajinara, from the dreams seen by the mother of the Jina down to his attainment of the nivedya. In the last stanza (25th) the author records his name.

(b) The Viśhāṭhastotra by Dhanapujaya, in 39 Sanskrit stanzas.

(c) The Aikbaddastotra by Vādirāja, in 26 Sanskrit stanzas.

(d) The Paramajotistotra, in Old Braja, from page 14a down to the foot of page 15b, deficient at the end, owing to the loss of the subsequent leaves of the MS. The text reaches to the beginning of stanza 26 and, therefore, 18 stanzas are wanting.

Though incomplete, this Paramajotistotra is, no doubt, of the greatest interest. It derives its value partly from its excellence as a translation; partly also, and perhaps chiefly, from the particular form of language, in which it is couched. The work is, in fact, a metrical version of Siddhasenadvakara’s Kalyanamandirasotra, in which the author has displayed an ability that is very rarely found in similar works. It was, indeed, no easy matter to put into a different language the often intricate meaning of the Sanskrit stotra, retaining all the puns that are met at almost every step in the latter; and, what is more, to put it into stanzas having verses rhyming with each other and corresponding exactly in number with the vasantatilakā in the original; even to outdo the very Sanskrit text in conciseness, by recasting the whole content of each vasantatilakā—without omitting any important particular—into stanzas numbering a smaller amount of syllables. How far the author has succeeded in this effort, the reader will judge for himself. In some passages, indeed, the vernacular version seems to be much more elegant than the Sanskrit original by Siddhasena itself. The work takes its name of Paramajotistotra from its beginning, after the example of the Kalyanamandirasotra itself and of many other stotras of a similar kind, such as the renowned Bhaktiśārara.

As to the probable author of the version—though it cannot be presumed that any positive conclusion on this question will ever be attained, owing to the scanty evidence,—I think there is a circumstance that may perhaps lead to his determination. Namely, the fact that the Paramajotistotra shares with the Pañchamaṅgala, the first work in the collection, not only the same language, but even the same linguistic peculiarities; and that the external affinity between the two works is such that it cannot be explained except by the assumption that both of them were composed in the same place and at about the same time, and, perhaps, even by the same poet. If it be correct to go as far as
the latter conclusion, it is with the Rūpacanda of the Pañchamaṅgala that the author of our version should be identified.

Turning to the form of the language in which the Paramajotistotra is written, I have to make some further observations concerning what has been stated above. The language is, in fact, Old Braja, but this statement would be altogether incorrect, if it were understood to imply that the version was made within the area where Braja is spoken at the present day. It is well known (and here I mean to refer chiefly to Sir G. Grierson’s authority) that in former times the use of the Braja Bhāṣā was spread towards the West far beyond the limits of the territory, where it was spoken. Indeed, for many centuries Braja has been the common polite language, in which poets of the Western Gangetic Valley, Rajputana and even Gujarāt used to compose their works. When so used for literary purposes by the poets of the West, it was called Piṅgala, and in contradistinction to it the dialects peculiar to each of the various countries, when they were used in poetry, were called Piṅgala. But the use of the latter for literary purposes seems never to have been so widely extended as that of the former. Now, it can be easily conceived that the adoption of the Braja by the poets in such countries as possessed a vernacular of their own, and differing from it, could not take place without the Braja growing more or less corrupt through the introduction of strange elements and foreign words, borrowed from the peculiar dialect of the writer. The resultant, then, was a form of language, that in its main features was Braja, but at the same time contained many peculiarities, which were not consistent with the latter and could be explained only by a direct reference to Maṇḍwaṛi or Gujarāt.

This is precisely the case with the language, in which our Paramajotistotra is composed. It is Old Braja mixed with alien elements, which clearly point to the West for their origin. Such are: झूण्डी, “dreams,” करी “of the actions,” two instances of the plurals in—वा as are met in all the dialects of the Rājaśthān and Gujarāt; दे “this, these,” for the singular and plural forms of the demonstrative pronoun, which in Braja ought to be वह and वे respectively; वे “who,” for the plural of the relative pronoun, instead of the Braja forms वह or वे; भाषा “says,” for the third person singular of the simple present, instead of भाषा, which is the only form that is possible in Braja; भाषा “is doing,” an instance of the definite present, which is not very common in Braja, whilst it becomes the rule in Maṇḍwaṛi and in the other dialects of the West; भाषा “will be,” an example of the sigmatic future, which is not found to exist in the Western Hindi, etc. Indeed, some of these as well as other forms, besides pointing to the West, seem to point also to an early stage in the formation of the vernaculars. In other words there are some peculiarities which, though they may happen to have their correspondents in the dialects of Rajputana and of Gujarāt, might be as well explained by a direct reference to the Apabhṛṣṭa. Such are for instance: the postpositions तथा and तथा of the genitive, which are liable to be directly chained to the corresponding forms: तथा and तथा in the Apabhṛṣṭa; the inflected locative singular ending in -रे, दे, of which there are traces in all forms of Bhāṣā and which likewise occurs in the Apabhṛṣṭa; the pronominal forms कोण “who?” for the interrogative pronoun, तिम “how?” for the interrogative adverb of manner, both of which are derived from the Apabhṛṣṭa forms: कोण and कोण, and the latter has spread so far in the East that it is found even in the Old Baiswār of Tulsī Dās; and finally the forms जाती, जाति, जाति, for the pronominal adjectives of manner, which are even older than the corresponding forms जाति, जाति, of the Apabhṛṣṭa, and for the explanation of which one must refer to the Prākrit. Further, there are some other forms, which are rather to be considered as Kanauji peculiarities, like दित, दिति, दिति, 2 which are used for the oblique singular of the

---

1 These two forms, as well as some of the others mentioned below, are not met in the Pañchamaṅgala, but only in the Pañchamaṅgala.
2 The MS. often reads दिति, दिति, दिति.
pronouns. Quite peculiar are the forms श्रृः "is" and श्रृः "are," for the 3rd persons singular and plural of the simple present of the substantive verb, both used in their original indicative meaning and therefore corresponding to the Braja है and हैः, respectively. I believe, they are to be explained as having arisen from two hypothetical forms: "चूः (हृत) and शृः" of the Apabhramśa, which, though they have not yet been found, may reasonably be supposed to have existed beside the more recent forms है and हैः. As for the है being retained in the terminations: हैः, हैः, instances of the same are not wanting in Old Hindi. Lastly, there will be noticed the use of the old genitive in-, which is also commonly found in the Old Gujarati as well as in Canda's poetry, and in the latter it appears to have superseded almost all other cases. In the same way, it will be found used with a meaning different from that of the genitive case in the example मुद्रण गणित in the 2nd caupā of the Paramajotistotra.

The conclusion, then, to be drawn is that the Paramajotistotra was written at a rather early period in the history of the Bhāshās, which it is not possible to determine at the present day, and in a country lying to the West of the area where Braja was spoken. Whether this country was Rajputana or Gujarāt, cannot be easily ascertained. The fact that some of the Western peculiarities, that have been treated of above—as for instance है for the singular of the demonstrative pronoun and शृः for the interrogative adverb of manner—seem to point rather to Gujarāt than to Rajasthān, is of no great account in this question, as at that time the difference between the vernaculars of Gujarāt and of Rajputana was much less distinct than at the present day. Be it remembered that both forms of speech have come out of the same stock, viz., the Caurāsenī Apabhramśa, and that their mutual connection still appears as a very close one, if we only compare the Old Gujarati with the Old Mārāyā.

I need not expend words in illustrating the contents or showing the literary importance of the Kālīḍānandarastotra,—the original, of which our Paramajotistotra is a version—nor shall I dwell on its being an imitation of Mānavaṇa's Bhākṭādamarastotra, and still less on the questions concerning the probable identification of its author Siddhasenadvākāra. For all these particulars, the reader may direct refer to Prof. Jacobi's introduction to the edition of the stotra in the Indische Studien (Vol. XIV [Leipzig, 1875], pp. 376-377) and to Paṇḍit Durgā Prasāda's introductory note to the edition of the same stotra in the Kavyamālā (Guchchhākha VII [Bombay, 1907], p. 10). Let me only say, in explanation of the fact that the present version is included in a Digambara MS., that the Kālīḍānandarastotra is read by the Digambaras as well as by the Čvetāmbaras.

The metre, in which the Paramajotistotra is arranged, is partly the chaupā, partly the dohā. The part of the work, that has been preserved to us, comprises 26 stanzas in all, out of which 16 are chaupās and the other 8 are dohās. The first stanza, from the initial words of which the version takes its name, is not found in the Sanskrit original, and is, therefore, to be regarded as an addition by the vernacular poet.

As regards the Braja text, which follows below, I wish further to note that I have tried faithfully to reproduce the reading of the MS., as far as it was consistent with the laws of grammar and prosody. So, I have kept purposely unchanged:—the sign है, without substituting for it हैः; the frequent inorganic nasalisation of the vowel चर, before है, न, म, हैः; the frequent substitution of चर for original है, न, and of हैः for हैः, etc. On the other hand, I have silently corrected all evident blunders like the substitution of हैः for है and the omission of the dot of the nasals, and I have kept carefully distinguished from the चर the चर, for which the MS. has no special sign. All other cases, in which I venture to differ from the reading of the MS., will be found recorded in the critical notes at the foot of the text. Their being so copious should not be imputed to any excess of scrupulousness on my part, but rather to the great incorrectness of the MS.

* The latter substitution is to be regarded as a Western peculiarity.
अथ परमज्योतिस्तोत्रः

दोहा

परम-भौति पर्वतस्या परम-ज्यों-परस्यः

वसोऽपि परमाणुनि भे पारस्य ज्योतिस्यः ॥ १ ॥

वैपायि

निम्न-कर्त्तन परम-परशुनि | कर-सुधा-जल-ताराः चाँदः ।

दीप-मानिशप्राप्य-कर्त्तन | दत्त हृद-धरणम् गुणणम् नीरः ।

दत्त-मनो-नधुर-बाल-वीर | गिराः-सागर् गुणणम् जिवः ।

‘वुममुरु पर कोह नहि’ जासः। रे च जाति जायसू हि जासः ॥ २ ॥

मु-संयत वाच्य-चपल-नीरः। कोहः हर-प्रेमे हस्तं निर्मयः।

कोहः दिन-चर्च्य चाँदः-को पारसु । काहि न लंके रण्य-निर्मयः-ब्रह्मकृत ॥ ३ ॥

सीर-सीर जाती नन-भौति । पौडः न युतमुख वदने जाहिः।

मयेपली चरी जाती-नन् । प्रमाणे रात्रि प्रीति सुधा। ते कायः ॥ ४ ॥

तुम च्यापी निरमण-शुद्ध-पालिनि । भे गाती-श्रीभूरी निम्न-भौति भूरी,

कोहः बालक निम्न-भाग पतारिः। सागर-परमति करेइ निम्न-भरिः ॥ ५ ॥

जे भिष्मं चाऽऽ तपावै! ते तन न जातीं युतमुखम् जातीं गुणम् जातीं ।

वाह भौतिक नाति भूम चन्द्रनिलाप। कोहः वपी बोले निम्न-भाग भूम।

तुम जात वहीं चन्द्रनन्मदनाशव । तौ क्रम एक वद्राम-नाथवाह ।

चाँदी पद्म परम-राष्ट्र होयं। भीमन-चन्द्रित निम्न-भूपी राष्ट्र ॥ ६ ॥

तुम चन्द्रवात मिन्नि नन्त्र नन्त्र । मन-नाथ नियम-नाथ होय वहीं ।

कोहः चन्द्रवात नात्र बोले मोर। वैत्र चन्द्रबृहो नात्र चाँद चाँद।

तुम निरपव जात जीन-पदमान। संकर से हुते सतताल ।

कोहः पल्ले बोले वहीं। बोले, बोले। से नार भानक वेदन भान।

तुम नाति जात-तालक वहीं मोर। से सित धार तिने से से ।

कोहः दैशी कार भाविन गुणाव । तिने भक्त कक्क गाती-भास ॥ १० ॥

जिनि लघु स्वर किये वहीं बोल । से नियम-भी कीची सी बोल ।

जी अन्त्र करे चन्द्रवात-कुल-भूपी । रह्वानाल वरी से पारति। ॥ ११ ॥

तुम चन्द्रवात-गती-चन्द्र-दिनेह । कोहः कार भगति-तरी। निम्न-भूपी।

वह लघु-चन्द्र तिरे संसार। भह प्रति मन्न्यहाँ चन्द्रनन्मदनाशव ॥ १२ ॥

काहिं नियम बोले मन-पालिनि। वर्ग-गुण्ड जातीं किन्नि भौतिः।

¹) परमाणु, जाना, ²) चाँद, ³) यज्ञ, ⁴) मन्न्य, ⁵) भागी, साति, अणि, अर्थ (instead of भागी), ⁶) गुरु, ⁷) चाँद, ⁸) वनक, ⁹) निर्माण, ¹⁰) वह, ¹¹) हप, ¹²) वह, ¹³) बो, ऐति, ¹⁴) किन्नि, ¹⁵) अणि, अणि, जाना, ¹⁶) वह, ¹⁷) बो, एति, ¹⁸) बो, एति, ¹⁹) जाना, ²⁰) अणि, अणि, जाना.

¹ For: गाती

² From: पल्ले < पल्ले

³ Contracted form from जाना.

An instance of the emphatic particle हूँ having combined with the final inherent ओ of the word to which it was added.
यह परसर हेमजी संसार। नील-विषय येही। वेंटों तुम्हारा ॥ १४ ॥

मुनि-मन बिवे कन्या वनिज वैद्य। सिद्ध-रूप सम्भववैं तीर्थ।
कन्या-काँडना बिन नाहीं। त्यसैं। कन्या-पति उपजन-की अवर ॥ १५ ॥

जब तुम पार वही मुद्दा वैद्य। तब भिन्न वर्षमाना हौं ।
असके यास विद्वान लाभों। कन्या-रूप भरे। जब भाषिया ॥ १६ ॥

आ-पैं मुनि तू के नवास। निरन्दर आय कितैं। विवह सास।
येहीं महत्त्व गिने जागी कोर। विवाह-गूढ़ नीवीरे रोय ॥ १८ ॥

कारे निविड जे धारणा-भूण। तुम ग्रन्थाती हें । निर्माण।
असके पात्र छुड़ा भागुणीत। नीपत तिथा-विकार को होनि ॥ १७ ॥

क्यों भगवन्न मनसा-गुण-जीव। सम्मल-रूप माने माति-हों।
की नीलिसा-रोम दिय गया। वर्ण विवरण तहूँ सी है ॥ १५ ॥

दोहा

निकट रहत उपेन्द्र खूनि। तारबर भवे बाबे। रायकर।
येहीं रघु उगाते जीव सब। मग्न होते भव-लोक। ॥ १९ ॥

समस्त हटे जे सुर वही। हें हृदय गुण-लोक।
येहीं तुम सुचत सुनेन-जन। बनव चापोइ रोय। ॥ २० ॥

परितुम तुम हिये बघीरे-थेली। बापानी सागर-सागर।
विधिना प्रवेल मन-जन लखे। चक्कर-चक्कर-पध-राम। ॥ २२ ॥

तवे इत्यार तिहें निको-की। वे कुरू-चाँदर शेषा।
भव-राहव हो जिन नै तसी। दातु गति उरन होय। ॥ २२ ॥

प्रियहार सिरी में सम। प्रमुण्डन गराहं धीर।
स्वीम सुरन वन-रूप लिख। नामत भव-जन-म्य। ॥ २२ ॥

छवि-पत्र संरक-मक्खन। नूम-ना मानुहो देव।
श्रीसङ्ग-के निपट रहिए। रहे नैराग विजेंद्र। ॥ २४ ॥

शीर भीते तिहें लीक-की। ए सुर-गुनण-गाव।
श्वाप-पत्र-सारपत्र जिन। भज्जि तन्जई परमांक। ॥ २५ ॥

शीर खुनि निदुरुवन जिहुिं।

………………

१४) हीर, कौशिक (for काशिका), निना, नाहीं भर, ठोर; १५) परमांक, धीर, घाना; १६) तिलिश; येन (instead of यें), विश्व; १७) निशिक, धार, नित; १८) सुल दी, कसी, गह, स्वीम; १९) तनाव; २०) कुड़, केद, (for तूत); २१) ब्याटृद, तोचुग, यहा; २२) उपन्य; हीरे, जिह, मन; २२) इंसार, नव (for सुर), सह, सी; २३) घि, वेदिह; २४) बिमा; २५) तिनमण।

* Observe that the coram is faulty.
ON THE PRONUNCIATION OF SANSKRIT.

BY P. T. SRINIVAS IYENGAR, M.A.; VIZAGAPATAM.

It is frequently urged, as one of the excellences of Sanskrit, that its alphabet is scientific and perfect, unlike the English alphabet, which is both superflorescent and defective. But it is not so well-known, that while the spelling of Sanskrit words is fixed for all time, its pronunciation varies so much from province to province that there are comparatively few letters whose values are the same all over India. When this is pointed out to a Hindu, his first impulse is to maintain that his pronunciation, i.e., that of his district, is the correct, ancient one of Pāṇini and the Rishis that preceded him, and that all others are wrong. I have heard a Tamil Brāhmaṇ (and a professor in a Government College who has passed a High Examination in the Science of Language) maintain that the Tamil pronunciation of Sanskrit is the only perfect thing, though the Tamil land is several thousand miles far from that where Sanskrit was first evolved, and though Sanskrit did not reach the Tamil land until many hundred years after it was born. On the other hand I have known Hindī gentlemen, great Sanskrit scholars, believe that the confusion in speech between śh and dh prevalent in North India was part of the original perfection of the Sanskrit (perfected) tongue! As a matter of fact there is no right or wrong in these matters. As every flower has a right to exist and the one with narrow petals is not more correct than the one with broad ones, all forms of pronunciation are correct, each in the district or caste or clan where it prevails, and no one form is superior to another. Pronunciation, like other manifestations of life, changes in accordance with individual environment.

Firstly as time goes on the sounds of a language change. It has been proved that Sanskrit has levelled down original Indo-Germanic a, e and o into one uniform u, whereas the original sounds have been preserved in Greek, Latin and other languages. Cf. Sans. paṇica, fana, Gr. pente, genos; Sans. cha, Lat. qua; Sans. chat, A. S. kweol; in all which cases the Sanskrit a is a later formation than the e or o of the other languages. That Sanskrit long e and long o are developments of ai and au is well-known to our Grammarians, but this is only a case of Indo-Germanic ai, ei, and oi becoming first ai and then long e in Sanskrit and au, eu and ow first becoming au and then long o. Compare Gk. aithos, Sans. ēdhas, Gk. teikos, Sans. ḍhā; Gk. oida, Sans. réda; Lat. aug-era, Sans. ḍhas; Gk. reuma, Sans. arb-tas. While Sanskrit has wandered further from the parent Indo-Germanic in its vowel system than its sister-languages, it has preserved the original consonant system better. But even here, there have been wide changes. In the Indo-Germanic there were two sets of k sounds, as to-day Arabic has, a velar and a palatal. These as well as the labialized velars were fronted, when followed by front vowels e, i; thence arose in Sanskrit the sounds of ē, ë, h, ch, etc. Thus the roots š, jtu, har, kai, chal represent an earlier kei, gwe, gher, qel, qwel.

Most of these changes from the Indo-Germanic to the Sanskrit have been revealed by the historical study of languages conducted by modern investigators. The method of Sanskrit Grammarians was purely analytical; it consisted in tracing forms to their roots (real or imaginary) and it is obvious that this method cannot but lead to laws of word formation, which may be practically useful but are not true as facts of history. The study of the growth of man based on anatomical considerations and intelligent inferences from the dissection of a number of corpses as to how man’s body must have been put together may lead to very interesting results, but these results are likely to be very different from the real story of man as revealed by Comparative Zoology and Embryology. Psychology, till recently, analysed the grown man’s mind into faculties and proceeded exactly like Pāṇini’s grammar; and as the growing science of Comparative Psychology has upset the old Psychology, so Comparative Grammar has upset the older Sanskrit Grammar. Thus in ś-ś, the e representing ai of Indo-Germanic is surely not derived from i, the so-called root. The h of mukta, rūka; is not a modification of eh as Pāṇini says, because the Indo-Germanic analogue of their so-called roots much, rich, are mens, lektu; similarly the gh of yamātiḥ is more primitive than the ḍh of ḍhātī. 
But even taking Pâñjî at the usual Hindu valuation, there are many difficulties in utilizing his sūtras in an investigation of Sanskrit pronunciation. His last sūtra is "na" (VII, iv., 68) and is usually interpreted to mean that though in the body of the sūtras vowels have been described to be open (cīrītā), short a is not open, but close (saṅkīrītā). This information can be utilized only if we know for certain how short a was pronounced by Pâñjî. This letter is pronounced in South India like the u of ' but ' when accented and like the shortened form of the e in ' her ' when unaccented. In Northern India when it is unaccented it loses all individuality and practically vanishes. In Bengal and Orissa, the accented a approximates to o. In which of these ways did Pâñjî intend the saṅkīrītā a to be made? This is a question difficult to answer. And then there is the further question, whether these different pronunciations of a are far off reminiscences of the fact that Sanskrit a represents Indo-Germanic a, e, and o. Again in modern Hindi we certainly hear short e and short o. Whence come these sounds?

It is fairly well-known that the Hindus are divided into two great groups, the four Gaṇḍas and the five Drāvīḍas. These groups are distinguished from each other, firstly by the fact that the Brahmins of the former group eat fish and the flesh of " five five-nailed " animals, and those of the latter do not, and secondly by the fact that the Drāvīḍas pronounce q and τ as sh and y, and that the Gaṇḍas in many cases pronounce them kh and j. Thus when they begin words or syllables, there are invariably kh and j; janus, jamunā, khat, pānkara, y in the middle of a syllable is y as in syād; sh when it is the first part of a conjunct consonant is sometimes attempted to be pronounced, and then it approximates to s, thus shashṭi becomes khaṣṭi. n, the nasal of ch-series is pronounced alike throughout India, when it preceded ch or j, but when it succeeds j as in the words yogin or jīvāna, it is pronounced differently in different parts of India. The Tamil has in his own tongue a distinct n sound, occurring by itself in words, e. g., nā śūru but it cannot be easily pronounced after j, so he pronounces these words as yōgīn, jīvāna. The North Indian makes the first word jagya and the second gyāna; the Maratha makes the former yadhya.

As regards sibilants, there are four sounds, the English s, the Tamil š, the English sh, and the Indian sh sounds, all made by the friction of air passing between the palate, beginning from behind the teeth and gradually receding to the mid palate. There is no difficulty with regard to the first of these sounds. The second is the sound made in South India and the third in North India when reading q. Seeing that Pâñjî was a Sindhī, it is probable that he followed the modern North Indian practice. South Indians claim that their pronunciation of this letter is the proper one, but there is no shadow of evidence to prove this, though when a South Indian speaks Sanskrit, the ear can much more readily detect the difference between q and k. But this is perhaps due to the fact that to the South Indian, Sanskrit is absolutely a foreign language, his mother tongue belonging to the Dravīḍan family and he is therefore plus royaliste que le roi. With regard to the last of these sounds, too, there is a difficulty. The Drāvīḍa makes the sound by doubling the tongue, and contacting the blade with the middle of the palate. The Gaṇḍa makes a sh of it. Where the South Indian reads tukhāra, the Gaṇḍa reads tukhārā. The Gaṇḍa and not the Drāvīḍa has spoken Sanskrit languages continuously from the beginning of the historic age in India, and hence his pronunciation must be regarded as the genuine Sanskrit pronunciation and the Drāvīḍa one but a modification of it by a foreign tribe attempting to acquire it. The main language of Afghanistan is Pashto in its S. W. parts and Pakhto in the N. E. Here we have again the Drāvīḍa-Gaṇḍa difference. The S. W. sh may be due to the proximity of a Dravidian language, the Brāhū. It is to be noted that Herodotus speaks of them Putktes and the Rig Veda refers to them as Pakthas. Apparently Pakhto was the ancient form and Pashto a recent one. This fact renders it probable that q was kh in Sanskrit till the Drāvīḍas made it into sh. This view will react on the discussion of certain problems of linguistic science. Collitz derives kehot from a root kehī and kekayatī and kekhīnāti, both from a root gheshet. But it is a disputed question whether the Indo-Germanic had a sh sound. If, as with the Gaṇḍas, Sanskrit q is really kh and keh is really kkh and if q developed from Indo-Germanic k ought to be pronounced sh, the above disputed question ought to be discussed in the light of this. As an example of a miś-
take due to the ignorance of the Gauḍa pronunciation of Sanskrit, I may mention that such a scholar as Bloomfield in his *Religion of the Veda*, p. 54, speaking of the Persian translation of the Upaniṣadās made for Ḍāma, says that “the Persian pronunciation of the word ‘uṇanāśad’ is ‘uṇanāka’”, whereas it is the Gauḍa pronunciation. Idg. *seeks* became Skt. ध्र, which Gauḍas pronounce *khashā*; Idg. *shwebh* became ध्र, which Gauḍas make *khubh*. In this connection it must be remembered that Idg. *sw* in some cases becomes *s* in Sanskrit and *kh(w)* in Persian; thus the Persian analogue for *seclas* is *kh(w)jag*, for *rasar* is *kh(w)ad bar*, and for *sakaras* is *khak*. Curiously enough Idg. *kw* when fronted by the influence of front vowels becomes *s* in Persian, corresponding to Skt. *j*; thus Idg. *kweit*, Skt. ज्वते, Pers. safīd. Hence the history of Skt. ध्र ought to be reconsidered in the light of these facts.

Scientific conclusions on the gradual changes of Sanskrit sounds are vitiated by four facts, (1) Maharāṣṭras have been the main teachers of Sanskrit Grammar for the past two centuries or more and have imposed their Drāviḍa pronunciation on Sanskrit; and European Scholars have on that account not given the Gauḍa pronunciation its dues. (2) The Gauḍas of Benares have for a long time been under the influence of these Maharāṣṭras and their own pronunciation to-day is a very mixed one. (3) Sanskrit was never the spoken language of the people; it was the *Sanskrita*, the literary, conventionalized form of the language of the people, first of the Indus valley, then of the Madhyadeśa, and lastly of Magadha and perhaps also of the Marāṭha country, before it became finally fixed in its present highly artificial form, dunned of syntax, divested of idioms, eminently suited to be the language of scholars, but unfitted to act as a means of registering the changing sounds of a living language. (4) The linguistic survey of Northern India has been conducted by gentlemen without a training in phonetics, and their enquiry has been to some extent vitiated by a belief that Sanskrit is the norm and the languages as spoken are corruptions of the *Sanskrita* *bhāsā*.

My object is not to solve these problems, but merely to prove that the Sanskrit alphabet is not devoid of perplexing difficulties, nor is Sanskrit pronunciation an invariable fixed thing as people usually suppose. To one who knows the facts of the case and is not blinded by prejudice, it is as full of difficulties, as full of variations, as any other language.

*SANTIDEVA.*

*BY MAHMAMHOPADHYAYA HARAFLASAD SASTRI, M.A., C.I.E.; CALCUTTA.*

*SANTIDEVA* is a great name in the later Mahāyāna literature. He is credited with the authorship of three works: (1) Bodhicharyāvatāra, (2) Sīkha-Samuchchaya and (3) Sūtra-Samuchchaya (See *Śikṣā-samuchchaya* of Bendall, *Introduction*, page IV., on the authority of Tārāśānta). Sūtra-Samuchchaya has not yet been found. But there is ample evidence that this was also written by Santideva, as will be found in the sequel.

*Bodhicharyāvatāra* has been several times published and even translated into English. It was first published by Professor Minnet in the eighties. Then it was published in the *Journal of the Buddhist Text Society* by me. I had the advantage of collating a beautiful palm-leaf manuscript belonging to the Hodgson Collection; in the Library of the Asiatic Society of Bengal. In 1893 I acquired a copy of the *Pāṭīkā* commentary of the work by Prajñākaramati. The manuscript was copied in the year 1078 A.D. in Newari character. The copyist’s name is not given. But he describes the commentator Prajñākaramati as his ādaśa, from which it may be inferred that he was a disciple of the monk Prajñākaramati who was a well-known scholar of the Vikramāditya-vihāra (See M. M. Satīs Chandra Vidyābhushana’s *Indian Logic, Medieval School*, page 151) and flourished about the beginning of the 11th century. Another
manuscript in Maithili character of the commentary running over the *Prajñāpāramitā* chapter only was also acquired at the same time. Professor De la Vallée Poussin has very nearly completed an edition of the text and the commentary in the *Bibliotheca Indica* Series. The commentary is a store-house of information about the later Mahāyāna School.

The *Śānkanādānābha* was edited in the *Bibliotheca Buddhica* Series of St. Petersburg by the late lamented Professor Bendall of Cambridge in 1902. He has enriched his edition with the meanings of the rare Buddhist words in English in the form of an index, and in the introduction he discusses the age of the work and the genesis of the passages quoted in the work. In the work Śāntideva rarely speaks himself, but quotes from a very large number of authoritative works. His *Bodhicaryāvatāra* is written in beautiful Sanskrit, very rarely tinged with Buddhistic license. The versification throughout is exceedingly musical. Śāntideva wrote at a time when Chinese scholars ceased to come to India. So it was at first thought that his works were not translated into Chinese. But my friend Professor Ohmiya of Tokio writes to me that he has discovered in Nanjio's catalogue of the *Tripitakas*, a work which appears to be a different version of the *Bodhicaryāvatāra*.

Recently three palm-leaves were acquired by me, being No. 9990 of the Government Collection of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, which gives a legendary account of Śāntideva's life. The leaves were written in the 14th century Newār hand at Kathmandu. It represents Śāntideva to have been the son of a Rājā. But unfortunately the name of the capital of the Rājā has been so completely effaced that with all my efforts I could not make out anything of it. The name of his father is Mañjuvarma. (Tārānātha says that Śāntideva was the son of a Rājā of Surākshā. See Introduction of *Śānkanādānābha* of Bendall, page 3. But Tārānātha was later than these leaves, on which my paper is based.) At the time of his installation as *Yuddhāṇa*, his mother pointed out to him that kingship led only to sin. "You better go," said his mother, "where Buddhas and Bodhisattvas are to be found. If you go to the place of Mañjuvarma, you will prosper spiritually". He rode on a green horse and left his father's country. He was so intent on his journey that he forgot to eat and drink for several days. In the thick of the forest a handsome girl caught hold of his horse and made him descend from it. She gave him good water to drink, and roasted goat-meat to eat. She introduced herself as a disciple of Mañju-varma. This pleased Śāntideva greatly. For his mission was to become a disciple of the same *Guru*. He stopped with the *Guru* for 12 years, and obtained the knowledge of Mañjuvarma. After the completion of his education the *Guru* ordered him to go to Madhyadēśa. And there he became a rāta, viz., a military officer assuming the name of Acharāsena. He had a sword made of *devadāru* wood, and he soon became a favourite with the king, so much so that other officers grew jealous of him. They represented to the king that this man had a sword made of *devadāru* wood. How could he then serve his master as a soldier in times of war? The king wanted to inspect the swords of all his officers. Acharāsena represented that his sword should not be seen. But the king insisted, and he agreed to show his sword to the king in private after covering one of his eyes. As soon as the king saw the sword his eye fell on the ground. The king was surprised and pleased. But Acharāsena threw his sword on a stone, went to Nālandā, changed his dress and renounced the world. There he got the name of Śāntideva on account of his calmness. He heard the three *Pitākas*, and practised meditation. He got another name too, Bhusuku, because

Sometime after the young folk of Nālandā became curious to test his knowledge. It was the custom at Nālandā to hold recitations every year in the month of *Jyaiśṭha* in waxing moon.
They pressed upon him to give a recitation. There was an extensive Dharmaśālā to the North-east of the great Vihāra at Nālana. In that Dharmaśālā all the pandits were assembled and Sāntideva was raised to the śīlāsadana. He at once asked

किंचित् परमाणुपर्यं तथा द्विप्रमाणणम् वाच्यं चौधरीकितोऽस्मिन् गो-

ज्ञानं च। नमो नामस्मिन्नम्बेदितरत्नम् इत्यादिकम् सुभाषितत्वादि

विवेकस्तूतः ग्रंथिनिवर्तमानं यथा।

तत्साहं स्वरूपोपूर्णम् वृद्ध्यं यथासंवर्धितम् प्रस्तुतं इत्यतः।

The pandits became curious, and asked him to recite a work that may be Arthārātā. He resolved in his mind which of the three works, Sūtra-samuchchaya, Śikṣā-samuchchaya and Bodhicharyāvalī, to recite. And he gave preference to the Bodhicharyāvalī, and began to read:

गुणार्थ समिक्षणः सभ्यमश्चत्तमां प्रारम्भिकाृत्तत्निषेधम् वन्यान।

तुरोद्वश्यमर्यादात्तरां कथितविद्यानि

वेयागरण विद्वान।

But when he came to recite the verse—

कस्म न नात्त्व नामानि मते सन्तितेऽतुः

लक्षणविद्यावेतः तिरिक्ष्य॥ प्रमाणवाति॥

the Lord appeared before him and took him to Heaven. The pandits were surprised, searched his Pādhu-kūṭa, viz., a student's cottage, a thatched room 17' by 18' and there they found the three works Sūtra-samuchchaya and others, which they published to the world.

This is the legendary account of Sāntideva's life given in those three palm-leaves. From this we come to know that Sāntideva was a monk at Nālana, that he had a kust there, that he was called Bhusuku, and that he was the author of the three works mentioned above.

Reading through Śikṣā-samuchchaya and Bodhicharyā, we find that he was a Mahāyānist of the Mādhyamika School. Professor Bendall thinks that Sāntideva's Sanskrit works are not altogether free from Tāntrika Buddhism. But from the Catalogue Da Fonds Tibétain by P. Cordier, Deuxième Partie, page 140, we learn that Sāntideva is the author of a Tāntrika Buddhist work entitled भृगास्मानवसंतीतोण्डपिपारितः: From a palm-leaf manuscript of भृगास्मानवसंतीतोण्डपिपारितः: in the Durbar Library of Nepal, we learn that to Bhusuku are attributed several works of the Vajrayāna schools, viz., the school of the secret and mystic worship of the later Buddhists. I have discovered several songs on the same subject in Bengali attributed to Bhusuku. One of the songs declares him distinctly to have been a Bengali.

48 रामायाणी—

वाज्यतात्त्विनम्

वाज्यवान परस्पर भाषायो भाषित।

चुऱश्व झुकानेौ खड़ा लुढ़कौ।

चाचित झुकानेत्तभ्रान्ति—

नामयं वायुवाद्यानेत्योऽस्मिन्

शास्त्रोपयोगी तमां ग्रामिन लेखितै।

भाष्यवल्लभानेत्त सुगुरुसर्वशक्तीपानेत्त वैभवनाथानन्दो अभिभाषित

इति भार्त्तर्म रामायाणी।

Though the name of his father's capital could not be read in the palm-leaves, it seems that the city was in Bengal. Sāntideva rode into the jungles of Terai where Mahāvajra-rāmdāki, his Guru, had a tapasana similar to that of Divākara in Harṣchārītā. The Guru asked him to go to Madhyadeśa in which term Hiuen Sthang included Magadha and which the Nepalese still use in the corrupted form, Madress, in the same sense. Bengal is beyond Madhyadeśa. So Mahāvajra would be justified in asking a Bengali to go to Madhyadeśa.
As to the age of Sántideva, written as Jayadeva, by mistake, on page 106 of Cambridge Catalogue of Professor Bendall, while treating of Śīkṣād-samuchchaya, it is stated that the work was compiled by Jayadeva in or about the 7th century A.D. But he reconsiders his position in his introduction to the Śīkṣād-samuchchaya, and puts him down between the death of Śrīharsha, in 648 and the translation of the work under the celebrated Tibetan king Khri-Ido-ren-btan, who reigned 816-838 A.D. If so, the Bengali songs attributed to Bhusuku would be as old as the 7th century though the songs belong to the Sahajā School of Buddhism, which seems to have branched out from Vajrāyāna or may be identical with it.

It may not be out of place to mention here how unhistorical Indian pañjītas became in the middle ages. In the Durbar Library, Nepal, there is a manuscript entitled Bodhicharyavatārānāma, which is nothing else than the Bodhicharyād itself with a few verses added at the beginning and at the end. The prologue and the epilogue make the Bodhicharyādpatāra a dialogue between Aśoka and his Guru Upagupta.

It may be argued that Sántideva, the author of Mahāyāna works, and Sántideva, the composer of Sahajā songs, under the name of Bhusuku may not be one and the same person. But this doubt is set at rest by the signature of one of the songs attributed to Bhusuku. The signature runs:

श्यात राजक दत्त मुखुलाधि रायानां साधसाधित ||
जागरूकमाधि साधकृत युथसुभाषण ||

In this signature Bhusuku calls himself a raudta, and we know from the palm-leaves that Sántideva served as a raudta in Magadha.

I have a mind to say more on the subject when I publish the old Bengali songs on Buddhism. Wassiljew, following Tārānātha, thinks that there were Buddhist works in an Apabhraṃsa language. In our joint expedition to Nepal in 1898-99 Professor Bendall and myself got a work entitled Subhadhitas-viṣṇugrahā. Professor Bendall has published the book. It contains some quotations in that Apabhraṃsa language. But in my last journey to Nepal in 1907 I found several works in that language which after a careful study I am inclined to call old Bengali. It is undoubtedly the language spoken in Eastern India in 7th, 8th and 9th centuries, in which these books were composed.

### MISCELLANEA.

**A POEM BY BHĀSA.**

PAṆḌIT T. Gaṇapati Sāstri of Travancore has laid all lovers of Sanskrit literature under a deep debt of gratitude by his discovery of twelve or rather thirteen of the dramas of the almost forgotten poet Bhāsa, who is known to have preceded Kālidāsa. Three of these he has edited in the Trivandrum Sanskrit Series.

I beg to draw the attention of scholars to a khāyā or epic poem by the same poet. It is referred to in the Prīthvīrauj-vijaya mahākāyasa, also called Prīthvī-mahendravijaya. I quote from a manuscript in the possession of P. Gaurishankar H. Ojha, copied from the one in the Deccan College Library.
From this we learn that Visnudharma (plural) was a kīrṣya of Bāhasā and it was put in the fire for being tested. The commentator, Janardana (son of Bāḥṣya Nārāyaṇa, son of Lōlārāja) who commented on the Kirālīkārya and Śīkāntaka-charita also, calls Bāha a muni, and says that he and Vyāsa were rivals and one work of each was thrown into the fire, which, as a referee, did not consume the excellent work of Bāha named Visnudharma. It is not said whether the work of Vyāsa escaped unhurt. The submission of the works of Bāha to the ordeal by fire is alluded to by Rājaśekhara in Jāhna's Śāktimuktāvalī in the verse—


where chhekai should be taken to mean vidyadhāra (critic), and where the surviving work of outstanding merit is said to be Ścapna-Vidhavādatta, and not Visnudharma. The epithet jālana-mittra (jusplana-mitra=friend of fire) applied to Bāha in Gauḍavāla (v. 800) refers, I think, to this episode in the poet's life rather than to an incident in the play (of Ścapna-Vidhavādatta) as is said by M. Sylvin Lévi. Testing the qualities of a drama or a poem by its combustibility or otherwise is indeed quaint. In his Prabandhakosa, Rājaśekhara-sūri alludes to the custom of authors taking their new books to Kashmir where the works were examined by Pāchis and placed in the hands of Bārati or Sarasvatī, who sat on a throne. If the work was of merit, the goddess nodded in approval and flowers were showered upon the poet; if not, it was thrown to the ground.

Thus there was a tradition in the 12th century of a kīrṣya named Visnudharma (plural) of great excellence by Bāha. The fact that Bāha is called muni and a rival of Vyāsa, and the possibility that Visnudharmaṇḍottara, one of the Purāṇas going under the authorship of Vyāsa, looks like the name-sake and counterpart of the lost Visnudharma by Bāha, would, no doubt, be very gratifying to Pāchit Gaṅapati Sāstrī, who, carried away by the enthusiasm of his discovery, the importance of which be it far from me to underrate, makes Bāha anterior to Kaṭūṭyā Chīkṣaka and Pāchini. I shall discuss his case for this assumption in another note. But those who are not prepared to accept Vyāsa and Bāha as contemporaries, would admit that, in the 12th century and thereafter, tradition remembered them as rivals of almost equal eminence and remembered a kīrṣya by the latter named Visnudharma.

Chandrādhan Guleri.

Maya College, Ajmer.

[There are two works of the name of Visnudharma or Visnudharmottara, of which one, according to Bāhler, is as old as A.D. 500 (ante, Vol. XIX, p. 408). Both professing to be Purāṇas, one was naturally attributed to Vyāsa, who is supposed to be the author of all Purāṇas. As it is inconceivable that one author can compose two different works bearing one and the same name, the other Visnudharma appears to have been hoisted upon Bāha. A rivalry was accordingly imagined to have sprung up between him and Vyāsa, and the tradition about the ordeal of fire which originally pertained to Ścapna-Vidhavādatta was transferred to Visnudharma.]

D. R. B.

Sankarāchārya and Balavarma

In a note on page 200 of this Journal for 1912, Mr. D. R. Bhandarkar has made an attempt to fix more accurately the date of Sankarāchārya. His attempt is based on the occurrence of the name Balavarma in Sankarāchārya's commentary on the Vedaṇīdīrājas, once under Sātra IV. 3, 5 and once under Sātra II. 4, 1. A Chāluksya chief of the name of Balavarma is mentioned in the Kājaba plates of A.D. 812 as the grandfather of Vimalāditya, who was the governor of the Kunungil district when the plates were issued. The period of this Balavarma would thus be roughly, the last quarter of the 8th century. Hitherto this was the only inscription in which the name Balavarma was found to occur. But I have recently discovered three vīragals in Hirigundagal and Sankānhalli, Tumkur Taluk, which tell us that Balavemmarasa waged a war against the Gangas during the rule of the Gangā king Śivamāra. As the period of the latter is also about the close of the 8th century, there cannot be much doubt about the identity of the Balavemmarasa of the vīragals with the Balavarma of the Kājaba plates. Balavarma's name also occurs in Muddagiri 93 and Tiptur 10, both of which, though undated, probably belong to the close of the 8th century. As all the above inscriptions are found in the Tumkur district, there can be no doubt as to the identity of the Kunungil or Kunungil of the Kājaba plates with the modern Kunigal of the

1 Chāka is a Pāli word meaning skilful, expert, vide Childers' Dictionary sub voc.—D. R. B.
2 Epi. Car., XII, Gubbi, 61 ; Epi. Ind., IV, 332.
3 See Mysore Archaological Report for 1916, para. 53.
same district. The Tamil inscriptions of the Chola and Hoysala periods in Kunigal Taluk, which invariably give the name as Kupungil, also support the above identification. Consequently the identification of Kunigal with the Kunikalvishaya of the Hoysag grant of Ambēra is no longer tenable. After the overthrow of the Chalukya power, Balavarman may have become a feudatory of the Rashtrakutas and fought on their behalf against the Gaṅgas. Several stūpas newly discovered in Tamkur Taluk refer to the wars between the Gaṅga kings Sripurusha and Sivamara and the Rashtrakutas, one of them giving us the important information that Sivamara fell fighting in a battle at Kāpīsmogayūr against Vallaha, i.e., the Rashtrakūta king (Govinda III).

There can thus be no doubt about the existence of a prince of the name of Balavarman at the close of the 8th century. And his period being about the same as that generally assigned to Śankarachāryya, the attempt on the part of scholars to identify him with the one alluded to by the latter in his commentary can by no means be pronounced unreasonable. On reading my Archaeological Report for 1910, Mahāthāpanitya Harṣaprabha Sastri, M.A., in a kind letter dated the 1st of May 1911, wrote to me thus:—"The date of Śankarachāryya has not yet been proved by any positive fact. In your Report you speak of a Balavarman in about A.D. 812, i.e., about the time when Śankarachāryya flourished; and he mentions in his Bhāṣṭrīya IV., 3, 4 of Balavarman as being near to him. May not this be a positive proof of Śankarachāryya's date?" And in the note under reference Mr. D. R. Bhandarkar has likewise based his conclusions on the same identification. It is possible that the identification is correct. There are, however, a few other circumstances which cannot well be ignored in this connection. Balavarman is not the only prince mentioned by Śankarachāryya. He mentions several others, e.g., under Sūtra IV., 3, 5 Jayasimha and Kṛishṇaguṭa along with Balavarman; under Sūtra II., 1, 17 Pūrṇavarman. In case Balavarman is taken to be his contemporary, it stands to reason that the others also should be treated as such. It is not reasonable to single out one of the names to base our arguments on and completely ignore the others. Identifying the Pūrṇavarman of Śankarachāryya with the Western Maṇḍha king of the same name, the late Mr. Telang came to the conclusion that Śankarachāryya flourished at about A.D. 600. With regard to the other kings mentioned above, we know of a Kṛishṇaguṭa, the first king of the Gupta dynasty of Maṇḍha, who ruled at about A.D. 650; of a Jayasimha of the Chalukya dynasty whose period is also about A.D. 500; and of another Jayasimha (Jayasimha II) among the Eastern Chalukyas, whose date is about A.D. 700. There is nothing to prevent us from identifying the kings alluded to in Śankarachāryya's commentary with those mentioned above. But none of them was his contemporary, if the date generally assigned to him is to be accepted. In these circumstances one may well be excused if one holds the opinion that the identification in the case of Balavarman is as much open to question as in the case of the others and that the synchronism based on it is purely accidental. It looks as if one out of several names had been purposely seized upon to the exclusion of the others in order to secure support for a favourite theory. When epigraphical or other evidence becomes available to prove the contemporaneity of the kings referred to with Śankarachāryya, the argument from the synchronism of Balavarman will be perfectly legitimate. Till then the names have perhaps to be looked upon as connoting imaginary persons like the words Dēvadatta and Yajñādatta or the letters A, B and C.

R. NARASIMHACHAR.

Bangalore.

[I have no doubt that my identification of Śankarachārya's Balavarman is correct. For, as shown by me, his grandson Vimalaḍītīya can alone answer to the description of the contemporary prince given by Śankarachārya's pupil's pupil, Prajñātātman. This receives additional confirmation from the fact that it agrees with the date of the philosopher arrived at by Prof. Pathak on irrefragible evidence. It is true that Śankarachārya speaks of other kings also, e.g., Jayasimha and Kṛishṇaguṭa. But their names can have no weight so long as synchronisms of their sons or grandsons with the philosopher's pupils or pupil's pupils are not established.—D. R. B.]

---

* Vid. Kunigal 2, 14 and 18.
* Epi. Ind., IV., 337.
* Antr., XIII 95.
BOOK-NOTICE.

THE MAHĀVAMSĀ OR THE GREAT CHRONICLE OF CEYLON. Translated into English by WILHELM GEIGER, Ph.D., Professor of Indo-Germanic Philology at Erlangen University, assisted by MARZI HAYNES BONE, Ph.D., Lecturer on Pāli at University College, London. Demy 8vo: pp. lxiv, 300; with a map of Ancient Ceylon. Published for the Pāli Text Society by Henry Frowde; London: 1912.

[Reprinted, by permission, from the J. R. A. S., 1913, p. 1110 f.]

Professor Geiger gave us in 1908 his critical edition of the text of the Original Mahāvamsa; that is, of chapters 1 to 36 and verses 1 to 50 of chapter 37 of the whole work, being that portion which was written to rearrange, expand, and explain the Dīpavamsa (see p. 11 of the introduction to the translation). He has now followed that up by his translation of the text, published in English through the co-operation of Mrs. Bode: Professor Geiger made his translation in German; Mrs. Bode turned his translation into English; and the English rendering was then revised by Professor Geiger: we may congratulate both collaborators on the result. As is well known, the text of the Dīpavamsa, with an English translation, was given by Professor Oldenberg in 1879. We are now at last provided with reliable and easy means of studying both the great Ceylonese Buddhist chronicles.

[1111] Professor Geiger’s translation is preceded by an introduction of 63 pages, in eleven sections, in which he has discussed a variety of important points.

In the first place, he has briefly recapitulated the demonstration given in his Dīpavamsa and Mahāvamsa (1908) that the two chronicles were based on an older work, known as the Aṭṭhakaṭṭhā-Mahāvamsa, which must have come down originally to only the arrival of Mahendra in Ceylon (in the time of Asoka), but was afterwards continued to the reign of Mahāsena first half of the fourth century A.D.).

In the second place, Professor Geiger, defending the two chronicles against what he has justly described (p. 14) as “undeserved distrust and exaggerated scepticism,” has shown that they are to be accepted safely as reliable historical records, with a framework of well-established dates. We have, indeed, to clear away from them a certain amount of miraculous matter. But they do not stand alone among ancient histories in presenting such matter. And when we have made the necessary elimination, which is not difficult, there remains, easily recognizable, a residue of matter-of-fact statements, in respect of which the chronicles have already been found to be supported by external evidence to such an extent that we need not hesitate about accepting others of their assertions, which, though perhaps we cannot as yet confirm them in the same way, present nothing which is at all startling and naturally incredible.

In dealing with the chronology, Professor Geiger has accepted B.C. 483 as “the probable year” of the death of Buddha (p. 24). That particular year is undoubtedly the best result that we have attained, and that we are likely to attain unless we can make some new discovery giving us the absolute certainty which we do not possess. For a brief statement of the manner in which it is fixed, see p. 239 above: Professor Geiger has added observations of [1112] his own (pp. 26, 28-30), based on something pointed out by Mr. Wickramasinghe, endorsing it. As regards one item in the process by which it is fixed, the interval of 218 years from the death of Buddha to the anointment of Asoka “is supported,” as Professor Geiger has said (p. 25), “by the best testimony and has nothing in it to call for suspicion.” As regards another item, we need not hesitate about accepting 28 years according to the two Ceylonese chronicles, against the 25 years of the Purāṇas, as the true length (in round numbers) of the reign of Bindusara. This last consideration, we may add, entails placing the anointment of Asoka in B.C. 265 or 264 (p. 27): if that should still remain unwelcome to anyone who, taking one item from one source and the other from another source, would place both the death and the anointment four or five years earlier.—well, it can be shown on some other occasion that there is nothing opposed to B.C. 265 or 264, for the anointment of Asoka, in the mention of certain foreign kings in the thirteenth rock-edict. So, also, though the matter does not affect that point we may safely follow the 27 years of the two chronicles, against the 36 years of the Purāṇas, as the length (in round numbers) of the reign of Asoka.
Professor Geiger hesitates (p. 28) to accept the “bold and seductive combination” by which I explain the mention of 256 nights in the record of Asoka at Sahasram, Rupnath, Brahmagiri, and other places. In what way, then, is it to be explained? As regards the other two explanations which have been advanced, there is nothing in the calendar to account for the selection of that particular number of nights or days; and a tour of such a length by Asoka, while reigning, whether made by him actually as king or in the character of a wandering mendicant monk, is out of the question. On the other hand, my explanation—that the 256 nights mark 256 years elapsed since the death of Buddha—is suggested exactly by the [1113] number of years established by the Dipavamsha and the Mahavamsha from that event to the end of Asoka’s reign, and by the well-established practice of ancient Indian kings, of abdicating in order to pass into religious retirement: see this Journal, 1911. 109 ff. My explanation may be set aside; but it has not been shown to be open to adverse criticism as the others are.

In respect of the later Buddhist reckoning, the erroneous one, now current, which would place the death of Buddha in B.C. 544, Professor Geiger, putting Mr. Wickremasinghe’s remarks in a clearer light, has shown (p. 29) that it existed in Ceylon in the middle of the eleventh century A.D. This carries it back there to more than a century before the time at which I arrived in this Journal, 1909. 333.

In § 8 of the introduction, Professor Geiger has given (p. 36) a tabulated list of the ancient kings of Ceylon, down to Mahasena, on the lines of the list given by me in this Journal, 1909. 359, but with some improvements. His table has the advantage of giving the references by chapter and verse to his text of the Mahavamsha; a detail which, for reasons stated at the time, I was not able to fill in. It increases the total period according to the Mahavamsha by 1 year, 4 months, 15 days, by alterations under Nos. 10 and 11 (plus 2 years) and No. 17 (minus 7 months, 15 days); these are due to improved readings. And it includes two additional columns, which give the chronology in terms of the Buddhist era of B.C. 483 and of the Christian reckonings B.C. and A.D.

As regards a remark on p. 39–40, there is no need to accept the assumption that Samudragupta began to reign in A.D. 326: a more reasonable date is A.D. 335 or 340: see this Journal, 1909. 342.

The last section of the introduction (pp. 51–63) deals with the first, second, and third Buddhist Councils, all of which are shown to be historical events, and clears away the confusion in the Indian tradition between two [1114] distinct persons, Kalaasoka and Dharmasoka, son of Bindusara, the Asoka who issued the edicts. Appendix D gives a list of Pali terms used in the translation without being turned into English. Under No. 34 there is quoted a statement that, according to the details given in a table of the end of the twelfth century, the yojana works out, for Ceylon, to between 12 and 12⅓ miles, but that in actual practice it must have been reckoned from 7 to 8 miles. This latter value, however, is quite an imaginary one: see this Journal, 1907. 655. And as regards early times there is no reason for discriminating between India and Ceylon in this matter; and for India we have (1) the vague day’s-march yojana, averaging 12 miles, but liable to vary according to the circumstances of the particular march, and, in the way of yojanas of fixed unvarying lengths, (2) the long yojana of 32,000 hasta=9 miles, and (3) the short yojana of 16,000 hasta=4½ miles; the last being specially favoured by the Buddhists: see p. 235 above, and this Journal, 1906. 1011.

Limitation of space prevents any further remarks. I conclude by expressing the hope that some Pali scholar will give us shortly the technical review of Professor Geiger’s translation which it merits.

J. F. Fleet.

1. There is an accidental slip on p. 60, last line but one, where Dharmasoka is spoken of as the son of Chandragupta: read ‘grandson.’
SOME PUBLISHED INSCRIPTIONS RECONSIDERED.

BY D. B. BHANDARKAR, M.A.; POONA.

1—Harsha stone inscription of Vigrahārāja.

The inscription, of which a transcript is given below, is engraved on a large slab of black stone, which lies in the porch of the temple of what is known as purēṇa Mahādeva on a hill near the village Haras situated in the Sīkhar princely state of the Sakhavati province, Jaipur State. The record was last published by Prof. Kiellhorn in the Epigraphia Indica, Vol. II, p. 116 ff. But as he had no local knowledge of the place, he fell into some inaccuracies. Besides, many inscriptions have since been discovered, which throw a new light on some of the verses contained in this record. No excuse is, therefore, needed for re-editing it.

The record contains forty lines of writing which cover a space of about 2' 11" broad by 2' 10" high. The corners have been knocked off a little, and the right and left margins slightly damaged. A few letters have also peeled off in the body of the inscription. Still the inscription is on the whole fairly well-preserved. The characters belong to the northern class of alphabet, that was prevalent in the 10th century. Attention may be drawn in this connection to (1) the single instance of the character २ employed in भविष्यवाह क इ 1.2; (2) the initial ॐ in अवारस (न) 2.2; (3) the subscriptus in म 3.29; and (4) प in लिंगरापो 1.7.

The language is Sanskrit, and the inscription, excepting a few short lines in prose, is in verse to nearly the end of line 33. The remaining portion, excepting the closing benedictory verse, is in prose. In respect of orthography, it is sufficient to note (1) that ॐ is throughout doubled in conjunction with a preceding ॐ, except in स्वरा-क्षमा 1.30; (2) the same letter is invariably doubled after a vowel in conjunction with a following ॐ; (3) the sign for ॐ is also used for ॐ except once in 1.2; (4) a single ॐ is employed twice instead of ॐ in उपालाः 1.16 and विश्व्हरा-ज़ा 3.2; (5) the dental s is substituted for the palatal श, in अवारस 1.22, and in चन्द्रन्विका, 1.29; (6) the dental nasal is used instead of अनुन्नद्रा in ध्वन्न, 1.22, and (7) in conjunction with a following letter of the dental class, in सन्नय्य 1.16 and in खराणम = तथाद, 1.28; and (8) the dental अ has wrongly been changed to the lingual न in प्रसादाः 1.16, and incorrectly retained in मिर्मद्वैद, 1.17. As regards lexicography, the following words may be noticed as being rare or unusual: (1) निरुद्धाश, l. 33 in the sense of 'until'; (2) ॐ, l. 33, meaning a guide (for this word see Ep. Ind., Vol. I, p. 187, l. 8; and Vol. XI, p. 48); (3) कुङ्का, l. 38, corresponding to the Marathi word कुंका, a measure of capacity, and (4) हेद्दवका, l. 38, equivalent to हेद्दवक, as shown by Kiellhorn, and signifying a horse-dealer (cf. the Mitaksharā on Yājñavalkya, II. 30).

Verse 1 opens with an obeisance to the god Gajánana or Gaṇeśa. The next ten verses except one are devoted to the glorification of Siva, who was here worshipped under the name of Harshadeva. The exception is verse 9, which, we are told, was composed by one Śūra and which informs us that the hill also was called Harsha after the god. Verse 7 is important, for, if we read between the lines, it will be found to contain the information that there were two temples, dedicated to the god Harsha, one on this hill and the other down below.

Verse 12 describes what is the temple where the inscription lies was like, and as Prof. Kiellhorn's translation of it, owing to his lack of local knowledge, is not satisfactory, I give here mine: "Glorious is the mansion of the divine Harshadeva, which is charming with the expanse of its spacious hall (वर्गपत्र), exquisite with the splendour of a gold shell, (and) lovely in consequence of (the statues of) Viśaka and the sons of Pāṇḍu set up in the row of structures along (its) sides. Resembling (in height) the peak of Meru, it is pleasant on account of an excellent arched doorway (तोरंद-तर्क) and well-carved bull (Nandl), and is full of manifold objects of enjoyment." All the parts of the temple referred to in this verse can be traced among its ruins on
the hill. A long flight of stairs leads to the courtyard of this temple. Just where these stairs end are the shafts of two pairs of columns one in front of the other, which were no doubt once surmounted by a toranā and formed the archiel entrance, as stated in the verse. A little further on, on a raised terrace is an old marble image of Nandī, once no doubt placed in a pavilion, of which the plinth only has survived. This is unquestionably the bull referred to in the inscription. It also says that there were other structures on the sides of the temple, and that in one of them were the images of the Pāṇḍavas and Viśnugūḍha. That there were these structures is clearly proved by the ruins of the subsidiary shrines on the south and north-west. The images of Pāṇḍava also may be easily recognised in the ruins on the north-east. Here are six colossal images, which were originally, when whole and entire, as high as seven feet almost, and which are to this day said by the people to be those of the Pāṇḍava brothers and Draupadī. I do not know whether Viśnugūḍha stands here for the ogress Hiśimā. The figure here is, however, that of an ordinary woman, and not that of an ogress. But Hiśimā, it must be remembered, had changed herself into a beautiful woman and then married Bhīma. And the figure in question may represent Hiśimā when she had assumed this form.

Verses 13-27 celebrate a line of princes belonging to the Chāṇakā family. The first of these is—

1 Gūvaka I., who was famous as a hero in the assembly of the sovereign Nāgāvaloaka and built the temple of Harśadeva (v. 13). The temple of Harśadeva here alluded to is no doubt the one where the inscription stone was found, and the fact seems to be that this temple was originally constructed by Gūvaka I. and simply repaired and renovated by Allaṣa, as we shall see further on. In verse 17 Harśadeva is said to have been the family deity of the Chāṇakākṣa kings, and his temple could not, therefore, have been for the first time erected by Allaṣa so late as in the reign of Vigrahārāja. The prince Nāgāvaloaka, who was the overlord of Gūvaka, is, as I have shown elsewhere, to be identified with Nāgabhaṭa II. of the Imperial Pratihāra dynasty. Gūvaka's son was

2 Chandrārāja (v. 14); and his son
3 Gūvaka II. (v. 14); and his son
4 Chandana, who slew in battle the Tomara prince, Ruḍra2 (v. 14). His son was
5 VāKPatiśīrāja, who, if I have understood verse 16 properly, at first harassed the prince Tantrapāla because he was coming hungrily towards the Ananta province with the behests of his overlord. It appears that to check the haughtiness of Tantrapāla, VāKPatiśīrāja did not at first meet him. And Tantrapāla, with his flaged elephants, could not overtake VāKPati with his fleet horses, and so was struck with shame at not having been able to deliver his overlord's orders to him. But when Tantrapāla's haughtiness was curbed down, VāKPatiśīrāja met him and propitiated him. This verse also, like verse 9, was, we are informed, composed by Sūra. VāKPati's son and successor was

6 Simhārāja, who, according to verse 18, seems to have set up the gold shell (anādaka) of the spire of the temple no doubt referred to in verse 12 above. Verse 19 states that having subdued Saḷavaṇa, the Tomara leader,2a he captured and put to flight the princes that had gathered under his generalship. And these captured princes were kept in his prison till his overlord, who belonged to the family of Rāghu, did not come to his house in person to liberate them. We have seen above that Gūvaka was a feudatory of Nāgabhaṭa II. of the Imperial Pratihāra dynasty, and these Pratihāras continued to be supreme rulers till at least A.D. 950. Hence the overlord or overlords

1 Ante, Vol. XI., p. 239.
2 Prof. Kielhorn takes this name to be Ruḍraṇa. But I think it is natural to split it into two words: (1) Ruḍra and (2)ṇa, the first as the name of the Tomara king and the second as an adjective of bhūpa and thus corresponding exactly to prasāra which precedes śriṇa in v. 13.
2a Or it may be that he subdued the Tomara leader together with his accomplice Saḷavapāṇa, as Kielhorn takes it.
of Vākpati and Simhārāja could have been no other than princes of this dynasty, which, as we know from Rājasēkharā, belonged to the Raghun family. We have seen that Chandarā slew a Tomār king called Rudra and now we see that Simhārāja vanquished Sālavanā, the Tomār leader. It is difficult to say where these Tomāras had established themselves about this time. The north of the Jaipur State is divided into two great divisions, one called Tanūravāṭi and the other Sekhāvāṭi. Tanūravāṭi, which is to the east, is so named after the Rajput tribe Tanūr, the same as the Tomāra of the inscriptions. The Tomāra princes, mentioned in our epigraph, may be rulers of this province, but according to the local tradition, the Tanūrars were at first ruling at Delhi, and when they were ousted from there by the Chohāns, they migrated southward and settled themselves at Pāṭan in Tanūravāṭi. Simhārāja was succeeded by his son

7 Vigrahārāja, reigning at the time when the inscription was composed (v. 20-4). He made a grant of two villages, Chhatriadbārā and Sāmkaṭrāpaka, to the god Harshānātha (v. 25). He had a younger brother named Durlabhārāja (v. 26). It will be seen from the prose portion below that besides Durlabhārāja, Vigrahārāja had two more brothers, Chandrārāja and Govindārāja, and that he also had an uncle, named Vatsarāja, brother of Simhārāja.

The remainder of the verse portion of the inscription gives an account of the line of ascetics who were in charge of the temple of Harshānātha. In the country of Ananta there was a devoted worshipper of Utpalārāma named Viśvarūpa, who was a teacher of the Lākula doctrine expounding pācchārtha (v. 28). Viśvarūpa was thus an ascetic of the Lākula-Pāśupata sect. The word pācchārtha, which is here conjoined to the expression Lākulaṃdya, is a term technical to the philosophy of this sect and has been explained by Sāyaṇa in his Sarva-darśāna-saṅgṛaha in the section dealing with Lākula-pāśupata-darśana. Viśvarūpa's pupil was Purāṇa, a Pāśupata (v. 29), and the latter's disciple was Bhāvirakta alias Allāta who belonged to a Brāhmaṇa family of the Vārasaṅka khāmp (v. 30) and whose wordly (śāmārika), as opposed to spiritual, family was at Rāṇapallikā (v. 31), correctly identified by Prof. Kielborn with Rāṇoli, 7 miles east of Haras. Verse 32 likens Allāta to Nandā, and from the next two verses we learn that he built the temple of Harshānātha with the wealth received from the pious people. Allāta's pupil was Bhāvāyota, who with the orders of his preceptor completed the other works started but left unfinished by him probably on account of his death, such as raising an orchard for furnishing flowers to the Śiva temple, a watering place (prapūt) for cattle and a well for sprinkling the orchard and filling the prapūt. They were all made on the east side below the hill (vs. 36-40). He also paved the floor of the court in front of the Harsha temple (v. 42). It is worthy of note that the preceding verse uses the word digambara in describing him, just as verse 33 above calls Allāta digambara. Does it show that the members of the Lākula sect were naked? If they were, this would be in keeping with the fact that Lākulaśa is represented nude and called śāttiseśatra. Verses 43-44 inform us that the temple together with the hall and the arched gateway was constructed by the sūtraśātra Chaṇḍāsīra, son of Vṛtabhadra. The same thing is told in a short inscription of three lines on a piece of stone in the hall immediately in front of the sanctum.

The date of the building of the temple is the 13th of the bright half of Āśāhṛta of the [Vikrama] year 1013. This date has been specified to be yathā-sriśita or as the composer of the inscription learnt it. The sage Allāta is mentioned in verse 48 to have expired in the elapsed year 1027, when the sun had entered the sign of the Lion, on the third bright lunar day joined with the yogā Subha and the nākaḥatra Hastā, on a Monday.' This date, as calculated by Prof. Kielborn, corresponds to Monday the 8th August, A.D. 970.

From about the close of line 33 commences the prose portion, which records the endowments of the temple of Harshadeva as they were severally received up to the 15th of the bright half of
Ashadh of the Vikrama year 1030, which no doubt represents the date of the composition of this inscription, as Prof. Kiellhorn rightly thinks:—

The Mahārājugdaḥīraja Simharaja, having bathed in the Pushkara tirtha, granted the villages: (1) Simhagoshtha in the Tūnakūpaka group of twelve, his personal possession, (2-3) Traikalaakaka and Itanakūpaka in the Paṭavaddhaka viṣhayā and (4) Kaṇhapallikā in the Saralokotā viṣhayā: his brother Vatsaraṇa, the village Kardamakhāṭa in the Jayapura viṣhayā, his present possession; the king Vigrantarāja, the villages Chhatradhīrā and Sāmkaraṇaka referred to in verse 25: Simharaja’s other sons Chandrarāja and Govindrāja, one village (grāma), one hamlet (pallika), and two wards or localities of town (pātaka) from the Paṭavaddhaka and Darbhakakasha viṣhayās; Dhandukā, an official of the Simharaja’s, the village Mayūrapadra in the Khaṭṭakaṇṇa viṣhayā; and a certainJayantirāja, the village Kolikūpaka. Likewise, for the benefit of the temple, one viṇāopaka on every kāṭaka of salt at Ṣikāmbhar was assigned by the Bhamma gaul, and one dramma on every horse by horse-dealers of the north. Besides, fields were given by various pious people in the villages of Maddāpurikā, Nimbaṭṭikā, Marupallikā, Harsha and—kalavapadra.

Of the places mentioned in the list, Pushkara tirtha near Ajmer is well-known. Ṣikāmbhar is, of course, Sāmbhar, on the borders of the Jodhpur and Jaipur States and famous for its salt lake. Of the names of the provinces Tūnakūpaka is Tūṇū, Paṭavaddhaka Pātodā, and Darbhakakasha Dhākās—all in the Sikar principality. Khaṭṭakaṇṇa is obviously Khaṭṭ in Sāmbhar Nizamat, Jaipur State, and Sāmkaraṇaka Sargō in Maroj, Jodhpur. Jayapura is suggested by Kiellhorn to be the modern Jaipur. But this is impossible as this town was founded by Jaisintha II. in A.D. 1728. As regards the names of places, Simhagoshtha is Simbot, Itanakūpaka probably Dhanū, Kaṇhapallikā Kālpatī, Kolikūpaka Koliṇa, Maddāpurikā Madajāvra, Nimbaṭṭikā Nimādā both at the foot of the Haras hill and Marupallikā Maroj—all in the Sikar Chiefship.

Text.3

1. 

2. 

3. 

4. 

5. 

* From the original stone inscription.  
** Supply गणानन्द.  
*** Read बालकु.  
Read निजायार.  
* Restore it to सम्म or निजाप्र.  
* Read चन्द्रकु.  
* Read चन्द्रकु.
6

[  \[\text{13} \] पृष्ठ  

विभव देवासुभिमण्डप रुफिरकारार्थः समाधिः।
वर्षक्रमः[ या ]कमालाकारार्थः सकान्त आलवती नीलवति नः
शोभायो हवीणवीय लुपनविरचनमाणुजयारोपमेवः। [ [ 1 ]
मून्तः[ 10]कामिर्नवच्चुः शूः [रत्नः] पुरुषः।
Derived text: صفحه 6

7

[  \[\text{14} \] पृष्ठ  

रिचार्डसैंजः क्रस्मविद्यविधिः। युक्तवागोश्च यथै।
रिचार्डसैंजः [हस्ती] हस्तीविद्यविधिः। युक्तवागोश्च यथै।
दिवसकवि श्रीविद्यविधिः। काव्यम्। [ [ 7 ]

Derived text: صفحه 7

8

\[\text{12} \] बन्दुरकृत राजकीय वैचारिक परिवार -

प्राचीन राजकीय वैचारिक परिवार -

सदस्य विद्यविधिः। युक्तवागोश्च यथै।
हस्ती विद्यविधिः। युक्तवागोश्च यथै।
दिवसकवि श्रीविद्यविधिः। काव्यम्। [ [ 8 ]

Derived text: صفحه 8

9


d\[\text{12} \] बन्दुरकृत राजकीय वैचारिक परिवार -

प्राचीन राजकीय वैचारिक परिवार -

हस्ती विद्यविधिः। युक्तवागोश्च यथै।
दिवसकवि श्रीविद्यविधिः। काव्यम्। [ [ 9 ]

Derived text: صفحه 9

10


d\[\text{12} \] बन्दुरकृत राजकीय वैचारिक परिवार -

प्राचीन राजकीय वैचारिक परिवार -

हस्ती विद्यविधिः। युक्तवागोश्च यथै।
दिवसकवि श्रीविद्यविधिः। काव्यम्। [ [ 10 ]

Derived text: صفحه 10

11


d\[\text{12} \] बन्दुरकृत राजकीय वैचारिक परिवार -

प्राचीन राजकीय वैचारिक परिवार -

हस्ती विद्यविधिः। युक्तवागोश्च यथै।
दिवसकवि श्रीविद्यविधिः। काव्यम्। [ [ 11 ]

Derived text: صفحه 11

12

\[\text{12} \] बन्दुरकृत राजकीय वैचारिक परिवार -

प्राचीन राजकीय वैचारिक परिवार -

हस्ती विद्यविधिः। युक्तवागोश्च यथै।
दिवसकवि श्रीविद्यविधिः। काव्यम्। [ [ 12 ]

Derived text: صفحه 12

13

\[\text{12} \] बन्दुरकृत राजकीय वैचारिक परिवार -

प्राचीन राजकीय वैचारिक परिवार -

हस्ती विद्यविधिः। युक्तवागोश्च यथै।
दिवसकवि श्रीविद्यविधिः। काव्यम्। [ [ 13 ]

Derived text: صفحه 13


Read [ 13 ]
Read [ 14 ]
Read [ 15 ]
Read [ 16 ]
Read [ 17 ]
Read [ 18 ]
Read [ 19 ]
Read [ 20 ]
Read [ 21 ]
Read [ 22 ]
Read [ 23 ]
Read [ 24 ]
Read [ 25 ]
Read [ 26 ]
Read [ 27 ]
Read [ 28 ]
Read [ 29 ]
Read [ 30 ]
Read [ 31 ]
Read [ 32 ]
Read [ 33 ]
Read [ 34 ]
Read [ 35 ]

Supplementary notes: Supply some such word as आचार्.
—"ताहें "— अमरी. 14
तत्त: [ पर ]नवजीती सत्य समाजज्ञान:।
भौतिकशास्त्रज्ञान: महाभाषीनवस्ती: 15।
बनाने में नेत्रावि कथायि ध्वस्ता वाणिज्यन्या मुनिवे।
पालित जातिवेक्षी: तासी कारिंतूलिवेक्षी: [ 78 ]।

—[अभ]।
वनवासात्तरात्त समात्मनिष्ठा वामस्तीतातः।
केनाप्रका चालानी विषिवि चिन्तिती सत्त्वात्मा: 16।
चार्यस्वार्थ।
णीकृत वड़ महतः नन्दा कत्वित्ती गीते।
स्वास्थ्य: [ वे ] जनेपु को।

— मना: 38 धर्मेष प्रवर्यक:।
बलावानी वराय निरकृतं नन्दया प्रभु:।
अोपायं करिण्यानासुर: 39।
हैमा: [दी] पितं वें शिववर्य नन्दोपरी।
पुरुषत.Load कथि दु:पे ब [ था ] "— उक्तम्। 17।
—32 तोमावालाकोक लगणं तैतारपितावरं।
तु:में वें को:पर: परिनिर्माण नविनिष्ठा:।
कारवित्तमें भूमिक विनिमायिवर्य वाचुकेः।
समुदयपञ्चाश्रमो रघुने भूमिकस्त्र स्वल्प। 18।
अन्याः।
—भ्राजाजो 33 भूमिकस्त्र स्वत्वोप्य।
निकाल्की ज्ञानावं बनेन विविधावर्यः। 19।
अन्तिहरिता वशिता किंचि विनिज्तानती।
तासिक समपि निरुपनु को महति।
बनावासुदु: 34 विविधावर्यः।
समापतितोवना।
—[उक्तिन्द्र] 36। 20।
बेद पुस्तः रेण सन्त: साप्ततितलमही स्ववाहिनः।
सीमायेच वाचार्यीयुत हुता विपक्षावयोगाती। 21।
बेद चाह चाहिं चाहिं सत्य शून्यस्त अगति कोनिंते जे।
हा हा जातावर्यांके।
—38 भावने सुवर्त मुलिवः। 22।
महानि:—सुताः वतरिचापविवेकानां शाखे।
कपूरी: पुत्रीयमय्यन्तरहरेवावतारपरः।
उदाहराः [ दी ] चिन्तारामनीविनिचा वर्यांच: परवर्यां।
—29 निरंतापूले: नन्दवै: तिरस्वः। 23।
छविपावीवातीच हितो: शाल्यवाकः।
लेवो: 35कया— [ व मल्या च वाणास्ती। 24।
भूमि: [सृज] भराजेन बोड्सेन विशुद्धित।
तथावतेव वाकाद्विध्य विनित्ती: हलादुः। 25।
22  राजावरी का संभवसित्। अधिकार भैन्दव स्थानिक विशेषता। [२३]
23  अन्तर्यापित असंशय प्रकाश अश्रुस्वर। [३०]
24  पार्वतीक हवालारे विश्वकर्मन कहूँ। [२९]
25  बिना बनकामत को नखुकुल देवरण। [४१]
26  आकार आकार तस्मान तिथि तिथि। [४२]
27  अलि लक्ष्मण माता भगवान भविष्य। [४७]
28  सहस्रोहम समाप्त विश्वास विश्वास। [४५]
29

— रे बहासी —

तालसिंहमप्लेक्ष्य: पूर्वकिल्ला गरींगुर्।
समलतुमसम्पन्न मुद्राप्रेस में तेज़ जाते
म[ लुर् ]यामजयामन: कारारं बलिंद[ पर् ] हर् [ [ \[43\] ]]
वीरमं [ पर् ] बुद्ध: कवितम् सुमुखरक्षक शंकलिंग [ 31 ]

िविवक्षयमेव साभाः वासुविधया [ म[ ]—]

30

———[[ ]] [ 43 ]

[मैं] न निविवक्षयमेव नानंहरं शंकलिंग भवनं सर्वत्रपुर्।
[यर्]विवेकचारणीरूपक्ष्यमुनियमेव अध्यात्म लघु || [ 44 ]
शंकलिंगप्रतिष्ठाने कारारं निष्ठारं अखेत।
अ[ [किम्] ते स] विण्मक्ष माध्यमिन्धर वीरङ्गमेव || [ 45 ]
वाक्यम्[ म[ ]—]

31

—सदानुमात्रं च दृष्टिपालयताम्

वाच्यक्षरभीमुर्थरसिति नित्यः [तिः] गोयते कौशल्य च।
गायकी यथा-[हृद्य]ते सत्यमुदाक्षे वेंमीं [ब्र]गोयते [ 34 ]
केलवारकारचार्यस्यस्य यथा हर्वेन्यम साधवः || [ 46 ]
अरु —

32

स्महः यथा कर्त्य कालस्य गोयतः।

हर्वविवेचनांकारुपः [तिः] यथा-हो विश्वामित्रे [ 35 ]
स्वातः महावर्ष[ 3 ] भ्रातापिन्ये ६२ नानोः प्राणामिनिः: || [ 47 ]
आराम्याः [ 37 ] सर्वं विण्मक्षमुदाये विष्णुपरी [ म[ ]]...

33

—आः[ 39 ] धुर्कर्षानिवया [ सोमः]बारमे सन्तानः।

भाविष्य: सूमनानी सुवनमयं विण्मक्षमुदायेः [ 39 ]
लघुम्[ 39 ] वेंमींसारे विण्मक्षमुदायेः महाकीच्छम् || [ 48 ]
स्वातः कर्त्य २३४ अर्थादायेः २३ निविवक्षमुदायवाङ्गः[ म[ ]] ३०

34

चानेहि निशयते। महाराजाधिकार्यभीम्हिन्दुराजः स्नाये तुलयुक्तस्वयंकृताक्षे सिंहवंदे || तथा

पारदिकारिये जैकलकमहाकृष्ण्। सरंकोत्तरिये कारारंकारिये धारि; [च]हर्वकारकिले परिः [स्व् ... न]—

35

गते भीष्मस्य गुरुभीमोऽभयमुदाक्षे साधवा। ख्वान्यमुदाक्षे वेंमींकोत्तरामहाराजस्यस्य तसमयामाणस्य परिये।

tयायण्डे तृतीयमहाराजः। स्नाये [म]तामा जगुरु... [ 37 ]

36

कारारंकारिये परस्मिन्माणानं गते [म] भीष्मिन्दुराजः शासनस्यमाहारणयमुदायेः || [ मा —]

स्ते। तयायिन्दुराजाराजा [जी] भीष्मिन्दुराज्ञानी भीमाराजाराजाये विण्मक्षमुदायकृतिये || [ 39 ]

37

पायंस्येन्य लघुसामिकादाया [दौ ग ...] कते परस्मिन्मपरिकाये नलया विषितः। भीमाराजाराजे

तुलयुक्तस्वयंकृताये [जुः] कारारंकारिये गुरुभीम भावमुदायेः [दौ] तसमयामाणस्य परिये | स्वातः [ मा —]

38

[सम्] अधिपिकाये भीमाराजाराजाये नलयामुदायेः || [ मा —] तथा लघुसामिकादाया [जुः] परिये कारारंकारिये परिये।

39

विषितः अवरधम्यांकने। भावमुदायेः [दौ] प्रतिधानस्य साधवामाणस्य परिये || [ मा —]

40

[कक] लघुमूदायेः तथा शासनानं निर्मातांकास्य [म] तमक्षे बुधासमाणस्य [म] कतेनपरिकाये माणस्यममाणस्य परिये || [ 49 ]

स्बामाणस्यममाणस्य माणस्य कतेनपरिकाये [ म]...[ मा —]

सारस्यमयीम्या पुराणायामहाराजः कारस्य काने [ पर न]गानस्य मध्य [ स्मृि ] || [ 49 ]

33 Read भरसीशय।
34 Read वर्षादिक्; but this offends against the meter. The composer of the inscription obviously meant it to be read चंद्रादिक।
36 Read भागासंतरस; here a lotos flower is engraved. 37 Read आत्मागान।
38 Read करताहे। 39 Read लघुसामिकादाया। 40 Read नीतावली। 41 Read पुराणसंस्कृत। 42 Read निपतिकादा। 43 Read स्वामी।
THE ADVENTURES OF THE GOD OF MADURA.

BY V. VENKATACHALLAM IYER, NELLORE.

'Men are but children of a larger growth.' The ancient priesthood of Egypt and India knew this truth quite as well as the poet Wordsworth. The priests of ancient civilisations exercised a paramount influence on the spiritual and temporal concerns of the community. They were the repositories of such learning as the period afforded. The masses were steeped in ignorance, of which superstition,—unthinking, unreasoning superstition,—is the natural offspring. It was not to the advantage of the priests to lift the veil, assuming them to have been able to do so. They trafficked in the ignorance of the people. They profited by it.

Rawlinson in his commentary on Herodotus has some pertinent remarks. "Priestcraft indeed" says he "is always odious but especially so when people are taught to believe what the priests know to be mere fable, and the remark of Cato—'It appears strange that one priest can refrain from laughing when he looks at another,' might well apply to those of Egypt." Let me add, to those of India also, for priestcraft everywhere was and is much the same.

The Indian priests wrote their fables in the form of Purāṇas, in the number of which the Mahabharata as now extant has also to be included. They fathered their inventions on divine or semi-divine personages, the conventional creations of fancy.

Among the later contributions to the Puranic literature, the Thiruvilayadal-Purāṇa of Pāṇḍyaṇāj, with its counterpart, the Halasya mahāāsītāvichāra, should be noted. It was a compilation of the Śiva-siddhānta period. The priests of this Order wrote the fables for the glorification ostensibly of the god Somasundara of Madura, but really of the Pāṇḍya kings, from whose revenues the endowments of the monastic orders and of the temple were alike drawn.

I propose to give in these columns a few selections from this repertory of folk-lore. If they are not all very instructive, it is hoped they will be found to be at least amusing.

I.

Indra in the height of his pride treated his guru and preceptor, Bṛhaspati, with positive discourtesy. The latter withdrew himself from Court. By degrees, Indra found that his prosperity declined all along the line. He complained to Brahmā, the Creator, about his reverses of fortune. Brahmā said to him that it was all due to the slight he had put on the sage, his priest, and suggested to him that he should enthrone the priestly sub pro tem to one Viśvarūpa, son of Trāśṭā (Thot). Viśvarūpa was one of the gods and of the priestly order, that is, of the Brāhmaṇ caste; for the gods had caste among them the same as we have here below. He was, however, a partisan of the Asuras, the hereditary foes of Indra and the gods. Viśvarūpa assumed charge of the priestly office and was duly installed as the domestic chaplain of Indra. On the occasion of a ceremonial sacrifice, he so managed the rite that the omens came out favourably to the Asuras.

The cheat was discovered, and Indra promptly cut off his head. This gave rise to Brahma-hatya or the sin of slaying a Brāhmaṇ, the most heinous of all sins. Indra was in great distress. He cast about for expedients to rid himself of the sin. He distributed equal portions of it among four unfortunates, the earth, water, trees and women. In the case of the earth, the sin manifests itself in pits and hollows contrived to receive the refuse and rubbish of sweepings. It manifests itself in the waters as froth and foam. The trees exude it in the form of gums and resins. Women are troubled by it every month. The effect of this device was to give the transgressor only a slight reprieve, but certainly no repose.

Trāśṭā burned with rage at the murder of his priestly son. He created another for himself, Vṛitrāsura by name. The latter did not go into orders. He did better. He became king of the Asuras, as besotted one who was to avenge on Indra the murder of his brother. Vṛitrāsura or Vṛitra, as often written, proved to be the most inveterate and formidable foe of Indra. In fulness of time, however, the King of Heaven, with the help of all the greater and lesser gods, prevailed in battle and slew his enemy. But by this act he incurred, at the same time, the sin of
Brahma-hatyā over again, for Vṛitra was the son of a Brahma god. Indra fell into a sort of dementia and wandered about, Orestes-like, pursued by his Nemesis and the relentless Furies. He had no peace of mind. He hid himself in a pool of water, for, the Furies could not pursue him into that element. They stood on the margin waiting for him to come out.

Brihaspati, the offended priest, was somehow appeased by Indra’s forlorn queen. He was prevailed upon to go in quest of the absent god. The priest traced him to the lake. Thither he repaired. He called out to him. But Indra was afraid to come out of the water. He knew that the Furies were in waiting. Brihaspati, by the potency of his incantations, managed to get them out of the way. Indra was encouraged to come out and did so. The Furies, indeed, were got rid of, but not the Nemesis. Indra felt the weight of the incubus, and prayed to his priest to help him out of it.

Brihaspati took Indra with him from one sacred place to another, at every one of which the latter had a ceremonial bath with the spiritual ministration of the former. But the sin was not washed out of him. At last, the pilgrim, footsore and famished and little thinking of his approaching deliverance, turned his wearied steps in the direction of the future location of Madurā.

When he neared the place, he found, to his astonishment and relief, that the load of sin, with which he had been oppressed so long, dropped down suddenly from his back. He was again a free god. He proceeded apace and reached the brink of a pond, where he observed a Śiva-liṅga of stone. He was certain then that he stood on sanctified ground and that his deliverance was due to the grace of the Bethel that stood there, looking quite innocent.

He lost no time, but bathing in the pond, he made pājā to the stone-god as well as the time and place allowed of it. Over the spot where the Liṅga stood Indra put up a shrine.

The god Siva was pleased with Indra’s devotion. He revealed himself to Indra and questioned him as to what he would have. The request of Indra was an humble one, that he should be allowed to stay there and worship the Liṅga day after day. But the All-merciful did not wish to take so much service from him. He reassured to Indra that he might go back to rule his own kingdom, and that, if he worshipped the Liṅga on a certain day of the year, it would be accepted as equal to daily and hourly worship.

[We must take it that the shrine raised by Indra was subsequently added to by the monarchs of the Pāṇḍya dynasty and that as the result we have the great temple now standing there.

The tale of Indra’s Brahma-hatyā is a very old one and drawn from Sanskrit sources. The point of the tale in the Tamil Purāṇa is that the compiler locates the deliverance at Madurā, and ascribes it to the god worshipped there. In this the compiler was amply justified by the example of the Sanskrit Purāṇists, who connect this purgation with almost every important place of worship in India; giving rise, very frequently, to the most contradictory accounts in the body of one and the same Purāṇa.

The attempt to enhance the sanctity of the temple by ascribing its foundation to the god Indra appears on the surface.]

II.

There is some foundation for the belief that the original capital of the Pāṇḍya chieftains was located on the eastern coast of the Madurā District, at a place which tradition records by the name of Maṇalūr. The name is suggestive. It is Tamil, and means ‘the sandy town.’ It would appear that, at a subsequent period, when probably the kingdom extended westwards and north, embracing the inland cantons, the necessity of shifting the capital to a central locality in order to secure the consolidation of political and administrative control occurred to the rulers.

The change in the seat of the government may be gathered from a tale recording another of the adventures of the god Somasundara. A trader of Maṇalūr, in the course of his itinerary progress for custom, happened to halt at sunset at the location of the future Madurā, on a certain Monday. In the course of the night, he observed the gods, great and small, come down from the heavens and worship a Liṅga that stood there. He was privileged to see all this, as he was a great devotee of Śiva, himself, and strictly observed the Monday ceremonial in his practice of religion.
When he reached home, on his return from his travels, he recounted his experience to his sovereign. Just about that time, the god Siva also revealed himself to the Pândya in the guise of a siddha and advised him to remove his capital to the interior, to where Madurâ now stands, and build there. The Pândya obeyed and made a start. The great Siva was pleased. It occurred to his divinity that, having chosen the site for the new capital, it behoved him to provide an adequate source of water-supply. He shook a tuft of his matted hair, in which the goddess of waters lies imprisoned. A few drops of water fell on the earth and welled out into the fountain-sources of the river Vaigai that flows past Madurâ. As the water of this stream is very sweet, and the foundations of the new city were baptised with it, the capital was named Madurâ. A Pândya raised a temple, we may take it, over the fane put up by Indra. He also cleared the forest all round. This Pândya was named Kulaśekhara.

[It is probable that the proximate cause of the change in the capital was, to some extent attributable to a seismic swell on the coast, which subjected Mañalâ to the rage of the flood. So much may be inferred from the two tales which will be noticed in their proper place.

The city of Mañalâ has had the distinction of being mentioned in the Mahâdhârata—doubtless due to the cupidity or venality of interpolators, who saw their advantage in connecting this southern Dravidian dynasty with the hero Arjuna, who is credited with having begotten on the appointed daughter of a Pândya an heir to his throne. This is to push back the antiquity of the dynasty, in popular belief, to more than 3000 B.C. The interpolation was achieved by a very slight verbal change in the text of a geographical name Manipura into Mañalâ.]

The Virgin Queen.

Kulaśekhara Pândya was succeeded on the throne by his son and heir Malayadhvaja. His consort was the incarnation of a demi-goddess. They had no issue between them. The King performed many aisvamedhas in hopes of getting an heir. In this he did not succeed just then. But his labours had, however, an unexpected and untoward result. Indra feared for his throne in heaven, for, it was an article of faith with him that, if any man of woman born succeeded in the accomplishment of a hundred aisvamedha sacrifices, he would attain to divinity, sufficient at least to dispossess Indra of his throne and to put himself in the place of the former. Indra had, as usual with him, recourse to a subterfuge. He suggested to Malayadhvaja to vary the sacrifice and try the putreshi for the fulfilment of his desires, as the more appropriate.

The king, accordingly, started the putreshi. A little girl, of the age of three years, came out of the sacrificial fire. It was observed that on her bust she bore the marks of three breasts in rudiment. A voice from above, at the same time, proclaimed that, when the child should grow to marriagable age and meet her future husband, the third breast would disappear. Malayadhvaja lived his time and went the way of his ancestors. He left no son behind him. He had crowned his only daughter before his death. This princess ruled under the regency of her mother, the dowager.

The girl-queen developed martial tendencies. Yet in her teens, she started on an ambitious project of subduing all the princes and rulers of the earth. This was easily achieved, but her ambition or love of glory was insatiable. She led a campaign against the dikpadas or the guardian-deities of the cardinal points. They were all vanquished, one after another, and bound down to fealty and tribute. Emboldened by these successes, the virgin queen led an expedition against the god Siva himself. She laid siege to his castle on Mount Kailâsa. The god marshalled all his clans and sent them out to fight against her, but the god’s veterans were routed. More troops came out to fight and gave battle, but they were annihilated. The god was utterly discomfited. He had never met with such a disaster before. It was no use sending out even his best troops to the battle. He roused himself to action. He came out in person,—the great god Siva on the war-path. The lady gave battle. She advanced. Their eyes met. As she looked steadily at him, she observed on the left side of his person a reflection of herself, as she might in a mirror. At once, the third breast disappeared. The virgin blushed; she felt abashed as she recognised in him her future husband and the fulfilment of the prophecy. The war was indeed at an end. The god’s
companions wished him joy and congratulated the lady on her conquest. The god requested her to go back to her capital, and promised that he would go there on the eighth day, being Monday, to claim her in marriage. The princess was prevailed upon to return. True to his appointment, the god appeared at Madura, and claimed of the queen-mother the hand of her daughter in marriage.

The wedding of the divine pair came off much after the fashion among high-class mortals. The religious ministration, however, as might be expected, was of divine agency. Brahmā acted as the priest. Viṣṇu gave away the bride. All the Viśiṣṭa, all the gods and angels witnessed the ceremony and sat down to the wedding-feast. By right of marriage the god succeeded to the throne, and reigned under the name of Somasundara-Pāṇḍya.

[During the time that the princess ruled, the kingdom obtained the name of Kanulnāçu or the country of the parthenos. This Parthenos is the presiding deity of the ancient temple of Kanyākumāri or Cape Comorin, at the southern extremity of the Peninsula.—a Hittite-Phoenician foundation. It is probable that the Madura temple was consecrated to the same divinity, after the settlements extended inland; and that, at first, it was the goddess alone that was worshipped there and that the association of the god-consort was a later idea. The princess, who is represented in the story as having had three breasts, is really the goddess herself, as is plain by the narration of her miraculous birth from the sacred fire. This warrior-queen is the Hittite Amazonian-goddess, the Ephesian Diana, with her many breasts, symbolising the super-abundance of nature. The number, three, of the breasts in the tale is not definitive of the real number, but merely suggestive of plurality.

Doubtless it was in Madura, as it was in other ancient countries of parallel civilization. The king was the high priest, and the queen, where she ruled, was the chief priestess. In later periods, when the spiritual chieftaincy was dissociated from the temporal, a prince of the blood royal was the priest, or the prince royal, a virgin, was the priestess. The priests and priestesses assumed the name and title of the deities to whom they ministered. In theory, the whole land was the demesne of the deity, an appanage of the temple, and the priest-king or priestess-queen was only the vice-gerent of the god or goddess.

The Dravidian Pāṇḍyas, as we find them in this early period, had progressed into the gentile organisation, but the gens still claimed through the female. It was a stage of social evolution, from which the neighbouring allied tribes of Malabar have not as yet emerged.

Descent and inheritance was therefore mostly in the female line, with the innovation of male descent encroaching on the old rule and creating exceptions. The dominion was ruled over by a queen. She did not cease to be a virgin, because she became a mother, any more than the goddess whom she worshipped and represented. We have the high authority of Pliny to vouch for the fact that women ruled as queens in this district. Vide, Christopher Cellarius in his Commentaries, Vol. II, in loco:—Ab illis gens Pandæ, sola Indorum regnata feminis. Unam Herculis sexus ejus genitam ferunt, ob idque gratiorum præcipium regno donatum.

A similar custom in dynastic Egypt is spoken about by Maspero, in his Struggle of the Nations, in a passage, which may be cited with advantage here.—From the 12th dynasty downwards, the part played by princesses increased gradually and threatened to eclipse the power of the princes. Perhaps it was due to the males being killed out in the continuous wars. The history is obscure. When it becomes clearer, we find quite as many ruling queens as kings. Sons took precedence of daughters, when they were the issue of a brother and sister along with their full-blooded sisters. But the sons lost this privilege when there was any inferiority in origin on the mother's side, and their chances diminished in proportion to the remoteness of the mother from the line of Ra. In the latter case, all their sisters born of marriages, which to us appear incestuous, took precedence of them and the eldest daughter became the legitimate Pharaoh, who sat in the throne of Horus on the death of her father and even occasionally during his lifetime. The prince whom she married governed for her, offered worship to the gods, commanded the army and administered justice. At her death, her children inherited the crown."

"
The princess in the tale is to be understood as representing a class, a succession of sovereigns like herself, in some sort of continuity. Where the annals of a whole period have been lost to tradition, a device of the ancient writers was to embody the history of the entire period in the individuality of one monarch, whose life they prolonged even to a millennium, as occasion required. Witness the instance of a thousand years of universal oppression by generations of Assyrian monarchs, impersonated in the Semitic Zohak of Pehlevi tradition and of the Šahânâmâ.

It appears in the Purâna that, subsequent to the time of this princess, succession went in the male line in unbroken continuity. This marks the change in the social organisation, by which the succession to property was finally transferred from the female line to the male. The princess, then, was the eponymous heroine of a whole line of queens of the earlier period. Were it otherwise, it is difficult to believe that a solitary instance, or an exceptional one, should have been effective in giving a historical and suggestive name to the kingdom to endure for future generations.

The god acquires the right to rule in virtue of his marriage, as was customary in ancient Egypt, Lydia, Caria, Lydia and neighbouring countries in matriarchal epochs. The attempt to deduce a divine origin for the founders of the dynasty is thus apparent.

The prominence given to that day of the week which is Monday is evidently referable to the cult of the Moon, a cult which had its origin when the Moon was the year-god of time measurement. When, in a later era, the Sun, having been liberated from his subservience to the Star-gods who commanded the year-reckonings, was allowed undisturbed sway in marking time, the cult of the Moon was transferred in its entirety to him and he ruled thereafter as Somañatha, or the lord of the Moon, and, as a consequence, of the Moon-goddess. The Monday cult, however, having been firmly established in practice, survived into the later epoch, though in association with the new god.

III.

The wedding-feast.

The table-provisions had been prepared for the Marriage feast on such an extensive scale that hardly any appreciable quantity was diminished by the efforts of Siva's retainers. The hostess, the mother of the bride, was disagreeably surprised and felt very sorry that so much should go to waste. When she made mention of this to her son-in-law, he thought he would play a practical joke. He happily recollected that his retainer, Kundotharan, had not been at the dinner. He now suggested that this faithful servant of his should be fed. At the same time, he exercised his divine will that the all-consuming fire of the ocean, the aurva, should get into the stomach of this yokel. He started eating and finished up with a mass of food of the cubic magnitude of the Himalayas, and yet, complaining of famine and hunger, implored, with the simplicity of the unfortunate Oliver Twist, for more. But all the available store had been exhausted, and the hostess acknowledged herself beaten. The god then took it on himself to feed his retainer and doubtless succeeded. At the end of the banquet, Kundotharan felt very thirsty. He helped himself to all the water available in Madura. But his thirst was in no way allayed. Then the god requested the Ganges on his head to spare some drops of her store. She did so and the great river of Vaigai at once wound her course past the walls of the city. Kundotharan drank his fill of the ceaseless stream and was so good as to announce that his thirst was now quenched.

The summoning of the seven oceans.

When the god ruled at Madura under the name of Somasundara Pândya, the queen-mother, desired to bathe in the ocean. For, the rishi Gautama had advised her that a bath in the waters of the ocean would free her from future births. This efficacy was due to the circumstance that all the sacred rivers flow into the sea, and the waters of the ocean are, therefore, impregnated with the combined purifying essence of all the holy rivers.
The old lady preferred her request to her divine son-in-law through her daughter that she might be enabled to take the bath as advised. The god-king suggested that there was no need for her to travel out of Madura to have her wish. If she had no objection, he would procure for her the waters of all the seven oceans at Madura itself. So there was a tank or pond contrived, the water for which, in obedience to the god's commandment, came bubbling up from the deep-sea fountains of the seven oceans.

When the lady went out for her bath in the tank, an unexpected difficulty was interposed by the Brahman priests. They ruled that, according to the law of the Sutras, the ocean bath had to be gone through by a woman in this wise. She should make the plunge holding her husband by the hand, or in default of the husband (that is in the case of a widow), her son, and in default of both, holding on to the tail of a cow. Unfortunately, the lady had neither a husband nor a son. So to satisfy the canon, she would have to adopt the third course. She felt it a great humiliation to be driven to do that. Was it for her, the living head of this ancient house to submit to this indignity? Was there no help against the rigour of the law?

The divine son-in-law, however, came to the rescue. He willed that the departed partner of the royal relict should come down from his place in Heaven. Fortwith, Malayadhvaja came down from Svarga. The spouses bathed in the tank with all due ceremonious observance. As soon as the bath was over and the parties put on dry clothes, a litter came down from the heavens, and Malayadhvaja with his queen flew up in it to Sivaloka, within sight of the wondering populace.

This tank, I believe, is the temple tank, in the waters of which experts in bacteriology will find enough to engage their attention and to test their learning. The tale was invented for the sanctification of the tank, where pilgrims bathe as a religious observance, to the present advantage of the priests, who receive a fee at each bath.

The attention of the reader is drawn to the incident, as narrated here, that brought the river Vaigai into existence. It is a second version of the subject, and quite contradictory of the one that has preceded it in the second tale, where, the god, acting as the health-officer of the newly-founded capital, calls the river into existence for the due water-supply of the new settlers.

IV.

The goddess-queen yearned for issue; the god-king understood this and willed that the Dieux Fils, Kumara, should be born in flesh and blood as their son. The queen soon found herself enceinte and in due course gave birth to a son, on a very suspicious day, a Monday in conjunction with the star Ardra. All the goddesses assisted at the accouchement and the gods at the naming. The infant was named Ugra-Pandya. Brihaspati taught him the Vedas and the divine father himself initiated him into the secrets of the Pusupalaiastra. The boy attained the age of sixteen and his marriage was contemplated. It was arranged that he should marry the daughter of the king of north Mañalur, of the Chola dynasty and of the solar race. The Pandyas were of the lunar race.

The father bestowed on his son three potent arms: vedi, vatal and sendu, divine weapons of offence which no one less a personage than the son god could wield. The prince was crowned king as soon as he attained majority, by his parents, who entered the temple, and, becoming united with the god and the goddess thereon, disappeared from mortal vision.

Ugra-Pandya performed many aivamadha-ydgas. Indra feared for his safety. He set up Varuna, or Poseidon, to invade the kingdom of the Pandyan and submerge the same with his waters. The briny deep at once trettet and foamed, swelled and surged. The flood rose so high and coursed so far inland that the waves dashed against the walls of Madura. The young king was told in a dream by his father, the god, to use the vedi he had given him against the attacks of Poseidon. It was a sort of javelin. The king followed the direction given, with the result that the Ocean god receded, shrank back to his original dimensions and lay prostrate at the feet of the youthful sovereign.
Indra, having been baffled in this attempt, changed his tactics. He withheld rain from the three kingdoms of the Tamil country, Chera, Chola and Pândya.

The three kings took counsel together, and questioned the sage Agastya as to how it happened that there was continued drought in the land. The Rishi gave very little of comfort; he said the same conditions would continue for a period of twelve years, unless they saw their way to make peace with Indra. But this was easier said than done. Where, when and how should they meet Indra for a conference? The Rishi advised them that, if they duly performed the Monday vrata or rite, they would be enabled to go up in the flesh to Indraloka. They went through the vrata, accordingly, and like angels they soared into the empyrean and higher above that into Indraloka. Indra received them in full court. High seats were placed for them, and Indra requested them to be seated. Chera and Chola responded, but the Pândya, with a dash of audacity, which took his brother kings by surprise, seated himself on the throne of Indra by the side of his divine occupant. Indra was greatly nettled, but kept his temper admirably. Chera and Chola begged of Indra to send down rain for their domains. He promised to do so. The Pândya did not design to make the request; he would get from Indra by force, if necessary, what he wanted. Chera and Chola were dismissed with costly presents. One was fetched for the Pândya also. It was a pearl necklace, but so heavy that a multitude of angels was required to bring it to the presence. Indra offered it to the Pândya, and requested him to wear it, with the idea of seeing him humbled; for, Indra supposed that the Pândya could not even move it, much less take it up by hand. But the Pândya took it up as lightly as if it were a goosequill, and wore it round his neck. Indra was beaten at his own trick, and felt, as may be surmised, somewhat ill at ease. The king of the gods took his leave of the king of men.

The interview certainly failed to promote a good understanding. Indra still withheld rain from the country of the Pândya, though he fulfilled the promise he had given to Chera and Chola. The king was thrown into a rage. He would have his revenge on Indra. He sent into prison, on a charge of espionage, some clouds that had inadvertently lighted on a hill in Pândyanād. This was throwing down the gauntlet for Indra to pick up if he dared. These clouds were among the faithful vassals of Indra. They had been out picnicking on a holiday in the neighbourhood of Madurā, on the Pasumalai hills, and had no passports to exhibit. War proved inevitable. Indra came down to fight the Pândya. The battle raged fiercely and long. The Pândya had to face the vajrītya, that is, the thunderbolt of Indra.

The Pândya launched the valai, the bangle that his father had given him, at the king of the gods. It sped like lightning. The thunderbolt of Indra was knocked down from his right hand and his jewelled crown from his head. Indra got his deserts; he felt, as others have done after him, that discretion was the better part of valour. He turned his back and fled in indecent haste. We are not told, but we may take it that, before he left the field, Indra managed to pick up his thunderbolt, for he is known to have used it again in battle and with better effect against the Asuras.

After some time, Indra feared that the Pândya would carry the war into Indraloka. He was advised to sue for peace. The Pândya was to some extent conciliated as the overtures came from Indra. It was agreed between the high contracting parties that the imprisoned clouds should be set at large and that Indra should send down rain on Pândyanād.

But the Pândya had no confidence in the word of Indra, or in his fidelity to an oath. Sureties were required. A certain man of the Villala caste, who was a personal friend of Indra, stood security for his good behaviour, and peace was concluded. Rain fell and the famine was at an end.

[The king and the queen being the evātrás of the god Siva and his divine consort, it was only natural and necessary that the son of their begetting should be the double of Kumāra, the son-god.]

The three potent arms which the divine father vouchsafed to the divine son are the usual outfit of solar heroes, the symbolism of which might vary, but is easily understood, as pointing to the same equation, as in the case of Bellerophon, Perseus, Sigurd, Karpa of the Mahābhārata and other solar protagonists.
The ṇī is a kind of javelin, the ashen spear which Cheiron gave to Peleus: the caduceus passed on by Hermes to Apollo. The valai, which signifies the bangle, is the perimeter of the solar orb, the discus, the chakra named sudarśana in the hands of Vishnu. The sendu or ball is the orb itself, the burning globe. These are the weapons with which the son god, that is the infant sun-god, Horus, fights his enemies in the heavens.

The mention of north Mañalur, which cannot now be located, any more than the south Mañalur, as the seat of the Chola dynasty, points to simultaneous settlements by cognate tribes, to the north and the south on the sea-coast. The portion of the fable recording the adventures of the prince in the Indra-loka is quite devoid of any interest. It embodies no history and no moral. The prince’s hauteur at the reception by Indra and his ultimate triumph over the latter is, perhaps, for a mortal prince, a trifle over-done, but is quite intelligible as the allegory of a solar myth.

The invasion of the district by the waters of the deep very probably records a reminiscence of the circumstances which made it desirable to shift the capital from the coast to the interior. This has been shown already.

The compliment paid to the Vellala caste, in that an individual of that section is made to stand surety for the due observance by Indra of his pledges, is probably due to the fact that the ruling chiefs of this caste, the members of which therefore ranked high as kinmen of the monarch, and in early times certainly supplied the military element of the body politic.

THE ADITYAS.

BY R. SHAMBASTETTY, B.A., M.E.A.S., BANGALORE.

(Continued from p. 41.)

"Very red are the garments; the Viśvērēvas throw (such weapons as) Aṣṭri, the thunderbolt, and the hundred-killer, and swallow things with fiery tongues; (the season seems to say) 'no god, no man, no king Varuṇa, the lord, no Agni, no Indra, and not even Pavanā is like myself; there is none like me.' One end of the heavenly bow (the rainbow) is attached to the sky, and the other to the earth. Indra, in the form of a white ant, cut off the string of this bow. This stringless bow they call the bow of Indra in the colours of the clouds; the same is also called the bow of Samyū, the son of Bṛhaspati; the same they call the bow of Rudra; one end of this bow cut off the head of Rudra himself; that head became what is called Pravṛgya. Hence, whoever performs the Pravṛgya rite reinsists the head of Rudra. Then Rudra will not molest him who knows thus." ²⁸:

The mention of a white ant seems to refer to the supposed connection of the rainbow with an anthill, as Kālidāsa says in his Māgadhatā:—"The rainbow rises from an anthill." ²⁹ As the word Rudra means the Number 11, there may be some reference to the last 12 days of the sidereal year, and it is likely that the excess of 4ths of a day in those 12 days may represent the head of Rudra. This excess, which, as we have already seen, is the cause of the break in the eighth intercalary month, seems to have been described as having been cut off by the rainbow. The Pravṛgya ceremony which is usually performed in the Sūma sacrifice is a rite which comes after the Sūma plant is purchased in the thirteenth month. ³⁰ Evidently, then, the Pravṛgya rite seems to symbolise the break in the eighth thirteenth month. The poet continues to speak of the characteristics of the winter and the winter solstice:—
"(Man) has his eyes raised up; he moves neither forward nor backward, for winter is seen; neither colour nor garments for the winter; the eye of the winter is not seen; people do not kill each other (in battle); this is the sign of the winter; the eyes (of people) will be red, and their head gray; observing the northern movement of the sun, you spread and raise the joined palm, of your hands and you bend your knees (as a mark of respect to the sun). May men use this expression: 'Bended knees, and spreading and raising the joined palms of the hands.' To the sun all the seasons bow, for he is the maker of the (two) goals. The Brâhman who knows thus obtains priestly functions to perform. This intercalated year with these troops (the intercalary months) brings all desired offerings to Indra."

The goals referred to in the above passage seem to be the two solstices, between which the usual six months, together with the 7½ intercalary months, seem to have been counted and observed. Since Indra is the god of the last intercalary month, the year having such a month is said to bring all offerings to Indra in the sacrifices for which learned Brâhmanas were invited.

The poet now goes on to speak of the cycle of 100 years:

`As a drop of time; about it the following is said:—The drop (of time) obtained its firm footing on the shining thing (Amśumatt), coming as a dark thing with ten thousand (days).'

'O Drop, thou art Indra, coming frequently; with all thy force, melt the surrounding clouds which are praised by men and which can pour water. With the same rain-bringing clouds, Indra slays the Asuras (of the intercalary months). The earth is called the shining thing (Amśumatt).

The year—having the intercalary month has obtained its firm footing on her, and also in heaven. The teacher and disciple who know this should hate each other, whoever hates so will fall down from the heavens. Thus are explained the circles of the seasons. Next the circles of the sun [the gods of the intercalary months] together with the stories and explanations.'

The word drapes, 'drop,' seems to be a name of one hundred years, since it is described as coming with 10,000 (days). We know that the last cycle of five years in every period of 20 years consists of 2,000 days. Accordingly there will be $5 \times 2000 = 10,000$ days in the five cycles occurring in $20 \times 5 = 100$ years.

While describing the same drapes, the Atharvaveda (XVIII, 18, 28, 29) calls it 'hundred-streamed,' to which no other meaning than one hundred years can possibly be attached. The verses run as follows:

`The Drop leaped toward the earth, the sky, toward both the source, and the one that was of old.

To the drop that goes about toward the same source, do I make oblations after the seven priests.

A hundred-streamed Vāyu (wind), a heaven-finding sun, do those men-beholders look upon; whose bestow and present always, they milk a sacrificial gift having seven mothers.'

It is to be noted how the author of the Aranyakas connects the 'drop' with Indra, the god of the seventh intercalary month, and ten thousand days, while the Atharvaveda combines it with seven priests and mothers (i.e., seven intercalary months) and one hundred streams (i.e., years).

Now let us revert to the poet of the Aranyakas and hear what he says about the seven suns:

We refer to the poet of the Aranyakas and hear what he says about the seven suns:
"Arōga (one without disease), Bhrāja (shining), Paṭara (one covered with clouds), Pataṅga (flying), Srarnāra (golden), Jyotishmā (one with mass of light), and Vibhāsa (one with splendour)—these illumine the heavens for him, milking strength (for the sacrificer) and never losing their splendour. Kaśyapa is the eighth; he never leaves the mountain called the great Mēru. The following is said of him:—

'What contrivance of thine, O Kaśyapa, is that which is full of shining, vigorous, splendid, and of wondrous light, and in which the seven suns are set together.'—"

सस्मानानानानानन्यगतिः पृष्ठभावितान्तः ।
सस्मानानानानन्यगतिः पृष्ठभावितान्तः ।
सस्मानानानानन्यगतिः पृष्ठभावितान्तः ।
सस्मानानानानन्यगतिः पृष्ठभावितान्तः ।

"In him (Kaśyapa) may we seek a king; they all (the suns) obtain light from him; the moon blows them out from Kaśyapa, just as a goldsmith blowing his bellows (over the fire with gold)."

मानी चित्तरमी निध्वन्यानान्तः ।
सस्मानानानानन्यगतिः पृष्ठभावितान्तः ।
सस्मानानानानन्यगतिः पृष्ठभावितान्तः ।

"(The seven suns are) the vital breaths; they are the forces of life; they are the principles of the vital organs; in the head are the suns,—so say the Teachers; Paṇḍakaṅka, the son of Vāṣyāyaṇa says:

'I have seen the seven suns,' says also Saptakarśaṇa, the son of Plākāhi.'"}

मानवयेक एव नौ क्षम्यव तन्म् वेदहसि ।
सह वेदविश्वदर्शिनः तारम्बनिनयानवात् ।
सह वेदविश्वदर्शिनः तारम्बनिनयानवात् ।
सह वेदविश्वदर्शिनः तारम्बनिनयानवात् ।

"Bhrāja, Paṭara, and Pataṅga shine, standing below; hence they are productive of heat to this world; the others are in the upper world; hence they are not productive of heat to this world; of them, the following is said:—"

"The seven suns have entered into the heavenly world; whoever has paid sacrificial fees will follow them; they all illumine the ghi (fire) for him, milking strength and causing no heat."

सस्मानानानानानन्यगतिः पृष्ठभावितान्तः ।
सस्मानानानानन्यगतिः पृष्ठभावितान्तः ।
सस्मानानानानन्यगतिः पृष्ठभावितान्तः ।
सस्मानानानानन्यगतिः पृष्ठभावितान्तः ।

"—The seven sacrificial priests are the suns,—so say the Teachers; of them, the following is said:—'The seven regions with many suns, the seven Hōtrī Priests, and the shining Ādityas who are also seven; by means of them the moon is maintained [i.e., the lunar year is prevented from rotating further]."

सस्मानानानानानन्यगतिः पृष्ठभावितान्तः ।
सस्मानानानानन्यगतिः पृष्ठभावितान्तः ।
सस्मानानानानन्यगतिः पृष्ठभावितान्तः ।
सस्मानानानानन्यगतिः पृष्ठभावितान्तः ।

"—Accordingly there is the saying: (the sun called) Dīghabrāja (illuminator of the regions) makes the seasons; in this way the suns are multiplied up to a thousand,—so says Vaṣaṁabhāya. About this, the following is said:—"

सस्मानानानानानन्यगतिः पृष्ठभावितान्तः ।
सस्मानानानानन्यगतिः पृष्ठभावितान्तः ।
सस्मानानानानन्यगतिः पृष्ठभावितान्तः ।
सस्मानानानानन्यगतिः पृष्ठभावितान्तः ।

"O Indra, if the number of both heaven and earth comes to a hundred, even then, O Wielder of the thunderbolt, no thousand suns will follow thee, born as thou art between those two worlds. Since the seasons are of different signs, the suns are many; but it is settled that they are eight."
What are called heaven and earth in this and other passages seem to be the two limits between which the seven intercalary months are inserted. Accordingly we may take those words to signify the cycle of 20 years. Hence a hundred of both heaven and earth will mean a 100 cycles of 20 years each, containing 100+7 = 700 or 100×7 = 700 suns or intercalary months, with Indra as their god, but not a thousand suns. This seems to be the meaning of the poet when he says that, though the number of the birth-places of Indra amounts to a hundred, no thousand suns will follow him. After speaking of various things, especially of Vāishṇa, of Kaśyapa, of seven Agnis who appear to be the same seven suns, of Gandharvas, and of seven Vāyu, the poet says:

जहस्वुर्द्रव्यं भूतेः पदो योगम सहसाद्वृः.

"This earth contains a thousand, and the distant heaven also contains a thousand."

If the explanation I have given above of the seven Ādityas and of the number one thousand, is true, it follows that the two worlds, each containing a thousand (days), as described in the above passage, must mean the two wings or halves of the last cycle of five years in each period of 20 years.

After speaking of sundry things which it is unnecessary to notice here, the poet goes on to say:

अतिरिक्तादिनयो द्रव्यीयातादिनये पदो।

The poet goes on to say:

Mātrana is past and Mātrana is future; of the eight sons of Āditi, who were born from her body, she approached the gods with seven and cast out Mātrana; with seven sons Āditi approached the gods in the former Yuga (cycle of 20 years); she brought them to the houses of Mātrana again for birth and death. We enumerate them: Mitra and Varuṇa, Dāhi and Aryaman, Amāś and Bhaga and Indra and Vivasvan, these are they.

After referring to the verses which describe Purusha, the poet concludes by saying:

ग निग्न: प्राजायनम| अथ गुरुपतसस्वपः।

"The seed belongs to Prajāpati, Father Time; and the Purusha (born thereof) is sevenfold."

The Satapatha Brähmana identifies the seven Purushas with the seven logs and tongues of Agni, and also with Indra. The passages in this identification are made thus translated by Prof. Eggeling:

"He offers with Vāg. S. XVII. 79, 'thine, O Agni, are seven logs,'—logs mean vital airs, for the vital airs do kindle him;—'seven tongues,'—this he says with regard to those seven persons which they made into one person;—'Seven Rishi,'—for seven Rishis they indeed were;—'seven beloved seats,'—this he says with regard to the metres;—'sevenfold the seven priests worship thee,'—for in sevenfold way the seven priests indeed worship him;—'the seven homes,'—he thereby means the seven layers of the altar; . . . . . . . . . . 'seven,' he says each time, of seven layers the fire-altar consists, and of seven seasons the year, and Agni is the year."

"This same vital air in the midst doubtless is Indra. He, by his power, kindled those other vital airs from the midst; and in as much as he kindled, he is the kindler (Indra): the kindler indeed,—him they call 'Indra' mystically (esoterically), for the gods love the mystic. They (the vital airs) being kindled, seven separate persons (Parusha)."

I presume that I have made it clear that the various expressions, such as the eight sons of Āditi, the seven or eight Ādityas, seven eagles or swans, seven butters, seven logs or fire, seven tongues of Agni, seven Vāyu, seven cattle, seven breaths, seven Agnis, seven Purushas, seven horses, seven sisters, seven priests, seven seers, and seven and a half embryos, are all of the same meaning, viz., the seven and a half intercalary months occurring in the cycle of twenty luni-sidereal years, and that the act of getting rid of the intercalary months is described as a recurring conflict between Vṛitra, the demon of the intercalary months, and Indra, the god of the seventh intercalary month. That this conflict was a periodic and recurring phenomenon, is so well known to all Vedic scholars that it needs no proof. The expression that Indra killed Vṛitra three times, securing thereby three śukhyas or 'fifteens,' evidently signifies the cycle of sixty years, which consists of three cycles of 20 years each or twelve cycles of 5 years each. Since Indra is said to be the slayer.

21 Sat. Br. IX. 3, 3, 44-45. 22 I bid. VI. 1, 1, 2.
of Vṛitra, Sambara, Bala and other demons, it is clear that those demons represent the same evil nature or side of the same intercalary months. The expression that Indra found out Sambara and killed him in the fortieth year (Ṛ. V. II. 12, 11) proves the same fact. We are also told in the Rgveda (I. 130, 7; IV. 30, 29) that the number of Vṛitra's forts which Indra destroyed amounted to one hundred. If this can be taken to mean a hundred times repetition of the cycle of 20 years, then we have the chronology of the Vedic period to be $20 \times 100 = 2000$ years.

The Satapatha Brāhmaṇa, on the other hand, makes the number of the repetition of the seven intercalary months to be 101. The following is the translation by Prof. Eggeling of the passages in which this idea is conveyed:

"Sevenfold, indeed, Prajāpati was created in the beginning. He went on constructing (developing) his body, and stopped at the one hundred and onefold one. He who constructs one lower than a sevenfold one cuts this Father Prajāpati in twain: he will be the worse for sacrificing as one would be by doing injury to his better. And he who constructs one exceeding the one-hundred-and-onefold one steps beyond this Universe, for Prajāpati is this Universe. Hence he should construct the sevenfold (altar), then the next higher up to the one-hundred-and-onefold one, but he should not construct one exceeding the one-hundred-and-onefold one, and thus, indeed, he neither cuts this Father Prajāpati in twain, nor does he step beyond this Universe." [23]

"Prajāpati, indeed, is the year, and Agni is all objects of desire. This Prajāpati, the year, desired, 'May I build up for myself a body so as to contain Agni, all objects of desire.' He constructed a body one-hundred-and-one-fold." [24]

"Now this year is the same as yonder sun; and he is this one-hundred-and-onefold (Agni);—his rays are a hundredfold and he himself who shines yonder, being the one hundred and first, is firmly established in this Universe." [25]

"And, indeed, the one-hundred-and-onefold passes into (becomes equal to) the seven-fold one; for yonder sun, whilst composed a hundred-and-onefold, is established in the seven worlds of the gods, the four quarters and these three worlds; these are the seven worlds of the gods, and in them the sun is established." [26]

"And, again, as to how the one-hundred-and-onefold (altar) passes into the seven-fold one: Yonder sun, composed of a hundred and one parts, is established in the seven seasons, in the seven stasas, in the seven Prishthas-sāmas, in the seven smaras, in the seven stāsas, in the seven sāvatī airs, and in the seven regions." [27]

"Therefore, also, they lay down around (the altar) sets of seven (bricks) each time, and hence the one-hundred-and-onefold passes into the seven-fold one; and, indeed, the seven-fold one passes into the one-hundred-and-one-fold." [28]

"And thus, indeed, the seven-fold (altar) passes into the one hundred and one-fold: that which is a hundred-and-one-fold is seven-fold; and that which is seven-fold is a hundred-and-one-fold." [29]

From the statement that they lay down sets of seven bricks one hundred and one times, where seven bricks evidently represent seven intercalary months, it is clear that by the time of the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa the number of the twenty years' cycles amounted to 101. It is, therefore, clear that by that time there had elapsed $101 \times 20 = 2020$ years in the era of the Vedic poets.

I have already pointed out how the statement of the Atharvaveda (XII. 3, 15), that thirty-three gods pertain to the seven sacrifices, can be explained as implying the thirty-three months forming one of the wings or halves of the last cycle of five years in the period of twenty years. Now, according to the Niyū hymn for the Viśvē Devās, the total number of gods amounts to 3339. Dividing this by 33 we have $\frac{3339}{33} = 101 \frac{1}{11}$ cycles of twenty years each. This is a number which is almost exactly equal to the number of layers of the one-hundred-and-onefold altar referred to above.

[23] Say X. 2, 3, 18.
[26] Say X. 2, 4, 4; the italics are mine.
[27] Say X. 2, 4, 5; the italics are mine.
[29] Say X. 2, 4, 8.
[30] See Hira's Translation of the Atharvaveda Brāhmaṇa III. 331; also his note on the number of gods.
Again we know that what are called Chāturmāsya are three intercalary periods of four months each. From the formula of these Chāturmāsya given in the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa (XI. 5, 2, 10), we can arrive at the same number of years. The passage in which this formula is given is thus translated by Prof. Eegelbing:

"Now, indeed, the formulas of these seasonal offerings amount to three hundred and sixty-two Brihati verses; he thereby obtains both the year and the Mahāvratas; and thus, indeed, this sacrificer has a two-fold foundation; and he thus makes the sacrificer reach the heavenly world and establish himself therein."

It is a fact that the Vedic poets usually represent a day by a syllable. Accordingly, the number of syllables contained in 362 Brihati verses must represent 362 × 36 days contained in all the Chāturmāsya so far counted. Expressed in months, they will be $\frac{362 \times 36}{30} = 434\frac{1}{2}$ months intercalated in cycles of 24 years each. Hence the number of years will be equal to $\frac{2172}{5} \times \frac{1}{4} = 1086$. But as stated in the passage, the sacrificer must have a two-fold foundation, i.e., must double the number, before he can reach the heavenly world, i.e., the era, and establish himself therein. Hence doubling the number, we have $1086 \times 2 = 2172$ years. It is unnecessary to point out here that these various numbers of years in the era of the Vedic poets, though differing from each other a little, lead to the same conclusion that I have arrived at in my Gavām Ayana, "the Vedic Era," where I showed the lapse of 465 intercalary days equivalent to $465 \times 4 = 1860$ years. That this era of nearly 2000 years had elapsed by the time of Parikhrit, the grandson of Yuddhishthira, the hero of the Mahābhārata war, is a point worthy of the attention of scholars.

THE MYTH OF THE ARYAN INVASION OF INDIA.

By P. T. Srinivas Iyengar, M.A., Vizagapatam.

It is well known that most writers on modern history have not escaped the bias of their political or religious convictions, however impartial they have tried to be. In the selection of facts, in the method of marshalling them to point to a moral, Hume was as much dominated by his Tory propensities as Macaulay was by his Whig predilections. This applies in a small measure to ancient history, too. When the theory of the great civilized Aryan race was started, German patriotism claimed the Aryans to have been originally tall, fair, and long-headed, and the direct ancestors of the modern Teutons. French patriotism insisted that the language and civilization of the Aryans came into Europe with the Alpine race, which forms such a large element in the modern French population; while the Italian Sergi, who belongs to the Mediterranean race evolved from an African stock, credits his own race with originating the Graeco-Roman civilization, and believes that the Aryans were savages when they invaded Europe. This colouring of history by the sympathies of the historian is not an unmixed evil, for it does the rehabilitation of the character of Catholic sovereigns and statesmen by Lingard, and the explosion of the myth of the Saxon extermination of the Celts in England by leaders of the pro-Celtic movement of our own days. The eye of sympathy can alone pierce through the thick veil of interested misrepresentation, and emotion must co-operate with cold reason in the recovery of historic truth. It is not in history as in physical science where passion cannot blind the eye to facts. The Dravidians, the Dasyus, the Dāsas—by whichever of these three names we may choose to designate the bulk of the people of India since historic times—have suffered from the misrepresentation of the Aryan Rishi, who composed the Vedas in the remote past, and of the ancient Indian commentators and modern European and American expounders of the sacred Scriptures of the Hindus. At the same time a mythical Aryan race has been built up out of scattered allusions in the Indian writings, and credited with the invasion of India, with the extirpation in some places, and absorption into the capacious Aryan fold in others, of the numerous tribes that occupied this vast continent. This theory appealed to the prepossessions both of those who

---

1 Maitrāyana Sanas. I. 7, 3.
2 First printed from the Journal of the Royal Society of Arts, July 1912, revised by the author.
believed in the re-population of the world by the three sons of Noah, and of those who speak what are supposed to be dialects of the "Aryan" speech. Being myself a Dravidian I propose to submit the theory of the invasion of India by the Aryan race, and of the extraordinary expansion of that race on Indian soil, to the test of reason inspired by sympathy for the Dravidian.

The comparative study of languages was born when it was discovered that the languages of North India, Persia, Armenia, and practically the whole of modern Europe, all belonged to one linguistic group. The wide spread of these languages, now generally called the Indo-Germanic, was explained by the supposition that a race of people that spoke the parent form of these languages inhabited the regions beyond the Hind Kush, and in prehistoric times sent streams of colonists to Persia, to India, to Armenia, and on to Europe. The flush of enthusiasm caused by such a brilliant recovery of ancient history by the study of languages was heightened by the emotional satisfaction due to the notion that the Germanic races that dominate the world to-day were of the same stock as the haughty Brahman of India, who has, like Saturn, gloomed by himself in the horizon of India for several millennia, has guided its destinies in fields intellectual and political, and been responsible for the grandeur of its philosophy, and for the political ineptitude of its people. The name Aryan, which originally belonged to certain Indian tribes that followed the fire cult in the valley of the Punjab, and spoke an ancient form of the language whose later literary form was called the Sanskrit, the polished speech, was extended to this imaginary race, partly because Vedic Sanskrit—the language of the Aryas—was believed to be the most primitive form of the Indo-Germanic tongues, and also because the word Aryan, whatever its derivative meaning, meant "noble," and was, therefore, a fit designation for the great race that was believed to have civilised Southern and Western Asia and the whole of the European continent, and to lead the van of the world's progress to-day.

Anthropologists soon pricked this Aryan bubble, and the great Aryan stock that peoples such a large slice of the world's surface soon became a small tribe that Aryanised Eurasia—i.e., transmitted its language and culture to other races. The original habitat of this much shrunken tribe was shifted in 1878 from the regions round the Hind Kush to the shores of the Baltic by Poëche, and in 1889 to Russia by Taylor. In 1901, Sergi maintained that the Aryans were "of Asiatic origin," and "were savages when they invaded Europe; they destroyed in part the superior civilisation of the Neolithic populations and could not have created the Graeco-Latin civilisation." In 1911, Dr. Haddon, the greatest living authority on ethnology, carefully avoided the mention of the word 'Aryan' in his admirable account of "the wanderings of people" in Europe. The "Aryan race" has been given the quietus so far as Europe is concerned.

The theory of the invasion of India by the "Noble Aryan," and of the extinction in some places and the subjugation in others of the "savage Dasyu," was promulgated by Max Müller, Muir and other Sanskrit scholars in the middle of the nineteenth century, and has since been an article of creed with writers of the history of India. In 1891 and 1892 Risley attempted to supply this theory with an anthropometric foundation. Dr. Haddon summarises the results of Risley's researches in these words: "The Aryan type, as we find it in India at the present day, is marked by a relatively long (dolichocephalic) head, a straight, finely cut (leptorhine) nose, a long, symmetrically narrow face, a well-developed forehead, regular features, and a high facial angle. The stature is fairly high. . . . and the general build of the figure is well proportioned and slender rather than massive." These investigations were based chiefly on "the distinction between the fine and coarse type of nose," and on the theory that in India the nasal index "ranks higher as a distinctive character than the stature, or even than the cephalic index itself." This "Aryan type" is found in the purest form in the Punjab valley and, in other parts of India, is mixed with another type, called by Risley the "Dravidian type." To account for the existence of a "pure Aryan type" of non-Indian origin in the Punjab valley, Risley assumes that the "Aryans" must have moved into India with wives and children, "by tribes and families without any disturbance of their social order," at a time when north-western

2 Sergi, the Mediterranean Race, p. vi.
2 Haddon, The Study of Man, pp. 106-4.
India must have been open "to the slow advance of family or tribal migration." The previous inhabitants of the fertile valley of the Five Rivers politely retreated before the advancing "Aryans," so that the purity of the "Aryan type" might not be polluted; and when the "Aryans" had moved into the Punjab, an obliging Providence ordered that the north-western frontier of India should be "closed to the slow advance of family or tribal migration." Granting that all these miracles took place four thousand years ago, does subsequent history help us to believe that this Aryan type has remained unpolluted in the Punjab? Innumerable races have poured into India through the north-west in historic times. Persians, European Greeks, Bactrians, Scythians, Huns, Afghans, Tartars, and Moguls, have all invaded India and settled in larger or smaller numbers in the Punjab, and been absorbed in its "Aryan" population. It requires great scientific hardihood to maintain that the nasal index of the Punjabi has remained unaffected by this age-long welter of races.

Apart from the measurement of noses, the only other source of information regarding the "Aryans" of India is the mantras of the Vedas of the Hindus. These mantras were composed by Rishis belonging to tribes who called themselves Ārya, and who called certain other tribes Dasya or Dāsa. In later days Ārya meant "noble," and Dāsa meant "a slave," but it is not possible to find out with certainty what these words meant originally. The Ārya and the Dāsa fought with each other frequently; but as frequently Dāsa tribes were auxiliaries of Ārya tribes in fights among themselves. None of these conflicts are incidents of a war of invasion. The Āryas do not speak of themselves as invaders gradually driving the aborigines before them, and wresting their land from them. There is no trace of the invertebrate habit of people settling in a new land, that of importing into the land of their adoption geographical and personal names from their far-off original homes. In the Vedic hymns there is not even the slightest reference to or memory of any land outside India which the ancestors of the Āryas inhabited, no hint of the route through which they came to India, no phrase reminiscent of any foreign connection. Nor is there anything to indicate that they were gradually or suddenly hordes; the Āryas of the Vedic mantras speak of themselves as people living in the Indus-Ganges valley, leading a settled life in towns and villages, ploughing the soil and tending their numerous herds of cattle. Their kings, petty chiefs, lords of towns, and heads of villages, their village assemblies, political and religious, their irrigation canals and roads, their threshing-floors and water-roughs for cattle, all indicate that the Āryas lived in an organised society in the Vedic times. Nor were the Dasya savages. It is true the Āryas do not refer to them in complimentary terms; but even from the contemporaneous references to the Dasya in the hymns of their Aryan enemies, we can easily infer that they were not savages, but lived like the Āryas in towns and villages. They owned many castles built of wood like the castles of the Āryas. Their chariots, horses, and cattle proved a standing temptation to the Āryas to attempt to raid them. Thus all the available evidence shows that the Dasya were not savages, but at least as civilised as the Āryas. There is nothing in the mantras from which the physical characteristics of the Āryas or the Dasya can be inferred. There is a solitary word (ānāśa) used in reference to the Dasya, which has been variously interpreted as "mouthless," or "faceless," or "noseless," and some scholars believe that this refers to the nose of the Dravidian, "thick and broad," and the formula expressing its proportionate dimensions, "higher than in any known race, except the Negro."* There are also references to the "black" colour of the Dasya; but, in some passages, this certainly refers not to the human enemies of the Āryas but to demons whom they dreaded, and, in others, it is not easy to decide whether the word is used metaphorically or literally. To construct theories of racial characteristics on the shifting foundations of solitary phrases of very doubtful import, and in the total absence of any other evidence, is speculation run mad.

The only certain difference between the Ārya and the Dasya, frequently referred to in the mantras, is one of cult. Whatever the etymological meaning of the word Ārya may

---

*Imperial Gazetteer of India, I, pp. 392.

Haddon, The Study of Man, p. 104.
have been in the *mantras*, Hindu commentators on the *Veda*, from the authors of the *Nirukta*, down to Sāyaṇa, have explained it as "the son of the Lord," "the wise performer of the (fire-rites.)," "wise worshippers," "practitioners of fire-rites," "he who has attained a high position through the performance of fire-rites." On the other hand, innumerable passages in the *mantras* describe the Dasyus as "devoid of (fire-rites.)," "opposed to the (fire-rites.)," "without Indra," "offerers of worthless libation," "fire-less," etc. From this it is evident that the Dasyus incurred the hatred of the Āryas, because they did not worship the Aryan god Indra, and did not, like the Āryas, offer sacrifices through Agni, the fire-god, the mouth of the Aryan gods and the mediator between them and their human worshippers. The Dasyus, like the Āryas, killed animals in sacrifice to their gods, and we may presume that, like the followers of many modern non-Aryan Hindu cults, they poured the blood of the slaughtered victims at their altars. The Dasyus must have hated the fire-rites of the Āryas as a strange innovation, and they are described as "revilers" of the (Ārya) gods and rites, and are said to have frequently interrupted their performance. The *Nirukta* defines a Dasyu to be one that "destroys fire-rites." Besides offering animal sacrifices through fire there was a special libation that distinguished Ārya worship. More than the flesh of bulls and goats, Indra, the Ārya god, loved the intoxicating juice of the *soma* plant, and his worshippers, inspired by liberal draughts of *soma* juice, ventured forth to raid Dasyu settlements, and bring back their cattle and their women as prizes of war. In comparison with *soma*, the offerings of the Dasyus to their gods were regarded by the Āryas as "worthless obligations." The Āryas also frequently refer to the Dasyus as "prayerless," "enemies of prayer," "those that do not employ hymns." This indicates another line of cleavage of cult between the Āryas and the Dasyus.

All Aryan sacrifice, of animal or of *soma*, of corn or of cake, was accompanied with recitations of "prayers," either composed for the occasion or taken from a pre-existing stock of *mantras*. These *mantras* were composed in an early literary form of the tongue that later gave birth to classical Sanskrit. This Vedic language must have entered India primarily as the hieratic dialect of the followers of the fire- and *soma* cult. Before the Vedic tongue reached India, dialects of two linguistic families other than Indo-Germanic were spoken in India. Today those of the speakers of the Dravidian and Munda languages that have not yet been Aryanized still follow "fireless" cults. As similar cults are universal among the un-Aryanized part of the people of North India also, we may be certain that the Dravidian and Munda languages now associated with the "fireless" cult were once spread throughout India. Those of the people that became Āryans, i.e., joined the fire- and *soma* cult, necessarily learnt the language in which the rites were conducted. It must be added that there is no indication in the Vedic *mantras* as to what the languages of the Dasyus were.

The fire and *soma* cult and the Vedic speech, then, and not differences of race, distinguished the Vedic Āryas from the Vedic Dasyus, in so far as we can judge from the Veda. There remains to be discussed the question whether this cult and this speech were suddenly transplanted among the Āryas by any considerable body of foreigners, or whether they were slowly spread among them, undergoing changes in the process. The mere entry into a country of a foreign cult and a foreign tongue does not prove any appreciable ethnic disturbance of it. Dr. Haddon says: "It is astonishing with what ease a people can adopt a foreign language, which, however, almost invariably undergoes a structural and phonetic modification in the process." It is well known to students of comparative grammar that the Vedic parent of Sanskrit is profoundly different from the original Indo-Germanic. In this, as well as in certain respects of structure, most of the Euro-Indo-Germanic dialects are nearer the original

---

1 The *soma* plant has not yet been identified, but, judging from the methods of preparation of *soma* and its effects on man as described in the *Veda*, it must be akin to the hemp (hemp) of modern times. The *soma* juice was drunk without being fermented, and mixed with milk or curds, or was cooked with flour and honey.

tongue than the Vedic speech. This shows that the Vedic tongue came to India as a foreign language, and underwent there a levelling down of its vowels and other alterations. Now, as regards the cults, associated with this language. The soma plant is described in the Vedic mantras as growing on distant hills, like those of Gandhāra, and generally procured with some difficulty, and stored in a dried-up form as chauris is to-day. In later times, when the centre of the fire cult shifted into the heart of India, the soma plant could not be procured, its identity was forgotten, and substitutes came to be used in its stead. The soma cult flourished in ancient times in Persia. We may hence infer that it found its way into India from without. But once it was introduced, it underwent a great development in this country. The Aryan Rishis appreciated the virtues of soma juice so much that a large part of the Vedic mantras is devoted to its praise; King Soma attained a distinguished position in the Vedic pantheon, and the soma sacrifice became the principal rite of the Brahman. The fire cult, like the soma cult, existed in ancient Persia, but with this difference, that to the Persians fire was so holy that throwing offerings into it would pollute it; so parts of the bodies of slaughtered animals were shown to the fire and thrown aside. As in India the offerings to gods were burst out in the sacrificial fire, the fire cult underwent a fundamental change in this country.

When the cult changed, there resulted a corresponding and equally profound change in mythology. It is surprising that though the language of the Avesta and that of the Veda are so nearly allied that very often a sentence of the one can be turned into the other by merely making the necessary changes, there is very little in common between Avestan and Vedic mythology. In fact, quite as little as the mythology associated with the ancient Iranian speech as of that with the Indo-Germanic ursprache seems to have reached India. The only god common to the Vedic Aryas and the races that spoke Indo-Germanic dialects in Europe is Dyaus, and Dyaus is scarcely worth the name of god in the Vedic pantheon, being so little removed from the physical sky. Then, again, Mitra is practically the only god common to the Vedas and the Zend Avesta, and is in both literatures a subordinate person. Indra, the chief god of the Indian Aryas, is a minor demon of the Iranian Aryas. Varuṇa was unknown in Persia. All other Indian gods are of pure Indian origin, Rudra, Vaiṣṇava, Aditi, Maruts, Śivas, Śivas, etc. The very name of the fire god, Agni, is also Indian, the corresponding Persian god being Aitar. It is impossible to discuss here how many of the Vedic gods were borrowed from the people of India, and then Aryanised, and how many were evolved on Indian soil from pre-Aryan sources latent in Vedic speech, but the fact is striking that so few Aryan gods came to India along with Aryan speech.

From this we see that the language and the cult of the Áryas were borrowed from without, and profoundly altered on Indian soil. If this cultural drift had been accompanied by any appreciable racial drift, if the cult and the language had been brought into India by any considerable body of foreigners, who formed a race by themselves, and lived apart from the native races, neither the cult nor the language would have undergone such serious alterations as they have, but would have remained relatively pure. Hence the only conclusion that is borne out by the facts that a foreign tongue, the Vedic, and a foreign cult, the fire and soma worship, drifted into India from without, and were adopted by certain tribes, later called Aryas, among whom the cult and the speech developed in new ways, and distinguished the tribes that possessed them from the other tribes of this country.

* The comparative study of religion has brought out the fact that the movement of religious thought in early times was not from polytheism to monothelism, but the other way about, from tribal monotheism to inter-tribal polytheism. In his Religion of Egypt, p. 4, Professor Flinders Petrie says: "Wherever we can trace back polytheism to its earliest stages, we find that results from combination of monothelism. The polytheism of the Vedas is one of the many proofs that the Vedas refer not to the beginning of any cult, but the culminating stage of many pre-existing tribal cults, which had come about chiefly out of political causes. This is the real explanation of the perplexing henotheism (as Max Müller called it) that runs throughout the Vedic mantras. At the time of the composition of the Vedic hymns, the tribe that worshipped Indra seems to have acquired predominance over the tribes that worshipped other gods.
Even among the Aryas this cult was but superimposed on, and did not oust, pre-existing cults. It mingled with the previous totemistic cults implying the worship of animals—like the cow, the hawk, and the serpent, of trees like the *ficus religiosa*, of hill deities, and river goddesses; it also mixed with innumerable religio-magical practices based on animistic beliefs, all of which are abundantly referred to in the Vedic *mantras*, and are prepotent to-day in India. But the fire-priests, some of whom, like the *Ritihin*, composed hymns and instituted rites, and others like the *Hdt*, the *Adhavaryu*, etc., assisted at the ritual, dominated the land from early times, and secured the patronage of kings. As they alone have left literary monuments, they loom large in the early history of India; but we must not forget that the bulk of the people of India followed, and still follow, the non-Aryan "fireless" rites of the Dasyus, and the fire-rite was at no age more than the semi-esoteric cult of the few. The spread of the fire cult into the lower Ganges valley and into the Deccan has been mistaken by historians for the spread of the "Aryan race." There is no evidence of a racial dislocation in India in these early days. So far as is known the bulk of the people was stationary. The story of the *Râmâyana* has been by some interpreted to refer to an ancient invasion of Southern India by the Aryas. But how the mythical defeat of a king of Lakshminarayana by a solitary ascetic prince, exiled from his kingdom, helped by his brother and by a South Indian monkey tribe, can mean the migration of a north Indian people, passes comprehension. In all the early books there is evidence of the spread of the fire cult and the gradual increase of the power of the fire-priests, but none of any racial drift. Even this gradual extension of the fire cult did not mean the adoption of it by the people, such as takes place when Christianity or Islam spreads in our days, but merely meant the predominance of the Brahmans and the adoption of forms of State fire-rites like the *Râjanâya* or *Aśvamedha* by kings for special public purposes. The fire-rite could not spread among the people, for from pretty early times the Brahmans alone were competent to act as the fire-worshipper, and kings could be admitted to the fire-worship, even in sacrifices peculiar to kings, only after being temporarily invested with Brahmahood, and even they could approach only the outermost of the sacrificial fires, that at the entrance to the sacrificial hall. This fire cult gradually died out even among the Brahmans, and to-day but faint relics of it are followed in a half-hearted manner in Brahmans' homes.

But from early days the name Árya—which originally belonged to the tribes that had adopted the fire and some cult—was transferred to the higher classes of the Indian peoples, who, whatever their beliefs and religio-magical practices, acknowledged the theoretical supremacy of the fire-priest; so much so that when Gantara Siddhârtha founded an order of ascetics (*Bhikshus*) open to Kshatriyas, in imitation of the Brahmans' order of Saññiyâsins, his dharma was called *Árya* (Árya). When, in later times, modern Hinduism rose with its numerous castes each characterised by endogamy, and with its beliefs and practices conglomerated out of every cult that had grown in ancient India, the term Árya was extended to every clan and every tribe that could lay claim to a high social status, and could enforce that claim. And, lastly, when the theory of the "Aryan invasion" of India was promulgated by European scholars, it was seized with avidity by the "higher castes" as affording a historical basis to their pretensions of superiority to other castes. And the result is that every member of every caste that calls itself "Aryan" believes that blue Aryan blood flows in his veins. Emotion plays a large part in the manufacture of history, and any theory that soothes the vanity of a people is straightway elevated to the rank of a fact; so to-day a scientific examination of the bases of the theory of a superior Áryan race is resented more in India than anywhere else in the world.

European Sanskrit scholars, who have mostly kept themselves aloof from the world's progress in the science of ethnology, still speak to-day of the "Aryan" invasion of India, and the supersession of the aborigines by the "Aryan," as if it were a fact. They do not realise that, as Dr. Haddon says, "the so-called Aryan conquest was more a moral and intellectual one than a substitution of the white man for the dark-skinned people—that is, it was more social than racial." But it is regrettable that Dr. Haddon, the cautious ethnologist, the most eminent authority on the social drifts of the world, should yet give his unhesitating adhesion to Risley's theory that
"Aryans, perhaps associated with Turki tribes," moved with wives and children into the Punjab about 1703 B.C., and completely displaced the previous population, and, what is more curious, their noses have remained unaltered since, notwithstanding that the Punjab has been the cockpit of races since the dawn of history almost down to our days, thus setting at naught at the same time the evidence enshrined in the Vedas Mantras and the necessities of the geographic control of all human affairs.

