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THE HISTORY OF THE NAIK KINGDOM OF MADURA.

By V. RANGACHARI, M.A., L.T., MADRAS.

CHAPTER I.

THE PAÑDAYAN KINGDOM FROM THE MUSSULMAN CONQUEST TO THE END OF
KRISHNA DEVA RAYA'S RULE. 1310—1530.
(The Muhammadan Conquest and Rule 1324—1371.)

THE dawn of the 14th Century of the Christian era witnessed a revolution in the history of South India,—a revolution which will be ever remembered, and be ever felt by the various races and peoples who inhabit this part of the country. It was in that age that the Muhammadans, hitherto confined to Hindustán, extended for the first time into the eis-Vindhyan region, and converted the Hindu kingdoms either into Muhammadan principalities or vassals of the Muhammadan Empire. More than a century had passed since Shahābuddīn Ghori and his lieutenants had marched their victorious legions as far as the Bay of Bengal, and cemented the disjointed kingdoms of Hindustán by a common allegiance to a single sovereign authority. For the space of a century the "slave kings" of Delhi enjoyed and abused their power, and gave place to the Khiljis. The new rulers were not satisfied with preserving the dominions which the martial enthusiasm of their predecessors had acquired.

The able and ambitious imperialist, 'Alāu’d-dīn Khilji, formed, for the first time, the bold design of crossing the Vindhyan barriers and subduing the mysterious region which lay stretching to the South, and which had escaped Musalmān subjugation so long. And fortunately, the circumstances were not unfavourable for his design. Centuries of internecine wars had already exhausted the vital strength of the Deccan and South Indian powers. The Yādavas, the Gajapatis, the Hoysālas, the Chōlas, and the Pañḍyas had, in spite of differences of tongue and language, a common civilization and a common method of government; but they had never known the virtues of peace and the value of harmony. The impulse of ambition and emulation led to constant wars, which often ended in the absolute exhaustion of some or all of the contending parties.

The Musalman conquest of the South.

It is not surprising that, under such circumstances, the Lieutenant of 'Alāu’d-dīn, the talented Malik Kāfūr, achieved in his celebrated campaign in the South, a rapid succession of triumphs. He first conquered King Rāmachandra of Dēvagiri, and made him not merely a
vassal of the growing empire, but an active participator in its growth, even at the expense of his own brother-chiefs. He then vanquished the pride of the powerful Pratāpā Rudra of Wārangal, and imposed the Musalmān yoke on the kingdom of Telingāna. The turn of the powerful kingdom, or rather empire, of the Hoysala of Dwārasamudra came next. The ancestors of Vira Ballāla III had extended their sway, by force of arms, over the effete and decaying kingdoms of the Chōlas and Pandyas; and Dwārasamudra, the proud and prosperous city of the Hoysala, was the seat of an imperial government. The empire, however, was scarcely in a condition to present a determined or protracted resistance to the invaders. The sincerity of history declares that the armies of the Hindu power were vanquished and that Vira Ballāla himself was a prisoner in the Musalmān camp. The whole land was exposed to the wickedness and vandalism of an enemy in whose views, plunder and devastation were the legitimate harvest of martial labour. The noble city of the Hoysala was sacked and ruined. Its buildings were levelled to the ground, its grand works of beauty and art demolished, and its temples polluted by blood and by sceptic feet. Reaction or policy, however, soon taught Kāfūr that his zeal must be tempered with discretion. He therefore set the captive king free on condition that he should, like the kings of Mahārāṣṭrā and Telingāna, acknowledge the supremacy of the Musalmān emperor at Delhi.

The date of the conquest of the Pandyā Kingdom.

The movement of Malik Kāfūr after the overthrow of the Hoysala power is uncertain. It is impossible to say how far he marched his invincible army further South. The celebrated historian Ferishta says that, immediately after the subjugation of the Hoysala, Kāfūr carried on his depredations as far as “Seet Bunder Ramessar” i.e., Ramesvaram, and erected there a mosque. The Musalmān writers, Wassāf and Amīr Khusrū, give some interesting details which go to support this view. They assert that, prior to the invasion of Kāfūr in 1310, a king named Kulasekhara had been ruling the Pandyā kingdom, for a space of 40 years and more. He, they say, was murdered by his elder and legitimate son Sundara Pādya. The parricide, however, was not allowed to enjoy the fruits of his terrible crime long; for his younger and illegitimate brother, Vira Pādya, avenged his father by

---
1 This is plenty of evidence in the epigraphical reports to prove this. In the middle of the 13th century, for instance, a Hoysa’s Viceroy settled a Saiva Vaishnava dispute in the temple of Tirumayiam in the reign of Maravarman Sundara Pādya II (1239-51). See Madras Ep. Rep. 1907, p. 76. Examples of such Hoysa interference can be multiplied. It is plain that frequent inter-marriages between the royal houses also took place. Ep. Rep. 1892, Aug. 7-8. Arch. Sur. 1907-8, p. 235; Madras Manual, I, 120.
2 According to Ferishta, the Muhammadan spoils included 96,000 mams of gold and innumerable chests of jewels and pearls. The soldiers threw away the silver as an encumbrance. See Dow’s Ferishta; Scott’s Ferishta, I, p. XIII; Elliott’s Hist. of Ind. III, 49. Wassaf, however, says that “Rai Pādya” of “Dur Samun” got assistance from Tira Pandi, one of the two rival brothers then ruling Ma’bar. The Rai, however, preferred submission, gave the province of Arikanna as a proof of his allegiance, besides an immense treasure and 55 elephants. The Muhammadans, therefore, left him in possession of the country. Amīr Khusrū gives certain details, but he does not mention Arikanna. Ibid., 89-90.
4 Scott’s Deeksh; Taylor’s O. H. Mes. II, 99.
5 Elliott’s Hist. of Ind. III 49-54 and p. 91; Sewell’s Antiquities, II, 222.
7 For the details of the war between Vira Pādya and Sundara Pādya, see Elliott, III, 53-54.
8 Bishop Caldwell identifies him with Kuna Pādya, the contemporary of Jānassambandhar. This is, of course, wrong. The Musalmān historian calls Vira Pādya, Tira Pādī.
overthrowing and driving him away. The royal criminal, however, promptly proceeded to Delhi, and asked for, and obtained Musulmān help for his restoration. The invasion of Malik Kāfūr was, according to these authorities, due to this disputed succession; and it ended, according to Wassif in the defeat and retreat of “Malik Nabu”, but, according to Amir Khusrū, in the flight of Vīra Pāṇḍya from Madura into the jungles and the consequent capture of the city and the burning of the temple. Amir Khusrū says that as many as 512 elephants were captured by the Muhammadans as well as 5,000 horses, and 500 maunds of jewels of every description—diamonds, pearls, emeralds and rubies. There is no question, says Mr. Sewell, of the fact that “this invasion of the Mahomedans actually, if not nominally, effected the entire subversion of the ancient Kingdom of the Pāṇḍyans. It convulsed the whole of South India. The Chōḷa kingdom went to pieces at the same time, and all over the peninsula there was a period of anarchy and confusion till the rise of Vijayanagar a few years later.” Mr. Nelson, the author of the Madura Manual, a work of classical authority on the history of Madura, also accepts this view, and says that, as a result of the Musulmān conquest of the Pāṇḍyan kingdom, it was ruled for the next half a century by a succession of Musulmān Viceroys, i.e., from 1310 to 1358 A.D.

The Hindu chronicles, on the other hand, distinctly assert that the year of Musulmān invasion of the Pāṇḍyan kingdom was Saka 1246, Rudhirotkari, i.e., 1324 A.D. “In S. 1246, 227 years after the destruction of Quilon,” says the Pand. Chron., “in the month of Āni, year Rudhirotkari, when a king, Parākrama Pāṇḍya by name, was holding a precarious sway, at Madura, Adhi Sultan Mulk and Nemian came from Delhi in the North, seized the king, sent him to Delhi, and took forcible possession of the kingdom.” “In S. 1246, corresponding to Q. E. 227,” says another chronicle, “when one named Parākrama Pāṇḍya was reigning, Adhi Sultan Mulk and Nemian (i.e., Malik Naib) came from Delhi in the North, took Parākrama captive, sent him to Delhi, and conquered the country.” These statements are corroborated by Col. Dow, according to whom, it was in the reign of Muhammad III, by the year 1326, that the Carnatic “to the extremities of the Deccan and from sea to sea” was reduced to subjection, and compelled to pay tribute. Mr. Taylor accepts this version, and rejects the date 1310. The Tamil work Kōyilōṇugu assigns the conquest of Trichinopoly to 1327.

---

8 Elliot III, 91; also Barnl’s account, p. 204. It appears from Khusrū’s account that Vīra Pāṇḍya was not slain. As shown, later on according to Mr. Krishna Sastri Vīra Pāṇḍya continued to rule till 1309. See Madr. Ep. Rep. 1900, p. 7-8, where Mr. Venkaiyānam discusses the whole question. Sewell misreads the Musulmān historians. He says that Vīra Pāṇḍya was defeated and Sundara Pāṇḍya restored. This is wrong. [Malik Kāfūr was equally well known as Malik Naib (the Lord Lieutenant).] Ed.

9 Sewell’s Antiquities, II, 222. It was evidently during this period of confusion that Ravi Varma Kulaṇekhara, the Kerala king, invaded the east, conquered Vīra Pāṇḍya, married the Pāṇḍyan princess, and crowned himself in Madura in S. 1234 (1312). He must have been subsequently overthrown by the Muhammadans. (See Madr. Ep. Rep. 1890). It is highly probable that Ravi Varma’s invasion was caused by the quarrel between Sundara and Vīra Pāṇḍya. Ravi Varma’s original kingdom was around Quilon (Kolamba). He first took Kerala, and then started in his campaign. In 1316 he was in Kānchi. Madr. Ep. Rep. 1900 p. 8; Inc. 349 of 1903 mentions him at Tiruvadi.

10 The exact Q. E. date is 499-9 and not 227.

11 Cf. the Musulmān chronicles, which give a different name altogether.

12 This is wrong. There was only one person—Malik Naib Kāfūr. Nemi is evidently a mistake for Naib. See Elliott, III. Dow’s Periβhika, I, 301.

13 O. H. Mus. II, 109; Wilks, I, 7; The Trichinopoly Gazetteer; 43

14 The Trichinopoly Gazetteer; 43

15 i.e., year Akebaya. For a full and complete analysis of this celebrated work, see Ind. Ant. May 1911.
It is difficult to say which of these is true. There are probabilities as well as inconsistencies in both. In regard to the first, we have to remember that the erection of a mosque at Rāmavaram is extremely doubtful. There is no trace of it whatever, nor is it mentioned by the Musalmān writers we have quoted. Rāmavaram has been a centre of Hindu worship for centuries, and if a mosque had been erected in such a sacred place, it would certainly have attracted the special attention, and merited the notice, of the chroniclers. Even supposing that it was in reality erected, but afterwards destroyed by the Hindus, the fact would, if it had happened, not have escaped the notice of Hindu writers. There is, besides the mosque problem, another difficulty. All the authorities assert that the Musalmān conquest of the country was followed by Musalmān rule for the space of 45 years. If the conquest had been achieved in 1310, it is clear that the Muhammadans ought to have ruled till 1358, and then been overthrown by Vijayanagar.

The conquest complete in 1334-7.

But it is more or less well known that the Vijayanagar conquest of this region was complete only by S. 1293, or 1371 A.D.\textsuperscript{15} We are thus unable, if we accept the date 1310, to account for the interval of about a decade. Mr. Nelson found himself in this position. He took it that the conquest took place in 1310, that the Musalmān Viceroy ruled till 1358, and that Vijayanagar rule came in 1371. He left the gap 1358-1371 unfilled. If, on the contrary, it is accepted that the Muhammadan advent took place in 1324, there is no incoherency in regard to dates. It is true that even in case of such an acceptance, some reservation has to be made. For the chronicles are not without mistakes. They say that from 1324 to 1327 the ruler was Sultān Malik, i.e., Malik Kāfūr; but he had returned to Delhi long before, and been murdered. It is clear then that the chronicles cannot be relied on, so far as the name of the conqueror is concerned; but the fact is beyond controversy. First, there is the distinct statement of Ferishta that it was in the time of Muhammad III [Tughlakh] that the conquest was achieved. Secondly, there is the agreement in regard to dates. Thirdly there is the independent evidence of the Tamil work already mentioned.

The Mahomedan Governors 1324-1371.

The Musalmān conquest of Madura, then, took place between 1324 and 1327; and from that time to the year 1371, the kingdom of the Pāṇḍyas was really under the rule of Muhammadan Viceroy. The Pand. Chron. mentions as many as six of them. During the first three years, it says, there was practically confusion and anarchy. Then a chief named Allathī Khān, evidently a deputy of the Delhi emperor, ruled for six years (1327-1333). His successors 'Alā’uddin Khān and “Suthi?” ruled respectively for three and five years. The next Viceroy, whose name the chronicle does not mention, was in power for the next 19 years, (1341-1360). The last of the Musalmān Viceroy was Fandakh Mulk, whose administration of twelve years ended in conquest by Vijayanagar. Mr. Nelson gives a slightly different account. As has been already mentioned, the dates which he assigns to the different rulers are different. He also asserts that there were eight chiefs.\textsuperscript{17}

\textsuperscript{15} The Hindu chronicles; the Kōyilolugu. Epigraphical evidences, no doubt, prove that Koppu marched south as early as 1365, but the conquest was complete only in 1371. See Ep. Ind. VI, 322-330, where the Ranganātha inscription of Coppu is discussed in detail with reference to Guru Parampara, Kōyilolugu, etc. Salem, according to the Rongudes Rājākai, was conquered by Vijayanagar as early as 1348.

\textsuperscript{17} These were: Malik Naib Kāfūr 1310-13; 'Alā’uddin 1313-19; Uttama’uddin 1319-22; Qutbuddin 1322-27; Nānakuddin 1327-34; Savada Malik and Aḥad Malik 1334-46; and Fandakh Malik, 1346-58, See Nelson's Madura Manual; Sewell's Antiquities, II, 223;
This period of Muhammadan rule was, we have every reason to believe, a period of misrule and misery, of popular suffering and keen discontent, of merciless oppression and furious iconoclasm. Unable to distinguish a permanent rule from temporary military occupation, the Muhammadan rulers committed atrocities hardly reconcilable with the wisdom of statesmanship. "Men were afraid of one another," says the chronicle we have already quoted, "and all things were in chaos. The tutelary God of Madura had to be taken into the Malayālam country. The walls of the temple, with their fourteen towers and the streets inside, were destroyed. The garbha grāha, the ardhamanta, and the periamanta alone escaped this destruction." The temples were profaned and destroyed, villages plundered, towns sacked, and women dishonoured. Trade was completely at a standstill, and personal liberty or security at an end. With the cessation of public worship and of the business of trade, with the absence of security and the dread of violence, the proud city of Madura, the richest and the most flourishing city of South India, became, with tragic suddenness, a scene of terror and desolation. Everywhere there was disorganisation and dislocation, chaos and confusion, which seemed irrevocable and eternal.

The Pandyan Kings—1324-71.

It is an interesting question to discuss whether, throughout this reign of terror, the Pāṇḍyan kings were in power or not. Was the dynasty extinct, or was it alive and powerless in the presence of the conquerors? The chronicles are reticent in regard to the subject, and seem to imply that the dynasty was completely overshadowed. But the evidence of archaeology and epigraphy clearly informs us that the Pāṇḍyan line did not die under the Muhammadan rule, and continued to be nominally in power, being in reality the slave of the foreigner. As the Madura Gazetteer says, "not only during the Muss'mān occupations, but also throughout the rule of Kampana Udayār and his successors, and even, see below, through the time of the later Nayakkān dynasty and down to the overthrow of the Vījayanagar kingdom in 1665, Pāṇḍya chiefs remained always in authority in Madura." (p. 39). According to Kielhorn there were at least three kings in this Muhammadan period, namely, Mārvavārman Kulaśekhara II (1314-21), Mārvavārman Parākrama Pāṇḍya (1334-32), and Jātavārman Parākrama Pāṇḍya (1357-72). According to Mr. Krishna Sastry, the epigraphist of Madras, the king of the Pāṇḍyas from 1310 to 1356 was one Vira Pāṇḍya whom he identifies with the rival of Sunḍara Pāṇḍya, the Delhi exile and the cause of Musulmān invasion. From inscriptions discovered at Tirupat in 1908, Mr. Sastry points out that the Muhammadans, who had occupied the local temple of Tiruttaliyāndar, had destroyed it; that it was rebuilt by one Visālaya Devar in the 46th year of the reigning

---

18 Madr. Manu. p. 81; O. H. MSS. II; See also the appendix.
19 For the difficulties to which Srl Ranganātha was subjected, see Kērīlojugu, 1888, p. 48-52.
20 The Pāṇḍu. Chron.; "The supple. MS. says that the high tower and the entrance tower also escaped destruction. Taylor's Oriental Historical MSS. I.; The Madr. Manu. I, 123 reproduces part of the MSS.
21 For a short description of the splendours of Madura, based on Marco Polo, the Muhammadan, Chinese and Singhalose chronicles, about 1300, see Madura Gazetteer, 37. For an account of the foreign visitors themselves, see Madr. Manu. I, 137-40; Yulo's Marco Polo; Stuart's Tinnevelly Manual, 38-40; Calkivell's Tinnevelly, etc.
22 The Musulmān Governor, however, had his residence there, and the city became, says Ila Bātuta, as large and prosperous as Delhi. Stuart's Tinnevelly Manual, p. 38, Madura Gatr., etc.
king Vira Pāṇḍya; and that, as "we do not know of any earlier Muhammadan invasion of the Pāṇḍyan kingdom prior to Kāfār's in 1310, the Vira Pāṇḍya during whose reign Viśālaya Dēvar reconsecrated the Tirupatūr temple must be identified with that Vira Pāṇḍya, who, according to Sewell, had succeeded Sundara Pāṇḍya II and was attacked and defeated by the Mahomedans under Kāfār;" that Vira Pāṇḍya's accession must have therefore taken place somewhere about 1310 A. D.; that he ruled as late as 1356, the time "by which the Mahomedans slowly began to clear away," thereby enabling a safe reconsecration of the temple. There are some difficulties in accepting this version. As I have already endeavoured to show, the Mahomedan conquest of Madura took place really after 1324, Vira Pāṇḍya's accession must have been before that year and not necessarily, as Mr. Krishna Sastri says, in 1310. A corroboration of this is afforded by the fact that the Muhammadans were overthrown in Madura by Vijayanagar not before 1370. It seems to me, under these circumstances, that Vira Pāṇḍya must have come to the throne some time between 1310 and 1324, and that the reconsecration of the Tirupatūr temple must have taken place between 1356 and 1370. The Pāṇḍyan monarchs thus continued to rule during the Muhammadan occupation, but with the sword of Damocles hanging over their head all the while.

SECTION II.
The Vijayanagar Conquest.

From this reign of terror the kingdom was rescued by the young and growing power of Vijayanagar. This is not the place to describe the various circumstances which gave rise to this state, a state which, ever since its rise, remained the bulwark of Hindu independence for more than two centuries. It is sufficient to state that, immediately after the sack of Warangal in 1324 and the final overthrow of the Hoyasalas by the Muhammadans in 1326, the two royal adventurers, Hariharā and Bukka, once the servants of the ill-fated Pratāpa Rudra, entered the service of the principality of Anegundi, and on its destruction by the Muhammadans in 1332, laid the foundations of an extensive empire by founding, in the year 1336, with the help of Vidyaranya, the glorious city of Vijayanagar. From this time onward, Vijayanagar grew at the expense of the Hoyasalas on the one hand, and the Musalmāns on the other. For, even though, even after 1327, the Ballāla king, Vira Ballāla III, managed to retain some vestige of power (till 1342), and even though he had a successor in Vira Ballāla IV, yet they were, ever since their great defeat, mere petty chiefs, leading a precarious life and holding a limited power at Toṇnūr (12 miles N. from Srīrangapatam). The imperial power passed for ever from their hands into those of the obscure, but more vigorous, house of Vijayanagar. The five brothers Harihara, Bukka, Kampana, Muddappa and Mārappa, conquered province after province, till at last the state of Vijayanagar was circumscribed by the ocean on three sides and by the Kṛṣṇa on the other. Within a generation after the foundation of Vijayanagar this wonderful result was achieved. Never was an empire so rapidly made and a power so well established in the history of South India.

25 Antiquities II, p. 222.
27 Sewell's Forgotten Empire; Suryanarayana Rao's Never to be Forgotten Empire; Wilks I, 8-9; for a curious version of the origin of Vijayanagar see Salem Manual; L. p. 44.
The Vijayanagar Provincial Organization.

From the first, the Vijayanagar Empire had an organized system of provincial government. It consisted of numerous divisions and principalities, some of which were under viceroys, who might or might not be the members or relations of the royal family, some under the direct administration of the emperor, and some under the old indigenous dynasties. In the very first decade of Vijayanagar history, i.e., in the short reign of Bukka I, such an arrangement had, if we are to believe the inscriptions of the day, come into existence. Bukka I was himself in the direct charge of the Muluvai Rajya, the central and eastern portion of the Hoysala kingdom proper, and the most important division perhaps in the empire. Harihara I was in charge of the western half of the old Hoysala kingdom together with the Southern districts of the Yadavas of Devagiri. The Paka and Muliki Vishayas (the Nellore and Kadapa provinces), collectively known as Udayagiri Rajya, were under the administration of Kampaśa I, while the Maléh Rajya, comprising the Shimoga and North Karnara districts, was under the rule of Mārapa. Barakār, the important city of the North Tulu country, was the seat of a viceroy; and Mangalore, the capital of the South Tula country, had the same position and importance. Part of the Shimoga district and part of S. Kanara was ruled in 1347 by a feudatory chief who bore the title of Pandyā Chakravartin. Kōlīr was an important district under Harihara's son-in-law, Dāndanāyaka Mahāmāndaleshvara Vāllapā. The empire, as it grew and expanded, was thus partitioned among the generals, mostly relations of the royal family. Even in places where the old indigenous chiefs continued to rule, care was taken that they paid the tribute and that they were subject to the watchful supervision of a viceroy, or rather political agent.

An arrangement so common and so widespread could not but be applied in the case of the Chōḷa and Pāṇḍyan kingdoms, when they were brought under the imperial sway of Vijayanagar. The common name by which these two kingdoms, especially the Pāṇḍyan, were known in those days, was the Raja Gambaḥra Rajya. The credit of bringing it under the empire belonged to Kampaśa Udayār II, the son of Bukka I. Himself an able soldier, Kampaśa had the fortune to be served by an even abler lieutenant, the Brāhmaṇ Gopāmachari, a man who combined with the martial valor of a warrior the scrupulous piety of a priest. Both these leaders seem to have availed themselves of the discontent of the Pāṇḍyan king and espoused his cause against the Mūlamadñas. The latter were completely overthrown, and Hinduism was once again triumphant at Madura. The date of this conquest is, as has been already mentioned, differently stated by the different authorities. The evidence of epigraphy tells

20 See Arch. Survey Ind., 1907-8, for a very able article on the "1st Vijayanagara dynasty, its Viceroyas and Ministers,"—by Mr. A. KrishnasASTR.
21 Afterwards under his two sons.
22 There are ample epigraphical references concerning him. Eg. Madr. Ep. Rep. 1890 p. 25, says he gave a jewel to Conjeevaram deity. He also did much for Tiruvannāmalai and Tirukkōlūr shrines. See Ep. Rep. 1903 (273 of 1902); Inc., 106, 111, and 114 of 1903 record his gifts at the Jagannātha Swami temple of Tirupallani (Madura district) and bear ample evidence to the Musulmān defeat; Inc., 1293, Nos. 282 of 03, (1374 A.D. Ananda), 159 of 1904 (1389 Saumya), and 163, show Kampeśa's power in Trichinopoly and S. Arcot District.
23 For his inscriptions at Sṛngam, see Ep. Ind. Vol. VI, 322-380; for his Conjeevaram inscriptions, see Ep. Rep. 1888, 1890, etc. These belong to S. 1286, 1289 and 1297. In 1371 he removed the image of Raṣṭah from Tirupati, took it to Jijji and then to Sṛngam (55 of 1892). See also Kōyadura (Ind. Ant. May 1911, p. 391) 1888 edn. p. 54; Trich. Gazetteer, p. 48; the Gurupurampūras of the Vaisnavas.
us that it began in S. 1237, i.e., 1365 A.D.\textsuperscript{35} The Madura\textsuperscript{31} chronicles, on the other hand, assign it to S. 1293 (1371 A.D.). Perhaps the conquest was commenced in the former year, and completed in the latter.

**The Continuity of Vijayanagar Rule over Madura.**

From this time onward to the close of the 16th century, the Pandyar kingdom, like the rest of South India, was under the rule of Vijayanagar. It is not possible to go into the details of every emperor’s actions in the South,—first we have no materials for such a work, and secondly it is outside our province. It is sufficient if we note that, in spite of wars and troubles in the north, in spite of invasions and disputed successes, the grip of the imperial power never relaxed. At one time, indeed, the control was strong, owing to the strong personality of the emperor and the comparative weakness of the vassal, and at other times, weak owing to the weakness of the emperor and the self-assertion of the vassal; but it never ceased altogether. Unaffected by dangers from without and revolts from within, the imperial rule was maintained, first through the Udayars and then the Naiks. Sometimes the Viceroy himself, generally relations of the royal family, proved rivals, and usurped the imperial crown. The usurpation of the Saluva chief Narasimha Naik\textsuperscript{25} in 1485 during the weak rule of Virupaksha, and that of the Tuluva, Narasa Naik, in 1501, afford illustrations. But the usurpers themselves, when once their position became secure and unassailable, signalised their valour by the maintenance of a strong control over the provinces. The Tirupatūr\textsuperscript{26} and Trichinopoly inscriptions of the Saluva emperor, Immadi Narasimha Rāya, the son of the usurper, for instance, prove that his power was felt in the far south. Similarly the Tuluva accession was followed by the strong and all-embracing imperialism of Krishna Deva Rāya (1509-1530). Usurper or right ruler, then, the sovereign of Vijayanagar was the suzerain of the south, and he took care, to display his power by a lavish distribution of patronage and a generous series of endowments in his vassal territories.

**SECTION III.**

**The Udayars, 1371-1404.**

**Kampana Udayār and his successors.**

The history of Vijayanagar supremacy naturally falls into two periods,—the period when Kampana Udayar and his descendants ruled as the Viceroy, and the subsequent period when a number of nominated Naiks or Governors ruled the country. The dynasty of Kampana was a short-lived one, and lasted from 1365 to 1404. "After subduing the South and taking possession of Raja Gambhirā Rajya," says Mr. Krishna Sastri, "Prince Kumāra Kampaṇa seems to have ruled as an independent sovereign. His rule must have extended

\textsuperscript{31} The Madura Gazette, p. 38. Wilks is wrong in saying that the conquest of Dravidā was achieved by Narasimha in 1496: (I. p. 10).

\textsuperscript{32} The Paud. Chron.; the "Supple, MS." The Kōyilōugu, etc.

\textsuperscript{33} Epig. Ind. VI: Madr. Ep. Rep. 1909-10; 1908-9, etc.


\textsuperscript{35} The title of Udayār, says Mr. Venkaiyah, "seems to have been generally applied to Vijayanagara princes sent out as viceroys of provinces." (Madr. Ep. Rep. 1904-5, 1907, p. 83). On another occasion he says: "It seems to have been the title which the kings of the first Vijayanagara dynasty originally bore as feudalities of Hoysalas" (Madr. Ep. Rep. 1899 p. 22) Maha Rajah is a higher title (ibid, 1905, p. 38). Mr. Stein knew also that the Udayār title was assumed by such Vijayanagara princes as were sent out as viceroys. According to Wilks it was first assumed by governors of a small district, generally 32 villages, but later on by powerful kings. See Wilks, I, 21, footnote.
over the whole South of the peninsula and parts also of the Mysore State, including at least the Bangalore and Kolar districts and South Mysore State." It is difficult to endorse the dictum that Kampâga became "an independent sovereign," as we know for certain that he was a mere viceroy, a sort of political agent, whose existence was not attended with the extinction of the local dynasties. Nevertheless he made himself a powerful grandee of the empire, whose position was hardly inferior to that of an independent potentate. "Kampâga," says Sewell, was succeeded by Aryanna or Aryana Udayâr in or before the year 1377, for we have an inscription of the latter's reign dated in that year. Aryena was succeeded by his son Virupanna," while according to another account, by his brother-in-law, Prakâsa Udayâr. Whatever the fact was, whether Prakâsa or Virupanna was the viceroy, we find it impossible to reconcile it with epigraphical records, which clearly assert that between 1380 and 1396, the dominant man of the South was Virupaksha, the son of Harihara II. He is said to have vanquished "the Tundira, Châja, Pâidya, and Simhâja kingdoms," planted a pillar of victory in Ceylon, and presented the immense spoils of his victorious campaign to his father. A fine soldier, he is said to have been equally great in religion, and distributed the traditional "sixteen gifts." As the late Mr. Venkaiah points out, he probably died as the viceroy of "Karnâta, Tundira, Châja, and Pâidya" lands. At any rate, from the fact that he did not succeed his father to the imperial throne, we have to infer that he must either have predeceased him, or, in case he survived, must have been contented with the role of a subordinate and a viceroy. It seems that Virupaksha had a literary bent of mind. The Telugu drama, Nârâyana Vilâsa, has been attributed to him; and it is not improbable that the temper of the scholar disliked the burden of the imperial office. As a viceroy, however, he was evidently an able officer. His relations with the notables Virupanna and Prakâsa are not known, but most probably he kept them under control. Whatever it was, there can be no question that it was his achievement that enabled his father to assume the imperial titles of Râjâdhi Râja, Râja Paramâvâra, etc.

33 Arch. Surv. 1907-8, p. 241.
34 Antiquities II, 100. Perhaps Aryena corresponans to the Embana Udayâr of Nelson.
35 Inscription 562 of 1902 at Tiruvâjirâmalai points out that he gave land and money for a watchman in S. 1299 (Pingâja). An insc. of 1383 at Gudimallâr says that, in his time, there was a quarrel between right and left hand castes for a space of four years. (422 of 1905).
36 Madura Manual based on Hindu chronicles. Virupanna's inscriptions are at Trinomali, etc., (Isca. 483, 565, 572, 649 and 654 of 1902). No. 565 mentions the remission of a certain tax in 1388 A.D. No. 572 says that his cousin, Jammanâ Udayâr, granted land to provide for 5 persons who were to recite the Vedas in the memory of his deceased father in 1388 A.D. Ins. 649 at Tiruvâlîr in Tanjore District says that in 1393 (Srinukha) he gave a house site to a certain Tirumattaperumâl who had spent 400 panius for the temple during a famine in 1391 A.D. For Virupanna's tâlābhâra ceremony and other works in Srirangam, see Kâyilolus, 1888, p. 54.
37 By Malladevi, daughter (1) of king Râmâchandra of Dvâgiri. Virupaksha's inscriptions range from Chingleput to S. Arcot. See Madr. Ep. Rep. 1899 p. 21-22; 1904; p. 13. Ins. 234 of 1904 belongs to 1357 A.D., (Kashaya year). His Alampundi plates of 1386 are the first instances of grânda plate inscriptions (Ep. Ind. II, p. 224-30) and give the same information. Most probably Vira Savanna Udayâr, son of Bukka Udayâr, was his cousin and ruled as a subordinate. (See inscription at Tiruvâyur temple. S. 1393, Saumya, Madr. Ep. Rep. 1895); For Harihara's works in Srirangam see Kâyilolus, 1888, edn. p. 96, see also Tichh. Jottâter, p. 49.
38 As Mr. Venkaiah says, his inscriptions are, excepting those of the Udayârs, the most numerous in the Madras Presidency. Ep. Ind. III p. 113 (Inscription at Nollâr.).
SECTION IV.
The Naik Governors: 1400-1500.

The Udayārs evidently became extinct in 1404, and Emperor Harihara II, then, seems to have inaugurated a new era of nominated viceroys, called Naiks, to look after the imperial interests in the south. The Naiks seem to have been less independent than the Udayārs. Their powers, moreover, were confined to lesser areas; for while the Udayārs had a sort of general control over the Pāndya, Chāla and Kanarese districts, the Naiks were confined to special districts. There were thus Naiks, or Generals, in Tanjore, Jīnjī, Vellore, Srirangapatanam, and other places. The history of the Madura Naiks from 1405 to 1500, when the Tuluva usurpation took place, is very obscure.

The first of the Naik Viceroy: Lakkana Danda Nayaka 1405-51.

According to the Pānd, Chron., on which Mr. Nelson based his monumental history, there were, in this period only two Naiks, named Lakkana and Madana. These were, the Chronicle continues, followed by an illegitimate branch of the Pāndyan dynasty, which gave place, after ruling for about half a century, to Narasa Naik, evidently the first of the Tuluva dynasty. To use the language of the Chronicle itself; "After S. 1327 (1405 A.D.), from Subhānu to Vībhava (1451), a period of 47 years, Lakkana Naik and Madana Naik ruled the kingdom. After this from 1374, Sukla (1452) to Nāla (1499) — a space of 48 years — the kingdom was ruled by Sundarāṭhī Māvīlī Vanaṭha Raya, Kālayār Sōmanar, Anjāṭha Perumāl, and Muttarasa Tirumalai Māvīlī Vanaṭhi Rāya, who were the sons of the Pāndyan king by a dancing girl of Kālayār Koil named Abhirami, and were brought to Madura and crowned as legitimate sovereigns by Lakkana Naik. Then in S. 1422 Pingāla (1500 A.D.), Narasa Naik came, worshipped at the Rāmāṭvaram shrine, and occupied Madura."

The evidence of epigraphy is not more informing. It gives no information whatever in regard to the condition of the south in the reign of Dēva Rāya 14 I (1404-22), the real successor of Harihara II. The reference to the province in the reigns of his successor, Vīrā Vijaya, and Deva Raya II (1422-1449), is not so meagre. An inscription discovered in 1901 (No 128) says that all the southern dominions of the empire were, about this time, under the charge of one Lakkana Dandanāyaka, evidently the same as the person mentioned in the Chronicle. Lakkana seems to have been a great man in his day. For a long time he had been minister at the imperial capital, and managed the imperial affairs. He then, at the instance of his master, started on a campaign in the south, and besides confirming the imperial authority throughout the mainland, crossed over to Ceylon and evidently brought

42a The dates and the years do not agree. Vībhava ought to be Pramoda, Sukla ought to be Pratapa, and Naia ought to be Siddhārtha, see Dikshit and Sewell's calendar.
43 For his connection with the Srirangam temple, see Kāṭilījaya, 1888, p. 59.
44 For an inscription of his at Tiruvaylar (S. 1351 Saumya) see Ep. Rep. 1894, No. 255; Vīrā Vijaya has an inscription at Trincomalee dated 1418 A.D. (Vilamb) where he orders that Isangai and Valanai castes should have the same privileges (564 of 1902); 565 of 1902 (1413 A.D.), says that he gave 32 cows and 1 bull for the maintenance of a lamp by Anandastra Udayar, son of minister Saundappa Udayar. For Deva Raya's inscriptions see 566 of 1903, 658 and 659 of 1905, and 666 of the same year. These prove that the power of Vijayanagar was felt in Salem and Coimbatore districts also during these reigns. No. 479 of 1905 at Tiruvēlangāl is an inscription of Deva Raya in 1427 A.D. See Ep. Ind. III. 35-41 for his Satyanarayana plates of 1424.
45 Epig. Rep. 1903, No. 141. In S. 1360 (1438 A.D.), Kālayutki Deva Raya II is said to have given a gift at Tiruvannamilai for the merit of Madana Udayar, brother of Lakkana Dandanāyaka, "the Lord of the South Sea." From inscriptions 966 and 967 of 1904, we understand that a local chief, Nāgaras, son of Siddharasa, built the Gopura of Tiruvudai in S. 1362 (1440 A.D.), for the merit of Lakkana Dandanāyaka Udayar, "Lord of the Southern Ocean." Insen, 666 of 1905 mentions Lakkana at Tiruvavannamalai. For an excellent account of the connection of Ceylon with Southern India from the earliest times to the British conquest, see Madr. Manu. I, 117-119, 125-26; Trichi; and Madura Gazetteer.
it to acknowledge the sovereign of Vijayanagar. The visits of 'Abdu'r-Razzaik and Nicolo Conti at Vijayanagar took place at this time of glory and expansion. According to these and to Nuniz, not only did the powers of South India and Ceylon salute the banners of Deva Raya, but distant kings, like those of Pegu and Tenasserim, hastened to pay tribute. It seems that much of this prosperity was due to the talents of Lakkana and his brother Madana. The emperor in reward despatched them to the government of the southern dominions. Lakkana's advent to the Pādyan region took place in 1431 A.D. Mr. Nelson is thus right in saying that in the earlier half of the 15th century, Madura was the seat of two Naik Viceroyos and brothers, Lakkana and Mattana (Madana ?); but, as Mr. Krishna Sastri says, the date 1405—1451 which he, on the authority of the Pand. Chron., assigns to them is not quite accurate. For, inscriptions of Lakkana in the Madura country earlier than S. 1360 (1438 A.D.) are not yet discovered; "and there are inscriptions that show that he was in the Muluwayi country till at least S. 1353 (1431 A.D.)" 48.

Whatever was the exact date, there can be no doubt that Lakkana was a prominent viceroy at Madura, and if we may trust the Pand. Chron., a broadminded one also, as he sought for a branch of the Pādyan line, and entrusted it with the royalty. So powerful was he that he assumed the title "Lord of the Southern Ocean," and issued a coinage of his own. Mr. Venkayiyah attributes a copper coin with the Canarese legend (Kha) Manadanayakar on the obverse and the initial La on the reverse, to Dandanayaka Lakkana, the invader of Ceylon.

The Empire between 1450 and 1500.

With regard to the position of Madura in the second half of the 15th century, when the sons and successors of Deva Raya II, Virupanna and Mallikārjuna, ruled the Empire, we are still more in doubt. We have already seen that, according to one version, an illegitimate branch of the Pādyan dynasty—consisting of Mávillivana Raya, Kālayār Somanār, Anjātha Perumāl and Muttarasa Tirumalai Māvillivana Raya—ruled till 1499 A.D. From the phraseology of the chronicle which mentions this, we infer that no viceroys of Vijayanagar were present in the South; but the evidences of epigraphical records prove that such an inference is contrary to the fact. The emperors were indeed weak at home, but their names were evidently pronounced with loyal allegiance by the princes and people of the south. The inscriptions of Mallikārjuna50 have been found at such different places as Tiruvēlāngādu, Trinomali, and Kāveripākam, while those of his successors, Pradhā Deva and Virupaksha, have been found as far South as Vēdrānyam. Nevertheless it seems that the power of these monarchs was not so very securely felt by the people.

48 Arch. Surt. 1907-08.
49 Arch. Surt. 1907-08. Mr. Venkayiyah says that in the obverse of the coin, where an elephant faces right or left, is a Canarese syllable. Hultsch thought it to be Ny, but Venkayiyah deciphered it to be La, thereby making it correspond with (Kha) Manadanayakar on the other side. See Madr. Ep. Rep. 1905.
50 Mallikārjuna's inscriptions at Tiruvēlāngādu belong to 1450 and 1451 A.D. (Ins. 470 and 473 of 1905); the Tiruvānmalai inscriptions to 1453 (570 of 1902; year Sringakula); Kaveripakam inscriptions, to 1455 (383 of 1905) and 1459 (392 of 1905 Pramūhī). The Kaveripakam or Arcot inscriptions are interesting. The first of them records a private agreement among certain merchants that they would set apart a sum of money, on all marriage occasions, for repairing a local temple; and the other speaks of "the great assembly" of Kaveripakam. Virupaksha's inscriptions are, at Vēdrānyam (1464, earliest of his) 489 of 1904; at Conjevarur (1465 and 1470 see Madr. Ep. Rep. 1890, May) at Gaugakonda Choliapuram (ibid; Inscription 83 of 1892), etc.
The greatness of the Sāluvas at this period.

There are strong reasons for believing that the imperial agents and representatives of the period belonged to a very powerful feudal house, called the Sāluvas, who advanced their interests in such a manner as to eclipse the names of their masters, and behaved with a vigour which could hardly be consistent with a position of absolute subordination. The Sāluvas—"the hawks (Sāluvas) to the birds of hostile kings"—had a respectable antiquity in Vijayanagar service. The first of them Saluva Mangu came to prominence as a subordinate of the celebrated Kampaṇa Udayar. He, it is said, distinguished himself by conquering the Sultan of the south (Madura) and making him subordinate to Samba Raya, a prominent though feudatory king in N. Arcot, and by restoring Ranganātha to Sīrangaṇa and endowing 60,000 madas for the revival of the worship in the temple. We have already seen that Kampaṇa’s general Gopānāryya restored the worship at Sīrangaṇam and subdued the Muḥammadans; evidently Saluva Mangu’s was his lieutenant or colleague. From the time of Mangu, the Sāluvas had increased in power and in renown. Various members of the family ruled in different parts of the Vijayanagara Empire, “sometimes as feudatories and sometimes as semi-independent chiefs,” as evidenced by the existence of stray epigraphical records.

The Sāluva Governors of the North.

Saluva Tippa Raja, for instance, the grandson of Mangu, so far advanced his career as to marry into the royal family; and as the brother-in-law of Emperor Deva Raya II, he became the viceroy of N. Arcot and part of Mysore,—a position which his son Goppa (circa 1430 A.D.) evidently continued to occupy. The relations of a family so nearly connected by blood with the imperial family and so prominent in the service of the empire, were naturally rewarded and honored with offices and powers in the different part of the empire. A Sāluva Raja, known as Kampaṇa Deva, for instance, seems to have ruled about 1446 A.D. in the neighbourhood of Tirupati, and made gifts to the holy shrine of that place. Four years later, we meet with another scion of the family, Sirumallaiya Deva, son of Malagangaiya Deva, in the same locality. In 1465, again, a Parvata Raja of the same family, distinguished himself by building a mantapa in the temple, and in 1481 Timma Raja, the son of the above-mentioned Sirumalaiya made a grant. More important, at any rate for our purpose, than the Sāluvas of North Arcot, were the Sāluvas who evidently ruled further south in the Trichinopoly, Tanjore and Madura districts. We, unfortunately, do not know whether the Sāluva chiefs exercised power over the region continuously from the time of Saluva Mangu, the contemporary and Lieutenant of Kampaṇa Udayar. We presume they did not. For, as we have already seen, the Udayar dynasty itself ruled in these regions till 1404, and then the great Lakkāru Dandanīyaka

31 For a discussion of the origin and meaning of the word Sāluva, see Arch. Surv. 1908-09, p. 186.
32 His inscriptions have been found at Conjeeveram in 1338 A.D. He has been called विनाक्रति, चोकहला (Ep. Rep. May 1896). From Insc. 46 of 1900 we find that he was the son of one Vira Champa the son of Vira Choh. Sambava Raya ascended the throne in 1337 A.D. It is evident he was a scion of the old line Chōla (Ep. Rep. 1900). At any rate he came to prominence during the Chōla decline in Chingleput, N. Arcot and S. Arcot districts. An inscription of 1335 at Tiruvannamalai says (434 of 1903) that he came to the throne in 1321. He refers to the Muḥammadan invasion and his victory over them in consequence of which he assumed the title सकलतन्त्र, चोकलाल (Emperor of the whole world). The invasion must be that of 1297, which Mr. Venkaiyana ignorance (see Ep. Rep. 1994 p. 16, 1906, p. 18; Ep. Ind. III.)
34 c.f., Ep. Rep. 1905 (693 and 703 of 1904) 69 of 1906 says that he built the flagstaff of Tiruvangalida and Ramesvaran; No. 428 of 1905 of the same place also refers to him.
became Viceroy. The Saluvas, then, must have come to the Chōla and Pandya realms in the latter half of the 15th century, after the death of Lakkana, that is, during the reigns of Mallikārjuna and Virupāksha,—a conclusion which epigraphy unmistakably confirms.

**The Saluva Governors of the South.**

The first of these southern Sāluvas was the celebrated Gōpa Timma Nripati, or Sāluva Tirumalaiya Déva Mahā Rāja, as he was more commonly called. The period of his rule was, to judge from inscriptions, from 1453 to 1468, and during this period, he earned high renown as a generous donor of wealth, land and jewels to the Sṛrāngam and Jambukeshwarām temples. Tirumalaiya Déva Mahā Rāja seems to have been succeeded by Gōpatippa, alias Tripurāntaka, who, not less generous than his predecessor, set up a golden flagstaff at Rāmesivaram, in 1469 A.D. A third prominent chief of the South was Sāluva Sangama Déva Mahā Rāja, whose two inscriptions at Ambil, belong to 1481-86, and therefore prove that he was a contemporary of Emperor Prauda Déva, during the last years of his rule. From this, it will be plain that, throughout the reigns of Mallikārjuna, Virupāksha and Prauda Déva, the Sāluvas were the masters of the major portion of the Empire. Connected with the royal family and entrusted with viceroyal powers in Mysore, in Arcot, and in the South, they proudly wielded the title of Mahā Rāja, and no doubt, by their immediate presence in their respective spheres, eclipsed the names of their suzerains. It is not improbable that, in their growing strength, they were not without enemies. The local chiefs and kings, in their real loyalty to the Emperor, or in their fondness for independence, must have naturally looked upon the proud but formidable Viceroys with jealousy, and not seldom, therefore, risen against them. In the mysterious and inexplicable circumstance of a Pāndya, Bhuvanēkavira Samarakōlahala, granting, according to a Conjeeverām inscription of 1469, two villages in the Pāndya kingdom to the Ekāmbaramaṇās temple,—in this, we perhaps see an example of such a local discontent and consequent disaffection, which had evidently a remarkable though temporary success. The identity of this Pāndya king is still a matter of uncertainty and controversy among epigraphists. It is not known whether he belonged to the Pāndya line which, as we shall presently, ruled in the district of Tinnevelly from the middle of the 14th century, or he was simply a local chief of Madura, who was a feudatory of the empire. The question will be discussed in detail in the next section; but here it may be noted that the rising was perhaps due to the overbearing turbulence of the Sāluvas. The triumph of the Pāndya, however, was evidently not long-lived. For it seems that, while the southern and middle parts of the empire were under the younger line of the Sāluvas, the representative of the main and elder line, Narasimha or Narasingha as he was called in common parlance, had made

---

55 An inscription of his at Tiruvādi (Srimukha, 1453 A.D.) records the gift of an ornament to the shrine. (Ep. Rep. 1903) The Kāyilōghu says that he contended with one Kampa Raja for the untroubled possession of Trichinopoly. During this struggle all the people lived from 1458 to 1470 in the 100 pillar mandapa outside the town. In 1470 Tirumal Raja established himself. The Kāyilōghu gives the details of his gifts to Sṛrāngam temple. See 1888 edn. p. 88.

56 These are 593 and 594 of 1902. The Chōlas at the same time seem to have been ruling at this time in Uraiyar. For, according to an inscription of Jambukeshvarām (30 of 1891) there was a king named Vala Kamayya or Akhala Raja Mahānandaleśanva, also called Chōla Nārāyaṇa, in 1481 A.D. (Ep. Ind. III) He claims to be a descendant of the old Chōla. Dr. Hultsch points out that in 995 of 1892 says that another Lord of Uraiyar Chamayya Bāliya Déva, ruled there in 1530, and gave gifts to Rāgavanātha and Valli Nachiar at Uraiyar in 1530 A.D. And as this inscription refers to Krishna Deva Rayya, Hultsch says, “It thus appears that as late as the 15th and 16th century of our era, descendants of the Chōla dynasty reigned at Uraiyar as vassals of the kings of Vijayanāgar.” (Ep. Rep. 1892 Aug. p. 7).

57 Elliott figures a coin of this king. On the reverse is a kneeling figure of Garuda, and on the reverse the Tamil legend, Bhuvanēkavira and Samarakōlahala (Ep. Rep. May, 1890).
himself the chief man in the counsels of the Empire. His name occurs in the epigraphical records during a generation of 30 years, from 1456 to 1486. Like the other civil officers of the day, he was also a general, and distinguished himself, with success, in the numerous wars of Vijayanagar with the Musalmán powers. A very able and domineering personality, he soon obtained the chief place in the imperial court, and became the de facto ruler of the empire, and we can hardly believe that he could have looked on the offensive campaign of the Pandyans at the expense of his own relations with equanimity. It, therefore, seems more or less certain that, in the name of the emperor, he curbed the Pandyans' ambition, drove him back to the confines of his kingdom, and revived the Sajuva power in the South by the appointment of a relation Sangama Dèva, as the viceroy of the Káveri region.

The Sajuva usurpation of Narasingha, 1486.

It is not surprising that, under these circumstances, the emperor soon found himself a nonentity and his minister his master. By the year 1486 the usurpation of the Sajuvas was complete. The Sanguja line which had been on the throne for 150 years was deposed, and the Sajuva was the master of S. India. The usurper justified the foul means he employed by the remarkable capacity with which he guided the imperial affairs. So well-known did he become that, from his day onward, the Karnata Kingdom came to be known to the foreigners as the kingdom of Narasingha. This is not the place to describe the various activities of Narasingha in the heart of his empire. Our purpose is confined to the history of Madura and the extreme South. It will be sufficient, therefore, if we briefly glance at its condition at his time. It seems that Narasingha owed his elevation to the throne to certain officers who had distinguished themselves chiefly in the South.

Sajuva's Lieutenants: (1) Nagama Naik.

First of these was a certain Nagama Naik, a personality around whom an almost impenetrable mist of obscurity has gathered. It is not known whether this chieftain, "the foremost of the servants of Narasingha Raya," was the celebrated Kottiyam Nagama Naik of the Madura chronicles, the father of the great Visvanátha Naik, the founder of the Naik dynasty of Madura. It is impossible to say, in the present stage of our knowledge, definitely, whether they were identical. As will be pointed out later, historians have not been at one in regard to Nágama's date. According to some, he was a contemporary and general of Krishnadéva Raya (1509-1530), and according to others, of Achyuta (1530-1542) and Sadásiva (1542-1567). The chronicles are hopelessly wrong in

---

55 For some of his inscriptions, see Madr. Ep. Rep. 1904, Nos. 249, 253 and 254.
56 The Thirukachir insc. for instance, says that a private individual built a village for the merit of Sajuva Narasimha and his first servant, Nagama Naik, and not of the king. (318 of 1909) Insct. No. 188 of 1902(1472 A.D.) says that Virupákhya gave lands for the merit of Sajuva Narasimha at Velliyarir. The position of the Sajuvas in the Vijayanagar history was first properly ascertained by Mr. Ramayyah Pantulu. (See Ep. Ind. VII, Derryvalli plates of Irmughi Narasimha pp. 74-85.) For a pedigree of all the Sajuvas, see ibid.: for a fuller one, Arch. Surg. 1908-9, p. 168. According to Kappalakka Vira Narasingha defeated Fradu Dèva and ascended the throne in S. 1406. A typical inaccuracy and ignorance of the older authorities on the relation between the Sajuvas and Taluvus can be seen in Madr. Manu, which says that Narasimha overthrew the first dynasty in 1470, and was succeeded in 1609 by Krishna Raya. See Madr. Man., I, 150. Later on, however, the same authority says: Narasimha "was succeeded in 1490 by Vêra Narasimha Rajahe, who at his death left three sons, Atehota, Sadasiva and Tirumal. These being minors, the country was managed by Krishna Raya, their father's brother who had previously held the office of prime minister." Ibid. p. 153. Examples like these can be multiplied; but the reproduction of exploded accounts is scarcely profitable.
57 Insc. 318 of 1909. It is perhaps this same Nágama Nâyaka, "who is mentioned in a Virunchi-puram inscription of 1482." (S. Ind. Insct. I, p. 132).
attributing him to about 1430, and may therefore be ignored, so far as chronology is concerned. Depending entirely on epigraphical evidences, then, the latest possible date of Nága Naik, is 1558, when his son Visvanátha Naik established, as we shall see later on, the Naik Raj in Madura. Now, the question is whether the father of Visvanátha and the servant of Nara-singha could be identical. Mr. Krishna Sastri believes it "not unlikely,"\(^{61}\) and it seems to me that his surmise is correct. The date of Narasingha’s lieutenant is 1486, and the latest date of Visvanátha’s father is about 1558. It is possible, in my opinion, that he died earlier. Under these circumstances it is not improbable that the Nagama of 1486 and the Nágama of the Madura chronicles were the same. If that were the case, Nagama must have been very young when he was in Narasingha’s service. He must have then supported Narasa Naik, the Tuluva, in his usurpation against the Saluva, and served the Tuluva emperors—Narasa, Víra Narasimha, Krishna Raya and Achyuta Raya, if not Sádásiva also. And such a long record of service perhaps instilled ambition into his mind and caused a desire to make himself, as we shall see later on, independent in Madura. To his first patron, Narasingha, however, he was faithful and true.

(2) Narasa Naik—His Family History.

Another chief whose valour was a main support to the Saluva usurper, was the renowned Narasa Naik, later on the founder of the Tuluva\(^{62}\) dynasty. Narasa Naik belonged to the same family as the old imperial house. He, in fact, deduced his descent from the younger brother of Yadu, from whom the kings of the first Vijayanagar line were descended. His ancestors, in other words, were the cousins of the Sangama emperors. The descendants of Tuluva had served the empire for a long time in a comparatively obscure sphere, in the Tuluva country. During the time of Narasingha’s usurpation, their leader, Işwara, emerged from this comparative obscurity, and distinguished himself largely as a devoted general of Narasingha Raya. Işwara is described to have been a chief whose bravery won for his master a number of victories over disaffected chiefs and Musalmán adversaries, and whose reputation for liberality extended "from Setu to Himáchala and from the eastern to the western ocean." In bravery and in generosity, in martial valour and faithful service, Işwara, however, had an equal and companion in his son Narasa Naik. It seems that Narasa first distinguished himself in the southern parts of the empire. We have already seen how, in 1469, a Pándyan chief defeated the Saluva chiefs of the south and marched as far as Conjee-varam, and how Saluva Narasingha, then a general of Virupáksha, vanquished him, and re-established the Saluva influence in the south. It is not improbable that Narasa Naik first came

---
\(^{61}\) Arch. Surv. 1908-9, p. 165.
\(^{62}\) The best account of the Tuluva history is in Ep. Ind. I. 361-371. The Hampe inscription of Krishna-deva begins from Timma, the first conspicuous chief of the family, and traces the following genealogy.

Timma

Işwara (Bukkamba)

Narasa S. (1404-1418).

Víra Narasimha

Krishna Raya (by Nagalá)

(by Tippambá)

The Unananjera plates of Achyuta Raya give the same genealogy, but add a third wife for Narasa in Obámbindik, by whom he had a son Achyuta, who succeeded Krishna Deva. (Ep. Ind. III, 147-58). The British museum plates add Ranga as Achyuta’s brother, and state that Ranga had a son named Sádásiva and Achyuta also had a son named Venkata Raya. Ep. Ind. IV, 1-22.
to prominence on this occasion. For inscriptions\(^\text{63}\) record how “he quickly bridged the Kaveri, though it consisted of a rapid current of copious water, crossed it, straightway captured alive in battle with the strength of his arm the enemy, brought Tanjore and Srirangapatattana under his power, and set up a pillar of fame,”; and how “he conquered the Chera, Chola, Mana Bhusa, the lord of Madura, the brave Turushka, the Gajapati, and other kings;” and how he made gifts at Ramayaram and every other shrine on earth which abounds in sacredness.

In other words, Narasa Naik was one of the greatest lieutenants of Narasingha\(^\text{64}\) Raya, and we may be sure that the usurpation of the latter in 1486 must have been effected with the assistance and co-operation of the former. After the elevation of his master to the imperial dignity, Narasa Naik seems to have been entrusted with the general control over the southern provinces, Madura, Trincheninopoly, and the extreme south of the peninsula. The Saluva of Ambil, one Aiyai Somayya Virmalarar, “the Lord of the Southern Ocean,”\(^\text{65}\) whose inscriptions have been found in Madura, were probably subject to his control. Besides thus exercising general supervision in the south, Narasa saved the Empire many a time from the Bahmani Sultans with whom Narasingha waged constant war.

It is not surprising that, under these circumstances, when Narasingha died in 1492 A.D., he entrusted the empire and the guardianship of his two young sons to Narasa Naik, his tried friend and counsellor. The name of the elder son of Narasingha is not known, but it is certain he ruled only for a very short time. For, a few months after his elevation, he fell a victim to an assassin who had been hired by a certain Timmarasa, evidently a scion of the Sajüva family, and a strong private enemy of the ill-fated boy-emperor. The murderer, however, was soon killed by Narasa, the Tulava regent, and the younger son of Narasingha, Immun Na-rasingha, was then raised\(^\text{66}\) to the imperial throne.

**Narasā’s Viceroyalty in Madura and Usurpation.**

Narasā Naik had all this time been true to the trust his master had placed in him. The *de facto* ruler of the Empire, he had never entertained any idea of ambition or treason, but now either the youth or the ill-nature of Immun Naasimba instilled the feeling of treason in his mind. Dissatisfied with actual power, he wanted the nominal title of emperor also. Already he had overshadowed his young ward; for as Mr. Krishna Sastri says,\(^\text{27}\) “In the records of Immun Naasimba the place of honour is generally given to Narasana Nayaka, who is invariably referred to either as a generalissimo in charge of the whole army of the Vijayanagar kingdom, or as an agent managing the State affairs for Immun Naasimba from the capital Vijayanagar. Records of the latter are found

\(^{63}\) *Eg. The Hampe incs, Ep. Ind. I.*

\(^{64}\) *Eg. Insc. 198 of 1904 (1483-4 A. D., at Tiruvayikarai, S. Arcot; yr. Sobhakrit) mentions Narasa as his agent; A Tirukkudiyur incs. (1 of 1905) says that in 1471 he was in those parts evidently. The Kūṭiyalūvu gives some interesting information in regard to Narasa Naik’s work at Trincheninopoly. It says that Kōneri Raja, the Saluva governor and successor of Tirumal Rāya at Trincheninopoly, favoured the Saivas of Tiruvasikavāl, and besides giving away some of the temple villages, annoyed the temple authorities by collecting purandavāra, kornkiri, etc. This matter was reported by Kandādai Rāmanuja or Kandādai Annan, as he was called, who was the elder brother of Emperor Vira Narasingha and was appointed general supervisor of the 108 Vaishnavas temples in the Empire. He reported the matter to Narasa Naik, who seems to have been a superior officer. He defeated Kōneri Raja and took away the charge of his district from his hands. Narasa then restored the villages and remitted the newly imposed taxes. It is said that some people, during Kōneri Raja’s oppression, threw themselves down from the Gopura and thus died. See *Ind. Ant.* 1011, p. 142.

\(^{65}\) *Insc. 664 of 1909. Ambil (Skr. Premapuri or pleasure-town) is 13 miles E. N. E. of Trincheninopoly, on the Coleroon.*

\(^{66}\) *The “Tammaraya” of Nuni (Ep. Rep. 1905, p. 62-3).*
distributed over the Kadapa, Anantapur, S. Canara, Trichinopoly, and Madura districts of the Madras Presidency and the Mysore State.” 68 “Almost all the viceroys, however, were directly responsible to the regent and not to the emperor.” Madurai-mandalam i.e., the country around Madura, appears also at this time, as a province of the Vijayanagara kingdom governed by a chief, who was under the direct orders of Narasa Nayaka. 69 It seems that, by gradually getting the control of the provincial viceroys, Narasa Naik practically deposed 70 his ward, and himself assumed the imperial dignity. Immudi Narasimha was indeed not killed, but he sank into the position of a subordinate viceroy in the region of the Kaveri, and there consoled himself, apparently for the loss of his actual power, by the assumption, whether rightly or wrongly, of the high-sounding titles of “the conqueror of Ceylon?” and of all countries,” “the witnessor of elephant hunt,” etc. The exact date of the Tuluvu usurpation is not known, but by 1502 it was a fact.

The advent of the Tuluvu dynasty to the imperial throne introduces a new epoch in the history of the imperial relations with Madura; but before going to consider them, we shall go back to the period of the Vijayanagar conquest, and trace, as far as the present state of historic research allows, the indigenous history of the Pandyam kingdom. The history of the imperial Viceroys has been sketched, and now the indigenous rulers themselves will command our notice.

(To be continued.)

A NOTE ON THE PADARIYA OR RUMMINDEI INSCRIPTION.

BY JARL CHARPENTIER, Ph.D.; UPSALA.

1 Devanā piyena Piyadasina lājina visāḥhisitena
2 atana āgācā mahiyite hida Budhe jāte Sakyamunīti
3 silā vīgaḷabhī ca kālāpita silāḥabhe ca usāpāpīte
4 hida Bhajavaṇa jāte ti Luśminiḥgāme ubalike kahe
5 aṭṭhabhāgiye ca.

The literature concerning this inscription until 1903 has been discussed by Pischel, S. B. Pr. A. W. 1903, p. 724 ff., who proposed a new interpretation, based on certain philological and linguistic facts, for the difficult words vīgaḷabhī, line 3, and aṭṭhabhāgiye, line 5. His conclusions were partly approved by Mr. Vincent A. Smith, Ante. XXXIV, 1 ff., who proposed another translation of aṭṭhabhāgiye, but agreed with Pischel concerning vīgaḷabhī. Dr. Fleet, J. R. A. S., 1908, p. 471 ff., suggested another interpretation of silāvīgaḷabhīca, 2 thinking bhīca to be Sanskrit bhīti from bhīti ‘wall,’ which is wholly improbable from a linguistic point of view, as consonants were not dropped to such an extent at that early stage of Prakṛt dialects; on the other hand, Dr. Fleet’s interpretation of aṭṭhabhāgiye seems to mark a progress in comparison with former translations. As for ubalike, line 4,—which was declared by Bühler, E. J., Vol. V, p. 5, not to be derivable from udbalika, but rather from uva-balika, Dr. Fleet proposed to connect it (p. 478 f.) with a vernacular word traceable in the Kannarese umbeli ‘a rent-free grant,’ etc.; again, Sir C. J. Lyall, J. R. A. S., 1908, p. 850 f., proposed to connect it with a modern word ubāri, occurring in Bundelkhandi, and meaning ‘an estate held on a quit-rent or something less than the full assessment,’ and finally Dr. F. W. Thomas, J. R. A. S., 1909, p. 466 f., has proved that the derivation from ud-balika is quite possible, as the Kautṣīṭika-arthaśāstra, p. 111, 4. 12, uses the parallel word uch-ahulka in the sense of ‘free from octroi.’

68 According to Muhammadan historians, he was killed. But this is wrong, as insc. of Vira Narasimha are found as late as S. 1427. (Ep. Rep. 1904) Insc. 386 points out that in 1193 Narassa was still a regent.
70 Ep. Rep. 1910, p. 114. Insc. of Immudi Narasimha have been found at Piramalai (139 & 151 of 1903). They belong to A.D. 1500 They mention one Eppuli Nayak and his gift for the meri of Tipparasa Aiyar in Kanelasingu Valanadu of Piramalai Simil.
1 At least in the text; but in n. 2 on p. 3, Mr. Smith says he is no longer quite confident of the correctness of Pischel’s interpretation.
I shall here try to put forth another interpretation of the word *vīgarābhī*, which forms the main difficulty, but let me first say some few words concerning the name of the place of Buddha's birth, *Lummini* or *Lumbini*. That this name still survives in the present Rummin-dī, the place where Aśoka's pillar was found, has been pointed out by Mr. Vincent A. Smith, and forms a strong proof for the correctness of the tradition. This word *Rummin-dī* means evidently 'the goddess (devī) of Rummin—Lummini', but it is by no means clear what *Lummini* is, and in what connection it stands to the Pāli form *Lumbini*, etc. Speyer, V. O. J., XI, 22 f., has suggested that *Lumbini* is a false form, and that *Lummini* is the right one, and represents Sanskrit *Rukminī*, name of the wife of Kṛṣṇa. But I do not think this derivation very probable either in sense or from a linguistic point of view; for *Rukminī* is, as far as I know, never mentioned in any connection with Buddhist legends, and the instances of Kṛṣṇa-worship in Eastern India at this time are rare and uncertain; moreover, *Rukminī* is represented in many passages of the Jaina canon, written in a dialect nearly akin to real Māgadhī, by Rūppīni. So all we could possibly expect from Aśoka would be Lūppīni (or Rūppīni), but not *Lummini*, *Rumminī*. The reference to Rummanavati for rukmanavati (Kuhn, Pāli-Gr. p. 46) does not help much, for the language of Aśoka's inscription is undoubtedly old Māgadhī, and not Pāli. However, the various forms of the word in the Pāli-canon and other Buddhist writings do not encourage us to try a derivation from *Rukminī*.

The Nidānakathā (Jāt. I, 52) has *Lumbini*; but the Sutta Nipāta, III, 11, 5,—undoubtedly the oldest passage where the word occurs—gives Sākyāna gāme janapade Lumbindye. This corresponds to what we find in Buddhist Sanskrit literature: *Lumbini*, *Lal. V.*, ed. Lehm. I, 78, 91; *Mahāv. I*, 99, 8; III, 112.9; and *Lumbini* *Lal. V.*, 1. 252, *Lumbindya*, *Lal. V.*, 1, 96; *Mahāv. II*, 18, 18; 145, 6; and *Lumbindya*, *Lal. V.*, 1, 234, 411; *Mahāv. I*, 149, 3; II, 18, 10, 12, 15; and *Lumbindya*, *Lal. V.*, ed. Calc., p. 92, 13. But besides we find a rather strange form in Mahāvastu, I, 99, 6, Lumbiṇyāna, which gives a word Lümib-, apparently connected, but not identical with *Lumbini*; and *ibid.* I, 99, 7 stands Lumbini in a position which undoubtedly gives us the right to assume with Senart, *ibid.* I, 453, that it is not a nomen proprium but merely an adjective. So we must perhaps think that Lumbindi should be derived in some way from this lumba, which may be the simple word. Now we find in Hāla, 322, a word lumbiś, which means, no doubt, valli or latā 'a creeper'; and also 'a cluster, bunch of flowers, tuft,' for He-m. Deśin., 7, 28, explains lumbi by stabako latā cha and there is no reason not to presume that lumba—may have the same meaning. If then lumba, lumbi, means 'a creeper' or 'a cluster of flowers' lumbindi would stand beside it just as kumudini, 'a place where water-lilies grow,' puśkariṇī, 'a lotus-pool,' etc., stand beside kumuda, puśkara, etc., and it would mean 'a place where creepers grow,' a wood, a thicket of creepers, or perhaps, a place where are clusters of flowers'—a forest of flowery trees' and this would be the real sense of the name Lumbini, also called Lumbini vana. This means, of course, that Lumbini, and not Lummini is the real form; but we must remember that the Sutta Nipāta, a text certainly older than the inscription, has only Lumbineyya, and, moreover, it seems to me much more probable that Lummini may be a local dialect-form from Lumbini than that the latter word should be a false translation from the former one.

So far for Lummini; I now return to the much-discussed word *vīgarābhī*. Pischel, supported by an overwhelming mass of philological evidence, has suggested that silāvīgarābhī

---

2 Ante., XXXIV, 1 f.
3 Windisch, Buddha's Geburt, p. 5 n., refers to Speyer's suggestion, without wholly approving it.
4 Pischel, Pāli-Gr. § 277.
5 Other instances are rumma-vāsin, Jāt. I, 407, I, rumma-rāhin ibid. g. 22 and rummin, Jāt. 489, g. 18.: of. Morris, J. P. T. S. 1891-93, p. 12 f., Charpentier, Z. D. M. G., 63, 173 n. 4.
6 Gāme and janapade must change place according to Oldenberg, Buddha, p. 423, n. 1.
7 The MSS. have also other readings which seem, however, to be merely attempts to explain the word lumbi which was not thoroughly understood.
must mean 'a flawless block of stone' (ein fehlerfreier Felstock) and may be connected with 

\textit{gada-

\textit{sha-

\textit{a-salā}, 'a rough block of stone', and further with a number of derivations from a root \textit{gadā-varane} (recorded in the Dhātupānī<sup>35</sup>, 84g), which occur in various northern Buddhist and Prākrit texts. But although this is grammatically absolutely right, I do not believe in it any more than in Dr. Fleet's explanation, "a stone surrounding and screening wall," which violates the rules of grammar. It is quite impossible for me to understand why Aioka should have thought it an action so remarkable as to be recorded for perpetuity that he had a rough block of stone made flawless, and a stone pillar cut out of it; for any person who saw the pillar could easily convince himself that it was smooth and well-polished, without any need of having this pointed out to him in the inscription. But there is another reason of far more importance which makes me disbelieve Pischel's interpretation, and generally any interpretation that does not try to account for it: Hsinan Tsang<sup>9</sup> tells us that Aioka had a pillar erected on this spot with a horse on its top. It does not matter whether Hsinan Tsang himself saw the horse lying broken on the ground, or whether it had already been removed when he visited the place<sup>10</sup>; no sound interpretation will doubt that he really knew that there had been a horse. And we may without hesitation believe that Aioka—or the person who had his order executed—considered it far more important to record that a horse had been made and put up there, than that the pillar had been cut out and polished from a rough block of stone. The only real question is this: can we find in \textit{vigaśabhī} a word that can be made to mean 'a horse' without straining the linguistic usage? I think we can, and shall try presently to prove it.

The whole inscription is quite clear in grammatical forms with the exception of the single word \textit{vigaśabhī}, and would run in Sanskrit as follows:—

1. Devanāṃ-priyēṣa Priyadarśinā rājñā viśāvatvarśābhāhiśiktena
2. ātmānaḥ āgātiyā mahāyītā<sup>11</sup> iha Buddhā jātaḥ Sākyamunिः-iti
3. śilā-vigaśabhī ca kārītā śilastambhāḥ chochchhṛāpītāḥ
4. iha Bhagavān jāta iti Luṁbinigrama udabalikrtāḥ
5. ashtābhāyaśa cha (kritāḥ).

Now, what is \textit{vigaśabhī}? Evidently a compound, for the derivations with the \textit{taddhita} suffix-\textit{bha} (Pā. V. 2, 139), although increased by Pischel<sup>12</sup> p. 728 by some new examples, scarcely, in my opinion, offer a possibility of explaining this word. I take \textit{vigaśa-bha} to be in Sanskrit* \textit{vigaśa-bhṛt}, a word which does not exist, that I freely admit, but this is no objection to the derivation of Prākrita words, when made in conformity with grammatical rules. Now, we know in Pāli and Prakṛita words like \textit{Pasena-dī} or \textit{"jī} = \textit{Prasena-jī}, \textit{Inda-ji} = \textit{Indra-jī}, \textit{Ava-jī} = \textit{Mahāvagga} I, 23, 2), \textit{Nagga-ji} = \textit{Nagga-ji} (or "cit"),<sup>13</sup> \textit{taṭā} = \textit{taṭā},<sup>14</sup> etc., and these and others leave not the slightest doubt that a Sanskrit word *\textit{vigaśa-bhṛt} should correspond to a Prakṛita *\textit{vigaśa-bhī} and \textit{vigaśa-bhī}. It is true that \textit{bhṛt}ya gives \textit{bhīchcha} in Pāli,<sup>15</sup> but this is no serious objection, for \textit{r} may give \textit{a}, \textit{i} and \textit{u} in Prākrita,<sup>16</sup> and \textit{bhṛt} must undoubtedly in the analogy of the words mentioned above have become \textit{bhī}. So I am fully convinced that \textit{śilā vigaśa-bhī} is to be rendered by \textit{śilā vigaśa-bhṛt} or *\textit{vigaśa-bhṛt}, since we might as well read \textit{vigaśa-bhī}. But the compounds ending in *\textit{bhī} seem mostly to exhibit the undenoted form of the first compositional member.

It remains now to attempt an explanation of \textit{vigaśa}, and here I think the Jainā texts will help us. Verse I, 12 of the \textit{Uttarādhyayanaśūtra}, one of the oldest texts in the Jainā Canon runs thus:

\begin{quote}
\textit{mā gatiyas̄e vā kasam vayyam ichchhe puṣo puṣo?}
kasam vā dāṭham ānne pāvagam pariṇaṁ ||
\end{quote}

<sup>9</sup> Julian, I. 324; Beal, II. 25; Watters, II. 15.<br>
<sup>10</sup> Cf. Pischel, I. c. p. 724.<br>
<sup>11</sup> Scil. mahāyīta, loc. absolu. 'worship having been made'; Bühlere, E. I. Vol. V. p. 4. takes it as mahī-yīta, which seems to me difficult and rather unnecessary.<br>
<sup>12</sup> Cp. J. A. 1911, p.<br>
<sup>13</sup> Cp. Pischel, Pkt. Gr. § 395.<br>
<sup>14</sup> Cp. the well-known Kordaḥaccasa-kamūrṇa-bhṛtya, S. B. E. XVII, 174 n.<br>
<sup>15</sup> Cp. here pahelī, pahala for prakṛtī, prakṛta, Pischel, Pkt. Gr. § 218. And there really exists \textit{vigaśa-bhī} = \textit{vigaśa-bhī} in \textit{Uttarādhyayana} III. 2.
"He should not, in every case, wait for the express command of the teacher like an unbroken horse for the whip of the rider, but like a broken horse which sees the whip of the rider he should commit no evil act."

I gather from this that galiyassa = Sanskrit galitāva or galiāvā means 'an unbroken, idle horse,' and is probably a technical expression as well as aśīqa = ojāya, ojāneya 'a thoroughbred.' In the same text, XXVII, 16, gali-gaddaha means 'a bad, lazy donkey'; and khalauka, khalokan 'a bad bullock,' used ibid, XXVII, 3, is explained by Devendra as meaning gali-yrishabhā 'a lazy bullock.' Moreover, Sanskrit lexicographers give us the word gali and gadi 'a young, but unbroken, lazy bullock,' which is clearly a shortening from gali or gali-vrishabhā. These facts permit me to assume the existence of an old word gadi-, gadi, or gali-, gali-, which means 'idleness' and 'idle, lazy,' and moreover as a term for a horse 'an unbroken, bad horse.' As, now, *gada, if it existed, must have been a shortening from *gaśāvā and mean 'an unbroken horse,' so vīgaśa is a shortening from *vīgaśāvā, and means *agadāvā, 'a broken steed, a thorough bred'; and this is an epithet well fit for the noble horse Kantha, which Pischel assumes to have been meant by the statue of a horse on the pillar. Consequently, silā vīgaśabhi means 'a block of stone bearing a horse,' and denotes, of course, the slab on which the horse stood and the statue itself.

As for aśābhāgya, I think Dr. Fleet is fairly right in suggesting that it means 'the king's share of grain,' i.e., the tax paid in grain. The land of the Sākyas where the village of Lumbini was situated, was famous from times long before for its rice-crops; and we know from Kauśalya, p. 60, etc., that a technical term for 'taxes received in the shape of grain' is bhāga. But we gather from the same source that the king was entitled to take at least one-fifth or one-fourth of the whole supply of grain, and not one-eighth as Dr. Fleet suggests. So aśābhāgya cannot mean this; it would rather be possible that it could mean aśā (varsha) bhāga, i.e., that the village should be entitled to the grain-tax for eight years. But I admit that this is wholly uncertain. However, it must refer to the 'grain-tax,' for bali is 'taxes for religious purposes' according to Kauśalya and so we have here two fiscal terms.

Consequently the whole inscription may be rendered somewhat in the following way:

"His Majesty King Priyadarśin came here himself twenty years after his anointment, and worship having been performed, because here was born Buddha the saint of the Sākyas he had a slab of stone bearing a horse made and a stone-pillar raised up. Because here was born the venerable one the village of Lumbini was made free from religious taxes and entitled to the grain-tax for eight years."

---

**MISCELLANEA.**

**KAYASTHA AND KAYATHAN.**

In connection with the history of writing in this country, I have been trying to find out the ethnic origin of the writer-caste Kāyastha. The original form of Kāyastha seems to be Kāyathā, which is the general and popular name of the caste. Kāyathā as a Saṁskṛta word is clearly meaningless. It is a mere fanciful restoration of Kāyathā.

I am told that in Telugu Kāyathā (Kāyathā) means 'papers,' 'records.' If this is a native

Dravidian word, the question of the ethnic origin of Kāyathā will be set at rest; we shall accept Kāyathā as a Dravidian element. Would some one from the Madras Presidency enlighten us on the philology of Kāyathā? I may also mention here that Śrīvelīgatam is an important subdivision of the writer-caste. This, too, does not appear to be an Aryan word, and it might give some clue to our Southern scholars in tracing the origin.

K. P. J.

---

16 Translation by Jacob, S. B. E. XLV. 3.
17 This seems to correspond to Pkt. galiyasa; but Devendra gives galiāvā, which might also be a possible rendering.
18 Devendra explains śīna akhra, viṇṭaśva, which would fit better to the form of the word; but I cannot make out the sense of it. Op. Leumann Aug. S. A. V.
19 C. p. 725.
20 Or 'made to pay only a quit-rent' (according to the suggestion of Sir Charles Lyall, J. R. A. S., 1908, p. 850 f.).
21 See Dr. F. W. Thomas, J. R. A. S., 1909, p. 467.
NOTES ON THE GRAMMAR OF THE OLD WESTERN RAJASTHANI
WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO APABHRAMŞA AND TO GUJRATI AND MARWARI.
BY Dr. L. P. TESSITORI, UDINE, ITALY.

Prefatory Remarks.

When I first discovered some Old Western Rājasthāni MSS. in the Indian collection in the Regia Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale at Florence three years ago, it occurred to me that an account of the new grammatical forms, which are met with in them, would prove very profitable to students of Neo-Indian philology. When, however, I took the task upon myself and began to study the MSS. and to grow familiar with the language, I saw I could give new explanations of many grammatical forms, the origin whereof had been missed or ignored hitherto, and therefore resolved to enlarge the original plan of the work into an historical grammar of the Old Western Rājasthāni, and this I now lay before the public in the form of the present "Notes." The subject being extremely important for the history of the development of modern Indo-Aryan vernaculars from Apabhrāṃśa, I hope that my labours will be well acceptable to all scholars interested in this branch of Indian philology. As regards imperfections, which will still for many years to come necessarily accompany every similar research into this field, I think there is a reason, for which I ought to be particularly excused in the present case. It is this: that, as far as I know, I am the first European who has ever dared to treat an important subject of Neo-Indian philology, without having been in India. I am, therefore, entirely cut off from that help from natives, which is thought to be indispensable for any such work. That I have never been in India is no fault of mine, as it has always been my strongest desire to prosecute on the spot the study of the languages I love so well. It has simply been want of that opportunity, which I yet hope may some day come to me.

CHAPTER I.
INTRODUCTION.

The language, which I have termed "Old Western Rājasthāni" and propose to describe in these pages, is the immediate offspring of the Caurasena Apabhraṃśa and the common parent of the modern dialects comprehended in the two general terms, Gujarāti and Mārāwari. Attention to this old form of language was first called by the late Mr. H. H. Dhruvā, who in the year 1889 published an edition of the Mughdhubodhamuktika — an elementary Sanskrit Grammar with explanations in Old Western Rājasthāni, — and in the year 1893 read a paper on "The Gujarāti Language of the Fourteenth-Fifteenth Century" before the Ninth International Congress of Orientalists in London. He was, however, too careless in his work and too unaccustomed to philological accuracy to give his observations a reliable character and to make his labour profitable for inquirers into the origin of Neo-Indian vernaculars. In Vol. ix, Part ii of the Linguistic Survey of India, Sir George Grieson took up the subject again and gave a most clear account of the language used in the commentary of the Mughdhubodhamuktika. This was as complete as it could be made on the comparatively scanty evidence of the grammatical forms occurring in it. He called the language "Old Gujarāti," and explained it as the link connecting Gujarāti with Apabhraṃśa. The reason that I have adopted a different name for it is that, from the new materials which I have utilized in the present "Notes," it appears that at least until the fifteenth century there was practically only one form of language prevailing over the whole area now covered by Modern Gujarāti and a great part, or possibly most of the area of Modern Mārāwari, and that this language was precisely that which is evidenced by the Mughdhubodhamuktika. In other words, at the time above-mentioned Mārāwari had not yet detached itself from Gujarāti, and hence the necessity of substituting for the one-sided term of Old Gujarāti another in which Old Mārāwari could also be comprehended. ¹

¹ The term "Old Western Rājasthāni," which seems to me a most convenient one, was first suggested to me by Sir George Grieson
The fact is that the language, which I call Old Western Rājasthāni, contains all the elements which account for the origin of Gujarāti as well as of Mīrwarī, and is therefore evidently the common parent of both. That Gujarāti and Mīrwarī are derived from a single stock, the Čaurasena Apabhraṃga, has long been recognized, and Sir George Grierson, who was the first to detach Rājasthāni from Western Hindi and to class it as a separate language, has already remarked that "if the dialects of the Rājasthāni are to be considered as dialects of some hitherto acknowledged language, then they are dialects of Gujarāti." The close agreement between Gujarāti and Mīrwarī is quite consistent with the ethnological theory according to which—as shown by Sir George Grierson and Mr. D. R. Bhandarkar—Rajputana and Gujarat were populated by the same Aryan tribe, i.e., the Gurjaras, who migrated from the ancient Sapādālaksha in the North-West of India into North-Eastern Rajputana and thence gradually spread westwards into Gujarat, imposing their language over the whole tract covered by their immigrations. The same theory also accounts for the agreement between Rājasthāni and the languages of the Himālaya, which Sir George Grierson has grouped together under the general name of "Pahiṛi," Dr. Bhagwanlal Indraji, in his "Early History of Gujarāt" represents the immigration of the Gurjaras into Gujarat as having taken place during the period A.D. 400-600. However this may be, it is certain that the language imported by the Gurjaras from Sapādālaksha took a principal part in the formation of the Čaurasena Apabhraṃga.

Our present knowledge of the latter language is chiefly based on the description given by Hemachandra, śātras iv, 329-446 of his Prākrit Grammar. Hemachandra, having flourished in the 12th century A.D. (St. 1114-1228), and it being evident that the form of Apabhraṃga treated of by him must be anterior to his time, we have authority for placing the terminus ad quem for the Čaurasena Apabhraṃga described by him at least as early as the 10th century A.D. For the subsequent period in the history of the Apabhraṃga we may expect ample information from the Prākrit-Paiṅgala, as soon as a critical edition of it will be available. A part of this work has been collated by Siegfried Goldschmidt and utilized by Pischel in his Prākrit Grammar, and from it it is clear that the language, in which the illustrations to the Piṅgala-śātras are written, represents a stage of development more advanced than the Apabhraṃga of Hemachandra. To confine myself to mentioning only one, but most important, feature of this later Apabhraṃga stage, I may quote the case of the present passive, which commonly ending in -ije (<ijij̄) is a sign that the process of simplification of double consonants and lengthening of the preceding vowel, which is the chief phonetical characteristic of the modern vernaculars comparable with the Apabhraṃga, had already begun long before the fourteenth century, during or after which time the final reductio of the Prākrit-Paiṅgala seems to have taken place. For, though some of the verses quoted in the above work to illustrate the various metres are not older than the fourteenth century, it is clear that the same cannot be the case with all the others, and anyhow the Piṅgala-Apabhraṃga can by no means be looked upon as representing a form of speech, which was current at the time, when the Prākrit-Paiṅgala was composed, but an antiquated form of language already almost dead and used only in literary composition. The practical conclusion is that the language of the Prākrit-Paiṅgala represents for us the intermediate step between the Apabhraṃga of Hemachandra and the earliest stage in the history of the modern vernaculars, and is referable to a period from about the tenth to the eleventh, or possibly the twelfth century A.D.

5 Cf. R. Pischel, Grammatik der Prākrit-Sprachen, § 5.
8 Ante, XL. (1911).
9 Progress Report of the Linguistic Survey of India, up to the end of the Year 1911, presented before the xvith International Congress of Orientalists, Athens, 1911.
11 E.g. hajij of hind, 93, kāhlje of hind, 93, 101, dje of hind, 102, 103, koṣij of hind, 101, etc.
Next in the development comes the stage of the language, which I have called Old Western Rajasthāṇī. It is, however, to be observed that the Piṅgala-Apabhraṃśa is not a pure representative of the stock from which the latter originated, but contains in itself many elements, which point towards Eastern Rajputana as to their home, and are now found to have developed into the dialects of Eastern Rajasthāṇī, such as Mewāṭi, Jaipuri and Māśī, and of Western Hindi. The most important of such Eastern peculiarities is the use of the genitive postposition kau, which is utterly foreign to Old Western Rajasthāṇī, and even at the present day is found to be completely missing in the dialects of Gujarāt and Western Rajputana, and vice versa to be largely spread amongst the dialects of Eastern Rajasthāṇī and Western Hindi. For the purpose of deriving Old Western Rajasthāṇī from Apabhraṃśa, the language of the Prākrit-Paścima is therefore only indirectly utilizable. The immediate successor of the latter is not the Old Western Rajasthāṇī, but that distinct form of language, of which we have a document in Chanda’s poetry, and which might well be called Old Western Hindi. One of the characteristic features of this language, as well as of the Piṅgala-Apabhraṃśa, is the use of the present participle to give the meaning of the present indicative. With the evidence hitherto available it is not possible to fix the limits of the Old Western Hindi on the West, just as it is not possible to fix those of the Old Western Rajasthāṇī on the East. It is very likely, however, that at the time, with which we are concerned, Old Western Hindi extended more to the West than at the present day and occupied some portion at least of the area of modern Eastern Rajasthāṇī. Whether it went so far as to be conterminous with the Old Western Rajasthāṇī or was separated from the latter by an intermediate form of speech, in which the two merged together, I cannot say with certainty, though I am inclined to favour the second alternative. If this intermediate language existed, it would be proper to call it Old Eastern Rajasthāṇī and to regard it as the old representative of the modern dialects, which are known under the general name of Dhuṇḍāḷi or Jaipuri. Possibly some documents of this old language are in existence, but until they are produced we shall have to leave the question sub judice. We may, however, take it for granted that the old vernacular of Eastern Rajputana—be it Old Eastern Rajasthāṇī or Old Western Hindi—was in origin more closely allied to the language of the Gangetic Doab than to that of Western Rajputana and Gujarāt, and was only afterwards differentiated from the former under the influence of the latter. In the collection of Indian MSS. in the Regia Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale at Florence, I have discovered a fragment of a Jaipuri version of Rāmacandra’s Purāṇagrravakthā-kāṇḍa and, though the language is hardly more than 200 or 300 years old, yet it is noteworthy that it presents many more points of agreement with Western Hindi, than does Modern Jaipuri.

I now return from this digression to take up the thread of my subject. The chief characteristics of the Old Western Rajasthāṇī, whereby it stands out as separate from Apabhraṃśa on the one side and from Modern Gujarāṭi and Māśī on the other, may be resumed in the two following:

1 A double consonant of the Apabhraṃśa is simplified and the preceding vowel generally lengthened. Ex.: Ap. āja > O. W. R. āja (Dd. 6); Ap. ṭāḍala > O. W. R. ṭāḍala (F535, ii, 2); Ap. *chīṭhādi > O. W. R. chīṭhāda (P. 525). This phonetical process is, with few exceptions, equally common to all Neo-Indian vernaculars and may be regarded as the most marked feature of the latter in comparison with the Apabhraṃśa.

2 The hiatus of the two vocalic groups aī, aū of the Apabhraṃśa is preserved, i.e., the two vowels in each group are still considered as forming two distinct syllables. Ex.: Ap. achkhāi > O. W. R. achhāi; Ap. *uṣhāldāi > O. W. R. ṭhāldāi (Adīc.). In Modern Gujarāṭi aī is contracted to ē and aū to ō, and in Modern Māśī aī to ai and aū to au. Thus in the former language the two examples above would be chē and undō respectively.

The meaning of these abbreviations will be explained at the end of the present chapter.
As regards the time, towards which the final detachment of the Old Western Rajasthan from the Apabhraṃśa took place, we cannot go very far from the truth if we fix it in the thirteenth century or thereabouts. This is borne out firstly by the consideration that the Prigala-Apabhraṃśa cannot have existed as a current language after the twelfth or at the most the thirteenth century A.D., and secondly by the evidence of the Mughdhavabodhamautika, which is dated in the year 1394 A.D. and represents the Old Western Rajasthan not in a period of formation, but already completely developed. Many grammatical forms older than those evidenced by the Mughdhavabodhamautika have been preserved in poems written in the fifteenth century.

As already pointed out above, Old Western Rajasthan represented in origin a single language, common over both Gujarat and Rajputana. When the process of differentiation of Old Western Rajasthan into Gujarati and Marwari began it is not possible to determine with the materials hitherto available, but it is certain that it was effected gradually and its completion required a very long time. One of the chief characteristics, by which Marwari is distinguished from Gujarati, namely the ending -ā of the first person plural of the present indicative, is already found in the Vasantavilasa, a work which is reported to come from Ahmadabad and to date from St. 1508.11 It would therefore seem that in the fifteenth century the formation of the Marwari was already in progress. But even long before that time it is possible to notice in the Old Western Rajasthan a Marwari tendency, chiefly characterized by the employment of the dative postposition rahaī to give the meaning of the genitive case. In the later stage of the Old Western Rajasthan the differentiation becomes so marked that it is always possible to say whether a MS. is written under the influence of the Gujarati or is of the Marwari tendency. Of the two currents, into which Old Western Rajasthan thus divided itself, the one represented by Gujarati remained generally faithful to its source, whilst the other represented by Marwari differentiated to some degree from the latter by assuming many peculiarities, which were common to the neighbouring dialects of Eastern Rajputana and, in some cases, to Panjabi and Sindhi. The above is the reason, for which Old Western Rajasthan has been hitherto explained as merely Old Gujarati. The chief characteristics of the Marwari tendency, which existed in later Old Western Rajasthan, are the following:

1. The common substitution of i for a, as in: kimūda for kamūda, khīpa for khaṇa, pīši, for pā/i, pā/a (ĀdīC.)
2. The employment of the genitive (oblique case) for the instrumental and vice versa, as in: suyāḥ-li dukkhē, instr. plur. (ĀdīC.)
4. The pronominal forms: tuhē for tumhē; amhē, tumḥē for amha, tumha; tā, jiś for tēhā, tēha, jēha, jiha.
5. The substitution of the compound pronouns jī-ki, ti-ki, for jē, tē.
6. The substitution of ēpa, ēpē for Gujarati ēpāṇa, ēpāṇē, when used to give the meaning of the first personal pronoun plural, including the person addressed.
7. The forms ṃ, tôme of the cardinals 2, 3, instead of bē, triştī.
8. The substitution of the pronominal adverb ēndi for kahi.
9. The ending -īs of the first person plural of the present indicative, instead of -āi.
10. The ending -īś of the second and third person singular of the future indicative, instead of -īśa, -īśī.
11. The substitution of the feminine for the neuter with past participles of verbs of saying or asking, used without any object expressed, as in: pūchhī “[He] asked” (ĀdīC.)

All the above peculiarities are found in the MS. ĀdīC. and a great part of them also occur in the MS. Śhashi. As regards the genitive postposition hāndē, which Marwari borrowed from Panjabi and Sindhi, I have noticed no traces of it in the texts I have seen. When the Old Western Rajasthan stage finishes and Modern Gujarati and Marwari properly begin, I am not able to say with certainty. All the MSS. of the later Old Western

Rajasthani period, which have been available to me, are unfortunately undated and, till further evidence is produced, it is impossible to fix any definite limits. Of one thing I am certain: that Modern Gujarati cannot commence with Narasingha Mehetā, as is commonly stated. This poet having been born in the year 1413 a.d., was contemporary with Padmanabha, who wrote his Kānhradīprabandha, in the year 1456, and it is therefore plain that Narasingha Mehetā too must have written in the same form of Old Western Rajasthani as Padmanabha did. That the songs of the former appear now to be couched in a form of language very near to Modern Gujarati, does not affect the question, for it is quite natural that they were in due course modernized during the 450 years, through which they have come down to us. Judging from the fact that the Old Western Rajasthani poems, which are known to be dated from the fifteenth century, exhibit a language, which must be at least 100 years older than that of the later Old Western Rajasthani MSS.—even allowing for the antiquated forms which are commonly employed in poetry,—I have no difficulty in holding that the Old Western Rajasthani period must have lasted at least as long as the end of the sixteenth century. But it is very probable that Old Western Rajasthani reached beyond this limit; anyhow some of its characteristics certainly did. The passing of one language into another being always effected through gradual steps, it is natural that, whenever the older language is made to finish and the younger one to commence, some of the features of the former must be found in the early stage of the latter and likewise some of the features of the latter in the ultimate stage of the former. Confining myself to Gujarati, which is more faithful to the Old Western Rajasthani tradition and better known than Mārwarī, I would take the following as the principal characteristics marking its existence independent from the Old Western Rajasthani:

1. Contraction of the vocalic groups ai, au into ē, ō. Ex.: kārā (<kārā), ṇrāti (<ārāti).
2. Substitution of a for i, u, in open syllables. Ex.: traṇa (<trāṇa), dāhūlo (<dāhūla), bāpala (<bāpulā), upari (<ēpāri).
3. Tendency to shorten the long vowels ē, ō. Ex.: ahāle (<āhāla), visare (<visara), upari (<ēpāri).
4. Elision of h between vowels or after nasals. Ex.: bīno (<bīhāna), derī (<dēhārī), ne (<nehra); anē (<ānē), ānī (<ānī). It is, however, to be observed that in most of such cases the h-sound, though disappeared in writing, is still slightly heard in pronunciation. Cf. the list of words quoted by Sir George Grierson, Op. cit., p. 347 ff.
5. Substitution of c for s, when the letter was originally followed by i > y. Ex.: karaḍ (<kariṣan), so (<ṣaṇa).
6. Cerebralisation of l, when derived from a medial single l of the Apabhraṣṭa. Ex.: maje (<mālī). This process had probably begun since the earliest Old Western Rajasthani stage, but in no MS. of the latter language the l-sound is distinguished from l.
7. Loss of the strong form -a in the nominative singular neuter and substitution of the weak form -a.
8. Introduction of the element -ē, as a characteristic of the plural.
9. Loss of the termination -a in the first person plural present indicative and future, and substitution of -ie in the former and -ī in the latter case.
10. Substitution of the potential passive in -āya for the original passive in -iṣya,-iṣā.

The information, contained in the present "Notes," is chiefly derived from Jain MSS. belonging to the Indian Collection in the Regia Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale of Florence (Italy). Beside these, however, I have also utilized two Jain MSS. of the India Office Library, which have been accessible to me through the kindness of the Librarian, Dr. F. W. Thomas, two Jain MSS. kindly procured by me by the munīrāja Ācārya Vijaya Dharma Sūrya and also all the printed materials, hitherto available on the subject and already referred to in the preceding pages. The following is a list of the chief sources of my information, alphabetically arranged under abbreviated titles. Works in prose are distinguished from those in poetry by an asterisk placed before the title. Florentine MSS. are indicated by F followed by a number, which corresponds to the progressive number under which they are

12 For the sake of simplification, I shall henceforth leave unmarked the quantity of e.
arranged in Professor Pavolini's "I Manoscritti Indiani della Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale di Firenze (non compresi nel Catalogo dell' Aufrecht)."[13]

* Adi.—Bhālavabodha to the Adinātha-deva-gāmdhāra, 88 Prākrit gīhās. From the MS. S. 1561, in the India Office Library.

* Adī.—Adināthe-prakāritā. From the MS. F 700 (Sūrapura).

* Indr.—Bhālavabodha to the Indriyamārāja-prajñāpati, 99 Prākrit verses. From the MS. S. 1561, in the India Office Library.

* Up.—Upadeśamālā-bhālavabodha by Somasundarāsuri. From a MS. kindly lent to me by C. C. Vijaya Dharma Sūri, 120 leaves. Saṃvat 1567.[14]

* Bh.—Rashabhadevadāvatalasamāna. From the MS. F 758.

* Kal.—Avachāri to Siddhasena-dāvākara's Kalyānāmanda-vastūstra, 44 Prākrit verses. From the MS. F 671.

Kān.—Kānha-prakāritā by Padmanābha (Jhālora, Saṃvat 1512=1456 A. D.) Lately printed by K. H. Dhruba (in the Śrīpada śāstra ?) I was able to collate it through the kindness of Sir George Grierson, who lent me his own reprint copy of it.

Chat.—[Nāvastha-natha—] Chaturvarṣi-paṇḍita, 27 verses. From a MS. procured to me by C. C. Vijaya Dharma Sūri. Saṃvat 1667.

D.—Jambusāmā-nas gūchchhanda, 30 verses. From the MS. F 752.

* Dw.—Avachāri to the Daṇḍakāśīkāstra. From the MS. F 557.

*Dd.—Daṇḍakāśīkāstra. From the MS. F 756.

P.—Paṭākha-yāna, a metrical translation of the first eight chapters of the Paṭākha-stra, 694 verses (including a number of Sanskrit verses, which are now and then interspersed). From the MS. F 106, registered in Theodor Aufrecht's "Florentine Sanskrit Manuscripts" (Leipzig 1892).

* Pr.—Paraphrase to the Prākrit Pragottaratanamāla by Rishyuttama, 29 verses. From the MS. F 762.

*Bh.—Bhālavabodha to the Bhaṭavairāgya-yāṣṭaka, 104 Prākrit verses. From the MS. F 615.

*Mu.—Mudgālavabodha-ha-muktika, a Prākrit grammar with explanations in Old Western Rajasthāni, written in the year 1364 A. D. An account of the Old Western Ra-jasthāni forms occurring in it, is made by Sir George Grierson in LSI, Vol. ix, Part ii, p. 353-364.

* Yog.—Chhāya to Hemachandra's Yuga-stra, first four chapters. From the MS. F 615.

Ratn.—Ratnachātra—or Maṅgātha-ni kahā, 351 verses. Saṃvat 1571. From the MS. F 792 Vi.—Vidyāvīrāchātra by Hiraśa-tandasūri, 174 verses. Saṃvat 1483. From the MS. F 792.

Çāl.—Çālābhadrachātra by Sādhūnand, 220 verses. From the MS. F 781.

Çāl.—Tabā to Jájakirti's Cilopa-prakāra, 116 Prākrit gīhās. From the MS. F 791.

Çāl.—Bhālavabodha to the Črāva-kapātri-prakāra-vastūstra, Saṃvat 1564. From the MS. F 638.

* Shash.—Bhālavabodha to Nemichandra's Shashī-kātra, 162 Prākrit verses. From the MS. F 638.

Besides the above, I have also partially collated several other Florentine MSS., which in the course of the following pages will be occasionally cited by F followed by their progressive number in Professor Pavolini's catalogue. As regards the chronology of the above-quoted materials, of which most are undated, the following is an attempt to classify them by centuries, chiefly based on the comparison with six or seven of them which are dated:

A. D. 1300—1400—*Kal., *Mu.,
A. D. 1400—1500—Vi., Kān., Rish., *Dw., *Yog,
A. D. 1650—1600—Chat., *Shash., *Adī Ch., *Pr., *Dd., *Çāl

It is not impossible that some of the MSS. classed under the last period, of which only one (Chat.) is dated, and this in the year Saṃvat 1667 (= A. D. 1611), outreach the end of the sixteenth century. The MSS., which show traces of the Mārvāri tendency, are the five following: *Kal., *Dw., *Up., *Shash., *Adī Ch. The two last, being more recent in time, are naturally affected by Mārvāri peculiarities in a greater degree.

(To be continued.)

---

[14] At the time of sending the present "Notes" to the Press, I had collated this MS. only as far as leaf 68, corresponing to Gīhā 360 in the Prākrit original by Dharmādāsa.
THE HISTORY OF THE NAIK KINGDOM OF MADURA.

By V. RANGACHARI, M.A., L.T., MADRAS.

(Continued from p. 17.)

SECTION V.

The Indigenous Pāṇḍyan Kings from 1371 to 1500.

From what has been said in the preceding section, the question will naturally suggest itself as to who the Pāṇḍyan kings of this period were; for as we have already seen, the Pāṇḍyan dynasty did exist during this period. Who were the kings then? How many of them ruled? Did they rule in Madura, as of old? How did they distinguish themselves? What was their attitude to the Vijayanagar political agents? We have, unfortunately, very few materials from which we can draw any definite conclusions in regard to these important questions.

The Line of Sōma-Sekhara.

According to one MS., "the Supple. MS." of Mr. Taylor, there was a continuous dynasty of Pāṇḍyan kings from the time of Kampaśa Udayār right down to the establishment of the Nai̇k Rāj. It says that immediately after his conquest of the Musalmans and the revival of Hindu government and worship, Kampaśa Udayār, the Vijayanagar General, instituted a search for persons of the old Pāṇḍyan race, as a result of which he caused one Sōmaśekhara Pāṇḍya to be crowned. This Sōmaśekhara, it continues, ruled for a space of 17 years, and was followed by as many as 14 kings. The last of these, it says, was Chandra Sekhara Pāṇḍya, and it was in his time that a war took place between the Pāṇḍya and the Chōja chiefs of the day, the result of which was the advent of the Nai̇k Rāj in Madura. The MS. mentions the number of years during which each of these kings is said to have ruled. The whole can conveniently be expressed in the form of a genealogy:

Sōmaśekhara (17 years)
Sōna Sundara (35 years)
Rāja Kunjara (18 years)
Rāja Sekhara (18 years)
Rama Varma (36 years)
Varada Rāja (19 years)
Kumāra Singha (16 years)
Bhima Sena (40 years)
Pratāpa Rāja (15 years)
Varaguna Pāṇḍya (27 years)
Kumāra Chandra (22 years)
Varatunga (8 years)
Kulottunga (19 years)
Chandra Sekhara (35 years)

12 The MS. says that he was "the general of the Mysore King." He came at the head of the Canarese in S 1293, Virodhikrit. See Madr. Manu, I, p. 123, and the appendix for the translation of the MS.
In other words, there were 15 sovereigns whose rule covered a period of 345 years. During this state of things, continues the MS., in K. 4533, S. 1354, (1432) year Parilāpi, Kottiyan Nāgama Nāik, by order of the Rāya, conquered the Pāḍyāy country. Afterwards down to Iśvara (S. 1380) Visvanātha Nāik ruled the country.

It will be at once perceived that, in regard to chronology, this account cannot for a moment be believed. From the distinct specification of the number of years allotted to each king, it will be plain that Chandra Sēkhara Pāḍyā, the king, in whose time the invasion of Nāgama Nāik is said to have taken place, must have reigned from 1683 to 1718. And yet in the very next line the MS. says that the invasion of Nāgama took place in 1432 A.D. How could the chronicle seriously maintain that Chandra Sēkhara lived, as a computation of its own dates shews, between 1683 and 1718, and yet that he was conquered by Nāgama in 1432? Further, as we shall see later on, the date 1432 assigned to Nāgama Nāik and his son Visvanātha, that is, to the Nāik conquest of the Pāḍyāy kingdom, is too early by a century. The chronology, then, of the “Supple. MS.” cannot be trusted; but is the list of the Pāḍyāy kings given by it genuine? So far as the indigenous chronicles are concerned, there are at least three MSS. which, though they do not give any dates, and though they differ in minor details, yet generally support the “Supple. MS.” After giving a good deal of legendary and historically valueless matter, one of them says: “While Kula Vardhana Pāḍyā was thus ruling, a Muhammadan named Badshah invaded the country, conquered it, destroyed temples, and drove the Pāḍyāy king to the Western country. Then the Pāḍyāy kingdom was miserable and subject to Musalmān rule. Subsequently the Canarese came in large numbers, destroyed the Muhammadans, and restored the worship in temples, came to the west, called Soma-ckhara Pāḍyā, a scion of the Pāḍyāy line, crowned him, and then returned to the Canarese country.” Soma-ckhara, continues the MS., ruled “for some time,” and was then followed by fifteen kings. These kings are identical with the kings of the “Supple. MS.”; but there are three differences between the two chronicles. First, while the Supple. MS. says that the dynasty ended with Chandra-ckhara, the 15th from Soma-ckhara, the other MS. says that it ended with Chandra Kumāra, the son of Chandra Sēkhara and the 16th of the line. Secondly, the latter MS. gives no date. Thirdly, the latter is, as we shall see later on, a little more detailed in regard to the circumstances of the Nāik conquest of Madura. In fact its account of the conquest places the whole fact in a different aspect. The third MS. (called the Pāḍyāy Rajas’ Purana Charita) mentions the same list of kings, but has got its own version of the Vijayanagar and Nāik conquests. After giving a list of 24 kings previous to the Muhammadan advent, it says: “While the kingdom was thus ruled, some Muhammadans from the north under Mulla, captured the country, ruined the temples, and necessitated Minākshi and Sundarā-vara to take refuge in the Malayālam country. When things were in this condition a Hindu king from the north named Kamanāi overthrew the Muhammadans, reopened the temples for worship, and reorganised the daily pūja. Some days after, a scion of the old Pāḍyāy dynasty who had fled westward, got the help of the kings of Malayālam and Mysore, and attacked Kumana. The latter, thereupon, came to an agreement with him by which he left the kingdom and returned northward. The Pāḍyāy, Soma-ckhara, then ruled for some time, and was followed by 14 kings. These are exactly the kings mentioned

[73] These are: “An account of the Chāda, Chēra, and Pāḍyāy kings, copied from a document in possession of one named Kāli Kavi Rāja of Pūndhurā, Comburā.” (Restored Mack. MSS. III, 234–236); Pāḍyāy Rajas’ Purana Charita (Ibid, 15–23); and Pāḍyāy Pratāpa Vamsadevi. See appendix for translations and references.


[75] I.e., Malik Kaftār.

[76] In this it agrees with the other MSS. see ante section 2.

[77] Kamanāi was Kampaṭa Udayar. He was a king of course. The MS. is very meagre and vague.

[78] That the Pāḍyāy king was at this time a refugee in the west is confirmed by other MSS. E.g. The Supple. MSS., Kāli Kavi Rāja’s Account, etc. But the account of Kampaṭa’s defeat and return is quite absurd and contrary to fact.
in the other two MSS, but no dates are given, and the cause of the Nāik advent is dismissed in the single statement that "as Chandra Sêkharra had no son, he adopted Visvanâtha Nâik, and the Râya confirmed this, and sent him as Pâ. dyamandalâtipati and Dhakhina-simhsanâ- sipati."

Another MS. Chronicle, The Pâdya Pratâpa Vamsâraî, has got its own version of the events. It says, after a good deal of legendary matter, that "while Kulavardhana Pâdyan was ruling, a Muhammadan named Mullah came from the north, fought with Kulavardhana, seized the kingdom, closed the temples, and spread Muhammadanism everywhere. Then a single garland, a single sandal paste and a single lamp were left in the holy of holies of the Madura shrine, a stone wall was erected in front of the Garbhagreha in both the shrines, and the festival idols were taken for safety to Malâyâlam. For many a day there was the Muhammadan regime. Then two Canarese named Kampaâa Udayâr and Emâna Udayâr came from the north at the head of a large army, overthrew the Muhammadans, and revived worship, as of old, in the temples. The stone wall before the Garbhagreha was then removed and lo! it was found that the sandal paste, the garland, and the lamp were as fresh as if placed that very day. The two kings were struck with wonder. They got the festival idols from Malabâr, revived the old festivals, and thus ruled for many days.

"Meanwhile Kulavardhana Pâdya had gone to the west and died there. His son Somâ- sêkharra then proceeded to the Canarese country in the north, had an interview with its kings, and proceeding to the court of Kampaâa’s master Basava Dêva Mahâ Râja, waited on him for a year, during which he enjoyed his grace and the favour of his ministers. At the end of the year, thanks to the advice of the latter, the Râja presented him with elephants, horses, army, etc.; crowned him as the king of the Pâdyaan kingdom, and wrote to Kampaâa Udayâr to give it over to him. Somâivara, thereupon, came to Madura and when three Kâlhâs off it, sent word to Kampaâa, who gave him a cordial reception, crowned him, and entrusting the kingdom to him, returned to his country. Then Somâivara ruled for some time."

The MS. then gives this genealogy. It has no dates. It, moreover, gives only 13 kings, and many of these are not identical with those mentioned in other MSS.

Somâivara,

Kuvalayandha Pâdya
Varada Râja P.
Kumâra Singha P.
Vajra Singha P.
Bhîma Sêna P.
Pratâpa Râma P.
Varaguna Râma P.
Kumâra Chandra P.
Varatunga P.
Chandra Sêkharra P.
Somâivara P.
Chandra Sêkharra P.

79 It will be seen that in regard to the name of the Pâdyaan king this MS. differs from others.
80 Cf. the Koyilo’gu.
81 The term Basava Dêva Mahâ Râja is unknown to the inscriptions. The MS. is here unreliable. It may however be the fact that the Pâdyaan king got back his kingdom from the Râya after waiting on him for a year.
“After Chandra Sêkhara the Pâïdyâna kingdom became extinct. For he had no child, and Vîra Sêkhara Chô’a invaded the kingdom, seized it, and drove him away. Chandra Sêkhara, thereupon, went to the Râya and complained, and he sent Nâgama Nâik to restore him. He came, defeated and drove out the Chô’a; but, turning traitor, seized the Pâïdyâna crown himself, and reigned for four years. Then owing to the Râya’s orders, Vivanaâtha Nâik came to the south, defeated his father Nâgama Nâik, and gave back the kingdom to the Pâïdyâna. Subsequently, however, the Pâïdyâna, owing to his having no heir and owing to his fear that after him his kingdom would be seized by his enemies, adopted Vivanaâtha as his son, gave him the royal seal, and crowned him in Mâskhi’s temple. From that time, Vivanaâtha and his descendants ruled the Pâïdyâna kingdom.”

The MSS. thus agree in mentioning fifteen kings as the rulers of the Pâïdyâna realm from the time of Kampaâa Udayâr to the time of Vivanaâtha Nâik. But, in spite of this agreement, the list must be considered a spurious one. Messrs. Nelson and Sewell solved the problem of their part by putting these monarchs to the pre-Muslim period, to, in fact, a Parâkrama Pâïdyâna who is said to have been the victim of the Islamites—a procedure which is directly against the account of the MSS., which plainly indicate that they were the successors of Kampaâa Udayâr. Mr. Taylor, on the other hand, believed in the existence of these kings, but not the dates ascribed to them by the “Supple. MS.” He says that the period of 345 years assigned to them cannot be accepted, as it would bring the last Pâïdyâna king “too low down.” Nor is he prepared to believe the date S. 1354 so inconsistently attributed by the MS. to Chandra Sêkhara. He gives three reasons for his contention. First the period of 61 years which will have to be assigned to the 17 kings in case the date S. 1354 is accepted, is too small as the average comes to less than four years. Secondly S. 1354, he surmises, may be a mistake of the copyist for S. 1454. Thirdly, Nâgama Nâik, the founder of the Madura Nâik dynasty, was, according to many authorities, a general of Krishna Deva Raya in the 16th century. For these reasons he adds 100 years to S. 1354 and concludes that the dynasty must have ended about S. 1454, i.e., 1532 A.D. In spite of Mr. Taylor’s opinion, there are certain reasons which warrant the belief that the list of kings is not genuine. It is more than probable that the three MSS. were taken from a single source.

**Their Existence doubtful.**

Then, again, all of them are suspiciously short and vague, and while the chronology of one is distinctly absurd, the chronology of the others is a perfect blank. Above all, there is a singular lack of epigraphical evidence to support the existence of these kings. Had they existed, they would certainly have left the marks of their sway in stone or metal, as the kings of those days invariably did. A Hindu king without resort to the panegyric of Brahmas and the reputation of a donor to temples and priests was, in the medieval age of Indian history, a practically impossible phenomenon. The name of religious benefactor was as dear as life to the kings of those days. Charters and grants carved in undying plates, and inscriptions cut in undying stone were, for them, the only means of ensuring an eternity of fame and a perpetuation of remembrance. A king indifferent to such means of reputation in such an age would indeed be a marvel, and a series of such kings would be a still greater marvel. And yet, throughout the 16th century, we do not meet with any inscription of these kings. Only one conclusion is possible,—they had not existed at all.

If the information given by the “Supple. MS.” and other MSS. in regard to the Pâïdyâna line of Somaâékhara can be thus dismissed as a fabrication, it ought not to be concluded that there were no indigenous rulers in Madura during the period of 1-1/2 centuries which we have surveyed. We have already seen how during the Muhammedan occupation and rule of Madura in the 14th century, kings of the Pâïdyâna dynasty continued to rule. We have seen how according to Kielhorn, three of them at least, Mâravarman Kuleâkhara II. (1314-21) Mâravarman Parâkrama Pâïdyâna (1334-52) and Jatâvarman Parâkrama Pâïdyâna, have left evidences of their nominal, though not actual, rule, and how, according to Mr. Krishna...
Sastri a certain Vira Pādyāya ruled and distinguished himself during the same period. We may be sure that, in the time of Kampana Udayar’s dynasty and of the Naik Viceroys who followed him, the indigenous kings continued to rule. But we have got few inscriptions of this period to enlighten us on the reigning dynasty.

Paṇḍyan Emigration to Tinnevelly.

This absence of inscriptions in the name of the Paṇḍyans between 1370 and 1550 has made some scholars suppose that the Paṇḍyans had left Madura. They indeed never abandoned the title of “Lords of Madura”; never for a moment thought themselves as otherwise than the kings of the city of Minakshi and Sundaravāra, of the city which the halo of tradition connected with prehistoric scenes, in which the gods played a more active part than men. Nevertheless, they ceased to be the direct rulers of Madura. They shifted their headquarters to the district of Tinnevelly, to the town of Tenkai which they built and beautified. Henceforward their immediate activities were in the basin of the Tāmbraparnī and not the Vaigai, and their immediate neighbours were the Keralās and not Chōḷas. The frequency of invasions, Chōḷa as well as Hayanā, Hindu and Muhammadan, Telugu and Canarese, must have been the cause of this emigration. Nearness to the historic areas of Trichi and Tanjore, of Coimbatore and Dwārasamudra, was a source of constant danger and ceaseless anxiety; and the Musalman conquest must have completed that dread and anxiety which the occupation of Madura must have inevitably engendered in the minds of its occupiers.

The Bānas established in Madura.

The Paṇḍyās of the Vijayanagar period, then, ruled in the Tinnevelly District. They, however, it should be clearly understood, never gave up the title of “Lords of Madura.” In fact it is more or less certain that the chiefs who were in the direct charge of Madura considered themselves to be the dependents and feudatories of the Paṇḍyās at Tinnevelly, both of course being under the control of the Telugu agents of Vijayanagar. Who were these chiefs, then? Were they the relations of the Paṇḍyās, or did they belong to a distinct hereditary line? It is in answering this question that we find a significant clue in the statement of the Pand. Chron. we have already noted,—namely that in the middle of the 15th century, Lakkana Daṇḍanjayaka installed, in Madura, the illegitimate sons of the Paṇḍyan, Māviliyāna Rāya Kālayār Sōmanār, Anjātha Perumāl and Muttarasa Tirumali Māviliyāna Rāya; and that these ruled till 1499, when Naras Naik became the master of the Empire. Now, the Pand. Chron. is valuable only in giving us a clue as to the rulers in Madura and nothing more. It does not enlighten us as to details. In fact, a minute consideration of it puzzles the investigator. From its phraseology, for instance, it is inferable that all these four chiefs were brothers and crowned at once; that could, of course, not have happened. The first Māviliyāna alone would have been brought from Kālayār Koil, and the others should have been his successors. They might have been his brothers or sons, or even grandsons. Then, again, the chronicle implies they were Paṇḍyās. This can be dismissed as false. It may be true that they were connected by marriage with the Paṇḍya royal family, but they were not Paṇḍyan except in title. They were, or at least two of them were, as their very name shows, Bānas. The term Māviliyāna Rāya was long a puzzle to the historians of Madura. Mr. Taylor believed that Māviliyāna was identical with Mahābalipuram! “The allusion to the king of Māviliyāna, he says, “is made in a passing and familiar way, as to a matter very well-known and understood at the time when the MS. was written. The word Māviliyānam will not bear an application to the Marava country. The Malayaḷam country is also radically different in its orthography. There is no independent pālayam of this name in our lists. And the only name (within our knowledge) to which the names agree is Māvali-varam, or the Seven Pagodas, near Madras, sometimes learnedly termed Mahābalipuram.

86 Mr. Taylor refers to the Hist. Carna Dynast. but this applies equally to the present MS.
Besides, on inquiry, it is found, that the people of the country commonly use the words Māvalivānām and Māvalivaram, quite indifferently, and interchangeably; and that there can be no reason whatsoever to question the application of the name in our MS. to the place called on the spot, more usually Māvalivaram. Hence we presume that the certainty of the reference may be taken for granted. We further remember speaking to an intelligent native, who, alluding to the ancient division of Soradēsam, said, that after the partition of it by a Soren king in favour of his son, this part of the country came to be called Soramandalam (that is, we suppose Tondamandalam) and that the capital of this latter kingdom was Māvalivaram.187 This interpretation, however, must be described as absurd. Mr. Nelson was happier in his endeavour to clear the mystery. He surmises that, from the fact that Māvalivānām is not mentioned in the list of the pālayams of the day, it must have been the name of some obscure chief, probably a scion of the old Pāḷiyān line. The eminent epigraphist, Rao Bahadur V. Venkaiyah was the first to give, with the aid of epigraphy, some information which goes to elucidate the early history and activities of the Māvalivānā kings.

The Previous History of the Bānas.

He points out that the Bānas or Vānas88 originally owned a kingdom which extended as far as Kālahasti in the east and Punganur in the west, i.e., "the whole of the modern North Arcot District to the north of the river Pāḷār."89 In the beginning of the 10th century the great Chōḷa king Parantaka I. deprived the Bānas of their dominions. One branch of them, in consequence, sought their fortunes in the Telugu country in the Guntār District.90 Another branch migrated apparently to the banks of the Southern Pennar, and gave their new home the name of Vanagepādī. Chiefs of these branches evidently continued to acknowledge allegiance to the Chōḷa Emperors of the 10th, 11th, 12th, and 13th centuries.91 With the decline of the Chōḷa Empire the Vānada Rāyars, like other feudatories, displayed a spirit of disaffection, and one of them, whose inscriptions are found at Kudumiāmalai in the Pudukkōtah State, and who reigned from 1243 to at least 1278, claims to have defeated the Chōḷa monarch. In later times, the Bānas seem to have gone further South and settled in the Madura District, where we find inscriptions of Māviliyānā Rāyars in the 16th century.92 Mr. Gopinātha Rao, the Superintendent of Archaeology in Travancore, is more explicit in describing the circumstances of the Bāna advent and advancement in the district of Madura. "About the beginning93 of the 13th century A.D." he says, "when the Chōḷa supremacy was getting weakened, and the Pāḍiyās were rising in importance, a chief of Nadu Nādu (or Magadhā Nādu), Rāja Vanakōvaraiyan by name, rebelled against his overlord,94 and seems

87 O. H. MSS., II, 140-44. Mr. Taylor often writes absurdity and this is a good illustration of it.
89 Ep. Rep. 1906-7, p. 73. An insc. at Tiruvallam of the 9th century says that the Bānas were the masters of 1200 villages of Vadugay vali; i.e., the road of the Vadugas or Telugas. (S. Ind. Ins. III, p. 90-91 and 95-96) A Chōḷa king of the 10th century changes the name of their region on the Pāḷār at the instance of a Māvalivāna Rāya to his own name Viranrāyanasēhri (Ibid. II, p. 389). See also Ep. Ind. XI pp. 222-229, for five Bāna inscs. from Gadamalai.
90 Mr. Venkaiyah says that a descendant of this branch was at Kendavūdu in the 12th century A.D. See Ep. Rep. 1890-1900, para 85; 1900, etc.
92 Ep. No. 885 and 587 of 1902.
93 Trav. Arch. Series, p. 53.
to have joined the Pāḍyaya king.55 Mr. G. Rao surmises that, in return for this invaluable service, the Pāḍyayas apparently left "the Madura country in charge of their new ally the Vānakovaraiyan"; and "changed their capital from Madura to Tinnevelly."

**Bana Chiefs of Madura 1400 to 1550.**

In the paucity of Pāḍyaya inscriptions in the 15th century in Madura and in the frequency of Vāna inscriptions, he finds unmistakable proofs of his theory. "We see from about S. 1375 (1453 A.D.), inscriptions56 of the Māvalivānda Rāya, of whom one Urangāvillidān Māvalivānadarāyan calls the country his own. The next person of this dynasty appears to be one Sundarattōludaiyān Māvalivānadarāyan, the son of Tirumalirunjōli, Māvalivānadarāyan. It seems to me that the Māvalivānadarāyars of the Pand. Chron. must refer to these kings. Gopinātha Rao further says that the second of these two chiefs, who bore a few of the Vijayanagar birudās and lived about S. 1396 (1475 A.D.), must have been the opponent of Narasa Nāik during his reputed invasion of the Pāḍyaya kingdom some time about this date. "Either57 the Māvalivānadarāyan was defeated by the Vijayanagar general and then dubbed himself with the Vijayanagar birudās, or he defeated the latter and assumed, as the conqueror, the Vijayanagar birudās; which of these was the case, it is not easy to say in our present state of knowledge of the history of that period. But that the chieftains of this family held or were suffered to hold the Madura country under them is certain. For inscriptions of a second Sundarathūludayan Māvalivānadarāyan are found in several places, such as Tirupaḷani, Alagar Kōil, Kālayār58 Kōil etc., till so late a period as S. 1469 (1545 A.D.)." It will be thus perceived that, whatever might be the case of Kālayār Somanar and Anjāthā Perumal, the other two Māvalivānas of the Pāḍyaya chronicle are historical figures; and it is not improbable that the Pāḍyaya that made grants in the Conjeevaram temple was a Māvalivāna Rāya, who, unable to endure the overbearing nature of the Śāivas, rose against them and marched as far as Conjeevaram,59 but only to be beaten and driven by Sāluva Narasinha and his general Narasa Nāik.

**Their relations to the Pāḍyans of Tenkāsi.**

The Pāḍyayas of the Vijayanagar period, then, confined themselves, if we are to depend mainly on inscription lore, to the Tinnevelly district. They still of course had claims over Madura as the Vānadārayas were originally their allies and later their vassals. But they did not directly rule the Madura country. In Tinnevelly, they distinguished themselves as great builders and rulers from the middle of the 14th century to the end of the first quarter of the 17th century. The researches of scholars have elucidated and defined the history of the various sovereigns of the line. Bishop Caldwell, the foremost authority on the history of

---

55 See Ep. Ind. XI, p. 240 footnote 5. It will be seen from this that Māravarman Sundara Pāḍyaya I (1216-35) is styled Vāna Rāya’; while Jalāvaran Sundara Pāḍyaya I, had an officer named Vīkrama Pāḍyaya Vāna Rāya. Vāna Rāya thus became the title both of the Pāḍyaya king and his nobles.
56 For one such inscription see Trav. Arch. Series, 48. It belongs to the Mahā nāntāpa of the Andal temple at Srivilliputtūr. Inc. 113 and 121 of 1903 are other examples.
57 Or, as Venkayyah says, perhaps he helped "the contemporaneous Pāḍyayan princes Śrī Vallabha and Klāśākha to set up a show of Pāḍyaya sovereignty." Ep. Ind. XI, p. 240; Ep. Rep. 1908-9, para. 32 and 1909-10, para 38.
58 Madr. Ep. Rep. 1903, p. 18 and 19. Nos. 585 and 587 of 1902 which are in the Alagar temple say that in 1530 (Maṇṇamātha, which is wrong) and Hēvillambī (this is also wrong) he made gifts of land.
59 Ep. Rep. 1907, p. 84, para. 57. The inscription is in the Ekkāmbarānathā temple. "It is not unlikely that he (the Pāḍyaya) took advantage of the weakness of the central Government at Vijayanagara and occupied Conjeevaram for a short time."
Tinnevelly, was the first to attempt a connected account of the Pāḍydas of this period. He gives a list of eight sovereigns from 1365 to 1623. From an inscription at Kottār in South Travancore he points out that the first of these, Parākrama Pāḍydan, by name, came to the throne in 1365 A.D. It was in his reign, says Caldwell, that Kampaṭa Udayar’s reduction of the South must have taken place. It was in his time also that the Bahmani King Mujaḥid Shāh1 imitated the exploits of Malik Kafur, and instituted a plundering raid throughout “the countries between Vijayanagar and Cape Comorin.”

The Tenkasi Dynasty 1365-1500.

From 1374 to 1431 Bishop Caldwell is unable to assist us, but Mr. Sewell points out from an inscription2 near Rāmnāḍ and another in the Sankara Nārāyana Taluk in Tinnevelly District, that two kings, Vira Pāḍyda and Kulaśekhara Pāḍyda, ruled sucessively in 1383 and 1402, while Kielhorn mentions a Kōṇerimākondān Vikrama Pāḍyda, who came to the throne between June and July 1401. The second in Dr. Caldwell’s list is Ponnun-Perumāl-Parākrama Pāḍyda who came to the throne in 1431. Dr. Caldwell then gives the following list.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>King</th>
<th>Reigns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vira Pāḍyda</td>
<td>1437–?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vira Pāḍyda</td>
<td>1475–1490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parākrama P.</td>
<td>1516–?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vikrama Pāḍyda</td>
<td>1543–1565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vallabha Ḍeva alias</td>
<td>1565–1610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ati Vira Rama. P.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sundara Pāḍyda</td>
<td>1610–1623</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During these reigns, concludes Dr. Caldwell, the Vijayanagar kings were the suzerains. But “I think it may be assumed that they did not interfere much in the internal affairs of the country, that they contented themselves with receiving tribute and occasional military help, and that the principal result of their suzerainty was that the various petty states included

1 It is highly probable that this was Jatāvarman Parākrama Pāḍyda whose inscriptions found at Nāgara Koilashevan that he came to the throne in 1357-8, according to Kielhorn (Ep. Ind. VII).
2 See for these inscriptions Sewell’s Antiquities I, 302, and 306. The former was found in the S. wall of the Subhāmāntapam of Tirutārakasamangai temple, 8 miles S. W. of Rāmnāḍ. It is dated S. 1306 (Rudrōṭkārī). The 2nd is a grant of lands and tolls by “Tribuvana Chakravarti Kulaśekhara Ḍēvar in S. 1324. It is a grant in Karivalamvanda Nallūr, N. of Sankara Narayana Koil, but the king was at Vāsudevanallur, when he ordered the grant, as is proved by Ext. I in Trav. Arch. Series, p. 45.
3 From a Tenkāsi inscription according to a local tradition he was the son of a Kāśi Kanda Parākrama Pāḍyda, whose existence, however, is doubtful. See Sewell’s Antiquities, II, p. 224. A Tenkasi inscription, stating that this king was accompanied by a commander, and the name of his minister, was found at Srisailam.
4 From two inscriptions at Srisailam and Tinnevelly.
5 Based on a Mack MS., and an inscription of 1490.
6 An inscription at Kuttālam.
7 Caldwell gives no authority for him. According to him Vikrama’s immediate successor was the famous Ati Vira Rāma Pāḍyda, but Mr. Nelson mentions an inscription at Srivilliputtr (Sewell’s Antiq. I., 105), which records a grant in 1546 by a Parākrama Pāḍyda. (Sewell’s Antiq. II, p. 224). Caldwell’s authority for placing Ati Vira Rāma’s accession in 1565 is a Kuttālam inscription, dated in his 40th year, 1605. Sewell points out, however, a Tenkāsi inscription giving the date of the beginning of his reign as 1562. 1610 is fixed by Caldwell as the date of Ati Vira Rāma’s death and of Sundara Pāḍyda’s accession on the authority of Burnell, who got the information from a copper plate grant belonging to a mitt in Tanjore Dī. (which is the mitt referred to here!).
within their nominal rule were protected from foreign invasion and their propensity in fighting with one another kept in check.” Subsequent researches have added much to the information given by Caldwell. It has been said that the first king of this line according to Caldwell was Parākrama Pādiya (1365) and the second Poonamperumal Parākrama Pādiya, who came to the throne in 1431, and that Mr. Sewell added the names of two kings between 1365 and 1431. Mr. Krishna Sastri confirms the additions of Mr. Sewell. Only he says, on the authority of an earlier inscription, that Kulek̄k̄hara ruled in 1396 A.D. The Parākrama Pādiya, whom Caldwell attributes to, year 1431 the really ascended the throne in 1422 and ruled for a space of 42 years till 1465 A.D.

**Arikṣaari Parākrama 1422-65.**

From a large number of inscriptions concerning him at Kuttalām and Tenkāsi, we find that Arikṣaari Parākrama is a celebrated figure in the history of the later Pādiyan kingdom. As the builder of the important and historic temple of Visvanāthaswāmi at Tenkāsi, “the Benares of the South,” which, ever since his time, was the capital of the Pādyas, he will ever live in the history of Indian religion and art. The story goes that god Visvanātha of Benares appeared to him in a vision, and asked him, as his own temple in distant Benares was dilapidated, to build a new temple at Tenkāsi, on the banks of the holy Chittra Nadhi, in the Tennar Nādu. The king accordingly commenced the building of a shrine in S. 1368. It was a huge undertaking, and occupied, from the laying of the foundation to the completion of the pinnacle, the long space of seventeen years, and did not cease with the king’s death. Parākrama Pādiya was a great devotee of Siva, and he signalled his piety by constructing, in addition to the Tenkāsi temple, a saha at Jayantipura, a mantapa to each of the gods at Marudhhār and Sanbagavanam, and by bestowing liberal endowments on the Salitśvaran temple at Tinnevelly. Arikṣaari Parākrama was not only a builder and devotee, but in the view of Mr. Gopinātha Rao, a great soldier and an important political figure of the age. An inscription affirms that he was the conqueror over the chiefs of Singai, Anurai, Irassai, Semba, Vindai, Mudali, Virai and Vaippār. Mr. Gopinātha Rao believes that he was also the enemy of the celebrated Narasa Naik, the father of Krishna Dēva Rāya. “In all the Vijayanagar grants of the second or Tuluva dynasty, Narasa Nayaka, the father of the distinguished Krishna Dēva Rāya, is said to have defeated a king of Madura named Mānabhusā. We know that Narasa lived about the time of the first usurpation of the Vijayanagar kingdom by Sāluva Narasimha, about 1470 A.D., and

8 Caldwell’s *Tinnevelly*, p. 54.
9 See *Madr. Ep. Rep.* 1906, p. 72 which gives an account of the Pudukottah plates, which are an important document in this period of Pādyyan history; (Ep. Rep. 1908-09, p 85-86.)
10 *Ep. Rep.* 1906-9; p. 100, Mr. Krishna Sastri here sums up all the information in regard to the Pādyyan dynasty of Tinnevelly.
11 Inscription No. 270 of 1908.
12 *Madr. Ep. Rep.* 1909-10, p. 100; *Trav. Arch.* p. 44. According to Keilhorn, Arikṣaari ascended the throne between 10th June and 19th July 1422, as proved from astronomical calculations (See. *Ep. Ind.* VII) Keilhorn mentions a Vira Pādiya Mānavarman, whose inscriptions are found at Tenkāsi, Kālayar Kōl and Tiruvadi, and who came to the throne, according to his calculation, between March and July 1443, and ruled till at least 1457. (*Ep. Ind.* VII).
13 For some minor differences between Mr. Krishna Sastri and Mr. Gopinātha Rao in regard to the meaning of the phraseology of the inscription describing the building of the temple, see *Trav. A. Ch. Series*, p. 62.
14 This is wrong. The Sāluva usurpation took place only about 1488. Narasa, however, lived about 1470. But he could not have met Parākrama, as the latter died in 1465.
distinguished himself in the latter's service. This period agrees very well with that of a Parâkrâma Pâëiyá. One other theory of the same scholar may be noted in this connection,—a theory which is, in my opinion, entirely untenable owing to its violation of accepted tradition. "In the section of stray Tamil verses called Tanipi-daltirattu, a verse praising a king named Mânâbhará, said to be the composition of the Tamil poet Pugalíndi, is found. If this name refers to Arikkári Parâkrâma Pâëiyá Dëva, the age of Pugalíndi will become the last quarter of the 16th century A.D. But tradition," he acknowledges, "places him at the beginning of the 12th century A.D."

Alagan Perumál Kuläxkhara till 1473.

On the death of Arikkári Parâkrâma, his younger brother Alagan Perumál Kuläxkhara Dëva, who had already shared with his brother the duties and dignities of royalty for more than three decades—for two inscriptions clearly prove that he began to reign in 1429,—succeeded him as the chief king. It is not improbable that he was the great Pâëiyá, who signalised his reign by marching as far as Conjeevaram in 1469 and was evidently compelled to retreat by Sáluva Narasingha and his general Narasa Nãik. This, however, remains yet to be proved. A builder like his predecessor, he constructed an audience hall in the Visvanâthá temple, and completed the tower which had been left unfinished by his brother. His reign seems to have ceased about 1473 A.D., when evidently his son Alagan Perumál Parâkrâma Dëva assumed the sovereignty. Like the large majority of the kings of the age, he had a colleague in one Parâkrâma Kuläxkhara whose period of co-operation, however, is completely overlapped by the period of his superior.

Alagan Perumál Parâkrâma 1473-1516.

Alagan Perumál Parâkrâma ruled till 1516, and was therefore the sovereign who must have been ruling at the time of Narasa Nãik's usurpation in 1501.

(To be Continued.)

NOTES AND QUERIES.

BEZOAR: MANUCI'S "CORDIAL STONE."

In his Homer Manucci has several references to the bezoar (Pers. pâzâzâh) or 'poison stone,' a hard concretion found in the stomach of a wild goat of the Persian province of Láh. He used it with beneficial effects when treating a female patient at Lahore c. 1673, and employed it, after he settled at Madras, in a special remedy which bore his name. The fame of Manucci's 'patent' medicine reached the ears of C. Biron, a French surgeon. Biron spent about six months in India in 1701-1702, chiefly at Pondicherry and Chandannagar. On his return to Europe he published a short account of his travels with many curious and interesting notes on the minerals, plants, animals, etc., that had attracted his attention. He has a chapter on "bezoar" stones and a long account of the properties of the Goa or Gaspar Antonie stone. "I have also," he adds, a cordial stone composed by Manouchi, a Doctor of Madras on the Coromandel coast. He sells it at a Crown an ounce. I do not know what it is made of; this Doctor makes a great secret of it."

H. Hosten.

["Manouchi's stones" were also known to Lockyer in 1711. See Trade in India, p. 268, R. C. T.]

15 Ibid. 53.
16 There were other Pâëiyán kings who had the same title. See Ep. S. Ind. Insc. III, 56, Madu. Gazetteer, 93.
17 i.e., Janilla Varman Kulâxkhara, who came according to Keilhorn between November 1479 and November 1480 and whose 20th year was 1499.
18 The history of this series of kings however is not so easily defined. There are so many Kulâxkharas and Parâkrâmas Pâëiyáns mixed together in the inscriptions that the whole period is one of hopeless confusion. But I hope that the version I have given here is fairly correct and complete. See Trac. Arch. Series and Ep. Rep. 1909-10, p 100-102, etc.
19 Hisoría de Moger, edited by W. Irvine. I. 54, II. 178, 481, III. 199.
20 Curiosités de la Nuture et de l'Art, Paris, Jean Moreau, 1703.
"DHARANI", OR INDIAN BUDDHIST PROTECTIVE SPELLS.

Translated from the Tibetan.

By L. A. Waddell, C.B., LL.D.

The cult of protective spells, in the form of magical texts, has been shown by me elsewhere to be widely prevalent throughout Buddhism in all its sects, and to have played an important practical part in that religion from its commencement. Such texts under the name of Parītā or Dhāraṇī are in universal use by all sections of Buddhists—"Southern" as well as "Northern,"—and I there adduced evidence, almost unimpeachable, to show that some of these spells were used by Buddha himself.

I also described the early widespread use of these spells amongst the amulet-loving people, not only of India but of the adjoining lands, that embraced Buddhism. It is also attested by the fact that the great bulk of the ancient Sanskritic manuscripts recovered from Central Asia by Sir Aurel Stein and others consist mainly of fragments of these protective texts, the originals of several of which are as yet unknown.

The interesting and historical importance of these spells is not merely Buddhistic. Most of the charms and their associated rituals (sādhanas) exhibit elements which, like those of the Atharvaveda, are manifestly pre-Buddhist and even pre-Vedic, and afford some insight into the religion of pre-Aryan India. Especially interesting in this regard are the vestiges thus preserved of the animal-gods; e.g., the Gāruḍa, dating manifestly to the earliest nomadic and pre-historic 'hunting'-stage of primitive society, and the references to the early anthropomorphic 'mother'-demons, (Rākṣasīnī), also pre-Vedic, and dating to the matriarchal and more settled stage of early civilization; as well as the light that is shed upon the evolution of many of the Brahmanical gods of the Vedic and later periods. Thus several of the gods of the Hindu Pantheon are disclosed by these contemporary texts in early or transitional forms, and in the process of being clothed by the hands of the Brahmins with the functions and attributes of popular aboriginal gods and genii, in regard to which prototypes Brahmanical literature is more or less silent.

As little of this Dhāraṇī Literature has hitherto been published for Western readers, and a great mass of it exists in Tibetan texts translated with remarkable fidelity from the Sanskrit, it has been suggested to me that translations of some of these Tibetan versions into English would be acceptable to students of Oriental religion and mythology. I accordingly offer here an instalment of these texts and their translations.

The Tibetan material now available in Europe for this purpose is immense. The British collections in the national libraries are especially full, as they have been greatly increased by the large accessions collected by me during the Lhasa Expedition of 1904, which included several sets of the "Dhāraṇī Pitaka" as well as the series contained in three sets of the great Mahāyāna Canon (Ka-kyur), in the Encyclopedic Commentaries (Tan-gyur), and in numerous separate texts, mostly in duplicate or triplicate.

1 The "Dhāraṇī" Cult in Buddhism, its Origin, Described literature and Images: Ostasiatischen Zeitschrift. 1912, 155-193.
2 Of the Pāli Paritā several have been translated by Gogerly—"Collected Writings" edited by A.S. Bishop, Colorado, 1938. Of Dhāraṇī a few have been translated or summarised from the Sanskrit by R. L. Mitra ("Nepalese Buddhist Literature" 1882), by Max Müller (U delightful D); by B. Hoernle (Mahā-bhütār in Bower MS.); From the Chinese, a few by S. Beal (Cutenia); by H. Kern (Sacred Books of the East. XXI); and a list of others contained in the Chinese Tripitaka is given by B. Nandjo (Catalogue). Of the Tibetan collections the titles of several are given by Csoma Körösì (Analysis in Asiatique Researches XX) and more fully by J. J. Schmid (Iset, St. Petersburg 1845), and for part of those in the Tan-gyur by F. W. Thomas (Śāḥanān in, "Meseon," Louvain, 1903) and Dr. P. Cordier (in his Catalogue of the Tan-gyur Collection, Paris 1909). From the Ulgur Dr. F. W. K. Müller has translated a few (Uqrioni, II Berlin 1911.)
4 Hiuen Tsang's Records (Beal) II. 165, Watters, do. II. 169; Kern's Manual Indian Buddhism 48.
The texts which I have selected at present are with one exception (No. 6) now published and translated for the first time and relate especially to the Garuda, which is characterised in the title by its 'beak.' That monstrous bird, which incorporates a sun-myth as well as a thunderstorm-myth, from its widespread prominence amongst primitive people in remote antiquity, presumably was regarded as the supreme spirit in prehistoric times. It is the Phoenix or Feng of the Chinese in its combat with the dragon-spirits (the nāgas of India) who withhold the rain; it is the grýps of the Greeks and the roc or rikb or simurgh of the Persians. In the ancient Indian Buddhist sculptures at Sāñchi and elsewhere it figures prominently in antipathy to the nāgas, and in process of being absorbed into Buddhist mysticism. Whilst into later Brahmanism it has been incorporated to form the car of Vishṇu and as the symbol of victory to surmount the standards and banners dedicated to that god by the Imperial Guptas and other would-be Chakravarta emperors. In No. 2 the appearance and functions of the bird are described.  

By No. 6 important light is thrown upon the genesis and evolution of the Buddhist goddess Tara, the so-called 'Queen of Heaven' and 'Mother of the (celestial) Buddhas.' The identity of Tara with the goddess Ûṣṇa-Vijyā was pointed out by me long ago. Now, in this Dhāraṇī Tara, is identified with Durgā (who also bears the title of Vijyā) and Kāli and most of those other 'Mother' she-devils of pre-Vedie times, who have in later days been imported into and incorporated with Brahmanism. She is moreover especially identified with the Garuda under the title of the 'Female Thunderbolt-Beak,' Vajratūṇa.  

In form, these Dhāraṇīs or spells are generally given the shape of the orthodox Buddhist sūtra. They purport to have been recited in the usual way by Ananda at the 'First Council,' the place and circumstances where they were 'delivered' is usually mentioned; and the words of the spell are often put into the mouth of Buddha himself. The incantatory formulas, constituting mantras or spells-proper, are in a crude style of Sanskrit, with recurring cabalistic ejaculatory words, such as are also found in Brahmanical mantras.  

1. The Iron Thunderbolt-Beak.  

Vajra-loha-tūṇḍa Dhāraṇi.  

[India Office Tibetan texts (Waddell Collection) No. 17 Vol. Z. (19). No. 261 in my list n 'Tib. MS., loc. cit.]  

Oṃ! In the Indian speech [this] is called Ārya vajra lōha-tūṇḍa nāma dhāraṇi: in the Tibetan speech Phags-pa rdo-rje gnam-lehags kyi mch'u [or 'The noble Iron-Thunderbolt-Beak of the Sky.']  

Salutation to Buddha and all the Bodhisattvas! Thus have I heard. The Blessed One having gone into the country of Magadha passed through 'the mango-grove.' Leaving the mango-grove he sat down in the rock-cave of the Indra- hills. Then Sakra the most powerful of the gods together with the [gods of the] directions, came to the outside of the place where The Blessed One was and saluted the feet of The Blessed One. Then Brahmā and Vishṇu and Indra (Sakra) and the four great kings [of the Quarters] thrice circled around The Blessed One and besought him saying:—O Bhagvān we, all assembled, beseech you to

---

5 A fragment of this Dhāraṇī from the Sanskrit has been published with translation by Dr Hoernle from a Stein MS. in J. R. A. S. 1911, 461, etc., and a full translation of another Stein MS. is I understand to be published in the final Report on the Expedition Results. An Uigur version of the same is translated into German by F. W. K. Müller, Uigurica II. 1911, 50.  
6 For further descriptions of this bird-god from Buddhist sources with illustrations, see my article on "the Dhāraṇī Cult" above cited, pp. 187-191.  
8 Indra-sakti-guhā in the Rājgir Hills.
capture the heart\(^9\) of the Nāgas to disperse their thunderbolts so that the malignant Nāgas may not destroy the harvest, with manifold despoilation. Turn them aside, the wind and hail of the clouds, that they do not destroy everything, that the flowers and fruits and the harvests be preserved from injury. We beseech you to utter the spell called "The Iron Thunderbolt-Beak of the Sky." We beseech The Blessed One for the welfare of all beings to bestow upon us this gift!

The Blessed One [then] spoke thus to Brahmā, Vishnu and Indra, and the Four Great Kings [of the Quarters], Honourable Sirs! for the welfare of all beings I shall utter it as a blessing [like one?] of the noble truths. Then Brahmā, Vishnu, and Indra and the four great kings heard the mantras of the dhāraṇī [as follows]:

Salutation to the Three Holy Ones!

Salutation to Buddha Śākyamuni, to all the completely perfect Tathāgata Arhants.

Salutation to all the great Magical powers\(^10\) for compelling the calm of the glorious hereafter.

Salutation to the highest in the three worlds.

Maṭha maṭha praṃathē [twice], jvalita bhikṣita vaṅγa jvaṅγa jvaṅγa; Maṭhaṭa vaṅγa-parakrama, kṣaṭa jvaṅγa, praṅgaḥvaṃma, praṃsuṣa! Bha bha naṅga dīpa dīpam! Bhiṣųvaṃmadha pranodhane naṃr bhanaṃ śphatayama haṅha haṅha haṅha! haṅha haṅha! . . . &c. &c. Haṅha sarva-

This what you have just now heard is "The glowing\(^12\) Iron Thunderbolt-Beak of the Sky." It will break all the malignant Nāgas, and convert evil things into sweet perfumes. It will madden and destroy [evil] . . . &c.

At the same time, he called forth by name [the following spirits to receive his commands:]

The Nāga-king of the ocean Mātāsīga, the Nāga-king [known as] the ‘Hooded One’ (Ch'atra), the great ‘Enchanter.’\(^13\) Ten billions, one thousand millions and one hundred thousand saluted the feet of the Bhagavān who, after those Nāgas had formed an outer assembly [said unto them] ‘Guard ye all the beings of the world (Jambudvīpa) the flowers and fruit and harvests, the trees, leaves and branches! Free them from wind, hail and excessive drought! Make timely rain to fall! By your own vow, by the vow to your tutelaries and to the Tathāgata, guard these for ever henceforth! Each of you becoming entirely perfect in mind do no injury to man.’ . . . &c., &c.

2. The Red-copper Beak.


No. 265 in my List].

In the Indian speech [this] is called Ārṣa ghaḍā pratāṅ bhanda-ghṛtā kada britāchakhdahāyā; in the Tibetan speech ‘p'aṅ-pha xaś-gi moh'u umar-pos gdug-pa phyogs t'ams-chad gnon par byed-pa ies-bya-baṅ gnus [i.e. ‘The Dhāraṇī of the noble Red Beak of Conner, who expels the mischief in all the directions.’]

Salutation to the Buddhas and Bodhisattvas! Salutation to all the noble ones (āryas)! Salutation to all the Buddhas of the directions, to all the Bodhisattvas and hearers! Salutation to the Blessed One. Tathāgatha Arhanta, the completely perfect Buddha, Sugata the fearless one whose words discipline humanity, the most high one, the leader of gods and men!

\(^9\) Or ‘spirit,’ ‘heart,’ or ‘essence,’ Tib. shin-po. Secondarily it means vaṅga or thunderbolt, also the bluejewel of Indra—Indranila.

\(^10\) Mn' u-po.

\(^11\) Literally ‘the other side’ [of life]—pa-rol sīb-gyis gnun-pa'i mn' u-po. The word which I have translated ‘compelling,’ namely gnun-pa, literally means to suppress or overcome by force, and is frequently used in magical operations (cf. Jaeschke, Tib., Dict., 307.)

\(^12\) Mn' u-ch'e-wa.

\(^13\) M' u-ch'e-wa.
Salutation to the faces of the thousand Buddhas! Salutation to the illustrious Bearer of the Thunderbolt (Vajrapāṇi).

This speech was thus heard by me:—The blessed One was seated at the hermitage of the reed-grove by the sheet of lotuses on the bank of the river Ganges, in company with a great retinue of monks and novices.

At that time all the people were overpowered by disease caused by the nāga (dragons) and prayed to Buddha for the terrific supernatural power of the noble Red-copper Beak, so that the eight plagues of the hot countries should not increase their fury, carry off, upset, suck up the blood and flesh (of the people); that the angry flood of consuming fiery waves might not descend [further]. [Here part of the Šāman’s operation in exorcising the Nāgas is indicated.]

By throwing the iron-nail the paralysed limbs will despatch their accumulated stupefaction to the cemeteries. By throwing up the seed the diseases of the eight great Nāgas will be ejected and the stupefying wounds over the earth be purified.

He [the Beak] has the head of the Garuda bird with a body of copper. He has a beak of copper 900 fathoms long. He devours anyone of the four races of Nāgas. He craves for blood and hair and water. He stars fiercely with red eyes. He crunches the gods. He laps up the marrow of things. He sends suddenly ulcerous diseases. He subdues the foundations of the three worlds. He scatters the poison of fearsome diseases. Below, he strikes widespread panic into the lower hells; above, he sinks down the highest of beings. He splits down the six thousand kinds of plague. He lays low the thousand kinds of Nāgas of the interior of the earth. For these reasons there is amongst the disease-causing Nāgas fear of his appearance and re-appearance.

Then Vajrapāṇi besought the Blessed One, the beneficent ascetic, [saying] “O Sagata, pray have compassion on the six classes of beings, pray set them free from their disease and distress! Pray set them free from the disease of passion, pray kill the fire of anger, pulverize the rock of arrogance, clear away the darkness of ignorance, the poison of disease, deliver from the thousands of disease-demons!”

Thus having supplicated, [the Buddha], in compassion seeing [the distress], acted at heart. [Seeing] Vajrapāṇi miserable and the torments of the fierce disease, the state of the bodies of all, the disease-spirits breaking [their] promises and vows had tormented by sickness and enfettered with the thread of passion [Buddha-exclaimed], “Come all [diseases spirits]! Swiftly come near here! I shall explain. Be advised.” Thus he commanded.

Then through Vajrapāṇi’s [request?] there arrived near, distressed at the commands of the Victorious One, to attend the presence of the Victorious one, the eight classes of the Rākṣa-a-mother fiends [also?] he or they called “The swift-goer of the depths, the middle and

---

14 Jam-bu-bdl. =Skt. mula. There was a hermitage of this name on the Ganges near Vaiśālī.
15 Or coverlet: sq-ke’ba=Skt. kunda (?).
16 Literally ‘possessed of the eight limbs or arms,’ which the Dictionaries state is the Ganges.
17 Mān-ūṇa, defined in the Dictionaries as ‘disease caused by Nāgas; also leprosy, kuṣṭa.’
18 guṇa k’ra-bo, literally ‘furious spirit.’
19 lohās-khyi gzer =Skt. kila, a form of Indra’s bolt.
20 Det, also ‘lines’ or ‘spots.’
21 In Jewish mythology Brass is symbolic of irresistible weapons Dan. 2, 39; Mic. 4, 13; Zech. 6, 1.
22 Chi-zer, may also mean ‘yellow water’ or ‘putrid water.’
23 Bur-du, which may also read ‘by (his) bolts.’
24 The construction here is very involved and obscure; and Buddha is not mentioned, probably intentionally so, in order that the spell of so bloodthirsty a being should not be directly ascribed to the splendid Buddha.
25 Lham-ten-se, literally = god or spirit + mother (or not) = fiend (rākṣasa), can read ‘the fiends who are not gods’ i.e. (Avast) i’ but the eight mothers rākṣaṇi form a well-known group.
top," the race of the Brahman Nāga Vasuta. Thus spoke Vajrapāṇi to the [whole] race of the Brahman Vasuta Nāga. "Who am I to... make useless speech? I am alone! You do not hear even me! You do not attend me, the mighty one... possessed of swift energy." Thus he said. Then Vajrapāṇi reflecting in heart [what he should do] said "You who are the lords of the earth, what should I say to you?" [Then the Nāga replied:] "I am the king of the Nāgas, and am called 'Vasuta' the gem of the Brahmans. To me belongs all poison...[here follows five leaves describing the various diseases &c. caused by Nāgas, and the spell appears to be disclosed by the Nāga king himself in these words:] These were the words commanded:—Oṁ Hr̥uṁ Hṛ̥ti Hṛ̥ti Hṛ̥ti Hṛ̥ti Hṛ̥ti Aṁ Tathāgatā nāga-hridaya. tathāgata namah dhamayat. tathāgata raja sri lhanana, budya budhya, raja iśita pari parilava, nagahū yarabha povanāha svaha! Guha rája-la svāhā! hṛ̥ti hṛ̥ti!... (etc. &c.)

By this fortunate talisman of the noble one, the sharp Red Copper Beak, may the [evil] power of the six classes of 'Vasuta' be swept away!...Then straightforward the vanquished race of the Brahman [Nāga] is turned aside.

This Dhāraṇi of the 'Red Beak of Copper' is translated by the Indian abbot Jiāna Deva and the Tibetan Bonde Cho's-grub, and the translator (-interpreter) sKa-ba Bha-po.

3. The Thunderbolt-Beak.

Vajra-tuñña Dhāraṇi.

[From Ka-gyur-rGyud, Calc. edn. (also India Office ?), Vol. M. fols. 426-466; Csoma, Analysis p. 540-7 St. Petersburg ed. 754 W., fols. 27-50; Schmidt, Index p. 167, also in gZuñi (Dhāraṇi Section) of latter, 937 W., fols. 38-79.]

Oṁ! In the Indian speech [this is called] Vajra dusaa nama nāga samaya; in the Tibetan speech rDo-rjei me'n zēs-bya-ba klui dam tīg-go—[that is The Nāga's vow called 'The Thunder-bolt Beak.']

Salutation to the Omniscient One! At that time The Blessed One was staying at the great city of 'The Striding Servant (?)' Amongst the great retinue [there] assembled [were] Takshaka [king of the Nāga Serpent-dragons] and the rest of the Nāga retinue, also gods and a great retinue of men assembled for the welfare of living beings. Seeing these, he [The Blessed One] thought that he would completely fulfill the hope of all by explaining the religious means of doing virtuous acts. At this time in that city was a Brahman named Viṣṇu a rich man enjoying great wealth. Proud in the possession of fine clothes and many goods and chattels [yet] was he not blessed. The sacred Vedas and the Brahman were [his] means of crossing to the other shore [of existence] These began and ended merely with mantras (spells). By respecting these spells the Nāgas were summoned; by burnt offerings [was summoned] the Fire [God]. When the harvest of this Brahman ripened it began to be destroyed by exasperating rain. He said I forgot for

23 This title suggests Kuběna, who was lord of the Vāsu spirits, and the rākṣasī were latterly placed under him; but he is not usually described as a Nāga himself, yet in the Jatakas he is given control over nāgas. In later Brahmanism the chief of all the Nāga kings is Vasuki.

24 Brum-rin-poče. 25 Cha's-po literally 'implement,' or weapon.

26 The last-named, who is called in one copy of this text, Ka-ba, appears to me to be the same as the Ka-ba Padubtses (or Shi-Kuta), who was a pupil of Padma Sambhava, circa 748-802 A. D.; see my Buddhism of Tibet p. 31 In, 3 No. 17; Also Grünwadel's Mythologie 49,53. Several of his works are in the Great Commentary, Tumgyur, mdo Section, Vols. 117-124.

27 Tumgyur, mdo Section.

28 This is obviously a corruption of the copyist—the Dictionaries give tuñña as the Sanskrit equivalent of the Tibetan me'n, a beak; and the correct form is given in the colophons.

29 Bhagavad.

30 Gye-gar, literally servant + thrown off or forsaken or striding; a possible restoration by the Sanskrit-Tibetan lexicon is Urama + dba.
obtaining victory over this to utter the excellent spell and therefore the rain has begun to fall; so remembering the astrological formula he summoned the Nāga [and] performed the burnt offering of fire—mixing together sesamum and fruits, and the mustard grain, butter, salt, he made the burnt offering. Thereupon the Nāgas merely appeared [but] were not subjected. He praised the bolt [of Indra] and struck the head of the Nāga, and splitting it he enjoyed the pleasure of weakening the downpour. Thereupon the Nāga quivering with great rage and fury, instantly by the swift power of a Nāga forsook his [former] body and changed temporarily in a vapour of dazzling light to destroy [his assailant]. When this great spirit was descending like a shroud to destroy the body of the Brahman, the latter unassisted by his men was unable to make the burnt offering of fire. Helpless, in order to escape, he besought The Blessed One as a protecting mother to save him. Falling at the feet of the Blessed One he prayed saying: 'O Bhagavān, save my life I beseech you from destruction by the enraged Nāga! Will you not save! Save, O Bhagavan, Save, O Tathāgata!' Then The Blessed One spake unto that great breathless Brahmin: 'Fear not great Brahmin, I shall be your protector, and saviour and friend; and having thus spoken and saying no more, he sat down.

Then Vajrapāṇi, the great general of the Yakṣas besought The blessed One, saying:—'Grant this prayer O Bhagavān, so that the harvest be not destroyed by wild Nāgas, also for the sake of [our] complete happiness, in the future. Your instructions are necessary for all living beings. In what way should we act in such an alarming emergency? O Bhagavān what is to be done to benefit the harvests, to protect them perfectly, to increase them to the utmost, for the complete protection of the fields against the hostile Nāgas—we beseech you tell us!'

Then, the Bhagavān answered Vajrapāṇi the lord of esoterism and said:—'Vajrapāṇi, the angry heart of the Nāga causes it to do angry deeds. The Dhāraṇī called the 'Thunderbolt Beak', the heart of the Tathāgata, the Arhat and most perfect Buddha, is the remedy. That I now declare [unto you]. By this speech the injury will be swiftly stayed and all the harvest be completely protected &c., &c.'

Thereupon Vajrapāṇi, the great general of the Yakṣas spake thus: 'The Blessed One is the healer of all living beings. We beseech him in kindness to utter the words of the mantras of this great Dhāraṇī. Then the Bhagavān in kindness said [the spell]: Namo Bhagavate sārāti Buddhaha nama Bhagavate Śākyarāja! Om jala jala giri giri bhavana, dipata vēga mañāchārā donate hridaya jalani, huru huru, hana hana, dahā dahā. pata sa pata, tātā tātā, nāgā-kula paśāna, &c. &c. &c. Nāgā dhāraṇīnī kunn phat jalmani phat jalini phat phat phat phat svāhā!'

(The subsequent pages go on to enumerate the various specific ills and diseases, demons, and animal pests against which the spell is efficacious, and also details the necessary offerings to be made. The only other reference to 'Beak,' which I have observed is the following, 'the owl and the rat and the various kinds of long-beaks and swarming pests shall not come forth on the muttering of this spell.' It ends by restating the title correctly as Vajra-limha, and adds that it is the thunderbolt-heart for allaying the harm done by Nāgas to the harvest. In the colophon no name of author or translator is mentioned.)

(To be continued.)

33 Tib. pur-bu. This is the name of the large nail of wood or metal used to stab demons. My Sanskrit-Tibetan Dictionary gives its equivalent as kīla and 'sālbu' and the former manifestly is intended for kīla 'bolt, pin or lance,' from kīl to bind (Wilson’s 1st Dict. 233); and the latter is obviously corrupt for sālbu = the thunderbolt of Indra, Wilson 8, D. 848.
34 Literally 'untamed.'
35 Or nirvāṇa.
36 Or 'essence' sālϕa-pa.
THE HISTORY OF THE NAÎK KINGDOM OF MADURA.

By V. RANGACHARI, M.A., L.T., MADRAS.

(Continued from p. 30.)

SECTION VI 1500-1530.

The Empire under the Tuluvas.

We have already seen how the great Tuluva regent Narasa Naïk deposed the Emperor Sāluva Immudi Narasimha and established a new dynasty on the throne of Vijayanagar. Men of great capacity and industry, the monarchs of the Tuluva line took prompt steps to bring the various provinces and feudatory states under the control of the central authority. It is true that Narasa Naïk died within a year or two after his exaltation to the imperial dignity; but even within this short space of time, he made his name a real power throughout the Empire. His eldest son and successor, Vira Narasimha, the Busbal Rao of Nuniz, ruled till 1509 A.D. According to copper plates and inscriptions, he was a virtuous emperor who made gifts at various places, such as Rāmāvaram, and Sīrangam; but according to travellers and chroniclers, a weak and incompetent sovereign, whose repose was constantly invaded by either external or internal enemies. Free from the dominance of the strong personality of Narasa, the feudatories of the various provinces shewed signs of disaffection and indepen-
dence, and defied the central authority. Many of the Kanarese chiefs of upper Karnata or Mysore, for example, became overbearing. The Musulmān governor of Goa openly made war with his suzerain. The chief of the small, but strategically well situated, feudatory state of Ummathūr in Mysore rebelled, and after a victory over the Emperor, made himself independent at Terkanambi and the surrounding country. Taking advantage of these troubles, the Gajapati king carried his arms into the empire, and seized the fortresses of Kondavī and Udayagiri. The sultāns of the Trans-Tungabhadra region naturally exulted in their immunity from chastisement and opportunity for aggression.

The Empire under Krishna Dēva Rāya 1509—1530.

It was under such circumstances that the great Krishna Dēva Rāya came to the throne. It is beyond our province to give a detailed account of the greatness, the magnificence, and the achievements of this remarkable man. Nowhere in the world's history do we find a more striking example of a king who deserved to be king not because of his inheritance, but because of his kingly qualities. Soldier and statesman, administrator and conqueror, poet, and patron of arts and letters, Krishna Dēva was undoubtedly the greatest monarch that ever sat on the Vijayanagar throne. The works of Akbar seem to fade into insignificance before the glories of this monarch. Numerous are the romances that have

19 In the latter part of S. 1424 i.e., 1502 A.D. See Arch. Surv. 1908-99, p. 171.
20 Ep. Carna. VI; Arch. Surv. 1908-09.
21 Terkanambi is Gundupet Taluk of Mysore. The Kongudūn Rājadē also mentions the growth of the power of this chief at the expense of the Empire. See Ep. Carna. III, 30, which says that a chief named Malla Rāja was so aggressive as to extend his territory as far as Penukonda. Inscriptions 578 and 579 of 1508 point out that Narasa Rāja Udayagir held territory as far as Tirumuranjam and in Coimbatore in 1499 A.D. (see also Ep. Rep. 1906).
22 He was about 30 when he came to the throne. Being the son of Nāgalī, a queen of inferior status, Krishna Dēva was considered by many wrongly to be illegitimate. His predecessor had tried to deprive him of his eyes and, according to one version, to kill him; but Sāluva Timma saved him. For details see Ibid., 174-186. Mr. Krishna Sāstria bases his account of Sewell's antiquities; Virēalaingam. Lives of Telug-U. Poet: Venkatārāya. Krishna Dēva Vijayanu, the account of Nānas; Forgotten Empire and Ep. Reports.
23 Ep. Krishna Dēva himself composed the poem Amukta mangala, besides some Sanskrit works. He also patronised many writers and came to be known as the 2nd or Andhra Bhūja. (See Lives of Telug-U. Poet, Arch Surv. 1908-99, p. 185-186 also Ep. Ind. I, 370-1. Ibid 389-402.)
gathered round his magic name. Numerous are the tales, embodying facts as well as fictions, with which poets and writers have, for centuries, loved to associate his beloved person. Poets have praised his poetic genius, scholars have admired his scholarship, kings his kingcraft, priests his piety, artists his taste, and the historian his towering personality in the history of Hindu civilization. Even to children his name possesses a charm. The hero of a hundred nursery tales, he is, with his friend and "father," Sāhuva Timma, Appāji, their friend, their companion and their hero. Even to-day when the round of tales goes around the domestic hearth of the Hindu home, when the children, old or young, gather around the smiling old man and cry for the good old stories, heard—perhaps scores of times, of the beloved "Rāja", and of the more beloved "Appāji," what a sunshine is there in their faces! how poignant their grief when the son of Nāgala was condemned by his cruel brother to be deprived of his eyes! What joy when he was saved by Appāji and the eyes of sheep were presented to the tyrant! How interested when the great emperor's personal habits, his gymnastic exercises, and his morning pursuits are narrated! Krishna Đeva Rāya, in short, is the national hero of the Andhras, and more than any other sovereign, made the Telugu sovereignty over South India a reality. Immediately after his accession, he adopted effecutal measures to re impose the yoke of the empire on those who had defied its standard. He first reduced the powerful Ummathur chiefs of the Mysore-Kongu marches, who, as we have already seen, had grown turbulent in the time of Vira Narasimha. The pride of the Gajapati was then humbled; not only the fortresses of Udayagiri and Kondavdu once again brought under Vijayanagar, but the Gajapati dominions invaded, and the Gajapati king had to humbly acknowledge the supremacy of Vijayanagar. The king of Orissa then felt the puissant arms of the great emperor, and a pillar of victory in the heart of the Kalinga country remained, ever after, a melancholy reminder of the military aggression of the Telugu over the Uriya; and when the defeated chieftain was compelled to give his daughter in marriage to the conqueror, he had to rue the proud and indiscriminate contempt in which he had held the family and powers of his adversary.

**Krishna Deva Raya's foreign Policy.**

An even more successful exploit of Krishna Đeva was the conquest of the Raichur durbar from the Muhammadan, and the invasion and occupation of Bijāpūr itself. The country of the 'Adil Shah was overrun, the fortress of Kalbarga was destroyed, and the Vijayanagar emperor found himself the arbiter in the internal politics of Bijāpūr and Ahmadnagar. Never before had the enemies of Vijayanagar trembled so much as in the days of Krishna Đeva and never had Vijayanagar ruled over such an extensive territory. While the emperor was engaged in these exploits in the north almost throughout his reign, he did not forget the comparatively tranquil South.

**His power strongly felt throughout the empire.**

Here, there was no corner of the extensive land which stretched from sea to sea and from the Krishna to the Cape which escaped his vigilant control. The large number

---

31 For a connected account of this celebrated man, based on epigraphical records, see Arch. Surv. 1908-9, p. 153. The literature concerning him and his activities is legion.
32 Ep. Ind. III p. 17-22, Mukku Timmanna Prājjādpaharana refers to this campaign a which ended in the capture of Sivasamudram; the Muhammadan historians, also refer to it.
33 All the epigraphical and other authorities in connexion with this have been ably cited by Mr. Krishna Sāktra in Arch. Surv. Rep. 1908-9, pp. 176-179.
34 Arch. Surv. 1908-9, p. 179 based on inscription and Telugu and Tamil literature.
35 See Sewell’s Forgotten Empire for an elaborate discussion of the date of the Raichur siege and capture. (1620 a. D.); Inscri. 47 of 1906; Ep. Rep. 1907; Nunn account; Scott’s Dekkan I, 239-40
36 The poem Amukta Mālīndra.
and the wide range of inscriptions go to prove this. In the districts north of Madras, in the region covered by modern Mysore, in Salem, Coimbatore, Malabar, the Arcots, Tanjore, Trichinopoly, Madura and Tinnevelly,—in the whole of South India, in fact, including Mysore and South Bombay, the marks of his sovereignty are apparent. In South India he distinguished himself chiefly by his temple architecture and by his religious endowments to almost every Vishnu and Siva temple. The temples of Chidambaram, Tiruvannamalai, were especially benefited by his magnificent labours. The thousand-pillared mantapam, the sacred tank, the eleven-storeyed gopura, the ear of Vinayaka, the central shrine, the gold and silver jewels, the gold pinnacle, cornice and doorways, and the other glories of the Tiruvahinsalai temple were due to Krishna Dèva's liberality. The lofty and imposing northern tower of the Chidambaram temple, again, was his work. "The high towers of most of the temples of the south," says Mr. Krishna Sástri, "must have been built in the time of Krishna Râya, as also the pictureque and extended addition known generally as 100-pillared and 1000-pillared mantapás. We frequently hear of a Râya-gopuram, which means the tower of Râya (i.e., perhaps Krishna Râya). It is not possible at this stage of epigraphical research to say how many temples were benefited by Krishna Râya's charities. It may be presumed that his liberal hand was practically extended to the whole of the Empire." In 1517 he remitted 10,000 varahās of the imperial revenue to the Siva and Vishnu temples of the Chója country. An inscription of 1528 at Piramalai says that the Emperor's power was felt in the island of Ceylon.

The Southern Viceroy between 1500 and 1530.

A word may be said about the viceroy of Vijayanagar in the south and the indigenous Páidiyan dynasty during the period of thirty years covered by the reigns of Narasa Náik, Víra Narasimha, and Krishna Dèva. It has already been pointed out, how, after the usurpation of Narasa Náik, the Sájuva Emperor, Immadi Narasimha, sank into the position of a subordinate viceroy, and ruled in the basin of the Kávéri and Vaigai—S. Arcot, Trichinopoly and Tanjore. Immadi Narasimha had the mortification to observe himself relegated to oblivion by Narasa's son, Víra Narasimha, in 1502. The relations between the two are unknown, but there is clear evidence to prove that the former lived at least till 1505. In the years which followed, the Sájuvas continued to rule over the Kávéri and part at least of the Vaigai regions. From his headquarters at Tiruvádi, one Selappa Víra Narasimha Náyakar, who has been styled in a Chingleput record, "Ubaya Pradháni," and occupied a very prominent place in the counsels of the Empire, gave various grants from 1515 to 1530. "In S. 1444 Selappa Víra Narasimha Náyakar restored, apparently on his own responsibility, a grant to a temple at Tirumaiyam in the

31 In Salem E. g. an insc. of Karpíram Udaya Náyanár temple at Uttamachóapuram (near Salem) shows that Sela Nädú was under him (see. Ep. Rep. 1888). The Sendamangalam insc. 1903 also proves it.
32 In S. Arcot he built the N. Gopura of the Chidambaram temple (Ep. Rep. 1888). His insc. are also found at the Vilipuram (11g., 117, and 168 of 1897); Acharapakkam (233 of 1901) S. 1400; at Tiruvannamalai (Ep. Rep. 1901 p. 13); at Tiruppalathur (228 of 1903); at Piramalai (146 of 1903); 35 of 1905 says that the governor of Tindivanam Síma gave a gift of land. In 1522 an insc. at Tadikombu near Dindigul (4 of 1894) mentions a gift in his name by a tributary Kondiai Dèva Mahá Rája, son of Senna Dájia.
34 Arch. Surv. 1908-9, p. 186.
35 Ibid. p. 182.
36 This gift has been recorded in the temples of Tiruvahinsalai (S. Arcot), Sendamangalam (S. Arcot), Kannúr (Trichi), Trichi, etc.
37 Arch. Surv. 1908-9, p. 172.
38 Arch. Surv. 1908-9, p. 172.
39 Arch. Surv. 1908-9, p. 172.
Pudukottai state. Two inscriptions from Tirupattur, dated S. 1432, refer to the same chief. From these we understand that Sāluva Nāik was a very powerful and conspicuous vassal of Krishna Deva Raya. So powerful was he, that he seems to have entertained ideas of treason, and to have been looking anxiously for the death of Krishna Deva, so that he could declare himself independent; and when Krishna Deva died in 1530, he actually declared himself independent, and excited, thereby, one of the most formidable rebellions in Vijayanagar history, a rebellion which had important effects on the history of S. India, and which indirectly led, as we shall see in the next chapter, to the establishment of the Nāik dynasty in Madura.

The Karnātaka Rāja's Sastirācharitra gives a different account of the southern part of the Empire under Krishna Deva Raya. It says that the affairs of the Karnataka were very much unsettled, that the chiefs were turbulent, and that an imperial army of 100,000 men had to be sent to conquer and compel the payment of tribute and allegiance. The imperial forces commanded by the Sirdārs Vyappa Nāik, Tuppākki Krishnappa Nāik, Vijaya Rāghava Nāik and Venkatappa Nāik, proceeded to Seringapatam and enforced tribute from all the chiefs of that region. Vyappa then descended into the lower Carnatic and arrived at Vēlur by way of Ambūr. Here the numerous chiefs of Chittār and Tondamalām met him and saluted the imperial flag. Making one Pennurutti Venkata Reddi, the Faujdar of this region, in accordance with the Rāja's orders, Vyappa then resumed his march and arrived at Jinni. Here the kings of the land between that place and Jayankondaalāpuram saluted him and paid obeisance. Vyappa then despatched his colleagues Vijaya Rāghava Nāik and Venkatappa Nāik to the south to collect tribute from the Chōla, Pāṇḍya, and the Chēra realms. These generals visited, in the course of their triumphant career, the cities of Tanjore, Trichinopoly, Madura and Tirunagiri, and excited so much fear in the minds of the local chiefs and governors that they hastened to acknowledge the Emperor. The whole of the lower Carnatic now formed part of the Rāya's Samasthāna, and brought in an aggregate revenue of three crores to the imperial treasury. Vyappa divided the whole country into three divisions, each of which brought in a crore, and was ruled by a viceroy. He himself stayed at Jinni. To Vijaya Rāghava he gave Tanjore, and to Venkatappa, Madura and Tirunagiri. Vyappa, and his lieutenant Tuppākki Krishnappa Nāik had the country north of the Coleroon under them, Vijaya Rāghava had the Kāvēri region, and Venkatappa, the Vaigai and the Tāmbraparni basins. Each looked after his province, and collected tribute from the local rulers. The Chronicle then goes on to describe the actions and achievements of the viceroys of Jinni in detail.

We cannot say how far this account is correct. But there is no reason to make us think that it is not correct. The division of the Empire for purposes of good administration is not unnatural, and Krishna Deva might have authorised such a procedure.

The Governors of Madura.

But if Venkatappa was the general Viceroy of Madura and Tinnevelly, what was the relation between him and Sāluva Narasimha Nāikan? Was he his subordinate, or was he subject to Vijaya Rāghava Nāik? It is difficult to say. Again, on
of the Mackenzie MSS. says that between 1500 and 1535 there were a number of Naik governors in Madura. These were Tenna Naik who ruled from 1500 to 1515; Narasa Pillai, 1515-1519; Timmappa Naikar, 1519-1524; Kottiyam Kamaiyar Naik, 1524-1526; Chinnappa Naikar, 1526-1530; Vijaya Naika, 1530-1535; and Vaidyanatha Naik, 1535-1545. What was the relation between these governors and Venkatappa Naik? Was he superior to them all? If so, how long was he in that position. All these questions are difficult to answer. Further epigraphical discoveries alone can enlighten us.

The local kings in the same period.

It is certain that while Saivuva Naik, or Venkatappa Naik, was representing the imperial interests in the districts of Trichinopoly and Madura, the indigenous rulers continued to rule as his subordinates. In Trichinopoly, for instance, one Chennayya Baliya Deva ruled about 1530 and acknowledged the supremacy of Krishna Deva, and gained distinction by his gifts to the god and goddess at Uraiyur. It seems that this chief looked on Saivuva Naik with suspicion, if not hatred, and proved himself, as we shall see later on, a no mean enemy of his. Coming to the south, the region around Madura was under the immediate rule of the Vanada Rayars. Still further south were the Paityan rulers of Tenkasi, who claimed a nominal supremacy over the Vanada Rayars, but readily paid allegiance to Vijayanagar and its representatives. We have already seen how, at the time of the usurpation of Narasa Naik, Alagan Perumal Parakrama was ruling in Tinevelly. He continued to govern during the reigns of Vira Narasishtha and Krishnaadav. He died in 1516 and was followed by the joint kings Abhirama Parakrama and Ahavaram, the first sovereigns of the Pudhukottai plates. These held power till 1533 when one of the most remarkable kings of the dynasty, Jatilavaranam Srivallabha, ascended the throne.

The genealogy as given in these plates is as follows:

Abhirama Parakrama,          Ahavara

Parakrama P.          Srivallabha, Srivallabha, Manabharana,  

Sillivatipati,            (Padiya Raya, relationship doubtful, 

Parakrama P.       Sillivatipati,  

 alas         Sriyvara Chakrya).

Kulaakha,  
Mannakavaha  
Kaliyuga Rayan  
Tirumalvelli Perumal  
Vira Padiya his  
Co-Regent.

Guin Rayna  
Varatunga Rayna  

The Donors.

Mr. Venkaiyya thinks that Abhirama Parakrama was the same as the Parakrama Padiya of Caldwell who ascended the throne in 1516 A.D. The relationship of Srivallabha and Manabharana who are said to be the brothers of Srivallabha Padiya Raja Yashobhanu Chakrya by Mr. Venkaiyya is disputed by Mr. Gopinatha Rao who believes that there is nothing to show in the original that they are his brothers. The actual donor is a certain Tirumal Naik of Chintalapalle, minister of Vira Mahipati, (i.e., Vrappa Naik). He is said to have fought in the battle of Vallapakara where the army of Vrabbhupa was annihilated and the troops of Achyuta were completely routed. For an explanation of the latter part see Chapt. III.
The Death of Krishna Deva

In the year 1530 Krishna Deva Rāya joined his fathers, leaving a void in South Indian history which could hardly be filled by any other statesman. His death was a blow to the Empire from which it never recovered. His brother and successor, Achyuta Rāya, was not wanting in capacity, but the moment the eyes of Krishna Deva closed, there was a universal rebellion in the Empire, and Achyuta Rāya had to go to the south and quell it. It was this formidable rebellion that indirectly led to the establishment of the Naik dynasty in Madura; but in order that the condition of Madura and the south in general may at the time of the establishment of the Naik dynasty be well understood, it is necessary that the civilization of South India in the period of Vijayanagar supremacy must be described. I shall therefore proceed to sketch the features of South Indian civilization in the next section, and then describe, in the next chapter, the events of Achyuta Rāya’s administration, which ultimately led to the Naik Raj in Madura.

BOOK NOTICE.


This is a notable work for two reasons. It breaks new ground and has been written by the wife of a young officer of a British Regiment serving temporarily in India. In the latter respect it supplies a welcome answer to the complaint that English ladies obliged to reside in India for a while take no interest in the country.

This is no butterfly book, but a serious attempt at the history of modern Indian gardening as introduced from further North and West by Babar and his successors, and at comprehending the symbolism in which the Indian lady of to-day enshrines her garden. There are minor mistakes in it, of course, for the writer is young and has had perforce to look for information and guidance to more experienced persons, who have not always guided her aright. But this fact need not trouble the reader. If he is experienced, he can put the errors straight for himself. If he is not, they will not affect him.

The main fact for both classes of readers is that this book seriously starts a line of enquiry well worth following up by those who would know what is in the minds of the natives of India, while they live out their daily lives.

The fact of the author being a woman gives her an advantage that no man, however experienced and learned in things Indian, could have. Gardens are everywhere naturally attached to dwellings in such a way that the women occupying the houses can have ready and continuous access to them. So she has been able to make friends with the wives and other female belongings of the owners, and find out at first hand from them what their gardens mean to them, and how their contents and forms have come to be preserved. All this enables her readers to get at the inner life of the people: always valuable information.

The author is rather severe on modern British taste in gardening as being inapplicable to India, whereas the formal Mughal garden and its successors are fully suited to situation and climate. The present writer cannot agree with this view altogether. India is a vast country and there are conditions in places to which the modern English system seems to be admirably suited, while in others, especially in the arid, dusty plains, the formal walled system seems to specially succeed.

What does appear to be faulty taste is to mix up the modern British system with the Mughal, and to attempt, as is sometimes done, to combine both within the same four walls. The irresistible tendency in all Oriental countries is to follow the governing powers, and there is no doubt a danger under British rule of all the formal Indian gardens becoming Anglicised to their damage. If the author succeeds in giving native ladies a pride in their form of gardening and in thus checking a mischievous tendency towards indiscriminate Anglicising, she will have performed a work of permanent usefulness.

In view of the severe controversy bound to arise over the ordering of the new Delhi this book is most opportune. Gardens on a great scale will be necessary and both British and native sentiment will have to be considered. This book will supply much necessary information on the latter point, which would not otherwise be forthcoming. I must, however, point out that the Mughal System to be beautiful and successful is “millionaires” gardening, and if followed on a cheap scale is bound to be the unpleasant failure that the modern Indian will achieve when left to himself.

R. C. TEMPLE.
"Dharani," or Indian Buddhist Protective Spells.

Translated from the Tibetan.

By L. A. Waddell, C.B., LL.D.

(Continued from p. 42).


Loha Kala-tupa. 37 Tib. Chags mch'ung-po.


This purports to have been recited by Ananda in order to procure rain, etc. It is to coerce a large number of 'great Naga-kinges,' who are specified by name.

5. The Thunderbolt-Claw.

Vajra-Raipur. Tib. rDorje sder-mo.


It is addressed to several 'Mothers,' and others she-devils who are specified by name. No translator is named.

6. The White Umbrella-one of Buddha's Diadem.

Ujñika Sitātaptra Aparajita.

The great Turned-away (of Evil).


"In the Indian Speech it is called Arya tathāgatoṣvita sitātaptra aparājita mahā-pratyāṅgira paramesīdhā nema dhāraṇī: in the Tibetan P'o-g-s-pa de-ba'i gn'ig-pa stueg-tor-nas byui-bai gdu-gs-dkar-po-chan gz'an-gyis mi-l'ub-pa p'yi-r-zo-pa che'n-po mch'og-tu grub-po zhes-byas ba'i gzu'us i.e., "The Dhāraṇī called The Noble White Umbrella One, invincible against others who sprang from the diadem of the Tathāgata to accomplish perfectly the great turning away of evil]."

Salutation to all the Buddhas and Bodhisattvas, and Noble Hearers and Pratyeka Buddhas! Salutation to the Blessed One, (Bhagavān), 38 the invincible queen of the diadem!

This word was thus heard by me. The Blessed One was seated in a storeyed temple of the gods of 'The Thirty Three' with a great congregation of monks, a great congregation of the Bodhisattvas together with Sakra, the ruler of the gods. At that time, the Blessed One seated himself on a low cushion, and at that low level entered into the deep meditation called 'the perfect Vision of the Diadem' (Ujñīsa vidariotana). 41

37 One version reads 'du fla'.
38 The masculine gender here, as well as in the Tibetan translation of the title, presumes, I think, a form antecedent to the deification of this spell as a female goddess.
39 grub-po, the Tibetan equivalent of the Sanskrit siddha means to accomplish by yoga-methods.
40 This is masculine.
41 In the list of 'religious stages' (dharmapaurānya) enumerated in the Mahāyānputti (No. 244, 82 St. Petersb, edn. p. 81) is mentioned Ujñīsa-rivarmurduhīn samādhi pravesā.
Not long after he was seated in that meditation these words of an esoteric spell issued from the middle of the diadem of the Blessed One. Salutation to the Buddha, the Law, the Congregation! Salutation to the series of the seven All-perfect Buddhas, the congregation of Bodhisattvas and the hearers (śrāvaka), Salutation to the great embodied Bodhisattvas, Maitreya and the rest!

Salutation to the saints (arhatas) of the world, to those who have entered the stream (of saṅgha), to the saints who will transmute only once (saññādīgāmī)!

Salutation to the perfectly enlightened ones of the present age!

Salutation to the saints of the gods (Devarīṇī) to the useful power of the saints who hold the spells (vidyadhāra-ṛṣi), to the saints (siddhi) who hold the spells!

Salutation to Brahmā, to Indra, to the blessed Rudra, the lord of Umā (the turner away of, or from, difficulties), also to herself!

Salutation to the blessed NŚrīya in his forms doing great deeds!

Salutation to the blessed Mahākāla dwelling in the fearsome three-tiered city in the cemeteries and the troops of Mothers doing energetic deeds, the adored ones!

Salutation to the line of the blessed Tathāgata!

Salutation to the line of the blessed Thunderbolt, the blessed Jewel, the blessed Elephant, the blessed Virgins (Kumārī), the blessed Nāgas!

Salutation to the blessed king holding hero-destroying weapons, the completely perfect Saint the Tathāgata, Buddha!

Salutation to the blessed completely perfect Saint Tathāgata Buddha Amitabha!

Salutation to the blessed completely perfect Saint, Tathāgata Buddha Akṣobhya!

Salutation to the blessed completely perfect Saint, Tathāgata Buddha of medicine Bājaś-ya Guru, the king of beryl light!

Salutation to the blessed completely perfect Saint Tathāgata Buddha, the vast flowery lord of the Sāl-tree [grove]!

Salutation to the blessed completely perfect Saint, Tathāgata Buddha the king of the top-most jewel (vatū-sambhāra)!

Salutation to the blessed completely perfect Saint, Tathāgata Buddha Sāmantabhadra!

Salutation to the blessed completely perfect Saint, Tathāgata Buddha Vairocana!

Salutation to the blessed completely perfect Saint, Tathāgata Buddha, the vast-eyed king of the scented top of the ukpa-lotus flower!

Having saluted all these, the Blessed Mother, the Invincible White Umbrella-One, the Great Turner-aside of Evil, issued from the diadem of the Tathāgata, to cut asunder completely all the malignant demons.

---

42 The Stein MS. does not contain the foregoing important matter, which locates the origin of the spell and explains its name from its mode of origin. The Hodgson Sanskrit MS. (No. 77) omits the last sentence from 'at' to 'diadem.'

43 To avoid needless reiteration I omit several of the phrases 'Salutation to...'

44 Legs-lod drag-po; my MSS. Dictionary restores Legs-lod to 'Bhāgavati.'

45 Dkā-ṣub-clo. This Tibetan etymology for Umā, differing from the current Brahmanical one, namely 'light,' is in keeping with the Brahmanist legend of the prohibition addressed to Durgā by her mother, Umā, i.e., 'practise not austerities."

46 In the Stein MS., Dr. Hoernle reads 'raja (J. R. A. S., 1911, 463)' for which the Tibetan would suggest gyal-ba.

47 Vatsīrya.

48 Bchom-lod-'des-mi, here the feminine form appears for the first time.

49 idem.
To cut asunder all the [hostile] spells of others;
To turn aside all untimely environments;
To save the animated beings from all fetters and from accidental death;
To turn aside all hostilities and evil dreams and evil spectres (bhūja);
To frighten away the injuries of yakṣas and rākṣas;
To frighten away the hosts of 80,000 malignant demons;
To cause happiness throughout the 28 lunar constellations;
To turn aside all enemies and dangers and hatred;
To frighten away all evil demons, all poisons and weapons;
To turn aside fire and flood.

She is the saviour (Tārā) from all fear of harmful things!
The great terrible destroyer (Ugra) is she, invincible against others (aparājita)!
Very fierce (Chopa) is she, with great might!
Very fiery, with great shining brightness (Marici)!
Of great whiteness, a white one is she, clad in a garland of flames!
The noble Tārā, with the frowning brows (Bṛhati (?))!
The renowned one known as ‘The garlanded with thunderbolts of victory’!
Her outward mark of the lotus is the mark of the thunderbolt!
The garlanded one, invincible against others (Aparājita)!
With thunderbolt-beak (Vajra-tanḍa) [yet] the shape of a beauteous damsel is she!
Placid (Sīrā) is she, adored by all the gods!
The placid one garlanded with gold!
The great White One in a white robe of fire!
Noble Tārā great in might, the thunder-bolt enchainning others.
The thunderbolt maid, the Upholder of the race!
Be jewelled with the juice of the saffron flower!
The famous thunderbolt diadem of Vairocarṇa!
May all this troop of thy mystic forms, protect our own circle and the [Buddhist] doctrine and all living beings!

[Here follows the especial incantation or spell, the Dhāraṇī proper, in crude Sanskrit. It is a shorter form of the above prayer for protection with some additional cabalistic words.]
Oh sarva tathāgatottame sarvapati hūm hruśā hriṣṭo.  
Jambhānaki hūm hruśā hriṣṭo.  
Mohanākari hūm hruśā hriṣṭo.  
Lambhānaki hūm hruśā hriṣṭo.  
Bhanākari hūm hruśā hriṣṭo.

20 Sh}), 21 Dwa-mo-gin-par.  
22 C'hö.  
23 Grol-pa.  
24 Behiss.  
25 Sdo.  
26 Gdon.  
27 Sgrol.

28 Drag sild, restored by my MS. Dictionary to Ugrā. Ugrā Tārā is one of the Nepalese series of the ‘Fine Tārā’ (Hodgson's Essays, reprint 94). See my Buddhism of Tibet, p. 436 for several of these fierce forms of Tārā.
29 Gtum-ch'en-ma.
30 Rnam sgo-smo, literary ‘shape’ + dancing damsel.
31 Most of these epithets in this hymn of praise have been found by Dr. Hocule in a Sanskrit text of this Dhāraṇī in the Stein collection, though in a different order.
Para pisabahakyanakari &c.
Sarva dusyanana pradustana, &c.
Sareva yaksa raiva grahyah nam vividvat sanakari, &c.
Sareva para vidya che danakari, &c.
Chatura-sitamah graha sahasra nam vividvat, &c.
Astavi-sitamah nakatranas nam prasadvahanakari, &c.
Astavi nazm mahagrahah nasa Vividvat, &c.
Raksha raksha nam sareva satavishya.
O White umbrella-one who issued from the diadem of the Tathágata, the Blessed One!
The greater averter [of harm] the diadem-thunderbolt,
The great mother possessing a thousand hands,
The great mother with a thousand heads, with millions of eyes of unchanging fire,
The great vast thunderbolt by whom, in the cycles of the three worlds, we ourselves and all living things will become blessed.
The thunderbolt always gaping, possessed of eyes like glittering gold.
The white one with the gait of the thunderbolt [and] eyes like the Buddha.
The thunderbolt like the light of the sun, holding a thunderbolt like the moon.
Learned in all these various [mystic] forms and spells!
We beseech thee to protect us and all living beings!
Oū rishiyava prasála sarva tathá jato mihis sitátapre hán druha, Śrádhávanakari, &c. . .

dhā mahá svahā.
O great averter, the thunderbolt diadem, the White Umbrella-one who issued from the diadem of the blessed Tathágata!
O great owner of a thousand heads and a hundred thousand eyes! thy distinctive name of the ‘Fiery-one’ is never changed!
Thy great vast thunderbolt is the terror of the three retinues of kings, of ourselves and the [other] beings!
It is the terror of everyone, the terror of water, of poison, of destructive weapons, of the hosts of foreign armies outside the frontier, of the famine, enemies, descending tongues, of untimely death, earthquakes, meteors!
It is a terror more than the punishment of kings!
It is a terror to the gods and nágas, to lightning, to the Garuḍa of the skies, to ferocious beasts of prey, the harmful spirits of the gods, the devils of the nágas and ásuras, the wind dust-devils, gandharvas [. . . &c. several other classes of spirits are named].
Instead of the pricks of these demons let us obtain happiness.
Feed [us] with wholesome fresh food, with plenteous food, with red amalaka fruit, and meat and the fat of the land!
Feed us with harvests of lifeless animals! . . [here various foods are specified].
Arrange for us the spells for doing all these things!
Bestow on us by the thunderbolt-dagger [favourable conditions] for our grain!
Arrange we beseech thee for this on a vast scale!
Bestow on us by the thunderbolt-dagger the spells necessary for performing these works by the sky-going fairies [dákini], by Bráhma, Indra, Náraya, the Garuḍa and its associates, Mahákála, the troops of [divine] mothers, human skeletons [spectres?] and vanquishers of dreams, [also] for performing the deeds of a naked ascetic, [Jaina] the deeds of a Buddhist

12 Myrobalan emblica. 25 P’ur-bus gdab-po. 26 Dge-sbyor’g giar-bus.
monk,\textsuperscript{65} of an arhanta freed from sensuous desire, of the followers of the creator of living beings' [i.e. Brahmans], of the following Vajrapāni, of the male and female angels, of all the Saints, of all the gods!

Bestow by the thunderbolt-dagger the power of the Gandharvas (\textsuperscript{66})

Salutation to the White Umbrella-One who emerged from the diadem of the Tathāgata. The Blessed One who is the means of performing deeds like those of the Buddha and all the Bodhisattvases.

We beseech you to protect us and all living things . . . [Here follows an invocation to the goddess as 'the terror of . . . ']\textsuperscript{67} To destroy (evil').

\textit{O a siñána lárka prabhá spha-va-vika Sitātaptra! O nāvāo jvala, khada khada, hana-hana, dha dháha, dhara dhara, viḍhara viḍhara, teśinda teśinda, bhindabhinda, hūn hūn, phat phat, suhá! He he phat, Ho-ho phat, Amoghāya phat, Apratihāya phat. Varadāya\textsuperscript{68} varaprādāya, pratyakṣa-viśeṣa, amrīṭavīśeṣa, Varudāya-vanakāra, Sarva devbhayah Sarva nāgē-bhayah.}\textsuperscript{60}

[Here follows a series of names good and evil to each of which sarvas is prefixed and bhayah phat is prefixed, namely rakṣa, bhute, prete, pīṣate, kuśmānde, pītāne, kapātāne, skande, unmāde, c'ch'aye, apasmāre, oṣṭākā, dākāṇ, revati, yamāṇa, sakuni, māṭigane, skambu kāṃmaṇi, apalaśavake, kantāne, gandharve, asura, kinnara, garude, māhorage, yakṣe, durlaśghite, duṣprakṣite, jāre, bhaye, upadrave, upasańve, krityakarmaśa-khora, kiraśa veda, cichapreśaka-sarvadaccharāta, durbhugte, tirthike (naked Jains) sarmane, patake].

\textit{Sarva Vidyādhara phat! Jīvakara madhukara sarva arthaśāhaye bhaya vidyācarye bhaya phat!} Chaurbhijośhiqiniye [The four fear-causing sisters? phat!]

\textit{Sarva Kaumāri vajra, Kulanhdari, vidyācarye bhaya phat!}

\textit{Sarva Mahāpratyakṣa-viśeṣa bhaya phat, Vajra Saśkhaśa pratyakṣa-viśeṣa phat!}\textsuperscript{71} Mahākāla āśa namaśkrītāya, Prahmānaye, Vīraavaye, Maheśvaraye, Rāndaraye, Mahākāle, Cāmundaya,\textsuperscript{72} Kunārey, Vārāhī, Indraye, Agnaye, Yamāye, Varunaye, Manute, Saumaye, Iśanā, Kāladyāye, Kālārātre, Yamadānē, Bātre, Kāpālyē, phat!}

\textit{Adhimuki smaśāna evaśīyē!}

\textit{O as naḥ, bandha bandha, rakṣa, rakṣa, maṁ svāhā!}

We beseech you to protect us all, the sinful as well as the worthy . . . May we become the first born for a hundred years, may we see a hundred thousand lives free from trouble by yaksas\textsuperscript{73} and other demons may we obtain wholesome food in plenty . . .

If the White Umbrella-One [be invoked] then the Thunderbolt-Diadem, the great turnaway [of Evil], will save from death, wild beasts, accident . . .

O White Umbrella-one [the product of all the Tathāgartas and Buddhas destroy [all evil]! Cause all the kings of the Nāgas, Ananta and Saśkapaśa and the great Mahākāla to shed sea-

\textsuperscript{65} Siṅg.-reg.

\textsuperscript{66} Literally 'the eaters of human offerings.'

\textsuperscript{67} It appears to read bhyaḥ, which is not intelligible; possibly it is intended for a derivative of the Sanskrit bhaya 'fear.'

\textsuperscript{68} After each of these titles comes phat, which I omit for brevity.

\textsuperscript{69} This is bhaya and not bhayah and clearly shows the word = 'fear' and that the latter form, which occurs in several places, is presumably an error.

\textsuperscript{70} This implies that there are several forms of Mahāpratyakṣa-viśeṣa.

\textsuperscript{71} From the following titles I omit phat for brevity.

\textsuperscript{72} It is interesting to find that Cāmundaya is identified with Sītātaptra (i.e., Śīrā, for this avenging form of Durgā was, like Sītātaptra herself, sent forth as an emanation from the head).

\textsuperscript{73} This prominence given to yaksas suggests an early date.
sonable rain, to yield seasonable masses of cloud, seasonable loud-voiced thunder! Be near to us in all dangers. Help us to perform the duties of a follower of the Buddha during the ages!

May the contents of this book through the grace of Buddha and all the Bodhisattvas be of use to gods, men, titans, (asuras) and angels (gandharvas), to ourselves and fellow beings!

Praised be the word of the Blessed One, and may its meaning become fully manifest!

The Dhāraṇī here contained is named The Noble Invincible White Umbrella-One, which issued from the diadem of the Tathāgata to accomplish perfectly the great turning-away "[of Evil]."

[End of the Dhāraṇī]

As a postscript there are five pages containing a further list of Indian demons and diseases and other evils for which the spell is efficacious, including the following:—

'Tongues of fire, itching and ulcers, emaciation, cough, difficulty of breathing, insanity, poisonous drugs, curses, fire-water, fever, death by enemies, untimely (accidental) death, 'unworthy' beggary, scorpions, worms, leopards, lions, tigers, the black bear (dom), the red bear (dred), wild yak (possibly buffalo), water-devil.' It concludes with this prayer:—

"Against all these evil swarms we beseech you to protect us!"

Against all these may you be pleased to perform the binding spells (mantras).

O brilliantly shining one be pleased to bind evil! Be pleased to perform the vidyāmantra spells against all others [counter-spells]!

Be pleased to fix their bounds!:

Tadyathā oṁ anale khasame . . . vai, Some āṇti, dênte viṣade vire, Devi-Vajradhari,

Vandhani, Vajrapāṇi phaṭ . . .

May it protect us! Svāhā!

Oṁ Vajrapāṇi bandha Vajrapāṇenamama sarva āstam vinidyaśa phaṭ svāhā!

Keep it near your heart!

Whoever having written this overpowering queen of magical spells (vidyā-mantra) named 'The White Umbrella-One,' the great averter [of Evil], which issued from the diadem of the Tathāgata,' on birch bark, or cloth, or on tree bark, and fixes it on his body or on his neck or causes it to be read [then] throughout his whole life he shall not be harmed by poisons, by fire, by water, poisonous drugs, curses . . . &c. &c.

(To be continued.)

74 Śūś-ūṣa or tree + bark. It is restored by the Tibetan lexicons to the Skt. vukkāla, which in Wilson's Sanskt. Dict. (p. 766) is defined as 'the bark of a tree, garment made from bark.' In the Sanskrit-script in Stein and Hodgson collections, the word is kalke, which Dr. Hoernle translates as 'paste' (loc. cit. p. 478), though he suggests it may be in error for vukka, which the Tibetan version I find shows (and as Dr. Hoernle admits in the correct form). See text in following note.

75 Lu-s-dū. The Sanskrit versions have khyāgata, which Dr. Hoernle has translated as 'paper,' but the Tibetan text indicates clearly that this should be khyā, the body.

The Sanskrit text as given by Dr. Hoernle is:—

bhaṭa-ostra vā nāstra vā

Kalke vā khyāgata vā khaṭtyagata vā likhito dhāriyeyata.

The Tibetan text with its literal translation is:—

pro-ga sam, ras sam, śūś īna m brīṣe,

i.e., birch bark, or cloth, or tree vukka-bark upon having written

luk sam myul-du bogs sam b log-pa-byed da,

body or neck on fixed or caused to be read it
NOTES ON THE GRAMMAR OF THE OLD WESTERN RAJASTHANI
WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO APABHRAMÇA AND
TO GUJARATI AND MARWARI.

BY DR. L. P. TESSITORI, UDINE, ITALY.

(Continued from p. 26.)

CHAPTER II.

PHONETICS.

§1. Old Western Rajâstâni possesses the same phonetical system as Apabhrâmça, with the exception of initial ṇ and medial ṣ, which in the former are dentalized much as in Jaina Mâhârâgri. Possibly Old Western Rajâstâni had also the j-sound, which is common to both Gujarâti and Mârâwâl, though in the MSS. there is no particular character for it. Other sounds, which are not distinguished from one another in writing, are: a and e, o and o, anusvâra and anusvâsa, ṣh and ।. Anusvâra and anusvâsa are both represented by a dot over the akâra, and । by the same character ṣ, which is used to render the sibilant of Sanskrit. In tatasmas, of course, all Sanskrit sounds may occur. The consonant y was generally pronounced as j both in tatasmas, especially when initial, and in sâdhyâvas, when not euphonic. Occasionally y is written for j, as in: yamava (Câl. 16) for jamaṇa < jimaṇa, yovâ yogya (Indr. 43) for jovâ yogya, yugalid (Adi C.) for jugalid, etc.

(a) Single vowels.

§2. An a of the Apabhrâmça is generally preserved in Old Western Rajâstâni, except in the cases following:

1) In initial syllables or in medial syllables, mostly when preceded or followed by a syllable having a long vowel, a is frequently turned to i. In Prakrit this was the case only when a fell before the accent of the word (cf. Pischel, Op. cit., §§ 101-103). Old Western Rajâstâni examples are:

īdâ (P. 504, 506, 508) < iñḍâ (F. 783, 74) < Ap. aṅḍâ < Skt. aṅḍakam;
 kādvâ (Dd. 8) < kādvâ (ibid.) < Ap. kacchâvâ < Skt. kacchapâkâh;
 kimâva (Adi C.) < Ap. kâvâda- < Skt. kapâna-;
 kimâ- (Dd.;) < Ap.* kâhî- < Skt. katham-âpi;
 gâu (Câl. 9, 96, Kal. 44) < Ap. gâu < Skt. gâhâ;
 jîjî (Bh. 22, Dd. 35, 36) < Ap. jîjî < Skt.* janiṣṭh (= jîṣṭh);
 jîkâ, tîkâ, etc. < Ap. jahâ, tahâ < Pkt. jamhâ, lamhâ < Skt. yismât, tâsmât;
 tîjî (P., passim) < Ap. tajî (Pûgâla, i, 104; ii, 64) < Skt. tyajî;
 dohîla (Dd.) < sâlala- < Ap. sâllâha- < Skt. durâlabha-;
 sâvîja (P., passim) < sâvâya < Ap. sâvâa- < Skt. svâpâdâ-;
 siû (see § 70, (5)) < Ap. sahû < Skt. sâkhîm.