When all is said, there may still remain in the minds of some the feeling of doubt how a cult or a speech can travel by itself. The fire cult and the speech of the Aryas must have come to India in the wake of a peaceful overflow of people from the uplands of Central Asia into the plains of India, or been the result of a peaceful intercourse between the Indian people and foreigner. But theories cannot be built on metaphors, and there is absolutely no evidence at present to guide to a solution of the problem. What we know for certain from the researches of Anthropologists and Philologists is that nearly 5000 years ago a race of tall, fair-skinned, narrow-headed giants, lived in the great steppe land extending from the north of the Carpathians to the north of Persia. The conditions of their life made them lead a pastoral life and tame the wild horse. They were savages who continued in the stone age, while their contemporaries in Egypt, Crete, Babylonia and probably India had begun to use iron tools. Among them the Indo-Germanic languages were evolved. About 2,500 B.C., the drying up of their steppes led them to migrate to the west and the south. One branch of these people settled in Bactria where they learned to worship fire and drink soma. From them this cult and this tongue came to India. It is well-known that cults can travel far without the help of the sword. The Christ cult arose in Jerusalem and, though promulgated by humble and despised people, spread through Europe within a short time. The Mithra cult started from Persia and spread also throughout Europe, even to remote Britain and for a long time proved a powerful rival to Christianity. Cults take with them a sacred language wherever they go. Latin spread along with the Roman form of Christianity to Britain and Germany and profoundly affected the languages of those countries. So the fire cult spread in India, the "divine" soma juice providing sufficient temptation to people to take to the Aryan rites; along with the cult spread the Sanskrit language. How far Sanskrit spread as a language and how far it affected the languages of northern India, whether it supplanted any of them or degenerated into any of them or helped the existing languages to change into the modern vernacular is another story. This question has not been squarely faced as yet by any one and I propose to take it up for discussion in a future article.

THE AGE OF SRIHARSHA.

In the concluding stanza of the fifth canto of his Namahdhyaycharitram Brihshara refers to a work of his entitled Srvijaya-praastati, "the panegyric of the glorious Vajraya." In the concluding stanza of the 7th canto of the poet refers to another work of his entitled Gandhorejikalaka-praastati, "the panegyric of the family of the kings of Gandha"; in that of the 17th canto to Chhinda-praastati, "the panegyric of Chhinda"; in stanza 151 of the 22nd canto to Navasahasansakcharitram, "the life of Navasahasansaka"; and in the concluding stanza of the same canto he states that "he received two gadas and a seat from the king of Kanauj." If Vajraya of Srvijaya-praastati is identified with Vajrayapa of the Prathahra dynasty of Kanauj, an inscription of whose time is dated in A.D. 990 (Kielhorn's N. I. List No. 89) and whose successor, Bajrapala, was a contemporary of Sultan Muhammad of Gauri, Chhinda of the Chhinda-praastati with Lalla of the Chhinda family whose Dewal prasasti is dated in A.D. 992 (Kielhorn's N.I. List, No. 51); and Navasahasansaka of the Navasahasansakcharitram with the Paramara king Sindurajya of Malva, who, according to Padmagupta's Navasahasansakcharitram, had his bhrata Navasahasansaka and succeeded Vaipati shortly after A.D. 994, we obtain a date for the author of Namahdhyaycharitram that satisfies all the conditions. The king of Gandha to whom Gandhorejikalaka-praastati was dedicated was Mahipala I. Brihshara, like Sihana in the 11th century, must have been a wandering pandit in the beginning of his career, and visited the courts of Sindurajya, Lalla, and Mahipala I and tried to win their favours by dedicating prasasti to them, before he secured the patronage of the king of Kanauj.

Rama Prasad Chanda.

NOTE.

I am afraid, Srikshara cannot be placed so early as the close of the 10th century, as Mr. Rama Prasad Chanda contends. I agree with Bühler (Jour. Bomb. As. Soc., Vol. X. p. 31 ff.) in accepting the statement of Rajasekhara, author of the PrasadaNaksha that Srikshara wrote the Naisha- dhiya-charita at the bidding of Jayantachandra,
who can be no other than the Gadhavāla king Jayachandra (A.D. 1172-87). At the end of this work he tells us that when he composed it he was receiving a couple of betels and a seat of honour in the court of the king of Kānyakubja. And this is in consonance with what Rājarākharā has said, because Jayachandra was a king of Kānauj. Vijaya of his Vijayaprabhāstrī can thus be no other than Jayachandra’s father, Vijayachandra (A.D. 1155-9). Sīrharṣa was also the author of the Arjuna-sūryaṇa, as seems from the concluding verse of canto IX. of the Nīshadāsīya-charita. Arjuna-sūryaṇa has been wrongly translated by “description of the sea.” It really means “description of (king) Arjuna.” And this Arjuna undoubtedly is Amṛsārā, who belonged to the Chāhamāna dynasty of Sambhar, who was a contemporary of the Chandrakula Kumārapāla, and for whom we have the date V.E. 1196=A.D. 1133. This identification confirms the conclusion that Sīrharṣa was a protege of Jayachandra. Chhinda of his Chhindaprabhāstrī is not, as Mr. Rama Prasad Chanda supposes, Lalla of the Chhinda family whose record is dated A.D. 992, but appears to be the Chhinda chief of Gaya, referred to in an inscription dated in 1813 after Buddha’s Nirvāṇa A.D. 1176 (ante, Vol. X. p. 342). It is difficult to determine who was the hero of his Nārāyaṇa-charita. Perhaps Nārāyaṇa may be an epithet of Jayachandra himself. The name Gadā-vṛtta-sūryaṇa does not refer to any specific ruler of the Gauda country.

D. B. B.


Only very few early Indian Mathematical works, irrespective of commentaries, are known to us. If we name those of Aryabhāta, Vārāhi Mihira, Brahmagupta, and Bhāskara, we practically exhaust the list. All these men were natives of North India Mahāvīrācārya is the first South Indian, whose work has been made accessible to us. And hence we have every reason to be grateful to Mr. Bhaṅgaśāhārya who, in editing the Gaṇita Sūrya-samārtha with the help of barely sufficient materials, has done a laborious work, and has performed it with conscientious ability.

Mahāvīrācārya lived in the time of the Raṣṭra-Kūta Emperor Amoghavāra Nyatāngara. He belongs, therefore, to the middle of the ninth century A.D. He takes his place between Brahmagupta in the seventh, and Bhāskara in the twelfth century. For the history of Indian Mathematics it would be interesting to know what Mahāvīrācārya relation was to his predecessors. He nowhere names them. His editor concludes that he was “familiar with the work of Brahmagupta and endeavoured to improve upon it,” because “his classification of arithmetical operations is simpler, his rules are fuller, and he gives a larger number of examples for illustration and exercise.” But perhaps this may not be sufficient to prove that he looked upon Brahmagupta “as a writer of authority in the field of Hindu astronomy and mathematics.” Simplification is hardly the usual mark of progress in Hindu science. Professor D.E. Smith, in his introduction to the edition, comes to the conclusion that “the works of Brahmagupta, Mahāvīrācārya, and Bhāskara may be described as similar in spirit, but entirely different in detail.” Still the fact that Mahāvīrācārya was a Jain, and that Jainism originated and spread from the country with the capital “Pñaliputra where Aryabhaṭṭa wrote” points to the line of descent of Southern Indian mathematics.

The scope of the Gaṇita Sūrya-samārtha may be seen from the Table of Contents. The work consists of nine chapters which treat of the following subjects: (1) terminology; (2) arithmetical operations; (3) fractions; (4) miscellaneous problems on fractions; (5) Rule of three; (6) minor problems; (7) calculations relating to the measurement of areas; (8) calculations regarding excavations; and (9) calculations relating to shadows. The edition is provided with four useful appendices on: (1) Sanskrit words denoting numbers with their ordinary and numerical significations; (2) Sanskrit words used in the translation and their explanations; (3) answers to problems; (4) tables of measures. On page 298, in Appendix XII, daśa, ten, has been inadvertently explained as “the tenth place,” instead of the second place in notation; see page 7 of the English translation.

A. F. RUDOLF HÖHNLE.
THE OBSCURE MALAY TIN CURRENCY AND MONEY OF THE
FEDERATED MALAY STATES.

BY SIR H. C. TEMPLE, BART.

Prefatory Remarks.

Mr. W. W. Skeat placed at my disposal some time ago a number of notes made on the spot, and some correspondence with Mr. G. M. Laidlaw from other notes made in Perak, relating to the tin currency and money in use in the Federated Malay States up till about 1880. I now address myself, without pretending to exhaust the subject, to the very difficult task of solving the mystery of this currency and coinage.¹

Before attacking the subject directly, I preface my examination by standard tables of the money established by the Dutch and British East India Companies in their Settlements in the Malay Peninsula, in order to make the comprehension of my conclusions and arguments the easier for the reader.

Standard Tables of Malay Money.

1. Table showing the old Dutch popular method of reckoning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4 pitis, pese (cash)</th>
<th>make</th>
<th>1 duit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2½ duit (cent)</td>
<td>make</td>
<td>1 dubbeltje, wang baharu (copper)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 dubbeltje</td>
<td>make</td>
<td>1 kündéri perak (silver)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 kündéri (candareen)</td>
<td>make</td>
<td>1 tali (string of cash)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 tali</td>
<td>make</td>
<td>1 suku (quarter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 suku</td>
<td>make</td>
<td>1 ringgit (Sp. dollar, real)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

400 cash to the dollar of 100 cents.

2. Table showing the modern British popular method of reckoning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4 pitis, kēping, duit (cash)</th>
<th>make</th>
<th>1 tēngah sen (half cent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 tēngah sen</td>
<td>make</td>
<td>1 sen (cent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2½ sen</td>
<td>make</td>
<td>1 wang baharu (copper)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 buaya</td>
<td>make</td>
<td>1 kupang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 kupang</td>
<td>make</td>
<td>1 suku (quarter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 suku</td>
<td>make</td>
<td>1 jampal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 jampal²</td>
<td>make</td>
<td>1 ringgit (dollar)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

400 cash to the dollar of 100 cents.


² Kēping means a bit, piece; buaya means a crocodile; both terms refer to the old tin ingot currency of the Malay States. There is another term, kōpang, for a small copper coin or weight in half a duit, giving 500 (small) cash to the British dollar, a figure which is of interest in regard to many statements that follow. Jampal is used at Bial for 30 (not 50) sen or cents; Wilkinson, Dict. s.v., also speaks of an "old dollar," of which the jampal was half. The main point for the present purpose is that jampal = half a dollar, or rupee.
It is important, in order to follow the remarks that succeed, to have the relations of the old Dutch and modern British money to each other, and also the terms, European and vernacular, used for both, as clearly as possible in the head. A comparative table is therefore given here.

### 3. Table of Malay Money in terms of cents to the dollar (ringgit).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modern British</th>
<th>Old Dutch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>cents.</td>
<td>cents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vernacular names.</td>
<td>vernacular names.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>½ kēping, pleis and pichis, pese, pesi, ¼ duix, and ⅛ duix, ⅛ cash</td>
<td>¼ pese and pesi, ⅛ cash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>⅛ tēngah sen</td>
<td>⅛ duit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 sen, duix</td>
<td>1 duit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2½ wang baharu, ⅛ buaya</td>
<td>2½ wang baharu, dubbeltje (Anglice vulgo double key?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(in accounts)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 buaya</td>
<td>⅞ kōndōri perak, ⅞ pēnjuru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 kupang (also, for tin, kati, tampang, jongkong, ranam)</td>
<td>12½ tašli (piak in tin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 dasplono hia</td>
<td>25 suku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 suku (bidor and rias in tin)</td>
<td>50 jampal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 jampal, 10 mas</td>
<td>100 ringgit (tahil)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I have spoken above of the "mystery" of the Malay tin currency and coinage, because, until quite lately, specimens of it in the form of animals and birds were regarded as toys, even by local collectors of considerable experience; and even now persons long resident in the Peninsula seem to regard this currency as mythical, and the specimens coming to light from time to time as children's toys. Local observers have not, however, always thought so; see the following instructive quotation in a translation from Klinkert, Woordenboek, s. v. buwaijai, crocodile: "A tin coin in the shape of a crocodile was minted in Selangor." Upon this Mr. Skeat comments: "the Malay peasant of Selangor to this day reckons his small currency by the buwaijai. I have myself often heard it so used, though the thing itself went out of use in Selangor about 60-70 years ago (c. 1825), and is now never seen in Selangor itself. I was told this by some of the old K'lang Chiefs who spoke of the tin ingots being brought to the custom house at K'lang."

That both the solid tin ingot and the "animal" ingot currency of the Peninsula were known to traders in the 18th century, the following quaint quotation from Steven's Guide to East Indies Trade, 1775, p. 113, will prove:—"Tin is to be bought at New Queda, in the Straits of Malacca (you cannot go in there within a league of the shore for a bar) by the bahar, equal to 419 lb."

---

9 In Singapore and formerly in Selangor: from Portugese, pese, pesi.
10 In Penang a duix = cent; ⅛ duix = duit elsewhere.
11 Wang means: "small change" synonymously with steng and st'eling (Dutch skilling) for 5, 10, 20 and 50 cents. Wang baharu, the "new wang" was a copper coin = Dutch dubbeltje. In accounts the wang was 2 cents. For "double key" see ante, vol. xxvi., p. 335.
12 Vulgo buwaijai, a reminiscence of the buwaijai (crocodile) tin ingot.
13 I. c., silver kōndōri or kōndri (copper). Klinkert (Nieuw Maleisich-Nederlandsch Woordenboek) calls this coin simply perak or sa-perak (silver piece) and makes it 6 cents. As a term of account sa-perak = 6 cents.
14 In weighing gold: 2 pēnjuru (silver coins) = 1 piak or mayam; 4 piak = 1 jampal; 2 jampal = 1 real (vinais) or Spanish dollar. Piak is, however, not the same word as piak: Wilkinson, Dict., s. v.
15 Suku is two strings or sets; it is the quarter dollar. Suku means properly "a quarter", originally, "a limb, leg."
16 This coin is now obsolete and rare = the Dutch guider.
17 It was, however, clearly in occasional use till 1860 or even later.
English. The advantage is considerable if you pay it in dollars. Here your opium will sell with safety for better than cent per cent. The English and Portuguese country-ships generally barter it for tin. The country-ships generally meet ours [F. I. Co.'s ships] and will sell their tin for rupees instead of dollars. But observe to get large slabs [kipping] if possible. If you cannot get all large, you may take everything but their chain-stuff, like jack-chains, and thin stuff of birds, etc. If you are obliged to take the small stuff, the officers must take care where it is stowed, or the sailors will steal it, for somehow [native liquor or spirits] and keep a good look-out while taking in. If you buy of a country-ship, know whether they sell by the Queda or Salangue bar. The first is equal to 419 l.b., the other not so much."

What Stevens meant by this caution is clearly explained in a useful statement by that accurate first-hand observer Lockyer (Account of the Trade in India, 1711, p. 43): "200 catty Malay is 1 bahar of 422 lbs. 15 oz. . . . 1½ China catty is commonly reckoned 1 catty Malay, which brings 3 pecull China equal to a bahar, but should one buy after that rate one should be a looser in every bahar, for 3 China pecull will not hold out above 396 l. This is a very necessary caution: since I have known several suffer through neglect in examining disproportion in receipt."

I.

Tin Ingot Currency and Tin Money.

In a dissertation on the Beginnings of Currency, I explained that "barter is the exchange of one article for another: currency implies exchange through a medium; money that the medium is a token," and I differentiated currency and money thus: "Currency implies that the medium of exchange is a domestically usable article, and money that it is a token not domestically usable." Under such definitions iron spear heads, cooking pots (Siamese Shans), and ingots of tin (Malays of the Peninsula) are currency. But iron lozenges (Siamese Shans), imitations of iron hatchet (Nassau Islanders), of iron knives (Kachins and Shans of Assam), of iron spears (Nagas of Assam) of ingots of tin (Malays of the Peninsula) are money. It is on the principle above-stated that I will proceed to examine the evidence at my disposal as to the tin media of exchange formerly in use in the Malay Peninsula.

There are in the Cambridge Museum certain specimens, both of the new obsolete tin ingot currency and tin money, which have been measured and weighed. In both instances the specimens refer to two scales of values.

The description given in the Museum Catalogue, obviously based on information supplied by the donors, is as follows:—

17. Tin Currency.

879. One block, very roughly cast, of truncated pyramidal form with string-hole, weight 19 oz., size across base 2".2 × 2".2.

---

12 Ships owned in Indian ports though officered by Europeans. Yule, Hobson-Jobson, s.v. Country. They were in severe competition with the East India Company. See Stevens, p. 112, s.v. Malaca.

13 Stevens means by "thin stuff of birds," small tin sambar (model of animal) ingots: see infra p. 92. By "chain-stuff like jack-chains" and "small stuff," he apparently means strings of cash, though these are not in the least like jack-chains (i.e., with unwelded or unsoldered links at right angle to each other) unless we read the word "jack" in its sense of "smaller than usual." See O. E. D., s.v. Jack and jack-chain.

14 See Yule, op. cit., s.v. Samahoo.

15 Kedah or Selangoe bahares. The modern Malay standard bahares or bahar is approximately 72 cwt. or 400 lbs., but it varies locally from time to time in the reports of traders, and one of the difficulties of this inquiry is the gauging of the probable accuracy of reports from all sorts and conditions of men.


880, 881. Two blocks, cast solid, similar to last, but with a receding step two-thirds up from the base, weight 112 oz., and 98 oz. respectively; the heavier measuring 4.5 x 4.5 at the base and 2.7 in height. They were formerly used in Selangor for the payment of duty on tin, but also passed as currency for general merchandise (their value was 25 cents: tin being then worth only 15 dollars the pikul).

882. One of similar form, but taller, with curved sides and no step. Its squared top is stamped in relief with an X-like mark, on the base of one face with two bold ridges, and on the opposite side with four smaller ridges. Weight 72 oz. Size 4 x 4, by 2.7 in height.

883-885. Three: the base (of plain truncated pyramid) being surrounded with a wide flat rim. The flat top is stamped with a quatrefoil, the tampung manpis. Weights respectively 30 oz., 22 1/2 oz., and 18 oz. This variety called sa-tampung, i.e., a block or a cake, or when small sa-buaja, was used, prior to the establishment of English rule, for the payment of tin duty. Value of the larger coins 10 cents, of the smaller 2 1/4 cents, but tin was then less than half its present value.

886-888. Three similar in shape to the last, but cast hollow, and called by the same name (sa-tampung). Top plain, but the wide base rim bears an inscription. These tokens, evidently derived from the solid form, are still current in Pahang. Two of 4 oz., value 10 cents, and one of 1 oz., value 1 cent.

Mr. Skeat and Professor Ridgeway, however, some years ago weighed and tabulated the Museum specimens and arrived at results which I now put forth as follows:

### Cambridge Museum.

**Ingot Tin Currency from Selangor.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Museum number</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Approx. fraction of dollar</th>
<th>Approx. weight oz.</th>
<th>Actual weight oz.</th>
<th>Mint mark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>885</td>
<td>buaya</td>
<td>1/20</td>
<td>11 1/2</td>
<td>12 1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>884</td>
<td>tampung (kati)</td>
<td>1/10</td>
<td>22 1/2</td>
<td>(1 1/4 lbs.)</td>
<td>22 1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>883</td>
<td>piak (tail)</td>
<td>1/8</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>881</td>
<td>bidor</td>
<td>1/4</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>(3 1/2 lbs.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>880</td>
<td>2-buaya piece</td>
<td>2/5</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>879</td>
<td>jampal</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>112</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dollar</td>
<td></td>
<td>224</td>
<td>(14 lbs.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### II. Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Museum number</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Approx. fraction of dollar</th>
<th>Approx. weight oz.</th>
<th>Actual weight oz.</th>
<th>Mint marks: top sides m and n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>882</td>
<td>karakura</td>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

164 Tampok manpis, represents the "rosette" at the end of a mangosteen fruit opposite the calyx. It has divisions indicating the number of the sections within, generally 3, 4, or 5.

17 Mint at Kerayong in Ulu Klang in Selangor.

18 Called tampok manpis or mangosteen rosette. It is not a quatrefoil as the Cambridge Catalogues states. It occurs on the first three pieces. This form is called "pagoda" later on in these pages.

19 The meaning of this word is "crocodile."

20 The tampung represents the kati of tin, which has a standard weight nowadays of 1 lb. The term means a block or a cake (of tin).

21 These have been inserted to complete the scale; the bidor represents the current akas, or quarter dollar.

22 The top represents the mangosteen rosette, the sides are called wemumba (?), after the sloping sheaves of a tin mine (lintong). This form is called the "tortoise" later on in these pages.

23 This is a roughly cast specimen.

24 The meaning of this word is "tortoise." Five other ingots have been weighed and are noticed infra, p. 94.
Thomas Bowrey writing about 1675 of Junkoeylon has the following passage, which is of great value in this connection:—

"They have noe sort of coined monies here, save what is made of tinne, which is melted into small lumps, and passe very current provided they be of their just weight allowed by statute: and are as followeth:—

one small lump or putta valueth here 3d English
one great putta is $2\frac{1}{2}$ small ones value 7\frac{1}{2} English
which is their current moneys and noe other: but if wee bringe silver or gold massy or coined the rich men will trade with us for tinne and give some advance, 10 or 15 per cent. upon the moneys.

"When wee have a considerable quantitie of these small pieces of tinne together, wee weigh with scales or stylyard 52 pound weight and $\frac{1}{2}$, and melt it in a steele pann: for the purpose and ruane it into a mold of wood or clay, and that is an exact cupine, 8 of which are one baharre weight of Janselone or 420 English pound weight.

"In any considerable quantitie of goods sold together, wee agree for see many baharre, or see many cupines; when a small parcel, then for see many piece, or see many great or small puttas: 4 great putta make a piece; 10 small ones is a piece,"

From this statement is derived the following scale:—

\[
\begin{align*}
2\frac{1}{2} \text{ puttas small make} & 1 \text{ putta large} \\
4 & 1 \text{ piece} \\
10 & 1 \text{ cupine} \\
8 & 1 \text{ bahar}
\end{align*}
\]

It is here necessary to explain that *putta* represents the Malay *patah*, a fragment: *piece*, the well-known Indian and Far Eastern commercial weight *viss* [*Tamil: viisi*] of which the most persistent standard equivalent is 3\frac{1}{2} lbs.: *cupine*, the Malay *koping*, a slab of *tin*. From the two foregoing scales also is derived the important fact that the *viss of commerce* (3\frac{1}{2} lbs.) represented the bidor or quarter dollar of the Malay tin currency (3\frac{1}{2} lbs.).

Captain Forrest, who visited the Mergui Archipelago in 1783, writes:—"Certain pieces of tin, shaped like the under half of a cone or sugarloaf cut by a parallel plane, called *poot*, are used on the island [*Junkoeylon*] as money: weighing about three pounds with their halves and quarters of similar shape: if attempted to be exported without paying duty, they are seizureable. This encourages smuggling. The value of tin is from 12 to 13 Spanish dollars the *peculi* of 183 lb. put on board clear of duty."

This statement affords a comparative table in the following terms:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bowrey 1675</th>
<th>Forest 1783</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2\frac{1}{2} patah small make 1 patah large</td>
<td>2 quarter put make 1 half put</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 patah large</td>
<td>1 viss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 viss</td>
<td>2 half put</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 cupine</td>
<td>1 put (viss)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Forrest’s *poot* is clearly the viss, and valuable information is procured from him as to the dual form of the currency, thus supporting the Cambridge Museum specimens; one in the form of a "pagoda" and the other in that of a "sugarloaf." For the purposes of distinction these terms will be used to describe them here.

---

25 Countries Round the Bay of Bengal, pp. 249 ff.
26 Mys (valpe Angloica, massaia, more) means the Malay gold of currency.
27 Voyages to the Mergui Archipelago, Milburn, Commerce, 1813, ii. p. 291, copies the information here and mixes it up with that to be found in Stevens' Guide to E. I. Trade, 1775, p. 127, and gives a table which is impossible on the basis that the *pott* is about 3 lbs. 4 *poota* = 1 viss, 16 viss = 1 capin, 8 capines = 1 bahar of 476 lbs. Kelly, Camb, i. pp. 103, 121 (1833), copies Milburn, but makes the bahar of Junkoeylon 465 lbs. and that of Toocopa 476 lbs.
We are now in a position to set up provisionally two comparative tables; which will, however, require recasting somewhat as we proceed, thus:

**Comparative Table of Malay Ingot Tin Currencies.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale of Pagoda Currency</th>
<th>Scale of Sugarloaf Currency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>corresponding to the modern British monetary scale</td>
<td>corresponding to the old Dutch monetary scale</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>cent$ to the dollar</th>
<th>name</th>
<th>approx. weight in oz. av.</th>
<th>cent$ to the dollar</th>
<th>name</th>
<th>approx. weight in oz. av.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 buaya</td>
<td>11¼</td>
<td>2½</td>
<td>patah (small)</td>
<td>5½</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 tampang (gajah)$^{20}$</td>
<td>22½ (1 lb.)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>patah (large)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12½ tali</td>
<td>[12]</td>
<td></td>
<td>tampang (kati)</td>
<td>2½   (1½ lb.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 bidor</td>
<td>56 (3 lb.)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>ayam bendar</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31½</td>
<td></td>
<td>viss</td>
<td>56   (3½ lb.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 buaya</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td>kurakura</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 jampal</td>
<td>112 (7 lb.)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>dollar (ringgit)</td>
<td>224 (14 lb.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 dollar (ringgit)</td>
<td>224 (14 lb.)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>keping$^{21}$ (jongkong)</td>
<td>52½ lb.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pikul</td>
<td>140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>bahara</td>
<td>420</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Certain useful facts come out of this table. The small *patah* is the *wong* or half *buaya*; the large *patah* is the *pinjur* or half *tali*; the standard weight *kati* (usually 1½ lb.) and *bidor* or *viss* (3½ lb.) are the same in both scales. The *viss* is 10 small *patah* and the *kurakura* is 2½ *tali*. The two scales constantly dovetail into each other, and it will be observed that the "pagoda" scale corresponds with the modern British monetary scale and the "sugarloaf" with the old Dutch, as stated at the head of the table. (See infra, pp. 92 ff.)

Having thus established the fact that the unit of the ingot tin currency—the dollar—represented 14 lb. or 10½ kati (at 1½ lb. the *kati* of block tin). I will proceed to examine the tin money and to tabulate the Cambridge Museum specimens as follows:—

**Cambridge Museum.**

**Table of Tin ("Hat"$^{22}$) Money from Pahang.**

**Form**

I. Pagoda Scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Museum number</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Approx. fraction of unit (dollar)</th>
<th>Approx. nominal weight in grs. (unit 3120)</th>
<th>Actual weight in grs.</th>
<th>Actual number of grains represented in unit (dollar)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24I</td>
<td>buaya</td>
<td>1/20</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>3200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24H</td>
<td>jongkong$^{23}$</td>
<td>1/12</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>3210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bidor$^{24}$</td>
<td>1/4</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>3108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^{20}$ These columns are added for the sake of clearing the comparison of the scales.

$^{21}$ This word means elephant. The names *crocodile*, elephant, tortoise, cock, have been shown to help in elucidating what follows.

$^{22}$ This term means "large cock" and is supplied from the scale of "ingot animal currency" (infra, p. 92).

$^{23}$ So called by European observers from its shape.

$^{24}$ Not in the Museum catalogue, but weighed at the Museum with the other specimens. The *jongkong* or rema of the tin money corresponded to the *tampang* of the ingot tin currency.

$^{25}$ Another piece was weighed out at 712 grs., which seems to be a "light" *bidor*. I have in my possession two specimens of the *bidor*, both dated on the under part of the "rim of the hat" 1821 A. H. = 1864, with the word *amap* (four) attached, valued at 2 cents; and two specimens of the *buaya* both dated 1855 A. H. = 1899, with the word *sah* (one) attached, valued at 2 cents; but according to Mr. Laidlaw's informant the tin *buaya* was worth 8 pittas or 1½ cent. Much importance does not attach to unsupported valuations in terms of
Now the standard silver (Spanish) dollar weighs 416 grs., therefore 7½ Sp. dollars weigh 3120 grs., and the references in the tin money table seem clearly to point to the subdivision of a unit of 8120 grs. This would mean that the ratio of silver money to tin money was 1 to 7½, but by the tin ingot scales we find that the unit of that currency weighed 14 lbs. or 10½ kati. That is, tin could be purchased at 10½ kati to the unit (Sp. dollar) of either money. This represents its most persistent par price.

The general inference therefore from the above considerations is that the ratio of the unit of silver money to the unit of tin money was 1 to 7½, and that the ratio of the unit of money to the unit of ingot tin currency was 1 to 10½. The difference between the two ratios represents the profit of the mint-owners of the tin money, which was thus 3 points in 10½ or 28½%. Practically the gross profit to the mint on its production must have been 30%, and considering the quality of the product, the method of minting and the prevailing low rates of labour, the net profit could not have been far short of the gross, say 25% of the value of the product. It was obviously to secure this profit that the weight of the tin money was fixed at 7½ times that of the established silver money of the time, which was the Spanish dollar and its recognised divisions. The weight or intrinsic value of the tin money is thus accounted for: its form merely imitated the contemporary form in which ingots of tin were usually cast.

The above conclusions are confirmed in an interesting and independent manner by a table to be made out of Mr. Laidlaw's letter dated 14th June 1904 from Lower Perak.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>cents</th>
<th>name</th>
<th>weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>½</td>
<td>tahil</td>
<td>1½ oz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6½</td>
<td>pénjaru</td>
<td>14½ &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12½</td>
<td>piak</td>
<td>1½ lbs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>suku</td>
<td>3½ &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>jampal</td>
<td>6½ &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>dollar</td>
<td>13½ &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>képing</td>
<td>50 &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pikul</td>
<td>135 &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bahara</td>
<td>400 &quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This shows that the weights and scales given to Mr. Laidlaw by his native informants are merely a reduction on the Dutch system, of the former pre-European system of the ingot tin currency made to suit the exigencies of commerce under British rule, by making the dollar 10 kati and the bahara 400 lbs. In outlying parts of the Malay Peninsula the old Dutch system of reckoning fractions of the unit might be expected to outlast for some time the introduction of the modern British system, which is comparatively recent.

dollars by Malay informants, as they usually depend on the price of tin, as purchasable by dollars, from time to time. Cf. infra, p. 108. With the help of Mr. C. O. Blagden I have been able to read the legend on the larger specimens and partly on the smaller. They are interesting as exactly dating the issues. Thus the two larger are identical and read—ini bāna Pahang | dārī tarikh sanat 1281 | gada asdulah | Rabi‘ul-thani: This is the money of Pahang under date year 1281, on the 1st of the month Rabi‘ul-thani, i.e., 3rd September 1864. The smaller coins are also identical and on them appear Malik-ul-Adil | tarikh sanat 1245 | the first king | date year 1239 | Perhaps Malik-ul-Adil should be read mili‘i‘-1‘-adil, full value, legal tender: see J. R. A. S., Straits Branch, No. 44, p. 215.

25 Tavernier says (infra, p. 83) in the 17th century that the Malay tin coin which he figures weighed 1½ oz. (= kati) and was worth in silver locally 2 sou (cents) = sung. This gives the ratio of silver to tin then as 1 : 2.
Perhaps the most interesting confirmation of all comes from some Portuguese coins described by Dr. H. A. A. S. Strata Branch, No. 44, p. 218 ff., as having been formed at Malacca in 1604 in two varieties. These were cast in the times of Kings Emmanuel (1495-1521) and John III (1521-1551), i.e., immediately or not long after the conquest of Albuquerque in 1511. These coins clearly imitated the indigenous tin ingot currency and approximated in denomination to the “hat” money. Five specimens of one variety weighed from 571 to 642 ½ grs. One specimen of the other variety was in the form of a truncated cone; and weighed 694 ½ grs. It seems to be fairly certain from what has gone before that they were meant to represent, in tin money, the viss or quarter dollar unit of tin. They were obviously cast (not struck) in Portuguese moulds, as they all bear the cross and globe of Kings Emmanuel and John III of Portugal and the legends:—*Nostre (a) opes unica cruz X P I* (for N.) and *s(ce)mp(e) r depu(l)i s or diem (for deus).* See also infra, p. 109, n. 10a.

II.

Gambir Currency.

(Tin Ingots in Molds [Gambir] of Animals.)

It will have been observed that, among the names for pieces of ingot-tin currency, there have been introduced certain names of animals: *buaya,* crocodile; *kurakura,* tortoise; *gajah,* elephant; *ayam,* cock. These all refer to in ingots cast in the forms of animals, specimens of which, brought together by Mssrs. Skeat and Laidlaw, may be tabulated as follows on the evidence available.

Standard Tables of Gambir Currency.

No. 1: Mess. Skeat and Laidlaw’s information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>&quot;Pagoda&quot; Scale</th>
<th>Corresponding to the modern British monetary scale.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>weight in oz. av.</td>
<td>name²⁸ meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 11½ buaya crocodile</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 22½ gajah elephant</td>
<td>12½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 45 bēlalang mid mantis</td>
<td>18½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

²⁸ See Appendix I, infra.
²⁹ *If* they are to be regarded as tin ingots, which is unlikely, then their value, according to weight varying roughly from 11 oz. to 14 oz. av., would be 2 ⅔ to 3 ⅔ per dollar of silver. See supra, p. 98.
³⁰ Variations from standard to almost any extent may be excepted in local finds.
³¹ These columns are added to clear the comparison of the scales.
³² These columns show correspondence with the Table of Ingots tin currency, ante, p. 96, 420 lbs. to the bēlalang of tin.
³³ One informant makes this equal the bēsora of the Pagoda Scale at 5 cents.
³⁴ A Horniman Museum (London) specimen of mania weighed 7½ oz. See Plate IV.
³⁵ The “elephant” is said to be *2 buaya* a average length of specimens, 9 in.
³⁶ The size of these “cocks” is given as 3 by 2 inches.
³⁷ Supplied from the Horniman Museum pedemum.
In addition to the above specimens Mr. T. A. Joyce has sent me accurate weighments of others in the British Museum (Nos. 1905-11-16-1 to 8) and in his own collection.

Mr. Skeat has also weighed some in his. The actual weights are as under:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>British Museum collection</th>
<th>Joyce collection</th>
<th>Skeat collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>gajah</td>
<td>18,135 grs.</td>
<td>1,522 grs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15,480</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,980</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ayam</td>
<td>1,910</td>
<td>2,727</td>
<td>2,738 grs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,735</td>
<td>1,460</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,848</td>
<td>550</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>280</td>
<td>547</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>buaya</td>
<td>26,420⁴⁶</td>
<td>16,625</td>
<td>9,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,865⁴⁶</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The practical identity of some of these specimens as representatives of currency and their relative proportion to each other is obvious. It is also clear that they have not been accurately cast, and so, for the purposes of this enquiry, I have turned their weight in grains into their approximately equivalent weight in ounces avoirdupois. These specimens may in this way be tabulated as follows:

**Standard Tables of Gambar Currency.**

No. 2: Messrs. Joyce and Skeat’s weighments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>&quot;Pagoda&quot; Scale</th>
<th>&quot;Sugarloaf&quot; Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>weight in oz. av.⁴⁴</td>
<td>weight in oz. av.⁴⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cents of a dollar</td>
<td>cents of a dollar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nominal</td>
<td>actual approx.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>name</td>
<td>name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>½ 1½ ½</td>
<td>ayam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1½ 1½</td>
<td>ayam (S)⁴⁶</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 4½ 4½</td>
<td>ayam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 4½ 4½</td>
<td>buaya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 22½ 22½</td>
<td>buaya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 35 35</td>
<td>gajah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18½ 42 41½</td>
<td>buaya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31½ 70 60½</td>
<td>buaya⁴⁶</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⁴⁴ One leg apparently broken off.

⁴⁶a Mr. Joyce conjectures that this specimen is a lizard or insect. I rather think it is meant for a crocodile.

⁴⁶ See ante, p. 88.

⁴⁶a All the weighments are by Mr. Joyce except those marked (S) which are by Mr. Skeat.

⁴⁶ Two specimens.

⁴⁶a Mutilated and now under original weight.
Mr. Joyce further weighed five ingots, three from the British Museum (Nos. 1905-11-16-9 to 11) and two from his own collection, and found that they weighed respectively grains 11, 183; 7, 623; 7, 462; 7444 (J); 302 (J). From this we get the following tabulated information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>cents of a dollar</td>
<td>nominal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>½</td>
<td>½ (J)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12½</td>
<td>12½</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All the above tables of ingots and gambar pieces can be stated together in another way, which clearly brings out the fact that the modern Malay monetary system is based on the kati or Malay pound weight (of tin), and the old Dutch monetary system on the tali or string (of cash or units, i.e., regulated pieces of tin). It also clearly shows how the ingot tin currency in any form met the requirements of Malay commerce.

### "Pagoda" Scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>cents of a dollar</th>
<th>name of animal</th>
<th>corresponding weight</th>
<th>reference to commercial weight standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>¼</td>
<td>(ingot)</td>
<td>1 kōping</td>
<td>the lowest denomination of Malay weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>½</td>
<td>ayam</td>
<td>2 kōping</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>⅔</td>
<td>ayam</td>
<td>3 kōping</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>buaya</td>
<td>½ kati</td>
<td>lower standard of Malay weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>buaya</td>
<td>half kati</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>buaya</td>
<td>kati</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>buaya</td>
<td>double kati</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>(ingot)</td>
<td>4 kati</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>(ingot)</td>
<td>5 kati</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>half dollar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### "Sugarloaf" Scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>cents of a dollar</th>
<th>name of animal</th>
<th>corresponding weight</th>
<th>reference to commercial weight standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1½</td>
<td>ayam</td>
<td>quarter pānjuru.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3½</td>
<td>gajah</td>
<td>half pānjuru</td>
<td>quarter tali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6½</td>
<td>buaya</td>
<td>pānjuru</td>
<td>half tali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7½</td>
<td>(ingot)</td>
<td>1½ pānjuru</td>
<td>string of cash or unit of tin weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12½</td>
<td>(ingot)</td>
<td>tali</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Notes:**

1 See ante, p. 88.
2 *Ayam, cook: buaya, crocodile; gajah, elephant; kurakura, tortoise; bilalang, mantis.*
One interesting point, as showing the force of commercial necessities on a people, is that we have (ante, p. 90) a “pagoda” ingot weighing a tali, and a “sugarloaf” ingot weighing a kati, both out of scale. This shows that the tali and kati were of such importance as standards of commercial weight that they had to be specially provided for under each method of reckoning.

There must always have been much confusion in the use of the two scales of the ingot and gambar pieces, unless they were not concurrent, i.e., unless they were in vogue only in separate places and periods, which is not at all likely. At the same time the above tables show that there was a simple and easily understood proportion between the various gambar pieces in circulation.

Thus, taking all the available ingot and gambar pieces together, we get the remarkable facts that on the “pagoda” scale there were issued, on the basis of the koping or cash, a series of 10 “coins” in the proportion of


On the “sugarloaf” scale, on the basis of a half panjuru, the proportion of another series of 10 “coins” is


As a matter of fact, however, the bases of the two scales were, no doubt, the kati or lower standard of Malay av. weight for the “pagoda” scale and the tali or string of cash for the “sugarloaf” scale. On this assumption we can get at the minds of the issuers of the tin ingot currency and observe that they intended to make the tin pieces represent the following proportions:—That is, on the “pagoda” scale.


Further dividing the lowest of these denominations into 1, 3, 4, to meet surrounding commercial requirements. On the “sugarloaf” scale the proportions intended were

3: 2: 1: 2: 1: 1

It is interesting to observe that the pagoda scale works out to 200 koping or cash, i.e., to half a dollar of 240 cash or 100 cents, and that the sugarloaf scale works out to 24 panjuru (24 × 6 = 150 cents) to a dollar and a half. This gives a proportion between the pagoda and sugarloaf scales of 1: 3. But, unless there were ready means of identifying specimens, this fact would not be of any practical use for appraising the relative value of pieces, when converting those of one scale into the other.

The various species of gambar pieces had also a clear and readily remembered proportion between themselves. Thus, from the specimens already available we get the following proportions.

---

See remarks above on the existence of ingots out of scale.

No specimen of the 1 cent gambar piece is as yet available to me.
"Pagoda" Scale. \(\text{Proportion } 1 : 4 : 8\).

1, 4, \(\frac{1}{4}\), kāping.

(1) ayam (cock).

3, 2, 1, \(\frac{1}{4}\), pānjuru.

Proportion; 1 : 2 : 4 : 8 : 12.

2, 1, \(\frac{1}{2}\), kāti.

(2) buaya (crocodile).


5, 2 1/4, 1 pānjuru.

2, 1, \(\frac{1}{2}\), kāti.

(3) gajah (elephant).

Proportion; 1 : 5 : 10.

3, 2 1/4, 4 pānjuru.

2, 1, \(\frac{1}{2}\), kāti.

(4) bīlālang (mantis).

Proportion; 1 : 10 : 12.

6, 3, 1 1/2 (for 1 1/2) pānjuru.

2, 1, \(\frac{1}{2}\), kāti.

(5) hurubura (tortoise).

Proportion; 1 : 1 1/2.

5, 4, pānjuru.

The above considerations seem to prove beyond doubt that there were two concurrent scales in the tin currency represented by the two forms of the ingot, and the main interest in the above statements is that they enable us to know what to look for in order to complete the information already gathered.\(^49\)

The practical use to which the gambar currency was put is curiously illustrated by a letter (Appendix I, No. VI.) from Mr. Laidlaw, dated 29th July 1904, in which he says that the trader Imam Haji Mat Arshat drove a "satisfactory trade" in rice in the Kinta Valley (Perak) in the "bad old days", before the introduction of British rule into the Federated Malay States, on the following basis. He sold his rice at 5 dollars the gantong of 4 chupak. He was paid in gambar (tin ingot) currency at 10 kāti of tin to the dollar, which is practically the rate on which the preceding tables are based. This trader placed the same value on the small gambar ingots of tin (small cock, mantis, crocodile) as the tables do; i.e., he said they were equal to a pānjuru of tin currency, or \(\frac{1}{4}\) a dollar in that currency (\(=\frac{6}{4}\) cents).\(^49\)

He also said that a small gambar ingot was equal in fact to 10 pilitus, or \(\frac{1}{4}\) tin "dollar," but that he valued such ingots in his trade at 5 pilitus, or \(\frac{1}{4}\) tin "dollar," and that he sold his rice at a chupak, or \(\frac{1}{4}\) gantong, for a small ingot, at the valuation of \(\frac{1}{4}\) dollar. By this means he got 8 dollars worth of tin for the gantong of rice, whereas his price was 5 dollars the gantong, presumably with a further profit attached to it on its intrinsic value. He therefore made a profit on his trading of 3 points in 50 or 60\% by his manipulation of the currency, without reference to what might happen to him on the actual sale of his rice. Thus was the trade made "satisfactory," and thus does this trader once again demonstrate the truth of the comment\(^50\) that in countries where there is a currency and not money, the opportunities of illicit profit are twice as great as in a country where there is a legally fixed currency.\(^50\)

\(^49\) We have not come to the end of the information procurable, because there is some evidence in the correspondence in Appendix I, that there was a bawas of account at \(\frac{1}{2}\) cents (pagoda scale), and other bawas valued at a daali or 12\% cents and at a kāping (slab) or 31\% cents (both sugarloaf scale).

\(^49\) He naturally reckoned his fractional parts on the old Dutch scale.

\(^50\) Ants, Vol. XXVI, pp. 200 ff.

\(^50\) The villagers he was dealing with, on the other hand, probably thought that they were making a good bargain for themselves by getting 5 gantong of rice for tin currency, which should have produced only 4 gantong. For other instances of this mutual "profit" between trader and semi-savage or savage, see ante, Vol. XXIX, p. 90.
III.

Historical Examination.

Yule, Hobson-Jobson, quotes Groeneveldt, Chinese Annals, p. 123, to the following effect as to Malay currency in tin in 1409 A.D.:— "In the year 1409 ... the land was called the kingdom of Malacca (Mo-la-ka). ... Tin is found in the mountains ... It is cast in small blocks weighing 1 catti 8 taels ... ten pieces are bound together with a rattan and form a small bundle, whilst 40 pieces make a large bundle. In all their trading ... they use these pieces instead of money."

This provides a scale

\[
\begin{array}{c|c}
1 \frac{1}{2} \text{kati} & 1 \text{patah} \\
10 \text{patah} & 1 \text{tali} \left(= 15 \text{kati} \right) \\
4 \text{tali} & 1 \text{köping} \left(= 60 \right)
\end{array}
\]

Ante, vol. XXXI, p. 51, I have quoted two statements from Stevens, Guide to East India Trade, 1775, p. 127, as under:

- Joneko, joneko.
- Toecopa.

\[
\begin{array}{c|c}
3 \text{punchor} & 3 \text{pingas} \left(= 1 \text{pota} \right) \\
4 \text{poot} & 4 \text{ putas} \left(= 1 \text{viss} \right) \\
10 \text{vias} & 10 \text{viss} \left(= 1 \text{capin} \right) \\
8 \text{capin} & 8 \text{capin} \left(= 1 \text{bahar} \right)
\end{array}
\]

And ante, p. 9, will be found Bowrey's statement in c. 1675, which affords the following table:

- Janselone,

\[
\begin{array}{c|c}
2 \frac{1}{4} \text{puttas} \left(= 1 \text{putta large} \right) \\
4 \text{putta large} & 1 \text{vicio} \\
15 \text{vicas} & 1 \text{cupina} \\
8 \text{cupina} & 1 \text{bahara of 420 lbs.}
\end{array}
\]

From these statements and those above made (ante, p. 94) as to the gambor or animal ingots in use about 1869, and from the standard weights for tin currency set up on the modern British and old Dutch scales, we can arrive at certain facts pertinent to the present purpose. The scale of 1409 shows 10 tali (bundles) of \(1 \frac{1}{2} \text{kati} = 1 \text{unit of 15 kati}. \) The modern scale shows 8 tali of \(\frac{1}{2} \text{kati} = 1 \text{unit of 10 kati}. \) The ratio of the two scales is therefore \(1 \frac{1}{2} : 1. \) The modern standard viss or bidor = 3½ lbs.; therefore the viss or bidor of 1409 was 5½ lbs., i.e., it was the great viss (1½ standard viss). The scale of 1409 was consequently the scale of the great viss.

---

31 The British E. I. Co. made attempts to control the money of the Malay Archipelago as long ago as 1835, see Frindge, Consultations, Fort St. George, Vol. IV, p. 170, quoting an agreement with the Raja of Pylama and Tiku (Sumatra), dated 27th Jan. 1834.—"No other Europeans or Natives are authorised or allowed to have a mint or coynne or stamp any sorts of money, whither gold or copper, tinn, or any other mettle or thing whatsoever."

32 See also Miscell., Papers relating to Indo-China, 2nd Series, I. 244.

33 Or bundle; it represents on the great viss scale the "dollar" unit of the modern nomenclature.

34 Read pêng, patah, viss, köping, bahara.

35 Read patah, viss, köping, bahara.
Reducing all the scales above mentioned to the standard of 420 lbs. to the bahara, or 52½ lbs. the keping (ante, p. 90), we find that the scales of 1409 and 1725 are those of the great viss, and that all the rest were of the standard viss. This enables us to arrive at the following table:—

Malay Tin Currency.
Comparative Table of Scales:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Great viss scale</th>
<th>Standard viss scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1409</td>
<td>1775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a = 1½ a = b</td>
<td>a = 3 a = b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b = 10 b = c</td>
<td>b = 4 b = c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c = 1½ d = 10 c = d</td>
<td>c = 15 c = d</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table stated in av. weight:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a = 14 oz.</th>
<th>a = 7 oz.</th>
<th>[a = 7 oz.]</th>
<th>[a = 5½ oz.]</th>
<th>a = 15½ oz.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b = 21 oz.</td>
<td>b = 21 oz.</td>
<td>b = 14 oz.</td>
<td>b = 14 oz.</td>
<td>b = 14 oz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c = 5½ lbs.</td>
<td>c = 5½ lbs.</td>
<td>c = 3½ lbs.</td>
<td>c = 3½ lbs.</td>
<td>c = 3½ lbs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d = 52½ lbs.</td>
<td>d = 52½ lbs.</td>
<td>d = 52 lbs.</td>
<td>d = 52 lbs.</td>
<td>d = 52 lbs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of modern currency, on the standard of 420 lbs. to the bahara, the half-gambar kēchil (small description of model of animal) or half-penjuru = 7 oz.: penjuru = 14 oz.: tampang (kait) = 22½ oz.: tali = 28 oz.: viss = 56 oz. (3½ lbs.): great viss = 84 oz. (5½ lbs.): “dollar” = 224 oz. (14 lbs.): keping = 52½ lbs.

The above comparative tables supply the following important facts:—

1. The “dollar” unit of weight (tim) is constant through the centuries at 13½ lbs. on the great viss (bidor) scale and at 14 lbs. on the standard viss scale. The persistence of this unit accounts for its existing use to represent in weight of tin the dollar unit of European imported silver money. The old Chinese kaiti is represented on the modern scales by the penjuru, and the old Chinese tali (bundle) by the tampang (block), to which the name of kaiti has become transferred in the course of time in the Malay countries. The constant units are the penjuru at 14 oz.: tampang (Malay kaiti) at 21-22½ oz.; bidor (viss) at 56 oz.; great viss at 84 oz.; “dollar” at 13½-14 lbs.; keping at 52½ lbs.: it being borne in mind that the bahara of the ingots and gambar ingots is still 420 lbs., though the modern standard British bahara has been rounded off to 400 lbs.

---

Footnotes:
46 I feel justified in setting up this standard of 420 lbs. to the bahara by a remark in Lockyer, Account of Trade in E. Indies, 1711, the most painstaking of all the writers on the period on commercial matters. He says, p. 30, that the Malay bahara weighed 422 lbs. 15 oz. = c. 423 lbs. He also says that the dollar weighed 17 dwt. 148½ grs. = c. 423 grs., thus incidentally showing the cause of the standard bahara, for by it 1 gr. of silver money = 1 oz. of merchandise. So all that the trader had to do was to bargain as to the number of grains silver currency he was to pay per ounce of stuff. This exhibits a strong instance of commerce accommodating itself to circumstances. The standard quoted by Lockyer was long maintained, for Dilworth, Schoolmaster’s Assistant (Arithmetical), 1789, p. 163, makes “pieces of 5, old plate of (i. e., old Sp. dollar) 17 dwt. 12 grs.” = 420 grs.
47 In accounts as the half buyya.
48 In accounts as the half gambar (buyya, ayam, Malayan) kēchil.
49 This is the “dollar” unit of later times on the great viss scale = 4 viss or bidor.
50 This denomination seems to have been originally the “great bundle” or tali, for which was afterwards substituted a slab of tin (keping) as the capacity for casting improved.
51 Also (at 1½ standard viss) 70 oz.
The modern talu or bundle is a double-panjuru or half viss or 28 lbs., but this denomination has been subject to many fluctuations, presumably dependent on the number of units that at different times and places went to the bundle.

The modern denominations of the silver money used in the Malay countries are the result of dividing the dollar unit into cents: the number of cents in each denomination representing it in the old tin currency.

The tin "hat" money of the old Malay State is a direct representation of the tin currency in money, to suit the requirements of the dominating silver money introduced by Europeans.

The general historical inferences from the above considerations are that the modern silver money adopted by Europeans for the Malay States is the direct descendant of the old tin ingot currency; that this in its turn was the direct descendant of the method employed for bartering in tin, which must have been evolved out of the obvious needs of the early traders; and that the gambor "animal" currency was evolved out of an attempt to regulate the tin ingot currency by giving it various readily recognisable forms, which could be made to conform to definite standards.

Historical continuity of the tin currency in the Malay Peninsula can be further shown in an instructive manner by references in Maxwell's paper, "The Dutch in Perak," J. R. A. S., Straits Branch, No. 10, relating chiefly to Dutch treaties and arrangements with native chiefs, which may be reduced to the following statements:

- In 1650, 1 bidor = 1$ Sp. dollar; 1 bahara = 3 pikul = 125 bidor = 31$ Sp. dollar; 1 slab (képing) of tin = 62½ kati = 78 lbs. Dutch.
- In 1651, tin sold at 50 rixdollars = 1 bahara.
- In 1765, tin sold at 32 Sp. dollars, the bahara.
- In 1768, tin sold at 32 Sp. dollars per bahara of 428 lbs.: 1 slab = 64½ kati = 8½ lbs. Dutch.

From these statements there can be constructed for Malay-land in general the following historical table, which might be indefinitely increased:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Sp. dollars to the bahara</th>
<th>lbs. to the bahara</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1403</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1650</td>
<td>1439½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1650</td>
<td>62½</td>
<td>1650</td>
<td>390</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 320 kati taken at 1$ lb. each.

This was a temporary reduction by the Dutch. Tavernier (see infra, p. 31) writing in his Travels, published in 1678, says that the Malay tin in India was 14 sous (cents) a lb. Taking Bowrey's statement in 1675 (ante, p. 89) that 240 lbs. = 1 bahara, then 33$ dollars went to the bahara. Tavernier also says that the Dutch had ousted the British from the trade, at what profit to themselves, less freight and charges, can be seen, when they purchased at 323 dollars per bahara of 420 lbs. In Sumatra in 1675 tin was 45-50 dollars the bahara: Anderson, English in Sumatra in Sixteenth Century, p. 183. In 1673 it was said to be 30-32 dollars for cash and 40 for credit, etc. cit.
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kati to the köping

Sp. dollars to the

lbs. to the

(bahara.)

bahara.)

1765 56½

\{1760^63\}

33

1675^6^6

420

1765 34

1765 375

1770^66\}

39½

1775^6^7

31½

1775^6^8

405, 419, 476

1785 64½

1786 32

1786 428

1819 40

1819 370

c. 1830 50-60

1830 430-475

1835^1^0

476-485

c. 1860^7^1

37½-38½

c. 1890 30

c. 1860 420

1883 37½

1883 30

1883 400

The forerunner of the modern ratios shown in the last two sets of figures can be ascertained thus. The statements of Bowrey, Stevens, Milburn and Kelly all give 8 köping (slabs) to the bahara, from which we get the following information:

1675— the bahara = 420 lbs, and the köping = 36½ kati.
1775— = 476 " = 44½ "
1835— = 485 " = 45½ "

With this information, and assuming that the köping mentioned at the other early date were eight to the bahara, the following table can be constructed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>kati to the köping were</th>
<th>lbs. in the bahara were</th>
<th>kati to the köping should have been</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1650</td>
<td>62½</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>36½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1765</td>
<td>56½</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1780</td>
<td>64½</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>40½</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If then the tin was paid for by the Dutch in dollars per bahara, the difference between the number of kati reckoned to the köping by agreement and the true number would represent the profit made by manipulating the currency, which would in the instances quoted above be about 33 per cent, in favour of the Dutch as against the native chiefs. This argues that the true silver monetary ratio between the kati and the köping on a bahara of 375-475 lbs, has been in all European times 35:1 to 40:1, but the tables show that the native idea of the ratio in tin currency was 50:1 to 60:1. The old Dutch traders and the commercial authorities were thus able to take advantage of native notions of currency to profit largely when assessing payments for tin weighed out to them in terms of silver money.

---

62 From Bowrey's statement, ante, p. 59.
63 There was a ratio of 32 dollars to the bahara some time between 1660 and 1765.
64 Abbé Raynal, quoted by Tyle, Holborn-Johnson, s. v. Calay, says:—[The Dutch in Siam] received in return calves (tin) at 70 klis the 100 weight. Bead cut., = pikul ; kins = franc = $1 dollar ; bahara = 8 pikul of 1½ cut. — and the statement gives 39½ dollars the bahara.
65 Stevens' Guide to E. I. Trade, p. 87.
66 From Stevens' statement, ante, p. 87. But on his p. 113 he also makes it 419 lbs. and p. 127 405 lbs., both at Malacca.
67 Milburn, Commerce, II., p. 291, but possibly he is copying Forrest, Voyage to Mergui Archipelago, 1783 and Stevens, Guide to E. I. Trade, 1775, jointly with improved information. Forrest gives 36-39 dollars per bahara of 400 lbs.
68 Kelly, Cambist, I., pp. 109, 121, who may be relied on, partly supports Milburn.
69 The last two dates represent respectively the standard for tin currency set up, ante, p. 20, and the modern British standards, and are added for comparison. A local variation is quaintly reported by Kelly, Cambist, I. 100, s. v. Malacca:— A kip [köping slab] of tin contains 15 bidors [biders] or 30 tampony. It weighs 37½ lbs. Dutch troy or 40 lbs. 11 oz. av: thus giving a bahara of only 325½ lbs.
3.

The information gathered by Mr. Skeat in the various districts and States of the Malay Peninsula affords another important historical deduction. The scales of the tin currency prevalent on the East Coast, that is, away from European influence until quite recently, conformed to the old Dutch scale, showing that that scale was based on the old tin currency systems of the Peninsula. The scales of the tin currency now prevalent on the West Coast, long subject to European influences, conform to the introduced European monetary scale of 1000 cash (Portuguese pese) to the dollar.

The old Dutch reckoning was:

- 25 cash (pese) make 1 kândâri (silver).
- 2 kândâri
- 8 tali
- 400 cash to the dollar.

The East Coast Malays still reckon on this system, but they make scale 4 kândâri to the tali, and vary the number of cash to the kândâri locally. On this explanation, a comparative table of reckoning in the Eastern Malay States can be readily made out from Mr. Skeat's notes, showing the descent of the old Dutch scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State or District</th>
<th>Number of cash to kândâri</th>
<th>Number of cash to dollar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Old Dutch</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelantan</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patani</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jering</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teuban</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ligeh</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trengganu</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patangkâ</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mr. Skeat also quotes in his notes Klinkert, *Nieuw Maleische-Nederlandsch Woordenboek*, 1893, which gives s.v. tali, the following scale of 600 cash to the dollar, thus:

- 75 pitie (cash) make 1 tali.
- 4 tali
- 2 gulder

600 cash to the dollar.

The actual origin of the existing European scale of 400 cash to the dollar can be ascertained from Marsden's *Sumatra*, 1811, pp. 171-2: "Spanish dollars are everywhere current and accounts are kept in dollars, suku (imaginary quarter dollars), and kepeng or copper cash.

---

72 Called kupang in Kelantan, E. Coast, and synonymously kupang and tali in Negri Sembilan, W. Coast.
73 Arrived at by multiplying the number of cash to the kândâri by 32 (4 kândâri by 8 tali = 1 dollar).
74 Called pitie and kepang in Patani and Patangkâ, and trâ (stamp) in Setul: kepang in Kedah.
75 25 cash by 16 kândâri = 1 dollar. This scale is added for comparison. The British scale is also worked out to 400 cash to the dollar.
76 Differences stated to be due to changes in the price of tin.
77 Siamese territory beyond Singora.
78 Marsden's scale (1811) for Sumatra is 50 cash to the tali; 8 tali to the dollar; 400 cash to the dollar.
79 Klinkert's scale seems to show the depreciation of cash between 1811 and 1893.
80 In modern terminology "money of account."
of which 400 go to the dollar. Besides these there are silver *fanam*, single, double and treble (the latter called *tali*),* coined at Madras: 24 *fanam* or 8 *tali* being equal to the Spanish dollar, which is always valued in the English Settlements at 5 shillings sterling. Silver rupees (*rupiah*) have occasionally been struck in Bengal, for the use of the Settlements on the coast of Sumatra, but not in sufficient quantities to become a general currency. In the year 1786, the Company contracted with the late Mr. Boulton of Soho [London] for a copper coinage, the proportions of which I was desired to adjust. The same system, with many improvements suggested by Mr. Charles Wilkins,* has since been extended to the three Presidencies of India. At Achin, small and thin gold and silver coins were formerly struck and still are current, but I have not seen any of the pieces that bore the appearance of modern coinage, nor am I aware that this right of sovereignty is exercised by any other power in the Island.*

This statement in Marsden's *Sumatra* shows that in 1811 he was working on the Dutch scale, and provides an interesting comparative table with what is nowadays understood as "the old Dutch" scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marsden's Scale</th>
<th>Old Dutch Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16⅞ cash</td>
<td>4 cash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 <em>fanam</em></td>
<td>1 duit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1⅓ double <em>fanam</em></td>
<td>2½ <em>duit</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 <em>tali</em></td>
<td>2 ¼ <em>dublettje</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 <em>saku</em></td>
<td>2 <em>kendi</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 <em>tali</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400 cash to the dollar</td>
<td>4 <em>saku</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 dollar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The statement tends to show that the modern European System of 400 cash to the dollar arose out of the requirements of Europeans in Sumatra in dealing with the Malays, and was imported thence to the Malay Peninsula, possibly by Sir Stamford Raffles about 1819, though apparently Marsden was working on notions of money current both in Sumatra and Malacca in his time.

There is a curious reference to the "old Dutch Scale" of 400 cents to the dollar in the following quotation from Tavernier's *Travels*, English ed., 1678, Vol. I, Pt. II., p. 6 f., showing that it, or something like it, existed long before Marsden's time:

"An Account of the Money of Asia."

The money of the King of Cheda and Pera [Kedah and Perak]. This money is of Tin, and is coined by the king of Cheda and Pera. He coins no other money than Tin. Some year since he has made several Mines, which was a great prejudice to the English. For the Hollanders and their merchants buy it, and vend it over all Asia. Formerly the English brought it out of England, and furnished great part of Asia, where they consumed a vast quantity; they carried it also into the Territories of the great Mogul, as also into Persia and Arabia; for all their Dishes are of Copper, which they cause to be tinned over every month. Among the meaner sort of people, there is little to be seen but this Tin-money, and the Shells called Cori (cowrey); Figs. 1 and 2 are of that great piece of Tin, which weighs an ounce and a half,* and in that Country goes for the value of two of our Sons. It is not worth above one Sons and three Deniers. This piece of Tin is only thick in the sides, the middle being as thin as paper.

---

* See infra, p. 107, n. 6, as to the transfer of the term *tali* for half a rupee, or four to the dollar, in modern Indian broker's slang.
* Librarian of the East India Company.
* The old French *poids de marc* or pound of 16 oz. = 7555 grs. Eng., as against the old Eng. lb. which = 7000 grs.
* The old French *livres* (called also the *franc*) was divided into 20 *sous* of 12 deniers each, so a *sou* was roughly an English half penny or 1 cent of a dollar.
Figs. 3 and 4 are of a piece that goes at the value of four Deniers.85

Figs. 5 and 6 are three Shells (cowries), whereof they give fifty for the little piece of Tin.”

Plate marked to face p. 7 of Tavernier’s Travels.

The money of the king of Beja [for Cheila] and Pera [Kedah and Perak]

(“That great piece of tin which weighs an ounce and a half.”86

All that Millies could find of this coin 200 years later in Paris, when it had become much worn, is given below.87 It is an indication of the liberties taken by Tavernier’s engraver.

Tavernier’s statement therefore exhibits an instructive scale.

| 50 cowries | 1 little piece (kepeng, pitia, cash). |
| 3 little pieces (cash) | 1 sou (cent). |
| 100 sou (cent) | 1 dollar. |

15000 cowries or 300 cash to the dollar.

85 Figs. 3 and 4 of Tavernier’s plate show a regularly minted coin with an Arabic inscription on the reverse. Its value of 4 deniers shows that it was ½ sou or cent; i.e., it was a kepeng, pitia or cash. Millies, Recherches sur les Moneutes Malaises, p. 132, thinks he can read the date 1051 A. H. on this coin = A. D. 1641. The misfortunes that have happened to Tavernier’s plates of Malay money at the hands of subsequent writers are detailed on p. 4 of Millies, Recherches sur les Moneutes Malaises, 1871.


87a This gives 7500 cowries to the rupee, a fair average number; see ante, Vol. XXVI., pp. 290 ff.
Remembering that this is the report of a French traveller on Mahayan currency as understood in India in the 17th century, one finds in it a clear reference to the old Dutch scale of 400 cash to the dollar.

4.

A transition stage between the two scales of 400 and 1000 cash to the dollar respectively, perhaps due to surrounding influences, appears to be found in the following facts reported from the Kinta Valley (ante, p. 96), West Coast, and Patani town on the East Coast. The Kinta Valley scale shows 800 cash to the dollar. Now, in Patani Mr. Skeat tells me that "cash" were cast in "trees" (pokok pitis), and that those with the Raja's stamp on the top were most valued as genuine. Such trees were valued at a kandari, 3½ cents, or 32 to the dollar (ante, p. 101). Each cash on the tree was valued at ½ cent or 800 cash to the dollar. This works out to 25 cash per tree.

On Plate VII, will be found a reproduction from the Cambridge Museum of a half pokok pitis or cash tree, consisting of 13 cash without the Raja's stamp. The cash bear date A. H. 1314 = A. D. 1896.

5.

The alternative term for "cash" in many parts is still pesa, Portuguese, Spanish, Italian, etc., for "weight," and used for the low unit of monetary weight, varying in the East from about 1000 to about 1600 to the dollar; by standard 1000. From information gathered by Mr. Skeat and other European observers, a table can be made out showing the effect of European commerce and influence on the monetary currency scales of the Peninsula. The evidence for the West Coast currency system is as follows:

(1). Mr. Skeat's notes for Kedah and Setul, North of Kedah, show 40 cash to the kandari and 32 kandari to the dollar = 1280 cash to the dollar. And Logan, Journ. Ind. Archipelago, 1851, p. 58, says the same thing: "The native coin is the tra, a small round piece of tin with a hole in the centre, of which 160 make a talit, and 8 talit are worth a dollar" = 1280 cash to the dollar.

(2). Mr. Laidlaw's information provides the following scales:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Telok Anson</th>
<th>Lower Perak</th>
<th>Kinta Valley</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62½ duit make 1 penjuru ayam</td>
<td>10 duit make 1 pitis ayam</td>
<td>10 duit make 1 pitis ayam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 penjuru = 1 piak</td>
<td>10 pitis = 1 gambar ayam</td>
<td>5 pitis = 1 gambar ayam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 piak = 1 suku</td>
<td>4 gambar = 1 suku</td>
<td>4 gambar = 1 suku</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) Other inferences from this valuable statement by Tavernier will be found in the appropriate places.

b) Pesas or rias, of which 1000 to 1200 went to the milreis or dollar unit. Hence the use of the term for "cash." The actual value of the milreis was always uncertain.

c) Reckoned as 4 tra (cash) to the duit, 10 duit to the kandari. Millies Recherches sur les Monnaies Malaiennes, p. 130, quotes Beaunier, Relation de Voyages, 1668, II, 38, who says 32 tra make a dollar, thus transferring the expression tra from "cash" to the kandari.

d) This makes the kandari of this scale half a penjuru or 34 cents = ¼ dollar. Usually the kandari is penjuru 6½ cents = ¼ dollar. Mr. Skeat quotes Deane, Description Dutt. of British Malaya, 1894, xiv, talit, who has 166 tra = 1 milreis = 250 cash to the dollar.

e) A coin, "cash with the cock," called also kiping and duji.

f) Or talit.

g) Ordinarily pitis means cash. 400 to the dollar here it is 100 to the dollar.

h) Tin ingot in the form of a cock: the small "cock" ingot = 1 penjuru, 15 to the dollar.
2 suku make 1 jampal 1000 duit ayam (cash) to
2 jampal = 1 dollar 1500 duit ayam to the

(3). Maxwell, Man. of the Malay Language, 1882, p. 142, gives the following scale for Perak:
36 duit ayam (copper) = 1 wang (silver)
7 wang = 1 suku
4 suku = 1 dollar

1008 cash to the dollar.

(4). Wilson, Documents of the Burmese War, 1827, App. 26, p. 61, says:— "The tical and tin pice were the currency in Tavai and Mergui, but the former has been superseded by the rupee. The rates for the rupee and pice may be expected to vary, but the following was in use at the date of our authorities (1826),

| 12 small pice | make 1 large one or kebean.
| 88 kebean | = 1 Spanish dollar.

1056 pice (cash) to the dollar.

"Small pice" here means cash, the Anglo-Indian term, pice (paise), being then commonly used on the Coast, from the "pice" coined by the E. I. Company at Penang in tin for the use of the Malay Settlements. Kebean is obviously kaping, used as an alternative for pBits, in the same sense as Mr. Laidlaw's informant used that term for a Dutch doit or cent.

There is also further instructive proof of the interdependence of the native and European money all down the Coast, Chalmers, Hist. of Currency in Brit. Colonies, p. 382 ff., says that in 1887 the E. I. Company commenced a coinage in Penang,1 which the Indian authorities proved very tenacious in retaining as long as they had control of the Straits Settlements up to 1867. This coinage consisted in the days of Wilson of half and quarter rupees and copper cents, half and quarter cents, and tin "pice" of the value of a cent. The rupee was the equivalent of the Dutch guilder, and so it was half a dollar. This means that they coined on the scale of 400 cash to the dollar. It is obvious, therefore, that Wilson's kebean referred to the E. I. Co.'s tin pice or cent, and his small "pice" are cash at 1200 to the dollar. His other statements of 88 and 77½ kebean, i.e., 1056 and 930 cash to the dollar, merely represent the discounts the local native merchants or money-changers tried to get as their profit by manipulating the currency.

---

*96 The difference here shows the difference in the value of tin on the coast and up-country in Perak.
*97 Called in Salangor, duit jagoh, Jav. jagoh, a cook.
*98 Chalmers, Hist. of Currency in Brit. Colonies, 1883, p. 388, quotes in a footnote a letter from Maxwell. "The wang was a Netherlands-Indian stijver or 4 duit, and the wong baharu was the European stijver = 5 duit. Twenty-two years ago (say 1780), when I was Magistrate of Malacca, I often heard the expression, wong baharu, used to signify 2½ cents of a dollar, though there was no corresponding coin. This is similar to the use of the word kaping (kaping) in Penang. This expression is still in use."
*99 Siamese silver coin, representing the old Indian tanaka, whence came also the rupee.
*100 This is a point that the student should always bear in mind when appraising a traveller's or "authority's" statement: e.g., Bowrey, loc. cit., puts the rupiah at 5d. Eng. = 60 S. dollars to the bahara. But p. 134 he says tin was reckoned at 28 dollars to the bahara "ready money," i.e., for immediate delivery, but 40 dollars the bahara "upon truck," i.e., for future delivery.
*1 Dr. Hausteth, J. R.A.S. Straits Branch, No. 39, P. 199, shows copper pice from Penang minted by the E. I. Co., dated 1798 and 1810, and superscribed 2, 3 and 4 kaping, i.e., 1½ and 1 cent. On p. 124 he shows rupees in silver, staters and half staters, duit in copper, and duit in lead, issued by the E. I. Co. for Malacca in the years 1811-1815.
*1a See para. next but one below.
Through all this, the influence of the E. I. Co.’s coinage for the Straits Settlements can be perceived. It had another curious effect along the coast. The money the Company established was on the Indian scale of rupees of 16 annas of 12 pies, i.e., 192 pie to the rupee. Between 1785 and 1825, Malacca had an alternating history as a possession of the Dutch and British. It was restored to the Dutch in 1818 and finally handed over to the E. I. Co. in 1825, when Kelly (Cambist, 1835, I., p. 108) reports that “accounts are kept in six dollars of 8 schilling or 48 stiver; this is subdivided into 4 duit.’ Now this statement makes 192 duit to the dollar of account. That is, the local people managed to make their accounts conform to the new money by the simple process of doubling its value on paper, and thus to stick to the old ideas and scale of 400 cash to the dollar, at a discount.

We have also an echo of this in the actual coinages. Dr. Hanisch, op. cit., p. 197, quotes specimens of a copper coin struck in Batavia with the Dutch E. I. Co.’s coins and dated 1802 and 1815-24. One of them (and perhaps two) was issued during the British occupation of Java (1811-16). These coins bear the figures 48 and 5, showing that they were 1/48 of something and 5 of something else. The figures 48 no doubt referred to the 16 annas in the rupee, which make the coin equal to 5 “pice” (kóping). This gives 80 pice to the rupee, though in point of fact, as the text shows, kóping ran at that time 40 to the Madras rupee or half dollar. It would appear, therefore, on this argument, that the value of the money was doubled in the coinage as well as on paper, in order to stick to the old ideas. This was the fact, because the coins in question were for currency in Achin as kupang or 5 duit (kóping) pieces. The Achin kupang was at that date 1/48 of a patau or dollar of 4 s. 8 d., i.e., double of a rupee of 2 s. 4 d. All this means that the familiar Indian coinage was adapted to the habits of Sumatra by doubling the value of the denominations, the anna or 1/48 rupee being exactly half the Achin kupang or 1/48 dollar.

How the rate of 88 kóping to the dollar became fixed is brought out in an interesting manner (op. cit., p. 56), thus: Wilson says, quoting the Government Gazette, 2 March 1826: “The Tavai (Tavoy) miner smelts the ore immediately on his return to town (from the tin mines), and coins these sorts of pice (cash) which are current in the bazaar. Of these 1546½, make one pikul of Pinang — allow 1½ for wastage — so that, if the average price of the tin of the coast be 20 Sp. dollars per pikul, we shall have 38½ pices current for the value of one sicca rupee, which is very nearly what it was once valued at in Tavai, viz., 40 pices. The established rate at present is 44 pices for one rupee, either at Madras or sicca (i.e., Bengal standard), although the bazaar people only give 40 pices for a Madras rupee, if allowed their option; 44 pices for a Madras rupee seems to be above the intrinsic value of the metal (in terms of the rupee).*

There is, therefore, here an exceedingly interesting proof of the spread of the tin currency along the Western Coast of the Malay Peninsula and its consistency and persistence over the whole country, as Mr. Laidlaw’s information gives 80 kóping to the dollar in c. 1860 and Wilson’s 88 kóping in 1826.

---

* For proof, see Appendix VI.

---

* The official E.I.C. Co.’s rate was 1600 to the dollar (Chalmers’ Hist. of Currency in Brit. Colonies, p. 382 f.).

The difference here means the local discount.

---

* i.e., 77½ cash to the dollar at 2 rupees to the dollar, giving a ratio of tin to silver at c. 6:1. Wilson’s 88 kóbean to the dollar gives a ratio of 6½ to 1. Chalmers’ loc. cit. shows that the ratios then varied at Penang from 1:1 to 5:1. Milburn, Oriental Commerce, 1818, Vol. II, p. 306, has a statement which makes the ratio 4:1. “The current pice are coined on the island, being pieces of tin, nearly the size of an English penny. They have the [E.I.C. Company’s] mark on one side and are flat on the other; 100 of them ought to contain 4½ cattia of pure tin,” at p. 316. Milburn makes the proportion 8:1 at Selangor alternatively 8:1 according to Kelly, Cambist, 1836, Vol. I., p. 115.

---

* This statement affords a strong instance of the necessity of referring all mercantile statements of value to a general standard.
(5). Mr. Skeat has a note (showing the spread of European influence Eastwards) that the old Singora (E. Coast) currency was reckoned 10 cash to the 10 kēping piece, 100 cash to the kōndēri, 32 kōndēri to the dollar: 3200 cash to the dollar. This scale is clearly that given by Mr. Laidlaw for Perak in 1860: 10 cash = 10 pitis = 1 kōndēri (pēnjaru), but 16 kōndēri to the dollar. The Singora ratio of "cash" to the dollar was stated to depend on the quantity of Dutch cash in the country from time to time.³

The accuracy of this statement is attested by some remarks in Raffles' Java, 1830, Vol. II., App., note to p. 11, and pp. clx, clxii (table), from which a scale can be made out thus:

200 pichis (cash) make 1 dubbeltje or wang.
24 wang

4800 pichis to the dollar.

Raffles' observations also show the great fluctuation of various dollars in terms of pichis: e. g., he rates the Sp. dollar at 28 wang = 5600 pichis to the dollar, and the rixdollar (of account) at a discount of 8% off the ordinary dollar, giving 4500 pichis to the dollar.

Something of the same kind must have always been going on in the countries East of India. Under date, 1567, Caesar Frederick (Hakluyt, Macheles ed., Vol. V., 491: Purchas, Macheles ed., X 181) says:—"The current money that is in this city [Pegu] and throughout all this kingdom is called Ganza or Ganza, which is made of Copper and lead . . . with this money Ganza, you may buy gold or silver, Rubies or muske and other things. For there is no other money current among them, and Golde, silver and other marchandise are at one time dearer than another, as all things be. This Ganza goeth by weight of Byza [plu.], and this name of Byza goeth for ye account of the weight, and commonly a Byza of a Ganza is worth (after our account) half a ducat [dollar] little more or lesse: and albeit that gold and silver is more or lesse in price, yet the Byza never changeth. Every Byza maketh a hundredth Ganza of weight, and so the number of the money is the Byza." ³ "Byza" (vissa) is here clearly half a dollar.

On his return from Pegu to India (p. 437), Caesar Frederick landed at the Island of Sondipa (Saadwip) near Chittagong, and took in provisions, buying, as he was told at an exorbitant rate, "great fat hennes for a Bisse apiece, which is at the most a penny;" i. e., a vissa weight of some coin or currency (perhaps cowries) was worth a penny according to Caesar Frederick's translator, or say 1/8 of the "byza" of Pegu.

Ralph Fitch, who was in Pegu in c. 1585 (Hakluyt, Macheles ed., V. 492: Purchas, Macheles ed., X. 192: Ralph Fitch, ed. Ryley, 1894, p. 166), says, while using terms which are suspiciously the same as Caesar Frederick's, that "commonly this bissa after our account is worth about a crowne or something lesse:" i. e., the "bissa" was half a dollar of account usually taken formerly at five shinglings English.⁴ Therefore, Caesar Frederick's "bisse" at Sondiva was 1/8 of the "byza" of Pegu. All this supplies an alternative scale:—

² For reasons for the depreciation of "cash" from time to time, see ante, Vol. XXVI., pp. 222 f.
³ The rixdollar was half a vissa and to this day rix in broker's slang means an eight-anna piece or half rupee (or quarter dollar).
⁴ A century later than Caesar Frederick's day, the value of bell-metal in Burma had gone down 50% at any rate temporarily, for Mr. William Foster has given me the following quotations from contemporary M. documents. The President and Council at Sraf, wrote to the E. I. Co., 25 Jan. 1659 (O. C. Dup. 2147):—They enclosed certain accounts relating to the recent Pegu voyage "which accounts being kept in vissae [vissa] of ganze [bell-metal], you may please to take notice (if it should not be so express in the accounts) that each vissae [vissa] is nearest 15d. sterling." That is, the price of bell-metal had fallen from 2, ed. to 1s. 4d. per vissae between 1657 and 1669, an statement supported by the generalisations of Sangermans about 1700 (infra, p. 132, n. 65).
⁵ On the 11 Feb. 1648, Thomas Breton and William Potter, E. I. Co.'s servants, wrote from Pegu to Fort St. George:—"Such is the cruelty of these people that seeing us in necessity of a boat, they will not be hired to furnish us for less than 500 mast vissae, for vissae." Taking then the vissae at 1s. 4d. or therabouts, the price demanded for a cargo-boat was some 535 Rs., which would not be unlikely at that time.
24 cash make 1 ganza, 30 cash make 1 ganza.
100 ganza ,, 1 byza. 100 ganza ,, 1 byza.
2 byza ,, 1 ducat (dollar). 2 byza ,, 1 ducat.

4800 cash to the dollar.

6000 cash to the dollar.

Again, William Barrett, Consul at Aleppo, writing in 1584, the last year of his life, on money and measures in the East, says (Hakluyt, Maclehose ed., VI. 21 f.) of Malacca: — "For the merchandise bought and sold in the city they reckon at so much the barre, which barre is of divers sorts, great and small, according to the ancient custome of the said citie and diversitie of the goods ... The measures of Malacca are as the measures of Goa ... For the money of Malacca, the least money current is of tinne stamped with the armes of Portugall and 12 of these make a Chazza. The Chazza is also of tinne with the said armes, and 2 of these make a challaine. The Chalaine is of tinne with the said armes and 400 of these make a tanga of Goa good money, but not stamped in Malacca. There is also a sort of silver money, which they call Patachines [rixdollor or dollar of account], and is worth 6 tangas of good money, which is 380 reyes. There is also a kind of money called crusado stamped with the armes of Portugall and is worth 6 tangas good money ... The rials of 8 they call Pardaos de Reales [dollar] and are worth 7 tangas of good money (420 reyes)."

Read chazza = calixa = cash; chalaine = calaim = calim = kalang (tin coin) = képüning; and this statement supplies the following table:—

| 12 small cash make | 1 cash |
| 2 cash | 1 képüning |
| 40 képüning | 1 tanga |
| 100 tanga | 1 dollar |

6720 cash to the dollar (for 6400).

On the information above detailed, the following table of cash to the dollar can be made out:—

**West Coast Currency System.**

| Old Dutch       | 62½ pese by 16 kündéri²⁰ = 1000 cash to the dollar. |
| Kedah          | 40 tra by 32 " = 1280 |
| Setul           | 40 pitis by 32 " = 1280 |
| Denys' Dict.    | 40 tra by 32 " = 1280 |
| Perak.          | Telok Anson 62½ duit by 16 pınjuru²⁰ = 1000 |
|                | ayam Lower Perak 100 " by 16 " = 1600 |
|                | Kinta Valley 50 " by 16 " = 800 |
|                | Maxwell, Mon. 36 " by 28 wang = 1008 |
|                | Tawoy and Mergui 12 pitis by 88 képüning²⁶ = 1056¹¹ |
|                | Old Singora 100 " by 32 künduri = 3200 |

The origin of the system of 1000 cash or thereabouts to the dollar can be traced even more satisfactorily than that of 400 cash to the dollar. Denys, Descriptive Dict. of British

* This statement is interesting as making Albuquerque's cruzeo = 6/7 dollar, and the Goa pardao in the 16th century to equal a dollar. Taking the Goa tanga (nominall a tanga, i.e., rupee or tickal) as the real upper unit of Goa money, then the remarkable likeness of Barrett's statement in 1584 to Wilson's (ante, p. 165) in 1826 comes out.

*² Shown here for comparison.

²⁰ This scale is really that of 8 tal to the dollar, with kündéri=péngurus, and reckoned 2 or 4 to the tal.

²⁶ For 1200.
Malaya, s. c. money, states that Castanheda, Vol. II., says:—As there was no money in Malacca except that of the Moors, the Governor-General (Albuquerque) ordered (1510) some to be coined, not only that he might extinguish the Moorish coin, but also in order that a coin might be struck with the stamp and arms of his royal master. Also, taking on this subject the opinion of the Gentile Chins and other honorable men, dwellers in the city (of Malacca), he commanded forthwith that a tin coinage should be struck. Of the one small coin called caixa (cash) he ordered two to be made into one, to which he gave the name dinheiro. He struck another coin, which he named soldo, consisting of 10 dinheiro, and a third which he called the bastard, consisting of 10 soldo. As there existed no coin of gold or of silver, for the merchants made their sales and purchases by weighing the precious metals, the Governor-General resolved, with the advice of the persons abovementioned, to coin gold and silver money. To the gold coin he gave the name of catolico, and it weighed 1000 reis, and to the silver that of malaque. Both were of the purest metal that could be smelted.

From this statement it can be deduced that the catolico and malaque represented the mitrei or dollar of 1000 reis in gold and silver respectively, and that the caixa or cash equalled the reis. We can further construct a table which shows the relationship of the modern dollar and its parts to the Portuguese coinage in the Malay Peninsula, which was obviously based on the coinage invented by the Chinese to suit their commercial dealings with the Malays.

**Albuquerque's Portuguese Coinage.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2 caixa (cash)</th>
<th>make 1 dinheiro</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 dinheiro</td>
<td>1 soldo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 soldo</td>
<td>1 bastard</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 bastardo

1 malaque (silver, 416 grs.)

1 catolico (gold, 26 grs.)

---

1000 cash to the dollar.

Therefore:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cash</th>
<th>Cents of the British dollar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>caixa</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dinheiro</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>soldo</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bastard</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>malaque</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

12 Malay tin money was found by Fyvard de Laval (Hak. Soc. ed. of Voyages, p. 235) in the Maldives in 1609 and according to his editor, Gray, it existed before the days of the Portuguese. Under the names of calcium and coin (kalang, tin) the coins were worth 100 cash or half one of Albuquerque's bastard (see below).

13 Cheling, Kaling, Kling, that is Tri-Kalinga, Telinga; Hindus from the Coromandel Coast of India. These Hindus were at first originally known to Europeans as Gentiles, Gentus, through Portuguese, gentio, a heathen. See ante, Vol. XXX, p. 350.


15 Assuming the ratio of gold to silver to be 1:16.

16 Birch, op. cit., vol. III, p. 140, makes out tables of Albuquerque's coinage which are not quite the same as mine, but I think he has misinterpreted the text. In the Commentaries, malaque appears as malaques. Dr. Haniš, op. cit., loc. cit., shows some coins in the Raffles Museum, Singapore, which are probably of Albuquerque's minting. In op. cit., No. 44, pp. 214 ff, he shows some Portuguese imitation of Malay tin ingots cast by Albuquerque or soon after his time (see ante, p. 99), which weighed 571, 524 and 694 grs. They represent in fact Albuquerque's bastard, or 1/8 dollar. Dr. Haniš also shows, op. cit., loc. cit., two smaller contemporary tin coins found in Malacca at the same time, inscribed nostrae (or) spec insica, and bearing the same cross and globe. These weigh 64 grs., or c. 1/3 of the large coins, and are therefore Albuquerque's soldo or 1/8 bastard.
How the "gentle Chins and honorable dwellers in the City of Malacca" were guided in their advice to Albuquerque in 1510, when he desired to reduce the local currency to Portuguese money may be gauged by a Chinese account of Java in 1416:*

— "Their weights are as follows:— a kati (kin) has 20 taels (liang), a tael 16 ch'ien and a ch'ien 4 kobang."

This statement supplies a table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4 kobang (kupang)</th>
<th>make</th>
<th>1 ch'ien</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16 ch'ien</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 tabil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 tabil</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 kati</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1280 kupang to the kati (of tin).

If then the ratio of silver to tin be taken at its most constant rate 1 : 10 and it be assumed that the Chinese denominations have remained unaltered, this kupang, $\frac{1}{10}$th of the silver dollar, is reduced in value to a cent, and the following table for the silver unit results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>128 kupang, pits or cash</th>
<th>=</th>
<th>1 kupang</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 kupang</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>1 milre (dollar)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1280 cash to the silver dollar unit.

This Albuquerque converted into 1000 cash to the milre.

The whole story is curiously confirmed by another Chinese account of Java dated 1618:*

— "The red haidar barbarians [Dutch and English] have come to Hakang [Chinese name for Bantam] and have established a magazine on the eastern side of the great river, the Franks [Portuguese] have done the same on the western side; and these foreigners arrive every year. In trading they use silver money, but the natives use leaden coins [cash]; 10/0 of them form a string and ten strings make a bundle. One bundle of leaden coins is said to be equivalent to one string of silver money." Clearly, the leaden coins were cash and the string of silver money was the dollar, one of which could purchase ten "strings," or "one bundle" or kati of tin.

The general inference to be drawn from Maradan's and Castanheda's statements is that historically the scale of 400 cents to the dollar arose out of Dutch and British dealings directly with the Malays through their tin currency, and the scale of 1000 cents to the dollar out of Portuguese dealings with the Malays through the ten money of the Chinese.

---

*Miscell. Papers relating to Indo-China, 2nd Ser., I., 177.

* The original Chinese characters are rendered kobang in the translation. But for the confusion between the Japanese kobang and the Malay kupang, see ante, Vol. XXVII., pp. 223 ff.

* This is a fact; see op. cit., loc. cit.

* Cash were commonly used in the Malay Archipelago in the 14th century; see op. cit., pp. 215, 222, 248. But the History of the Sung Dynasty (960-1279) reports that there were no copper cash in Malay-land then; op. cit., p. 187.


* Vasco da Gama in 1498 reporting on the Countries beyond Calicut by hearsay (Hak. Soc. ed., of First Voyage, p. 100), says, "There is also much tin, of which they coin money: but this money is heavy and of little value, 3 farsa, being worth only 1 crusado." Farsa, farzel, farsala, is an Arabic weight of c. 20 lbs: the old crusado=100 reis=.3 milree or dollars=40 cents: 3 farsals=50 lbs. represents the korcs (sab) of tin. At 8 farsals=1 bahara, this gives a bahara of 400 lbs. or more (see ante, pp. 99-100) but the silver value works out at only c. 7½ dollars to the bahara, or about 1/10 of the probable true rate. The editor, E. O. Ravenstein, has a note: "The farsas was equal to 16½ kilo.; the bahara was 210-22 kilo.; the crusado was a silver coin and was valued at 360 reis (8d. Ed.)." In giving Mr. Ravenstein this information his Calicut correspondent seems to have mixed up the gold and silver Portuguese standards, the terminology of which is nearly identical.

* The Portuguese early carried Albuquerque's coinage to India, where it still remained in Bombay in an instructive manner up to the end of the 18th century at any rate: witness Stevens, Guide to E. J. Trade, 1778, p. 124, "Bombay: Accounts are kept here in Rupees, Quarters and Raes: 100 Raes are 1 Quarter; 400 Raes are 1 rupee [i.e., 800 Raes=1 dollar]. Besides these Raes, which are made of lead with a stamp on them, there is a small coin made of iron or spelter, I called a pie, of which 80 are equal to a rupee." [The modern pie go 10 to the rupee].
Chapter IV.

Analogies and Developments.

1 The Oriental influences, which induced the early Dutch merchants, Marsden for the British Government, Albuquerque for the Portuguese, and indeed the Malays themselves, to adopt respectively the sums of 400 and 1000 (to represent 1280) cash to the dollar, may be arrived at from an examination of the following quotations from an obscure official book, which thus becomes of the first importance for the present purpose. Brown, *Statistical Account of the Native State of Manipur*, p. 89, says:—"the only coin proper to the country is of bell-metal and small in size, weighing about 16 grs. This is coined by the Raja as required, goods and money being taken in exchange. The metal is obtained chiefly from Burma and consists of old gongs, etc. Some of it is also procured from the British provinces . . . The word *sri* is struck on it . . . The market value of the *sri*, as it is called, varies. When rupees are plentiful, then *sri* are cheap, when scarce, the opposite. The present (1873) value of the coin is 428 to one British or Burmese rupee, and its usual variation is said to be from 420 to 450."

*Manipur* is a Native State between Burma and Assam, which, in reference to Malay-land, is "beyond" Burma, and it will be seen from the foregoing statement that the bell-metal (brass and tin) money of that country is 800 to 1000 to the dollar of two rupees, thus showing the existence of a system of reckoning money analogous to that of the Malays for reckoning cash to the dollar.

An exhaustive enquiry into the difficult and instructive question of the Manipuri monetary system shows that it was based on reckoning 400 *sri* to the rupee, in correspondence with the very ancient Indian system of 400 *dam* to the *jalala* adopted by the Emperor Akbar for his gold coinage, that the *jalala* equalled in weight the *tola*, the rupee or half-dollar weight, and that the Nepalese reckoned 400 *dam* to the *takha* (= *tola*) or rupee. These figures inevitably recall the 400 *pittas* or cash to the dollar of Malay-land.

The enquiry also shows that the 400 *sri* to the rupee of Manipur were reckoned by nomenclature as 5000 cowries,*24 that the standard scale for reckoning cowries was 400 to the anna or 1/16 rupee (6400 cowries to the rupee), that the *sri* of Manipur was the Indian *dam* of Akbar's time (16th century) and of modern Nepal, and that the origin of the Manipuri scale was directly due to the system of reckoning cowries. Thus, Manipuri *sri* are reckoned for purposes of account by fours, exactly as cowries are reckoned by the *ganda* or quartet, *i.e.*, by sets of four. The process was the practical and handy one of separating the cowries four at a time from the heap with a finger or stick and counting verbally*25 the cowries thus separated.

In this method of Indian reckoning, certain sums constantly recur, 400, 640, 1280, 5000 *sri* and cowries going to certain units of account, and the cowries themselves to certain units in multiples of 400, as 800, 1600, 3200, 4800, 6400, 7200. The foregoing pages show that these very figures recur over and over again in reckoning cash to the dollar of account and other units.

There are thus presented to us here the two concurrent facts, that the standard Malay scales of cash to the dollar existed very long ago in India and have been preserved there in different places to the present day, and that these scales were directly

---

*23* That is, of the coinage of King Mindon minted at Calcutta.


*25* That is, the people though using *sri* still count them in terms of cowries. Precisely the same thing has happened in Kashmir where the terms for reckoning money still represent those for reckoning cowries: 400 (or 4096) cowries to the rupee. *Stiein, Notes on the Monetary System of Ancient Kashmir*, 1896, pp. 36, 38-40.

*26* The process can be seen to this day in the *fantau* gambling with cowries at Macao in China.
connected with those for counting cowries. The inference therefore is that, whatever the method of reckoning may have been when cash was first introduced to the Malays by the Chinese, the Malay scales for counting such a small denomination as the cash had, in the course of centuries of commerce, come to be based on those for counting cowries in India; just as they adopted the Indian nomenclature for the currency and money. The cash were presumably treated in the same way as cowries for reckoning, i.e., they were separated from the heaps four at a time before stringing together.

The Malays, the old Dutch merchants, Maraden and Albuquerque were in fact, though probably unconsciously, utilizing the general Indian and locally commonly recognised system of counting cowries, and treating cash as metal cowries, in adopting scales for currency and monetary purposes in the Malay peninsula.

How far afield from Malay-land the ideas that have led to the counting of 400 cash to the dollar in modern times had spread in ancient days westward from India may be seen in the following important passage from Ramusi, Delle Navigationi Viaggi, Vol. II., t.t. 156b, 1566, quoting Herberstein, 1559:—“The old Muscovite money is not round, but oblong or egg-shaped, and is called denga . . . 6 denga make an altin; 20 a grifna; 100 a poltina and 200 a ruble.” Grifna is the modern griend of the Russian currency; denga is a direct descendant of tanka, the ancient Indian weight and coin. The above quotation supplies a scale, which with quite extraordinary completeness corresponds to the existing Malay scale of 400 cash to the dollar.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Russian scale</th>
<th>Malay scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>in terms of cents to dollar</td>
<td>to sen (cash)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 denga</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 denga make 1 altin</td>
<td>1 1/4 quarter make 1 sen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/4 altin</td>
<td>1 grifna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 grifna</td>
<td>1 poltina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 poltina</td>
<td>1 ruble (florin or half-dollar)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400 denga (cash) to the dollar</td>
<td>400 cash to the dollar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28 See ante, Vol. XXVI., p. 45 f.
27 Quoted in English by Yule, Hobson-Jobson, s. v. Tanga.
26 Plural, denger.
25 Just as are the modern dings of Burma, and (through the alternative form take) the tical of Siam. See ante, Vol. XXVI., pp. 235 ff., 236 ff. Mr. Blagden tells me that in old Tai ling inscriptions tical is found in the form of theor (for datel).
Another quotation derived from Yule, *Hobson-Jobson*, s. v. kopek, gives a history for this currency of Russia curiously analogous to that in Malay-land. Yule quotes Chaudoir, *Aperçu sur les Monnaies Russes*:—'It was on this that the Grand Duchess Helena, mother of Ivan Vassiliievitch, and regent in his minority, ordered in 1535, that these denegui should be melted down and new ones struck, at the rate of 300 denegui or 3 roubles of Moscow à la grisvenka in kopek... From that time accounts continued to be kept in rouble, kopek and denegui.' The kopek is the hundredth part of a rouble and therefore half a cent, or 200 to the dollar, or 2 denegui, which commences the scale of 400 to the dollar even more closely in the Malay style than the scale just shown:—2 quarter cents (denegui) = one half cent and so on. The story is carried on into modern times with an illuminating double scale, as in India and the Far East: one of account in kopek, 100 to the rouble, with halves (denushka) and quarters (polushka), 800 (cash: polushka) to the dollar; the other with 10 griven (also written grieven) and 33½ altin to the rouble of money, or in other words with a survival in terminology of the old scale of 400 cash to the dollar.

The analogy between the European and Oriental scales does not rest here, and as a matter of fact the alternative scale of 1000–1280 cash to the upper unit found in Malay-land must have been quite familiar to both the Portuguese and Dutch traders to the Malay Archipelago, as in those times exactly similar relations prevailed in their own respective countries. Thus, in Portugal itself the old scale ran then:

| 20 reis  | make | 1 vintem. |
| 5 vintem | ,     | 1 teston. |
| 4 teston | ,     | 1 (old) crusado. |
| 2½ crusado | ,     | 1 milrei. |

1000 reis to the milrei (dollar).

Whilst the actual figure of 1280 to the dollar unit or its half, 640 (exactly as in Malay-land) was then found in Germany. Thus:

**Liege, then in Germany.**

| 4 pfening | make | 1 liard |
| 4 liard   | ,     | 1 stiver |
| 10 stiver | ,     | 1 escalin |
| 2 escalin | ,     | 1 florin |
| 4 florin | ,     | 1 patzen (dollar) |

1280 pfening to the dollar.

**Vienna.**

| 2 heller | make | 1 pfening |
| 3 pfening | ,     | 1 groschel |
| 1½ groschel | ,     | 1 kreutzer |
| 3 kreutzer | ,     | 1 groschen |
| 2½ groschen | ,     | 1 schilling |
| 5½ schilling | ,     | 1 rixgulden |
| 2 rixgulden | ,     | 1 rixdollar |

640 heller to the dollar.


21 That this was the fact, so far as the Portuguese were concerned, is proved beyond doubt by the following quotation from the *Commentaries of Albuquerque*, Vol. III. pp. 771, Hak. Soc., Ed.:—'This King Xaquendarr [Sikandar Shah of Malacaos]... desired to see the King of China... so he set out from Malaca, taking with him a present for the King of China... because his vassal... and obtained permission to coin small money of pewter, which money he ordered to be made as soon as he reached Malaca; and to it he gave the name of ceitile, which are like our ceitile, and a hundred of them go to the ceitile, and each ceitile was worth, according to the appointed law, eleven reis and four ceitile. Silver and gold was not made into money, but only used by way of merchandise.' From this statement we get the fact that the Malay cash was recognised by the Portuguese as analogous to their own ceitile, as obsoleto coin, which Birch shows, in a note to p. 78, note 6 or 7 (the above quotation makes it c. £2) to the rei, or 6000 to 7000 to the silver dollar. Albuquerque's story gives incidentally a traditional date for the introduction of cash into Malay-land, as Sikandar Shah visited China in 1411 (op. cit. p. 319. — S. Yule, Marco Polo, 2nd Ed., p. 203 n.)


The double of the 400 cash to the dollar scale is to be seen in that of the old Dutch scales.  

Amsterdam and Rotterdam.

\[
\begin{array}{llll}
16 & \text{pfaening} & \text{make} & 1 & \text{stiver} \\
20 & \text{silver} & " & 1 & \text{guilder} \\
2\frac{1}{2} & \text{guilder} & " & 1 & \text{daelder (rixdollar)} \\
\hline
800 & \text{pfaening} & \text{to the dollar.}
\end{array}
\]

The general European scale, on which the above and very many others in the western countries are based, is that established by Charlemagne so long ago as the 7th century A.D.  

12 denarii make 1 solidus  

20 solidi " 1 libra (pound)  

240 denarii to the libra.

This scale gave rise to others which spread over Europe and especially to the Latin countries and were in force up to the 18th and 19th centuries. This scale works out to 960 denarii to the dollar, because the libra under various forms stood constant through the centuries at about a quarter of a dollar. Thus:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>France</th>
<th>Italy</th>
<th>Spain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 deniers</td>
<td>denari</td>
<td>dineros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 sols (sous)</td>
<td>soldi</td>
<td>sueldos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 livres</td>
<td>lire</td>
<td>libras</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

960 deniers, etc., to the dollar.

To show the close connection between the German and Latin ideas on monetary scales, there was a Vienna scale for money giving 960 heller to the rixdollar (Kelly, op. cit., p. 348).

In old Germany there was a scale that worked out on two lines of division to 288 pfaening to the rixdollar, which by multiplying by both 4 and 5, as the Dutch did in the Malay Peninsula, has led to instructive scales for the present purpose:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Old Copenhagen</th>
<th>Old Hamburg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 pfaening make 1 witte</td>
<td>2 pfaening make 1 dreyling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1\frac{1}{2} witte &quot; 1 fyrke</td>
<td>3 dreyling &quot; 1 grote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 fyrke &quot; 1 skilling</td>
<td>12 grote &quot; 1 shilling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 skilling &quot; 1 mark</td>
<td>8 shilling &quot; 1 rixdollar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1\frac{1}{2} mark &quot; 1 ort</td>
<td>2\frac{1}{2} rixdollar &quot; 1 pound</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1152 pfaening to the dollar.  

1440 pfaening to the pound (Flemish).

There were other connected scales in Europe most reminiscent of those in the Malay Peninsula. For instance in Poland there were two—one double of the other—in different divisions of the country, of 540 pfaening to the zloti or \frac{1}{2} rixdollar and the other 1080. Here we  

36 This figure of 288 to the upper unit was once common in Europe.  
37 Kelly, op. cit., pp. 74, 187.
have the "cash" pure and simple at 4320 and 8640 to the dollar respectively. Another scale showing a very low small denomination was that of Dantzo on the German Baltic9 showing 1620 pfennig to the rixdollar.

Without pursuing the enquiry further it seems to be clear that, in the Malay Peninsula and in Europe, mankind has been working on identical lines in devising means for finding proportions into which to divide its currency. And it seems also reasonable to assume that the scales have all originated out of the simple and necessary processes of rapidly separating (for counting) shells, beans or seeds from the heap, the said shells, beans and seeds having been selected for the purpose on account of their observed constant average weight.
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The wide spread and the antiquity of the ideas leading to the Malay scales for currency and money are thus clearly brought out, but the gambar (model of animal) currency can be shown to give concrete form to ideas equally ancient and widely distributed in Oriental lands.

That the principle of metal currency in ingots and models of animals and common objects was of recognised standing in India in the 1st or 2nd century B.C. is attested by the quotations which follow.

Firstly, there is a statement in the Nidānakathā, a Sinhalese Buddhist compilation of the 5th century A.D. about the land on which Anāthapiṇḍika, the famous rich merchant disciple of Buddha, built the Jetavāna Vihāra or Monastery: "Long ago, too, in the time of the Blessed Buddha Vipassīna, a merchant named Punabhāsa Mitta bought that very spot by laying golden bricks [7 ingots] over it, and built a monastery there a league in length. And in the time of the Blessed Buddha Sīkhīn, a merchant named Sirivajjha bought that very spot by standing golden ploughshares over it, and built there a monastery three quarters of a league in length. And in the time of the Blessed Buddha Vassabhā, a merchant named Sūthiyah bought that very spot by laying golden elephant feet along it, and built a monastery there half a league in length. And in the time of the Blessed Buddha Kaukaṇtha, a merchant named Atchchāva also bought that very spot by laying golden bricks on it, and built there a monastery a quarter of a league in length. And in the time of the Blessed Buddha Kūqāgman, a merchant named Uggā bought that very spot by laying golden tortoises over it, and built there a monastery half a league in length. And in the time of the Blessed Buddha Kassapa, a merchant named Sumāṅgala bought that very spot by laying golden bricks over it, and built there a monastery sixty acres in extent. And in the time of our Blessed One, Anāthapiṇḍika, the merchant bought that very spot by laying kahāpanas over it and built there a monastery thirty acres in extent."

The writer, in bringing the legendary history of the Monastery down to then comparatively modern times, is obviously using expressions, "bricks," "ploughshares," "elephant feet," "tortoises," which indicate ingots of certain shapes current as weights in his time, till he comes to the last payment, which he states in terms of a recognised weight. As a matter of fact he was recording in monkiah fashion a legend that was in existence many centuries earlier.

Plate LVI of Cunningham's Barhut Stupa, 1879, contains an inscribed bas relief, which represent Anāthapiṇḍika making over to the Church (Saṅgha) the park of Jetavāna, which he had...

---

9 Kelly, op. cit., p. 278.
99 Bhaja Davida, Buddhist Birth-stories, p. 132 f.
91 The account purports to relate to a gold ingot currency, of which the following is a quite modern instance: "Gold continues to pass current in small uncoined round 'bells' usually weighing a tota." W. Robinson, Account of Assam, 1841, pp. 249, 267 in Budge, Origin of Currency, p. 177 n.
92 Kahāpana (Skr. kārshapata) was in general terms a gold weight = 16 mūshā or about 176 gr.
purchased by covering the ground with a layer of crores (koṭi): see Pl. VII. infra. The inscription says: "Jetavaṇa Anāthapindiko deti koṭisanthatena keta; Anāthapindikas, purchaser for a layer of crores, presents Jetavaṇa."  

The date of the Barhut sculptures is of the 2nd or 1st century B.C., or some six centuries earlier than the Nālakakṣha, but that work gives the legend in almost identical terms—Tasmin samaye Anāthapindiko gahapati . . . Jetavaṇam koṭisanthārena athāvāsa-hirāṇnathākhi kinita: at the same time the householder Anāthapindika having purchased the Jetavaṇa (Jeta's park) for a layer of crores, or eighteen crores of treasure.

It will be observed that embroidery has accrued to the story in the six centuries, and that the layer of crores had become, by a clear addition, 18 crores of gold (or treasure), and also a layer of definite gold coins (kahāpaṇa, practically the modern gold mohar). Plate VII. infra shows a medallion on a pillar of the Barhut Stupa describing the scene: men are taking stamped bricks or ingots, not coins, from a bullock cart, and spreading them in the garden under mango and sandalwood trees, while Anāthapindika, with a libation ever in his hand, is making a present of the ground for the monastery.

In translating the expressions koṭi (crone), kahāpaṇa (coins), hiraṇnā (treasure, gold), Cunningham, Hultzsch (Bharuti Inscription No. 38 ; ante, vol. xxii., pp. 226, 230), and the others all agree in making the purchase price "crores of gold coins," thus turning the story into a manifestly exaggerated legend. On this point we can, however, usefully turn for the present purpose to Stein's edition of Kalhana's Rājatarāṅgiṇī, or Chronicles of Kashmir (A.D. 1148), in which prices are frequently stated in exact sums of dināra, an obvious derivative of the Roman denarius and used in the East for a gold coin. It has been so used by most commentators on the Rājatarāṅgiṇī, but so far from representing gold coins, Stein shows that dināra meant in Kashmir, firstly a coin of any kind, and secondly just money or currency.

Stein quotes a case of daily pay stated at a lakh (100,000) of dināra, sets himself to solve the question^ of what the Kashmir dināra really was, and shows that as a money of account it represented what is now our old friend the cash; i.e., it ran 820 to the rupee or 640 to the dollar. His instructive table (p. 36) is worth reproducing in part here.

### Ancient Kashmir Currency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value in dināra</th>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Equivalent values in</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>dvādaśa (bāhgaṇī, &quot;bargany&quot;)</td>
<td>1/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>puncthu</td>
<td>1/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>sata (hath)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>sahasa (sāsūn)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>lakṣa (lakh)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000,000</td>
<td>koṭi (crore)</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If then we follow Stein (p. 22) and interpret the statements as to the price paid for Jetavaṇa as meaning crores of metal currency instead of gold, then the sum of 18 crores of currency (atthāvāsa-hirāṇnākoṭi) represented Rs. 2,500 by 18 = Rs. 45,000 or say £2,000 of modern English money as the price of land required for monastery buildings covering 30 acres.

^2 Barhut Stupa, p. 85; also Faustbōll, Jātaka, I., 92.

^4 The story is a Buddhist favourite and appears in Hien Taïang, Fa Hien, Hardy's Manual of Buddhism, etc. Barhut Stupa, loc. cit., Cunningham Mahābodhi, Pl. VIII, fig. 8, which carries the story to Asoka's time, B.C. 250, Cunningham, Coins of Ancient India, pp. 67.
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These figures, even on Stein's statements (pp. 8, 14) can be cut down to half or a quarter, and in fact probably represented a still smaller sum, bringing the actual payment to a reasonable and credible amount.

All this leads to the conclusion that the legend records a transaction that really took place and that Anshapinioka bought the ground and expended on it a sum that was paid in ingots of currency. The sculptures show that in the century before Christ such ingots were usually stamped, and the legend of the 6th Century A.D. shows that they also often took the form of animals and common objects.

As regards Europe and the near East, Professor Ridgeway, in a note to Mr. Skeat, says he has "a silver ingot from Russia called griena or neck-ring, once used as currency and found in graves along with the actual silver neck-ring. In modern times the term griena (pln. grienly) means a coin worth 10 kopek.

Professor Ridgeway also quotes a passage from Brugsch, Hist. of the Pharaohs, Eng. trans. 2nd ed., I., 386, when referring to the days of Thothmes III. and Rameses II. of Egypt (c. 1500-1300 B.C.): "Solid images of animals in stone or brass in the shape of recumbent oxen took the place of our [modern European] weights." And he gives an illustration of an ancient Egyptian weighing by a steelyard or graduated balance with bull and ring weights.

Professor Ridgeway further quotes (p. 271) Professor R. S. Poole: "The sanction of the LXX., and the use of weights bearing the form of lions, bulls and geese by the Egyptians, Assyrians and probably Persians, must make us hesitate before we abandon a rendering [the Septuagint "lamb" for Hebrew qesita; translated "piece of money" in Gen. xxiii. 19: Joshua xxiv. 32: and Job xli. 11] so singularly confirmed by the relation of the Latin pecunia [cumulative property: money] and pexus [cattle, including sheep]." In support of this statement Professor Ridgeway exhibits (p. 271) two stone "lamb" weights from Syria and Persia respectively and a further illustration of the transfer of the "lamb" weight to the stamp on money by a Phoenician coin from Salamis in Cyprus (p. 272).

In Burma the chinth is a mythological lion, and the to is a mythological deer (half deer, half horse), and both are representative of guardian spirits. Examination of various forms, which these creatures assume in sculpture, picture and engraving, show them to be respectively the greatly degenerated modern descendants in a far country of the ancient Assyrian guardsman, the winged lion and the winged bull. The Assyrians also used models, both of the lion and the

---

44 Origin of Metallic Currency and Weight Standards, p. 128.
45 Loc. cit., from Leipzit, Denkmäler, p. 331.
46 Madden, Jewish Coinage, p. 7.
47 About 1892 I secured a silver "lamb" from a Baghduji Jew in Rangoon. In 1906 Prof. Barton recognized a tortoise bronze weight in Palestine with a Hebrew inscription showing it to be a quarter nekdep (shekel). This tortoise was a Phoenician symbol and became transferred to the once widely spread Aeginian "tortoise" coinage of ancient Greece, Quarterly Statement, Palestine Exploration Fund, October 1912, pp. 122 f.
48 In practice the to has now become a "lion," see infra, p. 123. There can be little doubt, however, that the to of the Burmese is of the same origin as the national guardian ki-lis, of the Chinese, transferred to Japan as the kirin, both in its winged lion and winged horse-deer form. Whatever can be proved as regards the one in reference to origin will hold good of the other: video Kaempfer, Hist. of Japan, 1690: reprint of 1906, Vol. I, pp. 191-92; figs. 25, 26 and 28. Gould, Mythical Monsters, 1895, has a valuable Chapter (x., p. 358) on the unicorn with which he connects the ki-lis and its congers, showing the instructive connection of the lu (unicorn) with a Chinese representation of the sphinx (p. 360, figs. 85-7).
built as standards of weight (Plate VI., figs. 4, 5 and 6). These considerations lead to a possible origin for some forms at any rate of the animal models used for weights and currency in the Far East, where the two ideas are still habitually mixed up in the popular mind.

In 1892 I had a plate drawn (ante, Vol. XXVII., p. 141) of Burmese metal weights (alô) in the form of animals, which were then still in use in Upper Burma as official standards of the old Burmese Kingdom. These weights took the form of chinthê, tō, sin (elephant), nuwâdi (bull), and myawk (monkey), besides the common henta (goose) of the bazaars. Notices of these have been traced in the writings of travellers from 1786 (ante, loc. cit.). About 1881 Carl Bock (Temple and Elephants, p. 159) found old native weights still in use in the form of the “hoong or sacred goose” [i.e., the henta of Burma], or of an elephant, among the Shans and Laos of Upper Siam. I saw this collection and they consisted of counterparts of the standard Burmese weights—henta, nuwâdi and myawk (goose, bull and monkey). This looks as if the animal weights had travelled from Burma into Siam.

The chinthê (lion) of Burma became transferred from the weights to the European-minted gold coinage of the late Alompra dynasty, together with the royal cognisance of the peacock and the hare (see Plate IV., figs. 8 and 10). In the other parts of the Far East, the cock appears on a modern duit ayam (copper cash: Plate III., fig. 8), and unmistakably on a very rough coin from Mergui (Plate V., fig. 5). The goose is seen on a Cambodian coin of 1848 (Plate III., fig. 10) and on a Tenasserim weight of 11½ oz. = the pennun of the tin currency lower down the coast (Plate IV., fig. 11). The to is found on a spelter (tin and lead) coin from Mergui (Plate III., fig. 9, Plate V., fig. 3).

The Mergui weights and coins had on the reverse debased imitations of Burmese legends, which one of them shows to have been Mahāsukham Nāgaram (ungrammatical Pali). This again points to the importation of the animal currency to the Malay Peninsula from Burma, as did the finds of Bock in the case of the Shans of Upper Siam. Such an inference is confirmed by a Plate in Tavernier’s Travels, Eng. ed. 1678, I., Pt. II., 6 t. (given ante, p. 103). This was copied by Crawford, Hist. Ind. Archipel., 1829, L., p. 150, and shows a tin coin purporting to come from Perak and Kedah, which, he says weighed 1½ oz. = hati or tameng. The obverse has a snake and the reverse some marks that might pass for serpents, but are more probably a further breaking down of the above mentioned Burmese legend on the coins from Mergui. Plate V., figs. 3 and 4, also shows that the “snake” coin may after all be only a debased or “developed” to.

51 All presented to the British Museum.
52 Plate IV., figs. 8 to 9.
53 One variety of this is called siene, the swift of the edible birds’ nests.
54 Such coins were found being used as gambling tokens in Rangoon in 1899.
55 Figs. 9, 10, 11 of Pl. III. are all from Phayre, Intern. Numis. Orient., 1882. The legend would mean City of great peace. This legend Mahāsukham-nāgaram seems to refer to Kedah, which on later coins assumed the Arabic form of Dārul-amān, Land of peace. Vide Appx. III., infra, where Millies’ readings are Dārul-amān Balad Kedah and Dārul-amān Kedah (Land of peace, City of Kedah and Land of peace, Kedah) on tin coins of 1741 and 1890. Mr. Blagden tells me that the capital of Kedah was known in the 13th and 14th Centuries as Lāngkasa, “Land of Peace,” a name still remembered.
56 A comparison with the imitation Burmese characters on the Mergui coins will show this. See Phayre’s Pl. IV., figs. 3 and 5.
The general inference, therefore, is that the idea of a model-animal currency travelled Eastward to Burma, and thence further East still into the Malay Peninsula and Siam. This inference is strongly supported by a statement by La Loubère (Hist. Relation of Siam, 1687-8, trans. 1693), who says (p. 14) that "Vincent le Blanc [a physician working the King of Siam's mines] relates that the Peguins [Talings of Burma] have a mixture of lead and copper, which he sometimes calls ganze [plu.] and sometimes ganza [sing.], and of which he reports they make statues and small money which is not stamped with the king's coin, but which every one has a right to make."

Against this inference, however, must be set the ancient Chinese model knife money, the origin of the form of the "cash," and the model horse money, still in use in Upper Siam, which point to an independent development of the idea of the model tin currency and subsequent coinage of Siam and the Malay Peninsula out of models of common objects (Pl. VI, figs. 7 and 8). Also the kentlu weight or coin exhibited by Phayre (op. cit., Pl. V. 2), bears an inscription obviously of Arabic origin, while Plate V., fig. 4, infra, bears a debased Arabic inscription with a probable date corresponding to 1408 A.D., showing that other influences have been at work.

The very close connection between the Malay tin "hat" money and the spelter and tin coins of the whole West Coast of the Peninsula came out clearly in an official letter of the Deputy Commissioner of the Mergui District, dated 27 May 1891, communicated to me by the late Mr. Hesketh Biggs, Accountant General of Burma, on the 28th Nov. 1895. It relates to two boxes containing "two sets of tin money", both of which have now unfortunately disappeared, but the letter shows that specimens are still probably procurable in Tenasserim without much difficulty. "The round pieces," ("about the size of a rupee") in Mr. Biggs' covering letter: cf. the "cock" coin, Pl. V., fig. 5), "are coined at Renong", and some on our side amongst the Chinese and Siamese. They are valued at 10 cents and 5 cents respectively, of the Straits Settlements currency. The Pagodas (shaped Mr. Biggs said ), which are cast by the mine lessees, are used in barter in the neighbourhood of mines at Thobawteik and elsewhere, and are valued at about 2 annas, 3 annas and 4 annas each." In other words: the coins represented the tampang 1/10 dollar and buaya 1/20 dollar respectively, and the "hat" coins a pajuuru 1/16 dollar, a tampang 1/10 dollar and a tali 1/8th dollar, of the ingot and gambar ingot tin currency of the Federated Malay States.

V.

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS.

The evidence available as to the tin currency and money of the Malay Peninsula seems to justify the following general conclusions.

The regulated solid tin ingots constituted a currency made, out of the customary forms of native tin castings, to meet the necessities of an external trade carried on by means of barter and currency, and to conform in weight and size to the weight-standards of that trade.

---

29 The ringgit bubi (infra, Appr. I, No. V) or pig dollar may represent a gambar bubi, pig ingot, and the snake a gambar uler, snake ingot, yet to be unearthed.
30 The Indian kana; Malay pajuuru: boll-metal, bronze; also used for lead and spelter. See Yule, Hoben Jolies, v. v. ganza. La Loubère, however, merely copied Caesar Frederick, 1567, in the last part of his statement. See Makings, Maclehose ed. v., 431; Parachas, Maclehose ed. x., 131.
31 Between Burma and the Federated Malay States in the Malay Peninsula.
Tin was adopted for the purposes of currency as being the staple metallic product of the Peninsula, and the system of tin currency devised by the Malays has not materially varied in historical times.

The solid "animal" ingot tin currency arose out of an attempt to improve the regulation of the solid ingot currency by giving it readily recognisable forms, which could be made to conform to definite standards; while the forms themselves were copied from those in use—with a very long history behind them—by the neighbouring countries carrying on the external trade, which were mainly Burma and China (directly or through Siam).

In regard to the weight standards of the countries trading with the Peninsula, I have shown, ante, Vol. XXVIII, pp. 102 ff., that the ponderary (Troy) scales in use in the whole of the Far East were originally based on that of ancient India, which in its turn was connected with that of ancient Greece; the terminology of the international commercial ponderary scales east of India is Malayan with a partly Indian basis; that the standards of weight for metallic currency spread eastward from India; that the basis of the standard was the seed of the abrus precatorius creeper (rati, rakat, crab's eye), with its double, the seed of the adenanthera parasitana tree (kondori, kondori, redwood-seed, candareen); and that these two seeds were habitually mixed in the popular mind, producing in various countries and places concurrent scales of standard weights, one double of the other and often mixed up.

The hollow tin money of the Peninsula grew in form, weight and size out of the solid tin currency, so as to meet the necessities arising out of a later external trade carried on by means of money.

The first external nation to use coined money in trading with the Peninsula was China, whose traders adopted a system of spelter coinage to suit the native tin currency.

The various European systems of coinage adopted to suit the trade with the Malay Peninsula are the descendants of the native tin currency: in the case of the British by direct descent; in the case of the Dutch by descent from the Chinese spelter coinage through the Portuguese.

The scales of the Malay tin currency were based in the first instance on the standards of the external trade, and later on were modified so as to conform to the scales of the predominant nations successively carrying on that trade in money—Chinese, Portuguese, Dutch and British; the necessities of the trade having always mutually affected the evolution of the scales by the Malays and the nations dealing with them.

All the existing scales used in the Peninsula—Malay, Dutch through Portuguese, and British—for the enumeration of cash for monetary and currency purposes are adapted from the Indian system of counting cowries as money, which in its turn is closely analogous to the system long since adopted in Europe for describing money.

The currency and money used in the Peninsula, in their final forms up to date, thus exhibit a clear instance of the development of human thought along a definite main line, as affected by environment and contact with outside influences.

60 But not the Burmese, who have but recently dominated the country now named after them. The old trade must have been carried on by the Talangs (Moa) or by the Siamese (Shans).
61 See also Vol. XXVIII., p. 103; XXVIII., 316 ff.
62 Also starling's eye, cock's eye, Job's tears, King Charles's tears. See also Wilkinson, Dict., 3, rev. Saga (adenanthera parasitana) and Saga belina (abrus precatorius), for which last a Malay term was mactubung, bird's eye; see infra, Appx. IV., Extract No. VI.
VI.

EXPLANATION OF PLATES.

Plate I.

Ex. coll. W. W. Skeat.

Fig. 1. "Hat" money, apparently the 6idor, quarter dollar. It is of a different mint from that of figs. 2, 3 and 4. The inscriptions are Chinese and ? Arabic.

Figs. 2, 3 and 4. "Hat" money in three sizes, made so as to fit into each, and holed for carrying on a string (tali). They represent respectively the quarter, twelfth and twentieth of a dollar: see ante, p. 88. They came from the same mint as my own specimens (ante, p. 90, n. 34), which are dated 1864 and 1829. They all bear legends in Malay on the inner rims. Fig. 3 is dated A.H. 1265 = A.D. 1849.

Fig. 5. A gambur buaya; "crocodile" tin ingot: length about a foot, representing probably buaya pinengah, mid buaya or jampal, half dollar, in the tin currency (ante, 96 n. 49).

Figs. 6 and 7. Gambur ayam; "cock" tin ingots, pierced for stringing together and representing the tali and pinjuru of the tin currency, the eighth and sixteenth of a dollar (ante, p. 94).

Plate II.


This plate represents a collection of tin ingot currency made by Mr. G. M. Laidlaw in 1904 in Lower Perak, of which he took two photographs. There are four more figures in Fig. 2 than in Fig. 1: all "crocodiles" (gambur buaya).

The figures correspond thus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crocodiles</th>
<th>Cocks</th>
<th>Elephants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fig. 1:</td>
<td>1 Fig. 2:</td>
<td>2 Fig. 2:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Four crocodiles in Fig. 2, Nos. 14, 15, 16, 22, have no corresponding forms in Fig. 1.

There are in addition to the gambur currency, two specimens of the "pagoda" ingot: no. 4 in fig. 1, and under the "crocodile," no. 4 in fig. 2. In fig. 2, no. 3, is an independent specimen of a "pagoda" ingot.

The plate seems to show that there must have been more denominations of gambur currency than those of which we have definite information at present.

Fig. 1, no. 3, corresponds with Fig. 2, no. 6. Mr. Laidlaw, in his letter of 14th June 1904 says that this is a jongkong, or firstling of the smelting house, to which a superstitious value was attached that caused these first fruits to be bequeathed as heirlooms. As currency they corresponded with the tampang of 22½ oz. or 10 cents. See infra, Appx. I, No. V. 63

63 Normally they were of most uncertain size and weight, as they were also cast from the superfluous tin left over after casting the kiping or slabs.
Plate III.
Figs. 1-8 ex. coll. W. W. Skeat.

Figs. 1, 2 and 3. Rough specimens of tin ingots of the "sugarloaf" form in the Cambridge Museum: ante, p. 88.

Figs. 4, 5 and 6. Specimens of tin ingots of the "pagoda" form, with the tampok manggis mint mark +. Figs. 5 and 6 are in the Cambridge Museum, ante, p. 88.

Fig. 7. Tin ingot of the "sugarloaf" form in the Cambridge Museum, bearing the tampok manggis X and the melumba F mint marks: ante, p. 88.

Figs. 8, 10 and 11. Developments in money of the gambar ayam (cock) tin ingot. Fig. 8 is a duit ayam, coined copper cash 83a: Fig. 10 a Cambodian coin of 1808 ante, p. 118: Fig. 11 is a spelter "cock" coin of Tenasserim (Mergui, ante, p. 116). Fig. 9 is a spelter "to" coin from Tenasserim (ante, p. 118).

Plate IV.
Figs. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6. Burmese ingot weights (iron) ex. coll. R. C. Temple. (1) chinté, lion; (2) sin, elephant; (3) hentha, goose; (4) myauk, monkey; (5) swadi, bull; (6) zicazo, swift.

Figs. 7, 8, 9, 10. Coins of the Alompra Dynasty: ex. coll. R. C. Temple.

7. Copper: coin of Thibaw (1878-1885). Ovbr. to taek taw, and figure of a to, which is here evidently a "lion." Rev. Yedanabon nebyidaw: 1 mu thong dinya = 8 pon tabon, 1240 (Burmese Era) Royal stamp of the to: Ratanapunna (Mandalay) the royal residence; 8th part of a coin to be used as one mu (64th part of one rupee = 1 anna), 1878 84.

8. Gold: coin of Mindon Min (1852-1878). Ovbr. to taek taw, 1840, and figure of to. Rev. Yedanabon nebyidaw: 5 mu thong dinya. Coin to be used as 5 mu, 1878: = half a (gold) rupee, or 8 rupees as the standard then was. This coin is evidently the forerunner of no. 7. There was a gold rupee or mohar with a chinté (lion) on it. Ovbr. Chínthé taek taw, 1238. Rev. Yedanabon 1 kyat thong dinya. Royal stamp of the lion, 1866: coin to be used as 1 (gold) rupee.

9. Copper (debased): coin of Mindon Min. Ovbr. figure of a peacock and udaung taek taw, 1227. Rev. Yedanabon nebyidaw 1 pe thong dinya = 6 bon tabon. Royal stamp of the peacock, 1865, 4th part of a coin to be used as one pe (64th part of a rupee = 1 paisa (piece) or 1 anna).

10. Lead: coin of Mindon Min. Ovbr. figure of a hare and yon taek taw, 1231. Rev. kyeni dinya = 4 bon tabon. Royal stamp of the hare 1869: coin to be used as 4th part of a copper coin (1 paisa or 256th part of a rupee).85

Fig 11. Hentha (goose) coin or spelter weight (ex. coll. R. C. Temple) procured in 1899.

Phayre, Numis. Orient. coins of Aracau, Pegu and Tenasserim, 1882, Plate IV. no. 2, exhibits a

83a This coin is described by Dr. Hanisch, J. R. A. S., Straits Branch. No. 9, p. 199, as a token issued in Sumatra by the British R. I. Co. in 1831, having on the reverse "satu keping, 1247." Specimens in B. M. bear dates from 1797 to 1802 and later.

84 Only three Burmese Kings issued coined money — Bodaw-phaya (1781-1819); Mindon Min (1852-1878); Thibaw (1878-1885). They all copied the British metallic currency of India.

85 Sangerman, Burmese Empire, ed. Tandy, 1833, p. 167, says the proportion of lead coin to the tical (rupees) in Burma in his day (1781-1839) was 200: 1, but was at times as great as more than 1000: 1. There was a still smaller lead denomination which was "the 8th part of a copper coin," or 324th part of a rupee.
better specimen, which has an illegible debased Arabic legend on the reverse. He remarks (page 93) that hentha-ingot weights were common in Pegu. Phayre's specimen weighed 11½ ounces and no doubt represents the pānjuru (14 oz. standard) of Malay tin ingot weight. Phayre's Plate IV., fig. 3 shows a clear "cock" variety, with debased Talaing or Burmese characters on the reverse.

Plate V.


Fig. 1. A bālalang kōchil, small "mantis" tin ingot: value a pānjuru or 6½ cents: weight 17½ oz., length 7 in. (ante, p. 92).

Fig. 2. A kura kōchil, small "tortoise" tin ingot: value a tampan or 10 cents: weight 22½ oz., length 4½ in., breadth 2¾ in. (ante, p. 92).

Fig. 3. A to tin weight or coin from Mergui (ante, p. 118) with the eight-star, or Malay "palm," symbol on reverse. Phayre, Numis. Orient., Coins from Aracan, Pegu and Tenasserim, Plates III. and IV., gives several examples, some with Pali and debased Talaing and Burmese characters on reverse: mahasukam nagaram (City of great rest, apparently Kedah, see ante, p. 118 n. 55 and infra, Appx. III.) Phayre's Plate III., figs. 5-10 are small denominations, all showing debased chaitya on the reverse, and hence all Buddhist and from Burma. His figs. 8 and 9 show the transition to the chinnthē, lion, and his fig. 5 to humped bull.

The effigies of the chinnthē, lion, and the to have become so confused in the process of cutting moulds for metal castings for standard weights, just as have those of the hentha, goose, and the saloso, swift (see Pl. IV. 3, figs. 3 and 6) that they are hardly distinguishable. This will be seen by comparing the drawing of a to weight below with that of chinnthē weight on Plate IV., fig. 1. This confusion has been carried on into the Burmese coinage where the to has become a veritable lion. See Plate IV., figs. 7 and 9.
Fig. 4. Tin "snake" weight or coin from Mergui (ante, p. 119) with debased Arabic characters on reverse, or what may be a date at = A. H. 811 = A. D. 1408. See also ante, p. 103, for another specimen from Tavernier, Travels, 1678, copied by Crawford, Hist. Ind. Archipel., 1820, I., 253. It is quite possible that the "snake" weight is only a debased or "developed" to. Cf. Figs 3 and 4 on this plate, and the various developments of the to in Phayre's plates, ante, p. 123).

Fig. 5. Tin cock coin or perhaps counter, token or tally, from Mergui. Reverse has a badly inscribed Burmese legend which reads: — thathanadaw (in the year of) religion: date illegible. This is probably the tin coin from Mergui "about the size of a rupee" mentioned ante, p. 119, and also that recorded by Sangermano (Burmese Empire, ed. Tandy, 1883, p. 167) as current between 1781 and 1808: — "In Tavai and Mergui pieces of tin with the impression of a cock which is the Burmese arms are used for money." Taking the ratio of tin to silver as 10:1, the value of this coin would be 5 cents of Malay money.

Plate VI.

All the figures are from Ridgeway's Origin of Metallic Currency and Weights Standards.

Fig. 1. Coin of Salamis in Cyprus, showing lamb weight (p. 172).

Fig. 2. An ancient Egyptian weighing with ox weights and rings (p. 128).

Fig. 3. Coin of Creusa, showing lion and ox weights (p. 298).

Fig. 4. Lamb weights, Syria and Persia (p. 271).

Fig. 5. Chinese hoe money (p. 28)

Fig. 6. Assyrian duck weight (p. 245), which is perhaps a debased "bull's head" (p. 247).

Fig. 7. A Jewish (? Assyrian) bull's head weight (p. 283).

Fig. 8. An Assyrian lion weight (p. 245).

Fig. 9. Chinese knife money (p. 157).

Plate VII.

Fig. 1 is a representation, from Plate LVII, of Cunningham's Barhut Stupa of Anñatapindaika dedicating the Jetavana (Jeta's park) to the Buddha, after having purchased it for a "layer of crores (of treasure)." See ante, p. 115. The scene shows Anñatapindaika himself with a libation ewer in his hands, standing beside the holy mango tree surrounded by a Buddhist railing. It also shows the two, Gandhakuti and Kosambakuti, shrines built in the garden and the attendant crowd. In front of Anñatapindaika is his treasurer tallying the contents of a bullock cart, which is in the process of being unladen. The bullocks have been taken out and are lying down. A basket of stamped ingots is being drawn off the cart by a cooly; another is carrying a basket of them on his shoulder and two others are spreading them over the ground under three sandal-wood trees. Every ingot is stamped with what appears to be a letter or figure.

Fig. 2. A half cash-tree, showing thirteen cash without the Raja's stamp at the top. The cash bear date 1314 = A. D. 1896.

(To be continued.)

66 Really the heathen, goose.

67 The Malay tin coin mentioned by Pyrard de Laval (ante, p. 109, n. 12) in 1602 was worth half a bastardo of Albuquerque, or 10 cents. That mentioned by Tavernier, 1678 (ante, p. 102), was worth 1 cent.
OLD MALAY CURRENCY.

PLATE III

Indian Antiquity

(Sizes reduced from the originals.)
THE OBSOLETE TIN CURRENCY AND MONEY OF THE FEDERATED MALAY STATES.

BY SIR R. C. TEMPLE, KBE.

APPENDIX I.

Correspondence.

No. I.

Mr. W. W. Skeat to Sir R. Temple. 13 March 1904.

The series is a most interesting one, as it includes a specimen of the Perak-Selanger "crocodile coin," the name of which (sau-bauya) is still used in reckoning small sums (≈½ cents). It is shaped like a crocodile with the tail slightly curved upwards, is made of tin and is several inches long. There are also several specimens of the fowl coin, also of tin, and cast in the shape of a cock. I am trying to get a specimen of the snake coin of Kedah to complete this series. There are also specimens of the solid tin coins [ingots used as coins] of Selangor and Perak, some of which weigh several pounds, and are copied in a similarly-shaped token series of Pahang, hollowed out to fit on to each other like hats.

I secured also two small gold coins from the East Coast with bulls on them, apparently not yet recorded, but in shape and size resembling some Sumatran coins; and finally a large and complete series of the tin cash of the various East Coast States, some of which have inscriptions in a script that I have not yet been able to get deciphered. A list of these coins was made out by Mr. [now Prof.] Rapson of the British Museum, who told me that the series was not in the Museum.

I should like to add that Prof. Ridgeway and I worked right through them, constructing tables of the various State currencies.

Some of the cash show symbols that reappear in old Javanese coins, notably a sort of "wheel ornament," and the unusual script may have some bearing on the same problem.

Besides the coins I have some "cash trees" (Mal. pokok-pitke) which show the method of making the cash.

No. II.

Mr. W. W. Skeat to Sir R. Temple. 10 June 1904.

The [tin] currency is all obsolete. Most of it has been so for two or three generations. It was only with the greatest labour that I could evolve order out of the chaos, or indeed find out anything about the ratio that the different coins bore to each other. All this is quite new, as is also the entire history of the development of the so-called "hat coin," whose shape is taken ultimately from the trade blocks of tin still in use. All this has never been touched before.

The crocodile coin took quite five years before I could run it to earth, and the cock coins are little if at all commoner. There was no proof till I got it that these things were ever used as currency at all. Even the Curator of the Perak Museum, from which State they came, told me that he had no idea of their use, and thought they were only toys. Both these and the 'snake' coin of Kedah—in fact the whole set—are purely entirely sui generis, and of the highest interest.

No III.

Mr. W. W. Skeat to Sir R. Temple. 30 June 1904.

1. I believe that there are two sizes of 'crocodile' coins, as there certainly are of the 'cocks.' I am trying hard to get further light from the Peninsula, without success so far.

---

*This contains original information on the subject gathered on the spot.*
2. To the 'cock' coin series might be added an Achinese coin\textsuperscript{28} of which I once possessed a specimen. It had a cock stamped on it, and is important because of the former relations of Achin with the Peninsula, as well as because their gold dinar in shape and execution rather reminds one of the gold 'bull' coins I found in the Peninsula.

3. These gold 'bull' coins should certainly I think be included in the animal series.\textsuperscript{29}

4. There might also be included two specimens of tin 'snake' coins from Kedah and Perak, of which I am trying hard to get specimens, and meanwhile send you tracing.\textsuperscript{31}

If one could get coins stamped with the 'crocodile' it would be a great point. It also occurs to me that it would be as well to get hold of a full-sized Perak or Selangor tin block. I have seen them at tia-smiths' shops in England. The small blocks ('hat' coins) stand in a definite relationship to the big blocks, I feel sure. It is possible that the Batavia Museum has specimens of coins of the 'animal' kind, perhaps important ones.

**No. IV.**

Mr. W. W. Skeat to Sir R. Temple. 21 July 1904.

I have just received an interesting letter from Mr. G. M. Laidlaw from Perak about some coins he has sent me, of which I am sending you a copy. It is of great interest to hear of the gajah and b[t]alang ('elephant' and 'praying mantis') coins, whose names were quite new to me. Of course they may turn out to be Malay nicknames applied to some of the less known European coins that were once used in the Peninsula, but anyhow it points clearly to the zo-omorph tendency of this branch of numismatics.

You will welcome the little 'cock' coin that I send herewith,\textsuperscript{32} the inscription on which is Tanah Malaya or 'Malay land' above the 'cock' and satu körping or 'one piece' with Arabic date on the reverse. I have seen these coins before, but imagined them to be Achinese.\textsuperscript{33} I feel sure they are at least of Sumatran origin, as they are practically identical in respect of material, weight, size and general design, with other körings in this very lot, which evidently came from the British Settlement in Sumatra. They have such inscriptions as 'Island of Sumatra' in English\textsuperscript{34} and 'Island of Sultan,' also in English.\textsuperscript{35} I have also coins of Dutch and Friesian origin.

**No. V.**

Mr. G. M. Laidlaw to Mr. W. W. Skeat. 14 June 1904. Written from Telok Anson, Lower Perak, Federated Malay States.

Your letter, asking for further information and fresh examples of tin coins, arrived just before I left on a down-river trip. I failed to get fresh examples there, but I have sent out by the Malay writers, and hope to have run some to earth when I get back to Telok Anson in ten days' time. I have tried to put my notes in order, but the results are meagre.

My earliest informant was Pa Lani bin Uda, the oldest native of Kota Stia. His information I have checked with other old men, both up and down river. I have, however, not really got

\textsuperscript{28} Probably a token of the British E. I. Co. of 1831. See ante, p. 122.
\textsuperscript{29} Prima facie they would be of Indian rather than of Malay origin.
\textsuperscript{30} Vide Plate IV.
\textsuperscript{31} Returned to Mr. Skeat, 23 July 1904.
\textsuperscript{32} Common in Singapore and Malacca. Good specimens in the British Museum. See ante, p. 122.
\textsuperscript{33} Dr. Hanitzki, J.R.A.S., Straits Branch, No. 39, p. 126, describes them as copper tokens of the British E. I. Co. in Sumatra, dated 1804.
\textsuperscript{34} The only explanation I can offer of this name is that it means Sumatra, or a part of it, perhaps Achin; in which case it should be read 'Island of the Sultan,' in reference to the long prevailing idea that Achin was governed by a Queen, owing to the fact that there were four governing Queens there in succession from 1541 to 1892. See Marston, Sumatra, pp. 44 ff.
behind this coin currency. This table is practically that of Wilkinson, Dict., p. 153, s. v. tali, with the addition of the pênjuru.

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>(one) pênjuru</td>
<td>62½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>piak or sa tali</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>suku</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>jampal</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dua²⁷</td>
<td>jampal or dollar</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Satus wang I was told was 36 kêping and the piak, which seems to have been a Perak term, was equal to 3½ wang. This equivalence is interesting, as it is not quite exact, being one kêping out in comparison with the above table.²⁸ There were presumably no bullion brokers to call the coinage in those days. Wilkinson, (Malay Dict.) quotes Clifford's proverb, sa tali tiga wang juga; one tali, three wang too.²⁹

Another difference from Wilkinson, which also appeared was that the value of the wang had by no means been constant. It had been successively 1 : 14, 1 : 20, 1 : 28, 1 : 36. The change in the ratio had been effected by beat of gong.³⁰ The Raja Muda,³¹ who lives here, tells me he thinks the old record was lost in the trouble at the time of the Perak War, (1879).

Pa Lani said:—"Wang tiada ubah, naik turun duit. Raja mahalan sebab baniah duit Buggis mosok, the wang did not alter, but the duit went up and down. The Raja raised the price because many duits entered from the Celebes."³²

Down the river they were not accustomed to a bimetallic currency, but they met the depreciation of copper by an alteration in the ratio. The copper unit was the duit or kêping. First came the duit ayam, 'fowl' duit, which was Raffles' Bencoolen coin, and equal to it was the duit bunga tanjung, 'flower of the Cape' duit. This I think is the coin described by Dr. Hantje, (Collection of Coins from Malacca, Singapore, 1902, J. R. A. S., Straits Branch, No. 39, p. 198) as having a sixteen-rayed star (? palm) on the reverse. There was also the duit lorek. This is the kêping with the shield and inscription 'Island of Sultana,' a coin which Luering said he had seen with the inscription 'Sumatra.'

The dollar had various names:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ringgit môricam</th>
<th>dollar with the gun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>koin</td>
<td>of cloth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bârûnain</td>
<td>covered with cloth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tua</td>
<td>old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gambar babi</td>
<td>with (picture of a) pig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rial</td>
<td>real (Sp. dollar).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The only specimen I got was that of a ringgit môricam. I am sending all my wang, the best of the copper coins and the only other gambar timah, tin model,³³ that I have.

One of the old Friesian coins shows the 'lightning' in the lion's paw pretty well. The Dutch East India Company's duit chabang, duit with the fork, X, latterly equalled the ordinary duit ayam, 'cook' duit, but formerly in Toh Bongko's time, say 1850, ten of these equalled one wang.³⁴

²⁷ 'Fowl' duit, or cash.
²⁸ See Maxwell, Manual of Malay Lang., p. 142.
²⁹ This would give 105 kêping to the piak or tali.
³⁰ I. e., successively the number of kêping to the piak rose from 42 to 70, 98 and 126, by administrative order.
³¹ Heir Apparent.
³² Animal currency
³³ Double.
³⁴ Other ratio of 35 kêping to the piak.
³⁵ 126 kêping to the piak in place of 125.
The tampang another informant said was current at ten sen, the sen (cent) being equal to ten duit. This however only showed a later equivalence with the kupang. It was stated to be a Selangor measure.

The only tin equivalences I could get were that the buaya, 'crocodile,' was worth 50 duit ayam, that two buaya made one tampang, and that the bidor equalled the suku (quarter dollar). "Datok mendatangkan orang 100 bidor, the Chief fined the people 100 bidor," which was equivalent to 25 dollars.23

"The people in Pahang used gold coins kendi, bok, lada, mayam (the big one)." Ratios I could not get. "They used the tin tampang and keping," but here again ratios were not forthcoming. "They did not use the bidor or buaya." Perak seems to have used the gambor, balaang, ayam, buaya, gajah25 and bidor. So far I have not got behind "ta'au, don’t know."

Possibly something can be made out of the following table of weight which I have pieced up from a string of statements made by Pa Lani. The last has a slight discrepancy which shows that the verbal equivalent was out by 2½ kati.66

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sa pînjuru</td>
<td>10 tahil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dua pînjuru</td>
<td>1 kati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>empat pînjuru</td>
<td>1 kati [2½ kati]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lapan pînjuru</td>
<td>2½ kati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 pînjuru</td>
<td>8 piak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>= 4 suku</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>= 2 jampal</td>
<td>5 kati</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 keping (slabs) = 75 kati

4 keping = tengahdua69

8 keping = 150 kati

2 keping 5 jampal = 300 kati

7½ jampal = 83½ kati

The bidor or suku (quarter dollar) will go into this "bullion currency," but the crocodile of which 20 went to the dollar will not.23

---

66 This provides a scale:
- 60 duit ayam = 1 buaya = 5 cents
- 2 buaya = 1 tampang or kupang = 10 cents
- 2 tampang = 1 suku = 25 cents
- 4 suku = 1 dollar = 100 cents

It shows also that 1,000 duit ayam or keping went to the dollar, and thus provides the required equivalence between the silver dollar money scale and the tin currency scale above stated, as in either case 1,000 keping went to the upper unit of the scale.