Other sporadic examples are: Iâkâ < Alâkâ (F. 659), itî < atî (Vi., Câl.), kaśîgâ < kaukâka (P. 125, 126, 128), kâhîrî < kumâtî (Vi. 38, 48, 50, etc.), khîtri < kâtriya (Kân. 23), khîna < kaṇâ (Adi C., Vi.), gîvâ < gâvâ (Indr. 64), pâtika < pâtaka (F. 783, 75), sâlâ < Arabic salâm (Kân. 20).16

In Modern Gujarâti it has become a again, ex.: kamâda, sâvâja, tajê, etc., but in Mârâwâl the tendency to substitute i for a has been preserved.

16 In examples like: dhîna < dhanâya (P. 65, 123, 167), Cûpâka < Cûpâkâya (Dd. 2), etc., i is to be explained as the result of eponthesis,
When falling before or after a labial consonant, a is often turned to u. For an analogy in the Prakrit see Pischel, § 104. Ex.: 

Ubbhayakumāra (Cāl. 96) < Abhayakumāra;
purūhavai (P. 680) < prīhuvāi < Ap. pāhuva < Skt. prabhūyaḥ;
puruha, puruha (P.) < Ap. pahara < Skt. prahara;
buhutari, bhuhutari (see § 80) < Pkt. bāhātari < Skt. devaspati;
maṇḍa (Up. 55) < Ap. maṣina < Skt. maṇḍena;
mahatāia (Ādī C.) < Ap. mahantaia < Skt. *mahantakāḥ;
mahuri (Vi. 20) < Ap. mahuri < Skt. mahūri;
soṣāpati < Ap. samappatī, samappatī < Skt. samaprayati.

Rarely a is changed to u under the influence of another u in the syllable immediately preceding or following. Ex.: Guruda < Garuda (P. 340 ff.); durdura < dardura (P. 539, 542), puṇḍitus < puṇḍhītus (P. 432).

(3) Rarely a is amplified to ai and this mostly when two or more syllables ending in a follow each other. Ex.: karāu < karatu (Ādī F 602), kaihāl < kahālī (F. 783, 24), gaḥagāh, < gaḥagāhī (F. 783, 27), gaihyagāh < gaḥagāhī (F. 722, 10), sahaisa cha ḫātālīsa > sahaisa chahatālīsa (F. 722, 41), naṃ < namā (Yog. ii, 26), naṃ < namā (= naṃa, see § 75) (Yog. iv, 36, 47, et.).

In Modern Gujarāti we have, ex. sahe, sevai < sahavā, and in Mārāwīr ai, ex. saikha imprisoned < saikhā, saikhañít < saikhit. The two latter examples are from the Nāsaketa-ṛ kathā for which see Rivista degli Studi Orientali, Vol. vi (1913), pp. 113-130.

(4) Initial a is very frequently dropped. Ex.: 

cho < chā (see § 114) < Ap. acchā < Skt. recchā (Pischel, §§ 57, 480);
tauai (see § 73, 4) < *paṇaiai < Ap. apapaiai < Skt. *ātmanakah;
tālāsa (Ādī C.) < Ap. utālāsa < Pkt. catālāsam < Skt. catārāṃyata;
naí < naalai (see § 106) < Ap. anamalai < Skt. anyāni;
bācai (F. 374) < Ap. avacaci < Skt. apatyakam;
rakaï (see § 71, 6) < arakha < urakha < Ap. *ara- < *avara- < Skt. apāra-;


(5) Medial a, when falling between two consonants of which one is h, is sometimes dropped. Ex.: ekaí (Up.) < ekaí, denkā (Ibid.) < denahānā, śinhīja (Ādī C.) < śimha-hīja, kinhāri (Da.) < *keha-vrāḥ (see §§ 98, 2).

(6) Euphonious a is inserted in the following cases: (a) between conjuncts, (b) before conjuncts in which the first element is s, (c) after terminal i. Ex.: garbhahā < garbha (F. 783, 72, 77), janama < janma (Rg. 34), parahāna < pahāna (F. 783, 36), mukti < mukti (Rg. 35, astrī < strī (F. 795, 1, 23); phōṭī-tvāti < ghotī-tvāti (Kānh. 46), jīga < jīgī (Rg. 60), vasamevita 226); < paśamevita (Rg. 1), maita < maiti (Rg. 7), mīla-nī < mīlī-nī (Rg. 63).

(7) a preceded by dh or followed by hā is lengthened. Ex.: vēcherahāra (Yog. ii, 9) < vēcherahāra < vēcherahāra < vēcherahāra < vēcherahāra < vēcherahāra (see § 135);

mādharai (F. 580, 722) < madharai (see § 83) < Ap. mahāraia (see Pischel, § 434).

§ 3. Medial a of the Apabhraṣṭa is occasionally shortened. In Prakrit this was the case only when a fell before or after the accent of the word (see Pischel, §§ 79 ff.), but in Old Western Rājasthān the shortening of a takes also place when a long vowel occurs in the syllable preceding or following. Examples are:
§ 4. Apabhraṣṭa i is liable to the following changes in Old Western Rajasthan:

(1) i is weakened to a. Ex.:

Andra (F 722, 13) < Skt. Indra,
asaś < isāś (see § 94, (1)) < Ap. asaśi < Skt. yadṛcātā (Pischel, § 81, 121),
āgāli (see § 101, (3)),
< eāgāli (see § 145) < Ap. agiḷle < Skt. agrile,
etav, ketaś (see § 93, (1)) < Ap. elītu, ketti < Skt.*
ayātyaḥ, kṣayātyaḥ (Pischel, § 123),
karavāṭ < karivatā (see § 134) < Ap. karevāḍ < Skt.* karevāyaḥ (Pischel, §§ 254, 570),
kukāṣi (Cri.) < Pkt. kuhīṣṭi (karpārah, Deqṭ, ii, 62),
ja < ji (see § 104) < Ap. ji < Pkt. jē, jēva < Skt. eva,
traṇi (Rs., F 602) < triṇi < Ap. tīṇi < Skt. triṇi,
puruṇa (Dd.) < Ap. *puruṇa, *ṣe< Skt. puruṇayati,
pharaṇi (Cri.) < Pkt. pharseṇ (Hc. ix, 182) < Skt. sprāṇi,
maṭra (see § 71, (5)) < Ap. *nimattāṭ, *nimitaṭ < Skt.* nimitakena,
Rukamani (F 783, passim) < Skt. Rukminī.

(2) i is amplified to e. Ex.:

gau (Cal. 10) < gui (see § 2, (1)) < Ap. gaui < Skt. gatī,<
prati (Dd. 1) < Skt. prati,
baitalisa (F 602, Ādi C.) < bitalisa (see § 80).

The case here is analogous with § 2, (3). Modern Gujarati has e, as in: bālēṣa, and Mārāwīlī aī as in: pāidī < pīṭ, vaśī < visā (Nīsaketa-rī kathā).

(3) i is amplified to ii. Ex.:

rahiita (Dac. viii) < Skt. rahita, sahiita (ibid.) < Skt. sahiita.

The two examples above are the only I have met with. An instance of an analogous case, in which a is amplified to aī, is: račiitä < Skt. račitam (F 588).

(4) i is lengthened to i. Ex.:

āraṇi (Dac. iii, 3) < Pkt. āraṇa < Skt. ādarca, kuhī (Bh., Yog., Saṣṭ.) < Ap. *kuhi-i, *-vī < Skt. kasmīn-api,
aḥī (see § 98 (2)) < Ap. ṛahī < Skt. *ayakāśmin or *ayakāmin (cf. Pischel § 429),
kiḥā (Ādi. 13, 47) < kiḥā (see § 98, (1)) < Ap. kaḥā < Pkt. kṁahā < Skt. kasmīt, nathī (see § 115) < Pkt. vathī < Skt. nāṭī.

In the last three examples the lengthening of i is to be explained as having been brought about by a metathesis of quantity (see § 43).

(5) i is changed to yo. The cases, in which this change may take place, are: a) when a medial i is preceded by a, as in:

payśātra (F. 246) < pāśātra, abstract noun from O.W. R., Ap. paśai < Skt. praviśai,
vaśāra (F. 503) < Ap. vaśāra < Skt. vaśāra,

ii Another explanation of bimāṇaṇa, which had previously occurred to me, is Ap. *bimāṇaṇa (cf. Pischel, § 251) Skt. dveṇaṇaka.
vayardhi (F 618, 126) < Ap. vairdhi < Skt. vairdjin.
and b) when a terminal i is preceded by a long vowel. This is especially common in poetry, when the terminal i falls at the end of a word. Ex.:
doya (P. 57) < Ap. *do-i < Pkt. do-vi < Skt. devapi,
kahinlya (P. 123) < kahivati (see § 140).

Rarely ya is written for i when the latter falls after a consonant and before a vowel and still more rarely when it falls between two consonants. Examples of the latter case are chiefly confined to the MS. F 722, where they are very common and it is thereby clear that they are to be looked upon as a mere writing peculiarity of the MS. Examples of both cases are:
dyai (Adi C) < dhi < Ap. dei < Skt. *dayati (=adinai)
lyai (ibid.) < lhi < Ap. lei < Skt. *layati (=latai)
vahyai (Vi. 73, P. 522, 627) < vahyai (P. 323) < Ap. vahyai < Skt. *vahyam,
yama, kyama, tama (F 722) < ima, kima, tima (see § 98, (3)),
yarai (F 722, 63) < irai < Ap. irai < Skt. irapakah
yairai (F 722, 64) < Skt. irai,
swai (F 722, 60) < swai, imperative 2nd sing. (see § 119).

§ 5. Apabhramshya i is retained except in the cases following:
(1) u is frequently weakened to o, mostly when another u (u, aù) occurs in the syllable following or a long vowel in the syllable preceding. The former case is also common in Prakrit (see Pischel, § 123). Ex.:
arañ (P. 479) < urañai (Adi C) < Ap. *awarañ < Skt. apārāñ,
aiñ (P. 675, 685) < Skt. alåka,
aiñe (P., Ratn. 234) < Ap. asñor < Skt. utakā,
alogu (P. 195) < Pkt. oluggo (Deol), i, 164 = seraka,
kariñ (see § 121) < Ap. kariñ (He., iv, 396, 4) < Skt. *kariñam (Pischel, §§ 63, 351),
jetalai, jetalaii, etc. (see § 93, (2)) < Ap. jetulai, jetulai (cf. He., iv, 435),
tai (see § 86) < Ap. tuñ < Skt. *tvakam (Pischel, § 421),
tñarai (see § 89) < Ap. tuñorai (see § 48) < *tuñ-kñruñ (Pischel, § 334),
raññorajñai, verbal infinitive (P. 34, 197) < Ap. rauñjññai, onomatopoetic substantive
(He., iv, 368),
saññaññai (P. 594) < Ap. saññaññai < Skt. saññaññakam,
haññai (see § 113) < haññai (Mu.) < haññai < Ap. hontai < Skt. *bhavanakai,
haññ (see § 113) < haññ < Ap. houn < Skt. bhavatu.
(2) u is amplified to où. Ex.:
huññ (Kv., 71) > huññ < Ap. hùññ < Skt. bhùññ.
(3) initial u is dropped. Ex.:
baññai (Dd. 2) < Ap. uññai < Skt. upaviññai.
In the following example, u previously to being dropped was weakened to a:
raññai (see § 71, (9)) < uraññai (Mu.) < uraññai < Ap. * awññai < Skt. apññai.
§ 6. Old Western Râjâsthântuñù is occasionally changed to o. Ex.:
toññai (Pb. 78) < tññai (P., Kal., Bh.) (see § 86),
dohila (Dd. 4, F 576) < dññññha < Ap. dññññha < Skt. dññññha.

After the analogy of the latter is formed soññila (F 576) < Ap. sulññha < Skt. sulññha.

The equivalence of u with o is incidentally evidenced by Hemacandra, sùtra i, 173 of his Pra-krit grammar, where it is stated that Sanskrit upa-may contract either to u or to o in Prakrit. The same interchange of u and o occurs in Jaipur (see L.S.I., Vol. ix, Part ii, p. 33). Cf. the analogous case of i = e, § 7, (2).
§7. Old Western Rajasthāni has both a long and a short e, as Apabhraṣṭa and Gujarāti and Marwāri. As in writing no distinction is made between ē and é, I shall transliterate both by e, save in a few particular cases, where it is important to know whether e is long or short. Generally e is long in tattvas and short in tadbhavas, but there are many exceptions to this rule as shown by Old Western Rajasthāni poetry as well as by the evidence of the modern dialects. Cf. the list of words containing a short e given by Sir George Grierson, p. 344 of L.S.I., Vol. ix, Part ii. In Old Western Rajasthāni poetry e in one and the same word may be accounted short or long only to suit the exigencies of prosody. Thus in P. we find: ājha (100), tēha (25, 100), jē (21), tē (69), jējē (270) and ājha (25), tēha (23, 38, 59), jē (100), tē (100) ēţē (62).

Apabhraṣṭa e undergoes the following changes in Old Western Rajasthāni:

(1) e is changed to ī. This process had already begun in the Apabhraṣṭa stage, but was chiefly restricted to the case of terminal e (Cf. Pischel, § 85), Ex.: ambi (see § 84) < Ap. ambe < Skt. some (—vayam), ina, kima, jima, tīna (see § 98, 3) — Ap. ēṭa, keṭa, jeṭa, teṭa, (Pischel, § 261), karjīj (Bh. 44) < Ap. *karejṭha (< Skt. karīṭkam), ēī (Bh. 13) < Ap. ēī < Skt. ēī < Skt. ēī, lī (Ādi. 11) < Ap. ēi < Skt. ēījī (< ēījī), bi (see § 80) < Ap. be < Skt. ēvē, hotē (Kal. 42) < Ap. *hotījī (see § 120).

In Gujarāti ī is further weakened to a, ex.: karajō, karawē, or brought back to e, ex.: ēma, kēma, amhe, bē. It is therefore probable that in some of the cases, in which Old Western Rajasthāni has ē for Apabhraṣṭa and Gujarāti ī, the former vowel stands simply to indicate ē. In Old Western Rajasthāni poetry, original ē is often preserved, mostly when a long mūra is required. Thus: karē (P. 250, 255) for karē (see § 119) < Ap. kārē (Pischel, § 461), karōvā (P. 96) for karīvā (see § 134), bē for bi, ēma for ima, etc.

(2) e is changed to ī. This was already the case in Apabhraṣṭa, as is evidenced by the two examples: ēīva < Skt. vēṇi and ēha < Skt. lekha, cited by Hemaendra, sūtra iv, 329 of his Prakrit grammar. In Old Western Rajasthāni ī appears to be often written for ē, in the same way as ī is written for ē.—Thus: valē (Ādi C.) for valē-ē (U.P.) for ē, an emphatic particle (see § 104). Similarly in poetry we find ima, kima, for ēma, kēma < ima, kima, jīha, ēha for jēha, tēha, etc. In the following prose-passage a form with ī is used by the side of a form with ē, which clearly means that the two vowels are easily interchangeable: jīvala prakārā koi gṛhashṭāpī na pēmaī, tēpha prakārāī . . . . (Daś, i, 4). “In which way no householders suffer, in that way . . . .” Cf. the common interchange of ī and ē in Northern colloquial Gujarāti (L. S. I., Vol. ix, Part ii, p. 329).

(3) Initial ē is dropped. Ex.: hava (VI, 18, P. 590) < ehava (see § 94, 3).

Kīva (ūr. kīva) < kēva (see § 94, 4).

§8. The case of ō is very similar to that of e. Though Modern Gujarāti and Marwāri do not possess a short ō, yet Old Western Rajasthāni possessed it much in the same way as Apabhraṣṭa. Take the following examples from P.: kō (171), jō (138), jōjō (120), jōjō (131), tumhe (465). Examples of Apabhraṣṭa ō having become ū in Old Western Rajasthāni are:

hū (see § 113) < Ap. hō < Skt. bhavatī, kūtā (see ibid.) < Ap. kontaī < Skt. * bhavantakah.
§9. Apabhraṃga \textit{aa} is never allowed to remain in hiatus in Old Western Rājasthānī, but is either contracted to \textit{a}, as in the oblique of nominal bases in \textit{-aa} (see § 82), or euphonically inserted between the two \textit{a}, as in: \textit{raṅga} < Ap. \textit{raṇa} < Skt. \textit{rāna}, \textit{vaṅga} < Ap. \textit{vaṇa} < Skt. \textit{vacana}.

The only case, in which \textit{aa} is suffered in Old Western Rājasthānī, is formed by the -\textit{a} termination of the second person present indicative, where \textit{aa}, however, is not original, but derived from Old Western Rājasthānī \textit{āi} (see § 117).

Apabhraṃga \textit{ad} and \textit{ād} are as a rule contracted, ex.:
\begin{itemize}
  \item \textit{padāi} (see § 75) < *\textit{pādāi} < Ap. \textit{pādā} < Skt. * \textit{prakārake},
  \item \textit{rā} (Cāl. 110, 124) < Ap. \textit{rā} < Skt. \textit{rā}.
\end{itemize}

but in the case of \textit{ād} contraction may be as well avoided, euphonious \textit{y} or \textit{v} (see §§ 28, 34) being inserted between the two vowels. Ex.: \textit{rīya, pīya, jivāi}, etc.

§10. Old Western Rājasthānī \textit{ā} remains as a rule in hiatus, both when original and when resultant from Apabhraṃga \textit{āhī}. Ex.:
\begin{itemize}
  \item \textit{paśa} (Yog. iii, 123) < Ap. \textit{paśa} < Skt. \textit{pravācita},
  \item \textit{kana} (see § 74, 1) < Ap. \textit{kauṣā} < Skt. * \textit{karaṃmin (kara)}.
\end{itemize}

Notice, however, the following exceptions:
\begin{enumerate}
  \item \textit{ā} is simplified to \textit{i}. Ex.:
  \begin{itemize}
    \item \textit{aan} (Dāl. 5) < \textit{anā} (see § 106) < Ap. \textit{anā} < Skt. \textit{anyini},
    \item \textit{iṣ} (Cṛā.) < \textit{iśa} (see § 89) < Ap. * \textit{enāhi} < Skt. * \textit{enaśmin},
    \item \textit{kari} (Pr. 3) < \textit{kara} < \textit{chāi} (see § 118) < Ap. * \textit{kara} < Skt. * \textit{karaḥ vchali},
    \item \textit{jīṣāi, tīsa}, etc. (see § 94, 1) < Ap. \textit{jāsāi, tāsāi} < Skt. \textit{yuddṛakāh, tiḍḍṛkāh}.
  \end{itemize}
\end{enumerate}
(Pischel, §§ 81, 121),
\begin{itemize}
  \item \textit{hośi} (Cāl. 61) < Ap. \textit{hośi} (He., iv, 388, 418, 4) < Skt. * \textit{bhavyati} (= \textit{bhavishyati}).
\end{itemize}

(2) \textit{ā} is assimilated to \textit{i}. Ex.:
\begin{itemize}
  \item \textit{ekī} (P. 496) < \textit{ekā},
  \item \textit{kāṇī} (Kal. 4) < \textit{kāṇī} (see § 91) < Ap. \textit{kana},
  \item \textit{kāsī} (Cṛā.) < \textit{kāsāi} (see § 121),
  \item \textit{ti} (Kān. 101, 102) < \textit{ti} (see § 86) < Ap. \textit{taś} < Skt. \textit{teyā},
  \item \textit{pārī} (Cṛā., Kal. 32) < \textit{pārī} (see § 75) < Ap. \textit{pārā} < Skt. * \textit{prakārake},
  \item \textit{bhānti} (Vi. 8) < \textit{bhanā} < Ap. \textit{bhānta} < Skt. * \textit{bhāntakena} (cf. Pischel, § 501),
  \item \textit{māḥi} (P. 410) < \textit{māḥi} (see § 74, 7) < Ap. \textit{majjhāhi} < Skt. * \textit{madhaśmin} (= \textit{madhya}),
  \item \textit{hūsi} (P. 663) < \textit{hūsi} (see § 121) < Ap. \textit{hosi} < Skt. * \textit{bhavyati}.
\end{itemize}

(3) \textit{ā} is contracted to \texti{}t. This change seems to have taken place through the intermediate step \textit{i} described in the foregoing paragraph. (Cf. § 16). Ex.:
\begin{itemize}
  \item \textit{a} (Adi C.) < *\textit{ā}, *\textit{i} < \textit{ā} < Skt. \textit{adī, 'pī},
  \item \textit{trījāi} (see § 82) < *\textit{trījāi} < \textit{trajā} or \textit{trajā} < Ap. \textit{trajā} < Skt. \textit{tritvakāh},
  \item \textit{lagō} (see § 72, 9) < *\textit{lāgā} < \textit{lagāi} < Ap. \textit{lagāti} < Skt. * \textit{lagnasāmin} (= \textit{lagne}),
  \item \textit{nīt} (see § 72, 11) < *\textit{nīti} < \textit{ntai} < Ap. \textit{nyaḥhi} < Skt. * \textit{bhavantaśmin}.
\end{itemize}
(Cf. the case of \textit{Marātī}, in Hoernle's \textit{Comparative Grammar}, § 79).

(4) \textit{ā} is contracted to \textit{e}. This change is already met with in Prakrit and Apabhraṃga (cf. Pischel, § 166), and in Old Western Rājasthānī it occurs only in the termination of the
instrumental plural (see § 60) and of the precative singular (see § 120), where it is no doubt very old. Ex.:

cora (Kal. 9) < Ap. coraha < Skt. *corahis (ca. corahis),
jā'usc (Bh. 21, P. 564) < Ap. *jā'uscāhā.

§ 11. Old Western Rajasthani aū remains in hiatus, except in the cases following:

(1) aū is simplified to u. Ex.:
ku(a) (Adi, Jrdr, Yogy., etc.) < kauwa (see § 91) < Ap. kava-yā-(Pischel, § 428),
cuthu (Yog. iv, 137, Ch. 25) < caùthau (see § 82) < Ap. caùthau < Skt. caturthakah,
sūpā (F 783, 33) < saùpā < Ap. saùppa < Skt. samarpayati.

(2) aū is changed to u. Ex.:
bolu (Dāq, i, x) < bolu (see § 117).

(3) aū is assimilated to uu. Ex.:
kaùya (Up. 215) < kaùya (see § 91) < Ap. kava-yā-,
pauhā (F. 432) < paùhī, in which latter example a has possibly passed into u under the influence of p. See § 2, (2).

(4) aū is contracted to i. Whether the reason of the contraction lies in the aū being first assimilated to uu (as in the analogous case of aū > i) or in the u being accented, I am not able to say. Possibly, in some cases prevailed the former reason and in some other cases prevailed the latter. Thus in the example:

mā (Vi. 77) (see § 83) < Ap. mahu < Skt. māhyām (Pischel, § 418),
the passing of aū to i might be assumed to have been effected through uu, and all the more so as there is a labial, whereas in the example:

hā (see § 83) < Ap. haù < Skt. ahu-kām (Pischel, § 417),
the contraction of aū to i seems to have been brought about by the u being accented.

Other examples are:

那一 (Dāq, i, 2) < ṇaù (see § 92),
kā (Adi. 3) < kau (see § 91) < Ap. kava-yā- (Pischel, § 428),
bulu (F 718, i, 3) < bolu (see § 117),
sā < saù (see § 70, (5) < Ap. sahu < Skt. dākām.

(5) aū is contracted to o. The intermediate step may be supposed to have been aou, the weakening of aou to ao being evidenced by the MS. Kāl., where the -aou termination of the second person present indicative is often substituted by -aū. Ex.:

kanāù (Adi C.) (see § 61) < *kanahā < Ap. kaùnāhā,
karā (Adi C., Shant) < karau (see § 117) < Ap. karahu < Skt. *karanaa (karanaa),
This contraction is amongst the peculiarities of Mārā and Eastern Rajasthānih and it
is utterly foreign to Gujāristā proper.

(6) aū is contracted to o. The case here is exactly identical with that of aū > e, see § 10.

§ 12. aū is contracted to o. Ex.:
anou (Yog. ii, 88) < Ap. anahū < Skt. *anyukīr̥aḥ,
bēù (Dāq., X) < *beù < Ap. *bhūṣaḥ, plural instrumental from bhūṣa- (see § 60).

§ 13. aū is contracted to o. Ex.:
polū (Ratn. 5, 111) < Ap. polū < Skt. pratoli.

In the example above, however, o might likewise be explained as a contraction from aū < ao, and all the more so as P. 100 we have paūtā for polū.
§14. *i is contracted to ā. Ex.:  

For other examples of plural neuters see §58, (3). An exception is formed by Apabhraṣṭa kādi (< Skt. kāmi), in which i does not combine with ā, but remains distinct, it being generally lengthened to i. See kādi and kādi, §91.

§15. *a is contracted to ā. Ex.:  
  ami (†§ 56, P 715, ii, 12) < Ap. amīa < Skt. omṛta-,
  ekendri (F 602, 1) < Skt. ekendriya-,
  jāmā (P. 354) < Ap. jāmāī< Skt. jāmāśka-,
  divi (Yog. ii, 87) < Ap. *divia < Skt. dipikā,
  āsā (P. 129) < Ap. *āsā < Skt. divasa-,
  dīh (P. 416) < Ap. dihā < Skt. divasa-,
  pāṭāla (ādī. 87) < Pkt. *pāṭālo (cf. pāṭaṇi, Deo, vi, 64),
  pī (Daq. ix) < Ap. pīa < Skt. pibita,
  hādā (P. 8) < hāda < Skt. *hādayakam.

§16. *i is contracted to ā. Some examples of this change have been already given §10, (3) above. Others may be derived from the -i termination of the conjunctive participle, which, as I shall show further on, is but a contraction of the locative ending -i of the past participle in -ī (see §131). Ex.:  
  mehāli (Bh. 79) < *mehāli < *meli < Ap. melii, *a (Skt. mukte).

§17. *a is contracted to ā. Ex.:  
  kāi (P 715, i, 10) < kāi < kāhiya < kāhīja (see §136) < Ap. kāhijja < Skt. kathya,
  Modern Gujarāti bi < Ap. bia- < Skt. biṣa-,

In the following example ia is changed to ā:  
  kariāi (Ādī C., passim) < kariā < kariya < karijai (see §136) < Ap. karījai < Skt. kriyate.

§18. *u is contracted to ā. Ex.:  
  cuu (Bh. 48) < Ap. cuu < Skt. cuutakāḥ,
  jōjāu (Dd. X) < Ap. jaujau (Hc., iv, 422, (14)) < Skt. *yuganyagakaś,
  mōu (Yog. ii, 97, Ādī. 33) < Ap. mūa < Skt. mṛtakah.

§19. *a is contracted to ā. Ex.:  
  jā (neuter) (P. 254) < Ap. jā < Skt. dyuṭa-,
  jā (feminine) (P. 424 ff.) < Ap. jā, jād < Skt. yukā,
  rūdāi (Ādī. 85) < Ap. rūdāi < Skt. *rūpaṭakāḥ,
  hāu (see §113) < Ap. hāa < Skt. bhātakāḥ.

Occasionally, however, the two vowels are allowed to remain distinct, as in: ḍāyā (P 715, i, 11) and ḍau (Dd.) For the latter example, the form hūa is also met with (Dd., P 322), whereby an analogy is afforded to the case of ia > ā mentioned §17.

(c) Anuvāra and Anunāsika.

§20. In Old Western Rājasthān MSS. no distinction is made between anunāsika and anuvāra, the bindu being employed for both cases alike. So we cannot decide whether such forms as ō, kāvina, etc. should be read jau, kaunam, namely with anuvāra as in Apabhraṣṭa, or jā, kāvinā, namely with anunāsika. But it is highly probable that the bindu represents anunāsika throughout, except of course in taisamas, where it stands for anuvāra or the
various class nasals. The passing of anuvāra into anundāsika had already begun in the Prākrit and Apabhraṃga stage. Prākrit Grammarians state that in Prākrit and Apabhraṃga poetry the terminations "ः", "ṛḥ", "ṣ", etc., can be accounted both long and short i.e., the terminal nasal may be optionally treated as anuvāra or as anundāsika (see Pischel, § 180). Hemacandra, sūtra iv, 411 of his Prākrit grammar, states that in Apabhraṃga the terminations "ः", "ṛḥ", "ṣḥ", "ṇ" are 'commonly' (prāhyas) pronounced as short and from the examples quoted in his grammar we can see that the same is the case with the terminations "ः", "ṛḥ" and "ṣḥ". It would therefore seem that terminal anuvāra had already passed into anundāsika in the Apabhraṃga and if we judge from the evidence of the verses quoted by Hemacandra, where nearly all terminal nasals are anundāsika and only a few ones anuvāra, we feel inclined to believe that the former represent the rule and the latter the exception, i.e., that in Apabhraṃga terminal anuvāra had actually become anundāsika in the ordinary language and had survived only in poetry, where it continued to be employed whenever a long syllable was required.

In passing from Apabhraṃga to Old Western Rājasthāni anuvāra and anundāsika are treated as follows:


(2) Medial anuvāra preceded by two vowels, which contract into a long vowel different from ā, may be dropped. Ex.: jójaya (Dd. 1) < Ap. jumjya < Skt. *yugamyugaka.


In the following examples, medial anundāsika has been transposed:


Occasionally, however, it is transposed, as in:

kāli (see § 91) < Ap. kāi < Skt. kānī, and if it is dropped, when falling on two vowels, which contract into ē, as in:


(5) In the following example anundāsika is changed to m:


(6) Euphonic anundāsika is commonly added to medial ā, chiefly when the latter is followed by the nasals ṣ, n, m or by h. Ex.:

purṇā (P. 3), evāna (P. 48), nāma (P. 521), vṛṛhmasa (P. 26), māhi (P. 573).

(to be continued)
ETHNIC ORIGIN OF TAMRALIPTI.

Since the time of Lassen it has been accepted by Indianists that 'Tamralipti' is a Sanskrit word, that it is connected with Śānta (ŚRAT). As a matter of fact the word has nothing to do with Śānta or any other Sanskrit word.

A form nearer to the original I find in the Dōda-brāmagāra-cheśā, viz., Dāmaliptika. In Dāmaliptika the principal member Dāmal is only a little removed from the original (Tamil) Dāmalī. The variations of Dāmalika are the Skr. Dāmalika, and the Pali Dāmalika or Dāmalīka. Tirūnthā drawing as usual on some old authority gives Dāmalī." The sense member -ipta or -ēpti is clearly non-Sanskrit. Its original form is best preserved in the Pāli -itti of its Tāmal-itti. In Tamil itti or -itti is a neuter-feminine ending. Hindu writers applied the rules of Prakrit philology and restored -iti into -ēpti!

The classical form of Drāmāśa in Tamil is Tirāmīśa, the Skr. Tāmal- (e.g., Tamral-ipti of the Mahā-Bhārata) and Tāmalī (e.g. Tāmalīpti of the Brihad-Savāhita) are derived from the classical Tirāmīśa.

The original forms of Tamralipti and Dāmaliptika would thus have been: *Tirāmīśati and *Drāmāśati. Both forms seem to have been current, the former being classical and the latter, popular. The expression rendered into Skr. would be *Drāmāśik or *Draśāśik.

Both members of the expression, the base Dāmal or Tāmal and the ending -itti or -ēpti, are Dravidian. This is sufficient to establish that Tamalitī was originally a Dravidian town, founded by the Dravidians before the Gaṅgetic delta and Orissa were colonised by the Aryans.

K. P. JAYASWAL.

BOOK NOTICE.

MUDBRĀKHAṢA by VISAṢHADATTA edited by ALFRED HILLEBRANDT. BRESSLAU. 1912. Indische Forschungen in Zwanglosen Heften herausgegeben etc., von ALFRED HILLEBRANDT, H.

The Mudbrākhaṣa is one of the best Indias plays, and it occupies a somewhat peculiar position within the dramatic literature of India. It is a Nāśika and conforms to the rules laid down by the authors on rhetoric. The main interest, however, centres about the dramatical conflict in the minds of the acting persons and in the intrigues spun by the leading actors. The principal plot is, as prescribed by Bharata and his successors, prakhyāka. According to the Daṣarāṇāvalok (I, 68) it has been taken from the Brihatkathā. In support of this statement Dhanika quotes a stanza from the Brihatkathā, which actually occurs in Kāshemendra's Brihatkathāmañjari I, ii, 216. There is however some difficulty about this statement, which is not found in all manuscripts, Kāshemendra's time was the 11th century, and the author of the Daṣarāṇāvalok.

1 Lassen, Alt. I, 146.
3 Caldwell, p. 125. cf. the Canarese neuter-feminine -itti (p. 125), and the Telugu -i, an infective increment of neuter singular nouns (p. 160.)
5 Its present-day survival Tāmalukka would prove that the pronunciation with T was more popular amongst the Aryans.

Calcutta.

1 See Hall, Visashadatta, Introduction, p. 55.
3 See my paper in the Norske journal Medal og Minne, 1913, pp. 1 ff.
events which form the principal contents of the Mudrārākhyasa. Chāṇakya’s intrigues with a view of bringing Rākshasa, the minister of the last Nanda king, over to the side of Chandragupta, are not dealt with in these popular sources, and even the name of Rākshasa seems to be a free invention by the author.

We have accordingly to acknowledge that Visākhādatta has freely invented the principal plot. He was possessed of great dramatic skill and the intrigue is extremely cleverly thought out. In itself the Mudrārākhyasa comes nearer to the idea of a tragedy than any other Indian play. Our sympathy, the whole time, with Rākshasa in his fight against Chāṇakya’s intrigues, and our interest in the development of the action comes when the former is defeated. According to our ideas, the natural end to the whole would have been that Rākshasa should become a victim of the misunderstandings created by Chāṇakya, or that he should have rushed against the enemy or committed suicide, or something of the sort. Then we should have had a real tragedy in Indian literature, and, I may add, a tragedy according to modern European notions. The struggle of the central figure, the honest and faithful Rākshasa, is not broken in vain attempts to break the blind forces of fate, as in the Greek tragedy, but the fight is fought between the devoted servant of a fallen dynasty, who trusts his friends and is beloved by them, against the traditional master of political intrigue, Rākshasa is of course also intriguing. He could not have been an eminent minister of state according to Indian ideas without that. But he does not live and breathe in intrigue as his adversary. On the contrary, we have the impression of an honest and straightforward man, who only occasionally takes to intriguing in order to satisfy the requirements of the Nītiśāstra. The conflict in the Mudrārākhyasa is therefore the same as in the tales of the Pānchatantra and similar collections which aim at teaching the advantages of shrewdness and versatility in all walks of life, even against honesty. It is therefore quite in keeping with the general tendency of the play that Chāṇakya achieves his aim in every respect.

The Mudrārākhyasa is accordingly a nīti drama, evidently intended to show the advantages of political training according to the Nītiśāstra. Though in many respects impresses the European critic as different from other Indian plays, and almost as a modern European play in its development of the plot, it is therefore entirely Indian in its general notions. This is of interest. Those scholars who maintain that the Indian drama is borrowed from the Greeks have paid considerable attentions to such points in which the Miśchhākāśīki, which has often been supposed to be the oldest Indian drama, agrees with Greek plays, The Mudrārākhyasa, where the agreement in general ideas with, later European plays is, to my mind, much greater, warns us to be very careful in such comparisons. It is not seldom happens that we are more struck by the similarity between India and Europe than by the difference, and in such cases we are apt to suppose that one of the two has been influenced by the other. But often we find that there are rather two different lines of development which have led to similar results, and I think we are usually on the safe side if we carefully examine whether such details which we would like to explain as due to foreign influence, cannot be the result of an independent development. In the case of the Mudrārākhyasa there cannot, I think, be any doubt! The whole atmosphere is entirely Indian and not European, though we are constantly reminded of European ideas. The whole question about the possible connexion between the Indian and the Greek play cannot be decided at the hand of such considerations. The oldest Indian plays we know, the Aśvaghosha fragments published by Professor Lüders, do not remind us of the Greek stage at all. To judge from the Pāṇḍya, the Miśchhākāśīki is considerably later. The dropping of single stops between vowels is already taught by Bhaṭṭa. We do not however know how old Bhaṭṭa is, and we do not know how far we can rely on the printed text of his treatise on Pāṇḍya phonology. It seems however impossible to assume that the dropping of such consonants became the rule before the third or perhaps the fourth century. In Pali and in Sanskrit they are retained, and this is, I think, a sign of the priority of these dialects as compared with the ordinary Pāṇḍya.

Bhāṣa, on the other hand, uses a Pāṇḍya which has already reached the secondary stage, and he is older than the Miśchhākāśīki, and than Kālidāsa. It is impossible as yet to arrive at certain chronological results. It seems to me, from the point of view of the Pāṇḍya, that we can only fix the chronological order between these works. The Bṛhadāyā of Guṇādēśa is probably at least one century older than Bhāṣa, and so are the plays of Aśvaghosha. If Professor Lüders and Dr. Marshall are right that Kanishka and Aśvaghosha belong to the second century A.D., it is hardly possible to

---

1 See Ganapati Sāstrī, Sāmarājasaṃvidatta, pp. xxviii, fl.
2 Epigraphische Beiträge, Berliner Sitzungsberichte, 1912, p. 839.
date Bhāsa before the third or fourth, and consequently the Mīrakhasañikā cannot well be older than the fourth. At all events, the Mīrakhasañikā cannot any more be considered as the oldest Indian play, and the arguments in favour of the Greek hypothesis which have been drawn from its supposed similarity with the Greek comedy can no more be maintained.

This hypothetical dating would of course have to be changed if Dr. Fleet were right in assuming that Kanishka belongs to the first century B.C. I have myself long held this view, but I have found it necessary to give it up after Professor Lüders' and Dr. Marshall's discoveries. I also think that it is necessary to assume that Kanishka is later than the Kadhphises kings in order to explain a statement in the Chinese sources, which seems to have been hitherto overlooked. We hear that after the conquest of India by Kadhphises II, the Yrm-chi became exceedingly rich and flourishing and were everywhere designated as "Kings of Kusê-shuang." Now this title "Kung of Kusê-shuang" is nothing else than the well known Showno shao Koshan, which title begins to be used by Kanishka. When the Chinese inform us that this designation only came in use after Kadhphises, and when Kanishka is the first to use it, the only possible inference is that Kanishka is later than Kadhphises.

I therefore think it probable that Bhāsa is not earlier than the third century. I should even be inclined to think that the fourth century is a still more likely date. The wish in the bharata-vadya of the Bālācharita, the Dītavāṣya and the Sādpā-vāsavadatta that the King may become the sole ruler from sea to sea between the Himalaya and the Vindhyā, leads us to think of a state of affairs in India which was not brought about before Śrīdurgaputra's conquests. If this theory proves to be right it constitutes a land-mark in the history of the Indian drama. Now the late Professor Speyer in his excellent Studies about the Kathāsāratasāgarā has tried to show that also the Mudrārakshasa belongs to the fourth century A.D. The stanza Mudrārakshasa II, 13 also occurs in the Tantrārākhyāyikā I, 46. Now, the Tantrārākhyāyikā was used by the author or compiler whose work was the source of the Kathāsāratasāgarā and the Bhāratkathāmānjari, and the stanza in question must have formed part of that work. Professor Speyer infers that it also formed part of the Bhāratkathā of Guṇḍāhya. I do not think that this conclusion can be adopted. For I agree with M. Lacôte that the source of the two Kashmir recensions of the Bhāratkathā was not the old work of Guṇḍāhya, but a later work, compiled in Kashmir, probably about the seventh century A.D. The fact that the stanza occurred in the Kashmir Bhāratkathā which was made use of by Somadeva and Kshemendra does not according carry us back to a very ancient time. If it belongs to the original Tantrārākhyāyikā, it is of course much older. But then it will hardly be possible to assume, as does Professor Speyer, that its author was Viśākhadatta. It must then have been borrowed by him from the Tantrārākhyāyikā, or from the floating stock of nṛti verses which have been current in India from the most ancient times. I agree with Mr. Keith that it is impossible to draw any chronological inference from the occurrence of the stanzas in the Mudrārakshasa and the Tantrārākhyāyikā. Nothing would be more natural than that the author of a nṛti drama like the Mudrārakshasa was indebted to the nṛti literature proper.

Professor Speyer is inclined to suppose that the Chandragupta named in the bhāratvadya of Mudrārakshasa may be some prince of that name who belonged to the dynasty of the Guptas. He who is eulogized in that final stanza as a successful protector against the threatening Mlechhhas may be Chandragupta I, the founder of the new and national dynasty, who lived in the beginning or his glorious descendant Chandragupta II at the end of the fourth century. It would be no matter of wondering at, if the brilliant exploits, especially of the first Chandragupta who subverted a secular domination of "barbarians" in the N. and N. W. parts of India, had prompted the unknown poet Viśākhadatta to "glorify a similar establishment of a mighty national monarchy by the name-sake of his king and by his famous minister."

I have myself thought of a similar solution of the chronological question. And in this connection I have noted the curious fact that the beginning of the Mudrārakshasa in the excellent manuscript M is nārya-an ante totāl pravati stātrdhāra just as is the case in Bhāsa's plays, while in other plays and in the remaining manuscripts of the Mudrārakshasa the remark totāl pravati stātrdhāra comes after the introductory stanzas. The arrangements therewith the Śrītrdhāra received the introductory stanzas was clearly a peculiarity of Bhāsa's. Compare Harahachārī v. 15. sātrdhāraśāryastraśārānām natsakauh bhasahūnāmikāh ampaśārikau yav'o leśa Bhāsa devavālikau ite.

7 See O. Franke, Beiträge aus chinesischen Quellen-Zur Kenntnis der Türkvolker und Sichuan Zentralasien, p. 66.
8 Verhandelingen, der Koninklijke Akademia van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam, Afdeeling Letterkunde, Nieuwe Reeks, Deel VIII, Nr. 5, pp. 51 ff.
9 Esmi sur Guṇḍāhya et la Bhāratkathā, Paris 1908, pp. 143 ff. and passim.
Other authors however did not in this respect follow Bhāsa. If now the reading of M is the original one that would tend to show that Viśākhadatta was probably one of the immediate successors of Bhāsa, and that he stuck to his arrangement with the introductory stanzas.

There cannot, moreover, be any doubt that Viśākhadatta has, to a not inconsiderable extent, imitated Bhāsa, and more especially his Pratijñāyanta-dharāya. The solemn vow made by Yamandharāya, his use of spies and persons in disguise, the curious use of a kind of argot in order to convey a hidden meaning in act III, and even minor details such as the comparison of dependents without affection to a wife (Kalatra) in I, 4 [cf. Mudrā, I, 14], and many other details in Bhāsa’s play constantly recall similar features in the Mudrārākṣasa and add support to the proposition that Viśākhadatta was an immediate successor of Bhāsa. But then the king alluded to in the bhavaśreṣṭīya cannot have been Chandragupta I, must have been Chandragupta II.

It may be objected that the whole tendency of the Mudrārākṣasa mitigates against the assumption that it was written in praise of a king Chandragupta. Our sympathy is the whole time not with Chandragupta and Chakravīla, though we admire the latter, but with Rākṣasa and the defeated dynasty. It is only by the force of circumstances that Rākṣasa is brought to adopt the cause of the Mauryas. If we were to think that the Mudrārākṣasa is written at the hand of actual events it would be more natural to assume that the author’s patron had fought the king of Magadha. Now this would suit the hypothesis based on the reading Rانتvarm instead of Chandragupta in the bhavaśreṣṭīya, occurring in some manuscripts, advanced by Mr. Telang in his edition of the play, and adopted by most scholars that the author’s patron was the Maukhari king Avantivarman whose son married the sister of the king Harsha of Kanauj. Their contemporaries was the Gupta King Mādhavagupta, whose father Mahāsenagupta defeated Sushitavarman, who was probably a contemporary of Avantivarman, and there must have been frequent wars between the Maukhari and the Guptas of Magadha. On the other hand there was also more peaceful relations between the two families, and two Maukhari queens wear names which show that they belonged to the family of the Guptas, viz., Harṣagupta, the queen of Ādiyavarman, and Upagupta the queen of Īyavarman. If we assume that Ādiyavarman was an ally of Sushitavarman, who was defeated by Mahāsenagupta, it is conceivable that Ādiyavarman was conciliated in some way by Mahāsenagupta, just as Malayakarn in the play is reinstated in his kingdom by Chandragupta. Hillebrandt has also drawn attention to the fact that Avantivarman, the son of Avantivarman, was killed in Rājyavardhana’s expedition against the Hāpas, and he agrees with Dhuwara and others in assuming that the Mleṣṭha mentioned in the bhavaśreṣṭīya were the Hāpas. Attention has also been drawn to the fact that the Mudrārākṣasa must have been written before the destruction of Patiliputra, because that town plays such a great rôle in the play. Now this argument would naturally lead to the conclusion that Professor Speyer’s dating of the play is the right one, because Patiliputra ceased to be the Magadha capital at a comparatively early date, and in the Mudrārākṣasa it is throughout treated as the natural capital. On the whole, therefore, I am inclined to follow the late Professor Speyer with regard to the date of the play. The reading Rانتvarm was perhaps introduced on the occasion of a later representation.

Professor Jacobi has advocated another dating of Viśākhadatta. He is of opinion that the Mudrārākṣasa shows traces of imitation of the poet Ratnākara, who lived under king Avantivarman of Kashmir in the 7th century. He also draws attention to some striking parallels between details in the Mudrārākṣasa and Kalihāya’s description of Avantivarman, and at the hand of the astronominical data mentioned in the introduction of the play he calculates that it was acted the 2nd December 890 A.D. Dhuwara, on the other hand, maintains that Ratnākara has imitated Viśākhadatta, and he also draws attention to such cases, where the Mudrārākṣasa seems to have been imitated by authors older than Ratnākara. It is almost impossible to judge about such cases. We never know whether there are direct loans or common loans from a third source. The direct allusions to the Mūdrārākṣasa in Indian literature mentioned by Dhuwara are still less decisive. The stanza Paśčatanaatra (ed., Bühlert), III, 138 cannot be dated. Nor is it possible to come to a decision about the date of the Chauśakāṇḍika, in which there is an allusion to the Mudrārākṣasa. Of greater importance is the fact drawn attention to by Dhuwara that there did not, in the days of Avantivarman of Kashmir, exist an independent king of Sindi, while the Sindi king is mentioned as a mighty ally in the play, and further the way in which Viśākhadatta mentions the Kashmir king. Against such a late dating as suggested by Professor Jacobi it is also possible to draw attention to the high respect with which the Buddhās are mentioned, Y, 6; to the recurrence of the stanza II, 18 in Bhartihari’s Nāṇīkata 27, in the Paśčatanaatra, and in the Vēṭāḷāpaśṇavampati, where it is probably borrowed from the Mudrārākṣasa; and to other

12 ZDMG, xxxix, 131.
15 Select Specimens of the Theatre of the Hindus, p. 251 foot note.
minor details. Wilson's view\textsuperscript{13} that the Mudrārākṣasā was written in the eleventh or twelfth century has now only historical interest. It was based on the assumption that the Mechedchhas mentioned in the Kāranākṣayya were the Mulasāmas. Who the author of the Mudrārākṣasā was, we know not. His name was Viśvakudatta, and he was the son of the Mahārāja Bhaskaradatta, or, according to most manuscripts, Pithru, and the grandson of the feudatory (Sāmasta) Vaṭeṣvaradattā.

We do not know any of these persons. Wilson\textsuperscript{15} thought it possible that Pithru was identical with the Chāhāmāna Pūjivirāja of Ajmer (12th century), but that is of course excluded. Hillebrandt\textsuperscript{17} seems inclined to identify Bhaskaradatta with Harsha's friend king Bhāskaravarnman of Kāmarūpā. According to the Harsha-hariśatra, however, Bhāskaravarnman was the son of Susthīravarman Miśśika and the grandson of Sīhiravarman. Now this agrees with the information derived from the newly discovered copper-plate grant of Bhāskaravarnman which has been brought to light by Padmanātha Bhattacharya.\textsuperscript{18} We only here learn that Sīhiravarman and Susthvārvarman are misreadings instead of Sīhiravarman and Susthītavarman. It is then probable that Susthvārvarman, the father of Bhāskaravarnman, was the king defeated by Mahāsenagupta.

Dr. Fleet's supposition\textsuperscript{19} that Susthvārvarman was a Mañjūhari has hitherto been generally adopted. Now that we know of a Susthvārvarman whose time suits the case, it will be necessary to change our opinion. We know that Bhāskaravarnman was the contemporary of Harsha, who again was a contemporary of Mādhavagupta. Now it was Mādhavagupta's father who defeated Susthvārvarman, and the Kāmarūpā king Susthvārvarman was the father of Bhāskaravarnman. There is then a perfect accord in the chronology, and there cannot be any doubt that Mahāsenagupta's adversary was the Kāmarūpā king Susthvārvarman Śrī-Miśśika. Now it is tempting to assume some connection between the Mañjūharis and the Kāmarūpā kings. Both dynasties use names formed in the same way. It has already been suggested that Aanti-varman may have sided with Susthvārvarman in his war against Mahāsenagupta, and the chronology is in favor of such a supposition. On the other hand it seems impossible to reconcile the genealogy of Viśvākudatta with that of the Kāmarūpā kings.

We cannot therefore say who the author of the Mudrārākṣasā was though it is highly probable that he belongs to the Gangetic country and lived in the fourth century. We know of no other work by him, but the Mudrārākṣasā itself has long been known and admired. It has also been published several times Professor Hillebrandt however is the first to give us a really critical edition, with full materials. To judge from his review of Telang's edition\textsuperscript{20}, his edition was planned more than thirty years ago, and the Mudrārākṣasā has evidently been in his mind during all those years. In 1905 he published an edition of all the Prakrit verses,\textsuperscript{21} and now follows the complete edition, with exhaustive apparatus criticism and an index of Prakrit words.

It is an exceedingly careful work. Professor Hillebrandt has given us. It would have made the book still more useful if he had added an index of pratikas. It very often happens that we have to identify verses, and such indexes are extremely useful. This is however a minor consideration, and I prefer to think of all we have got in this new edition.

There are of course many minor details where it is possible to have different opinions. Thus I am very doubtful about the restoration of the Prakrit forms required by the rules of the grammarians. This is more especially the case with the Māgadhī. The Prakrit grammarians are all comparatively late, and their rules about Māgadhī are probably to some extent artificial. Professor Hillebrandt has corrected throughout so as to bring the Prakrits into agreement with the grammarians, and he has done so in an excellent way. It is perhaps the only possible thing to do, and in the case of Sauraseni and Mahārāṣṭri our knowledge is so far advanced that we can do so with some confidence. But it is more difficult to be confident in the case of Māgadhī, about which dialect we are still very unsatisfactorily informed. The use of a comparatively correct Māgadhī in the fragments of plays preserved in later inscriptions does not prove much for the older plays, now that we know that the Prakrit grammarians cannot be so old as some of us were once inclined to think. It is also possible to find individual cases where one is inclined to disagree with the editor. Thus I would read jātādi and not jātadī in the Sauraseni, or else I would also read jātādi instead of jātādi. I would substitute a and not e for a when it is short; I would not allow Sauraseni in verses, at least not if the Mahārāṣṭri forms occur in some of the manuscripts; I would read susūlâdu instead of susūdū, p. 13, l. 10; tisādr or tā for tisādū, p. 18, l. 5, and so on. It is possible to disagree about such questions, and to think that the editor has erred. But the principal thing is that he has given the full materials so that we can judge for ourselves in every case. His methods are so sound that we usually feel convinced that he is right. Of misprints which have not been corrected I have only noted Sīnḍhuśāhā for Sīnḍhuśāhā, p. 140, l. 6, and karṣīf for karṣīf, p. 177, l. 5.

\textbf{Sten Konow.}

\begin{footnotes}
\item[16] l. c. p. 128.
\item[17] ZDMG, Vol. xxxiv, p. 131.
\item[19] Gupta Inscriptions, p. 15.
\item[21] ZDMG, Vol. xxxiv, pp. 107 ff.
\end{footnotes}
DOCUMENTS RELATING TO THE FIRST ENGLISH COMMERCIAL MISSION TO PATNA, 1620—1621.
EDITED BY SIR R. C. TEMPLE, BART.

Prefatory note.

[I have recently edited volume II. of the Travels of Peter Mundy, 1608-1667, for the Hakluyt Society. This volume covers the years 1628-1634 while Peter Mundy was travelling to and from India in the interests of the English East India Company of that date.

He spent part of the year 1632 in a commercial expedition to Patna, and as he made several references to the previous commercial mission of Messrs. Robert Hughes and John Parker to that place in 1620-1621, I had reason to examine the whole of the proceedings of those two men while there.

In Appendix D of my volume on Peter Mundy’s Journals, I have given a brief account of the work of Hughes and Parker and in Foster’s English Factories (1618-1621) there is a concise account of their doings. But in the course of my enquiries I had to collect together and edit all the original documents left behind, relating to the time spent by Hughes and Parker in Patna. They are of considerable value, as illustrating the kind of work the pioneers of British enterprise in India had to do, the manner in which they set about it, the conditions under which they lived, and the qualities required of such men. It is therefore worth while to reproduce the original correspondence in this Journal.

Hughes and Parker are exhibited to us as typical commercial pioneers, level-headed bargainers, quick to perceive where trading possibilities lay; brave, imperturbable, venturesome men, loyal to their employers; men whom neither difficulties nor dangers daunted.

Incidentally, the interesting fact came to light that even in those days the value of the subsequent great trade in Bengal (lasar, tussore) silks was foreseen and that much trouble was taken to introduce them into European markets. Among other things, Hughes tried to send talking mainās to England in 1620. In a letter to his superiors at Agra he writes of “a cupell of prattling birds called mynnas, which wee have bought to bee sent to the Company and intreate you carre may bee taken for there conveyance to Suratt.”]

I.

Robert Hughes to the Surat Factory.

Patna 13 July 1620.

Lovinge Frends, Mr. Kerridge etts. After longe expectation and no cirtayne newes of Mr. Younge and his companies aproche neare Agra (the yeare spendinge so fast), it was thought needfull to dispeece mee for Puttana; and havinge accorded upon a computed some of monnyes for some present investment, with bills of exchange for 4,000 rupees, I departed Agra the 5th Junee and (thankes bee to God) arived here in saftye the 3rd presant, havinge bine on the waye 29 dayes, in which I outran 300 Jehanger courses [Jahangir kos.]. Presentlye upon my arivall I procured acceptance of my exchanges, and hope of good payment, theire date beinge expierced; of whose currant performance, when received, I shall advise to Agra.

I have since my comeinge visitid the Governor Mookrob Con [Makarrab Khan], whose scenes wonderous pleasant for our arivall here, and was as inquisitive to knowe what goods I had brought with mee; wher unto I as exactelye answered that at present I had nothing, but that what futuryley should come fittinge his circare [sarkār, government, establishment]

1 At a Consultation held in Surat on the 22nd Jan. 1620, it was decided that John Young should "assist Mr. Hughes in Hogrepopatamia [Hājīpur Patna] or where else the ambicions are made." Foster, English Factories in India, 1618-1621, pp. 182, 191.
hee should have the first sight of, wherewith hee seemed well contented, and hath given order to serche out for a house for mee, but as yet cannot finde anye conveyent enoughe, yet hope shortlye to bee well seated, though I fear not rent free. The Nabob is desiers of some cloth and hydes, for which I have advised to Agra for what theye can spare, or maye lye there unvendable; also tapestrye, clothe of tishoo [tissue], velvetts, embrodlares, fethers, or anye other rich commodities to bee gotten, and hath desiered me to write you to procure him some from the expected fleete, of which if you may spayre anye, doublese theye wilbe well sould, and your selves knowe him to bee as free in payinge as in buyinge.

I have made some enquirey into the commodityes here to bee procured and by you required from England. And first for clothinge (as I have bise enformed, for I have not had tymet yet to make anye experiences), the usuall custome of buyinge the amberty calicoes at Lackhoure [Lakhāwar] (which is the pente [peth, penth, market-town] or fayer for that commoditye, and is a towne 14 course from this place) is as follows: theye are dalye brought in from the neighboringe gonges [gají, a village] by the weavers, from whom theye are bought rawe, of length 13 coveds Jehangery (which is one-fourth longer then the elahye [ulūh giz. 33 in.] of Agra), from which the buyer, of an antient custome, teares of 1½ or 2 coveds, and soo delievere them marked to the whiter, whose detainyes them in whitinge and starchinge about three moneths, the charge whereof is near upon 3 rupees per course [score], and the abatements and disturyes [dastirí, commision] in buyinge them rawe from the weavers 4 per rupye or 25 per cent. In this maner, by reporte, dalye maye there bee bought 50,60, and some dayes 100 pcees. Almost in the like nature are theye sold here in Putanna, beinge likewise brought thence by the weavers, but readye whited and cured, and the same custome and abatements as in the cuntrye; and by computation here may bee provided within the space of three or four moneths, soo bought, and of the broadest sizes, called zafarconyes [zafar-khāni], two or three hundred corges.

Of sannahes [sahan, fine sheeting] and hammomes [hammām, towelling] theire are but fewe at present in towne. Theye are bought from the lower partes of Bengalla in smalle parcelles by Puttanese [Pathans]. Other sorts of chouret cloth are not here to bee gotten, unless some fewe rahmoute.1 What of these sorts shall come to towne, I shall not slip anye opportunitie for their procuringe, for the yeare is allreadye so farre spent that it will not permite anye conveyent investments to bee made at Lackhoure in thembytes rawe, the tymbe beinge soe shorte for their dispesd hence, and theye soo tedious in whittinge.

Of rawe silke of Bengalla I have sent musteres [samples] to Agra, and have entreated, after puruiall [inspection], to send them you joynylie with this my later. In the paper No. 1 are two skeynes of the first and second sorts, which is the sortes cheslye by the Companye required, and by us provided [at] Agra, which at present is here to bee bought (wounde of into skeynes of a covede longe) for 5½ ruppees gross the seare of 34½ pieces weight per seare, from which is abated 17 per cent. kessure [kasur, diminution, discount] and disturye, and will faile out net not above 4½ ruppees the seare of 34½ pieces weight. In the paper No. 2 is two skeynes of the third and fourth sorts wee usialye buye in Agra, not wound of aparte,

--Ambery, ambertee ambartree (Hindī, amrī, amrīti, amritī amrīti), a name applied to a stout cloth of N. India, See Travels of Peter Mundy, ed. Temple, II. 141 n.

1 The word is chowth, chowtha, chowthi, chauht, chaut, lit., four folds, a coarse double-width cotton cloth of two lengths.

4 This word clearly means a kind of chawth or wide, coarse cotton cloth, but I am unable to trace it in any vernacular, unless it is a mistranscription for rāmūt, rámut, rāmut rámut.
for want of tympe, and is here worth at present, to bee wounded of as the former, 4½ rup[ees] gross per seare, out of which the prementioned disturye abated, will cost 3 rup[ees] 9 annyes [āna, anna] net the seare of 34½ pieces weight per seare. These are there present prizes, betwene which and that wee buye in Agra you will perceave a great difference in price for these four sortes, to saye, one-third of the sorte No. 1 and two-thirds of the sorte No. 2 hath cost us together in Agra neare upon 5½ rup [ees] net the seare of 30 pieces, which here halfe th'other maye bee bought for about 4 rup[ees] a net the seare of 34½ pieces weight per seare; and I am promised at about these rates to have delivered in from the silkwynere 10 or 15 m [aun]ds per monthe, and doubtes a greater quantitye therof maye bee procured, but then wee must venture out some monye before hande, which I resolve upon, findinge sufficient security for performance; and herupon have advised them at Agra to desist farther in its investment there, which per computation is at least 35 per cent. derer then here it maye bee bought. Serbandy silke, the best of Mucksoude [Maksūdābād Murshidābād] and Sideabaude [Sadībād], from whence these sortes are wounde of, is at present here worth 100 rup[ees] gross per maunde of 40 seres per maunde and 34½ pieces per seare, from which is abated the savoye [sawād, an excess of a fourth] or 25 per cent.; so it rests net worth about 75 rupees per m[au]nde net. The breakeridge as well on this as on all other sortes of silke is, by the Nabobes commande, but 5 annes of a ruypee per cent. from the buyer and 10 annyes from the seller; but the breakeres doe usuallye take one-half per cent. from the buyer and one per cent. from the seller. For breakeridge of clothe theye can clayme nothinge as due from the buyer, onlye his curtizeye; but from the seller theye right is half a pice per ruypee.

I shall here provide some quiltes of Sutgonge [Saigōn], wrought with yellowe silke, at reasonable rates; and they have already halfe a score in possession, and am promised more dalye as theye come to town.

There are some Portingalls at present in towne, and more are latlye gon for there ports in Bengal; into whose traffice I have made enquiere, and gather that theye usuallie bryng vendable here all sortes of spices and silke stufes of Chyna, tyne, and some jewelleries ware; in lawe whereof theye transporte course carpets of Junapoores [Jumpur], ambertyes, cassaces [dāss] and some silke. The Mogoles [Merchants from Upper India or Persia] and Praychaes6 are here like bees, whose cheeset provisioones are mandyles [mandil, turban-cloth], girdells [karmalband], layches [lāčha, ilāčha, silk cloth] and doupattas [dopattā] of Malda; also a sorte of thine cloth called caymeones [kā'im-khānī]7 of Beyhare [Bihār], and are much like unto course cassaces, 14 coverede longe and four-fifths of a coverede broade, of 40, 50, and 60 rup[ees] per course. These are bought for transporte to Lahore, and thence for Persia; samples whereof, and of all other commoditie here to be provided fittinge that trade, I purpose to buye some smalls quantityes of eatch for a tryall. And also ambertyes is a principle of their investments, for the compasinge whereof theye bryng hether either redy spetya [specie] or exchanges.

I praye adviz whether th' ambertyes you mention to bee provided rawe are ment as from the loome, without washinge and starchinge, or to bee whitned only without starche.

5 Serband, head-winding, evidently a cocoon, the ordinary words for which are kaya, pilak.
6 Mr. Foster conjectures that this word is the Sanskrit prāchyo, used like purbiya to indicate an inhabitant of countries to the eastward. See English Factories in India, 1618-1631, p. 195 n.
7 See Mr. Foster's note on this kind of cloth, op. cit., loc. cit.
The generall transporte of goods from hence to Agra is by Carte, but now in the seasone of the raynes the wayes are soe deepes that no Cartes Can passe, and therefore for necessitye whatever goeth hence is laden on oxen. It wilbe the prime October at soonest before the Carts can stir hence, whose freight to Agra is Commonslye 1½ and 1¼ rups, per maund and goeth not under lesse then 35 dayes. What goods maye here bee provided betwixt this and the begininge October shall, God willinge, bee dispeeded hence about that tyme, which wilbe the soonest.

I have written to Agra to dispend John Bangam with some goods advised for which lye unvendable there with the first oportunitye, for that this place will requir an assistant or two, for that it promiseth plente of Commoditie and doubtles will to good purpose bee established a factorye. I have also advised for 5 or 6000 rups, more to bee forthwith remitted hether, for th'exchange here is cheaper by 1½ or 2 per Centry, then there, for th'intrime I am promised at interest for ¾ per Centry.

At the foot of this my letter you will perceave the present prizes of sondry Commodities as well vendable here, as that here maye bee provided, which with the prescribed I entreate you accept unto future experience maye Imbouiden mee to enlarge. Untill when with hartye Commends and prayers for prosperitie in our Joynt affayres, I take leave and rest, &e.8

The present vallencies of sondry Commodities as well Vendable as to bee provided in Patana, advizd to Surat and Agra.

Broad Clothe good redd, worth 15 rups, the Jehangir Coved
Elephants teeth, the best worth 80 rups, per md. of 40 sers per md. and 33 picces per sr.
Seamose [walrus] teeth, worth 10 rups, per seare 37 picces
Bulgare hydes, worth 18 rups, per payer
Quick silver, worth 3½ rup, per seare
Vermilion, worth 3½ rup, per seare
Lead, worth 9 rup, per maunde
Tynne, worth 38 rup, per maunde
Amber beads, worth 2, 3 and 4 tankes [tanka] per rup.
Corral, no settled price, but according to its goodness
Saffron, worth 16 rup, per seare
Swords, knives, fine wares, etc., no price Currant

[The remainder of this list is illegible]

The Nabobe would faine have 3 or 4 Cases of emptie bottells. He was impertinent [importunate] with me and would not bee satisfied but that I had brought some with mee, see that I was Constrayned to give him the 3 small bottells out of my standishe [inkstand, bottle-stand]. Hee required many other things, which in regard theye are not to bee had I here omitte, and not havinge elce at present rest &c.9

II.

Robert Hughes to the Surat Factory.

Patna, 6 August 1620. Good Friends, Mr. Kerridge etts. My last of the 12th last month by waye of Agra advizd you of my arival here, and what elce the then poore experience of this place encouraged mee, a Coppye wherof (to avoyde repetition) I send you herewith,

8 Factory Records, Patna, I, 2-4.
9 Factory Records, Patna, I, 1, 4.
refferinge you, and havinge now made some experience of what my formeres gave you hopes of, it rests that I advise you therof.

I have bene dealinge with the weavers of Lackhoure (Lakhawar) which bringe the Ambertyes to towne, from whence in smale parcels I have bought about 16 Courege [kori, score] from 1 to 6 rups. net the piece, and allmost all of the broadest sizes. The raynes is some impediment to their provision, for that the weavers by reson thereof Com not to towne, as wondedlye, and there are great store of buyers abroad, which hath somewhat inhauned the Commoditye. Also there are latlye Come up diverse frigitts of Portingalls from Sutgonge [Satgôn] whose merchants byuye up all theye can laye hand of. If tyne would have permitted some investments to have bene made in the Country, it had bene the best and Cheapest Course to have bought them rawe [undressed] from the weavers and have put them fourth to whitinge, but the season for there dispiece hence to Come to you tynlye to send this yeare for England is soe neare at hand that this yeare it was impossible to get them ready. For the future, if you resolve that quantities thereof be provided it wilbe needfull that this place bee furnished with monnye in such season that no tyne bee lost; for that theye are teadious in whittinge; as also it is requisite that for what provisions shall heare bee made at Agra before the raynes to take the first opportunitye for Conveyance with theriegoods, which will bothe save Charges and regayne tyne.

Lackhower affords greate quantitieys of fyne clothe, to saye of four, five, six, eight to ten rupes per piece, and by bespeakinge them and delieveringe monyys out before hand the weavers will make them a full Jehanger coved [Jahângirî cowado, cubit] broaded, which is yeard, halfe quarter [i.e., about forty inches] English (which breadth, as theye saye, they cannot exceed, to have them close wroght), but of what reasonable lengths wee shall desier them.

For your list of goods required this yeare from Agra, you specify th'amberyes to bee all Course at or under 2 rups. Wherefore in your first praye advise how you stand affected to the fyne. There breedth are generallye neare upon an eahy [ilâhi], coved and brooder then your narowe haftas of Baroche [Broach].

Of Sahannes there is none to towne. Diverse boates are shortly expected from the lower partes of Bengalla, which by reporte bringe quantitieys. I have bought 400 rupes in tussir stufes of Bengalla, 10 of halfe silke, halfe cotten; and of Bieuntpoore layches [Baîkaînîpur awâlah about 16 courege at 12, 10 and 16 rupes per courge. Theye are 5½ covered longe and somewhat more than 3 broade, some patterns wherof I send you herewith. Theye are fitt lengthes for petticoetes, cheape, and doubles will sell in England to good profit. Theye are made five course hence, infinite quantitieys, and are generallye bought up by the Mogolles for Persia; by bespekinge them (if theye give Content) wee maye have them made of what lengthes and breadthes wee shall desier.

With my former I sent you masteres [samples] of Bengalla silke and there prices, since which I have made further serche therinto and herewith send you other samples by mee wounde of from the Serbandy [cocoon], of which I bought a maunde for a triall, and wound it of into seavene several sortes, whereby I finde that these 4, to saye the second, third, fourth and fifth will stand us in about 4½ rupes, net the seare of 34½ pice with all Charges of wyndinge it of defrayed; and the 3 other sortes, to saye the first, sixth and seaventh, rated at worthe here at present to be seoused for readye monnye, the first at 4½ rups. per seare, the 6th at 1½ rups. per seare, and the 7th at 3½ rups. per seare; see that the Ches-

pest and surest dealinge is to buye the serbundy and wynde it of my selfe and theron have resolved, having bought about 6 mds. more. And at present have thirty men at worke thereon, purposing to increase them to a hundred, and if you approve thereof and the price (which is 1/2 cheaper than in Agra) I may have two or three hundred silkwinderes to worke in the house all the yeare, wherof I praye advise your oppiniones, for to buye it from the Cotewalle [kotewl, nawab’s agent] it will cost 1/2 or 2/3 of a rupye dearer, and yet not see good stufe ; and the first 6th and 7th sortes, being sent hence to Agra, will sell here for 20 per Cent. more then it is worth the heare, which Course will much ease the price of the rest. And I purpose also to dye and dress some of the Course sortes into slike [floss] 11 silke and send you to bee sent for England as samples. It will wast the 1/2 in the dressinge, and the Charge herof be about 1/6 of a rupye the seare and will not stand in above 2½ rup. per seare readye crest.

I have taken a house in the greate bazaar, neare unto the Cutwalls choutrye [choutry, chabātrā, office]; the rent 6½ rupees per month. I have not herde from Agra since my departure thence, but expect John Banggam with some goods and monnayes formerlye advised for. Halfe my former exchange are runn out, And I hope to have the remaynder speedily invested in Ambertyes, of which commodity the partes about Lackhoure afords such quantitie that (by the weavers reportes) daly 1,000 pecces are taken from their loomes; and without question you maye have 50,000 rupees yearlye invested therin if you approve of the said sortes. Your order wherein and in the silke provisions for the aprochinge yeare I shall expecte. And not havinge elce at present, &c.

rup. an.

The Veround [bardeward] or proportion wound of from a seare of serbandy raw silke, containing 34½ pieces weight the seare; wounde of into seven several sortes, and Cost net ... ... ... ... ... ... 2 00

more for the Charge of wyndinge it of ... ... ... ... ... ... 2 ; ½

rup. an.

8½ pieces wt. waste or losse in the wyndinge it of rated at ... ... ... ... 00 00

6½ pieces wt. shekesty 12 or the 7th sorte at 14½ anns. per seare is ... ... ... 00 03½

4 piece wt. Cattaway 13 or the 6th sorte at 2½ rups. per seare is ... ... ... 00 02½

2½ piece wt. Gird 14 or the first sorte at 4½ rup. the seare is ... ... ... 00 06½

12½ piece wt. of the 2d, 3d, 4th and 5th sortes (of which this inclosed is the sample) rated at 4½ rup. net per seare ... ... ... ... ... 01 09½

34½ piece wt. rated together and costs rup. net ... ... ... ... ... 02 0½

and is as it is worth here at present, about which price, within 1/8 more or lesse the seare, quantitie maye bee provided wound of accordinge to this sample and of the lengths of thesse skeynys. 15

11 The 0. E. D. defines slike-silk as silk thread capable of being separated into smaller filaments for use in embroidery; floss silk.
12 Shikosta, broken, irregular (threads).
13 Kotoudi, imperfect, discoloured.
14 Gird, round, i.e., even quality.
15 Factory Records, Patna, I., 4-9.
Robert Hughes to the Agra Factory.

Patna, 3 September 1620. Kindred Friends, Mr. Fettiplace, etc. After no gentle expectation and desirer to hear from you, Yesterday I received yours of the 9th August......

I perceive that you take notice of what I write Concerning the provision of Amberty Callicoes and your opiniones jump with what I have bine latlye large unto you Concerninge that Commodity in their future investments to bee made at Lackhour. I once thought, and indeed fullye purposed to have made some small tryall there this yeare, but means and mence promises saylinge kept mee from them spight of my testhe [in spite of my efforts]. Howeover, I doubt not but to have the monnyes you now sent Employed therin here in Pottana tymne enough to bee dispended hence by the begininge of th'ensuinge mounthe and these with the cost of my provision to bee with you in Agra by the prime November, whereof more hereafter.

You have discouragd mee in the silke provisions of which I had and yet have [great] hopes to doe much good therin, of which I sent you second samples [hence the] 6th August, and therin was large of the settled Course I have taken for providing in the Condition required by the Company, and I am sure at Cheaper rates then theye approve of, to send fourth with what quantitye possibilye maye bee procured, which imboulsnd mee the rather therin, so that I have increased my Cor Conna [kārkhāna, workshop] to almost a hundred workmen, but here will stop untill I here further from Surat. I have delivered them mony out beforehand, which now can hardly bee recalled, and therefor they must worke it out; 10 or 12 mds. serbandyes wilbe the most I shall wynde of for this yeare, which will not bee much, yet I hope such a sample as shall Conferme its future provision, its price beinge Considered; neither (I am sure) were theye at Surat Ignorant of its price in Agra when in their letter, which arrived a litell before my departure, theye desired what quantitye possible might be procured this yeare. I have bine large unto them therof, and expexte therein order for the future. My last samples I hope you have sent them.

For quilts of Sutgonge I have not exceede above a dozen, nor shall not ad therunto manye more, unless such as promise good Content. Th [see] alreadye bought I have tymed up with silke fringe, tassells, etc., and lyned them parte with tastye, parte with Tassur [ṭasur, tussore], what goods I have in a redinesse I am packinge to regayne tymne. I perceave at what rates your exchange runns, which is much lower then here. I offered 4 per Cent. to have taken up some smallemat of Byrundas Chebil Sansye [Bhairoṅ Dās Chibillā Shāh], but could not procure it, see that you maye thanke Shame [Shyām, Shām] for his Casamna [khāsmā, letter of introduction], though he his letter of Creditt was of no Validitye. I have not to doe with Pragdas [Prāg Dās] his sonne, havige long since cleared with him. He is almost Crackte [bankrupt], thereh havige latlye Come hondyes [hundi, bill of exchange, cheque] on him for a lack of rupes and reporte of his fathers troubles in Agra. In your occasiones to remitt monyse by exchange, you maye bee bold to deale with Chāmsayes [Chāṅsdshāh Shāh’s¹⁰] sonne, whose father is the Current dealer [generally accepted agent] of Pottana.

The Ambertyes you mention to bee provided browne [unbleached] must of necessitie bee referred until the next yeares, and then (as you saye) theye must bee washt out of their

¹⁰ See infra, letter of 3 March 1621 where this name is given in full as “Chaunseyahaw”, Chāṅsdshāh Shāh;
mandye; or else hapily theye will rott before theye arrive in England, which course I all wisse endevored to take and shall endevor my utmes therein, and in all other sortes of that clothe according to your direction, bothe for its length, breadth, starch and close working.

It seemse Mr. Younge and his Companye arrived with you in saftie, and since have bine dispatched for Lahore. I expected Mr. Bangam to my assistance, in whose roome you mention Mr. Parker to bee long since dispeeded and with him the goods I advised for, of whose aproche I yet here no newes. When hee cometh I shall take notice of the appartacles, which wilbe wellcome to our Governor, whoe hath bine and is in expeste of some toyes aswell as rich Commodities. After Mr. Parkers arivall and receipte of your Invoyce and examination of the goods, I shall give you Creddit, as well for them as for the 200 rups. delivered for their expense on the waye, and shall expeste more monnyes forthwith to bee remitted to keepe us still in action, whereof I praye consider and what it is to gayne opportunitie. And so much in answer to the particular of your letter now received, whereof I may conclude for ought I have done since my last. Upon the arivall of Mr. Parker I shall enlarege, or in th'intryme, if necessiteit requier. Untill when, with a hartye Comend &c, I have enquired after spicknab, but at present here is none for our turnes. It comes out of the Northe Country in the could wether and will not bee here to be gottene this 2 or 3 monnthes at the soonest.  

IV.

Robert Hughes to the Surat Factory.

Patna 4 September 1620. [Identical in substance with the letter of 3 Sept. to Agra. The following are additions]. I yet here no newes [of Mr. Parker] although he hath bine a mouth on the waye, nor shall not expecte him yet this 10 dayes for that the countryes are sooverflowe that I feare his Carte with much difficultye will finde passadg. What goods hee bringse will come to late for there proceed to bee this yeare invested.

I praye remember our governor with what syne goods and toyes you maye spare of what you expecte in this fleete. Hee is verye earnest with mee to procure him some, And I have promised to write you in his behalfe. Hee groweth rich, and no feare but that he will paye well and a good price.  

V.

Robert Hughes to the Agra Factory.

Patna 14 September 1620. Mr. Fettiplace ettis. My last was of the 3d present by a sherefes [sarraj, money-changer] conveyance which advized you of the receipt of yours of the 9th August and therwith the second bills of exchange for 2500 rups. of their acceptance and what ele that instant required, since when, I praye take notice. This your expresse came hether the 10th present by whome I received yours of the 23th August, and therwith bills for 2500 rups. more, and the second bill for parte of the 3000 sent before, all which are well accepted and no feare but of Current payment. About 2000 rups. of the first exchange I have already received, as having occasion therof before it was dewe. The remaynder within this daye or two wilbe also received, of which ther is no feare.

I take notice of Pragacas his breakinge [bankruptcy], though I hope it's no damadge to us. I am aker I have sondrye tymes advized you of my clearinge with his sonne here for those exchanges I brought on him, which I hope is sufficient to cleare that doubte and assure your selves I shall not bee backward in receavinge in the mony of these exchanges when dewe.

[17] Mánd, mánr, mándá, mándì, mánri, any greasy dirt, also used for starch.
Two dayes since came hether one of Mr. Parkers servants, whoe brought mee a letter from him dated in Aughtmull surraye [Amwakanthã] 20 2 dayes Journye shorte of Bannare [Benares]. Hee writt mee littell save his troubles on the waye, and the damage the goods have susteynde by the raynyes etts., which in 2 or 3 dayes more I shall expecte him with his letter. Hee sent mee the first bills (which nowe are of no Imporhte) as also the Invoyce of what goods you have sent by him, for which when received (and what moneyes else received from you) I shall give your Account Credditt.

I take notice of the clause in the Surratt letter, and doe endeavor my utmost for provision of Ambertrees and what else maye give content, and doubt not but to have what monyres you have remitted mee wholese invested by the fyne [end] of this present monythe, neither shall I omit the first opertunitye for theire dispatche hence to bee with you with what expedition possible. I have detayned your bearer the longer in hope Mr. Parker would have arived, that thereby I mought have had wherewith to have bine larger, but therof now uncirtayne, I thought best to dispeed him, for that you earnestlie requier advice of the Exchange receypte and acceptence which is as prescribed, wherunto I have not aughtie else materiall to add save my hartye commend &c. 21

VI.

Robert Hughes and John Parker to The Agra Factory.

Patna, the 6th October 1620. 22 Very good Friends Mr. Fetiplace etts. Our last unto you was of the 14th September by returne of your expresse which brought your last bills of exchange. Therin wee advised you of their acceptance and now intreate you take notice that we have founde satisfaction bothe for those and all your formers, save only a rest of Champseyes [Chândmahāl Shah] which as yet is scarce dewe, and may bee about 600 rups. In a postscript of our last 23 wee also advised you of the then present arrivall here of John Parker with the goods mentioned in your Invoyce sent therwith, which having examined, wee finde to fall out just in quantitie, thoughse in quality they were somewhat dammified on the waye by reason of the extremitye of fowle wether theye met in their passaduy. Yet the most parte thereof, to saye the broadcloth, kersyes, hydes, swords, and small wares we have delievered into the Nabobs Circare [sar-kär, court, establishment] and theye have past his view, but as yet wee have not founde leasure to come to a price for them. Our quixsilver wee have sold (but not delivered) for 4½ rups. per seare of 37½ pice weight but have not bine offered for our Amber beads above 10 rups. the seare of 14 pice the seare, wherefore detayne it in hope of a better market.

Wee have finished our provisiones for this yeare,which consist of 1975 peeces Ambertyes, 60 pes. sahannes and hammones, 12 courge of Tusseres 22 quilts of Sutonge [16 Courge 14 pes. Bicunta-pore Layches (Baikunthpur alâchah, silk cloth)] 24 270½ seres Bengall silke [600 rupes in Malda wares for Persia], besides diverse other goods for samples, of all which wee have sent you an ampeall Invoyce hereinlosed, wherunto for their pertickuler cost refer you. The totall wherof Amounts to 7500 rups., and our remaynes in Cashe, silke wrought, etts. may bee about 1200 rups. The rest of your monyre remitted is disbursed in Charges etts.

20 The "Abumohol or Sara" of Mundy (Trewels, ed. Temple II, 115) and the "Aoomal-sera" of Rennell (Bengal Atlas) now represented by Amwakanthã (Indian Atlas).
22 A letter of the same purport was also written to Surat on this date. It contains some slight additions. These have been added to the Agra letter and placed between square brackets.
23 Not extant.
24 Added from the letter to Surat which is omitted.
The formentioned goods is all packed in 26 balles laden on 4 Cartes and was dispeeded hence under the conduct of 10 servants the 4th present, whose by agreement are to bee with you in Agra within 30 days, to saye by the second November. The transporte hence of the goods to Agra hath cost us [something more than the ordinarie freight hence, to saye] 25 2 rups. the Jehanger maund. 26 They conteyne in all 81 maunds, for which we have paid the Carters here 153 rups. and have delivered them our bill. on you for 8 rups. more, which wee intreate you paye them, if theye arrive with you within theire tyme lymited, otherwise detayne is, for theye not accomplishinge with us accordinge to agreement theye are to have but 1½ rups. 27 the maunde, the price now cut [reduced] of the Caravan which goeth in 40 days. Of theire performance wee praye advise us, that accordingelye, if theye faile, wee maye have redresse here from the owners and theire suerety.

The balle of silke no. 6. consisteth of Girde, Cattawaye and shkeestye, which wee send you purposely to sell in Agra. The rest is all for England, of which there is a small bale of sleave silke [packed up with the cannister of Lignome alloes], 28 drest from the Cuttaway and shkeestye and dyed into severall Colerces, a sample whereof wee send you by this bearer and is all Cuttaway, save the skye of watchet [pale blue] which is shkeestye. The crimson is died in Lack and all the rest of the Colleres Carrarye [karari, fast, ingrain]. After your persiall, if you please, you maye send it with the goods to Surrat for their view.

Wee have delivered into the hand of our servant Dyalla [Dyalla] 15 rups. to defraye the charge of the goods on the waye, whereof wee charge you. Wee had sent Abdul Caryme ['Abdu'l-Karim] with the Cartes but that hee is lepte sicke at Lackhoure, where Mr. Parker hath bine since his cominge and invested about 1000 rups. there amongst the weavers in white clothe; also 25 ps. browne (as from the loome) wee have sent to Surrat for samples. [Packt up with the rawe Ambertyes have wee sent 8 peeces Camsukes [kam-sūkhā, unfinished cloth] whitet onyly without starch and 10 ps. with starch, all provided at Lackhoure].

Wee have paid our servants which went with the goods 4½ rups. per pce. [apiece] for theire Journye. Wee entreat you retorn Dyalla with the newes of theire arrivall, and when you conceave them to aproche neare, send out one to meete them....

Wee expecet no more monye for this yeare past, for a tymlye dispatche hath left us somthinge in Cash which, with the proceed of our goods, wee purpose to begine our provisone in the rawe clothe of Lakhour in the ensainge yeare. The silke wound of [off] you will perceave to faile out in price as formerlye advised and by us expected, For its future provision wee shall not bee over hastye, onylye worke out our monye delivered the silkwinders, wherin their can bee no losse but gayne in its present sayle here...Here hath bine nothinge as yet elected save investments... Wee intreate you deliver Abdell Carymes wyfe 4 rups. more... With our goods wee have sent a cupel of pratlinge birds called mynnas [mainā], which wee have bought to bee sent to the Company, and intreate you carre maye bee taken for theire conveyance to Surratt. At the foote of our Invoyce you will perceave their cost, [also a muster (sample) of Lignome aloes of which here is quantitie, and cost 1¾ rups, the seare of 53 pices weight].

25 added from the letter to Surat.
26 The Jahangirī man, the royal man, was rather heavier than the commercial ‘maamu’, and weighed 82½lbs. in Mundy’s time. See Travels, ed. Temple, II. 237.
27 The letter to Surat says they were to forfeit ¼ of their freight if they exceeded the limited time.
28 added from the letter to Surat.
For what goods lye by you ded, if you send them hether, doubtlesse theye will finde
good sayle. The bone lace⁵⁹ is so well liked that the Nabobe requireth all the rest, which
wee entreate you send by the first convoye, with what sword blades, knives, etts. you
can spare.⁶₀

VII.

Robert Hughes to the Surat Factory.

Patna, 31 October 1620. Mr. Kerridge, etts. Our last unto you was of the 6th
present... Since the disposed hence of our goods wee have sould into the Nabobs
Circumference all the goods sent to us from Agra, viz., brocade cloth reds... greene... yellowe... Bulgare hydes... Cerseyes... besides diverse other brayed [damaged, tarnished] wares to good profit, in all for
2400 rups. for which wee have got out a Berat [barrat, order for payment], and are in
speedy expectation for our monies, which once received I purpose for Lackhoure, whether
Mr. Parket is gone before with 900 rups. to make enterance into the rawe Ambertyes, the
tyme being now principally good for thair provision and no buyers already. We intend
provision of none but the broadest sizes and are promised of a full Cowed broade which
comes littell shorte of an English elle. Wee shall expecte your order what sorts and
quantities thereof to bee provided for the ensuinge yeare as also for other Commodities this
place may afoorde. And for that tyme is precious and the whiting of th' Ambertyes tedious,
wee purpose out of hand to invest all the monnyes wee have in that Commoditye, and for
the future will expecte from you or Agra. Our provisions of silke wee have almost let
fall, untill wee here how you approve thereof. Diverse letters have wee written you since
our Comminge into these partes, answere unto none whereof have wee received, but live
in hopes.⁶¹

VIII.

Robert Hughes to the Surat Factory.

Patna, 11 November 1620. Lovinge Frends, Mr. Kerridge, etts. It is not manye
dayes past since I received yours of the 5th September, answere to mynse from hence of the
12th July... By what I then wriete you concerninge provisions of Amberty Callicoes,
you rightly apprehende the quantity to bee but small. I had that information but from
reporte, which since hath not proved much contrary. Here in Puttana where buyinge them
at the best hand, to saye from the weavers which bringe them readye whited to town in
small parcells, I could not with all my endeavours atayne to above a thousand peeces, wherefore
was foured for the present to make up our Investments of that Commoditye bytlye
bought in Lackhoure and bytlye from other merchants who bought them there rawe and
whited them themselves, which Course tyme would not permitt us to take, comming
hether so late in the yeare, and wee perceive for what the weavers bringe readye to towne
is onlye to serve the Bazare. And merchants that make their provisions abroad will
not sell here for halfe a savoye [sauie]²² profits, but transporte them for Agra, Lahore,
etta, where they make a far greater gaine. So that it is the extraordinarye profit which
induceth merchants to furnishe Agra with that Commoditye, from whence doubtlesse you
willte this yeare supplyed with a good quantity, in that wee understand theye have

⁵⁹ Bobbin lace, usually of linen thread. See O. E. D., s. v. Bone-lace.
⁶⁰ Factory Records, Patna, I., 10-11.
⁶¹ Factory Records, Patna, I., 14.
²² sauie means 1½, i.e., 3 or 25 p. c. profit. So “halfe a savoye” would mean ½ or 12½ p. c. profit.
bought all came to hand, though question at what rates, as having not herde of their barygaye. Those I provided here, bought from the weavers, was according to custom of the bazaar, bothe for price and allowance, which is a savoye per cent. . . . and makes 20 per cent. difference or abaitment, to saye, for 100 rupees gross wee payed 80 net,\textsuperscript{33} which is the 4 anyes or $\frac{1}{4}$ distury [dastūrī, discount]. . . . Now for the future provision of rawe Ambertyes at Lackhouare (which must bee our Course if you intend anye great investments therein), theye are bought there in Infinite quantityes browne from the weavers, and of all sizes and prizes, of which there is 3 sorts, viz., rasseyes [razā]\textsuperscript{34} zeffer conyes [zafar-khānī] and Jehgeres [jahāngīrī]. The rasis are generallye course narowe bredthe, of about our halfe Jehanger Coved Broade, and fewe or none above 2 rupees net the piece. The Zefferconyes are $\frac{1}{2}$ or at most $\frac{3}{4}$ broader then those from 1$\frac{3}{4}$ to 6 rup, the net piece. And the Jehangers the broadest of the 3 sorts, whereof som are a full Jehanger Coved, but those very fewe, fine, and high priced, from 3 to 12 rupes net per piece. In lengths these are about 13 coveds and therin litelle difference betwene either of the sorts. And these are all the sorts of Ambertyes Lackhoare yeldeth, of which if you intend provisions in all of them, 20000 peces maye yearly bee provided browne, but then wee must have the yeare and meanses beforehand to bee perpetually doinge therin for that their whitinge (as formerly advisd you) is exceedinge tedious and troublesome, though putting forth as bought, and their charge in cureinge them more or lesse, according to their finenes and breadth, some 2$\frac{1}{4}$ some 3, and some 3$\frac{3}{4}$ rupees per course, besides sone etts. But herin maye bee bothe some tyme and charges gayned if you aproove to have some of them caumsoucks [kam-sūkhā, unfinished] and onlye washt out of their grease or mandye [māndi] and no starch; but to send them you rawe as from the loome, wee are certaynyly persuaded theire thred will rott before theye come to your hands (and therfore in trente your expresse order therin), and was the principall resone wee sent you so fewe this yeare, which were only 25 peces for samples; wherby you might judge of the cloth, beinge rawe, and know it's length, breadth and vallue, all which it selfe expresseth. The disturies [dastūrī, discount] in buyinge it browne at Lackhouare is as the merchant makes it. Some cut of\textsuperscript{[f]}sa savoye [25 p. c.] some halfe a savoye [12$\frac{1}{2}$ p. c.], some a rupeye per piece, and some buye it for nett, which is all to one effecte, for what allowance souer you deducte it is inhaunced in the price, and therfore no setted custom, eveyone according to his fansye. The custome of tearinge of the reza [reza, scrap or fragment] from the length of the browne amberty is more beniffiall to the merchant here, by its sayle aparte, then the length of the remainder can advantage by its seeminge fynner, and is at least ten per cent.;\textsuperscript{35} which in their gaynes theye accompt not of, but allot it to the defrayinge their charges and cureinge of the rest; which custom wee neither have nor purpose to follow, but to white the intier piece as bought from the loome. Theye are not all of one exacte length, but some come out shorter then others by a coved, and generaly may bee 13 coveds Jehanger longe, or of Puttanna, betwene which and the coved of Lackhouare is

\textsuperscript{33} They paid, however, Rs. 5 too much. Discount of a sauā would be 25 p. c. not 20 p. c. This is shown by the statement *which is the 4 anyes or\textsuperscript{16} distury," i.e., 4 anyes in the rupee or\textsuperscript{16} discount—25 p. c.

\textsuperscript{34} Raza, ordinarily a quilt, coverlet; here applied to narrow breadth cloth.

\textsuperscript{35} This statement means that the reza was usually 10 p. c. of the whole piece and constituted a species of discount, like our own 13 to the baker's dozen.
some small difference, the country coved beinge the longer by almost a giery [ginik, गिर] of a gaz or $\frac{1}{4}$. In buying the browne cloth the buyer payeth no brokeridge; but in the sayle of the cloth the brokeres inhanceth five pices in etche piece of what price soever; wherof the brokeres share two pices, two pices the Governor or Shëkdar [shëkdër, revenue officer] of the prigony [pargana, district] and one pice they retorne back to the merchant; which custome is very large, and wee shall endeavor if possible to reduce it to lesse. And this is as much as I can advise you bothe for quantitie and Custome for buyinge the Ambertyes either here in Puttana or at Lackhoure.

What I was enforced concerninge the provision here of Bengalla silke, wounde of as our masters required, my letter of the 6th August aciertayned you bothe for price and quantitie, with which I sent you [thereof] musteres and advized you of the constant course I had taken for it's provision at the best hand, but our frends at Agra upon your advice unto them not to proceed further in that investment wholye discouraged mee which was th' occasion I almost let f[all my] determined purpose therin, yet with the rest of our goods have sent you a good sampell, which both for goodnes and price you will perceave to exceed what hath bin provided in Agra, the difference of them advised you; so that it cannot but prove a profitable commodity in England, and for the future if you shall determine on anye great provisions to be made therin, I cannot prescribe or advize of a better course to attayne quantitie therof at cheape rates then for our selves to buye the silke rawe, as it comes in serbandy [cocoon] from Bengalla, and wynde it of here in Puttanna into the condition the Compye ayme at; and in that nature have now sent you from hence but hope at somewhat better ratte then that was, for that the serbandy is latlye much fallen in price, of which sortes fittinge England I can aciertayne you the provision of 30 mds. per mouth, which as yet is the most I dare affirm to, and that will requier a good some of monye to keepe us Continually in Employment, and if but 300 maunda per Anno at 4 rupes the seare of 33 ½ pice weight (at which price wee maye without doubt furnishe you from hence) will requier at Leaste 50000 rups. for it's performance, wheron I leave you to conclude and determine. And if you shall desier slave silke of the best and principall sorte, it will cost us drest and died unto several Colleres 4 rups, net the seare of 33 ½ pices weight. What wee now sent for a sample was drest from the coarsest sortes of the serbandy silke, which is much inferior in goodnes to what maye here be provided in quantitie. And thuse have you my oppinion and advice of the two maye propes which must uphold this a factory, and theye not to be provided in anye quantityes without a continuall residence.

For other sortes of caliclo cloth, as sahanes and hammomes, wee perceave them not to bee brought hether in anye greate quantities, but a continuance here maye doubtles provide some, but to what number I cannot saye. For tusser stufes, 40 or 50 corge yerly. And wares for Persia (of which wee have sent you some sampels) greate quantities of all sortes; 100,000 rupes speediyle employed therin. Lignom aloes, also good quantitie, wherof likewise wee sent a sampell of the ordarye sorte knowne here by the name of simmulye [samaleh]\(^\text{26}\). . . . Of this commoditie there is here of diverse sortes and prizes from 20 rupes per maunde to 40 and 50 rupes per seare.

\(^{26}\) Watt, Dict. of Economic Products, s. v. Aquilaria Agallocha, gives the three kinds of this wood as sharkti (the heaviest), nim sharkti or samaleh-i-a'-ld, and samaleh (the lightest or commonest sort.)
The Caymeconyes [kāṁ-khāṇī] of Beyhare [Bihār] I with you acord to bee a commodiety fitter for Persia then England, yet as fit for Barbary or Turkey as anye other place.

Of Sutonge quilts wee sent you this yeare a pack . . . and all of them bought at such reasonable rates that wee expecte good muzera [27] for them from the Company. Theye are not made here, but brought from the bottom of Bengala . . . Other sortes of quiltes are not here to bee gotten of anye kinde . . .

The transporte of our goods from hence to Agra at 1½ rups. per maund is no dearer then usuialye all men paye for theire goods which goeth in Carravan and are 40 dayes on the waye . . .

In our last wee advized you of the saile of some goods into the Nabobs Cireare and to what value theye amounted. Since which wee have received parte of the monyes and hope within 2 or 3 dayes to cleare that busines. The poore rest of our Cash hath since bine invested at Lackhowre in the broadest sorts of raw Ambertyes; and they all delivered out to whittinge. Wee have bought about half a score maunds serbandy silke and are agayne setinge a foote its wynding of, and want but means to goe throughe for some good quantiety of that Commodity and our country provisiones of browne Ambertyes, both which is now to bee efected to good advantage. And therefore if suplye in som good some arrive not from Agra the sooner, wee shall endeve what possible on Credditt, beinge sore for [?] to lose] the least opportunitie which promiseth advantage.

If your encouragement from Persia shall induc ye to enorder provisiones of Banarse mandiles [mandil] it is from hence but a step together, where doubtles wee may furnishe you with more varietye and at farr better rattes then Agra can aforde. And so intreatinge your speedye order for what quantietye goods you shall requier from hence and meanes for their accomplishinge &c. [28]

IX.

Robert Hughes and John Parker to the Honoerable Company.

Patna, 30th November 1620. Right Honorable: Our humble dewtyes promised etts. Your Worships in your last yeares letters dated the 15th February and 6th March, 1618 [1619], sent by the Charles, Ruby and Dyamond, earnestly requiringe quantity of commodities fittinge England, and theire provisiones to bee made in such places as give best hopes, as well for attayninge quantietye as also for theire procuringe to best advantage for price, condition etcc., amongst sondrye other newe employments thought on by the President and Counsell in Surratt, after dispee of the Lyon the last yeare for England, theye enordered some experience to bee made in the partes of Bengalla, for that by reporte it promised good store of callico clothinge, rawe silke, etc., the commodities by your Worships most desiered; for which cause theye appoynted Robert Hughes to bee sent from the Agra factory to Puttanna, the chefest marte towne of all Bengala, appoynting him likewise an assistant then in Surratt, but afterwardes sent up for Agra in companye of Robert Younge; whoe beinge longe detayned in Ahmadavad, for want of company wherwith to proceed for Agra, spent a greate parte of the yeare there; wherof wee havinge notice in

[27] The word is apparently P. 'muzra,' lit. a place of seed produce: hence used mistakenly by this writer in the sense of produce, profit.
Agra, the tyme spending so fast, and the waye betwene Puttanna and Agra somewhat tedious, it was thought requisite to dispence Robert Hughes before and th' assistant to follow him upon advice of the necessity. And having accorded upon a competent some of monyees for some present trials, with bills of exchange importinge 4000 ruppes, hee departed Agra the 6th June, and after 29 dayes travell arived here in Puttanna the 3d July, where having procured acceptance of his exchanges, and made some inquisition into the hoped good here to bee effected, and upon good information being ascertained that this place to good purpose might bee established a factory, hee forthwith advized Surratt and Agra therefor, and intreted the sendinge his assistant and by him some English goods which in Agra laye unvendorable, with more supplye of monyees, to proceede in provision of what goods might posibyll bee compassed tymelye to be sent hence this yeare for Surratt and England; of which advize and information the Agra factors approved, and in place of John Bangam, which was proceeded with Robert Younge for Lahore, theye sent hether John Parker, and by him the goods advised for, whoe came hether about the midst of September; before and since whose arrivall what was have efected in our provisions, etc., we will proceed to give Your Worships notice. [Here follows a list of the goods provided at Patna for which see previous letters]. All which goods were dispceed hence for Agra the 4th October, exceedinge well packed and fenced with wrappers, cotton woll, waxecloth, and what else requisite for theire preservation both by land and sea.

The severall stufes now sent you... if th'ye give Content and prove vendable in England, greate quantityes thereof maye yearlye here bee provided, as likewise the quans wrought with yellowe silke, fethers, and Lignom Alloes, which are all but for tryall; and therefore the two maye properes which must uphold this a factory is Ambertly Calliaces and rawe silke, neither wherof are to be provided in anye quantityes without a continuall residence, for that th'ye requier great tymes, care, and diligence, th' one in the procuringe them whitted, and th' other in it's wynding of, and maye not be efected to anye purpose under a yeares tymes, wherof wee have bine large to Surratt, and expect theire resolutions how to proceede.