67 Models of praying mantis, fowl, crocodile and elephant.
68 Should be 1 kati; see table below.
69 16 tahil = 1 kati.
70 That is one and a half pikul = 150 kati; therefore 1 pikul = 100 kati. Three pikul = one bahara.
71 The kati is 1½ lbs; therefore the bahara is 400 lbs, or the remodelled British weight.
72 An error of 1½ kati in the keping (slab) should on this table consist of 27½ kati.
73 See ante, p. 99. Because the above table represents the old Dutch scale, which works out at 64 cents to the pînjuru, and the buaya of 5 cents is reckoned on the modern British scale.
This is very little, but I hope still to get some of the missing links.\textsuperscript{93}

2 buaya = 1 tampang
5 buaya = 1 bidor or suku
4 bidor = 1 dollar of 10 kati

No. VI.

Mr. G. M. Laidlaw to Mr. W. W. Sheat. 29th July 1904.

Written from Telok Anson, Lower Perak.

I have been able to meet with several buaya, but I have not been able to make their owners part with them. So I have tried to make them lend them me till I get them photographed, The first photograph was a failure, so after some days I had others taken. I do not yet know with what success.

I am sending the ayam referred to in my last letter, and also, what is of greater interest, an old ayam and gajah found at Pasir Panjang Laut some eight feet below the present surface in making a new well. They were given me by the finder, Mat Nor bin Bilal Yop. I could get no information about him.

From an old man at Setiawan I got the following facts—by name Haji Mat Said bin Sheh Huisin. In the time of Marhum Sebrang Bandar, the ratio of the duit ayam to the song was 14:1. In the subsequent changes, other ratios of 20:1, 28:1, 36:1 were made in the time of Marhum Durian Sabatang. I will try and get the sanat (date) of the reigns. It seems that the dowry of the mythical princess Tanjong Buchar was 1000 bidor.\textsuperscript{95}

While he said that the bidor equalled the suku, he also said that the buaya equalled the penjuru, i.e., 16 went to the dollar.\textsuperscript{96} Other informants give the ratio as 20 to the dollar.\textsuperscript{97} Two buaya equal one gajah.

It seems that ten kati of tin were worth one dollar.\textsuperscript{98} This level was known, whenever it was reached, as sa-urup or samurup. In other words the bimetallic currencies of tin and silver were at par whenever tin was 30 dollars per bahara.

The weight of the kati was the same as that of four score dollars (empat lekor ringgit), whereas it is now equal to two score (dua lekor).\textsuperscript{99}

At Janggor, the first district opened up, in Butang Padang, 8 köping went to the bahara, while in Butak Rabit (practically Telok Anson) perhaps only 6 went to the dollar.

I came across an old trader named Imam Haji Mat Arshat bin Imam Bugis. He did a lot of trading in the bad old days up the Kinta Valley. He said the köping (slab) was worth four dollars, less one suku, or 37\frac{1}{4} kati of tin,\textsuperscript{100} when tin was at par (samurup) ; i.e., when tin was at ten kati to the dollar. At the same time this level was very rarely reached in Butak Rabit, although he was able to do satisfactory business on the following basis up country. A pit is

\textsuperscript{93} This was, however, not possible, as the tin animal currency corresponded with the old Dutch scale, and the scale Mr. Laidlaw was trying thus to get matched was the modern British scale.

\textsuperscript{94} The late.

\textsuperscript{95} That is, 250 dollars of tin at 10 kati the dollar.

\textsuperscript{96} That is, this man was quoting the old Dutch scale, making the buaya = 6\frac{4}{5} (not 5) emits.

\textsuperscript{97} Probably confusing the buaya of the tin currency with the buaya of British silver money.

\textsuperscript{98} This is the approximate historical ratio.

\textsuperscript{99} A dollar weighs 416 grs. and this statement gives therefore 33,250 grs. as the weight of a kati of tin. The standard worked out at p. 91 note, makes the weight 3120 x 10^3 = 37,350 grs. The reduction of the ratio of tin and dollar to half the above is due to depreciation of silver. It may be noted here that the terms empat lekor for four score, and dua lekor for two score are unusual, and probably dialectic: ordinarily they would mean 24 and 22 respectively.

\textsuperscript{100} That is, 34 dollar of 10 kati = 37\frac{1}{4} kati to the köping.
was worth ten duit ayam, and ten pitiis were worth one gambar ayam. He traded his rice up country at the rate of five dollars to the gantang. From this basis I got the very unsatisfactory statements which follow:

1 gambar ayam kōchil fetched 1 chupak of rice
1 gambar ayam bēsar " 2 chupak "
1 gambar bēlalang kōchil " 1 chupak "
1 gambar bēlalang bēsar " 1 chupak and 1 kal3
1 gambar buaya kōchil4 " 1 chupak

The small crocodile was worth five pitiis, which gives 50 duit ayam or 20 to the dollar. It appears that 8 köping might weigh 3 pūkul 20 kati; that is, be 20 kati out.

He said that

the tortoise (bakura or burakura) was worth 3 pīak (tali)7
the middle sized crocodile (buaya pēnhah) " 5 tali
the small crocodile buaya (kōchil) " 1 pēnjuru
the small mantis bēlalang (kōchil) " 1 pēnjuru
the small cock (ayam kōchil) " 1 pēnjuru
the large cock (ayam bēsar) " 2 pēnjuru

At the same time there were crocodiles as large as half a köping (slab), and there were mantises worth 3 pēnjuru.

He said that these coins were made to order by any bellows-smith (tukang pīngambu) or magician (pawang), and that they were made for ornament, not use.

The oldest native I have met, Tukang Awang of Pulau Tiga, a man who "can remember ten Sultans," and was 15 years old in the time of Marhum Jabat, could give me no more information beyond the duit ayam currency. He, however, had never been in a tin district.

I send herewith a photograph of some of these coins. Better photographs to follow. Notice the bēlalang (mantis) in the second row, also in the foreground the primitive Pasiir Panjang Laut specimens sent you. The oval shell-backed casting is a jōngkoung. That is, the sūlong relau, eldest born or firstling of the smelling-house; or sūlong klian, eldest born of the mine.

1 Here duit ayam, 'cook' duit = 'cash' (money); pitiis, ordinary 'cash' = cent; gambar ayam, model of cook (tin currency). This gives 1600 cash to the dollar.
2 Unit measure of capacity: 2 kal = 1 chupak; 4 chupak = 1 gantang.
3 Stevens, E. I. Trade, p. 57, makes the cash or kal of Achin to be about 5 gantang.
4 gambar = model: kōchil = small; bēsar = large; ayam = cook; bēlalang = mantis; buaya = crocodile.
5 This is a wrong assumption, these 'crocodiles' were clearly 16 to the dollar, as the informant was speaking of the Dutch not the British scale. The sense of this statement is explained, ante, p. 96.
6 The trader was, however, here referring to the bhaura of 420 lbs. which was the standard for the animal currency, see ante, p. 90.
7 This table shows, in terms of tin currency at the standard of 420 lbs. to the bhaura —

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Conversion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>crocodile</td>
<td>14 oz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mantis</td>
<td>42 oz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cock</td>
<td>84 oz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tortoise</td>
<td>140 oz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crocodile</td>
<td>261 lbs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other observations are that the whole is on the Dutch scale of the great vis (64 lbs.). The tortoise represents the great vis; the mantis the half-great-vis or tali.

* Thus perpetuating a clear error.
* It is however clearly a crocodile; Plate II. fig. 2, no
They were usually cast in duplicate and were used for the tiang sêri (central pillar) in front of a house,⁰⁰ and were bequeathed as heirlooms (heritâ pása). The evidence is quite against the chief having the prerogative of casting the coins. The names and actual mines and dates of the hejira, 1280 and 1275,¹¹ of one elephant and one crocodile were given.

In 1252¹² the price of tin was theoretically at the level of 30 dollars per tahara. The price subsequently rose, though the old price could still be got in the case where a long credit of three months was given.

The average size of the crocodiles in the illustration is twelve inches and the maximum twenty. The average elephant was nine and the cock three by two.

No VII.

Mr. W. W. Skeat to Sir R. Temple. 6 September 1904.

From the letters received from Mr. G. M. Laidlaw of Perak, and the accompanying photograph,¹³ which came from the same source, you will see that the "animal" currency of Perak is a more elaborate affair than I at first supposed. Laidlaw has sent me in addition to the photograph one or two more anyam or "cock" coins, and a gajah or "elephant" coin, whilst the photograph shows several more gajah, a number of crocodiles and a tortoise (kurakura),¹⁴ with none of which the owners be persuaded to part.

The gajah sent me is noticeably different from the others shown in the photograph. It is far smaller, has bent legs, very short snout, no ears to speak of and no saddle. So evidently it must be an anyam gajah, or young elephant, intended to represent an amount of lesser value.¹⁵ Laidlaw also mentions a bélandang ("praying mantis") coin, of which he could not purchase a specimen. If it occurs in the photograph it is probably the long thin coin, under the topmost "cock," though I should say that it was really (despite its name) nothing more than a degenerated "crocodile."¹⁶

The fact that the "elephant" sent me was buried some feet deep—as are many other specimens of tin currency in the Malay Peninsula—argues for its long continuance in the land, if not for its validity.

The "tortoise" exactly resembles an ordinary piece of smelted tin, with the addition of head and flappers.¹⁴ At first one would naturally expect that the "animal" currency would represent only animals that had a distinct barterable value; e.g., fowl, goat, cattle, etc. But the introduction of the crocodile—as to the use of which as a coin there is more ample evidence than in the case of any of the others—shows that this was not the underlying motive: or at least not the sole one. Whatever the motive was, there is ample evidence to prove the use of the "animal" as currency, and this evidence receives the most practical corroboration from the arrangements for stringing these coins together, like cash. See the hole at the top of the "cock" coins and over the nose of several of the "crocodiles."

No VIII.

Mr. W. W. Skeat to Sir R. Temple. 11 September 1904.

No specimen of the bélandang (praying mantis) coin has yet been obtained, nor even a large "elephant." Only one "crocodile" is to hand and no kurakura or tortoise, if any indeed are obtainable.

---

¹⁰ The tiang sêri is really the first pillar or house-post planted in the ground.
¹² See Plate II.
¹³ This is the jongsong, vide p. 180.
¹⁴ In the description of Plate II. fig. 2, No. 2, it has been classed as a khusu or "crocodile," which it undoubtedly is.
I am sending a second pull of the first photograph. I also send you a second photograph, showing the various pieces in different positions, which will therefore be useful. I imagine they have been printed as dark as possible to facilitate reproduction.  

No. IX.

Mr. W. W. Skeat to Sir R. Temple, 7 November 1904.

I send a set of photographs of the tin currency in my collection at the Cambridge Museum. The specimens have each been taken separately. Note that which is described in the Curator's report as possessing ridged markings on the side. This coin belongs to a slightly different type, the sections lacking the usual step and curving upwards to the top:

[Diagram: as against the usual]

Two of the faces have the curious ridged markings already mentioned; one resembling the Roman numeral II and the other IIII. The top of this specimen is marked by a cross, which corresponds to the usual tampok manggis (mangosteen rosette), as it is called in Malay. The photographs are half size.

No X.

Mr. W. W. Skeat to Sir R. Temple, 7 March 1907.

Dr. Harrison of the Horniman Museum (Forest Hill, London) was sent round to me from the British Museum in connection with two specimens of the tin currency found there. I asked him for photographs and he has courteously sent me the enclosed, recording in each case the weight and dimensions. No. 1 is a gambar ḅaláng or mantis ingot. The disposition of the wings, shape of the head and eye, and the segmentation of the tail part of the body are all very clearly marked. No. 2 is, I take it, a gambar kurakura or tortoise ingot, showing the shell marks. Both are of bright new tin, as fresh as when first cast. There seems to me a possible connection in shape between the mantis and the long tin slab (ḅúping) and also between the tortoise and the round tin piece (jōngkōng) shaped like a rather flat bowl, into which form the superfluous tin is still cast in the Malay Peninsula, when there is insufficient metal left over at the smelting to form a slab.

(To be continued.)

THE INSCRIPTION OF ARA.¹

BY PROF. H. LÜDERS, PA.D., BERLIN.

The Kharoshthi inscription treated here was discovered in a well in a nālā called Ara, 2 miles from Bāgnīlāb. It is now in the museum at Lahore. Mr. R. D. Banerji was the first to bring it to our notice. In publishing it (ante, vol. XXXVII, page 58), he expressed the expectation that I should succeed in completely deciphering the text. I regret that I am not able wholly to respond to the expectation. The last line of the inscription remains obscure though the script is here partly quite clear. I believe, however, to have been able to read so far the remaining portion of the inscription with the help of the impression which I owe to the kindness of Dr. Fleet ², that at the most there will remain doubt as regards the two names in the fourth line.

¹ These two photographs form figs. 1 and 2 of Plate II.
² Plates I. and III.

¹ Translated by Mr. G. K. Nariman from the Sitzungsberichte der preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften 1912, pp. 824 ff., and revised by the author.
² It is the same after which the prototype has been reproduced in this Journal.
In order to show what I owe to my predecessor I reproduce here his reading of the text of the inscription. I consider it superfluous to go into every point in detail in which I differ from him; in most cases an inspection suffices to determine the text. Let me, however, make one observation: Banerji believes the inscription to be broken towards the left end, and that the final words of all lines except the first are missing. This assumption is wholly without foundation.

Only the last line is incomplete at the end. Banerji reads:—

1. Maharajasa rajarajasam devaputradeva(?)[thadharasa ...]
2. Vaisishaputradeva Karishkasa samvatsarad eka chatarai[hec] ... 
3. sam XX, XX, 1, Chetasasmdasa diva 4, 1 avra divasami Namikha ... 
4. ... na puha pura pumana mabarathi Ratapaputa ... 
5. atmanasa sabharya putrasa anugatiyarthae savya ... 
6. ... rae himachala. Khiyana ...

I read:—

1. Maharajasa rajarajasam devaputradeva [ka][sa][ra]asa 
2. Vajyeshkaputradeva Karishkasa samvatsarad eka sathapat [r] 
5. e Nanda(sa sa)sharya[sa sa] putrasa anugatiyarthae savya ... [pa]na? 

1. To the reading of this word we shall revert later on.
2. The second akshara in my opinion be only jhe; the reading si is at all events excluded. As regards the reading of the third akshara, there may be different views at first sight. Akshara occurs in the name of Kanishka, Vasishtha, Huvishka, and as exactly the same symbol occurs in the Zeda inscription in the name Kanishkasa, one might feel tempted to read shka. On the other hand shpa is suggested by the fact that in the ligature shka, in the word Kanishkasa, which follows immediately after, the ka is joined to the sha in a different way. But, I think, we shall decide for shka when we take it into consideration that in the Kharoshthi script the same symbol on the same stone shows often widely different forms.
3. I have already given the correct reading of the date of the year in Jour. R. As. Soc., 1909, p. 652. The ligature tia is not new as Banerji thinks. It occurs, not to mention uncertain cases, in the word samvatitaraye in the Taxila inscription of Patika (Ep. Ind. 4, 54; Bühler: samvatitaraye), and in the Mahabharata inscription (Jour. As. IX, 4, 514; Senart: samvattaraye), and in bhistiti and matyana in the MS. Dutreuil de Rhins, as was shown ten years ago by Frankel (Pali und Sanskrit, page 96 f.)
4. The 3 of ri is not clear.
5. After the symbol for 20 there is a hole in the stone.
6. The n has crumbled away. The sign for s is attached below as in de in line 1, in e generally, and probably also in se in line 4.
7. The de is uncertain.
8. The 3 at the end of the word and the following sa are not quite distinct, but perfectly certain.
9. The akshara after sarva is totally destroyed, and the pa is uncertain. Shall we read sarvasopapa?
10. The hi is not certain.
11. After khiyana there are three or four illegible aksharas.

Translation.

"(During the reign of Mahārāja, Rājārāja, Devaputra, Kāśika Kanishka, the son of Vajreshaka, in the forty-first year,—in the year 41,—on the 25th day of the month of Jēha (Jyāpiksha), in this moment of the day, the dug well of the Dashāveras, the Pashapura sons, for.
the worship of father and mother, in order to show favour to Nāpāda together with his wife and his son, and to all beings (?). For the welfare of these (?)..."3

The inscription reports the sinking of the well in which it was found, by a number of persons who called themselves Dashaveras, if that name has been correctly read, and who are further characterised as Poshapuriaputra. Since it is said later on that the work was undertaken for the worship of father and mother, Dashavera can only be the family name indicating here a number of brothers belonging to it. The expression "Poshapuriaputra" one would be at first sight inclined to understand as "sons of Poshapura"; but Poshapuria would be a very strange personal name. I therefore believe that puta is here employed in the frequently occurring sense of 'member of,' 'belonging to,' and that Poshapura is derived from the name of the city of Posha-pura, which is equal to Purushapura, the modern Peshawar. As for the form puta it can be authenticated from Pāli writings.

Khaṇḍa5 is no doubt derived from khaṇḍa in the sense of "dung"; whether it is an adjective or a participle (Sk. khaṇḍa) should be left an open question. Khāṇḍa ḫukpe seems to have been used as a contrast to the natural fountains. The expression is of interest inasmuch as it enables us to explain a passage in the enigmatic inscription of Zeda. There occur after the date sam 10 1 Aśhādha maṇḍala di 20 Utarapāhyapī Ṛbhyuṣati, the characters which Senart6 reads: "[khaṇḍ][a] ... chaṣa ma ... kasa Kanishkaśa raja[m] ... [dābhah] do[m]a[m]ukha"; and which are read by Boyer7 as: "khaṇḍa ṛṣiḥvam ... chaṣa mardakasa Kanishkaśa raja[m] [ro]yadahabha danamukha." Now the impression before me clearly shows that the three first akṣaras of this passage are exactly the same as those following the date in our inscription. Even the e of ka is joined to the mātrikā in exactly the same way as here.8 That the fourth character is neither ka nor ṛṣiḥ but e, can now hardly be disputed.9 The words thereafter I read as: Vardasaka mardokasa. They are pretty clear in the impression except the second akṣara which may as well be ro. As regards the fire akṣaras coming after raja[m], I can for the present only say that they can in no case be read as toyaṇḍaḥabha. Therefore the reading that we get is: khāṇḍa ḫukpe Vardasaka mardokasa Kanishkaśa raja[m] ... . . . . . . . i danamukha. The form ḫukpe instead of ḫukpe is found also in the Pāja inscription10 and in the Muchai inscription.11

Much more important than the contents proper of the inscription is its date. Until now the numerous dates of the inscriptions of the Kushana period presented no difficulty at least in so far as the succession of the kings is concerned. They yielded for Kanishka the years 3-11, for Vasiṣṭha 24-23, for Huṣṭika 33-60, for Vaiśādeva 74-98. Here we suddenly find Kanishka in the year 41.

To explain this contradiction it may be alleged that in the text of the inscription we find nothing to show that Kanishka was on the throne in the year 41. Kanishkaśa sambhatariśa ekachaparikṣa literally means "in the year 41 of Kanishka", and one might find in it the sense, "in the year 41 of the era founded by Kanishka". Now it is self-evident that the combination of the number of a year with the name of a king in the genitive case originally indicated the year of the reign of that king but I need cite no instance to show that later on in a similar way people combined the names of the reigning king with the number of the year of the current era; and

---

1. The final portion is not clear to me.
2. Compare e. g., ṛṣigamda in the Bhāṣapsī inscription and other instances. ZDMG. 55, p. 693 f.
3. I adhere to the usual transcript of the two na signs without expressing that I consider them as absolutely correct.
4. Ibid. X. 2. 464.
5. It seems that both Senart and Boyer have regarded the right hook of ḫu as a portion of the preceding symbol. Otherwise I am unable to explain the reading ḫukpe.
7. Ibid. 37, 36; Jour. R. As. Soc. 1909, 664.
that must be also the case here. Kañishka receives here his whole title, and even a statement about his descent is added. And people generally do not speak in this fashion about a king that was long dead especially when they are silent as regards the name of the reigning king. That explanation, therefore, seems to me out of the question. Another possibility is afforded by the assumption that Kañishka was a contemporary ruler of Vāśishtha and Huvišhka. Banerji has expressed this view. Accordingly Kañishka, between the years 1022 and 24, would have handed over the rule of India to Vāśishtha, who afterwards was succeeded by Huvišhka, and himself confined his rule to the northern part of his empire. This does not appear to be probable, because all other sources are silent. We should above all expect that in the titles of Vāśishtha and Huvišhka there should appear an indication of a certain relation of dependence. But in the inscription of Isāpur and Sānchi, Vāśishtha bears the title of mahārāja rājātirīja devaputra sīdha. That for Huvišhka up to the year 40 only the title of mahārāja devaputra can be ascertained as far as the inscriptions go, is probably a matter of accident. In the inscription of the Nāga statue of Anāra in of Saṃ 4014 and in the inscription of the Wardak vase of Saṃ 5115, we find that he is called mahārāja rājātirīja, and in the Mathura inscription of Saṃ 6016 mahārāja rājātirīja devaputra. Under these circumstances, it seems to me more probable that the Kañishka of our inscription is not identical with the celebrated Kañishka. I lay no stress on the fact that Kañishka here bears a title which is not applied to him anywhere else. But the characterisation as the son of Vajheshka, which too does not appear anywhere else, gives an impression, to me at least, that it was added with a view to differentiate this Kañishka from the other king, his name-sake. Now the name Vajheshka or Vajheshka sounds so near Vāśishtha that I look upon both forms only as an attempt to reproduce in an Indian alphabet one and the same barbaric name. These two forms at any rate are closer to each other than, for instance, the various shapes in which the name of Huvišhka occurs in inscriptions and on coins. Now, cannot the Kañishka of our inscription be the son of the successor of the great Kañishka? He would be probably in that case his grandson, which would well agree with the name, because grandsons are, as is well known, often named after the grandfathers. The course of events then would be something like this. Kañishka was followed by Vāśishtha between the years 11 and 24. After Vāśishtha's death, which occurred probably soon after Saṃ 2818, there was a division of the empire. Kañishka II took possession of the northern portion of the kingdom. In India proper, Huvišhka made himself king. The reign of Kañishka II endured at least as far as Saṃ 41, the date of our inscription. But before Saṃ 52 Huvišhka must have recovered the authority of the northern portion of the empire, for in this year he is mentioned as king in the Kharoshthi inscription which was found at Wardak to the south-west of Kābul.

I do not misapprehend the problematic nature of the construction I have proposed; whether it is correct will depend on further discoveries for which we are fortunately justified in entertaining hopes.

The inscription which presents us with so many new difficulties carries us, however, in my opinion, by means of one word further towards the solution of a question which for the last few

---

11 This is the date of an inscription in the British Museum which apparently was found in the country about Mathura, (see Ep. Ind. IX. 299 ff.)
12 Jour. R. As. Soc., 1910, 1318; Ep. Ind. II. 369.
15 16 Ep. Ind. 1, 385.
17 ज्य and स may have been used to express a; compare the writing ज्योिलास in Kharoshthi by the tide of ZΩΙΟΤΩ on the coins of Zellos (Gardner, Coins of Greek and Scythic Kings in Bactria and India, p. 202, 170). It need hardly be noted that the notation o or i before the shā makes no difference.
18 In case the Mathurā inscription (Ep. Ind. II. 266, No. 26) is dated in Saṃ 29 and in the reign of Huvišhka.
years has considerably occupied Indian historical research. This word is the fourth title of Kanishka which I read as kaisarasa. This reading appears to me to be absolutely certain, although the upper portion of some letters on the stone have been injured. Banerji read it pat(?)thadana. I must at once concede that the first akshara can be pa. But it is equally possible that the upper portion of the symbol has been broken away, just as has been the case with the preceding symbol which undoubtedly is sa. In that case the akshara can only be ka. The second akshara can be nothing but t. The hook at the top of the symbol is perfectly visible in the impression and makes the reading dha impossible. Of the third akshara, only the lower portion has been preserved. Comparing the remnant with the last sa of the word, one can have no doubt that it was a sa. The lection dha is simply impossible. The two last aksharas are manifestly rava. Thus we can either read paśarasa or kaisarasa; and it is obvious that only the latter can be the right reading.

The title of kaisara has not up to now been traced to Indian soil, and it would be incredible if we had to deal with a national dynasty. But the Kushana kings drew their titles from all parts of the world. They call themselves mahārāja; this is the genuine Indian title. They call themselves rajadhiraja; this is obviously the translation of the Middle Persian royal designation shaunano shao which we meet with on the coins of Kanishka, Huvishka, and Vasudeva. The third title devaputra is, as has been long known, the rendering of the Chinese tiien-tsou, ‘son of heaven.’ And now to these has been added the Roman appellation of Caesar. It may be asked: why this heaping up of epithets? For this too we have an answer: These were calculated to mark the monarch as the lord of the whole world. Mahārāja is the king of India, the ruler of the South. As against him we have rajadhiraja, the king of the Northern country. That properly speaking Iran lies to the North-West of India, and not exactly to the North, need not be considered as prejudicial to our explanation, inasmuch as we have to deal here with the cardinal points in a general way only. The term devaputra marks the ruler of the East. To him is opposed the kaisara or sovereign of the West. Thus the Kushana king is a sarvalokaśarasa, as runs the title on the coins of the two Kadphises. This idea appears to be an Indian one. I need only call to mind the diguśaya which was the ideal and aspiration of every Hindu ruler. In this connection there is an interesting passage in the Chinese translation of the Daṇḍakaranaṇadītra of A.D. 392. I quote it according to the version of Professor Sylvain Lévi. In the Ten-feou-ti (Jambudvīpa) there are . . . sons of heaven (tiĕn-tsou). In the East there is the son of heaven of the Tain (the Eastern Tain 317-420); the population is highly prosperous. In the South there is the son of heaven of the kingdom of Tiĕn-teau (India); the land produces many celebrated elephants. In the West there is the son of heaven of the Ta-ts’in (the Roman Empire); the country produces gold, silver, and precious stones in abundance. In the North-West there is the son of heaven of the Yen-teu; the land produces many good horses.” This passage is almost a commentary on the significance of the royal titles in our inscription.

We have seen above that there is some doubt as regards the personality denominated here as kaisara. It is immaterial to the chronological inference which we may draw from the use of these titles. No one will deny that this inscription dates from the Kushana period and its date Śaṃ 41 belongs to that series of dates which run from 3 to 98. The beginning of the era which the reckoning has for its basis is uncertain. The theory which was advanced first by Cunningham that the Kushana era is identical with the Mālava-Vikrama era of 57 B.C. has found in Dr. Fleet an energetic defender. Professor O. Franke has attempted to support and I too have agreed to it. But the word kaisara overthrows this hypothesis. The idea that so early as in the year 16 B.C. a Central Indian or Indian ruler should have assumed the title of Caesar is naturally incredible. With the possibility of transferring the beginning of the era, and con
subsequently Kapishka, to pre-Christian times falls likewise the possibility of placing the succession of kings from Kapishka to Vasudeva before Kujula Kadphises, whose conquests, according to Professor Chavannes and Professor Franke, took place in the first post-Christian century. In these respects I am now entirely at one with Professor Oldenberg, who has recently treated the whole problem in a penetrating way. The exact determination of the era however depends before all on the question whether we should identify the king of the Ta-Yi-chi, Po-t'iao, who sent in the year 229 A. D. an embassy to China, with Vasudeva, the successor of Huvishka. In that case the era would start at the earliest with 130 and at the latest with 168 A. D. None of the grounds which Oldenberg has adduced against this supposition is decisive. On the other hand, the identification of Po-t'iao with Vasudeva is, as observed by Chavannes, merely permissible and not necessary; besides there still remains the possibility that a later and another Vasudeva is meant. Accordingly a consensus omnium can hardly be attained at once, and final decision will vary according to the evidential value attached to the Chinese data. Our inscription has, however, perceptibly narrowed the bounds of the possible, a fact the value of which, under the prevailing circumstances, is not to be underestimated.

Postscript.

After I had already written the above paper, I received the July number of Jour. R. As. Soc. containing the first half of the essay by J. Kennedy, on the "Secret of Kapishka." The author supports the theory of Fleet and Franke. So far as I see there is nothing in the essay which invalidates the clear evidence of our inscription. This is not the place to enter into details; only one word I shall say regarding the argument upon which Kennedy seems to place chief reliance. Kennedy argues thus (p. 667): "We must date Kapishka either 100 years before 50 A. D. or after 100 A. D. (strictly speaking after 120 A. D.). Now the legends on his coin are in Greek. The use of Greek as a language of every-day life however ceased in the country to the East of the Ephratae partly before and partly soon after the close of the first Christian century. Hence Kapishka cannot be placed in the second century, but must belong to a period prior to the Christian times."

Now before me lie a pair of foreign coins: a nickel coin from Switzerland of 1900 and a Penny of 1897. The inscription on the former reads: Confederaatio Helvetica. On the Penny stands Victoria, Dei, Gra. Brit. Regina. Fac. Def. Ind. Imp. I pity the historian of the fourth millennium who will draw from the coins the conclusion that about the year 1900 Latin was the language of daily life in the mountains of Switzerland and in the British Isles.

INDIAN INSCRIPTIONS AND THE KĀVYA.

BY C. BÜHLER.

[Translated by Prof. V. S. Ghathe, M. A., Poona.]

(Continued from p. 32.)

II. Vatsabhaṭṭi's Prabasti.

Vatsabhaṭṭi's composition consists of 44 verses, not to mention the two 'blessings' or maṅgalas in prose form at the beginning and at the end. The whole can be divided into sections, as follows:

1. The maṅgala addressed to the Sun in verses 1-3 of which the 1st and the 3rd belong to the type of what is technically called ātis or ākredda (blessings), while the 2nd verse falls under the category of namaskṛti or namaskṛtā (salutation).

32 Fleet, Jour. R. As. Soc. 1903, p. 334; 1907, p. 1048; Franke, Beiträge aus Chinesischenquellen zur Kenntnis der Türk Walker, 29, p. 89 ff.
30 For Frage nach der Ero der Kapishka, N. G. W. Phil. Hist. KL. 1911, pp. 437 ff.
2. A poetic description of the guild of the silk-weavers of Daśapura-Mandasa, verses 4-32, in which, descriptions of their early fatherland Lāṭa or Gujratā, and of their later home Daśapura, are interwoven.

3. A poetic picture of the suzerain Kumāragupta, verse 23.

4. The same of his vassals Viśavarman and Bandhuvarman, the rulers of Daśapura, verses 24-28.


6. The mention of the date of its construction with a poetic description of the winter season, when the temple was consecrated, verses 31-35.

7. A postscript narrating a restoration of the edifice demolished in parts, with a mention of the date of this event and a description of the season when it took place, verses 36-42.

8. A wish that the temple may last for ever, verse 43.

9. The name of the poet, verse 44.

If one compares these contents of the composition in question with the sample I have presented in Wiener Zeitschrift für die kunde des Morgenlandes, Vol. II. pp. 86 and ff., it will be seen without doubt that this composition belongs to that class of prasasti (encomiaums or panegyrics), of which the recent epigraphical researches have brought to light such a large number. The composition itself provides us with a clear indication that the poet also wished to have his work called by that name. For verse 44 says—"By the order of the guild and owing to their devotion, was built, this temple of the Sun; and the above was composed, with great troubles, by Vatsabhaṭṭi."

"The above" (pārva) is an expression which occurs frequently in later inscriptions of this type and which must be supplemented by the word prasasti as Mr. Fleet also remarks in the note to this verse. The fact that the actual title of the composition is not mentioned, but is only indicated, proves that in Vatsabhaṭṭi's time there were many such prasasti and that it was a familiar custom in the 5th century, to glorify the erection of temples and other edifices, by means of such occasional compositions.

Another interesting point in the foregoing verse is Vatsabhaṭṭi's assurance that he composed his work prayatanam "with a great effort." By this he means to say, no doubt, that he utilized with care the best samples and strove to observe very carefully the rules of poetics and metre. This careful study and this effort to do justice to the pretensions of the art of court poetry are to be marked in every verse. The very eagerness with which the author takes advantage of every little circumstance to bring in poetic details and descriptions, shows that he wished to do his best to make his composition resemble a mahākavya. The science of rhetorics prescribes that a mahākavya should contain descriptions of cities, oceans, mountains, seasons and so on. Thus Vatsabhaṭṭi is not dissuaded from devoting one verse (4) even to the early home of his patrons, the Lāṭa country, casually mentioned as it is. The city of Daśapura, of course receives more space and is glorified in nine verses (6-14). The descriptions of the two seasons, of winter in verses 31-33 and of the spring in verses 40-41, also find a place, as, to give the date completely, the month must be mentioned, and this naturally serves as an occasion for an excursus on the season in which the month falls. The examination of the metres used by Vatsabhaṭṭi and of his style would likewise show what great troubles he had taken, though, of course, the product is only of a mediocre type.

Next to proceed to the versification, there is a frequent change of the metres, which are sometimes very artificial. We have the following metres used—1. Anusthūbha 34-37, 44; 2. Āryā 4, 13, 31, 33, 38, 39, 41, 42; 3. Indraśyād 17, 26; 4. Upajīti 10, 12, 128; 5. Upendraśyād 7-9, 24; 6. Drutakamalādīt 15; 7. Mandakrānta 29; 8. Māhīṭi 19, 43; 9. Vaiśistha
28; 10. Vasantatilokd 3, 5, 6, 11, 14, 18, 20, 22, 25, 27, 30-32, 40; 11. Sārdālavikṛīda 1-2; 12. Harīṇī 16. Of these Vasantatilokd is the most frequently used, i.e. in as many as fourteen verses. The frequent change of metre finds, without doubt, its explanation in nothing but the writer's desire to show his skill in the art, as otherwise the prakṣasti itself never demands it. There are many compositions of this class, in which only a single metre is used, or one principal metre and a second only in the concluding verses or verse. The best mahākāvyas present exactly similar phenomena. Sometimes we find that the whole of a kāvya comparatively short in extent, or a section of a long kāvya presents only one metre; sometimes there is one general metre with a different metre used at the close only; in other cases, again we see a large number of different metres used. One thing that is striking in Vatsabhaṭṭi's versification is the frequent use of the weak panse which occurs in ten Vasantatilokd verses, in two Upanidravijaha and in one Āryā (verse 38). In the last case, it stands at the end of a half-verse, where it is never found used by good poets, as far as I know. Vatsabhaṭṭi has thus made himself guilty of an awkwardness. Other cases wherein he commits offences against the rules of grammar or of rhetorics will be mentioned later on. As regards the form of the composition, it is to be further mentioned that often two or more verses form a yugalaika, a viśatāka or a kulaka. Yugalakas or yugamas are instanced in verses 21-22, viśatākas, in verses 23-24, 26-27, 34-36, kulakas in verses 6-14, 31-35, 36-41. This peculiarity also is very frequently met with in all mahākāvyas.

Vatsabhaṭṭi's diction shows many marks which characterise, according to Daṇḍin, the poets of the eastern school. First of all he makes use of long compounds, which cover a pāda or more than a pāda or even the whole of a half-verse. Instances of the last type occur in verses 4, 6, 8, 14, 32, 41, while those of the first and second type are much more frequent. The whole of the verse 33 consists of one single compound. If one compares Daṇḍin's illustration of the style of the Gaudas, (Kāvyādharis I. 82.) with our verses 32-33, the resemblance would be unmistakable. Secondly, the writer, in his attempt to bring the sound of the words into harmony with the sense, shows in one and the same verse a mixture of soft and hard sounding syllables, as is allowed only by poets of eastern India. Verse 26 runs thus:—

तस्यास्मि शास्त्रार्थानां बन्धुवर्मानं बुधिः प्रजानारः।
बन्धुवर्मानानि बुधिर्निधि यथार्थसत्वापतिकरः॥

'His son is king Bandhuvarman, endowed with firmness and statesmanship, dear to the brothers, a brother, as it were, to his people, removing the sufferings of the relations, the only man skilful in destroying the proud hosts of enemies.'

Here, there is a change of rasa or the poetic sentiment. The first three pādas describe Bandhuvarman's wisdom and goodness, the last his terribleness in war with enemies. Corresponding to this, the words in the first three quarters of the verse consist of syllables which are soft or light to be pronounced, in consideration of the necessity of the alliteration of the name Bandhuvarman. The fourth pāda, on the other hand, where the raudra rasa prevails, contains only hard sounding syllables and agrees quite well with Daṇḍin's typical illustration, kāvyādharis I. 72:

'वक्षण शरित: पक्ष: शत्रुत्यानां शपास्तिति।

While explaining Samātī or evenness of form required for the Vaidarbhī rūpī, Daṇḍin mentions (Kāvyā I. 47-49) the different types of letters which a verse can have and illustrates the same with examples. As the last example, he gives a half verse (49b) in which every pāda has a different combination of letters corresponding to the change of sentiment, and Daṇḍin further adds in verse 50, that this sort of change or unevenness was in vogue only amongst the Easterns.
Of Sādhanākṛta or figures of words, Vatsabhaṭṭi uses only the Amuprāsa, or alliteration. The letter-alliteration or Vṛṇḍauprāsa occurs in every verse. The Paddavprāsa or the repetition of the same word in different senses is found more seldom. The verse above (26) is an instance, where the word bandhu is repeated thrice in honour of the king Bandhuvarman. It is to be noticed that Kālidāsa in his brief account of the Rāghu kings Nabhās, Pundārika, Kehemadhanvan, Ahinagu and others, plays on their names exactly in a similar manner. (Rāguvahini, XVIII., 5, 7, 8, 13 and so on)25. In pṛaṇasti, this sort of play on names is met with occasionally and one should specially compare the above-mentioned Lākhā-Maṇḍala prāṇasti, wherein almost everything is provided with a play on his name. A second instance of the Paddavprāsa occurs in the beginning of the first verse in siddhāsiddhyatībbh, a third, in verse 2 in kinnara-karṇa, a fourth, in verse 18, where the first pāda ends with vihīd and the second pāda begins with the same syllable, a fifth in verse 25 in andhāndhāb, and a sixth in verse 37 in anyutdram udvarṣayd.

Of the Ardhanākṛtas or figures of sense, the author frequently uses only the most familiar ones, viz. Upāma, Upetkṣad, and Bāpaka or the identification of two similar things. In the phrase siddhāsiddhyatībhl, already mentioned above, a Vṛūdhaṁkara or Oxymoron appears to be attempted, and a Bhūt (see below) is contained in verse 9. It would be little interesting to enumerate severally the Upāmas, Upetkṣads and Bāpakas which the composition presents. Far more instructive would be the attempt to place the most important images and turns of expression side by side with similar ones in the Kāvyas and thus to show that quite a number of expressions characteristic of the kāvyā style occurs in Vatsabhaṭṭi’s pṛaṇasti.

Even the praise of the sun in the maṇḍala contains several points of relationship with passages in classical poems which are devoted to the glorification of the same godhead. The first two strophes:

1. ‘May the light-giver, the cause of the destruction and origin of the world, protect you; the God, whom the host of gods worship, for purpose of their own preservation, the Siddhas (the accomplished), because they strive for higher accomplishments, the yogins entirely given to meditation, and having their-objects of desire under their control, because they long for liberation, and the sages rich in severe penance, powerful through their cursing as well as favouring, from deep devotion of the heart!’

2. ‘An adoration to the Generator (Sarvitya), whom even the zealous Brahman sages knowing the truth, do not fully comprehend, who supports the three worlds with his far-reaching rays, whom Gandhavras, gods, Siddhas, Kinnaras and men, praise, as he rises, who fulfills the desires of his devotees!’

comprise briefly the ideas which are met with in the Purāṇas, in the writings of Sauras, which identify the Sun with the world-spirit, and even in still older works. Amongst the court-poets there is one Mayūra, in whose Śūryaṅkara, a prayer addressed to the Sun, we have almost every one of the ideas contained in the verses above, repeated and with much the same form of expression. As Vatsabhaṭṭi praises the Sun as being the generator and the destroyer of the world, so also Mayūra identifies him, in verse 99, with Brahman, Vīshnū and Siva, the three gods who generate, preserve and destroy the Universe. As the pṛaṇasti speaks of the worship of the Sun and of the prayers offered to him at dawn, so also does the Śūryaṅkara frequently emphasise the idea that men and spiritual beings adore the Sun in the morning, only with this difference that the number of the divine and semi-divine beings that bring their adoration to the Sun, is much larger therein. In verse 13, the Sun’s rays are praised by the seers amongst gods. According to verse 86, the lustre of the rising Sun is eulogized by the Gandharvas both in prose and verse, as also by

25 The numbers of verses should be 6, 8, 9, 13 respectively according to the Nirpaya-Sāgara edition of Rāguvahini.
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Nārada and other beings of antiquity. According to verse 81, prayers are offered to the Sun in the morning, by the Siddhas, gods, Chāraṇas, Gandharvas, Nāgas, Yāndhānas, Sādhyaś and princes amongst sages, by each in his own peculiar way. So also, the Sūryakataka often dwells on the thought that the Sun nourishes the gods and the world,—a thought already suggested by the Vedic name of the Sun-deity, viz., Pūshan—and that he makes them free from the bonds of transmigration (re-birth). As for this latter point, verse 9 says of the Sun's rays that they are 'the boats which carry men through the fearful ocean of existence, the source of great sufferings.' Further, the Sun's orb is described in verse 80, as 'the boat for the yogins across the ocean of existence', and in verse 73, as 'the door of the liberated.' So also the Sun is depicted with special fulness as the nourisher of men and gods and as the maintainer of the entire order of the world (verse 87). The same thought is more briefly expressed in verse 77, where the Sun's orb is named 'the life-principle of the world'. It may be further added that in the older Varāhamihira also we meet with the thoughts expressed in the beginning of our prāṣasti. Thus in the first verse of the Brihat-sanhitā, the Sun is invoked as 'the generator of the world' and as 'the soul of the Universe', and in the first verse of the Yoga-yudhā, as 'the soul of embodied beings', and as 'the door of liberation'.

The third verse of the maṅgala:

3. 'May the illuminator (Viśvarat) protect you, adorned with the beautiful ornaments of rays,—the god whose circle of rays shines forth daily, coming over from the high, expansive summit of the mountain of the East, and who is lovely like the cheek of an intoxicated woman !—' compares the reddish morning-sun with the reddened cheeks of a drunk Nāyikā. This comparison is quite characteristic of the court-poets, who are never tired of describing or alluding to the revels of their heroes with their wives in the harem. Even in the kṛṣṇa literature, this comparison is very often found used in connection with the rising as well as the setting Sun of the day. Thus, for instance, Bāga says in the beginning of a description of the evening: 'when the day went down, the day whose light became as soft as the cheek of a Mālava woman, reddened with the intoxication of wine, etc.' (Harshacharita p. 219). Bāga's comparison is somewhat more nicely brought out than that of Vatsabhānti, owing to the use of the term 'Mālava woman' in place of the general expression Aṅgandjana. The later poets make use of specific expressions, almost everywhere.

The following verses (4–6) describe the emigration of the silk-weavers from Lāṇa, the middle Gujarāt, to Daśāpurā, where with short descriptions of Lāṇa and of the environs of the city are interwoven. These do not rise above the level of mediocrity and have nothing remarkable. Of course, Daśāpurā, as we commonly see the cities described in the kṛṣṇa, is called the beauty-mark (tilaka) on the forehead of the province, and this province also, which is named bhāmi, the earth, is imagined to be a female. Accordingly the trees bending under the burden of flowers are spoken of as her ear-crests, and the thousands of mountains, as her ornaments. So also as befits the kṛṣṇa style, the mountains are spoken of as trickling with the juice flowing from the temples of wild elephants. The same remarks also apply to the next verses (7–9), in which further the lakes and gardens of Daśāpurā are spoken of. The description contains only the most usual expressions that are found used in kṛṣṇa in a similar connection. The lakes are full of blooming water-lilies, and lively with ducks and swans. The water near their banks is variegated with the flowers fallen from the trees. The swans therein are tawny-brown owing to the pollen fallen from the lotuses shaken by the fickle waves. The trees bending under the burden of their flowers, the humming of the bees bold with the intoxication of honey, and the incessant singing of the city-women walking for pleasure, make the groves lovely. It is to be noticed here that the description of the bees no doubt reminds us through dhārani of the bold
and intoxicated lovers of the beautiful women. The following verse, on the other hand, with which begins the description of the city is considerably more interesting:

10. 'Where the houses towering high, of purest wise, with flying flags and trim women, quite resemble the peaks of silver clouds variegated with flashes of lightning.'

Vatsabhaṭṭi has given himself great pains to bring out the best possible resemblance between the houses and the clouds and thus to excel the parallels frequently used in the kṛtyas. This fact is specially proved by the double application of the word 'lightning-flash'. He is not merely content with describing the lightning-flash as the mistress of the cloud, dancing before the house for a moment, as Indian poets do very often, but he portrays the same as the gay flags waving over the houses. There can be little doubt that Vatsabhaṭṭi in this intended to surpass some poet known to him, and we can hardly help thinking that he had before him the description of the palaces in Alakā, which Kālidāsa gives in the beginning of the Aparameyha in Meghadūta. The verse runs thus:

विन्दुवन्ते विलितत्विन्ति: पञ्चपार्व चन्द्रित्रः
शंगितवभ महतसूर्या: निर्घण्य-पीरेयपञ्च
अन्तर्तलाम् भवितप्रदृश्योवर्षकंग्रुत्सिंहासः
करातैसप्रभुविविवल्लभवं व वेदाविविषयं: ||

'Where the palaces can match themselves with you (the cloud) by means of these and other particulars—their lovely, fair inhabitants resemble your lightnings, their gaily coloured portraits, your rainbow, their drums struck for concert, your lovely, deep thunder, their jewelled floors, the shimmering drops of water that you hide, their terraces towering up to the clouds, your height.'

In the view that Vatsabhaṭṭi tried to compete with Kālidāsa, we are still further confirmed, if we observe that in the next verse, he adds all the details met with in Kālidāsa, which are left out in verse 10. In that verse, he says:

11. 'And (where) other (houses) resemble the high summits of the Kailāsa, with long terraces and stone-seats, resounding with the noise of music, covered with gay pictures, and adorned with groves of waving plantain trees.'

The agreement of thought and imagery is thus quite complete. Only, Vatsabhaṭṭi says something more, and it is what we expect of an imitator and a rival. It goes without question that Vatsabhaṭṭi's verses are on a lower level than those of his model.

The next verse also, in which the description of the houses is further elaborated quite in an insipid manner, presents one point worthy of notice.

12. 'Where the houses adorned with rows of stories, resembling gods' palaces, of pure lustre like the rays of the full moon, raise themselves up, having torn open the earth.'

Here, the statement that 'the houses raised themselves up, breaking through the earth' is quite striking. If this expression means anything, it suggests a comparison of the houses with something to be found in the deep or the nether world, with something like the thousand, white-shining heads of Sesa. Such an image is however, defective, when there is already a comparison of the houses with the vimānas, the moving gods' palaces, soaring up high in the sky. The difficulty, I think, may be solved by supposing that Vatsabhaṭṭi has conformed, with little understanding, two comparisons used by the poets of his time. The comparison of houses with the vimānas of gods is not rarely found in epic works, but is still more frequently met with in the kṛtyas. On the other hand, that of buildings with things in the nether world comes only as now and then in artificial poetry. Thus in Kālidāsa's Rāghuvamśa XII. 70, we have:

सं भैरवो रघुवम्भो रघुलिङ्गस्वरूपिण्यः
रसायनित्वादिकम्य भैरववस्तुताः कालिन्यः ||
'He (Rāma) had a bridge built by the monkeys on the salt ocean,—the bridge which was, as it were, the serpent Sesa, coming up out of the nether world, to serve as a bed for Viṣṇu.

So also in Māgha's Sīkṣapadāvalīka III. 33, we have:

मद्यपालनं कहुँতं: निधिजलिनी सुर्योदयकाश वचनवनसाः
तुलाकाण्डस्याभ्यासस्ततः दिशन स्वयंतरस्व

'In the midst of the ocean, tinged with yellow-red, the regions, with the lustre of its golden ramparts, the city (Dvārakā) shone forth, like the flame of fire from the mouth of the mares, breaking up through the waters.'

It can be further seen that Vatsabhaṭṭi, inspite of the great labours he has taken with his poem, has committed several offences against good taste; and thus we would not be unjust to him, if we suppose that in this case, in his eagerness to bring in many figures of speech, he was tempted (laid astray) to confound in quite an unintelligible manner, two comparisons current in the literature of his time.

Not less interesting is the following verse of the praśasti:

13. 'Surrounded by two charming rivers of tremulous waves, the city resembles the body of the God of love, which (his wives) Priti and Rati with prominent breasts embrace in secrecy.'

The idea of the rivers looked upon as females is a very natural one. It is very frequently met with in the kṛdvya. Thus Subandhu in Vīravardiṭṭa, p. 102, 1. 1-2, says of the Vindhya mountain: वधवा विद्यवंस सप्तान्तरतिप्रति: अन्वेषितं शतमृगः "It is surrounded by the Revā (Narmadā) as by a beloved with the arms in the form of waves stretched forth.' Even a more exact parallel we have in a passage alike referring to the Vindhya, in the above-mentioned hymn of Agastya (Bṛihat-saṁhitā XII. 6):

सत्थि भगवद्ग्रामवर्त्तमान रेवानाथ सर्वान्तप्रति:

'Whom the Revā embraces like an ardent beloved.' Even though it may not be certain that Vatsabhaṭṭi lived before Vārāhāmihira, one would be tempted to conjecture a close connection between his verse and that of the Bṛihat-saṁhitā. The real fact seems to be that all the three poets imitated some well-known model.

In the last verse in connection with the description of the city, we meet with a simile which is more rare:

14. 'With its Brāhmaṇa, who conspicuous with truthfulness, forgiveness, self-control, mental quietude, the observance of their vows, purity, firmness, the study of the Veda, pure conduct, modesty and understanding, possess no other treasures than knowledge and penance and yet are free from pride, shines forth this city like the sky with its multitudes of bright, glowing planets.'

Nothing similar to this, in the old kṛdvya literature is known to me. On the other hand, in many works and in the praśasti, we often see conspicuous persons compared to the Moon or the Sun, and their family to the heavens. In a later work, the Prabhāvacikeyarīta (the life of Hemachandra, p. 54) there is found the comparison of a poet with the planet Mercury (Buddha.)

In the following description of the guild of silk-weavers, which possesses more of historical than of poetical worth, there are, on the one hand, several particular expressions, and, on the other hand, some general assertions, which are quite characteristic of the kṛdvya style. Thus in verse 15, we have the figurative use of the verb jirbhā in the phrase abharaḥ praviṣṭram bhita-saṅkṛitiḥ, 'whose friendship augmented more and more everyday.' So also the compound Sraṇasubhaḥga 'pleasing to the ear' (verse 16) should be compared with netrasubhaḥ 'pleasing to the eye' (verse 21), and pratāpasubhaḥ 'pleasing on account of warmth' (verse 31). Subhaḥga is particularly used by Kālidāsa very often in the sense of 'beautiful, lovely, pleasing' at the end of
compound words. Other poets also use the word similarly—though more rarely. Further we must notice the second half of verse 17:

अवाग्ये च चारे समरप्रभुणा: कृत्तिर्चिं रष्यिः प्रसङ्ग ||

'And, even to-day, others courageous in war, effect by force the destruction of their enemies.' Here the wording which expresses the simple fact that some members of the weaver-class served as soldiers, is exactly as it is required in artificial poetry; and the words samarapragalbhah. And prasahya of which latter, the position also is to be observed, are quite characteristic of artificial poetry.

With verse 23, begins the description of the princes of Daśapura and their suzerain, wherein, at the very threshold we are face to face with quite a rush of images and turns of expression very frequently used by artificial poets.

23. 'While Kūmaragupta ruled over the earth, which is circumscribed by the four oceans as by a moving girdle, whose high breasts the mountains Sumeru and Kailāsa are, and which smiles with the flowers in full bloom coming from the woods.

24. 'King Viśvarman was the protector of Daśapura who, equal to Sukra and Bhīṣma in wisdom, the ornament of the kings on this earth, performed exploits in the battles, like Pārtha.'

The metaphor of the girdle and the breasts of the earth is absent from no Indian poet. The only thing to be noted in our passage is that Vatsabhaṣṭi selects for the comparison the most important mythical mountains. Probably, the Himavat and Vindhyā which are otherwise frequently referred to in this connection appeared too trivial to him, not to mention his desire to surpass his predecessors. The third metaphor of the smile in the form of flowers is also not a rare one. So also the compounds samudrānta and vandanta are quite characteristic, in which the word anta has, really speaking, no meaning. The word vandanta, as the passages quoted in the great Petersburg Lexicon show, is very frequently used in the sense of 'forest-region, forest' in epics as well as in kāvyā literature. Samudrānta, on the other hand, signifies only 'sea-shore' in other places. But this sense would not do in the present place. For the shores are really included in the earth; and it is only the rocking oceans that can suitably be represented as the swinging, moving girdle. Thus, on the analogy of vandanta, samudrānta appears to be used in the sense of 'the surface of the ocean'; and it is very probable that the compound is used only for the exigency of the metre.

Equally noteworthy is the figurative use of the word vandanta, so favourite with the court-poets, which Daṇḍin treats of in Kāvyā, I. 95–97 and sanctions as atisundaram. Of the comparisons in verse 24, that of the king with Pārtha or Arjuna is very familiar; so also is the comparison with Sukra and Bhīṣma, the teachers and Furohitas of the Asuras and the gods. In the second verse referring to Viśvarman (verse 25), the comparison of the king with the tree of Paradise, yielding all the desires, stands out prominently, a comparison which the needy poets, as is well known, apply very frequently to kings, in order to stimulate their generosity. Verse 26 with which begins the description of Bandhuvānman has been discussed above. In the following verse, there occurs the stereotyped comparison with the God of love, which the poet has taken trouble to make even more emphatic by the use of several epithets:

27. . . . . . . . . . . . . 'Of a graceful form, he shines forth, though not wearing ornaments, by virtue of his beauty, as if he is a second god of love.'

Even the last verse contains a description of the terrible character of the king, very frequently recurring in the kāvyās:

28. 'Even to-day; when the beautiful, long-eyed wives of his enemies, affianced as they are by the severe pangs of widowhood, remember him, a painful, violent tremour tortures their full breasts.' With this may be compared, for instance, Rāghuvrīṣe, IV. 68, Subhadhitdevī
eq rather 'incarnation of love.'
Nos. 2482, 2535. Still more frequently are the pangs of the wives of the enemies, described, in the praise, with very various modes of expression.

As for the description of the temple, it is naturally (verse 30) 'resembling a mountain'; 'white like the pure rays of the moon that has risen up', and 'quite comparable to a lovely jewel on the crest of the western city. After the restoration of the temple, it is said (verse 38) to be 'touching the sky, as it were, with its beautiful turrets,' and 'the receptacle of the spotless rays of the sun and the moon, at their rise', i.e., reflecting their rays. At last in verse 42, the poet assures us:

'As the heaven with the moon, and the bosom of Sārāgin with the Kaustubha jewel shines in pure luster, so does the whole of this stately city embellished with this best of temples. The similes and modes of expressions occurring in these verses also belong to the repertory of the artificial poets.

The last points in our inscription, which deserve special attention, are the descriptions of the two seasons. Of these, that of the winter in the kulaka formed by verses 31-35 runs thus:

31. 'In the season, wherein the houses are full of beautiful women, which is pleasant on account of the feeble rays of the Sun, and the warmth of fire, when the fish conceal themselves deep under water, when the rays of the Moon, the top floors of houses, sandal ointment, palm-fans and pearl-necklaces afford no enjoyment, when the hoar-frost burns down the water-lilies,'

32. 'In the season, which is made lovely by the swarms of bees rejoiced by the juice of the opened flowers of the rodhra, the priyasagu tree and the jasmine creeper, when the solitary branches of the lowest and of the nagar, dance under the force of the cold wind full of frost,'

33. 'When the young men counteract the effects of frost and snow-fall, by fast embracing the massive thighs, the lovely breasts and the bulky hips of their beloveds,'

34. 'When four hundred and ninety-three years had passed, according to the reckoning of the Malavas, in the season when one should derive pleasure from the high breasts of women,'

35. 'On the auspicious thirteenth day of the bright half of the month of Sahasya was this temple consecrated with the ceremony of auspicious benediction.'

Ritusanubheda V. 3, corresponds to a part of the first verse in this description:

'Neither the sandal-ointment cooling like the rays of the moon, nor the terrace pure bright like the autumnal moon, nor the winds cold with dense frost, please at present the minds of men.'

The idea of our verse 33 and of the close of verse 34 is expressed in Ritusanubheda, V. 9, thus:

'Now comes the season, which brings cold winds from the snow-mountains, when the swarms of bees are attracted by the juice of the jasmine in full bloom, when one should cling close to the high breasts of charming beloveds, breasts which are coloured yellow with saffron-ointments.'

Similar verses are found not seldom; and one may refer to Sārāg. Patdh, Nos. 3924, 3927, and Vikranthakaccharita XVI. 3 ff. 47-49, as parallels in point. In connection with verse 32, it must be added that 'the dancing of the branches or the creepers, owing to the wind' is a favourite
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idea in the kādyas, an idea which is sometimes found very much elaborated. Thus, in Kṛtādṛjy-
viṣya IV, 14-17 we have an elaborate description of the creepers as dancing women of the woods;
with this, we may also compare Kālidāsa, Vākramapāya, Act II. verse 4. The description of the
spring, which comes in connection with the statement that the restoration of the temple was accom-
plished in the month of Tāsasya or Phālguna (February-March), is shorter in length and presents
fewer characteristic features:

40. 'In the season, when the arrows of the god whose body is purified by Hara, increase
in their might, as they verily become one with the visible, fresh, blooming blossoms of the āsoka,
the kotaka, the sinduṇḍra, the moving atimukta creeper and the madayantīkā.'

41. 'In the season, when the solitary, large branches of the nagaśa are resounding with the
music of the swarms of bees delighted by the drinking of honey, when the lovely exuberant rodkha
is thickly set with flowers newly bursting forth.'

The most noteworthy point here is the identification of the five kinds of flowers with the fine
arrows of the god of love. This idea is frequently met with in the kādyas and still more prominent
is the fact that the spring is described as making ready the weapons for Kāma.

Thus in Kumḍrasñabhāra III, 27, we have:

सत्य सपनसोकभावभरे नाति समाधि नवजुवाने।
निविवरणात् धर्मीतस्तत्तमात्माभ्यवसा समर्थनवसम्॥

'As the arrow of the fresh mango-blossom with tender sprouts serving as feathers, was made
quite ready, Madhu set thronn the dark bees, which were, as it were, the letters of the name of the
god of love.'

The same thought is more simply expressed in the verse quoted by Ānandavarṇadhana in
Dhaṇḍaṇdā I, 28, (p. 106 of the text in the Kṛtamāla) and in the Śrāvakārā Sādāhāra Pādaṁati,
Yet 3789. The names of the flowers, however, do not wholly agree with those which, according to
the familiar idea, are supposed to form the tips of the arrows of Kāma. Probably the author has
intentionally chosen other names, because he misplaces the beginning of the spring in the closing
part of the Śiśir or the cold season whose last month is the Tāsasya or Phālguna.

What we have said so far is sufficient to establish the fact that Vatsābhāṣṭi was acquainted with
the rules of Indian poetics and that he tried to satisfy the demands thereof, so that his praśasti,
in form as well as in sense, strictly belongs to the domain of Sanskrit artificial compositions.
From this we can further deduce, without hesitation, the conclusion that in his time, there existed
a considerably large number of kādyas, from whose study he cultivated himself, upon which he
drew and with which he tried to compete now and then. The rightness of this supposition is
confirmed by many circumstances. Thus, Vatsābhāṣṭi was not at all a man to whom we can give
the credit of originality; nor can we name him as a poetic genius capable of giving new ideas.
He shows the several weaknesses which characterise the poets of the second or third class, who
compile their verses laboriously, after the model of the classical great poets. A number of points,
which can illustrate this, have already been discussed above, and can be still further multiplied.
Thus he uses expletives and particles not rarely, and never minds the fault of tautology, just in
order to complete his verse. To the first category belongs praśāstam (verse 5), sametya (verses 5
and 15), taitosu (verse 22), the abovementioned anī in samudrãota (verse 22), and tṛdṅta
(verse 7), so also the altogether meaningless prefixes praṇi and abhi in praśāstam (verse 3) and
abhavībhāṣi (verse 15); so also we meet with quite striking tautologies; e. g. in dhyānaṁkṣara-
raś (verse 1), where, however, the synonymous words ekdyā and para may perhaps be supposed
to be put together in order to make the idea of the complete merging clearer and more emphatic;
but in tālāpasāndī (verse 10), it is very difficult even to find an appearance of excuse for the
simultaneous use of the two synonymous words. Further, Vatsābhāṣṭi commits offences against
grammar, for purposes of metre. A slight mistake of the kind is the use of the Ātmaneśa in
nyāvasanta (verse 15), instead of Paramānand, though this may perhaps be excuses owing to its
similar use in epic poetry and on the ground of analogous mistakes met with in the kavya. Far
worse, however, is the use of the masculine form ṣrivāṇa-īva instead of the neuter ṣrivadā-īva
(verse 38), which has to agree with the substantive griham (verse 37). Mr. Fleet, of course,
proposes to write ṣrivāṭīcā, but it would not at all suit the metre. Besides, with this alteration,
the whole construction would not only be changed but broken up into pieces, because then the locatives
in verses 39-40, would be altogether hanging in the air. With the text as we have it,
sanaskritam 'was repaired' (verse 37) is the verb in the principal sentence with which, all the following
words, which are attributes of the time, can be quite rightly connected. If, however, we write
ṣrivāṭīcā, this itself, then, becomes the principal verb and then we must translate as follows:

37. 'This temple of the Sun, which the generous guild caused to be built up again, in all its
parts, very stately, in order to further their renown,'
38. 'That temple, which was exceedingly high, glowing white, the resting place of the pure
rays of the Sun and the Moon at their rise, touched, as it were, the sky, with its charming turrets.'

Here the sentence is complete, and there is no verb with which the following words, 'after
five hundred and twenty-nine years had passed, on the second day of the bright half of the lovely
month of Tapasya' can be construed. Thus Vatsabhaṭṭi cannot be freed from the charge of
having used a wrong gender, out of regard for the metre. We may suppose that he might have
been conscious of the fault but that he might have consoled himself with the beautiful principle:

माया जयं कृपं द्वितीयं निर्मितिः

according to which the correctness of the metrical form precedes every other consideration.

We can easily believe him as capable of such blunders, for, in the second half of verse 30,

वत्सः तन्त्रमेत्य निविदककालेऽविद्यामितः नवविद्यात्म

we come across something worse, a fault in construction. The genitive paśchimapūrṣasa goes with
Chāḍḍhaṇī, and there is no substantive which is connected with nivartta. The grammatically
form should have been paśchimapūrṣa, but that would not have suited the metre. To the
category of poetical absurdities not specially alleged belong verses 7-8, where at first sarāṣṭha 'the
lakes' in general is used, then again kvacit sarāṣṭha 'the lakes in some places' is used. Further
in verses 10-12, the poet first speaks of gṛhāṇि 'the houses,' then again of anyāni 'other houses,'
and lastly again of kālātkārī 'the house' in general.

Notwithstanding all these facts, it cannot be denied that Vatsabhaṭṭi was a versifier
perhaps learned, but clumsy and little gifted. This conclusion appears in no way surprising, if
we remember that he never lived at the court of his native place Čārapura, but was a man of
limited means or of moderate circumstances. If Vatsabhaṭṭi would have been able to boast of
a place at the court of Bandhuvārman or even of a mere connection with him, he would not have
failed to let posterity know of the same or at least to praise his master as a patron of poetry. As
nothing like this is done by him, we would not be wrong in supposing that he was a private
man of learning, of the type found in all Indian cities, that he had specially studied the worldly
lores and that he was not ashamed of making money by composing a piece of poetry occasionally, even when
such a low class of people as the silk-weavers required his services.

Thus it is quite evident that the points of affinity with the classical literature, which are
presented by a composition originating from such a man as Vatsabhaṭṭi are possessed of great
significance. When we know that Vatsabhaṭṭi was not an original genius, but only a man who
sought, with great effort in the sweat of his brow, to compile a medley of the classical modes of
expression and exerted himself, though with little success, to play variations on the same or to
improve upon them, then the supposition cannot be gainsaid that in the fifth century, there
existed a kavya literature quite similar to that known to us already. This conclusion is still
further confirmed by the fact that all the above prakāsas in Mr. Fleet's volume which were com-
posed between the year 400 and the year of Vatsabhaṭṭi's composition, present the same close
relations to the kdesyas known to us. We agree that a large number of these is no doubt of an insignificant character, and is written by private men of learning of the province, as, for instance, the Dasapura prasasti, but there still remains the stamp of the kdesya on them. One of the few pieces which show a higher talent, is Mr. Fleet’s Number VI. Although the first two verses are very much distorted, still it can be unmistakably seen that it is written in a high style and by a real poet. The fragments of the first verse:

बालस्वभव्यविख्यातिप्रकृतिकस्मिन्युक्ते 

remind us of Ganaḍāsa’s words in Kālidāsa’s Mālatikāvīṇītra: महाकाल पुराणक्रियाके विश्व स्वालेन। In the conclusion which is better preserved, the author gives his name and applies to himself the title of Kari. It runs thus:

तत्त्व राजाधिपश्चत्वविल्याम्योजतः 
अष्ठवार्त्यां व्याख्यायेन भावाश्चार्थां: | सार्थविचाराः: || \| कौशा: शाक ह्वति व्यासो वीरसंहस: कुलकाशवाः ||
शब्दाय्यान्नान्तोत्तर: कवित: पारितुष्ण: || \| कुलकाशवाः सार्थविचाराः राजसेव सहानाः || \| भव्यताः स्मोहनत: सार्थविचाराः सार्थविचाराः || ||

3.4. Virasena, known by the family name of Kauśa Saba, well-versed in grammar, politics, logic and the course of the world, a poet, living in Pañjaliputra, who served as a hereditary minister to the sage-like king of kings, who performed deeds, inconceivable and bright.

5. ‘ Came here (to Udayagiri) with the king himself, who intended to conquer the whole earth and caused this cave to be constructed, out of devotion for the divine Sambhu.

The poet Virasena lived about the year 400 A.D.; for, as Mr. Fleet’s No. III shows, Chandragupta II. had conquered the province of Malava in the middle of the Gupta year 82, i.e., 400/1 or 401/2 A.D. Thus the invasion, on which Virasena accompanied his master, can be undertaken not later than (but rather earlier) in the beginning of the year mentioned above. At this time, Virasena, as the verses above state, was the minister of foreign affairs. That a minister occupied himself with poetry leads us to conjecture that Chandragupta II—Vikramaditya looked upon the Muses with favour or that poetry had at least the right to appear at Court.

(To be continued.)

TWO JAINA VERSIONS OF THE STORY OF SOLOMON’S JUDGMENT

(in Gujarati and Jaipuri.)

BY L. P. TESSITORI, UDINE (ITALY).

That the story of the judgment of Solomon had been taken up by the Jains and introduced into the vast body of their legendary literature has been well known ever since my fellow-countryman, F. L. Pullè, published his paper: ‘Un progenitore indiano del Bertoldo,’ in which two Sanskrit versions of it are exhibited. The existence of the story in the Jaina tradition may be traced back as the composition of Malayagiri’s commentary on the Nandisutta and is also found in Rajaśākara’s Antarakathādsamgraha, a work which is partly based upon the former and the redaction of which appears to have taken place in the fourteenth century. It is as an exemplification of the parokshajātā that the story is quoted by Malayagiri in his commentary, in connection with other parables of a similar kind. Rajaśākara availed himself directly of such parables and incorporated them into his Antarakathādsamgraha, generally keeping close to Malayagiri’s version and only indulging in some lengthier, or rather less hasty, descriptions and in minuter details. It is particularly Rajaśākara’s version that Signor Pullè takes into account in the above mentioned paper, but in the notes thereto he quotes also the version by the commentator of the Nandisutta.

I think it sufficient to produce below the literal translation of both, since the reader may directly refer for the Sanskrit text to Signor Pullè’s paper, page 10, III.

1 See: Studi editi dall’ Università di Padova a commemorare l’ ottavo centenario dall’ origine dell’ Università di Bologna, Padova 1888, Volume III.
(a) The version in the commentary on the Nandisutta:

A certain merchant had two wives: the one had a son, the other was barren. The latter, however, also took good care of the child, for which reason the child was not able to distinguish: "This is my mother, not that." Now the merchant, together with his wives and his son, went to another country—where the tirthakara Sumatisvāmin was to be born—and there just upon his arrival he died. And between the two wives a quarrel arose. The first one was saying: "Mine is this child, so it is I that am the mistress of the house." The second one was saying: "It is I." Then there was made a complaint at the royal court of justice, but nevertheless the question could not be disentangled. At last the thing came to the ears of the queen Maṅgalā, the mother in whose womb was staying the venerable tirthakara Sumatisvāmin.

The queen had the two co-wives summoned to her presence and then pronounced sentence: "After some days a son will be born from me. When he will have grown up and will be sitting at the feet of the present king Aśoka, he will decide your dispute. So till then eat and drink without any distinction." The barren woman accepted the sentence and the queen made out thereby: "This is not the mother of the child," and reproached her and made the other one the mistress of the house.

One will see at once that the two versions above nearly coincide in all particulars excepting as to the person that is made to decide the question and in the pretended sentence pronounced to penetrate the truth. Of the two discrepancies the former is of much the less importance, in that the story, being an example of keen discernment, was naturally fitted for being ascribed to any wise person, whose sagacity was to be illustrated. But the discrepancy concerning the form of the sentence in the two accounts is of greater value, and in this particular case the version given by the commentator of the Nandisutta is all the more interesting, from the point of view of comparative folklore, the more widely it deviates from the version in the Bible, which has been faithfully reproduced by Rājashekara in his Antarakathāsamgraha. We shall return to this later on.

2 I read: सावत्ता च कूल्यापालम: परस्परे. Signor Pulle's reading: सावत्ताकूल्यानस्माते परस्परे. No meaning to me.
I have discovered two new later versions of the story in two MSS. belonging to the Indian collection in the R. Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale at Florence. The fact that both of them closely agree with Rājāśekhaṇa’s account, as far as the form of the sentence is concerned, is a testimony to the greater popularity of that account in the Jaina tradition. Both the new versions are in bhadā. The first is derived from a MS. in the above mentioned Library, No. 539, 63 leaves, with 6 lines on each page. The MS. contains the Prakrit text of the Nandīsūtta with an anonymous tabā written in an old form of Gujarāti, the orthographical features of which appear to have been somewhat modernized by the latest copyist, though so imperfectly that it still retains many obsolete words, forms and spellings. Such are: की, एवी, रावी, रावी, instrumental with suffix व (००० of the Apabhraṃśa); एवले, corresponding to the Old Gujarāti एलाइ and to the Apabhraṃśa एलाइ; मर, instrumental of the first personal pronoun like in the Old Gujarāti and in the Apabhraṃśa; दिख, for दिक, probably connected with the Apabhraṃśa दिख; दाइ, locative form corresponding to the Apabhraṃśa दाइ, etc.

I give below the Gujarāti text, in which I have corrected without remark all the most obvious blunders, but retained all orthographical incongruities like चट, beside चट, which are possibly the result of a period of transition, during which both forms of spelling were legitimate. For the same reason, I have nowhere substituted द and द for द and द, as in Old Gujarāti MSS. द is commonly written for द and there is no particular sign for द.

Text.

एक पुरुष-ने ते कलेले ते महानी स्वरूपे युध जोभये। पिता बडी पाने समाने रामाणे पाने पाने खञ्जन सब सस्त्रे वाह सरे। ते निजा माता जांजाय। माते जिम तिन पुरुष वाचित हे। ते बालक बडू पाने जाणी। तसे काठी नवे २ थीरो एण्ये पिता तु पाणी। कल्या एक पिन ने चालो सीक नी मनो प्रयोग जे ए बालक ती पुक्त ने हरी हे। ते माते यु पुरुष एषां ए हाव कर्ते। ए सीक ने बाधी सम हिरन करी चौखी। पाणे श्वेताक बोधी बली। हे यु पुरुष माता हे धने धनी भकतिवधारी। पेक्ष हेते। पुरुष माता बाघी पर-नी भकतिवधारी हे। इम सीके ने भगवती साक्षी ने। प्रजाती २ बडू राजा पाने। हे महाराजा ए पुरुष महाराजा परी श्राभी हे। इम बडी कारण भक्षी। पिंड बिच्छे सीके ने बिच्छे बालक-ने पाने बिच्छे बालक-ने पाने बिच्छे बालक-ने पाने बिच्छे बालक-ने पाने पारे बालक-ने एजु-नी माता। बालक-ने बालक-ने। बालक-बालक पाने बालक साही मोह। बालक न जाणी।

Translation.

A man had two wives. In the course of time the younger wife gave birth to a son. The elder, however, used to feed him, to take care of him, to amuse him, to make him sleep at her side and do everything for him. He used to take her for his own mother. Anyhow, the child was growing up well. The child used to go near both of them. After two years had elapsed in such a way, the father died. Some days after, the mind of the co-wife grew perverted, (for she thought to herself) “This child, indeed, is fondly attached to me. Therefore I will take to myself this child and this property, and I will put my rival to a condition equal to that of a slave”. Then she started a quarrel (by affirming:) “It is I that am the mother of the child! It is I that am the owner of the property!” The other one protested: “It is I that gave birth to the child, so it is I that am the mistress of the house!”. In such a way an altercation issued between the two co-wives. Wrangling all the way, both the women went to the king and there both began to protest: “O king! This child is mine and the money also is mine!” Then the king caused both the co-wives to sit down, with the child seated on the ground betwixt, and ordered them: “Call the child to whom he will go near, that one is his mother.” The child was called, but he went near both of them and looked both in the face. (It was clear that) the child could not distinguish...
which was his mother and which was not. The king began to feel perplexed. Now, the head queen was pregnant; by the power of that (divine) embryo keen discernment arose (in her mind, so that she said) : "Great king! I will decide this question." Then the queen spoke in many ways, but the two parties could not come to an understanding. Then she said: "Let one take the child, the other the property", but even so they did not come to an understanding. Then the queen said: "Let both the child and the property be divided into two equal parts and do each take her own". The step mother felt thereat rejoiced, but the natural mother grew distressed. "If they divide everything into two halves, this child will die and of what use thereafter would the money be to me?" —thus reflecting to herself, she said to the queen: "It is I that am the liar. Do not divide this child into two parts. Give both the child and the money to my rival. I shall support myself by hard work. She has won, I have lost." Then the queen removed the false co-wife and delivered over to the natural mother the son, the money, the house and everything.

This is the story of the wisdom of Sumati-nātha's mother.

The other bhâshâ version is found in a MS. in the same Library, No. 760, 40 leaves, with 14 lines on each page, modern copy, incomplete. It is a Digambara MS. containing a collection of novels of various length and bears the title: Pungâjarakathâ. It is written in a form of Central Eastern Rajasthâni, which may be easily identified with modern standard Jaipurî, though, perhaps, it is to be referred to a somewhat earlier stage of development, when the difference between Eastern Rajasthâni and Western Hindi was not so distinctly marked as in the present day. In fact it contains forms, which seem to point towards Braja and Kanaṇji, such as the forms: या, याह for the oblique singular of the second demonstrative pronoun, which in modern Jaipurî is: या; the forms: जिके, जिके, जिने, जिने for the oblique singular of the relative and correlative pronouns, for which Jaipurî has: कि, ती; कता for the neuter interrogative pronoun, which in Jaipurî ought to be: कता; the forms with the —क termination for the conjunctive participle, which in Jaipurî ends in —कर, etc. Quite noticeable are the forms: ये for the oblique feminine singular of the pronoun ये, which is probably derived from ये and is to be compared with Mewâdi: ये; ये for the oblique singular of the first personal pronoun, which in Jaipurî has: कि for the second person plural of the imperative, in which या is perhaps nothing more than an emphatic appendage. It will be further noticed that: या is very frequently substituted for: या; that the nominative singular of the first personal pronoun is: या and the negatives are: या and या. The version of the judgment of Solomon is found on pages 25a-25b of the MS. In the Jaipurî text, which is following below, I have mainly limited myself to restricting the use of the nasalization, which mostly appears to be quite unnecessarily employed especially after: या and या, and to correcting a few wrong spellings.

* Here and elsewhere, for the classification of the Indian vernaculars, I adopt the terms introduced by Sir G. Grierson in his Linguistic Survey of India.
The reader will have noticed that, whilst the form of the sentence is just the same in the two vernacular versions as well as in that of the Antarakahāḍasamgraha, the person that is introduced to decide the question seems to differ in each of the three. In the Antarakahāḍasamgraha it is the minister of an anonymous king, whilst in the Jaipuri version of the Purāṇyāvatākathā it is Abhayakumārā, the famous minister of king Śrenīka of Rājagrha, and in the Gujarāṭī version it is the mother of the tirathakara Samatīvāminī, just as in the version by the commentator of the Nandīsūtra quoted by Signor Pulilī. Now, as there is no reason to prevent us from identifying the anonymous king in Rājasyekhara's account with Śrenīka and his clever minister with Abhayakumārā, there can be no doubt as to the Jaipuri version having the Antarakahāḍasamgraha as its mediate or immediate source, and as to the Gujarāṭī version, on the other hand, being closely connected with the version in the Sanskrit commentary on the Nandīsūtra. The connection of the latter ones with each other is made furthermore evident by the fact that both of these two versions occur in commentaries on the very same work. Thus even the less important of the two main discrepancies between the two Sanskrit versions, to which attention had been drawn above, is turned to account for determining the affiliation of the two later versions of the story. There remains the discrepancy concerning the form of the sentence, which in the Sanskrit commentary on the Nandīsūtra is altogether different from the account given by all the other three versions alike. In other words, it is to be explained now that not unimportant discrepancy may be consistent with the Sanskrit commentary, which ought to be the source, not only of the Gujarāṭī version, but also of the version in the Antarakahāḍasamgraha, the author of which openly declares that he has availed himself of Malayagiri's novels. In my opinion, there are two probable explanations of the questions, to wit: either the account in the Sanskrit commentary quoted by Signor Pulilī does not represent the genuine version by Malayagiri, but only a variant of the latter; or, besides the version by Malayagiri, the Jain tradition knew also another version of the Judgment of Solomon, which was in better agreement with that in the Bible, and which — it being more current than the former — was preferred by Rājasyekhara for his samgraha.
THE OBSOLETE TIN CURRENCY AND MONEY OF THE
FEDERATED MALAY STATES.

BY SIR R. C. TEMPLE, BART.

Continued from p. 132.

APPENDIX II.

Notes made on the spot by Mr. W. W. Skeat.

I. East Coast.

1. Kelantan. 15 pitis or kupang = 1 kendi; 60 pitis or 4 kendi = 1 kupang. 120 pitis = 8 kupangs = 1 dollar.

2. Singora. At Singora (April 21, 1899). I obtained three of the small cowries formerly used here as coins. Phya Sukum, the Siamese Commissioner for the Ligor group of States, told me that the number of them which went to one pitis (cash) varied a good deal according to locality, but in this district he thinks it was 100.

3. Singora and Patalung (shores of the Inland Sea, East Coast). At Singora (April 16, 1899), the Siamese Governor of Patalung sent me by request 28 of the old cash formerly in use there. They were round coins of tin, or perhaps spelter, with a round hole in the centre, a little larger than the ordinary Singapore cent, and appeared to bear trilingual inscriptions—in Siamese, "Patalung" on one side; in Malay: "Negri Singora" and a Chinese inscription on the other. Some of them were also struck with the letters E. B. L., which the Governor believed to be the chop (Hind. chhop, shop-stamp) of the Chinaman who struck them; and who was, he said, well known in Singapore. Four hundred of these cash, he said, went to the dollar, but they were never current beyond local limits.

4. Patani, East Coast. Chinese gaming counters with Chinese inscription on one side only, but otherwise resembling cash, were obtained from Jala, a province of Patani. No special local cash were obtainable either from Jala, Nawng Chik or Raman provinces, but were so from the provinces of Ligei, Teliban, Patani and Jering, which were perhaps rather more Malayan in custom at the time.

5. Patani. Siamese money was not in general use here, perhaps, but was understood in the ports of the Siamese-Malay States: e.g., in Patani Town.

- 2 solat (lot) = 1 at
- 2 at = 1 phai
- 4 phai = 1 fuang
- 2 fuang = 1 salung
- 4 salung = 1 bat
- 4 bat = 1 tamlung
- 20 tamlung = 1 chang (kati)

6. Patani. Minted coinage. All Patani pitis (cash) were formerly coined in the precincts of the isana (palace) up to about two years ago (writing in 1899-1900). All the pitis were called in at the death of the late Raja, the new Raja issuing new coins, according to the usual custom.

---

12 Here the kupang = the tai.
19 See ante, Vol. XXVI, pp. 210 ff. Cowries are nowadays grated and used medicinally.
21 Patani was divided into seven provinces. Cash were not obtainable in Kedah, West Coast, but were so in Kelantan and Tringgann, East Coast.
22 lop = 1 nusk.
23 For an explanation of Siamese money, see ante, Vol. XXVII, pp. 1 ff.
7. Patani. On my visiting the office of the Customs clerk, a Patani-born Hokian (Chinese), in company with Luang Phrom, the clerk produced two of the old cash-trees, which had been cast before the making of cash had been prohibited by the Siamese Government, and also some cash of Jering.


20 pitia or képing make 1 këndëri
80 pitia or 4 këndëri " 1 kupang
640 pitia or 8 kupang\(^{24}\) " 1 dollar

In the last reign the coinage was as follows:—

15 pitia or képing make 1 këndëri
60 pitia or 4 këndëri " 1 kupang
480 pitia or 8 kupang\(^{24}\) " 1 dollar

The alteration was due to a change in the price of tin. The tin cash-trees may have from 10 to 12 or 15 coins on them.

9. Patani-Jering. I bought at Jering some gold dînar, there called mas kupang (gold kupang), which were brought round by an old Haji. He said that they had been dug up in a bottle at Bukit Kwong about 18 to 20 years ago (writing in 1889) by a Siamese, and that as they were considered a treasure trove, half of them had gone as usual to the Raja and half to the finder. Traditionally they are supposed to have been struck by Raja Merkah after his conversion to Islam. Another kind, struck on one side only, is said to have been minted by his wife after his decease. The traditional diameter of coins of this kind is alleged to be that of blossoms of the tanjung tree, but the two I bought were a little smaller. One of them had a rude figure of a bull on it, and the other that of a horse and both had Arabic inscriptions. One of them had had a small eyelet-hole added to the edge of the coin, which was intended (I was told) to enable it to be worn round a child's neck to benefit the child's eyes.

10. Patani-Jering. The new British dollar is called here peruk toka' (longhat, or the "staff silver" piece), on account of the trident borne by the figure of Britannia. The perak naga or "dragon-silver" piece (Chinese Canton dollar) is now charged here at a discount of from one to two këndëri (saga këndëri, canareen).

11. Patani-Jering. At Penarik, Singapore cents were by no means well or generally understood, but nevertheless they were accepted, though I had to get help in explaining what they were.


12 pitia make 1 këndëri
48 pitia or 4 këndëri " 1 kupang (sa-tali)\(^{25}\)
320 pitia\(^{26}\) or 8 kupang " 1 dollar

Formerly the coinage was as follows:—

10 pitia make 1 këndëri
40 pitia or 4 këndëri " 1 kupang
320 pitia or 8 kupang " 1 dollar

The statement that 320 cash instead of 324 went to the dollar in Teluban may have been due to the old associations of the time when 10 pitia went to the këndëri. It cannot point merely to an appreciation of the pitia, as that would have evenly affected the scale throughout.

13. Patani-Lige. At Tanjung'mas we found that the pitia of Teluban were current there as well as the pitia of Lige. These last bore inscriptions:—(1) chaping (këping) Al

\(^{24}\) Here the kupang = the tali.

\(^{25}\) Showing the kupang to equal the tali.

\(^{26}\) But should be 334.
Shamsu wal Kamer fā Rabi'-al-awwal, 1318 [A.D. 1898]. (2) Langhat (Līgeh) khālik min zalik menjadi dēri pada tni negeri.

The pitis of both districts were however of equal value, which perhaps made things easier. The scale of currency was as follows:

10 pitis make 1 kandéri
40 pitis or 4 kandéri = 1 kupang
320 pitis or 8 kupang = 1 dollar

14. Patani-Līgeh. The small currency at Tomoh consisted, I was told, of gold dust, and this is quite intelligible, as gold washing is the staple industry of the place. I asked the Chinese headman to give me 5 dollars' worth of this small change in gold; but his Chinese instincts were too strong for him, and I could afterwards only get 3 dollars for what he was pleased to call 5 dollars' worth of change.37

15. Patani-Līgeh. Gold-dust is said to be used as small change both at Mombang and at Rekoh, though the people at the pēnghulu's house declared they had none of it.


(a) Teluban. Inscription in Arabic:—ātāʾī taxānī šu billah bi awal. tubin (i.e., Teluban) sanat 1808 (A.D. 1891).

(b) Jambu (Jering): Inscription in Arabic: al kādir biladī saharnī hasar il wanna. Yambu (i.e., Jambu), 1812 (A.D. 1895).

(c) Patani.

(i) Inscription in Arabic: almanshirī uan št biladīl. Patani (i.e., Patani), sanat 1809 (A.D. 1892).

(ii) Inscription in Malay:—ini pitis bilanja didalam negeri Patani: this cash is coin within the country of Patani. It is said that in Jala no pitis are coined.

(d) A Singora coin. Has a Malay inscription on one side and Chinese on the other.

17. Kelantan. Old and present Kelantan pitis (cash) are said to go 480 to the dollar.

They bear inscriptions: (1) chaping (képing) i amir saj'a mulkahu dawlat Kelantan, 1305 (A.D. 1888)—(2) Thuriba fī Jomad-al-awwal.

18. Kelantan and Patani. Cash-trees were obtained in both States.


(a) Inscription in Arabic:—sultan-al-adhim dawlat Līgeh Khalif.

(b) Inscription in Malay:—2 hari bulan Rabi'-al-awwal, 2nd day of the month of Rabi'-al-awwal; sanat 1307 (A.D. 1890); aha ama wai rahman.

20. Coins obtained on the East Coast.

(a) Three small cash with hole in centre, and same legend on both sides; no mint mentioned, but probably Kelantan. Inscription: Khalif [atu'l-mu] minin.

(b) one Patani cash.

(c) one Kelantan cash.

(d) twenty-three large Trengganu cash, with legend: sapuloh kepeng 10, ten cash-piece 10 kepeng, on one side: dharam fī Terganu (Trengganu) on the other.

(e) two joko, gambling counters passing current in Trengganu with Malay legend on one side: ini Ban Sing-punya, this is Ban Sing's; and in Chinese on the other.

37 That is he made 2 points in 5, or 40 per cent., by manipulating the currency. See note, p. 17, for the West Coast mint method, and p. 26 for the Dutch E. I. Company's method in similar circumstances. It was his idea of legitimate trade profit.

38 All Arabic readings can only be approximate on such coins.
(d) one Siamese coin bent (tikai) used by gamblers as being easy to pick up.
(e) one Penang coin with Malay legend -- Pulau Pinang on one side, and arms of the British East India Company on the other.
(f) three old cash, much defaced: one with Trengganu clearly written (t-reng-a-nu): the other illegible.
(g) four American half-dollars, which go by the name of jampal: the oldest 1810.
(h) four Java coins (guider, half-guider, quarter-guider, eighth-guider). The two latter have Malay and Javanese inscriptions: sa-purêmpat rupiiga (quarter rupee) and sa-purêmpat rupiiga (eighth-rupee) respectively.

21. Pahang. In a Malay house on the Lebih, I saw cash hung upon the strings of a para (hanging tray), which was suspended over the hearth, just as they are hung upon the strings of an anchak (tray for offerings to the spirits). Deer-hoofs were hung underneath the para, just as is the case with the hoofs of the goat, whenever one is sacrificed for exposure in an anchak. In the same way coins are fixed to the shrouds of the spirit-boat (lanchah). In fact it seems pretty generally understood by all the Malays in the Peninsula that the spirits will appreciate the value of cash. Pahang is part of the British protectorate. Kelantan, Patani, Trengganu and Kedah, including Setul, Perlis, Singora and Patalung are under Siamese administration.

22. Patani: Jambu (Jering).
   2 saga këndëri = 1 saga bësar
   4 saga këndëri = 1 kupang
   4 kupang = 1 'mas (unice)
   16 'mas = 1 tahil (tael) of 16 dollars

   4 lada = 1 puchok
   4 puchok = 1 padi (saga këndëri)
   4 këndëri = 1 'mas
   5 këndëri = 1 kupang
   8 këndëri = 1 rial (Sp. dollar).
   15 rial = 1 tahil

24. Patani: Raman-Ligeb
   4 puchok = 1 padi
   3 padi = 1½ cents
   6 padi = 1 këndëri

II: West Coast.

25. Singapore and Malacca Currency.
   4 duit (4 cent.) make 1 sen (cent.)
   2½ sen = 1 wang
   10 wang = 1 suku (quarter dollar)
   4 suku = 1 ringgit (dollar)

26. Perak. Wang baharu²² means the new (silver) piece valued at 2½ cents. According to Klinkert,²³ the wang (wucang) was a small piece of money = 10 duit = een dubbelette (a Dutch

²² Trenggan, Kelantan, Kedah and Perlis have since been transferred to British territory.
²³ Këndëri seeds = candraoon: saga bësar = great seed. Saga by itself means usually the këndëri or candraoon, i.e., seed of the adenanthara punico, which is double of the abrus precatorius seed. Here however saga këndëri is clearly the latter and saga bësar the former.
²⁴ It seems possible that in these cases the informant mixed up weights with relative and absolute value.
²⁴ Maxwell, Malay Manual, p. 142.
²² Nieuw-M. Woordboek.
silver coin worth two pence). It was also a gold-weight = \( \frac{1}{3} \) mas (mace). Klinkert no doubt refers to the old wong.

27. **Perak.** Maxwell’s *boya* is no doubt a vulgar corruption of *buaya* (*buwaya*), i.e., the “crocodile” coin, which is referred to by Klinkert, who says it was a tin coin in Selangor in the shape of a crocodile, and that the value was 20 duits, as formerly issued.

28. **Perak.** The recess in the design in the tampang or “block”-coin is called metumba, which may be connected with *lombong*, a “paddock” in the workings of a local tin mine, so named from its sloping side.

29. **Perak and Selangor coinage.** In Penang, Kedah, etc., the tampang was called kupang.

The copper coinage now in use in the Federated Malay States is the cent (100 to the dollar) and half-cent of the Straits coinage. Till recent years, however, copper coins from nearly all the adjacent countries were admitted, but Government has some time since taken the matter in hand, and foreign copper coinage has been largely prohibited in the Federated States. A small copper Dutch coin called wong is still in use at 2½ cents.

The small silver coins of the Straits currency (British) now used in the Federated States are 5, 10, 20 and 50 cents. They are called *siling* or *skilling* (Dutch, *skilling*), and were preceded by small silver pieces about the size of a Straits half-cent piece, but thinner. They had a design described as a shield and crown and were evidently Dutch or Javanese. They were sometimes collectively called wong, i.e., change, though this term more properly applied to the copper wong.

For the half-dollar (*jumpal*), the United States coinage was sometimes employed.

The dollars in use were as follows:

(a) One of the oldest dollars, used in the Federated States, was the “pillar” dollar called by the Malays the “cannon” dollar, as they mistook the pillars on it for cannon. I have met with one or two specimens in Selangor.

(b) The Mexican dollar with eagle and snake was largely used till quite recently, and was called the “bird” dollar (*ringgit burong*): the “snake” dollar (*ringgit ular*): and even the “butterfly” dollar (*ringgit rama-rama*).

(c) The “scales” dollar (*ringgit niracha*).

(d) Chinese and Japanese dollars were also in use.

(e) Not long ago the Government has minted a British dollar at Singapore, which has been called the “Staff” dollar (*ringgit tongkat*) from the trident carried by Britannia.

30. **Perak-Selangor.** A tali was always 12½ cents. The expression *sa-perak* (one silver-piece) was also formerly used for 6 cents as money of account, though there may have once been such a coin.

31. **Penang and Province Wellesley.** Swettenham, Vocabulary, p. 129.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10 duit (cent) make 1 kupang</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12½ duit       ,        , 1 tali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 tali         ,        , 1 suku (quarter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 suku         ,        , 1 ringgit (dollar)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The duit (Dutch) is divided into halves and quarters: *satingah duit* and *suku duit*. Klinkert *Woordenboek*, says s. v. *tau* = *sa-tali = \( \frac{1}{4} \) gulden; “naar het koord met 7½ pitis, dat vroeger daarvoor gebruikt werd.” Here the *pitis* = cash of the Chinese variety.

32. **Kedah: Ulu Kedah.** At Baling I found old Straits coins, copper cents of the East India Company when it administered Penang, still current.

33. **Setul: N. of Kedah.** I was told at Setul that a species of cash, *keping*, was formerly current, with a quarter of a Penang or Singapore cent: 4 *keping* (cash) = 1 Dutch duit (cent).
34. **Negri Sembilan.** Names for currency, from report in *J. R. A. S.*, Straits Branch No. 18, pp. 556 f.

- sa-wang = 2 cents
- sa-perak = 6
- sa-kupang = 12½
- sa-suku = 25
- sa-omeh (sa-'mas)
- sa-liku33
- dua-liku
- tiga-liku
- and so on to 29 cents
- sa-'ng baharn34
- sa-tali = 5 - 'ng baharn34
- sa-liku-'ng baharn = 12½
- dua-liku-'ng baharn
- dua-baharn = 55
- duapuloh omeh = 10 dollars
- omeh duapuloh = 7
- duapuloh sa-rêpi = 7
- dua-bâlas sa-rêpi35
- = 4

35. **Singapore and Peninsula.** Dollars recently in use.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Average weight in grs.</th>
<th>Parts pure silver.</th>
<th>Parts alloy.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hongkong</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Mexican</td>
<td>416½</td>
<td>893</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexican</td>
<td>417½</td>
<td>893</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Trade</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

36. **Perlis, N. of Kedah.** A certain amount of tin is exported from Perlis: 60-70 kati=1 jöngkong or slab. In Selangor and Perak, the slabs are called kêping or jöngkong, and the smaller pieces buku. The shape of the slab was roughly that of the tampang, which was a clear imitation of it. This seems to be a strong link between the tin currency and the system of blocks or slabs in which the tin is actually cast.

---

33 Lekor (liâu) is the coefficient of the numerals between 20 and 30: so atu-lekor (sa-liâu) is 21 and so on.
34 Wong baharn, new coin; used in Malacca for a small obsolete silver coin. The phrase still means 2½ cents in accounts.
35 The original has 'ng baharn, which, as Mr. Blagden has pointed out, is a misprint for 5 'ng baharn.
36 The last three statements are not clear. Omeh duapuloh and duapuloh sa-rêpi are evidently equivalent: dua-bâlas sa-rêpi means clearly another kind of rêpi (piece). Apparently duapuloh sa-rêpi means "a piece of 20" = 7 dollars, and dua-bâlas (biâas, coefficient of numerals between 10 and 20) sa-rêpi = "a piece of 12" = 4 dollars. If this reading be correct, the proportion is not quite right, as 7: 4= 12 produces 84: 80. If, however, the two sides of the equation are intended to tally, mas duapuloh would seem to mean "a gold piece of 20," whatever "20" refers to.
In Pahang the tampang have been turned into mere tokens (money) by hollowing them out. The shape is preserved and they fit each other like a series of hats.

According to Wilkinson, Malay Diet., jongkong is applied to the hollowed-out tokens to distinguish them from the tampang or solid blocks, which were also called raman. It is however certainly applied in the first place to the slab of tin (képing), ride Klinkert. Tampang means a flattish square slab; the term is also applied to the "fort" or ramparts round a Raja's palace in the sense that these are four-square. It is also used sometimes even for the Pahang jongkong.


| 5 cents  | make 1 buaya (crocodile) |
| 2 buaya  | 1 tampang (block)       |
| 5 tampang | 1 'mas or jampal (½ dollar) |
| 2 'dor  | 1 dollar                |

The weight of the tampang is said to have been about 1 kuti in Selangor.

The entire currency is now obsolete and very hard to get. One of the minting places of the tin-block coins was Kerayong in the K'lang, Selangor. The tampang there minted were stamped with a mark called tampok manggis, or munggoen rosette, which it was meant or thought to resemble.

The value of tin when these coins were current may have been not more than 12-15 dollars the pikul. It has lately gone up to 80-90 dollars, but for a good many years it varied from 20 to 40 dollars.

Some of the small varieties of the coins were carried on a string, but not all, and it is perhaps some 40 years or more since they were in vogue.

A duit in Selangor was formerly called a pese. Four duit or pese, went to a cent.

(To be continued.)

EPIGRAPHIC NOTES AND QUESTIONS

BY D. R. BHANDARKAR, M.A.; POONA.

Continued from Vol. XLIII, p. 23.

XVI.—Sambodhi in Asoka's Rock Edict VIII.

A much discussed passage in this edict runs as follows, according to the Ginnar text:

Astikdram aitarana råjda rohatra vynta yaça yasa eva vasayata adāni cha etārāgam abhirakamāni abhāvan so Devadānapīyo Piyālaśi rājī dasa-vas-ábhitiśe suḥto ayāga saṁbodhiṁ ten-ād dhamma-vynta.

Now, what is the meaning of the expression, ayāga saṁbodhiṁ? According to Pandit Bhagwanlal Indraji, it means, "reached true knowledge". M. Senart translates it by, "set out for perfect intelligence". Bühler renders it by "went forth in search after true knowledge". Mr. V. A. Smith's translations is "went forth on the road to wisdom". According to Prof. Rhys Davids, it means "set out for the Sambodhi—that is to say, he had set out, along the Aryan Eight-fold Path, towards the attainment (if not in his present life then in some future birth as a man) of the state of mind called Aralatahip". Dr. Fleet's interpretation is entirely different from any yet proposed. He regards so Devadānapīyo Piyālaśi rājī dasa-vas-ābhitiśe as a sentence in itself, and takes suḥto to stand for śantah and to refer apparently to the Buddha. And he gives the following translation of the passage: "In times gone by, the kings went forth on pleasure-tours, on which there were hunting and other similar amusements: (so did)
this same king, Devānāpiya Piyadasi, when he was ten-years-anointer: (but) the Tranquil One went to true knowledge” therefore (there is now) this touring for dharmas. I submit my interpretation of the passage so that the scholars may take it for what it is worth. The knotty expression with which we are concerned is ayāya saṃbodhiḥ. The natural meaning of it is “went to saṃbodhiḥ” and not “set out for saṃbodhiḥ” as contended by Messrs. Senart, Bühlcr and Rhys Davids. The words we have in the text are ayāya and not pathito. Now the question arises: in what sense is the word saṃbodhiḥ to be taken here? Is it to be understood in the sense of “perfect intelligence” as done by all scholars? As pointed out by M. Senart, it is impossible to credit Aśoka with pretending to have attained to perfect intelligence. This meaning must, therefore, be rejected. It is worthy of note, that, while the Gārân recension has ayāya the Shāhī, Shāhī, and Manhērā texts give nūkriṇi and the Kālī, nītikam[th]. This root nītkriṇa, which always has a physical signification, precludes us from taking saṃbodhiḥ in the above sense; in other words, saṃbodhiḥ nītkriṇa cannot mean “attain to perfect intelligence”. Saṃbodhiḥ must, therefore, denote something with reference to which the physical action of going is possible. The conclusion is thus irresistible that the term here refers to the place where Buddha attained to true knowledge. If any instance is needed of the word bodhi or saṃbodhi having been employed in this sense, it is furnished by the following passage from the Divyāvadāna.

Yāvad rājā = Aśokānā jītaṃ bodhau dharmachāre pariśyarvā naivaśāhānā dattāṃ tasya bodhau viśvaśataḥ prasāda(o) jītaḥ Bhagavat = ānuttarā sanyāk-saṃbodhiḥ = abhi saṃbodhiḥ = śri sa yānī vīravā-gūdhañī rathañī tānā iḥi bodhāḥ prashayati, etc., etc.

I have no doubt that the word bodhi is in this passage employed in the sense of, “the place where the Buddha attained to perfect intelligence”. It may, perhaps, be argued that the word bodhi does not here denote the place where, but the date when, Buddha obtained perfect knowledge. But that this is not the sense here intended is shown by the words bodhāḥ prashayati where the word cannot possibly have that sense. The word jīta occurring in the extract similarly points to a place and not to a date. It may, however, be argued that bodhī here means the bodhi tree. This sense also can suit the passage of the edict, though it does not seem to be intended in the passage of the Divyāvadāna. For if jīta denotes the place where Buddha was born, bodhi must necessarily denote the place where he acquired true knowledge.

I have said, above, that bodhi or saṃbodhi, in the sense of the Bo tree, can also fit the passage of our Rock Edict. That this word has this signification is clear from Children’s Dictionary of the Pali Language. A slightly grander term is mahābodhi, which is an almost exact equivalent of Saṃbodhiḥ. It occurs in the name Mahābodhi-parivaha of a well-known Pali work, published by the Pali Text Society. Mahābodhi parivaha is an expression which is frequently met with in this book; e.g., on p. 130, we have tam khañnaṃ yeva Bārāṇāsi-rājākhaññey āsanaṃ saṃbodhiḥ upagantu, etc., etc.

Whichever sense of the word bodhi or saṃbodhi is taken, the purport of the edict in question is clear. It tells us that Aśoka’s religious touring commenced with his visit to Bodhi. Of the four places connected with Buddha, that where he obtained enlightenment is considered as most important by the Buddhists. The Divyāvadāna also, as will be seen from the extract cited above, says that Aśoka attached far more value to Bodhi than to anything else, and consequently gives a longer and much more glowing description of his visit there. It speaks of the religious benefactions made by him and also of the interviews he had with sahaviras, exactly as the Rock Edict tells us.

XVII.—Was Devagupta another name of Chandragupta II?

On pp. 214-15 of this Journal for the last year, Prof. Pathak has given a summary of a Vākāṭaka copper-plate grant which is in his possession. Therein Prabhāvati, mother of the
yuvardja Sri Divikarasena, is spoken of as daughter of Chandragupta II, of the imperial Gupta dynasty. The same Prabhavati (-gupta) is mentioned in at least two published Vákitaka grants as daughter of Devagupta. And, as Prof. Pathak’s grant, which was thoroughly examined by me, is an unquestionably genuine record, the conclusion is irresistible that Devagupta is another name of Chandragupta II. But if there is still any scepticism on this point, it is, I believe, set at rest by the Sāñcchī inscription of Chandragupta II, dated A.D. 38. The following words which occur in it are important: mahārājadhīrdja-śri-Chandragupta-ya Devarāja & priya-ndm . . . . . . . . . . . .

... tasya sarva-guṇa-rampattaye, etc. The lacunae here are rather unfortunate, but if we make an attempt at grasping the true meaning of the passage in the light of what precedes and follows, I doubt not that it is intended to tell us that Devarāja was another name of Chandragupta II. Princep translated this passage so as to make Devarāja another name of this Gupta king. “This may be correct,” says Dr. Fleet. But he prefers to supply the lacunae by reading Devarāja iṣi priya-ndm-[āmūṭa-bhuvar]y-[e][x]tasya, and take Devarāja as the name of his minister. Priya-ndm Dr. Fleet correctly renders by “of familiar name,” but this phrase loses its sense if Devarāja is taken to be a name not of Chandragupta but of his minister. What is the force of saying that the minister’s familiar name is Devarāja, when his other and generally known name is not given? On the other hand, if it is taken to refer to Chandragupta, the full significance of the passage is brought out. For the name Chandragupta is, as a matter of fact, first mentioned, and it is immediately followed by Devarāja. This first name is more widely known, but the second is more familiar. And there is also very great propriety in Āmrakārdava, the donor, giving this second name of the Gupta sovereign. For Āmrakārdava was not a Chief, but an officer of Chandragupta, as rightly said by Dr. Fleet. And it is but natural that he should mention over and above the usual and common, also the favourite, name of the sovereign by which he was familiarly known in his palace where Āmrakārdava must have more often come in contact with him than elsewhere. Again, Āmrakārdava is said to be anujiti-satpurusha-sabdīva-srītī jyāti prakhyapayan. This epithet becomes appropriate only if Devarāja is taken to refer to Chandragupta. For part of his gift is intended to produce perfection of all virtues in Devarāja. If this Devarāja is no other but a minister, the expression anujiti-satpurusha-sabdīva-srītī has no meaning. This epithet would, therefore, naturally lead us to suppose that Āmrakārdava donated the gift to the benefit, not of the minister, but of the sovereign. There can thus be no doubt that the Sāñcchī inscription gives Devarāja as another name of Chandragupta II only. And this corroborates the Vākitaka plates of Prof. Pathak.

XVIII.—Manandasor inscription of Naravarman.

A new inscription has recently been brought to light at Mandsaur or Mandasor, the chief town of the district of the same name in Scindia’s Dominions of the Western Malwa Division of Central India. It is now lying in the possession of Lala Dayashankar, a local pleader, but was originally found near the Fort gate not far from the village of Tojāl.

The stone on which the inscription is engraved appears purposely to have been neatly cut out after line 9 for being used in some building. The object of the record is thus not clear, as it is lost with the missing portion of the inscription stone; but it seems to be something connected with the god Vāsudeva. This benefaction, whatever it was, was made by an individual named Satya, who was a son of Varnaviridhi and grandson of Jaya. The record refers itself to the reign of Naravarman, son of Siṅghavarman and grandson of Jayavarman, and is dated the 5th of the bright half of śroja (Āśvina) of the Mālava (or Vikrama) year 461 A. D. 494. It is thus evident that this Naravarman is identical with the prince of that name who is mentioned as father of Viśavarman by the Gaṅghādhār inscription of V. E. 480.1 And we know from another Mandasor inscription that

1 Fleet’s Gupta Inscts., p. 76 ff.
Viṣṇavarman's son was Bandhuvarman. We thus obtain the following line of the feudatory princes who ruled over Malwa from about the middle of the fourth to about the middle of the fifth century A.D.

(1) Jayavarman
(2) Siṅghavarman, son of (1)
(3) Naravarman, son of (2)
    V. E. 461 = A. D. 404.
(4) Viṣṇavarman, son of (3)
    V. E. 480 = A. D. 423
(5) Bandhuvarman, son of (4)
    V. E. 493 = A. D. 436

Among the various epithets of Naravarman mentioned in our inscription occurs in 1, 5 the epithet Siṅgha-vikrānta-gāmī (Naravarman). If I interpret this expression correctly, it shows that Naravarman was a feudatory of Chandragupta II. We know from Gupta coins, that Siṅgha-vikrānta was a title of Chandragupta II.; and we also know from a Śāntideva inscription that this Gupta sovereign was reigning till G. E. 98 = A. D. 411, i.e., for at least seven years after the date of our inscription. Nothing, therefore, precludes us from concluding that the expression Siṅgha-vikrānta-gāmī hints that Naravarman was a tributary prince of Chandragupta II. And this is in keeping with the fact that his son and grandson, viz., Viṣṇavarman and Bandhuvarman were feudatories of Kumāragupta.

The verse which sets forth the year is very important, and, I, therefore, quote it here.

Eka-sahijāty-adhike pratāpte samād-kata-chaturūṣāy[Śrī] [12].

The two expressions that are worthy of consideration in this verse are Mālava-gaṇa-dmāḍa, and Kṛita-sahijāte. The first reminds us of similar expressions found elsewhere, viz., Mālavānāna gaṇa-sthitī and Mālava-gaṇa-sthitī-vaidī of the inscriptions dated V. E. 493 and 589 respectively and both discovered at Mandasāra itself. But what is the meaning of the expression Mālava-gaṇa-dmāḍa which occurs in our inscription? In my opinion, it can have but one sense, viz., "handed down traditionally by the Mālava tribe." The root, dmāḍa, primarily signifies "to hand down traditionally," and, consequently, the word gaṇa can here only mean "a tribe," which again is one of its usual senses 8. This, I think, is clear and indisputable, and the other similar phrases just referred to, must be so interpreted as to correspond to this. The late Prof. Kielhorn took these latter to mean "by, or according to, the reckoning of the Mālavas." But to understand gaṇa in the sense of gaṇand, as he undoubtedly does, is far-fetched. Besides the expression occurring in the new inscription clearly shows that the word gaṇa must in these phrases be taken to signify "a tribe." The word sthitī of the expression Mālava-gaṇa-sthitī now remains to be explained, and it is obvious that it must bear a meaning which would correspond to dmāḍa. Sthitī, therefore, must mean some such thing as "a settled rule or usage" which, doubtless, is one of its senses 8. This also brings out clearly the meaning of the instrumental which is intended by Mālavānāna gaṇa-sthitī and Mālava-gaṇa-sthitī-vaidī, as was first pointed out by Prof. Kielhorn. These expressions must, therefore, mean, "in accordance with the (traditional) usage of the Mālava tribe."
Now, what can be the meaning of Krița-sahajñīta, which expression also is met with in our inscription? Obviously, the years 461, are here meant to be called Krița. But it may be asked, "Are there any inscriptions which contain instances of this word applied to years?" I answer in the affirmative, for there are at least two inscriptions which speak of Krița years. They are the Bijayagadh stone pillar inscription of Vishnuvardhana and the Gangadhār stone inscription of Viśva-varman referred to above. In the first, the date is mentioned in the words, Krițeshu chaturṣuh sarṣa-katĒszu = asḥdariṣu(i)yeshu 400 20 8, etc. The second sets forth the date in the following verse: Yddesu chatuḥ(r)ṣu kri(kri)ṭeshu āteshu sau[m]yesu = diita-sottara-padesa(r)siha yatas[r]su]. Dr. Fleet translates the word krițeshu by "fully complete," but admits that it involves a straining. Besides, even with this meaning, the word is made redundant by ydteshu, which is used along with it. But the sense of krițeshu, and consequently of the two passages in which it occurs, is rendered clear and intelligible, if we take it to be a name by which the years of which what is now called the Vikrama era were known, as no doubt the phrase Krița-sahajñīta of our inscription tells us. But here a question arises: "Was Krița the name of an era?" It is difficult to answer the question definitely at the present stage of our research. But the manner in which the word Krița is employed leads us to surmise that it was at any rate not the name of a king or royal dynasty that was associated with these years. We have e. g., eras originated by Saka or Gupta kings. But we never hear of expressions such as Sakeshu vaṭasreshu or Guptesu vaṭasreshu. The Bijayagadh and Gangadhār inscriptions, on the other hand, as we have seen, speak of Krițeshu vaṭheshu or vaṭasreshu. It is for this reason that I am inclined to think that Krița was not the name of a king or dynasty that was given to these years. It is not safe just at present to make an assertion on this point, but it appears to me that what is now known as the Vikrama era was invented by the people or astronomers for the purpose of reckoning years and was consequently originally known as Krița, which means "made." If this supposition is correct, it is clear why Krița can be used in apposition to years as is no doubt intended in the passages cited above. I do not, however, believe that the Mālavas had anything to do with the actual foundation of the era. This is evident from the word dmādiça, which never means "originated". The word can here signify only "handed down traditionally," and shows that the Mālavas were in possession of a traditional usage regarding, i. e., of a mode of reckoning, the Krița years. We know that there are two systems of reckoning, which are peculiar to the Vikrama era, e. g., the northern (Chaitrādī) and the southern (Kṛtiśadī). Whether the Mālavas were supposed in the fifth century A. D. to have handed down one of these or not is a question which we must await further discoveries to answer.

ON SOME NEW DATES OF PANDYA KINGS IN THE 13TH CENTURY A. D.

BY DIWAN BAHADUR L. D. SWAMIKANNU PILLAI, M. A., B. L. (MADRAS); LL.B. (LOND.).

In December 1911, I obtained the permission of the Epigraphist to the Government of Madras, M.R. Roy, Rao Sahib H. Krishna Satia Trivedi, to search the files of his transcripts of Pandya inscriptions for unverified dates to be used as illustrations to my Indian Chronology as well as to the method of verification of dates advocated in my little brochure, Hints to Workers in South Indian Chronology. The search resulted in the discovery of many unverified Pandya dates, equal in importance, and more than equal in number, to those upon which the late Prof. Kielhorn had been engaged from 1901 up to the time of his death in 1908, and which had been published by him from time to time in the Epigraphia Indica. I had reason to believe that a considerable proportion of these unverified dates had also been submitted to Prof. Kielhorn, but that he had not succeeded in discovering a clue to them. From a note in German by Prof. Kielhorn, which I found in one of the transcripts in the Epigraphist's office, it was apparent that, in order to be able to deal more effectively with Pandya dates, which no doubt present features of unusual difficulty (as pointed out in my Hints to Workers in South Indian

* Blay, p. 75 II. 19-29.
Chronology, he had constructed a rough ephemeris for the years A.D. 1000—1800. From his description of the ephemeris, however, I gather that it could not have contained more than the first five or six columns of Table X of my Indian Chronology, if it contained so much; that is, he must have used, as data for all the tithis and nakshatras of a particular year, certain constants derived from the positions of the sun and the moon at the commencement of the year. I mention these details, because for the very same purpose of dealing effectively with Pāṇḍya dates, I have also constructed an ephemeris or daily Trayaṅga for the years A.D. 850-1000 and again from A.D. 1200 to 1500, which I intend to continue backwards as well as forwards; but my ephemeris gives, in addition to constants for every year and every new moon, which I have already furnished in print in Table X of my Indian Chronology, the actual ending moment of the tithi and nakshatra for every day in the period dealt with. It is possible to discover from this ephemeris, after a few trials and without any calculation whatever, the day corresponding to any combination of tithi, nakshatra and vāra. The accuracy of the results presented to Epigrafists in this article, as well as the ease with which I have been able to obtain positive results where Prof. Kielhorn and other investigators merely reported negative results, are due to the fact that I obtained them, as a rule, direct from my ephemeris, instead of having to work them out every time from my Indian Chronology.

For the sake of ready reference, I give below a list of all the Pāṇḍya rulers of the 18th and first quarter of the 14th century, whose initial years have been ascertained either by Prof. Kielhorn or by me, distinguishing by asterisks my own contributions to the list. Where I have been able to reduce to narrower limits the commencement of a reign given by Prof. Kielhorn, this fact is also indicated by an asterisk. Similarly, the fact that I have proved Kielhorn's Vīra Pāṇḍya (the only prince of that name disclosed by his investigations) to have been a Mārañvarman is also indicated by an asterisk. To Kielhorn's eight Pāṇḍyas of the 13th century, I have added a dozen new names, so that the obscurity in which the history of the Pāṇḍyas of the 13th century has been hitherto involved, and which finds frequent expression in the annual reports of the Madras Epigraphist, has to some extent been removed. It remains for me, however, to acknowledge gratefully the liberal hints I have received from Mr. Rao Sahib H. Krishna Sastri, in the matter of determining the broad

1 Annual Report, 1911-12, p. 71. "No. 352 of 1911 which is dated in the 10th year of Jat. S. Pāṇḍya and quotes the 15th of Puramjngadeva may be the anniversary of Jat. S. Pāṇḍya I (1251 to at least 1261), or to J. S. Pāṇḍya II (1260 to at least 1260). The latter is more probable, as J. S. Pāṇḍya I is always distinguished by the epithet who took all countries." I shall show below that the king referred to is J. S. P. I.

Annual Report, 1911-12, p. 79. "3 Inscriptions of this Jat. Vīra Pāṇḍya, copied in previous years, do not give any clue as to the period when he flourished." I shall show, by means of four inscriptions copied so early as 1294, and one in each of the years 1296, 1297 and 1298, that this Jat. Vīra Pāṇḍya came to the throne in A.D. 1294 and was no other than the person well known to Madras epigraphy as the conqueror of "Hun, Kongu and Chola."

Annual Report, 1910-11, p. 79. "Mar. Vīra Pāṇḍya is another unknown king to whose 14th year belongs No. 377 of 1910." Again Annual Report, 1909-10, p. 59. "Mar. Tribh. Vīra Pāṇḍya and Jat. Tribh. Vīra Pāṇḍya, mentioned in Nos. 307 and 344 of 1909, could not be identified with any of the kings in Kielhorn's list. I shall show, by means of inscriptions, copied in 1905 and 1909, that the only Vīra Pāṇḍya whose dates were investigated by Kielhorn was a Mārañvarman; I shall also show that there were at least three Jat. Vīra Pāṇḍyas in the 13th century.

Annual Report, 1910-11, p. 79. "We do not know who Mar. Sundara Pāṇḍya was in whose 13th year...... the Asikākāri....... 2 In Nos. 324, 343 and 344 of 1911 (three dated inscriptions of the 14th year of Mar. Sundara Pāṇḍya) the Asikākāri figure again, this time as donors of gifts. I have identified these dates as belonging to a reign which commenced in A.D. 1294.

Annual Report, 1900-19, p. 97. "Jat Tribh. Sundara Pāṇḍya whose identity with any of the known kings of that name cannot be definitely affirmed...... One of these inscriptions (418 of 1969) refers to an earlier grant by Kopperunjangadeva and helps us to identify this Sundara Pāṇḍya with Jat. S. P. II." I shall show, by means of 9 inscriptions copied in 1909 (including No. 418 of 1909), and three in earlier years, that this Jat. S. Pāṇḍya could not be either J. S. P. I or II, but a different person whose reign began in A.D. 1270-71.

Annual Report, 1903-04, p. 82. "Other kings of the name of Sundara Pāṇḍya who could not be identified by their characteristic epithets are Koner. Jat. Tribh. S. P. (Nos. 49 and 73 of 1908); Jat. S. P. (214, 217, 295, 417, 418 and 504 of 1968)...... Tribh. S. P. (150 of 1969 and 16 of 1969)...... Vīra Pāṇḍya is represented by 13 inscriptions, in nine of which (110, 120, 121, 122, 244, 296, 301, 305 and 306 of 1908 and 39 of 1909) he is called Jat. Tribh. Vīra Pāṇḍya. I shall show below that the eight inscriptions whose numbers are italicised in this quotation and for which details of day and month are available, can be referred definitely to certain known Pāṇḍya sovereigns, viz. Jat. S. P. I (111), Mar. S. P. II (120), Jat. V. P. II (150), Jat. V. P. III (112, 122, 123 and 401 of 1908), and Jat. S. P. IV (69 of 1969).
limits of the period to which each inscription relates. Without such hints, pure chronology would be very often at sea in such investigations. The annual reports of the Madras Epigraphist give only the Saka or the cyclic years of inscriptions, but not the details of month and day, where these are available. I have suggested to the Epigraphist that these details might be given in future in the Annual Report in all cases in which they are available, and also, where the only possible clue to the discovery of the year is the mention of a concurrent set of tithi, vāra and nakshatra with or without solar month, that a brief indication of the period to which the characters and other epigraphical evidence might seem to point should be furnished in the Annual Report. Such an indication as "circa 13th cent," or "12th or 13th cent." or "later than 14th cent." is in the latter class of cases indispensable for chronological investigation. All details of tithi, nakshatra and vāra, invaluable as they are for epigraphic research, are at present omitted from the epigraphist's annual reports, in order possibly to economize space, but no scientific record, however brief, can be complete without such details as may serve eventually to fix the date. The inscriptions containing such details are unfortunately not many. Moreover, if the tabular arrangement at present adopted in the appendices to the Madras Epigraphist's annual reports were replaced by the narrative form which I have adopted in Part IV of this article, there would not only be no waste of space, but considerable economy would result, and the Epigraphist would be able to include in the appendices everything he wished to quote from the contents of a given inscription, instead of having to divide his notes between the "remarks" column of an appendix and the text of his report. If the procedure I suggest were adopted, all the inscriptions found in a particular temple or other building would still stand together, as they do now, but they could be provided with a conspicuous heading, describing the temple or structure by its name, village, taluk and district. The tabular form seems to have been adopted more than 20 years ago when there were much fewer inscriptions and much less information to be recorded under each than is at present the case. It is now rather a hindrance than a help to the full treatment of an important or interesting inscription.

II.

List of Pāṇḍya rulers of the 13th century.

* An asterisk distinguishes additions made by the present writer to the list of Pāṇḍya kings published by Prof. Kielborn at pp. 226-228 of Vol. IX of Epigraphia Indica.

Name of ruler. | Limits of commencement of reign.
---|---
Jaṭāvarman Vira Pāṇḍya I | 18 Aug. 1189—15 Apr. 1190
Jaṭāvarman Kulaśekhara I | 30 Mar.—29 Nov. 1190
Māravarman Sundara Pāṇḍya I | 29 Mar.—4 Sep. 1216
* Jaṭāvarman Kulaśekhara II | 25 June—19 July 1216
Māravarman Sundara Pāṇḍya II | 16 June—30 Sep. 1237
15 June 1238—18 Jan. 1239
Māravarman Sundara Pāṇḍya II | *8 July—1 Dec. 1238
Jaṭāvarman Sundara Pāṇḍya II | 20th—28 Apr. 1251
Māravarman (∗) Vira Pāṇḍya | 11 Nov. 1252—13 July 1253
* Jaṭāvarman Vira Pāṇḍya II | 15 May—19 June 1254
Māravarman Srivallabha | 4—10 Sep. 1257
2—27 June 1268
Māravarman Kulaśekhara I | *12—27 June 1268
* Jaṭāvarman Sundara Pāṇḍya (II) | 2 Nov. 1270—5 Jan. 1271
13 Sep. 1275—15 May 1276
Jaṭāvarman Sundara Pāṇḍya II | 24 June 1276

* I am glad to find that in the annual report for 1912-13 these details are for the first time given in full.—L. D. S.
* I have assigned numbers to the Pāṇḍyas of the 13th cent. merely for convenience of reference in this article. I do not recommend the employment of such numbers generally when dealing with the Pāṇḍyas: for it is certain that there were earlier Pāṇḍyas bearing the same names, though we do not now know their exact dates. It would be better to refer to each Pāṇḍya by the year of his accession.
* Called Jaṭ. Sundara Pāṇḍya II in Professor Kielborn's list.
The following is a tentative arrangement of most of the above Pândya rulers, which will make it clear,

1. that five Pândyas ruled at the same time, a fact established by tradition as well as by the statements of contemporary historians;

2. that two Márvavarman and two Jatávarman were co-regents with a fifth Pândya who might be either a Márvavarman or a Jatávarman;

3. that as a rule not more than one or two years elapsed between the death of a Márvavarman or Jatávarman and the accession of the next Márvavarman or Jatávarman. The interval of 4 years between the death of Márvavarman Kulaśekhara I and the accession of Kulaśekhara II is accounted for by the Muhammadan invasion (circa A.D. 1310—see Report on Madras Epigraphy for 1908-09, p. 82). Again there is a gap of ten years or so in col. (5) which one would expect to have been filled up by a Jatávarman. For the present I am only able to fill it up with Jatávarman Vikrama Pândya to whom I have assigned above the conjectural date circa 1280; but I admit this is not satisfactory;

4. that, in what I have numbered as the first line of Pândyas of the 13th century, a Márvavarman was regularly succeeded by a Jatávarman and vice versa, each successor being presumably either appointed by the reigning sovereign during his life time or called to the throne after his death.

N.B.—The main purpose of this tabular arrangement is to show that, taking *almost* any year between A.D. 1250 and A.D. 1315, it is possible to prove from inscriptions that five Pândyas ruled simultaneously. The qualification “*almost*” would probably be unnecessary if we knew the exact terminal year of each reign.

The terminal year of each reign here assumed is merely the latest year occurring in inscriptions (Pudukkottai inscriptions have in one or two cases been used for this purpose by anticipation), whereas the actual year of death may have been a few years later than that here assumed. Also a more careful investigation of the relationship among the individuals reigning at the same time, as well as of the places where they had their palaces, may lead us to a better adjustment of the concurrent lines which, as presented here, make absolutely no pretense whatever to a genealogical arrangement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Regnal Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1280</td>
<td>Márvavarman</td>
<td>Vikrama Pândya</td>
<td>1216–1234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1291</td>
<td>Jatávarman</td>
<td>Vikrama Pândya</td>
<td>1291–1314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1305</td>
<td>Márvavarman</td>
<td>Sundara Pândya</td>
<td>1280–1305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1310</td>
<td>Jatávarman</td>
<td>Sundara Pândya</td>
<td>1310–1315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1315</td>
<td>Márvavarman</td>
<td>Kulasekhar I</td>
<td>1315–1320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1320</td>
<td>Jatávarman</td>
<td>Sundara Pândya</td>
<td>1320–1325</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* This was presumably the Sundara Pândya who, according to the Muhammadan historians, murdered his father Márvavarman Kulaśekhara I.
IV.

An analysis of 77 Pândya dates hitherto unverified.

[Between 1902 and 1908, Prof. Kielhorn verified 67 Pandya dates—vide list at pp. 226-228, Ep. Ind., IX.]

Explanatory Note.—I believe I have the authority of the Madras Epigraphist for saying that he accepts the conclusions arrived at by me in the present analysis. I accept sole responsibility, however, for the calculations here presented and wish to add, by way of caution, that variations to the extent of 0.02 of a day may be found in my results. This is the necessary consequence of my ephemerides being calculated to two places of decimals, but wherever the variation was likely to affect the śāra, I have taken care to calculate the result to four places of decimals according to the full method indicated in my Indian Chronology.

I have in my possession about 90 Pândya dates sent to me by the Pudukkoṭai State which, so far as they are capable of verification, I hope to publish in a later article after getting them epigraphically examined.

In quoting dates, I have used certain abbreviations the meaning of which will be obvious; e.g., śu. for śukla, ba. for bhave, etc. I have indicated nakshatras by placing their names between inverted commas, so as to distinguish them from the names of solar and lunar months. When I say that a tithi or Nakshatra ended at 25 of the day, I mean that it ended 15 ghaṭikas after mean sunrise. A key to this decimal system will be found in the Eye-Table appended to my book, Indian Chronology (1911).

Jātāvarman Kulasekhara I.

(Reign began between 30th March and 29th November 1190.)

1908 (103). From the south wall of the mandapa in front of the central shrine in the Tiruttalivāra temple at Tiruppuruttur (Madura District). Records (gifts) of some lands belonging to the temple of Kālāsāmuḍāya Nāyānār by the sabhā of Tirupputur, in order to provide for offerings on a festival in the same temple. Mentions śaṅkaraśāmacchāyam.

Date.—Year opp. 2nd of Tribh. Kulaśekhara; 5th day of Mithuna; Sunday = Sunday 30 May A.D. 1198, which was the 5th Mithuna.

* Jātāvarman Vira Pâṇḍya.

(Reign began between 18th Aug. 1189 and 15th April 1190.)

1903 (144). From the north wall of the six-pillared mandapa in front of the Central Shrine in the Maṅgaḷinātha temple at Pīrāṅmalai (Madura District). Gift of money for offerings.

Tirukkoṭugunuru was situated in Tirumalaisūru. Mention is made of Aḻagāpurī alias Selīyanārāyaṇapuram in Kā拉萨inga-Valanāḍū.

Date.—3rd year of Jāt Vira Pâṇḍya (no epithet) Kanni; su. 7; Anurādhā. On Monday, 17 August 1192, Anurādhā ended at 144 and su. 7 at 20; but as the solar day was only the 145th it was 10 days short of Kanni. [Kanni, error for Simha.]

1906 (352). From the north wall of the Aṅkîlavāri shrine in the Śrīkānṭhāsvāmin temple at Kuḻimiṇiāmalai (Pudukkoṭai State). Damaged. Sale of temple land for the purpose of repairing temple.

Date.—13th year of Tribh. Vira Pâṇḍya; Mesha; su. . . ., Sunday; Utt. Phalgunt = Sunday 15th April 1201, when Mēṣha su. 11 ended at 84 and “Utt. Phalgunt” commenced at 27; (possibly regnal year 13 should be 12).

Māravarman Sundara Pâṇḍya I.

Reign began between 29th March and 4th September 1216

* 25th June and 19th July 1216

1906 (362). From the south wall of the second prakāra in the Śrīkānṭhāsvāmin temple at Kuḻimiṇiāmalai (Pudukkoṭai). Registers a public sale of land and its purchase by Uḍaiyar Gāṅghēvarīyar, a native of Āṭṭur in Chōḷa-Śrīnivasa-Valanāḍū.
Data.—3rd year of Māravarman Sundara Pāṇḍya I; Mārgal; ba. 5; Sat.; “Maṅghā” = Saturday 8 December 1218. Mārgal; ba. 6 and “Maṅghā” commenced just before sunrise on, and were current throughout, Saturday, coming to an end at ‘07 and ‘10 respectively on Sunday.

1907 (133). From the north wall of the maṇḍapa in front of the Māchukudākkara temple at Koṇumbālūr (Madura District). Seems to record a gift of land. Mentions Kārṇiyūr in Sōja Pāṇḍiya-rajanādu.

Date.—13th year (in Pudukotai copy, tho’ Mad. Ep. Rept. notes that regnal year is lost) of Māravarman Sundara Pāṇḍya I; Mithuna; su. 2 (2nd tiyadi); Sunday; “Pūshya”. On Sunday 24 June 1229 Mithuna su. 2 and “Pūshya” ended at ‘59 and ‘22. Read tithi for tiyadi.

* Jatavarman Kulakšēkhara II.

(Reign began between 16th June and 30th September 1237.)

1905 (62). From the fifth pillar in the second storey of the east gopura of the Sundarēsvara temple at Madura. Gift of land.

Date.—2nd year of Jat. Kulakšēkhara; Tula; ba. 6; Thursday; “Mṛgagāra”. On Thursday, 30 Sep. 1238, Tula ba. 6 and Mṛgagāra ended at ‘91 and ‘36 respectively.

1910 (135). From the fifth pillar of the maṇḍapa in front of the central shrine in the Mulasthānsēvara temple at Teṅkarai (Madura District). Gift of land by the assembly of Sōjaentaka-Chatuvavādīmangalā, to the servants of the yōgasthāna of Kappāvar-dāsar situated in the ninth hamlet of the village.

Date.—2nd year of Jatavarman alias Tribhuvanachakravarthin Kulakšēkhara-deva—Mithuna 20, su. 13; Wed.; “Anurāda”. On Wed., 15 June 1239 (= 20 Mithuna) su. 13 and “Anurāda” ended at ‘87 and ‘20 respectively.

1908 (185). From the west wall of the store-room in the Tiruttalēsvara temple at Tiruppurū (Madura District). Seems to record a gift of four water pots for the sacred bath by Avarimuladuśāyini, wife of Dēvaranaṇaṇ.


Note.—It is curious that in the 23rd year of Jat. Kulakšēkhara I (whose reign began in A.D. 1190) there is a date, Tuesday 9 Ap. 1213, which satisfies the present conditions, viz. 16 Mēsha and “Anurāda”; but Madras Epigraphist thinks the characters of the inscription cannot be referred to beginning of 13th cent.

Māravarman Sundara Pāṇḍya II.

(Reign began between 15 June 1238 and 18 Jan. 1239.)

* 3 July and 1 December 1238.

1908 (130). From the north wall of the first prākāra of the Agastyeśvara shrine in the Tiruttalēsvara temple at Tiruppurū (Madura District). Sale of land for the maintenance of a flower garden which was founded by Poppaprijusāyaṇ Viluppādāryaṇ of Pullickūra in Naduvikūru in the district of Mīlalai-kūram.

Date.—2nd year of Tribh. Sundara Pāṇḍya. Dhanus 11, su. 10, Wed.; “Aśvini”. On Wed. 7 Dec. 1239 (= Dhanus 11), su. 10 and “Aśvini” ended at ‘72 and ‘99 respectively.

Note.—The result agrees with that of Prof. Jacobi, published, since this article was written, in Ep. Ind. Vol. XI, p. 183: but the learned author satisfied himself with stating that the king in question must have begun to reign in A.D. 1237-38. As a matter of fact, the king is identical with Māravarman Sundara Pāṇḍya II (Kielhorn’s C. vade Ep. Ind. vol. IX, p. 227), though the inscription itself does not style him a Māravarman; and if my other identifications of Madras and Pudukothai dates of this reign are correct, he must have come to the throne between 6 Oct. and 1 Dec. 1238, i.e. in A.D. 1238-39, not in A.D. 1237-38.

189 (169). From the east wall of the maṇḍapa surrounding the shrine of the goddess in the Kailāśaṭāti temple at Gaṅgāsikōṇḍān (Tinnevelly District).
Date.—2nd year opp. [8th] of Māravarman Sundara Pāṇḍya; ba. 6; Wed.; “Hasta” = Wed. 6 Jan. 1249, when ba. 6 and “Hasta” ended respectively at 32 and 37 of the day.

Possibly 11th year, not 10th; the reading is conjectural.

1902 (616). From the inner side of the north wall of the maṇḍapa in front of the Vṛiddhapurūṣvara temple at Tiruppunāvāsai (Tanjore District). Sale of land.

Date.—3rd year opp. 14th of Māravarman Sundara Pāṇḍya “who conquered every country”; Kaṭaka; su. 7; Monday; “Śrāti” = Monday, 12 July 1255, when Kaṭaka su. 7 ended and “Śrāti” began.

Jaṭāvarman Sundara Pāṇḍya I.

(Began to reign between 20th and 28th Apr. 1251.)

1906 (260). From the south wall of the central shrine in the ruined Śiva temple on the hill at Narasamaṇgalam (N. Arcot). Begins Sumasta-jagad-dāhara, etc. Incomplete. Registers a public sale of the village of Naraśingamaṇgalam in Māvaṇḍar-nādu, a sub-division of Kāliyūrkottam, a district of Jayāṅgoṇḍa-cholamaṇgalam.

Date.—7th year of Jaṭ. Sundara Pāṇḍya; Vṛisāchika; ba. 3; Monday; “Mrigaśāra” = Monday 6 Nov. 1256, when Vṛisāchika ba. 3 and “Mrigaśāra” ended at 97 and 33 respectively.

[6th Regnal year, not 7th.]

1901 (218). From the east wall of the Maṇḍapa in front of the Tirumūliśvara temple at Māgalar (Chingleput District). Records that a private person opened out streets and colonised the environs of the Agastyaśvara temple.

Date.—7th year of Jaṭāvarman Sundara Pāṇḍya “who conquered every country.” Mēsha; ba. 1; Rohini. On Thursday 27 April, 1256, Rishabhā su. 1 (not Mēsha ba. 1, which is a double error) and Rohini ended at 38 and 98 of the day respectively.

[7th year, as before, vide No. 260 of 1906 supra, an error for 6th.]

1901 (275). From the north wall of the maṇḍapa in front of the central shrine in the Divyajñānaśvara temple at Kōvilaṅk. (Tanjore Dt.)

Date.—7th year of Jaṭ. Sundara Pāṇḍya I., distinguished by the introduction Samasta jagad, (Tanjore Dt.) 8th tithi; Monday; “Pūrṇa Āśāhā” On Monday 17 Sept. 1257 Kannī su. 8 and “Pūrṇāśāhā” ended at 76 and 82 respectively.

1911 (322). From the west wall of the central shrine in the Dhēnnpūriśvara temple at Mādaṃbakkam (Chingleput District), quotes the 15th year of Perunjiṅgadeva and records a gift of lamps, etc., in the temple of Sirreri Ajunjiyaṇāṃpar.

Date.—10th year of Jaṭāvarman Sundara Pāṇḍya; Rishabhā; Sukla 11; Sunday; “Śrāti”. On Sunday 23 May 1260, Rishabhā su. 13 and “Śrāti” ended at 71 and 60 respectively of the day. According to Kielhorn (Ep. Ind., IX, p. 222) Perunjiṅgadeva began to reign between February and July 1243.

[As Rishabhā su. 11 cannot ordinarily concur with “Śrāti,” su. 11 must be an error for “su. 12.”]


Date.—Jaṭāvarman Sund. Pāṇḍya (“Samasta-jagad”); 11th year; Makara (apparent error for Mīna); su. 6; Wed.; “Rohini” = Wed. 5 Mar. 1264 when tithi su. 6 and Nakṣatra “Rohini” ended respectively at 50 and 53. Reg. year appearing in inscription as “pat [......] nravud” should be read as “pat [imuk] nravad” (13th), not as “pat [ino] nravad” (=11th).

The combination, su. 6 and “Rohini,” on Wednesday occurred only once (i.e., on this date) during the 40 years A. D. 1251-1290, although ordinarily such a combination may be expected at intervals of 3, 7 or 10 years.

1903 (125) From the north wall of the central shrine in the Agastyaśvara temple at Tiruchchupai (Madura District). Incomplete, Gift of land. A certain Vaiḍyaḥbirāja is mentioned.
Date.—14th year of Jaṭ, Sundara Paṇḍya “who took every country” [Mina]; su. 7; Sunday; “Punarvasu” = Wed. 25 March 1265.

[Note: Mina and Sunday, wrongly conjectured for Mēsha and Wednesday.]

Vira Paṇḍya (Kielhorn’s “E”).

(Reign began between 11 Nov. 1252 and 13 July 1253.)

1909 (395) From the south wall of the verandah round the central shrine in the Vyāghrā-pādēsvaram temple at Siddhalingaṃadām (S. Arcol). Gift of land by purchase to the temple of Tiruppulipagava-Nāyanār at Sirungūr, a brahmaidya in Kurukkai-kūṟṟam, a sub-division of Malādu in Rājarāja-valanādu.

Date.—15th year of Maravarman Vira-Paṇḍya; Dhanus; ba. 8; Saturday; “Hasta” = 10th Decr. A.D. 1267.

From this inscription it is clear that Kielhorn’s Vira-Paṇḍya was a Maravarman.

* Jaṭāvarman Vira Paṇḍya.

(Reign began between 15 May and 19 June 1254.)

1894 (142) From the outside of the north wall of the second prākāra in the Nellaiyappar temple at Tinnevelly. Gift of a lamp.

Date.—4th year of Jaṭ. Vira-Paṇḍya (no epithet); Vaikāsi [22]; Tuesday; “Hasta” = Tues. 14th May A.D. 1258 (= 29 Rishabhā or Vaikāsi). Hasta ended at ‘57 of the day.

[Note: The solar date, Vaikāsi 22, which I found entered conjecturally in the Madras Epigraphist’s records, should be 20th.]

1894 (129) From the outside of the south wall of the second prākāra in the Nellaiyappar temple at Tinnevelly. Gift of land.

Date.—[4th] year of Jaṭ. Vira-Paṇḍya Simha; ba. 9; Sunday; “Rohini” = Sunday, 5 Aug. 1257 when Simha ba. 9 and Rāhūṇi ended at ‘92 and ‘74 respectively.

1894 (186) From the outside of west wall of the second prākāra in the Nellaiyappar temple at Tinnevelly. Gift of a lamp.

Date.—Year opp. 5th of Jaṭ. Vira-Paṇḍya (no epithet); Kannī 14; ba. 5; Friday; “Uttara Bhādarapada”. On Friday 11 July 1259 (= 14 Kaṭaka, not 14 Kannī), ba. 5 and “Utt. Bhād.” ended at ‘36 and ‘66 respectively.

[Kannī, error for Kaṭaka]

1894 (151) From the inside of the west wall of the third prākāra in the Nellaiyappar temple at Tinnevelly. Gift of land.

Date.—7th year of Jaṭ. Vira-Paṇḍya; Kāttigāli 16; “Satabhishaj” = Friday, 12 Nov. 1260 (= 16 Kāttigāli) when Nak. “Satabhishaj” ended at ‘17 of the day.

1908 (134) From the west wall of the store-room in the Agastyesvara shrine in the Tiruttallēvara temple at Tirupputur (Madur District). Incomplete. Refers to the shrine of Sūryadar in the temple of Tiruttallēyāṇa-Nāyanār and to the Kannadīyan horsemen from a foreign country.

Date.—10th year of Jaṭ. Vira-Paṇḍya; (no epithet; but Kannadīyan horsemen are referred to); 10th year; Mithuna 7; day of “Maḥā”. On Sunday, 1 June 1264 (= 7 Mithuna). “Maḥā” ended at ‘44.

1906 (135) From the north, west and south walls of the central shrine in Vēdanārīyanap Perumāl temple at Murappunādu (Tinnevelly District). Mentions Srl-Pōsālai-Vira-Sominda-Chaturvedimangalam, a brahmaidya in Murappunādu and a maṭha in it. Refers to a sale made in the 11th year of the king’s reign.

Date.—14th year of Jaṭ. Vira-Paṇḍya “who took Īlam, Kongu, and Chōla, and performed the anointment of heroes at Perumbāṟṟumuliyūr.” Karkāṭaka; su. 1; Sunday; “Pushya”.

On Sunday 4 July 1266, Karkāṭaka su. 1; and “Pushya” ended at ‘44 and ‘79 respectively.
1907 (402) From stones built into the base of the śāvara temple at Perunagurunai (Madura Dt): these are fragments.

Date.—14th year of Tribh. Vṛtra Paṇḍya "who took 4lam, Kongu, and Sōjanāṇḍalam", Mithuna; Ekādaśi; Sunday; "Krittika." On Sunday 19 June 1267, Mithuna ba. 11 ended at 34 of the day, while "Krittika" began at 25 of the same day, ending at 29 next day.

1906 (125) From the Tiruttatiśvara temple at Tiruppurtur, (Madura District).

Date.—22nd year of Tribh-Jatavarman Vṛtra Paṇḍya 4th day (tedi) of Rishabha, su. 2, the day of "Rohini." On Monday 29th April 1275 which was 4th Rishabha, but fell in the 21st year of the present reign, su. 2 and "Rohini" ended, the former at 27 of the day and the latter about sunrise [22nd regnal year should be 21st]. Prof. Jacobi, in Paṇḍya date No. 91 contributed by him to Ep. Ind. Vol. XI, p. 137, was unable to refer this date in all its details to Jatavarman Vṛtra Paṇḍya whose reign began according to him in or about Decr. 1295, but the present reign is a more natural place for the date.

* Māravarman Srivallabhadēva.

(Reign began between 4 and 10 Sept. A. D. 1257.)

1900 (110) From the south wall of the central shrine of the Rishabheśvara temple at Chengam, in South Arcot District. (Inscription built in.)

Date.—4th year opposite the 17th of Tribh. Srivallabhadēva.

Mithuna su. 4; Saturday, "Magha" = Saturday 25 June A.D. 1278, when Mithuna su. 4 and "Magha" ended at 76 and 43 of the day respectively.

1904 (539) From the east wall of the first prākāra of the Tyāgarājasāvāmin temple at Tiruvārūr, Tanjore District; seems to record a gift of land (inscription built in at the end).

Date.—Māravarman Tribh. Srivallabhadēva’s 35th year; Simha; su. 5; Wednesday; "Krittika."

The day intended was probably Wednesday, 3 Sept. A.D. 1292 when Kanni ba. 5 (not Simha su. 5) and "Krittika" ended at 25 and 59 of the day respectively. [Simha and Sukla are errors for Kanni and bāhuṣa.]

Note—There is a Pudukkāta inscription for the same regnal year, Kanni; paurṇami; Monday; "Revati"); which corresponds to Monday, 10 Sept. 1291 when paurṇami ended at 02 of the day while "Revati" ended at 39 on the following day.

Māravarman Kulasekhara I.

(Reign began between 12th May and 27th June 1268.)

1902 (598) From the inner gopura of the Prēmapurīśvara temple at Āgil (Trichinopoly Dt.), left of entrance. Gift of land.