The Portingalls of late yeares have had a trade here in Puttanna, comminge up with theire friggits from the bottom of Bengalla, where theye have two portes, th' one called Gollye [Hayli], and th' other Pieppulyle [Pipli], and therin are licenced by this kinge to inhabitt. Gollye is theire cheffest port, where theye are in greate multitudes, and have yearlye shippinge both from Mallacka and Cochine. The commodityes th'ye usuallye bringe up hether is for the most part tyne, spices, and China wares, in lewe wherof theye transporte ambertye calliaces, carpets, and all sorte of thine cloth, which theye die into redds purposelye for sale to the sothwards. This cittye stands upon the river Ganges, whose swifte currant transporte theire friggits with such dexteritye that in five or six dayes theye usuallye go hence to theire portes, but in repairinge up agayne spend thrice the tymes.39

(To be continued.)

39 Factory Records, Patna, L. 16-18. Certain paragraphs of this letter have been omitted as they contain information previously given.
NOTES ON THE GRAMMAR OF THE OLD WESTERN RAJASTHANI WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO APABHRAMÇA AND TO GUJRATI AND MARWARI.

BY DR. L. P. TESSITORI, UDINE, ITALY.

(Continued from p. 63.)

(d) Single Consonants.

Apabhrāṃca consonants, in passing into Old Western Rājasthānī, undergo the changes following:

§21. $g$ is occasionally aspirated to $gh$. Ex.:


In $dghai$ (P. 554), from Apabhrāṃca $appai$, $gh$ is possibly the result of $g$ having combined with the locative suffix $hai$ (see § 147). The original form would therefore be $^*$ $dghai$.

For the analogous case of $p > ph$ see § 26. For $g > gr$ see § 31.

§22. $j$ is occasionally changed to $y$. In many cases this change is only apparent, for in the writing the two characters $j$ and $y$ are often interchanged and there is no doubt that they were pronounced much in the same way, i.e., as $j$ (see § 1), but in some other cases it would seem that an actual weakening of $j$ to $y$ took place, i.e., between vowels $j$ gradually lost its force as a consonant and came to be used as a mere euphonic element like the $āṇu$ of Jaina Prakrit. Ex.:

$kahi$ (P. 715, i, 10) $<$ kahiya (Cr.). $<$ kahiya (Ādi C.) $<$ Ap. kahiya $<$ Skt. kathyate,

$vdiya$ (Dd. 5) $<$ $vdhiya$ $<$ Ap. vāḍhiya $<$ Skt. vāḍhyakaḥ.

§23. Initial $n$ is always changed to $n$. Cf. the case of the Ardhamāgadhī and the Jaina Māhārāṣṭrī, where dental $n$ is always substituted for cerebral $n$ of Prakrit and Apabhrāṃca, both when initial and when doubled in the middle of a word. Thus in Old Western Rājasthānī we have:

$navi$ (Crā. 45) (see § 103) $<$ Ap. $nvi$ $<$ Skt. nā'pi,

$vdiya$ (Ādi. 2) $<$ Ap. $vdiya$ $<$ Skt. naḍakaḥ, etc.

§24. $t$ is changed to $t$ in the following:

$māt$a (see § 71, (5)) $<$ $nimatt$a $<$ Ap. $nimatt$a $<$ $nimitt$a $<$ Skt. nimittakena,

Modern Gujarāṭī $etalo$ $<$ O.W.R. $etala$ (see § 93, (2)) $<$ Ap. etelai.

§25. $t$ is occasionally changed to $p$ and vice versa. Ex.:

$jagapayyara$ (Rā. 67) $<$ Skt. jagatyayyra,

$jipaya$ (Ja. 3, Dd. 2) $<$ $ilvaya$ (ibid.), a denominative infinitive from $jita$ $<$ Ap. $jita$.

(Cf. Jaina Māhārāṣṭrī jitta, in Jacobis Ausgew. Erz. in Māh., p. 13, 6) $<$ Skt. jīt-,

$ta$ (see § 73, (4)) $<$ $pata$ $<$ Ap. appa $<$ Skt. *ātmanakah,

$po$ $<$ $dopa$ (see § 92).

Cf. the case of Sanskrit $ātma$, which in Prakrit appears under the two forms $appa$- and $alta$ (Pischel, §§ 277, 401). For $t > tr$ see § 31.

§26. $p$ is occasionally aspirated to $ph$. The case here is somewhat analogous with § 21, only from the two single examples available it would seem that $ph$ has been brought about by $p$ combining with an $h$ in the subsequent syllable. Ex.:

Mod. Guj. $āphay $<$ O.W.R. $āpahay[ya]$ (Dac. iv.) (see § 92) $<$ Ap. $appaya$ $<$ Skt. $ātmanah-$,
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$\text{upara}u$ (Âdi. 55) < $\text{upahara}u$ (Daç. v, 13) < *$\text{parahau}$ (see §147) < Ap. uppara- < Skt. upara-

See §38. For $p > pr$ see §31.

§27. $m$ is changed to $l$ in:

$\text{ka}\varphi$ (Yog. ii, 67, 111, Indr. 1) < Ap. *$\text{musai} <$ Skt. *$\text{mu}yati (=muṣñāt)$. 

§28. Euphonic $y$ is inserted before $a, d$, when the latter are preceded by another vowel, in much the same function as the $\text{asvrti}$ of Jaina Prakrit. Ex.:

$\text{kiyara}$ (Kânh. 10) < Ap. * $\text{kēra} <$ Skt. kumāra-,
$\text{joy}a$ (P. 158) < Ap. joai < Skt. dyota-te,
$\text{kū}t\bar{a}$ (Âdi C., passim) < $\tilde{t}u$ (see §90) < Ap. *$\text{tehāa}$,
$n\varphi\text{yara}$ (P. 10) < Ap. $\varphi\text{yara} <$ Skt. nagara-,
$\text{raya}$ (Rs. 62) < Ap. raai < Skt. rajani,
$\text{hū}d$ (Âdi. 37) < Ap. hād < Skt. bhūtāh.

In some MSS. it is however omitted, thus:

$\text{ku}t\bar{a}$ (Dd. 1), $t\tilde{u}$ (Âdi C.), bhaviṣya (Rs. 1), hād (Kal. 11), etc.

Euphonic $y$ is also inserted, though rather rarely, after $c, n$, mostly when these consonants are followed by $a, d$, after $j$, when followed by $o$, and after $kh, s$ to give the sound of Sanskrit ka, g. Ex.:

$\text{cārī}$ (see §80) < Ap. cəri < Skt. cañcara (Pischel, §439),
$\text{nyāpita}$ (P., passim) < Skt. nāpita-,
$\text{kari}j\bar{a}$ (see §120) < $\star$ karj\bar{a} < Ap. *$\text{karej\bar{j\bar{a}}}$,
$\text{sa}m\text{khy\bar{e}pa}$ (F 588) < Skt. saṁkṣēpa-,
$\text{gy\bar{a}}$ (P. 559) < Skt. gəpa-.

For other examples of the change jo > jyo. cf. the case of the relative pronoun in the dialects of the Rajasthani.

§29. $r$ is occasionally changed to $d$ and vice versa. Ex.:

ke$\varphi$ (F 715, i, 14) < $\varphi$ (see §73, (2)) < Ap. kə$\varphi$ < Skt. *$\text{kūryam}$,
$\text{baisārā}$ (Daç. 1v) < ba$\varphi$ā$\bar{a}$ (Âdi C.) (see §141, (3)) < Ap. *$\text{waisādai}$ < Skt. *$\text{upavi$\bar{s}$dāti}$ (=upaveçyati).


§29a. $r$ is changed to $l$ in the termination-ālai = -ārai = -ālai of the causal. See §141, (3).

§30. $r$ is occasionally elided, when falling between two vowels of which the second is $i$. Ex.:

$\text{oli}u$ (Mu.) < $\star$oril\bar{a} < $\star$oril\bar{a} (see §144) < Ap. *$\text{oril\bar{a}}$, *av$\varphi$il\bar{a} < Skt. apārīlīkhaḥ,
$\text{pail\bar{a}}$ (Mu.) < $\star$paril\bar{a} (see §144) < Ap. *pərīl\bar{a} < Skt. *pərīlākhaḥ,
$\text{s\varphi}r$ (Cəl. 118, Up. 28, 29, 41, 44, 50 etc.) < $\star$s$\varphi$rā < Ap. sər$\varphi$ra < Skt. sār$\varphi$ra.

§31. Euphonic $r$ is occasionally inserted between an initial single consonant and the following vowel, much in the same way as euphonic $y$ after $c, n, j$ (see §28). The consonants, to which $r$ is more commonly added, are: $g, t, p, bh, s$. The same tendency is to be observed in Apabhramṣa (see Pischel, §268). Old Western Rajasthani examples are:

$\text{girōhali}$ (Yog. iii, 37) < *$\text{gorhali} <$ Ap. *$\text{gorhali} <$ Skt. godha-,
$\text{gраhai}$ (P. 290) < Ap. *$\text{gahai} <$ Skt. *$\text{gраhаi} (=grāhāti),$
$\text{t\varphi}b\bar{a}$ (Indr. 23) < Ap. *$\text{tamb\bar{a} <}$ Skt. tāmram,
$\text{tr\varphi}\bar{a}$ (see §80) < Ap. $\text{tr\varphi} <$ Skt. tri$\varphi$,
$\text{trja}$ (see §82) < Ap. *la$\varphi$ja < Skt. tṛṣyakāh,
$\text{tr\varphi}a$ (see §80) < Ap. $\text{t\varphi}a$, $\text{t\varphi}m <$ Skt. tṛṣ$\varphi$cat,
$\text{t\varphi}\bar{a}$ (Bh. 74) < Ap. $\text{t\varphi} \bar{a}$ < Skt. tṛṣyati,
$\text{tro\varphi}a$ (F 783, 77) < Ap. *$\text{tovai} <$ Skt. *$\text{tovati}$ (Pischel, §486),
prāmai (Mu.) < pāmai < Ap. pārīs < Skt. *prapati (—prapnoti),
prāhūvai (Adi. 51) < Ap. pāhūvai < Skt. prāgūvakaḥ,
maṇi,
It will be seen that in many of the examples above r is the survival of an original r in
the Sanskrit. In estra (Daś.) < Ap. estra—(cf. etrula—, Pischel, § 268) we have an instance of
euphonic r added to a medial consonant.
§32. I is occasionally changed to n and vice versa. Ex.:
nānḥai (Daś.) < Pkt. lāvha < Skt. glaṃvakaḥ,
nidāda < Pkt. nidāda < Skt. lāte,
ība (Up. 36) < Ap. nimbu < Skt. nimbū,
In the MS. Up. we commonly meet with lākhai instead of ordinary nākhai (33, 105,
139, 149 etc.). For analogous examples in Prakrit see Pischel, § 260.
§33. Medial v is hardened to b, when by apheresis of a preceding vowel it becomes initial.
Ex.:
bausai (Dd. 2) < Ap. uvaisai < Skt. upaviṣati,
bacā (P. 374) < Ap. avacā < Skt. apatyakam.
The latter word is the regular form of Gujarātī baccā (Hindi baccā), the origin whereof
had been hitherto wrongly traced to Sanskrit vatsa.
§34. Euphonic v is inserted before a preceded by another vowel, much in the same way
as y (§ 28), only more rarely. Ex.:
jāvai (F. 722, 254) < jāvai (Adi C.) (see § 116) < Ap. jāti < Skt. yāti,
jovai (Adi C.) < Ap. jovai < Skt. yojana,
pivai (F. 535, iv, 3) < pivai (see § 116) < pī (Daś. ix) < Ap. pīai < Skt. pibati.
§35. Medial v falling between two vowels is occasionally elided. Ex.:
suīvai (Saṣṭ. 159) < Pkt. suśvai < Skt. svapnakaḥ.
When v is followed by a, the entire syllable va is elided. Ex.:
Kānḍade (Kān.) < Ap. Kānḍadeva < Skt. Kṛṇadeva,
Jayāsīnḥade (Vi. 59) < Skt. Jayāsīnḥadeva,
Cf. the case of Prakrit in Pischel, § 149.
§36. Medial v accompanied by anunāsika passes into m and the anunāsika is dropped. Ex.:
ima (see § 98, 31) < Ap. ima < Skt. eva,
In the following v is retained, anunāsika only being dropped. Ex.:
kāvār (Daś. v, 4) < Ap. kādvāt < Skt. kārdama.
§37. (1) a falling between two vowels in the last syllable of a word and forming part of
a termination, is generally elided and the two vowels are either contracted or remain in hiatus,
Ex.:
karaḥ (P. 582) < Ap. karahā < Skt. * karabhā (—karabhānām),
ka (Rat. 18) < Ap. kaḥ < Pkt. kahā < Skt. kaṃmā,
jāvai (Bh. 44) < Ap. jāvai < Skt. *jāvai (—Jāvai),
jito (Saṣṭ. 93) < *jito < Ap. jivā, vocative plural,
nayanaḥ (F. 783, 71) < Ap. nayanaḥ < Skt. *nayanabhis (—nayanais),
mā (see § 83) < Ap. mahu < Skt. mahyam.
In old poetry, however, a in a termination is occasionally retained. Ex.:
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(gaȳha (Vi. 45) < Ap. gāḍhā < Skt. *gatāśām (= gatānām),
gumā (Vi. 70) < Ap. guṇīḥ < Skt. *gunebhīs (= gunais),
bāppahā (Vi. 140) < Ap. bappahā (see Deśī, vi, 88),
manahī (Rā. 29) < Ap. manahī < Skt. *mānasmin.

In the plural oblique forms bibhā, trikā, cīkā (see §81) and savīkā (see §96), the ḥ in the termination is always retained. In the case of Apabhraṃṣa kahā, jahā, tahā, ḥ may be optionally retained or elided, as in the example kā quoted above.

(2) ḥ falling between two vowels in the last syllable of a word and not forming part of a termination is generally retained. Ex. :

-nahā (see §§48, 103) < Ap. nāḥā < Skt. na-hi,
pāhā (see §72, (8)) < Ap. pakkhe < Skt. pakṣe,
bhamuhī (P. 564) < Pkt. bhamuhā < Skt. *bhūrvukā (Pischel §§124, 206).

Two exceptions are formed by :

-su (see §70, (5)) < Ap. sahā < Skt. saḥkam (Pischel, §206),
auxda (see §80) < Ap. caussedha- < Skt. caturdoṣa-,
in the latter of which, ḥ has been dropped along with the following a. The same is the case with the other cardinals from 11 to 19.

(3) ḥ falling between two vowels in the middle of a word is generally retained, except in the later stage of the language, when it is occasionally elided. The only instance I have noted of the latter case is :

-pailaī (Ādi C.) < pailaī (see §82).

This process, which was but at its start in the later Old Western Rajasthānī stage, is nowadays found to be largely spread in Modern Gujarāṭī, especially in the Northern colloquial, and in Mārvārī, where elision of medial ḥ has become almost a rule.

§38. Euphonic ḥ is occasionally inserted between two vowels, to avoid hiatus. Ex :

-kūvāhā (Da. iv) < *kūvāḥ < *kāvāḥ < Ap. *kāvāḥ,
chevādā (Da. C.) < Ap. chevādā < Skt. *chedatākām,
pradhī (Yog. iii, 130) < *prādhai < Ap. prādai (cf. prāv, Hc., iv, 414, (1)) < Skt. *prādayeṇa (= prāyena),

Insertion of an entire syllable ha seems to have taken place after pa in:

-pahā (Da. C.) (see §§26, 92) < Ap. appamā < Skt. dhaman-.

Prefixing of ḥ occurs in :


(e) Compound Consonants.

§39. Apabhraṃṣa consonantie compounds are of two kinds, to wit: a) compounds formed by a consonant doubled, and, b) compounds formed by a consonant preceded by a nasal. To these might be added c) compounds formed by a consonant followed by a, but these undergoing no change in Old Western Rajasthānī, we need not take them into account here.

§40. Double consonants of the Apabhraṃṣa are as a rule simplified in Old Western Rajasthānī and the preceding vowel is generally lengthened. Examples for each class of consonants are :

(1) gutturals :
mukṣa (P. 422 ff.) < Ap. makkṣa- < Skt. mākṣa-,
lkkhā (P. 292) < Ap. *lkkhā (cf. Ardhamārgaīa lkkhā-) < Skt. ākṣākāḥ,
īgamaī (Rā. 29) < Ap. ūgamaī < Skt. udgamaī.
(2) palatals:
ścavaī (P. 297) < Pkt. saccavaī (He., iv, 181) < Skt. satyadpayati (Pischel, § 559),
Lāchi (Rś. 55) < Ap. Laccā < Skt. Laksmaī,
āja (Dd. 6) < Ap. ajja < Skt. adya,
In the termination of the preceptive plural jī is optionally simplified to jy. See §§ 28, 120.

(3) cerebrals:
vāṭa (Cār.) < Ap. vatā (fem.) < Skt. vartmā (nom. n.),
dīvhaī (Dd. 6) < Ap. dīvhaī < Skt. dvijakah,
pachḍdāī (F 783, 55) < Ap. *pachḍḍāī < Skt. *prachḍḍati,
Cerebral double ṣ having a peculiar treatment, it will be well treated separately under § 41.

(4) dentals:
pūtali (Dd. 7) < Ap. puttali < Skt. puttāi, puttalikā,
udēga (Dā. V, 90) < Ap. udēga < Skt. udvega-,
siddhaī (F 535) < Ap. siddhaī < Skt. siddhakāh,

(5) labials:
āpāi (Dd. 2) < Ap. appāi, appei < Skt. arpayati,
rāphāī (P. 63) < Ap. rappāhāi (cf. Pkt. raphho = valmikah, Dēyi, vii, 1),
cībhāī (P. 252) < Ap. cībhāi < Skt. cībhāi,

(6) semivowels:
ghālai (Dd. 10) < Ap. ghallai (= kiripi, He., iv, 334, 422),
dvāi (Dd. 7) < Ap. dvārī (cf. Dēyi, iv, 6).
For ll > lh see § 42.

(7) sibilants:
vīnāsa (P. 284) < Ap. vīnāsa- < Skt. vīṃśa-.

§ 41. Cerebral double ṣ of the Apabhraṃsa is simplified into dental n in Old Western Rājasthāni. Ex.:

inayu (Dā. < Ap. inīnai < Skt. unnatāh,
chānai (P. 352) < Ap. chāyai < Skt. channakah,

From this change one may be induced to assume that Apabhraṃsa ṣ was first changed to nh and then simplified to n, whereof an analogy might be afforded by the Jaina Prakrit, in which initial ṣ and medial ṣ are always dentalized. But there is evidence pointing out that, in some cases at least, the passing of ṣ to n was effected through ṣh > nh. The differentiating of ṣh to nh had already begun in the Pāṇgala-Apabhraṃsa, where we come across such forms as: diṣṭhaī, linhaī (i, 128) for regular diṣṭhaī, *linhaī (see § 126, (3)).
The case here is very analogous to the differentiation of ll to lh, which is explained below.
Old Western Rājasthāni further changed ṣh to nh and treated the latter as a single consonant.
The same did Old Eastern Rājasthāni and Old Western Hindī and out of diṣṭhaī, linhaī made dinhāi, and linhāi. To the Old Western Rājasthāni tendency to change ṣh to nh we have a testimony in the termination -anahāra of the noun of agency, which is derived from -anahāra through -anahāra (see § 135). The nexus nh has further survived in the postposition kanhāi, for which see § 71, (1), and in:
§42. Through the same process as य द द seems to have gone Apabhraṣṭa त. Differentiation of त to ठ is already found in the Jaina Māhārāṣṭri in the examples: melhiev < melliyai and melhevi < mellovi occurring Bhavnairājyaśatakaka, 47, 56, both of which are referable to the verb mellai of the Prakrit (see Hc., iv, 91). Old Western Rājasthāni has likewise melhāi (P. 343), whence also mehala (Bh. 47, P. 504) by metathesis of h (see § 51). Another Old Western Rājasthāni example is:


§43. Double consonants are simplified without compensatory lengthening of the preceding vowel, when the latter is followed or preceded by a long or accented syllable or comes immediately after another vowel. Ex.:

aḍhāi (see § 114) < Ap. aṭṭhāi < Skt. oṭṭhāi (Pischel, §§ 57, 480),
ānāi (see § 106) < Ap. anāṣai < Skt. anyāṇi,
ānerai (Ādī. 27) < Ap. anerai < Skt. * anyakāryakā,
āpuṇāi (F 724) < Ap. upaṇaṇai < Skt. utpāṇakā,
oḷaṇu (P. 105) < Pkt. oluggo (see Doetti, i, 164),
cauṭhāi (Dd.) < Ap. caṭṭhāi < Skt. caṭṭhakā,
nipājai (F 535) < Ap. niṇpajai < Skt. nippadyate,
paitthai (Ādī. 17) < Ap. paṭṭhāi < Skt. pravīṣṭāka,
māṭhāla (see §§ 101, 1, 145) < Ap. *mattkāla < Skt. *nastakalā smin,
vakkhāi (Crā.) < Ap. vakkkhāi < Skt. vyākhyānayati,
hojje (see § 120) < Ap. *hoejjahi.

In some few cases, however, there seems to be no apparent reason for the vowel remaining short, as in:

mūiha, mājha (see § 83) < Ap. majjhu < Skt. māhyam.

§44. Double consonants are retained in the following cardinals:

3, triṇi (Yog. i, 15, 34, 50) < Ap. tiṇi < Skt. trīṇi,
27, satāvīsa (F 669, 22) < Ap. satāvīsa < Skt. satāvīṇa,-
28, āṭṭhāvīsa (Pr. 29) < Ap. āṭṭhāvīsa < Skt. āṭṭhāvīṇa,-
38, āṭṭhatīsa (ibid.) < Ap. āṭṭhatīsa < Skt. āṭṭhatīraṇa,-
50, chappana (Rṣ. 63) < Ap. chappana < Skt. * saṇpaṇat (Pischel, § 445),
64, caivaśṭthi (F 758) < Ap. caivasṭthi < Skt. caivasṭthi,
72, būhattari (Ādī C.) < Ap. būhattari < Skt. doṇaṣāṭati,
98, āṭṭhāvi (ibid.) < Ap. *aṭṭhāvaṇi < Skt. aṭṭhāvaṇati,
in the ordinal:
chāṭhāvi (Rṣ. 17, 49, 56, F 602) < Ap. chāṭhāvi < Skt. saṭṭakāh,
and in the noun:
P. 374, however, the regular form baccī is met with.

§45. Consonantetic compounds of the Apabhraṣṭa, formed by a consonant preceded by the corresponding class-nasal, pass into Old Western Rājasthāni by changing the class-nasal to anunāśika and at the same time lengthening the preceding vowel. Ex.:

rāka (P. 151) < Ap., Skt. rāka,-
sāga (P. 63) < Ap. siṣga < Skt. srīṇga,-
pḍea (see § 80) < Ap., Skt. paṇca,-

19 Cf. also Mod. Gj. racc, for common O.W.R. vicā (§ 75).
§46. In tātāsāmas the conjuncts of Sanskrit are generally kept unchanged. The only exceptions, which I have noted, refer to kṣ, which is occasionally represented by khy (see §28), and to jñ, ny, which are occasionally interchanged as in the two examples following:

jñāsikta (Yog. ii, 66) < Skt. nyāsikta-

nyāna (F 729, 2) < Skt. jñāna-

(f) Metathesis.

§47. Cases of metathesis, i.e., of transposition of one element or interchange of two elements in the same word, are very frequent in Old Western Rājasthānī, much as they are, indeed, in Modern Gujarātī and Marwārī. I shall group the examples I have collected under four heads, to wit: a) metathesis of quantity, b) metathesis of anunāsika, c) metathesis of vowels, and d) metathesis of consonants.

§48. Metathesis of quantity occurs in the examples following:

ah (P. 553) (see §89) < Ap. āhī < Skt. *adakasmin,

kāri, kārī (Vi., passim) < Ap. kuṣāri < Skt. kuṃāri,

nāthi (see §115) < *nāthi < Pkt. rathā < Skt. nāṣṭi,

nāhi (see §103) < Ap. nāhi < Skt. nā-hi,

māharai (see §83) < Ap. mahāra < Skt. *mahakārakāh (Pischel, §434),

sah (see §96) < Ap. sahu < Skt. gacvat (Pischel, §64),

sohamāṇī < Ap. sohamāṇi < Skt. sohamāṇam.

From the above it will be seen that in bisyllabic words the long quantity is transferred to the ultimate vowel, and in words having three or four syllables it is transferred to the antepenultimate. The accent seems not to have been of very much account here. It will be further noticed that out of the four examples of bisyllabic words quoted above, three are formed by words, the ultimate syllable whereof was originally h followed by a short vowel, a fact which certainly accounts in some part for the metathesis of quantity, h generally tending to fall out when followed by a short vowel at the end of a word. An exception, however, is in the form following:

kihā (Ādi. 13, 47) < kihā (see §§91, 98, (1)) < Ap. kahā < Pkt. kamhā < Skt. kasmāt.

§49. Metathesis of anunāsika occurs in:

khi, k̄i (see §91) < Ap. kāi < Skt. kūni,

gaiha (Vi. 45) < Ap. gaihā < Skt. *gatādām (—gatāndām),

māhai (P. 212) < *mōjaḥi < Ap. majjhahi < Skt. *maḍhyaśmin,

in all of which examples the anunāśika is transferred from a short to a long vowel.

§50. Metathesis of vowels occurs in:

tuhaï (see §110) < Ap. *tai-hī < Skt. tato-hi,

thikai (see §72, (4)) < *thākīu < Ap. thakkiu < Skt. *stakṣyātalā (cf. Pischel, §488),

piya (Ādi C.) < paṇi (see §110) < Ap. puṣṇu < Skt. punar,

vīraja (P. 46) < Skt. vanijj, vanījya-,
haśāla (P 8) < hāya-la (F 715) < Ap. hia-la < Skt. * hṛdaya:akam,
hātā (Up. 196) < Ap. hia-iti < Skt. bhūtakā,</hiva (Sāsten, passim) < havi < ehavi (see § 94, (3)).

§ 51. Metathesis of consonants is in the great generality of cases effected by h, which possesses a strong tendency to be thrown back before the foregoing syllable. The same tendency h already possessed in Prakrit, and several illustrations thereof have been collected by Professor Pischel, § 354 of his Prakrit grammar. In Old Western Rājasthāni, however, this peculiarity of h is much more marked, a fact, which is quite consistent with the way in which intervocalic h is pronounced in standard Modern Gujarāti up to this day. 20

Examples are:

śphara (Ādi. 55) < * śphara < * śpara (see § 147),
dihā (P., Yog.) < * dihā < Ap. diha < Skt. * divasa-taka,<
dhōla (Dād.) < * dhōla < Ap. dūlaha < Skt. durlabha,<
meḥalā (Bh. 47) < Jaina Māh. melhāi (see § 42) < Ap. mehāi,
vāhīlu (Yog. i, 55) < Ap. vallaha < Skt. vallabha,<
śūma (F 602) < śūma (Crā.) < * sūma (Up. 108) < Ap. sammuḥa < Skt. caṃmu-
khaka,<

hrai (Crā.) < rahai (see § 71, (6)).

The reverse tendency seems to have been possessing h when originally initial in a word. This was already the case in Prakrit, as is shown by the examples draha < Skt. hroha, rāhassa < Skt. hrasva and luhai < hulai, quoted by Pischel, § 354. For the Old Western Rājasthāni I may quote:

draha (Dād. D.) < Skt. hroha, and:
tha (P. 70) < hata (see § 113).

In Marwāri we have: thai < hūvai. 21

Quite exceptional are the forms evahā, kevahā, etc. occurring in Sāsta for evahā, kevahā, § 94, (3).

Transposition of consonants different from h occurs in:

gam (for gamṣ?) (Mū.) < * māga (for mṛ-ga?) < Ap. maga (for maghā?) < Skt. mṛga,<
bhṛyoga (P. 635) < * bhṛtyoga < Skt. bhṛtyoga.

For the metathesis of r in double causals see § 141, (4).

(g) Samprastāraṇa.

§ 52. Samprastāraṇa is very frequent in Old Western Rājasthāni, both in tadbhavas and in taisamas. A few examples are the following:

abhināra (P. 320) < Skt. abhinātara—(cf. Ardhamāgadhī abhinātara),
guṃkha (P. 352, Ādi) < * guṃkha < Ap. guṃkha < Skt. guṃkha,<
desūra (P. 142) < Ap. desūrā < Skt. desūrā,<
dhāla (Up. 95) < Ap. dhāla < Skt. dhālaka,<
nāma (8, 31) < Ap. nāma < Skt. nāma,<
bhavi (F 535, ii, 21) < Skt. bhavya,<
vivahā (P. 41, 44) < Skt. vyavahārin,<
sūpana (F 715, i, 19) < Skt. svāpana,<

(To be continued).

21 Cf. Old Balāvārī rahasana < harasana (R. C. M. ii, 17).
"Dharani," OR INDIAN BUDDHIST PROTECTIVE SPELLS.

Translated from the Tibetan.

BY L. A. WADDELL, C.B., LL.D

(Continued from p. 54.)

7. The Flaming Diadem.

Uṣṇīṣa-jvala.

Oṁ ! In the Indian speech [this is called] Āryaṣīṣa jvala nāma Dhrāṇi ; in the Tibetan speech 'P'aga-pa gis-ṅ-tor ' bar-wa žes bya-ba'i gzuñs.

Salutation to The Three Holy Ones! Nāmas samanta buddhanām, apratikataśasanāmāṁ. Oṁ ! kha-kha, kha-hi, kha-hi, hāw, hāw, jvala, prajvala prajvala, tiśta tiśhāti sarvadvarani mitidusa svavana śanti kurā svāhā.

This indeed is the spell of the thousand Buddhas, it is the famous ‘flaming diadem’. This famous luck-bringer makes all one’s deeds to be blessed, whether they be of different kinds [good or bad ?], whether they be hundreds of thousands, 900, or five fold. Evil dreams and evil omens76 are made harmless. Whoever mutters77 it merely once has [harm] cleared away. The hosts of obstructing demons78 are rendered powerless and utterly destroyed. Life and future happiness become increased! Mangalās! (O happiness!)

8. The All-Victorious Turner-aside (of Evil.)

Vijayavati-pratvaṅgirā [Dhrāṇi].


Oṁ ! In the Indian speech [this] is called Ārya vijayavavacatina79 nāma pratvaṅgirā ; in the Tibetan speech 'Pa'ga-pa p'yir-zlog-pa rnam-par rgyal-ba-chan : [that is, The Noble All-Victorious Turner-Aside or Repeller].

Salutation to the Buddhas and Bodhisattvas, the guardians who strive after the welfare of all living beings! Salutation to all the Sādhanas [rituals for compelling visions of spell-spirits]! Salutation to all the holders of spells [mantras]! Salutation to Buddha, The Law and The Order! Salutation to the Bodhisattvas, Mahāsattva Mahākaruṇa80 and the illustrious Ārya Avalokiteśvara. All these were saluted by Vijayavati Pratvaṅgirā, who throws off life-destroying agencies and curses, pacifies the ghosts of the dead and excessive misfortune, dissipates fear [at the hands] of kings, fear of robbers, fear of fire, fear of flood-water, fear of dākini-p-retā, piedcha, kumbhāṇḍa āstāraka, apasmāra, putana,81 fear of losing the track, fear of the cremation-path fear of those beings who walk in the darkness of the night and in the daylight. She makes them harmless and of a good disposition or entirely disperses them, repels all enemies, pacifies all upsetting and obstructing demons. She cleanses

76 m'c'ar. śaṁ.
77 balas.
78 St. Skt. gāña.
79 This is obviously corrupt for vijayavatī, the form in the St. Petersburgh text, and Schmidt p. 101, which is also the form given in the Sanskrit Tibetan Dictionaries.
80 This is an epithet of Avalokita, although here differentiated from that divinity by ‘and.’
81 Classes of evil spirits.
completely from all sin, from sluggishness in speech, the stiff in speech become charming in address and expression. Salutation to the Bodhisattvas, Mahāsattva Mahākaruṇa and the illustrious Ārya Avalokisteśvara.

The essential spells which will accomplish these [objects] are as follows:— Oṁ dhara (repeat 7 times), dhiri (seven times), dhuru (eight times). Protect us against fear, harm, destruction of life, curses, protect us! Mara (seven times) Mara (seven times)! Mura (seven times)! Protect us from all disease, protect us! Hīlī (eight times) hulī (eight times) kīlī (nine times) mīlī (eight times)! tsi-li (nine times)! tsi-tsi (9 times)! Repel all demons! Oṁ visara visara ka ṣpa ka ṣpa naīana naīayanaiya!

Against wrathful and malignant enemies whom you desire may come no nearer, make burst-offerings and employ the above spells and afterwards repeat them once more. Svāhā!

This will close the eyes of foes, close the ears, nose, tongue, bind the body, mind, and all the members, large and small it will bind. Sphuṭa, sphiṭa, sphiṭa sphiṭaya (three times)!

To clear away all destructive influences and curses, suppress every evil under every circumstance. Sarcatur soma, tūra (four times), Svāhā! Protect us against fear and all kinds of harm, destruction of life, curses, ghosts and apasmāra. Protect us! Svāhā.

To cleanse from all one's sins—a prayer to cleanse: Tsara Tsara svāhā! mara mara svāhā, Sīri sīri svāhā, kuru kuru svāhā, dhuru dhuru svāhā!

For men desirous that harm shall not increase or that they be not befogged or stranded in solitude, or enraged or deluded, that they may turn aside all demons (bhūta), and all 'seizing'-demons (ghraha) and all diseases so that they do not drive people insane, do not befog the mind, stiffen, frighten, at all frighten, dismember, overpower, Svāhā! Nile (three times)! Keie svāhā pīti (three times)! Keie svāhā lohitā (three times)! Keie svāhā mavadāte avadāte avabhata! Keie svāhā tritva tritvā vastudhārayā svāhā! Turn aside the power of all demons! Cleanse us from all sin, Svāhā! Increase [good] deeds (two times), increase our good-luck and prosperity, increase our [good] deeds! Svāhā! Protect us against fear, harm, onset of sickness, all [evil?] births and destruction of life, and all curses, and all disease-demons and all sin, and all evil planets and vast evils and all visible and invisible harm! Protect us, Svāhā!

"This [spell] named The All-Victorious Turner-aside (Vijaya Pratyamgīrā) produces victory. Whosoever on their neck [hangs] this [spell] enfeeters [evil] and thus becomes certainly the victor. The unblessed path of troublesome dreams, sin, enemies of all kinds, robbers, fire and kings all these cannot harm. Whosoever on their neck [hangs] this [spell] enfeeters [evil]; then the water-floods cannot carry him off. Sins become cleansed, every virtue becomes swiftly increased, illness is banished by profitable gain. The [book on the] noble Vijaya pratyaṣgīrā, so named, is finished. Mangalaḥ!"

The Tibetan text of the Sitātapātra or Mahāprātyaṣgīrā Dhāraṇī is easily accessible, as in addition to its occurrence in the Kā-gyur Canon, and in the Dhāraṇī Pitaka (Mdo-maṅ gsum), it is also frequently met with as a separate manual. The 'Red Copper Beak' however, being less common and as yet un-known in its Sanskrit version, I here append its text, translated in Roman characters from the printed copy in my collection, in the India Office Library, K. 17 Vol. Z. (18). Its translation I have given at pp. 39-41.

---

82 Implies the attributes of the Vedic Vāch, the goddess of speech, the prototypic of Sarasvatī.
83 Mālā-mantra.
84 This spell with 'Hīlī kīlī mīlī' is evidently part of the great peafowl charm against snakes ascribed in simpler forms to Buddha. See my art. Dhāraṇī Cult., loc. cit.
85 Literally 'causes victory to arise.'
TEXT OF "THE RED COPPER BEAK."

Oṃ || rgya-gar-skad-du ārya ghadsha pratyaṃ bhandhaghāta kadabrīta tsakhadhayā bod-skad-du 'p'ags-pa saṅs-kyi-mch'u dmar-pos gdug-pa'i pyogs t'am-chad gnon-bar byed-pa' zhes-bya-ba'i gzhu-ṃ ||


'Di skad bdag-gis t'o's-pa dus gehi-na | behom-ldan-'das 'dam-bu-ts'a-la padma-mdses-byed sa-k'ubs-pa gnas ch'u-bo yan-lag-brgyad-da'i ldan-pa' gnam-na bzugs so | la-bor dmaq-tu med-pa da'i t'abs gehi-go | dge-slo-gi, dge-'dun-ch'en-po da'i t'abs gehi-tu bzugs so ||


[May, 1914]
rāsi's ta'd-du 'dug-bas | ghu-ba-su-tas ka-rla's bun-pa z'ig btad-bas | p'yag-na-rdo-rje-la šu-t'ug t'ug-du hu-'u-ńo.

De-nas p'yag-na-rdo-rje t'ugs-rtoq skyes-te | k'yod-na jo-bos-chan žig 'dug-pa ji skad bya-ba bas | šu ni klû-rgyal-po bram že rin-po-che Va-su-ta zes-bya-ba yin-no | ša-la dug-nam-pagla . . . [here five leaves from fol. 3b to 8b] žes bkâ stsal-pa |

Ôm hrâm hri hrâh áh tathāgatâ | nāgahridaya | tathāgata namah dhama-yâ | tathāgate râjasrilhanana | budya 'budya râja śâla pari pari-lira | nāgahu yarbara povamda svâhâ | guha râjala svâhâ hrâm hri | . . . [3 pages to fol. 11a].

'p'ags-pa zaâs-mch'u dmar-po rno-ba ś dpal-dan-chas-pa | va-su-ta rigs-drug dbâ-'du sdud-paô | de-nas kyaâi bram-zei-rigs rdul-du riog-par byed-paô ||

Zaâs-mch'u dmar-po'gziu'ís rdogs-rgya-gar kyi mk'an-po dsâna de-va daû bod-kiy bandê ch'os-grub daâ lo-tsas-ba ska-ba bha-pos bya ti'al-du bsgyur chiin zús-te gta-la 'pab-baô ||

The passages which I have enclosed between two asterisks, contain I find the Tibetan translation of a portion of a hymn in praise of Buddha in the first chapter of the Lalita Vistara almost word for word and in the same order of sentences; this hymn has unfortunately been omitted by M. Fouchaux in his edition of the Tibetan version of that text. It was probably one of the early rhymes of the Buddhists and may possibly occur in the Pali Tripiñika; for Dr. Kern has found (Man. Ind. Buddhism p. 15) that the Lalita Vistara contains whole passages identical with the Pali Scriptures. Some of the epithets indeed are those claimed by Buddha himself in his first sermon at Benares (Cf. Oldenberg 'Buddha' p. 129). The corresponding sentences in the Lalita Vistara I here extract from Leffmann's text p. 3:—

Bhaçaq vaqâh kori iabd-loko loko abhyudhato arha samyaksañbudho vidyâcarâsanâpanah sugato lokavitparah puruṣadityâsrâthi ištâ devânu ca manuvâyañ ca budho bhaçaq vaqâh paścakayo samanbâqatá.

Analysis of the details of these spells must be postponed for the present. The vivid picture of the Garûja as a paramount storm-deity of Nature speaks for itself, whilst the popular terror against disease and drought demons is reflected in the rampant Nâga worship dating to pre-Vedic times.

The dramatic birth of the Spell-goddess (“The invincible One of The White Umbrella: The Turner aside of Evil”) from the head of Buddha forms, I would point out, an exact parallel to the Greek myth of the birth of Athene (the helmeted Minerva, also a ‘Turner aside of Evil’ and custodian of the thunderbolts) from the head of Zeus.

---

A NEWLY DISCOVERED COPPERPLATES
GRANT OF BHASKARAVARMAK OF KAMARÇA.

The name of Bhâskaravarman, the friend and contemporary of Harshavardhana, is not unknown to the readers of Hei-yu-čhi of Yuan Chwang or the Harshâcharâia of Bâpabhaśṭa. Very recently a copper plate grant has been discovered at a village called Nidhanpur in Pargana Pañchâkaśaṭa in the district of Sylhet, which was issued by Bhâskaravarman from camp at Karṣuvañya. The grant consisted of four copper plates whereof the third is now missing; so that at present there are only three plates, the first, the second and the fourth containing inscriptions of four pages, both the
sides of the second plate being written. It is stated in the last verse that the original plates had been burnt and so new plates were issued with inscriptions written in characters differing from the former. The seal with which the plates were found bears witness to the destruction of the original plates by fire as it has been bent and shattered, the inscription in it all obliterated and the figure of the elephant—which was the seal-mark of the ancient kings of Kāmarūpa—has also been rendered very indistinct. Apparently, though the plates were renewed, the seal was not thought worth renewal.

The most important information that we get from this grant is the names of the ancestors of King Bhāskaravarman. The following is a tabular statement showing the names, but from this the names of the mythological kings Narsaka, Bhagadatta and Vajradatta have been omitted:

- Pushya Varman
- Samudra Varman (Queen Dattadevi)
- Balavarman
- Kalyāṇa Varman (Q. Gandharvati)
- Gaṇapati Varman (Q. Yajñavatī)
- Mahendra Varman (Q. Suvaratī)
- Nārāyaṇa Varman (Q. Devavatī)
- Mahābhūta Varman (Q. Vījñānavatī)
- Chandramukha Varman (Q. Bhogavatī)
- Sthita Varman (Q. Nayanadevi)
- Sūdhita Varman alias ŚrisūОсновы Varman (Q. Śyāmādevī)

Supratishṭhita Varman Bhāskara Varman

It is interesting to note that the names of the four immediate ancestors of Bhāskara Varman occur in the Harshacharita (Uchchheda VII) or Bārabhatā: there the genealogy is as follows:

- Bhūti Varman
- Chandramukha Varman
- Sthiti Varman
- Sūdhita Varman alias Śri-Mrigāśika
  (Q. Śyāmādevī)

Bhāskara Varman

The discrepancies are small and negligible—and they were due apparently to Bāra's careless notes about what the ambassador of Bhāskaravarman had said to king Harshavarman, or to the errors of the scribes who copied the Harshacharita. There can be no doubt that the names as found in the inscriptions are correct, as they were written under the immediate superintendence of the king himself.

Two very important points arise in connection with these inscriptions: (1) when and how Karṇasavarga came under the sway of the king of Kāmarūpa; and (2) was Sylhet within the political jurisdiction of Kāmarūpa?

I have discussed these points in detail elsewhere1 and the conclusions arrived at are: (1) Karṇasavarga became a part of the territory of Bhāskaravarman when, after the death of Harshavarman (in 648 A. D.) the former rendered material help to the Chinese invader Wang Hien Tsi in crushing Arjun (or Arupākṣa) who had usurped the throne of Harsha; and (2) Sylhet which had a separate existence as Shih-li-chi-to-lo mentioned by Yuan Chwang, did not form part of the kingdom of Kāmarūpa; the place where the record of locality of the grant was expected having been lost and there being instances of discovery of copper plates far beyond the locality of the grants, it cannot be asserted from the mere accident of the find, that the land granted by these plates belonged to the district of Sylhet.

These copper plates bear the most ancient record hitherto discovered in Assam: and as they contain the names of kings who—assuming at the rate of four in a century—reigned from the middle of the fourth to the middle of the seventh century A. D., these plates are most important documents to a student of the ancient history of Assam.

1 In Bengali, Vijaya Vol. I, No. 10; Rangpur Sāhityaparishod Patrika Vol. VII—In English an article is being published in the Epigraphia Indica.
DOCUMENTS RELATING TO THE FIRST ENGLISH COMMERCIAL MISSION TO PATNA, 1620—1621.
EDITED BY SIR R. C. TEMPLE, BART.

(Continued from page 69).

X.

Robert Hughes and John Parker to the Agra Factory.

Patna, 23 December 1620. Good Freinds, Mr. Fettiplace etts. Yours of the 27th November is come to our hands, wherein wee perceave of the receipt of our formers and that our goods sent you hence came in convenient tyme with saffyce to accompany yours for Surat, whereof we are glad... We will give your accompt credit... for the 33 pces. bone lace sent by Shek Cassums [Shekh Kásim's] man... We perceave of your purpose to retoune Dyalla [Dyálá] our servant with some goods. [The remainder of the letter concerns the price of raw silk at Patna; the reduction in the cost of winding if the 2d and 3d, and 4th and 5th sorts are wound together; and the stoppage in procuring silk and cloth owing to want of funds].

Wee have now but to rest in expect of monye, newes of the fleets arryvvall and the retoune of our expresse which brought you our letter for England to convey to Surat. 40

XI.

Robert Hughes and John Parker to Mr. Francis Fettiplace etc., in Agra.

Patna, 29 December 1620. Our good freinds, Two dayes since arryved here Dyalla who brought yours of the ultimo November and the goods therein specified... nor have wee more herewith to adde, as haveinge done no thinge since our last (which was 6 dayes past by a Bazar Cossid [kásid, messenger]), as nott haveinge monyes left, and therefore must lie idle untill you furnishe us. 41

XII.

Robert Hughes and John Parker to the Surat Factory.

Patna, 31 January 1621. Lovinge Frends: Maye it please you take notice that after longe expectation and desier to here from you, the 24th present wee receiued yours of the prime December... In [our letter] of the 11th November wee answered yours of the 5th September, therin endeavouringe your better satisfaction for the hoped good of this place, and the reasone which induced us to conceave it a meete residence, which was strengthened by the plentye of Commodities it affords, both for England and Persia, referinge all to your determinationes... Wee have bine longe in expectation of suplye from Agra, which is not yet come, the defaute wherof hath lost us four mounthes tyme wherein much good mought have bine done in this place; and if for what here shalbe provided you requier to bee dispeeded hence before the raynes, theye must bee gone hence by the prime Maye at farthest, unto which is but 3 mounthes, and yet wee have no means wherewith to procede...

In our last wee wrought [wrote] you what quantitie of silke and calicoes a yeares tyme and store of monyes would compass by the course wee have taken; the former not here to bee provided in the condition the Company requier it from the dollers [dealers]...
therin, for that theye are soe poore and begerlye that theye cannot furnishe us without trustinge them with monyes beforehand, which course wee dare not atempt, theye not beinge able to give securite for performance. The unacustomed wyndinge of it into so manye sortes in this place is a suftient reason why not so well performed as in Agra and Lahore, where theire use therof for weavinge of taffites, etc., requiers it. And for the original or serbandy, thousandes of maunds is alwais to bee bought in Agra, though not at such easye rates as here or in Bengall, and if what alreedy provided shall induce you to animete us futterlye for anye large provisiones therin, our selves know not how to prescribe a better course for its procuringe in quantitie at esier rates then formerly advised you, unlesse you would send into Bengalla, a hundred and fortye course from this place, to the citty of Mucksoudabad [Maksûdâbâd, Murshidâbâd] where it is made, which would bee worth bothe labor and charge, for wee are assured that there it maye be provided in infinite quantityes at least twenty per cent. cheaper then in anye other place of India, and of the choyesest stufe, wounde of into what condition you shall requier it, as it comes from the worme; where are also innumerabe of silkwynderes, experste workmen, and labor cheaper by a third then else where. But untill your farther resolution therin wee shall endeevour acordinge to your order the provision of what quantitie therof meanes and tyme will permit, as also of sahanies and such sortes of ambertye callicos as you advize of. For other provisiones, though in th' intrime we receave suplye from Agra, wee shall defer untill your farther injunctions.

Whee ... thank you for sending our English letters. Your detayninge them so longe in Surratt before theire dispeed was not soe prejudiciall for our replye therunto as was your messingers denays on the waye, who (it seemes) betwene Surratt and Agra spent almost 40 dayes, and from Agra hether.

XIII.

Robert Hughes to the Surt Factory.

Patna, 3 March 1621. Our last unto you was answere unto yours of the prime December, dispeeded hence the ultimo January, and two dayes since was received your letter of the 15th January, replye to our formeres of the last October and 11th November, wherein wee perceave what you apprehende of the sortes Amberty Callicos Lackhower produceth, as well for theire lengthes, breadthes as prizes, wherein wee also perceave you to bee mistaken in the length of the Jehanger Coved, you mentioninge it to bee but 32½ Inches, whereas Elahye [ilâhi] of Agra is full that length. And the Jehangery coved of this place no lesse then 40 Inches which wants not much of our English ell and makes greate differance both in the length and breadth of our Ambertyes. So that governinge your selves by the shorter coved it could not but give you just occasion to conceave the narowest sortes unitinge either for England or transporte, as likewise the broader sortes to come shorte in theire lengthes and breadthes for the use of sheetinge, shirtinge, etts., whereas rightlye apprehendinge them in their trewe lengthes and breadthes, questionles would have animated you to a better opynion of them. And wee doubt not but the well makinge of the Clothe (therin it exceeds either Samanes [samana] or your Bastaes [bâsta] will make it of good esteeme in England And wee shall endeavor what possible the provision of onlye such as for breadthes and lengthes, price, etts., maye bee well approved of, purpoisng our Investments onlye in the two broader sortes, to saye, Zefer Conyes and

42 Factory Records, Patna, 1, 20-21. 43 A fine cloth made at Samana, now in Patialâ State.
Jehangeres and those to bec, the Zefer Conyes all under 2 rups. per piece and the Jehangeres of all prizes to 8 rups. per piece, the quantities of cach you determine to enorder wee will, accordinge to your promise, expecte, and in the meanetyme proceede therin, and in silke so farr as our meanes will permitt, havinge now received some suplyse from Agra, Viz., in 6 bills exchange 5003 rups. . . . [We] have sent to Lackhoure to Mr. Parker 2500 rups. to bee doeinge there in the browne clothe, and have paid some debts for silke bought on Creditit, And now wee have monyes, purpose to laye in 50 or 60 mds, serbandye ware, so that untill your farther order, our provisions shalbe onlye silke, Ambertyes and Sahanes, if to bee gott . . .

Muckrob Con [Mukarrab Khán] is by the Kinge recalled from this Government, it beinge given Sultan Pervize [Parwiz], whoe is shortlye expected.

The yeare is allreadye so farr spent that it is impossible all our provisions shoude bee dispeeded to Agra before the raynes. What maye bee provided betwene this and the prime Maye shall then bee sent you, and the rest with the first oppertunitye after the raynes are spent. And soo not havinge elce &c. 44

XIV.

Robert Hughes to the Agra Factory.

Patna, 3 March 1621. Mr. Fettiplace &c. The last of the passed mouth came hether . . . yours of the 15th ditto, wherinlosed I received 6 bills exchange Importinge the mentioned some of 5003 rups. the which are all Currantly [generally] accepted and double but not of as good satisfaction, there owners beinge reported for Currant [accepted] dealers . . . havinge taken up partes therof, Viz., of Sunder Mydas [Sundar Mâyâdas] 1000 rups. and have cleared Maun Muckon [Mânmuhind] their bill of 500 rups. Baseesar Mera [Bisheshar ? Mall] hath a good reporte which is the best of his sustianwaye I can yet advize you . . . Chaunseyshaw [Chândsahe Sah] hath a sonne in Agra with whome if you deale in this kinde you maye rest confident of good satisfaction to bee here made by his father whoe in our experience is the Currant delar of Puttana . . .

Wee . . . apprehend what you advize of the sortes of Course silke sent you for saile in Agra. Wee cannot mervell that those sortes are in so littell esteeme at present, in regard, since their dispeede hence, th' originall from whence theye are taken of is fallen in price almost 30 per cent. Wee are ofered for our Shekesty a rupye net per sear to sell it here, and thinke to put that sorte of at about that rate rather then trouble you therewith. Oynyse our Cuttaway and Gird wee will detayne untill your farther approbation,

Wee conceave Surrats order for th' investinge the present monyes sent. Theye are stranglye mistaken in our Jehanger Coved . . . the misconceptions wheron theye ground their opiniones maye not bee our guide, and therfor . . . wee will proceed accordinge to our owne judgment in our Lackhour investments.

Th' exchange hence to Agra beinge to our present advantage I have ventered takinge up 2000 rups. more upon you at 1½ per Cen. losse havinge received here of Maun Muckon [Mânmuhind], sherafes [sarrâf] 1.962½ rup. muryes [for muryes, nári, newly-coined], to bee by you repayed in Agra unto Cassy [Kási] and Baseesar [Bisheshar] in 2,000 rup. londs [hundi, bill of exchange] . . . the bill . . . is written at 40 dayes Bandy mudet [band-i-mudat, term for settlement] . Th' occasion the exchange hence to Agra
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is of late so fallen is for that Muckrob Con [Makarrab Khan] hath delivered out 3 lackes of rups. to bee repaid him in Agra. Now beinge both in Cash and Credditt, I promise farther not to trouble you untill your answere hereunto, feringe lest I ought bee more bould then Convenient. Yet if your suplyes from Surratt have encouraged you, you shall doe well to strengthen us with 5 or 6000 rups. more out of hand, for which wee shall have speedy Employment.

The Parda [pandra, tapestry curtain]. Looking glasse, 2 pees. moheres [mohair] and 280 pieces weight amber beads I delivered into Muckrob Cons Circare and am promised [payment]. 

The Parda [pandra, tapestry curtain]. Looking glasse, 2 pees. moheres [mohair] and 280 pieces weight amber beads I delivered into Muckrob Cons Circare and am promised [payment].

Hee departhes hence (by reporte) within these eight dayes, and already Perveze his servants have umull ['amal, authority]. Seaventeene pees. of the bone lace I have sould Shekassaime [Sheikh Hasan] for 216 rups., which is received. The rest of the lace remaynes. Most of there papers were lost before come to my hands, so that I was fayne to guse [guess] at there particuler prizes.

XV.

To the Agra Factory.

Patna, 31 March 1621. Lovinge Frends: My last unto you was answere to youres of the 15th February since which have I received the second bills [of exchange] by Guarsaw [Gaunhar Shik] your expresse, whome I retourned with particuler answere the 13th present.

And now let me intreate you take notice of what hath passed with us since I have at sundrye tymes Caried and sent to Mr. Parker at Lackhoure 4000 rupes which is almost all invested in the browne Ambertyes of those partes which (as bought) are put out to whittinge, and now having more meanes will suplye that place with what parte therof maye bee spared. I have bought about 30 mds. serbandye silke [at betwene 70 and 80 rups. per md.] and have workemen in paye to winde it of, and as you strengthin us with meanes, shall accordinglye persist in that investment, for in aught else of this place we medell not, untill receive order from Surratt, save in sahannes and hamommes. Of the latter I have bought about 6 corge, and as such sorte come to hand shall ingrose them.

In my last I advized you howe I had cleard with Muckrob Con for those things delivered into his circare, to aye, for the parda or pecee of tapestrye,\(^4\) 300 rupes; as much for the greate looking glasse; 50 rupes for 2 pieces moheres; and 280 rupes for 280 pieces weight amber beads. Hee is at present removed from hence and gon for Helabaze [Allahabad], and doubtsles will for Agra; whoe if come to you, I praye demaund of his sonne, Shek Alaboxe [Shekh Allah Bakhsh], 18 rupes for two Bulgare hydes delivered him. And thus have you brefflye th'efecte of what hath passed with us in our afayeres since my last. And now I entreate you take notice what likewise hath beenped by disaster. The 24th present, Ieinge Saterdaye, about nounce, at the west parte of the suburbes belonginge to this cytie, at least a course without the walles, in th' Allum gange, [Alamgan], a tirable fier kindled, which havinge consumed at those partes, by the force of a stronge andye [andhi, a dust-storm], brake into the citte and within the space of two greese\(^5\) came into the verye harte thereof, where our aboadie is; whoe beinge enviorned


\(^{5}\) Added from the letter to Surat which follows.

\(^{4}\) Parda means a heavy curtain; the "peece of tapestry" must have been for use as a curtain and not as a wall-hanging.

\(^{5}\) Ghari, a native hour, about half an English hour, so "two greese" would mean one hour.
with neighboringe choperes [chhappar, thatched roof] (wherof indeede the whole cittye consists), it was no more then tyme to looke to our owne, which were not many, yet *more* then in so littell a warninge could bee conveyed of, although I wanted not th' assistance of almost a hundred of my workmen then at worke. But where the contrary element was wantinge, it was little bote to contend with the furuye of thother; and therfor gave waye to its voyolence of fowrse, to save that which most requiered ayde in this nesessite which was the mayne of our maisteres goods then under charge, which by good helpe I conveyed by a back waye into a stone house neare adjoyninge. But before it was entirlye erected, a choper before my chamber toke fyer, and in an instant was consumed, as also the chamber itselfe and all that therin was, save my accompts and monyees, which with as much difficultye as dainger I stayned; of ought elce not anye signe lefte of what it was; wherof belonginge to the Companye in a chest was theise perticuleres—the remaynder of the bone lace, 16 peecees; the amell [enamel], saffron and one pece moher, with some verouers [barāward, proportion] of silke taken, and other trifells standinge in the tankes, 49 which with all that was once myne and the litell houshould stufe wee had, was estierlye lost. The rest, thoughghe Gods providence, had an unexpected deliverance. From hence it proceeded eastward unto the verye scirtes of the towne, where, wantinge more combustable matter to mayntayne it selfe, was constreynd to stinke and goe out, havinge lefte behinde litell save ruines of olde walles, etc. The infinite losses of all men by this disaster are almost incredible to bee reported, besides men, woemen, and children registerde sattaes [sati, burnt alive] upwards of three hundred. And so much lett sufize for relation herof.

The 28th present came hether your exprese... with yours of the 16th March and therinclosed 4 bills of exchange importinge 5000 rups... Two of the bills sent on Sunder Mudas [Sundar Māyādās] was instantly ackseped, but the third importinge 1500 rups. I had much ado to put upon them, for although it was written on them, yet (as theye saye) not by their shawe [śahā, banker] but by one Calyane [Kalyān] of Agra, in whose afaires it seems forreyny theye have had some trust, but his gomoshite [gomāshāta, agent] latlye beinge gon hence for Agra with his goods caused them to make question of restitution, yet after much arbitrament this morninge theye ackseped it, which havinge doune, I instantlye, to avoyde suffer jorngees [sattā jhagrā, quarrels about bonds] caused them to paye in the monye, abatinge for the tyme, which theye have done. but have not taken in the bill, for that upon'advice from Agra in case that should prove difficulte theye purpose to Nat Care [nakūr, dishonour] it and use our Cusmona [khas nāma, letter of credit] for recoverye of the debtie therie from the said Calyane.

It is much to our disadvantage that you writte your bills at so longe a date of payment, wheras written at twise sevene dayes berbust [barbast (custom), sight] and send no worse Cassads [kāsīd, messenger] then this (who came in a leavene [11] dayes, theirie would bee much save in the deheig [dahyek, discount].

The exchange thence to Agra is at present but 1 1⁄2 rups, per Cent. lose betwene the tasye sickew [tāsā-sikkā, newly coined] and the hondye [hundi] rupee, 50 and but that you have promised sepdylye [i.e. speedily] more suplye by exchange from you, on occasion wee would have taken it up here, which would have bine more profitable. 51

---

50 This sentence means that the portion of the silk that had been wound off, and the cocoons still in the tanks were all destroyed.
51 Rupees remitted by bill of exchange.
52 Factory Records, Patna, 3, 24-25.
XVI.

Robert Hughes to the Agra Factory.

Patna 11 April 1621. Lovinge Frends, Mr. Biddulpe and Mr. Fettiplace. My last unto [you] was of the ultimo last mounthe ... since which on the 7th present came hether this berer with your last of the 25th March, wherunto in answer.

Inclosed I received second bills for the prementioned 5000 rups, and lower bills more Importinge 3000 rups, are all Currantly secepted, The bill of Mollas [Mallā] for a thousand rupis is written at twice seven dayes berbust [sight] but all the rest at 41 dayes after theire date ... .

I apprehend what you entende wee should doe with our course sortes of silke taken of for the serbandy and will endeavor it, if not better hopes for its sayle at Agra, the charge of transporte, etc., considered, but the prizes as rated in our last Invoype you maye not expekte to bee now obtayned, for that the tymes are otherwise, Th'originall from whence theye are parted beinge (as often advised) a savoye [sawāi, 25 p. c.] fallen in price over what it then was, and so proportionably theise Courser sortes. In your next I praye advise us of theire trewe value with you, for therby will wee governe our selves either for its detention or sayle here, for by Merchants that purposelye come from Agra to make their provisions in these sortes wee are informed that Agra vends greate quantitieys therof, and at much better rates then here it can bee soould.

Since my last wee have done littell save prosecute our silke and Amberty Provisiones, wherin wee over slip no oportunitie which maye bee to advantage and are in dalye expekte for what elce Surrat shall enorder, that tymlye wee maye make entrance therin, Wee shall not expekte more monye from you untill you have approbation from Surrat for our further supplye which cannot bee to soone.

Wee have ventured 500 rup. to Mucksoudabade [Maksūdābād, Murshidābād] for samples [of] silke of the sortes wee provide, rather for experience of that place then the necesitie, therof, beinge encouraged therunto by good liklyhood of principall commoditie and at much easier rates then theise partes aforde. The voyage is but two monethes, when expired and returne made wee will advize you more of the event.

Sultan Parvez is shortlye expected here, and if you intende a settled imployment, it would not bee enconvinent that you sent us somthinge therwith wee might make causmana [khās nīma] with him, and (if so stored) somthinge for saile, it would bee a furthermore to the rest of our busines to make frends wherof, since Muckrob Cones departure, wee are altogether destitute.32 ...

XVII.

Robert Hughes to the Agra Factory.

Patna, 19 May 1621. Lovinge Frends, Mr. Biddulpe etts. Yours of the 29th Aprill came to our hand the 14th presant wherein wee received bill of exchange importinge 8000 rups ... All save the two bills of Maune Mookonde [Mānmukand] were written as you advised, twice 7 dayes berbust [barbast, sight] ...

Wee have likewise received a Copy of the list for what goods are required by Surrat this yeare, and shall endeavor our utmost for their satisfaction in what theirof theise partes aforde. Upwards of 4000 pces. Ambertyes (of the sorte preadvised) are alreday provided, which wee will endeavor to inlarge to what quantitie more tyme

and meanes will permitt, as also for silke in the Condition theye ayme at, thoughe doubte wees shall come muche shorte in the quantity; the yeare beinge already so farr spent, and bat barre [barely] 3 months left us for th'efectinge this yere provi-
siones to bee dispceded hence with the first opurtunitye after the raynes, which wilbe
about the season of our last yeres goods went hence; and therefor to avoyde farther
trouble then, what goods weee have readye weee have despeeded towards you, and are as you
may perceve by a briefe invoynce therof here inclosed. They were this morning laden on
two Carts and have made their first Manzull [manzil, stage]. Wee have paide in partes of
their freight 74½ rups, and have given the Carters a bill on you to receive 8 rups, more
in full therof [if] theye deliver them you in safe and good condition, and are in all 17 balles
qt. [containing] 52 mds. net, hired at 1½ rups, 1 taka [taká]²³ per md, net, the Currant price
of the Caravan theye goe in Compaynee with, and maye bee about a hundred Cartes more.
Notwithstandinge, for their better safegard, wee have sent you Dyalla our servant and 6
Tietandazes [tirandāz, archer, guard] more, have paid them in full of their Journey, and
have delivered Dyalla 10 rups, to defraye their charges on the waye.

You will perceve that wee have sent you all our coarse silke, havinge not founde here
buyers for such a quantitye, which if you put of as you advize them to bee worth the there,
ytt will not come to a bad market. Howsoever wee thought it more convenyent to send
it you now then to detayyne it unteilt after the raynes, in regard there is hopes you maye
put it of tymely eneigne to have it's proecde agayne resente to bee this yeare invested,
which after the raynes wilbe to late, and by that tyme wee shall agayne bee furnished
with a greate parcel to trouble the market.

It seemes you have recevied but littell fine goods from Surratt which althoughghe not
enordered for presently, yet a trifell would at instant have stoode our business in some
steeoe if wee mought or maye yet excepte it from you, for from Surrat it will come to late
to further out this yeres necessietye, and for the next wee excepte not.²⁴

XVIII.
To the Agra Factory.

Patna, 2 June 1621. Good Frends, Mr. Biddulphe ettts. . . Maye it please you
take notice that the prime present came hether this bearer with yours of the 18th Maye,
and therinclosed second bills for the 8000 rups, last sent and eight other bills of Exchange
for 8000 rups, more . . . with a transcript of our late beloved frende Mr. Fetiplaces
Testament, for whose Lose we are hartilye Contrite. God graunt us all whom hee hathe
lefte behinde to bee assidualy myndfull of the waye he hathe led us, that wee maye with
the more Comforthe be prepared to followe him when the Lord shall caule us . . .

Wee apprehend Surrats resolution for the desolvinge this factory (our this yeres provi-
siones beinge accomplished), and wee will as neare as possible endeavor to follow direction,
as well for efectinge their disierses in the Commodities of theise partes as for our speedy
dispatche therin, for the sendinge hence our Investments with the first and convenient trans-
porte, which will not bee (as often advertized) untill the raynes are spent, to saye about
the prime October. And whereas you desier Robert Hughes his present repaire for Agra,

²³ The hiring price was therefore 1 rupee 12 annas and a taka. The copper taka (not the silver,
which was a rupee) was 2 or 4 pice (pāta) and the pice was a quarter anna; so one taka would be worth
from a half to one anna. The context presumes that it was half an anna, which makes the hiring price
to be R. 1 12½ a.

²⁴ Factory Records, Patna, I., 28.
necessitye answers that the heate of our present busines and Mr. Parkers indisposition of helthe [who almost theise 3 monthes hath the layne daingerously sicke of the blody fluxe] will not permit it untill the last of the raynes, unless it please God speedilye to strengthen Mr. Parker who hath not theise two monthes, nor is not at instant in case to manadge theise afares which lie dispersst. Yet you maye not doubt of our utmost diligence to the hastnings our beinge with you.

You shall not neede to send anye further suplye of monye untill farther advice; th' exchange from hence at presant is somuch to our losse that wee shall withbould drawinge bills on you untill necessitye urge it.

Our Lackhowre Investments are exceeded to upwards of 5000 pees, fine and course Ambertyes, which quantitiye wee hope at laste to trebell by that tyme wee shall with conveyency bee readye to dispatche hence.

The Princes (Prince Parwiz) arrivall here with so greate a retienewe hath made this place to narowe for his entertainement, which hath caused the removinge diverse, as well merchants as otheres, from theire abodes, whose houses the hee hath liberallye bestowed on his servants; amongst which coupemnt wee are displaced, and have bine theise ten dayes wandring to cover ourselves and goods. though but with grate [grass], to debare the heate and raynes, now in excesse; which havinge now attayned through the helpe of Mr. Monye [by paying a high price], wee endeavor agayne the plasinge our silkwyners, in which imployment you maye not expecte us this yere to exceed above as much more as alredye have, And wee hold it sufitient, beinge but a triall, so you cannot but conceve the necesitye of frends, and us destitute wherewithall to make them.  

XIX.

To the Surratt Factory.

Patna, 2 June 1621. Good Frends, Mr. Rastell etts, . . In all wee have received from them [at Agra] for our this yeares investments 29,000 rups, besides the proceede of some sailes here. Theye advise not of anye more monyes theye purpose to sende us, as thinkinge what alredye sent sufitient to keepe us imploied the littell tyme now left us, but wee hope to drawe from them seasonablye to bee invested at least 10000 rups, more, for that theye advise Mr. Younge hate the littell hopes for th' accomplishinge th' one halfe of the narowe clothe you expecte from thence, which defaulte wee will endeavor to salve by enlarginge them here.

We formerly also advised you of the dispeede hence for Agra what goods wee had then reade, which were 13 bales silke and 4 bales Callicoes which were sent hence the 18th last monthe.  

XX

To the Surat Factory.

Lackhowre, 3 August 1621. Loving Frends, Mr. Rastell etts, . . 3 dayes past came to my hands yours of the 8th June . . whereby I perceve you . . requyer ample and sudden replye to the points of your present received, which . . I shall endeavour.

And first I wonder at your hopes for soe sudden a dispatche in our Investments, Consideringe you are not ignorant of the late supplye of monyes for its effectinge sent

\footnote{Added from the letter to Surat which follows.}

\footnote{Factory Records, Patna, I., 29-30.}

\footnote{Factory Records, Patna, I., 30-31.
us which beeinge allmost spent before the first mo [nyes] came, and haveinge formerly both amply and frequently advized of the seasons for transporte of goods hence, which if before the raynes must be the latest in Maye, and if after, it is not to bee expected that carryage can possibly be gotten untill October, here beeinge noe other conveyance to Agra but by cartes, which by reason of the rottenes of the wayes in the season of the raynes passeth not. And what of our provisions in the first season was ready, wee gave Conveyance to . . . and with the first opportunity will proceed with the complete transporte of our full investments which will be (at the soonest) about the fine of th' ensewinge month.

In our lynnen Investments we have endeavoured to follow the honble. Companys and your orders, whereunto we have unyted our owne expeynce and Judgments, haveinge with noe little labour and toyle at present attayned to the provizion of 475 Corges or 9500 peces. upwards of the 3ds. wheroof are all at or under two rup. nett the pce., as bought browne from the loome, and are the desired breadthes, to say, the second sorte generally knowne by the name of Jafferehanes [zafar-khanī], which both for length and breadth will parallel, if nott exceed, your narrowre Barroch baftaes. The remaynder are fnyer, broader, and hyer, pryzed, to say, from all prayzes from two to six rup. the pce., samples wheroof, as well browne, white and starched, we intended to have sent you undemanded, whereby you may guoze at our penyworths [profit], and accordingly resolve or desist from further provisions thereof.

In regard you have called us awaye from hence with what convenient speeche may possible, of force hath caused the lettinge fall of our silke provizions, especially the cleeringe and gatheringe up of our rests with the silkewynders, seethee that we shall not much exceed what we have already dispced to Agra, neither have we met with any more sahians since we advised you of the 12 corges last bought.

Some Lignum Aloes have we provyde for tryall in England, of severall sorts and pryzes, from 2 to 10 rups. the seare of 33 pices wt. in all to the valew of about 400 rups., and now are lookinge out for musters of what other commodities which in our judgments may affoord fittinge either England or Persia, for provizion wheroof John Parker is now in Puttana, unto whose postscript I partly referre you, my selfe haveinge bene here in Lackhoare almost these 6 weekees to fynish these provizions and gather up our cloth at the washers, which this month I hope will be all come in, and packt ready to transporte.

Mr. Biddulph lately advisde us to mak provizion of the gumlacke mentioned in your list, which we conceave (consideringe the great freight from hence) will cost its worth in Agra; notwithstanding, some wee will provyde, though butt for a future tryall, The best is worth at present 4½ rups. nett per ml., and the Caryage from hence to Agra will be half Doe much more, wheroof we have advisde to Agra to th' end they may provyde the greatest part there. The Amber beades sould Mockrochban [Mukarrab Khan] at soe good rates was more by Accydent then through any great esteeme they are in these parts, which those we received there, as many more from Agra, which for want of vent yett lyeth by, beeinge in the Bazar worth nott above 8 or 9 rups. the seere of 14 pices, which by reportes they are better worth in Agra, which hitherto hath caused theire detention in hopes of a better markett, but now we shall endeavoure to put them off at pryece Current, rather then Cary them back.

At my first cominge into these parts, Among the sondry other Commodities, I enquered after the vent and esteeme of curral [coral], but could not learne it to bee a commodity worth the transporte from Suratt, it not vendinge in any great quantity nor the valew
truly knowne without sight of the sortes, which occasioned but a spareinge advice thereof, yett incerted it in my list of the valew of sondry other Commodities then sent Mr. Kerridge and Company. Yett for your better satisfaction I have intreated John Parker to make further inqury thereof, from whom you may be pleased to expect inlargement in this point.

Havinge advized you of the scope and effect of my present aboad here, have nott whereof to enlarge. . . .

XXI.

John Parker's "Postecerptum."

Patna, 7 August 1621. . . . Of the price and esteeme of currall in these parts . . . I have enquyred of the merchants which deals most in that commodity, who, as they say, never saw unpollished currall brought into these parts, which if I mistake nott, is the sort you seeke vent for. In other places it is much spent to burne with the dead; which here they use nott. And for pollishinge or cuttinge it into beads, heer are nott workmen that hath skill therein; and therefore noe commodity for this place. Pollished currall will set here, but in small quantity; and at what prysse I cannot informe you, the quality thereof beinge soe different. Currall beads is very well requeste for transporte into Bengala, and great quantityes thereof will yearly vend, to say for 50 or 60,000 rup., at or about the pryzes followinge, viz., those of 12 beads to a tanka [tankā = māsha] at 6 tanks for a rup., of 6 to a tanka at 2 tanks for a rup., of 4 to a tanka at 1½ tanks per rup., of 3 to a tanka at 1½ per rup., and soe accordinge to their bignes.95 For the sale of our remaynder of amber beads, we must noe governe our selves by those sould Mokrubhanch, those beinge all choice beads which you cannot but judge will somewhat disadvantage the sale of the rest. Besides, those sent hither were for the most parte of the 2 worst sorts, which, as we were informed in Agra, were the sorts most vendable here, and questionlesse are, accordinge to their valew, but the best sort will sell for more mony though nott for more profit; therefore it is nott much [wonder] that those sould in Agra were sould at for good rates, they beinge one with another as received from Suratt, besydes was helped with the best sort which was chosen out of the parcell sent hither. I have shewed them to dyers merchants since Mr. Hughes his beeing at Lackhoare, butt cannott attayne to above 9 rup. the sire, at which rate rather then retourny them for Agra would putt them off, butt it is nott a commodity which yeilds ready mony, and by reason of our sudden departure I dare nott trust them out, though should be promised payment within ten daies. For the future sendinge of which commodity I cannott anynye you, it beinge a commodity that will nott sell in any great quantity, but in small parcells, as for 100 and 150 rup., which will nott goe far therein; soe a small quantity will furnish a great many of these merchant.

I have not yet provyded the gum-lacke, nor else for musters, the merchants, brokers, shopkepers ette, of the city beinge all in trouble for mony which the Prince requyres them to furnish him with; Sée that none dares be seen to sell a pyece worth of goods. But

95 Factory Records, Patna, I, 31-32.
95 Taking the Jeweller's māsha at 15 gns. Troy, then the meaning of this statement is that small beads of 5 gns. sold at 72 for the rupee; beads of 10 gns. at 12 to the rupee; beads of 15 gns. at 7 to the rupee; beads of 20 gns. at 4 to the rupee; and so on. This statement shows that the small 5 gr. beads were much commoner than any other sort.
now he beeinge gone I shall soone imploie the small matter intended therein. We have at present about 4000 rups, in cash, 2000 whereof will run out in expences, charges, and transporte of our goods. The rest I shall endeaveour to disbourse accordinge to Mr. Hughes his direction and myne owne discretion. ... 60

XXII.

Robert Hughes and John Parker to the Honorable Company.

Patna, 14 August 1621. Honourable and right Worshipfull ... Our last yeares letter dated the ultimo November ... The cargozone of our goods therein mentioned and sent hence came both safely and seasonably to Agra, and from thence goods was dispced for Suratt, which and the whole Caffalo [kāfi] was most unfortunately rob'd and spoyle by the Deccans Armye, 61 for which we have just cause to be sorry, soe shall rest till time shall procure your Worshipps a full restitution, which we heartly pray for, and hope it will prove as successfull as the losse was disastrous.

Wee haveinge the last yeare made some small truyall into the Commodities of this place, and accordingly advis'd thereof to Suratt, we had theire approbation for a this yeares Contynuance and promise of speedy supplye of monyse for the effectinge some good Investments, as well in silke as Callicoes. Butt the late arryall of the last yeares fleet, with dywers other hindrances and Impediments in Suratt, occasioned us unexpectedly to remayne here untill March last before they had means to remitt us monyse as pretended, in which interim we endeavoured the sale of dyvers brayed [damaged] goods formerly receiued from Agra, which haveinge effect'd, to the valew of 4000 rups., the proceed whereof beinge receiued, we incontinently employ'd it, parte in Bengal silke and parte in Ambertye Callicoes. In fine of March 62 we receiued from Agra our first supplye in bills exchange for 5000 rups., and since at several time sondry other supplyes, in all bills for 32,000 rups., and therewith the transcript of a list from Suratt, which enordered the provizion of 100 mds. Bengal silke, and 20,000 pces. Amberty Callicoes of Lackhoare, with further promise of meane for its accomplishinge. Butt it seems them selves beeinge streighnted at Suratt, they could not supply us as determyned, nor effect what once enordered for want thereof. The monyse sent us we persist'd to its investment, which we have now brought almost to a Conclusion, and haveinge hopes of a Conveyance from Suratt by retourn of the last yeares shippes from the Red Sea could not omit to advize your worshipps thus breifly thereof. Forasmuch whereof as we had attayned unto by the beginninge of May last, we then sent for Agra, and was 13 bales Bengal silke, whereof 6 containing 18 mds. 12 scares of the sorts requir'd by your Worshipps and Suratt, throwne of here into skynnes of a yard longe; the rest was of the course sorte taken with that from th' originall or serbandy sent for salie in Agra, wherewith likewise went 3 bales containing 13 corges Amberty Callicoes and a bale containing 5½ corges Hammète [hammēm], the which goods ... is arryved there in safety. Since when wee have proceeded to the investinge our monyse last sent us, and have at present attayned unto 470 corges or 9400 pces. Amberty Callicoes ... Wee have likewise endeavoured theire whitinge, which is

60 Factory Records, Patna. 1., 32-33.
61 In 1620 hostilities were in progress between Jahangir's forces under Prince Khurram and the rulers of the Dakhan under Malik 'Ambar.
62 Should be February, see ante, letter of 3 March 1621.
nowe almost fynished, haveinge caused 400 corges thereof to be starched, as the ordinary custome of their cureinge is, and the remayner beinge 70 corges, we have whited unstarched, and yet shall endeavour the makinge them up 10,000 peces, which will be the utmost our remainder of Cash will permitt in this investment. In other sortes of Callicoes we have nor can doe little, Sahan cloth beinge scarce and nott such quantites thereof made, or brought hither, as your worshippse happily have bene enformed there is, of which sort 12 Corges is all we could, by much seekinge after, yet procure, and cost 78 rups. nett the corge of 20 peeces.

In regard of theire absolute order from Suratt to repayre with our this yeares proviziones for Agra, it hath caused us the letting fall of the further provizion of Bengala silke, which without a Contynuance here is nott to be provyded in the condition expected by your worshippse, soe that our this yeares proviziones thereof will not exceed above 25 mds. of the sorts fittinge England. And although a far greater quantity was listed us by the Council at Suratt, yet since (as it should seeme) whatt already is provyded is thought to be inough untill further tryall thereof. This intended to be sent you we hope, both for price and goodnes, will come your worshippse well to passe, and yeild in England expected profitt, beeing as good and better cheape then the sample last yeares sent.

Wee have doe deeply waded into our Callicoe Investments that at Instant we have [not] remayning in Cash (besides to beare the charges of the goods transport to Agra) above 2000 rups., wherewith we are to endeavour the provizion of some gumlacke, stuffs etts. of Bengala for musters both for England, Persia, or the Red Sea, which being accomplished, we will hasten our dispatch towards Agra with as much Convenyency as the season of the yeare will permitt, and lay out for Caryage to convoy our goods, which until the fine of the next month is nott here to be procured, the raynes beeing sev yvolent, that in time thereof noe Carts passeth betweene this and Agra, and other Conveyance or meanes of transporte here is nott. Notwithstanding, we question nott but our goods shall arrive in Agra as last yeare seasonably to accompany theire this yeares Caffalow [kāfīla] from thence to Suratt. . . in the meane tyme we shall nott omytt our utmost dilligence in the prosecutinge our present and what future affaires may bee committed to our charge.⁶³ . . .

XXIII.

William Biddulph and John Young at Agra to the President and Council at Surat.

Agra, 22 August 1621. They will observe the orders as to the placing of factors, and have recalled Hughes from Patna, leaving Parker in charge there until Young arrives.⁶⁴

XXIV.

Robert Hughes and John Parker to the factors at Agra.

Patna, 13 September 1621. Good Freinds, Mr. Biddulphe etts. The last night came hither your expresse with yours of the 19th August and the particular pointe in your letter from Suratt, which we have well considered, and apprehend theire order in all things, which

⁶³ Factory Records, Patna, 1., 33-35.
⁶⁴ Foster, English Factories in India, 1618-1621, pp. 260-261.
[if] it had come sooner might have bin followed; but now we having cleared (in effect) all our business here, and at instant are upon departure towards you, Robert Hughes afore and John Parker followeth with the Carts, which we hope according to Agreement will set out within 4 or 5 days more at farthest. There procureinge hath bin as well difficult as costly, we payinge 2½ rups. per md, Jehangere weight from hence to Agra Caravans Burbust [barbaste, i.e., customary caravan rate] and hope they will be with you according to our former Advice by the last of the ensuing month which will be the soonest, and therefore refer it to your Considerations whether to delaye your goods so longe or send a latter Caffalo. The raynes hath bin so extraordinary this yeare that extraordinary Charges cannot any way further our goods Arryvall, and therefore of necessity must attend untill the wayes are passable. Wee expect Thomas Haukeridge [Hawkridge] to meet John Parker, and so for present Robert Hughes beinge on departure, he refers you to John Parker for larger advyce, and hastily comends you to the Lord, restinge &c. 65

XXV.

John Parker to the Surat Factory.

Patna, 17 September 1621. Loving Freinds, Mr. Rastell etts., You may please be advertised that 4 dayes past came hither an expresse from Mr. Biddulph etts. in Agra who brought us Coppy of certaine points in your letter of the 14th July to them, soe well concerning this factory as others, which arryveinge with us but the night before Mr. Hughes his departure, he had not tyme to answer, and therefore I pray accept of this brief replye till conveniency permitt us to give you more ample satisfaction and larger relation of our this yeares Imployment which Mr. Hughes at his cominge to Agra will (questionlesse) endeavour, to whom I partly refer you.

We apprehend your order for the future furnisheing of this place with factors, and my stay here untill Mr. Youngs arryvall to discharge me, which before Mr. Hughes his goinge was considered of, and should have bin observed if had come sooner, butt having cleared (in effect) all our business, the Carts hyred and are promised they will lade within 3 or 4 dayes, havinge noe rest in Cash, nor any imployment to occasion my stay, thought better to hazard your sasure in derogatinge from your order then to putt the Company to the charge of (as we conceave) my needlesse stay, which when you Consider off and rightly apprehend, I hope will be soe charitabe that wee doubt not to appeare blamelesse. And though the way betweene this and Agra is not very dangerous for robbers, yett nott free of taxes, as you may perceave by the transporte of our last goods from hence, which cost 14 rup. per carte, and since other merchants have paid 200 [(sic) 20] rup. per carte, soe that it is nott unrequiteit that some Englishman accompany the goods, by whose presence the greatest parte or all may peradventure be saved, which I shall endeavour.

Mr. Hughes departed hence the 13th current and went by the way of Lackhoare, to hasten away the cloth bought there to Mobulepoore 66 which is there place of ladinge; and appointed me to make what hast I could and send away the goods here to meet them, which

65 Factory Records, Patna, I., 35.
66 Mahab Alipur, near Masaur [Museowrah], the Mohabalpoor of the Indian Atlas, sheet 103, ed. 1857.
haveinge effecte, to goe for Lackhoare to imbale four or five fardells yett unpaack and clere some small matters there, and thence to proceed in company of the goods with what speed possible for Agra.

In our letter of the 3d passed month you were advized the some of our Investments, since when we have done little butt gett in the cloth from whittsters, and bought 50 mds. Gum-lacke of the 3 sorts required, a few Malda wares for musters of commodities fittting Persia, some Ambertres of all sorts and prizes for your perussial, etts, stuff of small vallowe for musters. Wee had provyded the whole 200 mds. of lacke required, butt fear we should nott gett caryage for itt, which by reason of the princes remouo, and the Abowdance of raynes fallen this yeare is not easily procured, yett have obtayned promise of soe many Cartas as we shall need (which will be about 18 or 20) and hope of the Carters dew performance. The freight costs deare, to say 2½ rups. per md., which could nott be avoided to have the goods come in season to Agra, and now the beginnig of November will be the soonest, make what hast may bee.

XXVI

John Parker to the Agra Factory.

Patna, 17 September 1621. Loving Freinds, Mr. Biddulpe etts. By our joynt letter dated the 13th ditto you will perceave that Mr. Hughes was then upon departure towards you, who proceeded accordingly by the way of Lackhoare, and expect dayly to heare of his dispeed thence, whome I purpose with the goods to follow accordinge to his order, with what Convenyent speed I may, or rather the wether permitte, for nor yett is ended the raynes butt dayly powreth downs in such quantity that I cannott gett an hower of faiere wether whereby to send forth the goods, which nowe is all ready for the Carte, and attendant nothing but the wether, which alteringe, I will take the first opportunity.

Your letter received by this bearer requyers little answere butt promise to make what hast may bee with the goods, whereof you may be ascertayned. For any thing else needful your knowledge (except your Cossid [kásid] make more speed homewards then outwards, who was 25 dayes on the way) Mr. Hughes I doubt not will be with you sooner to relate.

XXVII

John Parker to the Agra Factory.

[Lackhowre], October 1621. Loving Freinds, Mr. Biddulph etts., In my last of the 17th and postcript of the 21th passed month I advised you in what forwardnesse I then was and the hopes I had speedily to proceed towards you with the fruits of our imployment, two dayes after date whereof I laded the Puttana goods from Mendroo Seray toward Mobulepoore, and my self came hi her to dispatch the little Mr. Hughes left here to be effected, which beenge longe since finished, I have bin idler than willingly I would have bin; for partly by reason of the longe winter (which yett is not ended) and the foulinesse of the wayes, I have nott yett found oppurtunity to send away the goods from hence. And now at last cominge to dispeed them, I fynde the packs soe heavy that they are nott port-

* Factory Records, Patna, I., 36-37.
* I cannot identify this sardi.
* In fact, however, "summer." This is a very curious expression for "the rains" as being the coolest season.
able either on oxen nor by caharr [kazár, porter], though offer treble the freight accustomed betwixt this and Mobulepoore, where the carts and rest of the goods have attended these 15 days, and the wayes soe untoward that in the best season of the yeare they are unpassable for carts, and camells are not here to be procured at any rate, for whose burden these fardles were intended. Yett Mr. Hughes before hee packt them agreed and gave earnest both for oxen and Cahars who then promised to accomplish and have laded hence the better halfe, but few of them able to goe thorow, have discharged theirs lading, some in one place, some in another, themselves ran away and left me to gather the goods togethers, which I seare will not bee till parte of them be repackt, which will cause great delay. Therefore, beware the worst, I thought good not to detayne your messenger longer, butt to advize you of the liklyhood of my tardy Arivyall with you to th'end you should Consider of detayninge any parte of your provisions in expect of ours, which (to my greife) I begin to double will come too late for retourne on the this yeares fleet. The Censure I shall incure there (by beeinge left here for there dispeed and Conduct) I must with patience undergo, in soe much as cannot be avoyded. All I can doe is promise to slacke noe tyme nor oppertunity in theire dispeed hence, nor theire passage on the way, which will nott be without extraordinary charges, which I seeinge the necessity I shall the lesse respect, though will be noe more lavish then the occasion requyers. The expences I lye at is not small, haveinge before Mr. Hughes departure entertayned almost 40 servants for the more safe Conduct of the goods, whom I could not discharge, haveinge paid them aforeshand and being in dayly hopes of settinge forward.

Your letter of the 27th August I have received and should (to prevent the worst) have bin glad to have received the desired firman [fírmáN], but beeinge it was not to be had, I must hope the best, and that now the countrey is soe quyet that I shall have noe necessity thereof.\[71\]

John Parker.

XXVIII

William Biddolph, Robert Hughes, Robert Young and John Parker to the President and Council at Surat.

Agra, 23 November 1621. Mr Hughes came to this place the 10th of last month; Mr. Young and Mr. Willowy arrived here with there goods from Semana the 12th same month; and Mr. Parkar with their Pattana goods arrived here the 14th present.\[72\]

THE HISTORY OF THE NAIK KINGDOM OF MADURA.

By V. Rangachari, M. A., L. T., Madras.

(Continued from p. 48.)

CHAPTER I.

SECTION VII.

The Effects of Vijayanagar Conquest.

Political Effects.

The Vijayanagar conquest introduced a new epoch in the history of South India. It gave rise to a singular complexity in government, by causing an influx of Telugu generals and viceys into the Tamil land. These Telugu generals came, it should be understood, as the supporters of Pāṇḍya authority against Muhammadan usurpation. They therefore did not interfere with the royal dignities and privileges of the restored Pāṇḍyas. Nevertheless they

\[71\] Factory Records, Patna, I., 38.

\[72\] Foster, English Factories in India, 1618-1621, pp. 335-336.
were, from this time onward, the real rulers of the land, and reduced the indigenous monarchs to the position of mere figureheads. The pride and perhaps the prejudice—for the new viceroys belonged to other castes, spoke different tongues and came from another part of the country—of the Pāṇḍyan might have disliked the presence of these, their allies or rather masters; but they could not but submit, for their own sake, with tame and willing resignation, to their dominance. The history of Madura, thus, in the Vijayanagar period is the history of a dual power, of two dynasties, one locally royal and the other extraneously viceroyal. The people of the kingdom of Madura (which included Tinnevelly and, in later days, Trichinopoly also), in other words, had two masters, the immediate one being their own king, and the more remote one the Vijayanagar agent. As has been already mentioned, the relations between the two authorities were, probably, cordial rather than strained. Self-interest and weakness necessitated a spirit of ready compliance on the part of the Pāṇḍyan rulers, while self-confidence and the possession of superior strength unconsciously led to the easy assertion of mastery on the part of the viceroys. At the same time, the viceroys do not seem to have availed themselves of their position to interfere too much in the internal Affairs of the kingdom. Prosperity did not kill their prudence, nor did the allurements of power banish from them the virtue of moderation. They evidently confined themselves to the collection of tribute, the upkeep of the imperial army, and the remittance of the surplus tribute to the emperor. They, as was natural in their position, controlled the foreign policy of the king, and kept a watchful eye on his political acts and movements, his alliances and his enemies. They also helped him in the subjugation of local risings, in the encouragement of learning by means of endowments to Brahmans, and in the furtherance of all the arts of peace. But they hardly, it may be believed with Dr. Caldwell, interfered much in the internal Affairs of the kingdom.

Social Effects. Immigration of the Badugas.

The influence of Vijayanagar was stronger on South Indian society than on South Indian government. It in fact created a revolution in the social history of the land. For it led to a considerable immigration of men and women from the Telugu and Canarese lands to the land of the Tamils. Centuries back, the political skill and imperial statesmanship of the Chōla emperors had caused and promoted a large influx of Tamil soldiers, servants, officers and men into the Telugu land; and now, by an act of Providence, the reverse process happened. Already, the territory covered by the Tanjore, Trichinopoly, Madura and Tinnevelly districts, i.e., the two kingdoms of the Chōlas and the Pāṇḍyanas, had received an influx of a few Canarese people during the short life of the Hoysala supremacy; but this immigration of the 13th century was on a comparatively small scale, owing the ephemeral nature of the Canarese dominion, as well as to the vehement opposition to it of the local kings and peoples. The Vijayanagar conquest was followed by such a large immigration from the north that the historian can hardly be deemed inaccurate if he describes that conquest as the conquest of the Tamilians by the

---

46 See his History of Tinnevelly.
47 In the days of the Chōla Empire, See the Madr. Ep. Reports for numerous examples.
48 Bishop Caldwell describes the construction of the Canadian Arche and the town of Palamkottah to the Canarese immigrants of this period. See his Hist. of Tinnevelly; also Stuart's Tinnevelly Manual.
Badugas or northerners as the Telugu and the Canarese peoples were called. The Râyas of Vijayanagar were probably Telugus, though their capital was in the Canarese country. The imperial civil and military services consisted largely, though not entirely, of the Telugu and the Canarese. The Viceroys were Telugu, their subordinates mainly Telugu, and above all, the thousands of followers who came with them were all Telugu. Nor could it be otherwise. A Telugu dynasty supported by a Telugu army and service, could not but send forth, for its own safety, into every quarter of the empire, Telugu soldiers and rulers. Refractory chiefs had to be subdued by Telugu generals, and tributary vassals had to be watched by Telugu political Officers. The result was, there came into existence a large number of Telugu colonies everywhere in the south. Throughout the Tamil country, hundreds of Telugu villages came into existence, and Telugu customs and habits, creeds and cults began to mingle in complex companionship with the Tamil oases. Many a strange festival and observance, many a household name and superstition, was brought by the conquering colonists, and the civilisation of the Tamils became mixed up with the civilisation of "the Badugas."

The causes of Baduga colonization.

The causes and circumstances of the colonization were not the same in all cases. Some colonies had a military origin. They arose from the camps of the northern army-camps which while on march resembled, in their size and their component factors, moving cities. The presence of a large number of men, and of horses and cattle, necessitated, wherever the camp was pitched, the opening of shops and the formation of villages; so to say, of the camp-followers. The frequency of military operations compelled the presence of engineers, masons, carpenters and other artisans. The Brahmins again, were indispensable as priests, as astrologers and as accountants. In this way wherever there was a military encampment, there was necessarily a Telugu-Canarese settlement, consisting of all classes and classes of the community. The camp in time became, after the conquest, a permanent colony; and even when the army was ordered to another locality, the activities which it stimulated there were adequate enough to perpetuate the village that was brought into existence by it. In this way, many Telugu villages and even towns arose. Some colonies had perhaps a different peaceful origin. They possibly arose from the men of peace following in the wake of a northern vicerey who, however, was invariably a military commander also. But the vast majority of the Telugu colonies owe their origin, not so much to the State or the army, as to the valor and enterprise of numerous private adventurers; and this is borne out by hundreds of historical MSS. They consisted, as a rule, of people, who followed the pastoral and other peaceful occupations of life. The majority of them were cowherds or peasants, some were soldiers and Sirdârs in the Râya's service, some minor chiefs, and some probably merchants and manufacturers. These men had naturally among them who had been rewarded by the Râyas with feudal estates, or

---

60 For an interesting article on the Badugas, see Chris. Coll. Magaz, Vol IX, 733-44 and 830-43. The Badugas who colonized the regions of Coimbatore and Nilgiris came to be called "Badagas." The Badugas were a race of strong and muscular physique, and "they were always very ready to enlist in the armies of the Rajas of S. India." The Vijayanagar sovereigns employed them largely, as soldiers, generals, governors and viceroys. The Vijayanatha Naik was one of these. For a description of the Badaga customs, etc., of the Nilgiris, see Grigg's Nilgiri Manual; Thurston's Castes and Tribes; Chris. Coll. Maga. Vol: IX, &c.

61 Wilks compares them to the Roman colonies. See his Itinerary, I. 10. Also Caldwell's Tinnevelly, p. 48.
pālayams as they were called in the Tamil country, for notable exploits and services rendered by them to the State. The distinction for which they received their reward may have belonged to any department of life. Some were rewarded on account of their hardy physical strength and triumph over professional wrestlers, some on account of their skill in magic, others on account of their having distinguished themselves as local chieftains or efficient soldiers. Howsoever it was, whether the newoming Pōlygar was a wrestler or a soldier, a chieftain or a statesman, he naturally never came alone. When he migrated to his new home, he took with him, as the MS. chronicles mention, hundreds of families of his own kinship and following, of his own caste and creed. The fertile valleys of the Kāvēri, the Vaigai, and the Tambraparni, the borders of the Western Ghats, the wild regions of Tinnevelly,—the whole of the South India from the Kāvēri to the Cape became in this way spotted with a number of Telugu pālayams. These pālayams were based on military tenure. The Pōlygar was to clear the forests, to build villages, to extend cultivation, to execute irrigational works, to, in short, rule over his estate, which of course was inhabited by his own countrymen and to a larger extent by the Tamilians of the locality. The Pōlygar was thus in the position of a petty ruler. He had the hereditary right of succession vested in him, although the succession of a new Pōlygar to his paternal estate had to be ratified by the central authority. He could tax his people, and had at the same time to maintain the police, and arrange for and preside over the distribution of justice. He could, with special permission (which was granted only in extraordinary cases), even fortify the capital of his colony. The ordinarily permitted fortification was of mud; but special exploits achieved on behalf of the suzerain power procured from the Rāya or his viceroy in Madura the sanction to build stone-forts as well. The Pōlygar lived in his palace; had hundreds of retainers, and held, during the Navarātri and other similarly important occasions, a Darbar or kolū as it is called in Tamil. To the central authority, he had of course to pay his tribute. He had further to maintain a stated number of troops, and wait on the Rāya or the provincial viceroy whenever called on to do so. All official communication between the Naik Viceroy at Madura and the Pōlygar seems to have been carried on through sānahapatis or agents, whom each Polygār had the right to maintain in the capital.

The date of the early Pālayams of Trichinopoly and Maṇapparai.

It is difficult to say, owing to the perplexing chronology and wild statements found in the chronicles of these adventurers, who, among these, came to South India in the 14th and 15th centuries, and who came later on with Viśvanātha, the founder of the Naik dynasty at Madura. But there is no doubt that many of them were immigrants of the earlier period, though they did not arrive so early as some of the MSS. would make us believe. Taking the Trichinopoly district, for instance, which, as we shall see later on, formed part of the Naik dominion, we find that, out of the five pālayams (Tūrāiyār, Ilūppār, Kulattūr Penamenti and Ariyalar) which belonged to it, three at least trace their founders to periods not

31 According to Wilks, the term Polylgar is a comparatively modern term introduced by the Telugu government of Vijayanagar in the place of Udaygar. See Wilks' Mysore, I, 21, footnote.
32 Tūrāiyār is even now the seat of a Zamindāri, 12 miles N. of Māṣrī in the Trichinopoly District. Ilūppār is now a Zamindāri, 26 miles S. of Trichinopoly. Kulattūr has become part of Pudukkōṭai. Penamenti and Ariyalar are estates in Māṣrī and Udayaḷpālayam taluks. For the description of these places see Trichi. Guzr. and for a translation of their MS chronicles see appendix II on Trichinopoly pālayams. A full reference to the bibliography of the history of these has also been given there.
later than the beginning of the 15th century. The most important and extensive of these pālayams, namely, Turaiyūr, situated strategically well and picturesquely beautifully between the two hills of Kollaimalai and Pachchaimalai,²² was founded, according to one version, by two Reddi brothers, Ayya and Sāra, the alleged owners of a “Pallavod estate” in the neighbourhood of Nellore during the time of Krishna Dēva Rāya, and according to another MS it came into existence between the years 1450 and 1456. The neighbouring pālayam of Ariyalīr, the chief of which was a Nāyānār of the Palḷi or Vannian caste, was founded about 1405 A.D. by two brothers, Rāmi and Bhāmi, the sons of one Udaya Nāyānār of Anagundi. It is true that the chronological value of this statement is very much injured by the later statement in the MS that the exodus from Anagundi took place in the time of Naraśinga Rāya and Viṣvanātha Nāik; for, of these the former is known to have died about 1490, and the latter came to the south, as we shall presently see, between 1530 and 1560; and in ascribing both these events to 1405, the MS certainly commits a blunder. But we may fairly assume that the first immigration leading to the foundation of this pālayam took place about 1405, and that it was later on confirmed first by Naraśinga and then by Viṣvanātha, when he established himself at Madura and organised the various pālayams so as to put them on a definite basis. We have no reliable information about the foundation of Kulattūr and Peramūr by the Taṇḍamān and Tirtakutti, Dēva; but we have authority enough to believe that the Kāmākshi Nāiks of Iluppūr (a place 26 miles south of Trichī) belonged to a very ancient line, though as the Pēḻgaṟs of Iluppūr proper, their antiquity cannot be traced to a period older than 1660. The story is that Iluppūr, together with the neighbouring estates of Marungāpuri and Kadavūr, which belonged to the division of Maṇappāra,²⁴ came to the Maṇappārai Taluk, we find that, according to one MS, there were eight pālayams,—namely, Marungāpuri under Pāchi Nāiken, Nattam under Lāmaga, Thēhaimalai under Vasuvappa, Pijlamulungi under Mūrti, Rāmagiri under Sāmī, Viramalai under Kāmāiya, and two others the names of which are not given, but the chief of which went by the names of Lakkaṇa Nāiken and Viranār Kāmi Nāiken. It is not improbable that the last is simply a repetition of Viramalai under Kāmāiya, in which case there would be seven pālayams according to this MS. Two other MSS on the other hand mention only six pālayams, and leave out the last two. One of these, however, leaves out Kāmāiya Nāik of Viramalai and substitutes, in his place, one Ranga Nāik of Kumārpālayam. All the three MSS agree in regard to the five estates of Marungāpuri, Nattam, Thēhaimalai, Pijlamulungi and Rāmagiri. Now, of these, as I have already said, Marungāpuri, like

²² The Kollaimalais lie chiefly in the Nāmakkaḷ and Atūr tāluk of Salem, and the Pachchaimalais partly in the Perambalūr and Muśni tāluk of Trichī and partly in the Atūr tāluk of Salem. For a short but fine description, see Trichī. Gaz. p. 3-4, and for a longer one Salem Manual.

²⁴ The Maṇappārai tāluk till 1866 was part of the Madura Distric. It was then transferred to Trichī District. Maṇappārai is no longer tāluk head quarters. It is in the Kūjitīlai tāluk. Marungāpuri is even now a Zamindari 12 miles S. of Maṇappārai. Kadavūr also is a living estate, 28 miles S. W. of Kūjitīlai. Thēhaimalai is an extinct pālayam the ruins of which can be seen 14 miles S. of Kūjitīlai. Pijlamulungi is the same as Kadavūr. Viramalai is also in the Kūjitīlai tāluk and Kumārpālayam in Salem Distric 15 miles N. W. of Tiruchengōdu. MS histories of four of these pālayams only are available, and they have been abstracted and translated in appendix III entitled Maṇappārai Pālayams.
IIuppūr, was an extensive estate till late in the 17th century. Muttiah Naïk, common ancestor of Marungapuri, Kadavür and Iluppūr, was a Tāttiyan of Gooty. He emigrated to the south, says a MS. in 1284 A. D., but at the very next line it says, quite inconsistently, that he was a serva of Tirumala of Vijayanagar and a contemporary of Viṣvanātha Naïk, who belonged to the 16th century! We have no historical materials concerning Thēhaimai, and Viramalai; but we are somewhat better informed in regard to Nattam and Rāmagiri. The founder of Nattam, Lingama Naïk, came originally from the neighbourhood of Chandragiri in consequence, it is said, of "Mughal" ravages—some time evidently previous to the establishment of the Nāik Rāji. Sāmi Naïk of Rāmagiri came from Gooty about 1420 A. D. in the time, it is said, of Nāgama Naïk, Chandra Sekhara Pāṇḍya and Viṣvanātha,—a chronological mistake which almost all the Pōiygar memoirs commit.

The Paḷayams of Dindigal and Madura.

Proceeding to the paḷayams of Dindigal, we find the same disagreement among the MSS in regard to the actual number of feudal estates in the Naïk period. One gives 24, another 23, a third 21, while the English records mention 26 paḷayams when the province came into the hands of the Hon. E. I. Company. The Chinnobas of Pañjí and the Kongama Naïks of Ayakudi came to their respective estates in the train of Kottiyam Nāgama Naïk, about whom we shall study presently (though the MS memoirs of these err, like many others of the series, in placing Nāgama in early 15th century), from Ahobilam, their native place. Tirumali Chinnappa Naïk of Virupakshi founded his paḷayam about 1381 A. D., and his brothers, Appaia and Errama, founded the respective estates of Kannivāći and Idayakōtai. The MS history of the Kannivāći chiefs, however, while recognising the close relationship between their ancestor and the ancestors of the Virupakshi and Idayakōtai chiefs, gives a different date for the settlement,—namely 1403 A. D. It further says that Appaia was the contemporary of Chandrasekharā Pāṇḍya and Kottiyam Nāgama Naïk, and can thus hardly be considered correct in its chronology. It is curious that, while both the Virupakshi and Kannivāći chronicles say that Errama of Idayakōtai was a brother of their founders, the chronicle of the latter does not mention this, but simply states that the ancestor of the family Vallā Makkā was a serva of Nāgama Naïk and came with him to Madura in 1432, and settled at Idayakōtai. The Naïk chiefs of Madur, Emakalapuram, Tavasmalai, Ammaiya Naikēnr, Kulappa Naikēnr.

55 For a comparative statement of the 3 MSS in a tabular form see Appendix IV entitled Dindigal paḷayams. The MS chronicles of almost all these are available and have been abstracted, translated and edited in Appendix IV. "Pañjī is the headquarters of a taluk in Madura District. (See Madura Gāz. 301-8) It is an extinct paḷayam. Ayakudi is 3 miles E. of Pañjī, and unlike the latter a Zamindāri even now. It has now been purchased by the Zamindar of Ottiyambādi. (Madura Gāz. p. 301). Virupakshi is also an extinct paḷayam 13 miles E. of Pañjī on the bank of the Nagānji. It is not a Zamindāri. For the full references to the MS chronicles and translations of them see Appendix IV.

56 This lies 10 miles west of Dindigul, close under the Pañjī hills, and is the largest Zamindāri in the district. Madura Gāz. 238-240 and Appendix IV, Section 4.

57 The seat of a Zamindāri, 21 miles from Dindigul, on the northern frontier of Pañjī taluk. Madura Gāz. 302-3; Appendix IV, Section 5.

58 8 miles S. E. of Dindigul (Madura Gāz. p. 237); Tavasmalai is near it. (Ibid, p. 243). See Appendix, IV, Sections 10 and 11.

59 Four miles east of Nilakottai, in Nilakottai Taluk (Ibid. 292-4). Appendix IV, Section 12.

Koppaiya Nāikenūr, Tōttiyan Kōttai, Gandama Nāikenūr, Bōchi Nāikenūr, Periyakuḷam, Kombai, Kambam, Kēdalūr and Erajaḷka Nāikenūr were all Kambala Tōttiyanws who migrated to the south with their families, followers and castemen, either along with, or some time before, Nāgama Nāik, the father of the great Viśvanātha. The period of their settlement can be roughly assigned to the latter part of the 15th and the former part of the 16th century. The same is more or less the case with the chiefs of the Pālayams of the Madura division known as Utappa Nāikenūr, Doddāppa Nāikenūr, Vellayakunjam, Pujiyankulam, etc.

The Pālayams of Tinnevelly.

In and about the district of Tinnevelly, a large number of the pālayams were in Tamilian hands, and were therefore more ancient than those of the Tōttiyanws. The majority of the Tōttiyanws obeyed their settlements to either Nāgama or Viśvanātha Nāik, while the Tamilian Pōlygars held their position from ancient times, primarily owing to their martial valour. They belonged to the Marava and Palji castes, and were once evidently so serviceable to the country as to be rewarded with the semi-sovereign powers and privileges of feudality. The most important of them were the Marudappa Tēvas of Ītumalai, the Tirtapatis of Singampattī, the Saluva Tēvas of Īrkadū, the Vanniyans of Sīvagiri and Elayirampāṇai, the Tiruvōṇāṭa Pāṇiyans of Sēttur, the Īndra-Talivas of Talaiyandōttai, the Valangaiplū Tēvas of Chakkampatī and the Puli Tēvas of Neikkattanśēval. The MS histories of these estates begin from legendary and pre-historic times and narrate in detail the feats and adventures of the early chiefs. The Pōlygars of Sīvagiri, for instance, are said to be the descendants of Sīva. They, it is said, were originally pigs, but transformed by Pārvatī into great warriors! They then entered the Pāṇiyans service, and helped Bahruvahana in the defeat of his father Arjuna in the

61 Ibid., p. 296. Appendix IV., Section 14.
62 This is six miles W. S. W. of Nīkōttai. Madura Gaz. 298. No MS history of this estate is available.
64 This is 15 miles S. W. of Periyakuḷam. Ibid 313-6 Appendix IV Section 16.
65 The Taluk centre. The Zamindārī referred to is that of Rāmādrama Nāken of Vādagaran, Appendix IV, Section 17.
66 Four miles N. W. of Uttamāpālayam, close under the great wall of the Travancore hills. The pālayam was resumed by the English. Ibid, 319-20. Appendix IV, Section 18.
67 Six miles S. W. of Uttamāpālayam. Its history is similar to that of Kombai. Ibid, p. 318-19. Appendix IV gives a legend about it. No MS history is available.
68 Four miles E. of Uttamāpālayam in Periyakuḷam Taluk. A living Zamindārī. Ibid, 316-17. Appendix IV, Section 20, gives what is known about this.
69 In the Tirumangalam Taluk. A living Zamindārī. See Madura. Gazr. p. 330. See Appendix V.
70 Chief village of the Zamindārī of the same name in Tirumangalam Taluk. Ibid, p. 326, and Appendix V, Sec. 2.
71 A Zamindārī, 8 miles N. N. E. of Madura, in Madura Taluk. Ibid, p. 231. See Appendix V, Sec. 3.
72 Thirteen miles S. S. W. of Tirumangalam. Ibid, p. 323 and Appendix V, Section 4. I have been able to get no MS history of Kācchātkatti.
73 The MS histories of all these have been translated and given in the appendix. Singampattī and Īrkadū are within 3 miles of Ambāsamudram. Ītumalai or Sīr-kēlām-būdhur is about 15 miles from Tenkā, and Surandai 10 miles. Talaiyandōttai, Neikkattan Śēval, Sīvagiri, and Sēttur can be visited by taking the road from Tenkā to Śrīvillīpūṭṭōr. Their picturesque situations and vicissitudes I have described in detail in Appendix VI. See also Chap. II.
course of his Aivamādhva campaign! They then received a pālayam at Tribhuvana\textsuperscript{74} where they lived for centuries, till one of the chiefs killed two dacoit brothers on the hills of modern Sivagiri, and was therefore honoured by the then Pāṇḍiya king by being made a Pālgar of the very scene of his glory. His descendants ruled there continuously; and the chief, who was the contemporary of Viṣvanātha Nāik, was confirmed in his ancestral estate and dignity, like many other indigenous chiefs in their ancestral estates. The stories of the other Pālgars are equally wild and legendary though some are not quite so miraculous and incredible. Chokkampatil,\textsuperscript{75} for instance, traces its history to an alleged Pāṇḍya king of the 12th century at Tenkasi called Sivili Mārān\textsuperscript{76}. It is said that the first Valangaipuli Tēva was a servant of that king, and rendered great service to the country in subduing a formidable rebel, who occupied the region covered by modern Chokkampatti and had successfully defied for long the king's generals. The first Pālgar of Talaivanāttal owed his position, it is said, to a similar achievement. His heroism and skill enabled him to capture a terrible boar, which had committed immense havoc in the country and had eluded the attack of all the royal hunters. Examples of this kind may be multiplied; but it is unnecessary, as the detailed history of every pālayam is given in the appendices, and as a reference to them will enable the reader to gain the needed information about the subject. It is sufficient here to note that most of these Tamil chiefs of Tinnevelly claim to have ruled their estates from the time of the Mahābhārata or a Sivili Rāja; and there can be no question that, even though the antiquity which they claim is, as a rule, absurd, they were much more ancient than the Tētiyans who immigrated into the country in the 15th and 16th centuries, and were formally recognised as Pālgars by the generous statesmanship of Viṣvanātha Nāik. Having been long in possession of the different parts of the country and highly valiant in arms, the Tamil Pālgars were, out of considerations both of expediency and necessity, placed by the founder of the Nāik dynasty in a position of equality with Tōtiyā\textsuperscript{77} chiefs, like Ettappa Nāik of Ettiyāpuram, Katta Bomma Nāik of Pāṇcālankuruchchi, and Iravappa Nāik of Nāgalāpuram.

(The to be continued)

THE DATE OF MAHAVIRA.

BY JARL. CHARPENTIER, Ps. D.; UPSALA.

In writing for the 'Cambridge History of India,' Vol. I., the chapter concerning the history of the Jains it has, of course, been necessary to me to try to ascertain the real date of Mahāvira; and, as it is impossible in the limited space assigned to that chapter to discuss fully the various facts concerning this most important question, I have found it convenient to set forth here my considerations, upon which I have founded my opinion concerning the date of the founder of the present Jain Church. Moreover, no full discussion of this theme has ever been entered upon since the time, when Professor Jacobi, in his introductions to the

\textsuperscript{74} The famous centre of Saivism, 12 miles south-east of Madura.

\textsuperscript{75} About 15 miles N. of Tenkasi. It is a living Zamindāri. I have collected a number of MSS about it and I shall abstract them in the appendix. The palace is now in ruins.

\textsuperscript{76} Sivili Rāja is a celebrated figure in the Tinnevelly traditions. To him are attributed a number of temples (e.g. the temple of Pālayam-kottai near Tinnevelly) and other holy works. He was evidently a king of Tenkasi, but nothing definite is known about him. In later days Ativira Rāma Pāṇḍya was known by this title.

\textsuperscript{77} See Appendix VI on Tinnevelly pālayams.
edition of the Kalpasūtra and to the Sacred Books of the East, Vol. XXII—works that mark a new epoch in the study of Jainism—established with undeniable evidence, at least very narrow limits for the age of Mahāvīra; and so it might not be without some utility to take up the matter once again. As my materials are in much the same as those of Professor Jacobi, most of my article will consist in summing up and further developing what has been previously said by him. And it will be seen that the result of my inquiry is in full agreement with the opinion on the date of Mahāvīra which he formed many years ago, but which seems not to have been taken up by scholars dealing with the matter since.

In important treatises dealing with Jainism, e.g., Hoernle, Proc. A. S. B., 1898, p. 39 ff., or Guérinot Bibliographie Jaina, p. VII., we find the date of Mahāvīra’s death fixed at 527 B.C.; and the later author calls it ‘la date la plus accréditée,’ it being in fact in agreement with almost the entire tradition of the Jains themselves. For it is well known, that the Svetāmbaras believe the death of their spiritual master to have occurred 470 and the Digambaras 605 years before Vikrama; and as the difference between these two dates is 135 years, or just the same as the interval between the Vikrama era (57 B.C.) and the Saka era (A.D. 78), it is quite clear, as Professor Jacobi points out, that the Digambaras have here confounded Vikrama and Śālavāhana, a confusion by no means of rare occurrence. Now at first sight this seems to be fairly correct, but when we examine the matter a little more closely it will be seen—as has many times been remarked by Jacobi and other scholars—that this statement is based on very slight facts, if really on facts at all. There are two main points which should be considered in connexion with the date 527 B.C., viz.:

1. The relations of the Jains concerning the 470 years between the Niraśa of Mahāvīra and the accession of Vikrama in 57 B.C., and

2. The possibility or non-possibility of accepting 527 B.C., as the right year for Mahāvīra’s death viewed from the certainly established fact of his being contemporary with Buddha, who died, according to my opinion (as I shall explain below) in 477 B.C.

Finally in the last part (III) of my paper I shall discuss the tradition represented by Hemachandra and the conclusions to be drawn from it.

I

The Jain Chronology and its Foundation.

Merutuṣiga, a famous Jain author, composed in V. Sam 1361—1304 A.D. his work the Prabandhacintāmaṇi and about two years later his Vīcitraśreni, being according to Bhāu Dāji a commentary on his Therāvali. In this work he gives as a basis for an adjustment between the Vira and Vikrama eras the famous verses, first quoted by Bihler and after him discussed by Jacobi:

jan rayāsīn kālayau.
arihā tāthāpikaro Mahāvīra
tau rayāsīn Avasī-vai.

1 Older opinions concerning the date of Mahāvīra are found in Rice Ante. III, 107; E. Thomas ibid. VIII, 30 f.; Pāthak ibid. XII, 21 f. etc. As all these discussions have been rendered obsolete by the works of Professor Jacobi, I need not dwell here upon them.

2 Kalpasūtra, p. 7.

3 Vidā J. B. Br. R.A.S. IX, 147; other works by Merutuṣiga and references to modern literature concerning him are found in Weber’s Cat. II, 1024 sq.

ahisitto Pālaga rāgā || 1 ||
śatūhi Pālaga-raṣṭo
pannavaṇṇasayaṁ tu hoi Nandāṁ
atihasaṁyaṁ Mūriyāṁ
tīsaṁ ciya Pāsamittasa || 2 ||
Balamitta-Bhāvamittā
śatūhi varisāḥ ca tatta Nahaṇāhane
taha Gaddabhiṣa-rajaṁ
terasa varisā Sagassa cau || 3 ||

Pālaka, the lord of Avanti, was anointed in that night in which the Arhat and Tirthankara Mahāvira entered Nirvāṇa (1)

Sixty are (the years) of king Pālaka, but one hundred and fifty-five are (the years) of the Nandas; one hundred and eight of the Mauryas, and thirty of Pusamitta (Pushyamitra) (2).

Sixty (years) ruled Balamitra and Bhānumitra, forty Nabhavāhana. Thirteen years likewise lasted the rule of Gardabhiṣa, and four are the years of Saka (3).5

These three verses are repeated in many commentaries and chronological works, (Bühler), for instance in a paṭṭavāli of the Tapaṅgaccha (extending from Mahāvira to the accession of Vijayaratna, V. Sam. 1732—A. D. 1585-86) where are added two verses filling up the space between Vikrama and Saka, which do not interest us here. The only point of difference is the reading Nahaṇāsa for Nahaṇāhāsa in v. 3, but this can be of no use to us here, as confused and incredible as the verses are, it seems still utterly improbable, that the author should have placed the Great Satrap Nahaṇāna before Vikrama.

These verses contain—as already remarked—a short account of dynasties reigning between the death of Mahāvira and the accession of the famous king Vikramādiya but their provenance is totally unknown. That they were not composed by Merutūṅga himself or any of his contemporaries is certain, because at that time the Jain authors had long ago ceased to write in Prakrit.7 They do not, of course, belong to the Jain canonical writings, and this makes it highly probable that they originated after the final redaction of the canon by Devardhigāva (in 980 or 993 after Mahāvira, i.e., A. D. 453 or 466 counting from 527 B. C.), and belonged to the older set of commentaries, the composition of which did undoubtedly begin immediately after—if not already before—the final redaction of the Siddhānta. If the nominative Nahaṇāhāsa is authorised by the manuscripts—on which point I cannot, of course, have an opinion—this might be a sign of a certain age; for it is absolutely certain that in later commentaries, e. g., that of Devendra on the Uttarādhyāyana (from A.D. 1073) where the Prakrit is much older than the time of the tikā itself, no nominatives in -e exist.8 But there is another fact, upon which a certain stress ought to be laid in connexion with these similar chronological statements of the Jains, and that is that they all take the Vikrama

5 The translation is taken from Bühler, l. c. Published by Klatt, Ante. XI, 251 sqq.
6 According to Pulle Studi Indiani, 1, 10 the Jain authors began to compose their work in Sanskrit about A.D. 850 (time of Silākā); but this is by no means an ascertained date.
7 I have chosen this text as an example because its Prākrit parts are well known from the Ausge- wählte Erklärunge of Professor Jacobi. To make the point here discussed quite clear, I wish to state that the few passages of the text, where really nominatives in -e occur (p. 28, ll. 17-24, p. 32 l. 35—33, l. 28 and p. 34, ll. 11-20) show a totally different style and probably belong to a canonical work, which is not possible for me to identify at present.
era as having been in reality founded by a king Vikramaditya of Ujjayini. For Kielhorn has long ago proved that the connexion of the era commencing 57 B.C. with a king Vikramaditya of Ujjayini, who perhaps never existed, was not established till a very late date, the first mention of 'Vikrama Saiva' being made in an inscription at Dhalpur from Saavy. 898—A.D. 842; and the oldest literary mentions of Vikrama in connexion with the era seem to be those afforded by Dhanapala's Paippalacch (V. Saavy. 1029—A.D. 972) and Amitagati's Suhkusti-sandroha (V. Saavy. 1050—A.D. 994). If we take these facts into account, it seems probable that the verses cannot at least in their present shape be so very old. But this is rather a suggestion, and their main content—the enumeration of kings between the death of Mahavira and the commencement of the era beginning in 57 B.C. may very well have existed long before this era was in any way connected with the rather mythical king Vikramaditya of Ujjayini.

As for the statements made in them, they are of a somewhat mysterious nature. Palaka, King of Avanti, is here mixed up with the Nanda and Maurya dynasties and Puyamitra of Magadha, and with several rulers of Western India, among whom Gardabhilla is elsewhere stated to have been the father of Vikramaditya, and Saka a prince belonging to the non-Indian dynasties of North Western India. Jacob has already shown that the introduction of King Palaka of Avanti into this list, which must from the beginning have been intended to give the names of the kings of Magadha, as Mahavira belonged to that country, seems highly suspicious. Who was this Palaka? No doubt, he is meant to be identical with Palaka, son and successor of Pradyota, King of Avanti, and brother of Vasavadata, queen of the famous King Udayana of Vatsa. As this Udayana was a contemporary of Mahavira and Buddha, it is quite possible that his brother-in-law, Palaka, may have succeeded to the throne in a time nearly coinciding with the death of Mahavira. But there is absolutely no connexion between him and the dynasty of the Sisunagas, ruling in Magadha at and after the time of Mahavira. However, I think it possible that his appearance in this list may give us a rather valuable clue to the question concerning the provenance of these verses. For in their present shape they are, as mentioned above, late and composed at a time when the kingdom of Magadha had absolutely ceased to have any connexion with or interest for Jain writers; but from the fact that out of 470 years recorded not less than 293 are filled up by the names of actual rulers of Magadha, we might undoubtedly infer that they were derived from older sources actually giving the right names of the Magadha kings. Now the list finishes with kings of Ujjayini, Gardabhilla being one such, and his son Vikramaditya being the most famous of them all; and, as the Jains already in the centuries immediately preceding our era played an important rôle in the west of India, and had many connexions with Ujjayini, they probably did not find it at all unsuitable to begin this list with a king of that famous town as well to end it with one. Moreover, we may perhaps rightly conclude, that the connexion of the Jains with Magadha and Eastern India really ended with the downfall of the Mauryas. From the confused tales of the Buddhists as well as from other and more certain sources,9

9 Ante. XX. 397 ff. 10 On the slight differences in fixing the date (A.D. 993 or 994) of Schmitt and Hertel Z. D.M.G. 59, 297 sq.
11 Kalpasutra, p. 8 sq.
12 This is expressly stated by Merutuisuga, who tells us that Pradyota died the same night as Mahavira according to Bhu Dali. J. B. B. R.A.S. IX., 147 sq. Whether he is the one mentioned in the Mechanetics is not likely to be discovered. But, as there is nothing in that play connecting him with Udayana, I do not deem it very probable. However, some light may perhaps be thrown upon this question, where the text of the Caturdutta becomes available in the Trivandrum series.
13 Cp. V. A. Smith, Early History of India, p. 188 sq.
we might think that Pusyamitra was zealously orthodox—or that at least they suffered considerably from the successors of these, and that they did not in reality know anything concerning the kingdom of Magadha after that time.\textsuperscript{14}

Professor Jacobi\textsuperscript{15} has tried a somewhat complicated hypothesis in order to account for the introduction of King Pālaka of Avanti into the list of the rulers of Magadha, considering Udayana, the brother-in-law of Pālaka, to have been confused with Udāyin, the son and successor of Ajatasatru, and Pālaka to have entered into the list in this way. As I have explained above, I do not think that Pālaka belonged to the original list at all; but, if his presence there is to be accounted for in any way, I think another suggestion may be more easily adopted. It is stated in Kalpas. § 147 (p. 67 ed, Jacobi) that Mahāvīra reached nirvāṇa while staying at Pāvā (or Pāpa) in king Hastipālaka’s office of the writers’ (rajjū-sabhā). This monarch is mentioned also in § 123, where he is called Hathhipālaka, and Jacobi, S. B. E. XXII, pp. 264, 269, has in both passages used the form Hastipālaka. But the manuscripts give in both paragraphs alternatively the form Hathhipālaka and *pālaka*, and the latter is taken into the text by Jacobi in § 147. From this it is clear, that he was styled Hastipālaka as well as *pālaka*, a circumstance upon which no special stress need be laid, because we have no reason whatsoever for expecting anything else. Now it is both possible and credible that a Hastipālaka (ka) might in more unofficial language be styled Pālaka, and as this king stands in the closest connexion with the death of Mahāvīra, we might well suggest that he may have been said later to have been anointed in the same night in which the Prophet entered Nirvāṇa. This might in my opinion supply a reasonable cause for the introduction into this list of a certain Pālaka, who was later mistaken for the king of Avanti well-known to the Jains in Western India.\textsuperscript{16} However, this king Pālaka is for reasons already partly mentioned, and to be further developed subsequently, of no chronological importance whatsoever for fixing the date of Mahāvīra and for filling up the space between him and the commencement of the Vikrama era.

Passing over, for the present, the regnal periods assigned to the Nandas (155 years), the Mauryas (108 years) and Pusyamitra (30 years), as I shall enter upon a more close examination of these dates later on, I shall now say some words concerning the kings, whose names fill up the last 117 years before the beginning of the Vikrama era, i. e., about 174—57 B. C. These are the following:

Balamitra and Bhānumitra, reigning for 60 years.  
Nabhovahana (Nabhovahana) reigning for 40 years.  
Gordabhillā reigning for 13 years,  
and Saka reigning for 4 years.

There is in reality not much to be said concerning this strange list of rulers, and nothing certain. Nabhovahana, a name which Bühler and Jacobi render by Nabhovahana, is a totally unknown personality;\textsuperscript{17} and the only suggestion to be made is that he may have been

\textsuperscript{14} Of course, the Jains had a patron in Eastern India in Khāravela, king of Kalinga; but this protection may have been of rather short duration. The Jains do not seem to recognise their obligation to their great patron even by mentioning his name, and his date is uncertain (ep. further on).

\textsuperscript{15} Kalpas., p. 8 sq.

\textsuperscript{16} King Hastipālaka (ka) of Pāvā undoubtedly a petty clan-ruler of the type of Sudhodana of Kapilavastu or Siddhārtha of Kupagāma, is, as far as I know, mentioned nowhere else in Jain or Brahmanical scriptures. This shows clearly that he could only have been remembered because Mahāvīra passed away in his dominions. And such an unknown ruler could, of course, very easily be confused with a far better known name sake.

\textsuperscript{17} If the variā lectio Nabhovāna is in fact worth anything and renders the name Nahapāna, the Satrap who seems to have flourished about A. D. 80-125 and in fact reigned between 40 and 60 years, this list would of course in its later part be absolutely useless. But there are reasons which make me believe, that this is not the case: (1) it seems really impossible that even a very confused chronology would put Nahapāna before Vikrama, and (2) if Nahapāna had really been intended, he ought most certainly to have been mentioned in the story of Kākakacārya, dealing with the rise of Scythian power in India before Vikrama; but this is not the case.
some petty ruler in Western India during the period between the downfall of the Maurya empire and the beginning of the Vikrama era. Just the same may be said concerning Balamitra and Bhānumitra, although they are mentioned elsewhere. For in the somewhat confused legend of Kālakārīya, edited by Professor Jacobi in Z. D. M. G. 34, 247 sq., we read on p. 268 sq. that these princes, who were the nephews of Kālaka, ruled in Bharukaccha (Bharoch) and were friendly disposed towards the Jain Church. As this Kālaka played according to the legend the somewhat despicable trick of calling the Sakas into India to destroy his enemy king Gardabhilla of Ujjaini, this would place the two princes a short before the time of Vikrama. Without trying to entangle the very confusing facts told about Kālaka or rather the different Kālakas—of which there seem to have been at least three—I point only to the statement that there existed one Kālaka, who was the 23rd śthāvira after Mahāvira and is said in the supplement to the Kalpadruma to have lived 376 years after the Nirvāna, i.e., 151 B. C. counting from 527 B. C. The patāñjali of the Tapāgaccha says that this Kālaka died 376 or 386 years after Mahāvira, i.e., 151 or 141 B. C.; and this would fit fairly well with the time assigned in the versus memoriales to Balamitra and Bhānumitra, as they are supposed to have reigned together during 60 years or between 174-173—114-113 B.C. However, I attach just as little importance to this concurrence as to the whole chronological statement of these verses.

In the same legend concerning Kālaka the history of Gardabhilla and the Sakas is told at full length. There may be really some historical foundation for the stories told concerning this invasion of India by Scythian rulers before Vikrama, rulers stated to have been brought in by a second Kālaka living 453 years after Mahāvira, i.e., 74 B. C. or just in the year of Gardabhilla's accession to the throne 17 years before Vikrama. This Gardabhilla is elsewhere said to have been the father of Vikramāditya and king in Ujjaini; and concerning him it has been suggested, that he was identical with Bahram Gor, king of Persia A. D. 420-438, and again that he is in reality the same person as the satrap Gudaphara or Gondophares, who must have lived in the first century B. C. But neither of these hypothesis is satisfactory, Gardabhilla being always closely connected with the time of Vikrama. Now it must be conceded that Gardabhilla is a rather strange Indian name scarcely to be accounted for, and seems very likely to be of foreign origin. And I might suggest that it is at least as probable as the above-mentioned theories, that Gardabhilla represents in fact a Greek name ending in φαρ, and that the person in question was perhaps a petty Greek prince or Governor overthrown by the Scythian invaders, and had in reality nothing to do with the famous king of Ujjain. There is nothing against this suggestion in the fact, that the Gardabhillas are mentioned in Viṣṇu P. IV, 24, 14 as a tribe or dynasty for they rank there together with the Yavanas, Sakas, Bāhlikas and other invaders, named as successors of the Andhra Dynasty. For of course these may have been named after the old Gardabhila, existing many centuries before, on account of some real or fictitious relationship to him.

(To be continued.)

11 Jacobi l. c. p. 250 sq.
15 A commentary to the Kalpaśtras by Laksnmitavallabha, who wrote a commentary on the Uttarādhijayamānaśtrasa in Sama.
21 Klatt Ante. XI, 251.
22 The first suggestion was made by Wilford As. Res. IX, 147 sq. the second one was propounded by Prinsep, Ante. II, 142 and supported by Lassen Ind. Act. II, 409.
23 To be compared as far as I can see, only with the old Gobhila and the obscure name Robhila in the Mārchatakīya. Cf. Indog. Forsch. 28, 178; 29, 380 sq.
MISCELLANEA.

PAINTING AND ENGRAVING AT AGRA AND DELHI IN 1666.

One of the best and most instructive of the old travellers was Monsieur Jean de Thévenot, who visited India in 1666 and 1667, dying near Tauris or Tabriz in Persia in November, 1667. His travels were translated into English and published in that language in 1687. Writers on Indian art have not yet noticed, so far as I am aware, his criticism of the Agra and Delhi paintings, which I transcribe as being of considerable interest:—

"One may see a great many pictures in the Indies upon paper and pasteboard, but generally they are dull pieces, and none are esteemed but those of Agra and Delhi: however, since those of Agra are for the most part indecent, and represent lascivious postures, worse than those of Aretin, there are but few civil Europeans that will buy them." (Part III, p. 39).

"The painters of Delhi are modeldest than those of Agra, and spend not their pains about lascivious pictures, as they do. They apply themselves to the recounting of Histories, and in many places, one may meet with the Battels and Victories of their princes, indifferently well painted. Order is observed in these, the personages have the suitableness that is necessary to them, and the colours are very lovely, but they make faces ill. They do things in miniature pretty well, and there are some at Delhi who engrave indifferently well also; but seeing they are not much encouraged, they do not apply themselves to their work, with all the exactness they might: and all their care is to do as much work as they can, for present money to subsist on." (Ibid., p. 46).

The traveller, it will be observed, had a poor opinion of the work of the contemporary artists seven or eight years after the accession of Aurangzeb, whose puritanical opinions no doubt much discouraged art. When I examined hundreds of specimens of Mughal and Indo-Mughal art, three years ago, I found only four, namely, three by Udat Singh and one by Gultum Raza, which could be reproached for indecency. The wholesale accusation of indecency brought against the artists of Agra, no doubt quite justified, has been a surprise to me. The explanation of the absence of such objectionable works from the London collections must be that suggested by de Thévenot, namely, that 'civil' or decent Europeans seldom bought the indecent paintings. Information about the lives of Indian artists is so rarely obtainable that I am unable to say whether Udat Singh and Gultum Raza belonged to the Agra School or not. The lasciviousness of that school may be ascribed reasonably to the evil example set by Shihjahan.

When Indian painting becomes better understood than it is at present, critics probably will be able to distinguish at sight the productions of Delhi from those of Agra. The traveller's high praise of the colouring as fully justified, but hisolesale that the Indian painters "make faces ill", does not apply to the better portraits.

His statement that there were tolerably good engravers at Delhi is new to me, and I shall be much obliged if any body can produce a specimen of seventeenth century engraving done by an Indian artist.

1 A History of Fine Art in India and Ceylon, p. 336.

VINCENT A. SMITH.

OXFORD.

KAUTILYA AND THE ARATTAS.

In the Bibliotheca Indica edition of the Vâyu-Purâna the passage (37, 324) about the succession of Chandragupta stands as follows:—

उपलुप्तस्य नाथस्य शरणां आरत्ताय एव विद्वस्यः: ।
चतुर्दशृणू नुस्य राजाय गुरुनिः: काश्मीरस्यखिय: ॥

"Kautilya will uproot all of them (Sahas or Sahasa and others), the 8 sons and successors of the Mahipadma, 323), through Devarajas ...."

What were these devarajas? Apparently some people. I propose to read the word as Vrisakhtihata, 4 Vrisakhtihata would be the same as Aratas.

On this datum of the Vâyu, it appears that Chandragupta was mainly helped by the Arattas in his war, which has been related, though no doubt in exaggerated terms, in the Mahâbhârata, as fought between Bhadrasala, the Nanda's general, and Chandragupta. They were "the band of robbers" of Justin, 5 as Cunningham guessed years ago. But Cunningham thought that Chandragupta used them against the Greeks. That might or might not have been the case; here we have evidence to hold only this much that they were used against the Nandas. 6

K. P. JAYASWAL.

1 Between these lines the second half of the preceding Iloka intervenes:

2 Sankala and others, in the Vishnu.

3 Changed in the Brahmadatta into विराजमेघः:

4 A confusion between de indica and de indica.

5 Probably it was originally विरा: राजाय गुरुनिः: implying that with Arasthas or Arasthas, Kautilya exterminated the Nandas, not all at once and the same time, but in two different attempts.—D. R. B.

6 And further there was Bhadrasala, the soldier in the service of the royal family of Nanda, and he waged war against king Chandragupta. New in that war, Nâgâsena, there were eighty Corps Dances' ii, p. 147.

7 "It was this prodigy which first inspired him with the hope of winning the throne, and so having collected a band of robbers, he instigated the Indians to overthrow the existing Government." (V. 4). The Ceylon tradiotn also says that he was also helped by "robbers." Cf. Maudhahkata, Korâ-Parâ, xiv, (31-32) the Arattas are born of virtue, (37) they are to be avoided; (44, 21) they are robbers by habit.

8 Buddhist tradition implies that he started his operations by first conquering or winning over the frontier.
THE DATE OF MAHAVIRA

BY JARL CHARPENTIER, Ph.D., UPSALA.

(Continued from page 123)

So much concerning Gardabhilla. As to Saka, to whom is attributed a reign of four years ere he was overthrown by Vikramāditya, there are without doubt some hints of very great interest and perhaps of real historical value included in the confused legend of Kālaka. For the text states that Kālaka, after having sworn to Gardabhilla to be revenged, roamed about till he came to the country Sakakula (Z.D. M. G. 34, 262), and in v. 63 of the Kālakācāryakathānaka it is said of the royal dynasty of Saka:

सगकुलां जेवं समागया तेपा सैगो जय
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'Because of coming from Sakakula they were called Sakas.

Moreover, we learn from the same source that the governors of provinces in Sakakula were called sāhī and the king of the country, 'this crown-jewel in the crowd of princes' was styled Sāhāṇusāhi. Now, I think Professor Jacobst24 was right in making Šakakula=Sakas-

āna, Σακα-, and moreover reminding us of the name Sakapālo, mentioned by Strabo XI 8, 2,25 which really presents a remarkable likeness to the Sanskrit word Sakakāla. And there cannot be the slightest doubt, that the title Sāhāṇusāhi is only a modified transcription of the well-known legend on the coins of the Kushan kings, Shaonano shao. So there must be some foundation for the legend told concerning Kālaka and the invasion of Scythians which he provoked; and as I deem it rather improbable from the whole shape of the legend26 that it relates to the great conquest of North-western India by Oeuma Kadphises, it may in fact contain a faint remembrance of some battle between Saka satraps and an Eem (?) prince (Gardabhilla), which has later been localized in Ujjayini. A full account of the Sakas princes who seem to have flourished in the first century B.C. may be seen in Duff Chronology of India, p. 17 sq., and it does not at all invalidate the possibility of this suggestion. The theory that the invaders were Persians and that Sāhāṇusāhi represents 'the king of kings' ruling that country cannot be upheld, as it is expressly stated that the invaders were Sakas, and not Persians or Bactrians. As for the title Shaonano shao, which I find in the Sāhāṇusāhi of the text, it is true that it does not occur on coins before Kaniska; but this is not material, as the legend arose apparently at a far later date, and in that time the earlier Sakas and the Kushans might very easily be confused. However, it is interesting and certainly a proof of the text not being wholly valueless, that it has preserved these rather minute reminiscences of the Saka dynasties.

I have tried to show, that the chronological list, on which the Jains found their assumption of a period of 470 years between the death of Mahāvīra and the commencement of the Vikrama era is almost entirely valueless. The line of rulers composed in order to fill up this time is wholly unhistorical and can by no means be trusted; for it assigns the first 60 years after the Nirvāṇa to a certain king of Ujjain, who had absolutely nothing to do with Mahāvīra, and for whose introduction into the list I have tried to find out reasons as above.

24 I. c. p. 255.

25 Μάλεσον δι γεώργοις γεγόνυι τῶν νεκρῶν οί οὗν Έλληνων αὐτοῦμενοι τὴν Βακτριανήν, Λασοῦν καὶ τῶν Βακτριανῶν, καὶ τῶν Ναβαρνακῶν, καὶ δραματέντων ἄρα τῆς περαιάς του Ἱππότος, τῆς κατὰ Σακάλαν καὶ Σακακάλαν Σακάλαν, ἵπ τε κατέχων Εκαν.

26 In the Kālaka legend it is not the 'king of kings' (sāhāṇusāhi) but only his satraps (sāhī) who invade India, and not with his consent, but to escape his rage against them.
The following 293 years are filled up by dynasties of Magadha of undisputed historical character, and this shows clearly, that it was originally the kings of Magadha who were to be recorded here. And that is just what we should expect, as Mahāvira passed nearly his whole life in that country and in close connexion with the two kings Bimbisāra and Ajātaśatru. As for the last 117 years before Vikrama, they are filled up by various kings or princes of partly different nationality, of whom we know with absolute certainty nothing more than that they never had anything at all to do with Magadha.

Thus, we find that the statement of the Jains, according to which their last Prophet died 470 years before Vikrama, or 527 B.C., rests upon a wholly hypothetical basis, and can nowise be trusted. I shall now enter upon the second part of my enquiry and show that it is wholly inconsistent with the adjusted Buddhistic Chronology too, and ought, consequently, to be absolutely abandoned.

II.

Buddhist relations concerning Mahāvira and the Jains—The date of Buddha's death.

The investigations of Jacobi and Bühler have made it quite clear, that the Buddhists and Jain canonical writings speak of persons who are to a large extent identical, although sometimes different names are used to designate them. From this it was rightly concluded by these two eminent scholars, that Buddha and Mahāvira must have been contemporaries, must have visited mainly the same localities, and have come into contact with the same kings and other prominent persons of their age. Moreover, Jacobi has shown with absolute conclusiveness that Nigantha Nāṭ(h)a-putta, often mentioned in the Buddhist canon amongst the six heretical teachers, who flourished about the same time as Gotama Buddha, must be identical with Mahāvira. And no one will nowadays doubt that these two teachers were absolutely different from and independent of each other, although living at the same time and, perhaps, often enough having to face each other at their wanderings through Magadha.

Passages in Buddhist canonical writings dealing with Nāṭ(h)a-putta and his followers have been admirably discussed by Professor Jacobi in S. B. E. Vol. XLV., p. XV sq. But as his main purpose was there to collect and explain the Buddhist notices of the early Jain creed and doctrine, and less attention was paid to the historical facts possibly to be extracted from these narratives, I shall here dwell upon some of these passages again. As the Pāli Canon was, of course, brought into its present shape at a time far posterior to the events related in it, it cannot always be absolutely trusted. But there seems to be rather strong evidence for thinking the main facts related in it to have really occurred, as they are represented there.

The well-known introduction to the Sāmaññaphalaagutta (D. N. I. p. 47, sq.), telling us, how king Ajātaśatru of Magadha paid visits to one after another of the six heretical teachers Pūraṇa Kassapa, Makkhali Gosala, Ajita Kesakambala, Pākudha Kaccāyana, Sañjaya Belaśiputta and Nagañtha Nāṭputta to hear their doctrines, and at last discontented with all he had learnt took refuge with Buddha may be a little exaggerated, as it is not very credible that Ajātaśatru saw seven great teachers after each other in one single night. But the

27 Passages where Nāṭ(h)a-putta is merely mentioned without anything being told about him are for instance C. V. V. 3, I; D. N. II. p. 150; M. N. L. pp. 198, 256; II. p. 284; he is called in Buddhist Sanskrit Nāgrānta Jñātīputra, e.g. Dharmarat 143; Mahāvastu I. pp. 263, 357; III. p. 333.
28 The late J. A. S. Nil. VIII. t. XII. 209 sq. held the opinion, taken from the Mahāvastu (v. J. A. 1887, p. 324 n.) that Mahāvira never met Buddha, but this is apparently a mistake not to be upheld.
29 The Majjh. Nik. II. p. 2 sq. tells us how the six heretical teachers once spent the rainy season in Rājagaha at the same time as Buddha. Mahāvira spent fourteen of his varas there according to Kalpasūtra § 122. But the visit of Ajātaśatru is said in D. N. to have taken place in the full moon of Kārttika (about Nov. 1) after the end of the rainy season. However, it seems quite possible that it may refer to the same event.
main content of it is undoubtedly true, as much as we can control the facts told concerning
the doctrines of at least two of the teachers, Gosāla and Nātaputta, by comparison with
Jain writings. Moreover, the Jain writings, e.g., the Aṣṭapāṭikasūtra § 39 sq., tell us of
visits paid by king Kāpiya or Kasiya (Ajātasatru) to Mahāvira; and although there are no
facts from which to conclude that it is the same visit as that alluded to by the Dīgha Nikāya,11
there are sufficient instances to prove that the imagination of Ajātasatru paying visits to
Mahāvira was quite familiar with Jain writers.

In Majjhima Nikāya I, p. 92 sq., Buddha tells his relative, the Sākya prince Mahānāma-
man, of a conversation which he had once had with some Nirgrantha ascetics in the neighbour-
hood of Rājagaha. These disciples of Mahāvira praised their master as all-knowing and all-
seeing, etc.; and there is nothing remarkable in this, for the claim of possessing universal
knowledge was a main characteristic of all these prophets, Mahāvira as well as Gosāla, Buddha
as well as Devadatta. Moreover, there are other instances in the Pāli Canon where Mahāvira
is praised in the same way by his followers; so in Majjh. Nik. II, 31, where Sakuludāyi in
Rājagaha, ibid. II, 214 sq., where some Nirgrantha monks, and in Aṅguttara I, 220, where the
Liechavi prince, Abhayā, in a conversation with Ananda in Vesāli, eulogizes Nātaputta in the
same way. But all these passages speaking in a quite familiar way of Nātaputta, his doctrines
and his followers seem to prove, that the redactors of the Buddhist canonical writings had a
rather intimate knowledge of the communication between Buddhists and Jains in the lifetime
of Gotama and Mahāvira.

The passage in the Mahāvagga VI, 31, 1 sq., speaking of the meeting in Vesāli32 of the
general Sīha, who afterwards became a lay-disciple of Buddha, with Nātaputta has been
discussed by Professor Jacob in S. B. E. XLV, p. XVI sq., and also the well-known
Upālisiutta of the Majjhima Nikāya (I, p. 371 sq.). Here it is related at considerable length,
how Upāli, who was a lay-follower of Nātaputta, went to see Buddha at a time when the
two teachers dwelt at Nālandā33 in order to try to refute him on matters of doctrine. But
this attempt had only a scanty result; for Buddha soon converted Upāli, and made him his
disciple. So Upāli went back to his house in Rājagaha, and told his door-keeper no more to
admit the Nirgranthas. When Mahāvira afterwards came with his disciples to see him,
Upāli declared to his former teacher the reason of his conversion, and eulogized Buddha,
his new master. The text finishes with the following words: atha kho Niggoṭhassa
Nātaputtaṇa Bhagavato sakāraṇa asahamānam tattva ‘eva unham lohitam mukhato ugaṇ-
chitta, ‘but then and there hot blood gushed forth from the mouth of Niggoṭha Nātaputta,
since he was not able to stand the praise of the venerable one.’

Much stress has been laid on this passage, as several scholars have combined it with the
story told in D. N. III., 117 sq. 209 sq. and Majjh. N. II., 243 sq.34 that Nātaputta died in

30 Cf. concerning the doctrines attributed to Nātaputta (DN. I. 57 sq.) Jacob in S. B. E. XLV, p. XX sq.
and concerning Gosāla (D. N. I. 53 sq.) ibid. XXIX and Dr. Horney’s admirable treatise in Hasting’s
Encyclopaedia Vol. I., p. 209 sq. (also Uṇṇadatado App. II.)
31 The Aṣṭapāṭikā Sūtra speaks of Kasiya as residing in Cāmpa, the Dīgha Nikāya places the meeting
in Rājagaha. The visit of Ajātasatru alluded to in Uṇṇ. I. 12 (quoted by Mr. Vincent A. Smith, Early
History p. 41 n.) refers also to Cāmpa. Of this I shall speak later on.
32 The passage is repeated in Aṅg. Nik. IV, p. 180 sq.
33 In the § 122 of the Kalpasūtra quoted above Mahāvira is said to have spent fourteen rainy seasons
in Rājagaha and the suburb (bhārītikā) of Nālandā. This was a famous place even with the Jains, cp.
§ 334 of the Śrāvakārtha II. 7. (SBE. XLV, 419 sq.)
Pāvā, while Buddha stayed at Sāmagāma in the land of the Sākyas. It has been concluded from this, that Mahāvira died a very short time after the interview with Upāli. 35 I cannot here dwell upon the Buddhist record of Mahāvira's death, which I shall discuss later on; but I wish here to lay stress on two facts in connexion with the tale of Upāli, and the death of his former teacher. The first is that, although the place where Mahāvira is nowadays said to have died is a small village called Pānapuri, about 3 miles from Giriya in the Bihār part of the Patna district, 36 it is quite clear from D. N. III, 117 sq., &c., that the Buddhists thought it to be identical with the town Pāvā, in which Buddha stayed in the house of Cunda on his way to Kusinārā; for it is said to have been in the land of the Sākyas, and this is at a considerable distance from Rājagṛha, where Mahāvira had his interview with Upāli. It will have been rather far to walk, if Mahāvira had really been so ill as to die soon afterwards. And as, according to the Kalpastra 37 §§ 122-123, Mahāvira spent the whole of his last rainy season, nearly four months, in "King Hastipāla's office of the writers" at Pāvā, he must have lived at least nearly half a year after the interview with Upāli, if we could trust the story that he died as a consequence of it. And for the second, we are told absolutely the same story of hot blood gushing forth from the mouth concerning Devadatta in C. V. VII, 4, 3, and that at an occasion when he like Mahāvira had real reason to be very excited. And in the old texts it is nowhere stated, that he died as a consequence of it, although later reports used by Spence Hardy and Bigandet seem to think so. 37 From this I venture to draw the conclusion, that Mahāvira's death stood originally in no connexion with, and was by no means a consequence of his interview with Upāli.

In the Abhayakumārasutta (M. N. I., 392 sq.) it is stated that prince Abhaya was asked in Rājagṛha by Nigaṇṭha Nātaputta to go to Buddha, and put to him the question, whether it was advisable or not to speak words agreeable to other people. By this a trap was to be laid out for him; for if he answered "no" he would, of course, be wrong, and if he answered "yes," Abhaya ought to ask, why he had in such fierce terms denounced Devadatta and his apostasy. I admit, that too much weight should not be attached to this passage, as another closely similar instance occurs elsewhere in the Pāli Canon 38 ; but, as it can, by no means, be proved to be worthless, it seems to involve the conclusion, that Mahāvira was still alive after the apostasy of Devadatta. This event is probably with justice thought by Professor Rhys Davids 39 to have taken place about ten years before the death of Buddha himself.

Professor Jacobi 40 has called attention to the fact, that Buddha and his followers are not mentioned in old Jain scriptures, which is rather strange, the heads of both churches being

36 Comp. Imp. Gaz. of India, Vol. XX, p. 381.
37 Cf. SBE. XX, 259 n. Another instance proving the same fact is afforded by the history of Saṅjaya, the teacher of Sāriputta and Mogallāna; in the Mahāsāṃghika I, 24, 3, he is said to have vomited hot blood, when his disciples abandoned him, but nothing is told about his death, which cannot have occurred then, if I am right in my suggestion that he was the same person as the teacher S. Bellaṇṭhiputta. But Beal and Bigandet tell us, that he died immediately afterwards, which is, however, directly contradicted by Spence Hardy, Manual, p. 202. Op. S. B. E. XIII, 149 n. 1.
38 Viz., in Sany Nik. IV., 322 sq. where we are told that Buddha and Nātaputta were staying in Nālandā at the same time during a severe famine; when the latter asked his lay-follower the squire (gāmeva) Anibandhakappatthā (cf. ibid. p. 317. sq.) to go to Buddha and ask him, whether he deemed it right to have all his monks there at that time devouring the food of the poor people.
40 Kalpas, p. 4.
contemporaries, and has drawn from this the conclusion that the Buddhists were of no great importance at the time of Mahâvîra. However, I cannot fully subscribe to this conclusion, the premise not being quite correct; for the Buddhists are undoubtedly mentioned amongst other sects in some places of the Siddhânta. Moreover, this may be partly due to the composition of the Jain Canon itself. Undoubtedly Buddha was a rival of Mahâvîra, and a dangerous one, too, but he never played in regard to him the same part of a treacherous and hated enemy as did Gosâla Mâmphalkiputtra, who went straight away from Mahâvîra and founded a new sect of his own, and, moreover, proclaimed himself to have reached the stage of a prophet (tirthakara) two years before his former teacher. To a religious congregation still in its infancy this may have proved a most fearful blow, and so we must not wonder at all the imprecations which the Jain Canon lavishes upon this philosopher, whom even Buddha is said to have stigmatised as the worst of all evil-minded heretics. So Gosâla may have been to the Jains of early time a far more important person than even Buddha. Moreover, the Jain canonical scriptures themselves, brought undoubtedly into their present shape at a much later time than the Pâli Canon, are wholly out of comparison with the sacred lore of the Buddhists. Far it be from me to suggest that any earlier stories about Buddha and his doctrine have been cancelled by the redactors—an hypothesis by no means to be upheld. But I desire to call attention to two facts, offering perhaps to some degree an explanation of what is remarked by Professor Jacobi:

(1) The Dēriśāda is lost, and it may have contained—I cannot absolutely say that it did—something concerning the Buddhists, as it is clear already from its name that it dealt with other doctrines.

(2) The schematistical style of the present Siddhânta itself excludes to a great extent the possibility of finding in it such statements as the one required, it being in my opinion only fragments—in some parts, to be sure, to a large extent worked out in a most abominable style—and register-like versus memorials detached or perhaps better preserved from what was the original canon.

I cannot dwell further here upon this topic, which I hope to treat more fully elsewhere.

I have merely wished to draw attention to some facts, which may perhaps account to a certain degree for what is remarked by Professor Jacobi. I shall presently refer to some instances from the Buddhist scriptures showing the rather intimate knowledge which they seem to possess concerning the Jains. Most such passages—mainly dealing with matters of doctrine—have already been collected by Professor Jacobi; some few dealing with rather trifling things may be added as giving further proof, if needed, of the well-established fact, that Buddhists and Jains must have lived in close contact with each other during the first growth of both churches, i.e., in the lifetime of their founders.

41 Cf. e.g. Weber Ind. Stud. XVI, 333, 381 and Satyakâta I, 6, 26 sq. (S.B.E. XLV, p. 414 sq.)
42 Cf. Bhagavati book XV summarised by Dr. Hoernle in his Udvigyanavala, App. I.
44 The previous existence of the fourteen pâres, the circumstances that the aṅgas are incomplete, the Dēriśāda being lost, and the blank denial amongst the Digambaras of the authority of the present Śvetāmbara Canon are all facts pointing to the rather late origin of the Siddhânta, as it is handed down to us.
45 To Professor Jacobi (S.B.E. XXII, p. XLV 21) the main reason for the loss of the 14 pâres— which constituted the main part of the Dēriśāda—is that they dealt with the doctrines of Mahâvîra’s opponents, but I do not think this suggestion quite acceptable. Another less credible explanation is offered by Weber Ind. Stud. XVI, 248: Cf. also Leumann Actes du VI Congrès des Orient, III, 559.
46 In the introduction to an edition of the Uttarādhyayanasūtra, which is in preparation.
That the Jains designate their spiritual masters by the title arhat is well known, and this title occurs already in the Edict of Kharavela, as far as I can see it in the expression: Vo samāyo vā brāhmaṇa vā arahā (cv. V. 8, 1), must mean a Jain. Moreover, it should be noticed that the Pali Canon gives to Nātaputta and the other five heretical teachers the titles gaṅga, gaṅgācariya, gaṅgassa satthā (Samy Nik. I., 66) and tirthakara, which are never, as far as I know, attributed to Buddha, but are quite suitable for the Jain prophet; for gaṅga seems to have denoted in old times the sections of the Jain community, and to have been identical with the more modern gaccha, and tirthakara is the most common title of Mahāvīra, which was claimed by Gosālā too. One might perhaps doubt a little, whether this really proves anything, since the same titles are used for all these teachers. But we must remember that Gosālā, the most important of all after Mahāvīra, was himself a former disciple of the latter, and had claimed himself to have already before his teacher attained to saintship. Moreover, these two are mentioned together with Pakudha Kaccayana and Pūraṇa Kassapa in a verse, which seems to be really old, in Samy Nik., II., 3, 10, 6, a circumstance perhaps of some weight. And Buddhaghoṣa asserts expressly in the Šūra Viḷās. I., 144, that Pakudha was sitādakapatikhitto, i.e., forbade the use of cold water (like Mahāvīra), and deemed it a sin to cross a river or even a pool on the road (nadiṁ vā maggoṇaṁ vā atikkamma sīlaṁ me bhinnan-iti); another point of his doctrine has been discussed by Professor Jacobi in SBE. XLV, p. XXIV sq. As for Pūraṇa Kassapa, his doctrines, as expounded in DN. I., 52 sq., do not show any resemblance at all with Jainism; but it is perhaps nevertheless worth notice, that two circumstances seem to hint at a somewhat closer connexion between Pūraṇa and Gosālā: in Šūra Viḷās. I., 142 is told a story explaining the reason, why Pūraṇa was a naked ascetic, and this story is undoubtedly similar to the legend concerning Gosālā, ibid. p. 144; and the well-known division of mankind into six classes (Jāti), the black, the blue, etc., by Gosālā is ascribed in Ahy. Nik. III., 383 to Pūraṇa, which is perhaps no mistake, but indicates that he really shared the opinion of Gosālā. Moreover, Gosālā denied the very existence of karman (n‘āthi kamman, etc., DN.), and Pūraṇa seems to do much the same, as he asserts, that a man could commit murder and slaughter without running into any sin, and likewise do meritorious works without storing up good karman. His leading maxim seems to be included in the words: nāsti pāpaṁ nāsti punyaṁ. So it seems at least probable, that there was some degree of connexion between these four teachers, Mahāvīra, Gosālā, Pakudha and Pūraṇa, however they may have differed on some points of doctrine, and their adherents may well have been divided into gaṅgas as were those of the Jains.

47 The title arhat is extremely rare as a designation of heretics in the Buddhist scriptures; Cf. Rhys Davids in Hastings' Encyclopaedia, I., 774.
48 Observe the difference in the Sāmaṇera-phala-nipāta (D. N. I., 47 sq.) between the attributes of the heretical teachers and of Buddha, which are here seen in close connexion with each other.
49 Cp. Hoernle in Hastings' Encyclopaedia I., 261 concerning the relations between Pakudha and Gosālā.
50 This legend is given by Dr. Hoernle, U. A. App. II., p. 29; Cf. Spence Hardy Manual p. 301.
52 I cannot account for the two others viz., Ajita Kesakambala and Sañjaya Belathipputta. Ajita seems to have been a mere materialist, denying not only the existence of a soul but also every thought on another life. The assertion in the Dalava (Roek: 'Il Life of Buddha p. 103), that he shared the doctrine of Gosālā is not worth much compared with the passage of the Dīgka Nikāya. As for Sañjaya, I think he is the same person as S. parinivṛtta, mentioned in Mahās. I., 23-24 as the teacher of Śrīpirnippa and Mogalla-līna. If this is right, he was undoubtedly a Brahman; to judge from the D. N. I., 58 sq., he seems to have been a sophist, mostly trying to display his rhetorical skill.
That Mahāvīra was a naked ascetic is stated already by the Ācārāṅga I, 8, 1 sq. In this respect he differed from his predecessor Pārśva, who had allowed the wearing of two garments. Gosalā too was a naked mendicant, and seems to have laid down nakedness as a rule for his followers, the ājīvikas, whilst Mahāvīra probably let open to his disciple the choice between nakedness and wearing of garments. The Buddhist scriptures frequently speak of naked mendicants, and especially denote the ājīvikas as such, e.g. Mahāvīrāṅga VIII, 15, 3, I, 38, 11; 70, 2; CV. VIII, 28, 3; Niss. VI, 2; Sāny. Nik. II, 3, 10, 7 etc. But in some of these instances the naked friars are only called tīthiikas (tīthiikas), and might well be followers of Mahāvīra. Moreover, in the report of the 'six classes' of Gosalā and Pārśva a difference is made between the 'nirgranthas' of one garment', the 'householders in white clothes, followers of the naked ascetics' (gihi odātavavāna acelakasāvekkā), and the naked ascetics or ājīvikas, which shows, that the Buddhists knew well the different schools of their rivals. It is very often spoken of the acelas or acelakas, without further definition, and acela is a favourite word with the Jains. In (Āg. Nik. I, 206) the nirgranthas are said to command their lay followers to strip themselves naked on the āposatha days. In CV. V., 10, 1, it is said, that a monk had a water-bowl made of a gourd and the people seeing him said 'just like the tīthiikas'. Now in Ācārāṅga II, 6, 1, 1 it is permitted to the Jains to have bowls made of gourds55, and so this may really point to them56 and in M. V. IV, 1, 12, there are monks keeping the māgavratas or 'vow of silence', which reminds us of the Gotra, where the vow of silence is practised (mopaṭa mottam), an expression denoting the Jain church in Sātrik-tāṇḍāga I, 13, 9 (SBE. XLV, p. 321).

There are certainly other instances, too, proving the same fact, viz., that the Buddhists in very early times had an intimate knowledge of the life and institutions of their opponents, the Nirgranthas or Jains, but I shall not linger over the discussion of these passages. From what has been said above, taken together with the previous instances, supplied by Professor Jacobi and other scholars, may be concluded, that not the slightest doubt is any longer possible as to the fact, that Mahāvīra and Buddha were different persons, contemporaries and founders of rival communities of monks. But, if we believed the Jain tradition to be right, when it asserts the death of Mahāvīra to have taken place 470 years before Vikramā, or 527 b.c., we might well doubt whether this is possible. For the death of Buddha, the date of which was first, and in my opinion rightly fixed by General Cunningham and Professor Max Muller, occurred in 477 b.c.; and as all sources are unanimous in telling us, that he was then 80 years old, he must have been born in 557 b.c. From this is clear, that if Mahāvīra died 527 b.c. Buddha was at that date only 30 years of age, and as he did not attain Buddhahood, and gain no followers before his 36th year, i.e., about 521 b.c., it is quite impossible that he should ever have met Mahāvīra. Moreover, both are stated to have lived during the reign of Ajātaśatru,

52 Cf. for instance Uttarādhyā. XXIII, 13.
53 In this chapter is a curious instance of coincidence between Buddha and Gosalā, which may undoubtedly have been taken by them both from some Brahmanical source. For in § 2 it is told that in a certain night there rose up a cāṭuḍdipi ko mahāmoha and rain fell, on which occasion Buddha said to his disciples: Yathā bhikkhave Jetavana vassati evam catāsau dīpesu vassati, evaṃucchata bhikkhave kīvan, agvan pacchimako cāṭuḍdipi ko mahāmoha, O monks, as well as in Jetavana it rains now in the four continents. Strip yourself naked, O monks, for this is the last great cloud over all the four continents. This 'last' great rain reminds us instantly of the 'last tornado,' one of the 'eight finalities' (aṭṭha caramāna) of Gosalā, cf. Bhagavatī p. 1254 sq. and Honein in Hastings' Encyclopaedia I, 263.
54 Cf. also Aṣṭasātipi. § 79, VII.
55 In the same chapter monks are told to have had waterbowls made of sculls, which seems consequently to have been the use of some sects already in very early times.
who became king eight years before the death of Buddha, and reigned 32 years; this makes it even more impossible to believe in the dates mentioned above. So either the date of Mahâvîra must be moved nearer the commencement of our era, or that of Buddha must be moved backwards. However, the date 527 B.C. is a traditional one, and the date 477 B.C. only a calculated one, so perhaps some one might find it easier to doubt the correctness of the latter. Moreover, the year of Buddha's death has been in some researches of the most recent years moved some years backwards: to 486 or 487 B.C. by Mr. Vincent A. Smith and others, or to 482-83 B.C. by Dr. Fleet. If this were really correct, there might be a possibility—but not more—of the correctness of the date 527 B.C. for Mahâvîra; but I do not believe in these alterations. I shall be more than ever examine the main facts for the calculation of Buddha's death, in order to give proof of my opinion, that the fixing of 477 B.C. as the year of the Great Nirvâna by General Cunningham and Professor Max Müller was probably as near to correctness as we can possibly attain.

The real chronology of India begins with Chandragupta after the invasion of Alexander. But the date of Chandragupta's accession or abhisheka is by no means absolutely fixed, varying between 325 and 312 B.C. according to different authorities. Moreover, the calculations of the time between Buddha and Chandragupta in old texts are not of great weight; and so I am convinced—sharing this opinion with M. Senart Ind. Ant. XX, 229 sq. and Mr. V. Gopala Alyer, ibid. XXXVII, 341 sq. amongst others—that it is only the inscriptions of Aśoka that can afford us the possibility of obtaining a fixed starting point for the chronology. The suggestion of Buhler Ind. Ant. VI, 149 sq.; XXII, 290 sq.; Ep. Ind. III, 134 sq. and Dr. Fleet J.R.A.S. 1904, p. 1 sq., that the number 256 at the end of the Siddâpur, Sahasrârâ and Râñânâth edicts denotes 256 years elapsed since Buddha's death, has been completely refuted by Dr. F. W. Thomas, J. A. 1910, p. 507 sq., who has proved with undeniable evidence that this passage means that Aśoka himself had been away from home 256 nights, when he had the edict published.57 Incredible as the suggestion was before the appearance of this article—for it is not very probable that Aśoka should have denoted his spiritual master by the epithet vyuha, never used elsewhere, while on the Luṭâbini pillar he employs the well-known epithets Buddha, Śakyamuni and Bhagavant—it has now totally lost all chronological importance. But M. Senart had long before found the starting point in the 13th Rock-Edict, where Aśoka speaks of the Yona king Antiyoka, and the four kings beyond his realm, Turamaya, Anttikina, Maka and Alikasudara, and I follow him in this. Lassen Ind. Alt. II., 264 sq. had previously remarked, that the kings in question are Antiochos II Theos, king of Syria (261-246 B.C.), Ptolemaios II of Egypt (d. 247 B.C.), Antigonos Gonatas of Macedonia (d. 239 B.C.), Magas of Cyrene (d. 258 B.C.) and Alexander of Epirus (d. probably 258 B.C.). Now the Rock Edicts were published when Aśoka had been anointed 12 years, i.e., in the 13th year after his coronation; and no one can doubt or has doubted, as far as I know, that in the Ed. XIII he speaks of these five kings as alive. As he sent missionaries to them all, and stood, to judge from this, in a rather intimate connexion with them, it is impossible to suppose, that he should not have known one or two years after 258 B.C., that two of them were dead, one amongst these (Magas) being, moreover, a close relative of Ptolemaios; and the latter was one of the mightiest kings of his time, who had himself despatched the ambassador Dionysios to

57 The conclusion of Dr. Fleet, J. R. A. S. 1916, p. 1301 sq. based on the acceptance of the reading of Dr. Thomas is totally untenable. The 256 days are explained in the only possible way by M. Levi, J. A. 1913, p. 119 sq.
58 Cf. Rock-Edict II, where probably the same kings are intended.
Bindusara or even to Ashoka. So the 13th year of Ashoka must fall after 261 B.C., the accession of Antiochus Theos, and before 258 B.C., the death of Magas and, probably, of Alexander (if the last did not die even earlier). If, thus, the 13th year fell between 260-258 B.C., the year of the coronation must have been 272-270 B.C., and as Ashoka had been, according to a unanimous tradition amongst the Buddhists, king four years before his coronation, his father Bindusara must have died between 276 and 274 B.C.

This calculation is founded on the irrefutable basis of contemporaneous monuments. But now the Chronicles of the Buddhists tell us, that Ashoka was anointed king in the 218th year after Buddha, after having put to death his 99 brothers. If this statement were to be trusted, it would with certainty fix the death of Buddha in 489-487 B.C. But it cannot be taken as evidence, because it is contradicted by another notice in these same chronicles. I shall explain here what I think to be wrong in their calculations.

Brahmanical, Buddhist and Jain tradition alike speak of king Bimbisara of Rajagaha, and his son and successor Ajatasthu, whom the Jains call Kaniska or Kanika. And the oldest documents of the Buddhists tell us, that this Bimbisara was the contemporary of Buddha, and was put to death by his son Ajatasthu eight years before the Nirvana. This Bimbisara was according to the Purana the fifth sovereign belonging to the Saisunaga dynasty and reigned 28 years; but the Dipavamsa III, 56-51 and the Mahavamsa II, 25 sq. tell us that he was born five years after Buddha, was made king at the age of fifteen, and reigned 52 years. This is however of no great importance, as Bimbisara died before both Buddha and Mahavir. After Bimbisara came Ajatasthu (or Kaniska), reigning for 25 years according to the Purana, and 32 according to the Ceylonese chronicles. Buddha died when he had been king for eight years. But here the coincidence, even in names between Brahmanical and Buddhist records ceases, for the Purana tells us that Ajatasthu was succeeded by a king, called Harsa or Darshaka, who reigned 25 years, and whose successor was called Udaya, and reigned 33 years, while the Buddhists call the successor of Ajatasthu Udayabhadda (DN.) or Udayabhaddaka (Dipav., Mahav.), and give him a period of 16 years, and the Jains call him Udain and attribute to him a rather long reign.

(The to be continued.)

THE HISTORY OF THE NAIK KINGDOM OF MADURA.

BY V. RANGACHARI, M.A., L.T., MADRAS.

(Continued from page 118)

The Pañayams of Kongu.

The Kongu country (Salem and Coimbatore) remains now to be noticed. The Madura MSS mention only three Pañayams here, namely, Tali of the Ettila Naiks, Talaimalai of the Ramachandra Naiks, and Dharamangalam of the Ghetti Mudaliars; but the Mackenzie MSS contain the history of more than a score of Kongu Pólygars, who

99 Cf. V. A. Smith Early History, p. 129.
100 That this is refuted by the Rock-Ed. V., where Ashoka speaks of his brothers, was noticed by M. Serani Ind. Ant. XX, 256 sq.
101 I attach no importance whatsoever to the assertion of the northern Buddhists, that Ashoka lived 100 years of the Nirvana. This is as valueless as the statement that Kaniska lived 400 years after Buddha, a suggestion certainly to be viewed only in connexion with the former one.
102 This may have been his real name, as avouched by the oldest Buddhist and the Jain tradition.
103 Upon this I shall deal further on.
104 All these are in Mack MSS, local tracts, BKS. IV, XVII, XVIII and XIX. They have been translated in Appendix VII and a reference to it will give an idea of the topography, the history, etc. of the Pañayams. It is unnecessary to dwell upon them here.
acknowledged the supremacy of the Nâiks of Madura. The majority of these Kongu Pêlygars were not Tottiyan Naiks, but Canarese Kavuqâns. Comparative nearness to the Canarese country naturally exposed this province from very early times to Canarese invasions and immigrations. It was on account of this that the establishment of the Hoysala as well as Vijayanagar supremacy was earlier here than farther south. It is not surprising therefore that when Viśvanâtha established the Nâik kingdom of Madura and extended it over Kongu, he had to either suppress or conciliate these Kavuqâna chiefs, as he had to do with the Maravas and Pallis of Tinnevelly. The Kavuqâns were Canarese, but it is curious that their chronicles say that they were Velîlas of Tôqdamandalam. They assert that about80 “Kali 1100,” a certain Chêramân Perumâl married a Chôla princess and she took with her 8,000 families of these Velîlas as her followers; and that these divided the Kongu country into 24 Nâdus, over each of which they placed a Kavuqân. The chiefs served the Chôla, Pândya or Chêra kings as the political exigencies of the day demanded. Indeed they were not infrequently subject to Mysore. They had in this manner occupied the Kongu country for centuries; and they, as we shall presently see, were conciliated by the Nâik rulers of Madura. It is not possible to go into the details of the histories of these Kavuqâns, but a very brief reference to them may not be out of place. There was, in the first place, the able Vênu Uçaya Kavuqân of Kákavâdi;81 the Maqâdîar of Kâdayûr, again, the chief whose ancestor Kângyan, we are informed, distinguished himself in the Kângyam Nâdu as early as Kali 557! The Vâlal Kavuqân of Manjarâpuram, again, whose ancestor gave his country the name of Talai Nâdu—“country of heads”—from his habit of using the skulls of his numerous opponents for ovens! There was the valiant Vâna Vâya Kavuqân of Sâmattûr, whose namesake and ancestor, Piramaya Kavuqân, had dared, in order to get an interview with the Râya in Vijayanagar, to cut off of the ears, horns and tail of the Râya’s fighting bull, and who, on account of his proud refusal to bow to the Râya, acquired the title of Vaçaângâmudi Kavuqân Râya! The MS history of this chief says that Vaiyapuri Chimmûba Nâik of Virâpâkshi was only a Vêda relation and nominee of his! Another prominent chief was the Kalingarâya Kavuqân of the village of Üttukul on the Ænâimalais, the 9th of whose line was soon to wait on Viśvanâtha Nâik in Madura, and accompany him, like a faithful vassal, in the war with the five Pândyas. The Nîlappa Kavuqâns of Nîmîndapâti had a fairly extravagant history. The first of them, it is said, served Kâna Pândya as a Sirdâr and vanquished an “Ođdiya” invader,—a feat which is attributed also to some other Kavuqâna chiefs. His descendant also was, like others, destined to acknowledge the Nâik supremacy, and pay tribute. The most important of the Cîmbatore chiefs, however, was the celebrated Ghetti Mudaliar of Dhârâmangalam. The MS history of his line says that, about S. 1400, two Mudaliar brothers, Kumâra and Ghetti, were in the service of “the Karta”82 at Madura; that the latter, a vain man, once admired himself by the use of the royal ornaments on his own person; and so fearing chastisement, left for the

80 See the Kongulâsa râjâkkal, which attributes the Vijayanagar conquest to 1348-9.
81 The date is of course absurd. The dates given by the Kongu Polygar memoirs are generally so. The chief of Kângym, for example, is said to have lived in K. 537 and yet in the time of the Vijayanagar rulers.
82 For a full account of the topography and history of all these Pâjyâmas see Appendix VII.
83 This is the term generally used to denote the king or governor in the Nâik period.
west, where the local chief of Amaravati, Kumara Veda by name, adopted him and, on his retirement, bequeathed to him the chiefdom of Dharamangalam. Another chief, Immadi Gopanna Maangadhar of Poravipalayam, had a very respectable family history which goes back to still ancient times. It says that, immediately after the return of Kampana Udayar, the restored Pandyas recognized the then Gopanna as a chief. "In course of time, the Pandyan kingdom became extinct, and the Raya’s power was extended throughout the south. The Raya then crowned Kottiyam Naga Naik’s son, Visvanatha Naik, as the king of the country east of the pass. Visvanatha when he came to Madura summoned all the Polygars and Mansabdars of the country. Gopanna Maangadhar went, and saw him and obtained his favour." The same was more or less the case with the Pallava Raya Kavundas of Thoppampaatigi, the Periya Kavundas of Maakur, the Choliyanda Kavundas of Sevvur, the Sakkarai Kavundas of Palayakottai, etc. These Kavundas, it should be mentioned, were recognized as feudal vassals by the later Naiks; but as in Timnevelly, they were controlled by a number of Tottiya chieftains whom Visvanatha either established or raised from obscurity to grandeur. Thus came into existence the Deva Naiks of Avalampatti, the Samba Naiks of Samuchuvadi, the Bomma Naiks of Andiapati, the Mattu Rangappa Naiks of Metrathi, the Chinnama Naiks of Mallangi, the Dimma Naiks of Vedapatti, the Softha Naiks of Sotampatti, the Sifa Naiks of Tungavai, etc. Some of these were, as a reference to their histories in Appendix VII will shew, Polygars in the times which preceded the advent of Visvanatha Naiken in Madura, but they were definitely organized by him in the middle of the 16th century.

The Castes and Creeds of the Immigrants. The Tottiyan.

It may be asked to what caste and creed the immigrants belonged. The majority of the Telugu colonists were Tottiyan, or Kambalattars. Both the chiefs who migrated to the south and became Polygars, and their main followers were Tottiyan. Of a proud and virile community, they connected themselves in their legends with God Krishna. They declared that they were the descendants of the 8000 cowherdesses of Krishna, a tradition which indicates, as Mr. Stewart surmises, that their original occupation was perhaps the rearing and keeping of cattle. Other circumstances also go to prove this. The names of their two most important subdivisions, Kollar and Erkollar, are simply the Tamil forms of the Telugu Golla and Eragolla, which denote the shepherd castes of the Telugu country. The subdivision of Killavars, again, is probably a corruption of the Telugu kiladi, a herdsman. The fact that the Tottiya bride and bridegroom are seated in their marriage ceremony, even now, on bullock saddles goes to prove the pastoral and agricultural life of their early ancestors. The extraordinary skill they display in the reclamation of waste lands is noticed in scores of Mackenzie MSS, which graphically describe the processes of their emigration with their herds of cattle. Besides agriculture, cattle breeding and

---

82 Nelson uses the term Vedugas to denote the immigrants. He subdivides them into Kavarers, Gollas, Reddis, Kammavars, and Tottiyan or Kambalas. Of these the last three were agricultural. See his Madu Manual, p. 80.
83 Madr. Census Rep. 1891; Thurston's Castes and Tribes.
fighting, the Tottiyanas had other occupations also. Almost all of them, men and women, were magicians. Indeed many of the Polygar memoirs assert that many chiefs owed their dignity and estate to their skill in magic. They were, in the popular opinion, experts in the cure of snake-bites by magical incantations, and "the original inventor of this mode of treatment has been deified under the name of Pambalamman." (Stuart).

It is impossible to go into all the divisions and subdivisions, endogamous and exogamous, into which the Tottiyan caste became divided. In Madura they were in three divisions,—the Vekkill or Raja Kambalattar, the Thokala and Erakolla. In Tinnevelly they were in six divisions. Each of these divisions again was further subdivided into septs. The Erakkollas of the Pajayam of Nilakkottai, for instance, formed a group of seven septs. There were similar groups in the Trichinopoly district. On the whole, there seem to have been, according to one MS, nine sub-castes or important septs—Kambajams as they were called—included in the comprehensive term Tottiyan; and in the tribal council meetings, representatives of each of the nine Kambajams had to be present. Each of the Kambajams had a number of headmen. The Vekkillans, forming one of the Kambajams, had, for instance, three headmen called Mettu Naiken, Kodia Naiken and Kambli Naiken. The first of these acted as priest on ceremonial occasions such as the attainment of puberty, the performance of marriage rites and the conduct of the tribal worship of Jakkamma and Bommakka. The Kambli Naiken attended to the ceremonial and other duties relating to the purification of erring members of the community. The Kambalam was so called, it is said, "because, at caste council meetings, a kambli (blanket) is spread, on which is placed a kalolam (brass vessel) filled with water, and containing margosa leaves, and decorated with flowers. Its mouth is closed by mango-leaves and a coconut."

The Tottiyanas were, as a rule, very conservative and did not yield to Brahmanical influence with ease. In the system of marriage after puberty, in the curious system of family polyandry which existed among them, in their preference of the Kodangi Naiken to a Brahman or their Guru, in the custom of allowing the tali to be tied on a bride's neck by any male member of the family into which she is married, in the eating of flesh, etc., we see the signs of primitive forms of social organisation still offering resistance to the assaults of Brahmanism and its patriarchal influence and monandrous marriage-bond. In their marriage customs they resembled the other Dravidian classes. They had the custom of marrying their boys to the daughter of their paternal aunt or maternal uncle.

A few, like the Kattu Tottiyanas of the present day, were perhaps even then the dregs of Tottiyan society, and led the indolent and easy-going lives of vagrants, beggars, and snake-charmers. Some were pigbreeders, and the lowest class were Cniiyarans or drummers, some peons and retainers, etc. They of course were held in contempt by the higher classes, and there was no interdining or intermarriage between them. As a whole, the Tottiyanas south of the Kaveri believe themselves to be socially superior to those north of it. This is explained on the ground that the latter gave a girl to a Muhammadan in marriage. That is why they are said to address the Muhammadans with unusual intimacy. The legend shows that the southern Tottiyanas were proud seceders from their northern brothers in protest of their intermarriage with a Muhammadan. See Trichi Gaz., Castes and Tribes p. 187; Madr. Gaz.

It is curious that the Tottiyanas did not celebrate marriages in their own homes, but in pandals of green pongu leaves erected for the purpose on the village common. It is equally curious that on such occasions they only used camels and horse-gram. The sacredness of the pongu is due to the fact that it was by means of the pongu tree that they were able to cross the floods of a river during their retreat from the pursuit of Muhammadans.
But in the arrangement of such a marriage they ignored even the most ridiculous disparity of age. Not unoften a tender youth found himself the husband of a grown-up woman,—a circumstance which necessarily gave currency to primitive ideas of female morality, and to the belief, characteristic of the caste, that a woman might, and indeed should, have, in case she did not desire disaster or unhappiness, marital relations with the father and other male relations of the husband. The same reason must be at the basis of the notion prevalent in the caste that a woman loses purity only when she chooses a lover of a different caste. The woman found guilty in this manner, however, was instantly put to death through the hands of the despised Chakkiliyan. Divorce among the Tottiyan was easy and the remarriage of widows freely allowed; but the widow who did not avail herself of the permission and committed sati with her husband, was highly respected and even divined. The ladies of the Tottiyan Polygars frequently committed sati on the death of their lords.

In religion the Tottiyan were chiefly Vaishnavites. A reference to the Appendices will show that when the Tottiyan Polygars emigrated from the neighbourhood of Vijaynagar to the south, they carried with them the images of Abhala Narasinja Perumal, Tirupati Venkatâchalapati, and other Vaishnava deities. Many curious legends are given in the MSS about these deities. The ancestor of the Kannivadi Appaliya Naiks, for example, we are told, neglected his tutelary god at first; but the deity managed to get into his notice, brought about an interview between him and the Pandyan king through the instrumentality of a vision, and finally secured for him a Pâlayam; and this of course led the gratified adventurer to build a temple to his divine benefactor. Wherever the Tottiyan went, they built temples, sometimes of stone, but generally of brick or mud, and dedicated them either to Narasingha or Venkatâchalapati. They had also their own minor household deities, which were chiefly the manes of departed relations, sati, or vestal virgins. The patron deities of the caste, Jakkamma and Bommakka, were women who committed sati. "Small tombs called Tipanjam-kôvils were erected in their honour on the high roads, and at these oblations were offered once a year to the manes of the deceased heroines." Another deity, Virakâran, was derived from a bridegroom who was killed in a fight with a tiger. Pattalumma was the goddess who helped the tribe during their flight from the north; Malai Tamburan was the God of the Ancestors.

Closely connected with the Tottiyan were their domestic servants or Parivârams, who formed a separate caste. Some of them were called Chimmâ Uliyams or lesser servants, as they discharged the comparatively low kind of duties, such as palanquin-bearing. The Periya Uliyams or Maniyâkârans had more honorable duties to perform. In their marriage customs, in the easy allowance of divorce, in the toleration of the loose marriage tie within the caste, in the recognised right of the Polygar to enjoy their women at will, and in the severity of the punishment inflicted on those who went astray with men of other castes, they in every way resembled the Tottiyan.

87 Not unoften a family of several brothers had one wife,—a custom sanctioned by the tradition of the Pâñjavanas. See Wilks I, p. 35; Thurston's Castes and Tribes; Madura Gaz., etc. Madr. M. H. I, 282.
88 Cf. the various chronicles of the Appendix.
89 Nelson, p. 81; the Polygar Memoirs, etc.
90 See Madu. Gaz. and Thurston's Castes. Excommunication was the punishment for immorality outside caste. A mud image of the offender was made and thrown away outside the village as a sign of social death.
The Reddis.

Next to the Tōttiya, the Reddis\(^{91}\) were the most prominent Telugu colonists. But the Reddis came without their women; and on account of their marrying Tamil women, they became very much denationalised. They are in consequence an almost different community from the Reddis of the North. They occupied chiefly the region covered by the modern Trichinopoly district, and also parts of Coimbatore and Salem. It seems probable that they immigrated in two different waves. One of them married the women of the lower classes called Pongalas, and so came to be known as Pongala Reddis, while the other married dancing girls and came to be known as Panta Reddis. Next to the Veḷḷālas in social rank, they considered themselves superior to all the other Tamil castes. They are a physically fine class, industrious and well behaved. Their chief occupation has been agriculture. Owing to some special social reason they were very friendly to the Chakākkīya, who were allowed to take part in their marriage negotiations, accompanied their women on journeys, and had the right of receiving alms from them. The Reddis were only partially open to Brahmanical influence. They wore the sacred thread, for example; but this they did only at funerals. They did not allow their widows to marry again; but their ideas of chastity were very loose, except in the case of maids and widows. They had, again, for their deities, Yellamma, Rengaiyamma, Polayamma, and other such non-Brahmanical creations, for propitiating whom they indulged in certain very gruesome rites.

The Teluguised Saurāstras.

In a survey of the tribal migrations in South India during the Vijayanagar rule the important industrial community of the Teluguised Saurāstras, the clothiers and master-crafts-men of the Peninsula, cannot be ignored. Centuries back the original habitation of this people had been, as their spoken language Patnūli or Khatri shews, in Gujarāt, or Saurāstra. About the 5th Cent.\(^{92}\) A.D. they, in response to the invitation of Emperor Kumāra Gupta, the son of the famous Chandrā Gupta Vikramāditya, immigrated to Malwa to practice there their art of silk-weaving. For centuries they stayed there. The Musalān invasion then deprived them of their royal patrons and induced them to cross the Vindhyas. In the kingdom of Devagiri they found welcome, but the Musalān Nemesis came there also, and the emigrants had to seek protection further South. The Empire of Vijayanagar had just then been formed and begun to attract to its magnificent capital everything that was grand and good in Indian religion, art, industry, and skill. The Saurāstras evidently found themselves a highly patronised community there. Nor is it surprising that they experienced such hospitality. The splendour of the imperial court, the gigantic establishment of the imperial harem, the royal practice of making presents to favourites and officers in gorgeous robes, and the love of luxury common in those days, contributed to the enormous increase in the demand for silk clothes; and the Saurāstras, assured of easy livelihood and substantial recompense, perfected their skill, and satisfied the emperors and the nobles. The period of the Saurāstras' stay in Vijayanagar, in consequence, was a period of unusual prosperity to them. It was evidently during this period that they enlarged their Khatri vocabulary by the addition of a large number of.

\(^{91}\) The Reddis or Kāpus were the landlords and agriculturists of the Telugu country. For their customs see Godavari Gaz. p. 55. For a fairly detailed description of them in the south see Trich. Gaz., 117-18 and Thurston's Castes and Tribes.

\(^{92}\) Mandasor inscription of 473-4. See Madur. Gaz. p. 110, which beautifully summarises the history of the community.
Telugu and Canarese words, and at the same time imbibed the customs and habits of the Telugus. With the advance of time, the Saurashtras, thanks to the close political relationship which, as we have seen, existed between Vijayanagar and the South Indian kingdoms, migrated, in large numbers, to the basins of the Kâvâri and the Vaigai. Wherever there was a chiefdom or a viceroyalty, wherever there was likely to be a demand for fine robes and garments, wherever there as the surety of royal patronage, they settled. The Chôpa and Pâdya kingdoms, the Kongu and Mysore regions, became in this way centres of industrial activity, and the silk and laced cloths of Madura especially became famous throughout the world.

Other Telugu Communities.

It is not possible to go into the history of the other Telugu communities who occupied the various parts of the South. It is plain that a number of Telugu Brahmans both of the Vaidika and the Niyâgi classes, must have come to the South in the wake of the immigrating Pâlghars. Then again there were professional castes like the Uralis or Uppiliyans, the traditional manufacturers of salt and salt-petre; the Kavaraists, many of whom were sellers and manufacturers of bangles; Telugu spinners, dyers and painters; the Sêniyars or Telugu weavers; Telugu barbers, leather workers, washermen; the fickle but industrious Oûdans, whose services in tank-digging and earth-working has made them highly useful in an age of utilitarian public works; the Dombans or jugglers; and lastly beggars attached to the superior castes. All these had generally their caste heads; and there were caste assemblies, which met at need and enquired into social complaints and grievances. These caste-assemblies freed the State largely from the necessity of administering justice as between persons of the same caste. Cases involving different castes or communities, however, came before the king for decision. As a matter of fact, each caste had its own self-government; and as each caste generally colonized in a separate village, caste government came to be more or less identical with village self-government.

Canarese Immigrants.

It has been already pointed out that the Telugus were not the only northerners who migrated to the South in this age. Side by side with them there came large numbers of Canarese, of all grades and professions of life. They were of course not so numerous as the Telugus, nor so influential, but they were none the less conspicuous in the northernising of the South. The districts of Coimbatore and Salem, in particular, the hilly regions which divided the kingdom of the Pâdyaens from Travancore, became the scenes of their colonisation. The vast majority of them were known by the caste title of Kâppiliyans, while others were known as Aruppans. A number of traditions exist in connection with their migrations. The Kâppilian tradition regarding their migration to this district is similar to that current among Töttiyanas (whom they resemble in several of their customs), the story being that the caste was oppressed by the Musalmans of the north, fled across the Tungabhadra and was saved by two pongu trees bridging an unfordable stream which blocked their escape. They travelled, say the legends, through Mysore to Conjeeeveram,

---

93 The Saurashtras were so indispensable in silk-weaving that even Haidar Ali established a colony of them in Mysore and gave them special facilities.

94 The habits and customs of all these can be fully understood from Thurston's Castes, which is based on all the information it is possible to get.

95 Nelson points out, for example, that panckyata or juries of leading men decided civil disputes among Töttiyanas. Examples may be multiplied, but are unnecessary.
thence to Coimbatore and thence to this district. The stay at Conjeevaram is always emphasised, and is supported by the fact that the caste has shrines dedicated to Kānchi Varadarāja Perumāl. The same, with slight modifications, is told of the Anuppanas. Both the communities had a close resemblance to the Tōttiyans in their customs and practices. Like the latter they carried the custom of marriage between a man and his paternal aunt's daughter to an absurd extreme, thereby reducing marriage to polyandry within the family, while prescribing severe chastisement to the exercise of it beyond it. Both were non-Brahmanical in their marriage rites, though in detail they differed from one another. Both had very curious ceremonies to be done at the attainment of age by a girl. Both sanctioned the remarriage of widows, though the Kāppiliyans seem to have been more restrictive in their regulations in regard to this. Early in their history they seem to have split up into those two endogamous divisions known as Dharmakāṭu and Māmyakaṭu, into which they are divided even in the present day. Both the Canarese and the Tōttiyans, again, worshipped satī, and observed festivals in their honour. The Kāppiliyans however were not inclined to ancestor-worship to the same extent to which the Tōttiyans were. Both were indifferent to the burial or burning of the dead. Both, again, had "an organisation mind," that is, had panchāyat which settled all matters concerning them, the Jāti Kāvunjān or Peria Danakkaran of the Canarese corresponding to the Mētto Naiken of the Telugus. Like the Tōttiyan Polygars, the Kāvunjān chiefs of Kombai, Dēvaram and the adjoining Pālayams had a number of parivārams or followers, who formed a distinct caste and closely imitated them in their customs and rites.

The rise of Caste jealousies.

The advent of the Vadugas into the Tamil lands was necessarily productive of occasional caste quarrels and popular disputes. There had been enough bickerings among the indigenous communities of the land, as between the Maravas and Kāḷḷas for example, the Vellālas and Pāḷḷis, the Pariyans and Pāḷḷas, and so on. There had been enough social unrest caused by the right and left hand disputes, and the range of those disputes was increased by the northerners. Proud and unscrupulous, the new colonists looked on the Tamils as a conquered race, while the Tamils, sullen and repentant, attributed their fall to want of organization and not of valour, and hated their late adversaries and present rulers. The hatred between the Marava and Tōttiya especially was inexhaustible, and conflicts between their chiefs in regard to their relative status seem to have been frequent. The Polygarmemoirs tell us of such squabbles, and they also glaringly illustrate the national solidarity of each community in opposing the other. The advent of the Saurishtras, again, was followed by certain social disputes between them and the Brahmans, which have not died even now. The great ambition of the Saurishtras was to get themselves recognised as Brahmana. Claiming to be the descendants of a sage named Tantravardhana,—literally one who improves threads, they adopted the titles of Aiyar, Aiyangār, Āchārya, Sāstrī, etc.,

---

* For a comparison of the rites and ceremonies, see loc. cit. and Thurston.
* Among other Canarese tribes who immigrated to the Kongu country may be mentioned the Toreyams. See Thurston and Salem Manual.
* The literature on this subject is fairly voluminous, but it would be out of place to enter into the various theories which have been suggested in regard to them. See Madr. Mon. I. p. 60; Taylor's Satirical, III.
* That is why they now object to being called Patnālikārans, which name, they say, belongs only to the Sṇiyas, Kaikōḷas and other 'low castes' weavers.
to the indignation of the Tamil Brahmans. Taunted with the fact that their non-Brahmanical occupation was an incontrovertible proof of their non-Brahmanical birth, they skilfully gave currency to plausible legends which showed that their occupation was a pure accident, was the result of a misfortune and not a symbol of their social status. They had a curse to that effect, they said, during their stay at Devagiri. Here, they say, they had occupied a number of streets on condition that they were to supply a number of silk cloths every year for the Dipavali festival to the goddess Lakshmi of the place; but the failure to do so on one occasion induced divine anger and the consequent decree that they ought not to be regarded as Brahmans. Another version, as given in the Skanda Purana, attributes their social degradation to the indignation of sage Durvasas, whose request to them to bear the cost of a temple they unwisely ignored. A third version says that once Indra performed a sacrifice in Saurashtra; that in the course of his religious observances he distributed monetary gifts to all Brahmans, but that the Saurashtras refused to take them in their unwise pride. The insulted god of the Devas thereupon cursed them to become poor, to be gluttons, and to swerve from Brahmanical ways of life. A fourth account attributes their social fall to Parashurama. It is said that he performed a ceremony to his father in Saurashtra, and invited the Brahmans of that region to it, but they refused. The sage therefore pronounced the decree that they should not only become poor, but leave their homes and wander without a settled home for centuries. More remarkable than these legends is the story of the Skanda Purana—that the Delhi Emperor despatched one of his generals to bring certain Saurashtra women to his harem; that the Saurashtras resisted, but could hardly stand before their adversaries; that many of the ladies then committed sati, or were killed by their defeated husbands or brothers; that the Musalmans thereupon vowed to kill every Saurashtra Brahman in the country; that a horrible massacre ensued, and Saurashtra blood ran like water; that most of them preferred death to dishonour, but that about 7,500 of them, more fond of life than of honour, bartered their safety for social dignity, cast away the sacred thread, pretended to be Vaishyas and traders, assumed Vaiya names and titles, and ultimately left their homes in search of new and happier homes. The account of Musalmān oppression and consequent emigration may be true, but it is inconsistent with the theory of ancient emigration.

Whatever the fact was, the Saurashtras never relaxed their efforts to demonstrate their alleged Brahmanical origin. The obstinacy of the southern Brahmans in denying it and the indifference of other classes who called them Chettis, only went to increase their efforts to declare their social rank. And they were not quite without success. Their light complexion, their handsome and regular features, their orthodoxy, their charities, their liberality in the maintenance of temples and the conduct of festivals, their assumption of Brahman titles, names and customs, and above all, the state patronage under which they lived, enabled them to counter-balance, to a certain extent, the opposite tendencies engendered by their occupation, by the observance of certain curious rites which showed their foreign character, and by the sturdy conservatism of their women who clung, in spite of their husbands' movements with the times, to old customs, their old language, and their old methods of dressing. Not infrequently the disputes between the Saurashtras and the Brahmans reached an unpleasant crisis, and the State had to intervene. A remarkable instance of such a crisis and such an intervention occurred in the regency of Mangammal. We are informed that, in that reign, "eighteen of the members of the
(Saurashtra) community were arrested by the governor of Madura for performing the Brahmanical ceremony of upākarma, or renewal of the sacred thread. The queen convened a meeting of those learned in the Śāstras to investigate the Patnālikarans’ right to perform such ceremonies. This declared in favour of the defendants; and the queen gave them a palm leaf award accordingly, which is still preserved in Madura. From this time onward the caste followed “many of the customs of the southern Brahmans regarding food, dress, forms of worship and names, and has recently taken to the adoption of Brahmanical titles, such as Aiyar, Ācharya and Bhāgavatar. Similar acts of state interference or arbitration made the conflicts between the various communities less serious than they would otherwise be, and before long the close proximity of the conquerors and the conquered, the services of the former in exploiting the country and increasing its resources, the growth of mutual acquaintance, the community of action and interest as against outsiders, and other causes contributed to greater cordiality among them; and the advent of the Badugas thus came to mean no other thing than an innocent complication of an already highly complex plethora of castes and tribes.

(to be continued.)

THE PAHARI LANGUAGE.

BY SIR GEORGE A. GRIERSON, K. C. I. E.

The word ‘Pahāri’ means ‘of or belonging to the mountains,’ and is specially applied to the groups of languages spoken in the sub-Himalayan hills extending from the Bhandrawāh, north of the Panjāb, to the eastern parts of Nepal. To its North and East various Himalayan Tibeto-Burman languages are spoken. To its west there are Aryan languages connected with Kāshmiri and Western Panjābi, and to its South it has the Aryan languages of the Panjāb and the Gangetic plain, viz. — in order from West to East, Panjābi, Western Hindi, Eastern Hindi and Bihāri.

The Pahāri languages fall into three main groups. In the extreme East there is Khas-Kūrā or Eastern Pahāri, commonly called Nāpālī, the Aryan language spoken in Nepal. Next, in Kumāon and Garhwall, we have the Central Pahāri languages, Kumauni and Garhwalli. Finally in the West we have the Western Pahāri languages spoken in Jumsār-Bāwar, the Simla Hill States, Kulu, Mandi and Suket, Chambā, and Western Kashmir.

As no census particulars are available for Nepal we are unable to state how many speakers of Eastern Pahāri there are in its proper home. Many persons (especially Gorkhā soldiers) speaking the language reside in British India. In 1891 the number counted in British India was 24,262, but these figures are certainly incorrect. In 1901 the number was 143,721. Although the Survey is throughout based on the Census figures of 1891, an exception will be made in the case of Eastern Pahāri, and those for 1901 will be taken, as in this case they will more nearly represent the actual state of affairs at the time of the preceding census.

1 Madu. Gaz. I, p. 111. 2 Madu. Gaz. I, p. 111. 3 This article is an advance issue of the Introduction to the volume of the Linguistic Survey of India dealing with the Pahāri Languages.
Central and Western Pahārī are both spoken entirely in tracts which were subject to the Census operations of 1891, and these figures may be taken as being very fairly correct. The figures for the number of Pahārī speakers in British India are therefore as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Speakers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Pahārī</td>
<td>143,721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Pahārī</td>
<td>1,107,612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Pahārī</td>
<td>816,181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,067,514</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It must be borne in mind that these figures only refer to British India, and do not include the many speakers of Eastern Pahārī who inhabit Nepal.

To these speakers of Western Pahārī must be added the language of the Gujurs who wander over the hills of Hazāra, Murree, Kashmir, and Swat and its vicinity. Except in Kashmir and Hazāra, these have never been counted. In Kashmir, in the year 1901, the number of speakers of Gujurī was returned at 126,849 and in Hazāra, in 1891, at 83,167, and a mongrel form of the language, much mixed with Hindīstānī and Pānjbāī, is spoken by 226,949 Gujars of the submontane districts of the Pānjbāī, Gujrat, Gurdaspur, Kangra, and Hoshiarpur. To make a very rough guess we may therefore estimate the total number of Gujurī speakers at, say, 600,000, or put the total number of Pahārī speakers including Gujurī at about 2,670,000.

It is a remarkable fact that, although Pahārī has little connexion with the Pānjbāī, Western and Eastern Hindī, and Bihārī spoken immediately to its south, it shows manifold traces of intimate relationship with the languages of Rājputāna. In order to explain this fact it is necessary to consider at some length the question of the population that speaks it. This naturally leads to the history of the Khaśas and the Gurjaras of Sanskrit literature. The Sanskrit Khāśa and Gurjaras are represented in modern Indian tongues by the words Khaśa, and Gujar, Gujar, or Gujar respectively. The mass of the Āryan-speaking population of the Himalayan tract in which Pahārī is spoken belongs, in the West, to the Kanēt, and, in the East, to the Khas caste. We shall see that the Kanēt themselves are closely connected with the Khaśas, and that one of their two sub-divisions bears that name. The other (the Rāo) sub-division, as we shall see below, I believe to be of Gurjar descent.

Sanskrit literature contains frequent references to a tribe whose name is usually spelt Khaśa (खशा), with variants such as Khasa (खस ), Khasha (खश ), and Khaśa (खश ). The earlier we trace notices regarding them, the further north-west we find them.

---


Before citing the older authorities it may be well to recall a legend regarding a woman named Khasā of which the most accessible version will be found in the Viśnus Purāṇa, but which also occurs in many other similar works. The famous Kaśyapa, to whom elsewhere is attributed the origin of the country of Kashmir, had numerous wives. Of these Kṛdhaśvāśa was the ancestress of the cannibal Piśācha or Piśāchas and Khasā of the Yakshas and Rakshasas. These Yakshas were also cannibals, and so were the Rakshasas.

In Buddhist literature the Yakshas correspond to the Piśāchas of Hindū legend. Another legend makes the Piśāchas the children of Kapāśa, and there was an ancient town called Kāpiśa at the southern foot of the Hindū Kush. That the Piśāchas were also said to be cannibals is well known, and the traditions about ancient cannibalism in the neighbourhood of the Hindū Kush have been described elsewhere by the present writer. Here we have a series of legends connecting the name Khasā with cannibalism practiced in the mountains in the extreme north-west of India, and to this we may add Pliny's remark about the same locality.—next the Aṭṭacori (Uttarakurus) are the nations of the Thuni and the Forcari; then come the Casiri (Khaśiras), an Indian people who look towards the Scythians and feed on human flesh.