Date.—1 [1] th year of Mār. Kulasekhara; Kanni; su. 2; Wed.; "Anurāda": on Wed. 19 Oct. A. D. 1278, Tula (not Kanni) su. 2 and "Anurāda" ended at 65 and 77 respectively. [Kanni, error for Tula, as Kanni su. 2 cannot join with "Anurāda" except in very unusual circumstances.]

1910 (126) From the west wall of the first prākāra in the Mūlāsthānēsvāra temple at Tenkara (Madura District). Incomplete. Mentions the Tirujñānasambandha-tirumaṇḍam in the same temple.

Date.—14th year of Mār. Kulasekhara “who was pleased to take all countries.” Kanni, su. 7; Sunday; “Mula.” On Sunday 21 Sept. 1281, Kanni su. 7 and “Mula” ended at 92 and 58 of the day.

1910 (123) From the west wall of the first prākāra in the Mūlāsthānēsvāra temple at Teŋkarai (Madura District)—Damaged and incomplete. Mentions Teṇ-Kallaganāḍu.

Date.—23rd year of Mār. Tribh. Kulasekha ("who took every country"); Makara; su. [7]; Monday; “Hasta.” On Monday 25 June 1292 (25th year of Mār. Kul. I), Mithuna (not Makara, which is an obvious error), su. 8 (not 7) and "Hasta" ended at 80 and 09 respectively. [Through the kindness of the Government Epigraphist I had an opportunity of examining the impression on which Makara and Saptami are fairly clear. If the inscription really belongs to this reign, it must be pronounced full of mistakes.]
1910 (124) From the west wall of the first prāhāra in the Mūlasrāthśvara temple at Teņkarai, Madura District. Damaged. Quotes the 10th year of Sundara Pāṇḍyadēva and mentions the Ālāsasundarān-tirumādam in the same temple.

Date.—28th year of Mār. Kulasēkharā "who was pleased to take all countries." Vṛṣṭikha ba. 4; Sunday; "Pushya" = Sunday 27 Nov. 1235, when Vṛṣṭikha ba. 4 and "Pushya" ended respectively at '70 and '56 of the day.

1909 (734) From the south wall of the māṇḍapa in front of the central shrine in the Mukhlśvara temple at Pūrattukōyil (Trichinopoly District). Gift of a village to the temple of Tiruvandavarunudiyā-Nāyaṉār at Karuvaṅkaṉi by the inhabitants of Mudiyaṉkūṭānāṭu and Vājakōṇāṭu which were sub-divisions of Uṟṟa-Vāṭrā in Kōṇāṭu alias Kaḍaladaiyāṭu-Ilūggaiṉkoṇa-Chōḷavāţiṇāṭu.

Date.—28th year of Māravarman Kulasēkharā; Kannī (should be Dhanau); ba. 10; Friday; "Hasta". On Friday 2 Dec. 1295, Dhanau ba. 10 commenced, ending at '46 next day, while "Hasta" ended on Friday, 2 Decr. at '55.

1904 (506) From the north wall of the central shrine in the Agastyśēvara temple at Agatiṭyāṉalī (Tanjore District). Gift of land in order to celebrate a festival in the temple for the recovery of the king from some illness.

Date.—31st year of Mār. Kulasēkharā; Rishaba; śukla . . . Sunday, "Uttārān-Phalgun" = Sunday 10 May 1298, when "Uttārā-Phalgun" ended at '89 of the day. The tithi was su. '9.

1906 (48) From the base of the verandah enclosing the central shrine in the temple of Amritagatśēvara at Tirukkaiṭiyāy (Tanjore District). Gift of land for 40 lamps for the merit of Ulagaṉaiya-Perumāl. The country is said to have been in a state of confusion for a long time and the inhabitants to be suffering distress in other provinces.

Date.—34th year Mār. Kulasēkharā; Kannī; su. 7; Sunday; "Mūla". On Sunday 10 Sept. 1301, Kannī; su. 7 and "Mula" ended at '31 and '93 respectively.

1938 (288) From the north base of the central shrine in the Pārthasarathiśvarān temple at Triplicāne (Madras). Mutilated in the middle. Records a sale of land.

Date.—[4] 9th year [may be read, says Epigraphist, also as 41st year]; Māsā; su. 5; Wed. "Rōhiṭā". On Wednesday 27 March 1308, Māsā su. 5 ended at '60 of the day, while "Rōhiṭā" had ended at '97 on Tuesday. Local time may have added about '02 to mean time, so as to bring Nakhaṭra "Rōhiṭā" up to sunrise on 27 March. A. D. 1308 was the 41st year of this reign.

(To be continued.)

THE INDIAN INSCRIPTIONS AND THE ANTIQUITY OF INDIAN ARTIFICIAL POETRY.

BY G. BÜHLER.

[Translated by Prof. V. S. Ghat, M. A.; Poona.]

(Continued from p. 148.)

III. Harīśeṇa's panegyric of Samudragupta.

This second one of the inscriptions which we are going to examine, Harīśeṇa's panegyric of Samudragupta, presents many points of close touch with the Kāvyā literature preserved and proves in the clearest manner that court-poetry was a subject most assiduously cultivated in the fourth century of our era. Harīśeṇa's panegyric covered originally thirty lines and a half, and consisted of eight verses in the beginning, a long prose-passage and a concluding verse. All the three parts together form one single, gigantic sentence. Unfortunately, the four lines in the beginning containing two verses have been entirely lost and lines 4-16 have been distorted more or less, so that we have only one of the introductory verses, in a complete form. The subscription of the author in Il.31-33 informs us that not only the metrical lines but the whole of the composition is to be regarded as kāvyā. It is said there:

'And may this Kāvyā, of the slave of the feet of this same lord, whose intelligence was expanded by the favour of dwelling near (His Majesty), the minister of foreign affairs, and the
counsellor of the royal prince, the great General Harisheṇa, the son of Khāḍyaśāpaṇḍika and of the great General Dhruvabhūti, lead to the welfare and happiness of all beings. The accomplishment of the same was, however, looked after by the great General Tilakabhaṭṭa who meditates with reverence on the feet of his lord.

Thus, this little composition of Harisheṇa belongs to that class of mixed compositions which in poetics are frequently called by the name kālamāla, while the oldest works preserved for us, such as Vīśvamitra, Kālambī, Harśacharita and Daśakundrakirti are called by the name of dūkhyaṇā or kātha, 'a narration, a romance.' It possesses a certain relationship with the descriptions of kings, which are found in the dūkhyaṇās. Similar to these last, the description, in the present case, consists of one sentence with many adjectival as well as appositional phrases and a number of relative sentences. As will be shown later on, there are many agreements in respect of details. But, besides, Harisheṇa's composition presents its peculiarity or special character in several respects. This comes out in the grouping of the elements and especially in the skill in bringing out a connection of the praise of Samudragupta with the pillar on which the inscription has been worked out. The last part which forms the very foundation for the compilation of the whole work, and the concluding verse, deserve a detailed examination not only for this reason, but also for the fact, which will be seen if they are rightly understood, that the inscription was not composed, as Mr. Fleet assumes, after the death of Samudragupta. They are to be translated in the following manner, according to my interpretation:

Lines 30-31—'This high pillar is, as it were, the arm of the earth raised up, which announces that the fame of Samudragupta, the illustrious lord of great kings, greatly augmented through the conquest of the whole earth, filled the whole surface of the earth, and found a lovely, happy path in that it wandered from this world to the palace of the lord of gods.'

Verse 9—And the glory of this (ruler), which rises up in layers one above the other, through his generosity, his bravery of the arm, his self-control, and his perfection in the science of letters, and which follows more than one path, purifies the three worlds, like the white waters of the Gaṅga, which rises up in even higher floods, follows more than one path, and dashes forth rapidly as it is from the imprisonment in the inner hollow of the braided hair of Paśupati.'

For the explanation of this translation, the following should be noticed.

1. The word uchehrīta (l. 30) refers to the arm as well as the pillar, for it is only the raised arm pointing to heaven that can announce the fact that the king's glory has gone up there. The poet here has the Ślesha or paranomasia in view, and the word is, therefore, to be translated twofold. It is possible that the word uchehrīta as taken with the pillar may mean 'erected' (just here), instead of 'high'; but to decide which of the two meanings is intended, we must know further particulars regarding the working of the inscription.

---

20 The title kunādmatyāgo 'counsellor or minister of the royal prince' corresponds probably to the title at present in use in Gujarāt, i.e., Kunavarjaka vāhārīr 'the manager of the prince'. At all the great courts in Kāśṭhikā and Kāśpārāk, the adult princes as well as the Chief Queens have their own vāhārīrs who look after their private affairs. The minister of an Andhra queen is mentioned in the Kāpatī inscription No. 11 (Arch. Surv. Rep. W. Ind. Vol. X, p. 78).

21 I take this word to be a title, however, I am not able to explain. (The translation above is grammatically wrong.)

22 The expression anuṣṭhitam will signify that Tilakabhaṭṭa who, as his title and name show, was a Brahmā of a high military rank, superintended the preparation of the fair copy and the engraving of the text; Cf. the use of the word at the end of the Girmā inscription, below.

23 See, for instance, Kālambī, pp. 5-53, 53-55, 72-52, 72-57 (ed. Petronio); Harśacharita, p. 237-239, 237-271 (Kāsetrī ed.) and especially Vīśvamitra, p. 271-273 (ed. Hall), where in the midst of prose, four verses have been interwoven.

24 For the sake of comparison, I give Mr. Fleet's translation of this passage, which differs from mine. 'This lofty column is as it were an arm of the earth, proclaiming the fame—which having pervaded the entire surface of the earth, with its (its) development that was caused by (his) conquest of the whole world, (has departed) hence; (and now) experiences the sweet happiness attained by (his) having gone to the abode of (Indra) the lord of the gods—the Mahābhāskarīrā, the glorious Samudragupta.' The points requiring explanation are: (1) the addition of has departed and now, (2) the translation of visharaṇa by experience, (3) the insertion of his i.e. of the king, before having gone.
2. As regards the translation of the word viṣharaṇa by 'path,' it is to be observed that the synonyms charaṇa, gamana and yāna are given in this sense in the Petersburg lexicon, and that this sense is justified by the statements of the grammarians about the suffix ana. According to them the suffix ana serves to denote the means; and the path is, according to the Indian conception, one of the means of going.

3. The adjectival phrases uparyupari-svahchāchchāritra and anekamārga must be translated in two ways, like chāchchāritra, because they refer both to the glory and to the river Gāṅgā. As applied to the glory, the first compound means that Samudragupta’s generosity, bravery, self-control and knowledge of the letters form the layers by which the glory towers itself up to the height of a mountain, and that every quality that follows, is higher and more excellent. As applied to the Gāṅgā, the adjective alludes to the Indian belief that this river is first visible in the heavens as the milk-path, then dashing through the mid-region, it falls upon the Kailāsa and lastly it rushes downwards to the plains. Thus to the looker-on, standing on the plains and looking upwards, the water of the Gāṅgā would appear to be towering in ever-rising layers. Anekamārga lit. ‘which has more than one path,’ as applied to glory, means, not only that the glory travelled in the three worlds, but that it followed different paths in the sense that it sprang from different causes such as generosity and so on. As applied to the Gāṅgā, the word has only the first sense and it is well known that the Gāṅgā is called tripathagā.

According to the translation given above, the last part of the panegyric tells us that Samudragupta’s fame, which is personified as a female, as is frequently met with in Indian poets, occupied the whole earth, and thus found it impossible to spread forth any more on this earth. Thus embarrassed, the fame went up to the palace of the lord of gods and thus found a new path for itself, along which it moved happily. Verse 9 informs us of the result which was brought about by this ascent to heaven. Then, says the poet, the king’s glory attained to a similarity with the Ganges. For, like the same, it flows through the three worlds: heaven, mid-air, and earth. Every one of these thoughts and images occurs frequently in the court poets. Almost in every prakāśi and in a large number of chādus or verses containing flattery, it is told that the glory of the king under description rushes forward into heaven. The most usual expression used to convey this thought is the statement that the glory of such and such a person fills up the three worlds. There are many places, however, where the ascent of fame, as here, is spoken of, and the figurative motive for the same is also given in different ways. Thus it is said in a verse of the poet Amritadatta who was a contemporary of the Kāśmirian Sultan Shāhābuddin (1392-1370 A.D.), Subhadhāśitāvālī No. 2457 (Peterson’s edition) : "

कौज्ञिकेऽजाज्ञिति च चतुर्मुखिभिज्ञानाय।
आचार्याः भरताः गता सार्वभुग्नानार्थात्।

‘Thy fame, oh lord of the earth, which was, as it were, benumbed with cold, through its bathing in the four oceans, went up to the sphere of the sun, in order to warm itself.’

Another conception we find in Sambhu, the bard of the king Harsha of Kāśmīr (1089—1101 A.D.) in Rājendraśarabdupāra, verse 67, (Subhadhāśitāvālī No. 2237):

कान्तायां ह व वाचनमेव ह व वाचनमेव
परिवर्त्तनायां ह व महाभ्यासः।

‘Thy glory, oh lord of the earth, which shines white like the inner sprouts of the kathala, wandered about in forests and groves, on the banks of rivers, on the slopes of mountains, in cities and on the shores of the ocean; and then, as if exhausted (by this long journey), it sprouts up (as white flowers) on the lovely plots of plantain trees in the garden of gods.’

These modes of expression are quite complex and bombastic in comparison with Hariśeṇa’s simple and natural conception of the motive for the ascent of fame. No doubt, this is accounted for by the change in the Indian taste, which was brought about in the long period that separated these three poets.

---

Not less familiar is the comparison of a king's glory with the Ganges, which flows through the three worlds and purifies them. Thus it is said in a verse of Pañjīt Krishnaka, Subhadśikīvālī, No. 3556:

\[
\text{सा बलालित अगच्छे सुनौरी सा पाण्डुप्रामधीं}
\]
\[
\text{केशा पतंसप्रामधीमानेहैं गुणोंभरीं।}
\]
\[
\text{कृत्या ना नवयात्रिकतुल्याविश्वासं सत्यसा न वन्दे—}
\]
\[
\text{उपायकारणसं सत्यमयाविश्वासं श्रद्धा॥}
\]

This would quite suffice to show that the ideas contained in the concluding part of the panegyric, according to the translation above, are current in court poets. This itself vouches for the correctness of the proposed interpretation and proves the fact that this part of Hariśeṇa's composition has been written in the kāvya style.

To turn from this digression to the examination of the form of the panegyric, we must begin with remarking that Hariśeṇa, like Vatsabhāṣṭi, tries to introduce too often a change of metre in his verses. Thus, of the verses partially preserved, three (3, 5 and 8) are composed in Sṛṣaṅgārdh, two (4 and 7) in Śāradāvaṁśi, and one each in Māndākṛita (6) and Pṛthu (9). The bad casura comes only once in the third pāda of the last verse. The language of the verses is, on the whole, simple, and especially the compounds of extraordinary length which are found used by Vatsabhāṣṭi, are carefully avoided. With the prose part of the panegyric, however, things are quite otherwise. Here, simple words are only the exception, while very long compounds are the general rule, the longest compound word (I. 19-20) containing more than 120 syllables. There cannot be any doubt that this contrast is intentional. Because all the manuals of poetics are unanimous on the point that the essence of elevated prose to be used in romances and stories consists in the length of compounds; while the different schools are not so unanimous regarding the admissibility of long compounds in verses. Thus Daṇḍin says in Kāvyādarāśa I, 80-81:

\[
\text{अः कामालक्षणेश्चक्षुर्विविधत्वं नित्यम्}.
\]
\[
\text{पदेनवासुवासुवानाविनिवेशं परस्परभिः \[90\]}\]
\[
\text{सत्यमपथमायंतु वासुवानाविनिवेशं नित्यम् \[91\].}
\]

81. 'The grāndeur (strength) (of language consists) in the frequency of compounds; it is the very life of (poetic) prose. Even in verses, it is regarded as the main feature by those who do not belong to the southern school.'

82. 'It is of many kinds, according to the mixture of a larger or smaller number of long or short syllables; and is found in romances and other similar works.'

Daṇḍin's statement leaves no doubt about the fact that Hariśeṇa follows the style of the southerners, the so-called Vaidarbhī tīti, which must have enjoyed in the fourth century the same high esteem as in later times, when a large number of writers belonging to the different parts of India advocate it as the most beautiful. Hariśeṇa, however, could hardly have come from the south of India. His station at the court of Samudragupta shows that he lived in the north-east, in Pātaliputra, and probably belonged to a family settled in the same place from of old.

Apart from the use of long compounds in the prose parts, there is nothing very artificial in Hariśeṇa's language. Of the Saṁlaṅkāras, he uses only the simplest kind of alliteration, the Varṣṇāṇasūtra, and even this occurs principally in the prose-parte of the work. Of the Arthādhyakṣas, he uses Rākṣas very often, and Upāną and Nīlaka more rarely. Two instances where the last Alankāra, i. e., Nīlaka occurs have been discussed above. A third instance of the same is met with in I. 25, in the epithets of Samudragupta: Sālakāpura, which is to be translated thus: — of an incomprehensible prince who is the cause of the elevation of the good and of the destruction of the bad (and thus who

38 Cf. also Strāgadharapaddhatī No. 1393.
37 That Pātaliputra, and not Kausā, as is usually supposed, was the capital of the Guptas, follows from the verses from Mr. Fleet's No. VI. translated above on p. 145 wherein the minister of Chandragupta calls himself an inhabitant, of Pātaliputra.
38 For instance, I. 17: parimāśrīṣṭikāryākṣitomāra; I. 20: "pācāraṇagamokṣhāvarāha; I. 25: vīgṛhaśato lokānaṃgraṇaya, and so on.
The poetic figure used here is a शक्ताविल रासुल, i.e., a metaphor which is brought about by the double meaning of the words used. This instance reminds us very much of the play on words found in Subandhu and Bāṇa. This is, however, the only instance of the kind, in the whole of the prakriti, a circumstance which shows, that Harishena, like Kālidāsa and other adherents of the Viṣṇudharmotta, indeed, regarded the Śakta as a poetic embellishment, but himself shunned the insipidly frequent use of the same. Harishena, however, does not direct his attention so much to the use of Alankāras, as to the fine execution of the pictures of the several situations under description, and to the choice as well as the arrangement of words. Of the former, verse 4, the only verse that can be restored completely, is a typical example in point, which depicts the manner in which Samudragupta was ordained by his father to be his successor:

4. 'Here is a noble man!' With these words, the father embraced him, with slivers of joy that spoke of his affection, and looked at him, with eyes heavy with tears and overcome with love—the courtiers breathing freely with joy and the kinsmen of equal grade looking up with sad faces—and said to him: 'Protect then this whole earth.'

It is not possible to have a more concise and a more graphic picture of the situation. There is not a word which is unnecessary; and one believes as if he sees the scene with his own eyes, how the old Chandragupta, in the presence of his sons, each of whom hoped to have the highest fortune, and of his court household who were afraid lest the choice may fall on an unworthy person, turns round to his favourite son. This verse is one of the best productions the Indians have given us, in the domain of miniature-portraits, which is their forte. This very example would also illustrate Harisena's special care for the choice and arrangement of words, a qualification which can be easily seen even in other parts of the composition, both metrical and prose. In the prose part, there are inserted between the long compounds, at definite intervals, shorter phrases, in order to enable the reciter to draw his breath and the hearer to catch the sense. In the long compounds, the words are so chosen as to bring about a certain rhythm through the succession of short and long syllables; and care is taken to see that this rhythm changes from time to time. This can be best seen by a representation of the design of the compounds occurring in lines 17-22, by marking the accents as is customary in recitation. The lines in question contain only seven long compounds, the arrangement of whose syllables is as follows:

1. बालुः ञुलुः वलुः वलुः लुः
2. बालुः ञुलुः वलुः वलुः
3. बालुः बालुः बालुः बालुः
4. बालुः ञुलुः वलुः वलुः लुः
5. बालुः बालुः बालुः बालुः बालुः
6. बालुः ञुलुः वलुः वलुः लुः
7. बालुः ञुलुः वलुः वलुः
It is obvious that the short compounds marked 3 and 7 are to serve as resting points, and that the rhythm in 1, 2 and 4, is to remind us of the beginnings of the Danṣśakas.

In Harīśeṇḍra's poetical imagery, we come across many conceptions that are very familiarly met with in the kṛṣṇa literature. Some of these have been already dwelt upon, while discussing the concluding part of his composition. We now notice a few others. The fragment of verse 3 says:

'The order of the possessor of the true meaning of the Edistras whose heart is highly happy at the association with the good, multiplied as its power is, by the virtues of the wise—puts an end to the war between good poetry and prosperity and thus enjoys in the world of the learned, a far-extending sovereignty whose shining glory endures in many poems.'

Here we have the exceedingly favourite allegory of the fight or discord between the Muse and the Goddess of wealth, which condemns the poet and the learned man to poverty and makes the rich incapable of service to Wisdom and Art. By way of comparison, I quote here from the classical literature only the Bharatavākya at the end of the Vikramorviśā, where Kālidāsa prays that this antagonism should cease:

परसपरविरोधस्थितिनिरश्चलनम्
संघट्य भीतरस्तयोऽयस्ति चक्षु सुंदरम्

'May the union of the mutually hostile goddesses Śrī and Sarasvati, which is to be found only rarely in one place, bring good luck to the good.'

Further, the author mentions in verse 8, which will be given yet more fully later on, amongst the high excellences of the king, गङ्गिरजस्युण्ड: कौमिन्द: समावनां: 'the fame sprouting forth, shining purely like the moon and thus bears evidence to his being aware of the well-known idea of the kīrtiratna or the creeper of fame, which covers over the three worlds with its tendrils. With this may be compared in the field of classical literature, Śringarāhara-paddhati, No. 1235.

A third most favourite poetic representation of fame is met with in the second compound in l. 23, referring to Samudragupta:—'Whose fame arising from the re-establishment of many fallen kingdoms and of many extinguished royal races, is tired by its journey through the three worlds.' Hemachandra also in the prakṣṭa to his grammar, verse 29, similarly speaks of the want of rest for his master's fame:

'With the bow bent into a circular form by your arm stretched round, you won, oh king Siddha, your fame that shines whitely like the blooming flower of the jasmine; being rendered helpless through the exhaustion of wandering through the three worlds, that your fame has at last rested itself on the palid, round breasts and the white cheeks of the Malava women.'

In l. 23, again, we have quite an original conception which is meant to illustrate how far Samudragupta's glory obscured that of all his rivals. The poet there praises Samudragupta as a ruler 'who, in consequence of the overflow of his many virtues elevated through hundreds of good works, wiped off with his feet the fame of other kings.'

The idea seems to be that the leaves, on which the fame of other kings is written, lie before Samudragupta. The flow of his virtues streams over them, and he is only required to stir his foot, to obliterate the praises of the rulers of antiquity. I cannot point out anything in literature, which exactly corresponds to this. Nevertheless, it cannot escape the attention of any one, that the conception quite fits in with the character of the style of court-poets.

In the next line (26), we meet with a comparison which occurs frequently in the epics and which is used in later times by almost every classical poet and in every prakṣṭa—where Samudragupta is celebrated as a king who resembles Dhananā, Varuṇa, Indra and Antaka, i.e., the guardian-gods of the four directions. Equally favourite is the immediately following Upanā: 'who puts to shame the preceptor of gods by his sharp and subtle understanding, and Tumburu, Nārada and others, by his lovely performances of music.' About the comparison of the king with...
Brihaspati, we have spoken above on page 144. As for the statement that Samudragupta was a better musician than the well-known Gandharva and the sage of gods who invented the rūḍhī, an explanation is furnished by the coins, as Mr. Fleet has pertinently remarked, on which Samudragupta is represented as a lute-player. For the last climax of hyperbolical representation, we also meet with analogies in the kṛdeva. When Harishena says in l. 27-28, that his master is 'a god dwelling in this world, whose many marvellous and noble deeds deserve to be praised for a very long time and who is a man only in that he performs the acts necessary according to the conventions of the world,' we are reminded, in the first place, of Bāna's description of his patron, Harsha (Sṛṣṭi-Harsha-charita, p. 207-208), where his deeds have been put on a level with those of Indra, Prajāpati, Vishnu and Siva, and he himself has been identified with these gods. A still more important parallel is provided by the statements of the Prakrit poet, Vākpati, about Yaśovarman of Kanauj (Guḍulalaha, verses 167-168), according to which, the king is an incarnation of Bālaka-Hari or Vishnu. As is to be expected of a poet of the eighth century, Vākpati expresses the idea with a greater elaboration of details.33

Many more points of relationship with the kṛdeva literature can be discovered in the individual expressions of our prakṛtī. It would suffice if I only point to upaṇṇa (for dhānta),44 bhāda-pāhana, mādn-dāhana, sneha-vyavattita, bāhpa-guru (all in verse 4), adbhut-odbhāna-harsha (verse 5), uddhāpika, tosh-ottunga, sneha-phulla, and the frequent use of sphuta. The parallel passages given in both the Petersburg lexicons spare me the trouble of giving here many new quotations. Whoever is familiar with the diction of the kṛdeva, will not require any special proof, but will at once recognize the affinity of these and other modes of expression to those used by classical poets.

Now, we have to notice a number of cases, especially in the prose part, where Harishena obviously tried to surpass his rivals in the composition of prakṛtīs. To this category belong most of the long compounds in lines 17-24, in which the closing part especially comes now and then as a surprise and deviates very much from the usual track. Thus, in line 21, for instance, instead of saying that Samudragupta had acquired great power through the forcible extinction of many kings of Aryavarta, Harishena represents his master as a prince 'who was great through his power which expanded itself through the forcible extinction of many kings of the land of the Aryas.' Perhaps, the simple and natural expression 'samudra-gupta' would appear too trivial to the poet, and, for that reason, he went in for the more artificial one: 'samudra-gupta' ka-para-nabha. So also the last parts of the following compound phrases are unusual and deliberately sought:—

1 (l. 22-23)—'whose fierce sovereignty (the neighbouring kings) propitiated, by means of the payment of all the taxes (levied), the carrying out of his orders, salutations and visits,' 2 (l. 25)—'the mighty bravery of his arm which held the whole earth in bondage, received homage from the inhabitants of all countries, in various ways, such as causing themselves to be presented to him, offering daughters and other presents, and presenting him for a decrees with the Gavrā seal for the possession of their country,' 3 (l. 26)—'whose heart had willingly received the formula and the consecration for the deliverance of the poor, the miserable, the helpless and the sick'.

Whoever will take the trouble of reading through other published prakṛtīs, will easily see the originality of these modes of expression and judge of them according to their worth. The fact, however, that Harishena makes use of deliberately sought modes of expression is to be explained by the existence of many other similar panegyrics whose simple and unadorned diction he tried to surpass.

The most clear proof, however, for the fact that Harishena's composition does not at all belong to the beginning of the kṛdeva period, is provided by those passages in which he speaks of the king's peculiar poetic activity. In this connection, we should refer above all to what we have of the eighth verse, wherein the poet declares:—

't He alone is worthy of the thoughts of the learned! Because what excellence is there, which would not be his? He has made firm the barrier of law, his is the splendid fame that shines purely like the rays of the moon, his the wisdom which pierces down to the truth, his the self-control . . . . . . , his the poetic style which is worthy of study, and his are the poetic works which multiply the spiritual treasures of poets.'

In the second part of his composition, Harishena again refers to the last point when he says in l. 27 that Samudragupta's 'title as the prince of Poets was well established by the composition of many poems worthy of the imitation of the learned.' If one adds to this, verse 3 spoken of above on page 176 and the expressions used by Harishena about his person, it naturally follows that, during the reign of Samudragupta, the kṛdeva literature was in full bloom, and that the conditions at his court were absolutely similar to those which are reported to have prevailed in later times at the courts of Kanauj, Kāśmir, Ujjain, Dhāra and Kalyāṇi, and which are found to exist even to this day, here and there in India. The cultivators of Sanskrit poetry, who were called by the names of kori or budha or śṛdha, were not born or self-taught poets, but were professional learned.33 The definition of the king is already found in old times; e.g., in Mānasa-dharmasthārī VII, 4-9.

34 See above p. 143.
men or Paññipits who studied the śāstra, i.e., at the least, Vyākaraṇa, Kosha, Alankāra and Chhandaś, and who wrote according to the hard and fast rules of poetics, as is shown by the form of Harisheṇa’s little composition. The Sanskrit kātya, which owed its origin to the court-patronage, and which can exist only by means of the same, was assiduously cultivated at the courts. The king supported and raised to honour, such poets, and even he himself, and with him his high officers, too, emulated with their protégés. Perhaps he had even a kaviṛṣi, or a poet-laureate, appointed. At any rate, the title, as such, was in use in the days of Samudragupta, the title which in later times occurs very often in Sanskrit literature, and which, even at present, is given away by Indian princes, associated as it is with many benefits. His court could not thus have been the only one which patronized the exertions of the Paññipits in the domain of poetry.

(To be continued.)

MISCELLANEAS.

A New List of Buddhistic Sanskrit Words, by
Prof. Sylvain Levi and G.K. Nariman.

The St. Petersburg Dictionary, a monument of Germanic erudition, published at the expense of Russia, contains an almost exhaustive inventory of Vedic and Brahmanic Sanskrit. Buddhism hardly appears in it at all. The authors of the Dictionary and their collaborators make use of a few meagre texts only. But in the last forty years the material for Sanskrit Buddhism has vastly increased. The published texts have revealed a perfect treasure of words which classic Sanskrit had ignored or neglected. A Buddhistic Sanskrit Dictionary is one of the

A list compiled by G.K. Nariman of new words unknown in classical Sanskrit and not yet met with in Buddhist Sanskrit except in the Mahāyāna Sūtraśāstras of Asanga, edited and translated by Prof. Sylvain Levi.

Abhiprāyika … … … … … … … 138
Adhimucanyā … … … … … … … 71
A dikālika … … … … … … … 159
Adhyavhitāsaka … … … … … … 31
A kilaśkatva … … … … … … … 78
A kilaśita … … … … … … … 86
Anukshudra … … … … … … … 55
Antarāyin … … … … … … … 3
Anusāsiṇi … … … … … … … 29
Āpāyika … … … … … … … 150
A pratiprasaṛbdha … … … 37
Arihat … … … … … … … 127
A tilājanā … … … … … … … 18
A upalabhyatva … … … … 49
A yoniśataś … … … … … … 192
Balika … … … … … … … 143
Bhājanbhāva … … … … … … 116
Citraṇā … … … … … … … 40
Danaśpraṇjya … … … … … 101
Evahā … … … … … … … 50
Hāyin … … … … … … … 94

Jugupśa … … … … … … … 178
Kaukṛtyāte … … … … … … … 72
Naiyamya … … … … … … … 166
Nirbhisaṁskāra … … … … 161
Nirjaśa … … … … … … … 138
Nirnīghya … … … … … … … 130
Parīkṣāṇika … … … … … 111
Parījñātāvin … … … … … 159
Parinirvāpana … … … … 35
Paripartha … … … … … … 51
Pārthagaṇa … … … … … … 85
Parvēṣaṇa … … … … … … 163
Prāhāṇika … … … … … … 28
Pratidevanā … … … … … … 71
Pratyavagama … … … … … 5
Pratyupasthāyin … … … 150
Pravedaṇā … … … … … … 61
Priyāṇa … … … … … … … 71
Prodhuṣa … … … … … … … 62
Samadāpanā … … … … … 116
Samathin … … … … … … 62
Samāśati … … … … … … 90
Samavabhāta … … … … … 55
Sāmbhagika … … … … … … 45
Sāmbhogyā … … … … … … 45
Sāmbhoṣaṇa … … … … … … 21

† The spellings of the words in this list are given as they are published in Prof. Sylvain Levi’s book.
A NOTE ON SIYA-BHAGAVAYA.

The mention of Śiva-Bhagavata in Patañjala-Mahābhāṣya is no doubt a proof that the Śāiva sect existed in the days of Patañjala. But that the Viṣṇu-cult is anterior to the Śāiva cult, whenever the latter came to be formed, is also proved by this compound word. Bhagavata is a worshipper of Bhagavān, the latter being a name peculiar to Viṣṇu. See Viṣṇu-Purāṇa and my notes on Bhagavān in the Journal, R. A. Society, London. The Bhagavatas, or those who belonged to the Viṣṇu cult, are contemporaneous with the Veda. When the Śāiva cult was inaugurated, it was felt to be necessary to appropriate this term of high and holy sanction. In adopting it, therefore, it was also necessary to add a distinguishing mark showing the differentiation of the new cult from the old one. That mark was, of course, Śiva. This was added; and the compound word Śiva-Bhagavata was thus launched into the world of the Sanskrit Grammarians.

A. Gopindacharyya Svamin.

MYTHS, VEDA-GEHAN.

NOTES AND QUERIES.

PROFESSOR TAKAKUSU (I-tei, p. xxxvii, n. 8) states that Alopen, the Nestorian missionary to China, visited Silāditya, in India, in the year 659 A.D. This statement is based on a remark of Edkins, quoted in the Athenæum of July 3, 1886, p. 8. Back numbers of the Athenæum are not readily available, and more than one writer has accepted Takakus’s account, without testing it as an important contribution to the history of Christianity in India. I myself did this in the article Bhakti-mārga, in Hastings’s Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics, Vol. ii., p. 548.

Since then, the statement has been called in question, and I have been able to trace it to its source. I now hasten to correct any wrong impression which may have been caused by my trust in Takakus. He is quite wrong, and has entirely misunderstood Edkins. In the passage referred to, Edkins is not dealing with Silāditya, but with the Emperor of China.

CAMBERLEY. GEORGE A. GRIESON.

BOOK-NOTES.

Anecdotes of Aurangzib (Translated into English with Notes) and Historical Essays by JADUNATH SARKAR, M.A., Professor, Patna College. M. C. Sarkar and Sons, Calcutta, 1912. Rs. 1-6, pp. 312.

This little volume consists of three parts. (1) A short account of the life and reign of Aurangzib. (2) A collection of anecdotes regarding that great emperor. (3) Miscellaneous essays dealing with the reigns of Shah Jahan and Aurangzib.

Of these, the second part is of real value to English students desirous of closer acquaintance with the individuality of the last of the great Mughal rulers. Here we have Aurangzib as courageous youth, jealous brother, ardent lover, stern parent, administrator of justice, upholder of royal prerogative and disappointed dreamer. The anecdotes have lost little of their vigour by translation and the editor has elucidated the text by valuable notes.

The third part is necessarily more fragmentary, but all the essays are brightly written and several contain information hitherto available to the English student, notably those entitled “The Companion of an Empress” and “Daily Life of Shah Jahan.” The last essay, describing the self-sacrifice of Khán Bahādur Khuda Baksh in collecting the nucleus of a “Bod’ean” Library at Patna will be read with deep interest by those hitherto ignorant of what this public benefactor accomplished for his own country. It is a pity that the learned author occasionally uses slang expressions, evidently under the impression that they are idiomatic English.

L. M. A.
THE OBSOLETE TIN CURRENCY AND MONEY OF THE
FEDERATED MALAY STATES.

BY SIR E. C. TEMPLE, BART.

(Continued from p. 159.)

APPENDIX III.

Extracts from

Milliez, Recherches sur les Monnaies des Indigènes de Malaisie. La Haye, 1871.

(Translated).

I. pp. 130 ff. Beaulieu says, I think, the first to mention the coins of Kedah: "They cast the money somewhat of the material of French sous, of a little better alloy however, which they call tra, 32 being worth a dollar. They (the people) count by tais (tahil), but a tael there is worth four of the Achin (tul).

The name tra or teras for a coin is not otherwise known to me, but I think it must be explained by tra, stamp, mark, which Marsden quotes in the term tra timah, lead (or tin) marked (to give it currency).

Mr. [J. R.] Logan, Journal of the Indian Archipelago, Singapore, 1851, p. 58, says, in 1859, that the native coin is the tao, a small round piece of tin, with a hole in the centre, of which 160 make a tali and 8 tali are worth a dollar.

Tavernier is the very first to publish some coins "of the King of Cheela (as he writes the ordinary name Quejoh) and Perak." In the second part of his work (Les six Voyages de Jean Baptiste Tavernier, Paris, 1679, Pt. II.) p. 601, he says that "the King struck no other coin than of tin," and he gives on the accompanying plate under Nos. 1 and 2 the "figure of a great piece of tin..." It is the only specimen of the celebrated traveller's collection which I have unearthed in the Musée Numismatique of the Bibliothèque Impériale at Paris. I give a drawing of it as I saw it, but it has suffered much during these two centuries. The piece is octagonal with two lines in relief parallel to the edge. Between these lines there are some dots. There is no hole in the middle, but a small square, which Phayre thought to be a rough image of the chaitya on the ancient Buddhist coins, with a central chamber for relics (?). Crawford, who copied without remark Tavernier's coin, thought that this square represented a hole, and had the coin engraved with a hole on the obverse, but without a hole on the reverse. Round the square are some characters which I have not been able to decipher. The reverse, which has some lines in high relief, parallel to the edge, with larger dots between the lines, bears in the drawing of Tavernier the figure of a serpent in the field.

There is in the same Museum a piece of tin of a similar type to the above specimen, with nearly similar characters, but it is round in form, and has on the reverse a figure which resembles a lotus flower.

Despite the authority of Tavernier, who, however, did not visit the Malay Peninsula himself, I doubt whether his coin belongs to Kedah or Perak. Not only is it unlike any of the known

38 Relation des Voyages curieux, etc. Paris, 1666, Part II., p. 83. Beaulieu is probably here contrasting the difference between the silver standard of Kedah and the gold standard of Achin.

39 This is from a footnote.

37 Vide page 6 of the English Translation of 1678. See ante, p. 30.

36 Plate XXII, fig. 230.

35 Hist. of Ind. Archipel. i. p. 288, plate 6. M. de Chaillon, Recueil de monnaies de la Chine, St. Petersbourg, 1842, has also repeated the obverse (Pl. LIX, No. 26), but by a mistake of his in the catalogue and on p. 70 we find "after Raffles" instead of "after Crawford."

34 Phayre gives a drawing of a similar piece of money, without explaining the legend (Pl. XVI, No. 6).
Malay coins, but also the characters on it do not appear to be Arabic, as would be expected at that time. On the contrary, the type resembles the coins which were in use in the neighbouring countries to the North, either on the coast of Tenasserim or Burma. Pieces of a similar kind, probably called kebean, which I know, and of which I have seen a good specimen in the Musé Numismatique de La Haye, usually bear on the obverse a circle with an eight-pointed star, and round it a legend in Pali in Burmese characters, and on the reverse a fantastic figure of a quadruped, probably of a sinhala or lion, or according to Phayre of a fabulous animal, called to or nayā in Burmese mythology, made up of a winged horse and a deer. Paulin de Saint Barthélemy (Fr., Paulinus), missionary to the Indies, was the first to attempt to explain one of these coins, and quite lately Lt. Col. A. P. Phayre has given drawings of a number of those which are to be found in the Museum of the Asiatic Society of Calcutta [A. S. Bengal], but [both] without adding much light which would extend the knowledge of these numismatic remains.

The other coin (his Plate, Nos. 3 and 4) which Tavernier attributes to the King of Kedah and Perak is of quite a different character: "The little coin, (says he) passes at the value of 4 deniers." It is unfortunate that Tavernier's drawing is so badly executed, that it is difficult to decipher the legend. Still, I think I can distinguish the ordinary formula of the [Muhammadan] creed—la illah ill illahu muhammad c r-rasulul ilahu : zarb f ... sanat ? 1041 ? ... There is no God, but God: Muhammad is the Prophet of God: struck at ... year? 1041? (1631-2). Unfortunately the name of the town has been injured, but it must be confessed that what remains visible does not appear to agree with the name of any known locality in the State. The date is also very doubtful. The type of this side (of the coin) resembles the obverse of the Persian coins of the Sufis; but the Shi'ah formula [of the creed] Ali careuul ilah [Ali is the Prophet of God] is not visible in the drawing. The reverse, which seems smaller, does not bear anything but some ornaments. In the centre is an eight-pointed star, or rather a wheel, encircled by a garland of flowers and fruit, with a milled edge. Gemelli Careri, Giro del Mondo, Vol. II., p. 148, without quoting the source, has reproduced this coin the wrong way round.

2. p. 133. After Tavernier we find hardly any mention of Kedah coins. However, I have discovered one (which is published by Maraden), but having been wrongly read has remained unrecognised. This piece is (what seems to me very remarkable) of silver ... The obverse bears: babulad Kedah daru l-aman. sanat 1154, in the country (or kingdom) of Kedah, the abode of peace, year 1154 (1741-2).

3. p. 157. In the Royal Numismatic Cabinet at the Hague I discovered a copper coin of Kedah, so far, unique. Its weight is 1/4 gra. The obverse bears ... Kedah; the reverse, daru l-aman: Kedah the abode of rest. The first word is too indistinct for me to dare to define it. ... This piece bears no date.

---

43 Millies was, however, not aware of the fact that the Burmese legend gives the mint in Pali as Mahāsukha nāgara, which exactly translates Daru l-aman or Kedah, on the Kedah coins; see ante, p. 65.
44 Of. J. R. A. S., 1886, III. 302. (This is, however, a mistake. The weight and value do not admit of the suggestion. These coins must have been about 6½ cents in value (ante, p. 31), whereas the kebean = kepying were worth about 1 cent. See the quotation from Wilson, Documents of the Burmese War, 1827, ante, p. 36 and Pl. V fig. 3.)
45 This is really a compound expression, to-nayā, a winged to.
47 Millies is writing before 1886, when he died.
48 I entirely agree with Millies' reading and would like to go further and read sarb f Kedah, struck at Kedah.
49 dar is for dar.
50 Plate XXII: fig. 234.
51 May it not read Munja Kedah: Kedah, money.
I am indebted to the kindness of Mr. Logan of Singapore for several pieces, unfortunately badly preserved, which belong to the class of *tra*, or modern tin coins of Kedah. I will describe those of them which are the most distinct.

A round tin coin with an irregular hole: diameter, 23 mill.; weight, 1.85 grs. The obverse bears *dar* (sic) - *u* l-aman (sic) balad Kedah; the country of Kedah, abode of peace. The reverse: *tahan alif*, 1224 (1809-10). The first and fourth words of the obverse and the second of the reverse are written contrary to orthography. Also if the word *dar* were not very distinct, one might read *zarb fi* [struck at]. Moreover the second and the fourth figures of the date are not very distinct on the coin, but nevertheless I think I can read the year 1224 by the accompanying definition *tahan alif*, the year Λ.

4. P. 138. One more piece of this State, diameter 24 mill. and weight 150 grs., though of modern date, offers several difficulties in reading and explaining. I think I can read on the obverse: *belanja balad* (?) al-paris qada: *sanat* 1862, money of exchange of the country of Perlis, Kedah; year 1862 (1846). On the reverse is seen a lotus flower of five petals. The Malay word *belanja* (*belanja*), revenue, expense, is moreover in use in the Malay Peninsula to indicate money of exchange. But the third word with the [Arabic] article seems to me so peculiar, as to leave me in doubt. I have found no explanation of it. I have never seen the name Perlis written in Malay characters, but as it is the name of one of the principal towns, which has often been the capital of the State, this name seems to me most probable.

5. P. 145. We have not been able to discover any coins which could with certainty be attributed to the other small States in the Southern part of the Malay Peninsula, but we must speak here of a class of tin coins, which though very simple in form, offer several difficulties in determining them. These pieces do not usually bear anything except some titles, either on one face or divided between the two sides; sometimes with, often without, a date.

A large round piece of this kind is to be found at the Musée Royal de La Haye. On one side is the whole legend—*mahtiku* l-adil khalifu l-muminin sanat with two figures of a date—13: King [by grace] of the Just [God], the chief of the believers, year—13. From the appearance of the piece I should think that it is not of ancient date and that the year 1213 H. (1798-9) must be meant. Some others, of a little smaller size, in the same collection, appear to be of the same manufacture, but have simply the title without date:—khalifu l-muminin, chief of the believers, in the Musée de Gotha there is to be found a fine example, and two less well preserved specimens in the British Museum, of an octagonal form, without a hole, [but] with the same legend and no date: obverse *mahtiku* l-adil; on the reverse *khalifu* l-muminin.46

6. P. 147. A learned Malay, who has published several works in his own language, Abdelllah, son of Abd’l-kadir, made, in 1838, a voyage from Singapore to Kalantan on the East Coast of the Peninsula. A judicious observer, he noted the most remarkable things he saw, and to the English he published an account of his voyage in Malay at Singapore in 1838.45 Speaking of the State of Trengganu, or Trangganu, on the East Coast, which formerly acquired a certain fame and played, even in the past century, a fairly great part in the political relations of the Peninsula, but which is now fallen into profound degradation, he mentions, among

---

51 Plate XXII. 6g. 235. 52 Plate XXII. No. 230-7.
53 Plate XXIII. No. 249.
54 [Plate XXIII. Nos. 251-2.] Perhaps the reading should be rather *Malik-ul-adil*, the just king, or *Miihi-l-adil*, legal tender.
55 Bahasa ini kerabat pu-layar-an Abdullah, ben Abd-ul-kadir munai. Deri Singapura ka-Kalantan. Turkarang uli-bnya. Singapour, 1254—1838. (Published also in Malay characters.) M. Ed. Dulacquier has rendered a great service by making the work better known through his French translation of the Malay text, published under the title:—*Voyage d’Abd-Allah ben Abd-ul-Kadir de Singapour à Kalantan*: Paris, 1859.
other things, the coins of the country. He says, p. 48, that the money of exchange at Trenggannu (warg blanja negri Trenggannu) is 3600 pitis\(^{36}\) of tin (pitis timah) to one dollar (ringgit). They bear an impression of the words maliku' l-adil and are of the size of our duit (duit ket). It seems to me from this remark to be very probable that all the coins of this class [above] mentioned belong to the Malay State of Trenggannu.

7. P. 149. Passing on to Pahang during his voyage along the same coast, the learned Malay Abdullah complains greatly of the difficulties relating to the monetary system: 16 tumpang (blocks of tin) are worth one dollar, but cannot be broken up into three suk\(\), a half suk\(\) and one suk\(\).\(^{37}\) If we wish to buy an object of very small value, we must give a whole tumpang. (Cf. text p. 23, French trans. p. 28.) Thus this State, once so flourishing, has returned to an almost primitive savagery, where great blocks of tin, the produce of the country, serve as an imperfect medium of exchange.

8. P. 150. I have been unable to discover any ancient monetary remains of this State (Patani), but I have received one coin of a fairly recent date. It is a piece of tin, round in form, with a round hole, larger and heavier than the ordinary pitis. The obverse bears the Malay legend: in [ini] pitis blanja raj [raja] Patani, this is a pitis current of the rajah of Patani.\(^{39}\) On the reverse there is: khalisu l-numinis, sanat 1261, the head of the believers; the year 1261 (1845).

9. P. 151. To the north of Patani is Sanggora... It was in the fine numismatic collection of Dr. W. Freudenthal in London, that I discovered a coin of tin of this small State. It is round with a round hole, and, as is perfectly explicable from the above-mentioned notice of Dr. Medhurst, it is trilingual.\(^{39}\) That which appears to be the principal side is occupied by a Chinese legend in four characters, which, according to my friend, Professor Hoffmann, should be read: Tsai-tch'ing thung pao, coin of Tsai-tch'ing. As however, we have very little means of determining the names which the Chinese give to foreign towns, we should be very uncertain where to find the locality of this Tsai-tch'ing without the help of the reverse. On the reverse is found the same name twice: in Malay in two words, above and below, Negri Sanggora, and to the right and left in Siamese characters Song-khla, which is [a corruption of] the name in use in that language.

10. P. 152. We ought also to speak of two coins, which, by their texture, seem to belong to the Malay Peninsula, but as to the exact locality of which, we have been unable to arrive at any determination. The first\(^{40}\) is a piece of tin, 28 to 30 mill. in diameter, and weighing 4.96 to 6.80 grammes, with a square hole in the centre. The obverse bears the titlule—khalisu l-numinis, the head of the believers. On the reverse there is nothing but the date—sanat 1256, year 1256 (1840-1)—which is clear. The rest shows certainly some Arabic signs, not Siamese as one would imagine after the preceding piece, but I cannot make out the meaning. On five examples, which I have been able to study, all bearing the same date, there is some difference in the signs, but they nevertheless seem to express the same words. On one specimen might almost be read shahr, which would recall to memory the name of the ancient capital of Siam, mentioned in the Sajra Malag (shahr al nawi or rather, shahr nawi, the new city); but besides the fact that this nomenclature,

\(^{36}\) I do not know why M. Dutilleur (p. 44) has translated [this]:—"It takes 2860 of them to make a dollar." The corresponding Malay text is clear: tek ribu dalatang raja ampah pelah [3240]. [Read: teko ribu dalatang raja ampah pelah.]

\(^{37}\) Suk\(\), a quarter, is also used for a quarter of a dollar, but here it must, I think, be considered the fourth of a tumpang. [This argues a great local appreciation of the dollar, as the standard tumpang is worth 1/10 dollar.]

\(^{39}\) Plate XXIII. No. 254.

\(^{40}\) Dr. Medhurst—who visited Singgora in 1828 found it divided into three parts, Chinese, Siamese and Malay. See Plate XXIV. No. 255.
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taken from the Persian, belongs to a time somewhat distant, the last part (of the name) is not found on these coins. The letters ba might be taken for an indication of a year of the short cycle, as on a coin from Kedah; but the preceding signs give as little satisfactory sense as the following ones reading the Arabic word at the beginning as shahr, month. Further, it is very improbable that the last signs should be read čr-ba for the Arabic sarb [struck], and that the first signs might indicate the well-known name Ligore or Lagor, Lakhon in Siamese. It therefore only remains for me to confess my ignorance.

11. P. 153. Again, MM. Netsehe and van der Chijs have reproduced a tin coin (De Munten van Nederlandisch Indie, Batavia 1862, p. 122, No. 220), which I have never seen, but which, although somewhat obscure, seems to me to belong also to the Malay Peninsula. According to their description, it weighs about 5 gr., with a diameter of 32 mill., and has a hole of 18 mill. diameter. One side is blank, the other bears the inscription in [inti] pittis Jering 1261. [This inscription puzzled Millies and the others, writing about 1865 and earlier, but from the knowledge since gathered by Mr. Skeat c. 1893, the coin clearly reads as above:—this is a pittis (cash) of Jering, 1261:—1845. Plate XXIV, No. 257].

(To be continued.)

ON THE DATE OF LAKSHMANASENA.

BY S. KUMAR.

Supdt. of the Reading Rooms, Imperial Library, Calcutta.

In this Journal for July 1912, Prof. Nalini Kāta Bhāṭaśālī has contributed a paper on the date of Lakṣmanasena, in which he has attempted to uphold Mīhāj al-Dīn’s story of the conquest of Bengal by Muḥammad bin Bakhtyārī-Ḵālījī, with a view to controvert an opinion expressed by Mr. R. D. Banerji in a meeting of the Bangiya Sāhitya Parishad on the same subject.

The author of the paper having implicit confidence in Mīhāj’s statement says that a composition executed by an artist of some note has succeeded in stirring up the students of history of our country to examine the story in a critical way. The author should have been aware that the “fresh stir” was not created by the painting referred to by him, but that a note of disbelief had already been struck, and that an attempt at criticising the statement which the author accepts as unquestionably true was first made by the late Baṅkim Chandra Čaṭṭopādhyāya.1

Mr. R. D. Banerji, whom Prof. Bhāṭaśālī controverts, has already laid on the table of the Asiatic Society of Bengal the results of his investigation on the subject, which when published will perhaps yield the soundest arguments and go a great way to establish the historical validity of the statement alleged to have been made by Mr. Banerji. The object of the present note is to point out the fallacies, which are apparent in Prof. Bhāṭaśālī’s paper. “Every School boy” is aware no doubt of the daring deeds of the son of Bakhtyār. But does this at all prove that the account is necessarily true? Our school books are not always well-chosen, and the authors, whose profession it is to get them up, do so anyhow, without taking much intelligence interest in their work.

About the four inscriptions which Prof. Bhāṭaśālī has referred to, we have here only a few remarks to make. The name of the king mentioned in these inscriptions is Āṇakachalādeva and not Āṇakavallādeva, the reading which has been accepted by Prof. Bhāṭaśālī. The name was first correctly read by Dr. Bhāgawāṇālā Indrajī, and was afterwards emended by Cunningham without much reason for doing so. If Prof. Bhāṭaśālī referred to the inscriptions themselves, or had examined the impressions taken from them, he would have no doubt, been convinced that the inscriptions, Nos. 2 and 4, on which Cunningham’s emendation was based, could not be relied upon. They seem to be very carelessly incised and abound in orthographical errors, and, on a minute examination, it will be found that in these practically very little difference exists between v and čā.

1 Prabhāṇḍhāṇī.
The trustworthiness of Minhâj's account, which Prof. Bhaṭṭācārya upholds, remains as much doubtful as it had been before he subscribed to it. The contemporary historians whom Minhâj takes as his authorities, with the singular exception of the author of Tâj al-Musâr, do not refer to Muhammad bin Bakhtyâr's raids in "Bângâla". Minhâj visited Bengal about forty years after the raids and collected his account of them from two old soldiers, Samsam al-Din, and his brother, Nizâm al-Din, who were said to have been in the raiding hordes.³

Their account was sure to be an exaggeration if not anything else, and little reliable on the ground that they even did not understand the language of the country, as is to be expected of the pioneer soldiers of a foreign raiding horde; their mistaken inādâra for a fort and the Buddhist Srâmanas for Hindu Brâhmaṇas⁴ would perhaps be sufficient for us to determine how far their story could be relied on.

In order to magnify their own achievements, they fabricated the story which Minhâj records as true. It was even alleged that when Lakṣāmaṇasena was still in his mother's womb, his mother was hung legs upwards,⁵ in order to prevent the birth of the child at an inauspicious moment. When the proper time arrived, she was released and gave birth to the child, the future Lakṣāmaṇa, but the mother did not survive. Such treatment of a lady has not been heard of in the country during the last two thousand years. Moreover, had the mother been treated in the way which Minhâj relates, the survival of the child would have been a physical impossibility. The source from which such stories originated cannot have much value with regard to veracity. The fanatic superstition and zeal of the raiders stood in their way of getting at a clear understanding of the circumstances which presented themselves at the time, and rendered them quite incapable of making a sympathetic study of the manners and customs of the nation, which, owing to internal dispositions fell an easy prey to the invading hordes of foreign barbarians, who were neither more brave nor more civilized. The rude vandals of the frontier border-lands, whose civilization was all to come, pulled down a superb edifice of refinement and culture by one sweep of their fanaticism. They had neither the time nor the capacity to understand the real cause of their success. They were blinded by their magnificent achievements in a country, which to them appeared to be the promised land—the land flowing with milk and honey. The treatment, which, according to Minhâj, was doled out to the mother of Lakṣāmaṇasena is unprecedented in India, and is only possible in a country where women are being regarded as mere commodities of trade and subject to the waqf of movables.

The next source of information, which the learned Professor makes much of, is the Lâghubhârata. The traditions, as recorded in this work, might have been the prevailing traditions of the time, but with regard to their genuineness from an historical point of view, they should find acceptance with a heavy amount of discount. The work itself is a composition of the sixteenth century. The distance of time sufficiently warrants scepticism with regard to the historical nature of the traditions, on which Prof. Bhaṭṭācārya builds up his arguments.

The demise of the queen, the reported death of Vallâla, and the necessary installation of the new-born infant, Lakṣāmaṇa, are events too sad to be commemorated by the institution of a new era. Such commemoration is without any parallel in the world's history. The Nirvâna era, which is supposed to commemorate the death of Buddha, has a different interpretation with the pessimistic Buddhist. To him it typifies the total cessation of pains, an utter dissolution of the entity, "a consummation devoutly to be wished". In the case of the Hijira, we might say that Muhammad's flight from Mecca to al-Madinah was the beginning of his success, and, hence, he had good reason to regard the date of his flight as auspicious and to perpetuate it in the memories of men by the inauguration of a new era.

---

² Minhâj: Tâhâfûs-i-Nâsîfî, Râverty's Trans., p. 592.  
³ Ibid, Râverty's Trans., p. 552.  
⁴ Ibid, Râverty's Trans., p. 555.
Mr. Banerji is perfectly right in rejecting the date of the first of the four Bodh-Gayā inscriptions of Aśokachaldava. When Hieuen Tsang visited India, there was a great divergence of opinions about the date of the Mahāparinirvāṇa. The Northern and the Southern Schools did not agree. The mention of the Mahāyāna and the Hevajra leads us to believe that the date might have been in accordance with the reckoning of the Northern School; but the mention of the “Sīnghal-sthāvatras” in the inscription IV raises doubts, and the definiteness which Prof. Bhāṭṭāsālī asserts is rendered cloudy. No chronologist in India, or anywhere else, during “the interval of the seven centuries,” took up the question and tried to harmonize the widely divergent opinions of the north and the south and to fix even a conventional date for the starting point of the Nirvāṇa era. Even now the same difference in opinions exists, and we fail to see any reason in the dogmatic assertion of the learned Professor. A calculation based upon so unsure a ground cannot stand the test of critical study. The assurance of the Buddhist friends of Prof. Bhāṭṭāsālī cannot obviate the difficulties that beset its acceptance as a datum for logical argument. It might probably convince himself of the existing difference in opinions by consulting Cunningham’s *Book of Indian Eras*.

The next question that has been raised by Prof. Bhāṭṭāsālī centres round the expression *attādīja*ya. The Sanskrit expression, as it is, directs our attention to the *rajya* itself, if not to its initial year. It is not equivalent to *rajya atta sati*, which would refer to the end of a regnal period. The *pūrva-nipāta* of *atta* is what we think renders the explanation of Prof. Kiellhorn more acceptable than the one proposed by Prof. Bhāṭṭāsālī, and we understand it to mean that “although the years were still counted from the commencement of the reign of Lākṣmīnārāyaṇa, that reign itself was a thing of the past.” Prof. Kiellhorn tried to harmonize the evidences of the Muḥammadan historians and those yielded by epigraphical studies and held that the so-called conquest of Bengal took place in the year 80 of Lākṣmīnārāyaṇa era, although the reign itself was a thing of the past.

The question of a distinct era counted from the end of Lākṣmīnārāyaṇa’s reign is altogether a new one. If the kings had been a very popular one, the end of his reign would be regarded rather as a calamity and would not be commemorated by the institution of a new era. The word that occurs in the old document referred to by Prof. Bhāṭṭāsālī has not been correctly quoted. The word is *pargandātī* and not *pargandāttī*. We are at a loss to understand how he could misquote it. The reference is to p. 45 (and not p. 511) of Babu Jogindra Nāth Gupta’s *History of Vikramāditya* (in Bengali). Before making any remark, we would draw the attention of the learned Professor to the language of the document. It is full of outlandish words and expressions, and was made out at the time when the languages of the courts of law in Bengal were Persian and Arabic. The word *pargandātī* has perhaps no relationship with *attā*. We should not like to risk any suggestion or improvise any correction as the learned Professor has done.

In the Madhānagar copper plate grant,* it has been said that Lākṣmīnārāyaṇa joined in an expedition against the Kalīngas when he was still a Kumāra (*Kumādra keli*). This must have been when he was at least 20 years of age. Then, following up the datum of the grant, he must have been at least 22 years of age when he was called to the throne. If we accept the conclusions of Prof. Bhāṭṭāsālī, king Lākṣmīnārāyaṇa should have attained 22 + 80 = 102 years when Muḥammad the son of Bakhtiyār led his Turks into Nadiya. Prof. Kiellhorn, as it appears from his *Synchronistic List of Northern India,* had afterwards abandoned his theory of the conquest of Bengal, an interpretation which he proposed by bringing together the evidences of the Muḥammadan historians and those obtained by the study of inscriptions of the period.

Mr. D. R. Banerjikārikar has pointed out that Mr. Nagendra Nāth Vasu has already set forth much of the matter which Prof. Bhāṭṭāsālī dilates upon in his paper; and, by the way, it might be said that the conclusions of Mr. Vasu on the date of composition of *Dharmapragāya* do not seem to us very

---

* Jour. As. Soc. Beng. for 1918.  
* J. A., VIII.
well warranted. When we find that ślokas indicate the date of the composition in a manuscript, copies only of which are available, and also find that in some of them such ślokas are absent, the possibility of their being interpolated in the copies in which they are found, generally comes to our mind, and such evidences should not be taken as conclusive enough to serve as data for further argumentation. With regard to the Adbhutādāgāra, we may point out a similar variation in the existing copies of the work. The copy of the Asiatic Society of Bengal does not contain many ślokas which are reported to be present in the manuscript described by Sir Rāmkrishna Gopāl Bhaṇḍārkār.

In conclusion, we are inclined to believe that Lakkhaṇaṇa was dead long before the raids described by Minhāj took place, and that A.D. 1119 or Saka 1041 is the approximate date of the death of Vallāḷaṇaṇa and the installation of Lakkhaṇaṇa. A new inscription lately discovered at Dacca by Mr. R. D. Banerji, which he has incorporated into his paper on Lakkhaṇaṇa read before the Asiatic Society, will conclusively prove the validity of our reasoning and hasten to a definite decision a yet undecided point in the history of Bengal.

INDIAN INSCRIPTIONS AND THE ANTIQUITY OF INDIAN ARTIFICIAL POETRY.

BY G. BUHLER.

[Translated by Prof. V. S. Ghate, M.A.; Poona.]

(Continued from p. 179.)

IV. The Girnār inscription of the reign of Mahākshatrapa Rudradāman.

The results obtained from the examination of Harisena's praṣasti, point to the provisional supposition that the Kāśyapa literature was in bloom, at least in the middle of the fourth century, and the works composed at that time, do not essentially differ from the samples of Vaidarbhī rīti preserved for us. Beyond this, we cannot go with the help of the Gupta inscriptions known to us up to this time. It, therefore, becomes necessary to consider the only great Sanskrit inscription, which can be, with certainty, placed in a considerably earlier age. It is the so-called Rudradāman inscription on the well-known rock on the way from Junāgadh-Girinagara to the present Girnār, a holy mountain known as Uṛjayat or Uṛjayaṇa in earlier times. This inscription would be more properly called the praṣasti of the restoration of the Sudarśana lake, during the reign of Mahākshatrapa Rudradāman. Its age is pretty certainly fixed, in the first place, by the names of the king and the Kshatrapa Chāshṭana, who is spoken of as Rudradāman's grandfather, and in the second place, the date of the storm which shattered down the embankment of the Sudarśana lake. Chāshṭana is no doubt rightly identified with the king Tishtanes, who, as Ptolemæus informs us, ruled in Osene or Uṛjayaṇi. The Greek name quite corresponds with the Indian name, not merely on the ground of other similar cases which occur and in which the Indian palatal sounds are represented by the Greek dentals with following ā, but because even the Indian pronunciation of the palatals varies between śa and tyā as well as between dēa and dyā, and we frequently hear of tyā and dya as combinations with the sibilants. The possibility that Ptolemæus could have meant any other Chāshṭana than that of our inscription must be regarded as out of question, because the name occurs in no other dynasty, and even amongst the western Kasatrapas, it is only the grandfather of Rudradāman, who is so named. Thus, if we accept this identification of names and persons, it follows that Chāshṭana must have reigned before 150 A.D. and further that his grandson Rudradāman can, in no case, be placed later than in the first half of the third century, probably even earlier. The settling of the date becomes even more accurate through the fact that the fixing of the beginning of the Gupta era in the year 318 or 319 makes entirely probable the view already maintained by Dr. Bhagvāñilā, Dr. Bhāū Dāji, Dr. Bhaṇḍārkār and others, according to which the date of the inscription in question, i.e., the year 20, refers to the

45 Cf. Tishtura-Chitor and Diamouna-Jammān.
46 See the remarks on the reverses of the table of letters in my Guide to the elementary course of Sanskrit. I shall, in another place, furnish proof that the modern pronunciation of the Indian palatals is very old.
Saka era and thus corresponds to our year 150 or 151. This date is the first of a long series, which continues down to the year 310. Inscriptions provide the following dates:—103 for Rudradaman's son Rudrasintha, 127 for Rudrasintha's son Rudrasena, and 252 for Smriti Rudrasena; while on the numerous coins are frequently represented almost all the decades between 100 and 310. During this long period, the successors of Chashtha appear to have maintained their sovereignty over western India, except for a short interruption, and to have been in possession of Malwa as well as the neighbouring provinces of Gujarat and Kathiawar. There is nothing in the inscriptions before us, that would admit the conclusion that their capital was ever removed from Ujjain further westwards. On the other hand, our inscription shows quite clearly that the residence of the prince lay outside of Gujarat and Kathiawar, as his officer Suvishaka, according to l. 18, was governor of Anarta and Surashtra. The successors of the Kshatrapas, in the sovereignty over Malwa and the whole of western India, were the Guptas, whose conquest of the former province falls before or in the Gupta year 82, i.e., 400/1 or 401/2 A.D., as is shown by Mr. Fleet's No 3. Accordingly, it is to be expected that the last date of the Kshatrapas coming from Chashtha's race can not lie far removed from the Gupta year 82. And this is actually the case, if the year 310 on the Kshatrapa coins is interpreted as a year of the Saka era. Then it corresponds to the year 388 or 389 A.D., and is removed only by eleven years from the year in which the conquest of Malwa can have taken place at the latest. Though this very consideration is enough to demand the identification of the era used by the Kshatrapas with that of the Saka kings, there are still many other reasons of not less importance, which would confirm the same. The titles of Chashtha are raja, Kshatrapa or Mahakshatrapa, and sedula. The word Kshatrapa is, no doubt, as has been long ago asserted, an adaptation of the Persian Kshatrapa 'strap'. Because, although we can look upon the word as a pure Sanskrit word and translate it by the protector of Kshatriyas, still such a title is entirely unknown to Sanskrit literature. Kshatrapa and its Prakrit substitute Chhatrapa or Khatrapa occur in the first place, in the coins and inscriptions of barbarous kings and their governors, who ruled over the north-western India. Even Chashtha as well as his father, the Mahakshatrapa Yasamotika, were foreigners, and there is no reason why we should believe that the title was fixed upon them in a different sense. If Chashtha bears the title of raja also, well, it might have been conferred upon him only as a mark of distinction for some special service. In a similar manner, the vassals named sambanta or mahadadanta, as well as other high dignitaries received the title maharaja in the fifth, sixth and later centuries. Chashtha's suzerain can have been just one of the Indo-Scythian kings whose might had overshadowed the whole of the north-western and western India, towards the close of the first century and in the second century; as is shown by the inscriptions and the accounts of the Greeks; and a still clearer proof of his connection with the north-west is provided by his coins, wherein his name is given in the Bactro-Pali or rather Kharoshthi alphabet which is written from right to left. It is very probable that the descendants and the immediate successors of Chashtha bore the same relation to the rulers of the Indo-Scythian kingdom as long as it was in existence. As for Rudradaman, in particular, I see a clear confession of his dependence in the expression (1. 15) svayam-adhiga-Mahakshatrapa-sabda,

47 The three dated inscriptions are, that on the rock of Gunja, ante, Vol. X., p. 157, that on the pillar of Jasdan, Jour. Bo. Br. Roy. As. Soc., Vol. VIII, p. 234 ff. (in which, according to an impression of Mr. O'Flaherty's, the date is to be read as 145/1000-450 B.C.), and one unpublished inscription on a pillar in Ockamandol, of which I possess a sketch and a photograph. The view, that the era used by the western Kshatrapas is the Saka era, is found at first in the Jour. Bo. Br. Roy. As. Soc., Vol. VIII, p. 243 ff., and is further developed in Dr. Bhagavat's Early History of the Deccan, p. 19 et seq. See also Jour. Roy. As. Soc., Vol. VIII, p. 234 ff., and I have opposed the same in Arch. Journ. West. India, Vol. V., p. 78, while I believed that the beginning of the Gupta era fell in the second century. Cfr.

48 Anarta includes Northern Kathiawar and northern Gujrat up to the Mahi.

49 Notice specially the copper-plate on which the Chhatrapa Lika Kushti appears by the side of the king Moga. In this case it is quite clear that Lika was the Ksatrap of Moga.

50 See Jour. Bo. Br. Roy. As. Soc., Vol. VIII, p. 3. A very nicely preserved coin on which this name is very clearly readable, was shown to me, some years ago, by Dr. Burgess. Dr. Bhagavatill read the name as Chashotika.


52 See Professor Terrien de la Comptoire Babylonian Record, Vol. I, p. 60. Dr. Bhagavatill (ante, VIII, p. 326) has rightly recognized the historical significance of the use of this alphabet on Chashtha's coins.
by (Rudradāman) who had himself won the title Mahākhaṭrapa. According to my view, the author means to say that Rudradāman did not inherit the title Mahākhaṭrapa from his father or grandfather (although they possessed it), but that he had to win it by means of his special services and that he received it from his suzerain. To this interpretation I am specially led by the meaning of the very analogous phrase, samāvīhaṭapāṇiṃchamatmahākhaṭa, 'he who has won the five mahākhaṭas (i.e., either five great titles, or the right to have the royal music band to play'), which is used in a very large number of inscriptions, of Śambhata or vassal-chiefsm. Moreover, even supposing Rudradāman had made himself independent and had himself taken a title, it appears to me improbable that he should have chosen the title Mahākhaṭrapa. In that case, he would have certainly named himself mahārāja, rājā, rājāvīdāja, or rājāvīdāja, as the independent kings of the first and second centuries always did. Thus Chashana, in all probability was a dependent of some Indo-Scythian king, and it is, therefore, not possible that he should have founded a new era. He must have used the era of his suzerain, and the same must be supposed in connection with his grandson. If then, as I believe it must be assumed, this latter also bore the same relation to the Indo-Scythians, there can be no doubt regarding the interpretation of the date of the Gīnnār prāvasti.

According to this calculation, then, the destruction of the Sudarśana lake by the storm mentioned in our inscription falls in the year 150 or 151 A.D. The inscription itself, however, must have been written yet later, sometime towards the end of the first century of the Saka era, i.e., between 160 and 170 A.D., because it is said in lines 17-18 that the restoration of the dam was attended with great difficulties. Thus it is most conclusively proved that even during the second half of the second century, there was in existence a Kāraṇa literature. Although there is wanting a colophon which might have given us the exact character of the composition, still it can be easily seen that it contains a gadyā kāvya as such. Its style is similar to that of the prose part of Harishenprāva's kāvya in many respects and besides the use of ahlakāras, there is an obvious effort on the part of the poet, to satisfy all the requirements prescribed for prose-composition by poets. At the same time, however, it cannot be denied that its worth is very considerably less than that of the Allahābād prāvasti, and that its author did not by far possess the imagination and talent of Harishenprāva. The language itself which is, indeed, generally speaking, flowing and good shows several deviations from the usage of classical poets and even presents some actual mistakes. Thus in . . . . no d vartdī (l. 9) there is a wrong somāṭi made. Among other objections against the rules of orthography prescribed by grammar are the frequent omission of ch before chā and the use of the anusvāra for ni and ni, in the body of words, as well as for na at the end, though both these, it is true, are sanctioned by usage. Further, there is seen the influence of the Prakrit in the word vānāvātanā (l. 7) which stands for viṇāsvātanā. Even the form viṇākat used only on the analogy of trīnākat etc., is not classical, but belongs to the language of the epic and the Purāṇas as is shown by the quotations in the Petersburg Lexicon. If the long syllables in nisvājyam avajityāvajitya which are against rule, are not mere mistakes in writing of the scribe or of the stone-carver,—although in the case of -ndgana for -ndgana, no other assumption is possible,—then they must be regarded as only instances of the Prakrit influence. Because, the Prakrit dialects frequently represent niḥ by ni or ni, and the Gujarati jīt 'conquest', and jītānu 'to conquer' agree with the long syllable in avajitya. So also, the instrumental pātāna in l. 11 is formed against Pāṇini's rules, though it is in agreement with the usage of the Vedic and epic language. There is also a mistake of syntax in anyatra saṅgrāmesu (l. 10), 'except in battles', which ought to be anyatra saṅgrāmebhyaḥ. So also the form pratānyāhārāvabhā (l. 17) would be a worse mistake of syntax, as I believe it in all probability it can not be regarded as an error in writing for pratānyāhārābhā.

Dr. Bhagvanālī thinks otherwise. According to him the idea is that Rudradāman freed himself from the yoke of a suzerain.

The frequent avoidance of a smāṭi is not incorrect, because, according to a well-known kārakā, the smāṭi depends upon suffixā, i.e., it is to be made only if the words actually belong together. In the prose-inscriptions, the smāṭi is usually not made where we would have a comma or a semi-colon.
Last of all, the phrase पर्षाव्ये एकार्यं सुत्तेन्द्रियं गुर्गिरि सुतसमाधिः (l. 5) is a hard nut to crack. No full-fledged classical poet has taken the liberty in this way. On the other hand, a similar phrase is more frequently met with in the epics. The many points of similarity with the epics, which the language of the Gīrān pūsātī exhibits, could have led to the supposition that the author had cultivated himself exclusively by the reading of epics and that a kāvya proper was not at all known to him. But such a supposition is contradicted, first of all, by the general impression, which his composition makes. Whoever reads it attentively would feel that in the master of the development of the style, it shows a stage considerably in advance of the epics. Further the supposition is contradicted by several particulars leading to a similar conclusion, especially the important passage in l. 14, wherein the author enumerates the attributes of a good composition, prevalent in his time.

As for the points of affinity with the kāvya style proper, which this pūsātī exhibits, it is to be first of all noticed that the author knew very well the canons laid down by Damādin as common to all schools, according to which sūtras or sāmaṇḍa-bhūyāstas, the frequency and length of compounds, is the principal feature of a prose composition. In the pūsātī also, the compounds occur more frequently than single words, and the compounds themselves often exhibit a conspicuous length. Thus in the very first line, there is a broken compound which consists of nine words, and with twenty-three letters. Such compounds and others extending over between ten and twenty letters are numerous. Once in the description of the king (l. 11) the author goes to the extreme of having a compound word which comprises seventeen words with forty letters. As compared with Harīshaṇa's performance, that of the Gujārātī author is by all means a modest one, though the latter far surpasses what the epic poets have been capable of doing or have regarded as permissible. As with Harīshaṇa, a rhythmical arrangement of letters in the longer compounds is often noticeable, as for instance, in ll. 6 and 9 ff. Hand in hand with the length and number of compounds, goes the length of the sentences. The pūsātī apparently contains only five sentences with forty-nine granthas, of which the fourth sentence alone consists of more than twenty-three granthas. Harīshaṇa surpasses the Gujārātī writer, in this point also, and this is an important point, because his whole kāvya, though longer in extent, contains only one sentence. Of the Sādādānākdras, we have only the Aṇuṃpratāsa, and the repetitions of parts of words, more seldom of whole words, as well as of single letters producing a similar sound, are very frequently met with. The specially remarkable instances are—

युज्यनिर्विनयानी (l. 14), सुन्दरिलाश्रणी (l. 15), सन्तोषीय मनोविनयान (l. 6), सतीत्विलित (l. 10), प्रकृति (l. 11), प्रकृतिपालित (l. 11), प्रकृतिपालित (l. 12), सतीत्विलित (l. 13), सतीत्विलित (l. 14), प्रकृतिपालित (l. 15), प्रकृतिपालित (l. 16), प्रकृतिपालित (l. 17), आर्थिकाशाली (l. 18).

The Varṇaūpanāsana, which do not strike us at first sight, but which are, nevertheless, not less characteristic, are specially numerous in the mārgaṇa-swāya-sāmaṇḍa-kāvyā, as in the words वार्षिका (l. 1-6), where the repetitions of consonants and vowels are linked together very skilfully.

Thus it is quite evident that the author took great trouble with these word-ornaments and attached great importance to them. His use of these far surpasses what the epic literature can present, and stands pretty on a level with what we have in Harīshaṇa. The word वार्षिका, the twenty-fourth word, is just exactly in the Kāvya style, for the compound arjītīṛa is very much favourite with the later court-poets. As for the Ardhādānākdras, our author uses them but very rarely. Thus there are only two Upamās to be noted. In l. 1-2, it is said that the lake or rather the embankment thereof is parveśa-pratisāparadhi, 'resembling a spur of a mountain'; and in l. 8, the dried-up lake is spoken of as maru-dhannya-kalpa, 'resembling a sandy desert.' In the former instance, the expression pratisāparadhi is quite characteristic of the Kāvya style. We have an Utprebhī in the already mentioned passage, वार्षिका.

88 Cf. for instance, Note XII, 28, and also the quotations under २३३ in the Petersburg Lexicon.
In the year seventy-two, 72, (in the reign) of the king and great Satrap Rudradamana, whose name is uttered by the worthy (praying for purity) - the son [of the king and great Satrap, Lord Jayadāman] the grandson of the king and great Satrap, Lord Chashāna - the mention of whose name brings purity - on the [fifth or fifteenth] day of the dark half of the month Mārgaśīra. a storm with great streaming showers, as it were, reduced the earth to one single ocean; the terribly augmented force of the Suvarnasīkāta, the Palāsini and other rivers of the mountain Uṛjayat broke through the dam, although proper remedial measures were taken, the water agitated by the whirlwind which (raging) with fearful violence as if at the end of the world-age, and which shattered down mountain-peaks, trees, rocks, terraces, temple-turrets, gates, abodes and triumphal columns, the water scattered about and tore to pieces the...and] this (lake) [crammed] with stones, trees, bushes and circles of creepers that were thrown down, was broken up, down to the bottom of the stream.

The small number of the Arthaśāstra is richly counterbalanced by the fourth word in l. 14, which praises in all probability Rudradamana's skill in poesy, and contains, without question, the views of the author regarding the requirements of a good composition. Unfortunately, the word is mutilated. After सुकृततत्तवग्रुषिस्त्रिक्रियानकालि, eight letters have been obliterated, followed by न. The last letter shows that the expression ended with the instrumental of an s-stem. Immediately after ग्राम्य, only the word काय can come, as it is absolutely necessary to complete the two expressions ग्राम्य and पव. The remaining six letters should then have been a phrase like विधिविधानwविधान, रचनकिल, रचनानलते or like आलाविष्ट. Now if we consider what is said of Rudradamana in l. 18, viz., that he had acquired great renown by the complete study, the preservation, the thorough understanding, and the skill in the use, of the great lores, such as grammar, politics, music and logic, we must go in for one of the first series of expressions proposed. Because, the practising of classical poetry is the natural complement of the cultivation of the abstruse śāstras in the case of the Panjiś, and both these have been very frequently extolled as the qualifications of Indian kings. These considerations make it quite probable that the compound in question, when completed should stand as सुकृततत्तवग्रुषिस्त्रिक्रियानकालि [कायकायम्] न Now, if we take the author on his word, and suppose that he is stating only facts, nothing more nor less, then it would follow that Rudradamana must have devoted himself to the cultivation of court poetry like Samudragupta and Harshavaradana. Then the passage in question would further prove that the Kārya literature, in the second century, had been developed to such an extent, that even the grandson of a foreign Satrap like Chashāna could not escape its influence. On the other hand, if it is thought more advisable to understand the expressions of praise in the prāsaṅga, with a qualification, and to think that these expressions regardless of actual facts, only concern themselves with representing Rudradamana as an ideal Indian prince - as the poet's fancy was pleased to depict, even then we would be justified in drawing this conclusion at least, that during the second century it was the custom at Indian courts to occupy oneself
with kāya. Even this result in itself is of no little significance inasmuch as it proves that
the invasions of the Scythians and other foreign races had extinguished the national art as little as the
sciences. Further, as regards the characteristics which the praśasti prescribes for gadiyapada 'the compositions in prose and metrical form', it is to be noted, that they essentially agree
with those which are given by Daṇḍin for the Vaiśārāviti riti, in accordance with an old tradition. 47 In Kāvyādāra, I. 41-42, we have:

श्लेष्य: प्रसार: व्यायम्यक्ष शुचिनिर्मलितका!
अवदानसिद्धार्थस्वप्नोति: कालिनिकोर्णश्च: ॥ ४५ ॥
हि वेदवीभवस्य भाषा शुचिप्रणाल: स्थान:।

Of these ten fundamental attributes of the Vaiśārāviti style, the praśasti names three, vis.,
mādhurya, kānti and uddrata, and there is no reason why the mādhurya and kānta of the inscription
should be interpreted otherwise than as rasavat 'full of sentiment,' and sarvajñakānta 'pleasing
to the whole world' or 'lovely', respectively. On the other hand, the word uddata 'elevated, grand' can scarcely have the meaning which Daṇḍin attributes to it, in Kāvyādāra, I. 76. 48 The preceding ābada-samaya specially enters into compound with uddata at any rate, and the expression ābada-samayoddra can not but be translated as 'grand through the conventional (with poets) use of words.' 49 Accordingly, our author, following those who are referred to by Daṇḍin, as kechit (Kādy., I. 79), means by uddata, that language in which are used proverbial words and attributes commended by poets, e.g., hrīḍeyakha, īlimbhāya, and similar words. A fourth characteristic mentioned by Daṇḍin, the arthāyukti 'clarity of meaning', can be easily recognized in the synonymous expression aṣṭha of the inscription. A fifth characteristic ejas, 'the force of expression' may probably be meant by the adjective citra 'wonderful, exciting wonder'. In favour of this we can quote Bharata's definition (Chap. XVI):

समासंवियतिविभिषिष्टैः परिकीर्तिन्त।

Even in the epithet laghu which is wrongly rendered by translators as 'short', we may find
hidden a reference to the sixth attribute of the Vaiśārāviti style. Laghū here, no doubt, means 'beautiful, pleasing' and it very possibly stands for praśada or subumārata, both of which are conduc-
tive to loveliness of composition. The last adjective aśakṣara leaves no doubt about the fact
that the author of the praśasti was acquainted with some theory of Alabkaras. In accordance
with the proposed filling up of the lacunas and the explanations offered so far, the whole clause
may be thus rendered:

'by the king and the great Satrap Rudradāman) who [was expert in the composition of]
prose and metrical kāyas, which are easily intelligible, charming, full of sentiment, capable of
awakening wonder, lovely, noble with the conventional use of words, emblazoned (with the pre-
scribed figures of speech)'. Thus, whatever we may say about Rudradāman busying himself with
poetry—a fact which is very probable, though of course we can not be absolutely sure about it—
so much is certain that the author of our praśasti lays on poets conditions very similar to those
prescribed by Daṇḍin, that in the second century there must have been already in existence
romances and other works in high prose as well as compositions in the Vaiśārāviti style, which
in no way differed from the samples of classical composition preserved to us, and that there also
existed an Alabkaras-vastra.

(To be continued.)

47 The same are mentioned in Bharata's Nāṭyaśāstra, ob. XVI:—
श्रेष्ठ प्रसारः चाल्मिक प्रवैभुवभाष्याणि: पद्मातुस्मयानि:। अवदानस्य च अभिमुखश्चर्य स वायुक्त कालिक ग्रन्थ देवीते॥

48 अवश्यायत्व: कालिकांस्य त्रितोति:।

49 तुद्रवीभवस्य — — — — — — — — — —

50 Dr. Bhagvanītā's translation, 'remarkable for grammatical correctness,' is not right for several reasons.
'Grammatical correctness' would be tabulavadikas, and this quality does not make a composition udāra.
Besides, the king's ability to write correctly is mentioned in I. 33. I explain tabulavāda thus:-हरे द्रव
शास्त्रीय ध: कविता समय: संकीर्ति आचारी वा तन्त्र वदराम्॥
BRAHMAN IMMIGRATION INTO SOUTHERN INDIA.

BY A. GOVINDACHARYA SYAMIN, C.E., M.R.A.S., M.M.S.; MYSORE.

(Continued from Vol. XLI, p. 232.)

From this the conclusion is irresistible that there was indeed an ancient Brāhmaṇ leader of that name, who led a colony of Brāhmaṇs into the South. What the motives were that led to the emigration, we cannot definitely ascertain. The Purānic account is that the Vindhyas began to grow higher and higher and obstruct the path of the Sun, that the Devas sought the help of the sage and requested him to humble the pride of the mountain; that while accordingly the sage approached, the mountain, being its āśāya or disciple, made its obeisance by prostrating itself before him, and then the sage crossed it and enjoined it to remain in that posture until he returned—which event has not yet taken place and therefore the mountain has remained low until to-day. Certainly there must be some meaning in this otherwise palpably impossible myth. Agastya himself was one of the Rig-Vedic sages, but he was not included among the Saptarṣis or the seven sages, though he as the latter has become one of the gotrākṣas, i.e., heads of the Brāhmaṇ families. The Rigveda plainly describes him as trying to introduce a cult somewhat opposed to the cult of Indra, which was the prevalent one, and, therefore, as meeting with some opposition. Tamil tradition also points to this split as the real cause of his southward march with all his following. Probably it was not Agastya himself of the Rigveda that made this southward march: a sort of quasi-eternity is given to the Vedic sages by the habit of calling the successive heads of the families or gotras by the names of the founders. Perhaps a descendant of the sage might have in later times led the southward march, when perhaps on account of the split in the camp, their continuance in the north had become intolerable. Perhaps, synchronous with that march, a depression of the Vindhyas took place due to seismic causes, which gave rise to the myths we have referred to. Geology owns the possibility of such subsidence and teaches that such subsidence may occur, due to undue volcanic activity, especially at the opposite side of the earth. A glance at the map shows us that about—20° lat.—70° long., the opposite point of the earth with respect to the Vindhyas, we have the Bolivian Andes with the powerful volcanoes of Sahama, Acancagua and so forth, and if in prehistoric times there was a terrible eruption of these volcanoes and this disturbance caused the subsidence of the mountain in India, we have precisely the state of things which the myth has obscurely represented as the prostration of the Vindhyas before Agastya. Some such extraordinary or apparently miraculous intercession is needed to make a dissenter like Agastya find favour with the Āryans of the north, who have not only included his name among the gotrākṣas, but have also accepted his hymns in the Rigveda and thereby practically adopted his cult. When this event took place, it is not possible to determine. Tamil literature refers it to a remote age, i.e., earlier than 5000 B.C. Considering the magnitude of the geologic changes with which the emigration was synchronous, there is indeed much to be said in favour of this tradition. The Rāmdāyaṇa also makes the southward march of Agastya long anterior to the events it narrates. Even before Sri Rāma's time, Agastya had been dwelling in a hermitage to the south of the Vindhyas about two gojanas from Pañchavati, where he had made his temporary home; and he always seems to have acted as the pioneer in the southward march; for we find him go down further south at the time of the close of the Íṣáká war. The Tamils locate his dīrāma in Podiyanam, a peak of the Tinnevelly Ghats, from which the Tāmaraparṇi takes its source; and he is still thought to be living there. Moreover, Rāvaṇa, Vali, Sugriva and other great epic heroes of the south are represented as children of Non-Āryan mothers by Āryan fathers. Perhaps before complete Āryanisation was effected, these hybrids, with the energy natural to the offspring of mixed union, and also with the ajavism of barbarian nature, which is seen to follow such unions
as a natural consequence, began to trouble the Áryan settlers in the Dāṇḍakā forest. For the Rāmdāyaṇ says that for a long time before the advent of Rāma the troubles from the Rākshasas—meaning thereby the aborigines of the south, had ceased; but only very recently they had begun again under the leadership of Mārcha, Subāru, Khara, Rāvaṇa and others—all offspring of Non-Áryan mothers and Áryan fathers; Rāvaṇa is even represented as a Brāhmaṇ and Sāma-vedin—a descendant of Pulastya. Thus the first movement of the Brāhmaṇs towards the south seems to have been caused by a split in the faith, and the succeeding settlements were made afterwards by ascetics and lay-brothers, seeking solitude and calm for practising all the self-mortifications that they thought were necessary for gaining spiritual wealth. It was the combination of the two sets of circumstances that led to the slow Áryanisation of the south long before the rise of Buddhism, or the southward march of Jainism. Later on, after some advance was made in civilisation, emigration from other motives began also to take place; until at last about the 1st century A. D. we find that it was the South that became the seat of revived Brāhmaṇism. For the North had become almost Buddhistic, and powerful Scythian princes, like Kanishka, who had embraced Buddhism, were ruling in Kashmir, and the Sungas and the Andhrabhrītyas in Magadha, and Persian Satraps like Rudradāman in Ujjain. Only Kanaṇa seems to have been still Hindu, but it was quite powerless then. The Kosālas had emigrated by that time to the south of the Vindhyas and had formed the Chalukyas, who later on founded in the 6th century A. D. the Chalukyan kingdom in the Mahārāṣṭra country, after defeating Indra of the Raṣṭa or Raṣṭrākūṭa family. Gotamiṇḍra Sātakarṇi, one of the Andhrabhrītyas, who ruled at Pratissāhā, is represented in the inscriptions, as having conferred on the Brāhmaṇs “the means of increasing their race and stemmed the progress of the confusion of castes,” whatever that may mean. Perhaps it was from his time that the downfall of Buddhism may be dated. For after this time we find a revival of Sanskrit literature and re-institution of sacrifices; and the long disused Aśvamedha is referred to as again having been performed by Pulakesīn and others. Even the satraps of Ujjain, who had apparently been given a place in the Hindu social system, took the Brāhmaṇs under their wings: for Ushavadvatta, son-in-law of Nāhapaṇa is represented as having fed thousands of Brāhmaṇs and, like Gotamiṇḍra Sātakarṇi, given them “the means of increasing their race” (whatever that may mean). During the time of the Chalukyas, Brāhmaṇism seems to have completely regained its lost power; for it was then that the greatest Neo-Hindu teacher, Sri-Saṅkarāchārya made his appearance. Before his time, Puriśāntavādā had been studied with great attention and famous writers like Prabhakaraśāvami. Nandīvāmi and others lived and wrote during the reigns of the early Chalukyas; and as we have said elsewhere, Telugu and Kannada began to differentiate themselves about this time, giving rise to two distinct languages.

In the meanwhile Mayūrārasman, the founder of the Kadamba kingdom in Konkan in the 6th century A. D., introduced a colony of Brāhmaṇs from Aihikabhera in Rohilkhand, and when it was found that during the reign of his son these showed a tendency to go back to their old home, the king seems to have set a mark upon them by obliging them to wear their top-knot in a special fashion. These formed the Nambudris (nāmbūṭras—our masters) of the West coast—a class of Brāhmaṇs, who differ from the Brāhmaṇs of the East coast and of the Andhāra, Kannāda, and Tamil country in many particulars. These Brāhmaṇs slowly spread towards the south along the west coast and now inhabit the whole of the maritime country west of the Ghats as far down south as Trivandrum. It was the influence of these Kadambas that led to the subsequent differentiation of Malayālam from Kannāda on the one hand and Tamil on the other. The Kūrgi and the Tālu from the links connecting it with the two older numbers of the Dravidian group; but none of these importations altered the essential character of the first settlers in manners and customs: they have remained distinct. The earlier settlers had borrowed many of the manners of the Dravidians, among which may be named the institution of tāṭi, the boring of the nose, the tying of the
tdi and the presenting to the bride of the new sari by the husband's party prior to marriage called sara, are all Dravidian customs, symbolic of slavery or purchase and do not find any sanction in the sacerdotal formulæ of the grhya ritual in use among the Aryans. In all these respects the Nambudris seem to differ from the other southern Brāhmaṇas. So much was the South favoured by the colonization of the Brāhmaṇas before the 6th century that the Pārāśāra, that seem chiefly compiled during the early Chalukyan kings, went to the length of prophesying that in future the only refuge of Brāhmaṇism would be the extreme south of the Peninsula, in the basin of the Tāmraparāśa. For they shrewdly found out how in the North, subjected to foreign inroads and irruptions from without, there was not much chance of their keeping either their blood or their religion pure, and they with one voice declared:

कृत्य खलु महिष्यन्ति नासरयाधानि।
क्रियाकलापसमारंभं प्रविष्टं च मूर्तिः॥
तात्त्विकं नि: चक्ष्यु कृत्यानु प्रयमिनी।
कार्ये च शास्त्राश्च
etc. etc. Bhāg.

Nor were their apprehensions long allowed to remain unconfirmed; the worst sort of disaster soon overtook them, when, early in the 5th century B. C. (711 A. D.), the relentless iconoclastic Muhammadan storm burst upon the land. It was Gujarāt, that first suffered from the outburst. The Bhāgavata Sampradāyins—worshippers of Krīṣṇa, who formed the bulk of the population of Gujarāt, Muttra and the north-west generally, soon felt the pressure of the times and the wisest among them migrated to the south and peopled the Telugu, Kannada and Tamil kingdoms. In the 9th and the 10th centuries their numbers increased when the Muhammadan incursions became more frequent and more threatening. It was these that brought into the South the Renaissance literature of the North, the product of more recent times, made during the times of king Bhōja of Dhārā and the Guptas of Ujjain and Pāṭaliputra and Harshavardhana of Kanajj.

The earlier emigrants had brought but the Mīndūm, the Epics and the Sūtras. It is these latter that brought Logic, Grammar and Belles-lettres in general, and gave an impetus to learning in the South. The 10th and the 11th centuries formed the Augustan period of Dravidian literature, alike in the Telugu, Tauri and Kannada lands. The chief impetus for this magnificent activity was given by the new-coming Āryan settlers. So much did Bāja-rāja, the powerful Chola king at Kānti, recognize the value of these new comers that he defended them against the attacks of his aunt Kunda-Arvai, who remonstrated with him for showing favour to the culture of the North in preference to his own Tamil. The Srīvaishnava revival in the 11th century A. D. in the South was only an episode in the literary culture that came with this latest emigration. Srī-Rāmānuja himself was directly related to Saint Ālavandār, grandson of Nāthamuni. In all likelihood Nāthamuni's father or grandfather was one of the pioneers of these latest settlers. If we examine the account given of the way in which these behaved towards each other, though settled in far off places like Kānti, Srīrangam, Madura and so forth, we are bound to conclude that they belonged to a closely-knit sect, and that they could be easily marked off from the rest of the Brāhmaṇ population among whom they had settled; the real name of the Saint Ālavandār, i.e., the name Yammunai-thuraiyar (the sage of the Jumna) itself tells us how new these settlers must have been in their new homes at the time of the sage. Even to this day these are distinguished from the other Brāhmaṇs of the South in several respects and go generally by the name of Vājana, meaning North-country men. It was chiefly from this community that the bulk of the Srīvaishnava conversions were made. Even in the Kannada and Telugu country, it is the Bhāgavata Sampradāyins that easily passed into the Srīvaishnava or the Mādhva fold. One distinguishing feature of these Sampradāyins is their partiality for Viṣṇu in his incarnation of Krīṣṇa. The Bhāgavata-Pārāśāra, which seems to have been compiled by one of their number
develops this point of view of the community. Sūtra Bhāgavata is prized alike by the Sṛvāṣṭikas, the Mādhyas and the Smārtas Bhāgavata Sampradāyins and Vaiṣṇavas. That these latter form the latest addition to the Brāhmaṇa population in the extreme south of the Peninsula is borne out also by a very curious custom. All the Smārta Drāviḍa Brāhmaṇa women, together with a few of the left-hand section of the Sūdras, tie their sārīs in a peculiar fashion. The upper end of the sārī is brought under the left shoulder over the right arm round the back and thrown over the left shoulder. This is precisely the manner of the costume of Greek ladies after 450 B.C. known as the himation. It was also the old mode of dress of the Āryan Brāhmaṇas before they entered India. It is the mode in use among the Persians and the Mughal emperors. Once upon a time it was precisely the way in which the upper garment was worn by the Āryan males also. But there seems to have come a change in the mode of the male dress somewhere about the time when the Āryans settled in India. The yajñopavita which the Brāhmaṇa wears is only a symbolic representation of his mode of dress. Much as the yajñopavita, the sacred thread, is prized by the Brāhmaṇa of nowaday, there seems to be nothing in the ritual or the mantras that are used during the upanayana ceremony to uphold the great value set upon it. That it is nothing but a symbolic representation of the upper garment will be patent to every one who considers the origin of the mode of wearing it as given in the Tattvāyav-Brāhmaṇa.

अन्तः कालो या स्वतित्त उत्पादी मुख्यमध्ये बाहुस्वर अधिमुक्ते सत्यविविक्त ब्राह्मणविभागे।

'Skin or cloth worn towards the right, round the body so as to go under the right shoulder and above the left is called ब्रह्मणी विविक्त, the mode of dress in the service of gods; the opposite mode is called prakṣhendita.'

The words उपायित and प्रक्षिणित indicate in what sense they might have been first used. प्रक्षिणित means the ancient mode of dressing; उपायित is the recent mode of dressing, both derived from योग to weave. Later on the sacred thread with a bit of deer skin tied to it has come to symbolize this mode of dress. That prakṣhendita means the old mode of dress is borne out by the fact that funeral ceremonies are enjoined to be performed, the performer being dressed in that fashion, agreeably to the primitive notion that the sacrificer must dress himself like the god or the spirit he worships. Yamaśvāsvaravatya, being the old ancestor, who is worshipped in funeral ceremonies, the old mode of dressing is recommended. But in other cases the upāyita, the new mode. A metaphysical reason is assigned in the Veda itself for the change of dress, viz., that the Devas and the Asuras performed a sacrifice, the Devas dressing in the स्वरूपित fashion, i.e., in the left to right fashion we have described and the Asuras in the other mode; and the Devas succeeded in gaining heaven while the Asuras were defeated and dispersed on all sides on account of the अस्वरूपित fashion they had adopted. Probably this refers to the Āryan ancestors in their new colonies following nature, where all motion is seen to take place from left to right. For, finding such a mode of dress among the non-Āryan dwellers in the soil, they seem to have adopted it as a part of their scheme of following nature, which included the taking of such of the non-Āryan customs under their patronage as would help them in assimilating them easily and thereby strengthening their stock. While the male population easily adopted the change, the conservative female population perhaps remained averse to it for a long time. It was probably at this stage that the Dravidian Brāhmaṇas first migrated to the South. For while their ladies, i.e., those of the Smārtas of Tamil-land preserve this old habit, the ladies of the later settlers have adopted the new orthodox fashion completely. Here is an evidence of a very curious but convincing kind for the very early settlement of the Tamil land by Brāhmaṇas, long before perhaps the Telugu country itself was occupied by them. For we know that the Kāḷāṭaka and Telingaṇa Brāhmaṇa ladies adopt the प्रक्षिणित mode. The whole subject seems to be very interesting, and is deeply connected with the distinction of right hand and left hand
factions that used until recently to disturb the peace of Tamil villages, and of the Phanas in the Kannada district.

At an early stage in the progress of this paper I asked the late Mr. Venkayya if he could throw some light on the solution of the problem I have taken up. I must, in justice to him, quote the letter he was good enough to send me from his camp at Vijayānagara. He wrote: "As I have not got all the books of reference, I am unable to give you a complete list of all inscriptions which contain grants of land to Brāhmaṇa. I suppose you know that the founder of the Kadamba dynasty, viz., Mayuravarma, was a Brāhmaṇa. His date is not definitely ascertained. But Dr. Fleet assigns the Kadambas to the 6th century A. D. As regards Pallava inscriptions, I would invite your attention to three copper plates, viz., Mayadavola plates of Sivakandavarman (Epigraphica Indica), Kadamba plates of Jayavarman and the Hiraladagalli-plates of Sivakandavarman. From the language and phraseology of these inscriptions, Dr. Hultsche has concluded that they cannot be very distant, in point of time, from the reign of Gotamiputra Sātakarṣi, who reigned about the middle of the 2nd century A. D. These and similar grants which Dr. Fleet has noticed show that the Brāhmaṇas had immigrated into Konjyāram long before A.D. 600. As regards Western India we have evidence to prove that there was a large colony of Brāhmaṇas at Nasik already in the 2nd century A. D., while the Western Chalukya king, Kirtivarman I, is said to have made a grant to Brāhmaṇas in A.D. 578. No Chola or Pāṇḍya records prior to A.D. 600 are known. But the presence of Brāhmaṇas in Konjyāram during the 2nd or 3rd century may be deduced as evidence to show that they might have advanced farther south. This information is perhaps quite meagre for your purposes." Thus wrote Mr. Venkayya; yes, meagre enough, as I have said in the beginning of this paper if we have to depend solely on the evidence of inscriptions. But we have seen what other sources of information we have regarding such points. Sanskrit literature and Tamil literature might be used conjointly in fixing the chronology or other points of Indian History; for these two together will be seen to act like a vernier to definitely fix many an otherwise doubtful point.

It will thus be seen that the Aryan migration to the South was part of the scheme of Providence unfolded during a long interval of time by divine agencies apparently working with diverse, and oft times with cross, purposes. It was part of the large scheme whereby a moral and intellectual conquest of the whole of India was effected and the newcomer Aryan was blended with the native Dravidian, tending to produce a homogeneous population. Thus the method followed by the old Aryans was not to substitute the white man for the dark-skinned people—the method which is universally practised by the present-day civilizing agency with its cry of "White-man's burden" and "Imperialism". In those days Brāhmaṇa missionaries of a different kind pioneered indeed and overran unsettled tracts and devoted their energies to the conversation of the heathen. But these missionary settlements, except in very early times, never led to the spreading of the sword in their wake, as has often happened in these afterdays of European colonization. "It was by absorption rather than by annihilation that Brāhmaṇism triumphed", says Mr. Crooke, the Bengal civilis-historian of the old North-West provinces. "We hear", says he, "of none of the persecution, none of the iconoclasm which characterized the Musalman inroad. A fitting home was found in the Brāhmaṇa pantheon for the popular village deities, the gods of fear and death of the indigenous faith. Vishnu by his successive incarnations has been the vehicle for conciliating the tribal gods or totems of tribes—now well within the fold of Hinduism". Thus the slow upheaval was going on and under the leadership of liberal teachers like Sākhara and Rāmānuja, the band was being removed from the eyes and hearts of the people, when it pleased God to throw open the country for the inroads of more powerful foreigners.
NOTE OF THE MANDASOR INSCRIPTION OF NARAVARMAN.

BY SIR DR. B. G. BHANDARKAR, K. C. I. E., &c., POONA.

In my article on the epoch of the Gupta era published in Jour. Bomb. As. Soc., Vol. XVII., I have stated, (p. 92) "the date 493 occurring in that (Mandasor) inscription is referred to the event of the Ganapthiti of the Mavalas. What this event was exactly and when it took place we do not know." The impression of a new inscription recently discovered at Mandasor, prepared by Mr. D. R. Bhandarkar of the Archaeological department and shown to me by him, enables me to make a contribution towards an elucidation of the point. The verse giving the date is thus worded:—

शीतलमण्डलवते नवत्र कुलाकिते |
एकबषणबिक्ष्य गाते साधर्मानवगुले ||

The translation is:—"the excellent quaternion of hundreds of years increased by sixty-one laid down authoritatively by the Mālava-gaṇa and named Kṛita having arrived." The word dmandā means 'laid down,'—authoritatively of course,—since what is dmandā is to be treated with respect and scrupulously followed. In the Saṁhitā: the sense is: the Saṁdānāya (Nīgṛhīṣṭa or thesauri) has been laid down (Nirukṣa I, 1). Similarly we are told in I, 20, that the later Rūsha saṁdānāyikā, i.e., laid down authoritatively or composed this work, and the Vedas and the subordinate treatises. In the Saṁhitā (Vedāntaśāstra I, 4, 25) dmandā has the same sense. In the present case therefore the sense is: the year 461 has arrived which has been laid down authoritatively by the Gaṇa of the Mālava. This authoritative laying down cannot be predicated of this one year only but of all previous and subsequent years. If these years were laid down by the Gaṇa, they must either be so by their having composed a long list or directed that the years following a certain event should be ordinarily numbered. Since a list must go on ad infinitum, i.e., be interminable, the former supposition cannot be accepted. The Gaṇa of the Mālava, therefore, must be supposed to have directed the use of an era beginning with a certain specific event. What must be the specific event? Light is thrown on this point by the following verse occurring in Yāsūvarman’s inscription at Mandasor:—

पञ्चाश शतसप्ट वतेस वातावरमनवलखितेषु |
नामवस्तविवा गाय वतेससत्तुतेषु ||

"Five hundred and eighty-nine years written down for the purpose of knowing the time in consequence (ablative) of the moment [moving cause or impelling force (vaśa)] of the condition as a Gaṇa or compact political body of the Mālava having elapsed." That the word vaśa should be understood as the moment or impelling cause is confirmed by the manner in which the date is given in Bandhuvarman’s Mandasor inscription. The words are:—

मालवानम गणवस्तविव वतेस वतेससत्तुतेषु |
विज्ञवमात्रमात्र अनमात्र.............. ||

The sense is: "four hundred and ninety-three years having elapsed since the condition (i.e., formation) of the Mālava as a Gaṇa." Gaṇapāthiti is to be taken as an ablative, the viṁśa-vaśa having been dropped in consequence of the following soft consonant. This then was an era, the impelling cause of which was the sthiti of the Mālava as a Gaṇa, that is, it was the era of the formation of the Mālava as a Gaṇa, i.e., their forming a body corporate or body politic.

The Mālava were originally a tribe which followed the occupation of fighting. They were soldiers by profession, and could enter any body’s service as such, and did not form a Gaṇa or an incorporated society for political and other purposes. Yājñavalkya, speaking of a person who takes away the wealth of a Gaṇa, necessarily implies that a Gaṇa is a corporate community with common property and common interest (II, 187). Occurring side by side in ibid, II, 192 with ārṣa a gauda, and vasava a gauda, or a body of merchants trading with foreign countries, Gaṇa must mean a body corporate of persons following the same occupation such as that of fighting (Vijñānaṭīvāra and Aparāṭāva). I translate ganasthiti as existence or condition as a Gaṇa. It should be taken as a Karma-dhāraya or oppositional compound (Gaṇa-dāraya, i.e., Gaṇa-dāraya or Gaṇa-dāraya). It cannot be taken as Gaṇa-sthiti. For in Bandhuvarman’s inscription the expression Gaṇa-dāraya Maṇi-sthiti: would in that case involve what is called Ekadasi-anaya or the latter part would be a sāpeśa compound, i.e., Mālavlädha would have to be connected with Gaṇa, i.e., the first or subordinate part of the following compound and not with sthiti the principal part, as it should be. When we take the compound as a Karma-dhāraya, Mālavlädha is to be connected with sthiti which is the principal noun as qualified by the word Gaṇa. A Gaṇa or a corporate and poli-
tical union the Mālavas constituted in B. C. 56 and laid down authoritatively (āmnāta) that that event should be commemorated by making it the epoch of an era. I now proceed to show by direct evidence what the condition of the Mālavas was in ancient times and how it changed subsequently as indicated by the inscriptions we have gone over.

In an article in this *Journal*, Vol. I, p. 29, I have stated that Alexander the Great met in central and lower Punjab two tribes of warriors named Malli and Oxydrakae. From Pāṇini's sūtra V, 3, 114 and from the instances given by his commentators it appears that in the Punjab there existed in ancient times two tribes of the names of Mālavas and Kshudrakas who are called dyādhaśivis, i. e., sustaining themselves by the use of warlike weapons, in other words, who followed a soldierly profession. Under the sūtra IV, 2, 45 Patañjali discusses why Kshudraka and Mālava are included in the group "Khaṇḍikā" and others and in the course of the discussion he and the Kādikā mention that these two tribes belong to the Kshatriya order—he, impliedly, and Kādikā, expressly. Since the two names occur in the group and as it is reasonable to suppose that the first three words of a group at least come down from Pāṇini himself Kshudrakas and Mālavakas were known to Pāṇini himself.

The Mālavas are mentioned in the Mahābhārata also sometimes among northern peoples (II, 32, 7; III, 51, 26); and sometimes among southern, with Dākṣinātayas and Avantyas (VI, 87, 6-7). It also mentions westerly (pratiśya) and northerly (udāchya) Mālavas (VII, 7, 15; VI, 106, 7). Varāhamihira too places the Mālavas among the northern peoples inhabiting the Punjab (*Br. S.* 14, 27). In speaking of a man of the name of Mālavya he represents him to be ruling over Mālava, Bharthakshina, Surāśṭra, etc. (*Br. S.* 69, 10-12) so that the Mālava country is here alluded to as occupying the same position as it does in modern times. Kālidāsa in his Meghaduta carries his cloud messenger over the country now named Mālwa but does not give that name; and mentions Dāsrāga, Vīḍīśa, Avantis, Ujaiyini, and Dāsappu. So that it is clear that according to these authorities the Mālavas in ancient times lived in the north, that is, in the Punjab and that they subsequently migrated southwards. While in the Punjab they were simply dyādhaśiva-s or professional soldiers and do not seem to have formed a political union. Their migration to the south and settlement in the region just to the north of the present Mālwa in the modern state of Jaipur is evidenced by a very large number of coins found at Nāgar near Tonk. Most of these bear the legend Mālavāṇum jaya and some Mālavagumayya jaya. The very fact that coins were issued proclaiming the triumph of the Mālavas or the Mālava-gaṇa shows that at the time when they were issued the Mālavas had already constituted themselves into a political unit with a regular system of government. That system appears to have been republican and not monarchical; since the legends on the coins bear the name of the tribe and its gaṇa. Probably afterwards the names of the leaders of the Republic were engraved on the money that was issued and perhaps in the course of time the Republic was succeeded by a Monarchy. The Mālavas gradually moved southwards and gave their name to the whole country now called Mālwa. Another instance of a race moving from the south to the north and giving their name to the countries they occupied from time to time is that of the Gūrjaras. They first settled in Punjab and a district of that Province is called Gujarātā to this day. Then they migrated southwards by western Rājaputāna which was formerly called Gūrjarasthā or the protector of the Gūrjaras. This name, however, that part of the country soon lost, and in the form of Gujarāt it was transferred to a southern province which is now called by that name.

The years of the era founded by the Mālava republican body had the name Kṛita given to them according to the new inscription and there are two dates at least in which the years are given with the epithet Kṛitesu prefixed to them. In the absence of any specific information we can only suppose that they were called Kṛita, because they were "made or prepared" for marking dates by the Mālava government.

---

KUMARILÂ'S ACQUAINTANCE WITH TAMIL
BY P. T. SÂNIVAS IYENGAR, M. A.; VIZAGAPATAM.

Burnell has quoted, ante, Vol. I. p. 310, a passage from the *Tantra-Vārttika* of Kumārila-Bhaṭṭa, beginning with the word Āṇḍra-Drāviḍa-bādhāyam; and, being puzzled by the singular locative termination, has remarked that the phrase is a "vague term by which the Tamil language is mentioned." Dr. Sten Konow in p. 277 of the *Linguistic Survey of India*, Vol. IV takes the phrase to describe "the language of the Āṇḍras (i. e., Telugu) and Drāviḍas (i.e.,
Tamilians).” He remarks that Andhra-Drdviḍa-bhāshā was Kumārila’s name for the “Dravidian family” of languages and translates the same word in page 284 by “the speech of the Andhras and the Dravidas” (shortening drdvida into Dravidas, it is not known why). The singular suffix is explained by Dr. Konow as denoting “a difference of dialect, which is by no means certain,” and, if true, he adds that the “Kanarese and Tamil would be included in the drdvida-bhāshā, as against Telugu, the anātrabhāshā.” All this is wasted ingenuity, for both in the printed text of the Tantra-Varātika and in the MS. copy (in Telugu script) used by Dr. Ganganath Jha, the translator of the Tantra-Varātika, the reading is atha drdviddi-bhāshā-dhāram.

The whole passage as printed by Burnell, is full of errors and unauthorized alterations by a Tamil copyist; I therefore transcribe it below:


The passage occurs in Kumārila’s discussion of Mīmāṃsā-sūtra I. iii. 9 choditam tu pratītya avirodhāt pramāṇaṇaḥ. This sūtra ordains that words borrowed from mlechcha languages and used in the Veda, ought to be understood in the sense they have in the mlechcha languages and not to be ascribed new meanings based on the Nirūta. Sabara gives four such words in illustration, phōkha, cuckoo, nema, half; tōmarāna, lotus and sata, a hundred-fold, round, wooden bowl—these words, having been borrowed, according to Mīmāṃsā tradition, by the Vedic Rishis from mlechcha tongues. Discussing this question further, Kumārila uses the opportunity for airing his knowledge of five words from the Mlechcha tongue, Tamil, which he, no doubt, had casually picked up from some Tamil man. So he says that when the Aryan hear mlechcha words, they add to or drop from them some sounds and make them resemble Sanskrit words, though not necessarily of the same import. Thus in the Drāviḍa, etc., language, where words end in a consonant, (the Aryan) add a vowel, a case inflection, or a feminine suffix and make them resemble significant words of their own language. Thus when food is called chor, they turn it into chorā; when a road is called atar, they turn it into atara and say, ‘true, a road is atara, because it is dūtaras, difficult to cross’. Thus they add a to the word pṛd p ending in p and meaning a snake, and say, ‘true, it is a sinful being.’ They turn the word māl meaning a woman into mālī, and say, it is so. They substitute the word vairi in place of the word vair end in r and meaning stomach, and say, ‘yes, as all hungry people do wrong deeds, the stomach undertakes to do wrong (vairi) actions.’ When such changes are freely made in the Drāviḍa, etc., language, what changes can be made in Persian, or, Greek, Latin and other languages, and what words can be got thereby, I do not know.”

It is to be noted that Kumārila misquotes four of the five Tamil words he gives. Three out of the five do not in Tamil end in a consonant, but in u, and Kumārila slips the final short vowel as North Indians do in speaking Sanskrit words and imagines his mutilated form to be the Tamil form. Besides he drops the nasal of the word for snake, perhaps for fitting the word to the point to be illustrated. The Tamil words are choror more properly kōr, pbdmbr, vaḻinr, the final vowel in each case being u made with the lips unrounded. By the word Māl, said to mean woman, Kumārila perhaps means Tamil anmāl, woman. Perhaps he heard women called Sitamāl, Maṅgamāl, etc., and broke them up into Sītā+māl, Māṅgā+māl, and thus arrived at the word Māl. The only word Kumārila quotes correctly is atar, more properly, adar, a word not now used in Tamil speech, as far as I know, except perhaps in some dialect unknown to me. From a Tamil dictionary, I learn, it means ‘way,’ and adaruk means highway robbery. It is curious that the only word Kumārila gives in a correct form is an obsolete word.

The misreadings of Burnell’s copy are also interesting. The copyist was, no doubt, a Tamil man for, not knowing the word atar, he boldly substituted nādai, and has thus turned the remark about atara into nonsense; and not being able to trace Kumārila’s māl, he changed it into āl, a man.

I am not able to explain the āl in Kumārila’s Drdviddi-bhāshā. Probably it is an expletive meaning nothing.
THE REAL AUTHOR OF JAYAMANGALA, A COMMENTARY ON VASTYAYANA'S KAMASUTRA.

BY PANDIT CHANDRABHUB GULEBI, B. A.; AJMER.

In Mahamahopadhyaya Pandit Durga Prasadji's edition, Vastyayana's Kamasutra is accompanied by a commentary named Jayamaangala, therein ascribed to one Yasodhara. At the end of every adhyaya, the colophon is as under—

इति शर्पाचार्यान्वितकामसूत्राय अवदकुलसिद्धांतायः ।
विवेधकुलसिद्धांतर्गुणसूत्रायः शर्पाचार्यान्वितकामसूत्रायः ।
— — अधिकारेऽपि — — अध्यायः ।

To me it appears clear from the above that the commentary, named Jayamaangala, was not the work of Yasodhara, who occupied himself, during his separation from a cultured lady, in writing out the bhashya, immediately after its corresponding text. The commentary existed before him, but was separate from the text of the Sutras. Yasodhara whiled away the days of his separation by putting the text and the commentary together. For this labour he has been amply rewarded, by being called the author of the old commentary for hundreds of years.

To the second edition of Kamasutra, Pandit Durgaprasadji's son has added an appendix containing the commentary on the last book which in the former edition was without it. This part of the commentary is printed from a Visianagaram manuscript, and its colophon is—

इति सप्तवेणिविविकितम्योऽवदकुलसिद्धांतायः । भावितः प्रसंगितः । सासारच्यान्वितकामसूत्रायः ।

Here we come across at least one manuscript of the commentary not tampered with by this worthy. From a close examination of the commentary one finds another interesting thing. This long colophon, giving the autobiographical details of the reductor, is found at the end of every adhyaya, but at the end of every prakarana, there is another pithy colophon incorporated in the text. The text is doubly divided into prakaranas and adhikaranas as well as into adhyayas. The text marks the end of adhyayas and adhikaranas by a colophon which the reductor follows, while the original commentator seems to have marked the ends of prakaranas only. He did not think much of the division of the text into adhyayas also, when it was already divided into prakaranas and adhikaranas, for he says—

सत्यभाषात्वकामसूत्रपूर्णालयं इह स्त्राध्यायं । वकालस्वरूपाान्वितसांप्रयुक्तन्त्र्यितप्राकरणे । (p. 9)

In Pandita Durgaprasadji's edition, these pithy colophons are not given for the first four adhyayas, which are the same as the first four prakaranas. At the end of the fifth adhyaya, which is also the end of the fifth prakarana and first adhikarana, the colophon, मात्रकामसूत्राय चारणां पर्यन्त प्रकरणम् । वकालस्वरूपाान्वितसांप्रयुक्तन्त्र्यितप्राकरणे, occurs in one MS. consulted and not in others; but after these prakarana endings regularly occur. From this I suppose that they were removed when a prakarana and an adhyaya ended in the same place, to make room for the bigger and newer colophon but when the prakarana endings did not coincide with the adhyaya endings they were allowed to stand.

I find further evidence of the fact that Yasodhara was not the author of Jayamaangala from a commentary of Kambakodi's Nitisatra, published in Trivandrum Sanskrit Series No. XIV. This is also named Jayamaangala, but its author is Sankararya.

The following is the first verse of the Jayamaangala on Vastyayana—

शर्पाचार्यान्वितकामसूत्राय भावितः प्रसंगितः ।
शर्पाचार्यान्वितकामसूत्राय भावितः प्रसंगितः ।

Compare this with the second verse of Sankararyaya's Jayamaangala on Kambakodi—

शर्पाचार्यान्वितकामसूत्राय भावितः प्रसंगितः ।
शर्पाचार्यान्वितकामसूत्राय भावितः प्रसंगितः ।
Not only the names and the beginning verses, but the general styles of both the Jayamangalas are similar. Both discuss questions of grammar in the same way and explain, criticise or quote references in the same spirited fashion of ancient commentators. Here is one passage from both in which the words and phrases are almost the same—

Vatsyayana: —

शश्व सम्बन्धकार्यां नमोऽकामुक्तिसम्बन्धिनयां।

Jayamangala: —

शश्व सम्बन्धकार्यां नमोऽकामुक्तिसम्बन्धिनयां।

Kamadaka's Nitisar —

शश्व सम्बन्धकार्यां कामस्य नमः।

Saṅkarārya's Jayamangala —

शश्व सम्बन्धकार्यां कामस्य नमः।

Unless these be cases of unconscious similarity, I propose to conclude that Saṅkarārya commented on both the Arthāśāstra of Kamadaka and the Kāmadaka of Vatsyayana. He named both his works Jayamangala, just as Mallinātha's commentaries on Kālidāsa are called Saṅkrita.

THE HARAPPLE SEALS.

Out of the three Harapp seals, the facsimiles of which have been published by Dr. Fleet in the July issue of the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society for 1912 on the plate facing p. 700, I propose here a tentative reading of the seal marked E, viz.

The letters may be called "Later Indian Hieroglyphs." Distinctively pictorial traces linger here only in two cases: the fish-pictures on the seal (A and C), and the tree-like letter in the legend of the seal B. The characters, on the whole, are nearer the system of the old Brāhmi than their pictorial predecessors. No reading could be offered with any definite amount of certainty until specimens of these characters are available in much larger numbers.

Adopting the Brāhmi order I propose a reading of the legend of the above (B) Seal as:

lo-ba-vya-di

And reading it from right to left we get:

1 The figures on A and C have been conjectured to be either that of a deer or bull. The long tail and the hooves in C indicate that it is an attempt at representing the cow. The burodinated portion between the hind legs in C probably represented the udder. There is a touch of domesticity in the little cover over the animal, like one seen up-country over the 'begging cows' of Jogle, and in the mark of a vessel below the mouth of the animal. There seems to be also a band round the neck.

2 On the same principle I would read the legend of C. as:

Ta-pu-lo-mo-lo-go=trippura-mayuraka?
A FEW REMARKS ON PROFESSOR PATHAK'S PAPER ON DANDIN, THE NYASAKArama AND BHAMASAHA.

In his paper on "Dandin, the Nyasakara and Bhamaaha," Ante, Vol. XLI p. 232, Prof. K. B. Pathak has said: "Mr Narasimhachar quotes from this verse the words गणितानिय नूमानवतं द्वासवारार् and would have us believe that the second word न्यास in this verse is the name of Pujapada's commentary on Pana. This view is amply refuted by the Hebbur plates, which describe king Durvinita:

शब्दावतारार्थ-नामार्थविविध शब्रकृतम् Ep. Car., Vol. XII, p. 17. 'He who was restricted to the path of eminence by the words of Deva [Devanandin, the author of the Sabdaavatara.]'

I do not think I have taken the word न्यास as the name of Pujapada's commentary on Pana. A reference to my paper will clearly show that I have taken the word in the sense of a commentary on grammar.

With regard to the passage quoted from the Hebbur plates, it has to be mentioned that the interpretation put on it is no longer tenable, the passage making no manner of reference to either Devanandin or his Sabdaavatara. In a set of copperplated, Gummaredji pura, Srinivasspur Taluk, Kolar District, which is dated in the 40th year of king Durvinita's reign and may be assigned to the early part of the sixth century, the corresponding portion runs thus:

शब्दा-व्यस्तार्थ श्लोकालि-नियंत्र यथाक्रमे संक्षिप्तप्रज्ञानकारी क्रियानि यथानिबन्धप्रेषयेत.

This makes it quite plain that Durvinita was himself the author of a Sabdaavatara, as also of a Sanskrit (Devabhara) version of the Patishath Vaddakath or Brikathath of Gudshyha and of a commentary on the fifteenth surga of the Kirti-drjiniya. We thus see that there is no ground at all for the supposed connection or contemporaneity of Devanandin or Pujapada with Durvinita. The passage from the Hebbur plates, which are of a later date than the Gummareddipura plates, can now be confidently corrected thus: शब्दावतारार्थ-नामार्थविविध-शब्रकृतम्.

That Durvinita was the author of a commentary on the Kirti-drjiniya had long been known, but his authorship of the other two works is gathered for the first time from these new plates. It is of considerable interest to know that there came into existence, though unfortunately it has not come down to us, a Sanskrit version of the Brikathath as far back as the 6th century A.D.

The versions now extant are those of Somadeva and Khamendra, of the 11th century, and that of Budhasvami, styled Brikathath-shoka-sangraha, recently published in Paris by Prof. F. Lacote, who is of opinion that it was composed between the 8th and 9th centuries. Prof. Lacote also writes to me: "I believe Budhasvami's work is based on an older Sanskrit version of the Brikathath, for his version shows by the aid of traits relatively modern traces very curious of archaism." This earlier version may in all probability be Durvinita's.

Further, as shown above, the Sabdaavatara mentioned in the passage quoted from the Hebbur plates, is a work by Durvinita himself. It is true that Pujapada's Nyesa on Pana is also named Sabdaavatara in a Mysore inscription, dated A.D. 1530, which is quoted by Prof. Pathak, but this work must be quite different from its namesake referred to above. The latter, which has not likewise come down to us, may have been a Nyesa on Pana just like Pujapada's; and it is just possible that Bhamaaha's reference is to this work, though, from the nature of the case, it is not possible to lay much stress on the point.

Prof. Pathak says: "Rakrilagomin was Reverend Rakrila, a Buddhist, and his son Bhamaaha was also a Buddhist." It is not clear on what evidence this assertion is based. If Bhamaaha were a Buddhist, we might reasonably expect some clue, however slight, to his religion in the illustrative stanzas, which, according to him, were composed by himself. On the contrary, we find in these stanzas references not only to the stories of Edmaya and the Mahabharata but also to the deities Siva, Vishnu, Govinda, Parvat and so forth. Further, in the fifth chapter of his work, which deals with the logic of poetry, occurs the expression प्रकट्वम् स्वत्व: वि. I am not sure if a Buddhist would express such an opinion.

As Bhāmaḥa criticises the division of उपनाम into विन्दिच्छन्या, घर्षिलाप्या and अच्छिलबालिप्या, and as these are found in the Kāvyārāṣa along with several other varieties, Prof. Pathak has come to the conclusion that Dāntī is anterior to Bhāmaḥa. He says further: “The justice of Bhāmaḥa’s criticism will be at once admitted if we recollect that these numerous varieties are not recognised by Sanskrit writers on Alamaṇḍa, who succeeded Bhāmaḥa. Nor can it be urged against this view, that Dāntī copied these thirty-three varieties from some previous author, since such a presumption is rebutted by the fact that Nripatunga has admitted most of these upama into his Kāvīrāṣa-jāmārga II, 59-85.” I venture to think that Dāntī could not have been the originator of the above-mentioned varieties of उप, nor can the fact that most of them have been adopted by Nripatunga, a later writer, prove that he was so. In the verse पुर्वप्रागः संस्कर्तस् Dāntī clearly admits his indebtedness to previous authors, and as a fact, we find some of his varieties, e. g., निदिच्छन्या and अच्छिलबालिप्या in the Nāyikaśvet in the Nāyikaśvet of Bharata.

I may remark in passing that the well-known line लिन्दिच्छन्या has now been traced to two of Bhāma’s dramas, namely, Chārudatta and Bālabarta, by Pandit Ganapati Sashti of Trivandrum.

It is gratifying to note that Prof. Pathak, following a different line of argument, has come to the same conclusion as myself with regard to the period of Dāntī, viz., the latter half of the 7th century.

R. Narasimahachar.

SOME NOTES ON BUDDHISM.

Among the problems regarding the origin and history of Buddhism, the most interesting refer to the original language of Buddhism and to the prime original tradition upon which the various schools into which Buddhism was early divided have drawn. In the year 1909 a little work of the highest importance on the question of the formation of the Pāli canon was published by Professor Sylvain Levi (Les Saintes Ecritures du Bouddhisme) which has been translated into English by me. Professor Herman Oldenberg has recently brought out Studien Zur Geschichte des Buddhistiche Kanon in which he fully recognises the value and indispensable importance of the Chinese versions upon which Prof. Sylvain Levi has relied. Prof. Oldenberg brings out a few fresh points which will be studied with interest by the schools of Ceylon, Siam and Burma. He produces a number of parallels from the Pāli texts to the Dīpavaṇḍa. He shows that the Pāli school is mentioned by the Dīpavaṇḍa. He admits that the Pāli is not the original language of Buddhism and that the Pāli canon is translated from the Māgadhi. He examines carefully the Pīcchel fragment of the Sanskrit Aṣṭottara Nikāya, and, with the help of the Chinese rendering furnished by Prof. Sylvain Levi, is enabled to correct the Pāli text; and interprets the whole differently from the construing of the passage by Pīcchel. Both the scholars emphasise the capital nature of the critical study of Prof. Anesaki on the four Buddhistic Agamas in Chinese. Prof. Oldenberg devotes some pages to the literary history of the Jātaka and examines finally the history of the canon as constructed by Prof. Sylvain Levi. He is of opinion that the artists of the Bharhat and the Sanchi Tropes were acquainted with a later version of the life of the Buddha than that preserved in the Pāli texts. He is of the same opinion as Prof. Lüders that the original language of Buddhism was the old Arda-Māgadhī. A very interesting fact is the prohibition of image worship by the Buddha as hinted at by Prof. Oldenberg. It would be highly interesting to gather together from the oldest portions of the Tipiṇaka direct interdiction of idol worship.

Another contribution of high value from the same distinguished Professor at Göttingen is the Studien Zum Mahāvastu which explores the Sanskrit work and takes up the search for parallels, where it was left by Prof. M. Senart and Prof. Windisch. Though generally the Professor is enabled to prove the superiority of the Pāli texts, he himself is the first to bring into prominence such passages in Pāli as have been emended with the help of Sanskrit. A striking instance of the Mahāvastu supplying a gap in the Pāli text, as published both in London and Siam, is given at p. 131. Prof. Oldenberg gives ample instances where the Sanskrit text is more brief than Pāli, and asserts that these are so many exceptions which prove the rule. At times he himself is in doubt to decide which is the older.

5 So see his edition of Bhāma’s Svapnaṃsaṃvedana, Trivandrum Sanskrit Series, No. XV, Introduction, p.XXIII.
the Pāli or Sanskrit (p. 135). Here and there Prof. Oldenberg finds traces of the prime canon on which both the Pāli and the Sanskrit are based (p. 150). Prof. Oldenberg objects, in the light of Central Asian discoveries, to the assertion of Prof. Rhys Davids that the old vinaya had never been translated into Sanskrit.

In the Journal Asiatique, Sept. and Oct. 1912, Prof. Sylvain Levi gives an exhaustive study of the apramāṇa-varga and the Sanskrit Dharmapada discovered by the Pelliot mission. A very interesting fact deduced by Prof. Sylvain Levi from the Chinese authorities is that a portion of the Dharmapada was translated from Sanskrit into Chinese by a fire-worshipper converted to Buddhism and that the Mahāvihāra mentions the Dharmapada.

Perhaps of still greater value and interest is the Professor’s dissertation on the pre-canonic language of Buddhism in the Journal Asiatique, Novem. and Decem. 1912. The conclusion of his most fascinating study seems to be that the Asoka edict of Bārāṭ mentions portions of the Buddhistic scriptures in the language in which they were first given out, that is to say, the prime language of Buddhism. I hope to give a more detailed notice shortly of Prof. Sylvain Levi’s studies, which, if accepted, must greatly modify our views of the Pāli-Buddhism and its language.

Theorie des douze causes by Prof. L. de la Valle Poussin is his further study of the Buddhist theory of the pātityasamutpāda. The Professor uses, besides the Pāli canon, the Tibetan Sktisamabodhā, and Sanskrit works among them the invaluable Abhidharmakosa of Vasubandhu. Sanskritists interested in Buddhist philosophy will be glad to learn that the new edition of the Belgian Academy will soon bring out the third kosa and that Prof. Sylvain Levi is engaged on the first dealing with viśeṣa and adhikāra.

G. K. NARIMAN.

KĀRAKARA OR THE KĀTKARI TRIBE.
(Translated from Mr. V. K. Rajade’s Marathi essay.)

(1) Along with the words Āraṭṭa, Paṇḍra, Sanvīra, Vāṅga, Kaḷinga and Prāṇa, expressive of those countries and their peoples, the word Kārakara also occurs in the 14th śūtra of the second kandā in the first adhyāya of the first pāda of

the Baudhāyana-dharma-sūtras. This same word Kārakara is met with in the 44th Chapter of the Karmopacara of the Mahābhārata. In both these places, this word is used to denote a tribe of barbarians. Baudhāyana has prescribed an expiation for those who might have incurred the guilt of visiting the country of these people. Dr. Bühler thinks that they must have lived in the South. (Vide, note on p. 148, Sacred Books of the East, Vol. XIV). This ingenious suggestion, if accepted—and we for ourselves see no objection to it—enables us to throw a new and a better light upon the 156th śūtra kārakaro-vyāshṭikāḥ occurring in the first pāda of the sixth Chapter of Pāṇinī’s Ashīnīṣyasa. The Pāṇinī’s Kārakarī group also includes this word Kārakara, which stands second there. There is, therefore, no doubt, that Pāṇinī knew the term Kārakara. Some people include is in the Kātkarī group, but this is not generally allowed. The expression Śūtra Kāraṇa vyāśṭikāya means a tree growing in the country called Kārakara and itself having the same name. Pāṇinī,1 we thus clearly see, well knew two facts—

(1) that Kārakara was the name of a country and
(2) that the trees from that country were also called kārakara. Of course, if the suggestion that Kārakara must be some southern country—lying to the South of the Vindhya mountains—be approved, then we may surely say that this southern country called Kārakara was known to Pāṇinī, who, moreover, knew that a very precious kind of timber was being imported from that country into Northern India, in his time.

(2) Now, Baudhāyana tells us that Kārakara is the name of a barbarian tribe. Let us try to find out, who these people must have been and what must be the present corruption of their name. We think that these Kārakaras of the time of Pāṇinī and Baudhāyana are the present Kātkarī of Mahārāṣṭra. The name Kātkari can be derived thus:

Kārtikkāra → Kārakara = Kātakara = Kāṭkara = Kāṭakar.

As at present, so in ancient times, these Kātkarī used to live in the Mahākāṇḍa to the south of the Vindhya and the country which they occupied came to be called Kārakara after them. The derivation of this word given in the Bombay Gazetteer is thoroughly untenable. Pāṇinī thus must have known the Kārakara country, the Kārakara tree and possibly also the Kārakara people.

K. C. M.

1 The original essay is published in the Report of the Bharat-Bhavan-Sahadharak-Mandal Vol. III Part II.
THE VADNER PLATES OF BUDDHARAJA.

In December 1912, I discovered at Vadner in the Chandor Talukah of the Nashik District a set of two copperplates. They contain a grant issued by Buddharaajas, son of Saikaragana, son of KrishnaRaja of the Katachur family of Central India, which appears to be an Imperial dynasty.

The characters belong to the southern variety of alphabet and resemble those of the Abhoma plate of Saikaragana and the plates of Buddharaajas found at Sarasvati, a village 45 miles from Parda in the Baroda State. These last bear the date, the 15th of the dark half of Kartika of the year 361 of the Kalaheuri era. The Vadner plates record an earlier grant, dated Bhadrapada Buddha Trayodashi of the year 360 of the same era. The date does not admit of complete verification. Attention is invited to Dr. Kielhorn's remarks on the Sarasvati plates of Buddharaajas. (Ep. Ind. Vol. VI, p. 295). Dwan Bahadur Pillai of Madras has kindly furnished me with three dates, viz., (1) A.D. 607, Friday, 11th August, (2) A.D. 608, Thursday 29th August, and (3) A.D. 609, Tuesday 19th August, one of which corresponds to that occurring in our grant. I am inclined to accept the third or the last date.

The Kalachuris are mentioned in the Miraj grant, the Nerdas plates (Anta Vol. VII, p. 161), the Shikheeda plate of Suntilla (Ep. Ind., Vol. IX, p. 23), the Aihole and Mahakuta or rather Makutecavara column inscriptions.

The last record states that Buddharaaja was defeated by Mangalisa of the Chalukya dynasty, who took possession of all the wealth of the former. From this one is apt to suppose that the power of the Kalachuris of Central India was crushed for ever. But the SarasaRni and the Vadner plates prove that Buddharaaja must have made good his resources, and reclaimed at least the territory from Guharat to the Deccan, which probably formed the integral part of the empire. The Vadner charter was issued at the request of Queen Anantabhaayi by the illustrious Buddharaaja while his camp was pitched at Vidiha. It was made for the purpose of defraying the cost of the five great sacrifices, bali, charu, saivadeva, agnistoma and others. The name of the dattaka (messenger for the conveyance of the grant) is Prasahnavigraha, the great officer appointed over the army, and that of the writer is Naphita, the minister who had to look to the arrangement of peace and war.

The dates as Bothsavmin or Bojjsavmin of the Vajasaneya-Madhyanidina school and of KayaGopa, and a resident of Vatanga, doubtless the modern Vadner in the Chandor talukah. It was the headquarters of the bhaja of that name. Vada is the Prakrit form of Vata and naga is shortened into n. We thus get Vadner. The village granted is said to be near BhabhaRurika, which may very possibly be BhabhaRurika about 9 miles from Vadner.

As my paper on the Vadner plates will be published later on, it is needless to dilate on other points here. The above summary is given, as antiquarians are always naturally anxious to learn the salient facts mentioned in an ancient inscription newly brought to light.

It will be noted that the present grant is only the third known issued by the imperial Kalachuris family.

Y. R. GUTTE.

BOOK-NOTICE.


This is a remarkable book both on account of its contents and its authorship, for it has been written by the Literary Secretary of the National Council of Young Men's Christian Associations in India and Ceylon, and it is a careful and competent historical account of that form of religion, which is known as Hinduism. The reader is taken successively through the prehistoric period, when primitive animism was first developed in the family, to the Vedic times and the rise of the priesthood and theology.

1 Ep. Ind., Vol. IX, pp. 295 to 300.
2 Dr. Fleet has shown that the forms Kalachesri, KalachoA, KalachoR, Kaleshur and KalacheRi are identical and are applied to the same family (Anta, Vol. XIX, p. 16).
3 Ep. Ind., Vol. VI, pp. 1 to 12.
4 The date of the Makutecavara column inscription is 12th April 602 A. D. or thereabouts.
5 Prasahnavigraha is also the dattaka of the Sarasvati grant.

Ibid., Vol. VI, pages 294 to 300.
Thence to the philosophic period and the formation of the religious doctrines, which laid the foundations of Hinduism as a distinct form of belief, with its offshoots of Buddhism and Jainism, and to the scholastic period, when the doctrine became defined in authoritative writings and manuals. The author then passes on the period of the deification of heroes, which has had so great an effect on the Hinduism of to-day and on its allied religions, and to the days of which he calls decadence, giving birth to the exclusive sectarianism from which India has never recovered, despite the efforts of the great general orthodox sects and of the unorthodox eclectic reformers that arose in medieval times, with their doctrines of faith and pure deism. And finally he deals with the modern revival of Hinduism as a patriotic stand against the enormous influence of Western ideas on the populace since the advent of British rule and the Christian Missionaries.

All the vexed questions involved in such a survey are treated with historical fairness and with true sympathy. The style is clear and brief. The reader is shown the history, religion, and literature of each period, with illustrative readings and delightful representative texts, and there are also attached to each chapter a series of most careful tables, exhibiting in the briefest and clearest form possible such points as caste, orders of Brahmins, the growth of the Vedas, the chief schools and their Brähmanas, Hindu chronological ideas, the Upanishads, Sūtris or the Hindu Canon, the Sūtras, the Manuals of the Vedic Schools, the Buddhist Tipitaka, the chronology of the Incarnation, the systems of Hindu Philosophy, the Sectarian Literature, the Vaishnavas, Saivas, Kshatriyas, and Bhāgavata Schools, and the mediæval reformers.

There are also useful chapters on the outline of the history of the Hindu family, Indian asceticism, modern Hinduism as a system, the animism of the outcaste classes, and the Hindu social organization.

To missionaries who would learn something of the religious ideas that dominate those amongst whom they work, and to all Europeans who would wish to understand, even dimly, the mental attitudes towards religion of those among whom they dwell or with whom they come in daily contact in India, this book is an invaluable cade mecum.

R. C. Temple.
THE OBSOLETE TIN CURRENCY AND MONEY OF THE
FEDERATED MALAY STATES.

BY SIR E. C. TEMPLE, BART.

(Continued from p. 188.)

APPENDIX IV.

Extracts from various authorities relating to the Tin Currency of the Malay Peninsula.

I.

Denys, A Descriptive Dictionary of British Malaya, 1894.

S. v. Money. A great variety of small coins of brass, copper, tin and zinc are in circulation throughout all the (Dutch) Islands. The most frequent of these is the Dutch doit, of which about 300 ought to go to a Spanish dollar. The intrinsic value of all such coins, however, has no relation to their assumed one, and being usually over-issued, they are generally at a heavy discount.

The small coins of Kedah are of tin. They go under the name of tra (stamp, impression). Of these 160 are filed on a filament of rattan, of which 8 strings (tail), or 1280 coins, are considered equal to a half dollar.

Chinese cash are often known as pitis by the Malays. This was the name of the ancient coins of Java, and is a frequent appellation for money in general, as well as for small change. Chinese coins of this description were found in the ruins of the ancient Singapore, of as early a time as the tenth century, and we have the authority of the first European that visited Borneo proper, the companion of Magellan, that they were the only money of that part of the Archipelago. 'The money,' says Pigafetta, 'which the Moors use in this country is of brass, with a hole for filing it. On one side only there are four characters, which represent the great king of China. They call it picis.' (Primo Viaggio, p. 121).

The absence of all other current coins than such as are now mentioned, previous to the arrival of Europeans is testified to by the Portuguese historian (Barro), and this even in Malacca, the most considerable trading emporium in the Archipelago. The enterprising Albuquerque, before he quitted that place after its conquest proceeded to supply this deficiency . . . 'he ordered money to be coined, for in the country gold and silver passed only as merchandise, and during the reign of the king Muhammad there was no other coined money than that made from tin, which served only for the ordinary transactions of the market.' (Decade, II. Bk. 2, ch. 2).

II.

Newbold, Political and Statistical Account of the British Settlements in the Straits of Malacca.

2 vols. 1839.

Vol. II, p. 94. The following extracts from treaties made by the Dutch show that they did not fail to profit by this opportunity of increasing the revenue of Malacca. Article 1. of a treaty concluded by the Dutch Governor, West Boelan, in council with the Chiefs of Rumbowe (Remban) and Calang (Klang) dated Malacca, 24 January 1760:—"The tin being the produce of Lingco (Lingga), Rumbowe and Calang, without any exception, will be delivered to the Company at 38 dollars a bahara of three pikuls, and this price will always continue without its being enhanced.

p. 96. The Dutch resumed their monopoly, as we find from the 7th article of a treaty, dated, Nanning, 5 June 1819, between the Supreme Government of Netherland India and Rajah Ali, the Panghulu and Ampat Suku, of Rumbowe which ran thus:—Rajah Ali, the Panghulu
and Ampat Suku, of Rumbowe, must give up to the Government all the tin from Lingge, Sungie-Ujong, Rumbowe, and any place under their authority, without reservation. The Government binds itself to pay 40 Sp. dollars per ḫara of 300 kati of 370 lbs."... On the resumption of Malacca by the English in 1825, the tin trade relapsed into the hands of private merchants.

p. 100. The tin assumes the shape of the ingots of commerce, of which there are two kinds, common in Sungie-Ujong, tampeng and kēping or bangka. The former weighs from half a kati to two kati, and the latter from 50 to 60 kati; one kati is equal to one pound and three quarters.

p. 103. According to Mr. Crawford (Hist. of the Indian Archipelago, 1820), the cost of producing a cust. of bangka63 tin is but £ 1-2-8, whereas the cost of producing the same quantity of Cornish tin amounts to £ 3-4-7. The cost of a cust. of the metal in Sungie-Ujong is estimated by an intelligent native at £ 1-3-0.

III.

J. R. A. S. Straits Branch, No. 10. 32 Nos., Singapore,
1878-99.

p. 246. In a MS. collection of Dutch treaties prepared in Batavia under the orders of Sir Stamford Raffles, while he was Lieut.-Governor of Java the following engagement is to be found. It is dated 15 August 1650, Cornelis van der Lyn being then Governor-General of the Company, dependent on Acheen, stipulating that the exclusive tin trade granted to the Company by the Ratu of Acheen will likewise embrace the State of Perak; that is to say, that the same will in future be restricted to the Dutch Company and the inhabitants of Acheen. Yang-de-per Tuan, Sultan of Perak, further promises in obedience to the order received from Acheen to direct all foreigners now trading at Perak to depart without delay with an interdiction against returning hereafter. The Company to pay the same duty as at Acheen for the tin they shall export, and the value of the tin coinage to remain as it is at present: viz., 1 bidor for ½ Sp. dollar, and 1 ḫara of 3 ṭīkūl for 125 bidor or 31½ Sp. dollars.

P. 247. c. 1651. The first named, Peirah (Perak), is situated on the Malay Coast and is subject to the Queen of Acheen (Acheen). The Establishment, which is under the control of an onderkoopman is maintained by the E. Maatschappij solely for the trade in tin, which is obtained for ready money or piece goods at the rate of 51 Rix-dollars the ḫara.

p. 258. We are told, in an extract from a Malay Chronicle of Perak, that for a ḫara of tin the Dutch could pay 32 realz (dollars); the duty was 2 realz besides.

p. 262. In a contract between the Dutch E. I. Company and the Sultan of Perak, dated 1765, the latter engages to sell all his tin exclusively to the Dutch "at the rate of c. 36½ or Sp. dollars 11½ per (ṭīkūl of) 125 lbs., or per ḫara of 375 lbs. Sp. dollars 34."

p. 267. The tin of Perak is said to be delivered to the Dutch "at the rate of 32 Sp. dollars per ḫara of 428 lbs." (1786).

p. 268. Maxwell says (1883) that the old Perak currency, lumps of tin weighing 2½ kati each, called bidor, have altogether disappeared.