Numerous passages in Sanskrit literature give further indications as to the locality of the Khasas. The Mahābhārata gives a long account of the various rarities presented to Yudhishṭhira by the kings of the earth. Amongst them are those that rule over the nations that dwell near the river Salīdā where it flows between the mountains of Mēru and Mandara, i.e. in Western Tibet. These are the Khasas . . . . . . the Pāradas (the people beyond the Indus), the Kulindas and the Taṅganas. Especially interesting is it to note that the tribute these people brought was Tibetan gold-dust, the famous pipīlīka, or ant-gold, recorded by Herodotus and many other classical writers, as being dug out of the earth by ants.

In another passage the Khasas are mentioned together with the Kāśmīras (Kālḥmīras), the inhabitants of Uraša (the modern Panjab district of Hazara), the Piśāchas, Kāmbōjās.

---

5 Wilson, II, 74 ff.
6 Bhāgavata Purāṇa, III, xix, 21. They wanted to eat Brahmā himself.
7 So Kalhaṇa, Rājaśāstra, i, 184, equates Yaksha and Piśācha. See note on the passage in Stein's translation.
10 XVI, 17; McCrindle, Ancient India as described in Classical Literature, p. 113. Is it possible that Thuni and Forcari' represent 'Hūva and Tukhāra'?
11 II, 1822 ff.
13 Vide post.
14 The Tāyāras of Ptolemy. The most northerly of all the tribes on the Ganges. They lived near Badrīnāth. Here was the district of Taṅgaṇapura, mentioned in copper-plate grants preserved at the temple of Papūkârava near Badrīnāth (Atkinson, op. cit. p. 337).
15 III, 104.
16 VII, 399.
17 According to Yaśaka's Nirukta (II, i, 4), the Kāmbōjas did not speak pure Sanskrit, but a dialectic form of that language. As an example, he quotes the Kāmbōja āvasti, he goes, a verb which is not used in Sanskrit. Now this verb āvasti, although not Sanskrit, happens to be good Eranian, and occurs in the Avesta, with this meaning of 'to go.' We therefore from this one example learn that the Kāmbōjas of the
(a tribe of the Hindū Kush), the Daradas (or Dards) and the Sakas (Scythians), as being conquered by Kriṣhṇa.

In another passage Dvapāsana leads a forlorn hope consisting of Sakas,13 Kambojas,18 Bahlīkas (inhabitants of Balkh), Yavanas (Greeks), Pāradas,18 Kulīgas (a tribe on the banks of the Satlaj19), the Taṅgaṇas,13 Ambasthas (of the i middle Panjāb, probably the Ambastai of Ptolemy),20 Piśāchas, Barbarians, and mountainiers.21 Amongst them,22 armed with swords and pikes were Daradas,23 Taṅgaṇas,23 Khaṇas, Lampakas (now Kafirs of the Hindū Kush),24 and Pulindas.25

We have already seen that the Khaṇas were liable to the imputation of cannibalism. In another passage of the Mahābhārata, where Karna describes the Bahlīkas in the 8th book, they are again given a bad character.26 Where the six rivers, the Satadru (Satlaj), Vipāṣā (Bias), Irāvatī (Ravi), Chandrabhāga (Chinab), Vitastā (Jehlam), and the Sindhu (Indus) issue from the hills, is the region of the Ārātas, a land whose religion has been destroyed.27 There live the Bahlīkas (the Outsiders) who never perform sacrifices and whose religion has been utterly destroyed. They eat any kind of food from filthy vessels, drink the milk of sheep, camels, and asses, and have many bastards. They are the offspring of two Piśāchas who lived in the river Vipāṣā (Bias). They are without the Veda and without knowledge.

Hindū Kush spoke an Aryan language, which was closely connected with ancient Sanskrit, but was not pure Sanskrit, and which included in its vocabulary words belonging to Eranian languages. We may further note that Yāska does not consider the Kambojas to be Aryans. He says this word is used in the language of the Kambojas, while only its (according to his account) derivative, pandu, a corpse, is used in the language of the Aryas.

Again in the same passage Yāska states that the northerners use the word ātra to mean a sickle. Now we shall see that in Western Pahārī and in the Piśācha languages generally, tr continually becomes ch or sh. Thus the Sanskrit word puruṣa, a son, becomes puṣh or puśh in Shis. We may expect a similar change to occur in regard to the word ātra. This word actually occurs in Persian in the form dā, but the only relation of it that has been noted in the Piśācha dialect is the Kshmiri drāt, which is really the same word as ātra, with metathesis of the r.

13 See above.
14 I. e., if they are the same as the Kaliūgas of Mārki, P., LVII, 37.
15 VII, 1, 66.
16 VII, 4818.
17 VII, 4848.
18 See above.
21 There were two Pulindas, one in the north and another in the north. See Hall on Wilson, Piśācha P., Vol. II, p. 159.
22 VIII, 2032 ff. A clan of the Bahlīkas is the Jartikas (2034), who perhaps represent the modern Jāta. If they do, the passage is the oldest mention of the Jāta in Indian literature.
23 Note that their religion has been destroyed. In other words they formerly followed Indo-Aryan rites, but had abandoned them. They are not represented as infidels ab initio. In this passage the Ārātas are mentioned in verses 2056, 2061, 2064, 2068, 2069, 2070, 2081, 2100 and 2110. The name is usually interpreted as meaning a people without kings, but this is a doubtful explanation.
The Prasthalas, the Madras, the Gandhāras (a people of the north-west Panjāb, the classical Gandarii), the people named Āraṭṭas, the Khaśas, the Vasāṭis, the Sindhus and Sauvīras (two tribes dwelling on the Indus), are almost as despicable.

In the supplement to the Māhābhārata, known as the Harivatassya, we also find references to the Khaśas. Thus it is said that King Sagara conquered the whole earth, and a list is given of certain tribes. The first two are the Khaśas and the Tukhāras. The latter were Iranian inhabitants of Bakhkh and Badakhshan, the Tākhāristan of Musalmān writers.

In another place, the Harivatassya tells how an army of Greeks (Yavanas) attacked Krishṇa, when he was at Mathuri. In the army were Sakas (Scythians), Tukhāras, Daradas (Dardas), Pāradas, Taigaṇas, Khaśas, Pahlavas (Parthians), and other barbarians (Mlečchhas) of the Himalaya.

Many references to the Khaśas occur in the Purāṇas. The most accessible are those in the Viṣṇu and Mārkaṇḍeyya Purāṇas, which have translations with good indexes. I shall rely principally upon these, but shall also note a few others that I have collected.

The Viṣṇu Purāṇa tells the story of Khaśa, the wife of Kāiyapa, with her sons Yaksha and Rakhasha and her Piścha stepson already given. It also tells (IV, iii) the story of Sagara, but does not mention the Khaśas in this connexion, nor does the Bhāgavata Purāṇa in the corresponding passage (IX, viii). The Viṣṇu Purāṇa, on the other hand, in telling the story mentions the Khaśas, but coupling them with three other tribes. Of these three, one belongs to the north-west, and the other two to the south of India, so that we cannot glean from it anything decisive as to the locality of the Khaśas.

A remarkable passage in the Bhāgavata Purāṇa (II, iv, 18) gives a list of a number of outcast tribes, which have recovered salvation by adopting the religion of Krishṇa. The tribes belong to various parts of India, but the last four are the Ābhhras, the Kākhas, the Yavanas, and the Khaśas (v. I, Sakas). Here again we have the Khaśas mentioned among north-western folk.

Again in the story of Bharata, the same Purāṇa tells how that monarch conquered (IX, xx, 29) a number of the barbarian (Mlečchha) kings, who had no Brāhmaṇas. These were the kings of the Kiratās, Hūṇas, Yavanas, Andhras, Kākhas, Khaśas, and Sakas. The list is a mixed one, but the last three are grouped together and point to the north-west.

28 Locality not identified.
29 In the Panjāb, close to the Ambasāthas (see above). Their capital was Sākala, the Sagala of Ptolemy. In verse 2049 of the passage quoted, we have a song celebrating the luxury of Sākala—

"When shall I next sing the songs of the Bāhikas in this Sākala town, after having feasted on cow's flesh, and drunk strong wine? When shall I again, dressed in fine garments, in the company of fair-complexioned, large sized women, eat much mutton, pork, beef, and the flesh of fowls, asses and camels? They who eat not mutton live in vain." So do the inhabitants, drunk with wine, sing. "How can virtue be found among such a people!"

30 At the time that the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa was written, the Bāhikas were not altogether outside the Aryan pale. It is there (I, vii, iii, 8) said that they worship Agni under the name of Bhava.
31 784. 32 6440. 33 See above.
34 I, xxii.
35 On the Indus, the Abiria of Ptolemy.
36 Kākhas have not been identified, but in the list of nations who brought presents to Yudhishthira already mentioned (Māhābhārata, II, 1850) they are mentioned together with the Sakas, Tukhāras, and Rōmas (? Romans), i. e. as coming from the north-west.
The Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa (LVII, 56) mentions the Khaṇās as a mountain (probably Himalayan) tribe. In three other places (LVIII, 7, 12 and 51) they have apparently, with the Sakas and other tribes, penetrated to the north-east of India. This would appear to show that by the time of the composition of this work the Khaṇās had already reached Nepal and Darjeeling, where they are still a numerous body.\footnote{Vide post.}

We may close this group of authorities by a reference to the Laws of Manu. Looking at the Khaṇās from the Brahmanical point of view, he says (X, 22) that Khaṇās are the offspring of outcast Kshatriyas, and again (X, 44), after mentioning some other Indian tribes he says that Kāmbūjas,\footnote{See above.} Yavanas,\footnote{Usually translated 'Chinese,' but I would suggest that in this and similar passages, they are the great Ship race, still surviving in Gilgit and the vicinity.} Sakas,\footnote{At present mostly in Nepal.} Paradas,\footnote{At Kullāka.} Kirātas,\footnote{xvii, 32. Bāhlīkabhāskhodichyānāḥ Khaṇānā cha svadāyajā: I am indebted to Dr. Konow for this reference.} and Khaṇās are those who became outcast through having neglected their religious duties,\footnote{Lakshmīdhara, a comparatively late Prakrit Grammarian, says that the language of Bāhlīka (Balkh), Kākṣaya (N. W. Panjāb), Nepāl, Gandhāra (the country round Peshāwar), and Bhōta (for Bhōta, i.e., Tibet), together with certain countries in South India is said by the ancients to have been Pai śāch. See Lassen, Institutiones Linguas Prākriticas, p. 13, and Pischel, Grammatik der Prākrit-Sprachen, § 27.} and, whether they speak a barbarous (Mlēchchha) or Aryan language, are called Dasyus. Here again we see the Khaṇās grouped with people of the north-west.

Two works belonging at latest to the 6th century A.D. next claim our attention. These are the Bharata Nāyāa Sāstra and the Brihat Saṃhitā of Varāhamihira. The former\footnote{The whole passage (29 and 30) runs as follows:— In North-East, Mount Meru, the Kingdom of those who have lost caste (naśakārājya), the nomads (pankakāla, worshipers of Pāu-pāti), the Kirās (a tribe near Kashmir, Srin, Bāja Tpratyi, trans. II, 217) the Kāmīras, the Abhisāras (of the lower hills between the Jhelum and Chinab), Paradas (Dards) Tāγgaṇas, Kūltās (Kulu), Sairindras (not identified), Forest men, Brahmāpuras (Bharmaur in Chamba), Darvas (close to Abhisāra), Dāmaras (apparently a Kashmir tribe, Stein II, 304 fl.), Foresters, Kirātas, Chinās (Shins of Gilgit, see note\textsuperscript{30}, or Chinese), Kāmpindas (see below), Bhalas (not identified), Pājōla (not identified), Jāśūras († Jūsā), Kumaṇas (see below), Khaṇās, Ghoṇhas and Kuchikas (not identified). It will be seen that every one of the above names which has been identified belongs to the North-West.} in the chapter on dialects says, 'The Bāhlīki language is the native tongue of Northerners and Khaṇās.' Bāhlīki, as we have seen above, is the language then spoken in what is now Balkh.\footnote{xvii, 32. Bāhlīkabhāskhodichyānāḥ Khaṇānā cha svadāyajā: I am indebted to Dr. Konow for this reference.} Here again we have the Khaṇās referred to the north-west.

Varāhamihira mentions Khaṇās several times. Thus in one place (X, 12) he groups them with Kūltās (people of Kulu), Tāṅgaṇas (see note\textsuperscript{41}), and Kāmīras (Kānghīres). In his famous chapter on Geography, he mentions them twice. In one place (XIV, 6) he puts them in Eastern India, and in another (XIV, 30) he puts them in the north-east. The latter is a mistake, for the other countries named at the same time are certainly north-western,\footnote{It will be seen that every one of the above names which has been identified belongs to the North-West.}
moreover Varāhamihira is not alone in this. Bhāṭṭotpala, in his commentary to the Bṛihatsaṅhitā, quotes Pāṇiśa as saying the same thing.\footnote{A similar but fuller list is also given in Varāhamihira’s Sandeśasāṅhitā, in which the Khaśas are classed with Daradas, Abhisāras and Chimas.}

In the section dealing with those men who are technically known as ‘swans,’\footnote{LXVIII, 26.} Varāhamihira says that they are a long-lived race ruling over the Khaśas, Sūrasēnas (Eastern Punjab), Gāndhāra (Peshawar country), and the Gangeśic Dūb. This passage does not give much help.

Kalhaṇa’s famous chronicle of Kashmir, the Rājatarangini, written in the middle of the 12th century A.D., is full of references to the Khaśas, who were a veritable thorn in the side of the Kashmir rulers. Sir Aurel Stein’s translation of the work, with its excellent index, renders a detailed account of these allusions unnecessary. It will be sufficient to give Sir Aurel Stein’s note to his translation of verse 317 of Book I. I have taken the liberty of altering the spelling of some of the words so as to agree with the system adopted for this survey:

“It can be shown from a careful examination of all the passages that their (the Khaśas’) seats were restricted to a comparatively limited region, which may be roughly described as comprising the valleys lying immediately to the south and west of the Pir Pansāl range, between the middle course of the Vitastā (or Jehlām) on the west, and Kāshṭavāṭa (Kishtwār) on the east.

“In numerous passages of the Rājatarangini we find the rulers of Rājapuri, the modern Rajauri, described as ‘lords of the Khaśas,’ and their troops as Khaśas. Proceeding from Rājapuri to the east we have the valley of the Upper Āns River, now called Panjubbar .

. . . as a habitation of Khaśas. Further to the east lies Bāvalā, the modern Bānahāl, below the pass of the same name, where the pretender Bhikshāchāra sought refuge in the castle of the ‘Khaśa-Lord’ Bhagika . . . . The passages viii, 177, 1,074 show that the whole of the valley leading from Bānahāl to the Chandrabhāgā (Chenab), which is now called ‘Bichhāri’ and which in the chronicle bears the name of Vishalāṭā, was inhabited by Khaśas.

“Finally we have evidence of the latter’s settlements in the Valley of Khaśālaya .

. . . Khaśālaya is certainly the Valley of Khaśāl (marked on the map as ‘Kasher’) which leads from the Marbal Pass on the south-east corner of Kashmir down to Kishtwār . . . .

“Turning to the west of Rājapuri, we find a Khaśa from the territory of Parchetas or Prants mentioned in the person of Tuṅga, who rose from the position of a cowherd to be

Regarding the Kausindas or Kuṇindas, it may be mentioned that Cunningham (Rep. Arch. Sull. India, XIV, 125) identified them with the Kanets of the Simla Hill States, whose name he wrongly spells ‘Kunet.’ The change from ‘Kuṇinda’ to ‘Kanet’ is violent and improbable, though not altogether impossible. It would be simpler to connect the Kanets with Varāhamihira’s Kanātas, but here again there are difficulties, for the in ‘Kanet’ is dental, not cerebral. Such changes are, however, not uncommon in the ‘Pāśaḥa’ languages.
chosen Queen Diddâ's all-powerful minister. The Queen's own father, Simharâja, the ruler of Lôhara or Lôhârîn, is designated a Khasâ, . . . . and his descendants, who after Diddâ occupied the Kashmir throne, were looked upon as Khasas.—That there were Khasas also in the Vitasta valley below Varahamûla, is proved by the reference to Viránaka as 'a seat of Khasas' . . . . Of this locality it has been shown . . . that it was situated in the ancient Duâravâti, the present Dwârbîdi, a portion of the Vitasta valley between Kathâi and Mughaffarâbâd.

"The position here indicated makes it highly probable that the Khasas are identical with the modern Khakhâ tribe, to which most of the petty hill-chiefs and gentry in the Vitasta valley below Kashmir belong. The name khakhâ (Pahâri; in Kâshmiri sing. Khokhu, plur. Khakhî) is the direct derivation of Kha'â, Sanskrit h being pronounced since early times in the Panjâb and the neighbouring hill-tracts as kh or h (compare Kâshmiri k < Sanskrit h)."

"The Khakhâ chiefs of the Vitasta valley retained their semi-independent position until Sikh times, and, along with their neighbours of the Bomba clan, have ever proved troublesome neighbours for Kashmir."

We have already noted that another name for the Khasas was Kâshîras. The name Kâshîra (Kashmir) is by popular tradition associated with the famous legendary saint Kasyapa, but it has been suggested, with considerable reason, that Kâsâ and Kâshîra are more probable etymologies. At the present day, the Kâshmiri word for 'Kashmir' is 'kashîr,' a word which is strongly reminiscent of Khasâra.47

Turning now to see what information we can gain from classical writers, we may again refer to Pliny's mention of the cannibal Casiri, who, from the position assigned to them, must be the same as the Kâshîras. Atkinson in the work mentioned in the list of authorities gives an extract from Pliny's account of Indus (p. 354). In this are mentioned the Cesi, a mountain race between the Indus and the Jamna, who are evidently the Khasas. Atkinson (l. c.) quotes Ptolemy's Achasia regis as indicating the same locality, and this word not impossibly also represents 'Khasa.' Perhaps more certain identifications from Ptolemy are the Kâshâ Mountains and the country of Kâshâ.48

In other places49 he tells us that the land of the Oorropokklîou (Uttarakurus) and the city of Oorropokklîos lay along the Emodic and Seric mountains in the north, to the east of the

47 The change of initial kh to k is not uncommon in Pusahaan languages. Thus, the Sanskrit kharâ, an aas, is kar in Basghall Kâfar, and in Shi'â a language very closely connected with Kâshmiri, the root of the verb meaning 'to est' is ka not khâ.
48 Serica VI, 15, 16, in Lassen I.A., I, 22.
49 VI, I, 2, 3, 5, 8; VIII, 24, 7, in Lassen I.A., I, 1018.
Kasia mountains. The latter therefore represent either the Hindū Kush or the mountains of Kashgar in Central Asia.50

To sum up the preceding information. We gather that according to the most ancient Indian authorities in the extreme north-west of India, on the Hindū Kush and the mountainous tracts to the south, and in the western Panjāb there was a group of tribes, one of which was called Khaśa, which were looked upon as Kshatriyas of Aryan origin. These spoke a language closely allied to Sanskrit, but with a vocabulary partly agreeing with that of the Eranian Avesta. They were considered to have lost their claim to consideration as Aryans, and to have become Mêchchhas, or barbarians, owing to their non-observance of the rules for eating and drinking observed by the Sanskritic peoples of India. These Khaśas were a warlike tribe, and were well known to classical writers, who noted, as their special home, the Indian Caucasus of Pliny. They had relations with Western Tibet, and carried the gold dust found in that country into India.

It is probable that they once occupied an important position in Central Asia, and that countries, places and rivers, such as Kashmir, Kashgar in Central Asia, and the Kashgar of Chitrāl were named after them. They were closely connected with the group of tribes nicknamed 'Piāchas' or 'cannibals' by Indian writers, and before the sixth century they were stated to speak the same language as the people of Balkh. At the same period they had apparently penetrated along the southern slope of the Himālaya as far east as Nepāl, and in the twelfth century they certainly occupied in considerable force the hills to the south, southwest and south-east of Kashmir.

At the present day their descendants, and tribes who claim descent from them, occupy a much wider area. The Khakhas of the Jehlām valley are Khaśas, and so are some of the Kanets of the hill-country between Kangrā and Garhwāl. The Kanets are the low-caste cultivating class of all the Eastern Himālaya of the Panjāb and the hills at their base as far west as Kulu, and of the eastern portion of the Kangrā district, throughout which tract they form a very large proportion of the total population. The country they inhabit is held or governed by Hill Rājpūts of pre-historic ancestry, the greater part of whom are far too proud to cultivate with their own hands, and who employ the Kanets as husbandmen. Like the ancient Khaśas, they claim to be of impure Rājpūt (i.e. Kshatriya) birth. They are divided into two great tribes, the Khasi and the Rāo; the distinction between whom is still sufficiently well-marked. A Khasi observes the period of impurity after the death of a relation prescribed for a twice-born man; the Rāo that prescribed for an outcast. The Khasi wears the sacred thread, while the Rāo does not.51 There can thus be no doubt about the Khasi Kanets.

50 According to Lassen, p. 1020, the Kasa or Kasā of Ptolemy are the mountains of Kashgar, i.e. 'Khasagairi,' the mountain of the Khaśas. See, however, Stein, Ancient Khotan, pp. 50 ff. The same name re-appears in Chitrāl, south of the Hindū Kush, where the river Khōser is also called Khasgar. For further speculations on the subject the reader is referred to St. Martin, Mon. de l' Acad. des Insér. Sav. Étrang., i, pp. 364 ff., and to Atkinson (op. cit.), p. 377.

51 Ibbetson, op. cit., § 487. Regarding the Rāos, see the next instalment of this article.
Further to the east, in Garhwal and Kumaon, the bulk of the population is called Khasi, and these people are universally admitted to be Khasas by descent. In fact, as we shall see, the principal dialect of Kumauni is known as Khasparjiya, or the speech of Khas cultivators. Further east, again, in Nepal, the ruling caste is called Khas. In Nepal, however, the tribe is much mixed. A great number of so-called Khas are really descended from the intercourse between the high-caste Aryan immigrants from the plains and the aboriginal Tibet-Burman population. But that there is a leaven of pure Khas descent also in the tribe is not denied.32

In this way we see that the great mass of the Aryan-speaking population of the Lower Himalaya from Kashmir to Darjeeling is inhabited by tribes descended from the ancient Khasas of the Mahabharata.

(To be continued.)

MISCELLANEA.

THE TRADITIONAL DATES OF PARSI HISTORY.

Prof. S. H. Hodivala, M. A., of the Junagadh College has been lately devoting considerable attention to the early history of the Indian Parsis, and read on the 29th of October, last, before the "Society for the Prosecution of Zoroastrian Researches" a paper on the "Traditional dates of Parsi History," of which the following is a summary.

The lecturer first pointed out that chronological statements about certain interesting events in the early annals of the Indian Parsis many are found noted down at random on the margins and flyleaves of many manuscripts, but that very few of them are properly authenticated, that some of them are nameless, and even where the name of the writer happens to be known we are left entirely in the dark as to the sources of his information or his competence to form a judgment. Moreover, not one of them has been hitherto traced to any book or manuscript written before the middle of the eighteenth century. Lastly, they exhibit among themselves the most bewildering diversity and the same event (the first landing at Sanjñân) is placed by one in V. Samvat 772 (A.D. 716) by another in V. Samvat 895 (A.D. 839) and by a third in V. Samvat 961 (A.D. 906). There is the same conflict as to the year in which the Persian Zoroastrians were, according to these entries, obliged to abandon their ancestral homes. According to one, it was in 638 V. Samvat (A.D. 582), according to another in 777 V. Samvat (A.D. 721). A much later event, about which for that reason, if for no other, we might suppose they would be in agreement, is the subject of a similar conflict. The old Fire Temple is said to have been brought from Yasuteshwar to Nasr’s according to one of these entries in 1472 V. Samvat (A.D. 1416), but another would place the event three years later, giving the actual day and month, as Ros Mâhres-pand, Mâh Shahrivar, V. Samvat 1475 (A.D. 1419); and not the least instructive fact about these rival dates is that both of them are demonstrably wrong.

The most important of these statements is the one which makes Ros Bahman, Mâh Tir, V. Samvat 771 (A.D. 716) the date of the first landing of the Parsi “pilgrim fathers” at Sanjñân. That the Parsi Ros mân here given does not tally with the Hindu tithi was proved to demonstration by the late Mr. K. R. Gama in 1870, but the year has for all that been accepted by many inquirers, perhaps only for want of anything more satisfactory to take its place. The earliest authority for this entry hitherto known was the Kadim Târikh Parsi nam Kasar a pamphlet on the Kabist controversy written by Dustur Aspirandji Kamdini of Boosa in A.D. 1826. The lecturer first showed that this entry can be carried back somewhat further, as it occurs in a manuscript of miscellaneous Persian verses belonging to Ervad Manekji R. Unwalla, which is at least a hundred and fifty years old. There can be no doubt that Dustur Aspirandji

32 Regarding the origin of the Nepal Khas, see Hodgson and Sylvan Levi, op. cit.
had seen this number 772 S. somewhere and that he was anxious for polemical purposes to obtain faith and credence for the date, by making it fit in somehow with the then universally accepted figures of the Kissah-i-Sanjān. It is fairly well known that according to that interesting old account of the "Parsi Retreat", the Zarathustrians lived for a hundred years in Kokāistān, for fifteen years in Old Hormuz and for nineteen at Diu. Now, if the Dastur had followed the Kissah out and out, and added 134 (100+15+19) to A.D. 636—the year of the first decisive victory of the Arabs at Kādisaiyā, or to A.D. 641, the date of fatal field of Nēshāvand, or to A.D. 651, the year of the Yəzdajd's death, the total would have been 770,775 or A.D. 785, but in no case would it have been anything like A.D. 716 (772 V. S.). What then was to be done? Why to go back five years—take A.D. 631 the year of Yəzdajd's accession as the starting point, borrow the cock and bull story of an astrologer having told Khusru Parviz of the fall of the monarchy from a Muslim annalist and adopt the inconceivably improbable notion that the Zoroastrians fled from their homes and took refuge in Kohistān forty-nine years before Yəzdajd's accession; A.D. (631-49)=582+100+15+19=716 A.D. =722 V. Samvat. It is needless to state that a date which cannot be made up without being bolstered up by such a supposition must be regarded as absolutely unhistorical. Having thus disposed of the earliest date for the arrival at Sanjān, the Professor took in hand the latest, viz., 961 V. S. (A.D. 905), which is found in a manuscript written about A.D. 1700. The writer first notes that the Atash Beheram was brought to Navāri in V. Samvat 1475 (A.D. 1419), and working backwards first on the line of the Kissah i-Sanjān and then diverging from it in two particular items, arrives at V. Samvat 777= (A.D. 721) as the year of the commencement of the Iranian wanderjahāri, which is by him made to extend to one hundred and fifty years (including fifty spent in different places), instead of the Kissah's century passed in Kohistān. V. S. 777+100+15+19=300+200+14=1475 V. S. = 1419 A.D. The lecturer then proceeded to shew the process by which these two new items (50 and 14 instead of 25) had been evolved and traced the first to a peculiar construction of some lines in the Kissah, and the second to a minor stream of tradition which made fourteen years only and not twenty-six (14+12) elapse between the sack of Sanjān and the transportation of the fire of Beheram to Navāri. The next thing pointed out was how 777 V. Samvat, which is by others regarded as the traditional date of the consecration of the first Indian fire temple, was converted by this calculator into the initial year of the Kohistān pergradations. Last came the date 895 V. Samvat, which is put forward in a MS. copied by an Udvids Dastur in 1819 A.D. It was shown to have been indebted for its existence to the ingenuity of some mathematician, who, thinking (as many of us also must do) that V. Samvat 772 (A.D. 716) was not only too early, but opposed to all the probabilities of the case, made his own calculations somewhat thus: A.D. 651, 54; 100, 15, 19 = 859 A.D. = 895 V. Samvat. Anquetil du Perron was told at Surat in A.D. 1759 that the Fire Temple was brought from Bānsdī to Navāri in V. Samvat 1472 (A.D. 1416), and the statement occurs also in a Persian poem written about the same time. This date is the simple result of 700—a round number which occurs in a much disputed couplet of the Kissah—having been added to A.D. 716 (772 V. Samvat), the apocryphal date of the landing. The other figure associated with the Navāri Fire Temple 1475 V. Samvat (A.D. 1419) can be shown to have been made up in two ways—one of which has been already indicated above. The other rests upon an ingenious emendation of the disputed line in the Kissah by which 76 is substituted for 700 ('haftāj' for 'haftād') combined with the two items of a fifty years cycle of wandering anterior to the Kohistān century, and the substitution of fourteen for twenty-six at the end. A.D. 651+30=100, 300=300=70=14=1419 A.D. = 1475 V. Samvat.

The Professor summed up by saying that most of these calculations appeared to have been ex post facto made up by combining a few generally accepted postulates with certain indeterminate items in that way which best brought up some preconceived answer. In short, he maintained that they were only speculative results arrived at by persons anxious out of a genuine historical curiosity to construct, for the satisfaction of their own understandings, intelligible systems of Parsi chronology, by arranging, altering and modifying the materials at their disposal according to their personal estimates of the probable and the improbable.

At the same time, the Professor emphatically declared that they were honest attempts for the advancement of knowledge, and even much like those mutually contradictory and even demonstrably false schemes of Kshāni, Parthian or Sassanian chronology, which were associated with the names of so many Oriental and European historians.
SUCH were the social and political effects of the Vijayanagar conquest of South India.

The religious effects were equally noteworthy. During the half century which elapsed between the Muhammadan conquest and the expulsion of Muhammadan power by Kampaña, Hinduism, both in its Vaishāvya and Saiva aspects, was in a depressed and precarious condition. Temples were closed or even destroyed, religious processions were disallowed, and forcible conversions to Muhammadanism were attempted and in many cases secured. The gods of Madura, as the chroniclers point out, had to become refugees in Travancore, and those of Srirangam at Tirupathi. The great leaders of Hinduism became scattered, and kept their precarious torch of light and learning burning in retired corners, in secluded villages. The great Vēdāntāchārya, for example, the apostolic head of the Sri Vaishāvya community at Srirangam and one of the most profound scholars and philosophic and literary writers of the day, had to retire to the distant and secluded townlet of Satyamangalam and spend his days there in grief owing to the cessation of divine worship in the temple at Srirangam; while his rival Sri-Vaishāvya teacher Sri-Saila was carrying on at Ālvār Tirunagari and the south, amidst equally depressing circumstances, the development of the more popular form of Vaishānavism which is adopted by the great Vaishāvya sect of Tengalais. Saivism and the Smārta cult had their doughty champion in Vidyāranya, and he devoted every moment of his life to their revival and extension; but his attention could not have been entirely devoted to this work. From 1336 onward, he had to employ all the versatile qualities and powers of his genius in the organization and the strengthening of the great Hindu Empire which he founded. There is no doubt that his chief object in establishing this power was the expulsion of Muhammadan rule from the south, so as to restore peace to the ancient religion of the Hindu gods, and maintain the safety of Hinduism free from all trouble and disturbance. The realisation of this object necessitated at the time the employment of the resources of his great genius in the firm establishment of the new Hindu kingdom and the organization of its army and military strength, in the construction of frontier defences, the subjugation of neighbouring powers, and so on. And as these naturally could not be effected within less than the period of a generation, the Vijayanagar march to the valley of the Kāvērī could begin only after 1360. In the period between 1327 and 1360, therefore, the religious freedom of the Hindus in the south had completely gone.

Madura was a centre of Musalmān influence rather than a stronghold of Saivism, and Srirangam was daily subject to the vandalism of the Musalmān governor and his followers. The Köyilolugī tells us that the Muhammadan was about to destroy the great shrine, when

---

3 See the Pāṇḍ. Chron. and other MSS.
4 See Yatindrapramoprobhāsu, Köyilolugī, and the Guruparamparas of the Sri-Vaishnavas of S. India.
5 See the Vādugalai Guruparamparas.
6 Yatindrapramoprobhāsu.
7 For a short but excellent account of the Smārtas see Madr. Manu., I, p. 87-88.
8 There are some authorities which say that Vijayanagar generals were in the south as early as 1348-9. E.g., the Kumbadas Rājajīkula and Vādugalai Gurupramparas; but epigraphy clearly proves that their advent was after 1360. Srirangam the great Vaishnava centre seems to have come under Vijayanagar generals only about 1370. See Köyilolugī.
the charms of a courtezan and the services of a Vaishyava Brahman, Singapirin by name, moderated the animosity of the conqueror and, made him proceed on moderate lines. A break in this comparative mildness was indeed caused by the attribution of a disease from which “the Mlecha” suffered to Brahmanical magic and his consequent orders to raze the shrine to the ground; but the importunities of his mistress and the counsels of his servant made him satisfy with the mutilation of various parts and works of the temple instead of a wholesale destruction. The progress of the disease, however, led to the destruction of the gigantic walls of the temple and the utilization of their materials for the construction of a fort at Kaçanur; but this was discovered to be a blessing in disguise, for the Muhammadan governor from this time onward made his sojourn at Kaçanur instead of Trichinopoly. The people of Srirangan—the remnants of a once teeming crowd—were, in consequence of this, able to carry on their worship, but with their festival idol a refugee in Tirupati, their religious leaders scattered; and their fears alarmed by daily acts of Muhammadan vandalism, their worship was, in the eyes of many, a mockery, and their apparent freedom worse than slavery. The same was the case in every other important place in the south, and everywhere the people were in despair.

It was from this despair and dislocation that Kaçapa U'ayär and his lieutenants freed the people of the south. The expulsion of the Muhammadans by the year 1371 led immediately to the revival of worship and the opening of the closed temples, both Saiva and Vaishyava. The deities of Madura, say the chronicles, were brought back from their refuge in Travancore. Worship was performed once more with extraordinary solemnity and fervour; and that nothing might be wanting to restore confidence and energy to all classes of men, the Brahmanas contrived a great miracle significant of the pleasure of the god and of the perpetual regard for his faithful worshippers. Kaçapa was taken on an appointed day to witness the reopening of the great pagoda, and on his entering and approaching the shrine for the purpose of looking upon the face of the god, lo and behold everything was precisely in the same condition as when the temple was first shut up just 48 years previously. The lamp that was lighted on that day was still burning; and the sandalwood powder, the garland of flowers, and the ornaments usually placed before the idol on the morning of a festival day were now found to be exactly as it is usual to find them on the evening of such a day.”

Kampaça U'ayär was struck with this remarkable miracle. With great piety and reverence he made the customary offerings, endowed numerous villages to the temple, bestowed many jewels, and established rules and regulations for the regular performance and revival of worship. The same thing was done by Gopianary in the Vaishyava stronghold of Srirangan. He cleared it of its Musulman tyrants, brought back the images of Ranganathar and Ranganayaki from Tirupati, and revived the ancient prosperity and busy activity of the shrine. He further made numerous endowments to it and made it, by the influence of his exalted office in the growing Empire, an object of solicitude in the eyes of the imperial rulers. Vaishnavism in consequence began to shew from this time onward a new energy and vigour, a new spirit of proselytism and progress. The

9 Kaçanur is a village adjoining Sambayapurem, celebrated in the Carnatic wars.
10 Nelson’s Madu. Mon. p. 82. Nelson here gives simply the translation of the MS. chronicles,—as will be seen from a reference to appendix I, Rev. Taylor suspects the existence of secret wastrels and private doers known only to Brahmanas. O. H. MSS.
11 See the various Gopura chronicles, Y. S. and G. and, above all, the Koyilayam. See also ante, for epigraphical references.
scenes of religious life on the banks of the Kāvēry came to be reproduced on the banks of the Tungabhadra, and the support of the Tamil kings and chieftains came to have its counterpart in the patronage of the Telugu ones. The despair of Vaishnava leaders was replaced by the prospect of unlimited triumph. The great Vaiḍāntākṣayya came back to Srirangam, and resumed those soul-stirring lectures and disputations which had been the source of so much enthusiasm to his admirers and of so much terror and anxiety to his detractors. By the time of his death in 1371 he had the double satisfaction of seeing Vaishnavism safe from Musalmān tyranny and Viṣṇuistādvaitism from Advaitic dominance; and when fifteen years later Vidyārāya breathed his last, he must have died with equal contentment at the bright prospects of Hinduism in general and of Advaitism in particular.

The rise of a popular Vaishnavism or Tengalism

The rescue of Hinduism from the tyranny of Muhammadianism was chiefly the work of the orthodox party, both of Vaishnavism and Saivism, through the agency of the Vijayanagar Empire. But the fruits of victory were to be realised by the people in general. The harmony established by the government led to a popular upheaval in religion, and there was a wide spread movement in the 15th and 16th centuries for the loosening of the reins of orthodoxy. Everywhere there was a cry against the rigidity of the caste system, against the elaboration of ceremonies, against exclusive adherence to Sanskrit at the expense of the vernaculars, and against the tendency to attach more importance to philosophy than to devotion. The people wanted, in other words, less philosophic and more devotional religions. They wanted less ceremony and more feeling in their cults, less formality and more sincerity of belief, less head and more heart. They wanted to see the caste system more in consonance with love of fellowmen; to remove that detestable social tyranny which went on in the name of religion. They wanted vernacular bibles in preference to Sanskrit ones. This widespread popular movement asserted itself both against orthodox Vaishnavism and orthodox Saivism. The movement against orthodox Vaishnavism was called Tengalism. It was organized and led by a great leader named Manavāi Mahāmuni, a native of Alvar Tirunagari and a disciple of Sri Sāla. About the year 1400 he proceeded to Srirangam and began to organize his party with such skill and foresight that the orthodox party of Nainār Aśhāryā, the son and successor of Vaiḍāntākṣayya, lost for ever its old prestige and following. The work of Manavāi Mahāmuni was carried on by his successors in the eight Matta; he established for the purpose, and though the orthodox party was revived and strengthened by the celebrated

12 In N. India the popular movement was carried on by the Rāmāndas, the Kabir Panthins, the Yellahākṣāryas, the Chaityapras, the followers of Nānak, the Dānu Panthins, the Mīrā Bāīs, etc.; all these belonged to the 15th and 16th centuries. See Monier Williams' Hinduism 141-145. For Chaitanya's influence in the south and the rise of the Sītā is, see Madr. Mun. p. 73, 86 and 90.

13 The classical biography of him is called Yatiṇḍraputra, mṛgabhātan, of which there are two editions. Manavāi is considered by the Tengalins to be the incarnation of Rāmānuja. He died about 1450 A.D. He is, of course, not the founder of Tengalism, but it was he that gave it a highly sectarian colour: not sectarianism, indeed, as to give rise to a new caste altogether. For a short description of the Tengalins see Madr. Mun. I, 84. Hopkins' Religion, Ind. p. 501 and J. R. A. S., Vol. XIV.

14 Otherwise called 'Vaiḍāntākṣayya.' He organized the worship of Vaiḍāntākṣayya in temples, and it is not without his zeal that the greatest of orthodox writers that contributed little to the strengthening of the rival sect of Tengalism. Vaiḍāntākṣayya was born about 1390 and died about 1416. His disciple known as Kādambi Naināri was the preceptor (in the Bhāshyas) of Manavāi Mahāmuni. See the Vaiḍāntākṣayya, 1913 edn. 168-180. For a comparison of the Tengalins and Vaiḍāntākṣayya doctrines see Myore's Census Report 1891; Brāhmaṇdās, 1913; Madr. Mun. I, p. 85 and 89-93. J. R. A. S., 1911.

15 The heads of these were called the Aśhta-dig-pajaś. The most important of them was the Jērā of Vaiḍāntākṣayya or Nānūnaii in Tinnevelly District.
Ádi Vān Saṭāgopa Swāmī of Ahōbilam, yet the attraction which Tengalaism possessed among the masses, its tactful alliance with a large number of the temple authorities and of the ruling princes of the day, its skill in organization, its comparative laxity in caste matters, its advocacy of the vernacular bibles, naturally made it stronger and stronger in the land; so that by the end of the 15th century there was perhaps an equal number of followers among the two sects. The princes were of course divided between the two, some professing Vadagalaism as the Sanskrit school came to be called, and others Tengalaism. The Emperors professed the former, as they had for their teachers a very orthodox Vadagalai family of Conjeeveram known as the Tātāchāryas, and as they were the special worshippers of the deity of Ahōbilam, a seat of Vadagalai influence. But the majority of the Polygars and minor chieftains seem to have been naturally attracted to the more popular religion. One of the Mavaliyā savage kings is actually said to have lifted up the palanquin of Manavāla Mahāmuni. It is not improbable that many of the Tottiy chiefs were likewise brought under Tengalaism,—a phenomenon which explains the profession of the Tengalai cult by them to-day.

The rise of Saiva-Siddhāntism.

The popular movement in Saivism or Saiva-Siddhāntism as it was called, revived by the famous Meykaṇḍa Deva, the author of Śivagunaabodham, the philosophic bible of that creed, in the 13th century, made rapid progress in this period. Meykaṇḍa Deva had adopted the Viṣṇu, advaitic philosophy of Rāmānuja, but made Śiva instead of Viṣṇu the Supreme Being. His system is thus the same as Rāmānuj's system, but with Saiva terminology. His great achievement was to make Saivism the religion of the masses as distinct from the religion of the higher castes as formulated by Śankarāchārya, Vidyārānya and other Advaitins. Meykaṇḍa's work was continued by a number of saints, chiefly non-Brahman. The famous pāṭṭiragiriyar, the fanatical Siva Vākya, the reformed

---

16 He lived in the latter part of the 14th and the earlier part of the 15th century. He was the disciple of Saṅghāvatīdevī, the son and successor of Viṣṇudāsāchārya. He established his celebrated Matt at Ahōbilam, the god of which place, Narasimha Perumāl, was his tutelary deity. Many miracles are attributed to Saṅgahāva. See Sats'ngāda Mātikā for an account of his life and his successors in the Ahōbil Matt. Ádi Vān Saṅgahāva's disciple was Tholappāchārya, the author of Śrīmād Raṇākari and the preceptor of the Vijayanagar Emperor. (See Ins. regarding Kannalīppāram tank near Hampi). Even non-Brahmanas were converted by Saṅgahāva, and many of the princes and Polygars who came to the south were devotes of Ahōbil Mahāmuni. That is why the Tottiyans built temples to him wherever they settled.

17 A number of epigraphical references prove this. See section II, ante.

18 See the Pāṭṭiragiriyar Saṅkaraṉa, pūrvabhāhu.

19 The date of Meykaṇḍa Deva has long been one of doubt and controversy. Prof. Sebaghri Sīṣṭrī says he was the disciple of Paranjītīsvāmī, the author of Tiruvīḷādoll Purāṇam, who, he says, lived about 1550 in the court of Ati Vira Rāma Pāṇḍya. (See his Rep. Sams. Tamil MSS. 1596-7, p. 22 and 56). The author of the Modras Manual also thinks that the Siddhar School was after Ativira Rāma Pāṇḍya; but he assigns Ativira Rāma to the 11th century, about 1040 A. D. (See Vol. I, p. 57 and 120). Mr. Gopinatha Rao has given epigraphical and other arguments to show that he lived about 1230 A. D. (Modras. Bev. 1904).

20 Gover attributes Pāṭṭiragiriyar to the 10th century. (See his Folksongs, 158). Anavaratnavinayakam Pillai in his edition of Pāṭṭiragiriyar's works (1907) says that as Pa pāṭṭu Pillai refers to Varagu in the 9th century and as some of his works are referred to by Nambikkai nambi in the 11th century, Pāṭṭiragiriyar must have lived in the 10th century, and so also Pāṭṭiragiriyar. From the fact that many of Pāṭṭiragiriyar's works are not referred to in the 11th Purāṇam and from the style of the majority of the scholars, attribute him and his school to the 15th and 16th centuries. See e.g. Dr. Caldwell's Dvid. Gram., p. 116. Caldwell, it should be noted, divides later Tamil literary history into two cycles—the literary, wherein he includes Ativira Rāma Pāṇḍya and the mystic, wherein he brings in the Sittas. The latter, he points out, pretend to be Śaivites, but philosophically nonsectaries. He attributes Saṅgahāva bōham to the 16th century and the Sittas (Tirumālai, Pāṭṭiragiriyar, Siva Vākya, etc.) to the 17th century (Ibid., p. 146, and L88-9). For the alleged connection between the Siddhar school and Christianity, see Caldwell's Dvid. Gram., 116; Bart's Religions of India, p. 210 and Hopkins' Religions of India, p. 482. The Siddha movement is described in detail in the last chapter.
Paṭṭināttu Piḷḷai, the scholarly Paranjodhimunivar, and the earnest Aṇghoṛa Sivāchārya and Sivaśrayīgūn are typical examples. They all declared a crusade against Brahmanical superiority. They condemned idol-worship, and held that religion ought to be a thing of feeling and not observation. They looked with abhorrence on the narrow view of limitation on which the worship of God in the form of an image was based. "Those who really know where the shepherd of the world lives, will never raise their hands to any visible shrine," nor "Are the gods of man's making helpful in the matter of salvation?" Can these artificial gods, Siva Vākyar asks, who owe their existence or non-existence, their elevation or neglect to the piety or caprice of men; can these, made and unmade, baked and unbaked move of themselves! Can they free themselves when bound? What is the use of decking stones with flowers? What true religion is there in the ringing of bells, the performance of set obsequies, the going around fanes, the floating of incense, the offerings of things arranged as if in a market? Siva Vākya ridiculed even the yogin and his 96 rules of procedure. He ridiculed those who believed that the carriage of linga on the neck was true piety. He had no faith in self-mortification or in the efficacy of mantras. He held that pilgrimage was of no use. "Can a bath in the Ganges turn black into white?" he asks. The transformation of a sinner into a saint is not possible by that process. "Shun illusions, repress the senses, then the sacred waves of Kāśi will, he says, swell within your own breast." In short, to Siva Vākya, his own thoughts are the flowers and ashes to be offered to the Lord, his own breath is the linga, his senses are the incense, and his soul the light, and his God is not the artificial image in the temple, but a wholly spiritual object,—"the original, the endless, whom no mind understands. He is not Vishnu, nor Brahma, nor Siva. In the beyond is He, neither black nor white, nor great nor little, nor male nor female,—but stands far, far and far beyond all beings' utmost pale." Pattnagiriyar was less fighting and more pathetic in his appeal. He prays to his Lord to bend his mnd like a bow, to bind his senses to it as strings and impel the arrows of his thoughts to Him alone. He asks: when will the senses be annihilated, when will his pride be subdued, and when will his tired being be steeped in sleepless sleep? "When, he asks again and again, will he cleave through birth's illusions and attain the last spiritual state, the acme of spiritual perfection from which there is no return? When will he be freed from the opium-like things of the world for the nectar-like things of God?" He finds all written wisdom useless as a guide to the identification with the divinity. He cannot find, inspite of immense poring into it, truth therein. He therefore yearns for the time when he can burn the Stātras, deem the Vedas lies, and exploring the mystery, reach bliss, when the soul, suffering like a fish in a net will get freedom and happiness, when the carnal lusts will end, and "I with eyelids dropped, to heaven ascend and with God's Being my own being blend." The waitings of Paṭṭināttu Piḷḷai were even more pathetic. No man had a truer idea of the illusion of earthly happiness, and a better capacity to weave fine ideas into "fine patterns of thought," though sometimes, in the opinion of Mr. Caldwell his productions are more "melodious verbiage than striking thought." When speaking of idol-worship, for example, he points out how God's presence is found not in stone or copper, chiselled or furbished by tamarind, but "in speech, in the Vedas, darkness, heavens, the hearts of ascetics and the loving mind." Idols, he vowed never to adore. Equally vehement is his hatred of earthly life and career. "What

11 Ind. Ant. I. p. 198 Dr. L. D. Barnett is of opinion that the Southern school of Saṅga Siddhānta had in reality its origin in the north. For a detailed consideration of the question. See R. A. S. J. 1910; Siddhāntadīpika, June 1910. For a few examples of the writings of Paṭṭināttu Piḷḷai and others see Gover's Folk Songs.
is there in the body, he asks in one place, that men should love and cherish it so much? It is a property claimed by various agents,—by fire, by worms, by the earth, by kites, jackals and curs. Its ingredients, moreover, are nasty and of bad odour. To love it, therefore, is the greatest of anomalies, of inexplicable inconsistencies. As is the body, so is every other thing of man. His habitation, his fame, his women, his children, his beauty, his wealth, nothing abides. The moment he is dead, he is, to his mother, an object of contempt. To his sons, “who encircle the pyre and fall the wonted pots, his memory is more a burden than a pleasure.” “There is no love, therefore, concludes Paśinattu Pillai, as the love of God. It is the most enduring, eternal and pleasure giving.” It is the sole support of his life. Vows and austerities, Vedas and Purāṇas, offerings and prayers, sandals and ashes, mantras and mortifications, all these are, in his opinion, “nothing but Godward perfidy.” It is the love of the Lord that is everything.

The Policy of Vijayanagar.

With tender solicitude the Vijayanagar sovereigns fostered all these various aspects of religious activity. Their attitude towards the two great religions of Hinduism was one of inexhaustible generosity and boundless encouragement. And they shewed it in various ways. They first built temples and towers, walls and mandapas, and constructed cars and vehicles. They organized festivals at state expense. They reared gardens of useful trees. They made numerous endowments of land. On all sacred occasions, on days of eclipses, on the anniversary days of the deaths of royal personages, they made various gifts to temples in the form of lamps, cows, gold, etc. They interfered in the management of the temples and looked after their proper maintenance. They even remitted revenues amounting to thousands of vārāhas on behalf of temples. Nowhere else in the world’s history do we find such a close alliance between the state and the church, such a hearty co-operation between temporal and spiritual leaders. True, Vijayanagar was pursuing no new policy. The idea of the close connection between royalty and religion is as old as Indian history; nevertheless the policy of Vijayanagar seems to have been singularly liberal and broadminded. The Emperors seem to have extended their patronage not only to sects of Hinduism. Their range of patronage knew no bounds, knew no petty partialities. A remarkable proclamation of Deva Rāya in the 14th century declares the unity of the Jain and Vaishñava religions, and the consequent necessity on the part of the adherents of the two religions to abstain from conflicts. Examples of endowments even to mosques are not wanting and prove the nobility of a power, which valued harmony above everything else among the various peoples and creeds of Empire.

The services of Vijayanagar to art and industries, to literature and culture were equally great, but space forbids an attempt to dwell on them. Nor is it my province to do so. The foregoing survey of the social, political and religious effects will suffice to point out the atmosphere in which the Naik Rāj was established, the policy which it inherited, and the problems it had to solve. The other effects—on art, on painting and sculpture, on architecture and literature—will be incidentally illustrated in the course of this treatise. With these remarks we shall proceed to consider the circumstances under which the Naik dynasty was founded in Madura.

22 Ind. Ant. I, p. 197-204.
23 See the Kōyio‘uyu for examples of such interference.
THE PAHARI LANGUAGE.

BY SIR GEORGE A. GRIESON, K.C.I.E.

(Continued from page 151.)

While Sanskrit literature commencing with the Mahābhārata contains many references to the Khaśas, until quite late times it is silent about the Gurjaras. They are not mentioned in the Mahābhārata or in the Vīshṇu, Bhāgavata, or Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa. In fact the earliest known reference to them occurs in the Śrīharṣacharita, a work of the early part of the 7th century of our era.

According to the most modern theory, which has not yet been seriously disputed, but which has nevertheless not been accepted by all scholars, the Gurjaras entered India, together with the Hūṇas and other marauding tribes, about the sixth century A.D. They rapidly rose to great power, and founded the Rājpūṭ tribes of Rājputānā. The Gurjaras were in the main a pastoral people, but had their chiefs and fighting men. When the tribe rose to power in India, the latter were treated by the Brāhmaṇas as equivalent to Kṣatriyas and were called Rājpūts, and some were even admitted to equality with Brāhmaṇas themselves, while the bulk of the people who still followed their pastoral avocations remained as a subordinate caste under the title of Gurjaras, or, in modern language, Gājars, or in the Panjab, Gجویا.

So powerful did these Gurjaras or Gجویا become that no less than four tracts of India received their name. In modern geography we have the Gجویا and Gجویا districts of the Panjab, and the Province of Gجویا in the Bombay Presidency. The Gجویا District is a Sub-Himalayan tract with a large proportion of Gجویا. It is separated by the river Chināb from the Gجویا District, in which Gجویا are more few. In the Province of Gجویا there are now no members of the Gجویا caste, as a caste, but, as we shall see later on, there is evidence that Gجویا have become absorbed into the general population, and have been distributed amongst various occupational castes. In addition to these three tracts Al-Birūnī (A.D. 971-1039) mentions a Gجویا situated somewhere in Northern Rājputānā.

In ancient times, the Gجویا Kingdom of the Panjab comprised territory on both sides of the Chināb, more or less accurately corresponding with the existing Districts of Gجویا and Gجویا. It was conquered temporarily by Sākāravarman of Kashmir in the 9th century. The powerful Gجویا Kingdom in South-Western Rājputānā, as described by the Chinese pilgrim Hiuen Tsang in the seventh century, had its capital at Bhinmāl or Srmāl, to the North-West of Mount Abu, now in the Jodhpur State, and comprised a considerable amount of territory at present reckoned to be part of Gجویا, the modern frontier between the Province and Rājputānā being purely artificial. In addition to this kingdom of Bhinmāl, a southern and smaller Gجویا Kingdom existed in what is now Gجویا from A.D. 589 to 735. Its capital was probably at or near Bharč. Between these two Gجویا Kingdoms intervened the kingdom of the princes of Valabhi, and these princes also seem to have belonged either to the Gجویا or to a closely allied tribe.

22 Authorities on the connexion of Rājputa and Gurjaras or Gجویا:

23 See Mr. V. Smith’s note below.

24 India (Sacchau’s translation, 202). Mr. Bhandarkar (I.c., p. 21) locates in the north-eastera part of the Jaipur territory and the south of the Alwar State. The Gجویا dialect spoken in the hills of the North West Frontier Province is closely connected with the Mwāţī spoken in Alwar at the present day. On the other hand, as stated in a private communication, Mr. Vincent Smith considers that it must have been at or near Ajmer, about 180 miles to the North-East of the old capital Bhinmāl.


The Gurjaras who established the kingdoms at Bhinmal and Bharuch probably came from the West, as Mr. Bhandarkar suggests. The founders of the Panjab Gurjara kingdom which existed in the 9th century presumably reached the Indian plains by a different route. There is no indication of any connection between the Gurjara kingdom of the Panjab and the two kingdoms of the widely separated Province of Gujarat.  

As may be expected, the Gujar herdsmen (as distinct from the fighting Gurjaras who became Raja') are found in greatest numbers in the north-west of India from the Indus to the Ganges. In the Panjab they are mainly settled in the lower ranges and submontane tracts, though they are spread along the Jumna in considerable numbers, Gujarat District is still their stronghold, and here they form 13½ per cent. of the total population. In the higher mountains they are almost unknown.

In the plains tracts of the Panjab they are called 'Gujars' or 'Gujars' (not Gajars), and they have nearly all abandoned their original language and speak the ordinary Panjabi of their neighbours.

On the other hand, in the mountains to the north-west of the Panjab, i.e., throughout the hill country of Murree, Jammu, Chhibhal, Hazara, in the wild territory lying to the north of Peshawar as far as the Swat river, and also in the hills of Kashmir, there are numerous descendants of the Gurjaras still following their pastoral avocations. Here they are called 'Gujurs' (not 'Gajars' or 'Gujar') and tend cows. Closely allied to them, and speaking the same language, is the tribe of Ajars who tend sheep.

The ordinary language of the countries over which these last mentioned people roam is generally Pushto or Kashmiri, though there are also spoken various Pitacha dialects of the Swat and neighbouring territories. In fact, in the latter tract, there are numerous tribes, each with a Pitacha dialect of its own, but employing Pushto as a lingua franca. The Gujurs are no exception to the rule. While generally able to speak the language, or the lingua franca, of the country they occupy, they have a distinct language of their own, called Gujur, varying but little from place to place, and closely connected with the Mewati dialect of Rajasthani, described on pp. 44 ff. of Vol. IX, Pt. II of the Survey. Of course their vocabulary is freely interlarded with words borrowed from Pushto, Kashmiri, and what not; but the grammar is practically identical with that of Mewati, and closely allied to that of Mewari.

The existence of a form of Mewati or Mewari in the distant country of Swat is a fact which has given rise to some speculation. One sept of the Gujurs of Swat is known as 'Chauhan,' and it is known that the dominant race in Mewar belongs to the Chauhan sept of Rajput. Two explanations are possible. One is that the Gujurs of this tract are immigrants from Mewat (or Alwar) and Mewar. The other is that the Gurjaras in their advance with the Himlas into India, left some of their number in the Swat country, who still retain their ancient language, and that this same language was also carried by other members of the same tribe into Rajputana.

The former explanation is that adopted by Mr. Vincent Smith, who has kindly supplied the following note on the point:—

"The surprising fact that the pastoral, semi-nomad Gujar graziers and Ajir shepherds, who roam over the lower Himalayan ranges from the Afghan frontier to Kumaoon and Garhwal, speak a dialect of 'Hindi,' quite distinct from the Pushto and other languages spoken by their neighbours, has been long familiar to officers serving in the Panjab and on the North-Western Frontier. In 1908 the Linguistic Survey made public the more precise information that the grammar of the speech of the still more remote Gujurs of the

---

58 The above account of the early history of the Gurjaras is based on information kindly placed at my disposal by Mr. V. Smith.

59 Ibsettan, Outlines of Panjab Ethnography (1883), p. 265.
Swat Valley is almost identical with that of the Rājpūts of Mewāt and Mewār in Rājputāna, distant some 600 miles in a direct line. In the intervening space totally different languages are spoken. Why, then, do the Muhammadan Gujur herdersmen of Swat use a speech essentially the same as that of the aristocratic Hindu Rājpūts of Mewār? The question is put concerning the Gujruls of Swat, because they are the most remote tribe at present known to speak a tongue closely allied to the Mewāt and Mewāri varieties of Eastern Rājasthān.

But dialects, which may be described as corrupt forms of Eastern Rājasthānī, extend along the lower hills from about the longitude of Chambā through Garhwal and Kumaon into Western Nepāl, so that the problem may be stated in wider terms, as: Why do certain tribes of the lower Himalaya, in Swat, and also from Chambā to Western Nepāl, speak dialects allied to Eastern Rājasthānī, and especially to Mewāt, although they are divided from Eastern Rājputānā by hundreds of miles in which distinct languages are spoken?

It is not possible to give a fully satisfactory solution of the problem, but recent historical and archeological researches throw some light upon it. All observers agree that no distinction of race can be drawn between the Gūjars or Gujurs and the Jāts or Jāts, two castes which occupy a very prominent position in North-Western India. It is also agreed that several other castes in the same region, such as Ajasr, Ahirs and many more, are racially indistinguishable from the Jāts and Gūjars. The name Gujar appears in Sanskrit inscriptions as Gujara, and nobody can doubt that the modern Gūjars represent the ancient Gurjaras. Long ago the late Sir Denzil Ibbetson recognized the fact that in the Panjāb it is impossible to draw distinctions in blood between Gūjars and many clans of Rājpūts, or, in other words, local enquiry proves that persons now known as Rājpūts may be descended from the same ancestors as are other persons known as Gūjars. Mr. Baden Powell observed that there is no doubt that a great majority of the clan-names in the Panjāb belong both to the "Rājpūt" and the "Jāt" sections. And this indicates that when the numerous Bāla, Indo-Scythian, Gūjar and Hūsa tribes settled, the leading military and princely houses were accepted as "Rājpūt," while those who took frankly to cultivation, became "Jāt". Mr. D. R. Bhandarkar has demonstrated recently that the ancestors of the Rāūs of Udaipur (Mewār) were originally classed as Brāhmaṇas, and were not recognized as Rājpūts until they were established as a ruling family. In fact, there is abundant evidence to prove that the term "Rājpūt" signifies an occupational group of castes, which made it their principal business to rule and fight. That being the traditional business of the ancient Kshatriyas, castes known as Rājpūt were treated by the Brāhmaṇas as equivalent to Kshatriyas, and superior in rank and purity to castes engaged in agriculture. We may take it as proved that there is nothing to prevent a Rājpūt being descended from a Brāhmaṇa, a Gūjar, a Jāt, or in fact from a man of any decent caste. Consequently the Gujur herdersmen and Ajasr shepherds of Swat may well be the poor relations of the Rājpūt chivalry of Mewār, and the present divergence in social status may be the result of the difference of the occupations to which their respective ancestors were called by Providence.

If the Swat Gujruls and the Mewāt and Mewār Rājpūts come of one stock, it is not so wonderful that they should speak a language essentially one. Certainly there is no difficulty in believing that all the Himalayan tribes, both in Swat and east of Chambā, who speak forms of Rājasthānī, may be largely of the same blood as the Rājpūts of Eastern Rājputānā. Of course, I do not mean that a pure race is to be found anywhere in India—almost every caste is of very much mixed blood.

61 Linguistic Survey, Vol. IX, Part II (1908), p. 323. [In the passage quoted from Vol. IX of the Survey, the particular Rājasthānī dialect was Jaipur. But further enquiry has shown me that Mewāt and Mewāri are more akin to Gujur than to Jaipur. This is a matter of small importance. Jaipur lies between Mewāt and Mewār.—G. A. G.]

62 "Notes on ... the Rājpūt Clans (J. R. A. S., 1899, p. 334)

"Not only are the Jaits, Gūjars, Ajars, etc., related in blood to the Rājpūtā, but we may also affirm with confidence, that that blood is in large measure foreign, introduced by swarms of immigrants who poured into India across the north-western passes for about a century, both before and after 500 A.D. The Gurjaras are not heard of until the sixth century, but from that time on they are closely associated with the Hūnas (Huus) and other foreign tribes, which then settled in India and were swallowed up by the octopus of Hinduism—tribes insensibly, but quickly, being transformed into castes. It is now certain, as demonstrated by epigraphical evidence, that the famous Parihār (Pratihāra) Rājpūt were originally Gurjaras or Gūjars; or, if we prefer, we may say that certain Gurjaras were originally Pratihāras; and it is practically certain that the three other 'fire born' Rājpūt clans—Pawār (Pramār), Solaikī (Chaulukya), and Chauhān (Chāhamāna)—were descended, like the Parihārs, from ancestors belonging to a Gurjara or cognate foreign tribe.

"We are not able to identify the locality beyond the passes from which these ancestors came, nor do we know what tribal names they bore before they entered India, or what language they then spoke. Further, it is not possible at present to be certain concerning the road by which the Gurjaras, Hūnas, etc., entered India. Probably they came by many roads. But the legend locating the origin of the fire born clans at Mount Ablā and much evidence of other kinds indicate that the principal settlements of the foreigners were in Rājputānā, which became the great centre of dispersion.

"We know that as early as the first half of the seventh century, Bhīnmiś (Srimāla) to the north-west of Mount Ablā, was the capital of a kingdom ruled by Vyāghramukha Chāpa. The Chāpas were a subdivision of the Gurjaras. A coin of Vyāghramukha was found associated with numerous slightly earlier Hūna coins of the sixth and seventh centuries on the Manasāval Plateau in the outer Siwālk Hills, Hoshiārpur District, Panjab, which at that period undoubtedly was under Hūna-Gurjara rule. Early in the eighth century, Nāgabhātī I, a Gurjara, who had then become a Hindū, established a strong monarchy at Bhīnmiś, where Vyāghramukha had ruled a hundred years earlier. Nāgabhātī's son, Vatsarājā, greatly extended the dominions of his house, defeating even the king of Eastern Bengal. In or about 810 A.D., Nāgabhātī II, son and successor of Vatsarājā, deposed the king of Kanauj and removed the seat of his own government to that imperial city. For more than a century, and especially during the reigns of Mihira-Bhōja and his son (840-908 A.D.), the Gurjara-Pratihāra kingdom of Kanauj was the paramount power of Northern India, and included Surāshtra (Kāthiāwār) within its limits, as well as Kārnāl, now under the Government of the Panjab.

"I take it that the Gurjaras and other foreign tribes settled in Rājputānā, from the sixth century onwards adopted the local language, an early form of Rājasthāni, with great rapidity. They brought, I imagine, few women with them, and when they formed unions with Hindū women, they quickly learned the religion, customs, and language of their wives. I am inclined to believe that during the period of Gurjara rule, and especially during the ninth and tenth centuries, the Rājasthāni language must have been carried over a wide territory far more extensive than that now occupied by it. It seems to me that the Gujurs and Ajars of Swāt, and the similar tribes in the lower Himalayas to the east of Chamba, should be regarded as survivals of a much larger population which once spoke Rājasthāni, the language of the court and capital. For one reason or other the neighbours of those northern Gujurs and Ajars took up various languages, Pushtī, Lahindā, or whatever it might be, while the graziers and shepherds clung to the ancient tongue which their ancestors had brought from Rājputānā, and which probably was spoken for a long time in much of the country intervening between the hills and Mewāt. If this theory be sound, the forms of the Himalayan Rājasthāni, should be more archaic than those of modern Mewāt or the other.

64 I have a suspicion that they may have been Irausians, perhaps from Sīstān, but I cannot profess to prove that hypothesis.
dialects of Rājputānā, just as in Quebec French is more archaic than current Parisian. I do not see any other way of explaining the existence of the Rājasthānī "outliers," if I may borrow a convenient term from the geologists. The historical indications do not favour the notion that the Gurjaras etc., came via Kábul and thence moved southwards, dropping settlements in the Lower Himalayas; they rather suggest immigration from the west by the Quetta and Kandahār routes or lines of march still further south. Settlements dropped among the Himalayan Hills by invaders speaking a Central Asian language could not possibly have picked up the tongue of eastern Rājputānā. The ancestors of the Śvāt Gujurs must have spoken Rājasthānī and have learned it in a region where it was the mother tongue. The far northern extensions of that form of speech must apparently be attributed to the time when the Gurjara kingdom attained its greatest expansion. We know from inscriptions that the dominions of both Mihira-Bhāja and his son, Mahendrapāla (c. 840-908 A.D.), included the Karnāl district to the north-west of Delhi.

"My answer to the problem proposed at the beginning of this note, therefore, is that the Gujurs, etc., of the lower Himalayas, who now speak forms of Rājasthānī, are in large measure of the same stock as many Rājpūt clans in Rājputānā, the Panjāb, and the United Provinces; that their ancestors emigrated from Rājputānā after they had acquired the Rājasthānī speech; and that the most likely time for such emigration is the ninth century, when the Gurjara-Rājpūt power dominated all northern and north-western India, with its capital at Kānauj."

Turning now to the other explanation, we may premise by stating that the Gurjaras may possibly have entered Rājputānā from two directions. They invaded the Sindh Valley, where they have practically disappeared as a distinct caste, the Gakkhas, Jaujūs, and Pathāns being too strong for them. But their progress was not stopped, and they probably entered the Gujrat Province and Western Rājputānā by this route. In Gujrat they became merged into the general population, and there is now in that province no Gurjar caste, but there are Gujar and simple Vaiśīs (traders), Gujar and simple Sutārs (carpenters), Gujar and simple Sonārs (goldsmiths), Gujar and simple Kumbhārs (potters), and Gujar and simple Salās (masons).

Gūjars, as distinct from Rājpūts, are strong in Eastern Rājputānā, their greatest numbers being in Alwar, Jaipur, Mewār, and the neighbourhood. Here they are a distinct and recognised class, claiming to be descended from Rājpūts. These must have come along the other supposed line of advance from the north. Several Gujar-Rājpūt tribes, such as the Chāluṇyas, Chāhamānas (Chauhāns), and Sindas, came to Rājputānā from a mountainous country called Sapādalaksha.

---

[As a matter of fact Gujar is more archaic in its forms than its nearest congener, modern Mēwāli; see the Gujar section below.—G. G.]

[For historical, epi-graphical, and numismatic details, see V. A. Smith—
"The Gurjaras of Rājputānā and Kānauj" (J. R. A. S., Jan., April, 1909);
"White Hun Coins from the Panjāb" (Ibid., Jan., 1907);
"White Hun Coins of Viśhramukha" (Ibid., Oct., 1907);
"The History of the City of Kānauj, etc." (Ibid., July 1908).]

D. R. Bhandarkar—
"Foreign elements in the Hindu Population" (Ind. Ant., 1911, pp. 7–37). Mr. Bhandarkar (p. 30) thinks that Eastern Rājasthānī is derived from Pahāri Hindī; but I do not think he can be right.

["Ibbetson, l. c., p. 252. Mr. Vincent Smith is of opinion that the position of their principal settlement, that at Bhūkhāla, North-West of Mount Abū, indicates that the Gurjaras came from the West, across Sindh, and not from the North down the Indus Valley. They could have entered Sindh either via Mārkān, as the Arabs did later in the 7th century, or through Bālāchistān by roads further north. If they came from Sistān and spoke an Eranian language, they would soon have picked up an Indian tongue. On this theory, the Gurjaras of the Panjāb would have entered their province from the south, proceeding up the Indus Valley. Mr. Smith points out that the Panjāb Gurjaras probably are a later settlement. We hear of them first in the Khānsīr chronicles in the 9th century.]

Bhandarkar, l. c., p. 22.

[In 1901, the total number of Gujar in Rājputānā was 462,739. Of these, 46,046 were enumerated in Alwar, 184,494 in Jaipur, and 50,574 in Mewār. Bharatpur, adjoining Alwar, had 44,573.]
Mr. Bhandarkar\textsuperscript{10} has shown that this Sapâdalaksha included the hill-country from Chamba on the west, to Western Nepal on the east, thus almost exactly corresponding with the area in which Western and Central Pâhârî are now spoken. Now, in this tract at the present day it may be said that, while there are plenty of Râjpûts, there are no Gûjars. The main population is, as we have seen, Khaâs, in which the non-military Gûjars must have been merged.\textsuperscript{11} The Sapâdalaksha Gûjar-Râjpûts, on the other hand, have provided Mewâr with its Chauhâns. We have seen that one of the Swât Gûjurs is also called Chauhân, and the second of the two explanations for the presence of the Gûjurs in their present seats is that they are not a backwash of immigration from Râjputâna, but are the representatives of Gûjaras who were there left behind while the main body advanced and settled in Sapâdalaksha. Instead of taking to agriculture and becoming merged in the population, they retained their ancestral pastoral habits and their tribal individuality.\textsuperscript{12}

We have seen that there were originally many Râjpûts in Sapâdalaksha. In the times of the Mùsulmân rule of India many more Râjpûts from the plains of India took refuge amongst their Sapâdalaksha kin and there founded dynasties which still survive. Particulars regarding these will be found in the Introduction to the three Pahârî languages and need not be repeated here. Suffice it to say that it is plain that down even to the days of late Mùsulmân dominion the tie between Sapâdalaksha and Râjputâna was never broken. And this, in my opinion, satisfactorily explains the fact of the close connexion between the Pahârî languages and Râjasthànî.

We thus arrive at the following general results regarding the Aryan-speaking population of the Pahârî tract.

The earliest immigrants of whom we have any historical information were the Khaâs, a race hailing from Central Asia and originally speaking an Aryan, but not necessarily, an Indo-Aryan, language. They were followed by the Gûjaras, a tribe who invaded India about the sixth century A. D. and occupied the same tract, then known as Sapâdalaksha. At that time, they also spoke an Aryan, but not necessarily an Indo-Aryan, language.\textsuperscript{13} Of these Gûjaras the bulk followed pastoral pursuits and became merged in and identified with the preceding Khaâs population. Others were fighting men, and were identified by the Brâhmans with Kshatriyas. In this guise they invaded Eastern Râjputâna from Sapâdalaksha, and, possibly, Western Râjputâna from Sindh, and founded, as Râjpûts, the great Râjput states of Râjputâna.\textsuperscript{14}

\textsuperscript{10} l. c. pp. 28 ff. Sapâdalaksha becomes in modern speech aspâldâkh, and means one hundred and twenty-five thousand, a reference to the supposed number of hills in the tract. At the present day the name is confined to the ‘Sudâsk’ hills.

\textsuperscript{11} We see traces of this merging in the great Kânâl caste of the Simla Hills. It has two divisions, one called Khaâs and the other Râo (Thebeson l. c. p. 269). The former represent the Khaâs, and it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that the Râos are Gûjars who have become merged into the general population and have adopted a name Râo, indicating their closer connexion with the Râjpûts.

\textsuperscript{12} The writer’s personal opinion upon this disputed point is given at length near the end of this article (p. 106).

\textsuperscript{13} It is possible that the Gûjaras, at the time that they first entered the hills, did not speak an Indo-Aryan language. We are quite ignorant on the point. But this must not be taken as suggesting that the languages of their descendants, the Râjpûts and the Gûjars, is not Indo-Aryan. It is now a-dâys certainly Indo-Aryan, and belongs to the Inner-Group of these languages.

\textsuperscript{14} It is interesting on this point, to note that the Central Pahârî of Kumaun and Garhwal (i.e., of Eastern Sapâdalaksha) agree with Eastern Râjasthânî in having the genitive postposition kî and the verb substantive derived from the achh, while in the Western Pahârî of the Simla Hills (i.e., Western Sapâdalaksha) the termination of the genitive is the Western Râjasthânî nî, while one of the verbs substantive (d, i.) is probably of the same origin as the Western Râjasthânî hût. As for Gùjarâlî, the genitive ends in nî, and the verb substantive belongs to the achh group. West of Western Pahârî we have the Puthwârd dialect of Lahâdâ, Here also the genitive termination is nî, but the verb substantive differs from that of Gùjarâlî. On the other hand Gùjarâlî agrees with all the Lahâdâ dialects in one very remarkable point viz., the formation of the future by means of a ablaut. We thus see that right along the lower Himalaya, from the Indus to Nepal, there are three groups of dialects agreeing in working points with, in order Gùjarâlî, Western Râjasthânî and Eastern Râjasthânî.
The Khaśas were, we have seen, closely connected with the tribes nicknamed 'Piśāchas' or cannibals, of North-Western India. I have elsewhere contended, and I believe proved, that the wild tribes of the extreme North-West, immediately to the South of the Hindū Kush, are modern representatives of these ancient 'Piśāchas,' and I have classed the languages now spoken by them and also Kāshmiri, as belonging to the 'Piśācha Group.' This Piśācha Group of languages possesses many marked peculiarities strange to the Aryan languages of the Indian Plains, and several of these are clearly observable in the various forms of Western and Central Pahāri,—strong in the extreme west, but becoming weaker and weaker as we go eastwards. It is reasonable to infer that in this we have traces of the old language of the Khaśas, whom Sanskrit tradition makes to be related to the Piśāchas. But the Pahāri languages, although with this Khaśa basis, are much more closely related to Rājasthāni. This must be mainly due to the Gūjār influence. We have seen that the Gūjārs occupied the country, and became absorbed in the general population, but at the same time they must have given it their language. Then there was a constant reflux of emigration on the part of the Gūjār-Rājput from Rājputāna and the neighbouring parts of India. These re-immigrants became, as befitted their Kshatriya station, the rulers of the country and to-day most of the chiefs and princes of the old Sapādalaksha trace their descent from Rājput of the plains. The re-immigration was increased by the oppression of the Mughul rule in India proper, and there are historical notices of tribe after tribe, and leader after leader, abandoning their established seats in Rājputāna, and seeking refuge from Musalmān oppression in the hills from which they had originally issued to conquer the Gangetic Valley.

In Sapādalaksha proper (the hill-tract with Chamba for its western and Kumaon for its eastern extremity) the Khaśas and the Gūjārs have kept themselves comparatively pure from admixture with the Tibeto-Burmans who overflowed from beyond the Himālaya and also occupied the southern slope of the range. Here the Aryans succeeded in arresting their Tibeto-Burman competitors in the race for possession. On the other hand, in the east, in Nepāl, the Tibeto-Burmans forestalled the Khaśa-Gūjārs, and when the latter entered the country they found the others already in possession of the chief valleys. The bulk of the population of Nepāl is Tibeto-Burman, and the Khaś conquerors have ever been in a minority. The result has been a considerable racial mixture, which is well described by Hodgson and Professor Sylvain Lévi in the works mentioned in the list of authorities. Most of the Khaśas of Nepāl are of mixed descent. Here it is unnecessary to do more than record the fact, and to refer the ethnologist to the works above mentioned for particulars. What concerns us now is the language, and that has followed the fate of the Khas-Gūjar tribe. While still distinctly allied to Rājasthāni, the Aryan language of Nepāl presents a mixed character. Not only many words, but even special phases of the Grammar, such as the use of the Agent case before all tenses of the transitive verb, and the employment of a complete honorific conjugation, are plainlv borrowed from the speech of the surrounding Tibeto-Burmans. These changes in the speech are increasing with every decade, and certain Tibeto-Burman peculiarities have come into the language within the memory of men alive at the present day.

---

15 Attention will frequently be called to these Khaśa traces in dealing with each language in the following pages. See especially the section devoted to Western Pahāri.

16 For details, see the Introductions to each of the three Pahāri Groups.
The question of the language spoken by the Gujurs of Swát is different and more difficult. Two opposing theories have been given in the preceding pages, and the present writer will now attempt to give his own views on the subject. It must, however, be observed that these views are founded on imperfect materials, and are only put forward as what seems to him to be the best explanation till further materials become available.

We do not know what language was spoken by the Gurjaras of Sapádalaksha. It has been stated that it was not necessarily Indo-Aryan. This is true merely as a confession of ignorance. We simply do not know. All that we can say is that in some respects (such as the use of kandé as a postposition of the genitive, the form chhā, for the verb substantive, and the use of ḍi to form the future tense) its modern descendant, Rājasthāni, shows points of agreement with the Pišâcha languages of the north-west.

These Sapádalaksha Gurjaras came into Eastern Rājputāna, and their language there developed into Modern Rājasthāni. But as has been shown in the part of the Survey dealing with Rājasthāni, this is not a pure language. The Gurjaras settled among a people speaking an Indo-Aryan language of the Inner Group akin to Western Hindi. They adopted this language, retaining at the same time many forms of their own speech. The result was Rājasthāni, a mixed language in which, as has been shown elsewhere, the influence of the Inner Group of Indo-Aryan languages weakens as we go westwards. In the north-east of Rājputāna, in Alwar and Mewāt, the influence of the Inner Group is strongest.

Now the Gujurs of Swát speak this mixed Mewātí Rājasthāni, and not the language of the Sapádalaksha Gurjaras, whatever that was. Of this there can be no doubt. Swát Gujuri therefore must be a form of Mewātí Rājasthāni, and we cannot describe the latter as a form of Swát Gujuri, for we know that it originally came from Sapádalaksha, not from Swát.

Mr. Smith has described how the Gūjars of Rājputāna can have entered the Panjāb, and, whether the details of his theory are correct or not (and the present writer, for one, sees no reason for doubting them), we may take it, that the main point,—their entry from Rājputāna—is proved.

We are thus able to conceive the following course of events. The Mewātí Gūjars went up the Jamná Valley, and settled in the Panjāb plains. There they amalgamated with the rest of the population and lost their distinctive language. Some of them settled in the submontane districts of Gujrāt, Gujwrāwāla, Kāngrā, and the neighbourhood. Here they partially retained their old language, and now speak a broken mixture of it, Pašābādi, and Hindostāni. The use of Hindostāni forms in this mongrel submontane Gujari, far from the River Jamná, on the banks of which Hindostāni has its proper home, is most suggestive.

Finally, other Gūjars, more enterprising than their fellows, went on further into the mountains, beyond the submontane tract, and are now-a-days represented by the Gujurs of Swát, Kashmir, and the neighbourhood.

These last wander free over the mountains of their new home, and have little intercourse with the other inhabitants of the locality. They have hence retained the original language which they brought with them from Mewāt. But even here we shall see in the specimens sporadic wails picked up on their journey—stray Hindostāni and Panjābī forms, retained like solitary flies in amber, within the body of the Gujur speech.
THE DATE OF MAHAVIRA.

AUGUST, 1914.]

BY JARL CHARPENTIER, Ph. D., UPSALA.

(Continued from page 133.)

From this point the various chronological documents ought to be considered separately, and I shall begin here with the Brahmanical tradition as incorporated in the Vāyu Purāṇa.

According to this text the above-mentioned, Darākara (or Harṣa-kara) after a reign of 25 years was succeeded by Udaya (or Udayā-va), who reigned 33 years; after him came Nandivardhana and Mahānandin, to whom a reign of altogether 85 years is assigned. Mahānandin was the last king of the Śāiśūṇāga dynasty, and after him the nine Nandas, Mahāpadma, etc., reigned during two generations altogether 100 years; of the Māuryas, who followed the last Nanda, Candragupta reigned 24, Bindusāra 25, and Aśoka 36 years. If we now sum up the different reigns from Ajāta-śatru down to the accession of Aśoka, it makes altogether 317 years; and if we take for granted, that Buddha died eight years after the accession of Ajāta-śatru, this would place Aśoka just 309 years after the Nirvāṇa, which is simply impossible, for even if we could use the Ceylonese era, according to which Buddha died 544 B.C. this would correspond to 234 B.C., and we know, that Aśoka had been anointed more than 12 years before a date which fell between 260 and 258 B.C. And, if we take 477 B.C. as the year of the Nirvāṇa, the accession of Aśoka would fall in 168 B.C., which is still more absurd.

So there must be an error in the Purāṇas, and I think it is rather easily detected. That there were two generations of Nandas, including a father and nine sons, the last of whom was called Mahāpadma, is related not only in Brahmanical, but also in Jain, and (to a certain extent) in Buddhist texts. Moreover, Hemacandra and other Jain authors assert expressly, that Udaya or Udayi was the last of the Śāiśūṇāgas. Now, it is obvious that names like Mahānandin and Nandivardhana have nothing in common with the Śāiśūṇāgas, but look suspiciously like Nanda, and Mahānandin may even be a sort of shortening for the fuller Mahāpadma Nandavardhana. From this and from the great exaggeration in years I conclude, that the Purāṇa has twice counted the reigns of the Nanda dynasty, which is quite possible, as there seems to have been a great confusion prevailing in matters concerning their history. Moreover, the number of years (100) seems very suspicious as allotted to a father and nine sons, for it would give just ten years to each. From these instances I venture to draw the conclusion, that Mahānandin and Nandivardhana originally represented the two generations of Nandas, reigning 85 years, and that the 100 years attributed to the Nandas is an interpolation based on oblivion and misunderstanding of the real facts. If then we eliminate the 100 years of the Nandas, the time between the death of Buddha and the accession of Aśoka would be 209 years instead of 309, which would place his date in 268 B.C. according to the adjusted chronology. But now the Buddhists, who may have had after all, the best information concerning Aśoka, tell us, that he reigned 4 years before his coronation and 37 years after it, which is fairly near the 36

64 In the Viṣṇu-Purāṇa his name is Darbhaka, C. Müller, Ancient Ski. Lit. p. 296.
65 Nandarāja is mentioned twice in the inscription of Khāravela and in Kāuliya p. 429. Nandrus is an evident emendation of (vide Gutschmidt) for Alexandrus in Justin XV, 4. I am absolutely at a loss to understand what Xandrus or Akravame, which was the name of the last king of Magadha before Candragupta according to Diodorus XVII, 93 and Curtius IX, 2, might be in Sanskrit. Xandrus seems to contain a Sanskrit candra "or perhaps cānḍa" but nothing can be made out of this, as there is no such name amongst the Nandas.
66 Two generations reigning for 85 years may seem to be a rather incredible event, but it is by no means impossible as Mr. Vincent A. Smith has supplied in his Early History of India, p. 40, examples from English history illustrating the length of reigns. I need only call attention to the fact that the reigns of Henry VIII and his children covered a period of no less than 94 years (1509-1603), and that Henry VIII was born 112 years before the death of Elizabeth.
years mentioned in the Purāṇa. If so, we must increase the 36 by five years, which would bring his accession to the throne to 273 B.C., which is nearly coincident with the date calculated from the inscriptions, 276-274 B.C.

So far concerning the Brahmanical tradition. The Jain records consist mainly in the versus memoriales treated of above, and the traditions incorporated in Hemacandra’s Pariśī taparvan, but these must be considered later on, and so I pass now to the statements of the Buddhists, as we find them related in the Ceylonese chronicles. Here we must begin with the Mahāvamsa, as the statements there are at least clear, whilst the Dipavamsa gives several utterly confused traditions.⁶⁷

According then to the Mahāvamsa II, 25 sq. and IV, 1 sq., V, 14 sq., Bimbisāra reigned 52 years, and was succeeded by his son and murderer Ajāta-ātru, who reigned 8 years before and 24 years after the death of Buddha, or altogether 32 years. The princes after Ajāta-ātru may have been rather faint supporters of the Buddhists religion, for the Mahāvamsa IV, 1 sq calls the following a ‘pituhātakavamsa,’ a ‘lineage of parricides’, and tells that one after another succeeded to the throne by slaying his father and predecessor. They were: Udāyabhaddaka, reigning 16 years, Anuruddhaka and Mūdā together 8 years⁶⁸ and Nāgadaśaka 24 years. After these monsters, of whom the last was slain by the infuriated people, a righteous minister, Susunāga, reigned 18 years, and was succeeded by his son, Kālāsoka, whose reign lasted 28 years. In the eleventh year (atite dasame vasse, IV, 8) of his reign the second council was convoked at Vesāli, 100 years after the Nirvāṇa of Buddha. Kālāsoka was succeeded by his ten sons, who reigned 22 years, and these by the nine Nandas, reigning another 22 years.⁶⁹ After the dethronement of the last Nanda by Cāṇakya, Candragupta reigned 24 years. His son Bindusāra reigned 28 years, and was succeeded by Aśoka, who, after having murdered his 99 brothers, was anointed king 218 years after the Nirvāṇa. All these dates fit fairly well to each other, but the ‘error’ in the Samanatapāsādkā mentioned above shows undoubtedly that the tradition is not on all points to be trusted, and we may perhaps, after all, not attach too much weight to the report that Aśoka was anointed just 218 years after the death of Buddha. However, there is one date, which may have been at least approximately known by the Buddhists, and that is the year of the second Council. That it took place 100 years A. B. is asserted by the C. V. XII, 1, 1, and it does not matter here if that is not the quite correct date, or even if the Council never

⁶⁷ I cannot consider here the Divyāvadāna, which states that Aśoka reigned 100 years after Buddha (pp. 368, 379 etc.) and gives on pp. 369, 430 an utterly incredible list of kings, which is in contradiction with all other records. According to this list the rulers of Magadhā were the following: Bimbisāra, Ajātaśatru, Udāyin (Udayabhadda), Mūdā, Kākavārjin, Sahāli, Tukakui, Mahāmaṇḍala, Praṇaṇjait, Nanda, Vindudāra, Aśoka, Sampadi (son of Kunāla and grandson of Aśoka), Vrhaspati, Vṛhasena (I), Puṣyadharmā and Puṣyaratthā. I only point to the fact, that in this list, Candragupta is forgotten, from which its value may be judged.

⁶⁸ In the Samanatapāsādkā 3213 ff. Buddhaghosa assigns to these rulers 18 years instead of 8: a very remarkable tradition as it is in contradiction with the total sum of years between Buddha and Aśoka. This seems to point to a grave uncertainty in the Ceylonese tradition.

⁶⁹ It has not been observed before, as far as I know, that the Jain tradition has preserved a faint recollection of Kālāsoka and his successors. In Upāśa 8 and 9 (nirayacell) it is spoken of prince Kālā and his 9 brothers, whom the tradition makes out to be step-brothers of Ajātaśatru, and later on of his 10 sons, two of whom bear the names Mahāpadma and Nandana. This shows a certain coincidence with other relations of the Nandas, albeit in an utterly confused form.
took place, for the main question is that the date was an important starting point in the Ceylonese chronology, and I am firmly convinced that the monks in Ceylon also knew from old traditions, that this centenary fell just after the tenth year of Kālāsoka’s reign. I only emphasize once more the deviating statement of Buddhaghoṣa which must perhaps induce us to alter in some way the list of rulers before Kālāsoka. But the events previous to his time do not, of course, affect the date of the great Aśoka, as there was, no doubt, a clear tradition that his abhiṣeka took place 118 years after the second. Council and A. D. 218. Counting according to the adjusted chronology, this would fix the date of the abhiṣeka in 260-59 B.C., which is impossible to judge from the inscriptions.

It is true, that Aśoka always does count from the year of his abhiṣeka, as is clearly seen from all the dated inscriptions; but we have calculated above, that his coronation must have taken place between 272-270 B.C. This would, no doubt, imply that the death of Buddha happened between 490-438 B.C., a date which does not coincide with the calculations of General Cunningham and Professor Max Müller. But here the following point of view ought to be considered.

Aśoka was, according to the Buddhist reports, an unbeliever during the first part of his reign, and he was converted three years after his coronation. Now this is of great interest, as it will probably be in agreement with the statements of Aśoka himself. The well-known introduction to the Rock-Ed. XIII tells us that “aśtasāvala abhiṣihan sa deśaṇa priyaḥ Pradakṣiṣān raśī kaśīga viśītya”73; so the conquest of Kālīgāra must have taken place between 264-262 B.C., and immediately afterwards the king began to repent the slaughter and bloodshed that had taken place and became to a certain degree a convert. Now he further tells us, in the Sahasrām etc., edicts, that he was residing more than 2½ years a rather luke-warm lay-follower, but had since that time more than a year been an energetic member of the community (adhiyakṣa) ‘hāmāṃ vasāntyai ‘hakam (upaśake) no tu kho bādhām pakaṇḍa hūsan ekun sa(m) vocāraṃ sāhiṣke tu kho sa(m)vocāraṇa na ‘yam mayā sanghe upayite bādhām ca me pakaṇḍa). This implies, that more than 10½ years had elapsed since the coronation, and consequently about 15 years since the accession, before he became a fairly faithful convert to Buddhism. And in the Rock-Ed. VIII he tells us that in his eleventh year he ‘set out for the sāmaṇḍhi’ (ayāya sāmaṇḍhiṁ), which fairly corresponds to the statement of the Sahasrām edict.74 If now we compare the three years after the coronation spoken of by the Dīpavāmaka and the ‘more than 2½ years’ of the Sahasrām edict, it cannot be denied that they present a striking resemblance, and I do not hesitate to conclude that in reality they point to the same event.75 But this leads us further

---

70 This is, of course, not my opinion, as I feel by no means convinced by the various theories adduced principally by R. O. Franke to invalidate the Buddhist tradition on this point.

71 Dates from the year 8 (conquest of Kālīgāra) in Rock-Ed. XIII to the year 26 (Pillar-Ed. I, IV and V) and 27 (Pillar-Ed. VII).

72 Dīpar. VI, 18; also the corrupt verse VI, 24 speaks of the conversion three years after the abhiṣeka.


74 I have here fully made use of the very clear and convincing statements by Dr. F. W. Thomas, J. A. 1910, p. 507 sq.

75 There are further proofs of coincidence between the Buddhist scriptures and the edicts which seem to be quite undeniable. The Dīvyavādana, e. g. knows of the existence of religious edicts, and makes their number be 84,000, a phantastical exaggeration; but it speaks in connexion with them (pp. 419, 429 etc.) of the institution of the Pācāvādika, which must be the same thing as the charmaṇḍra, taking place every fifth year according to Rock-Ed. III and IV. Moreover, Dīvyavādana, p. 407 tells us that Kumāra was sent by his father to Taṇḍasāla as governor (Hem. Pariṣṭap. IX, 14 sq. says to Ujjayini), which certainly reminds us of the expression in the Ed. I of Dhali and Jauda; Ujjini (a) Kumulé and Tākhassila (Kumāla). The coincidence between Dīvyavādana, p. 380 and the Rummindel inscription suggested by Barth, Journal des Savants, 1897, p. 73 and Büüher, Ep. Ind. V., p. 5, is denied by Pischel S. B. Pr. A. W. 1903, p. 731, and is rather uncertain. But it is a matter of fact that the Dīvyavādana tells us of Aśoka’s pilgrimage to the holy places.
to the conclusion, that the Ceylonese chronicles—or rather their source the old Aṭṭhakathā—were under a certain misunderstanding, when they spoke of 218 years between the Nirvāṇa and the abhiseka of Aioka. The 218 years did not refer originally to the abhiseka, but to the completion of the conquest of Kaliṅga or to the first conversion, or to both these events. And it must be conceded, that for the Buddhists the conversion was of infinitely more importance than the abhiseka, and that this may have been originally the point in the life of Aioka, from which they started their chronological and historical records concerning him. As for the conquest of Kaliṅga it was probably of no importance in chronological calculations, but merely in connection with the conversion, and there is in my opinion no single trace of an era founded upon the incorporation of Kaliṅga in the realm of Aioka, either in Kaliṅga itself or anywhere else.¹⁷⁶

If, then, 218 years of the Ceylonese chronicles did originally refer to the conversion, and not to the coronation of Aioka, this event would have taken place in 259 B.C., and the final conversion about three years later, or 256 B.C., i.e., if we accept the year 477 B.C. for the death of Buddha. But this seems to be some years too late, as the conquest of Kaliṅga must have been completed at latest in 262 B.C. However, we must notice two facts, which possibly might bring the dates into full agreement with each other: (1) as stated above there is a disagreement between Buddhaghosa and the chronicles which may be of certain importance, and (2) the Mahāvamsa attributes to Bindusāra a reign of 28 years, whilst the Brahmanical sources, which may be more correct here, give him only 25, or three years less. These slight differences taken together may involve the conclusion, that the 218 years are in reality a little exaggerated, and so I find in this no objection, but rather a confirmation, of the correctness of the adjusted date 477 B.C.

The relations of the Mahāvamsa, albeit in some points a little incredible, seem to be very clear, when we turn to the Dipavamsa, which gives us a most confused description of the different kings and their reigns. As far as I have been able to find a way through these entangled statements, there seem to be two main traditions concerning the kings of Magadha, of which the first is desperately confused, and the second is muddled up in a strange way with the calculations of the reigns of Ceylonese kings. To commence: two cardinal points stand out in the Dipavamsa, as well as in the Mahāvamsa, viz., that the second Council was held 100 years after Buddha, when ten years and 15 days had elapsed of the reign of Aioka, son of Susunāga, and that the second Aioka was anointed 218 years after Buddha. What the Dipavamsa supplies, in scattered notices from III, 56 ff. onwards as far as VI, 1 ff., where the reign of Aioka begins, is that Bimbisāra reigned 52 years, Ajātaśatru 8 years before and 24 years after the Nirvāṇa—32 years and Udaya (-bhuddha) 16 years²⁰: but Anuruddhaka

¹⁷⁶ I agree with Dr. Fleet J.R.A.S. 1910, pp. 242 ff. 824 ff., that the inscription of Khāravela does not give us any right to presume the existence of an Māurya era, although I find his interpretation of line 16 in that inscription absolutely unacceptable. Dr. Fleet translates: ‘he produces, causes to come forth (i.e., revives), the sixty-fourth chapter (or other division) of the collection of seven Yugas.’ What does this mean? The seven first yugas have never, as far as I know, been taken as forming a unity in the canon, and could not well do so, as Utpagaṇḍaṇa is in composition far more similar to VIII and IX than to VI; and presuming that the canon existed in its present shape at that time—which is most incredible—the 64th chapter would correspond to Bhagavata, suga 5, which Khāravela would have ‘revived.’ This is absurd. Moreover, aṅga 9-11 do not contain 75 adhyāyas, for 33-10:26 make 53. But I shall deal with this subject in another connexion. That Candra Gupta did not find any Māurya era seems clear, as Aioka never makes use of it; and moreover the statement of Megasthenes in Ind. VI, 17 (21), that at his time the Hindus reckoned 153 kings from ‘father. Bācchus’ down to Alexander during a time of 6461 years, seems to be a distorted record of the reckoning of the Kaliṅga, or the use of some Luṅkika era, Cf. also Arrian, Ind. ch. 8.

¹⁷ Dipav. IV, 44; V, 25.
¹⁸ Dipav. IV, 38; V, 97.
¹⁹ Dipav. VI, 1 ff.
and Muśa, who reigned together 8 years according to the Mahāvamsa, are totally omitted by the Dipavamsa, and from V, 78 it seems absolutely necessary to conclude, that Dipavamsa makes Nāgadīsa the immediate successor of Udaya; as for Nāgadīsa, he reigned at least 21 years, as is seen from XI, 10. Susunāga reigned ten years, and was succeeded by Kālīsoka; but I am not aware of any statement in the Dipavamsa concerning the length of his reign. Kālīsoka must have been confounded with his father Susunāga in V, 99, when it is said that:

Susunāga's accayena honti de āsa bhātaro |
Sabbe hāvishati vassa rajjan kāre je vasato ||

for clearly by this are indicated the ten sons of Kālīsoka, reigning 22 years according to the Mahāvamsa. The Nandis are totally lacking, Candragupta reigned 24 years, and Bindusāra is only mentioned, in V, 101; VI, 15, as the father of Aśoka without any further notice of the length of his reign.

As for Aśoka himself, he reigned 37 years (V, 101), was anointed 218 years after Buddha, and converted three years after his coronation, etc.: all well-known statements. But, beside the clearly corrupt verse VI, 24:

paripuṣavasvassamhi Piṇḍasūbhīsisicayum |
pāsādān parigahanto tiśi vasam atikkami ||

where the 20 years refer to an unknown event, there is another manifestly confused statement regarding the time of Aśoka. For in V, 102, it is said, that Tissa died in Aśoka's 26th year, but in VII, 32, in his 8th year. I am not able to make out how these contradicting statements may have originated.

In XI, 1 ff., we find the kings of Ceylon, who were in old times as remarkable for their long reigns as afterwards for the speed with which they succeeded each other. V, XI, 8 ff. states that Vijaya began his reign in the 8th year of Ajānta, and died after having been king 38 years in Udaya's 14th year. After an interregnum of about one year Pasuṣuva was anointed in Udaya's 16th year, and died after a reign of 30 in the 21st year of Nāgadīsa. After him Khaṇḍa became king, and reigned for 20 years; and after him there was an interregnum of 17 years, during which Pakuṣaka or Paṇḍukābhaya 'lived as a robber' (coro āśī, XI, 2); having put seven of his maternal uncles to death (XI, 3), and having been anointed at Aṇarādhapura he reigned 70 years, and died in the fourteenth year of Candragupta, leaving the crown to his son Mutasāva, who reigned 60 years, and died 17 years after the coronation of Aśoka. These accounts would place Candragupta in about 315/314 B.C., and the coronation of Aśoka in 257 B.C., but both dates are too late. Now, it is nearly impossible, that Pakuṣaka who was 37, when he was crowned, should have reigned 70 years, and have had a son reigning after him for 60 years. But where the error lies is not easily ascertained. However, the miscalculation is rather small, and after all the Ceylonese Chronicles do not form an obstacle to retaining the adjusted date, 477 B.C.

If we now sum up the results of this short investigation, we have found that Aśoka's coronation must have taken place between the years 272-270 B.C., and his real accession to the

---

80 If Nāgadīsa was really the successor of Udaya, he must have reigned 40 years; for Kālīsoka had reigned 10 years and 15 days at the centenary of the Nirvāṇa.
81 Dipavamsa, V, 97.
82 But this may be calculated from XI, 12-13 (v. below), and seems to have been about 29 years.
83 He came to Ceylon in the last year of Buddha, Dipavamsa, IX, 40, on the very night of Buddha's death, according to Mahā, VII, 1 ff.
84 From this statement the date of Bindusāra can be calculated; he seems to have reigned 29 years.
85 It is, however, remarkable that more than one classical author speaks about the high age reached by the inhabitants of Taprobane: Cf., e.g., Pliny, VI, 22 (24).
thrones about four years earlier, or 276-274 B.C. If, to obtain a more fixed date, we take the last of these years, and suppose that Asoka became king in 274 B.C., and reigned after that time 41 (41-37) years, he must have died 233 B.C. I further think, that the Brahmanical statement concerning Bujusara is more correct than the Buddhist, and that the absolutely longest duration of his reign that we can assume is 25 years; this would fix his time between 299-274 B.C., and I should rather prefer to think that he began to reign some years later. Candragupta would have reigned between 323-299 B.C., and this seems to me to be very probable; for from Justin Xv, 4, I fail to draw any other conclusion than that Candragupta became king of Magadha a certain time ere he conquered the western provinces, even if he really did see Alexander before that time. If Megasthenes, as seems sure, came in 303-302 B.C. to the court at Pataliputra, and lived there some years, the earliest date for Candragupta's death may be 290 B.C., for Megasthenes certainly speaks of him as being alive.