IV.

Marden, History of Sumatra, ed. 1811.

p. 172. "Tin called tīmah is a very considerable article of trade.... The mines are situated in the island of Bangka, lying near Palembang and are said to have been accidentally discovered there in 1710 by the burning of a house.... It is exported for the most part in small pieces or cakes called tampeng, and sometimes in slabs" (kēping).

63 I. e., from the Island of Bangka near Palembang in Sumatra.
64 Stevens, Guide to E. I. Trade, 1775, p. 67, says exactly the same thing: "The Pecul contains 100 Catty or 375 lbs. or 125 Bid." (bidor).
V.

Raffles, Java, 1830, Vol. II. Appendix.

(1) p. lii. footnote The pichis is a small tin coin, of which 200 make a wong, and 28 wong are equal in value to a Sp. dollar.

(2) p. liv. In the local currency of Java, 10 copper doits make one wong (a small silver coin) and 12 wong one rupee.

(3) p. 112. The following table shows the current value of the different coins circulating in Java:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Doits</th>
<th>Make</th>
<th>Coin Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 stiver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 dubbeltje</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 schelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 half rupee (Batavian, Surat or Arcot)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 rupee (ditto)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 American or Austrian dollar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[other variants]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Doits</th>
<th>Make</th>
<th>Coin Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 half sicca rupee (Bengal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 sicca rupee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 half Sp. dollar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Sp. dollar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 rix-dollar (of account)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>312</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 old ducatoon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 new ducatoon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From these tables can be deduced the following useful scales and inferences:

(1) 200 pichis make 1 wong
     28 wong = 1 Sp. dollar

5000 pichis to the Sp. dollar = the pichis here are Chinese cash.

Also 24 wong go to the dollar, making 4800 pichis to the dollar. The rix-dollar (account) would run 4500 cash to the dollar.

(2) 10 doits make 1 wong
     24 wong = 1 dollar

240 doits to the dollar. 2½ doit make 1 cent, and the doit is here the Dutch cash.

(3) General scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Doits</th>
<th>Make</th>
<th>Coin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 stiver (cent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 dubbeltje (wong)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 schelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 half-rupee (anuku)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 rupee (jampal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 dollar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

240 doits to the dollar. 2½ doit make 1 cent and the doit is here the Dutch cash.

---

* Selections only; differently stated from Raffles for clearness.
* Showing how easily the reports of observers of the old time can be misinterpreted.
VI.

Thomas Bowrey, Malay Dictionary, 1701.

10th Dialogue.

(1) Acbee.

16 Miams make 1 booncal
20 booncal " 1 cattée
100 cattée " 1 pecool
2 pecool * " 1 bahar Malayo

The bahar contains of English averdupois weight: 396 l. 11 oz. 14 gr. The booncal contains of troy weight: 1 oz. 8 dw. 23 gr.

The aforesaid is the Malayo weight, but they also use the China dachin or stilliard for great weights, which is accounted so:

10 cooderin make 1 mas
10 mas " 1 tial [taul, tale]
16 tial " 1 cattée
100 cattée " 1 pecool
3 pecool " 1 bahar Malayo

The China pecool contains of English averdupois weight: 131 l. 13 oz. 12 dw. The tial contains of Troy weight: 1 oz. 4 dw. 1 gr.

(2) Bambarmasseen.

The weights used to weigh gold and silver is accounted so:

3 matabooroong make 1 telae [téra, tra: Chinese prom.]
6 telae " 1 mas
16 mas " 1 tial

The tial contains of Troy weight: 1 oz. 8 dw. Ten mas is accounted a dollar weight, but if the dollar wants 4 telae it is passable. One mas weight of gold is accounted the same value as a silver dollar; if so, 10 mas weight of gold, or one dollar weight of gold, is valued at ten silver dollars, but men may buy gold cheaper.* The dust-gold is near equal in fineness to English gold. For great weights they use the China stilliards.

(3) succadana.

The weights used to weigh gold and silver is accounted so:

3 matabooroong make 1 telae
6 telae " 1 mas
16 mas " 1 tial

For great weights is used the China dachin or stilliard. The tial contains of Troy weight, 1 oz. 12 dw. 13 gr. The price of gold is 16 dollars a tial: its fineness is near as English gold.

(4) Passeer.

The weights used to weigh gold and silver are accounted so:

3 matabooroong make 1 telae
6 telae " 1 mas
16 mas " 1 tial

---

* A very rare and practically unknown book. Two copies in the British Museum.
* [?] Misprint for 3 pecool.
* Mataburung, bird's eye; abrus seed. Cf. Milburn, Oriental Commerce, 1813, Vol. II., p. 415, where matabooroong becomes matabourong and telae becomes tea (cestria), which, when written by a Chinaman, represents téra.
* This means that the ratio of gold to silver was in the latter part of the 17th century 10:1 or less. For ratio of gold to silver in the Far East at various periods see end, vol. XXVI, p. 319.
The tial contains of Troy weight: 1 oz. 5 dw. 1 gr. The gold is in fineness near the English gold, and is valued at 16 dollars the tial. For great weights is used the pecool and cattes: 100 cattes = 1 pecool. The pecool contains of English averdupoiz weight 119 pounds.

(5) Extract from a Letter about Merchandize.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dollars</th>
<th>Cents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black pepper</td>
<td>25 bahar, each bahar $3 pecool, at 12 dollars the bahar</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White pepper</td>
<td>15 bahar, at 22 dollars the bahar, is</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dragon’s blood</td>
<td>5 pecool, at 45 dollars the pecool, is</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bees-wax</td>
<td>10 pecool, at 12 dollars the pecool, is</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canes</td>
<td>1000 ...</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factorage</td>
<td>1025 dollars, at 2 per cent</td>
<td>1025</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VII.

Chalmers, History of Currency in the British Colonies, 1853.

p. 332. For this settlement (Penang) the Company in 1787 and 1788 struck a silver coinage consisting of rupees, with half and quarter rupees and copper cents, half cents and quarter cents, ... There were also 'pice' here usually of tin. For on 22nd March, 1809, a Government advertisement states that:—'whereas large quantities of spurious pice are now in circulation in this settlement and Government having ordered a new coinage of pice to the amount of 4,000 dollars, which with those that have been before coined at different times, by order of Government, will be sufficient for the purposes of general circulation. Notice is hereby given that on and after the first of next month no pice will be received into the treasury of this island, except such as have been coined by the order of the Government, as before mentioned, so that 100 of which pice shall not weigh less than 4½ cattes of pure tin.'

Though the (E. I.) Company had established the rupee as the standard coin in Penang, the trade relations of the settlement constrained the mercantile community to adopt as their standard, not the Indian coin, but the universal Spanish dollar, the coin familiar to the conservative races with whom they had commerce. Therefore from the earliest days of Penang, the dollar, not the rupee, was the recognised standard of value. Writing of this Island Kelly says in his Universal Cambist of 1825:—'Accounts are kept in Spanish dollars, copangs and pice, 10 pice make a copang and 10 copangs one Spanish dollar. The current pice are coined in the Island. They are pieces of tin, 16 of which weigh a catty or 1½ lb. English. On the exchange of dollars into pice there is a loss of 2%.

p. 333. The Currency of the Straits Settlements is thus described in Low's Dissertation on Penang, etc., in 1836:—'The dollar is the favourite coin in the Straits. It exchanges in the bazaars for a number varying from 100 up to 120 pice. At present it is pretty steady at 106. Indian rupees are also in circulation, but gold coins are hardly ever seen. There are also half dollars, and the divisions of the sicca [Government] rupee. A sicca rupee exchanges in the bazaar for 50 pice on an average' [i.e., at par as a half dollar]. And similarly Newbold in his Account of the British Settlements in the Straits of Malacca, 1839, (says) ... "The most current copper coins are the cent, half and quarter cent, the doit, the wang, the wang bhara [bahar], and the Indian pice."

8 The total is really 1024 dollars 60 cents including "factorage"
9 This gives the ratio of tin to silver as 5:1. See next note.
10 The nominal local ratio of tin to silver was 10:1 to 10:1. The actual ratio as shown by comparative weighments of tin money and its silver equivalents (vide p. 13) was 7½:1. The statements here show ratios of 5½, 6½, 8½ and 5:1; no doubt all due to local variations in the value of tin as stated in terms of silver money.
In 1835 the Company revised its currency legislation for the whole of its territories, which included the Straits Settlements, and made no exception in favour of the dollar-using colony when enforcing the establishment of the rupee as the standard coin, with pice as subsidiary circulation. The first concession which the Company made to the requirements of the Straits currency was in 1847, when by Act No. VI. of that year it was provided that the Indian Regulations shall not apply to copper currency of the Settlements of Penang, Singapore and Malacca... But this concession was withdrawn in 1855. The preamble of Act XVII of that year reads as follows:—Whereas the Company's rupee is by Act XVII of 1835 a legal tender in the Settlements of Prince of Wales Island (Penang), Singapore and Malacca, but no copper coin except the half-pice issued under Act XI of 1854 is now legal tender of fractions of a rupee in that Settlement... it was enacted as follows from the 1st July 1855:

A pie (cash) should be the legal
tender in the Straits as 420 to the dollar
A half-pice 280
A pice 140
A double pice 70

p. 383. (In 1863) Sir Hercules Robinson exposed the absurdities of the existing regulations:—All accounts throughout the Straits Settlements, except those of the Government, are kept in dollars and cents, but the smaller accounts are kept in the denomination of rupees, annas and pices, causing thereby much needless labour and confusion in the financial department.

p. 386. (On the transfer of the Colony from the Indian to the Imperial Government in 1867), the new local Legislation... under date 1st April 1867 passed the Legal Tender Act of 1867, repealing all laws for making Indian coin legal tender, and declaring that from 1st April "the dollar... shall be the only legal tender in payment or on account of any engagement whatever, except as hereinafter mentioned (i.e., as to subsidiary silver coins)... The Act goes on to place limits of tender of... such copper or bronze coins as may be issued by Her Majesty's Mint or any branch thereof, representing the cent or one hundredth part, the half-cent or two hundredth part or the quarter-cent or four hundredth part of the dollar... Footnote. The rate at which the conversion of the old into the new currency was to be effected was 220 rupees per 100 dollars.

VIII.

Histoire de la navigation aux Indes Orientales par les Hollandois.
Par G. M. A. W. L. [Lodewijcks Wollen].
Amsterdam. 1619. [Translated.]

[Book I. relates to the First Dutch Voyage, 1595-7] fol. 30b. The Chinese live only at Bantam... Those who live at Bantam are those who buy pepper of the villagers... storing it until the Chinese ships arrive, when they sell it at two sacks for a cattie, that is, 100,000 cakes [cash], for which they have bought eight sacks or more... Eight or ten of these ships come every year in January... They bring the coin which has currency over all the Island of Java and the neighbouring Islands; it is called cas in the Malay language and pitis in Java. It is less than a denier, and of very bad alloy, being cast in a mould. It is of lead mixed with the copper dross, and therefore so fragile that when a string

---

15 Ratio of tin to silver 41:1.
16 These extracts contain the first report of the currency in the Malay Archipelago made to the Dutch. The French in which the account is written is quaint and difficult.
17 At that time 346 deniers went to the livre (quarter dollar)=990 to the dollar.
18 The text has: "de plomb mêlé d'essence de cuivre" (7 zins).
of them is dropped, eight, ten, twelve, or more are broken. Also if they are soaked for a single night in salt water, they stick together so firmly that half of them are broken.

This coin is cast in a mould in China, at the town of Chinchen, situated twenty-five degrees North Latitude, and they first began to take it there in 1590, at which date it was first cast in a mould by order of King Hammion, the present ruler, because the King, who was his predecessor, named Wontai, seeing that the caxas which had been made for the preceding twenty years by King Hoyjen had, to a large extent, filled the islands; for they have no currency in China, where everything is bought and sold by little pieces of silver which they weigh by the conduri [candareen]. These are little red beans (fæiole), having a black spot on one side, called in Latin abrus.

Fol. 31s. The Chinese merchants bringing them [cash] from China in such a great quantity and being able to pass them, invented this nasty little coin, in order that by the use and handling thereof, they might break them and use them up. Considering this, that King had them made of an even worse quality, and strung them by a square hole in the middle, 200 together. This they call a sa Taoe and they are of the value of 3 liards of our money. Five sa Taoe fastened together make 1000 caxas which they call sopocou: 12,000-13,000 caxas are bought for a real of 8 [dollars].

Few of the first caxas are found because they are nearly all used up, and in Java they are no longer current. When they were first introduced, six sacks of pepper were bought for 10,000, where now, on the arrival of the Chinese, they buy only two or occasionally 2½ sacks for 100,000 caxas of the present currency.

Now, because we have spoken of the weight conduri, it should be noted that a large number of real[s] of 8 [dollars] are taken to China, which will not pass because no coin is current there. But they cut them into little pieces, weighed by the above mentioned conduri, ten of which make a [gold] mast, and 10 mast make a toyal, which is as much as 12 ordinary real[s] of silver.
Though 140,000 caunas, which is six score pieces of eight, were offered to make him [a Dutchman] prisoner and deliver him to the Portuguese: [1166] to the dollar.

The small caunas are not current money in Bali, but only the great ones, 6,000 of which are worth a piece of eight.

X.

John Crawfurd, *Journal of an Embassy to the Courts of Siam and Cochinchina, 1828.*

p. 517. The proper coined money of Tonquin and Cochinchina is called a sepek or sapeque, and formerly consisted of brass, but at present of zinc. It is about the size of an English shilling, bears the King's name in the Chinese character and has a square hole in the middle for the convenience of being strung, 50 sepeks make a mas, and 10 mas one kwan or quen [dollar] as it is more usually written. The two last are moneys of account: 600 sepeks, which make a kwan, are commonly strung upon a filament of ratan and in this manner kept for use, forming a bulky and most inconvenient currency. Ingots of gold and silver, stamped by the Government are current in the Country, although not considered coin... the zinc coin, as well as the gold and silver ingots are struck at Chacao, the capital of Tongking. The punishment of death is inflicted for forging the former. The Sp. dollar is current in Cochinchina and valued at one quan and a half by the Government. The kwan of account according to the statement now given ought to be worth 55 cents or something more than half a Sp. dollar, but its price fluctuates with the plenty or scarcity of silver, as may naturally be expected. The price paid by the King for the metal, from which the zinc currency is struck, is only 12 quans the pecul: so that of course it passes for infinitely more than its intrinsic value, and is therefore an object of considerable revenue.

XI.

*Bowring: Kingdom and People of Siam in 1855-1857.*

Vol. II., p. 94. [Cambodia—The King sent us] 30 chu-chu. This is the currency of the country and a very inconvenient one it is. The only coin current in Cambodia besides... is the petis. This is made of an alloy of zinc and tin, very thin, and so brittle as to be easily broken between the fingers. It has Chinese characters on one side and a square hole in the middle, for the purpose of being strung on a cord like Chinese cash. The coin itself is Cochinchinese, but is current over a great extent of country, including Cochinchina, Tongking, Laos, Champa and Cambodia...

60 petis make 1 teen
10 teen 1 chu-chu
7 chu-chu 1 Sp. dollar

4200 petis to the dollar.

Ten chu-chu are generally tied together in a bundle for convenience of carriage: the weight of the bundle is enormous, four of them weighing a Pecul. We received from the King 3 bundles—their equivalent value being equal in Straits money to the magnificent sum of 4 dollars and 28 cents or thereabouts. It certainly looked a great deal, and was just about as much as a man could carry.

(To be continued.)

---

600 sepek (cash) to the kwan.

Government reckoning, 400 cash to the dollar: actual relative value, 1300 cash to the dollar.

This exactly tallies with Cochinchina scale reported by Crawfurd, supra. No. X. Chuchet, Malay, a string, file [of pierced cash].
KING CHANDRA OF THE MEHARAULI IRON PILLAR INSCRIPTION.
BY M. M. HABAPRASAD SHASTRI, M. A., C. I. E.; CALCUTTA.

The Meharauli posthumous iron pillar inscription gives the following historical information:—

Chandra, an independent ruler conquered Bengal, crossed the seven tributaries of the Indus, and brought Bakhth within his sway. The southern boundaries of his dominions were washed by the waves of the southern seas. He was a worshipper of Vishnu and he erected a flagstaff in honour of that deity.

The inscription gives no information about his capital, his parentage and his time, but as the characters in which it is inscribed belong to the early Gupta variety of Indian alphabet, he may have flourished in the first century of the Gupta era.

The inscription does not give his surname. Any surname may be given to him. Babu Nagendra Nath Vasu gave him the surname Varman, and Mr. Vincent Smith, the surname Gupta. Mr. Vasu's paper appeared in the Proceedings of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, for 1895, pages 177 to 189, and Mr. Smith's in the J. R. A. S. for 1897, pages 1 to 18. Mr. Vasu bases his theory on the Susuniā inscription of Chandravarman which he read from an imperfect impression as follows:—


Mr. Smith bases his theory on the fact that at that period there was no great king who could conquer Bengal and Bakhth at the same time, and on the fact that the inscription belongs to the north eastern variety of Gupta character. Mr. Vasu says that this Chandravarman is identical with the Chandravarman who was defeated along with other potentates of Aryavarta by Samudragupta. Mr. Smith says that that may be true, but he cannot be the Chandra of the Iron Pillar, as he is simply styled mahārāja which means a subordinate position. Mr. Vasu says it this Chandra could conquer Bengal from the Pushkara Lake, how can he be a small king? Mr. Smith replies that Pushkarāmbudhi must be some place in Bengal or Assam, and not the Pushkara Lake.

I believe, I have stated the position of the two scholars on this point as far as a third person can do. But some facts have since then come to light which have strengthened the position of Mr. Vasu.

Mr. R. D. Banerji very kindly sent me a good impression of the Susuniā inscription. This impression improves the reading given by Mr. Vasu in one point at least. What he reads Pushkarambudhipate is really Pushkarambudhipate. This makes a good deal of difference in its historical bearing. Pushkarambudhi may or may not be the Pushkara Lake near Ajmer. It may appear to matter-of-fact people absurd to call that small sheet of water, 7 miles from Ajmer, an ambūdhī, but Sanskrit poets are capable of such exaggeration. The latter part of the compound word may lead men to think of the sea, which is close to Bengal though not to Assam. But all these speculations have been set at rest by the new reading. Pushkaraṇa is a city which still exists. It is the second city in the Jodhpur State, and now stands on the border of the great sandy desert.1 In the map given by Mr. Smith in his history of the conquest of Samudragupta, vast tracts of the country round Pushkaraṇa have been left outside these conquests. So even he admits that there were independent kings in this part of India which Samudragupta did not or could not conquer. There is nothing to prevent the supposition that Chandravarman king of Pushkaraṇa conquered or raided the greater portion of Aryavarta and even Bakhth but that Samudragupta sent him away from Aryavarta, but could not conquer his home provinces in Western India; and I believe this is the right supposition.

1 Its antiquity is vouched by the fact that an influential body of Brāhmans in Western India go by the name of the city.
Another fact has also come to light which confirms Mr. Vasu’s theory. Babu Jaya Sankar, Vakil, Mandasor, has some property close to the city. While he was cultivating one of the fields, his men turned up a stone which contained an inscription. It was immediately taken possession of and kept in the house of the Subah of the Province. In October last I saw the stone and read it. But as my stay there was short, I was not quite satisfied with my reading. Babu Jaya Sankar very kindly gave me two impressions which he had taken on very thin paper. But as I wanted to be quite sure, I applied to Dr. Marshall, Director-General of Archaeology in India, and at his instance Mr. D. R. Bhandarkar has sent me an excellent impression. This stone contains only half the inscription. It breaks up in the middle of a sentence. But the portion that remains gives us a good deal of historical information. It was inscribed in the year 461 of the Mālava era, that is, 404 A. D., and it gives us a line of kings in Western India, viz. Jayavarman, his son Simhavarman, and his son Naravarman, who was reigning in 404 A. D. Now, this Naravarman is known to us from the Gaugdihar inscription, dated 426 A. D., of Viśavarman, who was his son. Referring to the new impression of the Susunia inscription given to me by Mr. R. D. Banerji, I find that what Mr. Vasu read Siddhavarman is really Simhavarman, written exactly in the same way as the Simhavarman in the inscription discovered by Mr. Jaya Sankar. In the Susunia inscription then, Siddhavarman is the father of Chandravarman, and in the Mandasor inscription of 404 A. D. he is the father of Naravarman. May not Chandravarman and Naravarman be brothers? They both hail from western India, they both have the surname Varman, and the name of their father is also the same. They also come near to each other in time,—Naravarman in 404 A. D. and Chandravarman in Samudragupta’s time, which Mr. Smith puts down from 345-386. But as his successor’s earliest inscription is dated in Gupta Samvat 82, that is, 401 A. D., his reign may have come down to a few years later than 380 A. D. Mr. Smith is wrong, I believe, in including Mandasor in the map of Samudragupta’s conquests.

For Naravarman and his son Viśavarman do not seem to have acknowledged any obligation to the Guptas. The only inscription from Western Malwa in which a Gupta name appears is that of Bandhuvarman (436 A. D.), son of Viśavarman, in which Kumāragupta’s name is given first and then that of Bandhuvarman, who is again extolled for his many good qualities, showing that the subjection was not very hard. The line of Varman kings of Pushkaraṇa would then run thus:

Jayavarman
| Simhavarman

| Chandravarman

Naravarman
| Viśavarman

Bandhuvarman, reigning in subjection to Kumāragupta.

It may be urged that the title of all these monarchs, namely mahārāja shows a subordinate position. But is it a fact that mahārāja always meant a subordinate position? To whom would Mahārāja Jayavarman be a subordinate? Naravarman’s grandfather must have lived in 350 A. D. or thereabout. There was no big empire at that time in India, and, by the showing of Mr. Vincent Smith’s map, Pokaraṇa was never included in Samudragupta’s conquests, and yet Simhavarman of Pokaraṇa is styled a mahārāja.
Mr. Vincent Smith may say that as it is not probable that a Mahārājā of Pokarpa should invade distant Bengal, there must have been some Pushkara or Pushkarapā in Bengal or Assam. But then the burden of proving lies on him. Pushkara is a well-known place. The Susuni inscription agrees in character with the Mandosar inscription of A.D. 404. The compound letter m and A are exactly alike in both. They are records within a few decades of each other. So unless the contrary is clearly shown, people have a right to believe that a Mahārājā of Pokarpa did invade Bengal. It may be argued that while Chandragupta and Samudragupta were powerful monarchs and were extending their dominions on all sides from the capital at Pātaliputra; how could a king, however powerful, of Pokarpa, conquer Bengal? But the Susuni inscription says that Chandravarman of Pokarpa did conquer that part of the country and erect the wheel there; so in spite of Chandragupta and Samudragupta he did come there and conquer.

This may be possible only if it is considered that Chandravarman came to Bengal before the victorious career of Samudragupta began. In fact, Samudragupta, in establishing his dominions in Ṛtāvarī, had to conquer Chandravarman. In ancient India and even in modern India powerful kings often had dominions distant from their own provinces. Duryodhana had Aṅga as one of his provinces, though in the intermediate space there were other independent sovereigns. The feudatory states of the present day often have possessions detached from their main possession. Shivaji had Tanjore far away from Poona. Similarly Chandravarman might have possessions in Bengal.

It is much easier to believe that a Mahārājā of Pokarpa would invade or lead an army to Balkh than to think that a Mahārājā of Pātaliputra would invade that country. The distance between Pātaliputra and Balkh is certainly much greater than the distance between Pokarpa and Balkh or Pokarpa and Bengal.²

The argument from palæography, though very powerful when centuries are concerned, is not very little force for shorter periods. That the iron pillar inscription is written in eastern variety of Gupta character does not show that the inscription necessarily belongs to a Gupta emperor. The man who inscribed the inscription may have known only the eastern variety of character. The last argument of Mr. Vincent Smith is now given in his own words:—

"When to all these arguments is added, that it is impossible to indicate any other sovereign of the period to whom the language could be applied the conclusion is inevitable that the Chandra who set up the iron pillar was beyond doubt Chandragupta II."

The inevitable conclusion depends upon one assumption that it is impossible to indicate any other sovereign. But, with Simhavarman close by at Pokarpa, having complete mastery of western India including western and even central Malwa, where is the impossibility of indicating another sovereign?

Mr. Smith admits that the wording of the iron pillar inscription departs widely from the ordinary formula of the Gupta inscriptions, and yet he is convinced that the mysterious emperor can be no other than Chandragupta II. But others are not so convinced, and the probability of the mysterious emperor being Chandravarman is now all the greater for the new reading of Pushkara for Puakara in the Susuni record and the discovery of the new Mandosar inscription of 404 A.D.

---

² The Susuni inscription has the figure of a wheel before it. The wheel is pretty large and is complete with spokes, nave and rim. The inscription is meant to record the dedication of the wheel to Vishnu. The iron pillar inscription records the dedication of a flagstaff to Vishnu. Both these are likely to be the work of one devoted follower of Vishnu. This is another argument in favour of the Chandra of iron-pillar being Chandra Varma. Because the wheel and flagstaff are both sacred to Vishnu and one who erects a wheel is likely to erect a flagstaff also. I think the same donor dedicated other signs also sacred to Vishnu and some of them may yet be discovered.
MUKTAGIRI.

BY MIRA LAL, R.A.; NAGPUR.

MUKTAGIRI or Salvation Hill is what is called a siddha-khetra of Jaines, whence 3½ crores (35 millions) of Jaina devotees are said to have obtained nirvana or salvation. Its old name is said to have been Mehhigiri or Sheep Hill, because a sheep happened to fall from its top, but attained salvation owing to the sanctity of the place. It is referred to as Mehhigiri in the Jaina book Nirvana-bhakti, in which the following gatha occurs:—

Achhalapura vara niyade
vedna bhadra Mehhigiri sthake
Ahuṣṭhaya koṇio nirvāṇa.
gayd namo teṣām.

"To the north-east of Achhalapura lies Mehhigiri Hill (whence) 3½ crores attained nirvana. I bow down to it."

Achhalapura is the old name of Ellichpur, to the north-east of which lies Muktagiri, at a distance of about six miles. It is included in the Betul district of the Central Provinces and is fifty-seven miles from Badaun, the head-quarters of the district. The hill is included within the village of Thapora, and is about a mile away from the basti. It is reached by a country road, passing between two mountains rising high on either side, and presenting a most picturesque view to the passerby. These two hills, which are parts of the Satpura range, meet at the point which was selected by the Jaines as their sacred place, where as many as 48 temples have been constructed, containing 85 idols of the various Tirthankaras, the principal one being Parshwanatha. Below the hill there is a new temple built in which twenty-five idols are enshrined, some being new and others being those of old temples on the hill, now brought down below. The dates on these range from 1488 to 1833 A.D. The hill has two principal groups of temples, one at the highest point, containing four temples, which enshrine only the twenty-four pairs of charanas, or footmarks of the Tirthankaras or Jaina incarnations. As a matter of fact, however, there are 24 pairs instead of 24. The main group of temples is at the middle of the hill, and has a temple cut out from the rock. It is not exactly in the cave style, the roof being ornamented with artificial arches. The central and the largest temple is that of Parshwanatha with a golden pinnacle on its top. The image inside is canopied with seven snake-hoods, one of which, the local tradition goes, was broken with a stick by Aurangzeb, whereupon a stream of blood shot forth, which restrained the iconoclast from making further injuries to the idol. It is believed that until recently the blood mark was visible on the broken hood, but somehow or other it has now disappeared. The temple was apparently roofed, but a brick dome, as in almost all other temples, has been erected over it, fully on the Muhammadan style. To the west of this temple there are three temples made of stone. One has a small portico supported on four pillars, two of which belong to an old temple, which seems to have fallen down. The carvings on these pillars are beautifully executed, especially the one which occupies the south-west corner. It is ornamented with kiritimukhas and with carvings of bells suspended with chains, as also jinas in standing and sitting postures. Inside the temple, of which this forms the portico, there are broken pieces of pillars and sikhara, which indicate the existence of an older temple here.

On a still higher level to the west of this temple is another old temple, which has an underground terrace. This is rather in a decayed state, and has had to be supported by

1 Visited on 18-3-19.
2 The word is kshī, which is taken as a corruption of kshī; but the more reasonable version would be to take it in its ordinary sense of a score. It is very possible that 70 saints obtained nirvana from this hill.
buttresses in several places. At the entrance on the top there is an exquisite carved image of a Jaina Tirthākara. Thus there are really 5 old temples, which may claim to have been built during medieval Brahmanic period, or prior to the 13th century A.D.

Most of the images placed in this group of temples are made of black or white marble, but there are others made of ordinary red stone. Most of the marble stones are dated, and go as far back as 1488 A.D. They are much finer in sculpture than the red ones, which are locally believed to be older than the marble ones. It is very possible that the red ones are older and were made by local sculptors, who apparently were rude workers.

Besides the temples, there are spacious dharmā válīs, or rest-houses for the pilgrims, and there are also underground temples, where everything is pitch dark without a lamp. Some of these underground places are said to have been covered up as being dangerous. Formerly the temples were not carefully looked after and they had decayed, but now the Jaina community is taking active interest in their conservation, and duly repairs and whitewashes them. This work was first commenced in the year 1890 by Bāpū Shāh of Ellichpur, who spent about Rs. 22,000 in doing ā śīrānā ni or repairs, and enshrining new images where they were missing. Now each temple contains three or four or even a larger number of images. On one temple there is a stone inscription dated Sāṃvat 1691 and Saka 1556, or 1634 A.D., recording the names of the builder with his family. Another stone has now been inserted giving the repairer's name as Rājendrā of Amanvāla. A regular staff of temple servants is now engaged to look after the temples, whose picturesqueness is well described by a party of visitors, in the Visitors' Book kept by the manager. This may well be quoted here. "This charming place, due to the charity and munificence of the Jaina community, so full of beauty and interest, perched in such commanding surroundings, wrought upon us all a sort of spell. One would well believe that the green moss-grown water-fall was fashioned, as we were told by our guide, by the fairies. The images of the gods, their expressive countenances, mysterious and brooding, with foreheads that seem to hide within themselves great thoughts, withdrawn and unspakable, the courtyards, the temples and all their beauty, brought great enjoyment to our party."

The Jainas believe that there is occasionally a shower of kesar (saffron) rain on the temples, which leaves yellow marks on them. Whether this has any connection with any kind of droppings from the numberless bhāmar bees, which make numerous combs on the rocks is a matter for leisurely determination.

ON SOME NEW DATES OF PANDYA KINGS IN THE 13TH CENTURY A.D.

BY DEWAN BAHADUR L.D. SWAMIKANNU PILLAI, M.A., B.L. (MADRAS);

LL.B. (LOND.),

(Continued from p. 172.)

*Jaṭāvarman Sundara Pāṇḍya.

[Reign began between 29th December 1270 (See No. 584 of 1902 below) and 5th January 1271.] 1909 (680). From the west wall of the Ḍaṇḍikēvara shrine in the temple of Neḷḷuguḷa- nāṭhavāmī, at Tirunēduḷalān (Trichinopoly District). Gift of land for a lamp by Aryan Sivandakālaśiyān of Puduvūr in Árvalakūrūm, a sub-division of Rājendrā-chōḷa-vaḷanādū. Date.—3rd year of Jaṭāvarman Sundara Pāṇḍya; Rishabha; su. 11; Monday; "Puṣya" [su. 11 error for su. 5]. On Monday, 22 May 1278, Rishabha su. 5 and "Puṣya" ended respectively at 73 and 01 of the day.

Note.—A date wrong by 6 tithis is not a satisfactory date. It is possible, however, that Puṣan, the Tamil equivalent in the inscription for Puṣya, is a wrong reading for "Parām" = "Puṣya Phalguni," but though the combination of "Purva Phalguni" with Rishabha su. 11 is possible, such a combination did not actually occur even once on a Monday between A.D. 1200 and A.D. 1350. It occurred on days of the week, other than Monday, in A.D. 1206, 1216, 1227, 1235, 1238, 1254, 1265, &c; and on Monday, but in Meṣa (not Rishabha) in 1258 and 1275. Possibly

§ H. Campbell and others.
the date intended is Monday, 4th April, A.D. 1278, when Meha su. 11 and “Putva Phalogni” commented; they ended next day at 33 and 70 respectively. This would be the 3rd regnal year of Jät. Sund. Pandyja whose reign began in 1276.

1909 (303). From the south wall of the outer prakāra of the Kachchaphévara temple at Tirukkachchur (Chingleput District). Gift of one buffaloes for a lamp.

Date.—7th year of Jät. Sundara Pandyja: Mina; su. 10; Sunday; “Hasta” [Mina error for Rishabha]. On Sunday 24th May 1276, Rishabha su. 10 and “Hasta” ended at 49 and 16 respectively. [Regnal year, 7th, should be 6th.]

1908 (411). From the west wall of the first prakāra in the Vilināthasvāmin temple at Tiruvilūmilai, Tanjore District; Damaged. Seems to record a gift of land for the benefit of the māhās and minor shrines in the temple at Tiruvilūmilai; mentions a certain Nārpattegnāyira Pillai among the Saiva devotees.

Date.—8th year of Jāvārvarman Sundara Pandyja; Dhanus; su. 8; Friday; “Rēvati.” On Friday, 23 Dec. 1278, Dhanus, su. 8, and “Rēvati” ended at 26 and 03 respectively.

1909 (667). From the north wall of the maṇḍapa in front of the central shrine in the temple of Neḍāgaalanāthasvāmin, at Tirunēdujungalam, Trichinopoly District. Gift of land to the temple of Tirunēdujungala Udaiya Nayanār in Vadagavi-nādi which was a sub-division of Pandyakulapatir-vālanaṉu.

Date.—8th year of Jät. Sundara Pandyja; Makara; su. 10; Wednesday; “Rohipi.” On Wednesday 5 Jan. 1278, Makara su. 10 ended at 36 and “Rohipi’ commenced, ending next day at 41.

1909 (319). From the north wall of the Vighnēsvāra shrine near the tank, in the Tirukkachchur village (Chingleput District). Gift of land in Brahmaṇa [i.e.] ātis Vēṭākāran-kukalstār in Urukkāṭuṭkōṭam, to the temple of Nārpattegnāyira-vināgar Emberumāy at Tirukkachchur.

Date.—8th year of Jät. Sundara Pandyja; Rishabha; su. 3; Thursday; “Pushya.” On Thursday 26 May 1278, Rishabha su. 3 ended at 37 of day and “Pushya” commenced, ending at 27 of Friday.

1909 (305). From the south wall of the outer prakāra of the Kachchaphévara temple at Tirukkachchur (Chingleput District). Records the gift by a temple dancing-girl of a lamp and a brass image carrying it.

Date.—8th year of Jät. Sund. Pandyja; Mithuna; bāhuḷa . . . . . Monday, “Utt. Bhād.” On Monday 13 June 1278, Mithuna ba. 7; and “Utt. Bhād” ended at 20 and 79 respectively.

1902 (584). From the west wall of the Saundaryā-nāyaki shrine in the Kāllēvara temple at Kālaiyakōvil (Madurā District). Gift of land.

Date.—10th year of Jät. Sund. Pandyja; Dhanus, su. 2; Sunday; “Pushya” [Dhanus must be Makara, and śukla must be bāhuḷa]. On Sunday 28 Dec. 1281, Makara ba. 2 and “Pushya” came to end respectively at 76 and 00 of the day.

Note.—Relying on this date, I have fixed the earlier limit of the commencement of this reign as 29 Dec. 1270. The particular combination of tithi and nakshatra on a Sunday did not occur in the 10th year of reign of any of the other Sundara Pandyas and it may therefore be safely assumed that the date belongs to the present reign. If so it would belong to the 11th year, not to the 10th.

1909 (315). From the north wall of the outer prakāra of the Kachchaphévara temple at Tirukkachchur (Chingleput District). Refers to the confiscation of the property of some rebellious and misbehaved people at Uttipākkanm and registers a gift to the temple of Tirukkachchur.

Date.—8th year of Jät. Sund. Pandyja. Kumbha, su. 5; Wednesday; “Asvini.” On Thursday 4 Feb. 1283, Kumbha su. 5 and “Asvini” came to end at 20 and 39 respectively. They were both current for the greater part of Wednesday, 3rd February.

1909 (418). From the east wall of the prakāra in the Vāyāghrapādēvara temple at Siddharāmānāṭham (S. Arcot). Records that the Siva-Brahmagas of the temple agreed to provide for offerings in the shrine of Ājñāṣīya Pillaiyar, from the interest on 3000 Kāśu presented to the temple by Arindavan-Pallavarāyaj in the time of Köpperuṭṭiṉadēva and now placed in their hands.
Date.—13th year of Jat. Sund. Pandyā; Mina; su. 6; Saturday; "Rōhīpl." On Sat. 6th March 1288, Mina; su. 6 and "Rōhīnī" ended at 51 and 54 respectively.

1901 (191). From the south wall of the maṇḍapa in front of the Āṣatsahāyēśvara temple at Tenkermī (Chingleput District). Gift of land.

Date.—14th year of Jat. Sund. Pandyā; month of Ādi; Monday; "Hasta." On Monday 2nd July 1285, "Hasta" ended at 48 [Regnal year should be 15th, not 14th].

1909 (208). From the south wall of the outer prākāra of the Kachchhapēśvara temple at Tirukkuョkhi (Chingleput District). Gift of 3 cows for a lamp by a merchant of Madhurāntaka-Chatturvēdamangalam, residing in the street Buvananivilappagounder, of that village.

Date.—17th year of Jat. Sund. Pandyā; Śiṅha, śukla ....... "uḷuṣṇa", Monday; "Utt. Āsh." On Monday 6 Sep. 1286, Śiṅha śukla navaṁi (9th tithi) ended at 22 of day and "Utt. Āśh." was current for the greater part of the day, ending at 21 next day. [Regnal year was strictly the 18th, not 17th].

N. B.—This Jāṭāvarman Sundara Pandyā, whose reign is attested by six regular and several fairly regular dates, noticed above, comes between Kielhorn's Jat. Sund. Pandyā I and his Jat. Sund. Pandyā II, who is really the third of that name in the present list of Pandyas of the 13th century. I would, however, not assign any numbers till we know more about the Sundara Pandyas in the latter half of the 12th and the first half of the 13th century; but simply distinguish each Pandyā, whether Sundara or Vira, by the initial year of his reign. It would be interesting to know when Jat. Sundara Pandyā, who came to the throne on or about 29 Dec. 1270, ceased to reign. A. D. 1288 is the latest date furnished by Madras Inscriptions, while in one of the Padukōṭai inscriptions I have found a 30th year for him, i.e., A. D. 1300. If Jat. Sundara Pandyā whose reign began in 1270 ceased to reign in or about A. D. 1300, he cannot be the paricide who murdered Mār. Kūḷākēkara I, in or about A. D. 1310. Nor can the paricide be the Jat. Sundara Pandyā who next comes under our notice and whose reign, beginning in A. D. 1276, ended in all probability, according to the inscriptions, as well as the Muhammadan historians, about A. D. 1293.

Jāṭāvarman Sundara Pandyā II.

(Reign began between 13th September 1275 and 15th May 1276 on or about 25th June 1276).

1908 (414). From the Viḷiṅnāṭhāśvāmin temple at Tiruvilāṭalai (Tanjōre District). Gift of land for the recital of tirumūrti.

Date.—9th year of Jāṭāvarman Sundara Pandyā; Tula; ba. 7; Sunday; "Pushya." On Sunday, 21 Oct. A. D. 1285 Tula ba. 7 and "Pushya" commenced respectively at 24 and 14 of the day. They ended next day at 20 and 12 respectively.

1902 (581 A). From the west wall of the Saṃdāryaṇāyaṇī shrine in the Kaḷiḷiśvara temple at Kāḷaiyērkkōvil (Madura District). Gift of land.

Date.—11th year of Sundara Pandyā II. Dhanus; 2nd tīyadi, Wednesday; "Punarvasu" =Wed. 4th Dec. 1286, on which day Dhanus ba. 2 and "Punarvasu" ended respectively at 82 and 93 respectively.

[N. B. "Second tīyadi," ordinarily meaning the 2nd day of a solar month, is an unusual expression for deśītyād or "2nd lunar tithi," although tīyad i is etymologically the same as tīthi].

1902 (573). From the south wall of the Kāḷiḷiśvara temple at Kāḷaiyērkkōvil (Madura District). Gift of land to the temple of Kaṇappēr by Aṭhāraśīva Mūdāḷāḷūr uvas Vāṉyāḥ-chakravarthī. Mentions also a certain Pushpavanassāva.

Date.—12th year of Jat. Tribh. Sundara Pandyā; Śiṅha 29; ba. 3; Wednesday, "Rēvati." On Wednesday, 27th August 1287 [which was 80 Śiṅha, not 29 Śiṅha], ba. 3 and "Rēvati" ended at 27 and 37 respectively.

There is another date, very similarly worded, but referrible to a Sundara Pandyā whose reign must have commenced in A. D. 1303. [See No. 580 of 1902 below].

1907 (590). From the north wall of the Tiruchuṭumālīga of Saṃmyuṅṇāṭhāśvāmin temple at Nandāḷūr (Cuddapah). Damaged.
1909 (392). From the South wall of the outer prakāra of the Kachhapēśvara temple at Tiruppachchur (Chingleput District) Tamil. Gift of 30 cows and one bull for a lamp by a native of Mananallur alias Virasōcharatuvēdimāngalam in Sembūr Kottam, a subdivision of Jayaṅgonda chōla-māndālam.

Date.—Year opp. 13th of Jaśvarman Triḥb. Sundara Pāṇḍya; ba. 10; Monday; “Krittika” = Monday 3 July 1290 when ba. 10 in Katakā and “Krittika” ended respectively at ‘44 and ‘77 of the day.

Date.—(15th) year of Jat. Sundara Pāṇḍya; Virādhi Saṅvat; Kumbba; su. 10; Monday, “Punarvasu.” On Monday 20 Feb. 1290, which was in Virodhī Saṅvat, Kumbba su. 10 ended at ‘60, and Punarvasu began, ending next day at ‘05.

[15th year, error for 14th.]


Date.—{This date appears, without any result, positive or negative, among the dates published by Prof. Jacob in Ep. Ind. XI p. 136.} 3rd year opp. 13th Konerimaiñkonda Jat. Sundara Pāṇḍya, Kaṭaka; su. 7; Wednesday; “Hasta.” On Wednesday 4 July, A.D. 1291, Kaṭaka su. 7 and “Hasta” ended at ‘58 and ‘01 respectively. (For ending moment of Naksatra local time has also to be considered.)

1904 (128). From the east wall of the mandaṇa in front of the central shrine in the Sīvākuruśēvara temple at Tirthanagari (South Arcot). Gift of land for the festival called Kondapāṇi-mañdāli-sandi after the king.

Date.—3rd opposite 13th year of Konerimaiñkondā Sundara Pāṇḍya; Meśha su. 9, “Pushya” = Friday 28th March 1292, when Meśha, su. 9 and “Pushya” ended at ‘59 and ‘25 respectively.

N.B.—The inscription particularizes the date now dealt with as the 276th day of the 16th regnal year. If so, the regn would appear to have commenced on or about 25th June 1276, which is consistent with all the dates found so far for this Sundara Pāṇḍya, except Kielhorn’s “P.” No. 27 “year opp. 14; Monday 15th May 1290.”

* Māravarman Tribhuvanāchakravarti Vikrama Pāṇḍya.

(Reign began between 12th Jan. and 29 Aug. 1283.)

1902 (143). From the south wall of the prakāra in the Rāmaśāmin temple at Bannur (Mysore District). Sale of land.

Date.—3rd year of Māravarman Vikrama Pāṇḍya; Makara; su. 4; Friday; “Punarvasu” [Suśka 4 must be Suśka 14]. On Friday 11th Jan. 1286, Makara su. 14 and “Punarvasu” ended at ‘20 and ‘12 respectively.

1896 (129). From the north wall of the second prakāra in the Kaṇyākumari temple at Cape Comorin (Travancore State). Gift of lamp.

Date.—5th year of Māravarman Vikrama Pāṇḍya; Dhanus; suśka 8; Sunday; “Rēvati.” On Sunday 14th Dec. 1287, Dhanus suśka 8 and “Rēvati” ended at ‘12 and ‘64 respectively.

1909 (410). From the east wall of the prakāra in the Vyaṅgārapāṭēśvara temple at Siddhāliśgamadām (S. Arcot). Gift of land for offerings by the nacaratār of Sīrīṅgārā.

Date.—6th year of Mar. Triḥb. Vikrama Pāṇḍya; Kanni; su. 1; Sunday; “Hasta.” On Sunday 29 Aug. 1288 (= 1 Kanni), Kanni su. 1 ended at ‘60 while “Hasta,” began at ‘38, ending next day at ‘42.

[Inscriptions Nos. 53 and 54 of 1905 give this Pāṇḍya the Saka date 1209 = A.D. 1237.]

1900 (116). From the north wall of the first prakāra of the Trivikrama-Perumal temple at Tirukkoḷūr (S. Arcot). Refers to the king’s victory over the Kākaṭiya king Gaṇapati and records a gift of two lamps.

Date.—8th year of Tribhuvanārājāḥṅiraṅja Paramēśvara Sri Vikrama Pāṇḍya; Dhanus; ba. 8; Friday; “Hasta.” On Friday 14th Dec. 1291, Dhanus ba. 8 and “Hasta” ended at ‘90 and ‘85 respectively.
1901 (251) From the south wall of the central shrine in the Aksheśvara temple at Achcharampakkam (Chingleput District). Damaged; gift of land.

**Date.**—3rd year of Mar. Tribh. Vikrama Pāṇḍya; [“may be 5th,” says Epigraphist; but the impression which he was good enough to examine again with me, seems to be a fairly clear “3rd year.”] Mina; ba. 11; Monday; “Sravaṇa.” There is no date corresponding to the given chronological details between A.D. 1283 and A.D. 1290, but on Monday 26 Feb. 1291 (which however was in the 8th year, as in the last inscription, not in the 3rd or 5th), Mina ba. 11 ended at 51 of the day and “Sravaṇa” commenced at 15; ending at 17 on Tuesday.

*Jañāvarman Tribh. Vikrama Pāṇḍya.*

1894 (11) From the inside of the north wall of the second prakāra in the Sundararāja-Perumāl temple at Dāilikkombu (Madura District). Incomplete.

**Date.**—4th year of Jañāvarman Tribhurana-chakravarti Vikrama Pāṇḍya; Mithuna, su. 9; Thursday; “Śvātī.”

On this inscription the Madras Epigraphist remarks: “The characters are earlier than those of inscriptions belonging to Kiellhorn’s ‘K,’ Konerinnakondan Vikrama Pāṇḍya, whose reign commenced in A.D. 1401. This Jañāvarman Vikrama Pāṇḍya may have been contemporaneous with Māravarman Vikrama Pāṇḍya (A. D. 1283).”

Elsewhere (Annual Report for 1910-11, p. 79) we read “In the time of Jañ. Vikrama Pāṇḍya whose exact period of rule could not be fixed at present, etc.”

I find no dates that would suit the chronological details and the period assigned by the Epigraphist, except the following:

1. On Thursday, 80 June A.D. 1278, Mithuna su. 9 and “Śvātī” ended at 59 and 54 respectively.

2. On Thursday, 1 July, 1305, Mithuna su. 9 and “Śvātī” ended at 90 and 75 respectively.

When more dates of this reign are found, a further approximation may be attempted.

*Jañāvarman Srivallabhadava.*

(Reign began between 5 April and 12 Nov. 1291.)

1900 (503). From the South wall of the Pararangattarucchayavāmin temple at Pudupālaiyam (Tinnevelly District). Tamil, appears to record a gift of money for a lamp; much damaged.

**Date.**—6th year of Śrīmat Srivallabhadava; Mesha; [ba. 11]; Friday; [may also be read, says Epigraphist, as Monday]; “Uttara Bhādrapada.” On Friday, 19 April A.D. 1297, ba. 11 in Mesha and “Uttara Bhādrapada” ended respectively at 11 and 38 of day.

1909 (499). From the east wall of the Venkatāchalapati-Perumāl temple, at Sālapuram (Tinnevelly District), right of entrance. Damaged; mentions Ugramalā-Vinnagar.

**Date.**—9th year of Jañāvarman Srivallabhadava; Mesha 11; . . . . . . . . Paurṇami; Tuesday.

The Epigraphist commented thus on this inscription: “The record is much damaged and the reading very doubtful.” The value, however, of the solar day of the month, in investigating the particulars of a reign regarding which nothing was known, induced me to beg the Epigraphist to examine the impression once more in my presence. This was done; and the conclusion arrived at by us was that although the record was much damaged, there was no doubt about the words “Mesha, Paurṇami and Sivarā (Tuesday);” there remained the day of the solar month which we read as “11” but which might equally be “19” or “16”. Presuming that it was “11,” I arrive at the date, Tuesday 8 April A.D. 1300, which was full-moon day and 11 Mesha.

1902 (642). From the north wall of the maṇḍapa in front of the central shrine in the Pārivarāvānāvsvaravāmin temple at Tirukkaluar (Tanjore District). Sale of lands to Vijaya-Gandā-gopała.

**Date.**—2th year of Jañāvarman Srivallabha; Mesha; su. 11; Saturday; “Magha.” On Saturday, 3 April, A.D. 1316, “Magha” ended at 60 of the day and Mesha śukla 11 commenced on at 18, ending at 26 next day.
1902 (639). From the east wall of the āśānta in front of the central shrine in the Mihirān̄jaśvara temple at Tirumalaiyachur (Tanjore District). Gift of land.

**Date.**—21st year of Māravarman Kulaśekhara; Mithuna; śukla 12; Monday; "Śvātā,"

Later, the same inscription refers to Jatavaraman Srivallabhadeva's 25th year, Vyśāchika, ba. 15 [parapakṣahatu paurṇamāni, an extraordinary expression, since paurṇamā must of course fall in pāraṇa pakṣa]; Wed.; Rōhini. The date first quoted in the inscription may be referred, as is done below, to the reign of Māravarman Kulaśekhara II, i.e., to A.D. 1294.

The second date may be identified with Wednesday, 12 Nov. 1295, when Rōhini ended at 66 of day, and ba. 1 (parapakṣahatu prathamāt) at 65 of day. Either the inscription wrongly quotes paurṇamā for prathamāt which, considering the unusually erroneous expression commented on above, is the more probable alternative or the paurṇamā which in meantime ended at 97 of the day on Tuesday, was brought up to sunrise on Wednesday owing to local time or to a peculiarity of local calculation. I think, however, ba. 1 was meant.

* Māravarman Tribh. Sundara Pāṇḍya.

(Reign began 19 Feb. and 6 Mar. A. D. 1294.)

1911 (342). From the west wall of the central shrine in the Mūṅkuṇḍalīśvara temple at Kāḷakkotta (Chingleput District). Gift of land for offerings to the same temple by Kāḷkkunāyaka one of the Kaḷkkollas of the temple. Mentions Gaṅgākonaṭaṭa-chaturvīddhamalam

**Date.**—14th year of Māravarman Sundara Pāṇḍya, Māsha, sa. 13; Sunday; "Chitra" — Sunday, 16 April, A.D. 1302, when Māsha, sa. 13 ended at 66 of day, while "Chitra" ended at 69 next day, having been current for the greater part of Sunday.

1911 (343). From the north wall of the central shrine in the Mūṅkuṇḍalīśvara temple at Kāḷakkotta (Chingleput District). Gift of land for offerings by Āḷaṇṭaiyaṇaṇa, another Kaḷkkolla of Mūṅkuṇḍalīśvara temple at Kāḷakkotta (Chingleput District).

**Date.**—14th year of Māravarman Sundara Pāṇḍya; Mīna; sa. 1; Monday; "Rāvatī,"

On Monday, 6 March A.D. 1302, Mīna sa. 2 and "Rāvatī" ended at 62 and 47 of the day respectively ["sa. 1" error for "sa. 2"].

1911 (344). From the north wall of the central shrine in the Mūṅkuṇḍalīśvara Temple at Kāḷakkotta (Chingleput District). Gift of land [for offerings] by Mallāṇḍai, a third Kaḷkkolla of the same temple. The donors in Nos. 342 and 343 were his brothers.

**Date.**—14th year of Māravarman Sundara Pāṇḍya; Kumbha; śukla. . . . . . . Monday; Uttaṭa-Āśādha.

On Monday, 19 Feb. A.D. 1308, Kumbha ba. 12, and "Uttara-Āśādha" ended at 89 and 17 of the day respectively [Śukla error for bahula].

* Jatavarman Vira Pāṇḍya.

(Reign began between 23 June and 24 July 1296.)

1900 (78). From the north wall of the first prākṛtra of the Vēdapurāśvara temple at Tiruvottrur (North Arcot District). Gift of 64 Cows and 2 Bulls.

**Date.**—5th year of Jāṭ. V. Pāṇḍya; Mithuna; "Hasta." On Friday 7 July A.D. 1301, sa. 1 and Nak. "Puṣṭya" (not "Hasta") ended at 66 and 25 of the day.

† 1908 (401). From the north wall of the first prākṛtra in the Vēlīnāṭhavāmī temple at Tiruvilimilai (Tanjore District). Gift of land by a native of Periyāgudi in Tirunagaiyārṇādu a sub-division of Kōḷḷṭuvāḷaṇādu.

**Date.**—6th year of Jāṭ. V. Pāṇḍya (no epithet); Kannia; sa. 6; Friday; "Mūla,"

On Friday 28th Sep. A.D. 1302 which was, however, at the beginning of the 7th and near the end of the 6th year of Vīra Pāṇḍya who suffered the Muhammadan invasion, Kannia sa. 6 (it was the last day of Kannia) and Mūla ended at 10 and 25 of the day respectively.

4 Since this article was sent to Press, Prof. Hermann Jacobi of Bonn University has calculated four of these dates (i.e. those marked!) relating to the reign of Jāṭ. Vīra Pāṇḍya and published them in Ep. Ind. Vol. XI. pp. 137-139. The present results are, however, offered to the public in the form in which they originally stood first because several old dates not furnished to Prof. Jacobi, are here referred to the present reign and secondly because the findings here presented, especially that relating to the probable commencement of the reign, are not invariably those arrived at by Prof. Jacobi.
1906 (45). From the base of the verandah enclosing the central shrine in the temple of Amṛtágabhūtāvara at Tiranakadaiyur (Tanjore District). Gift of land; mentions the 41st year (of the king's predecessor?) and the shrine of Vikrama-Chōlchokramadaiyur.

Date.—14th year of Jaṭ. Vira Pāṇḍya; (no epithet) [Dhan] ba. 10 Wed. ; "Śvāti;"
(1) on Wednesday 22nd Dec. 1266, Dhan. ba. 10 and "Śvāti" ended at 14 and 14 respectively.

(2) on Wednesday 16 Dec. 1310, Dhan. ba. 10 and "Śvāti" ended at 55 and 57 respectively.

If the first of these days were the date intended, it would belong to the conqueror of "Ilam, Koṅgu and Choḷa;" but as no such conquest is explicitly referred to, we may adopt the second date which would then belong to Jaṭ. Vira Pāṇḍya whose reign began in 1296 and lasted till at least 1342. He was the only Vira Pāṇḍya who could, so far as is known to us, refer in 1310 to a predecessor with 41 years of reign, that is, to his own (natural) father, Mārvavarman Kulāšekhara whose reign began in 1268, and who in 1310 was murdered by his legitimate son Sundara Pāṇḍya.

All the remaining dates of this Jaṭ. Vira Pāṇḍya refer to the 40th and subsequent years of his reign. We know from the Muhammadan historians that Sundara Pāṇḍya, after murdering his father Mārvavarman Kulāšekhara in 1310, defeated his natural brother Vira Pāṇḍya but was afterwards defeated by the latter with the help of "Manar Barmul," son of the daughter of the murdered Kulāšekhara, and fled to Delhi. Vira Pāṇḍya’s success and restoration to his throne were of brief duration, because in or about 1312 he was attacked and defeated, and the city of Madurā sacked, by the Muhammadans under Malik Kafur. We are told also that eight Muhammadan Chiefs ruled over the Pandyā kingdom from 1310 till about 1358, and there is among the Pudukkottai dates a Hejra date A. H. 732 (= A. D. 1331-32). About 1340, however, the work of the reconstruction and consecration of the temples desecrated by the Muhammadan occupation was taken up under the auspices of Vira Pāṇḍya, who now reappears on the scene, always dating his reign from July 1296 when he seems to have been installed by his father as co-regent of the Pandyā Dominions.

† 1908 (192). From the east wall of the first prākāra of the Tituruttāḷṭavaṇa temple at Tiruputtīṛur (Madura District). Sale of privileges pertaining to paḍiṅkuḷam by the saṅhd of Tiruputtūr (Madura District) to Aṇavaiya alias Mālvavachakravartin of Sūraikandi.

Date.—44th year of Jaṭ. Vira Pāṇḍya; 5th Dhanus; su. 1 ; Thursday, "Mūla;"
On Thursday, 2 Dec. 1339 (= 5 Dhanus) su. 1 and "Mūla" ended at 31 and 26 respectively.

1996 (393). From the north wall of the māṇḍapa in front of the Satyagirinātha-Perumal temple at Tirumaiyam (Pudukkotai). Records the sale of all rights connected with paḍiṅkuḷam.

Date.—4 [5th] year of Jaṭ. Tribh. Vira Pāṇḍya (no epipheth); Dhanus; ba. 8 ; Wed, "Haṣa;"
On Wednesday 13 Dec. 1340, ba. 8 ; and "Haṣa" ended at 23 and 23 respectively.

† 1908 (119). From the east wall of the first prākāra of the Tiruttalṭavaṇa temple at Tiruputtūr (Madura District). Records that Aṇavaiya Periya Nāyaṇār alias Viśālajadēva, a native of Kuraikudi irrigated by the river Tēṅṟu in Adalaiyur-nāţi, consecrated again the image in the temple of Tiruttalṭaṇḍa-Nāyaṇār which had been polluted by the occupation of the Muhammadans.

Date.—46th year of Jaṭ. Tribh. Vira Pāṇḍya; 14 Kaṭaka; Monday; su. 5 ; "Uttara Phāḷgunu;" On Monday 12 July 1339, su. 5 and "Uttara Phāḷgunu" ended at 22 and 006 respectively; but the day of the solar month was 15 Kaṭaka not 14th [Regnal year 46 is apparently an error for 44]. At p. 183 of Ep. Ind. Vol. XI. Prof. Jacobi gives 2 Aug. 1339 as the equivalent of this date; but as he agrees with me as to the day of the solar month, his "2 Aug. must be a lapsus calami for "12 July."

(The Epigraphist, on reading the impression again in my presence, was of opinion that the recorded year was clearly 46).

† 1908 (120). From the east wall of the first prākāra of the Tiruttalṭavaṇa temple at Tiruputtīṛur (Madura District). Records the Muhammadan occupation of the temple and its consecration by Viśālajadēva mentioned in No. 49. He was on this account given certain special privileges in the temple by the priests of the temple.

Date.—44th year of Jaṭ. Vira Pāṇḍya; 21 Mithuna; su. 12 ; Sund.; "Anurādhī;"
[Reference to Muhammadan occupation commented on in *Ept's. Rept.,* 1908-09, p. 82]
Sunday 16 June 1342 (= 21 Mithunam) su. 12 and "Anurādhā" ended at '49 and '77.
[Regnal year should be 46, not 44].
(The Epigraphist read the impression again in my presence and was of opinion that the regnal year may be 46 or 49, not 44).

* Jaṭāvarman Sundara Pāṇḍya.*

(Reign began between 29 Aug. 1302 and 28 Aug. 1303).

1902 (580). From the west wall of the kitchen in the Kāllūvara temple at Kālaiyār Kōvil (Madurai District). Gift of land.

**Date.**—[1] year of Jaṭ. Sund. Pāṇḍya; Simha 81, ba 3; Wed. . . . . . . "rati niṭt,"
On Wed. 28 Aug. 1314 (= 31 Simha) ba. 3 and nakshatra "Aśvini" (Tamil, *Aṭvati*) ended at '89 and '47; respectively of the day.

*Māravarman Kulasekharana II.*

(Reign began between 6th and 29th March 1314.)

1902 (595). From the inner gopura of the Prēnasuprīvara temple at Apbil (Trichinopoly District). Right of entrance. Incomplete.

**Date year opp. [3rd] of Māravarman Kulasekharana II. Rishaba ;** 13th
. . . . . . . . . tithi; Wed.; "Śrāvīt."
On Wednesday 5 May, A.D. 1316, Rishabha su. 18 and "Śrāvīti" commenced, ending at '09 and '40 respectively on Thursday. [Regnal year should be "year opp. (2nd) not "year opp. (3rd)" ].

1903 (119). From the east wall of the mandapa in front of the central shrine in the Tilakēvara temple at Dēvīpāṭi (Madura District). Mutilated at the beginning.

**Date.**—year opp. 2nd of Kulasekharana . . . . Pāṇḍya "who conquered every country;"
. . . . . . . . . . . . 8th tithi; Sat.; "Rōhini;"
On Saturday, 19 Feb. 1317, Phalguna su. 8 and "Rōhini;" ended at '92 and '25 respectively.

—From the outer wall, (above the gōmbhī) of the inner prākṣi of the Kutalēvara temple at Kurpālam (or Courtallam, Tinnevelly District). Dato 7th (?) year of Māravarman Kulasekharana; 13 Kumbha; su. 8; Friday; day of "Rōhini;"

On Friday 5 Feb. A.D. 1321, which was 13 Kumbha, ākṣi 8 and "Rōhini;" ended respectively at '59 and '93 of day. The regnal year looks like "4th" in the impression but is really "7th," which fact was verified by the writer's friends at Kurpālam.

1907 (126). From the north wall of the kitchen in the Siddhājñānēvara temple at Paṭāṅgulam (Tinnevelly District). Sale of land to the temple of Karutt-arindumuditta-Pāṇḍjī [Sa] ramudaiya Nāyaṉār, here said to be in Śrēṇaṉa-Veṅṇaṅ-irurmasaṅvilāgam situated in Mulinjaṇu.

**Date.**—8th year of Māravarman Tribh. Kulasekharana "who took every country;" Tula "[1] 2" ; su. 9; Wednesday; "Sraṇa."  
On Wednesday 29 Sep. 1321 (= 2 Tula), su. 9 and "Sraṇa;" ended at '72 and '97 respectively. The reading 12 Tula, which I believe to be an error for 2 Tula, gives rise to the following observations:—The epithet "who took every country" may seem to relegate this date to the reign of Mār. Kulasekharana I. The interval between the initial years of the two Kulasekharas being 46 years, it is possible that lunar tithi and nakshatras are likely to occur at the same time of the solar year in either reign. (Vide sec. 229 of my *Indian Chronology.*) Moreover, if a tithi falls this year on 2nd Tula, it must have fallen last year on or about 12th Tula, so that per se in particular tithi and nakshatra, due on the 2nd Tula this year, would, ordinarily, have occurred 47 years ago on 12th Tula. Nevertheless, no suitable date, satisfying all the chronological details in the inscription, has been found in the reign of Mār. Kulasekharana I. except A.D. 1274, which however, was only the 7th year of that reign (not the 8th). On Wednesday 10th October A.D. 1274 (= 13 Tula, not 12 Tula) Tula su. 9 commenced at '08 of the day, ending next day at '14, while nakshatra Sraṇa ended at '55 on Wednesday.

**N.B.**—This inscription is on the north wall of a temple kitchen, while the next, No. 125, is on the west wall.
1907 (125). From the west wall of the kitchen in the Siddhājñānēśvara temple at Pāpiṇḍugulam (Tinnevelly). Sale of land to the temple of Karutt-ayindu-mudittā Pāṇi [Sa] ramūdaiya Nāyār, Dato.—8th year of Māravarman... Tribh. Kulaśekhara; Dhanus 11; ba...; Tuesday, "Śvāti."

On Tuesday 15th December 1821 (= 19 Dhanus) ba. 10 ended at '13 and "Śvāti" at '24 of the day.

[The inked impression of the inscription was read again in my presence by the Epigraphist, and the conclusion came to by him was that the solar day of the month could be read either as "11" or as "19." The latter reading suits the other chronological details which are clear.]

1907 (149). From the south wall of the shrine of the goddess in the Śiva temple at Pūvālaikkudi (Pudukkotai State). Gift of the village of Pūvālaikkudi. Mentions the festival called Maramāṉikkan-sandi and a certain Sōlai-Kalilāyamudaiyāgh atiś Kalikaṉinda Pāṇḍiyadēvar. The temple is called Uṉaiyā Tiruppūvalaikkudi-ṉaiyā-Nāyār in Vaiḍapuruṇai including Sevvalur, a sub-division of Koṭārur-ṉādu, a district of Ten-kōpādu.

Dato.—16th year of Mār. Kulaśekhara "who took every country;" Viśeṣika; su. 5; Wednesday, "Rēvati."

On Thursday, 25 January, 1830, Kumbha [not Viśeṣika], su. 5 and Rēvati ended at '20 and '18 respectively; in other words they were current for the greater part of Wednesday, 24 January, on which they commenced at '10 and '07 respectively [Viśeṣika, error for Kumbha].

[The Epigraphist, at p. 73 of his Annual Report for 1907-8, identifies this prince with Mār. Kulaśekhara I, but the date does not suit the 16th regnal year of that reign.]

On Wednesday, 3 Nov. 1838, Viśeṣika, su. 12 (not suklā 5) and Rēvati ended at '71 and '71 respectively.

On Wednesday, 31 Oct. 1836, Viśeṣika, su. 12 (not suklā 5) and "Rēvati" ended at '66 and '96 respectively.

These dates would answer for the 16th and 19th years of Māravarman Kulaśekhara I (16 and 19 being easily confounded in Tamil writing with each other); but suklā 5 for suklā 12 is not an error so readily accounted for as Viśeṣika for Kumbha.

* Jātvārman Tribh. Parākrama Pāṇḍya.

(Reign began between 15 April and 10 August 1315.)


Dato.—5th year opp. 7th of Jātvārman Tribh. Parākrama Pāṇḍya; Kumbha; ba. 12; Sunday; "Uttara Āśāha." On Monday 11 Feb. A.D. 1325, Kumbha ba. 12 and "Uttara Āśāha" ended at '22 and '11 respectively. In other words, ba. 13 and "U. Āś." were current for the greater part of Sunday, 10 Feb. 1325. [Regnal year should be 10th not 12th.]

1894 (17). From the east wall of the maṇḍapa in front of the Pushpavanāsvara shrine at Tiruppūrāṇam (Madura District). Gift of land.

Dato.—(Wrongly assigned in App. to Annual Report for 1894-95 to Konerimmakondan's 8th year) 9th year of Parākrama Pāṇḍya; Sinha su. 8; Wednesday, "Anurādha." On Wednesday 10 Aug. A.D. 1823, Sinha su. 8 and "Anurādha" ended at '43 and '45 respectively.

* Tribh. Kulaśekharadēva.

[23 July A.D. 1166 fell in his 5th year. This must have been the Kulaśekharā who waged a prolonged war against Parākramabāhun of Ceylon. Tiruppattur is one of the places mentioned in the Mahāsāṃga as having been visited by Lankāpura, the Ceylonese General.]

1908 (101). From the Tirattalaiyvar temple at Tiruppattur (Madura District.)

Dato.—Year opposite the 4th of Tribh. Kulaśekharadēva, "27th day of Karkataksa "Rohigi;" Saturday. In Ep. Ind. Vol. XI, at p. 137 the Epigraphist notes that the date of the inscription, as judged by the characters, must be earlier than A.D. 1200. I find that the date was Sat. 23 July A.D. 1166 which was the 27th day of Karkataksa. On this day "Rohigi" and Srāvaṇa ba. 10 ended at '70 and '87 of the day respectively.
THE INDIAN INScriptions AND THE ANTIQUITY OF INDIan ARTIFICIAL POETRY.

By G. BüHLER.

[Translated by Prof. V. S. Ghate, M. A.; Poona.]

(Continued from p. 198.)

V. The Nāsik-Inscription No. 19, from the nineteenth year of Sri-Pulumāyi.

A further contribution to the knowledge of the Kādyā style of the second century and especially of the poetic ideas and comparisons in vogue at the time is made by the prāsasti of a cave which was given over to the monks of the Bhadrāyaniya school, in the nineteenth year of the reign of the Andhra king Sri-Pulumāyi. The date of the inscription can be only approximately determined at present. Nevertheless it must be somewhat older than the Girnār prāsasti discussed above. Sri-Pulumāyi like Chashtana is, as we know, mentioned by Ptolemaïs, under the name of Siro-Polemos or Siro-Polemios, as the ruler of Bāithana, i.e., Paithāna or Prati-śabhāna on the Godāvari river. Accordingly the inscription in question will have to be placed somewhere about the middle of the second century. To the same result leads another circumstance which is put forth by Dr. Bhāṣā Dāji in Journ. Bo. Br. Roy. As. Soc., Vol. VIII, p. 242. According to l. 6 of our inscription, Pulumāyi’s father Gotamiputra Sātakaṇi extinguished the family of Khakharāta. In the inscriptions of Nāsik, Junnar, and Karle is mentioned a Kahaḥarāta king and satrap or great satrap Nahapāna, whose son-in-law, the Saka Ushavadāta or Usahbadāta was a great patron of Brāhmaṇas and Buddhists and made many grants in the western Decan, as well as in Kōṇaṇ and Katiḷavā, and we are provided with the several dates of his reign, from the year 40 to 46. The similarity of the names Khakharāta and Kahaḥarāta makes it very probable that they denote one and the same person, a supposition which is also favoured by the circumstance that just the very districts, in which Ushavadāta made his grants, have been mentioned in l. 2 f. our inscription as parts of Sātakaṇi’s dominion. The title satrap or great satrap borne by Nahapāna leads to the further conclusion that he was a dependent prince and the fact that on his coins, the Kharoṣṭhī lipī is used side by side with the southern alphabet, proves his connection with the north-west where the Indo-Scythians were rulers. We may, therefore, suppose that he, like Rudradāman used the Saka era, and thus his last date, Sāhvat 46, would correspond to A.D. 124/5. Very probably his unfortunate war with Sātakaṇi took place soon after this year. According to his inscriptions, Sātakaṇi ruled for at least 24 years, and extinguished the Kahaḥarāta king and satrap before the eighteenth year of his reign. For, the Nāsik inscription No. 13, bearing this year, disposes of a village in the district of Govardhana, which had in earlier times belonged to the dominion of Nahapāna. If then we assume that the battle between Nahapāna and Sātakaṇi took place in the year 47 of the Saka era used by the former, i.e., in A.D. 125/6, and in the fifteenth year of the reign of the latter, then the year of the writing of our inscription would be A.D. 113/4, by adding the 9 years of Sātakaṇi and the 19 years of Pulumāyi to 125. Of course it is possible that the date in question may be from ten to twelve years earlier or a very few years later even. A later date than this does not seem to be probable, because the mention of Pulumāyi’s name in Ptolemaïs shows that he must have been on the throne a long time before A.D. 151, the date of the completion of the Geography.

If we accept these conjectures which at least possess a very high probability, then our inscription is about twenty years older than the prāsasti of the Sudarśana Lake; and its style must be regarded as a proof for the growth of Kādyā in the middle of the second century. Although it is

60 Archæological Survey of Western India, Vol. IV., p. 92-103 (Nos. 5—11).
61 See especially Inscription No. 20, in which a village given as a present by Usahbadāta is again given away by an Andhrakara, Arch. Sur. W. India, Vol. IV., p. 103 (No. 6) and p. 112-113 (No. 20).
63 Ibid. p. 105, where 14 is to be corrected to 12.
64 Compare also Dr. Bhāṣā Dāji’s remarks in his Early History of the Dekkan, p. 20 ff. where the date of the inscription is placed somewhat earlier. In several particulars, I cannot agree with Dr. Bhāṣā Dāji.
composed in an old Prakrit very much nearer to Pāli, still the results that may follow from its examination would of course be equally applicable to Sanskrit Poetry; as there exists no separating barrier between Prakrit and Sanskrit kādyas. As far as the information provided by the Alankāra-sūtra goes, both Sanskrit and Prakrit compositions are regarded as branches of a common stem and are both bound by the same laws. Accordingly we find that all the known Prakrit kādyas are composed in obedience to the same canons as are written in Sanskrit. They present the same varieties of style and the same alankāras, and it happens not seldom that one and the same author uses both Prakrit and Sanskrit. Even the author of our inscription must have known Sanskrit and been expert in Sanskrit kādyas also, because he appears to be guilty of some Sanskriticisms. The compound Viihachhavatikā (l. 2) appears to be but a transliteration of the Sanskrit Vindhayarkshavat, since the Greek form apērykos shows that the Prakrit name of the Rikshavat began with u. Another apparently Sanskrit sūndhi is found in "Kesarajuna" (l. 8), where the rule of the Prakrit demands "Kesarajuna", i.e., "Kesarajuna". So also the form pitupatiyo (l. 11) occurring in a writing of such a late date, must be looked upon as only an archaic imitation of pitripatipatūh. As far as I know this is the only instance of a genitive in the dual number, which has been entirely lost even in older Prakrit literature. It is even possible that the inscription might have been at first composed in Sanskrit and then translated or transliterated, as the Prakrit, which resembled Pāli, was then, as even in much later times, the official language in southern India. Whatever may be the case, there is no certainty that the author was acquainted with the Sanskrit language as well as the Sanskrit literature.

His work is a gadyān kādyam like the Gītārā inscription discussed above and belongs to the class of prāśasti. After the date given in quite an official manner, there follows the description of the king of kings Gotamiputra Sātakaṇi written in a high poetic style, which together with the shorter praise of his mother Gotami Bālsiṇi and of the cave prepared by her, in all, covers eight lines and a half, and altogether makes a gigantic sentence. Then there come at the end two short sentences which say that the Queen gave away the cave to the Bhradrāyaṇya monks and that her grandson Punjamāi assigned the village Aśāchpadra for the preservation of the sculpture and pictures. In these concluding sentences, the language is quite business-like; but even there we find some figures on a small scale made use of. In the first of these, the mother is described by means of three epithets giving rise to alliteration, mahādevi mahādājāndī mahādajāpatāmaki, in the second the king is spoken of not by name but as mahādājanī aṣaṇāya seṣākīmo piṣayakāno ya- [ād Sakaṭlabākyah] pahatasa, ‘the grandson ever willing to serve and please the Queen the grandmother, the lord of the whole of the Deccan.’ Thus even here the author does not forget his profession altogether.

As for the first and the main part of the prāśasti, its style entirely resembles that of the Gītārā prāśasti in that long compounds are used to bring out ojas or the force of language. These ran on almost exclusively from l. 2 to l. 6; then in l. 7, the almost breathless reader is favored with a resting pause, in as much as only short words are used. In the last line and a half of the description of the king, the poet again takes a new leaf and uses towards the end the longest compound which contains sixteen words with forty-three letters (paramgāra ṛṣīdī). The Anuprāsa is more liberally made use of, as is the case with the Gītārā prāśasti. Thus we have in l. 2 "aṅgika-aṅgaka," in l. 3 "pavata-pavīna, dīta-saṅkara haṁ," "kamalavimāla," in the last parts of the compounds in l. 3 "vedaṇaṇa, vedanāra vedanaṇa, vedanaṇa," and many more similar expressions. In one point, however, the Nāšik inscription differs from the Gītārā prāśasti. While the latter disdains the use of the conventional similes of court poets, these are found in our prāśasti in a very large number and sometimes very striking too. Just the very first epithet of the king Himavat-Meru-Madara-pañca-sama-ratana, whose essence resembles that of the mountains Himavat, Meru, and Mandara, is conceived quite in the kādyas style. Thus the author shows that the comparisons of the king with these mountains so favourite in later times were in vogue even in his day. What he, in reality, means by the phrase in question is that Sātakaṇi was possessed of

65 See on this my remarks on the Prakrit Pallava Land-Grant in the Epigraphia Indica, p. 41.
great treasures, like the Himālaya, that he was the central point of the world, and overshadowed the same with his might, like the Meru, and that like the Mandara which was used as a churning rod by gods at the time of churning out nectar, he knew how to bring to light and to acquire for himself Lakshmi, the Fortuna regna.

The correctness of this explanation can be easily demonstrated. For, the idea that the Himālaya hides within himself immemorable treasures has been prevalent amongst the Indian people since a very old time, and it finds its expression in mythology, in that the abode of Kubera is located in the Himālaya. To the court poets, the idea that riches are the ṣdra of the Himālaya is so obvious that at times they do not express it at all, but only hint at the same. Thus Kālidāsa says in Rāgavahātra IV, 79:—

परस्वर्येऽविज्ञानविद्यात् विद्याम्।
राजः विष्णु: सारं गत: सारी हिमालिना॥

"As the (Gaṇas) (came) with presents in their hands, they understood each other's essence; the king, that of the Himālaya (i.e., his riches, and the Himālaya that of the king (i.e., his might)."

Equally old and generally prevalent is the conception that the mountain Meru is the centre of the world; and kings are very frequently compared with the same, in ṛṣyas, in order to illustrate their great might. Thus, in the beginning of the Kīdambari, Bāṇa says (p. 5.1.11, Peterson's ed.), the king of the king Sūdāra:—

मेरठ सरस्वतीयान्वेषा भवनसब्द:।
हेमण्डिलो मिश्रितस्तुतिव्यथात्।।

"He resembles Meru in that all the worlds live in the shadow of his feet,' i.e., are preserved through his protection, just as they live in the shadow of the spurn of the mountain. The comparison is also found in the inscriptions, e.g., in the prākṣasti which forms a prelude to the grant of land made by the Chauḷukya king Mālarāja I. It is said there—मेरठ सरस्वतीयान्वेषा भवनसब्द:।

As for the mountain Mandara, it is one of the most well-known myths, according to which it sired gods as a churning-rod, at the churning of the milk-ocean. As on that occasion, Lakṣmī, the goddess of wealth, came out, and she is often described as the representative of the royal power and splendour and even as the consort of kings, the kings themselves are often compared with the Mandara mountain in order to hint at the idea that they churn out Fortune from the ocean of the enemies. Thus in Śrī-Harṣhotarī, p. 227, 1.7 (Kāśmir edition) Bāṇa says, while describing the king Pushyabhūti, that he was मन्न्त्ररां व तथोन्नास्तिकारेण 'Mandara-like in drawing out Lakṣmī.' This same thought is farther elaborated in verse 7 of the Aṭhaṭ prākṣasti, a composition of the seventh century, written in a high Gaṇḍakī style, where it is said of the king Kumārabhūṭa:—

भूमिः भवरामणमशालिन्यगतिः सत्तनुराधिकारेण महीयर्विधीन्ति।
हेमण्डिलो मिश्रितस्तुतिव्यथात्।।

"Who became Mandara and immediately churned out the terrible army of the illustrious Jānśavarmā, a moon amongst princes, the army, which was the means of the acquisition of Fortune, and thus resembled the milk-ocean.' A still more artificial representation of the simile is found in the prākṣasti of the Rāṭhor king Govinda II, verse 3, belonging to the beginning of the ninth century. I have explained it fully in the translation of the passage.

In the face of these facts, it can not be doubted, that the author of the Nāyik inscription intended to say or to hint all that is contained in the explanation given above; and when we see that he dares to express himself in such an extraordinarily concise manner and is content with only

66 See Anīte, Vol. VI. p. 191. My translation as given there mentions only the second meaning of madhyāstha. It is, however, not improbable that the writer also means to say that Mālarāja was the centre of the world, although the expression cannot apply to a petty ruler who possessed only a few miles of land. Such considerations, however, have no weight with a court-poet.


68 It is just possible that he had in view even other less important qualities of the mountains named here. Thus, as the Meru is the abode of the viśvāku or the gods, and as viśvāku also means 'a wise man', the comparison of the king with the Meru may imply a compliment to the effect that the king was surrounded by wise councilors and learned men. Compare, for instance, Vāsavadatta, p. 14. 1. 1 नेरविम विद्वानाम.
alluding to the edra of the three mountains, we cannot but suppose that intle first place he knew all the myths in question and in the second place that the comparisons of kings with these mountains were in vogue then; for otherwise the expression in question would have been quite unintelligible to the hearer. The comparisons involved in the epithets in the next lines 3-4 are some of them so familiar that it is unnecessary to demonstrate their occurrence in the kādyas. This is the case, for instance, with the phrase divasakara-kara-vibodhita-kamala-vimala-sadiva-vadanasa, 'whose face resembles a spotless lotus which the sun's rays have awakened (from the nocturnal sleep), of which we should only remark that the use of the word vara, which also means 'hand,' is not unintentional. Equally commonplace is the comparison in patipusa-chada-madata-sasirika-piya-dasanasa 'whose appearance is lovely and lustrous like the disc of the full moon.' What is, of course, meant is that the face of the king shines like the full moon. But as the face has been spoken of before, the author uses dasana for edana and thus varies somewhat the usual idea. Lastly, no examples are necessary for varadraṣṭavriyakamadendramanasa, 'whose gait is beautiful like that of a lordly elephant,' and bhujagapatibhoga-pitaavatipadigasa-sudarabhujasa, 'whose arms strong, round, massive, and beautiful like the coils of the prince of serpents.' With regard to the last epithet it must be observed, in the meanwhile, that the author has taken great trouble to give a new unusual form to the old comparison of the arm of a warrior with a serpent, already very usual in the epics. For this purpose, he mentions the serpent-prince Sesa instead of some other favourite serpent, and piles together a number of adjectives. The first of these things is often done by court poets; e.g., in Raghuvarāja XIV. 31, Kālidāsa describes Rāma as Sarpākṣatadīṣṭurahuṣa. Some-what more rare is the absurd notion in ti-samudra-taya-pita-cālanasa 'whose armies drink the water of the three oceans,' though sanctioned by the usage of Indian poets. Similar expressions are now and then met with in panegyrics and prāṣasti, with a view to suggest that the victorious armies have pressed forward to the shores of the ocean. A rhetorician remarks that the water of the ocean would never be drunk. But nevertheless the poets very frequently use expressions like the one above, which, therefore, cannot be looked upon as involving a breach of auctiṣya.²⁶

The following lines contain nothing useful for our purpose. Their object is to represent Sātakaṇi as a ruler who lived up to the rules of Niṣṭhāstra. On the other hand, the short epithets in l. 7 remind us of several passages in the descriptions of heroes and heroines by Bāṇa who also frequently interrupts the long-winded compounds and the tiring rows of comparisons, in quite a similar manner, and now and then makes use of similar expressions in such cases. The rightness of what we say will be best shown by placing this part of the inscription side by side with a passage, in Bāṇa's Kādambarī, from the description of the king Sūdraka²⁷:

अआकाशन नित्यहस्त दुर्गितल असमव नित्यवाट अविनयमयः विचारणं प्रचारं एकाक्षरस्य एकभुधरस्य एकाधिकरणं एव सम्भव्यति||

कर्ता महावर्णानानाहि कर्त्तवानाहि: सर्वदशानाथः
स्वयमः कुलांत: कुलदल: सुपारिणामाणि:
काः विद्वानसिन्धुविशेषस्य सदा जनसत: 
वर्ण-विभिन्न ज्ञानेनाविभिन्न विनिविवादानभित्ति:
सेर्वश्रवणानाममभिविद्यामिति विश्वासः
धैर्यान्वितानामानमयानांविनिविवादामिति।

Of course Bāṇa's expressions are much more choice, and they show a considerable advance in the development of the style. Nevertheless, a certain similarity is unmistakable and the reason why simpler epithets are inserted in the midst of more complicate ones is no doubt the same in both the cases. In l. 8, we meet with two long compounds compare Sātakaṇi with the heroes of Mahābhārata as well as with the kings of yore described in that work:—'Whose bravery was similar to that of Rāma (Halabhrit), Keśava, Arjuna and Bhīmasena,' and 'whose lustre resembled that of Nābīga, Nahusha, Janamejaya, Saṁkara, Yayāti, Rāma (of the Raghu race) and Ambarisha.' Further these two compounds are separated, certainly not without intention, by another epithet inserted between them. Comparisons with the kings of epič tales are as a rule used by Subandhu and Bāṇa, in the descriptions of their heroes, who, however, work them out in a far finer way. They bring out the similarity in particular points by means of a īleka on every

²⁶ See, for instance, the Udāyav prashāti, verse 10; Ep., Ind., p. 234. The name of the rhetorician I have unfortunately not noted.
²⁷ Kādambarī p. 5, 12-16; compare also Kādambarī p. 56, 1, 7-8
name or they show that their heroes surpass by far the old heroes, in that they go more deeply into the original. Here, in our inscriptions, we have to do with the beginnings of a development which reached its high point certainly in the seventh century, or perhaps even much earlier.

To the great significance of the immediately following passage, I have already alluded (the Sāhadīkācharita, of Padmagupta, p. 48 ff.):—Who, standing in the forefront defeated the hosts of his enemies, in a battle in which, in a manner immeasurable, eternal, incomprehensible and marvellous, the wind, Garuḍa, the Siddharāja, Yakṣas, Rakṣasas, Vidyādharas, Bhuvas, Gandharvas, Chāraṇas, the sun, the moon, stars and planets took part.73 It is just the oldest instance of a mixture of history and mythology, so usual in the later court poets. As Bīhāra repeatedly makes Śiva to interfere in the fortunes of his patron Vikramaditya, or as Hemachandra surrounds his master Jñāsinī-Siddharāja with supernatural beings, or as Padmagupta-Parinala reduces the history of the life of Siddharāja to a pure myth, so has here our author given heavenly powers as confederates to the father of his master. This passage thus provides us with an interesting point of connection between our inscription and the style of narration of the court poets. About the meaning of the next phrase, unfortunately we are not sure, as the first letter can be read as nd or nd. If we read nāgarūkhaṇḍha gagaṇamaharṇa abhrivāyādhva, as is most probably the case, then it would be rendered thus:—Who towered up higher in heaven than the shoulder of a great mountain, or the trunk of a grand tree.74 With this we may compare Raghunātaka XVIII, 15, where it is said of king Pāriyātra:

उत्तर किले नसिन्द्रकिन नाम्री: लिनथे जिले पारियाग्रा।

'Fortune resorted, indeed, to (the king) Pāriyātra, the height of whose head surpassed (the mountain) Pāriyātra.'

If, on the other hand, we read nāgarūkhaṇḍha, then we must translate:—Who went up into the heaven from the shoulder of his lordly elephant.75 The meaning then would correspond to that of verse 20 in the Lakā Manjul prāṣasti,76 where it is said of Chandra-gupta, the consort of the princess Iśvarā of Śīvapura:

मभार दाहल नाम्री करिम: नाम्रा... . . . .

'As her husband ascended to heaven, from the shoulder of his elephant.'

These words describe Chandra-gupta's death, and would mean that he fell from an elephant, and had his neck broken, or that he, while fighting on elephant-back in the battle, met with a hero's death, or perhaps that he exchanged the splendour of the earthly life of a prince for heaven. The second alternative seems to be the most probable. At any rate the passage referring to Sātakaṇi will have to be understood thus, in case the reading nāga7 is the correct one.

The remaining lines, we have first, the praise of the queen Gotami Balasiri, who, in every way, acted worthy of her title "the wife of a royal sage"; secondly, the very bold, though improper, comparison of the mountain Trikāṇa with a peak of the Kailāsa mountain, and lastly the assurance that the cave possessed a magnificence which equalled that of a lordly palace of gods. All these three notions are most usual in kāvyas. Instances of the third have been already mentioned by us above on p. 142.

What we have said so far should quite suffice to prove that the Nāṣik-inscription No. 16, also, bears a close relationship with the gāyaka kāvyas preserved for us, and that it especially contains many comparisons current in the latter. It must, however, be repeated that this prāṣasti occupies a considerably lower rank than the prose parts in Harisheṇa's kāvyas, and is still less artificial than the works of Subandhu, Bāṇa, and Daṇḍin.

(To be continued.)


73 Dr. Bhāgaṅdārkar and Dr. Bhagyādālī transliterate vikādra—where I have freely rendered 'in which—took part,' by 'witnessed.' The reason why I do not follow this meaning is that no examples of this meaning accepted by the two gentlemen are known to me; on the contrary, Buddhāmaka 'to fight a battle' is given in the Petersburg Lexicon.

74 The ablative implies here, as is often the case in Sanskrit, that the Positive form has the sense of the Comparative.75 Ep. Ind., p. 13.
MATACHI: A BRAHVIalian WORD IN VEDIC LITERATURE.

Col. Jacob, in a paper contributed to the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society for April 1911, p. 510, makes two interesting suggestions regarding the word _matachi_ occurring in the Chhandogya-Upanishad I, 10, 1, which is explained by some commentators as _sūryažapatī_. Col. Jacob says, that “these red-coloured winged creatures are no other than locusts” and that the word _matachi_ “looks like an importation from outside Aryavarta.”

It is interesting to note that both of these suggestions are confirmed by the fact that _matachi_ is a Sanskritized form of the well-known Dravidian word _miṣṭi_ or _miṣṭicē_, meaning locusts, which is used at the present day in the Dharwar District. Mr. Kittel, in his Kanaḍa-English Dictionary, explains the word _miṣṭicē_ thus: “that which hops, a grass hopper, a locust.” According to the same authority the word appears as _miśṭaṇa_ in Telugu, as _miṣṭal_ or _meṣṭal_ in Malayalam, and as _meṣṭakkiḷi_ in Tamil. The word is obviously derived from the root _miḍ_, to hop.

Mr. Kittel in his introduction to his Dictionary gives a very long list of so-called Sanskrit words, which are really Dravidian. But in compiling this list he seems to have drawn exclusively upon classical Sanskrit. Matachi is thus the only Dravidian word as yet discovered in Vedic literature.

K. B. Pathak.

SANKARACHARYA’S REFERENCE TO JayADITYA.

In his commentary on the Chhandogya-Upanishad I, 1, 4, when elucidating the expression _brahman_ "Sankaracharya quotes the well-known _sūtra_ as: "_brahman_ ज्ञातिपरिवर्तन दक्ष्चित् [Pāṇini V, 3, 93] and says that the compound _ज्ञातिपरिवर्तन_ in this _sūtra_ should be treated as a locative and not a genitive compound, and continues:—

It may be contended that the illustration given in the commentary on this _sūtra_, namely, "_brahman_ ज्ञातिपरिवर्तन_ does not favour our view. But we reply that even this illustration is in perfect harmony with our view, if the question relates to the individuals composing the _Kātha_ _kīṭha_. Sankaracharya’s words are:

नन्द जाति: परिवर्तन ज्ञातिपरिवर्तने कतन: कह._

Anandajīdās explains this thus:

कस्मादित्व निर्वशातिपायी ज्ञातिपरिवर्तने निर्वशातिपायी।

Hence the illustration given by the Kāṣṭikā-vṛttiṭkāra Jayaditya, who died in A.D. 661, and whose words referred to above are:

कस्मादित्व: कतम:

Kāṣṭikā-vṛttiṭ, Benares Ed., Part II, p. 94. Sankaracharya omits the word _नन्द्_ and indicates this by using the expression _ह्रद्याह_ thus: _कतम_:

कह_ ज्ञातिपरिवर्तन_ नया: It may be stated here that Kātyāyana and Patañjali, as interpreted by Kātyāya, hold that the words _ज्ञातिपरिवर्तन_ should be left out of the _sūtra_ as unnecessary, and therefore an illustration of this _sūtra_ is given in the Mahābhāṣya. The fact that Sankaracharya quotes the celebrated Buddhist grammarian Jayaditya, who died in the second-half of the seventh century A.D., is so interesting from a literary and historical point of view that it deserves to be brought to the notice of Sanskrit scholars.

K. B. Pathak.

Poona.
BOOK NOTICE.

INDIAN CHRONOLOGY.—A practical guide to the interpretation and verification of Tithis, Nakshatras, Horoscopes, and other Indian Time-records, from B.C. 1 to A.D. 2000—By Dewan Bahadur L.D. Swaminathan Pillai, M.A., B.L., LL.B.; published by Grant Co., Madras (1917). Price Rs. 5.

The present book by Dewan Bahadur S. Pillai dealing with the citation of dates according to the various systems in vogue in India ranging between 1 B.C. and 2000 A.D. fills a longfelt want. Roughly speaking the book may be said to consist of two main divisions—the letter press and the tables. The former gives the preliminary information necessary for an intelligent use of the tables. It explains the relations between Indian Astronomy and Indian Chronology. Chapter XV gives a list of the principal systems of chronology in use in India, along with the mode of calculating the equivalent Christian date therefrom. The catalogue of Hindu festivals in relation to tithis given in Chapter XVI is likely to prove of much interest even to the ordinary layman. The three parts, into which the letter-press of the book is actually divided, are so arranged and treated that they gradually develop one into the other, without in the least slackening the interest of the general reader in the study of even such a dry abstruse subject as chronological research.

By far the most important portion of the book—and also the practical one—is the tables given therein. They occupy nearly 250 pages closely bristling with figures. They are twenty-two in all, embodying the various items of value and interest to the historian, the archaeologist and chronologist. In these tables the most important one, and of greater practical interest to the ordinary man of the world, is Table X, which enables him to know the exact English equivalent of any date from 1 B.C. to A.D. 2000. In this table also are given the solar years, new moons, and eclipses that occur during this long period of time. The calculations for this period of two thousand years is made according to the mode followed in the Sūrya-siddhānta as it is found at present. For the period from A.D. 500 to A.D. 999 the calculation according to the Arya-siddhānta also is given, and this special calculation is invaluable owing to the immense influence which the Arya-siddhānta enjoyed during this period. Dewan Bahadur S. Pillai's calculation for the period from 1 B.C. to 500 A.D. is made only according to the Sūrya-siddhānta. It is accurate and clear, but it is likely to lead the reader to form the wrong impression that Sūrya-siddhānta was followed in these days also. Varāhamihira's Pañca-siddhāntikā no doubt refers to a Sūrya-siddhānta, but it was not the Sūrya-siddhānta of the present day, from which the author has adopted the mode of calculation in the book. The calculation of the dates prior to 500 A.D. according to the latter-day Sūrya-siddhānta is, therefore, not quite in harmony with facts, and is merely a carrying backwards of the process used authentically only for the period from 500 A.D. onwards.

The eye-table appended at the end of the book sums up the results of the preceding tables, and is of great value for obtaining general results. It gives in a remarkably well condensed form almost all the items necessary to determine a date with fair accuracy. But for obtaining a detailed result, the reader must resort to the preceding tables.

Messrs. Dikshit and Sewell's book on Indian Chronology has acquired prominence because it was the first one in the field, but in point of cheapness and utility Dewan Bahadur S. Pillai's present publication in our opinion is much better. To an ordinary man Dikshit and Sewell's book is prohibitive owing to its high price; and consequently there was a longfelt want of a cheap ready-reckoner of dates. Mr. S. Pillai's book, however, meets this want to a remarkable degree. His methods are on the whole generally correct and sound. To workers in the various fields of antiquities and archeology, the present book must prove to be of incalculable value. To the layman also it will be of no small interest, inasmuch as hardly anyone will be found who has not at any time to look up some old date or another. Mr. S. Pillai's book is being constantly used by the Bhārat-Itiha-sāmānā-jānak-māndal of Poona for verifying dates from Marāṭhā history. In the course of calculations made for several dates of the Marāṭhā period, only one inaccuracy was detected. On page 116, the week day of 1st January 1704 ought to be 7 (Saturday) and not 1 (Sunday) as printed in Table X. This is the only misprint so far discovered. But speaking generally, the work is remarkably free from misprints or inaccuracies of any kind, which are too often the besetting sin of books teeming with figures.

Poona.

G. S. KHARE.
THE OBSOLETE TIN CURRENCY AND MONEY OF THE FEDERATED MALAY STATES.

BY SIR R. C. TEMPLE, Bart.

(Continued from p. 216.)

APPENDIX V.

Subsidiary Tables and Scales made during Investigations into the Malay Tin Currency.

I.

Professor Ridgeway’s and Mr. Skeat’s Table of Tin Money (Pahang) from the Cambridge Museum (and other) specimens.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>24 I</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 1 1/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>260</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td>712</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>24 H</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>2 1/2</td>
<td>2 1/2 1 1/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>24 G</td>
<td>1086</td>
<td>2 1/2</td>
<td>2 1/2 1 1/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1036</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[7. ]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>? 3200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II.

Professors Ridgeway’s and Mr. Skeat’s Table of Tin Currency (Selangor) from Cambridge Museum Specimens.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>885</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>12 1/2</td>
<td>2 1/2 2 1/2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>884</td>
<td>1/4</td>
<td>22 1/2</td>
<td>3 3/4 3 1/4 1 1/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>883</td>
<td>1/8</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3 3/4 3 1/4 1 1/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>881</td>
<td>1/8</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>4 1/4 4 1/4 2 1/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>1/8</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>4 1/4 4 1/4 2 1/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>879</td>
<td>1/8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2 1/2 2 1/2 1 1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** This is the "dollar" unit.
** These represent the half or quarter "dollar" unit and the "dollar" unit respectively.

The first three specimens bear the "tampo" mangosteen (mangosteen calyx) 🍌 mint mark; the last two have no mint mark.

The first seven numbers refer to the "Pagoda" Scale. See ante, p. 92.

The last two numbers refer to the "Sugarloaf" Scale. See ante, p. 92. The last bears the mangosteen calyx 🍌 mint mark on the top, and the melanelia, tin mine recessed, marks ⅾ and ⅘ on the sides. No. 879 is unsymmetrical and very roughly cast.
### III.

#### Mr. Skeat’s Money Tables.

**A.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>cents to dollar</th>
<th>Singapore and Malacca</th>
<th>Penang and Province Wellesley</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>quarter cents make</td>
<td>1 half cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(duit, pese)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>half cents</td>
<td>1 cent (sen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 cent (sen)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>quarters</td>
<td>1 cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>wang</td>
<td>1 buaya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1 buaya</td>
<td>1 kupang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1 kupang</td>
<td>1 20-cent piece</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1 20 cent piece</td>
<td>1 quarter (suku)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>2 suku</td>
<td>1 jampil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>2 jampil</td>
<td>1 dollar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Modern British in Federated Malay States.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>cents to dollar</th>
<th>2 quarter cents make 1 half cent</th>
<th>1 cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 half cents</td>
<td>1 buaya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1 buaya</td>
<td>1 kupang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1 kupang</td>
<td>1 20-cent piece</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1 20 cent piece</td>
<td>1 suku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>2 suku</td>
<td>1 jampil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>2 jampil</td>
<td>1 dollar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B.**

### IV.

#### Federated Malay States.

**Mr. Skeat’s table of old Dutch money.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>cents to dollar</th>
<th>in Federated Malay States.</th>
<th>cents to the dollar.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>pese</td>
<td>1 duit (cent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2½</td>
<td>duit</td>
<td>1 wang baharu (dubbeltje)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6½</td>
<td>wang-baharu</td>
<td>1 kóndéri-perak⁴⁶</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12½</td>
<td>kóndéri-perak</td>
<td>1 talí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>talí</td>
<td>1 suku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>suku</td>
<td>1 jampil (guilder)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>jampil</td>
<td>1 dollar⁴⁶</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mr. Skeat’s table of Tia Ingot Currency.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>cents to the dollar.</th>
<th>in Perak, Selangor, Sungai Ujong, Negri Sembilan.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2 buaya (crocodile) make 1 tampang (cake)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6½</td>
<td>½ tampang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12½</td>
<td>2 talí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>4 bidor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>1 “dollar”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

⁹⁴ In Penang the duit = a cent, following the old Dutch system.

⁹⁵ These names were also formerly current in Selangor.

⁹⁶ Wang and suku are moneys of account, not coins.

⁹⁷ Jampil are obsolete and scarce.

⁹⁸ i. e., the new wang, which, when first introduced, was copper.

⁹⁹ i. e., silver cundareen. For cundareen, see ante, Vol. XXVI, pp. 314 ff. This represents the half-talí, which, as money of account, was reckoned at 6 cents not 6½ cents. As money, it was called sa-perak, one silver piece.

¹⁰⁰ The Spanish dollar of 416 grs.
V.

Federated Malay States.

*Tables from the information* given to Mr. Laidlaw; see his letter dated 14 June 1904.

(1). Ingot Currency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>In cents</th>
<th>By av. weight of dollar.</th>
<th>Value of 1 lb.</th>
<th>Value of 10 kati (of tin).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tahil</td>
<td>7½</td>
<td>1¼ oz.</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>penjuru</td>
<td>6½</td>
<td>13½ oz.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>piak</td>
<td>13½</td>
<td>12½ lb.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suku</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>5½ lb.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jampal</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>5½ lb.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ringgit</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>19½ lb.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2½ käping (slab) = 1 pikul; 3 pikul = 1 bahara of 300 kati = 400 lbs. Therefore käping = 37½ kati = 50 lbs; 1 pikul = 100 kati = 133½ lbs. This gives a scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>In cents</th>
<th>By av. weight of dollar.</th>
<th>Value of 1 lb.</th>
<th>Value of 1 bahara (of tin) of 400 lbs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3½</td>
<td>dollars</td>
<td>1 käping (slab)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2½</td>
<td>käping</td>
<td>1 pikul</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>pikul</td>
<td>1 bahara (of tin)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

which is the standard scale of 420 lbs. to the bahara reduced to suit the existing British current money.

(2). Gambar timah (tin models of animals).

Selangor.

tampang = kupang = 10 sen = 10 cents
bidor = suku = 25 cents

Scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>In cents</th>
<th>By av. weight of dollar.</th>
<th>Value of 1 lb.</th>
<th>Value of 1 tampang (1/10 dollar)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>duit ayam</td>
<td>make</td>
<td>1 buaya (1/20 dollar)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>buaya</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1 tampang (1/10 dollar)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2½</td>
<td>tampang</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1 bidor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>bidor</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1 dollar (ringgit)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(3). Perak.

Scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>In cents</th>
<th>By av. weight of dollar.</th>
<th>Value of 1 lb.</th>
<th>Value of 1 bahara (of tin)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>tahil</td>
<td>make</td>
<td>1 Penjuru</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1½</td>
<td>penjuru</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1 kati (tampang)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1½</td>
<td>kati</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1 piak (tali)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2½</td>
<td>piak</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1 suku (bidor)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2½</td>
<td>suku</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1 jampal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3½</td>
<td>jampal</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1 ringgit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3½</td>
<td>ringgit</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1 käping</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>2½ käping (slab)</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1 pikul</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>3 pikul</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1 bahara</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(To be continued.)*

*Very confused as given to Mr. Laidlaw.*

*Varying to 320 kati.*
ONE MORE BUDDHIST HYMN.

BY G. K. NABIMAN, BOMBAY.

The spread of the Mahāyāna religion is due to the appeal it makes to the heart, laid on the principle of devotion (śālitrī), as opposed to the cold intellectualism of the Hinayāna. We do not find in Pāli any fervid hymns or prayers ever addressed to the Buddha, but we have a large number of them in the later Mahāyāna Buddhism, as witness the stotra-saṅgraha published by the Bibliotheca Indica.

Some time ago Professor Sylvain Levi reconstructed two hymns, translated in Chinese character from Sanskrit by an Indian monk from the college of Nalanda about the year 1000. They are called Ashtama-chaitya-saṁkandā and the Trikhyastava. The latter is a hymn on the three "bodies" of the Buddha, and consists of sixteen stanzas, of which we find a Tibetan translation under the name of Sku-gsum-la-datted-po. The Chinese transcription was made by the celebrated traveller Fa-hien. The Sanskrit text of the first twelve stanzas of this ode is also preserved in the beginning of the Tibetan block-print (Deb-ther-snon-po) communicated by M. Baradjian to Baron Von Stael-halstein, who expressed his opinion (Bulletin of Imperial Academy of Sciences No. 11, 1911), that the Sanskrit text preserved in the block-print is independent of Chinese tradition, and deserves to be published especially, as it sometime deviates from the reconstruction of Professor Levi, and in some cases diverges from the original used by the monk of Nalanda, who attempted about 900 years ago to reproduce the Indian sounds by means of Chinese symbols. The Baron proceeds to give the Sanskrit text and the Tibetan version according to the Deb-ther-snon-po, as well as the Tibetan text cited from the Tanjur.

All the texts are in the saṃghārām metre, but while the Tanjur text represents nineteen syllables, the others have twenty-one.

Note: It seems that even Fa-hien read

Note: Pañjāna must have read also Sku-gsum see the French translation of the Chinese paraphrase of Vīkāsyāsīr. by Sphavannes, R. H. B., 34, 16.

For Pāramahāsāta see Mahābhārata 245, 34.

It may be noted that Pañjāna is not particular about representing the Vīkāsīr.
REFERENCES TO BUDDHIST AUTHORS IN JAIN LITERATURE.
BY O. K. NARIMAN, BOMBAY.

Buddhist Sanskrit works of tolerable antiquity in comparison with Pāli texts are so rare that any references to them in other literatures must be welcomed. The Brahmical Sanskrit literature hardly offers any reference to Buddhist works of antiquity, and, as Vallee Poussin has shown, the Sarvadarsana-sangraha has no reference to Buddhism that goes back to respectable antiquity. Prof. Mironov in the course of a paper on Devabhacara and his Nydyvatāra-tippaṇa in the Bulletin of the Imperial Academy of Sciences, St. Petersburg (April 15, 1911) points out some Buddhist authors, whose standpoint was familiar to Jaina logicians.

The following sloka seems to have been borrowed by Devabhacara from Guparatna with its polemical prefatory remark:

The quotation is from his Pramāṇaviniścaya-ṣaṅkha and the comment is on the terms mūdhā and dhamma.
He lived at the close of the 10th century as shown by Satisheendra Vidyabhushan and composed three works, viz., Pradana-vinyaschaya-siddha, Karya-drayana-bhadra-siddhi and Tarkabheda.
There is also a reference to a Baudhāya-dharmādhyapī.

These are the allusions to Buddhist authors; the following bear on other schools of philosophy in the same Jain author:

Sāntaka:-

शिविषये कुमुध? परिपत्र दुर्गृह संगीती कर्माणि
प्रतिविषयीः स्वरूप्य यथा नद्य्य अन्वीति

Devabhadrān thus comments on this :-

विवेकत्वादेनायं परस्परं
व्याख्याताति वृहस्त्र दीर्घकृतां
नेह प्रकटवाति बुधवियानी व्याख्यायां प्रसंगानि

विद्यावासिः:-

पुरुषोऽविवेकतानाम व्याख्यातानं तत्तत्वमेतस्मानि
मनः कालित्वा सारिन्द्रावधुपायः स्वरूप्यं यथा

Two ślokas from the same Vindhyāvasī have already been known from Bhoja's commentary on the Yoga-sūtra, IV. 22.

वक्षेत्रविनायकः

व्याख्यातानि अधिनस्ति [सांख्य] वृहीन सिद्धं यथा।
चुरुङ्गविवेकवाटं तत्तत्वमेतस्मानि
स्वरूपादेकाकड़े पुरुष सारिन्द्रावधुपायः।

व्याख्या:

Of this school only the following authors are referred to, viz.:-

Akshapāda, Udyotakara and Kandallikāra.

It appears that Vyomasiva the commentator on Praśastapāda-bhāṣya ascribes to the Āchārya
(Praśastapāda) three pramāṇas, viz.:-

प्रामाण्यं अनुसारं शास्त्रं अंतर्गतं काक्षोऽक्षरिक विवेकः

Jaimini is mentioned to show that he taught six pramāṇas, viz.:-

प्रामाण्यं अनुसारं शास्त्रं अंतर्गतं अर्थविनिश्चितं अनुसारं

While Prakāsakār understands अमाव as a kind प्रमाणाः.

(Jaina) :-

As expected the author of the Nyāyadevatā-rāghava makes mention in several places of his co-religionists. He adduces the three Jain authors, viz., Bhadrabahu, Haribhadra and Prabhachandra. The last who wrote the Prameya-kamala-mārtanda and Nyāya-kumuda-chandra belonged to the Dīghaṇkara sect, and lived in the beginning of the 9th century.

His Nyāya-kumuda-chandra has a highly important reference to the Buddhist school of the Vaibhāshikas who are defined as:

विभवासस्मैपिन्यप्राप्तखं यथानि शिल्पिनि
तिष्ठित्वेति या बैन्धविकाः।

Besides the above we may note various other quotations made known by Mironov.

This grammarian is cited by Hemachandra and Kahlavāmin in their commentaries on the Amarakosha.

The Jaina Nyāya-devatā-riṣipada also quotes Māgha's Śiśupālavadha, XI. 88.
THE INDIAN INScriptions AND THE ANTIQUITY OF INDIAN ARTIFICIAL POETRY.

BY G. BÜHLER.

[Translated by Prof. V. S. Ghatge, M. A.; Poona.]

(Continued from p. 294.)

VI. The conclusions and their bearing on the theory of
Renaisaance of Sanskrit Literature.

Now we proceed to sum up the results following from the detailed examination carried on so far.

In the second century of our era, there existed a Gadya kavya which resembled the classical samples of the same, not only in respect of the fundamental principles, but in many details also. Like the rhetoricians and writers of the fourth and the following centuries, the poets of the second century regarded the essence of the Gadya Kavya as consisting in the frequent use of Sesquipedalia verba. Like the later authors, they were fond of constructing very long sentences, a thing which depended, for the most part, on the length and number of compound words. However, they permitted to the reciter and the hearer, resting pauses between long compounds, by inserting shorter words or phrases made up of shorter words, some of which are not unlike those inserted for the same purpose in the classical samples of works written in high prose. Of the Alasakaras the poets make use of Alliteration, Upanā, Utprakshā, and Rāgaka, and at any rate, an attempt at Slesha. As compared with what we find in the classical works, the figures of speech are, in the first place, used much more rarely, and, in the second place, are executed with much less care and skill. Sometimes these rise not at all or only very little, above the level of what is found in the epics. So also we are reminded of the language of the epics by the several grammatical forms which are used by the author of the prāasti of the Sudaśana lake. On the other hand, the arbitrary intermixture of history with mythology found in the Nāśik prāasti just corresponds to a tendency which, in much later kavyas, comes to view very strongly.76

Side by side with works written in high prose, there existed, as is to be expected, and as is distinctly shown by the Gīnār prāasti, metrical works whose form essentially agreed with the rules laid down, in the oldest available manuals, for the Vaidarbhī style. Further, this accordance with rules naturally points to the existence of an Alasakara-strotra or some theory of the poetic art. Both these compositions were equally esteemed with the Brahmansc sciences, at the courts of Indian princes, and in spite of the lacunae in the Gīnār inscriptions, it is hardly to be doubted that a personal occupation with poesy was ascribed to the king and great Satrap Rudradāman, the grandson of a non-Aryan governor of an Indo-Scythian ruler. Be this right or not, it is in any case quite evident that the poesy resembling the classical Kadya in essential features, enjoyed the royal favour in the second century, as it did in later times, and that it was cultivated at the Indian courts. In no case can it be said that the Brahmanic science and literature was extinguished by the invasions and the rule of the barbarian foreigners (as an Indian would say). If we suppose that the prāasti informs us of pure historical truth, then its contents clearly show that the life of literature in the second century must have attained to such a richness and strength as to win over to itself even the descendants of barbarians. Thus it naturally follows that the Kadya could not have been a new discovery in the 2nd century, but it must have had a long previous history which went back to the times when Aryan princes were the exclusive rulers of India. For this reason, it would not be certainly going too far to assert that the Gīnār prāasti makes probable the existence of the Kadya style, even in the first century.

A very large number of prāastis go to prove that in the fourth, fifth and sixth centuries, the Kadya literature was in its full bloom and that the kadyas did not at all differ from those handed down to us. The second, independent Gupta king whose reign, no doubt, covered the greatest

76 According to my view, what the two inscriptions present, must be looked upon as the minimum of the development of Poesy at that time, and not as the maximum. It appears to me very probable that in the second century, there had been many superior and more elaborate compositions; because the author of the Gīnār inscription was only an obscure provincial writer, and the author of the Nāśik inscription was only a Court poet of the Andhra king. It is, however, very questionable whether the poetic art had reached, in southern India, that degree of development which it had reached at the special centres of intellectual life, in northern India. It would be a strange chance, indeed, if the two inscriptions presented to us a completely accurate picture of the stages of development in which Indian Poesy was at that time.
part of the second half of the fourth century, Samudragupta-Parakramabahu, was himself a poet, and received from his admirers the title Kastra. He supported several poets, who at the same time were Pugdits, and put an end, as far as he could, to the old antagonism between the Muses and Plutos. His courtiers followed the example of their master, and the panegyric by Harishena, ‘the minister of foreign affairs and the counsellor of the prince royal,’ shows that Samudragupta had at least one poet, of whom he had no reason to be ashamed.

Harishena’s korya is in every respect an artistically finished little work, which places its author in a line with Kâlidâsa and Dâsîj. Its style is that of the Vaidarbhâ School. The very fact that Harishena himself belonged to the north-east of India shows that, there must have preceded his time, a period of literature, during which, poets from Berar in northern Deccan, accomplished much, and brought their particular taste to a high repute. Probably this fall bloom of the Vaidarbhâs will fall in the third century, or at the latest in the beginning of the fourth century. Under Samudragupta’s successor, Chandragupta II.-Vikramaditya, poetry must have similarly enjoyed the patronage of the court, inasmuch as even the king’s minister took to himself the title of kasty. The little proof of his art, handed down to us, discloses at any rate great cleverness, if not a real poetic talent as such. Even this little composition is written in the style of the Vaidarbhâ School. The same holds good of the praśasti of the time of Kumâragupta and Skandagupta. The works in existence are, however, most insignificant, a phenomenon which is satisfactorily explained by the fact that they were all written by provincial writers. In the second half of the fourth century, in Vatsabhati’s praśasti of the Sun-temple of Dâsîpara-Mandasor, we see traces of the existence of the school of the Gau’as, the poets of eastern India. This work should be called rather the exercise of a scholar who busied himself with the study of the korya literature, than a product of an actual poet. We can see therein that its author had studied the koryas and Rhetorics, but that, in spite of all the troubles he took to produce a real korya, he possessed little of inborn talent. Small offenses against good taste, such as the use of expletives and tautologous words, are more frequently met with. In one place, the author is led to forget one of the most elementary rules of Grammar, by the exigencies of the metre; in another place, in his zeal to form long compounds, he is tempted to disregard the rule, always observed by good writers, according to which, the weak pause can never come at the end of a half-verse. In a third place, he jumbles together two ideas in such a manner the least permissible; and his attempt to bring out a new comparison between the clouds and the houses leads to no way to a happy result.

These defects in Vatsabhati’s praśasti make it the more important for the historian of literature, inasmuch as they bear testimony to the fact that everything worthy of attention, in the praśasti, is gathered from the literature of his time and compiled into a whole. Thus, on the one hand, we are assured of the fact that about the year 472 A. D., there was a rich Korya literature in existence; and on the other hand, greater weight is gained by the points of accordance with the works handed down to us, which the praśasti presents. It has been already pointed out above that verse 10 of the praśasti only repeats, for the most part, the comparison contained in verse 66 of Meghaduta, with some new points added in a very forced way; while the remaining points contained in that verse of Kâlidâsa, find themselves repeated in verse 11 of the praśasti. Further it is to be noted that Vatsabhati, like Kâlidâsa, shows a special predilection for the word sukhaga, and that he while describing the king Baudhuvama, plays upon his name just in the same way as Kâlidâsa does with the name of Raghu, whom he describes in the beginning of Sarga XVIII. of Raghuvâna. These facts make the conjecture more probable, that Vatsabhati knew and made use of the works of Kâlidâsa. The same view is advocated by Prof. Kielhorn in a publication7 just appearing, which reached me after this treatise was nearly finished. He reads in verse 31 of the praśasti:

instead of "पुरुषस्वरूपिणि भाषास्वरूपिणि"—वासुदेवस्वरूपिणि—
and shows that the verse sufficiently agrees with Hituvibhâra V. 2-3, in both words and thoughts, as there are only two new points added. Although I am not in a position, without examining a good impression of the inscription, to give a definite opinion regarding the proposed, and no doubt very interesting alteration of the text, still the truth of his
assertion that verse 31 of the prāṣasti is an imitation of Ritusamhāra. V. 2-3, appears to me quite undeniable. If we may believe in the tradition which ascribes Ritusamhāra to the author of Meghadūta, then the point overlooked by me, which Prof. Kielhorn has made out, strengthens the probability of the supposition that Kālidāsa lived before 472 A.D., which is very significant. In that case, however, it will have to be assumed that Vatsabhāṣṭi knew the Ritusamhāra also.

One of these conclusions,—the statement that the Indian artificial poetry had developed itself not after but before the beginning of our era,—is confirmed also by references in a literary work which is by all means old. Whosoever goes through the collection of poetic citations from the Mahābhārata, which Professor Kielhorn has brought together Ante, Vol. XIV, p. 326 ff., can but see that the Kṛṣṇa prospered in Patañjali’s times. Many of the verses exhibit metre characteristc of the artificial poetry, such as, Mālati, Pramāṇākṣari, Praharasṇi and Vasantaśilpa. These verses as well as many others29 in the heroic Anuśṭabha-Sloka agree, in point of contents as well as the mode of expressions, not with epic works but with the Court kṛṣṇa. The composition of the Mahābhārata can now indeed no longer be placed with certainty in the middle of the second century before Christ, as was the case generally, up till very recently; because the uncertainty of the known arguments of Goldstücker and others has become more and more evident with the time.30 In the meanwhile, according to what Prof. Kielhorn in his article31 ‘The Grammarians Pāṇini’ has said about the relation of Bhartṛihari and Kālidāsa to the Mahābhārata, and for reasons of language and style, we cannot establish for Patañjali a later terminus ad quem than something like the first century after Christ. Thus the passages from Patañjali show at any rate, as Kielhorn remarks in Ante, loco citato, ‘that the so-called classical poetry is older than it has lately been represented to be.’ A further proof for the early growth of the Sanskrit Kṛṣṇa is provided by a Buddhist work, the Buddhāvarttika of Asvaghosa, whose Chinese translation was made between 414-421 A.D. The work is not a Mahābhārata in name only, but is written in the Kṛṣṇa style, as we may judge from the samples given by Mr. Bondall.32 Mr. Beal the translator of the Chinese version looks upon the Buddhist tradition as right,33 according to which, the author, Asvaghosa, was a contemporary of Kanishka (78 A.D.). Even if we lay aside this difficult question and take our stand on the date of its translation, which is beyond doubt, the work would still possess great worth from the point of view of the history of literature. The composition of the work in question cannot be placed in any case later than 350-400 A.D. Even the bare fact that a Buddhist monk, as early as this, thought of writing the Legend of Buddha, according to the rules of the poetic art, establishes a great popularity of the brahmanic artificial poetry and confirms the conclusions, arrived at, above, by the analysis of Harīścandra’s prāṣasti. A thorough examination of the Buddhāvarttika, and a comparison of its style with that of the older kṛṣṇa and with the rules of the oldest manual of Rhetorics will, without doubt, lead to more definite and more important results.

If one compares the conclusions, set forth in this essay, with the views of other Sanskritists regarding the history of Indian Kṛṣṇa, it will be found that they are entirely incompatible, especially with those which Professor Max Müller has argued out in his famous dissertation34 on the Renaissance of Sanskrit Literature; and thus I am not, in this case, in a position to agree with

29 This tradition is, at any rate, older than Vallaabhadeva’s Buddhāvarttikā, which belongs probably to the first half of the fifteenth century. In it, are quoted two verses from Ritusamhāra, No. 1874 (in Ritus. VI, 17) and No. 1875 (in Ritus. VI, 20) under the name Kālidāsya. In the note to the first of these, the editor wrongly attributes it to Kumāranāmanas, VI, 17. The mistake has been rather due to a misprint. Two other verses from Ritusamhāra have been cited in the same anthology, but without a mention of the particular author. Vallaabh has probably taken them from some older work on which the author’s name was not given.

30 In this connection one should notice the quotations from Vol. I, 423, 428; II, 119; III, 143, 333. (Kielhorn’s edition of the Bhāṣya.)

31 According to the communication of Pāṇini, Bhāskarārāmīya, ‘The Age of Patañjali’, Adyar Series No. 1, p. 4, the two old Mats from the South are unfavourable to one, historically important, word, not contested till now, inasmuch as they do not read मात्रेन्द्र, but प्रभु in the well-known passage on Vis. V, 3, 99. Although the treatise mentioned above contains very little else that is noteworthy, still this point requires to be investigated further, especially as Southern Mats, have not been used for the Bhāṣya up till now.

32 Catalogue of Buddhist Sansk. Mats. p. 82.


34 India, what can it teach us? p. 231 ff. On the other hand, Lawon’s views regarding the development of Kṛṣṇa, come pretty near to the results given above. As he had studied the inscriptions, it was but natural that the significance of the Glimpse inscription and of Harīścandra’s prāṣasti did not escape his observation; see Indische Altertumskunde, part III, p. 1159 ff., 1159 f.
the literary-historical suppositions of my honored friend and to build further on the same, as I have done many times on other occasions. His first proposition, that the Indians did not show any literary activity during the first and second centuries of our era, in consequence of the inroads of the different foreign races, is contradicted by the clear proof provided by the prasasti of the Sudarshana lake and the Nasik-inscription No. 18. I think, I must further add that the extinction of the intellectual life of the Indians during the first two centuries by the Scythians and other foreigners is improbable for other reasons also. In the first place, never had the foreigners brought under their sway, in the long run more than a fifth part of India. To the east of the district of Mathurā, no sure indications of their rule have been found, and the reports of the Greeks ascribe to the Indo-Scythian kingdom no further extent in the east or south. In India proper, the kingdom could permanently possess only the Panjāb, besides the high valleys of the Himalaya, the extreme west of the North-western Provinces, the Eastern Rājputāna, the Central Indian Agency, with Gwalior and Mālwa, Gujarāt with Kāthiawār, as well as Sindh. No doubt, temporally these limits are further extended in several cases, as the inscriptions from the reign of Nahapana prove for the western border of the Deccan, and several traces of war might present themselves in further removed districts. The rulers of such a kingdom could indeed have exerted a considerable influence, on the east of India, but they would never have been able to suppress the literary and scientific life of the Indians. Secondly, however,—and this is the most important point—the very will to show a hostile attitude towards the Indian culture, was wanting in the foreign kings of the time, as the sayings and authentic documents inform us. They themselves, as well as their comrades of the same race, were far inferior to the Indian, in point of civilization and culture, and the natural result was that they could not escape the influence of the Indian civilization, but were themselves Hinduised. Their willingness to appropriate the culture of their subjects is shown by the very fact that the descendants or successors of the foreign conquerors immediately began to bear Indian names, even in the second generation. Huvishka’s successor is indeed a Shāhi, but he is named Vātudrā; Nahapana’s daughter is named Dukhamitra and his son-in-law, the son of Dhinaka, a Saka, is named Ushavadā or Usabhadā, i.e., Rishabhadatta. The son of Chāndana is Jayadāna. The leaning of these kings to the Indian systems of religion is equally indisputable. According to the Buddhist tradition, Kanishka is one of the greatest patrons of Buddhism and even became a Buddhist himself. The latter fact is indeed shown to be improbable by the inscriptions on his coins. On the other hand, there is no doubt that he built a stupa and a śāhāra in Purnahapura—Peshawar. So also it is proved from the inscriptions that Huvishka had founded a Śāhāra in Mathurā.56 Ushavadā and his consort, according to the Nasik and Karle inscriptions,57 made grants to Buddhists and Brāhmaṇas without distinction, and the former, just like a pious Indian, carried out numerous works of public utility, for the sake of merit. The Mathurā inscriptions further show that under Kanishka and his successors, by the side of Buddhism, many other systems of religion also, like Jainism, were not only tolerated, but enjoyed a high prosperity. These inscriptions as well as numerous archaeological finds also prove that the national Indian architecture and sculptures in Mathurā were on a high level, and one of the newest discoveries of Dr. Führer permits us to conclude that even the dramatic art was cultivated in the city of gods. The inscription No. 18, out of the collection prepared by me for the next number of the Epigraphia Indica, says that the sons of the actors of Mathurā ( Mathurāni kāvīlakārān), who were known as Chāndaka brothers, dedicated a stone-slab, for the redemption of their parents, at the holy place of the adorable Nāga-prince, Dāddhikārya. If Mathurā had its company of actors, then it would not have been in want of dramas. All these circumstances make it impossible in my opinion to look upon the times of the Indian popular migration as a period of wild barbarism. The conditions appear to be in no way essentially different from those of the times when there were national rulers. The Indians of the north-west and the west had indeed to obey foreign suzerains and to pay them tributes and taxes; in return for which, however, they had the triumph of exerting away on their subjegators, through their high culture and of assimilating the same with themselves. The conditions necessary for literary activity must have been in existence, when an Ushavadā noted his great deeds in a mixture of Sanskrit and Prakrit itself.58

He would certainly have lent his ear and opened his purse to bards and *kāris* who would glorify him. These considerations appear to me to be of importance for the statements in the *Girnār prāṣasti* and heighten their significance.

A second proposition which Professor Max Müller in addition to other scholars advocates—that the real period of the bloom of artificial poetry is to be placed in the middle of the sixth century after Christ—is contradicted by the testimony of the *Alabābā prāṣasti* of Harisena, of other compositions of the Gupta period and of the *Mandasar prāṣasti*. These leave no doubt about the fact that there were not one but several such periods of the bloom of the *Gītāja*, of which one fell before the time of Samudragupta, and they also make it probable that Kālidāsa wrote before 472 A. D. The same conclusion is favored by the fact that Dr. Ferguson’s bold chronological combinations, on which is based the theory of the Indian Renaissance in the sixth century, have been shown to be unsupported by the researches of Mr. (Dr.) Fleet. The authentic documents going down to the year 533 A. D. know absolutely nothing about the Vikramāditya of Ujjain whose existence is inferred or set up by new interpretations of the different legends, and who is reported to have driven away the Scythians from India and to have founded the Vikrama era in the year 544 A. D., dating it as far backwards as 500 years. On the contrary, they prove the following facts concerning western India. Samudragupta-Parākramāśūra, according to Mr. (Dr.) Fleet’s inscription No. II., had extended the kingdom of his father, at any rate as far as Grāḍa, in the Central-Provinces. His son Chandragupta II.-Vikramāditya, according to No. III., conquered Malāwa, before or in the year 400 and also possessed Mathurā. Chandragupta’s son, Kumāragupta-Mahendrāditya, held fast these possessions, because, according to No. XVIII., he was the suzerain of the rulers of Daśapura-Mandasar, in the year 437. His son, Skandagupta-Kramāditya or Vikramāditya, according to No. XIV., ruled over Gujarāt and Kāthiāwar, about 455-457 or 456-458. In his time, the Hūnas came forth, against whom he made a successful stand, according to No. XIII. Later on, however, whether it was in his own reign which lasted at least till the year 467 or 468, or under his successors Puragupta and Narasimhagupta, the most western possessions were lost and went over to the foreign race. In No. XXXI. and XXXII., there appear the kings, Toramāna and Mihirakula as rulers of Grāḍa and Gwalior, and in No. XXXV., the latter is said to have reigned for fifteen years. The end of the rule of Mihirakula in these districts, is made known to us through Nos. XXXIII., XXXIV. and XXXV., according to which, he was defeated by a king Yasodharman-Vishvakarman, before the year 533 A. D. These inscriptions represent Yasodharman as a very powerful ruler who had brought under his sway not only Western India from Daśapura-Mandasar down to the ocean, but also large parts in the east and north. In his possessions, Malāwa was naturally included, whose capital Ujjain lies only something like 70 English miles to the south of Daśapura. In No. XXXV., and in two considerably early inscriptions Nos. XVII. and XVIII., the Malāwa era is used, which is identical with the so-called Vikrama era beginning with 56/57 B. C.; These exceedingly important discoveries which we owe to Mr. Fleet’s zeal in collecting and his ingenuity, prove the absolute untenableness of the Fergusonian hypothesis. Because they show that the era of 56/57 B. C. was not founded in the sixth century, but was in use under the name of the Malāwa era for more than a century; (2) that at that time, no Saka could have been driven from western India, as much as the country had been conquered by the Guptas more than a hundred years ago; (3) that, on the contrary, other foreign conquerors, the Hūnas, were driven out, of western India in the first half of the sixth century, not, however, by a Vikramāditya, but by Yasodharman-Vishvakarman, and (4) that, there is no room at all in the sixth century, for a powerful Vikramāditya of Ujjain, whose exploits are called forth a national upheaval in India.

---

86 See also Mr. Fleet’s article on Mihirakula, Ante. Vol. XV, p. 245 ff. and on Toramāna, ibid. Vol. XVIII, p. 225. With Dr. Hoernle (l. c., p. 93, Note 8) I hold that Vishvakarman is a second name of Yasodharman, as is shown by the grammatical construction.
87 Also see Ante. Vol. XV, p. 191 ff. and Vol. XIX, p. 56, in which latter place, Prof. Kielhorn has given the right explanation of the difficult expression *Mālavāpṛasthāṇi*.
88 As is quite clear, the Malāwa era has suffered the same fate as the Saka era and came to be known by another name, as its origin was forgotten. The change of name appears to have occurred in about 800 A.D. The latest known Malāwa date is the year 706, which appears in the Kāpara inscription, Ante. Vol. XIX, p. 58. Apart from the two doubtful documents, the oldest known Vikrama date is found in Dr. Hultzsch’s Dholver inscription, and corresponds to 16 A.D. Kielhorn has shown, ante Vol. XIX, p. 33.
89 If it occurs to any one to conjecture that the Hūnas had caused an interruption in the literary activity of India, I bring to his notice the fact that both the inscriptions of the age of Toramāna and Mihirakula contain no mean composition and that their authors glorify the foreign kings as highly as if they had been the national rulers.
Thus, when, with the fall of the Vikramāditya set up by Dr. Fergusson, it becomes no longer possible to place in the sixth century, on the same grounds, the writers, whom legends connect with a Vikramāditya, the view which holds that the leaders of the Indian poetic art belonged to this period, will be also compelled to support itself by other arguments and to produce a proof for every one of these writers in particular. What has been adduced, in this connection, about Kālidāsa—in whom alone we are interested here—is, in my opinion, not sufficient to make out even the bare probability of such a fixing of the age. The well-known but hardly accredited verse which mentions Kālidāsa as one of the nine jewels at the court of the Vikramāditya, and which makes him a contemporary of the astronomer Varāhamihira, loses all its value. The Vikramāditya referred to in the verse is, as the Jyotirśidhārāṇya shows, the legendary founder of the era of 56-57 B.C. So long as the history of western India was absolutely unknown, it was at least possible to conjecture that the writers named in the verse would have been contemporaries and lived under a Vikramāditya—whose time was wrongly put later—and that their actual age ought to have been inferred from the sure date of Varāhamihira. But now when we know that in the first half of the sixth century, there never existed a Vikramāditya of Ujjain, it naturally follows that the legend is the more defective. It would be more than ventures to hold as historically true what remains of the legend, namely, the simultaneity of the nine writers.

A second argument, which is based on Mallinātha’s explanation of Meghāūḍa, verse 14, can also hold water, in that it requires us to assume many things, no doubt, possible, but incapable of proof, and its conclusion is opposed by important considerations. One must, to begin with, be proved that Mallinātha was right in asserting that in the passage in question, Kālidāsa, in the word durgapādha referred to a hated opponent, further that this opponent is identical with the Buddhist teacher Dignāga, so also, that this latter was the pupil of Vasubandhu or Assāga, as the Buddhist tradition goes according to Tārānātha and Ratndharmārāja. Then comes the last and the most questionable link in the chain, i.e., the assigning of the year 500 or so to the two brothers Vasubandhu and Assāga, which derives its main support from the untenable theory of the great Vikramāditya of the sixth century. This assumption, as Professor Max Müller himself admits, is contradicted by a Chinese account, according to which, Kumārajīva translated the works of Vasubandhu in the year 404 A.D. The same is further contradicted by the tradition mentioned by Mr. Bunyin Nanjio, that the same Kumārajīva translated the life of Vasubandhu, as well as in my opinion, by the existence of Chinese translations of Vasubandhu’s works, in the years 508, 509, 508-11 (Bunyin Nanjio Catalogue, Nos. 1168, 1194, 1233).

A third argument, which is based on the assumption that Kālidāsa must have lived after Aryabhata (who wrote about 476 A.D.), just because he shows an acquaintance with the scientific astronomy borrowed from the Greeks, has fallen down to the ground, owing to the results of the newest researches. Professor Max Müller, in addition to the views of earlier scholars, held that Aryabhata was the father of scientific Indian astronomy, and assigned the five Siddhāntas selected by Varāhamihira to the sixth century. But this is quite a mistake, according to Dr. Thibaut’s thorough examination of the question in the introduction to his edition of the Pañca-siddhāntikā. Of the five Siddhāntas, two, Paitūla-makha and Vāsishtha, have nothing to do at all with the astronomy borrowed from the Greeks. Of the remaining three, two, Romaka and Paulisa, are more incomplete and older than the one ascribed to Sūrya, and all the three, in their form, go backwards even before Aryabhata’s works. They are also treated by Varāhamihira, with greater respect than Aryabhata and other individual astronomers. These and other considerations lead Dr. Thibaut to fix the year 400 A.D. as the terminus ad quem for the Romaka and Paulisa. Thus it is no longer necessary to assign Kālidāsa to the sixth century just on the ground that he is acquainted with Greek astronomy. I must still further add that the assertion made by

---

26 I purposely speak of the verse only. For, in my opinion, it is not advisable to refer to the Gayā inscription, translated by Sir Ch. Wilkins (Ar. Ess., Vol. I. p. 294), but now lost, as a proof for the existence of a tradition of the Nine Jewels. Whenever one compares the translation (Murphy’s Travels in Portugal) of the Cintamani-inscription by the same learned gentleman with the original, it will certainly agree with me in that his word is not sufficient to afford us the certainty that the Gayā inscription contained such a striking statement as that of the Nine Jewels.

27 India, what can it teach us? p. 399 ff.

28 The two Tibetic writers contradicted each other on this point. Tārānātha says, (History of Buddhism, p. 131), that Dignāga had been a pupil of Vasubandhu. The second account belongs to Ratndharmārāja. The older Chinese writers are not aware of this tradition.

29 Mr. Beal, according to his note 77 to his translation of the Sīkyo, Vol. I., p. 106, appears to have doubted the fact that Vasubandhu lived in the sixth century. And compare also Note 56, p. 106, where Mr. Beal shows that Vasubandhu, according to Hsien Tzang, lived in the middle of, or during, the period of 556 to 600 A.D.

30 India, what can it teach us? p. 316 ff.

31 In a recent article on the Romaka Siddhānta, Ante, Vol. XIX, p. 335 ff., Mr. S. P. Dikshit goes still further and fixes the period of Ptolemaeus 150 A.D. as the terminus ad quem for the old Romaka. Dr. Thibaut also says, i.e., p. 111-113, that the Romaka can be older than Ptolemaeus, although there is no conclusive ground for the supposition. Compare, in this connection, Dr. Burgess Ante, Vol. XIX, p. 257
Mr. S. P. Panda and Professor Max Müller, that Kālidāsa in Rāghuvamśa XIV. 40, traced the lunar eclipse to the shadow of the earth, rests on a misunderstanding. Kālidāsa, there, speaks of the spots on the moon, which as the Purāṇas teach us, are called into being by a reflection of the earth.\(^{39}\) As for the eclipse, he is quite orthodox, as is to be expected of an Indian poet.

A fourth argument, on which Dr. G. Huth lays some stress, in his investigation about Kālidāsa, too, carried out with much labour, rests on the mention of the Hūpas, amongst the frontier peoples of India, in Rāghuvamśa IV, 68. Dr. Huth thinks that it can be assumed that Kālidāsa has transferred the conditions of his time to that of Rāghu, and that by the Hūpas are meant, the White Huns. These possessed Kābul twice, once from the end of the second century B.C., to the end of the second century A.D., and again from the beginning of the fifth, to the end of the sixth century. Now as it is impossible on various grounds that Kālidāsa should have lived at the time of the first possession, so, Dr. Huth further concludes, he must have belonged to the second period, and that naturally the sixth century should be the terminus ad quem. The information provided by the Gupta inscriptions, regarding the history of the Hūpas in India, would very much modify this conclusion. But it is not at all necessary to go into further details, for there is no difficulty in showing the improbability of the very first proposition in the argument, which has not been proved. Indian poets, even when describing the triumphs of historical kings, their very masters and patrons, are frequently quite inaccurate in their geographical and ethnographical accounts, and instead of giving actual facts, they take their stand on the traditional accounts in the epics, Purāṇas and other older works that describe digvijaya. Thus Vākyapati (about 740 A.D.) makes his master and hero, Yaśovarman of Kanaṇja to conquer the Pārāśakas, although the Persian empire was then no longer in existence. Similarly, Bāhūn, in the Vikramāditya-charita XVIII. 34, describes Ananta of Kaśmir as conquering the Sakas, and further in 53-57, his son Kaśāsa, as conquering the kingdom of the Amazons (śtvērājya) after a ride through the ocean of sand, as well as visiting the Kailāsa, the Mānas lake, and Alakā the city of the Yakshas. In the face of these facts, it is hard to believe that Kālidāsa, instead of following, as a good kirti is supposed to do, the authority of the lists of peoples, in the Mahābhārata or of the Bhawana-vīṇās in the Purāṇas, should have occupied himself with the historic-geographical investigations regarding the conditions of the frontier peoples of his time. If we look into his works more carefully, we shall find that they contain much that points to his having made use of the sources mentioned above. The whole of the digvijaya contains no names which are not also mentioned in the Purāṇas on the same or similar occasions. It also mentions, side by side, peoples like the Pārāśakas (verse 60) and the Vaiṣṇas (verse 61), the Hūpas (verse 68) and the Kaṃbhoja (verse 69), which can never justly belong to the time of the poet, why even to no single period of time whatsoever. The Greeks have never been simultaneous neighbours with the Persians; and surely the Greeks have never possessed the North-west frontier of India in years after the birth of Christ. Further, even if the Hūpas rushed into India, through Kābul and possessed the country, still it is not intelligible how a writer who took his stand on historic facts can mention both the subjugators and the subjugated side by side, as independent peoples.

As for other so-called arguments for the supposition that Kālidāsa belonged to the sixth century, I pass them over; because they are open to similar and even greater objections than those discussed above. I do not believe that the question of the time of Kālidāsa and of other leaders of Indian poetic art whose dates have not been fixed by actual historical documents, will make an essential advance, by such methods as have been followed up till now, by most of the Sanskritists. In order to arrive at certain conclusions, we must thoroughly investigate the language, the style and the poetical technics of single works and compare them with those of works whose dates have been known with certainty or with approximate definiteness, and of epigraphical documents, as well as with the canons laid down in the older manuals of poetical. If we will extend the scope of our work to the epics also, we will be able to have quite a complete picture of the gradual growth of Indian Poesy. Such investigations of which a beginning has been made, especially in the works of Prof. Jacobis, naturally fall outside the limit of this essay whose only aim is to point out in a general way, the significance of the study of the inscriptions, for the Kālya literature.

\(^{39}\) Compare, for instance Vishnu Mahatmya I, 29, 18 f.;

\(^{115}\) On the Age of Kālidāsa. p. 80 ff. (Inaugural Dissertation) Berlin 1890.
SOME MAXIMS OR NYAYAS MET WITH IN SANSKRIT LITERATURE

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

I propose to point out some Sanskrit nyayas or maxims, which I have come across in the course of my reading, but have not found mentioned in Col. Jacob's Laṅkā-viṣṇu. So also I would like to cite a few more references or passages in which some of the nyayas already noticed by Col. Jacob occur.

अध्ययनमन्न—The maxim of burning what is not already burnt. When one thing, mentioned in connection with a second, is transferred to a third thing, because it is required by this last, but is not so required by the second thing which is possible even without it, then this maxim is said to be applicable. The nyaya is referred to in Rāmacaraga's commentary on Saṅkarā-yāmāna (Nirṇaya-sāgara, edition 1907), p. 582. The passage runs thus—'यथा च विनयस्वल्प कत्यां अभिन्नत्वादयान्तर वित्त्वा भवत्तेऽत्यथानां संबंधं तदपूर्वकारणं न भवति।' In the instance, विषयते बुधेन्द्री, though the injunction (viśākha) should grammatically refer to the act of sacrificing or offering (havāna), still, as hārana is not in need of such an injunction, being, in fact, a matter of course, the injunction refers to curds or dādi. Thus what is practically enjoined in the sentence in question is not the offering but curds as the material offered.

हेमादिकृपयस्मन्न—The maxim of a golden lotus possessing fragrance. When a thing already possessing a good quality, which alone makes it highly valuable, is found to possess another good quality in addition, it is a very happy combination, just like a lotus which is golden and which also possesses fragrance. This maxim is referred to by Vīrāgāvha in his Commentary on Uttarādvaśaṭākha (Nir. Sāgara, ed.), page 24. Rāma says 'यथावस्तेत ज्योतिर्विन्द्राय वर्णसाम्यालं च संवर्गं। कलं न विविधं। এতদ্বিধিঃ।' where the commentator remarks 'যथावस्ते। হেমাদিকৃপযস্মাতি। তদ্বিধিঃ।' I think, this हेमादिकृपयस्माः practically corresponds to the Marathi—हेमादि कृत्यस्माति.

प्रणालीन्न—The maxim of the tongue of a bell. Just as the tongue of a bell is free to strike either way, in the same way, when a word on account of its position in the middle can be construed either with the preceding or with the following sentence, this maxim is said to be applicable. This maxim is referred to by Malliṣeṇa in his Syādveda-dhamanjarī (Chau. Shāk. Series), p. 35—अथ। यथासम्बंधविन्यासम्। चेतों च। चेन्न। न। अनुवादकः। (These obstinate and ridiculous assertions would be made by them, of whom you are not the teacher): then he says that a second interpretation is possible by construing न with what precedes, thus the sentence being रण। चेन्न। चेन्न। न। अनुवादकः। (These obstinate and ridiculous assertions would not be made by them, of whom you are the teacher). Of course it will be seen, that practically both the interpretations give the same meaning. This प्रणालीन्न is to be distinguished from the more familiar शेषत्वविन्यास.

वीरागविन्यस्माति—The maxim of believing in a thing only on oath, as is taken at the time of drinking from a goblet. When one is asked to believe in a thing which does not stand the test of reason, this maxim is applicable. It is referred to in Syādveda-dhamanjarī (Chau. Shāk. Series), p. 27—वीरागविन्यस्माति। शेषत्वविन्यस्माति। आनन्दोऽसेव च। नस्यां न। अनुवादकः। (These obstinate and ridiculous assertions would be made by them, of whom you are not the teacher). The tongue of a bell can strike either side, but only one at a time; whereas the lamp on a threshold can light both the inside and the outside of a house simultaneously. Thus to take a particular instance, a word in the middle position can be connected at a time with either what precedes or with what follows according to the प्रणालीन्न, while it can be connected with both simultaneously according to the शेषत्वविन्यस्माति, as, for instance, in the phrase वीरागविन्यस्माति। शेषत्वविन्यस्माति। आनन्दोऽसेव च। नस्यां न। अनुवादकः.