The space of 164 years between 477 and 333 B.C. would then be filled up by Ajatasatru and his lineage and the Nanda Kings. Ajatasatru is said to have reigned 24 years after Buddha, and so we may probably fix his death at about 453 B.C.; Udaya or Udavy, however, who was, in my opinion, certainly the last of the Siunagas, is said by the Purana to have reigned 33, by the Ceylonese chronicles only 16 years. But here also we must consider, the testimony of the Jains, with which I shall deal below, and it seems rather to confirm the Puranic view. It is certain from the Digha Nikaya, that Udavy was thought to have been born and to have already attained some age when Ajatasatru visited Buddha; but notwithstanding this he may have reigned about 30 years. This would bring us down to roughly 425 or 420 B.C., or 100 years before Candragupta. And this time may have been filled up principally by the Nandas, who reigned according to Hemacandra 95 years (see below), and according to what I have tried above to make out from the Purana about 85 years. As concerns Susunaga the name is very suspicious, for Siunaga was founder of the dynasty to which Bimbisara, etc., belonged; if Kalsoka really existed, he may have been a Nanda. As the dynasty of the Siunagas may thus have ceased about 420 B.C., and this is not very much at variance with the statement of Hemacandra regarding the time of Nanda's accession, I think that date may as an approximation be approved. And I find no objection whatever to accepting the year 477 B.C. as the most probable date for the Nirvana of Buddha.

--

[The opinion of Mr. Vincent A. Smith, Early History, p. 115 sq. is the opposite one, but I cannot approve it.]

[Plutarch, Alex. ch. 72.]  

[Smith, L.c. p. 118 sq.]

[These 24 years show a remarkable coincidence with the statement of the Purana that Ajatasatru reigned for 24 years. Does this really imply the use of a reckoning from the Nirvana of Buddha, existing in the time in which the Puranic list of Kings originated? There is, of course, another coincidence in the 36 years of Asoka in the Purana and the 37 years after his coronation by the Buddhists.]

[As for the reasons adduced by Mr. Vincent A. Smith, Early History, p. 42 ft., for dating the Nirvana at 487/86 B.C., they do not seem to be convincing at all. Concerning Vrsagada and Vindhyavasa, they were contemporaries of Vasubandhu, and are said in Chinese sources to have lived 900 years after the Nirvana; but N. P. Peri, B.E.F.E.C. Xi, 399 ft., has showed with sufficient evidence, that the Chinese authors placed the Nirvana at the beginning of the sixth century B.C., and that Vasubandhu really lived before 350 A.D. As for the 'dotted record' at Canton, finished in 489 A.D., and indicating the year 486 B.C. as the Nirvana, it seems at first rather important; but when we consider, that the Buddhists of different schools have all gone astray about the date, and that no one of them, as far as I know, has ever counted with the year 486 B.C., it seems very strange if just this single record should have kept the right date. Paramasinha, for instance, who lived 499-506, tells us that one of his works was completed 236 years A.D. (Peri 1 c. p. 361). As for the tradition that Asoka lived 250 years after the Nirvana, and was a contemporary of She-hwang-ti (246-210 B.C.), this would bring the date back to 496 B.C. (246-230). As for the reasons of Mr. V. Gopala Aiyer, Ind. Ant. XXXVII, 341 ft., they are based on the wrong interpretation of 256 in the Sahasritan Ed., and on too uncritical acceptance of the dates given in the Ceylonese Chronicles.]
If then 477 B.C. is the most credible date for the death of Buddha that seems to be available, he must have been born about 557 B.C., as he was 80 years old when he died. And as the Pali texts—our only source on this subject—inform us that he was 29 years old at the time of his renunciation, and 36 when he attained Buddhahood, this last event must have happened about 520 B.C. From these calculations, which cannot be very wrong, it is quite clear that if Mahāvīra had died 527 B.C., as one tradition asserts, he and his great rival would absolutely never have come into contact with each other, and all the statements of the Pali texts concerning Nātaputta and his followers would be only fancy and invention from the beginning to the end, which seems a quite unjustifiable supposition.

Thus we have seen that if Buddha died 477 B.C., as he may really have done, there is no possibility of 527 B.C., being the right date for Mahāvīra; and we have seen above that this date, based on the calculation that Mahāvīra died 470 years before the commencement of the Vikrama era, rests on no solid ground. So there is no doubt that we must reject this date and try to obtain another, which fits better with the chronological calculations. As such a date has already long ago been suggested by Professor Jacobi, I have here merely to lay stress upon his arguments and try to confirm them by some new reasons.

III.

The Jain tradition according to Hemacandra and the real date of Mahāvīra.

Hemacandra (A.D. 1088-1170), the greatest of all Jain writers, in his Śīhāvīvādhibhāṣā, usually called Parīṣāpatarvan, has given a sort of history of the time between Bimbisāra and Sāmparāti, the grandson and successor of Aśoka. This often very fanciful and legendary historical record is given as a sort of appendix to what is the real object of the poem, the history of the old Jain patriarchs or pontiffs. But I am rather convinced that, confused and legendary as the record may be, it contains here and there some hints of real historical value, which may be used for the calculation of Mahāvīra's date.

Sṛṇāka (Bimbisāra) and his son Kūṣika (Aśītasatru) are well-known to the Jains, but the dates of their reigns are, as far as I know, never given. In VI, 21 ff., Hemacandra tells us how Kūṣika died in Campā, and was succeeded by his son Udāyin, who founded the new capital, Pāṭaliputra. This king was a stout Jain, and became very powerful, but he met with a sad fate, for the son of a king, whom he had deposed, managed to get into his palace disguised as a Jain monk, and murdered him. Udāyin had no heirs and consequently the five royal appurtenances were sent out to find a successor to him. The choice was rather strange, for it fell upon a certain Nanda, the son of a courtesan by a barber (VI, 231 ff.), and he was consequently anointed king. This took place 60 years after the death of Mahāvīra, according to VI, 243:

\[
\text{anantaram \ Vardhamānasamśīnamā, avāsātāt} \\
gūḍāyām \ pātivāvāyaṁ \ eva \ Nanda, bhavaṁ \ nirpaḥ \]

This first Nanda seems not to be very unfavourably judged by Hemacandra, and this may lead us to believe that he was thought to have been to some degree a protector of the Jain faith. Such a suggestion seems really to be confirmed by a document of great value, the inscription of Khāravela at Udayagiri. For there he speaks twice of a Na(r)darāja, who must, of course, have been a member of the Nanda dynasty; and although the first passage is by no means clear, and the second one badly mutilated, the latter seems to tell us that Khāravela made the king of Magadha bow down at the feet of the highest (or first Jina), brought away (?) by Nandarāja (padé evaṁdīpaṇī Nandarājanāstasa agajyasa); the agrajyasa may be Mahāvīra or iṣaṁbha, but that it does not matter which, but so much seems clear, that a Nanda king had taken away an idol of a Jina during a raid into Kālīga. And why should he have chosen so strange an object, if he had not been a believer in the Jina? Moreover,

1 Kalpas. p. 8 ff.
2 A curiously similar instance is told about Pradyota and Udayana in Jacobi's Ausgewählte Erzählungen, p. 31 sq.
Udāyin, the predecessor of Nanda, was a faithful Jain, and Ajātasatru may have been something of the same.\textsuperscript{93} No wonder then that the Buddhists style them 'a lineage of parricides', which elsewhere is only known to suit Ajātasatru.

Thus sixty years elapsed between the Nirvāṇa of Mahāvīra and the accession of Nanda. This period was evidently, according to the Jains, filled up by part of the reign of Kujjika (Ajātasatru) and the whole reign of Udāyin, and I have tried above to prove, that Udāyin was most probably the last of his dynasty. Now if Buddha died, as I think proved, in 477 B.C., Ajātasatru must have become king 485 B.C., i.e., eight years before the Nirvāṇa. The first enterprise of the new ruler was a war with the old king of Kosala, the brother of his father's second wife. Now the Bhagavuti, Saya XV,\textsuperscript{94} states that the heresiarch Gosāla, the bitter rival of Mahāvīra, died at Sravasti, just after that war,\textsuperscript{95} and that Mahāvīra survived him for 16 years. That this statement coincides with the other dates given concerning Gosāla is seen from the fact that he claimed to have attained Jinahood two years before Mahāvīra, when the latter was 40 years old, and that after that time they did not see each other for 16 years. Their next and last meeting did not occur before the year of Gosāla's death. So Mahāvīra must have been 56 years old, when Gosāla died, and as he attained the age of 72, he consequently did survive him for 16 years.\textsuperscript{96} These 16 years bring us down to a time shortly after 470 B.C., say about 468-67, and this coincides quite with the date proposed by Professor Jacobi for the death of Mahāvīra on the authority of Hemacandra. There is no exact statement, as far as I know, that Mahāvīra died during the reign of Kujjika-Ajātasatru, but there is also nothing said concerning an interview between him and Udāyin; and I think we must rather conclude that the reign of Ajātasatru is correctly stated in the Buddhist chronicles to have lasted for about 30 years, but that the reign of Udāyin must have lasted for more than 16, or even more than 33 years, if really there was no one between Ajātasatru and him.\textsuperscript{97}

The Nandas, served by very clever ministers, descendants of Kalpaka; the minister of the first Nanda, were nine in number. The minister of the last of them was the famous Sakaṭāla, here said to have been the father of Shālabhadra, the seventh (or ninth) pontiff of the Jain church, who died 215 (or 219) after Mahāvīra. The stories of Nanda, Sakaṭāla and Vararuci, and of the youth of Candragupta and his connection with Caṇḍaka seem all to be merely fairy tales: albeit it is remarkable, that they are found already in the commentaries on the Avayyaka Niruvāku, and agree partly with the tales in Kathāsāraśīrṣā, etc., and to a still greater extent with the stories told in the Mahāvamsa iti 119, 8 ff.; 121, 22 ff.\textsuperscript{98} But this cannot be of any value to us here, and only proves furthermore, that 'some centuries after the beginning of our era' popular stories about the epoch of the Nandas and the Mauryas were current in India.\textsuperscript{99} (Jacobi, Parittā, p. 50 n. 2). After all the only useful passage is here the verse VIII, 339:

\textit{\textit{evam ca irimahāvīramukte varṣaihate gale}}
\textit{paśca-parāśā sādāhīke Candra-gupto 'bhavan mrpayah}}

Which Jacobi\textsuperscript{100} has already emphasised as giving another and better tradition concerning the death of Mahāvīra. The similarity in construction between the expression:

\textsuperscript{93} Jacobi, Kalpa, p. 5.
\textsuperscript{94} Concerning the following Cf. Dr. Hoernle's Urdu App. I and Hastings' Enqul. p. 260 sq.
\textsuperscript{95} That it occurred after the war seems clear from the statement of the Bhum. p. 1254 sq. that an allusion to the war is included in the doctrine of the 'eight finalities' of Gosāla. Cf. Hoernle i, c. p. 263.
\textsuperscript{96} Cf. Hoernle Urdu, II, p. 116.
\textsuperscript{97} If Ajātasatru survived Buddha for 24, he must have survived Mahāvīra for 14 years, if we accept the year 467 B.C. for the latter, and then Udāyin would have reigned for 46 years according to the statement of Hemacandra concerning 60 years between the death of Mahāvīra and Nanda's accession. This seems to be a very long time, for he is spoken of as a boy already at his father's interview with Buddha, some 30 years before his own accession to the throne (D. N. I, 50).
\textsuperscript{98} Cf. Tournour, Mahāvamsa I, p. XXXIX, and xx. Geiger, Dipaw. and Mahāv. p. 42 ff. The agreement between this text and the Parittāparājya extends to the most trifling details. The Mahāvamsa seems to be late (Geiger c. p. 37), but it contains old materials.
\textsuperscript{99} Kalpas, p. 8 ff.
and the end of verse VI, 243:

\[
\text{Candragupto } \text{bhavan } n\text{\textasciiacute}p\text{\textacute{a}h}.
\]

\[
\text{es\textasciiacute} Nando \text{bhavan } n\text{\textasciiacute}p\text{\textacute{a}h}
\]

is scarcely fortuitous, and seems to infer the conclusion, that Hemacandra borrowed such verses \textit{verbatim} from an older source, or perhaps translated them from old chronological \textit{gāthās} in Prakrit. As Hemacandra only tells us that Candragupta was succeeded by his son Bindusāra (VIII, 445), and the latter again by his son Asoka (IX, 14 ff.), who in his turn left the throne to his grandson Samprati\textsuperscript{100}, the son of Kuśāla (IX, 35 ff.), and a faithful Jaina, without giving their dates or any further references to chronology, we may assume with Jacob\textsuperscript{1} that he took as correct the tradition of 255 years elapsing between the accession of Candragupta and the Vikrama era. This would then make up the time between the death of Mahāvira and the accession of Vikrama till 255 + 155 = 410 years, and involve the conclusion that Mahāvira died 467 B.C., which in my opinion is the date best fitted for all circumstances connected with it, and may be deemed the right one.

This gives, in conformity with the tradition reported by Merutuṇga, 312 B.C. as the year of Candragupta’s accession: a rather puzzling date. For I do not believe in the suggestion that the Māurya era was made to begin in 312 B.C., to make it to coincide with the Seleucid era; for if Candragupta, as we know, expelled Seleucus from India, and even took from him a part of his Bactrian Dominions, there is no reason whatsoever why he should have adjusted his era after that of a conquered enemy. Moreover, Candragupta probably never founded a new era (cf. above p. 170). But as Candragupta now is said to have been anointed king in 156 after Vira, this may stand in connexion with some event of great importance to the Jains, and I think it does so too.

The time of Candragupta was undoubtedly a period of affliction and distress for the Jain church. Not only is it very probable that the royal protection of the sect ceased, for, although the Jains themselves claim Candragupta to have been a believer and even a monk during his last years, there is little doubt that the policy of Cāṇakya was by no means favourable to the heretical sects,\textsuperscript{1} and in fact the connexion of the Jains with Eastern India, which ceases completely after Aśoka (with the single exception for the reign of Kharavela, whose time is uncertain), seems even earlier to become rather faint. But also under the reign of Candragupta happened the dreadful famine of 12 years, which is represented as having caused the schismatic movement, that marks, no doubt, the commencement of the Svētāmbara and Digambara sects. At the time when Candragupta became king, the Jain church was for one of the few times in its long history governed by two pontiffs, Sambhāṭavijaya and Bhadrabāhü; but the former died exactly in the year after Candragupta’s accession, or 156 after Vira, which may, after all, perhaps be the very same year as Hemacandra, \textit{Pariṇāmatap.} viii, 339, says that the one hundred and fifty-fifth year had passed \textit{(guta)}; and so I have no doubt that it is this very event, which has made Hemacandra place the commencement of Candragupta’s reign in the very year corresponding to 312 (or 311) B.C., instead of ten or eleven years earlier. For Sambhāṭavijaya’s death marks the end of a period in the history of Jainism. It is true that Bhadrabāhü, who died fifteen years later, and Śīlālābhahra, who became his successor, knew both the 14 \textit{pūras}, the latter,

\textsuperscript{100} The mention of \textit{Sampadi} as successor of Aśoka in \textit{Dīghaṇka} p. 430 receives a certain importance from this. As was known from the Nāgari inscriptions, that Aśoka was succeeded in Magadha by Dasaśrāta, of whom the Jains know nothing, the suggestion of Mr. \textit{Vincent A. Smith}, \textit{Early History} p. 181, that the empire was divided at the death of Aśoka into an Eastern and a Western part, seems to me therefore probable. The constant connexion of Kuśāla, the father of Samprati, with Ujjayini and Takṣāśila points to the same fact; and this perhaps accounts for the 108 years, which the Jains attribute to the Māuryas, for the dynasty may have ceased to rule earlier in the Western parts than in Magadha, where it was overthrown by Puṣyamitra about 185 B.C. However, it is remarkable that \textit{Paśamitra} (Puśyamitra) is mentioned in the chronological verse by Merutuṇga as having reigned 38 years, and at a period which must coincide with 204–174 B.C. I cannot account for this statement, which seems to be contradictory to the chronology ascribed by the Mahābhāṣya and the date of Menander.

\textsuperscript{1} Cf. \textit{B. Thomas}, Records of the Gupta dynasty p. 17 et.; Jacob\textsuperscript{1}, \textit{Katap}. p. 8 n. 1; \textit{Vincent A. Smith}, \textit{Early History} pp. 38 n. 1; 40. n. 1; 187 n. 2 and \textit{Fleet}, \textit{J.R.A.S.} 1910, p. 825 n. 2.
however, with the restriction not to teaching the last four of them to others. So the Digambaras consider Bhadrabahu as the last irutakevalin, while the Svetambaras consider Shilabhadra as such. It seems from this that Bhadrabahu was a more important person than Sambhatavijaya, and no doubt he was; but after all Bhadrabahu was, albeit the pontiff of the whole church, something of a sectarian, for he left behind a party of his followers in Magadha, when he himself went to the south. And that party, which withdrew with him, did not afterwards approve of either the conduct of the monks who remained at home, or their canon. And as Bhadrabahu afterwards went away to Nepal, and was not very willing to help the council in gathering the sacred texts, it seems not to have been in full agreement with their task, or to have fully approved of it. And so, after all, Sambhatavijaya is in fact the last pontiff of the original old, undivided church, unaltered since the days of Mahavira himself, whilst his far more famous colleague Bhadrabahu came, through the influence of the disturbed period, into a somewhat different position. So I think we might safely conclude that Candragupta was placed in the years of Sambhatavijaya’s death, just in the same way as we have heard Palka become king on the night of Mahavira’s Nirvana.

Other circumstances in favour of 467 B.C. as the year of Mahavira’s death have been discussed by Professor Jacob in his introduction to the Kalpasutra, and I shall here only dwell shortly on two points, which seem to be of importance for this question.

All Jain tradition from Hemacandra downwards gives 170 after Vira as the year of Bhadrabahu’s death. This would be 357 B.C., if we accept the traditional date, but 297 B.C., if we accept the date of Professor Jacob; and the latter is the only possible one, for Jain tradition also brings Bhadrabahu into the closest connexion with Candragupta, and this excludes totally the year 357 B.C.

§148 of the Janacaritra of the Kalpasutra tells us that the work was finished 980 years after Mahavira, but makes the significant addition that in another recension (vayasanare) the number is 993. The commentaries, all going back to the old caurii, refer this date to different events:—
1. The Council of Valabhi under Devardhigarin, where the Siddhanta was written in books;
2. The Council of Mathur under Skandila, who probably revised the Siddhanta;
3. The public recitation of the Kalpasutra before king Dharvasena of Anandapura, to console him for the death of his son, and
4. The removal of the Pojusan by Kalakarayya.

As for the council of Skandila at Mathura, it has here been confused with the far more important and famous one at Valabhi, where the Siddhanta was undoubtedly settled in its present shape; but if it ever took place, it was certainly of a far earlier date, and cannot be considered here. But the statements concerning the Council at Valabhi and the public recitation of the Kalpasutra before king Dharvasena of Anandapura are of great interest. Unfortunately, we have no statement concerning Anandapura, except that the commentaries identify it with Mahasthana, but this does not help us much. However, we must take in consideration the following facts:

—

1 The Arthasastra, which I prefer to hold for the real work of Cakshya till it can be fully proved that it is not, contains absolutely nothing of sectarian, or Jain influence, except perhaps the passage p. 50 etc., where Apirstita, Jayanta and Vapajanta are spoken of amongst other gods. However, this is in my opinion of no great importance. The turkakara mentioned on p. 189 etc., may denote a Jain saint, but we must remember that turkika, anuputtikika is a title given to ascetics of various schools in the Pali canon.
2 But there seem to be proofs for the fact, that even the Svetambaras sometimes considered Bhadrabahu as the last one. Cf. Jacob Kalpas. p. 11: ZDMG. 38, 14 sq.
3 For all details on this subject see the paper of Professor Jacob on "the origin of the Svetambara and Digambara sects" in ZDMG. 38, 1 ff.
4 Cf. above p.
5 Cf. Jacob, ZDMG. 38, 112.
6 Jacob, SBE. XXII, 370 n.
7 Jacob, ZDMG. 38, 247 ff.
(1) Dhruvasena is by no means a very common name. It belongs to a certain dynasty at Valabhi, and we know that Dhruvasena I came to the throne in A.D. 526;

(2) This Dhruvasena had apparently no son, for he was succeeded in A.D. 540, by his brother Guhasena; and

(3) If we take 467 B.C., as the year of Mahâvîra’s decease, and count with one reduction of the Kalpasûtra—that this version was a really old and valuable one is shown by the fact that it is mentioned in the ultimate reduction of the canon—993 years from that event, we will find a most remarkable coincidence, for 993—467 is 526, or just the year of Dhruvasena’s accession to the throne of Valabhi.

From these facts I do not hesitate to draw the conclusion, that the great council at Valabhi was held just in the year of Dhruvasena’s accession, and that consequently the present text of the life of Mahâvîra in the Kalpasûtra, which had been finally settled there, was publicly recited before Dhruvasena. And this forms in my opinion a very valuable confirmation of the suggestion that the real year of Mahâvîra’s death was 467 B.C.

There is only one more question to be dealt with here. It will be immediately pointed out by scholars, who do not find this suggestion acceptable, that it is expressly contradicted by the statement in the Pâli canon concerning Nâtaputta’s death at Pâvâ while Buddha was staying at Sâmagâma in the Sâkyâ-land, consequently before the decease of Buddha himself. I fully admit this, but I believe that somewhat careful consideration of the question will show that this statement is of no great value.

Evidence—and rather, strong evidence—has been brought forward by Professor Jacobi and in this treatise for rejecting the year 527 B.C., and accepting instead, on the authority of Hemacandra, the year 467 B.C. And I must add that I consider this evidence too strong to be thrown over on account of this passage in the Pâli canon.

The passage is found in Digha Nik III, 117 sq.; 209 sq. and Majjh. Nik., II., 243 sq. and tells us that while Buddha stayed at Sâmagâma, the report was brought to him that his rival had died at Pâvâ, and that the nirgranthas were divided by serious schisms and almost on the point of breaking up the whole community. The statement concerning Pâvâ is partly correct, for Mahâvîra died, according to the Jain tradition also, at Pâvâ, and partly wrong, for as I have shown above the Buddhists do not mean the Pâvâ near Râjâgha, which is still a place of pilgrimage to the Jains, but the little town near Kusinârâ, where Buddha took his last meal in the house of Cunda. Even this circumstance arouses suspicion. Moreover, I have pointed out above that the meeting with Upâli, which is said later to have been the real cause of Mahâvîra’s death, implies nothing of that sort in the oldest texts. And finally the story concerning the schism makes the report still more suspicious, for the Jain texts know absolutely nothing about this, but seem to represent the state of the community at this event as an entirely peaceful one; and they generally conceal nothing concerning the schisms. But instead of this, they tell us of two minor schisms occurring as early as during the lifetime of the Prophet, not to mention the everlasting trouble with Gosâla and his followers, finished only by the death of this heresarch. Accordingly I think, that some faint reports of these schisms reached the authors of the Nikâyas, and were confused by them by the similarly somewhat dim knowledge of the death of Nâtaputta at Pâvâ—for which they mistook the place of the same name more familiar to them—with the story told in the canon. After all, I cannot find in this legend an obstacle to the result of the investigation as expounded above, and I wish to note two other circumstances, which fit in very well with the opinion as to Mahâvîra being somewhat later than Buddha.

If Skandia, the president of the Council, is the same person as the one mentioned in a Praîvâcû published by Klatt, Testgruss an Böhtlingk p. 54 ff., he is said to have died 414 after Buddha, i.e., 113 B.C.

That the succession of brothers was no rule in this dynasty is seen from the fact that Guhasena again was succeeded by his son Guhasena II in A.D. 559.

The Jain creed is called in D. N. H., 57 sq.; M. N. I., 377; S. N. I., 66, etc., cāduryāna ‘consisting in four restrictions.’¹¹ But this is not the creed of Mahāvīra, who enforced five great vows upon his followers, but of his predecessor Pār. va the last tīrthaṅkara but one. And there seems in fact to be amongst the Jains themselves some confusion concerning the number of the ‘great vows.’¹² This is evidently no mistake on the part of the Śāmaṇāja phalacritta... and other Buddhist texts, but rather depicts the state of things such as it was, when Buddha and Mahāvīra came into closer contact with each other; and from this we may perhaps conclude that Mahāvīra did not finally fix his doctrine of the five vows before a somewhat later date, when Buddha was already out of any connection with him.

Moreover, Bimbisāra is the main ruler in the Buddhist canonical texts, and Ajātaśatru does not appear so very much there, which strengthens the statement that Buddha’s life was already in the beginning of his reign coming to its end. But in the canon of the Jains’ Kūṃka plays a far more important rôle in the life of Mahāvīra, and is certainly taken as much notice of as his father, if not more; and while the Buddhists represent their master as visiting and being visited by these kings in Rājagṛha, the old capital of Magadha, amongst the Jains Cāmpā, the new capital of Kūṃka, is almost as often mentioned as the scene of the interviews between the king and the prophet. This, too, undoubtedly points to a later period of Ajātaśatru’s reign.

I have now reached the end of this investigation. It may be said with justice that most of what it contains has been said in one form or another before; but this is an inevitable evil, common to all such researches of a more general kind. Moreover, I do not regret it, because I have found it most convenient to lay once more before the reader the whole mass of facts, which enables them far better to form a proper opinion, whether it agrees with that suggested above or not. And I think, that the question concerning the date of Mahāvīra is a very important one, and deserves to be discussed with the aid of as much material as may be available. If I cannot expect that all scholars will agree with my conclusion—which is in fact only that long ago suggested by Professor Jacobi, which I have tried to confirm by some new arguments—I may at least hope that the preceding discussion may be of some use in drawing the attention of scholars to a problem, which seems for a long time to have been somewhat neglected. New material, not available to me, will perhaps be supplied, and may furnish another solution of the question; for the present I see no possibility of arriving at any solution, harmonising better with the various facts connected with and depending upon the date under consideration.

Note.—It has perhaps occurred to the reader of this paper that I have nowhere quoted the introduction by Professor Geiger to his translation of the Mahāvīraśa (London 1912). In fact, I did not read this treatise before I had finished my paper, and consequently some of the conclusions drawn by me are simply repetitions of what has already been proved by Professor Geiger. But, notwithstanding the unsurpassed knowledge of this eminent scholar on matters connected with the Ceylonese tradition, I cannot agree with the main result of his chronological investigations. As for my reasons for believing the date of Buddha’s death to be 477 B.C. they have been set forth above; and I am not convinced of their incorrectness by the possible existence of a Ceylonese era counting from 483 B.C., traces of which cannot be discovered before the eleventh century A.D., or about 1500 years after Buddha’s death. And when Professor Geiger fixes the date of Ašoka’s Coronation to 264 B.C., he has neglected the epigraphical evidence, according to which the 13th year after that event fell between 260 and 258 B.C. And in comparison with the contemporaneous inscriptions the evidence of the Ceylonese chronicles is, of course, valueless.

In concluding this paper I wish to express my most sincere thanks to Dr. F. W. Thomas, who has had the great amiability to go through my manuscript in order to correct the numerous passages inconsistent with the usage of the English language.

MISCELLANEA.

COBRA MANILLA.

In Hobeen-Jobeen the name of this snake is derived from Malrjithi manj, which is said to be connected with Sanskrit mansi, 'a jewel'. But 'Manilla' seems rather to go back to mansj, which, according to the Dictionnaire Tamil-Francais, is a corruption of mansj, 'earth-eater', from msn, 'earth', and s, 'to eat.' In the Madras Presidency this snake is popularly believed to eat earth and to have two heads, one in front and one behind, which it uses alternately for six months! The Anglo-Indian form 'Cobra Manilla' was taken over from Portuguese, where cobra means 'a snake' and manilha 'a bangle.' As shown above, the second part of the name is due to a popular etymology of the Tamil mansj.

E. HULTSCH.

[This makes the cobra manilla to be the well known Indian water snake—the domunah.—Ed.]

BOOK NOTICE.


This monumental edition of the Bower manuscript is the result of long and laborious work—extending over more than twenty years. It commenced in the summer of 1891, and the introductory remarks were written in April 1912. The learned editor has had to contend with very great difficulties, but then his patience and careful work has resulted in adding considerably to our knowledge of ancient Indian medicine and Indian civilisation generally.

Though the discoveries of the first decanium of our century have brought to light fragments which are considerably older than the Bower manuscript, this latter occupies a unique position, so far as its discovery and publication in Calcutta, as the words of the editor, 'started the whole modern development of the archæological exploration of Eastern Turkestan.' It is not necessary in this short notice to follow the different stages in this development. Suffice it to remind of the fact that these explorations have in a remarkable degree widened the scope of Indian philology and research. We are now able to see, much more clearly than was formerly the case, what a predominant rôle Indian civilisation played in Asia at a very early period, and to trace the various elements that contributed to the history of Central and Eastern Asia during long centuries. And from the finds in Turkestan unexpected light has already been thrown on many questions concerning Indian archæology itself, Indian art, Indian literature, and Indian history. Every student of Indian history and archæology will consequently view the Bower manuscript with piety, and great a careful edition of it, such as the one we owe to the zeal of Dr. Hoernle, with gratitude.

The chief contents of the Bower manuscript are medical, and of considerable interest for the history of Indian medicine. That is a consequence of the fact that it seems possible to settle the question about the date of the manuscript with some confidence. The result of a careful study of Indian palæography and the alphabet of the Bower manuscript has led Dr. Hoernle to the conclusion that the time of writing was the second half of the fourth century A.D. The learned editor has succeeded in adding very valid reasons for this dating. He also tries to show that the writers were natives of India who had migrated to Kusar. One of them is supposed to hail from the northern, and the other one from the southern part of the northern area of the Indian Gupt script, "But the fact that they use birch bark as their writing material shows that the country, from which more immediately they migrated to Kusar, 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 Manuscript after their settlement in Kusar, when their store of birch bark had run short."

It is of course impossible to prove these theses with absolute certainty. We know that the Indian Brahmi alphabet was introduced into Eastern Turkestan in the Kashā period, and we also know that its Turkestan varieties did not change much in the course of the centuries. It is therefore possible that the date of the Bower manuscript is a little later than assumed by Dr. Hoernle, and that the scribes were not themselves immigrants from India. However, Dr. Hoernle's theory is, I think the most likely one. Only I should not attach such importance to such features where the alphabet of the Bower manuscript agrees with ārādā. That latter alphabet seems to have been used over a comparatively wide area, and, moreover, it does not occur in epigraphical records before a much later time.

1 Compare f. 1. forms such as parimākshayā with the common Khotanese change of द to च.
At all events, however, the Bower manuscript is much older than anything of the same kind so far found in India. It has already been remarked that it has been written by more than one hand. There seem to have been altogether three scribes, and the last one seems to have been a man Yasamitra, i.e., Yasomitra, by name. Dr. Hoernle thinks he may have been a Buddhist monk and probably a man of repute. This he infers from the fact that the manuscripts were found in the relic chamber of a stupa, which he thinks 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. I am afraid that this conclusion is a little rash. The manuscript was evidently deposited as a votive offering, but nothing authorises us to believe that it had belonged to the person in whose honour the stupa was erected.

The manuscript consists of seven different parts, which were put together in the shape of an Indian paheli. A similar book from Turkestan has been illustrated in figs. 6 and 7, of which the latter has been placed upside down. Parts I–III are purely medical; Part I is of a somewhat miscellaneous description; Part II contains a handbook of prescriptions covering the whole field of internal medicine and called Nacunata; Part III is a fragment of a similar work; Parts IV and V contain two short manuals of ennomancy, and Parts VI and VII contain two different portions of a protective charm against snake bites and other evils.

The most important is Part II, the Nacunata. This anonymous tract can hardly be younger than about 300 A.D. On the other hand, it quotes copious extracts from works like the Charaka Saaishita and the Susruta Saaishita, of which the former is ascribed to a contemporary of Kanishka. It is evident that the existence of a record like the Bower manuscript thus becomes important for the chronology of Indian medicine. From the fact, on the other hand, that Kayishka's contemporary Charaka was recognised as a great authority by the author of the Nacunata, it is not possible to draw any other inference as to the date of Kanishka than that he must have ruled before A.D. 300, supposing that Dr. Hoernle's dating is correct.

The history and chronology of Indian medicine is still far from being settled. Dr. Hoernle's work as editor of the Bower manuscript has naturally led to his taking up the study of these questions on a broader basis in his Osteology of the Ancient Indians; and in the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society. The most important contribution, however, is the edition of the Bower manuscript itself. The excellent facsimile plates will be of the utmost use to the paleographist in settling various questions connected with the Brahmi alphabet and its history in India and Central Asia. The text itself, with the careful translation and with the copious indexes, will prove extremely useful to the student. It is a consequence of the long duration of the whole work that many points, which from the beginning seemed too difficult, have, in the course of time presented a different aspect, and it is only natural that the editor has, in many cases, arrived at new and better results in the course of his work. In order to bring the whole edition up to date, he has thus reprinted not a few pages, so that the binder may, sometimes, experience some difficulty. Before taking up the study of the work it will also be advisable to consult the list of emendations and misprints in order to avoid unnecessary work and trouble.

Everybody who goes to this study and is able to form an opinion of the difficulties that had to be overcome in editing and translating texts dealing with subjects so unsatisfactorily known as Indian medicine and written in an alphabet which was, some twenty years ago, so little known that it baffled the efforts of experienced Indian scholars, will feel sincerely thankful to the editor for the zealous and unremitting work he has devoted to his task. He is himself to be congratulated on the excellent way in which he has acquitted himself of it, and the splendid edition which is now presented to the public is a fine monument of his critical scholarship. Our thanks are also due to the Indian Government, under whose auspices the Bower manuscript has been published. The edition itself bears testimony to the fire spirit prevailing amongst its officers. For everybody knows that much unselfish devotion is needed in order to take up a work of this kind, which must necessarily be slow and which will inevitably prevent the scholar who undertakes it from devoting his spare time to studies that bring more immediate results.

It would not be proper in this place to enter upon a minute discussion of details and to point out such cases where it is now possible to amend Dr. Hoernle's results. He has himself laid before us all the materials upon which such a criticism can be based. For the present the critic must be content to give expression to a feeling of sincere gratitude and admiration. The incessant zeal and the unselfish devotion which have always characterised Dr. Hoernle's work, is preeminently evident in this edition, and is sure to win the highest recognition from scholars and from the Government in whose services it has been completed.

STEN KONOW.
NOTES ON THE GRAMMAR OF THE OLD WESTERN RAJASTHANI
WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO APABHRAMÇA AND
TO GUJARATI AND MARWARI.

BY: Dr L. P. TESSITORI, UDINE, ITALY.

(Continued from p. 92.)

CHAPTER III.

Declension of Nouns.

§ 53. Old Western Rājasthānī possesses all the three genders of Sanskrit and Apabhrāṃca, and so do Modern Gujarāti and Mārvāri. As a rule the Sanskrit gender is retained both in tātsamas and tadbhavas; exceptions, however, are not wanting, as is to be observed in cognate vernaculars. In many of these exceptions, indeed, the change of gender had already been effected in the Prākrit; in the others it took place subsequently and was brought about either by the influence of a synonym of a different gender or, in the case of a few masculine nouns habitually used in the locative or instrumental, by mistaking for feminine the terminal "i", (<"ai") of the postpositions, with which they were construed. Illustrations of the different cases are:

kalatrap (fem.) "Wife" (Yog. ii, 76; See § 133) < Skt. kalatrap (neut.),
kāya (fem.) "Body" (P. 167, 488, 578) < cf. Jaina Māhārāṣṭri kāyā, (fem.) (Bhavavārāg-yaçatara, 7) < Skt. kāya (masc.),
deha (fem.) "Ditto" (P. 344) < Skt. deha (masc., neut.),
nāka (neut.) "Nose" (P. 311) < Pkt. naktā (masc.),
vāṇa (fem.) "Road" (P. 582) < Ap. vāṇā (fem.) < Skt. vartmā, nominative from vartman (neut.),
vāra (fem.) "Time, turn" < Skt. vāra (masc.),
veṭu, velā (masc.) "Creeper" (P. 548 ff.) < Pkt. vellī, vellā (fem.),
-nā pari (fem.) "Like..." < Ap. ... paṛī < Skt. pradārṣa (masc.) (See §§ 3, 75).

In the case of vāra the change of gender was probably brought about through such locative constructions as the following:

āstī (for āntā, see § 10, (3) vāri "This time" (P. 315),
bīsī (for bīsāī) vāra "A second time" (Dd.).

The noun āgī "Fire", which in some vernaculars has become feminine, has retained its original masculine gender in the Old Western Rājasthānī (cf. Indr. 83).

§ 54. There are two numbers: singular and plural. In the direct cases (nominative, accusative, vocative) nouns often have only one form for both numbers, and in one oblique case (instrumental), a plural inflectional termination has come to be used for the singular also.

§ 55. The declension is partly inflectional and partly periphrastic. For the purpose of studying the former it will be convenient to divide nominal bases into two classes, viz. consonantal and vocal. Consonantal bases end in a consonant (or conjunct) followed by a, which is dropped before all terminations. This class comprises all so-called "weak" tadbhavas and tātsamas in a. Vocal bases may be subdivided into: a) bases ending in a vowel different from a, namely: ā, i, u, ā, ə, and b) bases ending in a (Ap. ə, Skt. ə)aka). The former retain their terminal vowel before all terminations, the latter drop the final vowel, just like consonantal bases, and suffix the terminations to the penultimate a. In ordinary grammars the latter bases are called "strong". They are all tadbhavas, but there is one class of tātsamas, viz. tātsamas in əaya, which is treated exactly like them.
§56. The inflectional declension is limited to the cases following: nominative, accusative, instrumental, ablative, genitive, locative and vocative. Of these the nominative and accusative have the same termination and so have on the whole the instrumental and locative, the confusion having already taken place in the Apabhraṣṭa. Further, the ablative has lost its original case meaning and has passed into that of the locative, a change of which there are also traces in the Apabhraṣṭa. In the usual grammars of Modern Indo-Aryan Vernaculars, the instrumental and genitive cases are now termed as agentive and oblique, but I prefer to hold to the older terms, as being more correct from the point of view of historical grammar. Nouns are not all subject to inflection in the same degree. As a rule inflection is common to all nouns in the instrumental, ablative, locative and vocative cases only; in the other cases only vocal bases are inflected and consonantal remain unchanged. There are, however, some exceptions, chiefly formed by consonantal adjectives which may be inflected in all cases, consonantal nouns which are sometimes inflected in the nominative-accusative singular, and vocal nouns in "i, "u, which are not inflected in the nominative-accusative and genitive. In the latter three cases, bases in "i, "u may also optionally remain uninflected and bases in "a are uninflected as a rule. Feminine bases in "o, "e are subject to inflection only in the instrumental and locative, and feminine adjectives in "i remain generally unchanged in all cases alike. Let us now proceed to deal with each case particularly.


Consonantal bases and vocalic bases in "a remain uninflected and so bases in "i optionally. Ex.: vidvāsa Ādi, 76, bālaka Kal. 5, sārāla Ādi, 81.

Rarely consonantal bases take also -u Ex.: jinaṇaśu Ṛṣ. 190, murāvatsu Ādi, 28, bokadu Indr. 77.

In the accusative singular, masculine bases in "aa form an exception in that they may optionally take the ending "aḥ instead of "aū. This ought not to be considered as an irregularity, but rather as a survival of the Apabhraṣṭa habit of representing Sanskrit "kam by "a, instead than by "u (See Pischel, § 352). Instances of such nasalized accusatives are chiefly met with in the declension of pronouns and adjectives. Not rarely "aḥ is contracted to "a, according to § 11, (3). Modern Gujarāṭa and Mārwāri contract "aḥ into "a.

(2) Feminines have the nominative-accusative identical with the base. Substantival feminine bases end mostly in "a, "i, rarely in "u, "i. Adjectival feminine bases end always in "i. So "i appears to be the termination characteristic of the feminine gender in Old Western Rājasthāṇi. In Apabhraṣṭa the "i feminine termination had already begun to supersede "a, not only in adjectives, but also in substantives (Cf. bāli, Pischel’s Materialien zur Kenntnis des Apabhraṣṭa, XVI). Examples of the four classes of feminine bases are:

māḷa Dd. 5, kanyā, Vi. 125,
ghaṭi Ādi, 20, pūḍal Dd. 3,
pāda Ādi, 33, tarasā P. 541, āṣa Ādi.
sāpi Kel. 35, tāsi P. 366, koffi P. 391, bhāmuhi P. 564, seji P. 344, vakhāru Ādi, 110.

Observe that bhāmuhi and seji in the last class are from original nouns in "a, viz. <Skt. *bhru-vukā, gāyā (Pischel, §§ 206, 124). These feminine bases in "i have lost the latter vowel in
Modern Gujarātī, thus: sāpeṣa, tāna, koṭa, seṭa, vakhāra. The same has been the case with other vernaculars, as for instance with Hindi, as shown by the Old Baiswari, in which feminine nouns that in Modern Hindi end in -a still retain their terminal -i.

(3) Neuters are inflected exactly like the masculine, except that they are nasalized. Thus their termination is -ū. Apabhraṣṭa employed -u or -am after consonantal bases, and -ū after vocal bases in *aa. Old Western Rajasthani examples are:

ānkhū Daṣ. viii, 34; srokapasa Daśa Čiḷ. 3, mātha Ķrā., karavāṭā Indr. 51, yuktā Daś. Indr. 11.

According to § 11, (3), *aa is liable to be contracted into *a. Ex.:

*pahūlī Daś. iv, tāharī Kal. 7, kuṇā Daś. iv.

In some texts traces are still surviving of the old neuter termination -ā<Ap. -ā, -am.

I have met with the following:

jā (Kal., passim) < Ap. jū<śkt. yad,

hūyā (Daś.) < Ap. hū<śkt. bhūtām.

In Modern Gujarātī all original neuters in *a (from bases in *aa) have been simplified into *a, a process of which there are already traces in the MS. Up., which is dated in the beginning of the sixteenth century.

§ 58. Nominative-accusative plural.—(1) Masculine vocal bases add the termination -ā, which is identical with Apabhraṣṭa -ā<śkt. -āh. Before this termination, bases in *aa lose their penultimate vowel (according to §9), and bases in *i (*i), *u (*u) optionally insert euphonic y. Ex.:

gho-i Indr. 2, saṅga Adī. 13,
pānkhi F 722, 28, paulī P. 100, vivahāri F 728, 4, tāṣa Adī.Č.,
kunthuyā Daś. iv, bindū Daś. iv, 8.

Consonantal bases and, optionally, vocal bases in *i, *i, *u, *u take no termination. Thus:
cora Kal. 13, veṛi Indr. 8, paravāṭi Kal. 18.

(2) Feminine bases undergo no change. Thus:
kītī Daś. iv, nādi F 603, 6, mālā Kal. 28, riddhi Bh. 25.

(3) Neuter bases, when subject to inflection, take -ā, a termination which is from Apabhraṣṭa-āi (-āi) (see §14) <śkt. -āni. Examples are:

mo'ākā kūdā Yog. ii, 54, īḍā vivāṣḍā P. 536, amhārī karma Śaṭṭ. 55.

§ 59. Instrumental singular. — For this case there are two terminations, to wit: -i (-i) and -ī (-ihi). The former is from -ī, the regular Apabhraṣṭa termination for the instrumental singular; the latter is from Apabhraṣṭa -ihi <Pkt. -chīn <Vedic śkt. -ebhiḥ, and is therefore a plural termination. Both are used side by side, but the latter is by far the less common, it being generally used only after consonantal bases, whilst the former is used after vocal bases as a rule, and after consonantal bases optionally. With the latter bases, however, the -ī termination is more common than -i. Occasionally consonantal bases take -āi (<Ap. -āhi) instead of -ī, and so do optionally masculine bases in *ā, *i, *ū. Bases in *u generally drop their final vowel and take optionally either -i or -ī. Examples are:

(a) in -ī (-i): Masculines and neuters:
pasāi Čiḷ. rāi Daś. i, 14, rāi Up. 20, niṣca Adī., Indr., lobhi Indr. 24, sukhī Indr. 71, viḍāltī Indr. 90, pūpi, P. 248, āheji P. 664, pāū Daś. iv., guri Rs. 9.

Feminines:
mālī Pr. 2, mahimāi Čiḷ. 84, gāj P. 21, sarikhāī Adī. 75, strī P. 327, buddhi P. 694, Kal. 17.

* One instance of the termination -ahi is in the form ekāṣā, which occurs Up. 18.
(b) in -ii:

analīi Kal. 11, mihyāṭrī Ādi. 1, mohī Bh. 98, kāmī Indr. 73, sanyamīi Daç. iii. 13, ḍāthīi Daç. iv, pagī Daç. iv, heśīi F 583.

c) in -āī:

dehā Bh. 94, sokaś Ādi. 69, marawāi Indr. 24, vastra Daç. iv, purvāi F 659, 3, 4, tāpasaś P. 664, rājāś ĀdiC., mantriyaś Dd. 2.

Bases in -ā, whether masculine tattas or feminines, may optionally contract the -i- termination with the ultimate -ā into -ā, according to § 14. Examples thereof are very frequent in Up.:

mahātmā Up. 100, rājā Up. 113, nagaranayakā Up. 164, Suvyastū, ibid.

The old termination -āī has been preserved in the MS. Vi. (sāṃvat 1485) in the two passages following and in another one, which, it being used in the original plural meaning, will be quoted under the next head:

rāpihi Rambhā samāṇī "Similar to Rambhā in beauty" (Vi. 16),
daihī kīhā chāi je kīma " The things which have been done by Fate" (Vi. 93).

Observe that in both cases the -āī termination is added to consonantal nouns. Nine forms in -āī occur also in the Vasantavilāsā (see H. H. Dhrvā's The Gujarāti Language of the Fourteenth-Fifteenth Century, pp. 326-327). Occasionally -āī is assimilated to -ā (see § 10, (2)), thereby giving a termination practically identical with the original -ī. For the contraction of -āī into -i see §§. 10, (3), 53, 131.

Old Western Rājasthānī -āi, which is the regular ending of -aa bases in the instrumental singular, is turned into -ē in Modern Gujarāti and into -āi in Mārwārī. In the former language -ē is employed as a general termination after all bases alike (Cf. the Old Western Rājasthānī forms rājāś and mantriyaś quoted above).

§ 60. Instrumental plural.—This case is generally formed from all bases alike by the addition of -ē, a termination, which is derived from Apxbhraça -āhī, by dropping intervocalic h (see § 37, (1)) and contracting the two finals (see § 10, (4)). Apxbhraça had both -ēī and -ēhī, in Old Western Rājasthānī the former gave -ēī and the latter -ē. We have seen that in Old Western Rājasthānī the former came to be used as a singular termination. Instances of plural instrumentals with -ēhī contracted to -ē are already met with in Piṅgala. Thus Piṅgala i, 93 we find putte for puthāhi (Skt. putraś). To the same contraction were liable vocalic stems in -ā, after the latter vowel had been shortened to -ā. Thus matte for mātāhī (Skt. mātṛbhis) (Piṅgala i, 196). From the termination -ē (Skt. -bhis), which Apxbhraça employed after vocal bases, Old Western Rājasthānī derived -i, a termination apparently identical with that of the singular. We thus have in Old Western Rājasthānī two terminations for the instrumental plural, viz. -ē and -i. The former is by far the commoner and it has superseded the latter even after vocal bases in -i, -i, -u, which, to be regular, ought to have -ē. It is clear that in Old Western Rājasthānī -ē has become a general termination. The few remnants that are still occurring of -i are naturally confined to bases in -i, -i, -u, -u. Vocal bases in -aa before -ē lose their penultimate vowel according to § 12. Examples are:

(a) in -ē:

hāthe P. 318, diye P. 685, nayane F 783, 71, vidvēse Yogy. i, 16, Kal. 17, deve Sāst. 139, hathiāre Ādi C., trīśe muthāre ċrā, beše Daç.X, pārī Indr. 9, Bh. 82, mahātmāe Up. 40, gure Up. 66, bhādi, Up. 25, vāyu Up. 182.

Feminines:

jvāle Ādi. 38, nārī Indr. 68, asrī Indr. 24.

In poetry -ē is optionally shortened into -ē, -i. Thus: thoḍē dīni P. 166, 264.
(b) in -i: Masculines and neuters:
  vyādhi Bh. 56, vivekī Yog. iii, 94, pānī Indr. 62, sūdhāi F 663, 41, betūi F 585, 1.
Feminines:
  dorī Indr. 2, gakini Indr. 41, stri Indr. 24.
Of the old -ihi termination I have noticed the two instances following:
guśhikhi kari-nai cha samāvī “Equal to him in virtues” (Vi. 70),
ghara-ni riddhihi na vāśīyā “(Ho) was not seduced by (his) domestic wealth” (Up. 153).
Occasionally, though rather rarely, consonantal bases take -ai as in the singular. Ex.: kāśa Indr. 22, ahlalī Bh. 73, kamalai Rś. 53. In Adī, one instance occurs of -ai added to a vocal base, to wit: āṣai. It is to -ai that the -ē of Modern Gujarāti is to be traced. Observe that, in the case of vocal bases in -aa, Modern Gujarāti has ā before the -ē termination.

In Old Western Rājasthāni the instrumental being more frequently employed to give the meaning of the agentive, than of the instrumental proper, it is natural that a necessity was felt for establishing a difference between the two functions. This was obtained by adding to the instrumental proper the pleonastic postposition karī, which is the instrumental locative form of the past-participle karī “Done” and is identical both in form and in origin with the so-called conjunctive participle of karava “To do”. Examples will be found § 70, (1). Occasionally to karī the postposition naī was also added pleonastically, as in the example from Vi. 70, quoted above. The same in Modern Gujarāti.

§ 61. Ablative. For this case two terminations seem to be used in Old Western Rājasthāni, viz. -ā and -ō. The former is very rarely met with, except in the pronominal declension, where it is added to pronominal bases to form adverbs of place, as in: tīkā, tī, jīkā, jō, etc. (See §§ 89-91). When so suffixed to pronouns, -ā is no doubt from Apabhṛṣṭa -āḥ < Pkt. -māḥ < Skt. -smāt, the regular pronominal suffix for the ablative. Thus Old Western Rājasthāni tākā, tā are from Ap. taḥā (Hc., iv, 355) < Pkt. tamāḥ < Skt. tasmat. It is, possible that the -ā termination, which is suffixed to substantival bases to form ablatives, is also from Sanskrit -smāt. But against this identification is, perhaps, the fact that such ablatives in -ā, which are very rare in the Old Western Rājasthāni and strange to Gujarāti, are common in Mārwāri (and so also in Jaipuri), and therefore appear to be a peculiarity of the latter. This leads us to conclude that in this case -ā is from -āḥa, the Apabhṛṣṭa termination for the ablative plural, and therefore is only apparently identical with the -ā of the pronominal declension. The contraction of -āḥa into -ā is amongst the peculiarities of Mārwāri. The ablative in -ā having lost its original ablatival meaning and passed into that of the locative, scholars have been hitherto deceived into considering it as a real locative and so have perforce been unable to explain its derivation satisfactorily. The change of meaning from the ablative to the locative is a very old one, pronominal ablatives in -ā being frequently employed as adverbs of place in Pāñgala (see ii, 51, 182, 183) and so possibly also in Siddhāhevacandra, iv, 355, where the examples, though they are cited as ablatives, may as well admit of the locative meaning.

The only instances of ablatives in -ā, which I have noticed in Old Western Rājasthāni, are:
hīva lā (Crā.) < haeva lā < ekaha lā “Now” (See §§ 7 (3), 94 (4)),
sūri śiśa kopā [ja]i thayaś “Having heard [this], the lion burned with anger” (P. 484),
te dukaṭ to jī si vellā sahiyā pachi vīlā jāi “These sufferings, after they have been endured for a very short time, pass away” (Saṣṭ 155).

22 In this particular case vellā might also be explained as a contraction from the regular locative form vellā according to § 14.
bhagavanta-kanhā dikā dīvarāce “He caused the Venerable one to give him the dikā” (Adi C),

sukha-keṭā dukha avai “After pleasure cometh pain” (Up. 30).

Observe that the two last quotations above are from those very MSS., which exhibit a form of Old Western Rājasthāni, that is more closely connected with Mārwārī than with Gujarātī.

The other ablative termination, i.e., -ā, is evidently from Apabhraṣṭa -ahu. The only traces of its use, that seem to have survived in Old Western Rājasthāni, are possibly in some adverbial compounds, made up by a substantive, apparently in the ablative, followed by the same substantive, apparently in the locative. Example:

*hatthaku hatthahī “From hand to hand.”

Other examples are:


Cf. the Sanskrit adverbial compounds in “ā—i,” like: kastā-hasti and Prakrit “ā—i”, like: khasā-khandā, occurring Uvasagandasā, §§ 95, 99. Ablatives derived from Apabhraṣṭa -ahu (ahī) have survived in Sindhi, Paṣḍābī, and Western Hindi. In both the latter languages, such ablatives are commonly employed for the locative. Sindhi uses ablatives in -ā and in -ī side by side.

For the pronominal base pota-, the first syllable of which I derive from an ablative (appahu), see § 92.

§ 62. Genitive singular. In Old Western Rājasthāni the termination for this case was originally -ha, as in Apabhraṣṭa, and it was appended, it seems, to all bases alike. But this termination went soon out of use, -ha possessing a very strong tendency to be dropped without leaving any trace on the word, to which it was suffixed. So this case became apparently without suffix and practically identical with the base. In one case only -ha has possibly survived in a contracted form, viz., in the case of bases in “aa, which make their genitive (oblique) in “ā <*āaha.

Of the old form -hā of the genitive termination not the least trace has been preserved in Old Western Rājasthāni prose, but in poetry, where archaism is easily retained and additional syllables are occasionally sought to make up the sum of mātrās that are required for a verse, -hā has not altogether died out. Many instances of its usage I have noted in the MSS. I have seen. A few ones are the following:

vanahā-māhī “In the forest” (F 728, 16),
supanahā-rāhī “Of the dreamer” (F 535, ii, 16),
bāpahā-śāgī “Before the father” (Vi. 149),
katacaha-pāthi “In the rear of the army” (Kān. 43),
bharataha-sarīra “Equal to [her] husband” (Vi. 96),
amhā mānaha mānarathā “Our hearts’ desire” (Rs. 121).

(To be Continued.)

21 Cf. Prakrit diso disi.
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THE FOUNDATION OF THE NAIK DYNASTY OF MADURA.

SECTION I.

The Emperor Achyuta Raya 1530-1542.

The Common Version of Achyuta Raya’s Character and Administration.

On the death of the great Krishna Dèva Raya\(^{25}\) in 1530, the imperial throne of Vijayanagar was ascended by his half brother Achyuta Raya, a person about whose character and capacity a very widespread divergence of opinion exists. According to Nuniz,\(^{26}\) a celebrated traveller who visited Vijayanagar at this time, and Mr. Sewell who bases his history on the account of that traveller, no worse man than Achyuta could have been chosen for the throne, and no worse misfortune to the empire was possible than his accession. Achyuta, we are told, could neither endure the fatigues of war, nor was fit to perform the duties of peaceful rule. He was endowed with a character which could hardly endear him to his people. His tyranny alienated the nobles around him, and his weakness invited the dominance of the despised Sultan of Bijapur. Ismaul Adil Shah had received humiliating treatment at the hands of Krishna Dèva, and felt it so much that he had vowed to refrain from wine till he avenged the disgrace and removed the stain of subordination. A fit opportunity presented itself, we are informed, with the accession of the weak Achyuta Raya. The keen Musalmän promptly invaded the Raichur Duab, captured the coveted towns of Madkal and Raichur—never again to come into the hands of the Hindus—and even marched as far as Hospat,\(^{27}\) which he razed to the ground. This disgrace, together with the general weakness of Achyuta Raya’s internal administration, we are further informed, lost for him the esteem, the obedience, and the loyalty of the people. In their hatred, the nobles set up the standard of rebellion. A liberal policy of tact and conciliation would have killed disaffection and restored order; but Achyuta Raya had more pride than wisdom, more passion than tact. Unable to rise to that statesman-hip and forgiveness which could forget injury and disarm the ruling, he brought an eternal ignominy on his name by calling for help, at the cost of the independence of Vijayanagar, his deadliest enemy, Ibrahim Adil Shah\(^{28}\) (1533-1537). The latter was of course too glad to obtain an opportunity of triumph which none of his predecessors had had either by arms or by diplomacy. To be within the city of Vijayanagar, to have the mastery of its internal politics and the emperor for his tool, was a circumstance which the most ambitions of his forefathers had not dreamt. Such a circumstance was practically equal to the subordination of Vijayanagar to Bijapur. Ibrahim found himself therefore in 1536 as the guest of Achyuta Raya\(^{29}\) at Vijayanagar. It is true his satisfaction at this achievement received a rude and premature check; for the Hindu nobility suddenly awakened to the seriousness of the situation and, by a timely obedience to their debased sovereign, persuaded him to cancel an engagement, so derogatory to the prestige, and so


\(^{26}\) See Fors. Emp. 366 ff. (Chap. 20-23).

\(^{27}\) Arch. Surv. Ind., 1908-09, p. 137. Nuniz points out that Achyuta had 200 chiefs and 600,000 soldiers under him, and yet suffered defeat.

\(^{28}\) See Briggs, Ferishta, Vol I, pp. 78-112; and Scott’s Dekkan, Vol I, pp. 261-85 for the details of his reign. Ibrahim came to the throne in Sep. 1534. Note the fact that Ferishta does not mention Achyuta but “Bhoj Trimul Ray” in his place.

\(^{29}\) See Briggs III p. 83-4 and Scott I 262-265 for a most confused account of the alleged domestic plots, civil wars and disputed successions that are said to have taken place in Vijayanagar. A discussion of this is out of place here. For an attempt at the unravelling of the whole, see Fors. Emp. 193 ff.; Ind., Anti. XXVII, p. 300-4.
harmful to the safety of the empire. But it was easier to invite the Sultán than to expel him. The proud Musalman had seen with his own eyes the splendour and glory of Vijayanagar, its noble streets, its magnificent palaces, its grand temples, its untold wealth, its busy trade, and the sight was not calculated to another ambition or encourage sacrifice on his part. Ibrāhīm Adil Shah, however, was a wise opportunist. He had come to help the emperor against his subjects, and he now had no plausible reason for the continuance of his stay. He felt, moreover, that a permanent occupation of the Hindu capital was impossible. He therefore yielded to exigencies, but only after the receipt of about two million pounds (50 lakhs of huns) from the imperial treasury to compensate him for his troubles and expenses.

The different Epigraphical Version.

Such is the commonly accepted version of Achyuta Rāya's administration; but Mr. Krishna Sastra, the epigraphist of Madras, gives a different picture of the emperor. He points out from the incontrovertible evidences of epigraphy—and these evidences are singularly numerous in the case of Achyuta Rāya,—and of contemporary literature, that, whether Achyuta Rāya was a tyrant or not, he can, under no circumstances, be called a craven. He might have been wanting in the virtues of a statesman, but he was certainly not wanting in the talents of a soldier. In fact Mr. Krishna Sastri speaks of Achyuta Rāya as not only an equal of his illustrious predecessor in prowess but also in popularity. "The way in which people still speak of the happy days of Achyuta Rāya Krishna Rāya sufficiently suggests the popularity and the greatness of that sovereign." Far from being the tool of Adil Shah, the inscriptions speak of him during the very first year of his succession, as "the terror to the Tululkars," and "the conqueror of the Oddiya forces" and later records call him a universal conqueror and the conqueror of Ceylon. Mr. Krishna Sastry believes that these titles were not idle panegyrics, that the early inscriptions really record an important victory which Achyuta Rāya achieved over Bijāpur and Wāsaigal which had perhaps taken advantage of Krishna Dēva's death to make a joint attack on Vijayanagar. It is in the strong hold which Achyuta Rāya had over the numerous feudatories in his empire, however, that his martial valor is conspicuous. He made his sovereignty a potent factor throughout South India. His magnificent donations to temples and Brahmans reminded men of the palmy days of his predecessor. 200 feudatory chiefs who maintained an aggregate army of 600,000 men saluted his standard and acknowledged his supremacy.

SECTION II. THE TINNEVELLY CAMPAIGN 1532.

Achyuta Rāyas expedition to Tinnevelly.

A remarkable campaign which Achyuta Rāya led to the basin of the Tēmbraparī during the very second year of his accession serves to illustrate his martial capacity and his determination to retain at all costs his hold on the South. This campaign of Achyuta Rāya deserves close scrutiny; for it had momentous effects on the history of South India and indirectly led to the establishment of the Nāik dynasty in Madura. Historians or rather epigraphists have been puzzled to account satisfactorily for the expedition; but a careful

---

31 This is proved by an inscription at Tiruppunnaśāgādu dated S. 1453. The emperor boasts of his victories over the Muhammadans and his erection of a pillar of victory in Orissa. See Madr. Ep. Rep. 1907 p. 85; Ibid, 1911(inci. 290 of 1910); and Ibid 1913, p. 122.
32 Nuna Chronicle.
33 The authorities for this are both literary and epigraphical. The chief literary work is Achyuta Rāyabhyudayag. The inscriptions are at Conjeevaram, Tiruppunnaśāgādu, etc. All these have been summarised and commented on in Madr. Ep. Rep. 1899-1906; 1907; 1908; 1909; 1910; etc; Arch. Surv. Ind. 1908-09; and Trav. Arch. series. See also Taylor's Rāiś cat. III, 331. Regarding this important campaign Sewell wrote: "two inscriptions at Conjeevaram, dated respectively in 1532 and 1533, imply that at that period king Achyuta reduced the country about Tinnevelly; but apparently he was not present in person, and nothing farther is known regarding this expedition." (For. Emps. p. 167). It will be seen that much information has been brought to light after Sewell wrote.
grasp of the circumstances under which the campaign was organized leaves no problem as regards the *causa belli*. Students of epigraphy will easily remember how in the time of *Krishna Dêva Râya*’s administration, there ruled in the basin of the Kâverî and the Vaigâli a great Sâluva chieftain of the name of Chellappa, Vira Narasinha Nâikar, who had gained the first place among *Krishna Dêva*’s grandees and who had been only looking for a timely opportunity to declare himself independent. The death of *Krishna Dêva Râya* and the difficulties in which Achyuta Râya was involved with the Sultân and the Gajapathi, afforded him the long-wished-for opportunity. Sâluva Nâik would probably have been reconciled to subordination and allegiance, if he had been approached with tact and friendship by the new emperor. But immediately after Achyuta Râya’s accession, an event happened which had exactly the contrary effect, which did not only increase the vassal’s discontent, but drove him into actual rebellion. This was the rise of a formidable rival, Mahâmândâla-âvara Tirumalâya Mahârâja, in the court and counsels of Achyuta Râya.

**The causes of the Tinnevelly Campaign.**

Tirumalâya was the head of the Salaka chiefs, and had distinguished himself in the camp as well as the court. He was, moreover, closely allied by blood to the emperor, for the latter had married his sister. The Salaka chiefs again, had evidently long been the rivals of the Sâluvas, and in the keen race for office and distinction had not been perhaps come into conflict. The result of all this was the growing discontent of Sâluva Nâik. He could not endure to see himself dethroned from the post of first minister by a rival. He could not follow the imperious lead of a man who obstructed his own views of ambition and chances of distinction, and who, thanks to his family, his tradition, his office, and his kinsship with the emperor, was his deadly enemy. Either he or Tirumalâya must go. They could not live side by side, and as the emperor was naturally partial to the Salaka chief, Sâluva Nâik felt that he had nothing more to gain by his loyalty to the Empire. From a long-standing feudatory he now changed into an irreconcilable foe, and prepared to gain allies. And they were not wanting. Between Madura and Tinnevelly, there was one of the most turbulent feudatory chiefs of the age—the celebrated Tumbiâchi Nâik. A restless and greedy soldier, he was evidently in dispute with his nominal suzerains, the Pândyan kings. In him Sâluva Nâik found a capable colleague and congenial ally. Shortly after, he found an even more capable ally. In the extreme south of the peninsula, the region between the TâmbârapaÎî and the sea, the greedy and aggressive king of Travancore, Udaiya Mârtâna Varma “the greatest and the most illustrious of the early sovereigns of Vénâd,” was waging a deadly war with the Pândyas. From very early times the kings of the Pândyan dynasty and the kings

---

21 The inscriptions speak of Chellappa, but the *Achyutarādayahyayukta* uses the word Chellappa. An example of Vira Narasinha’s disobedience is his exaction of jötî from the village of Tiruppanâlgâlu, though this tax had been excused in favour of the temple there.  
22 See Arch. Surv. 1908-09, p. 188; Ep. Rep. 1911 p. 86. That there were curious disputes between Achyuta and Sâluva about grants is clear from a curious insec (No 83) described in p. 336 of Rais eauld. III. Achyuta Râya, it will be seen, reserves certain grants as a result of Sâluva’s representations. See Madr. Ep. Rep. 1910, p. 115 for his genealogy, and Ibid 1912, p. 81 for some of his inscriptions.  
23 See Madr. Ep. Rep. 1911, p. 86 and appendix VI—the Tinnevelly Pââyans. According to a Makk. MS. (M. 30, p. 84-85), the founder of the Pââyans was a servant of *Krishna Dêva*. The MS. says wrongly that he was sent by the emperor with Viśvântâsha Nâik to the south in S. 1331, K. 4710. The date of *Krishna Dêva* and Viśvântâsha as given here is wrong. It is too early by a century. We may suppose that the first of the Tumbiâchis came to the south, about 1409 A.D. Then, as a reference to the family memoir will show, the Tumbiâchi Nâik referred to here must be Kumârdâla who ruled from 1509-1535 A.D. Tumbiâchi’s Pââyans included Piriyur, Tummasa, Mâlâkânpaî, Tirumalâpaî and three other villages.  
24 See Nagam Aiya’s *Travancore Manual* I, p. 207, fl. Mr. Nagam Aiya points out that throughout the 15th century the dispute gave rise to war. The kings he attributes to the 15th century are Śri Vira-Râma-varma, elder Champaka-Râma-varma, the senior Tiruvâdî of Tirupâddur (10 miles south of Trevândrum) who ruled about 1460 A.D.; Vira-Kâlêide Ađîtîa-varma (1472–84); and Vira-Bâvi-varma (1479-1512) in whose time Kâyâl was evidently part of Travancore state; Ađîtiya-varma; and Bhûtâla-vira Udâya-Mârtâna Jayavarman (1494-1535), the conqueror of the TâmbârapaÎî region then reigned. According to Shunggono Menon, the rulers of Travancore in this period were: Venad Mootha Raja 1444-1458; Vira Mârtâna...
of Trāvancore were engaged in this dispute. And now, Udaya Mārthaṇḍa was so much inspired by the desire to achieve a permanent conquest of the region that he seems to have employed all his resources against the Pāṇḍya Aṅava-Rāma38 and had such a triumphant career that, by the year 1530, he had the villages of Brahmadēśam, Shermadēvi, Ambasamudra, Kajakadu, etc., in his hands. The Pāṇḍya, in alarm, appealed to the emperor for protection. Achyuta Rāya commanded the Tīruvaiyakas to disgorge his spoils and surrender his conquests, but the imperial mandate had only the effect of confirming the rebel in his treason and extending the range of his activities. He did not only withhold the customary tribute due to the Empire, but entered into an active alliance with Sāluva Nāik and his ally Tumbichethi Nāik. It is not improbable that the Chōla princess whom he is said to have married was the daughter of Sāluva Nāik. There thus came into existence a powerful confederacy against the Empire in the south,—a chain of enemies from the Kāveri to the end of the peninsula. Sāluva Nāik guarded the districts on the banks of the Kāveri, Tumbichethi those on the banks of the Vaigai, and Udaya Mārthaṇḍa assailed those on the Tānbrarapar. Nothing is known about the attitude of the Vānadavāryas of Madura, and Bōgajyayādeva-Mahārāja41 of Trichinopoly in this crisis; but as they were the enemies respectively of Sāluva Nāik and Tumbichethi Nāik, they possibly threw in their lot with the Pāṇḍyas and the Empire; but divided from one another by inimical territory and open to raids on every side, they could not make a successful resistance.

Achyuta's Generals: Tīruvaiyakaiya and Nāgama Nāik.

There was now no other alternative for Achyuta Rāya than to prepare for a decisive blow against the enemies. The Pāṇḍya had to be saved from danger, perhaps from destruction. The prestige of imperial power had to be restored. Delay meant disaster, and Achyuta Rāya hastily patched up peace with his adversaries in the north, and himself took the command of the gigantic army which was to chastise the spoliators of the imperial fabric. The ablest generals of the day commanded the different sections of the grand army. Tīruvaiyakaiya, Varma 1485-71; Eravi Varma 1478-1504; Mārthaṇḍa Varma 1504; Vīra Eravi Varma 1504-1528; Mārthaṇḍa Varma 1528-1537 and Udaya Mārthaṇḍa Varma 1537-1560; Keralai Varma 1560-3 (see Sewell's Antiquities, II p. 238 and Shungonny Menon's Hist of Travancore p. 95-6). There are thus two different accounts of the more reliable being Nāgama Aiyar's, but both agree in regard to a Mārthaṇḍa Varma in the early years of the 16th century. By the year 1509 he got possession of Kajakadu, as an inca in the local Siva temple, as well. Mārthaṇḍa was a liberal donor to temples. Sewell mentions his grants of lands in 1511, 1513, 1521, 1531, etc., to the temples of Siva, Gomati, etc., in Cape Comorin, Nāgercoil, (Ins. 63 of 1896), and other places. Kajakadu seems to have been Mārthaṇḍa Varma's seat of residence. Mr. Nāgama Aiyar says that he got this place as a dowry of his queen, a Chōla princess, by name Chōlayakavalli. "Bhūtala Vīra mado Kajakadu his capital and built in it a new palace." On account of this marriage, Mārthaṇḍa Varma is said to have called himself Pulimārthaṇḍa—from the fact that the Chōla dynasty had the leopard's11 name of its insignia. He is also said to have conquered Ceylon and exacted tribute. He maintained 300 female dancers. His enlightened religious policy is clear in his Edict of Toleration to the Paravas. See Trav. State Manu, I, p. 296. The latest epigraphic reports also contain inscriptions concerning him. E. g. 463 and 473 of 1899. See also the Christ Col. Mag., 1904-5 for an excellent article on the relations between Travancore and Vijayanagar.

Mr. Coginitha Rao says the king at this time was Sivavallabha, Aṅavaramma's successor. But Sivavallabha came to the throne only in 1533. It is highly probable, however, that Sivavallabha distinguished himself even in his predecessor's time, and so came to have the title of Iravakalamejuttu and Pāṇḍya Rājyakshāpandodhya.39

The writer in the Christ Col. Mag. (1904-5) makes a curious mistake in saying that Taylor and Nelson attribute Achyuta's invasion of 1632 to the struggle between Chandra Sēkhar and Vīra Sēkhar. He thinks that the Chōla queen referred to was the daughter of Vīra Sēkhar Chōla.40

For the origin of this word see Indian Antiquity XXIV, p. 257. Tīruvaiyakaiya means Holy Feet. As Sundaram Pillai says, the kings of Vēṇj were always known to literature as Vēṇjivaiyakaiya, "the Holy feet of Vēṇj." Sri Vīra-Keralai Varma (c. 1140) was the first king to bear this title, and Sundaram Pillai sees in it the indication of the expansion of his dominions and the growth of his power.

There is evidence to show that about this time there was a war between the Vēṇj king and Tumbichethi Nāik. See the Hist. of the Pillaiyars of the Tumbichethi Nāik, Appendix VI.

Owing to the absence of epigraphical lore, Caldwell said that it was simply a struggle between the Pāṇḍya and the Chōla. It was Mr. Venkayya that first suggested that the Chōla referred to was probably Chinnayya, evidently co-ruler with Bōgajyayādeva Mahārāja. Mr. Krishna Sastri thinks that Bōgajyayādeva Mahārāja was the successor of the deposed Vīra-Narasimha-Nāyaka. He does not trace any connection between Chinnayya and Bōgajyayādeva. It seems to me that the latter was the contemporary, if not successor of the former and perhaps shared or inherited his dialect of Sāluva Nāik. Arch. Surv. Ind. 1908-9, p. 199.
maliyadéva, the emperor's brother-in-law and the personal enemy of Sáluva Náik, was the first of the leaders. Equally prominent, if not even more, was a celebrated man who was destined, more than anybody else, to reap rich harvest from this expedition. It was the renowned Nágama Náik, the kalayam or store-keeper, according to some, the cattle-keeper according to others, and the finance-minister according to still others, of KRíshna Dèva Ráya. No figure is more elusive and mysterious in Indian History than this Nágama Náik "of the Káyapa-gotra." There is very meagre mention of him in epigraphy. It is from contemporaneous literature, the Polygar memoirs and the Madura chronicles that we understand that he was one of the most powerful, scheming and enterprising noblemen of the Empire. The History of the Karnátaka Govenors tells us that Nágama became, by his pushfulness, skill and loyalty, one of the most influential grandees of the imperial court. Besides being the leader of 40,000 horse, a corps of 4000 elephants and 10,000 camels, which belonged to the Empire, he had his own army of retainers consisting of 6,000 horse and 20,000 foot, for the maintenance of which he was authorised to collect the peskhus from all the feudatory states of Vijayanagar from Arcot to Nanji (Travancore). A man of soaring ambition and formidable valour, Nágappa was a powerful magnate both as a feudatary chief and as a guardian of the Empire from its enemies, and he was therefore, as the Krishnapuram plates seem to inform us, a prominent commander of the Vijayanagar army during this expedition.

(3) Víśvanátha Náik.

A third imperial general who loomed large in the eyes of his contemporaries and who evidently had a share in the grand enterprise was the son of Nágama, Víśvanátha Náik by name. Few among the many adventurers who have figured in Indian History as the founders of kingdoms and the architects of their renown, can be compared with this remarkable man and hero, who was to stamp a permanent impression of his existence in history by the firm foundation of a powerful and magnificient line of kings. Though it is a notorious fact that, owing to the caprices of armies, the loose tie of allegiance between princes and vassals, and the weakness of the kings themselves, the dynasties of mediaeval India had, as a rule, an extremely ephemeral and precarious existence, and though the establishment of a new dynasty may not be conceived to be noteworthy in an age when the rise and fall of dynasties was a commonplace occurrence, yet there is so much of singular interest in the exploits of Víśvanátha, that they deserve the close attention, and excite the warm appreciation, of the critical historian. Many lesser men than Víśvanátha have raised themselves by the strength of their personality or by the support of strong partisans, to the rank and dignity of kings; but few of them have left behind them such lasting monuments of their work, as the founder of the Madura Náik kingdom has done. His work as a statesman, an organizer, as a friend of the people and the framer of an administrative system, will be narrated in its proper place; but here it may be noted for a correct understanding of his policy and movements, that he was not a mere soldier capable of gaining the blind devotion of his men, but a statesman endowed with a keen insight into character and a genius for organization. From the first, Víśvanátha was a cynosure of his countrymen. An idol of his contemporaries, he became a theme for romance and tale even from his birth. The story goes that his

---

42 There is an inesc in his name at Virinchipuram in 1482: the Krishnapuram plates call him by the title of Pändya Ráya Sálapuránabhára, a title willed by Achyuta Ráya and Sír-Vallabha. 43 See appendix I for a full translation of this very important MS. 44 See Trav. Arch. Series. Nágama had, in consequence of this, the title of Pändya Ráya Sálapuránabhára, like Achyuta Ráya and Sír-Vallabha. It is curious that Mr. Krishna Sastri totally ignores Nágama's part in this campaign. 45 The MS calls it Nanji Náik. It is the tract lying between the Kérula and Pändyan kingdoms. For its history see Travancore State Manual, I, 260-3; Ep. Rep. 1900, p.119; Arch. Surv, Ind. 1908-09, p. 191 &c. 46 Ep. Rep. 1900, p. 119; Arch. Surv, Ind. 1908-09, p. 191 etc.
father Nāgama Nāiḍ̱ had at first no son to inherit his vast estates and to perpetuate the memory of his family, in spite of the many propitiatory offerings and the practice of hard vows with which he implored the favour of the gods; that he went on pilgrimage to Benares, where by the liberality of his donations, the magnificence of his charities, and the vigour of his penance, he obtained, by the grace of the god Viṣvanāthā, the blessing of a son, later on the founder of the Madura Nāiḍ̱ dynasty, whom he christened after the god whose gift he was. The exact date of Viṣvanāthā's birth is unknown; but it may be surmised that it was sometime about 1500. A child of penance and prayer, Viṣvanāthā foreshadowed his coming greatness even in his youth. He underwent an excellent military and literary training under his father, and developed into a fine scholar and a finer athlete; and by the time he was sixteen, "he was admired for the beauty of his person and his natural as well as acquired knowledge, and was in every respect accomplished." When about twenty years of age, he was introduced by his father to the imperial presence and into the imperial service. A romantic and picturesque story is narrated in the indigenous ChronICLES in connection with his advent into the emperor's service. In accordance with the custom of those days, we are told, the emperor brought, as a result of the chase, a wild buffalo from the neighbouring woods, to be offered, on the tenth day of the Navarāṭrī festival, as a sacrifice to Durga, the guardian deity of Vijayānagar, the celebrated Bhuvanēvari of Vidyārāgya's devotion and worship. It was widely believed that the efficacy and fruitfulness of the sacrifice depended on the head of the beast's being severed from the body at a single stroke. The superstition of the day held that if the victim had to be struck twice, a disaster was in store for the empire. Now it happened that the buffalo which was led to the sacrificial altar had such long, strong and irregular horns that it became a serious problem how to cut its head off at one stroke. The Emperor, courtiers and people were in despair, when young Viṣvanāthā, we are told, came to the rescue. He was, we are further informed, induced by the goddess herself, in a vision, to offer himself as the executioner, provided he was given a particular sword in the king's armoury. When the youth made his appearance before the anxious Emperor and offered his service, he was not believed to be earnest, but the fervent solicitude of the young hero, his earnest offer to sacrifice his life in case of failure, made Kṛṣṇa-Dēva agree to try him. And the emperor had no reason to be sorry for his decision. To his unbounded joy and enthusiasm, the young soldier performed his task with remarkable success. As a reward for his service, Kṛṣṇa-Dēva declared him a public benefactor, a saviour of the State from a catastrophe, and promised him before long, inasmuch as he deserved a crown and kingdom, the dignity of royalty. At the same time he distinguished the favourite's merit by appointing him to the command of a section of the army. As a general, Viṣvanāthā's career was a brilliant one. He distinguished himself with such glory in the subjugation of certain enemies of the empire in the north, that the emperor raised him to a high rank, and bestowed on him all honours and privileges as well as the ensigns and trophies which his valour had taken from the conquered chiefs.

(To be continued)

46 The Hist. Curn. Govern or gives details. It points out how Nāgama and his wife bathed daily in the Ganges, ate everyday only three handfuls of rice, and waited on the god Viṣvanāthā day and night in the temple. They did so for forty days, when the god appeared to them in a vision, expressed his satisfaction at their penance, promised to give them a sight of his person the next day in the Ganges, and declared that their object would be fulfilled. The next day the pious couple, while bathing in the Ganges, felt a piece of stone coming into contact with their knees. They went to another spot, but here also the same thing happened, and once again in a third spot. They now found that it was an emerald linga. Realising at once that it was the god's fulfilment of his promise, Nāgama returned to his country. About a year afterwards Viṣvanāthā was born. The Mirt. Mat. give a slightly different version. See also the various Polygar Memoirs, where there is ample reference to this story.

47 The Navarāṭrī was the most important festival in the Vijayānagar Empire. Both the imperial and the provincial court celebrated it with great splendour. See Sewell's Fors. Empe, 86, 175 and 376, and Madr. Manu III, 285. For stray accounts of the worship of Bhuvanēvari see Rais catal. II 427-55.

48 It is not known who these were. The Hist. Curn. Govern or says they were feudal chieftains in the north, who withheld the tribute to be paid by them. One of the Martarjya MSS says they were the kings of Agra, Vāngā, Kāli-ya, Kāmra, Nēpāla, etc. This is of course absurd. Taylor suggests that they were the princesses of Kondavījū, Wārangāl, Cuttack and the Bahmani Sultaṇas. See O. B. MSS. II, 143 and appendix I.
HÁTHAL PLATES1 OF (PARAMÁRA) DHÁRÁVARSHA

[VIKRAMA] SAMVAT 1237 (1180 A.D.).

BY SÁHITYAÇHÁRYA PANDIT VISHWESHWAR NATH SHASTRI, JODHPUR.

This inscription was found in the Háthal village in the Sirohi State about 3 miles North-West of Mount Ábú. It is engraved on two copper plates, each of which measures about 6\(\frac{1}{2}\) in. broad by 5\(\frac{1}{2}\) in. high and contains a ring hole but the ring has been lost.

Each plate is engraved on one side only. One of these plates contains 10 lines and the other 11. But the 11th line seems to be a post script, for the letters in this line differ widely from the others.

The characters are Nāgari of the 12th century. The language is very incorrect Sanskrit. This may be due to the fault of the engraver. It is written in prose throughout except the three imprecatory verses (lines 15 to 20 of the second plate). In respect of orthography the letters \(b\) and \(v\) are both denoted by the sign for \(u\).

This inscription is dated Thursday, the 11th of the bright half of Kārtika in the [Vikrama] year 1237, and refers to the reign of Dhárávarsha, who, in this inscription, is styled the descendant of Dhámañjádeva, Rája of Ábú who is described in the inscriptions of Ábú2 and Girvar3 as the founder of the Paramára clan.4

The minister, at that time, was Kovidá. The day of the charter specified in the inscription is Devottháni Ekhádi; and it says the following with regard to the donee Bhaṣṭáraaka Visala Ugradamaka, áchárya of ivadharmá: (1) That he be granted .... in Sáhilivájá. (2) That he be permitted to graze his cattle on the pasture grounds free of charge. (3) That a pasture land be granted him in Kumbháranú. (4) That he be granted an area of land which can be tilled with two ploughs in a day. (5) In the 11th line of the second plate, which is supposed to be a postscript it is mentioned that the pastures of Mágavájí and Háthalájí villages also be granted to him.

Lines 5-10 of the second plate contain curses on those princes who would deprive him of these privileges.

Of the localities mentioned here Háthalájí is obviously Háthal where the plates were found. In the 16th century inscriptions, this village bears the name of Brahmasthána. This

1 The ink impressions of these plates were kindly given to me by Rai Bahadur Pandit Gauri Shankar H. Ojha, Superintendent, Rajputana Museum, Ajmer.

2 तनाथ नैछवार्धनिय Nála Thevávalikádráputá: पुरानतत् ||

मथा युगंज्ञ: परमारेन्द्रवं स्वाश्रयं परिपर्वतवत् || १६ ||

पुरा सस्तानवं राजा पुर्णाराज्याभ्यो भवत् ||

केश्व चुरुणाय ज्ञेय स्वस्त: संस्थापाद || १२ ||

(Unpublished Inscription in the Achatálvara temple at Ábú).

3 जनमु किंवतंत्रं: सप्तवानसमाननादस्तिन्दुपुरस्वपनीन्द्रवतरुपीः ||

बिलासनन्दक नान्दक: भी माहिति: कम्पित सुमनाने कुरुतवन्ते च | च चेते: || ७ ||

आचार्यस्वमेव पौराणिकोऽद्विं शब्दांशं परमाराजस्वितः ||

सर्वे वस्तुधर्मनिरार्थे सं पौराणिकोऽच च नारायण नामस || ६ ||

(Pánárdráya Inscription of Girvar). I shall edit this inscription also as soon as possible.

4 भूभुजाक: प्रहरं बन्धु भूभुजाकानां नंदेविदोऽ ||

भूभुजाक: प्रहरं बन्धु भूभुजाकानां नंदेविदोऽ ||

name must have been given to it either because it was granted to Brähmaśa by Paramāra princes, or because there was a temple of Brahmā near it which is now in ruins.

Text.

First Plate.

1. Dr. 1239 चारापण्य 19 या कालिक पुन: मार वाचक 5. 6
2. याचारण्य 6 धर्मकारिकानमययाहु को भोगहृदयस्य. 8
3. द्विपिनातिशुलायमनह द्वारककनलीये (घो) तनसह न को...
"SHANDY" AND "SHINDY"

1. Madras residents in Madras know from experience the weekly market at which provisions are purchased for the next week, and which is termed "sandai." At Octacumund it lasts till night and winds up with the merry songs of the inebriated Bajagras who are returning to their distant haunts.

The word "sandai" is the Tamil form of Sanskrit "sandha," while "sandi" and "sandu" are derived from "sandha." I have noted the Anglo-Indian form "shandy = Tamil "sandai" in the following amusing extract from the "Madras Mail" of May 1890, which professes to be a reply to a query that had been inserted by the then Collector of Kurnool:

RABBITS AND GOVERNMENT.

Sir—"To keep rabbits on the plains," send your boy to the local "shandy" for some string, adjust it in loops and pass them over the heads of the rabbits, draw up and fasten to the legs of a four poster bedstead. This is the most effectual way of keeping rabbits on the plains, and prevent them wandering to the hills. Can Mr. Rough kindly tell a fellow countryman the best means of keeping Government on the plains, especially in April and May?"

Erin-Go-Bragh.

2. In the Slang Dictionary (1874) the word "shindy" is explained by "a row, or noise." I have found the following instances of its use.

(a) In chapter 36 of Thackeray's *Pendennis* (1845-50) the Major's valet Morgan remarks with reference to the French chef Mirobalan:—

(book notice)


The genealogy of old dynasties is one of the traditional topics of the Purāṇas, and the lists of ancient rulers contained in them were at an early date considered as authentic by the Brahmans. When the later dynasties started the practice of deriving their genealogies from the ancient kings of India, these lists were largely made use of, and we can frequently trace their influence in inscriptions. No critical scholar would think of considering them as authenticated history. On the other hand, they are not merely poetical fictions, and critical scholars like Sir R. C. Bhandarkar have shown to what extent they can be utilised in reconstructing the ancient history of India.

One great difficulty, in using these lists, has hitherto been that they have had to be consulted in so many different works, and that these latter ones are not available in critical editions,
Mr. Pargiter, who has long devoted much time to the study of the Purânas, has now helped us out of this difficulty. In a handy volume he has brought together the accounts of the dynasties of the Kali Age contained in the Matayā, Vāyu, Brahmāṣṭiya, Viṣṇu, Bhāgavata and Gauḍa Purānas. In addition to the printed editions of these works he has compared a great number of manuscripts, so that it is now easy to see at a glance, in every particular case, how the different sources read.

It will be apparent even from a superficial perusal of Mr. Pargiter's book how much the various accounts agree, and we are forced to the conclusion that they are all derived from a common source. This source must, according to Mr. Pargiter, be the Bhavishya-purāṇa, for we are often told that kings will be enumerated as they have been handed down (kathita or pañhitā) in the Bhavishya. Now it is a curious fact that the account of the same dynasties actually occurring in the Bhavishya does not agree at all and is evidently very late. There are, as is well known, two recensions of the Bhavishya-purāṇa, one of which even contains the Biblical history of Adam and Eve. On the other hand, a Bhavishyapurāṇa is mentioned in the Āpastambisahasrāstra, i.e., from a period previous to these dynasties. We thus know that there existed an old Bhavishya-purāṇa, which was added to and recast in the course of time. Mr. Pargiter has not taken up the question about the various recensions which are now available. On the whole, a critical study on the Purāṇas is a great desideratum, and will have to be taken in hand as soon as we get a critical edition of the Mahābhārata.

I should think that Mr. Pargiter must have brought together much material for such a study. It is to be hoped that he will some day make them available to the student.

Mr. Pargiter contends that the source of these accounts was written in Prakrit and probably in Kharoṣṭhī characters. The question about the original language of the Indian epic has often been discussed, and the arguments in favour of the Prakrit hypothesis have usually been the same, and never quite convincing. We cannot overlook the fact that the Indian epics have largely been handed down orally, and that their wording has not been safeguarded in the same way as in the case of the Vedas. Our manuscripts, which are all late, must therefore necessarily present many irregularities. In such circumstances we cannot wonder if we find several Prakritisms in the Purāṇas. The same is, as is well known, the case in Indian Sanskrit inscriptions, and it does not prove that there was once a Prakrit original. The instances of wrong rhythm in the verses are just as little significant, if we remember how late our manuscripts are.

We must also remember that the classical Prakrits are not very old forms of speech. If the Indian epics were not originally written in Sanskrit, they must have been written in some old vernacular and not in the Prakrit described in Pischel's grammar. If Mr. Pargiter is right in assuming that aklinda is occasionally misread instead of abda dāsa, it should be remembered that abda is Sanskrit and not Prakrit. Everything depends on what is understood under the terms, Sanskrit and Prakrit. If the word Sanskrit is used to denote only the classical Sanskrit of the grammarians and if every thing else is called Prakrit, then Mr. Pargiter may be right. But if we include the Vedic dialects and the epic language of the Mahābhārata in Sanskrit, then I do not think that we can agree. The Purāṇas are throughout Brahmanical, and the sacred language of Brahmanical literature was Sanskrit, in this wider sense of the word.

The theory that the oldest Puranic account of the dynasties of the Kali Age was written in the Kharoṣṭhī alphabet, is based on a still unsound foundation. That we occasionally find y for i and I for i in late manuscripts, does not prove anything whatever.

If all the Puranic accounts, for instance, had Ayokà instead of Aioka, we should have to account for it. But occasional mistakes of this kind do not make it even probable that the account of the Kali Age dynasties was originally written in Kharoṣṭhī. It is not the case that “Kharoṣṭhī is the oldest Indian script that we know of,” and if the accounts of the dynasties of the Kali Age were drawn up or at least closed in the fourth century A.D., the Kharoṣṭhī theory becomes very unlikely indeed.

On the whole, I am inclined to disagree with Mr. Pargiter about several questions dealt with in the introduction and the notes. I also think that it would have added to the usefulness of the book if tables of the different dynasties had been added. As Mr. Pargiter's book is, however, it should be received with sincere gratitude. It bears testimony to prolonged and careful work, and the exhaustive critical notes added to the texts are an important feature of the book. A work of this kind has long been wanted, and we must be very thankful to Mr. Pargiter for making it as reliable and handy as he has done.
THE TRUE AND EXACT DAY OF BUDDHA'S DEATH.

BY DIWAN BAHADUR L. D. SWAMIKANNU PILLAI, M.A., B.L. (MADRAS); LL.B. (LOND.).

THE object of the subjoined chart is to show that the true date of Buddha's death (Tuesday, 1 April, 478 B.C.), is deducible from the eight week-day dates cited in Bishop Bigandet's Life of Gaudama (Trübner's Oriental Series). The demonstration is accomplished by selecting 5 out of the many dates which have from time to time been associated with Buddha (see a long list of such dates at p. 165 of Vol. II of Prinsep's Tables) and testing the week-days of the several occurrences with reference to each of these dates. The dates selected were:

1. 1027 B.C., which is the most frequently occurring among the dates collected by Prinsep;
2. 901 B.C., corresponding to 980 B.C. for the birth, and to 991 B.C., which is said to be quoted by Jachirig from Pallas' Mongol Chronology (Prinsep, loc. cit.);
3. 846 B.C., corresponding to 835 B.C., which is said by Prinsep to be the era adopted at Lhassa and founded on an average of 9 dates: 846 B.C. appears to be the date of "Buddha's appearance" alluded to in a well-known Tamil Buddhistic poem of 8th cent. A.D. called "Manimekhalai;"
4. 638 B.C., known as the Peguan date; and lastly,
5. 478 B.C., Cunningham's second date, which, at p. 22 of J. R. A. S., 1909, Dr. Fleet admits to be an alternative to his own date, 483 B.C., Karthika sukla 8.

In selecting supposed dates for trial, I have endeavoured to limit myself to typical ones, i.e. to those which have at least some points in their favour. I made an exception in favour of 846 B.C., because, though wide of the mark, it is a curious date and seems to have been adopted by Tamil Buddhists of the 8th century A.D. [I have published a magazine article on this subject, a copy of which I shall be glad to send to any one genuinely interested in it]. Other dates, which might have been selected, had to be rejected in limine, because the week-days were obviously unsuitable. This remark applies to 544 B.C., which would give a Sunday (instead of Tuesday) as the day of Buddha's death, as well as to 543 B.C., in which the tithi and nakshatra of Buddha's death concurred on a Friday. As

N.B.—The following abbreviations are used in this chart.

1. su. for sukla, the bright fortnight of a lunar month. Bahula paka is not referred to even once in the chart.
2. f.d.t. and f.d.n. These symbols indicate respectively that a tithi or a nakshatra ended on the following day after that cited as the day of the tithi or the day of the nakshatra. Ordinarily a tithi or a nakshatra is cited as belonging to the day on which it comes to end but occasionally, it is cited as belonging to the day when it only commences. "F.d.t." and "f.d.n." mean accordingly "following day's tithi" and "following day's nakshatra."
3. The ending moments of tithis and nakshatras are generally given correct to two decimal places of a day. The key to this system will be found in the author's Eye-table.
   Thus 01 means 12 ghatikas after sunrise.
4. When both tithi and nakshatra are cited, the ending moment of the tithi is given first, and then the ending moment of the nakshatra.
5. The English calendar years cited in pairs run from 1 March to 0 March, (i.e. the last day of February). Thus 1096-95 B.C. is the period from 1 March 1096 to 28 February 1095. At the epoch we are considering, this period coincided very nearly with an Indian solar sidereal year.
6. The expression "preceded by an ashtika month" draws attention to the circumstance that the lunar year under consideration was one of 13, not of 12, months.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week-Day dates in Bugazet's Life of Gautama.</th>
<th>Supposed central date 1277 B.C.</th>
<th>Supposed central date 961 B.C.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In Vol. II, p. 134, footnote, appended to this error as to this date; see para. (8) of explanatory note.</td>
<td>Vol. I, p. 26; Vol. II, p. 71.</td>
<td>2 Eetzana Era, year 0 marked by Phalgun Sukha 1 in 1049-46 B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Birth of Buddha year 68; Vaisakha, Purnima; Nakshatra = &quot;Vikrama.&quot;</td>
<td>1056-97 B.C., Friday, April 11, 1057 B.C.; 24, 16.</td>
<td>1055-79 B.C., Friday, April 1, 950 B.C.; 96; f. d. n. 45.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conception occurring under water Nakshatra, &quot;Uttara Ashadha,&quot; but nakshatra had ended on Sat. at 49. This was Shravana full-moon.</td>
<td>2. Phalgun Sukha 1 in 951-80 B.C. marked Eetzana 68 expired (1049 less 981).</td>
<td>3. Phalgun Sukha 1 in 951-80 B.C. marked Eetzana 68 expired (1049 less 991).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Buddha leaves Kapilavastu—year 96, Sunday, Ashadha Full Moon—Nakshatra = &quot;Uttara Ashadha&quot;; and enters into scoliptic next day, Monday.</td>
<td>959-96 n. c. Tithi ended on Sunday June 29, 959 n. c. at 31 and Nakshatra had ended on Sat. at 49. This was Shravana full-moon.</td>
<td>952-51 n. c.; Sunday, June 19, 952 n. c. at 98; 96.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol. I, pp. 69, 64 (per 957).</td>
<td>N.B.—1. Nak on Sund. was not Uttara Ashadha.</td>
<td>N.B.—1. This was Ashadha full-moon (preceded by adhika month).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol. II, p. 72 (per 956).</td>
<td>2. Phalgun Sukha 1 in 953-52 B.C. marked Eetzana 96 expired (1049 less 953) and 97 current.</td>
<td>2. Phalgun Sukha 1 in 953-52 B.C. marked Eetzana 96 expired (1049 less 953) and 97 current.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Attestment of perfect wisdom—year—103, Vaisakha full moon; Vaiśāka Nakshatra; Wednesday.</td>
<td>992-91 n. c.; Wednesday, April 14-17, 992 a. C. = pūrṇima, but nakshatra Vaiśāka had ended on Tuesday at 77 of day.</td>
<td>945-44 n. c.; Wed. 4 April 945 B.C.; 91.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol. I, p. 97; a little before the break of day.</td>
<td>N.B.—1. Nak on Wed. was not Vaiśāka.</td>
<td>N.B.—Phalgun Sukha 1 in 946-45 B.C. marked Eetzana year 103 expired (1049 less 946).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Death of Buddha's father Buddhodana—year 107; full moon of Wakaung (=rivana); at sun rise on Saturday.</td>
<td>998-87 n. c.; Friday, June 27-30, 998 B.C.; śrāvana full-moon.</td>
<td>941-40 n. c.; Sunday, July 17-20, 941 B.C. full moon of Velma (preceded by adhika month).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Death of Buddha—year 148; Vaiśāka, full moon. Nak. Vaiśāka Tuesday: a little before day break.</td>
<td>948-47 n. c.; Tuesday, 7 April, 948 B.C.; 94; 97.</td>
<td>901-99 n. c.; Wed. Mar. 21, 901 n. c.; 71; 89.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol. II, pp. 63, 72.</td>
<td>N.B.—Phalgun Sukha 1 in 948-47 B.C. marked Eetzana 148 current or Eetzana 147 expired.</td>
<td>N.B.—1. Nak = &quot;Vasikha&quot; commenced at 04 on Wed. and was not current on Tuesday.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol. II, p. 113. The week day was possibly Sunday which appears in another version recorded for the event; side footnote to p. 113.</td>
<td>N.B.—This was the Phalgun before Buddha's death and marked new era year 0. Phalgun Sukha 1 in 948-47 B.C. marked year 1 expired of new religious era.</td>
<td>2. 902-01 B.C. Philg. Su. I was Sunday, Jan. 16, 901 B.C.; 34; the same day was Adi Chandraya.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol. I, and para. (6) of explanatory note.</td>
<td>N.B.—This was the Phalgun before Buddha's death and marked year 0 of the new religious era. Phalgun Sukha 1 in 901-00 B.C. marked year 1 expired of new religious era.</td>
<td>N.B.—This was the Phalgun before Buddha's death and marked new era year 0 of the new religious era. Phalgun Sukha 1 in 901-00 B.C. marked year 1 expired of new religious era.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
is deducible from the week-days dates cited in Bishop Bigandet's members of the Dinner. 2. Ettana year 0 marked by Phalguna Sukta 1 in B.C. 915-14.

Supposed central date 916 B.C.

916-15 B.C.; Phalguna Sukta 1 was Monday, 20 January 916 B.C.; 71. N.B.—Sat. was not Phalguna Sukta 1 or 2. 2. Abolition of old Kausika Era.

916-15 B.C.; Chaitra Sukta 1—Wed, Feb 19 10, 915 B.C.

N.B.—Sunday was not Adi Chandraya.

2. Ettana year 0 marked by Phalguna Sukta 1 in B.C. 915-14.

Supposed central date 638 B.C.

637-36 B.C.; Phalguna Sukta 1 ended on Sat, Jan 29 99 636 B.C. N.B.—Abolition of old Kausika Era.

637-36 B.C.; Chaitra Sukta 1 ended on Sunday Feb 24 57 636 B.C.

N.B.—Ettana Era, year 0 began on Phalguna Su. 1 in 638 B.C.

N.B.—Ettana Era, year 0 began on Phalguna Su. 1 in 638 B.C.

N.B.—Tuesday, April 20; 567 B.C.; 36; 21. N.B.—Uttara Sandya Era: 14 ended on Thursday at 08.

(2) Phalguna Su. 1 in 647-46 B.C marked Ettana 98 (915 less 847).

818-17 B.C.; Wed, 9 June, 818 B.C.; 48; f. d. n. 72.

N.B.—This was Ashadh full moon but neither thitii nor nak fell on Sunday.

2. Phalg. Su. 1 in 619-18 B.C. marked Ettana 96 expired (915 less 819) and nak current.

811-10 B.C.; Sat, 25 March; 811 B.C.; 19; f. d. n. 32.

N.B.—Week day was not Wednesday.