तुषारकृपयस्माति—The maxim of the burden of the matted hair of a frog. Anything, which is void of an independent existence, and is still supposed to exist independently, is said to resemble the matted hair of the frog. I think it very much corresponds to castles in the air (काल्पन्क.
SOME MAXIMS ON NYAYAS


The maxim of those living in a palace. It is mentioned and fully explained in *Patañjali*’s *Mahābhāṣya*, on the *śūtra* महाभाष्यानां सन्तानं शुभार्थिः (Nirṇaya Sāgara ed., pt. I, p. 166).

The point in question is that the *santaraksita* may be either called *mudha-vikarana* or *adisekha-vikarana*, because they are both; thus any one of the words *mudha* or *adisekha* being sufficient for the purpose in the *śūtra*, just as those who live both on the ground and in a palace may be called either *prādhrātā-vikarana* or *bhūmi-vikarana*. The passage in the *Mahābhāṣya*, which is quite intelligible by itself, runs thus:—

पत्तान्यात्तत्त्वानां सन्तानं शुभार्थिः पारस्यालं ज्ञानं।

By the *śūtra* of the 4th verse, many scholars hold that the *āryā* or *śūtra* referred to in the *Nyāya-sūtras* is *Nyāya-sūtra*. In the *Nyāya-sūtras*, as also in the *Māyūra-sūtras*, the word *śūtra* is employed in a special sense. The word *śūtra* is used to denote a *santaraksita*, a *prādhrātā* or a *bhūmi-vikarana*.

The maxim is referred to by way of illustration by Śrīdārāṁ in his *Nyāya-kanda* (Vī., Sk. Series) p. 33, thus:—

सन्तानं परमाणु एवं कार्यं न दुष्कृतिनिसिद्धान्तं विकारामागाधारियो तथा वर्णनार्थविशेषः।

But the *Nyāya-sūtras* do not mention the *Mahābhāṣya* in the *Loaukika-nīyāda* (Vī., Sk. Series). So also on the next page of the same book we have the *Nyāya-sūtras* mentioned in the *Nīyāda* (Vī., Sk. Series) p. 190.

So far the *Nyāya-sūtras* not mentioned in the *Loaukika-nīyāda*. Now I proceed to add some more passages illustrative of the *Nyāya-sūtras* already mentioned therein.

The *Nyāya-sūtras* are mentioned in *Tarkabhāṣa* (edited with the com. *Nyāya-pradīpa* at Benares (p. 188), in the section dealing with *Samāja*. The *Nyāya-sūtras* are mentioned:—

अन्तर्यांत्रिकप्रकारकमुद्भूतसन्तानः वेदान्तसंस्कृतानि निर्देशितोऽपितः।

The *Nyāya-sūtras* are also mentioned in *Śylvādāmaṇi* (Ch. Sk. Series) p. 33, thus:—

सन्तानं परमाणु एवं कार्यं न दुष्कृतिनिसिद्धान्तं विकारामागाधारियो तथा वर्णनार्थविशेषः।

The *Nyāya-sūtras* are also referred to in the *Chāndogya Upanishad* (Anand. Sk. Series, p. 257, thus:—

सन्तानं परमाणु एवं कार्यं न दुष्कृतिनिसिद्धान्तं विकारामागाधारियो तथा वर्णनार्थविशेषः।

The *Nyāya-sūtras* are referred to in the *Chāndogya Upanishad* (Anand. Sk. Series, p. 257, thus:—

सन्तानं परमाणु एवं कार्यं न दुष्कृतिनिसिद्धान्तं विकारामागाधारियो तथा वर्णनार्थविशेषः।

The *Nyāya-sūtras* are referred to in the *Chāndogya Upanishad* (Anand. Sk. Series, p. 257, thus:—

सन्तानं परमाणु एवं कार्यं न दुष्कृतिनिसिद्धान्तं विकारामागाधारियो तथा वर्णनार्थविशेषः।

The *Nyāya-sūtras* are referred to in the *Chāndogya Upanishad* (Anand. Sk. Series, p. 257, thus:—

सन्तानं परमाणु एवं कार्यं न दुष्कृतिनिसिद्धान्तं विकारामागाधारियो तथा वर्णनार्थविशेषः।

The *Nyāya-sūtras* are referred to in the *Chāndogya Upanishad* (Anand. Sk. Series, p. 257, thus:—

सन्तानं परमाणु एवं कार्यं न दुष्कृतिनिसिद्धान्तं विकारामागाधारियो तथा वर्णनार्थविशेषः।

The *Nyāya-sūtras* are referred to in the *Chāndogya Upanishad* (Anand. Sk. Series, p. 257, thus:—

सन्तानं परमाणु एवं कार्यं न दुष्कृतिनिसिद्धान्तं विकारामागाधारियो तथा वर्णनार्थविशेषः।

The *Nyāya-sūtras* are referred to in the *Chāndogya Upanishad* (Anand. Sk. Series, p. 257, thus:—

सन्तानं परमाणु एवं कार्यं न दुष्कृतिनिसिद्धान्तं विकारामागाधारियो तथा वर्णनार्थविशेषः।
(1)

ASIATIC'S ORIENTAL RESEARCH.

The value of co-operation of Asiatic scholars in the prosecution of oriental research has begun to be realised. We have already a couple of works of authority in which Indian and Japanese scholars of note have collaborated. The Vth volume of the *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics* contains a number of contributions by Asiatics. This important book of reference is likely to remain a standard work for a long time. It therefore needs little apology to indicate such slips as have inadvertently appeared there. In the Vth volume speaking generally one misses the master hand of Vallee Poussin in the treatment of Buddhist subjects so well represented in the first four volumes.

Parsi subjects are treated with the usual conspicuous ability of Dr. Hastings’ colleagues. There is however a curious error in the article on "Parsi disposal of the dead" by Dr. Lehmann, a correction to which will perhaps appear in a subsequent volume. Dr. Lehmann is made to say "the Parsis to-day bring the dead bodies of men and dogs to the tower of silence." The Parsees have some religious veneration for the dog, but they certainly do not carry its dead body to the tower of silence.

(2)

A work of equal authority and value as the above *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, though perhaps appealing to a more limited public, the great *Encyclopedia of Islam*, is slowly progressing, being published simultaneously in English, French, and German. Some of its articles are invaluable monographs, which if reprinted separately would enjoy a deserved wider popularity. Here and there the work is responsible for curious lapses. For instance under the heading of Baku (*Encyclopedia of Islam*, p. 609) we find the following: "The main assumption that the naphtha wells of Baku with the eternal fire played an important part in the fire worship of Persia likewise rests on no historical foundations; the fire worship was not brought here till the XVIIth century by Indians and Indian Parsees." The portion I have put in italics certainly rests on no historical foundation. It would be highly interesting to know if Parsees from India ever visited the Baku springs in sufficient numbers to establish the so-called fire worship there.

This Mammoth collection of Moslem information includes much that pertains to ancient Iran. One however would be justified in looking for (what he does not find there) an article on that unusually interesting book the *Bilawhar va Budasaf* which enjoys the unique reputation shared by two other books only, *the Khatla wa Divna* and a third one of which nothing remains except a bar mention in the *Fihrist of al-Nahhaw* of being an Arabic translation of a Pahlavi version of Indian origin. (see Horovitz’s all too brief para at p. 663.)

Among the great lost books of the world the *Khudai-nameh*, the official history of pre-Moslem Iran, composed in Pahlavi, and forming the immediate or immediate basis of the epic of the *Shahnameh* of Ferdowsi enjoys a unique position. The last word has not been said on this fascinating book. All the available material on its origins is to be found in Mohi’s introduction, in Noeldeke’s *Das national-epoch of Iran*, and in the less known but scarcely less exhaustive monograph of the late great Russian Iranist Baron Hosen, *Kah vopprov ob Arbe. pervovch Khudai-nameh* (i.e., on the question of Arabic translation of the *Khudai-nameh*). Two facts of arresting interest in connection with the celebrated book deserve to be better known in the West. The *Khudai-nameh* has been noted as mentioned by Arab chroniclers of Iran like Hamza of Isphahan, but so far as I know no reference to it has been detected in any Pahlavi Iranian work by Western scholars. It is clear however that *Khudai-nameh* does occur in the celebrated *Bundahesh*, a reference which escaped the notice of Dr. West, who mistook its proper name for a couple of common nouns. (S. B. E. Vol. V., p. 147.)

From the lengthy introduction by Dr. J. J. Modi to the *Magian-i-hazar Dadistan* (p. 44) we learn that the *Khudai-nameh* was still extant in Persia about ten years ago, and that it was in the possession of an old Iranian woman, who valued it above all money out of superstitions regard for it, but could not unfortunately be prevailed upon under any circumstance to part with it. She looked upon it as an ancient heir-loom, the disappearance of which from her house was certain to bring down the wrath of heaven. The large volume, with its number of loose leaves, for which she betrayed little solicitude rested in her wine-cellar, which was opened every Navroz day and locked up again. The late Parsi Pahlavi scholar Ervad Tehmuraz D. Anklesaria, endeavoured his best to secure even a transcript of this *Khudai-nameh*, but without success. Since the death of Mr. Anklesaria all trace of the Iranian woman and her son-in-law, through whom the MS., was attempted to be secured, has disappeared. This must give hopes to the disinterested devotees of Iranian antiquities in the West for the recovery of the priceless history, if not also of other similar works of old Zoroastrian Iran. If the *Khudai-nameh* existed at the end of the last century, there is strong presumption that it and works of its genre may still be awaiting in a corner of Persia the adventurous and learned search of a Westergaard or Jackson.

G. K. Nariman.
THE OBSOLETE TIN CURRENCY AND MONEY OF THE
FEDERATED MALAY STATES.

BY SIR R. C. TEMPLE, BART.

(Continued from p. 239.)

APPENDIX. VI.

An Achin Kupang or Five Duit Piece.99

Dr. Hanitsch, J. R. A. S., Straits Branch, No. 39, p. 197 f., says that there was found at
Malacca in 1800 "a copper coin, probably one duit, of the following description:—Obr., coat
of-arms consisting of a crowned shield enclosing a lion rampant, with the figures 5 and 1/16 to
the right and left of the shield respectively. Rev., the legend Ins业主 Batav 1816." That is, the
coin bears the arms of the Dutch E. I. Co. and was struck in Batavia. "Coins identical with it,
extcept for the date, were issued by the Batavian Republic previous to the English occupation of
Java, and by the Dutch Government after the English occupation, and the Raffles Museum
contains such coins of the year 1802, 1818, 1819, 1821 and 1824. The Museum also contains
a coin of 1815; that is, a coin struck in Batavia with the Dutch coin of arms during the time
of the English rule. Therefore it is possible that the above coin of 1816, found at Malacca, may
also have been struck under English rule. I cannot offer any explanation of this. A coin of this
kind, but of the year 1802, is figured in Netscher and Chijis, pl. VI, fig. 39 (De Munten van
Nederlanden Indis, 1883). The figures 5 and 1/16 to the right and left of the shield respectively
are somewhat mysterious. Netscher and Chijis (p 108) say they are not able to offer any
explanation of their meaning."

The coins in question are dated 1802—1824 and therefore the following quotation from Kelly’s
Accounts are kept in tales, pardows, mace, copangs and cash. A tale is 4 pardows, 16 mace or
64 copangs. The coins of the country are mace and cash. The mace is a small gold coin
weighing 9 grains and worth about 1/4d sterling. The cash are small pieces of tin or lead, 2500
of which usually pass for a mace, but this number often varies.” This scale of money of account
was of long standing in Acheen: see Stevens, Guide to E. I. Trade, 2nd ed., 1775, p. 87, who
makes almost the same statement as Kelly. It goes back in fact a long way in the Malay
countries: see Bowrey, Countries round the Bay of Bengal, Hak. Soc. ed., p. 280 f., writing about
1675.

From the statements above quoted we can extract the following results:

A. Achin Currency.

| 40 cash | make | 1 kupang |
| 4 kupang | , | 1 mas |
| 4 mas | , | 1 pardao |
| 4 pardao | , | 1 tahil |

2560 cash to the tahil
640 cash to the pardao

B. Value of mas and pardao.

1 mas equal 14d.
1 pardao , 56d = 4s. 8d.

99 See ante, p. 37.
Therefore the pardao was a dollar of account (rix dollar, reichsthaler) reckoned at 540 cash.

C. Value of the coin.

5 doit (kēping) make 1 kupang = 6½ cents
16 kupang of Achin = 1 pardao = 100 cents

Therefore the Achin kupang was the kēndiri of the old Dutch popular currency (see ante, p. 86). Therefore also the coins represent the kupang (kēndiri) of Achin, which was 1/16 of a pardao or rixdollar of 640 cash, and was worth 5 duit (kēping) of 1½ cent. Hence the figures 1/16 and 5 on the coins.

The coins appear to have been struck for the convenience of the Achin trade, then very important. Historically Achin does not seem to have been so closely under British rule as Java was, during 1811-1816, and on the restoration of Java to the Dutch "a good deal of weight was attached by the neighbouring British Colonies to the maintenance of influence in Achin. In 1819 a treaty of friendship was concluded with the Calcutta Government, which excluded other European nationalities from fixed residence in Achin. When the British Government, in 1824, made a treaty with the Netherlands, surrendering the remaining British settlements in Sumatra in exchange for certain possessions on the continent of Asia, no reference was made in the articles to the Indian treaty of 1819; but an understanding was exchanged that it should be modified, while no proceedings hostile to Achin should be attempted by the Dutch." (Encyc. Brit., 11th ed., l. 145). It is quite possible, therefore, that the British Government issued the kupang or 5 doit piece for the Achin merchants as well as the Dutch Government, and its use of the Dutch arms can be accounted for by the almost universal custom of the retention by a new Government of a well-known, even though inappropriate, design on coins meant for popular use.

The coin is not likely to have been intended for Java currency, as at that time "in the local currency of Java, 10 copper doits made one wong (a small silver coin) and 12 wong one rupee" (Raffles, Java II. Appx., p. 166). Therefore, if intended for Java currency, a coin of 5 doits would equal 1/24 rupee or 1/38 rixdollar, as the rixdollar was then in Java equal to 190 doits (op. cit. p. 167). These proportions do not fit in with the statements on the coin.

It is interesting to note that 5 and 1/16 represents a very ancient proportion in India. The oldest copper coinage known there, the purāṇa, pāṇa, kārshāpāṇa, or current copper cash, was based according to Cunningham, Coins of Ancient India, p. 46, on the cowry by tale, and on the raktikā or rati (= abrus precatorius) by weight, the cowry being equated to the rati. On this basis the tale of the actual copper coinage ran as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>grains</th>
<th>cowries or raktikās</th>
<th>pāṇa</th>
<th>names</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1/16</td>
<td>ardhakāśipīl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1/8</td>
<td>kāśiṣīl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1/4</td>
<td>ardhapāṇa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>pāṇa, kārshāpāṇa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"The old copper punch-marked coins of copper and all the one-die [oldest] coins from Taxila were pāṇas."

This exhibits a most interesting comparison.

Scale of modern gold coins in Sumatra.

Scale of ancient copper coins in India.

9 grains = mās       = 1/4 kāśiṣīl
36 "       = pardao  = kāśiṣīl
144 "      = tābil    = pāṇa, kārshāpāṇa

*(To be continued.*)*
EPIGRAPHIC NOTES AND QUESTIONS.

BY D. R. BHANDARKAR, M. A.; POONA.

(Continued from Vol. XLII. p. 163.)

XIX.—Asoka's Rock Edict I. Reconsidered.

Eleven years ago I contributed a note to the Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society1 on Asoka's Rock Edict I., and therein showed what the true sense of the word samāja was and why it was that the Buddhist monarch spoke of it in an edict connected with the preservation of life. I am glad to find that my view has now been generally accepted.2 I have, however, since I wrote last about it, found many more references to samāja, which are interesting and which throw light, in particular, on the passage asti pi chu ekacit samājā saddhumaṭt Devadatta-priyasa Priyadasino, which I then was not fully able to comprehend. The last portion of the edict wherein he makes mention of hundreds of thousands of animals slaughtered every day in his royal kitchen was also not quite clear. I, therefore, make no excuse for considering this edict again, and, above all, making a somewhat detailed discussion about the word samāja.

I have in my last article on the subject cited a passage from the Harivamsa, which represents Kṛishṇa to have held in honour of the god Bilvodakeśvara a samāja, which "abounded in a hundred (varieties) of meat and curry, was full of diverse (kinds) of food, and surcharged with condiments." Samāja was thus a public feast where meat formed one of the principal articles of food served. This is one sense of the term, and doubtless shows why Asoka took objection to such a kind of samāja. But there is another sense of the word which indicates that there was a second kind of samāja where no animal life was sacrificed and which could not consequently have been disapproved by him. No less than three descriptions of such samājas I have been able to trace in the Brahmanic literature. One of these has been set forth in the Harivamsa in verses 4528-4538 and 4642-4658. This samāja was called by Kaṁṣa in order that his people might witness a wrestling match between Kṛishṇa and Balarāma on the one hand and Chāṇḍra and Mūṣṭika on the other. Here the word samāja is used synonymously with raṅga and prekshādvara, and appears to be a building erected by Kaṁṣa for permanent use for entertaining his subjects by the exhibition of public spectacles. The building was at least two-storied and divided into a number of compartments with passages running inside. They all faced the east, and were provided each with maṇikās which were arranged in raised tiers one behind the other. Some of these compartments were specially reserved for the various guilds (rāṣṭi) and classes (guna), which on festive occasions decorated them with banners indicative of their profession. The prostitutes had also their own maṇikās separately. But ladies of the harem were accommodated in the compartments of the upper storey, some of which were furnished with minute lattice windows (sūkheśma-jāla) and others with curtains (javānādha). The golden paryāṇkas and the principal seats were covered with painted cloths (ksthā) and flowers. Drinking pitchers were fixed into the ground at due intervals, and fruits, stimulants (avandāsha) and unctions (kashādyā) were provided for. A not forgettable feature of the samāja was the offering of balti, which has been twice mentioned in this account.

A second description of samāja is contained in the Mahābhārata, Aṣṭaparvan, chap. 184 and ff. When Droṇa had the young Kaurava and Paṇḍava princes conversant with the science of arms, he informed Dhṛtarāṣṭra of it, who thereupon ordered Viḍūra to have a public exhibition made

---

1 Vol. XXI., p. 392 ff.
3 Maṇḍika no doubt corresponds to the Hindī maṁḍhā or Gujārātī maṁḍ, and denotes a kind of stool or chair. Paryāṇa was only an elaborate kind of maṇḍika.
of their skill. A samāja was accordingly announced to the people. Land, even and free from trees, was selected, and the necessary portion of it measured out, by Droṇa, who also made an offering of bals. On the ground so selected the architects of the king raised a prekhādyāra. The people made their own maṁchas and the rich folk their own śivalīgas. On the day fixed Dhṛtarāṣṭra with the ladies of his royal family attended; and what with musical instruments sounding and what with the excitement of the people, the samāja was in an uproar like the ocean. There after Droṇa entered the raṅga, again offered a balti, and caused Brahmānas to pronounce benedictions. Then the whole array of the young princes made their appearance and commenced each showing to the best advantage his proficiency in the military science.

The third description of the samāja occurs in the same epic but in chapter 185 and in connection with the svayastvara of Draupadi. On an even piece of ground, we are told, and to the north-east of Draupada’s capital a samāja was erected, adorned with walls, meats, doors and arched gateways and covered with a variegated canopy. It abounded with actors (natasas), dancers (nartakas), and hundreds of musical instruments (turyas) and was made fragrant by the burning of aguru sticks and the sprinkling of sandal water. The maṁchas were occupied by princes come from the different quarters and by people of the capital town and the districts. For sixteen consecutive days the samāja was held, and it was concluded on the sixteenth day with the appearance of Draupadi and the hitting of the target by Arjuna.

It will be seen from the above summaries, brief as they are, that the words samāja, raṅga, and prekhādyāra have been used synonymously and that samāja sometimes refers even to the concourse of the people assembled there. All the three samājas were held by kings, the first to witness a wrestling match, the second the military manoeuvres of the princes, and the third the svayastvara of a princess. No pains were spared to make the people comfortable and make their amusements complete. Maṁchas and paryāṅkhas were set up, and different classes of people had different compartments assigned. Arrangements for drinking water and stimulants were made. Actors, dancers, and musical instruments were also brought in to feast their eyes and ears. The samājas were sometimes permanent structures as in the case of Kamā’s sandja, and sometimes put up temporarily.

The Brahmanical literature thus tells us that there were two kinds of samājas, one in which amusements for the people were organised and the other in which meat and other food were distributed among them. The same thing we find in Buddhist literature also. In Vinaya II. 5.2.6 we are informed that certain Bhikshus attended a samāja that was held on a hill at Rājagriha and that they were censured by the people because they like ordinary sensual laymen took delight in dancing, vocal and instrumental music that were going on there. Here not the slightest mention has been made of victuals. But Vinaya IV. 37.1 has a different account to give. Here also a samāja on a hill near Rājagriha is spoken of, and certain Bhikshus again mentioned to have gone there. But there was nothing at this place to gratify the eye or the ear. The Bhikshus are represented in this samāja to have bathed, smeared themselves with unguents and dined, and also to have taken some victuals for their brethren. The words used here for dining and victuals are bhujāniya and bhāḍāniya, which last word the commentator, it is worthy of note, has explained by the term maṁasa.

We thus find that both the Brahmanical and Buddhist literatures allude to two classes of samāja. In one the people were entertained with dancing, music, and other performances, and in the other with food of which meat formed the most important part. Now, turning to Rock Edict I. let us see what Asoka’s attitude towards samāja was. There were some samājas which he condemned outright and in which he saw nothing but evil. On the other hand, there were some which were approved by him. As this edict is devoted to the preservation of animal life, there can
be no doubt, that, the samadjas, which the Buddhist emperor taboed, were those, in which animals were slain to serve meat. And further as there was nothing in the other samadjas for Piyadasi to object to, these must have been the samadjas which were called siddhamata by him. But why should they have been considered excellent by him? If they were unobjectionable, he should have bestowed neither praise nor condemnation on them. But why were they designated siddhamata? It is not difficult, I think, at least to frame a reply which is plausible. The samadjas of the second kind were intended as we have seen for the exhibition of public spectacles. Could Asoka have given a somewhat different turn to these spectacles and utilised the institution of samadja for impressing his people with something that was uppermost in his mind? If my interpretation of Rock Edict IV, is correct, in all likelihood Piyadasi must have shown to his subjects in these samadjas representations of vimalnas, hastinas and agnistambhas, by means of which he claims to have increased their righteousness. He informs us that the sound of his drum became a sound of righteousness. What is probably meant is that the drum was beaten to announce a samadja in which these spectacles were exhibited. After publishing my interpretation of Rock Edict IV, I was revolving in my mind the question where Asoka could have shown these representations to his people. The idea suddenly struck me that as samadjas were prekshaigdhas which were thronged by all sorts and conditions of men, he could not have done better than used these places for exhibiting these vimalnas, hastinas, and so forth. This is the reason, I believe, why samadjas of the second class were looked upon favourably by him. That it was the practice of the kings of ancient India to call samadjas is clear from the descriptions given above and also from epigraphic references cited in my last article. These last speak of Kharaevela, king of Kalinga, and Goutamiputra Satakarni as having amused their subjects with utsavas and samadjas.

I now proceed to consider the third or last part of Rock Edict I, in which Piyadasi speaks of hundreds of thousands of animals slain every day in his royal kitchen. In my last article on this inscription, I interpreted this passage to mean that these animals were slaughtered to serve meat on the occasion of these samadjas which he now condemned but which he formerly celebrated. But this interpretation is open at least to two objections. First, the word amudivasah is rendered devoid of all meaning. For the natural and usual sense of this term is "every day", and it is not possible to suppose that before the spirit of righteousness dawned upon the mind of Piyadasi, he was in the habit of holding a samadja every day. Such a thing is an utter impossibility. Secondly, the slaughter of the animals referred to by him took place, as we are distinctly told, in his own kitchen (mahamasa) and not in a samadja. Nor is it possible to suppose that these samadjas were celebrated near the royal palace, and, in particular, in the close proximity of the royal kitchen. For all evidence points to such samadjas coming off not only far from the palace but also far from the city. Both the samadjas described in the Mahabharata and alluded to above were held outside the capital towns. And the references from Buddhist literature cited above inform us that they were held on the tops of hills. Hence samadjas can possibly have nothing to do with the fearful killing of animals, that, as Asoka tells us, was carried out every day in his kitchen. The questions therefore naturally arise: why did this daily slaughter take place? Was such a thing ever done by any other king? Those who have read chapter 208 of the Vanaspata and of the Mahabharata can have no difficulty in answering these questions. In this chapter we are told that two thousand cattle and two thousand kine were slain every day in the kitchen (mahamasa) of the king Rantidcva and by doling out meat to his people he attained to incomparable fame. This statement, I have no doubt, at once unravels the mystery which has hung over the passage of the edict. We cannot help supposing that like Rantidcva Asoka also was in the habit of distributing meat among his subjects and that his object in doing so must have been precisely the same.

*Ante, p. 25 ff.*
viz., that of making himself popular. This explanation fits here so excellently that, in the absence of a better one, it may, I think, be safely accepted. But he put a stop to this terrible animal carnage the moment his conscience was aroused and at first restricted it to the killing of three animals everyday which were required strictly for the royal table, and finally abolished this practice also, as we can well believe from the concluding words of the edict.

XX.—Ujjain Stone inscription of Chaulukya Jayasimha.

When I was at Ujjain in January last, I was told by the people that a fragment of an inscription recently discovered was lying in the compound of the local Municipality. On personally inspecting it, I found that though the inscription was but a fragment, the preserved portion of it was of great importance for the history of the Chaulukya and Paramara families. It begins with the date, viz., Thursday the 14th of the dark half of Jyeshta of Vikrama Samvat 1195, and refers itself to the reign of the Chaulukya sovereign, Jayasimhadeva. His usual epithets also are given, viz., Tribhuvana-gaṇḍa, Siddha-chakravarti, Avantidhīrśa and Varvaraka-jishnu, and he is mentioned to be reigning at Anahilapāta (Anhilvād). Mahattama Sri-Dādāka was at that time the keeper of the seal at Anahilapāta. Then, in lines 7-8, whose meaning is clear but whose grammatical construction is not faultless, we are told that Jayasimha was per force holding the district (maṇḍala) of Avanti after vanquishing Yaśovarman, king of Mālwa. The next two lines inform us that Mālwa was held for Jayasimha by Mahādeva, who was a son of Daṇḍa Dādāka and who belonged to the Nāga race. Then follow names of some individuals and the mention of the god Kṛtinārāyaṇa. But as the stone is broken off from here, their connection is far from clear.

The importance of the inscription is centred in the mention of the district of Avanti being held by the Chaulukya Jayasimha after defeating the Paramāra Yaśovarman. This gives confirmation to the fact that the old Gujarāt chronicles speak of Jayasimha as seizing and imprisoning Yaśovarman and bringing all Avantidesa together with Dhar under his subjection. That Yaśovarman was thrown into prison is borne out by a Dohad inscription,6 which represents Jayasimha to have imprisoned king of Mālwa who can be no other than this Paramāra prince. We have a copper-plate grant found at Ujjain, which gives V.E. 1191 as the date of Yaśovarman and couples with his name the titles Maḥārājādhirāja Pataimevara. Jayasimhadeva must, therefore, have inflicted this crushing defeat on Yaśovarman between V.E. 1191 and 1195. We are told that Yaśovarman contrived to escape from his prison, and, with the assistance of the Chohān king of Ajmer, regained his possessions and came to terms with Jayasimha.

THE PRIORITY OF BHĀMAHA TO DĀDĪN.

BY RAO BAHAĐUR K. P. TRIVEDI, B.A.; AHMEDAABAD.

The question of the priority of Bhāmaha to Daṇḍin has been discussed fully by me in the Preface to my edition of the Pratītaradrayaśivbhāṣā in the Bombay Sanskrit Series. I have also given there my views in regard to the reference to Nyāsakāra which is found in Bhāmaha's work. Since, however, Prof. K.B. Pāṭhak has chosen to establish his theory of the priority of Daṇḍin to Bhāmaha on the strength of the reference which he thinks is indisputably a reference to Jinchendrabuddhi of the eighth century, disregarding, or not attaching much value to, or not caring to refute other grounds which lend a strong presumption in favour of the priority of Bhāmaha to Daṇḍin, I shall try in this article first to show that the Nyāsakāra alluded to by Bhāmaha is not Jinchendrabuddhi, and then to mention some grounds which lend a very strong colour to the belief in my mind of the priority of Bhāmaha to Daṇḍin.

The verses in Bhamaha's *Kavyadarsaka* in which Nyasakara is alluded to are as under:—

िविद्योग्मात्रेष्य न्यावासंग्रामो वा।
तुष्च समस्तपरिक्रम न कर्योपितार्थ। ||
सूचवाकपामात्रेष्य बृहस्पत्ति बलविषर्षा।
अर्कर च न कृत्यो तृष्णिन्ा तस्य पदकार्य। ||

The passage from Jinendrabuddhi's *Kāśikāvṛtaraṇṇa-pañjikā*, as quoted by Prof. Pāthak, is as under:—

अयं किमति तुर्ल: सात्सुवन्नस्मृतिभार: 
तुष्च निवास्यं धर्मं नैवेद्य:।
तथायो: न लोकांस्यब्रह्मान्यश्चर्य: 
एवं तद्वितरायाम स्वात्मक नन्दलयं नवन्ति।
तैन निल्यम्: कुक्तिः नयोक्तकाल्यनं 
देवसर्वकालं सिद्धं नःस्तति।

Now what Bhamaha urges is that Pāṇini's *sūtra* 'तुष्च बुध्मान्य करतेर' (२.१६३) should be strictly observed and no पूर्वतपस्य compound formed with words ending in the subjective तुष्च andअक seluices. Consequently no compound takes place in instances like अर्तगं मात्र, वसमन्तर, and अलोक्यपामकाल: . How then, says Bhaṭṭoji Dikṣita, is a compound like निल्यम्यादिः: in पान्त: 

निल्यम्यादिः सुम्बवारामक बनह: to be accounted for? He then gives Kāśikā's view 'अङ्गमात्र: समान्त हलति केवलः'. It will thus be seen that a compound of कारकांश्च with a word ending in तुष्च orअक in the subjective sense is forbidden and that whenever a compound of a word in the genitive case is formed with a word ending in subjective तुष्च orअक as in निल्यम्यादिः it should be taken as a compound of तुष्च बुध्मान्य a तुष्च तुष्च अर्तगं अक.

Let us now see what the extract given above from the *Kāśikāvṛtaraṇṇa-pañjikā* means. Nyāsakāra discusses the propriety of the अनुबंधि in तुष्च in the *sūtra* 'तुष्च बुध्मान्य करतेर'. His extract, as I understand it, means as under:— 'Why does Pāṇini pronounce तुष्च with its अनुबंधि in तुष्च in the *sūtra* 'तुष्च बुध्मान्य करतेर'? In other words, why does Pāṇini not give the *sūtra* as 'बुध्मान्यि करतेर'? What is the propriety of the अनुबंधि? Nyāsakāra says that तुष्च is pronounced to exclude तुष्च. That is to say, a compound of पत्र्गी with a तुष्च is forbidden, not with a तुष्च. But this view brings in another difficulty; for the use of the genitive is forbidden with a तुष्च word by 'न लोकांस्य ब्रह्मान्यश्चर्य: निल्यम्यादिः मूलगम्यम् (२.१६३) and so पत्र्गीs with a तुष्च is out of the question. This difficulty is obviated by Nyāsakāra by supposing that this very *sūtra* is a तार्किक that the genitive may sometimes be used with a तुष्च word and that the निल्यम्य or prohibition of the genitive with a तुष्च word by the *sūtra* 'न लोकांस्य' is अर्थबंधि or inconsistent. The prohibition of the genitive with a तुष्च word being inconsistent, the *prayoga* ब्रह्मम्: कुक्तिः नयोक्तकाल्यनं etc. according to the extract as given by Prof. Pāthak or the compounds नयोक्तकाल्यनं etc., can be justified.

In brief, this extract of the Nyāsakāra's contention is this. No compound of the genitive with a तुष्च word can take place according to Pāṇini's *दक्सिणात्यः करतेर*. Therefore compounds of the genitive with a word ending in तुष्च should be justified by taking the word ending in तुष्च to तुष्च.

Now let us see what Bhamaha means and whether the Nyāsakāra alluded to by him is Jīnendrabuddhi. He urges very strongly that Pāṇini must be strictly followed and that compounds of the genitive with a word ending in तुष्च should on no account be formed. Either on the strength of शिष्टाचार, *i.e.*, the use of such compounds by the learned, or on the strength of the view of the Nyāsakāra, as the compound तुष्च तुष्च has actually been mentioned simply on the strength of तुष्च तुष्च. करतेर seems to have been explained by Bhamaha by तुष्च तुष्च अर्पितान्त:.

Some justify compounds of the genitive with a word ending in तुष्च by Pāṇini's own निल्यम्य in the *sūtra* जानिकै: प्रयोक्तः. The sense of Bhamaha's words is quite clear. He contends that Pāṇini must be followed and no compound of the genitive with a तुष्च word should ever be formed; Nyāsakāra's opinion should on no account be accepted and पत्र्गीसमारय
with a तुष्ण should not be formed. Thus the view of Bhāmaha’s Nyāsakāra is that पहासतमान with a तुष्ण word may take place. This is distinctly against Pāṇini and is therefore very strongly condemned by Bhāmaha. तुष्ण समस्तभाविक न्यासकारानि न कर्मिंतवुधार्थस्त्रेष्ट means distinctly that according to the view of the Nyāsakāra तुष्णसमाय with a तुष्ण may be allowed. तुष्ण पहासतमान नवपतित न्यासकारानि समस्तभाविक न कर्मिंतवुधार्थस्त्रेष्ट यतोऽपिति विवेकानिवेकस्तु।

This is the purport of Bhāmaha’s words. Bhāmaha had great reverence for Pāṇini; for at the end of the sixth परिच्छेद he says, ‘अः चेत वेणित नर हि पाविनेयम्.’

Now let us see whether Jindendrauddhi is the Nyāsakāra alluded to by Bhāmaha. That the two Nyāsakāras, the one alluded to by Bhāmaha, and the commentator on the Kāśikāvṛtti, are far from being one and the same person must have now been clear on the following ground:—

The Nyāsakāra, Jindendrauddhi, is not in favour of a पहासतमान with a तुष्ण word; but justifies a compound of the genitive with a word ending in तुष्ण by taking the word ending in तुष्ण to be तुष्ण and not तुष्ण. Thus Bhāmaha’s Nyāsakāra can never be Jindendrauddhi.

Moreover, नवपतित: means that the compound नवपतित is उपित:—actually mentioned by Nyāsakāra. It cannot mean नवित: so that it can be included in the class नवपतित: owing to the use of the word आदि as Prof. Pāṭhak seems to think. Bhāmaha’s Nyāsakāra must be one who has actually used the compound नवपतित. It is thus as clear as anything that the Nyāsakāra of Bhāmaha is not Jindendrauddhi on the two following grounds:—

(1) Bhāmaha’s Nyāsakāra is distinctly in favour of the compound of the genitive with a word ending in तुष्ण; while Jindendrauddhi is not in favour of such a compound and justifies a compound of the genitive with a word ending in तुष्ण by taking the word ending in तुष्ण to be a word ending in तुष्ण and not तुष्ण to avoid the violation of the Sūtra तुष्णानां करणिः.

(2) Bhāmaha’s Nyāsakāra has mentioned the compound नवपतित on the strength of नवपतित and this compounded word must be understood to be तुष्ण समस्तभाविक; that is, नवपतित is a compound of the genitive with a तुष्ण word and not तुष्ण word. Jindendrauddhi does not mention the compound नवपतित at all; and the compound that he mentions according to Prof. Pāṭhak’s extract is नवपतित. He uses आदि and thus नवपतित may be proved to be correct (विज्ञ) according to him. But it is not उपित: or actually mentioned by him; nor is it according to Jindendrauddhi a compound of the genitive with a तुष्ण as Bhāmaha’s Nyāsakāra evidently sanctions.

Prof. Pāṭhak says, “I shall give below Bhāmaha’s verses, together with the passage containing the Nyāsakāra’s Jādaṇas, as the extract supplied to Mr. Trivedi from Mysore is most corrupt.” Now Bhāmaha’s verses given by Prof. Pāṭhak are the same as in my edition of the Pratāparudrīga and there is no difference in reading whatsoever; and the extract supplied to me does not differ from Prof. Pāṭhak’s extract except in one place, where the reading in my passage is more to the point than the one in Prof. Pāṭhak’s extract. My extract is as under:—

अष्ट किंचित सातुष्णस्मार्यं तुष्णित। हुनो तिःनुमर्युमेव | नैतिषत् | तधृति न लोकायानविनविअविन | पद्मपातिभाग।।

On comparing this extract supplied to me for my edition of the Pratāparudrīga with Prof. Pāṭhak’s extract as given above, it will be seen that there is no material difference in them except at the end in the instance given. Now नवपतित is more to the point than नवपतित; for Jindendrauddhi has given this instance to justify the use of the genitive with a तुष्ण word and to show that the prohibition ‘न तुष्णानां’ is अनिवार्य. The justification of a compound is not in dispute and therefore the reading given in Prof. Pāṭhak’s extract is not quite in point; though it appears to be the correct reading as a line of a verse from the Mahābhārata.
Prof. Pāthak says, 'When Mr. Trivedi says that "many Nyāsakāras are mentioned in the Dhātuvrīti of Mādhavāchārya: स्मृतिमयमया, न्यासाचार्य, बोधियाचार, धातुवर्गीय, शास्त्रविधान, अग्निवर्गीय," he tells us something less than the truth.' Prof. Pāthak then quotes three or four passages where Nyāya or Nyāsakāra is mentioned. The truth is that Nyāya, Nyāsakāra, Haradatta, Padamānjarī, Maitreyā, etc., are mentioned or quoted so very frequently in the Dhātuvrīti that it is useless to quote passages to show it to the reader. Moreover, the point at issue is whether there was only one Nyāsakāra or whether there were more than one Nyāsakāra. To establish that there were more than one Nyāsakāra, I have given the different Nyāsakāras, mentioned by Mādhava, and I now quote a few passages where they are mentioned:

(a) स्वतं गृहीतं गृहीतं गृहीतं गृहीतं गृहीतं। अन्यं क्षेत्रम् नन्दिनम्भादिके। येन प्रमेयमयमया पञ्चं। सार्वभावातः कारान्यानां।

(b) कवित्यं नैसर्गिकं। नैसर्गिकं। नैसर्गिकं। नैसर्गिकं। नैसर्गिकं।

It is not quite clear whether the न्यासियोत्त र or the उद्धोत्त on the न्यास quoted here is on the same न्यास that is quoted before or on another न्यास.

The above quotations make it clear that Mādhava mentions more than one Nyāsakāra.

Having shown that the Nyāsakāra of Bhāmaha is not Jinendrabuddhi, I shall proceed to place before the reader arguments in favour of Bhāmaha's priority to Dāndin.

(a) Old writers on Āśukhāras are mentioned as न्यान्त्याल: in the following:

(1) नूर्जुलाही न्यासार्थालयः।

The above quotations make it clear that Mādhava mentions more than one Nyāsakāra.
The views of Daṇḍin being the same as those of Bhāmaha about Āryāvarta, Rudraṇa would have said हस्तिऴारिन्द्र, had he thought Daṇḍin to be the oldest Ālayukdrīka in place of Bhāmaha.

(b) Bhāmaha's work is looked upon with great reverence by authors like Mammaṭa and Abhinavagupta and is called आकार. The following verses have been quoted by Mammaṭa:

सोपव सत्त्र वधृक्ष्यरायाः विनापत्रोऽभि
वसंतदेहान किन्य नुसंसंस्रकारणयाः विना ॥
काव्यम् X

This verse is quoted in भास्माताप न्दिपतम् pp. 207-8 and ब्रम्हचार्याः काव्यवादसन p. 267.

Rāghavabhāṣṭa in his अयद्योतानिऐ on the अत्तिविनाकुलता calls Bhāmaha's work आकार—अतिर सर्वकारणसिद्धीद्वैपेक्षाय विनोऽभि शान्ति—“नालंकारीणयाः विना” हितः।

The mention of authors like Bāmāśārman and Sākhāvadhantha and works like Açhyutottara, Ratnāvaraṇa, Rājāmikra, and Áśimakavijñāna, and the fact that nothing is known about these authors and works and that they are not found quoted anywhere else lend a strong colour to the presumption that Bhāmaha belongs to very ancient times and this justifies the mention of Bhāmaha at the top of old Álayukdrīkas in expressions like पूर्वोऽय नामान्निष्ठन्ताः: नामसंदृढ्यमृट्याभिरथविनाकुलतायाः कारणाः the great reverence in which he was held by authors like Mammaṭa and Abhinavagupta, and the application of the epithet आकार to his work.

(c) Daṇḍin's numerous divisions of Úpamā, Rāpaka, Ákaheka, and Vyattireka and his detailed treatment of Šaṭṭilāṅkūdras in a separate chapter strengthen the presumption of the priority of Bhāmaha to Daṇḍin and of Daṇḍin's belonging to a later age than Bhāmaha; since the latter's divisions of Álayukdrīkas are not so minute and since he does not attach much importance to Šaṭṭilāṅkūdras.

(d) A close comparison of several portions of the works of Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin almost affords a convincing evidence in favour of the priority of Bhāmaha to Daṇḍin. The following may be mentioned as instances:

(1) Verses about क्रिया and भायवाक्यः

क्रियान्मरक्षाक्षादयोसंपद्यति
गच्छन वधृक्ष्यरायाः सोपवारियाः विनापत्रोऽभि
वसंतदेहान किन्य नुसंसंस्रकारणयाः विना
काव्यम् X
Compare with the above, the following from Dandin's Kadāyyākāra:

अति व्यंजन नाशकोऽहैतु नाशकोऽहैतु
स्वयं विषयमिति किंतु भवाम
कथा वर्ण: || नाम.

On a comparison of the description of कथा and आधारवित्तेक as given by Bhāmaha and Dandin, it will be seen at once that Bhāmaha recognizes a difference between them; while Dandin says that they belong to one and the same class of compositions with two names. The facts that Dandin knew that the difference between कथा and आधारवित्तेक was traditional (as the word किंतु-किंतु विषयमिति 'किंतु विषयमिति' shows) and accepted by old Alākādārīkāts, that Bhāmaha acknowledges the difference between them and that the points of difference between them (1 आधारवित्तेक शोभास्वरूपी; 2 आधारवित्तेक शोभास्वरूपी; 3 आधारवित्तेक शोभास्वरूपी) as attacked by Dandin are precisely the same as those mentioned by Bhāmaha afford a strong presumption in favour of the priority of Bhāmaha to Dandin.

2 गायत्रीमाताः भागीदारिणी वादाय पश्चिमः ||
इत्येवमाति विकाव्यं वादायिनां पश्चिमः ||

Here गायत्रीमाताः etc. is declared to be bad poetry by Bhāmaha; while Dandin says that it is undoubtedly good poetry. The use of द्रव्य is pointed and seems distinctly levelled against those who call it bad poetry. Bhāmaha is one that we have found as such and this allusion of Dandin is another strong evidence in favour of the priority of Bhāmaha.
It will be seen that the first ten *doshas* mentioned by Dāṇḍin are precisely the same as those given by Bāhāmaha and that the eleventh *dosa* of Bāhāmaha is criticised by Dāṇḍin. This is almost conclusive evidence in favour of the priority of Bāhāmaha to Dāṇḍin.

4. The verse

\[ \text{चतुर्व सम गोविंद जाता स्वयं} \]
\[ \text{कर्ममेवा नवेन नविष्कारे वर्णमानाय सुना} \]

is given as an instance of *वेयेकासांकर* both by Bāhāmaha (III.5) and Dāṇḍin (II.276). It is very probable that Dāṇḍin has borrowed this verse from Bāhāmaha; for when the former does not acknowledge the source from which he borrows as in *शस्यानि समाजाकनि शस्यानि* &c., the latter acknowledges the sources wherever he borrows verses from others as *Rājāmitra, Achyutottara*, etc. Moreover, Bāhāmaha says distinctly that the instances to illustrate figures of speech are his own composition (*प्रेक्षके एव नविष्कारिश नविष्कारिश मना प्रसुक्ता कहत वाक्यंकृतिः* | II. 96). This is an additional evidence for the presumption of the priority of Bāhāmaha to Dāṇḍin.

5. Bāhāmaha is quoted by Bhāmaha by Śrīvatsāsākamīra of the tenth century A.D. This places Bhāmaha before Bhaṭṭi of the 6th or the 7th century.

Prof. Pāṭhak quotes from my text the verses *वणुकं विचित्रम्* *वर्णः*, *काव्यमालिकः* etc., and states that Bhāmaha is attacking Dāṇḍin in whose work the three divisions of *Upamāṇa* mentioned by Bhāmaha are found. This inference or presumption does not seem to be at all warranted by facts; for Dāṇḍin does not divide *Upamāṇa* into three kinds only, but into a number of varieties (*भासमणक, ब्लुष्यमणक, वायुसिद्धमणक, अन्यायसिद्धमणक*, *विम्वमणक*, *विधिबंधुमणक*, *विद्याबंधुमणक*, etc.).

Here it is evident that one has borrowed from the other. The verse is ascribed to Bhāmaha by Śrīvatsāsākamīra of the tenth century A.D. This places Bhāmaha before Bhaṭṭi of the 6th or the 7th century.

(c) Tārūṣāvāchachāpati, a commentator on the *Kāvyādārśa*, distinctly mentions in three or four places the priority of Bhāmaha to Dāṇḍin:

(a) मामसम 'काव्याधर्म्योपमान्तम् भास्मादित्वं इदै भास्मादित्वम् सा भास्मादित्वम्' एव अच निराकराह | Com. on I. 29.

(b) हेतुः नारायण नामवर्णः—हेतुः नामवर्णः 'त नारायणः मनः'—हेतुः नारायणः हेतुः नारायणः | Com. on II. 238.

(c) हेतुः नारायणः 'स्म नारायणः मनः'—हेतुः नारायणः हेतुः नारायणः | Com. on II. 237.

(d) हेतुः नारायणः 'स्म नारायणः मनः'—हेतुः नारायणः हेतुः नारायणः | Com. on IV. 4.

In (b) and (c) the commentator states distinctly that Dāṇḍin criticises Bhāmaha. He thus places Bhāmaha before Dāṇḍin.

I think I have made out a sufficiently strong case for the presumption, almost amounting to certainty, for the priority of Bhāmaha to Dāṇḍin.
THE DATE OF THE MUQURA-RAKSHA SA AND THE IDENTIFICATION OF MALAYAKETU.

BY KASHI-PRIASAD JAYASWAL, M. A. (OXON.), BARRISTER-AT-LAW, CALCUTTA.

The arguments of Telang¹ are conclusive to establish the thesis that the play could not have been written later than the eighth century A.D. Now there is a further piece of internal evidence which has been missed, and which, I think, fixes the date of the play with almost absolute certainty.

The bharata-vākyā to the play names the reigning monarch: “at present (adhunā) . . . . . . . may long reign king Chandragupta.” Who was this the then reigning king Chandragupta? Before the eighth century and during a period when Pātaliputra was a living town (before 644 A.D.) there had been only three Chandragupas: Chandragupta the conqueror of Selucus, and the two Guptas bearing that name.

He could not have been the first. Omitting other reasons, it would be sufficient to point out that the Sakas and the Hūpas are mentioned in the play.² I attach more importance to the mention of the latter, who were absolutely unknown in the fourth century B.C.³

As the first is excluded, the identification must be limited only to the ambit of the two Guptas, out of whom I would select the latter, Chandragupta (II) the Vikramaditya. Chandragupta I was not a monarch of much importance; his name is not associated in any of the Gupta inscriptions with the suppression of any foreign enemy, or any great deeds to elicit a comparison, as in the bharata-vākyā, with Vishaṇu. Chandragupta II, on the other hand, did suppress the political power of the Sakas mlechchhas of Western India.⁴ Also I feel inclined to suspect a veiled defence of the scandalous murder of the Sakas Satrap⁵ in the story put forward in the Muqura-Rakṣaṇa of the destruction of the Mlechchha Parvata⁶ by Chandragupta the Maurya through the alleged agency of the vishaṇa-hanyā (‘poisonous girl’).

² चंद्रगुप्ताः पतलिपुत्रहरितम् महान विक्रमादित्यः।
³ युग्मोद्धरोज्जवल्युक्तराज्यमः।
⁴ युयु-पुर्णः (c. 644 A.D.) found Pataliputra in ruins with a population of some 1000 persons. Besides the fact that most of the scenes are laid at Pataliputra, the patriotic speech of Rakṣaṇa about Pataliputra indicates that at the time of the composition of the play Pataliputra was the capital:
⁵ “चारु, मधु सिद्धो ते: कुरुक्षेत्राप्रसारिति। महर्षि प्राचर्याः, कृतिविद्यािनां। प्राकार परिवर्तितं गृहन्तव्। नियं परिलोक्यताः, इतिहासमेव प्रतिविपणे।” स्याय: अच्छ:। Act II, verse 13.
⁶ Act V, verse 11.
⁷ I discuss below the Hūpas of the Muqura-Rakṣaṇa.
⁸ In this connexion the prophecy of the Purāṇas as to the rise in Śikṣāpatā (Śikṣāpatā) of a popular leader, the Brahmaṇa Kalkī, who is an ordinary man in the Vēyu-Puraṇa but is treated as an āchārya in later works, is significant. There seems to have been some great popular attempt made at uprooting the Sakas in Mālavā and Western Bājpatākā about the early decades of the Gupta days, at which point the earlier Purāṇas close their chronology. (The Vēyu, I think, closed before the reign of Chandragupta II, probably in the early days of Samudragupta. For the dominions of the Guptas described there precedes the conquests of Samudragupta:

⁹ The Parvata of the Muqura-Rakṣaṇa probably conceals in it the historical Philippos, Alexander’s Satrap of the Punjab, who is recorded to have been murdered by Indian troops. Philologically Philippos would be changed into Pirābā, Pirābā or Pirābā; and an attempt to restore Pirābā or Pirābā into Sanskrit would produce Parvata or Parvata.
On the basis of the occurrence of the Hūnas in the play, it might be argued that the play must be dated after the Hun irruptions into India, which are believed to have taken place a generation later than the reign of Chandragupta II. But the Huns had been known to this country before they came in as invaders. The Lalita-vistara mentions the Hūna-śāstra. They came to be known through the intercourse between India and Tartary and China, which had been well-established and frequent in the 1st and 2nd century A.D. A series of Hindu missionaries of Buddhism to China had already preceded Dharma-rākha (died 313 A.D.), the translator of Lalita-vistara. The Questions of Milinda, (ii. pp. 203-4) describes "people from Scythia, Bactria, China and Vilata (Tartary)" coming here. We do not know exactly where the Huns stayed immediately after they were driven away by China in the 1st century A.D. But this much is certain that they must have remained in the neighbourhood of Transoxiana through which the route to China lay. Before their attack on Persia (420 A.D.) they had already occupied Bactria. At Balkh and Bamiyan they had their head-quarters from which they raided south-west and south-east. In view of these circumstances there is nothing contradictory in having an author under Chandragupta II mentioning the Huns. The very mention shows that up to that time the Huns had not yet occupied any part of India, for they are associated with the Chinese or China (Chīna-Hūṇa, Mūdṛā-Bā. Act V, verse 11). By Kālidāśa they are described as occupying Kāśmir (the land producing saffron); their Chinese association was completely forgotten in his days. It is also worthy of note that they do not figure in the first army of invasion which came to help Chandragupta against the Nanda (Act II, p. 124); they only appear in the army of Malayaketa, and there too not prominently, but as mere auxiliaries to Saka monarchs (the northern Sakas = the Kūshānas). They had not yet shown themselves superior to their Scythian neighbours, whom they actually overthrew about 465 A.D.

The conclusion, therefore, to which we are led is that the play knows the Hūnas of a time when they had not yet acquired any territory in India, although an attack from them was considered probable. We may roundly put it down on chronological considerations c. 410 A.D. This also would confirm the view that the reigning Chandragupta of the bharata-vāya must be Chandragupta-Vikramāditya (c. 413 A.D.) And the annoyance caused to the country by the mlechchhas at the time of the composition of the drama would refer, if the composition, as it seems probable, took place after the suppression of the Western Satrap (c. 390 A.D.), to the Kūshānas, or possibly to the new element of the Huns, who might have already made some incursions, possibly in league with the Kūshānas, during the last years of Chandragupta's reign.

"Malayaketa." All the nations, which help the mlechcha king Malayaketa, in his invasion of Pāhaliputra, belong, as the late Mr. Telang has pointed out, 'one and all' except the name Malaya' to the northern parts, and most to the northern frontier of India, to be more accurate.

---

V. Smith, Early History of India, 2nd ed., p. 264.
10 E.g., Mahābhārata (c. 197 A.D.), Dharmapāla of Kapilavastu (c. 207 A.D.), Dharmākīśa (222 A.D.), Vighna (c. 294 A.D.).
It is very probable that the invasion of Balkh by Chandra of the Delhi Iron Pillar inscription (who has been now conclusively identified with Chandravarma (c. 400 A.D.) by M. M. Haraprasad Sastri in the light of his new Māndakūśa inscription) was in response to an early Hun incursion in territories, which were not subject to Samudragupta.
12 Rāghuvaṃśa, IV, 47-56. The Hunic occupation of Kāśmir comes over a century later, i.e., after Mihirakula's defeat (c. 390 A.D.) by Bālikittā and Yaśodharman. This would place Kālidāśa about 540-550 A.D. or some 130 years at least later than the composition of the Māndrā-Rādjasa. (I may mention here that I have come across a Hun caste at Almora, Himalaya.) (For a different interpretation of these verses of Kālidāśa about Hūnas, see Prof. Pākhā's note, Anta, vol. XXI, D. B. R.)
13 गार्हरूपसाथैं भाष्यपरिशिष्टः संविशेषः प्रयत्नः इति.
प्राचीनसंस्कृत संस्कृतम् श्रोता [हृ? तारानी] नाविकाराय! इति.
to the north-western frontier of India. Malayaketu’s predecessor, Parvataka, also belonged to the same regions. Not a single southern nation is mentioned in his army. Malayaketu thus obviously has no connection with the Malaya of the south. Further, no Malaya in the north-west is known to any branch of Indian literature. And as Malayaketu is nowhere associated with the name of Malayaketu’s alleged father and predecessor the mechcha Parvataka, it does not seem to be connected either with any place-name or with any tribal designation. In view of these considerations Malayaketu cannot be taken as representing originally a Samsrūta name. It appears to be merely a samskritised edition of the original mechcha name of the mechcha invader. I propose to read Malayaketu as Salayaketu, taking the latter as a Hindu edition of Seleucus. There is a deceptive similarity between the letters ma and sa of the Gupta and later scripts, and the change from an unfamiliar Salaya-into the familiar Malaya—would have been an easy process in the course of copying manuscripts. Whom else could Indian tradition have intended by the mechcha king ‘Malayaketu’ invading from the north-western frontier with a huge army of Greek and other (auxiliary) forces against Chandragupta the Maurya than the Greek Seleucus? If by the invasion of Malayaketu the Greek invasion alone could be meant, the proposed reading Salayaketu in place of Malayaketu, I submit, has a very strong case.

KINSARIYA INSCRIPTION OF DADHICHIKA (DAHIYA)
CHACHCHA OF VIKRAMA SAMVAT 1056.

BY PANDIT RAMKARNA, JODHPUR.

An article on the above has been prepared and sent by me for publication in the Epigraphia Indica, but a summary of it is given here for the information of those interested in the ancient history of Raiputana.

The inscription belongs to the reign of a prince called Chachcha, a feudatory of Durlabharāja of the imperial Chāhamāna dynasty and whose genealogy is as follows:

Vākpatirāja

Simhāraja

Durlabharāja

Chachcha is spoken of as a prince descended from the well-known rishi Dadhlchi. The inscription unfolds the following genealogy of this chief:

Meghanāda

Vairisimha

Yāsahpūshaṭa

Chachcha

Uddharāṇa

Chachcha is styled Dadhichiaka or Dahyaka, which is now-a-days called Dahiyā. The following remarks translated from the Hindi Marwar Census Report of 1891 would be found interesting:

"Some people hold that Dahiyās are the one-half race that goes to complete the thirteen and a half races of Rātaṇas. They once ruled over Parbatārā and Jālār, but now they are scattered

---

15 Mahālahapāthaśya Hareprasad Ṣastri has kindly drawn my attention to the fact that the term Malaya is itself a Dravidian word meaning ‘mountain’. Cf. Caldwell, Grammar of the Dravidian Languages, 2nd ed., p. 21.

16 It is probable that some of the details of the invasion of Seleucus might have been confused with the details of the invasion of Menander, e.g., the march upon the capital Pāḷiputtra might have been transferred from the latter to the former, although it is not impossible that Seleucus was actually used into a long march in the interior—a strategic policy largely and very successfully followed later on by the Parthians.
here and there. The old fort of Jâlor was constructed by the Dahiyâs. They now abound in the districts of Jâlor, Bâli, Jaswantpurâ, Pâlî, Siwanâ, Sânchôr and Malâpî. They observe widow marriage, and are not regarded as of equal position with other Rajputs."

A detailed and more reliable account of this clan is contained in Mûtâ Neṣasî's Chronicle, a summary whereof will not here be out of place:

"The original seat of the Dahiyâ Rajputs is reported to be a fortress named Thálner situated on the banks of the Godâwarî near modern Nasîk, whence they migrated into Mârvâr. In the Ajmer province they held the following places:—(1) the Derâvâra-Parbatsar group of fifty-six villages, (2) Sâvâr-Ghâtiyâli, (3) Harâur and (4) Mârît also called Vilasâvâ. All the four villages lie in the north-eastern part of Mârvâr. They also owned villages in south-western part as well, i. e., Jâlor and Sânchôr. Sânchôr is said to have been conquered by Vijayâs with the aid of an accomplice, Vâghelâ Mâhirâva (sister's son of Vijayârâja), from the Dahiyâ Vijayârâja in S. 1142. This event is recorded in a verse quoted below:

"भरा पृथ्वी धक्कान की ग्रीष्म विहार
सबसी सबलां साज माना नवाल पाहै॥
चालित न हूण विदवाएं वचना सार धराव शान्त॥
खान धिलान कालिगत सरया निम्म पंजार सीख हूढ॥
भू मेरे बेस जा लग ध्यान न चाल राज सावधार घर ॥१॥"

Mûtâ Neṣasî also gives a list of the Dahiyâ princes, who reigned round about Parbatsar and Mârît. He mentions Dadhiche as one of their ancestors and specifies their names as follows:

No. 27 Râhâ Râpo (who inhabited Rochaî). No. 28 Kaçâva Râpo. No. 29 Kirtasî Râpo. No. 30 Vairasî Râpo. No. 31 Châcha Râpo (who raised a temple on a hill in the village of Sinahâdiyâs). No. 32 Anâvî Udharâna (who ruled over Parbatsar and Mârît).

It is clear that the names Vairasi, Châcha and Udharâna of this list (Nos. 30-32) exactly correspond to Vairisinâ, Chachîcâ, and Udharâna of our inscription. The list however gives Kirtasî as the name of Vairasi's father, whereas he is called Meghanâda in the inscription. But there is nothing to preclude the supposition that Meghanâda and Kirtasî (Kirtisinâ) were the names of one and the same prince, as instances are not wanting of kings known by more than one name. Châcha Râpo, as we have just seen, is described in Mûtâ Neṣasî's Chronicle as having built a temple on a hill in the village of Sinahâdiyâs, which seems to be an old name of Kînasariyâ. Our inscription also tells the same story, viz., that Chachîca caused a temple of Bhavâni to be built. The epithet anâvî, which is coupled with Udharâna, appears to be a corruption of anâmra, meaning "unbinding." He was succeeded by Jagadharâ Râvâta, who ruled over Parbatsar. He constructed a temple, dug a step-well and a well in village Mândala, 2 miles from Parbatsar. His second son was Vilhâna, who wielded sway over the whole district of Mârît, which is, up to the present day, called Vilasâvâ. He used to reside in the village of Deprâ situated on a hill and 4 miles from Mârît, where an old fort and a tank still exist. Some Dahiyâs are still called Deprâ-Dahiyâs after this village. Of the succeeding generations, Bilto (No. 34) constructed a tank called

1 There are several villages which are collectively still called Dahiyâspatî, as districts of Mâroît and Parbatsar are called Godâhi (on account of their being once held by Guâgas) and districts to the north of Jodbyur are called Indârîhî (owing to their being once ruled over by Indâ Râjputs). This name Dahiyâspatî is sufficient to testify the fact that Dahiyâs held some sort of sway over that part of the country in some time past.
Bibásar in Parbatsar; and Hamira (No. 35) was a great warrior. His deeds are beautifully described in the following verses:

"माकालो यामालो बौधर जैनमार्ता,
कालो मधम गंग्यार काहिय, राजा,
दुर्ग दर्शाये सांसा को हीरूद्धे,
हिते खोट हर साउंडा वहके || 1 ||
हिते खुद हते वाह वहके रीते,
हिते हाड़ा ताजा साल शौरे || 2 ||
वाहरत करर चालन चालन सिघ,
काम पहलाम आकार काहे || 3 ||"

There is a number of pātalis or figures of kṣatris in an enclosure adjoining the temple containing this inscription. One of these figures bears an epitaph dated V. S. 1300 and containing the name of Vikrama son of Kṛtisimha Dahiya.

This shows that Dahiya held this part of the country for nearly 300 years, i.e., up to 1300 V. S. The use of the letter ṅa, which is but an abbreviation of ṅaṭu, prefixed to the name of Kṛtisimha, and the word ṅaṭu before that of his wife show that Kṛtisimha was a ruling prince, and not an āddṛā Rajput. The Dahiya kings mentioned in our inscription were chieftains, no doubt, feudatory to the Chāhāmāna overlords, but also wielding power over a tract of a country. This fact is again corroborated by the following abstract from an inscription of V. S. 1272 discovered in Maṅgāla in the Māroṭ district:

"वाटिचत्रवरी नगरायनस्थलाम पुरा जवानपुराचं
परस्परस्य धर्मान्यदेवारागुरु सिखं ज्ञातिः"

The inscription refers itself to the reign of Sri Relaṇa-deva (lord) of Raṇastambhapura or Raṇthambhor, and records some arrangements made in connection with a step-well. In this inscription also, the Dahiya prince, Jayatasiṇha, is spoken of as mahā rājaṇaputra, and his forefather Kaduvairajadeva as mahāmaṇḍaparacchāra, showing that originally the Dahiya were certainly of a higher status than that of āddṛā Rajputs, to which position they have now sunk.

A NOTE ON A FEW LOCALITIES IN THE NASIK DISTRICT MENTIONED IN ANCIENT COPPERPLATE GRANTS.

BY Y. R. GUPTA, B.A.; NASIK.

1. Vaṭañagarikā.

Vaṭañagarikā occurs in the Pimpari plates, edited by Prof. Pāthak in the Epigraphia Indica. On page 85 he says that Līlāgrāma and Vaṭañagarikā are identified by Mr. G. K. Chāndōrkār with Nilagvān and Vaṇī in the Nasik District. I do not intend to pass any remarks at present on the identification of Līlāgrāma with Nilagvān. But the assertion that Vaṇī is the modern representative of the ancient Vaṭañagarikā seems to me to be without any foundation.2 If

---

2 This identification was first proposed by Dr. Fleet when he edited the Vaṇī grant (ante, Vol. XI., p. 137), but he afterwards identified Vaṭañagarikā with Vaṇī in (ibid, Vol. XXXI, p. 218)—D.B.B.
proof is wanted, it is afforded by the mention of Vaṭanagara in the Kalachuri grant of the year 360 (about A.D. 609).3 which must be Vaḍnēr in the Chândavād īḍukā of the Nāsik District, where it was discovered. I do not urge that the Vaṭanagarikā of the Pimpri plates must be this Vaḍnēr. Probably it is not. But the name Vaḍnēr is sufficient to show that this must really be the modern form of the ancient name, Vaṭanagarikā. As in the Pimpri plates the name given is Vaṭanagarikā, it appears that this was in all probability smaller than Vaṭanagara of the Vaḍnēr plates. But there is another Vaḍnēr, viz., in the Mālegao īḍukā on the bank of the river Mōsam, and probably it is this Vaḍnēr which may represent Vaṭanagarikā, if the identification of Mōsim with Mōsam, which is all but certain, is accepted.


These localities occur in the Ābhōpe plates4 of Saṅkaraṅgaṇa of the imperial Kalachuri dynasty. To a Brāhmaṇ of Kallāvana (Kalvan in the Nāsik District) the village Vallisikā in the province of Bhogavardhana is noted as given, while king Saṅkaraṅgaṇa was encamped at Ujjyanī. Bālhēgāon in the Yeola īḍukā, about 15 miles from Ujjani, may perhaps be the modern representative of the ancient Vallisikā. The shortened form of Vallisikā would be Vālē and then Bālhê, and would further run into the modern longer form Bālhēgāon. There is a village called Bōṛa not far from Bālhēgāon, which may perhaps be Bhogavardhana. I would propose another set of villages for consideration. Vallisikā is most probably Vārasi I and r being interchangeable, and a being changed to ē for the ease of pronunciation, as a conjunct consonant follows, and the ka being dropped. This village is about 8 miles from Kalvan. Bhogavardhana very likely must be Bhagurjē, an ancient village in a dilapidated condition just near Ābhōpe, n taking samsrādraṇa and the vowel preceding and following being dropped. It is worthy of note that the plates were discovered not far from it. Again Bhagurjē seems comparatively older than Bōṛa, Bhagurjē is 8 miles from Kalvan and 4 miles from Ābhōpe.

It would be of some use to the antiquarians, if I would note one or two particulars about the above plates, not given in the Epigraphica Indica. They belong to Parvatrao Bhāusing Thōkē of Ābhōpe in the Kalvan īḍukā. The plates weigh 132 tolas without the rings and the seal, which are missing. (I have taken impressions and plaster casts from them. They were kindly forwarded to me by Mr. L. S. Potnis, Mamlatdar of Kalvan).


Chebhāṭikā occurs in the inscription of Karkarāja, edited by Mr. D. R. Bhaṇḍārkar. He identifies it with simply Chebhāḍ, in the Niphūṭ īḍukā. But it is better to call it by its usual name Chebhāḍ Khurd, to distinguish it from Chebhāḍ Budruk close to it in the Nāsik īḍukā.


These localities occur in the partly forged Daunatābdād grant,5 edited by Mr. D. R. Bhaṇḍārkar, which prove that Dhrupa usurped the throne, deposing Givinda II. Of the boundaries of the village, which appeared to Mr. Bhaṇḍārkar something like Sāmīra, two can easily be identified. The village situated on the west is Dadhivāhala. This would naturally assume the form Dahivāl, dahi being the Prakrit form of the Sanskrit word dādi. Dahivāl is in the Mālegao īḍukā. The name of the village on the north is given as Paṭalāvadapāṭana, the latter part of which would be dropped and the former would become Pātalād very naturally. It is 4 miles from Dahivāl.

---

3 Anē, July 1913, p. 267.
6 Ep. Ind., Vol. IX., pp. 194 to 195.
BOOK NOTICE.

SIWA-SUTRA-VIMARSHIN AND PRATTABHISHI-HEIDAYA,
Nos. 2 and 4 of the Kashmir Series of Texts and
Studies. By J. C. Chatterji, S.A. (Cantab.), Vidya-
varidi. Printed at the Nirmaya-Sagar Press, Bombay.

The Archaeological and Research Department of
the Jammu and Kashmir State has been under
the distinguished patronage of H. H. the Maha-
raja Sahib Bahadur, preparing for publication
a number of Sanskrit and Kashmiri works, which
have so far remained unpublished, and which are
called the "Kashmir series of Texts and Studies."
The works under review form Nos. 2 and
4 of this comprehensive series. The editor has
undoubtedly rendered great service to the cause
of Kashmir Saivism by the publication of these
two works. The first gives the sūtras called Sīva-
sūtras, and a commentary on the same by Khasem-
rāja. These sūtras, according to tradition, were
revelled to Vasugupta, who handed them on to
his pupils, who interpreted them in several ways.
Kahemarāja, the commentator, says at the very
beginning, that there lived on the Mahādeva-giri
the great teacher, by name Vasugupta, who, always
devoted to the worship of Sīva, received an inspira-
tion from the same. Once, the great Sīva, being
moved to pity by the unsatisfactory condition of
the world of mortals, inundated as it was with the
doctrines of Duality, wished that the doctrine of
Unity should be spread, and hence appeared to
Vasugupta in a dream, and gave him to understand thus:—' On this same mountain, on a
great slab of stone, there lies the secret; know it and proclaim it to those who are worthy of
the favor.' On getting up, Vasugupta searched for
the stone. As he approached it, he turned it round
with his hand and found his dream realized. This
is the origin of the Sīva-sūtras.

Kahemarāja, who names himself as the pupil
of Abhinava-vatsa, represents one school of inter-
pretation, as opposed to that of Kālāra and his
followers. It should be noticed here that the Sīva-
sūtras must not be confounded with the Spanda-
sūtras, as Bühler seems to do. In his Kashmir
Report of 1875-76, one manuscript, really contain-
ing the Sīva-sūtras, which we have before us now,
is named Spanda-sūtra without any reason.1
That Sīva-sūtras and Spanda-sūtras must be the
names of two different collections of sūtras
follows from what Khasemarāja remarks on p. 3
of the 1st volume before us:—

The Sīva-sūtras are divided into three sections,
called uṣṇa, dealing with the three remedies of
attaining to Unity of Sīva, without which freedom
from this worldly existence is impossible. The
three remedies are technically called kāmāhara,
sīka and dāvara. Thus the Sīva-sūtras and so the
Vimarshin also do not give us any satisfactory idea
of what the philosophy of Saivism is, except
conly incidentally, but at once proceed to show
men, in the words of the editor himself, 'a
practical way of realising by experience the fact
that man is essentially...... no other than the
Deity himself, and of enabling him, in virtue of
this realisation, to attain not only to absolute
freedom from all that limits him and subjects
him, as a helpless creature, to the sorrows and
sufferings of limited existence—but also to gain
the omniscience like the Deity himself, indeed,
as one with him'.

Thus it would be seen at a glance that the
Sīva-sūtra-vimarshin is not at all the book with
which one should commence his study of Kash-
mir Saivism. One is at first likely to think that
the sūtras may provide us with an outline of
Saivism from the philosophical and argumenta-
tive point of view, as is for instance the case with
Nyāya-sūtras. But the reader is disabused of this
illusion as soon as he goes to the fifth sūtra.

Besides, the over-abundance of the technical
terms of the Mantra-sūtra and the uncoutness of
style have rendered the book a hard nut to
erack, and in the prose of Kahemarāja we miss
the fluency and literary finish which characterise
many a similar manual of Vedānta.

The second volume, however, named Praty-
habhiṣā-ḥrydaya is calculated to be more useful
to the beginner than the first, by its very nature.
As the name signifies, it aims at giving the
essence in brief of the Pratyabhijñā or the doctrine of 'Recognition,' in twenty sūtras with
a commentary on them, by Khasemarāja. Thus
this book bears the same relation to the Advaita
Saiva system of Kashmir as the Vedāntasāra of
Sadānanda does to the Vedānta system. That is
to say, it is intended to be an easy introduction to,
and a summary of the doctrines of, the system.'

All the same, one must not be too sanguine
about the usefulness of the treatise, in the ab-
sence of some preliminary knowledge of Saivism.

The editor, too, has not come to our help by
giving a short sketch in the preface, but he only
refers us to his book 'Kashmir Saivism,' which
is intended to be a general introduction to the
history and doctrine of the system in question,
but which, unfortunately, has not seen the light
of day as yet.

The Pratyabhijñā doctrine, with which both the
volumes before us deal, and which is called by the
editor, by the general name of Kashmir Saivism,
corresponds really to the Pratyabhijñā darśana in

1 Bühler's Kashmir Report, p. clxvii. The same point has been referred to by Sir R. G. Bhaṣṭākara in his
Report 1882-84. (Section on Saivism.)
the Śiva-darśana-saṅgraha of Mādhavāchārya, and not to the Śiva-darśana, which immediately precedes it in the same work. Mādhavāchārya introduces this 'Recognitive system' thus—'Other Māheśvaras are dissatisfied with the views set out in the Śaiva system as erroneous in attributing to motiveless and insentient things causality in regard to the bondage and liberation of transcending spirits. They, therefore, seek another system, and proclaim that the construction of the world or series of environments of these spirits is by the mere will of the Supreme Lord. They pronounce that this Supreme Lord, who is at once other than and the same with the several cognitions and cognizants, who is identical with the transcendent Self posited by one's own consciousness, by rational proof and by revelation, and who possesses independence, that is, the power of witnessing all things without reference to aught ulterior, gives manifestation in the mirror of one's own soul to all entities, as if they were images reflected upon it. Thus looking upon Recognition as a new method for the attainment of ends, and of the highest end, to all men alike without any the slightest trouble and exertion such as external and internal worship, suppression of the breath and the like, these Māheśvaras set forth the system of Recognition.' The very first Śiva-sūtra नर्तकपर्यायः is quoted by Mādhava, and the verse which Mādhava quotes and attributes to Vasuguptāchārya, viz.—

निविष्कारणस्त्रयोऽर्थिन्तम्यः

जगादिकं नवत्रयश्चाहृत्ततः ||

corresponds to the second sūtra of Kāmarāja, viz.—‘विभूषितं समानत्वं सिद्धान्तविविधता।’

Intelligence is the nature and essence of all. Thus the individual soul is the same as the supreme soul. If it is so, why is the recognition of the same fact necessary? In order to make perfect the sameness which no doubt already exists. And in order to illustrate this is given by Mādhavāchārya. A love-sick woman is not consoled by the mere presence of the lover, unless it is so recognized by her. In the same way, the bondage due to ignorance is not put an end to, unless a recognition of the sameness of the lower and the higher soul, which is always existing, is produced by virtue of the instruction of a teacher, etc.  

One more point to be noticed in connection with Pratyabhijñā-ḥrīdaya is the sūtra No. 8 'तत्त्वज्ञानं संस्कारविलय:’ and the explanation thereof. The different systems of philosophy, or rather the different views held regarding the various problems of philosophy, for instance, by the Chārvakas, the Naiyāyikas, the Bauddhas, the Mīmāṃsakas, the Pāṇḍarīkātras, the Sāṁkhya-s, and so on, are, the sūtra says, only so many stages in the progress of knowledge arising from a more or less partial eclipsing of the real nature of the Supreme Self and of his perfect independence, the final and the most perfect stage being represented by the Pratyabhijñā doctrine.

This Kāmarāja, the author of the Śiva-sūtra-vivāraṇā and Pratyabhijñā-ḥrīdaya, lived in the first half of the 11th century A.D.* He was also called by the name of Kāhenendra and was the pupil of Abhinava-gupta, and wrote many other treatises amongst which are Spanda-nirūpaṇa, Śaṅchchhandodgāta and commentaries on several Śaiva works.

The get-up of the books is excellent, and the works are, on the whole, carefully and critically edited. Again, the several appendices at the end greatly add to the utility of the volumes. However, we cannot but notice a few defects in the writing of the text. In the first place there is no uniform principle regarding the putting-in of dashes (which are in our opinion generally superfluous) between the different members of a compound word, (see line 8, p. 4, Śiva-sūtra vivāraṇā). Secondly, the use of commas and semi-colons is not very discreet and sometimes tends to make a sentence even more illegible than otherwise (e.g., the long sentence on p. 6, Pāṇḍarīkāraṇa). Thirdly, no uniformity is observed in making sanādhis. Thus on p. 10 of Pāṇḍarīkāraṇa, we have ‘स्तूति अति वस्त्र', 'कप्यो वर्ण,’ and 'ब्रह्म इत्यादि’...’ and in Pāṇḍarīkāraṇa, ‘संसारित दोषाय च भक्ति...’ On p. 13 of the same we have ‘ब्रह्मम्; वाक्य;’. On p. 17, we have ‘अन्तरदेशाः...’ where the purpose of the saṅgraha sign is not clearly seen. It is to be sincerely hoped that the editor will attend even to these minor points in the publication of the other volumes of his comprehensive series, to make them flawless, so far as possible.

V. S. Ghate.

* This is how Professor Gongh renders the word 'अन्तरदेशाः...’ which should be rendered thus: 'independence consisting in not having to look up to the faces of others,’ i.e., solely depending on himself.

** नवत्रयश्चाहृत्ततः सामान्यतया विविधतार्थिन्तम्यः विविधतार्थिन्तम्यः सामान्यतया विविधतार्थिन्तम्यः सामान्यतया विविधतार्थिन्तम्यः

चारादेशाः'-विविधतार्थिन्तम्यः सामान्यतया विविधतार्थिन्तम्यः सामान्यतया विविधतार्थिन्तम्यः सामान्यतया विविधतार्थिन्तम्यः

चारादेशाः'-विविधतार्थिन्तम्यः सामान्यतया विविधतार्थिन्तम्यः सामान्यतया विविधतार्थिन्तम्यः सामान्यतया विविधतार्थिन्तम्यः

चारादेशाः'-विविधतार्थिन्तम्यः सामान्यतया विविधतार्थिन्तम्यः सामान्यतया विविधतार्थिन्तम्यः सामान्यतया विविधतार्थिन्तम्यः...’

Śiva-darśana-saṅgraha (Anandaleham Sk. Series), p. 79.

* Bühler's Report, p. 82.
Fig. 6.

Pothi found in the Ming-oil of Qizil. (Unopened).

Fig. 7.

The same Pothi. (Opened.)
THE OBSOLETE TIN CURRENCY AND MONEY OF THE FEDERATED MALAY STATES.

BY SIR R. C. TEMPLE, BAR. (Concluded from p. 254.)

APPENDIX VII.

Synopsis of Malay Currency, 1800-1838.

In examining the evidence to establish the identity of the Achin five-doit piece I went through the whole of the Malay currency reported by Milburn, Oriental Commerce, 2nd ed., 1813, Vol. II, and by Kelly, Universal Comptist, 2nd ed., 1835, Vol. I (s. c. under East Indies), who includes in his report Milburn's information and that sent him officially. I give here a synopsis of the result. In the following summaries M. stands for Milburn and the figures that follow for the page in his Vol. II; K. stands for Kelly and the figures for the page in his Vol. I.

1. Spanish Influence Paramount.

Money of Account.

Philippines; Manilla (K. 109, M. 480) : Scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prop.</th>
<th>Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>372</td>
<td>34 maravedi = real</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8 real = peso (dollar)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Dutch Influence Paramount.

Money of Account.

(a) Rixdollars of 48 stivers, value 3s. 4d. Sumatra; Palembang (K. 112, M. 34).

(b) Rixdollars of 48 stivers, value 3s. 6d. Sumatra; Palembang (K. 112, M. 34).

(c) Rixdollars (value 4s. 7d.) and stivers. Celebes; Macassar (K. 109, M. 409).

(d) Sp. dollars, value 5s. Java; Batavia (K. 100, M. 351): Kaupang (M. 386).

(e) Rixdollars, value 3s. 4d. and Sp. dollars value 5s. 4d. (M. 406). Moluccas; Ternate (K. 120, M. 406).

(f) Scales : value of rixdollar 3s. 4d.

Moluccas; Ambon (K. 97, M. 396).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prop.</th>
<th>Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>4 doit = stiver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>4 stiver = dubbeltje</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1½ dubbeltje = schilling¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8 schillings = dollar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Moluccas; Banda. (K. 99).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prop.</th>
<th>Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>768</td>
<td>16 penning = stiver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>6 stiver = schilling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 schilling = dollar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(¹) 4 penning = doit

¹ Milburn's scale stops at schillings.
Coins in use.

(a) European and Indian.
Java; Batavia (K. 100, M. 351); Sumatra; Padang (M. 346).
(b) European and Indian valued in stivers.²
Moluccas; Amboyna (K. 97); Peninsula; Malacca (K. 100).
(c) Spanish dollars and other coins.
Moluccas; Ternate (K. 120), Sp. dollars⁳ 4s. 7d. (M. 396), ducatons (4/5 Sp. dollars),
crowns at 2% premium on Sp. dollars (K. 120, M. 396); Celebes; Macassar, Sp. dollars⁴ 4s. 7d.
European and Indian coins: Sumatra; Palembang (K. 112, M. 347), Sp. dollars 5s. 5d., and
holed cash, 500 = 1 parcel, 16 parcels = Sp. dollar = 80,000 cash to the dollar.

3. European Influence.

A Dollar with Native Divisions.

Money of Account.

Peninsula; Selangor (K. 115, M. 316), 8 tampang = rixdollar; Celebes; Macassar (K. 107)
7 mas = rixdollar.

Scales

Sumatra; Sängkel
(K. 118, M. 332).

Proportion.

64 16 tali⁵ = suku 32 8 tali⁶ = suku
4 suku = tabil 4 4 suku = dollar
(∴ suku = dollar)

Peninsula; Trengganu.
(K. 121, M. 323).

Proportion.

25,600 400 pitis⁷ = kupang⁸
64 64 kupang = mas
16 16 mas = dollar
4 4 dollar = tabil
(∴ 6,400 pitis = dollar)

∴ Coins in use.

(a) Sp. dollar.
Peninsula; Trengganu (K. 121, M. 323).
(b) Sp. dollar, value 5s.
Sumatra; Sängkel (K. 118, M. 332), Benkulen (K. 101).

B. Dollars with mixed Native and European Divisions.

Money of Account.

Scale,

Java; Batavia (K. 100).

Proportion.

48 2 štiver = cash
3 cash = tali
8 2 tali = suku
(4 4 suku = dollar)⁹

---

¹ Milbourn says, p. 318, "in shillings."
² I. e., 4/3 rixdollar.
³ I. e., 3/4 rixdollar.
⁴ Reported (K. 118) as satellites.
⁵ Reported (K. 121) as potties; (M. 332) as potties.
⁶ Reported (K. 101) as satellites, sataller.
⁷ Reported (K. 121, M. 332) as cossangs.
⁸ Supplied; not in K. 100; suku = one quarter dollar.
5. Indian Influence.

Money of Account.

Sumatra; Natal (K. 112, M. 334), Sp. dollar of 24 fanam or tali; Java; Batavia (K. 100)
50 pitis\(^{10}\) = stiver, \(\therefore 15,000\) pitis = rupee of 30 stivers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
<th>Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sumatra; Tapanuli</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>16(\frac{2}{3}) kōping = fanam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24 fanam = dollar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sumatra; Benkulen</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4 suku = dollar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(K. 101)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>2 single = double</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>6 double = rupees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(K. 114, M. 299)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2 rupee = Sp. dollar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Coins in use.

(a) Sumatra; Natal (K. 112), Sp. dollars and rupees, also 1, \(\frac{1}{2}\), and \(\frac{1}{4}\) fanam; (M. 335)
Sp. dollars and 1, 2, 3 fanam pieces; Tapanuli (M. 334) dollars of 24 fanams.

(b) Java; Batavia (K. 100, M. 351) rupees, value 8s. 1\(\frac{1}{4}\)d.

Scales.

(K. 100).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proportion</th>
<th>Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>4 doit = stiver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>2 stiver = cash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1(\frac{1}{2}) cash = dubbeltje</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3 dubbeltje = schilling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4 schilling = rupee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(M. 251).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proportion</th>
<th>Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>4 doit = stiver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>2 stiver = cash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1(\frac{1}{2}) cash = dubbeltje</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3 dubbeltje = schilling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4 schilling = rupee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Native System.\(^{12}\)

Money of Account.

Borneo; Sakadanaka (K. 119).

(a) in mas and tahil.

Chinese cash.

Peninsula; Bantam (Singapore, M. 320): Borneo; Morpora (M. 418).

(c) Scales.

Java; Batavia (K. 100).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proportion</th>
<th>Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>10 kōndēri = cash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>4 cash = mas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10 mas = tahil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Java; Bantam (K. 100, M. 354).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proportion</th>
<th>Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10 pōku(^{13}) = laksan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>10 laksan = kati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>10 kati = uta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25,000 - 30,000 cash = dollar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{10}\) Made of lead and tin; proportion 4 : 1.
\(^{11}\) Proportion of pice to half of tin, 10 : 1.
\(^{12}\) For Aohin (K. 97) see ante, p. 233. Milburn, 329, has masas for Kelly's 'small mas.' Milburn gives system at Pedir (331), and Analabu (311) as identical with those of Aohin, to which these pieces were subject.
\(^{13}\) Reported as pice; pōku = Chinese pak, a string of cash; see ante, p. 215.
\(^{14}\) Uta = string of kati here; see ante, p. 215.
(a) Coins in use.

Peninsula; Bintang (K. 320) = Singapore; Java; Batavia (K. 100, M. 354).
(b) Sp. dollars.
Borneo; Saksdana (K. 119, M. 417); Mompara (M. 418).
(e) Native.
Java; Batavia (K. 100), patak and cash.

Scale.

| 4 cash  | = | mas |
| 8 mas   | = | patak |
| (.24) cash | = | patak |

6. Rough Conditions.

No Coinage.

Currency of Accounts.

(a) Tin.
Peninsula; Tecopa (K. 119), bahar of tin (476 lbs.); Junkceylon (K. 106) "pieces of tin shaped like the under part of a cone," (see ante, p. 19).
(b) Measured linen cloths and paddy (rice in husk).

Sulu Archipelago (K. 107, M. 424): Philippines; Magindanao (K. 107, M. 417) in kanga (coarse cloth) and paddy.

Coins used by Europeans.

(a) Chinese cash.
Philippines; Magindanao (M. 417), 160-180 to a kanga.
(b) Sp. dollars.
Peninsula; Kedah (M. 296), Pahang (M. 520), Pakang River, Riau (M. 321), Patani (M. 394):
Borneo; Pontiana (M. 417) Sambas (M. 419), "Borneo Town" (M. 429).
(c) Sp. dollars and Portuguese coins.

Java; Deli (M. 386).

(Misconceptions about the Andhras.

By P. T. Shrinivas Iyengar, M.A., Vizagapatam.

Mr. Vincent A. Smith, in p. 194 of his Early History of India, 2nd edition, says, "In the days of Chandragupta Maurya and Megasthenes, the Andhra nation, probably a Dravidian people, now represented by the large population speaking the Telugu language, occupied the deltas of the Godavari and Krishná rivers on the Eastern side of India... The capital of the State was then Sri Kākulam, on the lower course of the Krishná." The only authority for this statement seems to be a passage from the Trilāgāṇudānam of Atharvaṇāchārya, quoted by Campbell in his Telugu grammar, where he calls the book Athurvāṇa vyacūrum. The passage as translated by Campbell runs as follows:—"Formerly, in the time of Manu Svayambhu, in the Kali age, Hari, the Lord of Andhra, the great Vishnu, the slayer of the Danava Nisumbu, was born in Kakulam, as the son of the monarch Suchandra, and was attended by all the gods as well as revered by all mankind. He having constructed a vast wall connecting Srisailam, Bhimesvaram and Kalesvaram, with the Mahendra hills, formed in it three gates, in which the three-eyed Iśvara, bearing the trident in his hand, and attended by a host of divinities, resided in the form of three lingams. Andhra Vishnu, assisted by angels, having fought with the great giant Nisumbu for thirteen yugas, killed him in battle, and took up his residence with the sages on the banks of the Godāvari, since which time this country has been named Trilāgam. The adherents of Andhra Vishnu who then resided on the banks of the Godāvari spoke tātāma words. In the course of time, these words, not being properly articulated by the unlearned, by the change or obliteration of letters, or by being...
contracted, a fourth or a half, became tadbhava. These words consisting of nouns, verbs and
verbs, created by the God Brahma, before the time of Hari, the Lord of Āndhra, are called atma
(pure)." Campbell does not quote directly from Atharvaṃśārya, but takes the passage from the
Āndhra-haṃmūdī, which quotes it. A manuscript copy of Atharvaṃśārya's work is to be found in the
Madras Government Oriental Library. Campbell adds in a foot-note that Āndhra Viśṇu or Āndharaṇyaṇu, as he was also called, is now worshipped as a divinity at Srikākula on the river
Kṛishna and was the patron of Kavya, the first Telugu grammarian. The utter worthless-
ness of Atharvaṃśārya's testimony for historical purposes is patent on the face of it.
There is no Āndhra king of the name of Suchandra. The first king, according to the Purāṇas,
of the Āndhra dynasty, was Simuka, which name has as variants in the Purāṇas, Sindhuka, Sišuka,
Sipraka, but not Suchandra. Secondly, Atharvaṃśārya quotes in his book a number of
authorities, e.g. Viśṇu, Indra, Bhūkapati, Somachandra or Hemachandra, Kaśyapa, Pushpaḍanta,
Dharmarāja, all giving pronouncements on Telugu, but none traceable anywhere. Atharvaṃśārya
also gives a quotation there which, he pretends, is from the Ātharvaṃśārya-paniṣad, but it is not
found in that Upaniṣad. From this we may infer that the quotations were made up by
Atharvaṃśārya. This author is desperately anxious to prove that Telugu may be used in books
and has hence manufactured these quotations. Possibly Atharvaṃśārya is the pseudonym of
a Telugu writer, whose use of Telugu in books was attacked by the purists of the day and who
resorted to this method of defending his procedure. This work of Atharvaṃśārya has not yet been
printed, but a kārikā professing to be from the same man has been printed and it reveals the fact
that the author has stolen numerous stanzas from Daṇḍin's Kāvyādārīa without even the
acknowledgement 'iti'. Thirdly, Atharvaṃśārya quotes the so-called Vālmiki-sūtras on Prākrit.
These sūtras have been proved to be the composition of Trivikrama, who lived in the 14th century.
Hence Atharvaṃśārya must have lived later. The statement of Atharvaṃśārya, that Āndhra
Viśṇu lived on the banks of the Godāvari, shows that he was a late writer who lived long after
Rājaḥmundry became the capital of Telugu Rājās.

The earliest reference to the Āndhras is the passage in the Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa2 where the
Āndhras, Pudrās, Sabaras, Pulindas and other Dasyu tribes living on the borders of the Aryan
tribes, are said to be the descendants of the exiled sons of Viśvāmitra. As the Aryan cult did not
extend beyond the Vindhya in those days, these tribes must have then lived in the Vindhya
region. Even in the age of Bāṇa (7th century A.D.) the Sabaras are mentioned in the
Kālambari as living in the Vindhya forests. The next reliable reference to the Āndhras is that
in Aśoka's Rock Edict XIII, where he claims "the Āndhras and Pulindas" as people in his
dominions, who, among others, followed the dharma he taught so vigorously. It is to be noted
that the Āndhras are here grouped together with the Pulindas, thus showing that they were still
living in the central parts of the Peninsula, not far from the Vindhya range. Soon after
Aśoka's death the Āndhras rose to prominence. Rāya Simuka Sātavāhana, who, according to
Mr. Vincent A. Smith, lived about 220 B.C., was the first king of the dynasty. His name, as well
as that of a later Āndhra king, Sīrī Sātakaṇi, are cut under figures of persons in the back wall of
a cave at Nāṅgāhāri. The next king was Kṛishṇa, whose lieutenant scooped out a cave at Nasik,
which was apparently his capital. The next reference to Āndhra kings is found in the inscription
of Khaṇḍavāla, king of Kalinga, in the Hāthigumpha cave, where Khaṇḍavāla says that in the

2 VII. 18; also Śākthipāna-śāstra, XV. 10
3 The reference to "the Pudrās, Drāvīḍas, Uṭḥras, Keralas and Āndhras" in Sahāpāvan, XXXI and to
the Āndhras, Pudrās, Cholas and Keralas in Rāmāyana, iv. 41 are not useful for historical purposes, from the
fact that these ṛkṣas have been the result of centuries of growth. The references may prove that either the
final reduction of the ṛkṣas was made, or at least the particular ṛkṣas were composed not earlier than the 3rd
century, B.C., when these states rose to fame and were first mentioned together.
second year of his reign (168 B.C.) "Śātakaṇi, protecting the west, sent a numerous army of horses, elephants, men, and chariots" apparently to help him in his operations against Magadha. This Śātakaṇi was either the third or fifth king of the list of Andhra kings in the Māṭya-Purāṇa. The Andhra territory was hence, still in "the west" of Kaliṅga. Next comes the cave inscription at Pitasūkha near Chālīṅga cut in characters of the 2nd century B.C. and referring to the king at Pāṇtā or Pratīsthana. The centre of Andhra influence is still in western India.8 The next Andhra king we hear of is Hāla, the 17th king, who, according to Mr. Vincent A. Smith lived circa 68 A.D. The Bṛhat-kathā, the original of Kālidāsa's Bṛhat-kathā-manjari and Somadeva's Kathāsaritarāgama, said to have been written in the Paścaḷī dialect by Gūṇāḍhyāya, was composed, according to tradition, for the sake of this king's wife, who must, therefore, have been a northern princess. Hāla is the reputed author of Saṁtaśat, an anthology of erotic verses in the ancient Māhāraśṭra tongue. This fact and the other one, that the Andhra inscriptions are all in some form of Pāṇḍītī (probable that the Andhras spoke some kind of proto-Māhāraśṭra. In modern usage Andhra means Telugu; and hence many historians assume that the ancient Andhras spoke Telugu. Sir Walter Elliot in his discussion of the question in the Numismata Orientalia,9 hopelessly mixes up the Kaliṅgas, the Triglephyt of Ptolemy, Trīkaliṅga, Trilīṅga, Telugu, and Andhras and takes an imaginary Kaliṅga-Andhra tribe to have migrated from the Gangetic region, the Andhra tribe separating off in Orissa, first settling on the Chilka Lake, then going down the coast to the Godāvari-Krishṇa valley and shooting up into the Deccan, and accomplishing this itinerary in an impossibly short space of time! Not to speak of the blending into one of so many tribes by Sir Walter Elliot, even the assumption that the ancient Andhras spoke Telugu is an entirely gratuitous one. If the ancient Andhras had been Telugus, Telugu literature would have been born in the early years of the Christian era, in the palmy days of Andhra supremacy in India, whereas its birth took place in the 11th century A.D. when undoubted Telugu princes, i.e. princes whose mother-tongue was Telugu, whatever their (ultime) origin, reigned in the Telugu country.

The next reference to the Andhras is in Pliny (77 A.D.)10 where he says that "the Andhra territory, stronger than other territories of India) included thirty walled towns, besides numerous villages, and the army consisted of 100,000 infantry, 2,000 cavalry, and 3,000 elephants." The Andhras must have been dominant throughout India at this epoch, as references to them are found in inscriptions in various parts of India. Their sway extended from sea to sea in Central India and up to Sāncī in the north.11 The Periplus, which was written at about the same time as Pliny's Natural History, says, "Beyond Barygaza (Bassagadh, the adjoining coast extends in a straight line from north to south; and so this region is called Dachinabades, for Dachinasa in the language of the natives means south. The inland country back from the coast towards the east comprises many desert regions and great mountains; and all kinds of wild beasts—leopards, tigers, elephants, enormous serpents, hyenas, and baboons of many sorts; and many populous nations, as far as the Gangas. This is the first clear12 reference to the Andhra country by the name Dakshināpatana, which still survives as the Deccan.

8 Rom. Gaz. I. ii. p. 147. 9 P. 18. 10 Hist. Nat. VI. 224. 11 Ep. Ind. ii. 88. 12 Dakshināpatana is mentioned in the Bij-Veda vii. 38-9 as a place of exile; it meant of course the Vindhyaka region, which was in those days outside the pale of the Aryan fire-cult. Dakshināpatana occurs in the Rājatarangini (I. 1. 2), coupled with Saurashtra. It occurs in the Mahāhārṣika, Saṁhā-Purāṇa, xxxi. 17, when Sahadeva is said to have gone to the Dakshināpatana after defeating the Pulindas and the Pāḍyāyas. In Purāṇa's Mahāhārṣika on Pāṇini, I. 1. 19, also, the word Dakshināpatana occurs. In all these places it probably means the Andhra territory, but we cannot be certain that it is so. In the Purāṇa, Dakshināpatana is clearly defined, but we cannot use it in historical investigations, since the question of the dates of the composition of the Purāṇa is hopeless of solution. Similarly the Andhra country is, in the Saṁhitā-sāhasratantra, said to be above Jagannath and behind Bhramaratikā, and the next country is said to be Saurashtra (Vīda Saṁhitā-sūtra 1. sub detak). This drāma work is apparently a recent one and is absolutely unauthoritative.
The Periploès mentions Paithān as one of the two principal market-towns of Dachinasabades; and then refers to another market-town on the coast, “the city of Calliena, which in the time of the elder Saraganus became a lawful market-town; but since it came into the possession of Sandanesa the port is much obstructed and Greek ships lying there may chance to be taken to Barygaza under guard.” Calliena is certainly the modern Kalyān, near Bombay. Saraganus is probably Sātakapi, the title used by most Andhra kings; and Sandanesa is Sundara, the 20th Andhra king, in the Mātya-Purāṇa list; if so, the elder Saraganus is perhaps his immediate predecessor, Pulindasena (a noteworthy name associating the Pulindas still with the Andhras), also called Purindrasena, during whose time, Sundara was, as usual in ancient India, viceroy of part of the country. Kalyān was in the district administered by Sundara. By this time Saka Satrapa of the Kehararāja clan had risen to power in Gujarāt and seized some of the northern territories of the Andhras, their early leaders being Bhūmaka and Nahapāna. The initial date of the Saka era is by some historians held to mark the establishment of Saka power under Nahapāna; if this is correct, Nambanaus, whom the Periploès names as the king of the country round Barygaza is probably the same as Nahapāna; whether this identification is correct or not, it is certain the rise of Saka power in this age made the port of Kalyān dangerous to foreign ships, the Andhra viceroy not being able to guard the post efficiently, against Saka depredations.

The Sakas and the Andhras were in constant conflict from this time and the Andhras gradually lost their western dominions and were driven to the east. Vijjāyakura I fought with them in 128 A.D., and his mother Balsairi tells us in the Nāsik cave Inscription that her son “destroyed the Sakas,” but we find that the Sakas continued to reign at Ujjain till Chandragupta II. Vikramāditya, extinguished the dynasty about 409 A.D. ; Rudradāman, the Saka Satrapa, fought with his son-in-law, “the lord of Dakshinapatha,” Pulumāyi, son of Vijjāyakura II, and desisted from destroying him, because he was his son-in-law, in 150 A.D.

This phrase “destroyed the Sakas,” used in Balasairi’s inscription, like all other phrases therein descriptive of Vijjāyakura, ought to be taken with many grains of salt, for they form a mere eulogy of the king composed by a court-poet, and secondly, subsequent events have disproved the destruction of the Sakas and the consequent stoppage of the “contamination of the four castes” (also referred to in the eulogy), Pulumāyi, son of Vijjāyakura and king while this inscription was incised, having married the daughter of the Saka Rudradāman. But yet Elliot and others have deduced from this phrase that Vijjāyakura was the head of a great revolution and gained a national victory; Cunningham has gone one better and made him found the great Saka era, in commemoration of the event.

Ptolemy, the geographer, (in his Geog., VII, 17) writing in 151 A.D., after describing Larike, the Lāt or Gujarāt coast, describes the Ariake coast (a name used by the Periploès also), which he divides into two parts, Ariake Sadinon and Ariake Andron Peiratōn. The latter phrase is usually translated Ariake of the Pirates, but Sir James Campbell in Rom. Gaz., Thana, ii, 415

11 From Vijjāyakura I, the Andhra kings used metronymic titles, e.g. Vasithiputa, Mādhiriputa, Gotamiputa, etc., as in Vedic times people were called Kausikiputa, Kausthiputa, Aidhibiputa, Valyagahapadiputa, etc. Does this mean that the Andhras were now definitely drawn into the Brahman polity and recognized as orthodox Kshatriyas, bearing names like the hallowed ones in the Vedas? It certainly does not warrant Sir Walter Elliot’s conclusion that one of the Rāja that bear metronymics, i.e., the third of them, Vijjāyakura II. Gotamiputra Sātakasi, was “a bold adventurer” who seized the throne; this Sir Walter Elliot has inferred because the mother’s name is found so remarkably associated with that of her son.” (Num. Orient. p. 19.) That this deduction is absolutely unwarranted will be readily seen if it is remembered that dozens of Vedic names are metronymic and among the later Andhra kings, at least seven have a similar title.

12 Another view regarding Vijjāyakura and the son-in-law of Rudradāman has been set forth in my Epigraphic Notes and Questions, nos. IV and V, published in the Jour. Bomb. As. soc., Vol. XXIII—D. H. B.

13 Ibid. 47.
argues that the phrase means Ariake\(^{15}\) of the Andhrabhryṣa. Besides this, Ptolemy mentions (Ib. vii. 1. 83) Baithana as the royal seat of Siro Polemaios and Hippokoura as the royal seat of Baleokouros. The former is certainly Paithana, the capital of Sīra Pulumāyi or Pulumāvi, and the latter place, which is identified with Kolhapur, by most authorities was the royal seat of Viṣṇyakura II. Pulumāyi was his son and viceroy (yuvrāja) at Paithana. In an inscription in a cave-temple at Nasik of Pulumāyi’s time occurs the phrase Dhanakaṭasamanehi, meaning by the lord of Dhanakaṭa\(^{16}\)(ka).

Bhandarkar has suggested that this may be a wrong reading and the original may be read as Dhanakaṭa-tāminīthi or Dhanakaṭa-adnaythi, by the lord of Dhanakaṭa. Bhandarkar is clearly wrong, as Senart points out in Ep. Ind. viii, 69, Dhanakaṭaka is a hypothetical name, and the actual names of the place near Amarāvati being Dhamānakaṭaka\(^{27}\) in the fourth century A.D., Dhanakaṭa (rājā inra), Hionen Tsang’s To-na-ki-tse-kia,\(^{13}\) Dhānayavāṭāpura in an inscription of 1381 A.D., and Dharasikota of modern times. Thus the name Dhanakaṭaka is as much a myth as that of Amarāvati or any place near it was an Andhrā capital. Senart himself guessed that Dhanakaṭa is a misreading for Benākata, which occurs in another inscription of the same reign. This conjecture of Bhandarkar’s is the only source of the assertion made by most writers on Andhrā history that Dhanakaṭaka, near Amarāvati, was the Andhrā capital from the time of the second Andhrā king, Krīṣṇa. Among others, Burgess\(^{19}\) makes this statement without giving the authority for it and also needlessly accuses the Andhrā kings of constantly changing their capitals. About 200 A.D. Nāgārjuna is said in a Tibetan life of his, to have “surrounded Dhanakaṭaka with a railing.” I-tsing, the Chinese traveller, says that Nāgārjuna’s patron was of the So-pho-han-na family; Hionen Tsang calls him So-pho-lo. These names are probably to be equated with Sātakaṇi or Sātavāhana, the proper name of the king being either Sīra Pulumāvi or Sīra Yaśa.\(^{20}\) It is noteworthy that among the numerous scraps of inscriptions found at Amarāvati, the only reference to an Andhrā king is V [ṇu]la[p]a[n]a[n]a[n]. The “bow and arrow” coins of Viṣṇyakura I, Sivilakura and Viṣṇyakura II (84 A.D.—138 A.D.) were all found only at Kolhapur. The last two of the latter half of the second century and the early part of the third century, i.e., those of Pulumāvi and his successors (138 A.D.—229 A.D.) have been found only in the Godāvarī and the Krishṇa districts, which alone formed the dominion of the later Andhras when the Sakas on the west and the Pallavas in the south hemmed them in. Mr. Vincent A. Smith who has discussed the Andhrā coinage in Z. D. M. G. 1903, has remarked that “the Andhrā coinage, although geographically to be classed with the southern issues, is Northern and Western in its

\(^{12}\) Numismatic evidence, so far as has been obtained, corroborates the above view. The legends of the Andhrā coins are all in Prākrit, as their inscriptions are. The earliest Andhrā coins are two, bearing the name of Sīra Sata (c. 68 n. c.) and the so-called Ujjain symbol—the cross and balls device, which probably originated in Mālwā. The “bow and arrow” coins of Viṣṇyakura I, Sivilakura and Viṣṇyakura II (84 A.D.—138 A.D.) were all found only at Kolhapur. The last two of the latter half of the second century and the early part of the third century, i.e., those of Pulumāvi and his successors (138 A.D.—229 A.D.) have been found only in the Godāvarī and the Krishṇa districts, which alone formed the dominion of the later Andhras when the Sakas on the west and the Pallavas in the south hemmed them in. Mr. Vincent A. Smith who has discussed the Andhrā coinage in Z. D. M. G. 1903, has remarked that “the Andhrā coinage, although geographically to be classed with the southern issues, is Northern and Western in its
affinities, and has nothing in common with the peculiar coinage of the South." The gratuitous assumption that the Andhras were a south-eastern tribe is the cause of this apparent anomaly. It has been proved above that there is not a shadow of evidence to assume that the original home of the Andhras was the east coast of south India and all reliable documents indicate that their original home was south of the Vindhyas, as their coins also prove.

In the third century A.D., the Andhra dominions in the west passed into the hands of the Sakas whose capital was Ujjain. The eastern Andhra territory was acquired by the Pallavas, the earliest kings of which dynasty, so far as has been made out from epigraphical evidence, was Sivaskandavarman. The Pallava capital was Kanchipuram and the Andhra district of the Pallavas was called 'Andhrāpatha.' This name, translated into Tamil, Vajugavali, 12,000, was in use even in the 9th century A.D. Dharakaça, which is the same as Dhamakaça of the Amaravati inscription already referred to, was the capital of a Pallava governor in Sivaskandavarman's time, at about the beginning of the fourth century. Now for the first time we hear of Dhamakaça as a capital of any kind. In the year 340 A.D. when Samudragupta went round India on a digvijaya tour, he vanquished Hstivarmā of Vēugi (now Pedda Vēgi, eight miles north of Elore), a Pallava viceroy of another part of the Andhrāmaṇḍalam wrested from the Andhra King by the Pallavas. Vēugi was also called Andhranagaram. But the Andhra kings and the Andhra tribes have disappeared without any trace from the 3rd century A.D. We do not hear of them in Samudragupta's inscription, nor in the Raghumāthā where a digvijaya similar to that of the great Gupta conqueror is attributed to the mythical Raghu. The word Andhra now became the name of a territory. As such it is mentioned by Hiouen Tsang, who visited the province in the 7th century A.D., about 30 years after the Eastern Chālukya dynasty was founded at Vēugi by Kubja Vishnuvardhana. The Chinese traveller says that he went from (southern) Kosala (Bara) to the country of Andhra ('An-ala)-lo, "through a great forest, south, after 900 li or so." He calls its capital Ping-ki-lo (? Vēgīnā). He says that not far from the city is "a great Saṅghārāma with storeyed towers and balconies beautifully carved and ornamented." The extensive Buddhist ruins at Günnapalli, 16 miles from Pedda Vēgi, are perhaps relics of this Saṅghārāma. These consist of a chaitya cave, a circular chamber with a simple façade containing a dagaba cut in the solid rock, and several sets of vihāra caves with entrance halls and chambers on each side. Hiouen Tsang says of the Andhra country, "The soil is rich and fertile; it is regularly cultivated and produces abundance of cereals. The temperature is hot." This applies very well to the Elore Taluk, which is the modern representative of the ancient Vēgīrāśṭram. Hiouen Tsang also says, "the language and arrangement of sentences differ from Mid-India (where Kosala was) but with reference to the shapes of the letters, they are nearly the same." The language referred to by the keenly observant Chinese traveller, is the Proto-Telugu evolved in the Godavari-Krishṇa valley, the (later) literary form of which was used by Nannayya Bhatta, the author of the Telugu Mahābhāratamu, who lived in the 11th century, and, who, so far as I can discover, was the first person to call the Telugu language by the name of Andhra.

We thus find that the Andhras were a Vindhyan tribe and that the Andhra kings originally ruled over western India and spoke Prakṛti and not Telugu. The extension of Andhra power was from the west to the east down the Godavari-Krishṇa valley. When their power declined in the west, the name Andhrāmaṇḍalam travelled to their eastern provinces and stuck to it under Pallava as well as Eastern Chālukya rule. The word Andhra was first a tribal name; then it became the name of a dynasty of kings, who ruled in the west; and then it became the name of a language which evolved in the east sometime before the eleventh century. Whence and when and how Telugu arose, what influences fostered its inception and growth is, however, another and a more complicated story, which will be told in a future article.

---

23 A.S.I. 06-07 p. 222.
25 The next occasion when Dhamakaça is called a capital is in Hiouen Tsang's description of the place, when it continued to be, it is presumed, the capital of a Pallava viceroy.
26 Dānakumḍrasahāstrī, viii.
27 Imp. Gaz., Ind., xlii, 382.
ROCK EDICT VI OF ASOKA.

BY KASHI-PRAKASH JAYASWAL, M.A. (OXON.), BARRISTER-AT-LAW; CALCUTTA.

The passage:

श्वस्वते

शवर्धन व वालतमाना सा या व या चुन

शरसनमुन्त्र शरसवजीकुक्तकः शशरीतिन भवति

ताव क्रयाण विशार्दितिः गिनिती च संस्कृति

परस्परश्चालिते शरसवायतनेण मयं सर्वं

स्यावेच च चुन नन्दो च धारणे [1]

(Girnar, lines 5-7)

has been translated by Bühler as follows:—

"Moreover, if, with respect to any thing which I order by (word of) mouth to be given or to be obeyed as a command, or which as a pressing (matter) is entrusted to my officials, a dispute or "a fraud happens in the committee (of any caste or sect), I have given orders that it shall be brought forthwith to my cognisance in any place and at any time." [2]

In the above translation the word nighati [1] has been rendered as "fraud." I could not trace Dr. Bühler’s ground for adopting this meaning. No explanation has been offered by him in his articles on the edicts published in the Zeitschrift d. Deutschen Morgen. Gesellschaft, vols. 43 and 44 and the Epigraphia Indica, vol. 2. I do not think there is any warrant for this rendering. The source of the mistake seems to lie in M. Senart’s remarks on nihati, an incorrect reading of nighati: "Le sens de ‘bassease, fraude,’ atteste pour le pâli nihati et son prototype sanskrit nikkriti, s’accorde très bien avec de voisine de vicado ‘désunion, querelle.’" But the reading nihati, as Bühler himself pointed out, was wrong, naha being quite distinct in all the recensions. If nihati meant ‘fraud,’ there is no reason why nighati also should mean the same. The two are not one and the same.

Jha in Asokan phonetics, as in Pāli, represents either ḍhya (ः) or keha (केह) of Sanskrita, e.g., the jha in the nihapatitvams and njhastivā which, as M. Senart pointed out, are derived from the Sans. ध्य and केह, and the jha in the jhapatitvā of the Pillar Edict V., which comes from the Sanskrita keha (केह) (Chidara). The nighati of our Rock Edict would therefore represent either *nīdhyati (निद्धयति) or *nīkshati (*nikshapti). The context shows that it does not stand for nīdhyati or a similar expression connected with ni-dhyati, ‘to attentive,’ ‘to reflect.’ For if in respect of the royal order, there was to be seen, in the parashat nīdhyati, ‘attention’ or ‘reflection,’ the king would not have been in a desperate hurry to be told of it “forthwith” and at all hours and in all places. It is evident that some unsatisfactory conduct on the part of the parashat is meant by nihati. And this sense of nihati is the other restoration, nihapati (or nikhipti), ‘casting away,’ ‘throwing down,’ or the act of ‘rejection.’ In respect of an order given to the Mahāmatra if there happened or was going to happen (संस्कृत) in the parashat a division (cīrād) or a total rejection of the order (nikhapatī), the king was to be informed forthwith at whatsoever place he might be and whichever hour it might be. The sense becomes still clearer with an appreciation of the real import of the parād.

1 The s-stroke attached to kā is unmistakable, the projection being clearly noticeable beyond the abrasion. See the facsimile in the Ep. Ind., II, facing p. 454.
3 See the facsimile in the Ep. Ind., II, facing p. 454.
4 Le tissul. du Piyadasi, i. 157. It must be at the same time noticed that M. Senart himself in translating the edict (p. 173) does not adopt "bassease" or "fraude" but "division" as the meaning of the supposed nihati.
5 Pillar Edict IV.
6 Les ins. de Piyas, i. 39, 94.
Parishat; M. Senart takes it to be synonymous with saṅgha and Bühler, as the committee of caste or sect. It is obvious that Bühler's importation of caste or sect is too far-fetched and does not suit the context at all. Têya athâya qualifies the whole sentence. The dispute which might arise in the parishat would be a dispute in the matter of an order charged to the Mahâmâtrás; and in respect of matters charged to the Mahâmâtras a discussion could hardly be expected to arise in a council of caste or sect. The same objection applies to M. Senart's l'assemblee du clergé. I do not think anybody would suggest that the Mahâmâtras figured as members of the saṅgha. That the parishat was the parishat of the Mahâmâtras is a conclusion which is forced upon us by the context. This conclusion receives confirmation from an independent source, which I propose to notice after commenting on the term Mahâmâtra.

The confusion with regard to the meaning of this expression has been removed by the recent rendering of the High Ministers. This rendering is confirmed by the Arthashastra, the Mahâmâtras there are the Highest Ministers. I think the term Mahâmâtra, "of high authority," distinguished the Mahâmâtra class of ministers from the inferior ministers.

Dr. Fleet has noticed in the inscriptions of the Gupta period two grades of offices distinguished from each other by the addition mahâ to particular offices. For the sake of comparison I would draw attention to a passage of the Subra-nîti, which lays down that each minister in charge of a portfolio was to have two ministers under him as juniors (ii. 109).

For the council of ministers we have a technical expression in the Arthashastra, the mantri-parishat.

In the edict we have वा युन महâमâtras चारायिके चारायिके महâमâtras. In the Arthashastra we are told that an dâtyika business had to be entrusted to the parishat whose decision was to be followed in the matter: जारायिके काव महâमâtras महâमâtras साह्य हस्ते। तत्र वशिष्ठीमार्णम्: कार्यस्य विकारं वा सुतस्य वकारं। (p. 29)

"In case of an dâtyika business the mantri-parishat of the ministers shall be called and told (the business). Therein what they say or whatever for the success of the matter they tell, shall be done." 11

In the light of this evidence as well as the other considerations put forward above there seems to be a strong ground to hold that the parishat of the edict is the mantri-parishat of the Arthashastra. The edict, which is purely an administrative one, exhibits the emperor's dissatisfaction at the restiveness of his ministers with regard to his certain commands. That the ministers had such wide powers as to be in a position to offer opposition in certain matters can be gathered also by the data of the Greek writers. 12

12 At the succession of a sovereign, who is a minor, the Mahâmâtras are told. 'He is only the symbol, you are the real sovereign.' (ed. Mynors, 1909, p. 254.वस्तुवदायेन वचन वस्तु स्थानिकः). It is they who collectively deal with the annual account sheets of the province sent to the capital (p. 64. प्राचार्या महामात्राः स्थानिकः).
13 This explanation supports the tradition of the Dîyuvâdâsa that Radhâgupta opposed the gifts of the king to the Buddhist Brotherhood.
14 Cf. "Hence (the "Councillors of State who advise the king") enjoy the prerogative of choosing governors, chiefs of provinces, deputy governors, superintendents of the treasury, generals of the army, admirals of the navy, controllers and commissioners who superintend agriculture." Arrian, Indika, XII.
I propose to translate the passage as follows:—

"If, again, in the matter of anything that I myself order by word of mouth—either (an order) to be issued (to be given) or to be proclaimed (by word of mouth)—or, again, in the matter of anything urgent that is charged to the Mahāmātras, a division or rejection is taking place (in the council), without any interval I must be informed at all places and at all hours. This has been ordered by me."

Muktāto: This signifies that the orders were not always given by word of mouth. In this connexion I would refer to a rule of the atri as surviving in the Sākramā, viz., that orders by the king should not be given otherwise than in writing, and if an order was otherwise given it was not to be obeyed by the public servant, "for it is the royal signet which is the king and not the king himself."

FOLK-LORE FROM THE NIZAM’S DOMINIONS.

BY M. N. CHITTANAH.

No. 1. The King and His devoted Minis ter.

There lived once upon a time a king and his faithful minister. They loved and trusted each other much. Their love was so great that when anything ever happened to the king, the minister felt as if it had happened to him. Likewise the king also felt in the same way if anything ever happened to the minister.

On one occasion, a dealer in swords and other arms and weapons came to the king and showed him his wares. The king, while examining one of the swords unfortunately cut off his little finger because it was so sharp. He immediately informed his devoted minister of this accident and wanted him to see to come at once. But the Minister, to the utter amazement of the king, instead of running to his aid and comforting and sympathizing with his royal master, sent back his reply in these words.

"Whatever God does is done well. Though the reason why to tell."

When the messengers brought to the king this unexpected reply, his anger knew no bounds, and he at once caused his minister to be dismissed and appointed another man in his place.

Some days after, the king went out hunting. While chasing a deer, he lost himself in a thick forest, which was the den of one hundred and one notorious robbers. It happened to be the festival of their presiding and protecting deity, to whom they offered a human sacrifice annually. Every preparation was ready and the only want was the required sacrifice. So they took it as good luck that they chance to meet the unfortunate king. Thinking him to be the gift of the goddess, who had been pleased to help them in times of difficulties and utter want and disappointment, they hastened to perform the sacrifice. While they were engaged in bringing the king to the altar, the chief robber’s glance happened to fall on the king’s missing finger. He at once bawled out to his comrades and showed the defect in the sacrifice to be offered.” In sorrow and anguish they let the victim go free.

On returning to the palace, he remembered the minister’s wise words at the time of the loss of his little finger, which had saved him now from the hands of the murderous band of robbers and reinstated his wise and learned minister to his former place, passing the remainder of their days in blessed harmony of peace and pleasure.

---

14 dākapaksa might mean a fiscal order. Cf. षणां च वापिष्ठादिकाः Agamākara, p. 57.

15 न कहय भूलकः कुष्टीलोकसामाहिताः कापिल।
माताः विनाशान्तिः विनायकः या महाबुः॥ II. 290

16 नृसंहारिः लेख्यं नृसंहर्ष युवाः नृपम्॥ II. 392. (Jyānanda’s ed.)

Among the lower classes of people very great care is taken when a goat, a sheep or fowl is being chosen for sacrifice to goddesses to see that the animal is free from defective limbs. Even now when an animal sacrifice is offered to the lower goddesses, or presiding deities over cholera, small-pox and other epidemics, votaries and worshipers are very careful to obtain a sound animal or fowl.
THE JÔG OR GERSAPPE FALLS.

The Jôg Falls on the Shârâvati river,\(^1\) which for about eight miles forms the boundary between Mysore and the North Kanara District of the Bombay Presidency, are best known to Europeans as the Gersappe Falls, though they are eight miles farther up the river than that old village, and about thirty miles from Honâvar on the coast.

In the south of India there are not a few waterfalls of considerable height and volume. The falls of the Gânatâlhe, near Gûkâ in the Belgaum District, for example, are 170 feet high, horse-shoe shaped, and with a flood-breadth at the crest of 580 feet, discharging in November after the rains an average of nineteen tons of water per second.

But the Jôg on the Shârâvati is by far the grandest, pouring a large volume of water over a vertical cliff with a sheer drop of 880 feet in height, and extending, even in the dry season, to about 720 yards across, whilst in the monsoon the flood is about doubled, overflowing the precipice at a depth of eight feet into a pool some 130 feet deep. In August 1844 Captain Newbold estimated the fall of water at 43,000 cubic feet per second. In November and later the sight of this mighty cataract is still magnificent; while during the rains the huge chasm is filled with the clouds of spray and mist which hang over the cliff. It is divided by rocks into four separate channels. The Râja or Grand Fall is that nearest, the right or Kanara bank of the river, and by itself is a fine fall sweeping down in a smooth unbroken volume till lost in clouds of spray. A good way to the left is the second fall, named the Râuner from the noise it makes: it is within the curve on the north-end of the cliff, and falls into a basin whence it rushes down a deep channel and leaps out to join the Râja fall and the joint streams dash down a rugged gorge upon a great rock. The Rocket is outside the north curve and is of great beauty, and falling upon a projecting rock and darting out thence forms a rocket-like curve of 700 feet, throwing off sparkling jets of spray. To the left of this is the fourth cascade styled LaDame Blanche, which

glides gracefully over the precipice in a sheet of foam and spreads out over the face of the rock down to the pool like folds of silver gauze.\(^2\)

When visiting these falls in March 1880, I found the following lines in the visitors' book at the Koikani Travellers' Bungalow, close to the falls, which I got copied out: they may be of interest to some readers: the author of them, Mr. Gordon Forbes, was a Madras Civilian, and seems to have been at one time Head Assistant in South Kanara.

J. BURGESS.

GERSAPPE FALLS.

Unnamed yet ancient river! Since the flood
Your tribute—gathered from a thousand rills—
Increasing journeys to the Western main,
Anon, as now in summer heat, waxed low,
Winning slow way amongst the wave-worn rocks;
Anon, ere many moons, above their crests
Rolling triumphant, an all-conquering flood.
Thy varied scenes are like a changeful life:
Turbmoil and rest: now harassed and now still.
Thou hast deep reaches where thy waters rest
Calm as a healthful sleep; there drink at noon
The wild herds of the woods; there with deep
Shade
Primeval forests curtain thy repose.
Then on with gentle flow and rippling sound—
Dimples as mirth and musical as joy!
On, lured to swiftness, or provoked to strife,
By rough obstruction or inviting slope.—
On, still unconscious to the awful brink,
Where the wild plunge hath made thee glorious.
Mortal! where wast thou when the hand of God
Quarried the chasms in the living rock,
And rent the cliff to give the torrent way?
How pigmy on the brink thy stature shows,
Topping a rampart of a thousand feet!
Bend o'er the cliff when the uplifting clouds
Reveal the terrors of the deep abyss,
Where the blue pigeon circles at mid height,
Amidst the spray the darting swallow bathes;
Then, with firm foot and brain undizzied, hurl
A fragment from the precipice, and mark—
With fearful sympathy—its long, long fall!
It dwindles to a speck, yet still descends,
Descends and vanishes ere yet the eye

---

\(^1\) Kanaresi jôga, 'a waterfall.'

Discern the signal of its distant splash.
Grudge not the toil to track the rugged stair,*
Down where huge fragments strew the torrent-bed.
Look up and scan the tow'ring precipice.
Set ever beauty on such awful front?
Was e'er dread grief so girt with loveliness?
How goodly are thy robes, thou foam-clad queen.†

What hues of heaven are woven in thy skirt;
Thy misty veil, how gracefully it falls—
Forever falls and yet unveils thee not!
Down the black rock in many a show'ry jet,
Like arrowy meteors on the midnight sky,
Prone shoot the parted waters. And lo where
With angry roar athwart the precipice
In mighty furrows rushing to the plunge;
A headlong torrent. But majestic most
Thy stately fall, unbroken to the base,
Fair column of white water meekly shrouded
In the dim grandeur of thy gloomy chasm.

Imperishable waters! To the place
From whence ye came incessant ye return,
Dissolve, condense and constant reappear;
A river now, and now a restless wave,
Aloft a heaven-obscuring canopy,
A thunder cloud alighting in soft rain,
Or split in torrents on the streaming earth,
Again to gather, and perchance again
Shoot from ye heights a sounding cataract.

GORDON FORBES.

THE AGE OF SRIHARSHA.

In connection with Mr. D. R. Bhandarkar’s note appended to my note on “The age of Śrīharsha” ante, p. 83, I have to offer the following observations:—

(a) Rājaśekhara’s Prabandhakaṇḍa was composed more than a century and a half after the reign of the Gāhāḍavāla king Jayachandra (A.D. 1176-1193) in A. D. 1348 (Śivadattasūryān’s introduction to Naishadhiyacharitam, p. 3). The story of the composition and publication of the Naishadhiyā as told by Rājaśekhara has very little historical basis. Of course the names of some historical personages find place in the story. But even here the author is not correct. He names the patron of Śrīharsha as Jayantachandra and not Jayachandra and makes him the son and not the grandson of Govindaachandra, king of Vārānasī; so Rājaśekhara cannot be accepted as a very reliable authority on Gāhāḍavāla history, and it is not safe to accept his testimony concerning the contemporaneity of Jayachandra and Śrīharsha as decisive without corroborative contemporary evidence. Rājaśekhara may as well have connected a poet of an earlier age with Jayachandra as Māruttunga has connected Bāna, Māgha, and the dramatist Rājaśekhara with Bhoja Paramāra in his Prabandhakāchéśāntara.

(b) As for Arghava-vargana we know of no other charita which is called varṇana, and so it is difficult to accept Arghava-vargana as a charita of the Chāhamāna king Arnoraḷa.

(c) The Chhinda chief (of Gayā) mentioned in the Gayā inscription of Purushottamadeva, who was a tributary of Āśokavalla, and dated in the year 1813 after Buddha’s Nirvāṇa, was not a contemporary of Jayachandra, but flourished a century after Jayachandra’s accession. The date of this inscription is usually taken as corresponding to Wednesday, 28th October, A.D. 1176, with 638 B.C. as the initial year of the era of Buddha’s Nirvāṇa. As this is the only instance of the use of this era in India, it cannot be considered as of Indian origin, but must have been imported from outside. It has been proved that the era of Buddha’s Nirvāṇa starting from 544 B.C. took its rise in Ceylon in the middle of the eleventh century and was thence carried to Burma (Fleet’s Contributions to J. R. A. S. of 1909, 1911 and 1912; Geiger’s Introduction to the Mahāvamsa, London, 1912, p. 29). From a Burmese inscription at Bodh-Gayā we learn that Burmese monks repaired a chaitya at Bodh-Gayā three times, and that the last repair works were

* The descent on the south side of the fall down to the pool at the bottom.
† The section of the fall called La Dame Blanche,—the fall on the south or Mysore side of the river.
* The fall known as ‘The Rocket,’—to the north or right of La Dame Blanche.
* The Roarer, falls into a basin and thence leaps towards the Rāja fall and joins it.
* The Rāja, also called the Horse-shoe fall, the Main fall and the Great fall,—is the large fall on the north or Kanara side of the Sharavati river.

The era of Buddha’s Nirodha was, therefore, probably imported from Burma into India in the thirteenth century, and according to the Ceylonese, Burmese and Siamese reckoning the year 1818 after Buddha’s Nirvana corresponds to A.D. 1270.  

We arrive at similar conclusions regarding the age of Ashokavallia, and, therefore, of the Chhindra chief of Gaya, from two other Gaya inscriptions. The first of these two inscriptions is dated in the year 51 of “Śrīmal-Lakshmanasena nayamadīta rāja,” “the year 51 after the end of Lakshmanasena’s reign.” (Kielhorn’s Northern List, No. 576), and the second in the year 74 of the same era (Ibid, No. 577).  

Assuming that Lakshmanasena ascended the throne in A.D. 1119, the initial epoch of the Lakmāna Sākya, Kielhorn gave A.D. 1171 and 1194 as the equivalent of these dates. But in some copies of Dānasāgarā by Bālalāsesa, father of Lakshmanasena, Sakā 1091 = A.D. 1169 is given as the date of the composition of the work (J. A. S. B., 1896, Part 1, p. 29; Eggeling’s Catalogue of India Office Mss., p. 545), and in one copy of Abhutasāgarā by Bālalāsesa it is said that the work was begun in Sākā 1090 = A.D. 1168 (Bhandarkar’s Report, 1887-88 to 1890-91, p. lxxxv). Giving the date of composition in Śaka era was the usual practice with the Bengali authors of those days. Śrīdhar, the author of Nāyakandali, a native of southern Rājdā in Bengal, gives Śaka 913 = A.D. 991 as the date of composition (Bühler’s Kashmir Report, p. cvii; Visānavatī Sanskrit Series, No. 6, p. 331). Śrīdharāsana, whose father was a friend of Lakshmanasena, compiled his Saṅkṣetā-karana āsṛṭa in Śaka 1127 = A.D. 1205. Kielhorn, in his synchronistic table for Northern India appended to Ep. Ind., Vol. VIII, accepts the date of the composition of Dānasāgarā as a landmark in the Sena chronology and places the reign of Lakshmanasena in the fourth quarter of the twelfth century.  

But in the list of dated inscriptions of Northern India prefixed to the table he does not make corresponding changes in the dates of the Gaya inscriptions of Ashokavali. Taking A.D. 1200 as the approximate date of the end of the reign of Lakshmanasena, the record of 51 should be assigned to A.D. 1251, and that of 74 to A.D. 1274. Thus the dates of Ashokavali’s inscriptions dated in Lakshmanasena-dītā-rāja may be reconciled to his third inscription dated in the year 1813 after Buddha’s Nirodha in which a Chhindra chief of Gaya is referred to.

(d) Mr. Bhandarkar admits, “It is difficult to determine who was the hero of his Navadhasākha-charita.” This difficulty disappears if we reject the tales told by Rājaśekhara and identify the hero of Bṛhatara’s Navadhasākha-charita with Sīndhurāja Navadhasānika of the Paramāra dynasty, the patron of Padmaputra-Parima and the hero of his Navadhasākha-charita.

Rama Prasad Chanda.

BOOK-NOTICE.

Pandit D(es) Bharkar D(is) Jitālī, Prakritāngopasakārī (in Gujarāti).—Printed at the Dharmabhāsya Press, Benares, 1911.—Pages 148, 38.—Price 12 annas.

To be fully appreciated, the above book should be considered in connection with the object at which it aims, namely, smoothing the way of learning Prakrit to Indian students, by putting Hemacandra’s aphoristic rules into an easy and readable form. As regards this end, the author—a scholar in the Śri Yaśovijay Banaras Sanskrit Pāṭhālā—has no doubt reached it, and has fairly succeeded in giving a co-ordinated and lucid exposition of the whole Prakrit morphology and of the most important phonetical rules and āsṛṭas in the Halabhadākharana. It is an original reconstruction of the latter work, not a mere translation, and its most pleasant feature is the division of the matter into lessons—33 in all, which can be successively studied, one after another, in the easiest way. Each lesson generally contains, besides paradigms and grammatical rules, lists of words to be learnt by heart, and
very useful exercises, consisting of short Prakrit sentences to be translated into Gujarati, and Gujarati sentences to be translated into Prakrit. The practical value of the book is further increased by a complete index at the end of all the Prakrit words occurring in it, each word being explained in Gujarati. We have therefore in this work the substance of an ancient Indian vyākaraṇa—the most authoritative one in the present case—recast into a modern form, in accordance with much the same practical principles as any European grammar of to-day; and I do not hesitate to recommend it strongly to all Indian students, who wish to learn Prakrit from the rules set down by Hemacandra.

Another important feature of the book, which will not be approved by all, however, is the total banishment of Sanskrit from it. Here Paṇḍit Bahocar Dās Jīrvāj seems to have gone either on the assumption that there might be students of Prakrit, who are not acquainted with Sanskrit, or, what is practically the same thing, that the latter language is not necessary for the explanation of the former. I need hardly show that this is not the real situation. It is clear that reference to the Sanskrit is absolutely indispensable not only in describing Prakrit phonetics, but also Prakrit morphology. There are many irregular Prakrit forms, like soca (<Skt. śrutas), pappā (<Skt. pṛddyā), bhūyā (<Skt. bhūyāte), moçchā (<Skt. moçkyāmi), etc., which could never be understood by a student, who is unacquainted with Sanskrit. It is probably on the same assumption that Paṇḍit Bahocar Dās Jīrvāj has given to phonetics but little importance in his Grammar, and has contented himself with a short description of the principal phonetical changes, added at the end of the book as a kind of supplement. Now, this is just the reverse of the rational proceeding already followed by Hemacandra, and in this case one must confess that the innovation is not an improvement. I would therefore advise the author to take Sanskrit more into consideration in a second edition of his book and to add in brackets all Sanskrit forms, which might be of help in understanding any Prakrit word. Similarly, I would suggest that, in giving the Gujarati equivalents of Prakrit words, that he employ tātamas of the same origin as the latter, whenever it is possible; e.g., putra instead of dīkaro as an equivalent of putra, naga instead of sūhā as an equivalent of nayāra, etc. This would, in many cases, greatly facilitate for students, the work of learning Prakrit words by heart.

The language, which Paṇḍit Bahocar Dās Jīrvāj teaches in his Prākṛtadāgopadeśika, is naturally the same as that described by Hemacandra in the three first, and also in half the fourth, pāda of the eighth adhyāya of his vyākaraṇa, namely the Māhārāṣṭrī, mixed with some of the peculiarities of the Jaina Māhārāṣṭrī and of the Ardhamāgadhī. Amongst the characteristics of the two latter dialects, we may reckon the yastrati and the dentalisation of initial ṇ and medial ṇa, which Hemacandra and most Jain writers often transfer not only to the Māhārāṣṭrī, but even to other Prakrit dialects and to the Apabhraṃśa. The greater part of the book is devoted to a description of the morphology, and it contains the whole substance of the third pāda in the Haimavīkaraṇa, each śūtra being expanded into one or more very clear rules, and the succession of the various subjects wholly rearranged in the most convenient way. Ādēnas, indefinables etc., are occasionally interpersed.

Within the above limits the book is quite complete and, if there are any deficiencies in it, these generally are not to be imputed to Paṇḍit Bahocar Dās Jīrvāj, but to Hemacandra himself. Only I would venture to remark that, since the Prākṛtadāgopadeśika is practically intended for training students to understand the Prakrit of Jain canonical and extra-canonical works, i.e., the Ardhamāgadhī and the Jaina Māhārāṣṭrī, its author would have done well to complete Hemacandra’s description of the language by the addition of such forms as are peculiar to the Prakrit used by the Jains, and are not to be found in the Māhārāṣṭrī, like the -e ending of the nom. sing., and also the -de ending of the nom. plur., the -dē termination of the dative, the -pē, -pōt terminations of the locative, the accusative form vājāna from the base vājana, and the -pēṇa plural termination of the ablative, etc.

L. P. T.
THE ADMINISTRATIVE VALUE OF ANTHROPOLOGY.¹

BY SIR RICHARD C. TEMPLE, BART., C.I.E.

The title of the body of which those present at this meeting from a section is, as all my hearers will know, the British Association for the Advancement of Science, and it seems to me therefore that the primary duty of a sectional President is to do what in him lies, for the time being, to forward the work of his section. This may be done in more than one way: by a survey of the work done up to date and an appreciation of its existing position and future prospects, by an address directly forwarding it in some particular point or aspect, by considering its applicability to what is called the practical side of human life. The choice of method seems to me to depend on the circumstances of each meeting, and I am about to choose the last of those above mentioned, and to confine my address to a consideration of the administrative value of anthropology because the locality in which we are met together and the spirit of the present moment seem to indicate that I shall best serve the interests of the anthropological section of the British Association by a dissertation on the importance of this particular science to those who are or may hereafter be called upon to administer the public affairs of the lands in which they may reside.

I have to approach the practical aspect of the general subject of anthropology under the difficulty of finding myself once more riding an old hobby, and being consequently confronted with views and remarks already expressed in much detail. But I am not greatly disturbed by this fact, as experience teaches that the most effective way of impressing ideas, in which one believes, on one's fellow man is to miss no opportunity of putting them forward, even at the risk of repeating what may not yet have been forgotten. And as I am convinced that the teachings of anthropologists are of practical value to those engaged in guiding the administration of their own or another country, I am prepared to take that risk.

Anthropology is, of course, in its baldest sense the study of mankind in all its possible ramifications, a subject far too wide for any one science to cover, and therefore the real point for consideration on such an occasion as this is not so much what the students of mankind and its environments might study if they chose, but what the scope of their studies now actually is, and whither it is tending. I propose, therefore, to discuss the subject in this limited sense.

What, then, is the anthropology of to-day, that claims to be of practical value to the administrator? In what directions has it developed?

Perhaps the best answer to these questions is to be procured from our own volume of 'Notes and Queries on Anthropology,' a volume published under the arrangements of the Royal Anthropological Institute for the British Association. This volume of 'Notes and Queries' has been before the public for about forty years, and is now in the fourth edition, which shows a great advance on its predecessors and conforms to the stage of development to which the science has reached up to the present time.

The object of the 'Notes and Queries' is stated to be 'to promote accurate anthropological observation on the part of travellers (including all local observers) and to enable those who are not anthropologists themselves to supply information which is wanted for the scientific study of anthropology at home.' So, in the heads under which the subject is considered in this book, we have exhibited to us the entire scope of the science as it now exists. These heads are (1) Physical Anthropology, (2) Technology, (3) Sociology, (4) Arts and Sciences.

¹ Presidential Address delivered to the Anthropological Section of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, held at Birmingham, 1913.
It is usual, however, nowadays to divide the subject into two main divisions—physical and cultural anthropology.

Physical Anthropology aims at obtaining 'as exact a record as possible of the structure and functions of the human body, with a view to determining how far these are dependent on inherited and racial factors, and how far they vary with environment.' This record is based on two separate classes of physical observation: firstly on descriptive characters, such as types of hair, colour of the eyes and skin, and so on, and actual measurement; and secondly on attitudes, movements, and customary actions. By the combined study of observations on these points physical heredity is ascertained, and a fair attribution of the race or races to which individuals or groups belong can be arrived at.

But anthropology, as now studied, goes very much further than inquiry into the physical structure of the human races. Man, 'unlike other animals, habitually reinforces and enhances his natural qualities and force by artificial means.' He does, or gets done for him, all sorts of things to his body to improve its capacities or appearance, or to protect it. He thus supplies himself with sanitary appliances and surroundings, with bodily ornamentation and ornaments, with protective clothing, with habitations and furniture, with protection against climate and enemies, with works for the supply of water and fire, with food and drink, drugs and medicine. And for these purposes he hunts, fishes, domesticates animals, and tills the soil, and provides himself with implements for all these, and also for defence and offence, and for the transport of goods, involving working in wood, earth, stones, bones, shells, metals and other hard materials, and in leather, strings, nets, basketry, matting and weaving, leading him to what are known as textile industries. Some of this work has brought him to mine and quarry, and to employ mechanical aids in the shape of machinery, however rude and simple. The transport of himself and his belongings by land and water has led him to a separate set of industries and habits: to the use of paths, roads, bridges, and halting places, of trailers, sledges, and wheeled vehicles; to the use of rafts, floats, canoes, coracles, boats, and ships, and the means of propelling them, poles, paddles, oars, sails, and rigging. The whole of these subjects is grouped by anthropologists under the term Technology, which thus becomes a very wide subject, covering all the means by which a people supplies itself with the necessaries of its mode of livelihood.

In order to successfully carry on what may be termed the necessary industries or even to be in a position to cope with them, bodies of men have to act in concert, and this forces mankind to be gregarious, a condition of life that involves the creation of social relations. To understand, therefore, any group of mankind, it is essential to study Sociology side by side with Technology. The subjects for inquiry here are the observances at crucial points in the life history of the individual—birth, puberty, marriage, death, daily life, nomenclature, and so on; the social organisation and the relationship of individuals. On these follow the economics of the social group, pastoral, agricultural, industrial, and commercial, together with conceptions as to property and inheritance (including slavery), as to government, law and order, politics and morals; and finally the ideas as to war and the external relations between communities.

We are still, however, very far from being able to understand in all their fullness of development even the crudest of human communities, without a further inquiry into the products of their purely mental activities, which in the 'Notes and Queries' are grouped under the term 'Arts and Sciences.' Under this head are to be examined, in the first place the expression of the emotions to the eye by physical movements and conditions, and then by gestures, signs and signals, before we come to language, which is primarily expressed by the
voice to the ear, and secondarily to the eye in a more elaborate form by the graphic arts—pictures, marks and writing. Man further tries to express his emotions by what are known as the Fine Arts; that is by modifying the material articles which he contrives for his livelihood in a manner that makes them represent to him something beyond their economic use—makes them pleasant, representative or symbolical—leading him on to draw, paint, enamel, engrave, carve and mould. In purely mental efforts this striving to satisfy the artistic or aesthetic sense takes the form of stories, proverbs, riddles, songs, and music. Dancing, drama, games, tricks and amusements are other manifestations of the same effort, combining in these cases the movements of the body with those of the mind in expressing the emotions.

The mental process necessary for the expression of his emotions have induced man to extend his powers of mind in directions now included in the term 'Abstract Reasoning.' This has led him to express the results of his reasoning by such terms as reckoning and measurement, and to fix standards for comparison in such immaterial but all essential matters as enumeration, distance, surface, capacity, weight, time, value and exchange. These last enable him to reach the idea of money, which is the measurement of value by means of tokens, and represents perhaps the highest economic development of the reasoning powers common to nearly all mankind.

The mental capacities of man have so far been considered only in relation to the expression of the emotions and of the results of abstract reasoning; but they have served him also to develop other results and expressions equally important, which have arisen out of observation of his surroundings, and have given birth to the Natural Sciences: astronomy, meteorology, geography, topography and natural history. And further they have enabled him to memorise all these things by means of records, which in their highest form have brought about what is known to all of us as history, the bugbear of impulsive and shallow thinkers, but the very backbone of all solid opinion.

The last and most complex development of the mental processes, dependent upon all the others according to the degree to which they themselves have been developed in any given variety of mankind, is, and has always been, present in every race or group on record from the remotest to the most recent time in some form or other and in a high degree. Groups of men observe the phenomena exhibited by themselves or their environment, and account for them according to their mental capacity as modified by their heredity. Man's bare abstract reasoning, following on his observation of such phenomena, is his philosophy, but his inherited emotions influence his reasoning to an almost controlling extent and induce his religion, which is thus his philosophy or explanation of natural phenomena as effected by his hereditary emotions, producing that most wonderful of all human phenomena, his belief. In the conditions, belief, faith, and religion must and do vary with race, period and environment.

Consequent on the belief, present or past of any given variety of mankind, there follow religious practices (customs as they are usually called) based thereon, and described commonly in terms that are familiar to all, but are nevertheless by no means even yet clearly defined: theology, heathenism, fetishism, animism, totemism, magic, superstition, with soul, ghost, and spirit, and so on, as regards mental concepts; worship, ritual, prayer, sanctity, sacrifice, taboo, etc., as regards custom and practice.

Thus have the anthropologists, as I understand them, shown that they desire to answer the question as to what their science is, and to explain the main points in the subject of which they strive to obtain and impart accurate knowledge based on scientific inquiry: that is, on an
inquiry methodically conducted on lines which experience has shown them will lead to the minimum of error in observation and record.

I trust I have been clear in my explanation of the anthropologists' case, though in the time at my disposal I have been unable to do more than indicate the subjects they study, and have been obliged to exercise restraint and to employ condensation of statement to the utmost extent that even a long experience in exposition enables one to achieve. Briefly, the science of anthropology aims at such a presentation and explanation of the physical and mental facts about any given species or even group of mankind as may correctly instruct those to whom the acquisition of such knowledge may be of use. In this instance, as in the case of the other sciences, the man of science endeavours to acquire and pass on abstract knowledge, which the man of affairs can confidently apply in the daily business of practical life.

It will have been observed that an accurate presentation of the physical and mental characteristics of any species of mankind which it is desired to study is wholly dependent on accurate inquiry and report. Let no one suppose that such inquiry is a matter of instinct or intuition, or that it can be usefully conducted empirically or without due reference to the experiences of others; in other words without sufficient preliminary study. So likely indeed are the uneducated in such matters to observe and record facts about human beings inaccurately, or even wrongly, that about a fourth part of the 'Notes and Queries' is taken up with showing the inquirer how to proceed, and in exposing the pitfalls into which he may unconsciously fall. The mainspring of error in anthropological observation is that the inquirer himself the product of heredity and environment. This induces him to read himself, his own unconscious prejudices and inherited outlook on life, into the statements made to him by those who view life from perhaps a totally different and incompatible standpoint. To the extent that the inquirer does this, to that extent are his observations and report likely to be inaccurate and misleading. To avoid error in this respect, previous training and study are essential, and so the 'Notes and Queries on Anthropology,' a guide compiled in co-operation by persons long familiar with the subject, is as strong and explicit on the point of how to inquire as on that of what to inquire about.

Let me explain that these statements are not intended to be taken as made ex cathedra, but rather as the outcome of actual experience of mistakes made in the past. Time does not permit me to go far into this point, and I must limit myself to the subject of Sociology for my illustration. If a man undertakes to inquire into the social life of a people or tribe as a subject apart, he is committing an error, and his report will almost certainly be misleading. Such an investigator will find that religion and technology are inextricably mixed up with the sociology of any given tribe, that religion intervenes at every point not only of sociology but also of language and technology. In fact, just as in the case of all other scientific research, the phenomena observable by the anthropologist are not the result of development along any single line alone, but of a progression in a main general direction, as influenced, and it may be even deflected, by contact and environment.

If again the inquirer neglects the simple but essential practice of taking notes, not only fully, but also immediately or as nearly so as practicable, he will find that his memory of facts, even after a short time, has become vague, inexact, and incomplete, which means that reports made from memory are more likely to be useless than to be of any scientific value. If voluntary information or indirect and accidental corroboration are ignored, if questions are asked and answers accepted without discretion; if exceptions are mistaken for rules, then the records of an inquiry may well mislead and thus become worse than useless. If leading or direct
questions are put without due caution, and if the answers are recorded without reference to the
natives' and not the enquirer's mode of classifying things, crucial errors may easily arise.
Thus, in many parts of the world, the term 'mother' includes all female relatives of the past
or passing generation, and the term 'brother' the entire brotherhood. Such expressions
as 'brother' and 'sister' may and do constantly connote relationships which are not recog-
nised at all amongst us. The word 'marriage' may include 'irrevocable betrothal,' and so
on; and it is very easy to fall into the trap of the mistranslation of terms of essential import,
especially in the use of words expressing religious conceptions. The conception of godhead has
for so long been our inheritance that it may be classed almost as instinctive. It is nevertheless
still foreign to the instincts of a large portion of mankind.

Also, when working among the uncultured, the inquirer attempts to ascertain abstract
ideas, except through concrete instances, he will not succeed in his purpose for want of repre-
sentative terms. And lastly, if he fails to project himself sufficiently into the minds of the
subjects of inquiry, or to respect their prejudices, or to regard seriously what they hold to be
sacred, or to keep his countenance while practices are being described which to him may be
disgusting or ridiculous—if indeed he fails in any way in communicating to his informants,
who are often super-sensitively suspicious in such matters, the fact that his sympathy is not
feigned—he will also fail in obtaining the anthropological knowledge he is seeking. In the
words of the 'Notes and Queries' on this point, 'Nothing is easier than to do anthropological
work of a certain sort, but to get to the bottom of native customs and modes of thought, and
to record the results of inquiry in such a manner that they carry conviction, is work which
can be only carried out properly by careful attention.'

The foregoing considerations explain the scope of our studies and the requirements of
the preliminary inquiries necessary to give those studies value. The further question is the
use to which the results can be put. The point that at once arises here for the immediate
purpose is that of the conditions under which the British Empire is administered. We are
here met together to talk scientifically, that is, as precisely as we can; and so it is necessary
to give a definition to the expression 'Imperial Administration,' especially as it is constantly
used for the government of an empire, whereas in reality it is the government that directs
the administration. In this address I use the term 'administration' as the disinterested
management of the details of public affairs. This excludes 'polities' from our purview, defining
that term as the conduct of the government of a country according to the opinions or in the
interests of a particular group or party.

Now in this matter of administration the position of the inhabitants of the British Isles
is unique. It falls to their lot to govern, directly or indirectly, the lives of members of nearly
every variety of the human race. Themselves Europeans by descent and intimate connection,
they have a large direct interest in every other general geographical division of the world and
its inhabitants. It is worth while to pause here for a moment to think, and to try and realise,
however dimly, something of the task before the people of this country in the government
and control of what are known as the subject races.

For this purpose it is necessary to throw our glance over the physical extent of the British
Empire. In the first place, there are the ten self-governing components of the Dominion
of Canada and that of Newfoundland in North America, the six Colonial States in the Com-
monwealth of Australia, with the Dominion of New Zealand in Australasia, and the four
divisions of the Union of South Africa. All these may be looked upon as indirectly adminis-
tered portions of the British Empire. Then there is the mediatised government of Egypt,
with its appanage, the directly British administered Sudan, which alone covers about a million square miles of territory in thirteen provinces, in Northern Africa. These two areas occupy, as it were, a position between the self-governing and the directly-governed areas. Of these, there are in Europe, Malta and Gibraltar, Cyprus being officially included in Asia. In Asia itself is the mighty Indian Empire, which includes Aden and the Arabian Coast on the West and Burma on the East, and many islands in the intervening seas, with its fifteen provinces and some twenty categories of Native States 'in subordinate alliance,' that is, under general Imperial control. To these are added Ceylon, the Straits Settlements, and the Malay States, federated or other, North Borneo and Sarawak, and in the China Seas Hongkong and Wei-hai-wei. In South Africa we find Basutoland, Bechuanaland, and Rhodesia; in British West Africa, Gambia, the Gold Coast, Sierra Leone, and Nigeria; in Eastern and Central Africa, Somaliland, the East Africa Protectorate, Uganda, Zanzibar, and Nyassaland; while attached to Africa are the Mauritius, Seychelles, Ascension and St. Helena. In Central and South America are Honduras and British Guiana, and attached to that continent the Falkland Islands, and also Bermuda and the six colonies of British West Indies. In the Pacific Ocean are Fiji, Papua and many of the Pacific Islands.

I am afraid that once more during the course of this exposition I have been obliged to resort to a concentration of statement that is almost bewildering. But let that be. If one is to grapple successfully with a large and complex subject, it is necessary to try and keep before the mind, so far as possible, not only its magnitude, but the extent of its complexity. This is the reason for bringing before you, however briefly and generally, the main geographical details of the British Empire. The first point to realise on such a survey is that the mere extent of such an Empire makes the subject of its administration an immensely important one for the British people.

The next point for consideration and realisation is that an empire, situated in so many widely separated parts of the world, must contain within its boundaries groups of every variety of mankind, in such numerical strength as to render it necessary to control them as individual entities. They do not consist of small bodies lost in a general population, and therefore negligible from the administrator's point of view, but of whole races and tribes or of large detachments thereof.

These tribes of mankind profess every variety of religion known. They are Christians, Jews, Mahomedans, Hindus, Buddhists, Jains, Animists and to use a very modern expression, Animatists, adherents of main religions followed by an immense variety of sects, governed, however loosely, by every species of philosophy that is or has been in fashion among groups of mankind, and current in every stage of development, from the simplest and most primitive to the most historical and complex. One has to bear in mind that we have within our borders the Andamanese, the Papuan, and the Polynesian, as well as the highly civilised Hindu and Chinese, and that not one of these, nor indeed of many other peoples, has any tradition of philosophy or religion in common with our own; their very instincts of faith and belief following other lines than ours, the prejudices with which their minds are saturated being altogether alien to those with which we ourselves are deeply imbued.

The subjects of the British King-Emperor speak between them most of the languages of the world, and certainly every structural variety of human speech has its example somewhere in the British Empire. A number of these languages is still only in the process of becoming understood by our officials and other residents among their speakers, and let there be no mistake as to the magnitude of the question involved in the point of language alone in British
Imperial regions. A man may be what is called a linguist. He may have a working knowledge of the main European languages and of the great Oriental tongues, Arabic, Persian, and Hindustani, which will carry him very far indeed among the people—in a sense, in fact, from London to Calcutta—and then, without leaving that compact portion of the British Possessions known as the Indian Empire, with all its immense variety of often incompatible subordinate languages and dialects, he has only to step across the border into Burma and the further East to find himself in a totally different atmosphere of speech, where not one of the sounds, not one of the forms, not one of the methods, with which he has become familiarised is of any service to him whatever. The same observation will again be forced on him if he transfers himself thence to Southern Africa or to the Pacific Ocean. Let him wander amongst the North American Indians, and he will find the linguistic climate once more altogether changed.

Greater Britain may be said to exhibit all the many varieties of internal social relations that have been set up by tribes and groups of mankind—all the different forms of family and general social organisation, of reckoning kinship, of inheritance and control of the possession of property, of dealing with the birth of children and their education and training, physical, mental, moral, and professional, in many cases by methods entirely foreign to British ideas and habits. For instance, infanticide as a custom has many different sources of origin.

Our fellow subjects of the King follow, somewhere or other, all the different notions and habits that have been formed by mankind as to the relations between the sexes, both permanent and temporary, as to marriage and to what have been aptly termed supplementary unions. And finally, their methods of dealing with death and bringing it about, of disposing of the dead and worshipping them, give expression to ideas, which it requires study for an inhabitant of Great Britain to appreciate or understand. I may quote here as an example, that of all the forms of human head-hunting and other ceremonial murder that have come within my cognisance, either as an administrator or investigator, not one has originated in callousness or cruelty of character. Indeed, from the point of view of the perpetrators, they are invariably resorted to for the temporal or spiritual benefit of themselves or their tribe. In making this remark, I must not be understood as proposing that they should not be put down, wherever that is practicable. I am merely trying now to give an anthropological explanation of human phenomena.

In very many parts of the British Empire, the routine of daily life and the notions that govern it often find no counterparts of any kind in those of the British Isles, in such matters as personal habits and etiquette on occasions of social intercourse. And yet, perhaps, nothing estranges the administrator from his people more than mistakes on these points. It is small matters—such as the mode of salutation, forms of address and politeness, as rules of precedence, hospitality, and decency, as recognition of superstitions, however apparently unreasonable—which largely govern social relations, which no stranger can afford to ignore, and which at the same time cannot be ascertained and observed correctly without due study.

The considerations so far urged to-day have carried us through the points of the nature and scope of the science of anthropology, the mental equipment necessary for the useful pursuit of it, the methods by which it can be successfully studied, the extent and nature of the British Empire, the kind of knowledge of the alien populations within its boundaries required by persons of British origin who would administer the empire with benefit to the people dwelling in it, and the importance to such persons of acquiring that knowledge.

I now turn to the present situation as to this last point and its possible improvement, though in doing so I have to cover ground that some of those present may think I have already
The main proposition here is simple enough. The Empire is governed from the British Isles, and therefore year by year a large number of young men is sent out to its various component parts, and to them must inevitably be entrusted in due course the administrative, commercial, and social control over many alien races. If their relations with the foreign peoples with whom they come in contact are to be successful, they must acquire a working knowledge of the habits, customs, and ideas that govern the conduct of those peoples, and of the conditions in which they pass their lives. All those who succeed find these things out for themselves, and discern that success in administration and commerce is intimately affected by success in social relations, and that in its turn is dependent on the knowledge they may attain of those with whom they have to deal. They set about learning what they can, but of necessity empirically, trusting to keenness of observation, because such self-tuition is, as it were, a side issue in the immediate and imperative business of their lives. But, as I have already said elsewhere, the man who is obliged to obtain the requisite knowledge empirically, and without any previous training in observation, is heavily handicapped indeed in comparison with him who has already acquired the habit of right observation, and, what is of much more importance, has been put in the way of correctly interpreting his observations in his youth.

To put the proposition in its briefest form: in order to succeed in administration a man must use tact. Tact is the social expression of discernment and insight, qualities born of intuitive anthropological knowledge, and that is what it is necessary to induce in those sent abroad to become eventually the controllers of other kinds of men. What is required, therefore, is that in youth they should have imbibed the anthropological habit, so that as a result of having been taught how to study mankind, they may learn what it is necessary to know of those about them correctly, and in the shortest practicable time. The years of active life now unavoidably wasted in securing this knowledge, often inadequately and incorrectly even in the case of the ablest, can thus be saved, to the incalculable benefit of both the governors and the governed.

The situation has, for some years past, been appreciated by those who have occupied themselves with the science we are assembled here to promote, and several efforts have been made by the Royal Anthropological Institute and the Universities of Oxford, Cambridge, and London, at any rate, to bring the public benefits accruing from the establishment of anthropological schools before the Government and the people of this country.

In 1902 the Royal Anthropological Institute sent a deputation to the Government with a view to the establishment of an official Anthropometric Survey of the United Kingdom, in order to test the foundation for fears, then widely expressed, as to the physical deterioration of the population. In 1909 the Institute sent a second deputation to the present Government, to urge the need for the official training in anthropology of candidates for the Consular Service and of the Indian and Colonial Civil Services. There is happily every reason to hope that the Public Services Commission may act on the recommendations then made. This year (1913) the Institute returned to the charge and approached the Secretary of State for India, with a view to making anthropology an integral feature of the studies of the Oriental Research Institute, to the establishment of which the Government of India had officially proposed to give special attention. The Institute has also lately arranged to deal with all questions of scientific import that may come before the newly constituted Bureau of Ethnology at the Royal Colonial Institute, in the hope with its co-operation of eventually establishing a great desideratum—an Imperial Bureau of Ethnology. It has further had in hand a scheme for the systematic and thorough distribution of local correspondents throughout the world.
At Oxford, anthropology as a serious study was recognised by the appointment, in 1884, of a Reader, who was afterwards given the status of a Professor. In 1885, it was admitted as a special subject in the Final Honours School of Natural Science. In 1904, a memorandum was drawn up by those interested in the study at the University, advocating a method of systematic training in it, which resulted in the formation of the Committee of Anthropology in the following year. This Committee has established a series of lectures and examinations for a diploma, which can be taken as part of the degree course, but is open to all officers of the public services as well. By these means a School of Anthropology has been created at Oxford, which has already registered many students, among whom officers engaged in the administration of the British Colonies in Africa and members of the Indian Civil Service have been included. The whole question has been systematically taken up in all its aspects, the instruction, formal and informal, comprising physical anthropology, psychology, geographical distribution, prehistoric archaeology, technology, sociology, and philology.

At Cambridge, in 1893, there was a recognised Lecturer in Physical Anthropology, an informal office now represented by a Lecturer in Physical Anthropology and a Reader in Ethnology, regularly appointed by the University. In 1904, as a result of an expedition to Torres Straits, a Board of Anthropological Studies was formed, and a Diploma in Anthropology instituted, to be granted, not for success in examinations, but in recognition of meritorious personal research. At the same time, in order to help students, among whom were included officials in the African and Indian Civil Services, the Board established lectures on the same subjects as those taught at Oxford. This year, 1913, the University has instituted an Anthropological Tripos for its Degrees on lines similar to the others. The distinguishing feature of the Cambridge system is the prominence given to field work, and this is attracting foreign students of all sorts.

In 1909, joint representations were made by a deputation from the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge to both the India and Colonial Offices, advocating the training of Civil Service candidates and probationers in ethnology and primitive religion.

In 1904, the generosity of a private individual established a Lectureship in Ethnology in connection with the University of London, which has since developed into a Professorship of Ethnology with a Lectureship in Physical Anthropology. In the same year the same benefactor instituted a Chair of Sociology. In 1909 the University established a Board of Anthropology, and the subject is now included in the curricula for the Degrees of the University. In and after 1914, Anthropology will be a branch of the Science Honours Degree. The Degree course of the future covers both physical and cultural anthropology in regard to zoology, palaeontology, physiology, psychology, archaeology, technology, sociology, linguistics and ethnology. There will also be courses in ethnology with special attention to field work for officials and missionaries, and it is interesting to note that students of Egyptology are already taking a course of lectures in ethnology and physical anthropology.

Though the Universities have thus been definite enough in their action where the authority is vested in them, it is needless to say that their representations to Governments have met with varying success, and so far they have not produced much practical result. But it is as well to note here that a precedent for the preliminary anthropological training of probationers in the Colonial Civil Service has been already set up, as the Government of the Sudan has directed that every candidate for its services shall go through a course of anthropology at Oxford or Cambridge. In addition to this, the Sudan Government has given a grant to enable a competent anthropologist from London to run a small scientific survey of the peoples under
its administration. The Assam Government has arranged its ethnographical monographs on the lines of the British Association's 'Notes and Queries' with much benefit to itself, and it is believed that the Burma Government will do likewise.

Speaking in this place to such an audience as that before me, and encouraged by what was already been done elsewhere, I cannot think that I can be mistaken in venturing to recommend the encouragement of the study of anthropology to the University of such a city as Birmingham, which has almost unlimited interests throughout the British Empire. For it should be remembered that anthropological knowledge is as useful to merchants in partibus in dealing with aliens as to administrators so situated. Should this suggestion bear fruit, and should it be thought advisable some day to establish a School of Anthropology in Birmingham, I would also venture to point out that there are two requirements preliminary to the successful formation of almost any school of study. These are a library and a museum ad hoc. At Oxford there is a well known and well conducted anthropological museum in the Pitt-Rivers Collection, and the Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology at Cambridge contains collections of the greatest service to the anthropologist. Liverpool is also interesting itself in such matters. The Royal Anthropological Institute is forming a special library, and both that Institute and the University of London have the benefit of the splendid collections of the British Museum and of the Horniman Museum readily accessible. The libraries at Oxford and Cambridge are, I need hardly say, of world-wide fame. At all these places of learning, then, these requisites for this department of knowledge are forthcoming.

It were almost superfluous to state why they are requisites. Every student requires, not only competent teachers to guide him in his particular branch of study, but also a library and a museum close at hand, where he can find the information he wants and the illustration of it. Where these exist, thither it will be found that students will flock. Birmingham possesses peculiar facilities for the formation of both, as the city has all over the Empire its commercial representatives, who can collect the required museum specimens on the spot. The financial labours also of those who distribute these men over Greater Britain, and indeed all over the world, produce the means to create the library and the school, and their universal interests provide the incentive for securing for those in their employ the best method of acquiring a knowledge of men that can be turned to useful commercial purpose. Beyond these suggestions I will not pursue this point now, except to express a hope that this discourse may lead to a discussion thereon before this meeting breaks up.

Before I quit my subject I would like to be somewhat insistant on the fact that, though I have been dwelling so far exclusively on the business side, as it were, of the study of anthropology, it has a personal side as well. I would like to impress once more on the student, as I have often had occasion to do already, that whether he is studying of his own free will or at the behest of circumstances, there is hardly any better hobby in existence than this, or one that can be ridden with greater pleasure. It cannot, of course, be mastered in a day. At first the lessons will be a grind. Then, until they are well learnt, they are irksome, but when fullness of knowledge and maturity of judgment are attained, there is, perhaps, no keener sense of satisfaction which human beings can experience than that which is afforded by this study. Its range is so wide, its phases so very many, the interests involved in it so various, that it cannot fail to pleasantly occupy the leisure hours from youth to full manhood, and to be a solace, in some aspect or other, in advanced life and old age.

The processes of discovery in the course of this study are of such interest in themselves that I should wish to give many instances, but I must confine myself now to one or two. The
students will find on investigation, for instance, that however childish the reasoning of savages may appear to be on abstract subjects, and however silly some of their customs may seem, they are neither childish nor silly in reality. They are almost always the result of 'correct argument—from a false premise' — a mental process not unknown to civilised races. The student will also surely find that savages are not fools where their concrete interests are concerned, as they conceive those interests to be. For example, in commerce, beads do not appeal to savages merely because they are pretty things, except for purposes of adornment. They will only part with articles they value for particular sorts of beads which are to them money, in that they can procure in exchange for them, in their own country, something they much desire. They have no other reason for accepting any kind of bead in payment for goods. On few anthropological points can mistakes be made more readily than on this, and when they are made by merchants, financial disaster can well follow, so that what I have already said elsewhere as to this may bear repetition in part here. Savages in their bargains with civilised man never make one that does not, for reasons of their own, satisfy themselves. Each side, in such a case, views the bargain according to its own interest. On his side, the trader buys something of great value to him, when he has taken it elsewhere, with something of little value to him, which he has brought from elsewhere, and then, and only then, can he make what is to him a magnificent bargain. On the other hand the savage is more than satisfied, because with what he has got from the trader he can procure from among his own people something he very much covets, which the article he parted with could not have procured for him. Both sides profit by the bargain from their respective points of view, and traders cannot, as a matter of fact, take undue advantage of savages, who, as a body, part with products of little or no value to themselves for others of vital importance, though these last may be of little or none to the civilised trader. The more one dives into recorded bargains, the more clearly one sees the truth of this view.

I have always advocated personal inquiry into the native currency and money, even of pre-British days, of the people amongst whom a Britisher's lot is cast, for the reason that the study of the mental processes that lead up to commercial relations, internal and external, the customs concerned with daily buying and selling, take one more deeply into aliens' habits of mind and their outlook on practical life than any other branch of research. The student will find himself involuntarily acquiring a knowledge of the whole life of a people, even of superstitions and local politics, matters that commercial men, as well as administrators, cannot, if they only knew it, ever afford to ignore. The study has also a great intellectual interest, and neither the man of commerce nor the man of affairs should disregard this side of it if he would attain success in every sense of that term.

Just let me give one instance from personal experience. A few years back a number of ingots of tin, in the form of birds and animals and imitations thereof, hollow tokens of tin ingots, together with a number of rough notes taken on the spot, were handed over to me for investigation and report. They came from the Federated Malay States, and were variously said to have been used as toys and as money in some form. A long and careful investigation unearthed the whole story. They turned out to be surviving specimens of an obsolete and forgotten Malay currency. Bit by bit, by researches into travellers' stories and old records, European and vernacular, it was ascertained that some of the specimens were currency and some money, and that they belonged to two separate series. Their relations to each other were ascertained, and also to the currencys of the European and Oriental nations with whom the Malays of the Peninsula had come in contact. The mint profit in some instances, and in other instances the actual profit European governments and mercantile authorities, and even native traders, had made in recorded transactions of the past, was found out. The origin of the British, Dutch, and Portuguese money, evolved for trading with the Malays, was disclosed, and several interesting historical discoveries were made; as, for instance, the explanation of the coins still
remaining in museums and issued in 1510 by the great Portuguese conqueror, Albuquerque, for the then new Malay possessions of his country, and the meaning of the numismatic plates of the great French traveller Tavernier in the next century. Perhaps the most interesting, and anthropologically the most important, discovery was the relation of the ideas that led up to the animal currency of the Malays to similar ideas in India, Central Asia, China, and Europe itself throughout all historical times. One wonders how many people in these isles grasp the fact that our own monetary scale of 960 farthings to the sovereign, and the native Malay scale of 1,280 cash to the dollar, are representatives of one and the same universal scale, with more than probably one and the same origin out of a simple method of counting seeds, peas, beans, shells, or other small natural constant weights. But the point for the present purpose is that not only will the student find that long practice in anthropological inquiry, and the learning resulting therefrom, will enable him to make similar discoveries, but also that the process of discovery is intensely interesting. Such discoveries, too, are of practical value. In this instance they have taught us much of native habits of thought and views of life in newly acquired possessions which no administrator there, mercantile or governmental, can set aside with safety.

I must not dwell too long on this aspect of my subject, and will only add the following remark. If any of my hearers will go to the Pitt-Rivers Museum at Oxford he will find many small collections recording the historical evolution of various common objects. Among them is a series showing the history of the tobacco pipe, commonly known to literary students in this country as the nargileh and to Orientalists as the hukka. At one end of the series will be found a hollow coconut with an artificial hole in it, and then every step in evolution between that and an elaborate hukka with its long, flexible, drawing-tube at the other end. I give this instance, as I contributed the series, and I well remember the eagerness of the hunt in the Indian bazaars and the satisfaction on proving every step in the evolution.

There is one aspect of life where the anthropological instinct would be more than useful, but to which, alas, it cannot be extended in practice. Politics, government, and administration are so interdependent throughout the world that it has always seemed to me to be a pity that the value to himself of following the principles of anthropology cannot be impressed on the average politician of any nationality. I fear it is hopeless to expect it. Were it only possible, the extent of the consequent benefit to mankind is at present beyond human forecast, as then the politician could approach his work without that arrogance of ignorance of his fellow countrymen on all points, except their credulity, that is the bane of the ordinary types of his kind wherever found, with which they have always poisoned and are still poisoning their minds, mistaking the satisfaction of the immediate temporary interests and prejudices of themselves and comrades for the permanent advantage of the whole people, whom, in consequence, they incontrollably misgovern, whenever and for so long as their country is so undiscerning as to place them in power.

 Permit me, in conclusion, to enforce the main argument of this address by a personal note. It was my fortune to have been partly trained in youth at a University College, where the tendency was to produce men of affairs rather than men of the schools, and only the other day it was my privilege to hear the present master of the College, my own contemporary and fellow-undergraduate, expound the system of training still carried out there. 'In the government of young men,' he said, 'intellect is all very well, but sympathy counts for very much more.' Here we have the root principle of Applied Anthropology. Here we have in a nutshell the full import of its teaching. The sound administration of the affairs of men can only be based on cultured sympathy, that sympathy on sure knowledge, that knowledge on competent study, that study on accurate inquiry, that inquiry on right method, and that method on continuous experience.
CRITICAL NOTES ON KALHAṆA'S EIGHTH TARĀNGA.

BY E. HULTZSCH.

The subjoined list forms the continuation of my "Critical Notes on KalhaṆa's Seventh Tarānga" in Vol. XL of this Journal (p. 97 ff.). It is concerned with verses 1-1500 of the last Tarāṅga (VIII.) of KalhaṆa's Rājatarāṅgini and registers those readings of my ancient Sārādā MS. (M) which are either preferable to those of Sir Aurel Stein's edition or worthy consideration. The abbreviations are the same as before (Vol. XL, p. 97), but the two MSS. P and E were not at hand during the preparation of this list. In M the following verses of the passage VIII, 1-1500 are preserved either in full or partially:—1-24, 738-1369, and 1495-1500, while the leaves containing verses 25-732 and 1370-1494 are lost. It will be observed that, wherever M is available for comparison, it becomes possible to correct some details of the published text. Every student of the eighth Tarāṅga is therefore recommended to consult this list when using Sir Aurel Stein's excellent edition and translation of KalhaṆa's chronicle.

3. यमाहि M.
13. त्वचिकै M.; read त्वचिकु.
14. Read नमवयानुप्रेरी with M.
17. Read गिथा with D.
149. Read शुद्धया with D.
175. Read वाचिकै with C and D.
252. Read perhaps मयोजी मस्स, मयोजी M, मयोजी C.
296. Read perhaps मयोजी with C, D and मयोजी: गमि.
368. Read धुरवस्था with D.
375. Read द्विनिकै: with N.
490. Read त्वचिकै.
501. Read विनिकात (पातिकाय, C, D, N).
588. बन्यापुरा N; cf. my note on VII, 588.
600. If the reading तन्यायातनविनस्तिकम् is correct, KalhaṆa would have offended against दागिन, VI, 1, 125.
610. Read दागिननान: with D.
708. Read वाचिकै.
715. Read अन्यर्षेय with D.
733. चक्षुस्य M.
737. चक्षुस्य M. Divide अन्यर्षेय or अन्यर्षेय, while Dr. Stein's translation presupposes अन्यर्षेय.
739. Read योगिनास with M.
746. ममधकु M.
747. अन्यर्षेयतिति M; read अन्यर्षेयतिति.
750. Read तवा से with M.

After 756 M. adds the following verse:

विश्वासातीको दुःखग्राही कर्मनापि:।
चन्द्रेऽन्नवजनं सरस्वता राजस्विजयसि।॥

"The commander of the army (stood) at Vihāra Vātiḍa (?) on the Tuṅgāsapaṇa (cf. VI, 190) and the other ministers of the king in the Nandanavana with soldiers.

760. राजस्वम् M.
764. वादनिकान् M.
766. निस्बिद्ध M.

770. चेत्तम M, as suggested by P. Durgaprasad. स्वाभ: M; cf. the footnotes in P. Durgaprasad's edition and in Dr. Stein's translation.

774. कुर्स M; read कुर्सी.

777. Read "बन्त्राभ" with M.

780. "पालिका" नामांकुण्य M.

782. "स्वाभ में" C, N, "स्वाभ " (which seems to be correct) D.

785. विजयनाथ M.

788. बस मारलि द्वारपल M; read बस नामपत्रापि.

790. सम्बन्ध M. Read अन्वितार with M.

798. विषयमुख M.

800. Read "आनंद" with M; cf. VIII, 824.

801. राजा रेवतेश M.

802. पञ्चापि M.

803. नाम for वास M. Read अवात्साधु with C and D.

812. प्रतापकुंड M.

813. Read प्रारंभिक with M; see Pāṇini, VI, 1, 95.

814. "निबित" M.

816. निर्मल M.

817. "वृक्ष" and तकुरस्वा M.

819. स मुखस्थ M.

821. "पुस्क" विनिवेषसम M.

824. खुचिम M. अवात्साधु M, N.

825. Read "निरोधित" with M.

827. Read "सम्मान" with M.

831. "का पञ्चालिका" M.

834. "गोड" M.

844. "गणित" M.

845. "वोदाहितिनादा M.

847. Read "सम्मानसृष्टि स्वातम" and पार्थाजापे with M.

848. Read निहारिका with M.

849. "कुर्सी" M.

850. Read स न्यावासस्थ with M.

858. Read "रेखापूर्ण" with M.

859. अम्लमुखपारस्त्र M.

861. "मुख" M.

862. "करण" M.

863. अन्तरस: M, as suggested by P. Durgaprasad.

864. दबे M.

872. "सम्मानसृष्टि" M.

874. मेघ M.

898. चंडोलघरा M.

899. अक: मध्य M; read "का मध्य.

900. लेखा M.

902. "विनायक" M.

908. Read शाम्भवाची से with M and D
Inwardly this resentful (king) did not change (in his feelings) towards (his) servants.

962. वंदन्या म.
968. सेविका म.
970. पुरुष म.
971. विपुल व.
975. निम्न म.
976. शीश म.
980. केवल न.
989. भरमुक्ति म.
992. राज म.
993. साधा म.
997. गर्भ म.
999. द्राक्षे म.
1002. विशेष म.
1005. शासन नुसार व.
1006. द्वारका म.
1018. धर्मशास्त्र (read धर्मशास्त्र) हस्ता म.
1019. विशेष म.
1021. निम्न म.
1023. शासन नुसार म.
1031. शासन नुसार म.
1033. म full confirms Dr. Stein's conjectural readings.
1048. शासन नुसार म.
1049. पापे म.

The second half of verse 961, which is missing in other MSS., runs thus in म:—

चरणकिरणा तथा गृहा गृहेत्रायार्यमिव: ||
M omits verses 1052 and 1053 and continues thus:

स्त्रीकृतान्तन्यप्रकटियम्
सश्रेयस्निः नृपसम्
सर्वानि ततं न करार नमनाति
मुन्यारोपेतम्भो
मत्सरात्सरसिंधुपापुरुषे
मित्रूपावतिकृषि
षुनादत्

the first of these four lines, which is missing in other MSS., seems to be meant for

स्त्रीकृतान्तन्यप्रकटियम्

"Having won over numerous other Lavanayas (and) having secured horses (for them), he commenced a fight with the horsemen within the city. Then Bhikshu pitched on the bank of the Kshepitika a camp which was regarded with apprehension by the king's ladies from the top of the palace."

1056. राजादानीः M.
1057. राजादानीः M.
1058. राजादानीः M.
1059. राजादानीः M.
1060. राजादानीः M.
1061. राजादानीः M.
1062. राजादानीः M.
1063. राजादानीः M.

Instead of verse 1059 M has the two following verses:

चरित्रसब्जेति
हस्तरूपेऽमर्गि
परिमश्च मुरारोपेति
श्रेयस्निः
पण्डितो भक्तिं गन्धो
कार्यवतः

1066. श्रीजीरो M.
1067. श्रीजीरो M.
1068. श्रीजीरो M.
1069. श्रीजीरो M.
1070. श्रीजीरो M.
1071. श्रीजीरो M.
1072. श्रीजीरो M.
1073. श्रीजीरो M.
1074. श्रीजीरो M.
1075. श्रीजीरो M.
1076. श्रीजीरो M.
1077. श्रीजीरो M.
1078. श्रीजीरो M.
1079. श्रीजीरो M.
1080. श्रीजीरो M.
1081. श्रीजीरो M.
1082. श्रीजीरो M.
1083. श्रीजीरो M.
1084. श्रीजीरो M.
1085. श्रीजीरो M.
1086. श्रीजीरो M.
1087. श्रीजीरो M.
1088. श्रीजीरो M.
1089. श्रीजीरो M.
1090. श्रीजीरो M.
1091. श्रीजीरो M.
1092. श्रीजीरो M.
1093. श्रीजीरो M.
1094. श्रीजीरो M.
1095. श्रीजीरो M.
1096. श्रीजीरो M.
1097. श्रीजीरो M.
1098. श्रीजीरो M.
1099. श्रीजीरो M.
1100. श्रीजीरो M.
1101. श्रीजीरो M.
1102. श्रीजीरो M.
1103. श्रीजीरो M.
1104. श्रीजीरो M.
1105. श्रीजीरो M.
1106. श्रीजीरो M.
1107. श्रीजीरो M.
1108. श्रीजीरो M.
1109. श्रीजीरो M.
1110. श्रीजीरो M.
1111. श्रीजीरो M.
1112. श्रीजीरो M.
1113. श्रीजीरो M.
1114. श्रीजीरो M.
1115. श्रीजीरो M.
1116. श्रीजीरो M.
1117. श्रीजीरो M.
1118. श्रीजीरो M.
1119. श्रीजीरो M.
1120. श्रीजीरो M.
1121. श्रीजीरो M.
1122. श्रीजीरो M.
1123. श्रीजीरो M.
1124. श्रीजीरो M.
1125. श्रीजीरो M.
1126. श्रीजीरो M.
1127. श्रीजीरो M.
1128. श्रीजीरो M.
1129. श्रीजीरो M.
1130. श्रीजीरो M.
1131. श्रीजीरो M.
1132. श्रीजीरो M.
1133. श्रीजीरो M.
1134. श्रीजीरो M.
1135. श्रीजीरो M.
1136. श्रीजीरो M.
1137. श्रीजीरो M.
1138. श्रीजीरो M.
1139. श्रीजीरो M.
1140. श्रीजीरो M.
1141. श्रीजीरो M.
1142. श्रीजीरो M.
1143. श्रीजीरो M.
1144. श्रीजीरो M.
1145. श्रीजीरो M.
1146. श्रीजीरो M.
1147. श्रीजीरो M.
1148. श्रीजीरो M.
1149. श्रीजीरो M.
1150. श्रीजीरो M.
1151. श्रीजीरो M.
1152. श्रीजीरो M.
1153. श्रीजीरो M.
1154. श्रीजीरो M.
1155. श्रीजीरो M.
1156. श्रीजीरो M.
1157. श्रीजीरो M.
1158. श्रीजीरो M.
1159. श्रीजीरो M.
1170. Read कृत्रि नगरे विना with M.
1171. Read स्तन्तकी with M.
1174. Read "बिज विना with M and C.
1175. "देवविलम्ब" M.
1185. "तत् तव म व and N.
1186. Read "सन्तोनस" with M.
1190. मृतमति M.
1192. "सन्तन म, as suggested in Dr. Stein's translation.
1193. "हजाराबाज म.
1194. मृत्यु गच्चखा म.
1198. खेलवान M; read वैरवान. Read व्यसनेवत् with M.
1200. अकृत्वाणो M.
1201. निःसर्ग and व्युह M.
1202. "व्यक्ता" M.
1203. "मानसच्छोकारण म; read "सामान ["स्तन्तकारण] with C.
1205. Read आमन, with M, N, C, D and स्तन्त क with D.
1208. Read perhaps न्याय (for न्याय) प्रभुगिरि.
1221. जानमिद्रि" and "पूरतमाने M.
1223. Read "सन्तानि with M.
1229. "मं जान: M.

Instead of verses 1230 to 1236 of the printed text M has 151 other verses. That the latter are genuinely follows (1) from their style, which is unmistakably Kalhaga's, and (2) from the fact that the published text shows a gap in the narrative between the years [41]39 (verse 1151) and [420]3 (verse 1348), which is filled up by those verses: verse 50 specifies the year 100 (i.e. 1420), verse 79 the year [420]3, verse 117 the year [420]3, and verse 152 the year 1420. This period was occupied by continual fights between Sussala and his enemy Bhiksharahara. Much of this passage is so corrupt that it seems difficult to publish the whole from M alone in an intelligible form. Hence, shall note only the following occurrences:—Pritiviraha is killed by Rithaha and Sylum. (verse 13 f.); Prajii dies (verse 144) in Vaisakha of the year [420]3; Sussala leaves Srinagar for the last time (verse 152).

1237. "हेतु गुरुर कन्तलमस्जन म.
1238. सं सं ब्रह्मान M.
1241. स्तन्तस्विपि: M.
1246. Read perhaps साधिको for साधिका.
1248. "स्तन्तस्विद्यायि म.
1252. सर्वमन्व्यं भेदात M.
1258. चिन्दे M.
1259. Read सुधिकारी with M.
1260. वाहायुपलसप M.
1269. कसरे and "सुधिकारी M, which adds the following verse:—

वाहनावस्थ इत्यादि निष्पर्यस्ति
निम्नलिखितमं सप्तासंविधि

"The beginning of winter prevented the king from inflicting any punishment on the enemies."

1270. "सामे म.
1271. "स्तन्तस्विपि म."
ON THE ORIGIN OF THE NĀRADA-SMRITI.

BY K. P. JAYASWAL, M.A. (OXON.), BARRISTER-AT-LAW.

I should like to draw the attention of orientalists who are interested in the study of the Smritis, to one of the sources of the Nārada-smriti. I brought out the point in the course of a series of articles discussing the connection between the Artha-āṣṭra and the Dharma-āṣṭras.

The procedure law of the Nārada-smriti is greatly based on the Dharmasthātya book of the Artha-āṣṭra of Kaṇḍāliya. In the preface the smriti avows that it is based on Manu, while it seldom follows the Code of Manu. The importance of the Artha-āṣṭra in Hindu legal history is so very considerable that we shall be justified in treating the Book on Law (Dharmasthātya) as a part of the permanent legal system of the Hindus. The Mānav-dharma-āṣṭra1 criticises it, the Yajñavalkya2 borrows from it, and the Nāradasmriti adopts its purely secular treatment and its principles of procedure law.3

---

1 See The Doctrine of Equity in Hindu Jurisprudence, Calcutta Weekly Notes, No. 39, 41, and 42 (1911). (Cf. also the Archiv für Rechts und Wirtschaftsphilosophie, V, 4, where the articles have been discussed.)

2 C. W. N., 1913, No. 38.

3 See NS., Introduction, 2, 7, 10, 11, 37, 39, 40, and AS., verses at p. 150 (ed. Shamsa Sastri); cf. also the laws of evidence in AS., III. 11, with NS. I.; rules about plaint and written statement in AS., III. 1, with those in NS., Intro. II.
A NOTE ON THE "ORIGIN AND DECLINE OF BUDDHISM AND JAINISM IN SOUTHERN INDIA."

I have read with some interest the paper on The Origin and Decline of Buddhism and Jainism in Southern India written by Mr. K.V. Subhrmanya Aiyar and published in the pages of this Journal. I cannot leave the subject without making a few observations on some statements made by the author which are wrong and consequently likely to become mischievous. I shall not trouble myself with the first part, which is based exclusively on the Mahāvamsa, whose authenticity for historical purposes has been questioned by scholars, but shall confine my observations to the latter part. But, before doing so, I shall notice in brief one point. Our author says that the famous Buddha bhikku, Ariṣṭa, who was the maternal uncle of Dhāvanāpiya Tissa, might be the person after whom the village of Ariṣṭāpattī in the Madura District must have been named. There is as much likelihood as for such a supposition. If the Brahmī inscriptions found there call the village by the name Ariṣṭāpattī, we could easily take it to have been named after this Buddha apostle. On the other hand, our friend himself states that one of the Vaṭṭeluttu inscriptions found in that region mentions an Ariṣṭanāme. There is now a probability of the place being called after this person also; so then, one cannot be certain as to the origin of the name of the village. It is apparent that, since this fact came in handy enough to bring home a theory of his making, Mr. Aiyar has utilised it here. I do not mean to say that he himself could not have perceived the difficulty in an identification of the kind he has made.

A similar error is committed by coupling the name of an Ajjananda mentioned in the Tamil epic Jīvottakamītānmai and a similar name found in inscriptions. I would be the first person to accept such an identification if the date of any of the two factors of the identity had been known. Has our author determined the approximate date at least of this Tamil epic poem? Or, does he know the period in which the Jaina dāchīrya mentioned in the stone records lived? If neither of these dates is known, how can we assert that the two Ajjanandis are identical?

From a careful study of the hymn of Tiruṇīṇaṇaṇuṣandhar, one would perceive that he ridicules the curious names of the Jaina gurus, rather than gives a list of his contemporaries of the Jaina persuasion, who lived on the Āṇaimalai hill. He says "As long as I have the grace of Śiva of the temple at Āḷavāḷ (Madura), I would not feel helpless, before the blind fools of Jainas who hail with the names Sandūraṇaṇ, Induśeṇaṇ, etc., and who like monkeys, go about without any knowledge either of the Āryan tongue or of the refined Tamil." The vein of derision is seen when he talks of the swarthy colour of these people, while he describes Kanduśena, an imaginary personage. The very peculiar satirical tone of Tiruṇīṇaṇuṣandhar is visible throughout the verses referred to here. He also plays upon the names of the religions that were in vogue at that time, Andanā (Brahmanism), Arugandar (the religion of the Arhantas), Puttanā (that of Buddha), Sittanā (of the Siddhās), etc.

Another statement which cannot go un questioned is: "The time of the three Āḷavāḷ has been definitely made out. They belong to the latter half of the 8th century A.D., and seem to have held high position in life. What Jhanasambandar and Appar are to the Śaivites, Nammāḷvār and Tirumangai are to the Vaishnavites of the south. The hymns composed by them are equally stirring. Madhurakavi was the minister of the king Neṇunāḷaṇaḷ and Nāmangāḷvār was the magistrate of the town of Āḷavār-Tirunagari in the Tīnnevelly District. It is easy to conceive the amount of influence they might have brought to bear upon the people." Will Mr. Aiyar be good enough to tell us who has made out the time of these Āḷavāḷ and how it is definite? Where is it said that Madhurakavi, the Āḷavār, was the minister of Neṇunāḷaṇaḷ or that Nāmangāḷvār was the District Magistrate of the district of Āḷavār-Tirunagari in the Pāṇḍya kingdom? Was the name of the place in which the latter Āḷavār was a magistrate the same as is given by our author in those days, or did it come to be known after the Āḷavār at a subsequent time? For angh we can gather from the Garuparampara of the Śrīvaishnavas, Madhurakavi, the Āḷavār, was a poor Brāhmaṇa born in Tirukkōṭṛ, long before Nammāḷvār was born, and had travelled far and wide on pilgrimage, and eventually became the disciple and constant companion of his master, Nammāḷvār. He does not appear to be a master in the art of composing sweet verses and therefore called Madhurakavi. For the only composition of his that we have got at present is only a decade of verses in praise of his master. These verses do not speak much for his capacity for making sweet verses. The minister of Neṇunāḷaṇaḷ is called Māraṇ-Kāri (Kāri the son of Māraṇ, Māra-sūṇ), and
was born in the Vaidya-kula in the town of Karavandapuram (Kalakkāṭu in the Tirunelveli District). He was remarkable for his sweet compositions and was also known on that account as Madhurakavi. Except in the matter of identity in the name Madhurakavi, there is nothing to prove that the Áḷvār, a Brāhmaṇa of Tirunakṣār, was the same as the Vaidya of Karavandapuram.

A curious dictum which finds favour with the official epigraphists of Madras is that he who mentions another must be a contemporary of the former. The late Mr. Venkayya held that Tirumangai must be a contemporary of Nandivarman Pallavamalla and Vayiramāgān, because he praises them as the benefactors of certain temples. Similarly, Mānikkalvālāka, who mentions the name Varaguna in his work must be the latter’s contemporary. If to-day someone writes the biography of another, say Mr., Vincent Smith of the life of Asoka, could he be called the contemporary of that Buddhā Emperor?

The most egregious of all the blunders is contained in the statement: 'The proper names of Namāḷvār and Madhurakavi suggest that the former must have been the father of the latter. As Madhurakavi appears to have died at some time prior to A. D. 769-70, if Tirumangai was his contemporary, there is every likelihood of the latter having lived in the reign of Nandivarman Pallavamalla,' (p. 217, f. n. 33). What are the proper names of the two Áḷvār according to Mr. Subrahmanya Ayyar? how does he claim to have identified the first as the father of the second? Does he not know the former was a Brāhmaṇa, while the latter is said to have been a person of the fourth caste? Was not the birth of Namāḷvār unknown to Madhurakavi, and the latter, finding the south glowing with a divine light, traced his steps from Ayōdhyā to seek this light? If all this tradition is idle, I should object to our friend utilising from the idle tales those portions which say that Namāḷvār was called Kārmāṇaḥ, that he was a magistrate (7) of Áḷvār-Tirunakṣār, etc. Most certainly Madhurakavi, the Áḷvār, was not the father of Namāḷvār. I would rather put it that the minister, Māraṇ-Kāri, alias Madhurakavi, was the father of Namāḷvār, and the latter gave the name of his father to his disciple Madhurakavi, the Áḷvār. In that case I am myself prepared to admit that Namāḷvār lived about the beginning of the 9th century of the Christian era. It is no wonder that Mr. Ayyar commits so many mistakes, because he follows only in the footsteps of Venkayya, who is the first to blunder in that manner in the construction of the history of the Śrīvaishnava Áḷvār and Āchāryas.

The article is a fine specimen of working facts into preconceived theories and basing argument on ipse dixit. A wrong theory is tolerable, because, it is ever subjected to examination, while a wrong fact, if allowed to remain uncontradicted, is likely to prove mischievous in the hands of subsequent students of history, who, because this fact has remained unchallenged, would assume it to be true, and in their turn commit serious blunders. By repetition a wrong fact, even a wrong theory, acquires the status of truth. No more glaring instance of this statement could be quoted than the theory of the Gaṅga-Pallavas, which, when facts against it were placed before Prof. Hultzsch, its author, was accepted by him to be no more tenable, but is still frantically hugged by the bosom of its supporters in Indiā. i. e. by scholars like Messrs. Venkayya, Krishna Śāstri and others.

Trivandrum.

T. A. Gopinātha Rao.

COINS OF AMRITA-PĀLĀ, RĀJA OF BADĀUN.

In my Catalogue of the coins in the Indian Museum, Calcutta, vol. I (1906), pp. 244, 249, and Plate XXVI, 6, I described certain rare silver coins of the bull and horseman type under the name of Asṭā-pālā, and doubtfully connected them with the mintage of the kings of Ohind.

Mr. Richard Burn has proved to me that the correct reading is Amrita-pālā, and that the coins were struck by the prince of that name, mentioned in the long inscription now in the Lucknow Museum, and edited by Kielhorn in Epigraphia Indica, vol. I, pp. 61-66. The inscription was found in the ruins of the south gate of the old fort of Badāun, U. P. It treats of the foundation and endowment of a temple of Śiva, erected apparently at Badāun, which is called Vodā-mayāṭā. The record gives the genealogy of a Rāshtrakūṭa Rāja named Lakhanapāla, the younger brother of his predecessor, Amrita-pālā, who is described as having been learned, pious, and valiant. It is possible that there may have been a date at the beginning of line 23, but Kielhorn could not read the characters. The script is that of about A. D. 1200.

V. A. S.

1 Elsewhere I have stated that Namāḷvār must have lived about A. D. 1000, which my subsequent researches have shown to be wrong. I am getting a paper ready on the subject, once again dealing with the Śrīvaishnava chronology in the light of these fresh facts.
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Buddhist, Indian, in Burma, and the Sunda Islands 38, f.; under Ushavadáta ................................................... 230
budha, videsa, kávi q. v. .................................................. 178
Bühler, Prof. and Asóka edicts etc. 23; 27; 159, f., 283, f.; 287; and the Age of Sríhara ... 83
INDEX

buku, small piece of tin .......................... 158
Barmia, and the Sunda Islands, and Indian Buddhists ...................... 38, ff.
Burman, from Ganges Valley .................... 33
Burmane, inscription at Bodh Gaya .......... 286
busek, a gold coin ............................... 128
Buton Thag, E. of Kuchar, has rock-cut caves ........................................................................... 312
bunaiya = buaya ......................................... 86
byza, byza, Port. for vass ................................ 107

cavas = cash, 108 f = 10 to a cent ............... 109
cualain, see caulline, 108 ; tin coin in Maldives in 1602 = 100 cash, ten to a dollar 108 n. 10
cual (tin coin) see caulain 109 n. 12; see caulline .......................................................... 108
Calliana, modern Kalyan ......................... 279
Cambridge University and anthropology 296, ff.
Campbell, and the Andhras ........................ 276, f., 279
candareen, see kandareen .......................... 85
Varma, Chandra Varman .............. 219 f.
cupin = keping ......................................... 97 n. 54
cupin = cupine = keping, a slab of tin 89 n. 27
cus (Malay) = cash ..................................... 214
cash = 1 cent. in modern British Malay money 86; as 1 cent in Dutch Malayan money, 86; of lead, 110; — Malay scales of, very old in India 111, directly connected with system of reckoning cowries 111 f.; — of tin 214, 215 n. 79; — treated as metal cowries 112; — Chinese described 214, f. origin of in Malay countries 113 n. 30a, 125; — tin piece (paisa) 105; — of tin or spelter with trilingual legends 153; legends on 154, ff. stamped with English initials 153; custom regarding hoarding of 153; — used as charms ......................... 156
cash, scales in terms of the dollar: table of West Coast and Perak 239; — Scale of 400, pp. 85, 153, 275; origin of 101, f.; spread in Europe 112; Russian and Malay identical, 112, f.; = 400 dsm to the jalad of Akbar = 400 sel. to the rupee (Mayapur), 111; variants 320 and 384, 154 f. 480 pp. 153, ff. 600; p. 101; 800, pp. 103, 105; — Scale of 1280, pp. 104, 181, 209, half scale (640) pp. 154, 258 reckoned as 160 to the string, 209; 1280=1000, common to all Europe 113, ff., explained 113 f.: — converted into by Albuquerque at Malacca 110; — Scale of 1000, origin of, 101, 108, ff.; see also 105, 127, 127 n. 84; variants 1008 and 1056 pp. 105; — Scales of Chinese, fluctuating 1600, p. 105, f.; 3200, p. 107; 4200, p. 216; 4800, pp. 107, 211; 5600, p. 211; 6400 pp. 108, 274; Chinese zinc, 6000, p. 216; — debased Chinese 25,000 =100,000, pp. 214, 274, f.
cash trees (Patani), 125, 154; = kandareen = 34 cents = 25 to the tree, 104; — half tree is 13 cash ................................................... 104
Castel. in Java ........................................ 41
cathatic, gold coin, 26, gra. = 5 bastardo = 1000 cash = dollar ................................. 109
caul, see kal ............................................. 130
caves and inscriptions ........................... 277, ff.
cazza = Chinese cash ............................. 214, f.
caztai, Port. coin (1511), 6 or 7 to the real 113 n. 30a, cents, scale of 400 rose out of Malay tin currency 110; scale of 1000 rose out of Chinese tin currency ............................................. 110
ceylon, 38; and Baddagoope etc. 39, ff.
Chaccha, Chacha, prince ....................... 267, f.
Chakmaa, family in Harpa stone inscr. 58
chakra, wheel, mark in ................................ 38
challaine, caulain, caul, kalang (tin coin) = keping .................................................. 108
chalya, Kasas et. 195, f.; E. 281
Champy, mixed composition ................... 173
Chandak, brothers, actors of Mathura 246
Chandana, Chahmana k. ......................... 58, f.
Chandii-talatka, song by Bahnabhatta 30
Chandra, Emp., his Meheran pillor inscr. 32; 217, ff.; Chandravarna ...................... 266 n.
Chandragupta I ........................................ 219, 265
Chandragupta II, Vikramaditya and the Gupta era 30, ff.; etc. 148; 160, ff.; and Samudragupta 172 n.; 175 n. 176; 219, death of 234; conquests etc. 244, 247, 265, ff.; and the Andhras 276, 279; B. MS. 26
Chandrajika, Chisina Maha k. ................ 38
Chandrasekar, k. ..................................... 218, f.
chaping = keping ................................... 164, f.
Chargion inscription ............................... 135
Charlemagne, 7th. cent. scale of reckoning 240 denarii to the pound = 960 to the dollar .................. 164, f.
charms, against snakebite, for long life B. MS. 22, 41
Chashtana, Chashtana, Sattap 188, ff., 192; 230; 246
Chatopadyaya, the late Baskim Chandra, and Mujhammedbin Bakhtiyar-i-Khalji .......... 165
chaturmasas, intercalary periods .................. 76
chatus, flattering verses .......................... 174
Chaulukya Jayasimha his Ujjain inscription 258
chaza = cash .......................................... 108
Chebhas, of the Karkarika inscr., and Chebij Khurd in Nasik dist. ......................... 279-
cheling see Kling .................................... 109 n. 13
Chera, Co. ............................................. 71
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDEX</th>
<th>313</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chinda, Chief of Gāya</td>
<td>83, f ; 286, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chin see Kling</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China, visited by Alopen 180; and Hindu</td>
<td>266; and brush writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhism, etc.</td>
<td>B. MS. 34, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chintu of Burma, lion-weight, origin of</td>
<td>117, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choja, dyn., and Paścyā</td>
<td>70, ff ; 164 n, 170; 227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christianity in India</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronology, Indian, book-notice</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chu-chu = Chinese zinc cash</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>churak = ⅓ gantang, measure of capacity</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cintu inscription</td>
<td>248 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Service, Colonial, and anthropology</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Cock' coin, Raffles' in Bencoolen, 127;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in Achi, of 1831, 126 n. 69 a: copper token of 1804...</td>
<td>126n. 73 a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coinage, Malay, origin of Chinese and European 120; origin of scales of</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coins, Burmese, specimens explained</td>
<td>122, ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coins, Guptā 122 and n.; 189 and n.; Mālava etc. 200; 230; 246; 280; 287; of Anrāta.</td>
<td>308; B. MS. 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pāla</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comma, used</td>
<td>42, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comorin, c. Kanyakumārī</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conduri = candareen</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>copang see kungang, money of account=10 pence 213</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>copper coinage in Sumatra in 1811</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>copper-plate grants, of Vākṣa 160, f.; Uj-</td>
<td>258; ancient, mentioning localities in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jain 258; ancient, mentioning localities in Nāsik dist. 269, f.; B. MS. 22, f.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>correction marks</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cosmos Indicopleustes and Kalāh</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coassang see kungang</td>
<td>274, n. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councils, Buddhist</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cow, the</td>
<td>22, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crowies, currency in Singora, 100 to the cash,</td>
<td>153; ganda system of reckoning, 111: money still reckoned in 4000 crowies to the rupee, 111 n. 24: ground for medicine 153 n. 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cross, mark in</td>
<td>B. MS. 40, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crow's foot, kika-pada mark</td>
<td>B. MS. 40, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cruzado, a Portuguese dollar of 8 tangas 108;</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albuquerque's</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cunningham, and the Kushana era etc.</td>
<td>136; 185; 197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cupine-keping, slab</td>
<td>89, 97 n. 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currency, identity of European scales based on counting small articles 115: animal ingota, story of Anathapiṇḍakā 115, f.: in linen cloth, 276: in rice in husk 276; 299, f.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dachinabades, Dachināpātha</td>
<td>278, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dadhichi, rišhī</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dadhichi, (Dahiya) Chacheha, his Kinsariya inscription</td>
<td>267, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dadhikārṇa, Nāga prince</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dadhivāhala, of the Daulātabātī grant, and</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dahivāl in Nāsik</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dahiysa, Rathorse</td>
<td>267, ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>daksha, prāga</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daksha's well inscription, Mandasaor</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dakshamūtra, d. of Nāhapa</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dakshināpatha, Dachinabades, the Deccan, various mentions of it</td>
<td>278 and n. 279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dakshiniyana, season</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>daṇḍa, period of twenty-four minutes</td>
<td>6 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daśgīn, poet 175; 191, 193; The Nyāsakāra and Bhamās 294, f.; 244; and Bhamās 258, ff.; and Atharvāṇīśhārya</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dāru'la'ahān-Mahāsukha-nāgara-Kedāla 118</td>
<td>55; 182 n. 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daśapura-Mandasaor, tn. in the Paścāti of Vatsabhāṣṭi 138, 141, 144, 147, f.; 244, 247</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daśāratha, prince, and Burma</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daśas, Dasus, people of India</td>
<td>77, ff. 82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daśavaras, name in the Ara inscr.</td>
<td>133, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date, of Lakshmanasena 184, f.; of the Muḍra-Rakhasha etc. 265, f.; of some of the Paścyā kings in the 15th sec. 163, ff.; 221, f.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daulātabātī grant, villages in</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deccan, and the fire-cult 82; Dakshināpatha etc.</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delhi Iron Pillar inscription</td>
<td>266 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dēviṣā image inscription</td>
<td>B. MS. 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dē pil, a guild</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dēnga, Russian money—cash 112—sāka</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devabhādra, writer</td>
<td>241, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devagupta, and Chandragupta II</td>
<td>160, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devāṇāpiya Piyadasi, k. in Rock Edict VIII</td>
<td>159, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devanandin, Pujaśāda, and k. Durvindita</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devaputra, from śventa, Kushara title</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devas, and Agastyā 194; and Asuras</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>devatās, spirits of good men</td>
<td>28 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dewas</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhammamacheta, k.</td>
<td>38, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhaninākaśāka, Dhanākaśā, To-nā-kie-te-kia, Dhanayāvātpura etc. modern Dharani-koṣa, Pallava Cap. 230 and n. 281 and n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhanayavāṣṇu, his boar statue inscr. at Eran 31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhīravāman, prince of Java</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dharmakīśa, Buddhist Missionary</td>
<td>266 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dharmapāla, Buddhist Missionary</td>
<td>266 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dharmarākṣa, translator</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dharmāsoka, Āśokā</td>
<td>56 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhitā, g.</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhaulī inscription</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dholpur inscription</td>
<td>247 n.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Gajhwâ inscrip. ........................................... B. MS. 26, f.
Gadgâô kâvâs. ............................................ 190; 243

Gùjâh, elephant. 90 n. 30 = tâmpang. 90; = 224 oz., 90; = 10 cents, 92; = proportion between specimens, 93, 96; measurement of specimens ........................................... 131

gambhr, a form of tin currency, ingot models of animals, 92, f. = string together for carrying 131; = specimens explained, 121, f., 123; = instance of practical use, 96; = scale of, 239; = origin of 129; = analogies with Burma 117, f., other countries 117, Egypt, bull and ring weights 117, China, knife and hoe 119; = spread of, ancient, oriental, 115, f.; = direction of spread 117, 119; = forms transferred to coins 118; = actual weighments, 93; = standard tables of, 93; = bases of scales, pênjîra and kêping (cash), 95; = pieces in circulation, proportions of, 65; = dated specimens ........................................... 131 n. 11

gambhr bâbi, pig ingot ................................... 119 n. 57, 131 n. 15

gambhr timâh, tin model, see gambhr currency ........................................... 127, 239

gambhr uler, snake ingot ................................ 119 n. 57

gâp, of the Mâlâvas ....................................... 199, f.
Gâpâpat, Kâkâtiya k., defeated ........................ 224

ganda system of reckoning cowries by quartets (sets of four) 111: used in fantan gambling in China ........................................... 111 n. 25
Gâpâsâ, at Dondra 41: Gâjâmâna ........................................... 57
Gaâga, kgs. and Kârânâ. 1. 28; and Balâvem-maras .......................... 53, f.
Gaâga-Pâllâvas ........................................... 308
Gâgîghar, well inscribed ................................ 31, 161, 163; 218
Gangee Valley, and the Burmans 38; and the fire cult ........................................... 82

gangâsa, gangâsa, a money of copper and lead in Pegu (1567), 107; 100 to half a ducat, (dollar) ........................................... 107

gantang, measure of capacity ................................ 130

ganî, note on spelter coinage of Pegu (1687) ...................... 119

garlic, treatise on ........................................ B. MS. 37
Gauâ, co ........................................... 83, f.
Gaujâs, the five, Hindu group ........................................... 48 f.
Gaujâs, poets of E. India ........................................... 244
Gaula, Gola, Indian tribe ........................................... 40
Gautama, rishi ........................................... 69
Gautama Siddhârtha ........................................... 82
Gautâmputra Sâkakârî, k., celebrated the Samâyâ ............... 237
Gayâ inscrip ........................................... 248 n., 288, f.
Gersappe or Jog Falls ........................................... 285
Ghanizas Khâan ........................................... B. MS. 9, 14 and n
Ghâtprabhâ Falls, in Belguem dist. ........................................... 285

ghf, energy of Agni ........................................... 25

Girrâr, inscrip. 28, f.; 159, f.; or Urjayat 188, ff.; 231, 243 and n., 245, n. 247

Gobi, desert, has buried cities ........................................... B. MS. 5

God of Madura, Adventures of the .......................... 65, f.

Godfrey MS ........................................... B. MS. 7, 15

Gola, Gaua ........................................... 40

Golanagara or Golamattikânâagara, port in Burma 39, and Kalâh ........................................... 40, f.
gold dust as currency ........................................... 155
gold weights, scale of, at Patani ........................................... 156
Goparâja's tomb inscrip. Era ........................................... 31

Gotama ........................................... 28, f.

Gotami Bâla, q ........................................... 231, 234

Gottamputra Sâkakârî, k., and the Brâhmans 193; date 198; and the Khâkharas family etc. ........................................... 230, f., 233, 279 n.

Gôdavâri Delta, and the Andhra 276, 278, 280, 281

Govindârja, Prabhutiga, son of Krishna I ........................................... 27

Grântha-Pradarsani, Nos. 34–39, "book-notice" 208

Greirger, Prof. and the Mahâpurâsala ........................................... 55, f.
grrîya ritual ........................................... 196

(grievous), a Russian ingot of silver currency = 10 kopek (coin) ........................................... 117

Gruel, preparation of ........................................ B. MS. 41

Gruwendel, Prof., in E. Turkestan ........................................... B. MS. 17

Gujârât, Lîfâ 138, 141; 189 and n.; and the Muhammadans ........................................... 196

Gujârâta, and the Gûjaras ........................................... 200

Gûjarâti and Prakrit ........................................... 288

Gummarâdpîra, Kolar dist., copperplates recently found there ........................................... 204

Gupîjîha, poet ........................................... 30

Gupûl, rock inscrip ........................................... 189 n.

Gupta, Era, 30; 188, 189 and n.; 199; coins 162 and n.; conquest of India 247; inscrip. 249; script ........................................... B. MS. 25, f., 31, f.

Gupta and Varman, suggested surnames of K. Chandra ........................................... 217

Gûjjaras, migration of ........................................... 200

Gîvaksâ, 1., Châhâmâna k., in Harsha stone inscrip., and II ........................................... 58

Gwaliâr, inscrip., 31; dist. ........................................... 247

Haddon, Dr., The Study of Man 78 and n., 79 n., 80 and n., 82

Hîlâ, Ândhra k., whose wife is mentioned in connection with the Bhât-kâthâ ........................................... 278

Hîlâ-Sâtavahana, K. collector of verses ........................................... 30

Halasaga-Mdhâmâya, later Puranic work ........................................... 85

Harappa seals, the three ........................................... 203

Haras, vil. in Jaipur State, and the Harsha inscrip. ........................................... 57, 59

Harishepa's panegyric of Samudragupta, 31, f.; 172, ff.; 244, 245 and n.; prajâstî 188

Hîrâr, 190, f. 247
INDEX

Harsha, Harshavardhana, k. of Kanauj, and Kavya literature ..... 30, 192
Harsha stone inscrip. of Vigarhara ..... 57, ff.
Harshanâtha, g. ..... 59
Harṣidaura, word in Aśoka edict 25; Harṣipura ..... 26
Hastins ..... 25; 257
Hastivarman of Vêngi and Samudragupta ..... 281
Hâthi-gûpâha inscr. of Khâravala ..... 27
Hat-mone (Pahang) direct representative of tin ingot currency 99; origin of weight and form, 91; close connection with spelter and tin coins 119; tables of, 90; specimen explained, 121: ratio to silver money 1 to 7, 91; mint profits on ..... 91
Hebrew plate inscr. and k. Durvinda ..... 207
Héka, hejâduku, horse-dealer ..... 54
Hemachandra, quoted ..... 177; 287, f.
Kenthâ, goose weights of Burma ..... 119
Hîmbâ, ogress, and Vîkaštâ ..... 58
Hieuen Taing, Chinese pilgrim 187; 281 and n.; or Huan Thasang ..... 39
Hijira Era ..... 186
Himalaya, Mts. ..... 233; 246
Himation, Greek custom, in S. India ..... 197
Himavat, Mt. ..... 231
Hînyâna, religion ..... 240
Hindu, Buddhist, Missionaries to China ..... 266
Hinduisation of foreign invaders ..... 246
Hinduism, in Ceylon 41; book-notice ..... 207
Hindu Kush, cradle of the Aryans ..... 78
Hippokoura, Andhra cap. Kolhâpur ..... 280
Hirahadangali plates of Sivakandavarmar ..... 198
History of Aurnângab, book-notice ..... 208
Hole, for binding, in Indian Ms. B. MS. 22, 23 and n.
Horinâi Ms. ..... B. MS. 23, 31, 33 and n. 34
Horinman Museum and anthropology ..... 298
Hukka, tobacco pipe ..... 300
Hultsch Prof. and Aśoka edicts 25; and the Gaśâ-Pallavas ..... 308
Hûpās, in India 247 and n.; and White Huns 249; in the Mudra Râkshasa, 265 and n., 266 and n.
Huvishka, and the Aśa inscr. 133, ff. 246
Hymn, Buddhist, one more ..... 240

Imperial administration ..... 293
India, and Burma 38; and Sanskrit pronunciation 48; Aryan invasion of 77, ff.; S. Brahman Immigration into (contd. from Vol. XLI p. 232), 194, ff.; and the Scythians 246, f.; W., and the Sakan Mlechchhas etc. 265, ff.; E., home of the Andhras 276; 278; 281; S., waterfalls in 285; and the origin and decline of Buddhism and Jainism 307, f.; the introduction of writing materials etc. into, B. Ms. 17, f., 20, 23 and n., 25, ff.; 29, 32, 34, ff.

Indian, Buddhists in Burma and in the Sunda Islands, the peregrinations of 38—41; Chronology, book-notice 236; names assumed by foreign invaders 246; and Japanese Scholars, collaborate 252; Empire ..... 294
Indian Inscriptions and the Antiquity of Indian Artificial Poetry q. v. ..... 29—32; etc.
Indische Studien, and the Kârgâmanidra-stotra ..... 44
Indrâ inscr. ..... B. MS. 30
Indra, g. 17, 19, ff., 65, ff.; 70, ff.; 80, 81 and n.; cult, and Agastya ..... 194
Indra, Raṣṭa k., and the Chalukyas ..... 195
Indrâjí, Pandit Bhagwanlal, and Rock edict VIII ..... 159
Indus-Ganges, Valley, and the Aryas ..... 79
ingot currency, gold in balls ..... 115 n. 41
ingot in two currency, see tin currency: origin of forms 119; dollar unit of, 90; in Lower Persia ..... 91
ink, black ..... B. MS. 44
Inscriptions, and the Antiquity of Indian Artificial Poetry 29—32; 137—148; 172—179; 188—193; 230—234; 243—249
Inscriptions, some published, reconsidered I.
Harsha Stone Inscrip. of Vigarhara ..... 57, ff.
Inscriptions, the Indian, and the antiquity of Indian artificial poetry 29—32; 137—148; 172—179; 188—193; 230—234; 243—249
Inscriptions, in Epigraphic Notes and Questions:—Rock Edict IV, of Aśoka 25, f.; Talegaon grant of the Rastrakuta King Krishna I, 27, f.; Rock Edict VIII, 159; Vâkâtaka copper-plate grant 180; Manda rawsor, of Naravarman 181, f.; (see also 199, f.):—Rock Edict I, reconsidered 255, f.; Ujjan stone inscr. of Chaulukya Jayasimha ..... 258
**INDEX**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inscriptions, in Shwe Dagon Pagoda 38, f.</th>
<th>Kālayani 40; in Java 41; Kāśambha etc. 53; Tamil 54; of Vijayanāla 83; Taxila, Mahānā 133, 134, 135 and n. of Nāravarman etc. 161–168; 185, 187; 189 Pālavā etc. 198; in Ellichpur Temple 221; Delhi Iron Pillar etc. 266 n.; Hāthigumphā cave etc. 27; 277, f.; Nasik 279; Andhra etc. 280 and n.; Pāya 286; of N. India 287; Brahmī 307; from Bādun 308; Gupta etc. B. MS. 22; 25–34</th>
<th>B. MS. 22; 25–34</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>interpunation marks</td>
<td>B. MS. 37</td>
<td>B. MS. 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>invasion of India, Aryan</td>
<td>77, ff.</td>
<td>77, ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran, history of</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iśapur inscr.</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islam, in India</td>
<td>B. MS. 18</td>
<td>B. MS. 18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Jacobi, Prof. and the Kālīyāmāndiratātra 44; on Pāpalya dates 226 n., 227; 249

Jāgirdār, Rajput title 269 n.

Jain literature, references to Buddhist author's in 241, f.

Jaina, versions, two, of the story of Solomon's judgment 148, ff.; temple in Ellichpurā 220, f.

Jainas, Nirgranthas, in inscriptions 29

Jainism, and Hinduism 208; under Kanishka 246; and Buddhism, in S. India, origin and decline of 306, f.

Jaipur State, Harâsa inscr. in 57; divisions of 59, 60

jāṭarāmitta, jostanamitra=friend of fire, applied to Bhasa 53

Jâlor, Râthor territory 267, f.

Jambudīvāpa, Ien-feou-ti 136

jampal=Dutch gulder 101, 238, f.; now rare and obsolete 238 n. 93=half dollar 85, 157; 50 cents 86, 91=30 cents 85 n 2=500 cash 127; in British scale of Malay money 5 kati, 128=6½ lbs., 91=112 oz. = 7 lbs.

Japanese and Indian Scholars, collaborate 252

Jasdan Pillar inscription 189

Jāṭavarman Kulaśekhara, I and II Kings 165, ff.

Jāṭavarman Pārâkrama Pāpalya, K. 166

Jāṭavarman Srîvallabha, K. 166; 225, f.

Jāṭavarman Sundara Pāpalya, L. K. 165, f.; 169, f.; II = 165, f., 221, ff.; III = 166; IV = 166 and n. 228

Jāṭavarman Tribh. Pārâkrama Pāpalya, K. 229

Jāṭavarman Tribh. Sundara Pāpalya, K. 224

Jāṭavarman Tribh. Vikrâma Pāpalya, K. 166

Jāṭavarman Vīra Pāpalya I 165, 171

Jāṭavarman Vīra Pāpalya II 165, f., 170, 227

Jāṭavarman Vīra Pāpalya III 166, 226, and n.

Java and caste 41; table of coins in circulation, 1830 211

Jayachandra, Jayantachandra, Gāhâjavâla K. 84, 286

Jayadâman, son of Châshtana 246

Jayâdeva, Śântideva 52

Jayâditya, referred to by Śâkhârâkârya 233

Jayâvāgañjâ, a commentary on Vâtsyâyana's Kâmasûtra, its real author 202; two works of the name 203

Jayanâtha, his copperplate grant B. MS. 22

Jayanta, Indra's son 7

Jayantachandra, (Jayachandra) 83

Jayapur, and Jaipur 60

Jayaisinha, Chalukya K. 54; and Yâsavarman 258

Jayavarman, his inscriptions 198; 218; B. Ms. 23

Jering in Patani 101

Jînendrabuddhi, Nyâsakâra 258, ff.

Jînasambandar, Śâivite teacher 307

Jog, or Gersappe Falls, on Sârávati riv. 285

joko, see tokens, gambling 155

jongkong tin currency=kati 86; =ampang, 90 n. 32, 157, origin explained, 121; =kâping, slab, 90, 158 f.=in hat-money, 12 to a dollar =260 grs. 90 = 10 cents. 86 = casting of, 132 = as a charm 130, f.

Junâgâj rock inscription 31; B. Ms. 31, f., 34

Kâbul, and the White Huns 249

Kâśambha, inscription 53; 198

Kadamba script B. Ms. 30

Kâdombari, a romance by Bânavahâja 30

Kadhphises, Kushana K. 136

kâkâpaya, meaning of, ' coin not 'gold mohar' 116; compared with the dinâra of Kashmir 116

Kahâti, pillar inscription 31; B. Ms. 30

kâsupara, title of Kâpiâsha 136

kâkâ-pâda, crow's foot mark B. Ms. 40, f.

Kâkâsika monks 20

kal=pach, measure of capacity 130, n. 2

Kalâchuri, Kâçehchuri, and other forms 297 and n.

Kalâh, Golanagara and Point de Galle 40, 41 and n.

kalâng (tin coin) see chailâna 108, see cailâm 109 n. 10

Kalâsa, and the Amazons 249

Kâlalâsâka, k. 56

Kalâhâna's Eighth Tarâsâga, critical notes on it 301, ff.

Kâlïdâsa, poet, date of, etc., 29, f.; 247; copied by Vatsabhâti 142, 146, 148; quoted 177; 244 and n., 245; 248, 249 and n.; and the Huns 266 and n.
Kaliyā, ancient Calliæa
Kalyāṇā, inscriptions, at
Kāmaṇḍukā, author of the Nitisārā
Kāmaśītra, a work by Vatsyāyanā, and the Jayamāgala
Kāmbojas, a people
Kapāsava, inscription, at
Kanauj, and the Guptas 175, n., 178; Hindu province
Kānchipuram, Pallava cap.
kongan, coarse cloth, used as currency 160—
180 cash
Kauśikā, in the Ara inscription 133, f., probably Kāśikā II; 136, f.; and Buddhism etc.
Kanānū, Co. of the parthenos
Kantideva, K.
Kāṇyakūṭa, K., and śrīharsha
Kanyākumārī, C. Comorin
kappag=kupang, money of account 105, n. 98
Kapilavastu, tn.
Kārashahr, in E. Turkestan
B. Ms. 1 n.
Kārakara, the Kātkā tribe
Kāravandupuram, town in Tinnevelly district, birth place of Mānāg Kāri
Kārārāja, inscription of
Karle inscription
Kāshgar, in E. Turkestan
B. Ms. 1 n.
Kashmir, dūtra of, compared with the kahapa 116; and the Huns 266 and n.; and Saivism 271; and the birch tree etc., B. Ms. 19;
31, and n., 33 n., 35.
Kāśyapa, intercalary month
kathā, akhyatākā
Kāthiāwār, and the Kathrapas
189 and n.
katri, 1 to Malay pound, 94; lower standard of Malay weight, 94, usually 1½ lbs, 90, 128 n.
90; 1 lb. 90 = 1½ lb. 209; basis of a scale in gambar currency, 95=40—80 dollars by weight, 129=kupang, 86=jongkong, slab of tin, 158=bundle of ten strings of cash, 1 dollar 110—in terms of cents to the dollar, 86=22¼ cents, 90=10 cents, 86, 129=basis of modern Malay monetary system, 94—
Malay=12 Chinese = 300 to the bahara
Katkarı Tribe, the Kārakara
Kansambhā inscription
B. Ms. 27
Kausiliya, his Arthasastra and the Nārada Smṛti
kavi, or bhāṣa or vidvāna cultivators of Sanskrit poetry
kavirāja, poet laureate
Kāvyā, Sanskrit and Prakrit artificial poetry of the Court, and Indian Inscriptions 29—32;
137—148; 173—179; 188—193; 230—234
Kējama, the, and the Kalyāṇamandirastotra
kēśān=kgīng
105, 181 n. 42
Kedah, near Penang, and Kalah 40, 41 and n.; or Selang or
87 n.
Kedah, old tin coinage 102, f. = Mahasukha Nagara=Dār-ūl-amān
182 n. 41
Kelantan currency
101
kēndēri=candareen, 85, 154: 156 n 29 — as a standard weight ½ tali, 101=pēnjaru, 108
n 11=25 cash 102—a gold coin in Pahang 128
kēndēri perak (Silver candareen) 85=81 cents, 86=Cents
238, n. 95, 95
kēndēri=kēndēri
86 n. 7
kēpung=cash 101 n. 74, 155=Copper cash, 101=Tavernier’s piece of 4 deneers, 103—
Copper coin=half a duit
89 n 2
kēping, a slab of tin, 87, 90 n. 31a, 158=50
lbs. 91=52½ lbs. 90 = 37½ and 38½ kati, 128 n. 91=75 kati, 128=6 and 8 to the bahara 129; 8 to the bahara historically, 100—substituted for the great tali, bundle, owing to improvement in casting 98 n 60
kēping, cash: lowest denomination of Malay weight, 94—basis of a scale of Gambar currency, 95=kupang, 85 n. 1—origin of 88 to the dollar
106
keping=cash, 101 n. 74, 127=ār bit, piece, 83 n. 2—unit of Malay coinage, 127=¼
Dutch duit=¼ cent
157
Kern, Prof., and Aśoka edicts
25, ff.
kād: vīya, māmaṃ, viññāta
Khāri-sa-garā-jāaka, a story
27
Khakhara, Khasahārā family conquered by Gotamputa Śātakaśi
230
Kharavela, k., his Hāthigumpa inscription 27; and the somāja 257; and Śātakaśi
277
Kharaubhā inscription, of Ara 132, f.; War
dak
135
Khāv, town, inscriptions from B. Ms. 28, 30, 31
Khotan, in E. Turkestan
B. Ms. 1 n.
Khi-lde-ron-btsam, Tibetan k.
52
Khudai-nameh, a lost work
252
Kielhorn, Prof., and dates 29; and the Harsha stone inscription 57, ff.; and p. the Māndar inscriptions, 162; 244, 245, and n. 247 n. and
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>163-165</td>
<td>Paññiya dates 163—165, 167, t, 170, 229 ff.; and the Suraśvāti plates of Buddharāja</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>kilin</em> of China, <em>kiri</em> of Japan, connection with the to of Burma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>kirtimālakṛtī</em></td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>King Chandra</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kings, Paññiya, of the 13th cent, some new dates of</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Kinsariva</em> inscription of Dadhihiya</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>kira-kēpa</em> (slab)</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Kirtinārāyika</em>, g.</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Kirtirivali</em>, the creeper of fame</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Kirtivarman</em>, L. W. Chalukya K., and the Brāhmaṇa</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Khakhtindhā</em>, C.</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Khakhtindhā</em>, a work by Tulasi Dāsa</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Kling</em>, derivation of</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Kokang</em> = <em>kung</em> 110 n. 17; cause of confusion</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Kollāpur</em>, Hippokoura</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Koçemadi</em> grant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Kone Shahr</em> ancient city, in Qum Tūr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Konu</em>, conquered</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Konyvram, and the Brāhmapa</em></td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Kosikalvishya, and Kuṣāgala</em></td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Košala</em>, tn., and the Burmese kings</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Kusales</em> and Chalukyas</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Kṣesam image inscription</em></td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Kṣaṭu, apīna</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Krishṇa</em>, g., and the <em>sampradāya</em> 196; and the <em>sandhya</em> feast</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Krishṇa</em>, Andhra K.</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Krishṇa I., Rāṣṭrakūta K., his Tālegaon grant</em></td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Krishṇa</em>, district, and the Andhras 276, 278</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Krishṇaṇaga, K.</em></td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Krishvakā, Paññī, poet</em></td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>kṛta</em>, years of Mālava era</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>kṛta-saiva-jīte</em>, word in Mandarśa inscription</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>162, suggested meanings of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Kshaparāśa</em>, and Khakharāta clan 230; and the Andhras</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Kharatīyā, as bālakhaśa 82; and the Andhras 279 n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Kahaya, Akshaya</em></td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Kahemardarja</em>, author of the <em>sīra-satva-vimaranānti</em> 271, or Kahemendra</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Kahudrukas, Panjab warriors</em></td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Kumbja</em>, Vishvuvardhana, founder of the Chalukya dynasty</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Kuchar</em>, (Kushā and other forms) scene of its discovery B. M. 1, ff., 5-15; 19, 24, 28</td>
<td>32-36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Kujula Kadphales, Kushana K.</em></td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Kulasikhara, Paññiya R.</em></td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Kumāra</em>, g.</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Kumāragupta, K. 31; 135; 144; 218; 244; i inscription of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Kumāragupta—Mahendarāya, k.</em></td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Kumārajīva, translator</em></td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Kumārigrāma, Karehgaon, village in Telegaon grant</em></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Kumarla’s acquaintance with Tamil</em></td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Kundotharan, retainer of Śiva</em></td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Kuṇīgala, Kuṇīgalkalvishya, ancient Kuṇūgali</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>kuṭumang = kēpa</em></td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*kuṭumang, Malay weight = kati, 86 = tampang 157;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>kati</em> 161 n. 72, 153, f.—in British scale of Malayan money, 85 = 1 cent, 110 = 10 cents 86,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>128 n 84 = money in Java (1416), 110, running 1280 to the kati 110 = in Achīra = bālakhaśa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>254=5 doz. piece, 106, 233, 1 f. = 10 to the pārada (dollar)</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>kurakura</em>, tortoise, 88 = 70 oz. of tin, 90 = specimen 132; varying sizes of 130 n, 7,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>proportion between them, 96 = in hat money = 1 dollar = 1040 grs.</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>kurakura 88</em>, large tortoise, gambar currency, 70 oz. value 64 bathing 162 cents</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>kurakura bālakhaśa</em>, small tortoise, in gambar currency=22 oz. value 10 cents</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>kurakura pānangas</em>, middle tortoise, gambar currency=50 oz. value 25 cents</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Kusana, inscriptions 134; era, and the Mālava-Vikrama 136; inscription B. M. 27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Kushanaas, Northern Šakas</em></td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>kēta</em>, kēta, measure of capacity</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>kuu</em>, a dollar of zinc Chinese cash, in accounts 216</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Lacuna</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>lada</em>, a gold coin</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>La Dame Blanche, Fall of the Sharavati riv.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>285, 286 n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Laghuthāra</em>, the, and the date of Lakshmanesana</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Lagor</em></td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Lahore Museum, has the Ara inscription</em></td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Laidlaw, G. M., correspondence on Malay tin currency</em></td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Lakhanapāla, Rāṣṭrakūta rāja, in Badān</em></td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Lakshmanesana, Lakshramesha, date of 185, ff., 289</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Lakhor</em></td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*takson = 10 pēks = $ dollar (Java)</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Lākula</em>, sect</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Lālā, Chhinnda</em></td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>lamb weight and money of the Jews</em></td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>languages of Europe, of one group</em></td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Laṅkā, Ceylon</em></td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index Entry</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lātha, Gujarāt</td>
<td>138, 141</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Coq., Dr. A von., and Miss. in Turkistan B.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS. 1 n. 3 and n., 9 n. 11, 13, 15, 16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left, and Right Hand Brahmaṇ Sections</td>
<td>197</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lehmann, Dr. and the Parsi.</td>
<td>232</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liaka Kusula, Satrap</td>
<td>189 n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library, Imperial, of St. Petersburg, has the Petrovsky Ms.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Līgēsh currency</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Līgōr, coins of</td>
<td>184, f.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lilāgrāma, Nasik dist., and Nilgavhān</td>
<td>269</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature, Sanskrit Kavya 29; Dravidian spread of 196; Jain, references to Buddhist authors in, 241, f.; Sanskrit, theory of the Renaissance of 243, ff.; maxima or syayas in, 250 here=franc, old French... 102 n. 84 London University, and anthropology 296-298 lotus, white, padma, B. MS. 38, 39, 40 and n. Liders, Prof., and the meaning of kākāṭika</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>māyaka, a gnat</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macartney Ms.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macc., Massaie, Malay gold currency</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madhāinagar. Copper-plate grant</td>
<td>187</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madhavachārya, author of the Saravardhana-Saṃgraha</td>
<td>272</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madhyadesa, town, and Sāntideva</td>
<td>50, f.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madra, his Khaṭāṇa pillar inscription</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madra's inscription, and the Pāṇḍyās</td>
<td>223</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madura, Adventures of the God of 65, ff.</td>
<td>227</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madurakavi, Āyār, and Mārag Kāri</td>
<td>307, f.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magadhā, c. and Sāntideva</td>
<td>51, f.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māgadhā, lang, and Buddhism</td>
<td>205</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahābala, Buddhist missionary</td>
<td>266 n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahābhārama, the, 65; mentions Māṇḍūla 67, 71; and the Māḷavas</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahābhāshyā, the, date doubtful 30; citations from</td>
<td>245</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahādeva (purāḍa) town in Jaipur State, Harsha inscription at 67; and Jayapura</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahādeva-giri, home of Vasugupta</td>
<td>271</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahākāta, Makubōvāra inscription</td>
<td>207</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahāmātrās, in Rock edict VI</td>
<td>282, ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahānāma, kitchen</td>
<td>257</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahārāja, Kushana title</td>
<td>136</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahārāstrī, lang. used by Andhra K.</td>
<td>278</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahāsādeva-raja, his copper-plate grant B. MS. 22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahasukha Nagarā, Kodah</td>
<td>182 n. 41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahāvagga, the, and Burmese Buddhism</td>
<td>38, f.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahāvānas, book notice</td>
<td>55, f.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahāvatsa, the, and the Pali canon 206, and the Dharmapada</td>
<td>206</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahāvrāchārya, S. Indian mathematician</td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahāvira-Vardhamāna, and the Jainas</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahāyāna, religion</td>
<td>240</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahendrapāla, K., and Rājaśekhara</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahinda and Ceylon</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahpāla, k., and Rājaśekhara 29; I, Gauja k.</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mairamuhāra, period of time</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mantrāyantarīya Satākiśa, and sacrifice 19; quoted</td>
<td>20, f.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majhgawām, town, land grants at B. MS.</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malabar, and female rule</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malacc and Buddhism 41; East India Coy's coinage in</td>
<td>106</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malau, Malauque, silver coin of 416 gns., 5 bastaar=1000 cash=dollar</td>
<td>109</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malay Currency, origin of existing legal, 214; synopsis of 273, ff.; European influence, 274, Dutch 273, f.; Spanish, 273; Indian influence 275, f.; native system 275, f.; of account by weight</td>
<td>276</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malay monetary system, modern based on the katu, 94; Marsden's scale (1811), 102; effect of European commerce on</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malay money, Standard Tables, 85; table in terms of cents, 86; Dutch popular scale, 85; referred to two scales, 87, British and Dutch</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malay tin currency, dual form of, 89; referred to two scales, 87, pagoda and sugarloaf, 90; specimens</td>
<td>87, ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malay, Dravidian, mountain</td>
<td>267 n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malayamandāra, Pa ya, k.</td>
<td>67, 70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malayagiri, and the story of Solomon's Judgment</td>
<td>148, 152</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malāva, era, and the Vikrama 31; and the Kushana</td>
<td>136, 247 and n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malāvas, the Gāgasūthī of</td>
<td>199, f.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malayaketu, Mlechchha K., the identification of, and the Muḍra Rākṣasa 265, f., or Salayakelū</td>
<td>267</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malū, Panjab warrior tribe</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malik-al-'Adil on coins; alternative reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malik-ī', full value, legal tender</td>
<td>90 n. 24, 183</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malik kaft, sacked Madura</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malikā script</td>
<td>227</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mallīyā script</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mallinātha, his explanation of Māghadāta</td>
<td>248</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mālāvā, conquered by Chandragupta II</td>
<td>148</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mālāvā, feudatory princes of 162; conquest of 189; and the Māḷavas</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mammaja and Bhūmaha</td>
<td>262</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mānaśā, bhādanta</td>
<td>256</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māṇalūr, traditional Pāṭya cap, 66; Manipura</td>
<td>67, 70, 72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index Page</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>321</td>
<td>INDEX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Manandasor inscription of Naravarman** 161
- **Māśīca, māśiccha, etc., stool, chair** 255 and n., 256
- **Mandara, m.** 231, f.
- **Manandasor, inscrip. 31, f.** or Manandasor, Man-
dasaur 161, f. 199, f. 218, f. 266 n. B. Ms. 25
- n. 27, 30
- **Manandasor—Daśapūra ṃapati** 244 and n. 247
- **Maṅgālāśṭhāna temple, Madurā dist., inscrip-
tion from** 167
- **Maṅgalā, Mother of Sumatśavāmī, and Solo-
mon’s judgment** 149
- **Mangalśa, Chalukya K., and Budhārāja** 207
- **Maṅgilā, inscription found at** 269
- **Maṅipūra, and Maṅalur** 67
- **Maṅjūśrī** 50
- **Maṅjūvajra, guru of Śāntideva** 50, f.
- **Maṅjūvarṇī, father of Śāntideva** 50
- **Mankūwar image inscription** B. Ms. 27
- **manasa** 275 n. 12
- **Maṅṣa, in Mysore, Maṅṇapura, Maṅṣānagaro** 28
- **Manashehrai, inscrip.** 25, 169
- **mantra, various sizes of** 130 n. 3
- **Maṅṇapura, Gaṅga royal residence, Maṅṣāna-
garro, Maṅṣa in Mysore** 28
- **Maṅra, demon** 27
- **Maṅra Kāri, minister of Neļuljājāyīya 307, 308
- **Maṅrarāvarna, Kulaśekhara I. 165, 166 and n., 171, 172, 223, 227, 228, 229
- **Maṅrarāvarna Kulaśekhara II 166, 226, 228, 229
- **Maṅrarāvarna Sarasvātabha, K.** 165, 166, 171
- **Maṅrarāvarna Sundara Paṅgīya I, 164 n., 165—168
- **Maṅrarāvarna Sundara Paṅgīya II, 165, f. 168, f.
- **Maṅrarāvarna Sundara Paṅgīya III** 166
- **Maṅrarāvarna Tribh. Kulaśekhara K.** 171, f.
- **Maṅmarāvarna Tribh. Sundara Paṅgīya** 226
- **Maṅmarāvarna Tribh. Vikrama Paṅgīya, K.** 224, f.
- **Maṅmarāvarna Vikrama Paṅgīya K.** 166
- **Maṅmarāvarna Vira Paṅgīya 164 and n., 165, 166, 170
- **Maranča, 372 to the dollar in Philippine cur-
cency** 273
- **Martha, m.** 268; 293, 295
- **Marthāja, son of Aditi** 19, f.
- **Mātrārā, and the Dāhāiyās** 268
- **maṭha, massie, 89—99: 50 cents—89:**
  1: paṭana (dollars 14d, 253:)—jumāla 159
- **maṭha (ṭīr) a gold coin** 154
- **Mašero, and female rule in Egypt** 68
- **Maṭabouning, bird’s eye, Maṭabouning** 212
- **Maṭači, Maṭišči, Dravidian word in Vedic
  literature** 235
- **Maṭhārā, inscription, 135 and n.; the eastern limits of
  Sāyan conquest 246; 247; inscrip.
  B. MS. 26, 28, 30
- **Māṭṭheśa’s temple of Vīṣṇu in Gwalior** 31
- **Māṭṭivinashu, and Dhanayavirah, their Eraq
  pillar inscrip.** 31
- **Maṭhahara, genealogy of** 32
- **Mauri Timūra, near Khānu, Khotan B. Ms. 14
  Max Müller, and the Aryans, 78, 81 n. and
  Sanskrit literature 245, 247; and Indian
  248, f. Maxim and nayga, some met with in Sanskrit
  literature** 250, f.
- **nayum-piṭh, a gold weight, 86 n 8: a gold
  coin** 128
- **Mayidavola plates of Sivākandavarman** 198
- **Mayūrākāhaka, his Gādghār well inscrip.** 31
- **Mayūrāvaran, k. of Kādamba, and the Nam-
budris** 105; 198
- **medicine** B. MS. 20
- **Neḷhagirī, Muktāgirī** 220
- **Mṛgasthena, the Andhras of his date** 276
- **Neḷvadāta, i. 244, f. 248
  Moherauli Iron Pillar inscrip. 32; Mohēraulī,
  and K. Chandra** 217—219
- **nulamba, a mint mark 123, 132: means a tim-
  mine recovered shelf 237 n 89: derivation of
  157 Monander** 267 n
- **Meru, m.** 231, 232, and n.
- **Mihirakula, K.** 31; 247 and n., 265 n.
- **Mīhrāuli inscriptions** B. Ms. 27
- **Milk, energy of Sōma** 23
- **milīra-dollar** 110
- **Mīmāṃsā, the** 198
- **Ming, groups of rock cut caves in E. Turkes-
tan B. Ms. 4 and n., 5 and n., 9—14, 16, f. 34 n., 36
  Minhāj-ud Din, author of the Tabāqat-i-Nāṣirī
  185, 186 and n., 188
- **Miraj grant** 207
- **Misconceptions about the Andhras** 276, ff.
- **Mitra, G. 19; Mitra 23; 81, cult of** 83
- **Mīśeḥṛa, words in the Vedas** 201
- **Mīśeḥṛa, Saka, of W. India, and Chandra-
gupta II** 265, ff.
- **Mōdi, Dr. J. J., and the Khudai-nameh** 252
- **Mōga, K.** 189 n
- **Mōguliputta, Tissa, K.** 39
- **Monday, cult** 65, ff.
- **Mōnk, Buddhist** B. Ms. 29, 34, 35
- **Monotheism and polytheism** 81 n.
- **Mōṣn, Mōṣma, riv.** 270
- **mother** 293
- **Mās., from E. Turkestān B. Ms. 2 and n., 3, 5—
  11: 18 pagination of, 20—22, binding** 23
- **Mudra-Rākha, the, and the identification of
  Malayaketu** 265, ff.
- **Mūnammad bin Bakhtyār-i-Kāliji and the
  conquest of Bengal** 185, ff
INDEX

Muhammadans, in South India 196, f.; and
Pāñjāla Kingdom 226, ff.; B. Ms. 17.
muhāra, period of time 6 and n.
mukhata, word in Rock Edict VI. 234.
Muktakīri, Meḥūgāri, Salvation Hill 220.
murder, ceremonial 295.
Museum, Lahore, has the Ara inscr. 132; British 135 n.; and the Macartney Ms. B. Ms. 2 n.

Nadiya, invasion of 187.
Nāgābarha II., Negāvaloka, Pratīhara K. 58.
Nāgārjuna, and Dhanakāśaka 280.
Nāgārjuna, inscription, B. Ms. 30.
Nāhāpāna, satrap 230, 246; and Nāmabhu 279.
nārāṇa, trading body 199.
Nālandā, to, visited by Sāntideva 50, f.; nāsākī, nāsākāra, salutation 137.
Nāmabrū Bhārmansa rise of, etc. 195, f.; Nāgda, name in the Ara inscr. 134.
Nāmāvār 307, 308 and n.
Nānāgātā cave-figures 277.
Nanda, the, and Chandragupta 266.
Nandu, image in Harṣadeva Temple 57, ff.; Nandisūta, the, and the story of Solomon’s judgment 148, f. 132.
Nārādana-Nārangita, the, origin of 306.
Nārāsīhagupta, K. 247.
Naravaran, his Manandasa inscr. 191; or Mandasa 218.
nárī̄gh, tobacco pipe 300.
nāmāśa, phrase 33.

Nasik, Inscrip., from the nineteenth year of Śirṣapumālyi 230—234; 246; 277; 279, 280 and n.; and the Brāhmaṇa 198; prāṇa 243 and n.; 246; district, note on localities in it, mentioned in ancient copper-plate grants 269, f.
Natural sciences 291, and anthropology 297.
Navasāhāsāka, a bīruda of the Paramāra K. 85.
Nindhā rāja of Mālīva 183.
Navasāhāsākāscharita, two works of the name 287.
Negri Sembilan, scale of money 184.
Neolithic populations and the Āryas 78.
Nepal, religions of 41.
Nepalles, Ms. B. Ms. 23; ins. 27.
Nērur plates 207.
Newārī, character in palm-leaf Ms. 49, f.
Newbold, Capt., and the Jōg Falls 236 n.
mīṣhī, mīṣhī, word in Rock Edict VI. 282 and n.
Nīgranthas, Jainas 29.
Nirmand inscription, B. Ms. 34.
Nirvāṇa, era 186, f.; 286, f.
Nīruḍa-Bhakti, Jain work 220.

Nizam’s Dominions, folklore from 284.
Note, on Śiva Bāhgavata 190; on the Mandasor inscription of Nārāvarma 192; on a few localities in the Nāsik district, mentioned in ancient copper-plate grants 269, f.; on the origin and decline of Buddhism and Jainism in Southern India 307.
Notes, some, on Buddhism 205; critical, on Kālhana’s Eighth Turanga 301—306; and Queries, on Anthropology 299, ff.; 292, f.; 298; and Questions, Epigraphic 25—28; 159.

numeral signs B. Ms. 37.

Nyātākāra, the 204.
Nyāsākāras, Jinda-dibuddi, etc. 258—261.

Ockhamśplal Pillar inscr. 189.
Oldenberg, Prof., on Kushnera dates 137; and Buddhism 205, f.

Ona, sacred symbol B. Ms. 21, f.

ordain, by fire, for books 53.

Oriental research, Asiaties’ 252.
Origin of the Nārāda Smṛti 306.
Origin and Decline of Buddhism and Jainism in Southern India, note on 307, f.
Orissa, and Ukkel 39.
Orthography of Harsha Stone inscr. 67.
Oxford University and Anthropology 296—298.
Oxydrakas, Panjab warrior tribe 200.
Ozene, Ujjayini 188.

Pājāḷavatāpana, of the Daulatabad grant, Paḍalā, in Nāsik 270.
Padma, White Lotus, mark B. Ms. 38.
Padmagupta—Parimala, author 287.
pagination of Ms. B. Ms. 20, ff. 29.
Pagoda form of Malay tin currency 87.
Pahladpur inscription, B. Ms. 34.
paisa in tin=cash 105.
Pātāma, astronomer 248.
Pātīsthāna, Pratīsthāna, Baitthana 230; or Pāṭīha, B. Ms. 23, 278, ff.
Palaekography, Bühler’s Indian, B. Ms. 29, 30, 33.
Pātiśa Can, the 205, f.
Pātt land-grant B. Ms. 27.
Pallava, inscr. 198; grant B. Ms. 23 and n., Script 30, copper-plates 31.
Pallavas and Andhras 328, 328 n.
Palm-leaf, Ms. of the Bodhikārityaśatāra 49, ff.
as writing material B. Ms. 17 and n. 23.
INDEX

Pañcâladesâr, rock temple in Poona ..... 28
Pañchamañjala, a work by Rîpachanda 42, f.
Pañchavaliikrama, festival ..... 41
Pañchavastu, home of Agastya ..... 194
Pañđu, the sons of, as statues in Harshadeva
temple 57, or Pañdźavas ..... 58
Pañḍya kings, in the 13th century, on some
new dates of ..... 163, f; II, list, 165; III
tentative arrangement of 166; IV, analysis of
dates ..... 167—172; 221—229
Pañḍyan kings and the God of Madura etc. ..... 65—71
Pañpi, and the pronunciation of Sanskrit 47, f.,
and the Panjab warriors 200; and the Kârâks
cana co. 206; quoted ..... 259, f.
Panjab Valley and the Aryan:
paper, its introduction into India B. M. 17; ..... 78, f.
18; 32
Parakramabahu, k. of Ceylon, and Tribh.
Kulasâkhâra ..... 229
Paramârâ, dyn., and Chaulukyas Jayasimha ..... 42—46
Pâraśâkhas, a people ..... 249
Parbatsar, Râhâot territory ..... 267—269
pardo = dollar, 105, 253; —rix-dollar of
account=4s. 8d. ..... 233, f
pardo de reale, Portuguese dollar of 7 tagas ..... 256
Parlakshita, g. son of Yudhishtira ..... 77
paris = word in Rock Edict VI, 282, and
sanâga ..... 283
Parsi, customs ..... 252
Parthenios, g. of Kanyakumâri ..... 68
Parvataka, Philippes, Piribô, etc., Saka Satrap,
murdered by Chandragupta II 265 and n. ..... 267
paryâka, mastîka ..... 255 and n. ..... 256
patachîne, rix-dollar of accounts ..... 108
patah, slab or sheath, (phît) 89 n 28; = ¼
kati, 97; —large = pânjñura = tali, 90; small,
=5 oz. = 14 oz., 90 = wâng = half buaya ..... 90
patak = 24 cash (Java) ..... 276
Pâtaliputra Council of 39; Gupta cap. etc.
175 and n; in the Mudra-Râkshasha 265—
267 n.; B. Ms. 26
Patalunga Currency ..... 101
Patani Currency 101; —provinces of ..... 153
Patanjali, and the Saïva Sect 180; and the
Kârâya style ..... 245 and n.
Pattak, Prof., and Vâkõâka's copper-plate
grant ..... 160, f.
pattîs = pîtis ..... 247, n. 7
Paulina, astronomer ..... 248
pecco see pach ..... 275 n. 13
pecul see pikul ..... 87
Pedda Vêgi, Vêgi ..... 281
peku, string of cash ..... 275 n. 13
Pelliot, M., and Mas. B. Ms. 2 n. 3 and n.; 8—14, 16
Penang, E. I. Co.'s currency in ..... 105
Penang, scale of money ..... 157
pânjûra, ingot tin, =1¼ oz. 91 = ½ kati = 8 to 10
talî 128 n. 88; 12—20 to the dollar, 128, 129;
=half tali, 90, 94 = kândrî, 10 8 n. 11; =
6½ cents; 91; = 62½ kâping (cash) ..... 127
penning = ½ doit = 2 picces = double paisa ..... 273
Perak, scales of tin ingot currency 104, f.;
old coinage of ..... 102, f.
perak = kândrî, a silver coin = 61 cash ..... 86 n. 7
perak naga, dragon, silver = canton dollar ..... 154
perak tongkat, staff silver = British dollar ..... 154
peregrinations of Indian Buddhists in Burma
and the Sunda Islands ..... 38—41
Persia, the, and the Dachmabade region ..... 278
Persis, coins of ..... 183
Perumbârapûlûyûr, tin. anointment of heroes at
Persia, and the soma cult 81; 82; and the
Huns ..... 296
Pese, Portuguese cash 86 n. 4; —see pitis, 85—
mean weight and = cash, 104; = laid =
cash, 159; = 1,000 to the dollar, 101,= ruis,
1,000 to 1,200 to the mîre or dollar unit 104 n 89
Peshâwar, ancient Purushapura ..... 134; 246
pesë = pitis ..... 86
peso, Philippine currency = dollar ..... 273
petis, see pitis ..... 210
Petrie, Finders, Prof. and religion ..... 81 n.
Peterovsky, Ms. ..... 2, 9—11, 14 f.
Philippus, Pîribo, etc., and Parvataka q. e. 265 and n.
pikâ, a gold weight = mayam, not the same as
pikâ ..... 86 n. 7
pikâ, tin ingot = ½ lb. 91 = ½ kati, 128 =
talî = 3½ wâng = 125 cash, 86, 127; = 10 cents
86 = 12½ cents ..... 91
pice, tin coin, Penang, 213; = paise in Mer-
gui and Savoy (1839) 105; = 16 to the kati
275 n. 11; = cents 105, 275; = 100 to 120 to
the dollar, 213; 4—20 to the dollar, ..... 214
pickâ = pitis, 86; —a small tin coin 211; =
Chinese cash ..... 211
pîcë = pititil ..... 200
pie, a spelter coin of Bombay (18th cent.) 50 to
the rupee ..... 110 n. 22
pikul, Malay cut, = 13½ lbs., and 133 lbs. 89,
91; = 140 lbs. 99; 3 to the bahar, 87; 128 n. 89, 209; = 100 kati ..... 128
Pimpari plate inscriptions, villages in ..... 269, f.
pingâ = pânjûra ..... 97 n. 54
Pâgala, Braja ..... 43
pipe, tobacco, history of ..... 300
INDEX

Pitalkhoro cave inscrip. 278
pittis, cash, 101, 130 n. 1—Chinese cash, 157, 209, 214—kping, 85—duit, cent in Dutch scale and money, 86, 105—cash in same scale 85—a coin of jiring and Patani—both money and small change in Java, 209—a mixed lead and tin coin in Sumatra 275 n. 10
Pitt-Rivers Museum, Oxford 298, 300
Piyadasa 257
Pliny, and female rule in Madurâ 68; refers to the Andhras 278
Podyam, peak in Tinevelly Ghats, and the Arama of Agastyâ 194
poetry, Indian ancient, the antiquity of, and the Indian inscrip. 29–32; 137–149; 174–179; 188–193; 230–234; 243–249
Poids de marc, old French pound 102 n. 83
Point de Galle, and Kalar 40
Pokara, co. in W. India 218, f.
opok—pits, cash-tree 104, 125
Polenaos, Siro, Suri Pulamayi 280
Politics and anthropology 300
polytheism, and monotheism 81 n.
Poona, Pûnaka, in Telegaon grant 28
Poo—puta 89 n. 27, 97 n. 54—viss 89
Portuguese cash (pesa)=1,000 to 1,600 to the dollar, by standard 1,000, 104, 104—tin money of Albuquerque 92
Portuguese money, etc. in Malay States 299
Püsche, writer, and the Aryas 73
Poseidon, g., and Madurâ 70
Poshapuria, and Purushapura, in the Ara grant 133, f.
pûthi, Sanskrit pustakâ, pustika, book, B. Ma. 9 n. 17 and n. 18, 20, 22–24
Pc-t’iao, Ta-Yüe-chi k., and Vasudeva 137
Prabandhakô, a work by Râjasékharâ, date of 286
Prabhava, first year of a cycle 37 n.
Prabhavati, d. of Chandragupta II. 160—(gupta), of Devagupta 161
Prabhu-tunga, Govinda-rája 27
Prachi, mode of dress 197
Prajñâpati, g. 22, f.; 75, f.
Prajñâkaramati, monk and commentator 49
Prakrit lang., and Kâvya literature 29; and the Andhras 280, f.
Prékârâjagopadesä, book-notice 287, f.
Prâsa, air inhaled 20, Dukhà 22
Prathïrâ dyn., and the Chàhâmanas 58
Pratishthâna, Pâshâ 278
Pratyâbhitâhâma, idoya, book-notice 271, f.
Pravarasena, poet 39
Pravarna rite 72
Praya, tn., and Bharata 6
Prekshâgâtra and samâja 255, f.
Prime of Hinduism, book-notice 207
Priority, of Bâhma to Dâdjin 268–269
Priyadarśin, k., Âoka 25; Priyadasíno 255
profits, merchants and money changers, by manipulating currency 105
Pronunciation, of Sanskrit 47, f.
Ptolemæus, mentions Siro—Polemaios 239; date 248 n.
Ptolemy, 279; and the Andhra co. 280 and n.
Pudukkoṭa, inscrip. 166, f.; Pudukkoṭa 171; 223; 227; 229
Pûjýapatâ, Devanandân 204
Purândaëa, Purandrasena 279
Pulâ, Signor, and the story of Solomon’s judgment 148, 152
Pulamai-Siri, Andhra k. 279; Polemaios, Siri 280, f.
Yayâ, inscrip. of 280 and n.
Pûnaka, Pûna 28
Punorph=punjuru 97 n. 54
Punjab, warrior tribes 290
Purânapura, k. 247
Puruânas, fables 65, 69
Pûrâvarna, W. Magadha k. 54
Purusha, ‘man,’ period of time 33
Puruâshapura, Poshapuria, modern Peshâvar 134; and Kanishka 246
Purushottamadeva, date of 286
Pushkara, lake 217
Pushkara, and Pushkara, c. in Jodhpur 217, and the Varman kings 218, f.
pustakâ, pustikâ, pûthi 28, f.
putresâ chi sacrifice 67
putta, see puñatak, a fragment 89
putra (Hebrew) analogy to Malay gambar 117
Pizil, W. of Kuchar, Ming-of. B. Ma. 4 n. 9, 16, 17
Pizil Qâghe, N. of Kuchar has rock-cut caves 218, f.
Qosh Türâ, Stûpa 217, B. Ma 5 n.
Quan see kwã, a dollar of account 216
Qumbâs 217, B. Ma 10
Quan Türâ, Ming-of. B. Ma. 5 n. and n. 7, n. 9–14, 36
Qutluq Urdu stûpa B. Ma. 5 n. 7, n. 9–12, 14, 32
raes (lead coin)=reis 110 n. 21—400 to the rupee in Bombay (18th cent.). 110 n. 22
Râghavabhâja and Bâhma 262
INDEX

Raghu ............... 249
Raghus .............. 244
Rāja, or grand, Fall, on the Shāhāvati river 285, 286 n.
Rājagriha, tn. 5; Rājagriha, in the story of Solomon's judgment .......... 152
Rājahumdry, Telugu cap. .............. 277
Rājā-rajā, Chota k., and the Brāhmās ..... 196
Rājāsekhara 29; and the age of Śrīharsha 83, f; and the story of Solomon's judgment 148, ff, 152; date of his Prabandhakosa ........ 286, f.
ṛajasāya, fire rite .............. 82
Rājatarādīgīti, a work by Kāliṣa .... 301-306
rājātārādīgīti, from shanoman shaō, Kushana title .......... 136
Rājendraśakapāra, work by Śambhu, quoted .............. 174, 176 n.
Rājīm, inscrip. at ... B. Ms. 30
Rājāyāpāla, Prañhāra k. of Kannauj 83
Rakrālogamīni, father of Bhāmaha ..... 204
rākharasa, 8-10, 12-14, 15; rākharassas, aborigines of the South .......... 195
Rāmakaritamānasī, the, and the Rāmaṇya, continued from Vol. XLI p. 286;—Ayodhyākāra 1-6; Arasgākṣāya 7-10; Kishkindhākṛa 11, 12; Sundaranākṣāya 13, 14; Yuddhākṛa ......... 15-18
ramā, see tampang 159;—kati, 80;—in hat money= Jongkong, 90 n. 32;—10 cents .... 86
Rāmānuja, Śrīl .... 196, 198
Rāmarāmāyaṇan, and Bhāmaha .... 262
Rāmāyana, the, and the Rāmakaritamānasī, q. v., 1-18; and Agastyā .......... 194
Rāgapalikā, Rāpolf, vil. in Jaipur .............. 59
raha and samāja .......... 255, f.
Rāhōrakṣa, and Gaṅga kings .... 54
Rāhōr Rajputus .............. 267
Ratnadāhrāmarjaya, writer .... 248
rātu, military officer 50, rātu .... 52
Rāvaṇa, hero 10, 12-18, 1, 94, f.
real, Spanish dollar, 82;—of 8 $Sp. dollar 215;—in old Philippine currency $ the dollar .......... 273
religion .......... 291, f., 294
Renaissance, literature, of North 196; of Sanskrit literature, theory of .... 243-249
Renoun State, coinage of .............. 119
rēpt, piece (of money) .......... 168, n 34 b.
Research, Asiatic's Oriental .......... 252
reya=reisi .......... 108
Rhyta Davids, Prof., and Rock Edict VIII .......... 159, f.
rial=dollar .............. 108
Right, and Left Hand, Brāhmās Sections .... 197
rīgveda, the, and Agastyā .......... 194
ringgit=dollar, 85, 119;—standard of tin weight=10 kati 128;—tāhīl 86
ringgit, various descriptions of —bābī, pig 119
n 57;—burong, bird (Mexican) 157;—kāin, bārkoj, cloth, 127;—mīrīm, gun, 127;—rial, Spanish, 127;—tōngko, staff (British), 157;—tu, old, 127;—ular, snake (Mexican) 157
ringlet, mark .............. B. Ms. 38
Risley, and the Āryāns .......... 78, 82
Īśita, goddess, Atirikta, Bita, intercalary months .... 24; 34
Rūtaṇākāra, the, and the Prajakṣi of Harīshaṇa 27; 159; 175; 176 n.; 194, 194 n.
rixdollor, (reichs-thaler) a money of account, 106;—scale and value .......... 273, f.
Roarer, Fall, on the Shāhāvati riv. ...... 285, 286 n.
Rock Edicts, fourth, of Aśoka 25, f.; in scrip. 31; VIII 159; I, renumbered 255, ff.; IV. 237; XIII 277; VI. .......... 282, f.
Rocket Fall, on the Shāhāvati ...... 285, 286 n.
Romakṣa, astronomer .... 248
Rudra, Rudrana, Somara k. .... 58 and n., 59
Rudradāman, Mahakāhatrapa, his Gīrār, inscrip. 189-193; 195; and the Andhras 279 and n.
Rudrā, and Bhāmaha .......... 262
rāpa, dieya, words in Aśoka edicts .... 27
Rāpachanda, author of the Paśchāmanāgala 42; his connection with the Paramajotiśotra .......... 43 and n.
rāpaka, the, used .......... 243
rupee=half a dollar 213;—half a Dutch guilder, 105;—220 to 100 dollars 214
Russia, and the Āryas .......... 78
Sabara Gamuva, precious none district, in Ceylon .......... 40
Sabdāvatāras, two works of the name .......... 204
sa-buaya, see buaya .......... 125
Śākhumāta, samājas .......... 257
Sahajāya School of Buddhism, and Śāntideva 52
Śāiva sect .......... 180
Śāivism of Kashmir .......... 271
Śaṅka era, 189 and n., and the Kshatrapas 190; 279 n.
Śākā era, 189 and n., and the Kshatrapas 190; 279 n.
Śākambarī, Śambhar .......... 60; 265 n.
Śakas, in India 247; and Ananta 249; in the Mudra-Rākhasa 255 and n., 266; and the Andhras .......... 279; 281
Sakkavardhamāna and Bhāmaha .......... 262
sākta, Śāiva term .......... 271
Salavanā, Tomara leader .......... 58, f.
Salayaketa, for Malayaketa, and Seleucos .... 267
samāja, word in Rock Edict I, 153, f., and stūhamāta .......... 257
samāja, demon .......... 29
INDEX

Sambhar, Śākambhī, salt lake... 60, 265 n. 82
Śāmbhavā, Śaiva term... 271
śambodi, word in Rock Edict VIII... 169
Sampradāyas, (Bhāgavata), immigration of... 196, f.
Samudragupta, k. date of 556; Harishcheva's panegyric of 31, 172–179, 244, 245 and n.; his conquests 217–219, 247; 192; 266 n. 266; and Hastivarman 281; coins and inscrs. 82
B. Ms. 26, f.
Śāntā, stūpa, 26; 265; inscr. 135, 161, f.
Śāntehor, vil. of Dahiyā Rājpūta... 269
Śandanesa, Sundara... 279
Śanggara, see Singgara... 184
śaṅgha and pariaš... 283
Śanghamittā and Ceylon... 161
Śākara, cave inscr. in Udayagiri... 31
Śākārāchārya, and Balavarmā 53, f.; 195, 198; his reference to Jayāditya... 235
Śākunāragaṇa, Kalachuri, k. his Abhōpe grant... 270
Śākunāra, author of a commentary (on the Nītīāra of Kāmandaki) called Jayamadāgala, 202; and the Jayamagala, a commentary on the Kāmaśīra of Vatsyāyana... 203
śākṣa, conch shell, mark... 86 n. 5, 157
Śākībhūja, plate of Sāntilla... 207
Śāntideva, his works 49, legendary life, or Achāsena 50; or Bhuceku 51; miscellaneous Jayadeva... 52
Śanskrit, (kāya) literature, 29; theory of the Renaissance of, 243–249; maxims and nyayas in 250; f.; inscrs.—of Kedah 41; Harana stone 57; Girnar 188–193; on the pronunciation of 47, f.; lang. of the Āryas 78, 80, 82; Buddhistic words 179, f.; and the Pali canon 205, f.; and Prakrit 246; 288; B. Ms. 9 n. 14, 44 and n.
sa-paku, sa-paku, string of cash 215 n. 80 supek, se sopāqué 216
sopāqué, sa pak, string of cash 85 n. 1, 215 n. 80
sa-perak, silver coin see kāndēri pīrak, 238 n. 90
śa-prak, 61 cents, 86 n. 6—in account 6 cents... 157
śa-prapta, 'seven men,' period of time... 33
śaparshita, seven sages... 194
Śāradā script... B. Ms. 31–34
Saragunus, perhaps Sātakaṇi... 279
Sarasvati, or Bhārati, goddess, and the testing of poetry, etc... 53, 177
śastra, among the Śmarā Drāviḍa Brāhmaṇs... 197
Saralakṣitiṣvara, Kushana title... 136
sātō, sa-tok, string of cash 215 n. 80
Śatākaṇi, Śi, Andhara k. 277 f., and, Sārāganus 279, Sātvāvahana, So-to-pho-lo, Śi... 280
Pūrāṇāvī... 280
śatāli, satāler, see tali... n. 5 and 6 274
Śātya, donor in Manandasaon inscr. 161
śauta, sa-utā, string or file of cash 215 n. 82
savages, and argument etc... 299
Savargabhumi, Ukkalā, Burna... 38
Savitri, g. 32; generator... 140
sciences and arts, and anthropology 280–291, 297
scribal errors... B. Ms. 42
scripta, used... B. Ms. 22–28
Seychelles, in India... 246, f.
śeals, the three Harappa... 203
Sokhavati, division of W. India... 59
śel, Manipuri bell-metal coin, 111; 800–1000 to the dollar, 111; 400 reckoned as 500 cowries on Indian system of reckoning cowries by gandās (quarters)... 111
śelling... killing... s'killing, small silver change 86 n. 5, 157
Seleucus, and Chandragupta 265, Salakaketa... 267 n.
sen, cent, in British scale of Malay Money 85, 128
Senari, M., and Ațoka edicts 25; 159, f.; 182 and n., 183
śendu, divine weapon... 70, 72
Serai Tam, ruin, at Qum Tura... B. MS. 10, 11, 13
Sergi, Italian writer and the Āryans... 77, f.
Śāhībāgarhi inscr. 25, 160
Śāh Jahān, Emp., regn of... 208
Śāivism, in Java... 41
Śravasti, riv., and the Jog Falls... 285, 286 n.
Śrīve Dagon Pagoda inscr., Rangoon 285, 286 n.
Śiamese money, scale of... 153
śica rupee, Government rupee, 213; —Bengal standard, 106; —half a dollar... 213
Śiddha, k... 177
Śiddhasenadivākara, author of the Kāyāna-mandirasotra... 42, 44
Śidhavaran and Simhavaran... 218
śigns, numeral... B. Ms. 37
Śīkha—Samuchchaya, a work attributed to Śāntideva... 49–53
Śīlātya, k., and Alopen... 180
śiliga, to tin, ratio 1:10; to gold, ratio 1:6... 109 n. 15
śilver money used in Malay States, origin of, 99;—modern denominations of, result of dividing dollars into cents... 99
śilver weights, scale of, at Patani... 156
Śimharāja, Chāhāmāna k... 58–60
Śimhavaran and Siddhavaran... 218, f.
Śimūn, N. E. of Kuchar, has rock cut caves... B. Ms. 4 n.
Śimuka, Sindhuka, Rāya Śātvāvahana, first Āndhara k... 277
Śindhirāja of Mālijā, Navaśhāsanaśa 93; hero of the Navaśhāstakachārita... 287
Śingora, trilingual coins of... 184
son's table of Malay tin currency is to be found. s. v., 127:—in hat money = 28 oz., 90:—values, 1 cash, 127; 50 cash, 102; 124 cents, 96, 157; ½ gudhen, 157:— = half rupee in Indian broker's slang 102 n 80
tsili-tying, Dravidian custom 195, f.
Tanagata Mount, Burma, Pagoda on 38
Tamil, literature, and the subsidence of the Vindhyas 194; Kumanilas' acquaintance with it, 200, f.
tampang, block or cake of tin, 88, 158, 210:—
22¼ oz., 90:— = kuti, 90, 158; ½ kuti, 209: = kudung, 138, 157:—hollowed out in hat money, 159:—special in Panang, 184:—
value 1 cent, 128, 10 cents 86
tampok manggis, rosette or calyx of the mangosteen, 88 n. 16 a, 132, 257 n 87:—mint mark on tin ingots 122, 132, 159
Tanvar, Tomara, Rajput tribe 59
Tanvārvātk, division of N. Jaipur, home of the Tanvaras 59
tanga, Goanese silver coin, 6 and 7 to the dollar, 108:—=tanka—rupee, tikal 108 n. 8
Tanjore bull, worshipped at Dondra, with other gods 41
Tantrapāla, and Vākṣapārāja 58
Tapassu, Burmese merchant, visited Buddha 38, f.
Tārānātha, and Sāntideva 50, 52; 248
Turangā, Kālānātha's eighth, critical notes on it 301, ff.
Turāsvatāchaspati, commentator, and Bhumā 264
tatasa words, 276; or tatamas 268
Ta-trin, Roman Empire 136
Tavernier's tin coins (Malay) described, 181,
ff.:—his monetary (Malay) scale in 1678, 102, f.: 309
Taylor, writer, and the Aryas 78
technology, and anthropology 288, f., 292
tīla, telae, Chinese pronunciation of tīra, tra 212 n. 65 a.
Teluban in Patani 101
Telugu and Andhra, langs. 276—278, 281
tenag sank═cent 85, f.
Tennent, Sir, E. and the territory of Kalah 40, f.
tera═tra 181
Thāliner, near Nāsik, home of the Dahiyā Rājputs 268
Thiruviyur akal Purikku, a work by Pāṇaji
naṭār 68
Thot, Tvashṭi 65
Timastas, k. of Osene or Ujjaini, identified with Chrestana 188
tical, tikal, Siamese silver coin 105 n 99;—used as gambling token 156
Tien-chou, India 136

Tilakabhaṭja, general 173 and n.
tin═tin 210

Tin, the Malay medium of exchange, 200; par value, 10 katti or 30 dollars, 129; recent rise in price, 159:—value per bahara, 311—40 dollars, 209, f. 57 rix dollars, 210:—ratio to silver 44 to 1, 214; 54 to 71 to 1, 213 n 72;—nominal ratio—10 to 14 to 1 213 n. 72

tin coins, Malay States, 183, f.:——origin of legends and designs on 118

tin currency (and money), Malay States, 85, ff.:—origin of 120:—tables and scales of 237, ff.:—Wilkinson's table, 127; chiefs had no monopoly of casting 131

Tin hat-money; ratio to silver money is 1:7 30

Tin ingot currency, see ingot currency:—table of, 159:—specimens explained, 122:—weights of, 94:—in two forms on two concurrent scales, 96:—history of, 97, ff.:—historical continuity of, 99, table of, 97, f.:—scales of, 94, f.:—comparative, 98:—West Coast (1000 cash to dollar), 101, East Coast—Dutch, 101, f.:—Perak, 104, f.:—French in 1770, 100 n. 66:—Chinese in 1409, 97; great viss in 1409, 97, in 1725, 98; profits in manipulating Dutch, 100, native, 96:—Junk Ceylon in 1675 and 1775, 97: Tokopa (1775) 97 n. 53:—old traders valued one grain of silver (Malay) money as 1 oz. merchandise, 98 n. 56:—ratio to silver money 1 to 104... 96

Tin money (Malay), Skeat's scales of, 238, Laidlaw's, 239:—Albuquerque's, 91:—Tavernier's, 91, his ratio to silver 1 to 5, 91 n. 35:—hat money, origin of... 128

Tiruvānasambadār and the Jainas 307
Tirukkōḻūr, birth place of Madhurakavi 307, f.
Tirumāṅgai, Vaishnavas teacher 307, f.
Tiruttalaiyāvar Temple, Madura dist., inscrip.
at 167, f.
titles, Kushana... 138
To, of Burma, deer—weight, origin of, 117 f.:—specimens explained 123

tobacco pipe 300
tokens, gambling, used as money 155, f.
Tomara, Taśvar kings, and Chandana 38 and n., 59
Toramāta, k. 31, 247 and n., his stone inscrip.

B. Ms. 34 n.

tra (stamp)═cash, 101 n. 74:—a small round piece of tin with a hole in the centre, 104; tin holed cash, 1280 to the dollar, 181:—modern tin coin, 183:—copper coin, 32 to the dollar, 181:—tin coin (Kedah) 299; 1280 to the dollar, 160 on a string, 209:—kāndūri in 1668... 104 n. 90
INDEX

tra timēḥ, lead or tin marked to give it currency...181
Triolkōyanātha Sudēvajinasara, the Jina...42
Trenggannu Currency...101
Trihūvanachakra, alias of Jat. Kulaśekhara...168,171
Trihūvanachakravartin Kulaśekharadeva...229
Trihūvanachakravati Para Srī Vikrama, Pañjika R...224
Trīḍāya, a Buddhist hymn...240
Trilingam, home of Āndira Vaiṣṇu...276
Trīṣaṅg, applied to the Ganges...174
Tulasi Dāsa, author of the Rīmācharitamānasī...1,2,4-18
Turkestān, E. expeditions to and explorations in, B. Ms. 2, 3, 5, 7, 14, paper in 32; Gupta script, etc...33-35
Tvāśṭrī, Tūti...65
Tvāśṭrī...20,22
uchochhrīṭa, word in Harīśeṇa's panegyric of Samudragupta...173,f
Udayāgiri inscriptions. 25 n., 27a, 28, 31. B. Ms. 30
Uddharāṇa, for Udharāṇa...267,f
Udyāna, co. and the birch tree, B. Ms. 19, 31...33 n. 35
Ujjain, 195,f; 247,f, and the Sakas 279-281; stone inscription of Chaulukya Jayasimha...238
Ujjayanta, Ujjayāt...188
Ujjayini, Uzene...188,f
Ukkal, Suvārasabhumī, Burma 38, Orissa...39
ukṣyā, fifteen...23
unit of ingot tin currency=dollar...90
Upame, use of...243
Upāsishad, quoted...34-37
uparāspurā-sa, chayochchhrītā, meaning of...174
Urga-Pālyya, k...70
Ujjayāt, Ujjayanta, Holy Mts., Gīrma...188,192
Uttāravatadatta, and the Brahmās 195, Śaṅka, Usahradāta 236 and n., Rishabhadatta...246
uta, =string of tin pieces (kati)...275 n. 14
uṣṇakāṭa, use of...194,243
uṣṭeṣa...227
Uttara, Buddhist apostle to Burma...39
Uttarāyāna, part of the year...36
uṣṇa, see uṣṇa...156

Vaṅgai, niv. origin of...67,69,190
Vairāsin, prince, Vairāsa...267, f
Vaiśesha, father of Kaśishka II, 133, f, and...135
Vāsishka...249
vajra, sign...23
vajrayāna, school of Buddhists...51, f
Vākṣa, k., his copper-plate grant...160, f
Vākpati, k., date 83; Vākpatirāja...58, f
Vākpati, poet...178, 249
vahula, divine weapon...70-72
Vallabha, author...245 n.
Vallāla, k., death of...186,188
Vallo Poussin, Prof. L. de la, and Buddhism...206, 241
Vallikā, of the Ābhāne plates, perhaps...270
Balīghon or Vārisi...270
Valmiki, author of the Rāmāyaṇa...1-18
Vān, Vaiṣṇavagārīka...260 and n.
Varāhamihira, author of the Brhat-Samhitā...30; and the Mālava...200; 248
Vāraṇs, Vallisīkā, Balīghon...270
Varman, and Gupta, suggested surnames of k. Chandra...217
Varāṇisuprana...191
Varuṇa, G. 19, 36; and Madura...70
Vasco da Gama, report on tin money, confused by editors...110 n. 21
Vāṣishka, Vaiśesha, father of Kaśishka II 133-135
Vāśiśtha, astronomer...248
Vasu, Bubu Nagendra Nath, on k. Chandra 217, f
Vasubandhu or Asaiga...248 and n.
Vasudattā, wife of Samudradattā...152
Vāsudeva, g...161
Vāsudeva, K., date of 134, 136, or Potūno...137; 246
Vaṇgupta, Śaiva teacher...271
Vāsula, inscription of...31
Vasunītrā, wife of Samudradattā...152
Vaṇanagara, vil., Vaṇner 207, and Vaṇi, Vaṇanagarīka...269 and n. 270
Vaṃsabhaṭṭi, his Mandosor prastiṭi 31, f; 137...144, 145, f, 175, 244, f
Vātāyana, his Kāmaśāstra and the Commentary Jayanagaṇadī...202, f
Vaṭṭeṇjuttu inscription...307
vadu, wind...73
Veda, the, and the Dravidians, etc. 77, 79, 80 and n. 81
evī, divine weapon...70, 72
Vellala, casto...71, f
Vāgīl, Pudda Vīgī, Ādhiranagaram...281
Vāgīrakṣāmān, modern Ellore...281
vicēhara, word in Harīśeṇa's panegyric of Samudragupta...174
Vidarblha, Bohar, poetic school of...29, 244
### Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>videva, budha or kavi</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>virose, see viss</td>
<td>89, 97 n 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vigna, Buddhist missionary</td>
<td>266 n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vigharita, his Harsha stone inscrip.</td>
<td>57—64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vijaya, Vijayapala, 83; Vijayachandra</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viksa, statue, 57 and Hitimba</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vikrama, and Malaya era</td>
<td>31; 163; 247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vikramaditya, Chandragupta II</td>
<td>30; 244, 247 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vijayavakuras, I and II, Andhra kings</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and n., 280</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vimanc, word in Afsa edict 25, 26 and n.</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vimanas</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vimana-satthu, Pali work</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vindhyag Mts., and Agastya 194; home of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andhras</td>
<td>277, 278 n., 281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vira Pādiya K., Maravarman</td>
<td>164 and n., 170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vraequa, Raja's inscrip.</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viravasa, poet</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viska-kany depending on the event</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visquadvadottana, a work by Dhamasmita</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vishnug, g. 29, f.; at Dondra 41, 48; and k.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandra</td>
<td>217, 219 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visuddharmin, a poem by Bhosa, or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visuddhabhaktattana, two works of the name</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visnuvarthana, his inscriptions 31; 163</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yasodharman</td>
<td>247 n. and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viss, standard of Far Eastern avoirdupois</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weight, 95; of commerce—56 oz., 90;—2½</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lbs., 89;—great—1¼ and 1½ viss, also a standard of tin weight, 95;—2½ lbs., 130 n. 7;—10 small Patah, 90;—double tali, 94:—in hat money, 1 dollar or 750 grs. = 25 cents 86;—half dollar in Pegu in 1867 and 1885, 107;—of base coins—a penny in Chittagong in 1867.</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vavamitra, ancestor of the Andhras</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vadvarga, an ascetic</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visvarman, K. 31; 138, 144; inscr. of 161</td>
<td>163; 218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vivasval, the Illuminator</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vridehanuksha, meaning of</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vrtta, demon 20—23; or Vrttakusa</td>
<td>65, f., 75.f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vyasa, rival of Bhosa</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wang, currency=½ buaya, 90;=36 kiping, cash,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wang = of constant value</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>wang baharu</em>, new wang, a coin, 213;—silver—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2½ cents, 85, 156, 158;—dubelt=—2d., 156, f.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—copper, 85, 86 n 5, 238 n 94;—money of account=5 duit=—2½ cents</td>
<td>105 n 98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wardak base inscrip.</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weavers, of silk in Daftapura—Mandasaor</td>
<td>138, 143, f. 147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weber, collection of Mrs., B. Maj. 2 and n.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and n., 7—9, 11, f., 14—16, 32, f.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weight standards, oriental, origin of</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weights, animal, of Burma, specimens explained</td>
<td>122 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weights, Malay, in 1701 Bowrey's tables</td>
<td>212 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellesley, Prov. inscrips. from</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West coast (Malay) currency</td>
<td>101 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wheel, chakra</td>
<td>B. Ms. 38, f., 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Huns and Huns, marriage, among the Dahiya</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willen, Lodewijkz, History of Dutch Naviga-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tion to the East</td>
<td>1600, 214, ff.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Additional Terms

- **prajaputra**, a symbol 197
- **Yamunai-thauravar, Ajavandar** 196
- **Yaasmitra, Yatromitra, name** B. Ms. 29
- **Yaasodharana, reputed author of the Commentary** 202
- **Jayaamaala** 202
- **Yasodharana, Vishnu-vardhana, k. 31; 199** 266 n.; and Mirshakura 247 and n.; B. Ms. 27
- **Yaasvarman, k., of Kansaiv 249; of Malwa, and** 258
- **Jayasinha** 258
- **yor, grula, gruela** B. Ms. 41
- **Yavanas, a people** 249
- **Yasamitka, father of Chalisana** 189
- **Yuddhaksheta, a work by Tulsai Dasa** 15—18
- **Yue-toi, 136; Ta-yue-chi** 137
- **Yuwan Chwang, Chinese pilgrim and Pali-putra** 265 n.

### Additional Sections

- **Zabadj, kingdom in S. and E. of Malacca, and** 40
- **Kalah** 134
- **Zoda inscrip.** 134
- **Zohak, of Pehlevi, tradition** 69
ERRATA.

Page 301, line 5 from bottom read, चान्देपि न्यायम्.
Page 304 line 16 from top, read हस्यास्ततः.
Page 304 verse 1093, read पङ्खास्यह.
Page 305 verse 1192, read रेषेिः.
Page 306 verse 1332 read बातः.
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THE BOWER MANUSCRIPT.*

CHAPTER I.

THE DISCOVERY OF THE BOWER MANUSCRIPT: ITS DATE, LOCALITY, CIRCUMSTANCES, IMPORTANCE, ETC.

The Bower Manuscript, which is named after its discoverer, Lieutenant (now Major-General) H. Bower, C.B., fell into the hands of that officer, early in the year 1890, in Kuchar, where he had gone, on a confidential mission from the Government of India, in quest of the murderer of Dalgleish. 1

Kuchar, or Kucha, 2 situated about 41° 42' 50" N. Lat., and 80° 33' 50" E. Long., is the name of one of the principal oases and settlements of Eastern Turkestan, on the great caravan route to China which skirts the foot of the Tian Shan Range of mountains on the northern edge of the Takla Makan desert.

On his return to India, Lieutenant Bower took the manuscript to Simla, whence in September 1890 he forwarded it to Colonel (now Major-General) J. Waterhouse, who was then the President of the Asiatic Society of Bengal. By him it was exhibited to the Society at their monthly meeting on the 5th November 1890, when a short note (see below, No, i, p. iv) from Lieutenant Bower, dated the 30th September 1890, was read explaining the circumstances of the discovery. Some attempts were made after the meeting to decipher the manuscript, but they proved unsuccessful. 3 At the time I was absent on furlough to India. It was on my return voyage to India that I received the first news of the discovery through a copy of the Bombay Gazette which fell into my hands at Aden. By a lucky chance, Major (now Major-General) W. B. Cumberland, whose companion Lieutenant Bower had been during the earlier part of his travels, happened to be a fellow passenger on the steamer, and furnished me with corroborative information. On reaching Calcutta in February 1891, being then the Philological Secretary of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, I at once claimed the manuscript from Colonel Waterhouse, who most readily made it over to me. At the April meeting of that year, I was able to communicate to the Society the first decipherment of the manuscript which was immediately published in its Proceedings (April, 1891), pp. 54-55. 4


2 The spelling Kuncha represents the local pronunciation of the name, see M. A. Barth in Comptes Rendus of the Académie des Inscriptions & Belles-Lettres, 1907, p. 21. The spelling Kucha, or Kucha, (Chinese K'ü-hia), as Dr. A. van Le Coq informs me (letter of 24-10-1900), occurs on coins and public documents. It is used, e.g., in M. A. Stein's Ancient Khotan, Vol. I, p. 8, et passim, also in M. Chavannes' Documents sur les Turcs Occidentaux, p. 8, et passim. The latter work may be consulted on the ancient history of Kuchar. It is one of the few territories, or so-called "Garrisons," the other three being Kashgar, Khotan, and Karakash, which, anciently constituted Eastern Turkestan. The latitude and longitude of Kuchar above given, are those which have lately been determined by Dr. Vaillant of the French Expedition with a possible slight error of 300 or 400 metres in latitude, and of about 1,000 metres in longitude, as communicated to me by him in his letter of the 5th January 1910. See also his article in the L'année Cartographique, October, 1910.

3 See Proceedings, Asiatic Society of Bengal, 1890, p. 222.

4 The whole story of the discovery and decipherment of the Bower Manuscript is reviewed in Sir Alfred Croft's Presidential address to the Asiatic Society of Bengal in their Proceedings for 1892, pp. 61-63. See also Sir Charles Elliott's Presidential Address in the Proceedings for 1894, pp. 31-34.
It was the discovery of the Bower Manuscript and its publication in Calcutta which started the whole modern movement of the archaeological exploration of Eastern Turkestan. The late Hofrat Professor G. Bühler, having seen the report of the discovery in the Proceedings of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, at once announced it in an early issue of the Vienna Oriental Journal for 1891, p. 103. The Russian Archeological Society, having thus their attention attracted, addressed, in November 1891, a request to Mr. Petrovski, the Russian Consul General in Kâshgar, to endeavour to collect similar manuscript treasures. In response to it the Petrovski Collection went to the Imperial Library in St. Petersburg, in the autumn and winter of 1892-3, of which Professor Serge d'Oldenburg published a report and specimens in the Transactions of the Imperial Russian Archeological Society, Vol. VIII, for 1893-4, pp. 47 ff. In the same year, 1892, the Weber Collection of manuscripts was acquired by the Rev. F. Weber, Moravian Missionary in Leh, whose curiosity had been aroused through a meeting with Lieutenant Bower on the latter's return journey to India (see below No. iv, p. vi). This acquisition was at once transmitted to me, and a report and specimens were published by me in the Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, Vol. LXII of 1893, pp. 1 ff. In the following year, 1893, on my motion, the Government of India issued instructions to their Political Agents in Kashmir, Ladak, and Kâshgar, to make enquiries for ancient manuscripts, and secure all that might come in their way. It was in pursuance of these instructions that the "three Further Collections" of manuscripts came into my hands, of which a report and specimens were published by me in the Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, Vol. LXVI, of 1897, pp. 213 ff. The most important, in the present connection, of these three collections are the Macartney manuscripts, so named after Mr. (now Sir) George Macartney, K. C. I. E., the British Consul in Kâshgar, who secured them in 1895.

The direct result of these discoveries of ancient manuscripts was the inception of the first expedition of Dr. (now Sir) M. A. Stein, K. C. I. E., into Eastern (or Chinese) Turkestan in 1900-1901, of which a report was published by him, in 1902, in his Ancient Khotan in two volumes. It is true that there had been numerous expeditions into that country in earlier years, such, e.g., as the Russian expedition of General Prejevalski in 1878 and 1885, the British expedition of Major (now Lieut-Colonel) Sir Francis E. Younghusband, K. C. I. E., in 1887-90, the French expedition of M. Dutreuiul de Rhins in 1891-2, and the Swedish expedition of Dr. (now Sir) Sven Hedin, K. C. I. E., in 1894-7, but none of these was

---


7 The Weber Manuscripts, which were subsequently purchased by me from Mr. Weber (Journal, As. Soc., Beng., Vol. LXVI, 1897, p. 239, footnote) passed, in 1902, into the possession of the Bodleian Library in Oxford; see its Catalogue, Vol. II, p. 111, No. 1091.

8 For particulars, see my Report on the British Collection of Central Asian Antiquities, Part I., Intro., p. li; also Proceedings, Asiatic Society of Bengal, 1898, p. 65.

9 See also my Report on the British Collection of Central Asian Antiquities, Part II., being an Extra Number to the Journal, Asiatic Society of Bengal, Vol. LXX, 1901.

10 Since 1902 they are in the possession of the British Museum in London.

11 On its inception, see Intro., p. v. vi. The expedition started from Kashmir on the 31st May 1900, and returned to London on the 2nd July 1901.

12 For two fuller, though still not quite complete lists of such expeditions, see the Geographical Journal, R. G. S., for 1893, p. 57, and the Journal, R. A. S., for 1900, p. 299; also Professor W. Geiger on Die archäologischen und literarischen Funde in Chinesisch Turkestan und ihre Bedeutung für die orientalische Wissenschaft, Rede beim Antritt des Prorektora des Königlich Bayerischen Friedrich-Alexander-Universität Erlangen, November, 1912.
undertaken with the object of archaeological exploration. Their main object was scientific, i.e., geographical, geological, zoological, and the like, and any antiquities which they, brought home had been gathered, as it were, accidentally and by the way. The first expedition to Eastern Turkestan which was undertaken avowedly for the purpose of exploring the country archaeologically, and excavating ancient sites, was the Russian of M. D. Klementz in 1898. As in the case of the expedition of Sir Aurel Stein, it owed its inception directly to the stimulus imparted originally by the discovery of the Bower Manuscript. A series of archaeological expeditions now followed in rapid succession. It comprised the first German expedition, led by Professor Grünwedel, in 1902-3; a Japanese expedition, in 1902-3, under Count Otani; the second German (or first Prussian) expedition, under Dr. A. von Le Coq, in 1904-7; and the second Prussian expedition led again by Professor Grünwedel, in 1905-7. These were followed, in 1926-8, by the second British expedition of Sir Aurel Stein, which was extraordinarily successful; and fruitful of archaeological results, and of which a preliminary account was published in the Geographical Journal (for July and September 1909). The last of the series was the French expedition, under M. Paul Pelliot in 1907, which has recently (automn 1909), returned to Europe. As it made a particular point of thoroughly exploring the district of Kuchar, where the Bower Manuscript was found, its full and final report when it appears may be hoped to set at rest any still remaining doubts regarding the exact locality and time of its discovery.

In the meantime the publication of the Bower Manuscript steadily pursued its course. The proposal to prepare a complete edition of its text, illustrated with facsimile Plates, and accompanied by an annotated English Translation, was a corded, in 1892, the sanction of the Government of India through the cordial support of Sir Charles Elliott, the then Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal. The first part of the edition appeared in 1893; the Second Part (in two fasciculi) in 1894-5, and the remaining Parts III to VII in 1892. This completed the edition of the text and translation. After an interruption of several years, caused by my retirement from India and engagement in other time-consuming work on subsequent finds of ancient Central Asian Manuscripts, the Sanskrit Index, being a complete vocabulary of the Bower Manuscript, was published in 1908, and a Revised Translation of its medical portions, in Parts I, II, and IV, in 1909. The Introduction, benefitting by the long delay and the attendant material increase of information, now brings the laborious work of the edition to its long-desired completion.

The Bower Manuscript itself, which till the completion of the edition of the text in 1897 had remained in the hands of the editor, was returned, in April 1898, to its owner, Colonel Bower. By him it was taken to England, where it was finally purchased, in 1898, by its present possessor, the Bodleian Library in Oxford.

It remains to determine, so far as it is possible with the evidence at present available, the exact locality and the exact time of the discovery of the Bower Manuscript.

---

8 Since the above list was written, two new expeditions have been undertaken, and are now in progress: a German, under Dr. A. von Le Coq which left Berlin in April, 1913, and a British, under Sir Aurel Stein, which started from Kashmir, in August, 1913.


11 A summary report appeared in the Century Magazine for October, 1906.

12 A preliminary report, read in the Séance of the French Academy, on the 22nd of March 1907, is referred to in the sequel (No. x, p. viii). The preliminary sketch map of the Kuchar district, which illustrates this chapter, was, in response to a request from me, most kindly prepared by Dr. Vaillant, who had accompanied M. Pelliot on his expedition.

15 In the Second Part (1935) of the Library Catalogue it is No. 1090, p. 110.
The earliest information on the subject is contained in the note of Lieutenant Bower, which accompanied his transmission of the manuscript to Colonel Waterhouse, and which is published in the *Proceedings of the Asiatic Society of Bengal* for 1890, p. 221. It is dated from Simil, the 30th September 1890, and runs as follows:

> "While at Kuchar, a man offered to show me a subterranean town, provided I would go there in the middle of the night, as he was frightened of getting into trouble with the Chinese, if it was known that he had taken a European there. I readily agreed, and we started off about midnight. The same man procured me a packet of old manuscripts written on birch bark. They had been dug out of the foot of one of the curious old erections, of which several are to be found in the Kuchar district. There is also one, on the north bank of the river at Kasigar. The one out of which the manuscripts were procured is just outside the subterranean city.

> These erections are generally about 30 or 60 feet high, broad in proportion, and resembling somewhat in shape a large cottage loaf. They are solid, and... are principally composed of sun-dried bricks, with layers of beams now crumbling away. Judging from the weather-beaten appearance they possess, and taking into consideration the fact that in Turkestan the rain and snowfall is almost nominal, they must be very ancient indeed.

> The subterranean ruins of Ming-o, to which my guide had promised to take me, are situated about 16 miles from Kuchar on the banks of the Shalgar river, and are said to be the remains of Afrasiab's capital. The town must have been at considerable extent, but has been considerably reduced owing to the action of the river. On the cliffs of the left bank high up in mid-air may be seen the remains of the houses still hanging on the face of the cliffs.

One of the houses I entered was shaped as shown in the sketch (Fig. 1). A—B represents a tunnel, 6 yards by 4 yards, through a tongue-shaped hill, C and D are entrances, the hill being almost perpendicular at A and B. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 are cells, roughly 6 feet by 6 feet. The walls have been plastered, and what appear to be the remains of geometrical patterns can be made out.

> I was told the remains of other similar towns may be seen in the district. In Yaqub Beg's time a lot of gold was dug up.

(ii) Nearly two years later, in a letter dated Kasuli, the 17th August 1892, written in response to a request by me for further particulars, Lieutenant Bower wrote as follows:

> The story of the finding of the manuscripts is this. A man in Kuchar told me of the existence of an underground city, and said that he had gone there to dig for treasure a few days previously, but had only succeeded in finding what he called a book. I asked him to show it to me; and he went away, and came back bringing the manuscript as it now is. He was anxious to sell it and... I was very glad to pick up for a small sum what might prove of great value.

> I induced him to take me to the underground city; and as he was frightened that he might get into trouble for taking a stranger there, we marched in the night. When day broke, we found ourselves amongst some low barren hills, and keeping on, came to the banks of a river, and there the hills were tunnelled by the streets of the ancient city. I asked the guide to show me the place he had dug the manuscripts out of and he took me to the large mound-like erection that I have alluded to before (see No. 11), to the best of my recollection about 500 yards from the underground city, and showed where a hole had been recently excavated straight in, level with the ground. There some bits of wood lay about, in a very crummy state.

As a fact, similar Ming-o, or large groups of rock-cut caves, exist at Qali, west of Kuchar, higher up the Mazart river; at Qali Qâgha, north of Kuchar; and at Bubon Turk east of Kuchar; also further north-east, Mt Subashi and Simsin. See the Sketch Map.

According to Sir Aurel Stein (letter of 3rd December 1909) "very low broken conglomerate ridges approach the town from north-west and west."
SKETCH-MAP
of the
OASIS OF KUCHAR.
(Scale: 1 cm = 4 km, reduced from Original by Dr. G. Vanston.)

- Cultivated land
- Z.C. Saline land
- Dunn.
- Desert of carpeted tamarisks
- Desert of carpeted palm trees

(Read items in italics.)
"A more perfect hermetical sealing than the mound formed it would be impossible to imagine, as the outside had a slight coating of a baked clayey nature, ... ... ... ... ... ... and the documents had been buried right in the centre of it. The statement that they were dug out of the ruins of the underground city is a total misconception of the facts. 19 ... ... ... ... ...

I think I saw about Kuchar five or six of these mound like erections. 20 This (Fig. 2) will give you a rough idea of the erection. The asterisk indicates the place where the documents were found."

(iii) Again three years later, in 1895, Captain Bower repeated his account of the acquisition of the manuscript in a paper contributed by him to the Geographical Journal of the Royal Geographical Society of London, in which he described his trip to Turkestan. That account, in Vol. V., pp. 254 ff., was as follows;—

"At Kuchar, where I halted for several days, a Turk who had been in India, used to come and sit with me in my room in the serai. One day in conversation, he told me about an ancient city he knew of, built underground in the desert. I thought at first that he meant one of the ordinary buried cities of the Gobi desert; but he insisted that it was something quite different, and explained that it was underground by the wish of the people that made it, not by reason of a sandstorm. He told me also that he and one of his friends had gone there and dug for buried treasure, but had found nothing but a book, I asked to see it; and going away, he returned in about an hour, bringing some sheets of birch bark covered with writing in a Sanskrit character and held together by two boards. I bought them from him; and it was fortunate that I did so, as they have since excited a considerable amount of interest in the learned world ... ...

When I asked him to take me to this interesting place, he demurred a good deal, on the ground that the people would kill him, if he took an European there; but at last he consented on condition that we went at night, so as not to be seen. This I readily agreed to do; and starting at midnight, we marched steadily forward in a westerly direction. When daylight broke, we had left cultivation far behind, and were on the shoulders of a range of low gravelly hills, and away to the south a narrow strip of green with houses at intervals marked the course of a canal. Keeping on, we came to the curious old erection from under which the manuscript had been unearthed. Similar erections are found in different parts of Chinese Turkestan ... ... ... ... They are solid, and built of sun-dried bricks and wooden beams now crumbling away. In shape they roughly resemble a gigantic cottage loaf, about 50 feet high.

"Close by, on the banks of a river, were the remains of the ancient underground city of Ming-oi to which the guide had promised to take me ... ... ... ... High upon the face of the cliffs overlooking the water, the marks of what have been habitations are to be seen worn away in such a manner as to show sections ... ... ... ... I entered one of the tunnels. It was shaped as under ... ... ... ..."

Here follows the section through the Ming-oi (Fig. 1), and its explanation, exactly as given in No. i (p. iv).

With the help of the Topographical Plan and View of the Ming-oi of Qum Turâ (see Frontispiece, Nos. II and III), which I owe to the kindness of Professor Grünwedel, the description of Lieutenant Bower's march will be readily understood. He approached the Ming-oi from the east, from Kuchar. (See the Sketch Map of the Oasis of Kuchar.) At day-break he was above the point marked A on the Plan, looking "away to the south" on the double canal with its narrow strip of green cultivated land, and the houses belonging to the large village of Faizabad. "Keeping on" he came to the ruined Stupa of the manuscript

19 This apparently refers to the remarks of Bühl in his paper on the discovery of the Bower Manuscript in the Vienna Oriental Journal, Vol. V. (1891), pp. 103 and 302.

20 As a fact, there are four ruined Stupas near Qum Turâ, one at Qosh Turâ, and one at Qutluq Urdu (letter from Sir Aurel Stein, 3rd Dec. 1909)—all six on, or near, the line of Lieut. Bower's march to the Ming-oi of Qum Turâ. See the Sketch Map. Of the four Stupas near Qum Turâ two are at D, one at A, and one at C, of the Topographical Plan.
at the point marked C, "Close by," at the distance of about 500 yards (see No. i.), was the main group of caves on the left bank of the river, into one of the tunnels of which Lieutenant Bower entered. On his return, he went to the village of Faizabad, the houses of which he had, earlier in the morning, discerned from a distance, see below p. xiii.

(iv) With regard to the Weber Manuscripts, the earliest reference to their discovery is contained in a letter, addressed to me by the Rev. F. Weber, of the Moravian Mission in Leh, in Ladak, on the 21st June 1892. Translated from the German, it runs as follows:—

"Two years ago I met here in Leh the traveller Captain Bower. He showed me an old book which had been found not far from Yarkand, and which he intended submitting to you. I regret that I have never been able to learn anything about the age of that book; but in the meantime I have succeeded in getting hold of an undoubtedly very old book, which I venture to submit to you for critical examination. It was found, the year before (im vergangenen Jahr), not far from Kuglar on the border of Yarkand. Near that place, there is a house which, apparently since immemorial times, is ruined and buried. Some merchants, hoping to find treasure, undertook with much trouble to excavate it, but found only the bodies of some cows which, on the first touch, crumbled into dust. On that occasion they found also the above mentioned book."

(v) The above narrated particulars of the excavation of the "house," or stūpa, in which the Weber Manuscripts were found, Mr. Weber had from a letter written in Urdū, which was interpreted to him by the person who delivered the manuscripts to him. This appears from another letter addressed to me by Mr. Weber from Leh on the 29th July 1892. In it, he wrote that the book had been no more than three days in his hands before he transmitted it to me. He, then, continued as follows (translated from the German original):

"As I received the book through an intermediary, the latter could not furnish me with exact information. He showed me a letter in Urdū (which, however, I could not read) written by the finder of the book, an Afghan merchant, in which the find-place and everything that I reported in my previous letter was stated. The people knew that I collect Tibetan objects of every kind, and it was for that reason that the book was brought to me."

(vi) The identity of the "intermediary (Munshi Ahmad Din), and the "Afghan merchant" (Dildār Khān), mentioned in the preceding quotation, is disclosed in a letter written by Sir George Macartney, on the 12th October 1896 from Kāshgar, to Lieut-Colonel Sir A. C. Talbot, K. C. I. E., then British Resident in Kashmir. That letter was sent together with the Macartney Manuscripts, the acquisition of a portion of which is explained in it as follows:—

"This is a manuscript, presented by Dildār Khān, an Afghan merchant in Yarkand. It appears that when the Bower MS. was found in Kuchar, two others were at the same time and under the same circumstances discovered. Dildār Khān obtained possession of the latter, and took them to Leh in 1891."

21 The reference, of course, is to the Bower Manuscript, which, owing to a misapprehension, Mr. Weber at that time believed to have been discovered in Kuglar (Kokyar), about 60 miles south of Yarkand, at 77° 12' E. Long., and 37° 25' N. Lat. See the Map in the Geographical Journal, July 1893. The misapprehension was subsequently corrected in a letter addressed to me by the Rev. F. B. Shawe from Leh, on the 12th September 1893. See Sir Charles Elliott's Annual Address to the Asiatic Society of Bengal, 1894; p. 33; also Journal ASB., Vol. LXII (1893), pp. 1 and 2; and ibid., Vol. LXVI (1897) p. 229.

22 The German original has versunkenes und verschüttetes Haus. The word "house" evidently represents the Urdū ghar of Mr. Weber's native informant. That word appears to be usually employed by the natives of Turkestan to indicate a stūpa: See, e.g., Sir Aurel Stein's Ancient Khotan, Vol. I., p. 483.

23 See Journal As. Soc. Beng., Vol. LXVI (1897), p. 27.

24 This statement, as will be shown in the sequel, is a misapprehension. The "two others" are rather "two bundles of manuscripts" (see No. x), and they were found at a place and at a time different from those of the discovery of the Bower Manuscript.

25 This should be 1892. See Nos. iv. and v.
He gave one to Munshi Ahmad Din, who in his turn presented his acquisition to Mr. Weber, Moravian Missionary. Hence the origin of the Weber Manuscripts. The other manuscript in Dildar Khan’s possession was taken by him to India, and left with a friend of his in Aligarh, a certain Faiz Mu’ammed Khan. Dildar Khan brought it back to Turkestan last year [1893], and presented it to me.

(vii) From the preceding quotation it is seen that the “intermediary,” from whom Mr. Weber received his manuscripts, was Munshi Ahmad Din, and that the “Afghan merchant,” who sent them, through the intermediary, to Mr. Weber, was Dildar Khan of Yarkand. This man, however, was not the writer of the Urdu letter to which Mr. Weber (in No. v) refers. That letter must have been one written to Dildar Khan by his elder brother, Ghulam Qadir Khan, who sent the manuscripts, a portion of which found its way to Mr. Weber, through Munshi Ahmad Din. This appears from an account, which was procured for me by Sir George Macartney from Dildar Khan himself in January 1898. That account was written in Urdu and may be translated as follows:

“I heard from my brother Ghulam Qadir Khan that there was a dome-like tower near Kuchar at the foot of a mountain. Some people said that there was a treasure in it; it must be searched out. Accordingly, some people, making a hole in the tower, began to excavate it, when inside they found it to be a house containing a compartment (ghar khandar), and in it a cow and two foxes standing. On touching them with the hand the cow and foxes fell to the ground as if they were dust. In that place those two books were found enclosed in wooden boards. Also there is in that place a wall made as if of stone (diwār sang be muwīfī), and upon it something is written in characters not known. It is said that a few years ago an English gentleman went there, and having visited the place, came away. Nothing more is known.”

Plainly this account is identical with that given by Mr. Weber (see No. iv), as interpreted to him from an Urdu letter. It shows that the letter was written by Ghulam Qadir Khan, an Afghan merchant resident in Kuchar, to his brother Dildar Khan, a merchant residing in Yarkand. It was this letter, in the possession of Dildar Khan, on which the latter based the account, above-quoted, which he gave to Sir George Macartney for transmission to me. The importance of these facts lies in this that we see that the earliest statement concerning the locality and the circumstances of the find of the Weber Manuscripts and Macartney Manuscripts was made immediately after the discovery, in 1891, by a native informant in a letter written for the information, not of any European enquirer, but of his own brother. Native informants, in their dealings with Europeans, are, no doubt, not reliable; but in the circumstances of the present case—a native merchant dealing with another native merchant, his own brother, with common interests—there seems to be no good reason to distrust the substantial accuracy of the account of the discovery.

(viii) A little later in the same year, in November 1898, another more detailed account, in Urdu, of the discovery and dispersion of the Weber and Macartney Manuscripts was procured for me by Captain (now Lieut-Colonel) S. H. Godfrey, C. I. E., from Munshi Ahmad Din. In all probability it was based on information supplied to the Munshi by Dildar Khan. The main points in it are the following:

27 In my Report (see preceding note) this phrase is translated “spacious,” but the literal, and more correct, translation is as in the text above. As to the term “house,” see ante, Note 22. See also below, p. 119, M. Berezovski’s account.
28 Or rather “bundles of manuscripts.” See below No. x.
29 This is a confused reference to Lieutenant Bower, who went to Gum Turā, but not to Qutluq Urda.
30 See my Report on the British Collection of Central Asian Antiquities, Part I, Introd., pp. x and xi. There explanatory statements of my own are interspersed. See also Proceedings, ASB., 1898, pp. 63, 64.
Some years ago some people of Kuchar undertook to make an excavation of an ancient tower. Their object in digging into the tower was to find treasure, as it was well known that in the time of Yakub Beg much gold had been discovered in such ancient buildings. Whether or not they found any treasure is not known; but what they did find was a number of manuscripts and detached papers, together with the bodies of a cow and two foxes standing. The manuscript books and papers were taken to the house of the chief Qâfî, of the town, where a couple of days afterwards they were seen by Hájj Ghulam Qâfî heaped up in a corner, there being a big basket (subad) full of them. On enquiry, having been told the whole story by the Qâfî, he brough away a few of them. Of these he gave one to Lieutenant Bower, while he sent the others to his younger brother Dildâr Khan in Yarkand. These latter took with him to Lâh in 1891. Here he gave one portion to Ahmad Din, who in his turn gave it to Mr. Weber. The other portion Dildâr Khan took with him to India, where he left it with a friend in Alligarth. On a subsequent visit to India, in 1895, he re-took it from his friend, and brought it back to Turkestan, and presented it to Mr. Macartney. What became of the rest of the manuscripts in the house of the Qâfî is not exactly known. It is probable that Anjijani merchants in Kuchar, who are Russian subjects, got hold of some of them, and gave them to Mr. Petrovsky, the Russian Consul General in Kashgar. As late as 1894, ten manuscripts were reported by Dildâr Khan, on the information of his brother in Kuchar, to be in the possession of a certain Yusuf Beg. Unfortunately the negotiations set on foot by Mr. Macartney for the purchase of these manuscripts fell through, owing to the Beg's denial of possession from fear of the Chinese authorities. It is believed that subsequently Mr. Petrovsky succeeded in purchasing them.

(ix) With regard to the ten manuscripts referred to at the end of the preceding account of Munshi Ahmad Din, I received, in response to a request for further information in November 1895, from Sir George Macartney the translation of a letter of the Chinese Amban of Kuchar, dated on the previous 7th December 1894, which runs as follows:

I have received your letter desiring me to enquire whether there are any sacred Tibetan manuscripts in the family of Timur Beg. I lost no time in summoning him. He stated that he had no such manuscripts, but that some people had several years ago [i.e., in 1891] dug some out from a big mound situated at the west of the city of Kuchar, and almost 5 miles [about one mile] from it, and as this took place a long time ago, the documents had either been sold or burnt. I also went in person to make an inspection of the mound which was about 10 chang [approximately 100 feet] in height, and about the same dimension in circumference. As people had already been digging there, a cavity was seen which however had fallen in. I hired 25 men to dig under proper supervision. After two months' work, they dug out only a parcel of torn paper, and torn leaves with writing on them. I now forward this to you. If afterwards I discover any person possessing such manuscripts, I shall again communicate with you.

(x) Subsequently the oasis of Kuchar was visited by a series of expeditions—Japanese, German, Russian, and French (see ante, p. iii)—for the purpose of exploring all the sites of archaeological interest situated in it. It was the object of the last expedition, the French, led by M. Pelliot, more especially to explore systematically the

---

34 This is a total misconception. Lieutenant Bower, as the latter states himself (see No. iii), received his manuscripts not from an Afghan, but from a Tarki, and as will be shown in the sequel, he received it one year earlier than the occasion here referred to. The statement, it should be noted, appears only in an account of 1898, and is due to a confusion of the Munshi himself. The genuine early and contemporary native tradition knows nothing of it. For an explanation of the facts, see below p. xii.

35 This should be 1892. See ante, note 25.

36 That this really was the case is proved by the fact that among the manuscripts which Mr. Petrovsky sent to the Imperial Library in St. Petersburg during the autumn and winter of 1892-3, there are portions of at least two manuscripts, of which other portions are included in the Weber and Macartney Manuscripts. See Journal, As. Soc. Beng., Vol. LXVI (1897), pp. 241-2, also my Report, Part II, in Extra Number to Journal, ASB., Vol. LXX (1901), pp. 16-17 (No. 2, Pothi); also Vienna Oriental Journal, Vol. VII, p. 273.

37 These, of course, are not included in the Petrovsky Collection of 1892-3 referred to in the preceding note.

sites reputed to be those from which the Bower, Weber, Macartney, and Petrovski Manuscripts had been extracted by the native treasure seekers. The only report on the subject, however, which as yet is available is contained in a letter of M. Pelliot, dated the 29th January 1907, which was read by M. A. Barth to the French Académie des Inscriptions & Belles Lettres in their séance of the 22nd March 1907, and which is published in the Comptes Rendus, pp. 162 ff. It gives an account of all the information which at present, and at this distance of time, appears to be obtainable at the locality of the discoveries itself. M. Pelliot relates (loc. cit., p. 164) that on the 21st January 1907 he went to visit the Ming-oi or rock-cut caves of Qizil to the north-west of Kuchar (see the Sketch Map). On his return he took the more difficult hill route, where he met with a well-educated Turk, named Timur Beg, who was in charge of the copper mines of Kuchar. From this man M. Pelliot elicited some interesting information regarding the discovery of the manuscripts in question. His letter, translated from the original French, proceeds as follows (p. 165):

"From the time of my arrival at Kuchar, Beneskovski had spoken to me about 250 bundles of Hindo manuscripts which had been found about a score of years ago, in the ruined grand stupa of Quthlu Urga, a little to the west of Kuchar. These books, Beneskovski told me, had been distributed in a series of small receptacles built into the very brick core of the stupa; and some of them still remained in a certain Turk family which refused to sell them. Beneskovski had this information from "his man" as he always called him, a shady person, treasure-seeker and sorcerer on occasion, well acquainted with the country, but a liar without an equal. I have caught him in flagrante delicto on several occasions, and as the places which were shown to me as the ancient receptacles of the book were little capable of ever having contained anything, I was convinced that, even if the discovery was true, at all events the informants, Mir Sheriff, had not been an eye-witness of it.

"Until my meeting with Timur Beg it had seemed to me little probable that we should ever hear much more about the discovery. But while I was conversing with him, he spoke to me, of his own accord, of books which had been found some time ago by treasure seekers at Quthlu Urga. There were about 25 bundles, each between two wooden boards, the whole in an unknown script, measuring about 0.10 by 0.10 metre; also one very large book was found in a bag. The treasure seekers, not knowing what to do with their booty, offered it to Timur Beg's uncle, Ghaniyat Khoja, who was the headman of that part of the village. He, however, did not attach to the books any greater value, and thus little by little, being torn by the children, and exposed to neglect, they all got lost. No one suspected that these old papers could possess any value.

"The idea occurred to me that possibly the Bower Manuscript was one of the manuscripts of Ghaniyat Khan. For this, however, I had no proof, nor even any serious indications. In fact, as I should explain, Bower was told that his manuscript had been found in one of the caves of the Ming-oi of Qum Turi. This in itself is quite possible; for though, as a rule, the Ming-oi have yielded only detached leaves, the Germans are said to have stumbled at Qizil on an almost complete text. But in any case, it appeared to me very likely probable that the particular grotto which had been indicated to Bower, and which, in the course of centuries, had been but little encroached upon by the sands, had yielded any manuscript. The find, if it was made at all in Qum Turi, must have taken place in another grotto.

"But there is another possible solution. I asked Timur Beg whether he ever heard of any of the bundles having been sold to a foreigner. He replied that he had heard say that one of the servants of his uncle had once taken one or two bundles and sold them to the "Afghan" Qadir Khan, who had resold them to an Englishman. There is still, at the present day, at Kuchar a Qadir Khan who, as a fact, is an"

36 Dr. A. von Le Coq informs me (Letter 28th October 1909) that it was a well preserved jōthi, tied up between two wooden boards, consisting of a large number (about 60) of leaves in Brāhmi script, and Sanskrit language; also one leaf in Brāhmi script and an unknown language; measuring about 22.8 cm. It is shown in figs. 6 and 7, Chapter II, pp. xvii and xviii.

37 This is a vague reference, but it cannot refer to Lieut. Bower, who is out of the question, but to Mr. Weber, or to Sir George Macartney, or possibly to both. See below, page xv.
English subject. People call him an Afghan, just as they call the Aqsaqal an "Afghan," because he comes from the region of Peshawar. Is he the same man? I do not know; for, as I believe I had understood from Timur Beg that the Qadir Khan in question was dead. If the truth of his story can be fully relied on, it would seem to afford us glimpses of the Bower MS. I am rather disposed to admit that solution, seeing that the manuscripts of Quilqu Urdâ are, on the whole, the only ones regarding which I have hitherto obtained some little more precise information. On the other hand, if Qadir Khan owed his manuscripts to the theft of a servant, he would only too naturally prefer to attribute them to another source, and, from this point of view, the Ming-oï of Qum Turâ would be just what he required.

But it is also possible that we have here a false tradition, that the sale to an Englishman is an invented story, and that there is reference perhaps rather to a text which Petrovski acquired and which may now be in St. Petersburg. We must not forget that in consequence of Bower's discovery, Petrovski and Macartney sent men into the country, and their enquiries, by arousing the attention of the natives, would tend to originate legends. All that I wish to say is that the traditional version of the discovery of the Bower MS. can be received only with a good deal of reserve, and that possibly the manuscript came from Quilqu Urdâ.

(xi) In a subsequent English letter, dated Peking, 10th July 1909, addressed to me in response to a request for further information, M. Pelliot wrote as follows:—

"Unfortunately I have not come across any new date since the time I wrote to the Academy the letter you allude to. [See No. x.] Quotlouq Urdâ is a ruined stûpa, lying about one mile to the west of the town of Kuchar, while the Qum Turâ Ming-oï is about 12 miles further west, on the left bank of the Mouar Daria. . . . . . . I am quite at a loss to decide between the two versions I have collected for the discovery of the Bower Manuscript. It may just as well be true that there were unearthed in the cave of Quotlouq Urdâ, when Bower was shown to it. But it seems to be a well-established fact that an important manuscript-find was made in the Quotlouq Urdâ stûpa some time before the arrival of Capt. Bower. I really cannot say anything more. . . . . . ."

(xii) M. Pelliot's concluding remark in the preceding No. xi regarding the "well-established fact of an important manuscript find in the Quotlouq Urdâ stûpa" is confirmed in a letter addressed to me by Dr. A. von Le Coq, dated the 9th October 1909, from which the following, translated from the German, is an extract:—

"That a very considerable find of manuscripts was made in a stûpa in Kuchar appears to me to follow from the narration of the Russian [Andijan] Aqsaqal in Kuchar, Chal Muhammed. He showed me the pyramid-like structure near the town, north of the road to Qum Turâ, from which, some 20 years ago, some people extracted the largest find of manuscripts, which, so far as I know, had never been made. Possibly the Bower manuscript was part of that find. To native statements, as a rule, no weight attaches; but this man was the most honest of all whom I came to know in that place."

(xiii) From the careful survey made by the French expedition it appears, as I learn from M. A. Barth (letters of the 3rd June and 22nd October 1909), that there are four stûpas in the neighbourhood of the Ming-oï of Qum Turâ. Their distribution is shown in the following extract from a letter to me of Sir Aurel Stein, dated the 3rd December 1909:

"The Qum Turâ site, as far as I saw it on a gloomy winter day, consists of:

(a) the caves on the left river bank, in two groups, close together, cut into the barren outer hills;

(b) a Kone Shahr, or "ancient city," about 11 miles to the south, near the right bank of the river containing the ruins of a large monastery with one stûpa in the centre, and another big stûpa ruin outside it to the north;

(c) the Scral Tam ruin, about 11 miles to the south-west of (b), on the left bank of the river, consisting of a massive enclosing wall about 55 yards square with a ruined stûpa in the centre, and a fairly well preserved Qumbân in one corner.

"In addition I noticed some ruins, probably of temples, about 150 feet above the caves on a ridge of the left bank. These I had no time to visit, and hence cannot say whether stûpas could be distinguished among them."
That there was, however, a large stūpa among them, the fourth of the list, appears from a letter of Dr. A. von Le Coq, dated the 24th October 1909:

"Stūpas are there . . . Bower's statements are likely to be correct; all the stūpas are more or less ruined. Qum Turā, or 'the (old) building in the sand' is a modern small settlement which takes its name from an old (Buddhist) temple which stands on a gravelly alluvial flat (apparently Sarai Tam) on the bank of the river where it debouches from the valley. On the height of the eastern (left) bank there stands, unless I am much mistaken, the principal stūpa. In order to get to the Ming-ōi one has to ride in the bed of the river (or on the ice). I should say the distance is about half a kilometer."

In a later communication from Dr. von Le Coq, on the 16th November 1909, the following distances are given:

"The distance from Qum Turā to the Turā (or the ruined building) on the ridge is about five kilometer (or about three miles). We rode at the time over the ice: in the summer the distance may be a little greater. From the Turā to the beginning of the caves I should say the distance is about 500 meters (or about 500 yards, see No. ii)."

On the basis of the above-given extracts from letters as illustrated by the Sketch Map, the Topographical Plan, and the View of Qum Turā, an attempt may now be made to determine what, in all probability, would seem to have been the true find-place of the Bower Manuscript. In the first place, two misapprehensions must be removed which hitherto have prevented its recognition. It will be seen from the extracts Nos. x, xi and xii, that according to an admittedly well established native tradition, current in Kuchar, a large find of manuscripts was made in the Qutluq Urdā stūpa; and it is there suggested that the Bower Manuscript may have formed part of that find. Again, in Nos. x and xi, a rival version of the tradition is referred to, according to which the Bower Manuscript was found in one of the caves of the Ming-ōi of Qum Turā. Now this rival version is not a native Kuchari tradition at all, but merely a mistaken view originally started by Bühler in his contributions to the Vienna Oriental Journal, Vol. V (1891), pp. 103 and 302, in which after having read Lieutenant Bower's note (quoted in No. i), Bühler announced the discovery of the Bower manuscript to the learned world of Europe, as having been "obtained by Lieutenant Bower from the ruins of the ancient underground city of Ming-ōi near Kuchar in Kashgaria." On referring to that note, it will be seen that Lieutenant Bower made no such statement. He says explicitly that the manuscript was "dug out of the foot of one of the curious old erections" which stood "just outside (or "close to") as in No. iii) the subterranean city." Bühler's misrepresentation is, in the circumstances, easily enough explainable, but it suggested what Lieutenant Bower explicitly states in his letter (see No. ii) to be "a total misconception of the facts"; and unfortunately it has had the effect of obscuring the real facts to all subsequent investigators.

The correction of Bühler's misconception practically disposes also of the other misapprehension regarding the Qutluq Urdā stūpa. As may be seen from Nos. ix, xi, and xii, that stūpa is situated close to the town of Kuchar itself, that is to say, only about one mile (No. x), or "about 5 li" (No. ix) to the west of that town and north of the road to Qum Turā; while the stūpa, from which the Bower manuscript was extracted, stands close to, that is to say "about 500 yards" (No. ii), or "about half a kilometer" (No. xii) from the Ming-ōi of Qum Turā, and that Ming-ōi itself is situated, according to Lieutenant Bower, "about 16 miles from Kuchar" (No. i), or according to M. Pelliot, "about 12 miles further west" (No. xi) from the Qutluq Urdā stūpa, that is to say, about 13 miles from the town of Kuchar. Clearly the stūpa of the Bower manuscript, and the stūpa of Qutluq Urdā from which the Weber, Macartney and Petrovskii manuscripts were obtained, are two entirely distinct structures.
But the extracts, above given, furnish us with some further corroborative evidence. Lieutenant Bower tells us that his stūpa (i.e., the stūpa close to the Ming-o of Qum Turā) was "about 50 feet high" (No. iii). On the other hand, the stūpa of Qutluq Urdā, which is described by M. Pelliot as a "grand stūpa" (No. x), is stated by the Chinese Amban, who visited it at the end of the year 1894, to have been "about 10 chang (pr about 100 feet) in height, and about the same dimension in circumference (No. ix). This "grand stūpa," therefore, in those days, was about twice the size of the stūpa of Qum Turā. Again the stūpa of Qum Turā, according to both Lieutenant Bower and Dr. von Le Coq, stands right upon the (eastern or left) bank of the river Shāhyār (Nos. iii, xiii), or Muzart as it is also called (No. xi); while the stūpa of Qutluq Urdā is described by Dildār Khān, in his Urdā account, as standing "at the foot of a mountain" (No. vii), the reference apparently being to the "low barren hills," alluded to by Lieutenant Bower in the account of his march to Qum Turā (No. ii). The topographical position of the two stūpas, therefore, is quite different. There is a further difference in the dates of the opening of the two stūpas. Lieutenant Bower obtained his manuscript early in 1890. Therefore the stūpa, in which it was found, was opened, at least, as early as that year. In fact, as will be shown presently, it appears to have been opened only a few days previously. On the other hand, the Qutluq Urdā stūpa must have been opened in 1891, that is, about one year later than the Qum Turā stūpa. For when Mr. Weber obtained his manuscripts in June 1892, he was told that they had been found "the year before" (Nos. iv and v), that is to say, in 1891. There was, therefore, an interval of about one year between the openings of the two stūpas. Between the year 1891 and the date of M. Pelliot's visit in 1907, there is an interval of 16 years. The native tradition, at the time of his visit to Kuchar, made the interval to be "about a score of years" (No. x). The same statement, "some 20 years ago," was made about the same time to Dr. von Le Coq (No. xiii). As to this discrepancy, the contemporary statement, made to Mr. Weber, is obviously more trustworthy than the vague statement, in round numbers, of a much later oral tradition, which had no longer an exact recollection of the date, and which, in any case, would be inconsistent with either date, 1890 or 1891. M. Pelliot's remark that the find in the stūpa was made "some time before the arrival of Captain Bower" (No. xi) would seem to be merely a deduction from the statement "about a score of years" in the native tradition, seeing that the latter would work out about the year 1887, or about four years earlier than Lieutenant Bower's visit. The tradition itself knows nothing about Lieutenant Bower. Lastly, there is a difference between the numbers of manuscripts which are reported to have been found in the two stūpas respectively. The Bower Manuscript is the solitary manuscript which is said to have been found in the stūpa at Qum Turā (No. iii). On the other hand, with regard to the stūpa of Qutluq Urdā the uniform native tradition is that a large number of manuscripts were dug out from it (Nos. vii, xii), the number being sometimes given as 25, and at other times (no doubt, exaggeratedly) even as 250 (No. x).

The facts above set out make it quite certain that the Bower Manuscript was not found in the stūpa of Qutluq Urdā, about one mile from Kuchar, but in a stūpa close to the Ming-o of Qum Turā about 13 (or 15) miles from that town. But further, it seems practically certain that it was dug out from the stūpa, on the ridge above the caves, at the spot marked C on the Topographical Plan. For this stūpa alone can be said to be "close
to" the Ming-oï or "just outside the subterranean city" (No. i), the other three stūpas at Kone-Shahr and Sarai Tam being about 1½ to 2½ miles distant from the Ming-oï.

Having determined what in all probability is the true find-place of the Bower Manuscript, we may now attempt to determine the exact time when it was discovered by the native treasure-seekers of Kuchar. For guidance we have the following data, supplied by Captain Bower in the report of his travels in the Geographical Journal of the Royal Geographical Society, Vol. V (1895), pp. 252 ff., and illustrated by the annexed Sketch Map. At Kuchar, Captain Bower tells us, he halted several days, and while staying there, he received, as related in Extract No. iii, the visits of a Turki who gave him the manuscript and guided him to its find-place, the stūpa close to the main group of caves of the Ming-oï of Qum Tūrā. He started on this expedition about midnight of the day on which the manuscript was brought to him (Nos. i, iii). He reached the Ming-oï at day-break (say, about 5 A.M., Nos. ii, iii) of the following day. Here he spent some hours in examining the stūpa of the manuscript, and some of the adjacent caves of the Ming-oï, of the appearance of which the accompanying photographs (Figs. 3 and 4), supplied by the kindness of M. Pelliot and Dr. von Le Coq, give us some idea. Having done so, Lieutenant Bower went on to Faizābād, where he spent the night. The next day, i.e., the second day after leaving Kuchar, he marched down the banks of a canal to Charshamba Bazar, shooting on the way wild ducks that were on the canal.

On the same day, or the day after, he reached Shāhāyr. On the 6th of March he left Shāhāyr on his return journey to Kāshgar, which he reached on the 1st of April. These are the only two definite dates mentioned by Captain Bower in the recital of this part of his tour.

He does not say how long he stayed in Shāhāyr, but as it was his second visit to the place, and as nothing that might have caused a longer detention is mentioned, it may be concluded that the 6th of March was the day after his arrival in Shāhāyr from his visit to the Ming-oï of Qum Tūrā. On the basis of this count, it was the 2nd or 3rd of March, on which Lieutenant Bower received the manuscript, and on the midnight of which he started on his visit to the Ming-oï. Now Lieutenant Bower states (see No. ii) that the Turki, who brought the manuscript to him told him that he had dug it out "a few days previously," and that he "showed him where a hole had been recently excavated." It follows, therefore, that the discovery of the Bower Manuscript must have occurred a few days previous to the 2nd or 3rd of March, that is, on some day of the month of February of the year 1890.

Having passed in review the evidence for what is probably the true find-place of the Bower Manuscript, and for the exact time of its discovery, we may now proceed to sketch
briefly the course of events connected with the discoveries and vicissitudes of the manuscripts called after the names of Bower, Weber, Macartney and Petrovski, so far as they may be deduced by means of a careful comparison and co-ordination of the statements quoted in the preceding extracts. There are some minor discrepancies in them; but they do not affect the main lines of the story.

In February 1890, two Turkis of Kuchar, searching for treasure, dug into the stūpas which stand near the Ming-oî, or system of rock-cut grottos, of Qum Turā. In one of the stūpas, they discovered the birch-bark manuscript, which one of the two men on the 2nd or 3rd of March 1890, sold to Lieutenant Bower, and which is now known as the Bower Manuscript (Nos, i-iii). The partial success of this enterprise apparently suggested to a number of men of Kuchar the attempt to break into the neighbouring great stūpa of Qutluq Urda, which by its much larger size gave promise of the yield of much more valuable booty (No, vii). This enterprise, it appears, was executed some time in the early part of 1891. The story of the men as to what they found in the interior chamber of the stūpa seems never to have varied in its main lines from that year down to 1907, when it was repeated to M. Pelliot (No, iv of 1892, Nos, vii and viii of 1898, No, x of 1907), Nor is there any good reason to discredit it. Interior relic chambers do not uncommonly occur in stūpas of Eastern Turkestan, as has been observed by Sir Aurel Stein in his Ancient Khotan, Vol. I, pp. 82 ff. Such an interior chamber may be clearly seen, e.g., in the subjoined view of the stūpa at Subashi (Fig. 5) to the east of Kuchar (see Sketch Map) from a photograph taken by Sir Aurel Stein. A similar interior relic chamber in the Mauri Tim Stūpa, near Khânuq, is shown in Sir Aurel Stein's Ancient Khotan, p. 74, fig. 13. However, the only point of interest in the men's story is that they found a large number of manuscripts, enough to fill a "big basket" (No, viii). These manuscripts are said to have consisted of twenty-five "bundles," that is, Indian pāṭhis (see Fig. 6, p. xvii), each tied between two wooden boards, and written in a script unknown to the finders (No. x), that is, in a Sanskrit, or Brahmī, script. They were taken to the house of the Qāṣī, or headman, of Kuchar (Nos. vii, x), a Turkī called Q̣anisat, Khaṅ, the uncle of a man called Timur Beg28 (Nos. ix, x). In his house they lay about, uncared for, and suffering much injury at the hands of the children. In the meantime, Lieutenant Bower, on his return journey to India, having shown his acquisition to Messrs. Macartney and Petrovski in Kashgar, and to Mr. Weber in Leh, these gentlemen had instructed their native acquaintances, or Aqsaqās, to keep an outlook for similar discoveries with a view to securing them (Nos. iv, v, x). The presence of the "bundles" of manuscripts in the house of the Qāṣī soon became known generally in Kuchar. Among others the British and Russian Aqsaqās

28 In No. viii the owner is called Yaqṣī Beg. If this is not a mere error, Yaqṣī Beg may have been a son of Q̣anisat Khāṅ, who may have been dead by that time.
Fig. 3: View of a portion of the Ming-a of Qum Turā.

Fig. 4: View of the river Shīlyār from the window of a cave of the Ming-a of Qum Turā.

Fig. 5: View of shān at Subashi.
in that town came to hear of it, and at once went to the Qāṣī's house to secure some portion of the find for their patrons. The British Agent, an Afghan merchant residing in Kuchar, named Qādir Khān, obtained, only a couple of days after the manuscripts had been brought to the house of the Qāṣī, a few of them in two bundles, no doubt, by means of a gratuity given to the servant of the Qāṣī (Nos. viii. ix). The manuscripts thus obtained he transmitted to his brother, Dildār Khān, another merchant, acting as the British Aqaqāl in Yarkand. The latter sold, in the following year, 1892, one of the two bundles to Mr. Weber, through Munshi Ahmad Din. This bundle has since been known as the Weber Manuscripts. The other bundle Dildār Khān carried to India, no doubt with the object of selling it there, but failing therein, he brought it back, in 1895, and disposed of it to Sir George Macartney in Kashgar (Nos. vi, viii); and it has since been known as the Macartney Manuscripts. Similarly, the Russian Aqaqāl in Kuchar, an Andijani merchant (perhaps the man Chal Muhammad who was Dr. von Le Coq's informant; see No. xii), secured another bundle of more or less injured manuscripts from the Qāṣī's house, which he transmitted to Mr. Petrovski in Kashgar, and which now form the Petrovski collection in St. Petersburg. As to what became of the remainder of the manuscripts in the house of the Qāṣī, there is no certain information. The current opinion in Kuchar appears to be that, utterly neglected as they were in the house of the Qāṣī, they gradually got lost or destroyed. Some of them may, in the form of detached leaves, have subsequently found their way into the hands of Europeans; others may possibly, as Mr. Berezovski seems to believe (No. x), still yield to persevering search. To the former class may possibly belong some of the detached leaves, which were given to Captain Godfrey in 1895 apparently by some Yarkand traders, and which are said to have been "dug up near some old buried city in the vicinity of Kuchar." They belong to the collection which now bears the name of the Godfrey Manuscripts.  

The general truth of the native tradition respecting the condition of the manuscripts at the time of their discovery, and their treatment afterwards in the house of the Qāṣī, is fully confirmed by the appearance of the Weber, Macartney and Petrovski Manuscripts at the time of their reception. At the latter date, they consisted of more or less disorderly bundles of damaged manuscripts in which a number of leaves of different manuscripts were mixed up. Among the Weber and Macartney Manuscripts there actually were portions of manuscripts of which other portions are among the Petrovski Manuscripts. This strikingly illustrates the ignorant neglect and careless treatment to which, according to Timur Beg's story (see No. x), the manuscripts were exposed in the house of his uncle. According to that story, in the original condition in which they were found, they appear

---

39 See Journal, Asiatic Society of Bengal, Vol. lxvi (1897), Part I, p. 14, and Plates II and III;
40 See the description of p. 87, No. 2 of set i, in my Report on the British Collection of Central-Asian Antiquities, Part II, page 15; also ante, footnote 33, p. viii.
to have been in more or less good order, each manuscript being tied up, in the ordinary fashion of an Indian pāthī, between two wooden boards (see No. x, also No. vii). The condition, in which probably they were found, may be seen from the photographs (Figs. 6 and 7, pp. xvii and xviii) of a manuscript, which was found by Dr. A. von Le Coq in a grotto of the Ming-ōi of Qizil. As a matter of fact, among the Macartney Manuscripts both boards of a manuscript were still preserved, though the manuscript itself was defective. Also the bundle of Weber manuscripts contained two single boards of different sizes, belonging to two different manuscripts, which manuscripts themselves were defective both in the size and number of their leaves.\(^{41}\) It is probable that at the time these two manuscripts were found, they as well as their boards were in good order, and that they got into their present defective condition during their sojourn in the house of the Qādī. Similarly the Bower manuscript was found enclosed between two wooden boards (see Chapter II). Again, according to the native tradition reported to M. Pelliot (No. x), the dimension of the manuscripts was about 11\(\frac{1}{2}\) by 4 inches (0'30 sur 0'10 metre). As a matter of fact, the Weber and Macartney Manuscripts, in their original condition, measured roughly from 5\(\frac{1}{2}\) to 10\(\frac{1}{2}\) inches in length, and from 2\(\frac{1}{2}\) to 4\(\frac{1}{2}\) inches in breadth.\(^{42}\) This is as near to the traditional statement as, in the circumstances of the case, we can reasonably expect it to be.

\(^{41}\) See the description in the Journal, Asiatic Society of Beng. Vol. LXII (1893), Part 2, pp. 2, 5, 9, 22, and Vol. LXX (1901), Extra Number, pp. 8, 16.

\(^{42}\) See \textit{ibidem} Vol. LXII, pp. 9 ff., Nos. 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 9; also Vol. LXX, p. 18, No. 7.
CHAPTER II.

DESCRIPTION OF THE BOWER MANUSCRIPT.

The term "Bower Manuscript" is not strictly correct. As will be seen from the sequel, the object in question is not really a single manuscript, but, in point of size, rather a combination of two manuscripts, a larger and a smaller. The larger manuscript itself, moreover, in point of subject matter, is a complex of six smaller manuscripts, the distinction of which from one another is indicated also by their separate pagination. The Bower Manuscript, therefore, in reality is a collection of seven distinct manuscripts, or it may be called a collective manuscript of seven parts. The latter is the terminology adopted in the present edition; that is, Parts I-III, IV, V and VII, constitute the larger manuscript while the smaller manuscript consists of Part VI.

The external form of the collective Bower Manuscript is that of the Indian pūṭhi. A pūṭhi consists of a number of leaves, of a practically uniform oblong shape, generally enclosed between two wooden boards, and the whole held in position, or "bound," by a string which passes through a hole drilled through the whole pile. Unfortunately no photograph was ever taken of the Bower Manuscript in the condition in which it was found, or in which it was made over by the finder to Lieutenant Bower. But an idea of its appearance may be formed from Fig. 6, which shows a paper pūṭhi, tied up with a string between its wooden boards, exactly as it was found by Professor Grünwedel's expedition in a cave temple of the Mingor of Qizil. In Fig. 7, the same pūṭhi is shown untied and unfolded.

The leaves of the Bower Manuscript are cut from the bark, or periderm, of the birch tree; those of a modern Indian pūṭhi are, as a rule, of paper. Before the introduction of paper into India, which event probably coincided with the advent of the Muhammadans, the writing material for the purpose of literature was palm-leaf or birch-bark. Palm-leaf must have been the original material of an Indian pūṭhi; for it was the shape of the palm-leaf which determined the narrow oblong shape of the leaves of the pūṭhi. The bark of the birch tree may be obtained in very large strips, about a yard long and eight inches broad. There is no apparent reason why these strips should have been cut into narrow oblong pieces in order to be used as the writing material of books. On the other hand, from the long narrow segments of the leaf of a palm tree none but strips, at most about a yard long and three inches broad, could be cut. These, if used as writing material, necessarily determined the narrow oblong shape of the leaves of the pūṭhi. The birch tree (Betula utilis), the "Himalayan Birch," is indigenous in the extreme North of India (e.g., in Kashmir), while the palm tree (Talipat, Corypha umbraculifera) is peculiar to the South of India. Hence the fashion of the Indian pūṭhi must have originated in the South of India.

---

43 From the Sanskrit pustakā, or rather pustikā, book, applied at the present day to any book, written or lithographed or printed, Indian or European.
44 See Sketch Map to Chapter I.
45 Occasionally they are still made of palm-leaf, in Bihar, Orissa, and Southern India.
46 On the local distribution, and other particulars, of these two materials, see my Epigraphical Note, in the Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, Vol. LXIX (1900), Part I, pp. 93 ff.
India, while the original "book" of the North of India must have been written on large strips of birch-bark. As a fact the oldest Indian "book" on birch-bark, the Dutreuil de Rhins Manuscript, which probably dates from near the beginning of our era, is written on such large strips. The Southern Indian fashion of the pāṭhi is, in many ways, more convenient for literary use; and as evidenced by the Bower Manuscript and by the other birch-bark manuscripts which have been discovered in Eastern Turkestan (see Chapter IV), it must, at a very early period, have made its way into Northern India, whence finally it was carried, by the spread of Buddhism, to Eastern Turkestan, nearly all the indigenous paper manuscripts of which exhibit the narrow oblong shape of the Indian pāṭhi. At a much later period, probably after the advent of Islam and its western culture, the fashion arose, within the birch-bark area of Northern India to use birch-bark in imitation of paper, and to give to birch-bark books the shape of the paper books of the West. The Indian pāṭhi shape of the birch-bark Bower Manuscript, therefore, is corroborative evidence of the great antiquity of that manuscript,—a point which will be discussed in detail in Chapter III.

The birch-bark leaves of the Bower Manuscript, as already intimated, are of two different sizes. The leaves of Parts I-III, IV, V and VII are considerably larger, both in length and breadth, than those of Part VI. The former measure about 11 by 2½ inches; the latter, about 9 by 2 inches. Besides the size of the leaves, there is another point which differentiates the two portions of the collective manuscript from each other. The birch bark of the larger portion is of a quality much inferior to that of the smaller portion (Part VI). The former is hard and brittle, and apt to break if roughly handled, while the latter is soft and tough, and can readily be bent. The difference may be due to the age of the tree from which the bark was taken, as well as to the thoroughness of the process (probably boiling in milk or water) by which the bark was prepared for the reception of writing. Moreover, some of the leaves used in the larger portion were in a defective condition at the time when they were inscribed, while the leaves of Part VI were, and are still, in perfect order. For example, in Part I a large portion in the upper right corner of the third folio (see Plate III), affecting no less than six lines, had broken away, before the leaf was inscribed; for nothing of the text is wanting. Similarly, in Part II, large holes had broken into folios 25 and 26 (Plates XXVII and XXVIII), before they were written on. On the other hand, the defects in folios 9 and 12 of the same Part (Plates XIV and XVII) only occurred after those leaves had been inscribed; for some portion of the text is lost. But there is also another cause to which the defective condition of the leaf is occasionally due, viz., exfoliation. Birch-bark, as writing material, is of varying thickness, consisting of several layers of periderm of extreme tenuity, numbering from two to twelve, or even more; one layer by itself would be too tenuous to be inscribed. When the bark is properly prepared, the process renders the natural adhesion of the layers more durable; but when it is imperfectly prepared, or when it is

87 Thus, of the five folios of Part I, the first consists of two layers, the four others of four layers each (Journal, As. Soc. Beng., Vol. LX, 1891, p. 139). Of the five folios of Part IV, the second has at least twelve, and the other, four layers each (Indian Antiquary, Vol. XXI, 1891, pp. 129, 130). Of the four folios of Part VI, the first has three layers, the third, six, and the two others, four each. Of course with good birch-bark it would not have been necessary to have a large number of layers to render the bark inscribable; it was the inferior quality of most of the bark which prevented a separation of the layers in unaccompanied portions of sufficient dimensions to admit of being used as writing material (see Journal, As. Soc. Beng., Vol. LX, 1891, Part I, p. 137).
taken from a too old tree, or from an unsuitable part of the tree, the surface layers are apt to flake off, when the bark becomes thoroughly dry. In that condition, a leaf is unsuitable for writing. This may be illustrated by the blank reverse of the fourth folio in Part IV (Plate XLI), which distinctly shows the surface in process of exfoliation; and it was, no doubt, for that reason that the scribe abstained from writing on it. For the same reason, apparently, the obverse of the fourth folio of Part V (Plate XLVI) was left blank. On the other hand, occasionally exfoliation took place after the leaf had been inscribed. Thus on the left of the reverse side of the thirty-third folio (Plate XXXIV) of Part II, about one-fourth of the surface layer has flaked off, carrying with it a large portion of the text; and the same injury has befallen a smaller portion of the reverse of the twenty-ninth folio (Plate XXXI). On the obverse side of the sixth folio of Part V we have another example of the same phenomenon; and in the case of folio 1 of Part VII (Plate LIII) the whole of the inscribed top layer of the obverse side has flaked off. In the third place, much of the bark, used in the larger portion, is full of faults in its texture. It appears to have been taken from an unsuitable part of the tree, producing a rough and knotty surface, unserviceable for writing. This may be seen by reference, e.g., to the reverses of the first folio of Part II (Plate VI) and the second folio of Part IV (Plate XXXIX), about one-half of which has been left blank. It is also illustrated by the fact that sometimes when the scribe attempted to write across a fault, his letters would form only very badly, as, e.g., in Part I, folio 549 (Plate V), where the syllable tā (ofśā) is almost illegible; or they would not form at all, and the writer was obliged to abandon a half-finished letter, and trace it anew on the other side of the fault, thus leaving a more or less extended gap in his line. Thus in Part I, folio 307 (Plate III) we have vivi[sa]śrā, folio 36, jī[sa]śrākām, folio 562 (Plate V), vya[sa]śrākāchā, where the abandoned half-finished letters are indicated by being placed within brackets (Journal, As. Soc., Beng., 1891, Vol. LX, Part I, p. 137). Other examples are in Part II, fol. 7, 8, 22, 27, 29, etc. (Plates XII, XIII, XXIV, XXIX, XXXI), in Part III, folio 3 (Plate XXXVI), and in Part V, folios 2 and 6 (Plate XLIV and XLVIII), which show large uninscribed places. None of these defects is seen in the bark of Part VI, which is of the proper texture, and has been properly prepared.

The fact of the larger portion of the Bower Manuscript being written on birch-bark of such an inferior quality, of course, suggests the enquiry as to what may have been the cause of it. So much seems obvious that, as Kashmir and Udyāna are the lands of the birch and birch-bark, the scribes (on their number, see Chapter III) of the larger portion of the Bower Manuscript would not have had recourse to an inferior quality of bark, if at the time of writing it, they had not been, for some reason, in a position which made it impracticable for them to procure a supply of good bark. The most obvious explanation that suggests itself, of course, is that when they wrote their manuscript, they were already settled in Kuchar, where fresh birch-bark prepared for writing was not readily procurable, for which reason they were reduced to the necessity of using up what inferior portion remained to

---

48 The blankness is not due to the spots: that need not have interfered, as may be seen from the obverse of folio 2 of Part III (Plate XXXVI).—The leaves and plates of Part V are wrongly placed; for "Leaf 6, Plate XLVIII" read "Leaf 1, Plate XLIII", and shift the others accordingly.

49 The number 33 which is seen on the peeled off surface on Plate XXXIV is not original: it was inscribed by myself for guidance.
them of the store of birch-bark which they may have originally brought with them from their home in north-western India. But by the time that Part VI came to be written, a fresh supply of good and well-prepared bark had been procured.

One of the indications of the collective character of the Bower Manuscript, as has been stated, is the mode of pagination which it exhibits. For the leaves of each Part are numbered separately, so far as can be judged from the numbering where it is preserved. In Indian pōthīs the practice is to number, not the pages, but the leaves; and the numbers are placed on the left-hand margin, either on the obverse or the reverse side of the leaf. In northern Indian manuscripts it is always the reverse side which is thus numbered, while in southern manuscripts, it is the obverse.\(^{50}\) In Parts IV and V, the margins are so imperfectly preserved that it must remain uncertain whether they ever bore any numbers. The practice of numbering the folios, however, is so general in Indian manuscripts that, on the whole, the probability is in favour of its having once existed in those Parts at the time when the margins were intact. In Parts I—III and VII the margins of most leaves are fairly well preserved, and they show the usual pagination on the reverse side of the leaf, thus pointing to a northern locality as their place of origin. Part VI, the margins of which are well preserved, shows pagination throughout; and, what is noticeable, the numbers are on the obverse side of the leaves. That fact points to a southern place of origin, and this indication is confirmed by others which will be fully discussed in Chapter III.

The total of the existing leaves of the Bower Manuscript is fifty-one. But unfortunately the more important portion of it, Parts I—III, which treats of medicine, is incomplete. Part I ends quite abruptly with the fifth folio. How many more have completed the text, it is impossible to conjecture from the context. The existing six leaves are numbered consecutively from 1 to 5. The obverse of the first leaf, as usual in Indian pōthīs, is left blank. In the left-hand margin of the reverse of the third leaf, there appear, below the ordinary pagination 3, two other signs of doubtful value. If they are to be read as separate numeral figures, they might be 51; or if they are to be read as a single figure, it might be an imperfectly (i.e., discontinuously) written 40 or 70. But in either case their purport is a puzzle.\(^{51}\) Part II also is a fragment; for it ends, apparently abruptly, with the 33rd folio somewhere in the fourteenth chapter. Moreover, the two final chapters, the fifteenth and sixteenth, which are announced in the introduction (verses 8 and 9), and which might have comprised five leaves, are entirely missing. In addition, the entirefolios 20, 21 and 30, and the major portion offolios 16 and 17 are missing. Also, as previously stated (p. xix), smaller portions are missing, by fracture infolios 9 and 12, and by exfoliation in the reverses offolios 29 and 33. The total number of the existing leaves, inclusive of the two fragmentaryfolios 16 and 17, is thirty. In the case of most of these existing leaves, viz., infolios 2—10, 12, 13, 15, 22—26, 31 and 32 (total 19), the ordinary pagination is fully preserved. It is only partially preserved in the fivefolios 16, 18, 19, 28, 29; and it is entirely lost, by fracture or exfoliation of the margin, in the sixfolios 1, 11, 14, 17, 27, 33. On folio 13 (Plate XVIII) there is an indistinct mark between the figures for 10 and 3, apparently the cancellation of another wrongly inscribed figure. The pagination is placed

---

\(^{50}\) See the Vienna Oriental Journal, Vol. VI, p. 261, quoted in Chapter III, p. xxiii.

\(^{51}\) The figures, or figure, cannot well refer to the number of the corresponding verses in the text, as doubtfully suggested in note 57 on p. 5 of my edition.
as a rule, in the middle of the margin, but in folios 25*, 31, 32 it appears in the top of the margin, facing the third or fourth line of the text; and it must have occupied the same position on folios 1, 11, 27, where the top of the margin is mutilated.22

Part III, again, is a mere fragment. Its commencement is marked, as usual, by the sacred symbol of ☦ on the obverse of the first leaf; but it breaks off abruptly on the obverse of the fourth leaf. But the noteworthy circumstance is that it breaks off, not at the bottom, but in the middle of that side of the leaf. This circumstance certainly suggests that the original scribe left off writing at that point, and never completed his work. Subsequently, the manuscript came into the possession of the writer of Part IV, who commenced the writing of that Part on what was then the blank reverse of the fourth folio of Part III. Ultimately the whole manuscript, that is, the unfinished Part III and the subsequently added Part IV, came into the possession of a third person, viz. the writer of Parts V and VII, who proceeded to write a remark of his own on the space left blank by the original writer on the lower portion of the obverse side of the fourth folio of Part III (Plate XXXVIII). This curious case will be the subject of further consideration with additional details in Chapter III (p. xxxv), where it will be shown that the writer of Part III must have written also Parts I and II. In connection with this latter circumstance the query suggests itself whether Parts I and II, no less than Part III, might not have been incomplete at the time when Part III came into the possession of the writer of Parts V-VII; that is to say, that already at that time Parts I and II extended no further than they do at present. It might be surmised that the scribe who made the copies of Parts I-III died before he had finished his task, and that his unfinished copies passed on, in turn, to the writers, or owners, of Part IV and Parts V and VII. There is nothing in the Parts concerned to decide one way or the other about this hypothesis, but in any case the hypothesis has no concern whatever with the losses of folios 21, 22 and 30 of Part II, or the fractures (e.g., of folios 15 and 17) and exfoliations which have been referred to. For injuries of an exactly similar kind are observable in every one of the Parts of the Bower Manuscript, with the exception of Part VI which is written on birch-bark of a superior and durable quality. All these injuries occurred at a date subsequent to the hypothetical transmission of Part I and II to its later owners. The second of the four folios of Part III is the only one which bears pagination. In the others the margin is defective.

Of Parts IV and V, which are two tracts on divination, the former is practically complete,23 while the latter seems to be considerably defective (see Chapter VIII). Neither of them shows any pagination. As they are very small manuscripts, of five (strictly four and a half) and six folios respectively, it is possible that they never had any; but as the margins are more or less defective, the numbers may be lost; and this alternative seems more probable. The obverse of the first leaf of Part V is blank, just as in the case of Part I. Its reverse is inscribed only with the introduction to the treatise, which does not cover the whole of its surface. It bears only five lines, and there is a blank space left, sufficient for, at least, one additional line: all the other leaves have six or seven lines to the page.

Part VI, which is a treatise on a charm against snake bite, is complete. Being written on a superior quality of birch-bark, it is the best preserved portion of the Bower Manuscript. The left-hand margins of all its four folios are in good condition, and bear the pagination,

---

22 The numbers marked on the reverses of folios 17, 21 and 33 are not original, but were inscribed by myself for guidance.

23 On Part IV see my article in the Journal, A. S. B., 1892, p. 129.
1 to 4, on the obverse sides. The manuscript commences with the usual symbol for ōṁ on the obverse of the first leaf, and ends with the usual Buddhist terminal salutations and the double stroke (Chapter IV, p. xxxvii) on the top of the reverse of the fourth folio.

Part VII, which contains a portion of the same charm against snake bite (see Chapter III, pp. xxix and xxxv and Chapter VIII) is defective. It consists of two, much damaged, leaves, the first of which, on its reverse side, bears the pagination 1. The obverse has lost its inscribed surface layer of bark (p. xix), and with it the commencement of the charm. The pagination of the second leaf is lost with the broken-off margin.

Indian manuscripts, or records, as a rule, commence with some benedictory word such as siddham, success, or auasti, hail, or with the sacred particle ōṁ. The last mentioned is almost universally used at the present day. It may be either written in full, or indicated by a symbol. The latter takes the form of a spiral which may turn either to the right or the left (Fig. 8), and which is probably a conventional representation of the sacred sanukha or conch shell. The dextrorse form may be seen on the first leaf of Part I (Fig. 8a), Part II (Fig. 8b and c), and Part III (Fig. 8d), while the sinistrose form appears on the first leaf of Part IV (Fig. 8e), and Part VI (Fig. 8f).

In Parts V and VII it is lost through the damage suffered by their first folios. In all the Parts, except the second, the symbol occupies the usual position facing the first line of the text; but in Part II it appears in the more unusual position, on the left-hand margin, opposite the third line of writing, exactly as it is seen in the two copper-plate grants of Ananta Varman, dateable probably in the sixth century A.D. (fig. 8g, h), shown in Dr. Fleet’s Gupta Inscriptions, pp. 220 and 226, Plates xxxB and xxxIA. Among the dated northern Indian epigraphical records of the Gupta period, the earliest known examples of the dextrorse form of the symbol are those of the year 448-9 A.D. in a stone inscription of Kumara Gupta I (Fig. 8i, see ibid., p. 45, Plate viA), and of the year 493-4 A.D. in a copper-plate grant of Jayanātha (Fig. 8k, see ibid., p. 120, Plate xvi). The earliest known example of the sinistrose form occurs in a copper-plate grant of Mahāsādēvarāja, of an unknown though early date (Fig. 8l, ibid., p. 198, Plate xxvii), and apparently, though mutilated, also in the Bodhgayā inscriptions, of 583 A.D. (ibid., Plate xliA and B).

Of course, these dates are not sufficiently numerous to settle the exact beginning and end of the period of the use of the two forms; but on the whole the sinistrose form seems to be somewhat later in origin. Curiously enough, the symbol for ōṁ, in its dextrorse form, is found also on the obverse side of the 32nd leaf of Part II, on the left margin, opposite the second line of writing. How it comes to be there is, at present, not apparent.

As already observed, the typical Indian pēṭhi is provided with a hole for the passage of the binding string. At the present day, the hole is placed exactly in the middle of the leaves; and it has been so during many centuries past. In the Bower Manuscript the hole is placed in the left side, about the middle of the left half of the leaf; about 3½ inches from the left margin of the larger, and 2½ inches, in the case of the smaller folios. There are reasons to believe that the latter practice was that which prevailed in ancient India. In the old Indian copper-plate grants, the copper leaves are strung together on a copper
ring which passes through a hole in the left side of the leaves. The oldest known copperplates of this kind are those of the Koukadumbi grant of Jayavarman (Epigraphia Indica, Vol. VI, p. 316) and the Pallava grants of King Sivakanda Varman (ibid., Vol. I, pp. 4-6,397; Vol. VI, p. 84), which, on palæographic and linguistic grounds, must be referred to the second and third centuries A.D. respectively. They have their ring-hole near the middle of the left half-side. They are all South Indian grants; and seeing that, as already pointed out, the oblong form of the earliest birch-bark pòthis of Northern India, as seen in the Bower Manuscript, is an imitation of the palm-leaf pòthi of Southern India, it may be concluded that the placement of the string-hole in southern manuscripts pòthis was the same as in the southern copper-plate grants, and that the practice of placing the string-hole in the middle of the left half of the manuscript was adopted by the northern scribes from their southern brethren, whom, in fact, they imitated in the whole mode of fashioning the pòthi. All the earliest birch-bark manuscripts of the fourth and fifth centuries show their string-hole on the left side. But as birch-bark (as well as palm-leaf) is a more or less fragile material, the practice soon arose for the greater safety of the leaves, to make two holes, in the right and left halves, at corresponding distances from the right and left margins. The earliest known examples of this practice are presented in the Horuzi Manuscript (see Anecdota Oeconomica, Vol. I, Part III, Plate I) and the two Nepalese manuscripts of the Cambridge Collection, Nos. 1702 and 1409 (see Bendall's Catalogue, Plate I, Figs. 1 and 2), all of which probably belong to the sixth century. Still later, the practice arose of replacing the two holes by one hole in the middle of the leaves. The existence of this practice is recorded by Alberuni in the eleventh century, who says (Professor Sachau's Translation of Alberuni's India, Vol. I, p. 176) that "the Indians bind a book of palm-leaves together by a cord on which they are arranged, the cord going through all the leaves by a hole in the middle of each." The hole was not at first in the exact middle, but—probably a modified survival of the ancient practice—slightly more to the left, as seen, e.g., in the Nepalese manuscript No. XXI (Paleographie Society), which is dated in 1015 A.D. Still later, and in the present day, the hole appears in the exact middle of the leaves. The peculiar position of the string-hole, in the middle of the left side of the Bower Manuscript, therefore, is an evidence making for the extreme antiquity of the manuscript.  

This is the general practice; but there are exceptions in various directions. Thus exceptionally the hole is found in the bottom margin. A very old example, from the third century A.D., is the Pallava grant of Queen Chāruṇdevi (Epigraphia Indica, Vol. VIII, p. 144). Two other examples of the 7th century are the Chiplul grant of Pulikēśin II (ib., Vol. III, p. 52), and the Nāsikī grant of Śrīsāraya (ib., Vol. VIII, p. 232). Occasionally there are two holes at the bottom, e.g., in the 3rd century the Ganesagad grant of Dhrusnēśa I (ib., Vol. III, p. 320) and the Mālīyā grant of Dhrusnēśa II (Fleet's Gupta Inscriptions, No. 38, p. 168, Plate xxiv); in the 7th century the Śaṅkhaḷa grants of Dādā III, (Epigraphia Indica, Vol. II, p. 20 and Vol V., p. 40); and the Nāgawī grant of Dhrusnēśa II (ib., Vol. VIII, p. 192). Another early practice, which however appears to be limited to a particular Central Indian province, is to place the hole in the top margin of the plates, as in the Kāhī grants of Hastin and other princes (Fleet's Gupta Inscriptions Nos. 22, 25, 27, 28, 30, 31, plates xiii, xvi, xvii, xx). Lastly the hole is occasionally found on the right side. The earliest example of this appears to be the Pājñā grant of the Rāṣṭhakāṭakā king Viśnuṣī, of 791 A.D. (Epigraphia Indica, Vol. III, p. 106). But the overwhelmingly favourite practice throughout ancient India, and at all times, is to place the hole on the left side.

These grants are written in Prākrit, and the spelling in Jayavarman's grant (single for double consonants), as Professor Hultzsch has pointed out (Epigraphia Indica, Vol. VI, p. 316) is exactly like that in the records of the Audhā kings Gautamputra and Vashishtputra, whose dates are c. 117-137 A.D. The spelling in Śivaśākāra's grants has double consonants, but the writing otherwise resembles that of Jayavarman's grant. Accordingly they can be dated, at most, about a century later.

Unfortunately it has never been recorded in what condition the Bower Manuscript was when it was received by Colonel Waterhouse in Calcutta in September 1890. When it came into my hands in February 1891, the leaves of the pāṭhī were enclosed between its two wooden boards, and a string run through them. In order to examine the leaves, I cut the string, and, on doing so, discovered that they were not arranged in their proper order, but that the leaves of the several parts were mixed up (see Proceedings, Asiatic Society of Bengal, 1891., p. 55). How they came into this state of disorder is not known. It does not seem probable that they were so originally when the manuscript was discovered by its Kuchari finders. The people who enshrined it in its receptacle in the stūpa may be assumed to have been able to read it; and they would not have enshrined it in a disorderly condition. But from the time of its discovery, it passed through the hands of, at least, four different persons, all of whom may be assumed with certainty to have cut or unloosed the string to satisfy their curiosity, and none of whom knew, or could read the characters. In the case of Babu Sarat Chandra Das this is certain; for he stated himself to Colonel Waterhouse who had first given him the manuscript to examine, that he had failed to decipher it (see Proceedings, As. Soc. Beng., 1890, pp. 222-3). Moreover, two of the leaves were photographed (see ibid., Plate III) by Colonel Waterhouse, before ever the manuscript came into my hands. It may, therefore, be concluded with good reason that the disorderly condition of the manuscript arose only in the course of its passage through the several hands; and it seems not at all improbable that the serious damage done to the folios 16 and 17 of Part II may be due to incautious handling by the original Turkī finders in Kuchar. After each examination the leaves seem to have been bound together again by a string, whether the same original string or any other may be doubtful. That they were in this bound condition when they reached the hands of Colonel Waterhouse seems to be expressly stated in the original report, published in the November Proceedings of the Asiatic Society of Bengal (1890, p. 223).
CHAPTER III.

THE SCRIPT, THE Scribes, AND THEIR USAGES IN
THE BOWER MANUSCRIPT.

A glance at the Tables which illustrate this chapter shows at once that all the seven
Parts of the Bower Manuscript are written in an essentially identical script. Considering
the fact, which will be proved in the sequel, of a diversity of scribes, the identity of their
script is strikingly shown by the occurrence of the same slight variations in the forms of
such consonants as k, r and s (Table I), and such vowels as i, u, and a (Table II, Nos.
5, 7-10). This script is that which prevailed in Northern India from the fourth to the
sixth centuries A.D. (both inclusive). It is now generally known as the Gupta script,
because its prevalence coincided with the rule of the (Early) Gupta Emperors in whose
epigraphic records it is employed. Most of these records, inscribed during the period of
the Gupta Empire, are collected in the third volume of the Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum.57
The facsimile Plates, accompanying that volume may be consulted for the purpose of
comparing the script used in the Gupta records with that seen in the several Parts of the
Bower Manuscript.

During the period of approximately three centuries of its prevalence the Gupta script
shows two distinct types, a southern and a northern, their areas being separated by a line
running in a north-easterly direction, roughly between N. Lat. 24° and 22°. At Mandasor
(Lat. 24°3′), Eran (Lat. 24°5′), and Udayagiri (Lat. 23°32′), there exist inscriptions, side
by side, in both types of the script. From the dates of these inscriptions58 it will be seen
that, in every case, the records of the southern are earlier than those of the northern
type,—a circumstance which points to the gradual advance southwards of the fashion of
writing in the northern style. For practical purposes the most useful test for distinguishing
the two types is the form of the letter m (Fig. 9). Here (a) shows the original form
of the letter, in the so-called Asoka script. Gradually the curve at the
base was flattened, and the point of crossing shifted, more or less, to the
right. In this form (b) the character was preserved in the southern type
of the script. In the north-west of India the tendency of straightening
the curves was more pronounced. At first it affected only the right side
of the letter. This side was made quite straight; and in consequence
thereof it was entirely severed from the crossing point. Thus arose the
earlier northern Gupta form (c). Soon also the left side was straighten
ed, producing the alternative form (d). In these two forms the
character for m prevailed throughout the Gupta period (Table I), gradually spreading
castward over the whole of Northern India. From the second of the northern Gupta forms

57 Volume III, Inscriptions of the Early Gupta Kings and their Successors, edited by Dr. J. F.
Fleet, C. L. E., in 1888. A few additional inscriptions, discovered after that date are published in the
Epigraphia Indica. These two publications are quoted in the sequel as F. G. I., and E. I. respectively.
58 Mandasor, northern type, F. G. I., Nos. 33, 34, 35, dated c. 530-531 A.D., and southern type, F. G. I.,
No. 18, dated 473, A.D. Eran, northern, F. G. I., Nos. 19, 20, 36 dated 468, 484, 508 A.D., and southern,
F. G. I., No. 2, dated 370 A.D. Udayagiri, northern, F. G. I., No. 61, dated 423 A.D., and southern, F. G. I.,
No. 3, dated 401 A.D.
of $m$, developed, at a later time, the Nāgarī form (c), and its ringleioned variety (f), by the production of the right lateral below the base line.

The origin of the northern form of the Gupta $m$ must be placed in the earlier half of the fourth century A.D. The starting point of the Gupta empire (Pāñjaliputra) was in the East. On the coins and in the records of Samudra Gupta the older form of $m$, with its curved sides (Fig. 9, a b) is still exclusively prevalent. But with his son Chandragupta II, who added the West to the empire, a total change takes place. All his coins and records show only the forms of $m$ with straight sides (Fig. 9, c d). He commenced to reign about 375 A.D.; and he completed his conquest of the West about 395 A.D. His earliest known dated inscription of 407 A.D. (F.G.I., No. 7, p. 36) shows the straight-sided $m$. Its locality Gajhwa, Lat. $80^\circ 38'$, is just within the eastern area. Another of his inscriptions, within the western area, at Mathurā, Lat. $77^\circ 43'$, which also shows the straight-sided $m$ (F.G.I., No. 4, p. 25, Plate iii A) is mutilated and hence undated; but it may be some twenty years older. Anyhow, the fact that the straight-sided $m$ shows no signs of a gradual origination or introduction, but with Chandragupta's western conquests, all at once, entirely supersedes the older curved-sided form of $m$ in the records throughout the northern portion of the Gupta empire, proves that, at the time of that conquest, it must have been the established and prevailing fashion of writing $m$ in the north-west of India. The beginning and growth of that fashion in the North-west itself, therefore, may have good reason be placed in the earlier half of the fourth century, though, of course, in calligraphic records of a particularly ornate kind, such as the Bijayagaḍh inscriptions of about 372 A.D. (F.G.I., Nos. 58, 59, pp. 251-2, Plate xxxvi B. C.), the old form of $m$ with its angular or curved sides, might tend to survive for some longer time. The only form of $m$, prevailing throughout the whole of the Bower Manuscript, in its calligraphically as well as cursively written portions, is the earlier of the two north-western forms, with its right side straight, but the left side twisted (Fig. 9, c; and Table I). So far, therefore, the graphic indications of the manuscript point to some time within the fourth century A.D. At any rate, they need not carry its date back of that century.

The northern type of the Gupta script, again, is divisible into two distinctly marked varieties, an eastern and a western. With regard to this division the most useful test letter is the character for the cerebral sibilant $s$, as compared with the character for the dental sibilant $\delta$. The original forms, in the Aśoka alphabet, of these two characters are shown in Fig. 10, a and $f$ respectively. The form of the former was soon modified, as in (b), by closing up the lower semicircle. In the East, gradually that semicircle was made to bulge out on the left, as in (c), and finally reduced to a small ringlet, as in (d), while in the West it was simply more or less angularized, as in (e). On the other hand, in the case of the dental $\delta$ (f), its basal curve was angularized in the East, and at the same time its tail closed up to form a ringlet, as in (g), while in the West the whole character was angularized, a triangle taking the place of the ringlet, as in (h). The final result of these modifications was, in the East, to cause the forms of the cerebral and dental sibilants, (d) and (g), to resemble each other so closely as to make them practically indistinguishable, while in the West the forms of the two sibilants remained quite distinct. It may be added that the western form of the dental sibilant occurs in
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PART I</th>
<th>PART II</th>
<th>PART III</th>
<th>PART IV</th>
<th>PART V</th>
<th>PART VI</th>
<th>PART VII</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>अ</td>
<td>आ</td>
<td>अ</td>
<td>ऐ</td>
<td>अ</td>
<td>अ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>इ</td>
<td>ई</td>
<td>ई</td>
<td>ऑ</td>
<td>ऐ</td>
<td>ऑ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>उ</td>
<td>ऊ</td>
<td>ऊ</td>
<td>उ</td>
<td>ऊ</td>
<td>ऊ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ri</td>
<td>रि�</td>
<td>रिय</td>
<td>रिय</td>
<td>रि</td>
<td>रिय</td>
<td>रिय</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>ए</td>
<td>ऐ</td>
<td>ऐ</td>
<td>ऐ</td>
<td>ऐ</td>
<td>ऐ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ai</td>
<td>आि</td>
<td>आि</td>
<td>आि</td>
<td>आि</td>
<td>आि</td>
<td>आि</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>ओ</td>
<td>ओ</td>
<td>ओ</td>
<td>ओ</td>
<td>ओ</td>
<td>ओ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Au</td>
<td>आू</td>
<td>आू</td>
<td>आू</td>
<td>आू</td>
<td>आू</td>
<td>आू</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>क</td>
<td>क</td>
<td>क</td>
<td>क</td>
<td>क</td>
<td>क</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kh</td>
<td>ख</td>
<td>ख</td>
<td>ख</td>
<td>ख</td>
<td>ख</td>
<td>ख</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>ग</td>
<td>ग</td>
<td>ग</td>
<td>ग</td>
<td>ग</td>
<td>ग</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gh</td>
<td>घु</td>
<td>घु</td>
<td>घु</td>
<td>घु</td>
<td>घु</td>
<td>घु</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>नू</td>
<td>नू</td>
<td>नू</td>
<td>नू</td>
<td>नू</td>
<td>नू</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>तू</td>
<td>तू</td>
<td>तू</td>
<td>तू</td>
<td>तू</td>
<td>तू</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Th</td>
<td>ठू</td>
<td>ठू</td>
<td>ठू</td>
<td>ठू</td>
<td>ठू</td>
<td>ठू</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>दू</td>
<td>दू</td>
<td>दू</td>
<td>दू</td>
<td>दू</td>
<td>दू</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dh</td>
<td>ठू</td>
<td>ठू</td>
<td>ठू</td>
<td>ठू</td>
<td>ठू</td>
<td>ठू</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part I</td>
<td>Part II</td>
<td>Part III</td>
<td>Part IV</td>
<td>Part V</td>
<td>Part VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>น</td>
<td>น</td>
<td>น</td>
<td>น</td>
<td>น</td>
<td>น</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>ท</td>
<td>ท</td>
<td>ท</td>
<td>ท</td>
<td>ท</td>
<td>ท</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Th</td>
<td>ธ</td>
<td>ธ</td>
<td>ธ</td>
<td>ธ</td>
<td>ธ</td>
<td>ธ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>ด</td>
<td>ด</td>
<td>ด</td>
<td>ด</td>
<td>ด</td>
<td>ด</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dh</td>
<td>ฒ</td>
<td>ฒ</td>
<td>ฒ</td>
<td>ฒ</td>
<td>ฒ</td>
<td>ฒ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>น</td>
<td>น</td>
<td>น</td>
<td>น</td>
<td>น</td>
<td>น</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>ป</td>
<td>ป</td>
<td>ป</td>
<td>ป</td>
<td>ป</td>
<td>ป</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph</td>
<td>ปห</td>
<td>ปห</td>
<td>ปห</td>
<td>ปห</td>
<td>ปห</td>
<td>ปห</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>บ</td>
<td>บ</td>
<td>บ</td>
<td>บ</td>
<td>บ</td>
<td>บ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bh</td>
<td>บห</td>
<td>บห</td>
<td>บห</td>
<td>บห</td>
<td>บห</td>
<td>บห</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>ยุน</td>
<td>ยุน</td>
<td>ยุน</td>
<td>ยุน</td>
<td>ยุน</td>
<td>ยุน</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>ย</td>
<td>ย</td>
<td>ย</td>
<td>ย</td>
<td>ย</td>
<td>ย</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>อ</td>
<td>อ</td>
<td>อ</td>
<td>อ</td>
<td>อ</td>
<td>อ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>ธ</td>
<td>ธ</td>
<td>ธ</td>
<td>ธ</td>
<td>ธ</td>
<td>ธ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>ล</td>
<td>ล</td>
<td>ล</td>
<td>ล</td>
<td>ล</td>
<td>ล</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>ว</td>
<td>ว</td>
<td>ว</td>
<td>ว</td>
<td>ว</td>
<td>ว</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>ส</td>
<td>ส</td>
<td>ส</td>
<td>ส</td>
<td>ส</td>
<td>ส</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>ส</td>
<td>ส</td>
<td>ส</td>
<td>ส</td>
<td>ส</td>
<td>ส</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>ฮ</td>
<td>ฮ</td>
<td>ฮ</td>
<td>ฮ</td>
<td>ฮ</td>
<td>ฮ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>ฮ</td>
<td>ฮ</td>
<td>ฮ</td>
<td>ฮ</td>
<td>ฮ</td>
<td>ฮ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>ยูน</td>
<td>ยูน</td>
<td>ยูน</td>
<td>ยูน</td>
<td>ยูน</td>
<td>ยูน</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>ยูน</td>
<td>ยูน</td>
<td>ยูน</td>
<td>ยูน</td>
<td>ยูน</td>
<td>ยูน</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1: Alphabet**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part I</th>
<th>Part II</th>
<th>Part III</th>
<th>Part IV</th>
<th>Part V</th>
<th>Part VI</th>
<th>Part VII</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>א</td>
<td>א</td>
<td>א</td>
<td>א</td>
<td>א</td>
<td>א</td>
<td>א</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ג</td>
<td>ג</td>
<td>ג</td>
<td>ג</td>
<td>ג</td>
<td>ג</td>
<td>ג</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ד</td>
<td>ד</td>
<td>ד</td>
<td>ד</td>
<td>ד</td>
<td>ד</td>
<td>ד</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ה</td>
<td>ה</td>
<td>ה</td>
<td>ה</td>
<td>ה</td>
<td>ה</td>
<td>ה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>י</td>
<td>י</td>
<td>י</td>
<td>י</td>
<td>י</td>
<td>י</td>
<td>י</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ק</td>
<td>ק</td>
<td>ק</td>
<td>ק</td>
<td>ק</td>
<td>ק</td>
<td>ק</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ל</td>
<td>ל</td>
<td>ל</td>
<td>ל</td>
<td>ל</td>
<td>ל</td>
<td>ל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מ</td>
<td>מ</td>
<td>מ</td>
<td>מ</td>
<td>מ</td>
<td>מ</td>
<td>מ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נ</td>
<td>נ</td>
<td>נ</td>
<td>נ</td>
<td>נ</td>
<td>נ</td>
<td>נ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ג</td>
<td>ג</td>
<td>ג</td>
<td>ג</td>
<td>ג</td>
<td>ג</td>
<td>ג</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ד</td>
<td>ד</td>
<td>ד</td>
<td>ד</td>
<td>ד</td>
<td>ד</td>
<td>ד</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ה</td>
<td>ה</td>
<td>ה</td>
<td>ה</td>
<td>ح</td>
<td>ح</td>
<td>ح</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>י</td>
<td>י</td>
<td>י</td>
<td>י</td>
<td>י</td>
<td>י</td>
<td>י</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ק</td>
<td>ק</td>
<td>ק</td>
<td>ק</td>
<td>ק</td>
<td>ק</td>
<td>ק</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ל</td>
<td>ל</td>
<td>ל</td>
<td>ל</td>
<td>ל</td>
<td>ל</td>
<td>ל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מ</td>
<td>מ</td>
<td>מ</td>
<td>מ</td>
<td>מ</td>
<td>מ</td>
<td>מ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נ</td>
<td>נ</td>
<td>נ</td>
<td>נ</td>
<td>נ</td>
<td>נ</td>
<td>נ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ג</td>
<td>ג</td>
<td>ג</td>
<td>ג</td>
<td>ג</td>
<td>ג</td>
<td>ג</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ד</td>
<td>ד</td>
<td>ד</td>
<td>ד</td>
<td>ד</td>
<td>ד</td>
<td>ד</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ה</td>
<td>ה</td>
<td>ح</td>
<td>ح</td>
<td>ح</td>
<td>ح</td>
<td>ح</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>י</td>
<td>י</td>
<td>י</td>
<td>י</td>
<td>י</td>
<td>י</td>
<td>י</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ק</td>
<td>ק</td>
<td>ק</td>
<td>ק</td>
<td>ק</td>
<td>ק</td>
<td>ק</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ל</td>
<td>ל</td>
<td>ל</td>
<td>ל</td>
<td>ל</td>
<td>ל</td>
<td>ל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מ</td>
<td>מ</td>
<td>מ</td>
<td>מ</td>
<td>מ</td>
<td>מ</td>
<td>מ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נ</td>
<td>נ</td>
<td>נ</td>
<td>נ</td>
<td>נ</td>
<td>נ</td>
<td>נ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
several slightly differing variations, shown in (h), (i) and (k), none of which, however, affects its distinctive character of angularity.

The boundary of the western and eastern areas runs roughly along E, Long. 81°. At Kausambhi (Long. 81° 27') we have inscriptions in both varieties of the northern Gupta type side by side: the western variety in the Pālla land-grant (E.I., Vol. II, p. 364, l. 4, yathaiśa), the eastern in the pillar inscription of Sāmudragupta, now in Allahabad (F. GI. No. 1, p. 1, Plate i), and in the Kōshān image inscription (F. GI. No. 65, p. 266, Plate xxxix C). Similarly, we find the western variety in the image inscription of Dēorīyā (Long. 81° 51’, F. GI. No. 68, p. 271, Plate xi B), and close by, the eastern variety in the image inscription of Mankuwār (Long. 81° 52’, F. GI. No. 11, p. 45, Plate xii A), and in the inscriptions at Gaḍhvā (Long. 81° 18’; F. GI. Nos. 7, 9, 64, 66, pp. 36, 40, 264, 267, Plates iv B,D, and xxxix B,D). As the Nepal valley lies within the eastern area, all the Nepalese inscriptions at, or near, Kātmāndū (Long. 85° 71’) exhibit the eastern cerebral ś (Fig. 10, d), but exceptionally they preserve the distinction of the two sibilants by using the western angular dental s (Fig. 10, h). Throughout the whole of the Bower Manuscript, the two sibilants appear in the western variety of the northern Gupta type, as may be seen by referring to Table I. This fact limits the country of origin of the manuscript to some part of north-western India; and as will be shown in the sequel, the probability is that Parts I-III were written in the extreme north, and Parts V-VII, in the extreme south of that portion of India, or rather (p. xxxv) by scribes coming from those localities.

The western variety of the northern type of the Gupta script itself possessed two sub-varieties. The distinctive feature of these sub-varieties is their different way of writing the palatal sibilant s, either with a curvilinear or a straight-lined top. The successive stages of development of the form of this sibilant are shown in Fig. 11. Originally, in the Asoka script, it had the form (a). Gradually the medial perpendicular line assumed a slanting position as in (b), till finally, in the Indo-Scythic period, in the Kushana script of the second century A.D., it became more or less horizontal, as in (c). Somewhat later, apparently in the early Gupta period, in the fourth century A.D., the alternative form (d) arose, which flattened the rounded top into a straight line. These two forms of the palatal, s the round-topped and the flat-topped, however, were not restricted to a particular area, or a particular period of time. They existed contemporaneously during the Gupta period, and in the same common area. An instructive example is the group of Mandaśr inscription of Yaśodharman (F. GI. Nos. 33, 34, 35, pp. 142, 149, 150, Plates xxi B,C, xxii), which were written by the same scribe, named Govinda (ib., p. 146), about 533 A.D. He uses the flat-topped form of ś throughout his three records. On the other hand, the writer of the somewhat earlier Mandaśr inscription, of the time of Kumāragupta and of the year 473-4 A.D., uses the round-topped
throughout (F. GI. No. 18, p. 79, Plate xi). Good examples of the use of the flat-topped \( i \) are the cave inscription of Udayagiri (Lat. 23° 32', Long. 77° 50'), dated in 425-6 A.D. (F. GI. No. 61, p. 258, Plate xxxviii), and the stone image inscription at Mathurā (Lat. 27° 30', Long. 77° 43'; F. GI. No. 63, p. 262, Plate xxxix A), dated in 454-5 A.D. On the other hand, good examples of the use of the round-topped \( i \) are the copper-plate land-grants of the Parivṛṣṭa Mahārājas, at Khōb, Majhigāwām, and Bhūmarā (about Lat. 24° 25' and Long. 80° 45'; F. GI. Nos. 21-25, pp. 93-112, Plates xiii, xiv, xv B), which are dated between 475 and 529 A.D. These examples show that the two forms of the palatal \( i \) were in use over the same western area, and during the same period of time.

But there is one point to be observed with regard to the use of the two forms of the palatal \( i \), which is of great importance in connection with the Bower Manuscript. The two ways of writing that \( i \) are never confounded, nor do they ever occur promiscuously in the same epigraphic record. It is clear, therefore, that they mark two different styles of writing, each peculiar to a particular writer. They thus offer a test for determining the number of writers who were engaged in the production of the several Parts of the Bower Manuscript.

As may be seen by reference to Table I, the round-topped \( i \) is used exclusively in Parts I-III, while the flat-topped \( i \) is used exclusively in Parts IV-VII. In Parts I-III, the flat-topped \( i \) never occurs, nor does the round-topped \( i \) ever occur in Parts IV-VII. It is inconceivable that the same person should have used habitually and exclusively one mode of writing \( i \) in one set of manuscripts, and another in another set of manuscripts.

It follows, therefore, that Parts I-III were written by a person different from the three persons who wrote Parts IV-VII; for as will be shown in the sequel (pp. xxix and xxxiii), on similar grounds, the two writers of Parts IV and VI must have been different persons from the writer of Parts V and VII.

In this connection, as bearing on the question of the number of scribes, the following fact, which will be fully discussed in Chapter IV, must be noted. The modern form of the letter \( y \), which originated in the northern area of the Gupta script, and which is found in Parts I-III, is entirely absent from Parts IV-VII. The latter make use exclusively of the old three-pronged form of \( y \) (Fig. 19), which persistently continued to prevail in the southern area. Also, another small point which distinguishes the scribes of Parts V-VII from the scribe of Parts I-III is worth noticing. It is the fashion of writing the character for the dental \( th \). As may be seen in Table I, in Parts I-III that character has an upright position, while in Parts V-VII its position is more or less slanting. Though a small point in itself, it is worth noticing, because it marks the germ of a fashion of writing with a slant, which developed subsequently in the Eastern Turkestan settlement of Kuchar, and which is shown in Fig. 15, I, 2, (p. xxxii), and in Fig. 17, I, 3, c and d (p. xxxiv).

The peculiarities of writing above set out shown that there must have been no less than four persons engaged in the writing of the Bower Manuscript. In Parts I-III, the similarity of writing is, in all points so conspicuous that it is impossible to ascribe their production to more than one person. As to Parts V, VI and VII, it has been shown from their mode of writing the palatal \( i \), that they cannot have been written by the identical person who wrote Parts I-III. Moreover, it is practically certain that they must have been written by two different writers. That Parts V and VII are due to the same writer follows, as in the case of Parts I-III, from the conspicuous similarity of the writing. The case of Part VI may seem uncertain. There is superficial dissimilarity in its style of writing from that in Parts V and VII, but on the other hand, it must be remembered
that Part VI is written calligraphically, while Parts V and VII are written in an extremely cursive and careless fashion. Also, there is a not inconsiderable similarity of writing in the three Parts, which extends even to the use of the same signs of punctuation (see p. xxxix), parts V-VII having in this respect a common system differing from that in Parts I-III. Moreover, there is the fact that the same name Yasamitra (i.e., Yasomitra) occurs both in the calligraphically written Part VI (fol. 4a, l. 6, ed. pp. 225, 230) and the cursive written Part VII-(fol. 2a, l. 3, ed. pp. 237-9). This name must be that of the votary, who either wrote the manuscript himself, or got it written for himself by a scribe. For, as the Japanese scholar, Dr. K. Watanabe, explains (Journal, Royal Asiatic Society, 1907, p. 263), it "was a custom in ancient China and Japan" that "a votary must recite his name" in the copy of a devotional work which he either wrote himself, or caused to be written for himself. On the other hand, there is the very significant circumstance that Part VI is paginated on the obverse side of its folios, while Part VII bore its folio numbers on the reverse sides (see Chapter II, p. xx). As in the case of the two modes of writing the palatal i, it is hardly conceivable that the same person should have been in the habit of using two entirely different modes of paginating. It should, also, be observed that (see Chapter VIII) Parts VI and VII contain two different portions of the same tract, and (see Chapter II) greatly differ in their quality of birch-bark and state of preservation. The explanation which best accords with all these facts seems to be that a monk, called Yasomitra, wrote, or got written, for his own use, a copy of the protective charm, a portion of which now survives as Part VII. At a subsequent date, when that copy had become damaged, he got the damaged portion replaced by a new copy, namely the existing Part VI, on a fresh supply of superior bark, which a new arrival from India may have brought with him. Regarding the personality of Yasomitra, it may be surmised that he must have been a Buddhist monk of great repute for saintliness and learning. For the fact that the manuscripts were found in the relic chamber of the stupa shows that they must have been the property of the person in whose honour the stupa was erected; and to be accorded such an honour that person must have been a monk of acknowledged eminence. But whatever the exact number of writers may have been, the fact that Parts V-VII have so many peculiarities in common shows that the writer of Part VI must have been a native of the same country, or locality, in India as the writer of Parts V and VII. On the writer of Part IV, see below, p. xxxiii.

This introduces another important subject, viz., the native country of the writers of the several Parts of the Bower Manuscript. On this point the manuscript presents some very interesting evidence. In the first place, looking at Table I, a difference will be observed in the forms of the initial vowel ē. In Parts V-VII, the right side of the triangle projects, or juts out, beyond the apex. This projection is wanting in Parts I-III. On consulting the Tables III, IV and VII in Bühler's Indian Palaeography (in the Encyclopedia of Indo-Tibetan Research), it will be found that the projection is peculiar to epigraphic records of the southern area of the Gupta script. The forms which obtained in the northern and southern areas respectively are shown in Fig. 12. The boundary line, as already stated, runs roughly in a south-easterly direction between N. Lat. 21° and 22°. The form of the jutting ē is shown in (a) from an inscription at Mailiyā (about Lat. 21° 31′, F. GI. No. 38, p. 164, Plate xxiv
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l. 26), well below the boundary line, in the southern area. The same southern form, from an inscription at Eran (Lat. 24° 5', F.GI. No. 20, p. 91, Plate xii B, l. 1), is shown in (b). Eran is just on the boundary line of the two areas; and from another inscription (F.GI. No. 36, p. 158, Plate xxiv A, l. 2) at the same place comes the northern form without the projection, shown in (e). The same northern form, in two slight variations, is shown in (f) and (g), coming from the same place Khōh (Lat. 24° 13', F.GI. No. 27, p. 121, Plate xvii, l. 9, and No. 28, p. 125, Plate xviii, l. 12). From further south come the Pallava and Kadamba forms, shown in (c) and (d); and from further north comes the Kushana form, shown in (b).

In the second place, there is the characteristic difference in the form of the vowels a and ā, in the akṣhara, or syllables, ru and ṛu, which are shown in the 7th and 9th traverses of Table II. In Parts I-III the short vowel a is attached to the foot of the consonant r, but in Parts V-VII to its middle. The long vowel ā is indicated in Parts I-III, by adding a stroke above, but in Part VI, by adding a semicircle, to its own particular symbol for ru respectively. For Parts V and VII, unfortunately, no examples are available; but their agreement, in this respect, with Part VI may be presumed. On referring again to the Tables III and VII in Bühler's Indian Paleography, it will be seen that the forms used in Parts V-VII are peculiar to the southern, but those in Parts I-III to the northern area.

Both forms, the southern and northern, are shown in Fig. 13. Well within the southern area occurs the southern form (a) from the same above-mentioned inscription at Māliyā (about Lat. 21° 31', F.GI. No. 38, p. 165, Plate xxiv, l. 3); also the similar southern form (b) from an inscription at Junāgadh (Lat. 20° 31'; F.GI. No. 14, p. 61, Plate viii, l. 29), as well as (c) from an inscription at Rājīm (Lat. 20° 58'; F.GI. No. 81, p. 295, Plate xiv, l. 12). The strictly southern character of these three inscriptions is proved by the fact that they all exhibit the distinctly southern form of m (Fig. 9 b). The Māliyā inscription (Plate xxiv, ll. 12, 16) shows the southern forms (e) and (f) of ṛu. On the other hand, we have, well within the northern area, the northern form (i) of ru in inscriptions at Kahanu (Lat. 26° 16', F.GI. No. 15, p. 67, Plate ix A, l. 8, 12), and at Indār (Lat. 28° 12', F.GI. No. 16, p. 71, Plate ix B, l. 6), and the similar forms (k) at Nāgārjun (Lat. 25° 0', l. 1) at Mandao (Lat. 24° 3'), and (m) at Mathurā (Lat. 27° 30'; F.GI. Nos. 50, 33, 63, pp. 227, 147, 263, Plates xxxi, l. 1, xxi B, l. 8, xxxix A, l. 3). The northern form (n) of ṛu appears in an inscription at Udayagiri (Lat. 23° 32' F.GI. No. 61, p. 259, Plate xxxviii, l. 7) and with a slight difference (o) at Bīdhagaya (Lat. 24° 41', F.GI. No. 71, p. 277, Plate xli, l. 13). Both these inscriptions are on the border line; but on that line also the southern forms of ru and ṛu are found side by side with the northern. Thus at Khōh (Lat. 24° 23') both forms of ru occur: the southern (d) (F.GI. No. 22, p. 102, Plate xiii, ll. 5, 11, and No. 25, p. 114, Plate xvii B, l. 7, 13), and the northern (i) (F.GI. No. 27, Plate xviii, ll. 6, 10; No. 28, Plate xviii, l. 6; No. 29, Plate xix A, l. 13, and No. 31, Plate xx, l. 6); and what is particularly to be noted, the southern form occurs here, in conjunction with the northern form of m (Fig. 9 c). Similarly both forms of ṛu are seen at Mandao (Lat. 24° 3'), the
southern (g) (F. GI. No. 18, p. 82, Plate xi. 110, 15) and the northern (n) (F. GI. No. 35, p. 153, Plate xxxii. 11). Moreover, there is a peculiar form ra (h) and (p) which substitute two parallel strokes for the southern semi-circle, and this form appears to be common to both areas; for it is seen in the south at Junagadh (Lat. 21° 31'; F. GI. No. 14, p. 59, Plate viii. 110), as well as in the north at Bilsad (Lat. 27° 33'; F. GI. No. 10, p. 44, Plate v. 11).

In the third place, there is the striking difference in the use of the two forms of the letter y, the old and the modern. In Parts I-III, as already observed, and as will be explained in detail in Chapter IV, the modern form of y is used optionally with its older three-pronged form; while in Parts V-VII that three-pronged form is used exclusively. The modern form of y originated in the north, and its use never spread to the south.62

The obvious conclusion suggested by the foregoing evidence is that the persons who wrote Parts V-VII were natives of some place lying within the southern area. In the case of Part VI, at all events, this conclusion is confirmed by the other significant fact that the folios of Parts VI are numbered on their obverse sides (see Chapter II, p. xx). For, as Bühler has pointed out in the Vienna Oriental Journal, Vol. VII, p. 261, the practice of numbering the folios on their obverse side is a peculiarity of Southern India. We have a good example of this practice, of a very early date, in the copper-plates of the Pallava king Śivakanda Varman, and the Kōmānduli Plates of Jaya Varman, a contemporary of the Andhra kings Gautamiputra and Vaiśālīputra, who reigned about 113-137 A.D. These copper-plates may be seen in the Epigraphia Indica, Vol. I, pp. 4-5, Plates I-V., Vol. V, p. 86, and Vol. VI, p. 315. At the same time, the place whence the writers of Parts V-VII came must have been somewhere near the border line of the two areas. This is indicated by the circumstance that the southern forms of t, ru, and rā are employed in conjunction with the northern form of m, exactly as in the inscriptions, above mentioned, at Eran and Khōh, both of which places lie on the border line. While the writers of Parts V-VII appear to have come from some place near the southern limit of the northern area, the person who wrote Parts I-III must have come from somewhere near its northern limit, that is to say, from Kashmir or Udyāna. This is indicated by the occurrence in Part II (fol. 27a. 11) of the peculiar Sāradā form of the letter k (Table I, No. 2 in Traverse 2). The Sāradā script is peculiar to Kashmir, where it originated directly from the Gupta script in the course of the seventh century, and where it is still current, almost unchanged, to the present day. The Sāradā forms of those letters which enter into the present enquiry are shown in the lower line of Fig. 14.63 The upper line shows the corresponding letters in the script of the Horuzi Manuscript, which was written in the first half of the sixth century (Anecdota Oxoniensia, Vol. I, Part III, p. 64). Its script, therefore, was the immediate predecessor of the Sāradā script. The

---

62 There is a further point of difference between Parts I-III and Parts V-VII. It concerns the shape of the initial vowel t. This point, however, is not decisive of locality, and will be discussed in the sequel, p. XXXVI.

63 These letters are extracted from a birch-bark manuscript in Sāradā characters which was presented to me by Dr. Stein in December 1908.
The appearance of the Sāradā form of k (Fig. 14, 1. 2 b) in Part II is quite exceptional. It occurs only once. Its use would seem to have grown gradually more frequent, till it finally became distinctive of the Sāradā script. On the other hand, that script selected for itself (Fig. 14, 1. 2 g), from the two co-existent forms of the palatal i, the flat-topped variety, which is used in Parts V-VII.

The forms which the Gupta script developed on its transference to Central Asia are shown in Fig. 15. That figure shows the same series of letters (as in Fig. 14) in the forms which they assumed in manuscripts written in the Buddhist settlement at Kuchar. They are extracted from Parts II and IX of the Weber Manuscripts, which are shown in Plate I, Fig. 2, and Plate III, Figs. 3-5, in my Report on the Weber Manuscripts in the Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, Vol. LXII, Part I (1893), pp. 1-39. It will be seen from Fig. 15 that there are two distinct varieties of the Kuchari script, the second variety (lower line) showing an appreciable slant which is absent from the first variety. The latter variety, it will be noticed, resembles much more closely the upright ductus of the Gupta script as it was current in northern India, and as it prevails in the Bower Manuscript. The latter Manuscript, as has been explained in Chapter II, is written mainly (i.e., all except Part VI) on inferior and damaged birch-bark, which circumstance suggests its having been written by Indian emigrants on remnants of the store of birch-bark which they had brought with them from India. On the other hand, the Weber Manuscripts are written on paper, which was the ordinary writing material of Eastern Turkestan. The two varieties of the Kuchari script, shown in these manuscripts, were current contemporaneously; for they were all dug out from the Qutluq Urdā stūpa in the vicinity of Kuchar (see Chapter I). How the divergence of the two varieties arose is not known. What the difference of the writing material, however, suggests is that the manuscripts on birch-bark, such as the Bower Manuscript, were written at an earlier date than the manuscripts on paper. The former probably were written by immediate immigrants from India, who still possessed some store of birch-bark, their native writing material, while the latter were written by their descendants, or by native Kuchari converts who naturally made use of the paper of their own country. In this connection a curious point may be noticed. The upright variety (upper line in Fig. 15) conserves the Southern Indian fashion of writing the syllables ru and ru (e and f), the jutting e (a), and (though not quite distinctly) the flat-topped i (g), all of which fashions are peculiar to Parts V-VII of the Bower Manuscript. On the other hand, the slanting variety (lower line of Fig. 15) conserves the northern fashion of writing ru and ru (e and f), and the round-topped i (g) of Parts I-III, with which, however, it combines the southern

---

64 The two varieties are shown also in Fig. 17, where the difference of the upright (c) and slanting (d) forms of n and th (in ll. 1, 2, 3, respectively) is very clearly marked.

65 This conclusion is suggested also by the circumstance mentioned earlier (p. xxix) that the letter th is written in Parts V-VII with an approach to the slant which distinguishes one of the two varieties of the fully developed Kuchari script.
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jutting e (a). This combination, in the slanting variety, of different Indian fashions of writing seems to suggest that that variety originated among the native Kuchari converts to Buddhism, while the upright variety persisted among the Indian Buddhist immigrants and their descendants. For it should be noticed that both the Sāradā script, which originated from the Gupta script, and the Horiuizi script, which occupies a position intermediate between the Gupta and Sāradā, agrees with the upright variety of the Kuchari script in conserving the southern Gupta fashion of writing e, ru and ru, and e. The considerable modification in the forms of some letters, such as m and y (Fig. 15, c and d), presupposes a not inconsiderable interval of time to have passed since the introduction of the Gupta script into Eastern Turkestan and the production of the Bower Manuscript. As the date of the latter is probably to be referred to the second half of the fourth century (see Chapter V), the date of the Weber Manuscripts may be placed within the sixth century, or possibly a little earlier.

It has been stated (ante, p. xxix) that Part IV must have been written by a person different from the two writers of Parts V-VII, as well as from the writer of Parts I-III. From the latter the writer of Part IV differs (see Plate I) by the use of the flat-topped e, as against the use of the round-topped e in Parts I-III. From the former he differs by the use of the plain e, as well as the northern ru and ru, as against the jutting e and the southern ru and ru of Parts V-VII. Further from both, the writer of Parts I-III as well as the writers of Parts V-VII, the scribe of Part IV differs in the following striking points. In the first place, he writes the initial vowel ri in a way quite peculiar to himself. In Parts I-III it is written quite differently, as may be seen from Table I. In Parts V-VII that vowel does not happen to occur at all. It is altogether a character of very rare occurrence. From the epigraphic records of India, as may be seen by a reference to the Tables in Bühler’s Indian Palaeography, it appears to be altogether absent. In the Horiuizi Manuscript (first half of the sixth century) it resembles rather the character for the vowel a. In the Sāradā script, also, it has a very simple form, though quite different from that in Part IV. The full data for an effective comparison, therefore, are not available. All that can be said is that the form of the initial vowel ri, which is seen in Part IV, stands quite by itself.

In the second place, in Part IV the initial vowel i is written quite differently from Parts I-III on the one side, and from Parts V-VII on the other. The character for the vowel i is made up of three dots arranged triangularly (see Table I). With the exception of Part IV, all the Parts agree in placing the dot, which forms the apex, below the two dots which form the base of the triangle; with this difference, however, that in Parts V-VII the apical dot is made plain, while in Parts I-III it is furnished with a tail. But in part IV the arrangement of the dots is exactly reversed; the apical dot has the superior position. The evidential value of this difference, however, is not quite assured.

*6 The line of graphic descent, on the present evidence, appears to be as follows: The southern Gupta travels in the fourth century northwards, through Kashmir and Udyāna, to Kuchar in Eastern Turkestan. In Kashmir it develops gradually, through the Horiuizi script (6th cent.), into the Sāradā (7th cent.). In Kuchar it develops contemporaneously with the Horiuizi stage, into the slanting variety of the Kuchari script (6th cent.).
In the Gupta script, as seen in the epigraphic records of India the initial \( i \) is made in a great variety of forms. These are shown in Fig. 16. The four forms (a–d) are peculiar to the southern area of that script. The two forms (e and f) and the four forms (g–k) prevail mainly in the eastern and western portions respectively of the northern area. Finally the form (l) has no definite habitat: it is found in the inscriptions at Nirmand in the north-west (Lat. 31° 25', Long. 77° 38'), in Pahaldpur in the north-east (Lat. 25° 26', Long. 3° 31'), and at Junagadh in the south-west (Lat. 21° 31', Long. 70° 36'). Moreover in the Nirmand inscription it occurs side by side with the proper western form (l), and in the Pahaldpur record it alternates with the form (g). Considering that the record at Nirmand comprises only sixteen lines, and that at Pahaldpur even only a single line, the suspicion obtrudes itself that the reversal of the position of the apical dot in the form (l) may be a mere error of writing. Whether or not its occurrence in Parts IV of the Bower Manuscript is due to a scribal error, it is not possible to say with certainty, seeing that the initial (i) occurs only once in that Part; but the possibility of its being due to a mere error cannot be disregarded, and it is this possibility which detracts from its evidential value. For the purpose of further comparison there are added in Fig. 17 the forms of initial \( i \) in the Horiuzi (c) and Sāradā (b) scripts, as well as in the Kuchari script of the upright (c) and slanting (d) varieties. In order to bring out more clearly the marked distinction between the two varieties (c) and (d) of the Kuchari script, the forms of and \( \tilde{i} \) are added in the second and third lines.

In the third place, the general appearance of the writing in Part IV conveys the suggestion that it was done with a brush rather than a stylus or reed-pen. Thus the curious flourish, or jerk, at the bottom of the right limb of the letters \( g \) and \( t \), and of both limbs of \( \tilde{i} \) (see Table I), suggests the brush. The apparently similar curves, to be seen in the letters \( g, t, n, \tilde{i} \) in Parts V–VII, are obviously due to a different cause, viz., to the tendency towards continuity in cursive writing.\(^67\) The stylus, or reed-pen was the usual instrument of the Indian scribe, and with it undoubtedly Parts I–III and V–VII are written. The brush was peculiar to the Chinese scribe, and hence would naturally be the instrument used in the Chinese province of Eastern Turkestan. And though an Indian immigrant into Kuchar might conceivably abandon his accustomed instrument and take to that of his adopted country, it is—on the assumption that Part IV was really written with a brush—practically certain that it must have been written by a native of Eastern Turkestan, or perhaps by a Chinese Buddhist monk, resident in the monastery of the Ming-oi of Qum Turā.

\(^67\) An instructive example of an exactly similarly written cursive \( \tilde{i} \) may be seen in the Tōrāmārga stone inscription at Kura, in the word \textit{māhīa} in Epigraphia Indica, Vol. 1, p. 240, l. 12.
Irrespective of the details which distinguish the three styles of writing in Parts I-III, Parts V-VII, and Part IV respectively, it is impossible not to be impressed by the pronounced difference in the general appearance of the writing in those three portions of the Bower Manuscript. This circumstance leads to a further observation. On the blank space of the obverse of the leaf on which Part III ends, there is inscribed a remark, the exact purport of which is, at present, not intelligible. But it is obviously written by the same hand that wrote Parts V and VII. For, in addition to the general appearance of sameness, there occur in the remark those forms, previously explained of the letters s and th, which are peculiar to the writer of Parts V and VII. On the reverse of that same leaf there is inscribed the commencement of Part IV. On the obverse of the third leaf of Part IV (see Plate XL), there is seen, written between the fourth and fifth lines, the brief remark na saiiaga. This interlinear remark, too, is clearly in the handwriting of the scribe of Parts V and VII; for it comprises the peculiar s and y of those Parts; for example, as will be seen by reference to Table I, the left-hand stroke of y of the remark curls to the left as in Parts V and VII, while in Part IV it curls to the right. The conclusion that may be drawn from the existence of the two remarks in the positions in which they occur is that after Parts I-III had been written, they passed into the hands of the writer of Part IV who began his writing on the blank page of the last leaf of Part III. Afterwards Parts I-IV passed into the hands of the writer of Parts V and VII, who added his explanatory remark to the final page of Part III, and his brief complementary remark on the third leaf of Part IV. Probably it was also he who put all the Parts together, and enclosed them as a collective manuscript between a pair of wooden boards. It may be suggested that the remark appended to the end of Part III, if we only understood it, might refer to the monastic order or rank of the writer of Parts I-III. The interlinear remark in Part IV only adds a phrase which had been inadvertently omitted by the original writer.

The results of the foregoing enquiry may be summed up as follows. The writers of Parts I-III and Parts V-VII were natives of India who had migrated to Kuchar. They, no doubt, were Buddhist monks, and these, as is well known, were often in the habit of travelling, or migrating, for missionary or other purposes, into Foreign Parts. To judge from their style of writing, the scribe of Parts I-III originally came from the northern, and the two scribes of Parts V-VII from the southern part of the northern area of the Indian Gupta script. But the fact that they use birch-bark as their writing material shows that the country, from which more immediately they migrated to Kuchar, must have been Kashmir or Udyana; and the quality of the birch-bark which they use suggests that they wrote their respective parts of the Bower Manuscripts after their settlement in Kuchar, when their store of birch-bark had run short. Parts V and VII probably were written about the same time as Parts I-III. The latter apparently were never completed. They passed, in their incomplete state, into the hands of the writer of Part IV, who would seem to have been a native of Eastern Turkestan, or perhaps of China. From him Parts I-IV passed into the hands of the writer of Parts V and VII, who added the two remarks above referred to. Part VI was written at a subsequent date by a fourth scribe on a fresh supply
of well prepared birch-bark leaves, since received from India, for the purpose of repairing the damage suffered, in the mean time, by part VII. In fact, that fresh supply may have been brought from India by the fourth scribe himself who may have been a later immigrant. All four writers must have been residing in a monastery near Kuchar. But the ultimate owner of the whole series of manuscripts, whose name appears to have been Yaśomitra, must have held a prominent position in that monastery. For his collective manuscript was contained in the relic chamber of the memorial stūpa at the Ming-či of Qum Turā, which would appear to have been built in his honour.
CHAPTER IV.

THE SCRIPT, THE Scribes, AND THEIR USAGES IN THE
BOWER MANUSCRIPT—Contd.

It remains to notice a few miscellaneous points connected with the script and the usages of the writers of the several Parts of the Bower Manuscript,

(i) The Numerals Signs; see Table IV.

These are the old signs of the original Indian system of notation, anterior to the discovery of the "value of place" and the invention of the cypher. That system made use of twenty signs, viz., nine for the units, nine for the tens, one for hundred, and one for thousand. Thirteen from among these twenty signs occur in the Bower Manuscript; viz., the nine unit figures, and the figures for 10, 20, 30 and 50. The figure for 50 is doubtful: it might be the figure for 70 (see Chapter II, p. xx). Most of the thirteen figures occur in the numbering of the leaves of the several Parts, a few also in the text of Parts II, IV, and V. The series of three numbers which occur in the divination treatises of Parts IV and V have to be understood, not as possessing any "value of place," but simply as being three successive unit figures. For example, the series 444, in Part IV, p. 192, which repeats three times the unit figure 4, is to be read, not as four hundred, forty, four, but simply as four, four, four. It indicates that the die is thrown three times, (see p. X CI) so that each time its face shows the number four.

(ii) Miscellaneous Marks; see Table V.

A variety of marks occur to indicate various purposes, such as interpolation, correction, or a lacuna.

(1) Interpolation (see Traverses 1 and 2 of Table V for Parts I-III, Traverses 1-3 for part IV, and Traverses 1-4 for Part's V-VII). The writers of the Bower Manuscript observe no consistent system of interpolation. As to Parts I-III, which are written, practically entirely, in verse, the writer, as a rule, makes no use of any sign to indicate the ends of half or whole verses. Occasionally he marks the end by a rather wider interval, as, e.g., the end of verses 121 (Part II, p. 32, fol. 5b, l. 5), 223 (ib., p. 38, fol. 8b, l. 4), 555 (ib., p. 44, fol. 11b, l. 7), etc. This mark, however, is very unsafe, as the writer often disperses his writing, mostly by reason of the defects of the birch-bark (as in Part II fol. 12b, l. 2; Part III, fol. 2b, l. 3), or on account of the spread of a conjunct consonant (as in Part III, fol. 2b, l. 3); also sometimes apparently from mere caprice (as in shadin on l. 6 of Part II, fol. 12b). If he does use a sign, it is either the well-known double stroke, or a comma laid lengthwise, or a ringlet, simple or complex.

(a) The Double Stroke.—The modern Indian usage is to mark the end of the half-verse by a single vertical stroke, and the end of the full verse by a couple of vertical strokes. As regards the single stroke, in Parts I-III, the end of the half-verse is never marked, unless it coincides with the end of a formula, or of a section; and in that case, it is marked—if it is marked at all—with any of the marks of a full-verse. The single stroke, accordingly, is never found. The double stroke always, except as above noted, marks the end of a full verse. In Part I, it occurs not infrequently; in fact, in the forty-three verses of the initial treatise on garlic, it is used regularly, the only exceptions being verses 29 and 35. In the subsequent portion it occurs very rarely: only in verses 51, 59, 69, 67, 70, 73, 79-88, 97, 98, 100, 116, 128. In Parts II and III, also, it occurs very rarely. Thus, in Part II, in verses
1, 2, 3, 20, 149, 336; after which it grows rather more frequent, on account, apparently, of the shortness of the formulae; thus in verses 427, 444, 446, 459, 462, etc. In Part III, it occurs only in verses 52 and 61. But as will be noticed presently, it is used occasionally also in conjunction with the ringlet.

(b) The Comma.—Another sign which is occasionally used to mark the end of a full verse is a comma, laid lengthwise. It exactly resembles the figure for the numeral one, and is, no doubt, identical with it. In Part I it is found at the end of verses 49 and 71; and in Part II at the end of verses 5, 45, 108, 130, 178, 372, 488, 619, 642, etc. In Part III it does not occur. In addition to marking the end of a full verse, it is also used occasionally in other ways. Thus, in Part I, fol. 3b4a (p. 5), it marks the prose notice bhavati chātra, preceding the fiftieth verse, and in Part II, fol. 29a7 (p. 70) it marks the prose notice tatra ālokah. Again in Part II, fol. 4b6 (p. 32), it separates the two parts of a colophon.68 Sometimes, again, it marks merely a superfluous blank space; see below under Lacuna, p. xlii.

(c) The Ringlet.—The third sign which exceptionally marks the end of a full verse, is a ringlet with a central dot, or a ringlet containing a still smaller ringlet the circumference of which is studded inside with (usually) three dots. The former probably represents the sacred chakra (dharma-chakra), or Wheel of the Law, the latter, the sacred padma or White Lotus; and in the sequel these two signs will be referred to as the wheel and the lotus. The latter is found only in Part II, while the wheel is common to all three parts. An example of the lotus, used as the mark of the end of a full verse, occurs in Part II, fol. 2a10 (p. 28), and of the wheel, in fol. 19b7 (p. 57), where they mark the end of verses 38 and 639 respectively. As a rule, however, the lotus and wheel are used as the special marks to indicate the end of a passage which is longer than a verse, such as a whole formula, or a whole chapter, or the whole of a subject. Accordingly they constitute the special marks of the colophon, which is marked off, afores as well as after, by them from the surrounding text. Thus we have two lotuses to mark the colophon of the first formula in Part II, fol. 14a4b (p. 26), and of the first chapter in Part II, fol. 4b6c (p. 32).68 Similarly we have two wheels to mark the colophon of the sidhāra formula, in Part II, fol. 18a8 (p. 54), and of a formula for boluses, in Part III, fol. 3b5a (p. 184). Sometimes the two signs are combined; thus the sequence wheel, lotus is found with the colophon tryūpoṇānaḥ, in Part II, fol. 6a1 (p. 34), and the reversed sequence lotus, wheel, with the colophon avināraṇāṇaḥ, ibid., fol. 24a1 (p. 61). Also other variations occur, such as placing one of the two signs between a couple of double strokes, as in the ārdula-chukṣa colophon in Part II, fol. 3b4 (p. 30), or placing a double stroke after both signs, as in the mōdaka formula in Part III, fol. 3b5a (p. 184). Exceptional cases, however, are found in which the colophon is marked only by one sign, or by no sign at all. An example of the latter case is the paṇcha-gauya colophon in Part II, fol. 5b11 (p. 34). Examples of the former case are the colophons after verse 613, in Part II, fol. 19a2 (p. 56), and after verse 782, ibid., fol. 24a8 (p. 61), which are marked only by a lotus after them.69

The signs of the wheel and the lotus, however, are also employed to indicate the end of a formula, or of a subject matter, whenever a colophon is dispensed with. Examples are, in Part I, the wheel in fol. 3b7, 5b10, where with verse 120 the subject of hair dyes closes. 68 This colophon combines those of a formula as well as of the chapter; and the two portions are separated by the comma mark.

69 The colophon after verse 894, in Part II, fol. 24a10 (page 63) is no real exception, because it is misplaced, and should stand in the preceding line. The misplacement is marked by the two crow's feet; see below on Correction, p. xlii.
### Table III: Conjunct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part I</th>
<th>Part II</th>
<th>Part III</th>
<th>Part IV</th>
<th>Part V</th>
<th>Part VI</th>
<th>Part VII</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ཞ འ</td>
<td>འ འ</td>
<td>ཡ འ</td>
<td>འ འ</td>
<td>འ འ</td>
<td>འ འ</td>
<td>འ འ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ས ས</td>
<td>ས ས</td>
<td>ས ས</td>
<td>ས ས</td>
<td>ས ས</td>
<td>ས ས</td>
<td>ས ས</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ས ས</td>
<td>ས ས</td>
<td>ས ས</td>
<td>ས ས</td>
<td>ས ས</td>
<td>ས ས</td>
<td>ས ས</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ས ས</td>
<td>ས ས</td>
<td>ས ས</td>
<td>ས ས</td>
<td>ས ས</td>
<td>ས ས</td>
<td>ས ས</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table IV: Numerals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>50</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>༡</td>
<td>༢</td>
<td>༣</td>
<td>༤</td>
<td>༥</td>
<td>༦</td>
<td>༧</td>
<td>༨</td>
<td>༩</td>
<td>༠༠</td>
<td>༠༠</td>
<td>༠༠</td>
<td>༠༠</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table V: Marks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>འ</td>
<td>འ</td>
<td>འ</td>
<td>འ</td>
<td>འ</td>
<td>འ</td>
<td>འ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>འ</td>
<td>འ</td>
<td>འ</td>
<td>འ</td>
<td>འ</td>
<td>འ</td>
<td>འ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>འ</td>
<td>འ</td>
<td>འ</td>
<td>འ</td>
<td>འ</td>
<td>འ</td>
<td>འ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Part II we have the lotus, reinforced by the comma as well as the double stroke, after verse 10; in fol. 1a, to mark off the end of the introduction to the treatise. Similarly after verse 24 on fol. 1b, we have the lotus by itself to mark the end of a series of short formulae (verses 18-24), and after verse 39a, on fol. 2b, to mark the end of a single short (unnamed) formula (verses 38-39a). And after verse 737, on fol. 22b, we have the wheel to mark the end of the long pippali-vardhamāna formula (vv. 716-737). In Part III a disk is frequently used in this way, to mark the end of a formula; especially in fol. 3b, where it occurs not less than seven times, in ll. 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, 9.

Of particular interest is the circumstance that the lotus and wheel appear to be used, in Part II, also to indicate glosses, which the author of the Nāvaṇitaḥ himself seems to have added to the extracts from old authoritative works of which his own work is mainly composed. Thus on fol. 27a (page 67) there is, after verse 879, the obvious gloss prācitikā pāthā enclosed between two wheels (see note 418, on page 162). On fol. 33b, verse 1109 is enclosed between two wheels, and its purport suggests its being a gloss (see note 490 on page 180a). In the similar case of verse 929, on fol. 28b (p. 69), which the author had at first omitted to mark as a gloss, he (or rather a subsequent copyist) has afterwards, on revision, inserted the lotus mark between lines 2 and 3. The same practice is observed in Part III, which may be a work by the same author. Here, on fol. 1b, the lotus marks what appears to be a gloss; so also on fol. 3b. It will be observed that both passages, thus marked, are in prose.

In Parts V-VII, the usage with regard to marks of interpunctuation is much the same as in Parts I-III. But in addition we meet with three signs which exactly resemble our modern comma, semicolon, and full stop. The comma occurs, e.g., in Part V, fols. 2b, 3b, 5a, twice even in a reversed position on fols. 3a and 5a (see Table V, Traverse 3), in Part VI, fol. 2b, and in Part VII, fol. 1a. But it is probable that the comma is really identical with the more usual lengthwise-comma (the numeral one), of which it is an exaggerated cursive form. The semicolon, practically identical with the well-known sign of the visarga, occurs, e.g., in Part V, fols. 6a and 6b, and in Part VII, fol. 4a. The full-stop, or single dot, is found, e.g., in Part V, fols. 2a, 3a, 6b, in Part VI, fols. 1b, 3a, and in Part VII, fols. 2a and 2b. As to the ordinary signs, the double stroke does not happen to occur in Parts V and VII, in which the comma, either erect or prone, regularly takes its place. In Part VI the double stroke is found in a slightly modified form, embellished with a hook to the left at the top of the first stroke, as in fol. 4a, or with a hook to the left and right respectively at the top of the two strokes, as in fol. 4b. The lengthwise-comma, or the numeral one, as already observed, is used regularly in Part V, e.g., in fols. 1a, 2a, 2a, etc. So also in Part VI, e.g., in fols. 1b, 3a, and in Part VII, e.g., in fol. 1a. Neither the wheel nor the lotus is found in any of Parts V-VII. In their place Part V uses the spiral which is the conventional representation of the sacred śaṅkhā, or conch shell, as in fol. 5b. Once in fol. 3a, this spiral is accompanied by the lengthwise-comma. It will be observed that the same spiral appears also in the remark which is appended to Part III (Plate xxxviii, obv.), and which, as has been previously (pp. xxi and xxxv) stated, was written by the scribes of Parts V-VII.

In Part IV the usage with regard to interpunctuation is as follows. The double stroke is not uncommon. In its plain form it occurs, e.g., in fols. 2a, 3a; but it is often accompanied with the lengthwise-comma, or numeral one, as in fols. 2a, 3a, 4a, and occasionally this comma is drawn across the double stroke, as in fols. 3a, 3a. Moreover in the case of
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fol. 3a5, the double stroke is hooked, just as in Part VI, fol. 4a5. Once, fol. 2a4, the crossing comma is found also with a single stroke, imitating the form of a regular cross. In equally frequent use, however, is the lengthwise comma, or numeral one; it occurs, e.g., in fols. 3a2, 3b1, 4a3, 5a5, 5b5, etc. The spiral, in a rather imperfect form, and enclosed between a pair of double strokes occurs in fol. 1b5, to mark off the introduction to the treatise. The same spiral, in much better form, is used also for the benedictive om at the beginning of the treatise, in fol. 1b3 (see Chapter II, p. xxii).

(2) Correction;—see Table V, Traverse 4 for Parts I-IV. For the purpose of correcting an error in the text, when a letter, or a word, had to be cancelled or altered or inserted, or when a misplacement had to be indicated, certain signs are used in the Bower Manuscript. In Parts I-III one of these signs consists of two, or more, minute strokes attached to the top of a letter or a word. Thus in Part I, fol. 3b3, the word which originally was written prōktō is altered to prōktah, and this alteration is indicated by attaching two minute strokes to the cancelled vowel ə. Similarly on fol. 2a3, the syllable ə of the word, which was originally written havah, is marked to indicate that it is to be read ya (yavāh). Again on fol. 4b4, the vowel ə of samustām has been cancelled by the attachment of minute strokes. In Part II there occur the following examples. On fol. 7b, the final ə of line 10, which is written in faint ink, is cancelled because it is superfluous, being repeated at the beginning of line 11; so also on fol. 14a the superfluous final ə of madhunā. On fol. 16a, one of the duplicated cha of chandana is cancelled; so also, on fol. 19a6 the vowel ə of āriddhe, and on fol. 19b5, the syllable na. On fol. 28b4, the misspelled final ə of kābādē has been cancelled, and replaced by a well-made d. In all the above-mentioned cases the double stroke indicates cancelation. The following are examples of its indicating an insertion. In Part I, fol. 4b5, the original writing had only mé ṇa, which is false for mé śrīnu. The omitted syllable śrī is inserted, in very faint ink, between ll. 9 and 10, and the place of insertion, between mé and ṇa, is indicated by two minute strokes placed above those two syllables. Similarly in Part II, fol. 12a4, a double stroke indicates the omission of the syllable ṇa, which is inserted, just below, between ll. 4 and 5. But there exist also numerous cases, in which these correttive double strokes are applied for no apparent reason. They all occur in Part II. Thus we find them attached to yō of yōgō on fol. 6b5, to the visarga of svyā on fol. 10a4, to lā of bhallātaka on fol. 10b4, to rā of rāndhāna on fol. 11a2, to ha of bahuṣu on fol. 12b5, to cha of chatur on fol. 13b4, and to ima of aimari on fol. 31a5. On fol. 55a even the whole word pādhaṇ is thus marked. In all these cases, the existing text is correct (see note 45 on p. 33, and note 87 on p. 93). They are so numerous that they cannot be attributed to inadvertence on the part of the scribe. He must have had some reason for attaching the mark; but what it can have been is not intelligible, unless it be that he wished thus to indicate the correction of something (an error, or a lacuna, or the like) in the original from which he was copying.

Another sign, found in Part II, is a cross. On fol. 15a11 it indicates the omission of a passage which is supplied in the bottom margin. Its use on fol. 2a3, where it appears to be duplicated, is not intelligible.

A third sign, found also in Part II, is the so-called kāka-pada, or crow's foot. It resembles the mathematical sign of the "root." It may be seen on fol. 12b10, where it indicates the omission of a portion of the mark of the colophon, viz., lotus plus double stroke. The omission is supplied in the margin below. Unfortunately the margin is damaged, but the traces that remain can be completed from the same mark10 on fol. 22a1.

19 The traces are not those of a damaged syllable, as suggested on p. 46, n. 99. The verse 391, beginning with madhunā is complete. Precisely the same mark (lotus and double stroke) is supplied interlinearly on fol. 28b5.
We have the same crow's foot on the margin of fol. 13b, where it refers to the cancelled numeral four. On fol. 24b, it occurs in duplicate, at the end of line 10, apparently to indicate the misplacement of the preceding colophon, which should stand on line 9. It will be observed that there are twenty-four formulae for the preparation of various kinds of gruel (vv. 785-802). To these is appended a charm for insuring long life (āyus) in vv. 803-4, and after it comes the colophon Bhêla gacāgū. This colophon indicates that the verses preceding it are composed by Bhêla (or Bheça). As a fact, the charm (vv. 803-4) is found in the existing unique Tanjore Manuscript of the Bhêla Saññhitā (see note 376, p. 154), in the seventh chapter of its Sûtra Sthāna which deals with indriyopakramaniya, that is, with general rules for the preservation of bodily and mental health. But the formulae for the gruels (vv. 785-802) cannot be traced in it owing to its mutilated condition. Seeing, however, that formulae, practically identical, are found in the Charaka Saññhitā, in the second chapter of its Sûtra Sthāna, it may rightly be assumed that the missing formulae would be found in the second chapter of the Sûtra Sthāna of the Bhêla Saññhitā, if the text of the latter were intact. It is further to be observed that the charm has no particular connection with the gruels. It and they are mentioned in two different and quite unconnected chapters of the Saññhitā, and the charm may be used with any kind of treatment in order to render the latter effective for long life, while the gruels of Bheça are specifically referred to in the colophon. One naturally expects, therefore, to find the colophon, not after the charm, but immediately after the gruels, that is, after verse 802. If it is replaced in its proper place, in l. 9 of fol. 24b, it will be seen that it comes to stand between two wheels (see Fig. 18).

And in fact, the existing misplacement of the colophon appears to be indicated by the scribe, or his reviser. He placed two crown's feet, together with the numerals 4 (one above the other) on the margin against the wheel mark of the colophon. The figure 2 would refer to the second chapter of the Sûtra Sthāna which contains the formulae for the gruels, while the figure 7 would indicate the seventh chapter of that Sthāna as the source of the charm; and the reviser's object in thus identifying the two different sources of the gruels and charm would be to indicate that the colophon which speaks of the gruels (gacāgū) of Bheça really belongs to the verses 785-802 which contain the formulae for those gruels.

Exceptionally the correction of a letter is made in the text itself. Thus, in Part I, fol. 2a the second letter r of durjijaya is written across the letter y of the original reading durjijaya; see note 10 on p. 12.

In Parts V-VII only one of the above-mentioned signs, viz., the cross, is found. It occurs twice in Part V, fol. 5a, where it marks the omission of the syllable na, supplied below, between lines 2 and 3; and ibid., fol. 6b, where it marks the insertion of the syllable te, written on the margin, below the cross. Otherwise corrections are not marked by any sign. For example, in Part VI, fol. 3a, the omission of the syllable na of upananda, which is supplied below, between lines 4 and 5, is not marked by any sign; neither is the interlinear supply of e, ibid., fol. 6a. Similarly the supply of the syllable kha, on the margin of fol. 3a, in Part VI, is not marked. The meaning of this syllable is quite unintelligible; for the suggestion made, in note 18, p. 224, is not tenable. Possibly it may really be the badly drawn and hence cancelled numeral three; though this explanation, too, is not satisfactory. Occasionally blundered readings are defaced; as in Part VI., folia 26a and 36a, and in Part VII, fol. 1e.

11 See also Journal, Royal Asiatic Society, 1909, pp. 869-70; and ib. 1910, p. 830.
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In Part IV, fol. 3a, the interlinear insertion of the phrase na saṅkhaya, which was made by the scribe of Parts V-VII, appears to be marked by a double stroke in a slanting position in line 4. But the interlinear insertions of the syllables pi on fol. 4a² and bha on fol. 5a² are not marked by any sign. On fol. 5b³, the correction of tri to tri is made in the text itself. The favourite method, however, of correcting blundered letters is to deface them, as on fol. 3a³, 3a⁶, 5b⁴, where false numerals are defaced. See also fol. 4a² and 5a⁴.

3. Lacuna:—see Table V, Traverse 5, for Parts I and II. The existence of a lacuna is indicated in the Bower Manuscript by means of dots. The number of these dots is equal to the number of the missing syllables, when the latter is very small. Thus in Part I, fol. 2b⁴, there are three dots to indicate the absence of three syllables, which the scribe was unable to read in his original, but which can now be identified as pañcha cha from the Bheda Sāūhitā, the source of the Navanītaka (see Journal, Royal Asiatic Society for 1909, p. 858); also below, Chapter VI, p. Ivii. Similarly, ibid., fol. 7b¹, there are two dots to indicate the absence of the two syllables para (see note 61, p. 36). Also ibid., fol. 4b⁶, there are two dots indicative of the loss of two syllables, the identity of which, however, for the present, is unknown (see note 38, p. 32). The case is slightly different with Part II, fol. 3b⁷. Here we have a blank space, partly filled with four dots and enclosed between those double strokes which are the usual mark of the end of a full verse (see ante, p. xxxvii). Here the dots indicate the loss of an indefinite portion of the text in the original manuscript, from which the scribe prepared the existing copy of the treatise.

Dots, however, serve to indicate not only a lacuna in its proper sense, i.e., a gap in the text, but also such gaps, or blank spaces, in the inscribed surface of the leaf as are due, not to the loss of any portion of the text, but to defects of the birch-bark, or to other causes. (See Chapter II pp. xviii, xix). Thus we have three dots at the end of the first line of fol. 7b in Part II, to show that nothing of the text is missing, but that the surface of the birch-bark was not good enough to be written on. The single dot on the third line of the same page serves the same purpose; so also the two single dots on the tenth line of fol. 5b, though here their presence is not due to badness of the surface of the bark, but probably to a real lacuna, which the scribe could only partially fill up with the word chitra, for which reason he put dots into the superfluous blank spaces on either side of that word.

Besides dots, also the lengthwise-comma, or numeral one, is frequently used to mark a superfluous blank space. Thus in Part I, fol. 16¹, Part II, fols. 4a¹, 7a¹, 7b¹, 8b¹, 11b¹, 25a¹, 29b¹, 31a¹, 31b¹, 9¹, 11, etc. In Part II, at the beginning of the fourth line of fol. 15b, the comma indicates a blank space due to the conjunct letter above it.

Finally a more or less lengthy serpentine line is used for the same purpose of indicating a superfluous blank space. It occurs, e.g., in Part II, fols. 6a¹, 8b¹, 14a¹.

(iii) Abbreviation.

The practice of abbreviating a word is found only in Part II, and only in application to the two words śloka and pāda, when they are connected with numbers expressed by figures. The word śloka serves as the name of any kind of verse, not of the technically called śloka only; and pāda is the name of a quarter verse. The two names often occur in the colophon of formulae, to indicate the number of verses, or parts of verses, of which they consist. When so used, they are usually abbreviated to ślo and pā, respectively. Thus we have ślo 2 on fol. 2a² (p. 29), and ślo 11 pā 1 on fol. 5a² (p. 32), etc. Twice, however, śloka is written in full, viz., śloka 14 on fol. 18b¹ (p. 55), and śloka 5 on fol. 19b² (p. 57). As part of the text, of course, it is always written in full; thus in verse 498, on fol. 15b⁸, we have ardhao ślokasamāpenāḥ, and in the prose note introducing verse 947, on fol. 29a³, we find tatra ślokāh.

(iv) Scribal Errors.

Lapses in writing occur not infrequently in the Bower manuscript. In Parts V and VII, which are written with evident carelessness, they are particularly numerous. In a
comparatively small number of cases they have been corrected by some revising hand, and some of these corrected errors have already been referred to in the Section on Correction (p. xl), and others will be referred to below in the Section on Revision (p. xlii). The subjoined list refers only to uncorrected errors, and comprises only selected examples. For many others the footnotes to the transcribed texts may be consulted.

The most frequent error consists in a miswritten letter or syllable. Thus in Part I fol. 1³⁶ (p. 1) guṇa is written for gaṇa; fol. 3³⁶ (p. 4) Suśruta-ākṣaraṇāḥ probably for Suśruta-ākṣaraṇāḥ (i.e. Suśruta-ākṣaramāñḍīḥ); fol. 3³⁶ (p. 5) pradhamanāyadhā for pradhāmanāyadhā, etc. In Part II, fol. 2³⁶ (p. 23), phalāni for palāni; fol. 6³⁶ (p. 35), arpaṇī for arpaṇī (possibly only a badly written m); fol. 24³⁶ (p. 63), mādhyagāḥ for māvyagāḥ; fol. 29³⁶ (p. 7¹), lōga for lōga, etc. In Part IV, fol. 2³⁶ (p. 193), nishphala for nishphala; fol. 3³⁶ (p. 194), sahaṇayā for sahaṇayā; etc. In Part V, fol. 3³⁶ (p. 205), sasīkā for paktīkā; fol. 3³⁶ (p. 205), upasthitāḥ for upasthitāḥ; fol. 4³⁶ (p. 206), puṣṭa for puṣṭa, etc. In Part VI, fol. 2³⁶ (p. 223), jāluṇā for jāluṇā, etc. In Part VII, fol. 2³⁶ (p. 237), kṛṣṭiṇā for kṛṣṭiṇā, etc.

Or, a letter or syllable is misplaced. Thus in Part I, fol. 4³⁶ (p. 7), śaṅkarā for śaṅkarā; fol. 5³⁶ (p. 8), paśuṇā for paśuṇā; fol. 10³⁶ (p. 41), kṛṣṇāḥ for kṛṣṇāḥ; fol. 19³⁶ (p. 57), jātiṇī for jātiṇī; fol. 2³⁶ (p. 192), jātiṇāḥ for jātiṇāḥ; fol. 2³⁶ (p. 204), viśeṣāḥ for viśeṣāḥ; fol. 4³⁶, svāmityāḥ for svāmityāḥ; fol. 2³⁶ (p. 224), uragadāhāra-kāḷē for uragadāhāra-kāḷē; fol. 4³⁶, kītyāḥ for kītyāḥ, etc. Occasionally even a half-verse, or a whole verse, or a whole clause, is missed out; see note 1³⁶, p. 171, and note 2, p. 225.

Or, a superfluous letter or syllable is inserted. Thus, in Part I, fol. 1³⁶ (p. 1), "ōkṣhīṁ for 6ōkṣhīṁ. In Part II, fol. 4³⁶ (p. 32), nā nāmā for nāmā; fol. 2³⁶ (p. 63), mā at the beginning of the line. In Part IV, fol. 1³⁶ (p. 192), balamamantarāḥ for balamantarāḥ. In Part V, fol. 1³⁶ (p. 203), tatāhāśā for tatāhāśā; and exactly the same superfluous word in Part VI, fol. 1³⁶ (p. 222), dāharāḥ for dāharāḥ. A superfluous anusvāra is rather common; e.g., in Part I, fol. 1³⁶ (p. 1), jvalañcā for jvalañcā; Part III, fol. 3³⁶ (p. 183), śrīvāntā for śrīvāntā; Part IV, fol. 3³⁶ (p. 194), sarvañcāḥ; Part V, fol. 1³⁶ (p. 203), māyānukāmaḥ; Part VI, fol. 1³⁶ (p. 222), dārāmī; fol. 2³⁶ (p. 223), arōchakāḥ, m for arōchakāḥ, in this case there is a superfluous comma in addition to the superfluous anusvāra. Once there occur also two superfluous verses, see note 114, p. 98.

Occasionally there occur entirely wrong words, such as pushā for paktī in Part I, fol. 3³⁶ (p. 4); sa-patruṇā for sa-puṣṭhān, in Part II, fol. 2³⁶ (p. 59); devīṣya for tritīṣya, in Part IV, fol. 3³⁶ (p. 195); and 243 for 343, in Part V, fol. 3³⁶ (p. 205). But the responsibility for these errors possibly lies rather with the original writers of the treatises than with the scribes who copied them in the Bower Manuscript. Still such grossly blundered readings, as kāyōṣhāṇaḥ in Part I, fol. 3³⁶ (p. 4), and chāsahkāṣaḥ in Part V, fol. 2³⁶ (p. 204), are probably to be laid to the charge of the scribes, who may not have been able, or careful enough, to read correctly their original. They are certainly responsible for such curiosities as those referred to in note 32, p. 3, and note 77, p. 7.

In this connection a brief reference may be made to certain defects due to the inferior quality of the birch-bark on which the scribes wrote rather than to the scribes themselves. To this category belong half-formed letters, such as may be seen, e.g., in Part II, fols. 7³⁶, 1³⁶, 2² ³⁶, and in Part V, fol. 2³⁶ (see note 21, p. 193); and want of evenness, or continuity, in the lines of writing, as, e.g., in Part II, fol. 1³⁶, lines 5 ff.
When the Bower Manuscript was exhibited for the first time in Calcutta in November 1890, it was stated (Proceedings, As. Soc. Beng., p. 223, Journal, As. Soc. Beng., 1891, Vol. LX, p. 137) that "the writing was entirely in black ink." So it no doubt appears at first sight; but on closer examination letters and syllables are met with occasionally, which are written in a very light, or faint, ink. The significance of these light-inked letters, namely, that they indicate corrections, is disclosed by such cases as the following. In Part I, fol. 4b, the original writing in black ink was mē yu, which is false for mē ṭi yu. Here the omitted syllable ṭi is inserted below, in the interlinear space, in almost invisible light ink, and the proper place of insertion between mē and yu is marked by two minute strokes, also in light ink, above those two syllables. Again, ibid., fol. 36b, the original black-ink writing was prōktō sa, and this is, as it should be, corrected into prōktah sa, by inserting a visarga and cancelling the top-strokes of the vowel ṭ by two minute strokes, all in light ink. Similarly, ibid., fol. 3b, an originally omitted visarga is inserted in ajara. But not infrequently corrections are found made also in black ink. Thus, in Part I, fol. 4b, we have the original reading sa-mustām, which is adjectively made to qualify the preceding noun triphalām, corrected into sa-mustam, which, just as the following sa-śrākkaruna (derived from sa and śrākkara), now qualifies the succeeding noun aścyotanah. Here both, the original as well as the correction, are in black ink. Again, ibid., fol. 5a, (p. 7), the original blundered reading mūrava is corrected to mūrava, both in black ink, though another error is left uncorrected; for the fully correct reading should be mūravā. Ibidem, fol. 4b, there is another instructive example. The original reading prālēpaḥ is corrected to prālēpah, both again in black ink. As a matter of fact, the noun prālēpa refers to both, the preceding instrumental plural ardha-rūpāḥ and the succeeding nominative singular saimpragōyaḥ, and may grammatically be made to agree with either. This correction, as well as the correction of sa-mustam in black, and of prōktah in light ink, shows that the revisers, whoever they were, were familiar with the technicalities of the Sanskrit language. Equally instructive is an example ibid., fol. 5b. Here we have the word lavanāptārī entirely in black ink with the exception of the syllable so which is in light ink. It would seem that the original writer in black had left a gap for that syllable, which for some reason he had omitted to write, and that a subsequent reader of the treatise supplied the missing syllable so in light ink. The fact that the original writer should have failed to recognize the compound word lavan-āptāra, and to supply such an obvious complement of the word lavanyā, compounded with upāta, seems to suggest that he must have been a rather illiterate person, a conclusion which the occurrence of the numerous other errors (see Section iv, p. xlii) in the original writing tends to confirm. A further instructive example occurs in Part II, on fol. 7b. Here the last word of the tenth line appears to have been originally dāpasyā in black ink. To this the reviser added in light ink the terminal t (dāpasyē), and after it, the vowel ā, as if to commence a fresh verse. Then noticing his mistake—for as a matter of fact the vowel ā which commences the new verse does stand at the beginning of the eleventh line—he cancelled the superfluous ā by two minute double-strokes.

The foregoing remarks are concerned, in the main, with Parts I-III of the Bower Manuscript. The general conclusion suggested by the observed facts is that those Parts were originally written in the usual black Indian ink by a somewhat illiterate writer, and that some of his numerous errors were afterwards corrected by a more intelligent user of the manuscript at different times, sometimes in black ink, at other times, when for some reason good black ink was not at hand, in diluted ink.

Both forms dāpasyā and dāpasyē, are correct; only the former is Prakrit, while the latter is Sanskrit,—another indication that the reviser was a person familiar with Sanskrit.
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