807-06 B.C.; Wed, 7 July, 807 B.C.; 17.

N.B. Svarana full moon, but week day was not Sat.


767-66 B.C.; Sun, 17 Apr, 767 B.C.; 14 Nak. “Vishaka” ended on Sat, 17 April.


766-57 B.C. Phalg. (preceded by adika month). Sukta 1 was Wed, 2 Feb; 90.


Correct central date 478 B.C.

477-26 B.C.; Phalguna Su. 1, (preceded by adika month) ended on Sat, Feb 4 476 B.C.; 37. N.B.—Abolition of Kausika Era.

475-23 B.C.; New moon at the beginning of Chaitra month was Sat, March 4 99, 475 B.C. Sukta 1 ended on Monday, March 6 at 05 and this was first Chandraya, Sukta 1 was current throughout Sunday.

N.B.—Phalguna Su. 1 in 475-23 B.C. marks Ettana year 0 expired (636 less 558).

539-28 B.C.; Nija Ashadh full moon and Nakshatra “Vidhata” ended at 59 and 42 respectively of Sunday, 22 June, 529 B.C.

N.B.—Phalguna Su. 1 in 530-29 B.C. marks Ettana year 96 expired (636 less 559) and nak current.

522-31 B.C.; Wednesday, 6 August, 522 B.C.; 31; 74.

N.B.—Phalguna Su. 1 in 523-22 B.C. marks Ettana 103 expired (636 less 533).

518-17 B.C.; Full moon tithe of Svarana commenced on Sat, 20 July, 518 B.C. at 61 and ended on Sund, 21 July at 31 of day.

Saturday, at sunrise of which, Sudhodana died, was slowly called of Full Moon, although this description was properly applicable to neither, Monday.

N.B.—Phalg. Su. 1 in 518-18 B.C. marks Ettana 107 expired (636 less 519).

478-77 B.C.; “Vishaka” nakshatra commenced at 87 on Tuesday, 1 April, 478 B.C. and ended at 39 on Wed, 18th was current all Tuesday and ended on Wednesday about sunrise.

N.B.—Phalguna Su. 1 in 479-78 B.C. marks Ettana 147 expired, 480 B.C. (915 less 788). Phalguna Sukta 1 ended on Monday, 8 April, 480 B.C. at 72.

N.B.—Phalguna Su. 1 in 478-78 B.C. marks year 0 of new religious era. Year 1 expired is therefore marked by Phalguna Su. 1 in 479-77 B.C. Ettana 148 expired (656 less 478).
regards 483 B.C., I must say, with reference to Bigandet's week-days, that a more improbable year would be difficult to find, since in that year Vaśākha pūrṇimā ended on Saturday March 28-90, while Nak. "Viśākha" commenced on Sunday, March 29-92 and came to end on Sunday, March 29-98: in other days, pūrṇimā and "Viśākha" Nak., did not concur in Vaśākha month of that year for even one second of time. The year, 484 B.C. is a more probable year, because both Vaśākha su. 15 and "Viśākha" Nak. ended in that year on a Tuesday.

An additional reason for selecting (2) 901 B.C., was that if any year was likely to yield week-days identical with those yielded by 478 B.C., it was 901 B.C., on account of a well-known principle in Indian Chronology that week-days, tithis and nakshatras generally repeat themselves on the same days of the Indian sidereal year once in 423 years. The year 901 B.C. does yield week-days closely similar to those yielded by 478 B.C., except that it fails at the most important point and brings out the week-day of Buddha's death as Wednesday instead of Tuesday.

It will be seen that the only year for Buddha's death which brings out all the week-days correctly is 478 B.C. The number of tests could be multiplied, but we may be fairly certain that the result would always go to confirm 478 B.C.

This being so, it becomes an important question when these week-days were first recorded. Evidently, not during Buddha's life time or shortly after his death, because the week-day, as a detail for ordinary citation was not known in Europe till the 3rd century A.D. and probably was not known in India till at least the 5th century A.D.; indeed, week-day citations are not commonly met with in India till the 8th century A.D.—[See on the whole subject of the Indian week-day, Dr. Fleet's valuable articles in Oct. issue of J. R. A. S. for 1912 pp. 1039-1052.]

The Burmese chronicle, translated by Bishop Bigandet, is called Malla-linkara wouttoo and was composed about A.D. 1773, but Prof. Rhys Davids testifies to the substantial, even verbal, identity of that chronicle with the Jātaka commentary current in Ceylon in 5th century A.D. (Prof. Rhys Davids, cited by Mr. Harry C. Norman in J. R. A. S. 1908 p. 15). We may, therefore, assume that the week-days in Bigandet's Life of Gauḍama were calculated retrospectively by some one between the 5th and the 8th century A.D.: but even so, we are led to infer that the true date of Buddha's death, though forgotten, as Dr. Fleet has shown, by 1,200 A.D. in Ceylon, had been preserved in the traditions of Buddhists for at least a thousand years after the death of Buddha.

There are certain points worthy of note in the calendar system disclosed by an investigation of these week-days:

(1) In this calendar there runs throughout an implied distinction between the commencement of an "era", and the commencement of a "year". The commencement of eras was shifted from time to time, it was sukha 1 of Chaitra of a particular year under the Ectzana Era, and under the New Religious Era, it was associated with the date of Buddha's death; but what is clear is, that the commencement of the year was always the...

1 There is a possibility (though it seems to me highly improbable,) that the author of Malla-linkara wouttoo may have himself calculated the week-days in accordance with the modern Burmese Calendar, which has been in use in Burma since 1738 A.D. In Ind. Ant., Vol. xxxix (1910), Sir Alfred Irwin has given the elements of the Burmese calendar from A.D. 638 to A.D. 1752, but adds: "It is not certain what calendars were actually observed in Burma before the year 1,100 Burmese Era, etc. A.D. 1,738." I hope shortly to be able to verify and state in this Journal whether, according to the modern Burmese calendar, the week-days in Bigandet could be located anywhere else than in the years shown in the last column of my chart. Bigandet is certainly in error in supposing, in footnote to p. 133, Vol. II, and elsewhere, that they can be located with reference to 513 B.C., and the central date.
same, i.e., sukla 1 of Tabaong or Phalgun. As an analogous case, we may cite the era of the reformed English calendar which began on 14 Sep. A. D. 1752, though the commencement of the year was always the same as before, the 1st of January.

(2) Secondly, it is apparent, except in the case of the last date on the chart, that the commencement of the lunar month under this ancient calendar, was sukla 1 or pratipada, as in the present day Indian calendar, and not the first heliacal rising of the moon, as in the Jewish and the Muhammadan calendar. In the excepted case I suspect, as observed in paragraph (6) of this note, a wrong reading in Bigandet’s English Translation (Vol. II p. 113) of Monday for Sunday. On the other hand, the phrase idi chandrodaya dinae quoted by Dr. Fleet from Dipavamsa (J. R. A. S. 1909), seems to refer, not necessarily to sukla 1, as assumed by him, but to the first day when the crescent was actually visible, and in 242 B. C., as shown below, this was actually sukla 2. The ordinary rule is, that if sukla 1, ends before 42 of a day, (25 ghaṭikās after sunrise) the crescent will rise the same evening and that if sukla 1 ends later than 38 of a day, (35 ghaṭikās after sunrise), the crescent will only appear next day. Between these limits, the day of the first appearance of the crescent is a matter of calculation.

Among other indications going to show that the “first of the moon” or “the first of the waxing moon” in Bishop Bigandet’s translation is meant for sukla 1 is the following, which is also otherwise interesting. We are told at p. 107 of Vol. 1 that for 49 days from the attainment of perfect Buddhahood i.e. from Vaisākha pūrṇimā, Buddha did not taste food, and that on the 50th day which was the 5th of the moon of Watso he was hungry. [Bigandet’s translation in this place “5th after the full moon of Watso” is an obvious mistake, since (1) 49 days from Vaisākha pūrṇimā can only take us to sukla 5 (29) + 14 1/2 + 5 = 49) in Watso or Āśādha, and (2) we know from p. 118 of Vol. 1 that some days after the conclusion of the 49 days fast, Buddha preached a sermon at exact full moon and exact sunset; this we may identify as Āśādha pūrṇimā or Watso full moon — which tithi, in 522 B. C., ended on 6 June at 40 of the day or a little while before sunset.] The 50th day from Vaisākha pūrṇimā in 522 B. C. was Wednesday, 27 May = Āśādha (or watso) sukla 5, which tithi ended at 78 of the day. In this case, sukla 1 was first moon rise, but as sukla 1 ended on May 24-18, the 5th tithi, if it had been counted from first moon rise, would have been Thursday, May 28, the 51st day, not Wednesday the 50th day counted from Vaisākha pūrṇimā. It is clear, therefore, that tithis in the text translated by Bigandet were calculated, as now, from new moon and not from the first moon-rise.

(3) On the relative merits of 483 B. C. and 478 B. C. as years of Buddha’s death, Dr. Fleet remarked, at p. 22 of J. R. A. S. 1909: “For the latter occurrence” (the anointment of Devānaṃpiya Tissa), “the mention of the Āśādha nakṣatra indicates 247 B. C. or 242 B. C. The choice thus lies between 247+236 B. C. = 483 and 242+236 B. C. = 478 B. C. The earlier year is preferentially supported by a consideration of the circumstances which paved the way to the acquisition of sovereignty by Chandragupta.”

It will be seen from the author’s “Eye-Table” that Nakṣatra Pūrva Āśādha can coincide with Mārgaśira sukla 1 or sukla 2 (on either of which days Devānaṃpiya Tissa was anointed) only in a year in which some month previous to Mārgaśira was adhika. This was the case with the years 247 B. C. and 242 B. C., and Dr. Fleet is, therefore, perfectly right in observing that the choice lies between these years. There is, however, this noteworthy difference between these two years. In 242 B. C., the year of anointment of Devānaṃpiya Tissa, corresponding to 478 B. C. for Buddha’s
death, Mārgaśīra śukla 2 ended on November 14, at 51 1/2 ghaṭikās (in Lanka time) after mean sunrise, and as śukla 1 had ended at the corresponding part of the previous day, it is clear, from the rule cited above, that śukla 2, Nov. 14, was ādi chandraśaya dina or first moon rise in the month. Nakṣatram Pūrva Āśāṣṭha was current all through Nov. 14 and came to end at 2 1/2 ghaṭikās after mean sunrise next day. The case was very different in 247 B.C., since, in that year, Mārgaśīra śukla 1 ended at 9 ghaṭikās after mean sunrise on 6 November, it is evident that that was ādi chandraśaya dina or the day when the crescent first appeared, Nakṣatra Pūrva Āśāṣṭha, however, commenced only at 50 1/2 ghaṭikās after sunrise on the same day, i.e., 2 hours after midnight and was current for only about 9 1/2 ghaṭikās at the very end of the day. The anointment could, of course, have been performed in what we should call the small hours of the morning of 7 November, 247 B.C. so as to bring the ceremony within the influence of Pūrva Āśāṣṭha, but generally speaking, such a day would not be called a day of Pūrva Āśāṣṭha, whereas 14 Nov. 242 B.C. was strictly a day when Pūrva Āśāṣṭha joined with the ādi chandraśaya dina of Mārgaśīra. So far, the calculation of nakṣatras appears to point to 242 B.C. rather than to 247 B.C. as the year of anointment of Devānāmipya-Tissa; and consequently, to 473 B.C. rather than to 483 B.C., as the year of Buddha’s death. Dr. Fleet promised to exhibit in a separate article, the process of determining the nakṣatras, but to the best of my belief he has not done so yet. The determination is very easy by the tables and method of my Indian Chronology.

(4) One of the reasons which led Dr. Fleet to adopt Kārttika śukla 8 rather than the traditional Vaiśākhā śukla 15 as the day of Buddha’s death, was that, on the latter assumption, it was not possible to place the two anointments of Devānāmipya-Tissa 247 B.C., Mārgaśīra Śukla 1, and 246 B.C., Vaiśākhā śukla 15, as well as the arrival of Mahindo in Ceylon (B.C. 247 Jayaśaṅha śukla 15) within the year designated by Dipavamsa as “236 years after the death of Buddha,” i.e., after 483 B.C., Vaiśākhā Śukla 15. He argued rightly that if each “Vaiśākhā śukla 15” was the commencement of a new year, the arrival of Mahindo at any rate must belong to a year later than 236 expired of the Buddha era, which would be complete on Vaiśākhā Śukla 15, 247, B.C. Now, if as I have shown above, the ancient Buddhist year always took its departure from śukla 1 of Phāluguna, then it follows (a) that year 236 expired of the religious era would be marked by Phāluguna śukla 1 in (473 B.C. less 236 =) 233 B.C., and (b) that the second and third events, referred to above would both fall within the space designated by a single year, 236 expired, (running from 243 B.C., Phāluguna Śukla 1 to 242 B.C., Māgha Amāvasā). Such being the case, the necessity for adopting Kārttika śukla 8 as the day of Buddha’s death, in great measure, ceases. Dr. Fleet seems to think that both the anointments of Devānāmipya-Tissa should be placed within the 237th year current after the death of Buddha. I do not know if the text of Dipavamsa requires this construction. The text, as quoted by him (J.R.A.S. 1909, p. 11) makes two statements, (1) that Devānāmipya-Tissa was anointed 236 years after the death of Buddha; (2) that he was twice anointed. It may be that the 1st anointment was in the 236th year current, towards its close, and the second in the 237th year current.

(5) It follows from an examination of these week-day dates that Buddha’s age at the time of his death was 79 complete years, not 80 years, and that supposing he was born in the year 68 of the Eeczana Era, he could be said to have died in the year 148 of that era only in the sense that the year 148 was varottamāna or current. See however, division (8) below of this note.
Bishop Bigandet remarks in a footnote on p. 133 of Vol. II that the Kauzda Era was abolished on a certain Saturday which was the new moon of Tabao (March) and that the Eotzana Era commenced next day Sunday the first after the same new moon. This of course is not correct, since the old era was abolished with effect from Phâûgûna (Tabaon) suka 1 (See Vol. I p. 13), while the new era was brought into force with effect from suka 1 of the next month Chaîtra (=Tagu).

On the other hand, while referring to the commencement of the New Religious Era (the era of Nirvana), Bigandet has made a mistake just the converse of the above. He says (foot note on the same p. 133 of Vol. II): “In the year 148, the first day of the month of Tabao (April), which fell on a Sunday, was fixed as the beginning of the new computation, emphatically called the era of religion, 543 B.C.” We need not concern ourselves with 543 B.C. (As a matter of fact, the first of the new moon of Chaîtra or Tabao in 543 B.C. was Wednesday, not Sunday.) But it will be seen from a comparison of this passage with those at p. 13 of Vol. I and p. 113 of Vol. II, (1) that where Bigandet affirms Phâûgûna Su. 1 to have been the beginning of the Kauzda Era, he should have said this of Chaîtra su. 1; and (2) that where he affirms Chaîtra su. 1 to have been the beginning of the New Religious Era, he should have said this of Phâûgûna su. 1. So far, there may have been, on his part, a mere mistake of transposition of months, but in saying (in foot note to p. 133, Vol. II.) that Sunday was the beginning of the new religious era (Era of Buddha’s death), he is backed by the calculations exhibited in my chart against the 8th date; and contradicted by his own statement in the text (p. 113 of Vol. II), that the New Religious Era began on a Monday. Should my conjecture that Sunday was the proper week-day in this case prove justified by a reference to the Burmese Manuscript used by Bigandet or to any other original text, then it will follow that “first of the waxing moon” throughout the chronicle translated by Bigandet means “Suka pratipada,” and not the first heliacal rising of the moon.

7) In one or two instances, details of dates, not explicitly affirmed by Bigandet, have had to be supplied from other circumstances stated by him. Thus, as regards the birth of Buddha, we are told, in the first place (Vol. I, p. 28), that he entered the womb of his mother Mâyâ at a full moon under the Constellation “Oottarathan” (‘Uttara Ashâdha”). Reference to the Eye-Table appended to my “Indian Chronology” will show that this must have been the Full Moon of Srâvana. As Buddha was born 9 months later under the constellation “Withaka” (‘Viśâkha’). (Vol. II, p. 71), the birth, as may be seen from the same table, must have taken place at the Viśâkha full moon, not 6 days after the same full moon, (as stated erroneously in the footnote to p. 47 Vol. I), when Nakshatra “Viśâkha” would be an impossibility.

Similarly, when we are told (Vol. I, pp. 62-64) that Buddha, preparatory to embracing the life of an ascetic, left Kapilavastu “at the full moon of “July” under the constellation “Oottarathan,” we may infer that it was the full moon of Ashâdha month, because elsewhere Bigandet has rendered the Burmese “Watso” (“Ashâdha month) by “July” (see, for instance, Vol. I, p. 290). July is no doubt the English equivalent of Ashâdha at the present time; but it was not so in Buddha’s time when the equivalent of Watso or Ashâdha was May-June. The reader has to be reminded that English months, in 477 B.C. meant, in comparison with Indian months, a time of the sidereal year more than one month in advance of what they now mean. This result is due (1) to the forward movement of the Indian sidereal, as compared with the European tropical, year, and (2) to the dropping of 10 days in the Gregorian Calendar. In support of my statement that the departure from Kapilavastu took place on a Sunday. I may refer to Vol. II, p. 72 where the next day when he entered into solitude is given as Monday.
Lastly, the year when Buddha left his home to lead a hermit's life is given as "Eetzâna 97" in Vol. I, p. 62, and as "Eetzâna 96" in Vol. II, p. 72. This is not a discrepancy, because we may understand the former to be an expired, the latter a current, year. Similarly, the Eetzâna year of Buddha's death, 148, has, I believe, to be understood only as a current year, the equivalent of expired year 147.

(8) I have reserved for the last place the discussion of the important question, whether, admitting the correctness of the dates shown for Buddha’s life, in the last column of the chart, the date of his death may not be 477 B.C., as conjectured, first by Cunningham, and more recently by Prof. Charpentier of Upsala in the July issue of this year’s Indian Antiquary. I am bound to say that two sets of considerations are in favour of 477 B.C.: in the first place, this date would make him fully 80 years old when he died, which, indeed, is the commonly received age, attained by Buddha when he passed into Nirvâna; and in the second place, although the week day of Vaisākha su. 15 and Nak. "Viśākha" in 477 B.C. was Monday (April 19; 90; 44), yet the next day was Tuesday, and as he is said to have died “on Tuesday, a little before daybreak,” this may mean, though not strictly, “a little before the daybreak of Tuesday,” that is, in the early morning hours of what we should call Tuesday, (in the Indian Calendar, in the last hour or two of Monday).

The real difficulty, however, about 477 B.C. is in harmonizing with this date the statement that the new religious era began on the 1st of the waxing moon of Tabaong (Phālguṣa) “in the year of Buddha’s death,” the week-day being either Sunday, as stated in Bigandet’s note on p. 133 of Vol. II, or Monday, as stated at p. 113 of Vol. II of his text. The following are all the relevant Phālguṣas:

Phālguṣa suka 1 of 479-78 B.C. fell on Sunday, 19 January 478, B.C. ending at ’88 of day.
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JAINA SAKATAYANA, CONTEMPORARY WITH AMOGHAVARSHA I

BY PROF. K. R. PATHAK, B.A.; POONA

The Amoghavritti is the oldest commentary on the sūtras of the Jaina grammarian Sākātayana. Prof. Kielhorn\(^1\) thought that the Amoghavritti was later than the Chintōmāṇi, a different and smaller commentary on the same sūtras by Yakshavarman. That this view not correct will be obvious to Sanskrit scholars who will carefully study the introductory prātiṣṭas in both, which I quote below.

\[\begin{align*}
\text{अमोघवर्षि} & \text{नमः} || \text{अमोघवर्षि} \text{तत्त्वं} \text{अमृतं} \text{सेवितं} || \text{चास्यात्यादनन्तरं} \text{सम्यक्षप्रेमं} \text{वृत्तिकरणं} || 1 \||
\end{align*}\]

\[\text{अमोघनाद्याक्सर्वः} (वर्षि) \text{प्रमाणमन्येन} \text{संगमः} \text{सम्मतिः} \text{सार्वतिः} \text{प्रतिविधिः} || 2 \|
\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{द्वारः} & \text{शास्त्रः} \text{अध्यायः} \text{सर्वं} \text{संबंधः} \text{श्रीमतः} \text{वर्षि} \text{अध्यायः} \text{सर्वं} \text{श्रीमतः} \text{वर्षि} \text{अध्यायः} \text{सर्वं} || 3 \|
\end{align*}\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{नमः} & \text{सीधेः} \text{सीधेः} \text{संहोर्यं} \text{संहोर्यं} \text{संहोर्यं} \text{संहोर्यं} \text{संहोर्यं} \text{संहोर्यं} \text{संहोर्यं} \text{संहोर्यं} \text{संहोर्यं} \text{संहोर्यं} \text{संहोर्यं} \text{संहोर्यं} \text{संहोर्यं} || 4 \|
\end{align*}\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{नमः} & \text{सीधेः} \text{सीधेः} \text{सीधेः} \text{सीधेः} \text{सीधेः} \text{सीधेः} \text{सीधेः} \text{सीधेः} \text{सीधेः} \text{सीधेः} \text{सीधेः} \text{सीधेः} \text{सीधेः} \text{सीधेः} || 5 \|
\end{align*}\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{तत्त्वं} & \text{तत्त्वं} \text{तत्त्वं} \text{तत्त्वं} \text{तत्त्वं} \text{तत्त्वं} \text{तत्त्वं} \text{तत्त्वं} \text{तत्त्वं} \text{तत्त्वं} \text{तत्त्वं} \text{तत्त्वं} \text{तत्त्वं} \text{तत्त्वं} \text{तत्त्वं} || 6 \|
\end{align*}\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{तत्त्वं} & \text{तत्त्वं} \text{तत्त्वं} \text{तत्त्वं} \text{तत्त्वं} \text{तत्त्वं} \text{तत्त्वं} \text{तत्त्वं} \text{तत्त्वं} \text{तत्त्वं} \text{तत्त्वं} \text{तत्त्वं} \text{तत्त्वं} \text{तत्त्वं} \text{तत्त्वं} || 7 \|
\end{align*}\]

Amoghavritti.

---


\(^{2}\) Read विपण.
Yakshavaranman, the author of the Chintâmani, tells us, in verse 7 quoted above, that his work is a smaller commentary (नवीव ज्ञति). He lays claim to no originality, but admits that his Chintâmani is an abridgment of a very extensive commentary (अन्तगती ज्ञति). This very extensive commentary is no other than the Amoghavṛiti itself, since the concluding passage of the two prakāśas given above, beginning with the word इति वर्णमाणीः is the same except that Yakshavaranman substitutes सामान्यवर्णात् for the सामान्यवर्णात् of the Amoghavṛiti. Then again Yakshavaranman gives only the pratika नन्दा सविनयभवायेश्वरि of the मंगलस्तोऽः which occurs entirely in the Amoghavṛiti. Moreover, he borrows the two alternate explanations of the second half of this आंशक्ष्यो मध्यां in the very words of the Amoghavṛiti. These facts will suffice to convince Sanskrit scholars that the Chintâmani is an abridgment of the Amoghavṛiti, and is, therefore, a later work.

As I have remarked above, Yakshavaranman lays no claim to originality, but copies the Amoghavṛiti with slight alterations, omitting the less important words thus:

नन्दा किस्मत: च (सक्कुश्या) 

ब्रह्मवेदः संवेदहरारिः, उस्मलुक्यां तृप्तं ग्रहस्त: 

Chintâmani.

Sometimes Yakshavaranman entirely copies the Amoghavṛiti thus:

अन्तरात् स्वामिवस्त्रयन्त्रयां, तदस्वा नमस्कृते 

Chintâmani.

In the preceding passage the only alteration which Yakshavaranman makes is to use the word नन्द instead of the नन्द प्रबंध of the Amoghavṛiti. I have already proved by ample evidence that the Chintâmani is later than the Amoghavṛiti. It is thus clear that the illustration mentioning Amoghavarsa, the great patron of Digambara Jaina literature, fixes the date of the Amoghavṛiti, which is obviously so named in honour of that king.

3 Omit this mark of punctuation.
4 Read वदगासिकाः.
It is interesting to note that the achievement attributed to Amoghavarsha I, namely, that he burnt his enemies अवधोभवया रायानाते, is actually mentioned in a Rāṣṭrakūṭa inscription, dated Saka 832 (Ep. Ind. Vol. I, p. 54) where the passage relating to Vallabha Amoghavarsha, is thus read by Prof. Hultsch मुक्ताकरकरान्ति सपारिवेत्यान्वेदित(वि)ष्कासह. It is proposed to read the first two words as मुक्ताकर करराजानां. And the passage means that Amoghavarsha I, surrounded the kings who had suddenly turned disaffected, and burnt them. In this inscription the form रायानाते, which iseśe, is correct, because the writer of it could not have witnessed the event which was न द्वेष्यमयस्तमयूर्णिज्ञ to the author of the Amoghavṛitti, who deliberately uses the form अवधोभवया which is अवधोभवया. But the constant warfare between Amoghavarsha I and his kinsmen of Gujarat is also alluded to in an earlier grant of the time of Amoghavarsha I himself, namely, the Bagumā grant of Saka 789, in which we are told that “Dhrula died on the battle field, covered with wounds, while routing the army of Vallabha-Amoghavarsha.” It is thus manifest that the event alluded to in the illustration, which we have been discussing, must have occurred shortly before Saka 789. It may, therefore, be safely concluded that the Amoghavṛitti was composed between Saka 736 and 789. Yakshavarman is certainly entitled to our gratitude for preserving the text of the historical illustration, which he quotes from the Amoghavṛitti. He has conferred upon us yet another favour by communicating to posterity a very important fact about the authorship of these Sākājāyana-sūtras. In verses 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 of his opening praśasti quoted above, he says:—

Hail! Sākājāyana, the eminent lord of the great community of Sramāgas, who attained to glorious universal sovereignty over all knowledge. 3.

Who, (like Vishṣu) single-handed, lifted up all nectar-like grammar, together with fame resembling the goddess Lakṣhmi, by churning the Ocean of words, with [his] intellect resembling Mount Mandara. 4.

Whose original science of grammar, of limited extent, attainable by easy means, and withal very complete, is beneficial to all like the religion of Arhat. 5.

In whose science of grammar, there is neither श्री nor are there words used, such as न नक्त्रा बलस्य, nor उपसंधान laid down, apart from the sūtras, [as in Patañjali's Mahābhāṣya]. 6.

By abridging the very extensive commentary [called Amoghavṛitti] of him [Sākājāyana just described] this smaller commentary [Chintāmaṇī] endowed with all good features will be composed by Yakshavarman. 7.

I have offered a literal rendering of these verses. This is all the more necessary as the sense intended by Yakshavarman, as well as the historical illustration, has failed to arrest the notice of Dr. Burnell, Prof. Bühler and Prof. Kiellhorn, who have published valuable contributions to the study of this Sākājāyana grammar. The first four verses translated above contain adjective clauses descriptive of Sākājāyana. They are introduced by the relatives म: (in verses 3 & 4) वस्त्र in वस्त्रवन्दन (verse 5), and वरम in वरमम् (verse 6). These relatives are correlative to the demonstrative तस्म in तस्म महती वस्त्रम where तस्म is करोतिपक्षी and is part of the principal sentence in verse 7. The construction is वस्त्रवन्दन शब्दम्युन्दते गाय तस्म महती वस्त्रम संहतं रेव तथोद्वितीयेव शर्यत्वेत वरमम्युन्दते गाय. This smaller commentary will be composed by Yakshavarman by abridging the very extensive commentary of him whose original production called सहदुमासान्या is beneficial to all. The conclusion to which we come is that the Jaina Sākājāyana wrote both the text and the commentary in the Amoghavṛitti and lived between Saka 736-789.

References:
5 Ante, Vol. XII, p. 181.
The identity of the author of the śūtras with that of the Amogha-vṛtti seems to have been widely known. Mr. Rice says: "Sākātyāna not only wrote the grammar but also a gloss thereon called Amogha-vṛtti." In support of this statement Mr. Rice quotes the Munivigohi-bhyudaya, written in the reign of Chikkadeva Rāja of Mysore (1672 to 1704), by Chidānanda-kavi, who afterwards became the pontiff of Sravāṇa Belgo under the usual title of Chārukirti Paṇḍita Deva.

A muni nīja-buddhi-Mandaradīn śrutada mahāvṛddhiya mathisi ||
Prēma-yāso-Lakshmi vrasu ṣūkaraṇa-mahāvṛddhārā eseṣa ||
Vāra-Sabdānurāṇamara rachisi y-adak uru-Sākātyāna-resara-||
Voredan Amogha-vṛttiya padāṇamur-śeṣirada-granthi-saikhyeyo[ũ] ||
Lōka-sikhyetan ā Śākātyāna-muni vyaḥkaraṇada śūtracana ||
Sākalya-vṛtti-samanvida rachisi y-aneka-pūnyacan arjjesidaru ||
Mandura-dhīran Avidhā-kaviyada Padmanandi-siddhānti chakrēśa ||
and ētām-pada-viṣṇa Śākātyāna-muni-vindarakeniy itan odi ||

I adopt Mr. Rice’s translation:

"That muni, churning the great ocean of the śruti (or revealed truth) with the Mandara mountain of his own understanding, began to uplift (or restore therefrom), along with the loved Lakshmi of fame, the best nectar of grammar. Having composed the excellent Sabdānurāṇam, to it (is) the name of the great Sākātyāna, he declared the Amogha-vṛtti, 18,000 verses in extent. That world-famed Sākātyāna-muni, having composed the śūtras of the grammar, together with the complete vṛtti, acquired a variety of merit. Then Avidhā-karaṇ Padmanandi siddhānti-chakrēśa, firm as Mount Mandara, approving of him, gave his own rank (or office, as head of the gāra) to Sākātyāna, the revered among munis." Karṇīṣaṇa Sabdānurāṇa, Intro. p. 2.

From the passages quoted above it is evident that in the opinion of Yakshavarman and Chidānanda, the Śākātyāna-śūtras and the Amogha-vṛtti were composed by one and the same author who calls himself Sākātyāna. I have proved above that this Jain author lived in the time of Amoghavarsha I. that he wrote his work about Saka 789, and that the Amogha-vṛtti was so named in honour of this illustrious Rāṣṭramukha king. The fact that this Sākātyāna wrote the Amogha-vṛtti as well as the śūtras was well-known even to Brahman authors. Vardhamāna, the author of the Gauraratanamahodadhi, who composed his work only about 273 years later, frequently attributes statements which are found only in the Amogha-vṛtti but not in the śūstras to Sākātyāna himself.

Gauraratanamahodadhi. \[ Amogha-vṛtti. II, 1, 57. \]
Benares ed. p. 82.

Gauraratanamahodadhi. \[ Amogha-vṛtti. II, 1, 79. \]
Benares ed. p. 90.

Vardhamāna also assures us that this Sākātyāna was not a Digambara but a Svetāmbara writer:—

Vardhamāna tells us that he restricts the term Śrivaśī Digambara to Devanand, the author of the Jaimindra-ṣūkaraṇa. From this we are to infer that the other Jaina grammarian Śrivaśī Śākātyāna mentioned in the above verse was a Svetāmbara.

Vardhamāna’s view that Sākātyāna was a Svetāmbara is amply borne out by numerous passages in the Amogha-vṛtti.

अथोऽः स्वेताम्बरे स्नाते संबंधते
अथोऽः स्मारयणे श्रवान्न धीरविति
Amogha-vṛtti. I, 2, 201.
The mention in the foregoing passages of Svetambara authors works and the fact that the study of the *Avayaka* and the *Nirguṇti* is enjoined upon the readers leaves no room for doubt that Śāktāyana was a Svetambara, and not a Digambara Jaina. That he has been unjustly superseded among the Svetambara Jaina community by the later and more well-known Svetambara grammarian Hemachandra is evident from the following passages in which the latter makes no secret of his desire to copy Śāktāyana:

Hemachandra says:

Hemachandra's *Brihadāvṛtti*, VII, 1, 109. The *sūtra* just quoted appears to be based on the remarks in the *Kāśikāvṛtti* on *Paścimī* (V, 3, 100).

These passages show that Hemachandra copies the *Amoghaavṛtti* to such an extent that no claims to originality can be put forward on his behalf, though it is easy to admit that on this very ground Hemachandra's *Brihadāvṛtti* will prove most helpful in bringing out a correct edition of Śāktāyana's *sūtras* and his *Amoghaavṛtti*. On the other hand,
Sākapāyana never copies the Kāśīkāvritti in the way in which Hemachandra copies the Amoghāvatī. The title Amoghāvatī must have been selected, as I have already remarked, to commemorate the reigning sovereign Amoghavarsha I. But it must have been also suggested by a desire on the part of Sākapāyana to show the superiority of his own work to the Kāśīkāvritti. As might be naturally expected, Sākapāyana frequently refers to the authors of the Kāśīkā thus:

यद्यपि अनादान्तार्थः काव्यम्

स्वतंत्रतेन वाक्यविकारः

Sākapāyana sometimes borrows his illustrations from the Mahābhāṣya, the Kāśīkā and the Nyāsa:

कालं कालम् मूलिकालम् संस्कृति व यज्ञः

संस्कृती कुप्पलकारं नियतं च
Bhāravi III, 14.


रक्तपालिणि दीप्यमयाः

It is very interesting to note that Sākapāyana quotes the two following passages from the Arthaśāstra of Kautilya.

चावक्स्ये कच्छ नारायणो दूधुमाचरे व्रतं महीं

It may be incidentally remarked here that Kautilya's Arthaśāstra is also quoted by Vatsyāyana in his Nyāyasūtra Chap. I. and in the Kāmasūtra, p. 24.

Sākapāyana's sūtras resemble those of the Jainendra-vyākaranā. They must have been borrowed from Pūjyapāda, who can be easily proved to have lived prior to Sākapāyana. The Jainendra sūtra (II, 3, 36) as mentioned is known to the authors of the Kāśīkā, who remark:

उपवनयु भाषकीयी वैधकृतः
Kāśīkā, III, 3, 40.

This is not a vārttika as Pāṇini's sūtra III, 3, 40 has been quoted above. Kautilya, therefore, clear that Sākapāyana's sūtra (IV, 4, 45) based on the Jainendra sūtra quoted above.

The following three Jainendra sūtras:

संस्कृतम् IV, 1, 207.

वस्त्रम्  208.

व  "  209.

were thus alluded to in the Kāśīkā.

The Jainendra sūtra (I, 1, 61) corresponding to Sākapāyana (I, 1, 52) is quoted by Akalankadeva, who was contemporary with Sāhasatuṣa-Dantidurga, the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king.

The last sūtra is thus borrowed by Sākapāyana II, 4, 36.

नवरथसूत्रानि शास्त्रायानि ग्रः प्राचीनानि

Jinasena, in the opening prāvastti of his Harivamsa (Saka 705) mentions the Jainendra-vyākaraṇa. These facts suffice to prove the priority of Pūjyapāda to Sākapāyana.

Pāṇini's sūtra (IV, 1, 102) is that which is mentioned in the Harivamsa while Jainendra sūtra (III, 3, 134) reads शास्त्रसूत्रानि धर्मसूत्रानि श्रावणानि. The latter sūtra is thus borrowed by Sākapāyana II, 4, 36.

5 Mysore ed. pp. 7 and 11; Nyāyaśīla, Benares ed. p. 7. 6 Chandra (II, 4, 38) copies Pāṇini.
Amoghavṛtti explains:—

This explanation about Varshaganyya being Agnīṣṭomaṇya is copied by Hemachandra in his Brihadāvṛtti (VI, 1, 57). Now Varshaganyya was the name of Śivarakṛṣṇa, the author of the Śākhyā-kārikās, who is assigned by Dr. Takakusu to A.D. 450. Another Jainendra sūtra (III, 2, 5) gūḍhavatārānāsya (कृष्णे) is borrowed by Śakatāyana and Hemachandra.

Hemachandra reads the sūtra as

and copies the Amoghavṛtti in explaining it. It is needless to state that Yakshavarma has this sūtra in his Chintamāni. The authors who have this sūtra are:—

Pāñjapāda in his Jainendra,
Śakatāyana,
Yakshavarma,
Hemachandra.

This sūtra is most important as it alludes to the twelve year Cycle of Jupiter according to the heliacal rising system. This system was in vogue in the times of the Early Kādambara kings and their contemporaries, the Early Gupta kings. Expressions like pariśvarasūla occur in the epigraphic records of that period. The late Mr. S. B. Dikshī has contributed a very interesting paper on this subject to Dr. F. E. G. Gupta volume and has also independently dealt with it in his monumental Marāṇi work on the history of Indian Astronomy. The four Jainī authors, whom I have mentioned as alluding to this system, are in addition to the eleven authorities quoted by Dikshī. The last two sūtras which I have discussed above enable us to assign the Jainendra-yaṭkāraya to the latter part of the fifth century A. D. But no inference as to the age of the other three authors can be drawn as they have copied these sūtras from Pāñjapāda.

In the Amoghavṛtti on sūtra III, 4, 50 we read:

though this remark is copied by Hemachandra in his Brihadāvṛtti (VII, 2, 133) I am tempted to think that Śakatāyana was influenced in making this remark by his knowledge of the Kāñcan-root nandu, to go out, to be extinguished (as a light).

Under the sūtra (II, 1, 79) Śakatāyana says:—

The rule beginning with śakti instead of fō is also found in the Gaṇapati of Pāñjini and the Mahābhāṣya, Nirmāna ed. Vol. II, p. 46.

But Vardhamāna says,

Under the corresponding

Pāñjini's sūtra (II, 1, 72) the authors of the Kāśikā say:

The rule beginning with śakti instead of fō is also found in the Gaṇapati of Pāñjini and the Mahābhāṣya, Nirmāna ed. Vol. II, p. 46.
Let us now turn to Hemachandra, who in his *Bhikshudviti* (III, 1, 116) says:

"हस्तिस्य स्वकर्मः क्षमार्थमीवेऽसरी समायसिधिः"

And the commentary called *Laghunayaka* on the *Bhikshudviti* explains:

And remarks:

"सुंदरः प्रेमिः रसोऽस्मिचि ब्रह्म्नः श्रवसः"

It is thus clear that अंदुमेत्र is an irregular compound, applied as an epithet to a person who frequently says, "kill the slave, kill the slave." According to Vardhamana and the Jaina authorities quoted above, not only अंदु, 2nd pers. sing. imper., of हस्तिः, but forms of other verbs ending in हस्तः may be used in forming such compounds, as is evident from the following verse.

अन्तुमेत्रस्य प्रेमिः रसोऽस्मिचि श्रवसः

Sravasa Belgo Inscription No. 54.

Here the words beginning with अंदु, अंदुमेत्र, अंदुमेत्रस्य, and अंदुमेत्रस्य प्रेमिः are compounds used as adjectives qualifying श्रवसः: The last three are the 2nd pers. sing. imper. forms of the root हस्तः to abandon. The verse may be translated thus: "In the victorious camp of the prosperous Charuluka-emperor, which is the birth-place of Sarasvatī, there suddenly wanders forth in all directions the loud sounding drum of Virdaśāra desiring of vanquishing disputants, which frequently says "kill rising conceit in disputation, give up abundant pride in learning, lay aside envy in oratory, abandon vanity as regards poetry lucid, soft, sweet and pleasing to the ear."

The considerations set forth above naturally lead to the conclusion that the correct reading not only in Śakaṭāyana but also in Pāṇini's *Catapātha* should be not अंदुमेत्र श्रवसः but अंदुमेत्रस्य श्रवसः.

The mention of Virdaśāra and the Charuluka emperor, who, as we shall see presently, was Jayasimha II, is most important as it enables us to fix the date of the *Rūpasiddhi*, a *prakrit* by Dayapala on Śakaṭāyana's *Sadānusāsana*. A Kanarese inscription, dated Saka 993, refers to Dayapala thus:

*Sādānusāsanakko Prakritṛ endu Rūpasiddhiyam māḍīda Dayōpāla*

In another inscription we read:

This author Dayapala was the pupil of Matisagara and a fellow-student of Virdaśāra.

In the concluding *praisati* of his *Pāricandhācharita*, after telling us that he was a bee on the lotus-like feet of Matisagara, Virdaśāra says:

From this verse it may be safely concluded that Dayapala composed his *Rūpasiddhi* in the time of the Charuluka King Jayasimha II, who was reigning in Saka 947.

---

9 Nagar 39.
10 Ms. of the Jaina Matha at Kolhapur.
NOTES ON THE GRAMMAR OF THE OLD WESTERN RAJASTHANI
WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO APABHRAMÇA AND TO GUJARATI AND MARWARI.

BY DR. L. P. TESSITORI, UDINE, ITALY.

(Continued from p. 186.)

It will be observed that all the genitives above are from consonantal bases. That -ha should have survived only in the latter case is quite reasonable, inasmuch as, when suffixed to vocal bases, it could not so easily avoid contraction. Thus a form like *beḷāha, from Apabhrāṃṣa beḷāha, was soon contracted into beḷā. It is only after bases in "i, "u that -ha has left some traces. Masculine and neuter bases in "i, "u, which, as it has been shown § 57, may optionally take -a in the nominative singular and thereby become practically equal to bases in "i, "u, make their genitive in "i, "u (from *"i-a ha) and "u (from *"u-a ha). Thus:

bṛdhiyaḥ hāthiyaḥ-ni parī "Like a bound elephant" (Daś. x),
socai tāḥaḥ nu rosa ṛṣava-nu "Dries up his palate" (Indr. 34)²⁵

Feminines in "i, "u, which seem to have likewise been taking -ha in the genitive, have completely lost the latter termination, except in poetry, where occasionally forms occur, that may be taken for old genitives. Examples are:

devaḥ pāya "The Goddess's feet" (Ṛṣ. 1),
ṛvira-sāhiḥ "Together with the queen" (Ṛṣ. 26),
vaḥra-sahita "Together with the bride" (Ṛṣ. 132),
Mrgāṅkalekhaḥ-sāti ca ṛivra "The story of the virtuous Mrgāṅkalekha" (F 728, 1).

For some of such genitives in "i, however, it is doubtful whether -a is from -ha or is a mere euphonic appendage identical with that in poetry is very frequently added to terminal "i (see § 2, (6)). Thus in the same ṛvira quoted above, we have ṛvira for ṛvī (nominative, 30), mila-nai for milī-nai (63), etc.

63. Genitive plural. The case of the genitive plural is very similar to that of the singular, the chief difference being in that the former is nasalized. Apabhrāṃṣa had for the genitive plural the termination -hā, before which a terminal "a in the base could optionally be lengthened. Apabhrāṃṣa bases in "a had therefore two endings in the genitive plural, to wit: "aḥaḥ and "aḥā. Old Western Rājasthāni generally drops -hā after consonantal bases and contracts "aḥā or "aḥā into -a after bases ending in a vowel. Examples of the latter case are:

kuraḥ-kurṣiḥ "On the neck of camels" (P. 582),
vaḥraḥ -nā viyoga "Separations from dear ones" (Ādi. 22),
pagalī-āparī "Upon his foot-stamps" (Ādi C.),
cāritryaḥ -nā mana "The hearts of men of good conduct" (Indr. 42).

Feminine bases remain unchanged. The only instance I have noted of a feminine inflected in the genitive plural is nārayaḥ nāḥa-saḥapaṇaḥ "In the company of women" (Ādi. 47). In the MS. Vi. (45) two instances have perhaps survived of the old termination "aḥā of the Apabhrāṃṣa, viz. gayāha and nayarāha (see § 49). Another instance would be spyāka-nai arthi, which occurs in the MS. F 588, if the reading is correct. Vi. 93 we have kuṣāhaḥ, from the pronominal base kuṣa- (See § 91).

²⁵ Cf. vaṭṭhā (Sanskrit vaṭṭhā) occurring Piṭāla 1, 114.
§ 64. Locative Singular. There were two ways of forming this case in Apabhraṣṭa i.e., by suffixing -hi (-hi) < Pkt. -mhī < Skt. -āmin to the base, or, in the particular case of bases in *a, by inflecting the latter vowel into *ā, *ā, *i. Both terminations have passed into the Old Western Rajasthāni and, though they are often no longer distinguishable from one another—both having given -i (-i)—it is clear that they continue to be employed in the same way as in Apabhraṣṭa, namely the former chiefly after vocal bases in *ā, *i (*i), *u (*u), and the latter only after bases in *a. Examples are:

(a) from the Apabhraṣṭa locative in *āhi (-āhi): vidyāī Pr. 18, gībhārī Adī C., rāpī (adjective) Kal. 35, rātṛā Adī C., bābāhī (from bāhū) Daṇ. iv.

(b) from the Apabhraṣṭa locative in *ā, *i: gharī P. 295, sūrī Rā. 182, godī Kal. 9, pei mājharī Čāl. 33, sūryi āgīrī Kal. 19, sūnai Adī 33, P. 96, vikāhī Bh., Indr., Yog., Kal., etc.; kāi Yog. iv, 48, rāi P. 139, āhi Kal. 10.

As in the instrumental singular, masculine bases in *ā, *i, *u may optionally take -aī, -aī instead of -i, -ī, Ex.: nagāriāi Adī C., nagāriyāi Dd. 6, gocāriyāi Daṇ. v.

Of the old form āhi I have found a remnant in manahī "In the heart," which occurs R. 11, 29. In Daṇ., there are many instances of locatives in āi (as rahi, iī, pahlī paharī xi, etc.), but from these we are by no means authorized to postulate a termination *āhi, for they have quite probably arisen from the common habit of assimilating aī to āi (see § 10, (2)), and possibly are also due to the influence of the analogous termination of the instrumental singular.

§ 65. Locative plural.—The termination for this case being identical with that for the instrumental plural, I need not go over here again on what I have already said when dealing with the latter. Let me only add, in explanation of the identity of the two case-terminations, that in Apabhraṣṭa the same suffix -hi was employed both for the instrumental plural and for the locative singular and plural. If I have succeeded in showing that Old Western Rajasthāni -ē, the termination of the instrumental plural, is from Apabhraṣṭa -āhi, the same explanation applies to the -ē of the locative plural. The fact that in the locative singular, which possessed also the termination -hi, we have not -ē, but -i, -i cannot be used as an argument against my derivation, for there is plenty of evidence pointing out that in Old Western Rajasthāni bases in *a generally formed their locative singular by inflecting their terminal vowel into *ā, and only exceptionally by adding -hi. The latter suffix was chiefly confined to bases in *ā, *i, *u.

Examples of the locative plural are:

gravaṇe Čāl. 65, kāne P. 540, taravara-ṇe phalade F. 502, i, 3, pāe Rā. passim, sans divas (shortened for divas) Kān. 9, ghavi dese Kān. 19, saqale-kī yuddhe Adī C.

Before leaving the present subject, it is important to remark that in Old Western Rāja-
sthāni the locative has assumed also the meaning of the dative. This remark will prove of use when we shall take to consider the so-called postpositions for the dative, which are all nouns in the locative. The passing of meaning from the locative to the dative can be easily explained as having been effected through the intermediate meaning of the locative of direction. Examples of locative-datives are:

āpāṇapāi sarasa ahārā lii " Takes succulent food for himself " (Crā.),
te manu ya-rahaṇi te nāga ahārā-nai karaṇā hui " tasya sa nāgā hitāya syat " (Daṇ. viii).

Observe that locative-datives are generally nasalized.

§ 66. Vocative singular. It is a well known fact that in most of the Neo-Indian vernaculars this case is identical with the so-called oblique singular and with the nominative plural (see Hocart’s, *Comparative Grammar of the Gauian Languages*, § 369, 6). So also in Modern
Gujarātī and Mārvārī and possibly also in Old Western Rājasthānī. The consequence then is that, to account for the apparent identity of the vocative with the genitive singular, we ought to postulate that in later Apabhraṃcā the vocative singular was made by the addition of the same suffix as the genitive. In standard Apabhraṃcā this was already the case with the suffix -he of the feminines and with the suffix -ho, which was used for both the genitive singular and vocative plural of all nouns. In Old Western Rājasthānī the genitive (oblique) being in most cases identical with the base- and nominative-form of nouns, the vocative too is practically identical with the latter. The chief exception is formed by bases in 'aa, which have a nominative in 'aū, quite distinguishable from the vocative, which ends in 'a as the genitive. The identity of the two latter cases would be better shown by the evidence of bases in 'a, 'a, which optionally make their genitive in 'a, 'a and so ought to do in the vocative, but I have noted no instances of the latter case. In Braja, however, singular vocatives in 'a from bases in 'a, are common enough (see Kellogg’s Hindi Grammar, § 168).

Old Western Rājasthānī examples for this case are: re Gorambhā P. 233, māmā P. 379, 380, 383, etc., bāpādā P. 390, karahā P. 576, re jīva pāpiā Up. 194.

§ 67. Vocative plural.—The termination for this case is -o, which is derived by contracting the suffix -ho of the Apabhraṃcā, with the final vowel of bases in ‘a. The intermediate step was ‘a -hu, whence ‘aū > ‘o. The suffix -hu has survived in the Old Baiswārī, as in the example:

dis-i kuṣājarahu “ O elephants of the quarters! ” (Rāmacaritamānas, i, 260).

In the Old Western Rājasthānī I have noted the instances following:

loko P. 291, ahā tīj ro ṣaṇi, 93, he sidha Daĉ. v.

From the last example it is clear that Old Western Rājasthānī, to form the vocative plural, inflected into ‘o all bases alike. In the following an exceptional instance occurs of a plural vocative in ‘o :

sabhalayou nare nāra “Hear, oh men and women!” (F 591, 8).

§ 68. The Periphrastic declension is made up by combining the inflectional forms of the nouns with postpositions. These are either nouns in the locative, instrumental or ablative case, or adjectives and participles. They always go after the noun, with which they are construed and they require the latter to be inflected either in the genitive or more rarely, in the locative or instrumental case. Two of them only, viz. prati and siū, are indeclinable by origin.

Postpositions are very numerous in Old Western Rājasthānī. Some of them being employed for more than one case, and others having not a definite meaning and being capable of quite different constructions, it is not possible to divide them so as to assign each to one particular case. The following is an attempt to classify them according to cases:

Accusative: na, prati, raha,
Instrumental: kari, na, pāhī, sāthi, siū,
Dative: kauhā, na, prati, bhani, māṣāi, raha, rai,
Ablative: kauhā, tāi, thaūi, thakūi, thēi, pāsēi, pāhī, lagāi, lagī, hīlaūi, hōtī,
Genitive: (kau), keraū, (caui), taṣāi, na, rau, raha,
Locative: kauhā, tī, pāsēi, maṭhāīi, māṣi, mā, mēhī.

It will be observed that the postpositions that are adjectives or participles are confined to the ablative and genitive cases. They are, of course, subject to inflection like all other adjectives (see § 76).
I shall now proceed to deal with each postposition separately. Whenever no special remark is made, it should be understood that the postposition in question governs the genitive (oblique) case.

§ 69. The Postpositions of the accusative are but postpositions of the dative, that are employed simply to denote the direct object of the verb. The use of the same postpositions for both the dative and the accusative is common to most of the Neo-Indian vernaculars. In the Old Western Rājahāni the dative postpositions that may be used for the accusative are: naï, prati and raha. I shall explain the origin of these when dealing with the postpositions of the dative. Here it will be sufficient to quote a few examples, where they are employed to give the meaning of the accusative.

(1) naï is the most common of the three in the accusative sense. Ex.: bālaka-nāĩ te lei căiāyāi “He went taking the child with him” (F 783, 60), rājā-naĩ māravi-ni prati;jūā kīdhi “He made the promise of murdering the king” (Dd. 2), toka-nāĩ sānsāra-atai-māhī pādai “Causes men to fall into the forest of worldly existence” (Indr.98).

Modern Gujarāṭī has né and Mārvārī naï, naï.

(2) prati is not very largely used, except in bālava bodhas or commentaries, where it is often introduced to render the Sanskrit or Prakrit accusative, Ex.: parastrī-pratāi kima savai “ parādārān kathām vratay” (Yog. ii, 98), pukatu narrā-pratāi “prāpa narakam” (Yog. ii, 99).

(3) raha is used in the accusative meaning in the following:
pathika-jana-raha prīnāi “Delights the travellers” (Kal. 7), mūrka-raha rākhāi cha “Thou savest the ignorants” (Kal. 30),
majha-raha rākhī “Save me!” (Kal. 41), majha-raha sikhāi “They instruct me” (Daç. ix), majha-raha koi na jīnāi “No one knows me” (Daç. v).

It is to raha that Modern Mārvārī rai is to be traced (see § 71, 7).

* In the following passage lei, the conjunctive Participle of rava “To take.” is used as an accusative postposition:
kotara lei tevai trī bharī “He filled the hollow [of the tree] up with grass” (P. 629).

§ 70. Under the term of Postpositions of the instrumental, I include not only postpositions denoting the instrument or the means proper, but also postpositions denoting agency and companionship. Be it remembered that in Sanskrit all prepositions having the general sense of companionship govern the instrumental case. Under the present head fall the four postpositions following:

(1) kari. This is not a postposition properly, but a mere appendage, which is added to nouns in the instrumental, simply to give more force. It is itself an instrumental, it being contracted from *kari, the instrumental form of the past participle kari “Done.” How it came to be pleonastically appended to nouns in the instrumental, is well illustrated by the following phrase from Daç.:
kosāi karam kari majha-rahae e phalo háyāi “Owing to which deed performed [by me] > owing to which deed [of mine] did I reap this result ? ”

Other examples are:
khalāi kari jāgha arapharasata “Without touching the legs with the elbows” (Çrâ.),
aṅkā ra νeu kari sahitā “Endowed with the eighteen virtues” (F 644),
tīsi kari rakita “Deprived of that” (Sast. 46),
mantra-prabhāva kari “By the power of the spell” (P. 138).

(To be continued.)
THE HISTORY OF THE NAIK KINGDOM OF MADURA.

By V. RANGACHARI, M.A., L.T., MADRAS.
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The Battle of the Tâmbraparâj and its significance.

Such were the imperial Generals who led the campaign of 1532. Achyuta Nâya combined, we are told, the activity of a soldier with the piety of a pilgrim. In the course of his expedition he visited the sacred shrines of Tirupati, Chidambaram, etc. and reached Srirâgâm. There the sanctity of the place arrested his march and induced his stay, and made him despatch his brother-in-law to the south, whither Sâluva Nâïk had fled. Mârtâda-varna had in the meanwhile advanced to the Tâmbraparâj banks. There the two forces met. The engagement was one of high political importance. On one side were ranged the resources of the empire and of its Pâdyyan vassal, and on the other the gallant Nâyars of Travancore. The Nâyars, in those days, were a "peculiarly military" race trained in the exercise of war from their earliest youth. A writer of the first decade of the 17th century speaks of them in language of admiration and praise. "It is strange to see" he says, "how ready the soul of this country is at his weapons. They are all gentle men and learned Naires. At seven years of age they are put to school to learn the use of their weapons, where to make them nimble and active, their sinews and joints are stretched by skilful fellows and appointed with the yole syamus; by this appointing they become so light and nimble that they will winde and turn their bodies as if they had no bones, casting them forward, backward, high and low even to the astonishment of the beholders. Their continual delight is in their weapon persuading themselves that no nation goeth beyond them in skill and dexterity." With such men the imperialists had to fight, and on the result of that fighting lay the position of the Pâdyya and the integrity of the Empire. The skill of Tirumâlaïya and of his colleagues, however, was more than a match for Nâyâr valour, and ultimately gained the day. The colours of Vijayanagar waved in triumph over the Tâmbraparâj banks, and the vanquished king of Nânji hurried to come to terms. He took the victor to Trevandrum, presented a number of elephants and horses, and accompanying him to Srîraigaâm, made obeisance to the Emperor, and obtained pardon on promise of a faithful allegiance and regular tribute in future. At the same time he seems to have restored the territory of the Pâdyyan king, which he had unlawfully seized. The emperor gave a wise termination to the whole affair by cementing his alliance with the Pâdyyan and marrying his daughter. The fate of Sâluva Nâïk is unknown.

\[^{0}\text{Capt. Drury compares "the effeminate disposition" and the incapacity "to bear transplantation from his native soil," which he attributes to the Nâyars of early 19th. century, with the Nâyars of the 16th and 17th centuries, and gives the palm of superiority to the latter. See Madr. Journ. III (1889), 203-4.}

\[^{1}\text{Johnson's Relations of the most famous kingdom in the world, 1611, quoted by Capt. Drury. Inid. see also Logan's Malabar Manual and Thurston and Rangachari's Castes and Tribes, V, p. 235-90 for other references to Nâyâr valour, by various writers in the 17th and 18th centuries. The term Nâyâr is held by some scholars to be derived from the same term as Nâïk. The glossary of Yule and Burnell, in fact, says that "the Nâyars of Malabar are closely connected by origin with the Nâyakas of Vijayanagar." P. L. Moore in his Malabar Law and Custom maintains the same view. His reasons are quoted in Castes and Tribes, V, p. 292. Munro used the terms Nâïk and Nâïr interchangeably. It seems to me that there has been a general misapprehension among these writers and the confusion has been caused by a similarity of sound between the two words.}

\[^{2}\text{See Trav. Arch. Series, based on the Achyutayâ thyayudayam, p. 55.}
Achyuta's power felt throughout the Empire.

The imperial power was thus safely asserted throughout the south; and if we are to believe the inscriptions, Achyuta Dēva rounded off his conquest by the conquest of Ceylon also. From this time to his death in 1542 he maintained his power intact throughout the Empire. Ample epigraphical evidences prove this. In 1532, for instance, the very year of his Timmelly campaign, he was at Tanjore, and gave a local chief Thattaḷappa Nāika (son of Kōḷappa Nāika) a tract of land as recorded in the Thoppil Pillayar temple there. In 1533 he was at Conjeeveram, where, in the temple of Varadarāja, he weighed himself against pearls, performed the great gift of kāṇcheṇa-mēra, and otherwise celebrated his victory in the south. In 1535 he recorded a grant at Mahābalipuram. In 1538 he was recognized as emperor in the province of Dindigal, as is clear from the inscription in the shrine of that fort. In 1539 an inscription of the Rājakōṭipālasrāmi temple at Tanjore mentions that he was the founder of it. In 1542 he gave a grant to the Chidambaram pagoda. In 1533 his Viceroy Bala-Dēva-Mahārajā Uḍayār ruled at Coimbatore, and distinguished himself by his gifts and donations to temples.

SECTION III, The Viceroys of the South during Achyuta's Rule.

As to the viceroys of Vijayanagar, during this decade, in the south, we learn from the Pāṇḍya Chronicle that one Aiyakarai Vaiyappa was ruling in Madura at the time of Achyuta Rāya's expedition. Vaiyappa, if we are to believe the chronicle, ruled for two years after Achyuta's return to Vijayanagar. In 1535, we are told, he was succeeded in his exalted office by one Visvanātha Nāīdu, who held it during a continuous space of nine years. Now the question is, who was this Visvanātha Nāīdu? Was he the son of Nāgama Nāika, whose early career and whose part in the recent campaign against Travancore we have already sketched? Is there again any epigraphical evidence to prove the identity? Both these questions have been answered by Mr. Krishna Sastri in the positive. Inscription 113 of 1908, he says, "supplies the interesting fact that Visvanātha Nāyaka, the son of Nāgama Nāyaka, was an officer of Achyuta in S. 1457, 1534-5 A. D." And how did Visvanātha come to occupy that position? Mr. Krishna Sastri surmises that Visvanātha followed Achyuta in the latter's campaign against the king of Travancore, and "taking an active part in the subjugation of the rebellious chiefs, Tumbhechehi Nāyakkan and Sāḷava Nāyakkan of the Pāṇḍya country, found an opportunity to secure a footing there which he gradually strengthened." And in proof of this he cites another inscription, which says that "Visvanātha conquered in battle the Tiruvādi, the Pāṇḍya king Vānada Rāya and other kings and annexed their dominions."

(To be Continued.)
THE POEMS OF PRINCE KĀMRĀN.

BY MAULAVĪ 'ABDUL WALLĪ M R.A.S. &c. &c.

The dynasty of Chaghtā Tūrks, commonly called Mughals, that was founded by Bābar in Hindustān, after he had defeated the Lōdī Monarch Ibrāhīm in the battle-field of Panipat on April 21, 1526, ushered in a gifted family to India, that has bequeathed to the world a literature that stands unique in the annals of any single dynasty, ancient or modern. The autobiography of the founder is a standing monument of the nobility and charm of his character, the perspicuity and directness of his language.

The little work of his beloved daughter Gulbadan Bēgām (Lady Rosebud), recently published with translation and notes by Mrs. Annette S. Beveridge, is a book that blazes throughout with touches of feminine grace and charming simplicity, and stands unique in the annals of colloquial Persian. While we admire so much the style of several European female writers, we might have foregone the same delight but for the appearance of this charming monograph by an Eastern princess.

It is very strange that till now the world has been unaquainted with the existence of another book composed by another member of the same illustrious family, Prince Kāmrān. A notice of it, so far as I can recollect, appeared first in a Hindustānī periodical of Lucknow; but since then a detailed account of the Divān-i-Kāmrān Mirzā has been published in the catalogue of Persian Manuscripts of the Bankipore Public Library (Vol. II, prepared by M. 'Abdul-Muqtadir). This Divān, like Gulbadan Bēgām's Humsāyin-nāma was once treasured in the Imperial Library of Delhi, and bears autographs of Emperors Jahaqīr and Shāhjīhān, and other eminent persons, who once owned or examined it. The Sepoy revolt of 1857 did not give the rebels what they wanted; but it has unfortunately robbed India of her literary treasures.

Of the life and career of the Prince, I need say very little. The exact date of his birth cannot be determined. When he was a child, Bābar left the ladies of his family in Kābul under the nominal command of Kāmrān 'Askāri, his younger full-brother was born in 922 H. (1516). Supposing Kāmrān was older by two years, he would be about 12 in 1525, when Bābar had left him in Kābul and about 42 years old in 964 H. (?) 1556) when he died in Mecca. Dildār Bēgām was the mother of Prince Hindāl and the Lady Gulbadan Bēgām. Māham Bēgām was the mother of Humāyūn. Gulrūkh Bēgām was the mother of Princes Kāmrān and 'Askāri.

This collection of Kāmrān's poems consists of fragmentary pieces in Turki and Persian, as if the author had it copied in haste for presentation to, what appears to me, one Hazrat Khwaja, with a Turki epistle added at the end of the Dīwān. The copyist Māhmūd bin Islāq of Herāt writes that he copied the book in haste. The Dīwān as it has come down to us clearly shows that Kāmrān composed the poems as an impulse to his poetic genius and not as a sustained effort to produce something for the general public. They are in my mind the work of an artist who is employed, for the time being, in doing some other duties not very congenial to his genius. His rebellions against his generous brother, and his military exploits and subterfuges to gain for himself the sole sovereignty of Hindustān must be dismissed as ill-planned and ill-executed and something beyond his ken. But the fine art, in the shape of short lyrics and ballads that Kāmrān has left behind, and for which he probably did not much care in his lifetime, was indeed the work of a gifted poet and the worthy son of a worthy father. The inimitable style which Bābar
employed in writing his Memoirs was fully maintained by his descendants down to our own time. The elegance, the grace and the directness of the sentences of Bābār may clearly be traced to the writings of Jahāngīr, Shāhjāhān, 'Ala'īgīr, as well as the unfortunate Bahādur-Shāh Zafar, the last of the line, in his Urdu poetry.

Not being competent to pass an opinion on Turki poems, which are, however, longer and occupy a greater portion of the Divān, I give below a few Persian poems of the unfortunate Prince, which, by the way, are nearly in jauāb, or imitation, of well known pieces. It appears that Kāmrān Mīrzā was quite at home with Turki and Persian, using both indifferently as his mother speech.

The Bānkipur Codex consists of 34 folios, comprising 58 ghazals, 6 qā'as, 30 rubā'īyāt, 18 mathnawīs, of which 21, 3, 4, 4 respectively are in Persian. Of some 44 Distiches or fards, 23 are in Persian.

I have before me, as I write, a copy of the Divān made lately for the Bengal Asiatic Society and transcribed from the original copy now in the Bānkipur Public Library.

The following facts, extracted from Princess Gulbadan Bāg̣am's Humāyn-nāma as translated by Mrs. Beveridge, will conclude this introduction.

As soon as Kāmrān had fled from Sallīm Shāh and gone as far as Bhīra and Khusbā, Ādām Ghakkār, by plot and stratagem, captured him and brought him to Humāyūn.

"All assembled Khāns and Sultāns, and high and low, and plebeian and noble, and soldiers and the rest, who all bore the mark of Mīrzā Kāmrān's hand, with one voice represented to His Majesty; 'Brotherly custom has nothing to do with ruling and reigning. If you wish to act as a brother, abandon the throne. If you wish to be king, put aside brotherly sentiment ....... 'It is well to lower the head of the breacher of a kingdom' His Majesty answered; 'Though my head inclines to your words, my heart does not.' All cried out: 'what has been set before your Majesty is the really advisable course' ......... Even His Majesty was compelled to agree. When he drew near to Rohtās, the Emperor gave an order to blind Mīrzā Kāmrān in both eyes."

غزلات
منقول من دیوان کامران میرزا
بعد از این خاتم در پیرامون و سرما
ور کریست پی زخره‌خواهان گدایدی در ما
واو اگر هادیئی لطفت نشود رهبر ما
دم پدم درد و غیب بر دندن فل پرپور ما
میریم مزدود و فصیح مگر از دابر ما
ک بکوش نوشته ذره خانگخرا ما
لک نبست

حس تو دمیدم ازور بادا
کب که چشم من ممتاز بادا
جاه او دیده مکون بادا
مد جو دارا و فریدن بادا
و ازین دیده بودون بادا
خارج دهر ہیارون بادا

بیشتر فرخ و میمون بادا
بر چی چشم من ممتاز بادا
خان کو زر ایلی خیزد
بندگا حلقه نگوی تو چو بی
هارم گرد نچر پوران نگاهت
کامران تاک جهانرسا بقا
دریه‌های همیشگی می‌دانم و هم‌زمان دیده یار را
وه‌چ، به‌آمد بی‌فرارها و به‌میر و قرار
در تکم لعل از زنطاکه میروزد گهر
غیر جانان در جوان چشی بیدارد دگر
کامران نامه در افند تسلی می‌دهند
در نظر

و لعل
ای کافر می‌خیره، یی با خدا را
از اگر چو سیم دل نو نام نگرد
دلم طبع گوشه چشی زنو باعی
شیرین پسا لعل و بی آپ گیدنست

و لعل
چشم بر درا تو دارم و شد آیامی چند
رنت آن شد که نیپ جانی ما با می‌چند
آن گمرک می‌خیره، سیری ما پیدایی
چه شد و گر کنند شاد باًشیام، چند
نی کسی میلان دلم را به‌هم بی نبود
دلم و دل تو خواهم و دلا‌ریم چند

و لعل
هوگره کم‌حباب تو سرا در نظر آید
ناری‌تکه نخ ول امید سعید نیست
از تو گر نفل امید بیر آید
رخسارتو می‌خواهم، معینه که همست
بهر خطبه به‌هم دگری در نظر آید

نظمات
رفس ری به از درد کم شد انحوه‌همن
حد اخداوند را اذپین عنا الکری
باز زیادی شب می‌سید، را گفتم
زنانه پینه از پناد که نا پرست

و لعل
زمان پژل و رخت، مدهزار زیباان
هزار شوق زتو در دل تنشاهی
شکیب یی تو کسی چون کنده کر پیش لیل
वाण: उस दल से ने उनके देवस्थान समेत रहस्यमय उस दरबार पर रहने की उस समय तक नहीं अच्छा नहीं था।

वाण: ये अग्रभाग के उन दल ने उनके देवस्थान समेत रहस्यमय उस दरबार पर रहने की उस समय तक नहीं अच्छा नहीं था।

राज: उस दल से उनके देवस्थान समेत रहस्यमय उस दरबार पर रहने की उस समय तक नहीं अच्छा नहीं था।

राज: ये अग्रभाग के उन दल ने उनके देवस्थान समेत रहस्यमय उस दरबार पर रहने की उस समय तक नहीं अच्छा नहीं था।

राज: उस दल से उनके देवस्थान समेत रहस्यमय उस दरबार पर रहने की उस समय तक नहीं अच्छा नहीं था।

राज: ये अग्रभाग के उन दल ने उनके देवस्थान समेत रहस्यमय उस दरबार पर रहने की उस समय तक नहीं अच्छा नहीं था।

राज: उस दल से उनके देवस्थान समेत रहस्यमय उस दरबार पर रहने की उस समय तक नहीं अच्छा नहीं था।

राज: ये अग्रभाग के उन दल ने उनके देवस्थान समेत रहस्यमय उस दरबार पर रहने की उस समय तक नहीं अच्छा नहीं था।

राज: उस दल से उनके देवस्थान समेत रहस्यमय उस दरबार पर रहने की उस समय तक नहीं अच्छा नहीं था।

राज: ये अग्रभाग के उन दल ने उनके देवस्थान समेत रहस्यमय उस दरबार पर रहने की उस समय तक नहीं अच्छा नहीं था।
TRANSLATION.

Ghazals.

As no one guided us towards our destiny, let there be, hereafter, the dust of the Magi's door and our forehead.

As our affairs did not open (prosper) from the locked door of the pious, perhaps hereafter our door may be unlocked from the grogshop.

The steed is slow, the night dark, and the highwayman behind: oh, if the guide of your mercy will not direct us the way.

We are inured to pain and care of your love, so send every moment pain and care to our sorrow-nurtured mind.

Oh, with longing my heart beats and I am full of anguish, perhaps the glad tidings of union are coming from the captor of our hearts.

O Kamran, I have burnt myself by the fire of separation of a person, into whose lane never reaches a particle of our ashes.

May your beauty increase every moment, may your luck be happy and auspicious.
The dust that rises from your path, may it be the sarma of my eyes, who am distressed.
The dust that rises from the way of Laila, may it rest on the eyes of Majnum.

Like me, hundreds as Darius and Faridun be your slaves. He who did not move round you like a compass, ought to be out of this circle.

Kâmrân so long as the world exists, may Humâyûn be the ruler of the universe.

I saw the beloved in full sympathy with my rivals, O God, make easy to me this difficult situation.

Would that He, who gives power of skipping to that gracefully walking Cypress, give the impatient patience.

In conversation, his rubies (lips) as if showers pearls: how shall I suppress weeping from my pearl-raining eyes.

He who lifts from his front the screen of egotism, will never think of another thing in this world except of the beloved.

O Kâmrân as naught came to my sight except the Friend, so I did look to my heart's content the treasure of the sight.

O Kâfir, wine-bibbing, fearless, by God have mercy on this burnt-one, without head and foot.

Your heart is never melted by my suvery tears, You silver-cheeked, stony-hearted and tulip-faced.

I wish a corner of your eyes, that is to say, give consolation, with a look, to my sorrowful heart.

Sweet boy, your ruby-like lips are the water of life, a' drop of that water upon the thirsty-lipped, by God.

I am having my eyes on your way, and so it has been since some time, it is time that you should put towards us a few steps.

He who never sends towards us any message, would that he had pleased me with a little abuse.

That no one may gauge my heart's longings towards your face, I want the treasure of your company and a few heart-comforts.

Whenever my eyes look to your beauty, a hundred life-wasting lamentations come out of my soul.

Since your body is the tree of hope, it is not strange that my tree of hope will bear fruit from your body.
Your face is full of meaning, hence it is that your beauty appears, every moment, in different forms.

QUIT A S.

The rival has gone away from your threshold, my grief has decreased, God be thanked, who took away from us the sorrow.

Once again the Zulaikha-like night loosened her tresses, because the rose-coated Joseph went down the well.

How nice! Your looks and forehead show a hundred thousand beauties, a thousand wish of you in the mind of sightseers.

How can any one have patience without you, nor before your lips the stock-in-trade of patience flies into wind.

My heart has gone out of my hands, and I cannot trace it, perhaps the Beloveds of Yaghma have stolen it.

Whither I repair, I see your splendour: whatever I see, you appear in my sight.

Oh, your beauty is in its perfection, your body in its happiest symmetry.

Your tresses are proof positive of your exuberant beauty, which are the dālī of beauty.

Your face is the tulip-garden of beauty;

Your eyes in it are the gazelle of excellence.

The rose became ashamed of your beauty through modesty.

Hence there is beauty in being ashamed,

Do show mercy upon those who are thirsty of you: Oh, your ruby-lips are the fountain of excellence.

In your mirror (face) is reflected that Beloved of unrivalled excellence.

Owing to the grace of your face and elegance of the mole, they have made you the beau-ideal of excellence.

Like a dot under the lips (उ  ) has fallen underneath your lips the mole of excellence.

Have mercy on the condition of Kāmrān,

O the ruler of realm, and treasure of excellence!

RUBĀ'ĪYĀT.

O Zephyr, give me my greeting to that Friend,

Carry my message unto the seclusion of her union,

Pass on upon her morning-of-union, and the evening-of-locks, 2

O God, out of your mercy open a door upon me, remove from my sad heart the taint (i.e., thoughts) of others, loosen my connection from all concerns, show me the way towards you from both the worlds.

MATHNAVI

(SĀQĪNĀMĀ).

Come, O Sāqī, give me that wine which may nourish my soul and which may be appropriate to my afflicted soul, as the world is in enmity with me, and is contemplating to take away my life.

Come, O Sāqī, give me that world-reflecting goblet, that removes the troubles and enhances the pleasures, so that I may say shouting and intoxicated that the measure-glass of life will break.

1 The letter ū in its curvature resembles the tresses.

2 In Persian, the letter ba has a dot below it and resembles the lower lip.

3 That is, convey to her my blessings of mornines and evenings.
Observe that kari is never appended to instrumentals, when these are used in the agentive meaning. (Cf. § 60). Not unfrequently nāi is pleonastically added to kari. Cf. the use of kara-ke (from kari-kai) in Hindi (Kellogg, Hindi Grammar, § 173, a). Occasionally karaṁ is employed in the same function as kari, as in the following from Çrā.: e païca-paramesṭī-nai namaskāra karaṁ sarva pāpa-nai nāca hui “By paying homage to these five paramesṭīna, all sins are destroyed.”

The difference between kari and karaṁ is simply in that the former is passive and the latter active. In fact karaṁ is but an adverbial present participle, or, as will be explained § 124, a plural genitive absolute.

(2) nāi. This postposition is identical with that for the dative, for which see § 71, (2). In Old Western Rājasthāni it is only exceptionally employed for the instrumental to give the meaning of the agentive. I have noted only the two instances following:

Adiṣvara-nai dīkā līḍhi jāu “Having learned that Adiṣvara had taken the dīkā” (Adi C.),

devatāe bhagavanta-nai kidhaṁ te dekkh “The gods having seen what had been done by the Venerable One” (Adi C.).

The use of nāi as a postposition for the agentive seems to have been growing more and more frequent in the later form of the language. Nowadays it is common, not only to Gujarāti and to some dialects of Rājasthāni such as Mewātī and Mālvi, but also to Western Hindi, Naipāli, Paśjābī and Marāṭhi.

(3) pāhi. This is properly a postposition of the ablative and is therefore explained under § 72. In connection with causals it is occasionally used for the instrumental, to govern the person by whom is performed the action that is caused to be done. Exs.:

aṇerā-pāhi kudā bolāva naḥ “I do not cause others to tell falsehood” (Daṇ. iv.),
aṇerā-pāhi himāda ārambhava naḥ “He does not make others to commit offence” (ibid).

Cf. the use of pāhi, pahi, pai in Hindi, to indicate the agent of the potential passive, as in the following passage from Tulasī Dāsa:

kaḥ na jāi mohi-pāhi “It cannot be told by me” (Rāmacaritamānas, i, 233).

Cf. also Kellogg, Hindi Grammar, § 796.

In the following passage from Dd., pāsi is used instead of pāhi:

samaṇa-loka-pāsi ājñā manaṁ “Caused all the people to obey his command” (Dd. 5).

(4) sāthi (sāthi, sāthā). This postposition may be explained either as a locative from Apabhraṁça sāthē < Skt. sārthe “In the company of...” or, more probably, as an instrumental from Apabhraṁça sāthē < Skt. sārthena. Cf. the phrase tasyāḥ sārthena in Weber’s Campakāsṛṣṭihikathānakam, 219. Examples of the use of sāthī in Old Western Rājasthāni are:

Bharata-rāya Jina-sāthī bolai “The king Bharata speaks to the Jina” (F 722, 59),
amha-sāthā “Along with us” (P. 649),
mā-sāthī “Along with me” (Adi C).
When so used in connection with pronouns, sāthi may be optionally construed with the possessive pronominal adjectives instead than with the genitive. Ex:

māharaśi sāthi “Along with me” (P. 650).

māharaśi sāthi “ Ditto ” (Kānha. 26).

(5) sīū (syā, saū, sū, sū). This postposition is from Apabhrāṇa sahū (Hc., iv, 419, 5) < Skt. sākām (Fischel, § 206), with i for a according to § 2, (1). It governs the genitive generally, but occasionally instances are still found of its being construed with the instrumental as in Apabhrāṇa and in Sanskrit. Ex.:

mośā-nai mośā-sīū dosa | mujha-sīū kisiū karai te dosa — “Who is great finds fault with the great; how could he find fault with me?” (P. 215),

tumha-sīū mitrapañā-nai kāji “In order to make friendship with you” (P. 675),

chojai háthe-sīū bā̤dhasū “Unties the bindings with his hands” (P. 318),

kavi-saū na karasū vāda “I will not compete with poets” (P. 6),

kumara-sū “Along with the princes” (P. 35),

Kirāta-sū yuddha karai “Fights with the Kirātas” (Ādi C).

Modern Mārāwā has sū, (=< saū) and Modern Gujarāti gu (< syū), sū.

§ 71. As already explained (see § 65), most of the Postpositions of the dative are by origin nouns in the locative. Some of them are still capable of being used in the original locative meaning, and by the subsequent development of the language they are also commonly used for the accusative, as we have seen above.

(1) kanhai (kanhai, kanhi, kanholi, kai) is from Apabhrāṇa kaṇhāli (< Skt. kara-smin (= karase), as already surmised by Mr. Trumpp, p. 401 of his Sindhi Grammar. It means “Near” generally, but in particular cases it may be understood either in the sense of the locative “Near to”, or of the accusative-dative “Towards, to”, or of the ablative “From near to far”. When used for the dative, kanhai mostly indicates motion towards and is connected with verbs meaning “To go,” such as āvavā, jāvā etc. Ex.:

āvū rā-kanhai “They went to the king” (Cāl. 120),

āvāj tiːh-kāri “ Goes there ” (Rs. 188).

Himavanta-kanhai jai “Having gone to the Himalaya” (Ādi C.),

stripūṭrādika-kanhai jai “Having resorted to wives, sons, etc.” (Ṣaṭṭ. 22).

It will be observed that in all the examples above kanhai is used in the function of an accusative of direction, rather than of a dative. In fact periphrastic dative and accusative have merged together in most of the Neo-Indian vernaculars and have practically become a unique case. In spite of this I have thought it convenient to make a distinction between postpositions of the accusative (direct object) and of the dative (indirect object), and accordingly I have included in the latter the postposition kanhai, which is never used for the direct object.

This postposition is found largely spread amongst the Indo-Aryan vernaculars and it is everywhere used in the general meaning of the accusative-dative. From Old Western Rāṣṭrās-kāhā are derived Gujarāti kāne and Mārāwā kana, and from its equivalents kānai, kāsi are derived Gujarāti kāse, kāsa, kāna, which occur only as an appendage to adverbs, as in: ašā-kāse, -kāṣa (see Belsare’s Gujarāti Dictionary, p. 86), and Kumānī kāsi, which still finds a large employment as a postposition of the accusative-dative.

(2) naś (nai, ni, ni) is but a curtailment from kanhai, brought about by the dropping of the initial syllable. It has, therefore, nothing to do with the locative of the genitive post-
position nāi and, though being probably cognate to the latter postposition, it has not derived from it. In my article On the Origin of the Dative and Genitive Postpositions in Gujarāṭī and Mār-wārī (J. R. A. S., 1913, pp. 553-567), I have collected many arguments in favour of the above-mentioned derivation of nāi and I believe I have shown that nāi and kanhaṛi are practically identical also in most of their meanings and constructions. 28 Examples of the use of nāi are:

jima vā/a bhādā -nāi koi -eka vā/a dekhādāi “As if one showed the way to him, who has lost his way” (Crā.),

svayambudha mantri teha-nāi “He had a minister [by name] Svayambudha” (ṛṣ. 7),
Damanaka Piṅgala-nāi kahāi “Damanaka says to Piṅgala” (P. 260),
te savihū -nāi karaṇa paraṇama “I bow to all them” (F 728, 406).
From nāi are regularly derived Modern Gujarāṭī nē and Mār-wārī nai, nāi.

(3) pratī (pratī, pratāi, pratī) is a tatāama identical with the preposition pratī, which in Sanskrit is also used in the manner of a postposition, i.e., after the noun it governs. In the Old Western Raṣṭhānī pratī is chiefly employed in connection with verbs involving the general idea of “Speaking to” and “Saluting, bowing to,” to indicate the indirect object. These verbs are construed with the dative or with the accusative with pratī in Sanskrit also.

Old Western Raṣṭhānī examples are:

rāya rāṛi-pratī kahāi “The king says to the queen” (P. 353),
muṛha-pratī te kahāi chaī isīū “He says to me this” (P. 226),
rāya-pratāi te nara vinavai “Those men relate [the fact] to the king” (P. 348),
āçāra-pratāi māharu namaskāra hu “I bow to the āçāryas” (Crā.),
sara śādkh-pratāi vādī-nāi “After having saluted all śādhus” (F 644).

In the following, pratī is used to form adverbs:

bhava-pratī “pratibhavam” (Kal. 33),
dina-pratī “Every day” (Yog. ii, 98).

(4) bhaṛi is the contracted form of the locative singular from bhau “Said” and it is therefore identical in origin with the so-called conjunctive participle (See §131). The uncontracted form bhārī has been preserved P. 23. Formerly it was employed as a real past participle, in agreement with a preceding noun in the locative, in the absolute construction, but afterwards it was understood as a postposition and became capable of governing the genitive of the nouns with which it was connected. Instances of bhaṛi construed with the original locative are still occasionally met with in Old Western Raṣṭhānī texts. The general meaning of this postposition is “With a view, or with regard to, for”, but in particular it may assume many shades of meaning as will be shown by the examples following:

teha - bhaṛi “Therefore” (Yog., Indr., Crā., Adi C. etc.),
syā-bhaṛi “Wherefore?” (P. 535, Adi C.),
Devadatta-nāi milavā-bhaṛi “In order to meet Devadatta” (P. 298),
rājā-nā pratibodha-nā-bhaṛi māhataśi gūṭā kahāi “In order to instruct the king, the minister recited a couplet” (Adi C.),
śāstra-samudra tarawā-bhaṛi | niti-buddhi chaī nāva | “Political wisdom is the boat for crossing over the sea of science” (P. 5.),
cālī vana-bhaṛi “He started for the forest” (P. 134),
śīvī śiṅgha-bhaṛi “Went to the lion” (P. 97),

28 Of the intermediate form nāi we have a survival in the following: teha-nāi bhāi “Her brother” (Up. 33).
te tedi avai tujha-bhapi “Having called her, I will return to you” (P. 538).
cauva vidya-bhapi vidvata hau “He became learned in the fourteen sciences” (Dd. 2).
Examples of bhapi construed with the locative are:
tini bhapi “Therefore” (Adi C),
Mathurā noyari bhapi sākaryā “They started for the city of Mathurā” (P. 52),
deswari bhapi . . . . caivi “He went abroad” (P. 142),
bhavia-nava-nai kita bhapi “For the benefit of the righteous” (F 616, 1).
(5) mātai (mātai, mātī), if I am right, is from nimattai < Ap. simittai < Skt. *nimittakena, by apheresis of the initial syllable and change of t to t, analogously to the example of Modern Gujarāti etalo < O.W. Rājasthāni etala < Ap. etula (See § 24). This derivation is strongly supported by the consideration that nimittai, mostly under the form nimattai, is very commonly used as a postposition in Old Western Rājasthāni texts. Instances thereof are especially common in the MSS. Dd., F°585 and F°760, which is written in a somewhat old form of Jaipuri. In Old Western Rājasthāni mātai and nimittai are used exactly in the same meaning, viz., to indicate both purpose and consequence. Examples of the use of mātai are:
etalā-māṭi “For this” (F 555),
roi syā-māṭi “Wherefore dost thou cry?” (Cāl. 131),
vatāgarā-māṭai navı hava “In consideration of [your being my] servant, I do not kill you” (P. 253).
Modern Gujarăti has māṭe.
(6) rahāi (rahai, rahī) is from arahai (see § 2, (4)), the locative of arahai < urahai, an adjective, which I derive from Sanskrit apārdo, through Apabhraṃcya * avāra- > *oral (See § 147). Its original meaning is “Near,” whence “To.” In some Old Western Rājasthāni texts this postposition has a very large employment and it is used not only for the dative and accusative, but even for the genitive. Most frequently, however, rahāi is used for the dative, whereof take the following illustrations:
te-rahai unnumai na di “I will not give my assent to them” (Daç. iv),
kaha-rahī “Wherefore?” (Cra.),
namaskāra te subha-rahi hu “Let homage be paid to those heroes” (Cāl. 36),
apakāra-rahī “For the sake of infamy” (Kānh. 17),
majha-rahāi e phala hū “I have reaped this result” (Daç. v).
(7) raũ (hraũ) is identical with the foregoing postposition, from which it has derived by h being first thrown back to the beginning of the word, according to § 51, and then dropped. The intermediate form hraũ has survived in the MSS. Cra., Up., Satl., F°580. Ex.:
jima dādalū purwa-hraũ koi akhi dī “As if one gave an eye to a blind man” (Cra.),
te-hū mujha-hraũ na gamai “Even him I do not like” (Up. 63),
te dhanya jeha-raũ sūdhaiv guru milo “Those are fortunate, to whom a blameless preceptor falls in sort” (Satl. 136).
This postposition has gone lost in Gujarāti, but has survived in Mārwārī under the form rau.

§ 72. The Postpositions of the ablative are partly nouns in the locative and partly participles. The latter are either inflected in agreement with the subject in the sentence, or used absolutely in the neuter, or in the locative singular.

(To be continued.)
THE HISTORY OF THE NAIK KINGDOM OF MADURA.

BY V. RANGACHARI, M.A., L.T., MADRAS.

(Continued from p. 202.)

The Contemporary Indigenous Kings.

Both inscriptions and chronicles thus agree in saying that Viśvaṇātha Nāik was at Madura in 1535. Was there any indigenous ruler in Madura then? According to the chronicles there was one Chandra-Sēkharā, the 16th in descent from Sōma-Sēkharā, the object of Kampaṇa Uḍayār’s soliciite. But there are grave doubts, as I have already pointed out in the first chapter, in regard to the existence of this dynasty. It was the Vānadarāyaś who were in possession of Madura in this age. The relation of Chandra-Sēkharā to these Vānadarāyaś is very obscure. Was he after all a relation, an unfriendly relation, or member of the Vānadarāyaś line? However it was, there were, farther off, in Tinnevelly, the Pāṇḍyas of Teukāi and their feudatories who continued, as of old, to be in power. As has been already pointed out, Ahaḍa-Rāma was succeeded by Śrīvallabha in 1523, and acquitted himself with remarkable distinction for a space of ten years.

SECTION IV. SADASIVA-RAYA 1542—65.

The Rise of the Āraviṇu House.

It was under such circumstances that Achnyta Rāya died in 1542. On his death, the care and sceptre of the Empire devolved eventually on his nephew Sadāśiva Rāya63, a man whose mild character and humility of temper unfitness him to meet the stress and storm which was soon to surround the state. The weak and yielding nature of the new sovereign made him the tool of ambitious nobles and intriguing ministers. All power was seized by the three brothers Rāma-Rāja64, Tirumala and Vēnkaṭādri of the powerful house of Āraviṇu—a house which, like those of the Sāljuvās and the Salakas, had distinguished itself largely in the imperial service. The earliest of the race was one Tāta Pinnama, whose son Śomīdeva, it is said, was such a fine soldier that he took seven forts in a single day from an unknown enemy. His son Raguha Dēva and grandson Pinnama II, lord of the city of Āraviṇu, were comparatively obscure figures. But Pinnama’s son Bukka was a devoted servant of Śāluka Narasimha, and no doubt helped him in his usurpation. There can be no doubt that Bukka’s son Rāma I. and grand-son Runga I. played some part in the Tuluva usurpation and administration that followed. The Āraviṇu chiefs seem to have been a line of capable men and, what was more, experts in diplomacy. At first the servants of the Sāljuvās, they evidently changed sides when the Tuluvas came, and served Narasa Nāik, Vīra Narasimha, Kṛṣṇa Dēva and Achyuta Rāya. So powerful and influential did they become that Runga’s sons, Rāma Rāya65 (who married the daughter of Kṛṣṇa Dēva Rāya), Tirumala,
and Venkatadri, a man of exceptional martial valour, became the most powerful and influential men in the Empire in the time of Sadasya Raya. Powerful as those men were, they neither abused their power nor behaved like cowards. On the other hand, Rama Raya was one of the most aggressive statesmen of the age, one in whom the love of domination was the quintessence of life. His soaring ambition not only longed wiped off the disgrace which Vijayanagar had sustained in the previous reign, but to extend its borders, at the expense of the Deccan Sultans, to the Vindyas. As great in action as he was bold in design, Rama Raya proceeded to achieve his object with wisdom. A born diplomatist, he adopted the Machiavellian sixth scheme of playing off the Musalmans States against one another. The very next year after Sadasya's accession, he joined the Nizam Shaik of Ahmadnagar in an invasion of Bijapur. In 1551, he again co-operated with Ahmadnagar against Bijapur, and in the campaign which followed, recovered the whole of the Raichur Dabab. Four years later, he assisted Bijapur, the very State whose humiliation he had so recently effected, in its endeavour to quell a rebel vassal and to check the Portuguese. With the aid of this new ally he then made war with his old ally Ahmadnagar, and in a series of campaigns, spread terror and devastation through that kingdom. The result of these skilful alliances and counter-alliances was that Vijayanagar was able to assume a sort of supremacy over the Bahmani States. The Hindu Emperor beheld with pleasure the discord of the Musalmans, and boldly despatched a Vijayanagar army to the Vindyan barriers, which he considered thereafter to be the northern confines of his Empire.

The Revival of the Travancore Aggressions in the South.

Never was the power of Vijayanagar so much felt, and never did fortune so invariably follow its standard. The Sultans were so completely eclipsed by the Hindu Emperor that they had to implore his protection and acknowledge his dominion in practice, if not in theory. While the foreign policy of Rama Raya was such a glorious success, his internal policy was not less glorious. A number of inscriptions prove that the exercise of imperial authority in the south was a living and potent fact. An incident which took place in the extreme south of the peninsula similar to that of the year 1532 illustrates this. In the year 1543 the great Sri Vallabha Pandyya-Rajya-Sthapanacharya died, and was succeeded by his cousin Abhirama Parakrama, who ruled for the next decade, till 1552. The new king was apparently a feeble and incompetent man. At any rate, he seems to have been

66 For details of his campaigns see Perishita, Vol. III. They have been reproduced and compared with Portuguese authorities by Sewell in his Fung. Emp., 158-185. For a Mr. account of Rama Raja's contests with the Muhammadans till the battle of Talikotta, see the Canara Kyofos, Vol. IV of Col. Mackenzie. A very short and meagre review of it is in Taylor's Ris, Catal. III, p. 440. The most conspicuous Telugu literary work, Narapatinsrayamu, also celebrates the glory of Rama Raja. The Vasukaritra is another important work throwing light on this period of Vijayanagar history.

67 More than 15 insc. exist, showing Sadasya's rule in the south. Ins. 129 of 1905 says that he was the conqueror of all countries and Ceylon, and that his viceroy was Visala, who had an agent named Ramanappa Nalk at Kajalagod. Ins. 5 and 27 of 1906 recognize his power in the Koio Country, 476 of 1909 mentions him at Tiruvallagod, 256 of 1891 says that his brother Venkatadri was at Tiruvannamalai in 1559. Ins. 318 of 1905 says that Rama Raja remitted the tax on banars in the Carnatic country in 1547. His subordinate in Gippee was Achyuta Nalk. Examples may be multiplied, but are unnecessary.

69 Ibid. p. 61 Mr. Gopinatha Rao's version seems, in this case, to be preferable to Mr. Krishna Sastry's. (See Trev. Arch. Series p. 103). The whole question, however, is still unsettled.
far inferior in capacity to his brilliant predecessor. The reigning king of Travancore, Rāma-varma—he was the successor or, more probably, the co-regent of Ravivarman—who had succeeded Udāya-Mārtanda, the adversary of Achyuta Rāya—took advantage of this and embraced the resolution, in consistency with the policy of his ancestors, of committing inroads into Paṇḍya lands. So keen and aggressive was he that, by 1544, he was, as an inscription of the Nelliappa temple shews, at Tinnevelly itself. We do not exactly know what the Paṇḍya did at this crisis; but we may be certain that he appealed against his greedy neighbour, as of old, to the Emperor. Sadāvī, or rather Rāma Rāya, was hardly likely to ignore such an unscrupulous ambition in a feudatory vassal.

The invasion of Travancore by Viṭṭhala and his Viceregency.

The therefore ordered his cousin Mahāmaṇḍalasvara Viṭṭhalasvara Mahā-Rāya to proceed to the south and restore the balance of power there. We do not know why Viśvanātha Naik who, as we have already seen, was Viceroy in 1544, was not asked to settle the question. It is not improbable that he was asked to serve as a subordinate officer under Viṭṭhalasvara. It seems that Viṭṭhalasvara was a relation of his—a cousin. For an inscription of S. 1534 says that Nāgarasū of the solar race and Kātyaya Gātra, (i.e., the father of Viśvanātha Naik) was the nephew of Rāmarāja Tirumalaiya-Diva-Mahārāja of the lunar race and Aṭrēya Gātra, and this Tirumaliya was Viṭṭhalasvara's father. So Viśvanātha was a cousin of the new Viceroy, and no doubt accompanied him in his southward march, in 1544. The campaign of Viṭṭhalasvara was in reality a repudiation of the campaign of Achyuta Rāya—a second conquest of the south by the Badugas. The Badugas were, as may be imagined, victorious everywhere. They recovered the Tinnevelly province and were soon within the Tiruvadai dominions. Two miles off Kottār, we are told, the two forces met. The exact date is unknown, but it is almost certain that it took place in July or August 1544. The king of Travancore, according to Xavier, did not yield; but inscriptions prove that he did. We

17 For an inscription of his, dated 1538, at Kailasanātha shrun at Suchindram, see No. 79 of 1896. The Travancore State Museum says that Udāya-mārtanda, the contemporary of Achyuta Rāya, was succeeded by Bhātala-vira-UDAYA-RaVivarman and Bhātala-vira was his co-regent. Mr. S. Parameswara Ayyar in the Chron. Col. May. (1901) says Miśrāñjana Varman's successor was “Srīvedā Ramavarman,” one of whose inscriptions is dated 1537 A.D. “It was the successor of this prince, Bhātala-vira Śri Vira Bhātala Varman who was reigning in Travancore, at the period of the invasion of Viṭṭhalasvara,耄ὶ the name Inqueleristu, which, considering the monstrous perversion of Indian names generally made by European authors, is not an altogether unfaithful reproduction of the name Uṇāi Kāraja Varman.” (p. 188.) He was a great friend of the Portuguese KārajaVarma “must have died” soon after the Bujagas invasion; for an inscrip. of Rāma Varman is found at Suchindram in 1546-7.

18 Inscription 120 of 1894.

19 See Arch. Surv. Ind. 1908-9, p. 195. The order seems to have been passed in 1544-5. Ins. 273 of 1901 at Kollāini says that Viṭṭhalasvara “granted the whole country” by Saḷāśīva Rāya. Just before his arrival in the south he was at Penukota, where, as ins. 340 of 1901 shows, he remitted certain taxes to barbers. Ins. 140 of 1895 records a gift by Viṭṭhalasvara at Tiruvallur (Tanjore Dist.) Viṭṭhalasvara's relation to Rāma Rāya was long uncertain. He was considered by Nelsen to be the same as Rāma Rāya and by Mr. Venkayya, to be his son. In reality he was his cousin. (Ep. Rep. 1911, p. 96); ibid, 1912, p. 82 ff. See also Bhalbhachyanatsam of Douāri Konrukavi, Lives of Telugu Poets, p. 241, for references to Viṭṭhalasvara. (See also Chron. Col. May. 1904-5, p. 187.)

20 Inscription 101 of 1905, found in the Mārkapor temple, dated S. 1554 (Andora).

21 Viṭṭhalasvara's success ranged, says an inscription, from Ananta-ayanam (Trivandrum) in the south to Mudalal in the north. See Ep. Rep. 1900, para 80. Ins. 140 of 1895 says that a Brahmin served Viṭṭhalasvara as a soldier throughout these wars, and was in consequence rewarded with two villages. For a detailed consideration of this campaign, see Tran. Mav. 1, p. 297-9 and Chron. Col. May., 1904-5, 157-90.

22 See ante, Vol. XXVI, p. 144 for a history of this place.

23 For Xavier's career see Chap. III. Mr. Nagan Ayya says that Ravivarman and Viṭṭhalasvara arrived at a compromise by which the extreme south of the peninsula was to be part of Travancore dominion, and that Tiruvadi in return was to desist from future aggression. In Ravivarman's Suchindram grant, Mr. Nagan Ayya sees a proof of this 'compromise.' See Tram. Mar., 295-300.
are informed, for instance, that in 1546 he gave a piece of land to the Sthánëśvara Temple at Suchirābām for the merit of Viśhåkåśvara Mahā Rāya on his birth-day,—a thing which he would hardly do if he was independent. From this time onward to the year 1557, i.e., for a space of eleven years, Rāma Rāya Viśhåla was the imperial viceroy of the south. The indigenous chronicles of Madura are reticent about him; but the inscriptions are unanimous in describing him as a statesman, enjoying the most honourable rank and the most affluent fortune in his day.

The Rise of a new trouble in the South: Chōja Aggressions against the Pāṇḍya.

Such is the history of Madura and the southern end of the peninsula till the year 1557, when certain important events happened, which directly led to the establishment of the Nāik dynasty. Unfortunately a most mysterious obscurity prevails in connection with the immediate circumstances which brought it about. According to the Pāṇḍya Chro., there were three Nāik chieftains, Dimppa, Sevappa and Paṭukōṭai Raivappa, during the three years which followed the end of Viśhåla's administration. Then in Raivatri Mārgalā (1559), it continues, in consequence of the Rāyār's orders, Koṭiyām Nāgama Nāik came to Madura, and ruled till Dundum, for a period of two years and four months. In other words, according to the Pāṇḍya Chro., there was an interval of three years between Viśhåla and Viśvanātha; and Viśvanātha ruled for the space of two years. It is curious that it does not give the circumstances under which Viśvanātha assumed the crown of Madura. This defect is supplied by the other chronicles. They indeed are hopelessly wrong in regard to the dates of the events which they describe (for they attribute Viśvanātha to the third decade of the 15th century), but the facts they give are evidently true. They say that there ruled in Madura a very feeble and irresolute ruler, Chandra-Śēkhaṇa Pāṇḍya, the last of the Śoma-Śēkhaṇ line, that he was deprived of his crown and kingdom by an aggressive Chōja ruler of the day, Viśa-Śēkhaṇ by name. Nothing substantial is known about these kings and rivals. Chandra-Śēkhaṇ was, as I have already pointed out, probably a chief distinctly related to either the old Pāṇḍyan or the Vānādāraṇa line. Viśa-Śēkhaṇ is described as the Chōja king of Tanjore, but the Chōlas had ceased to rule at Tanjore by the beginning of the 15th century. Even supposing that some scions of the old Chōja dynasty continued to live in Tanjore, we are practically certain that they could not have exercised any power for the dynasty of Sevappa Nāik was by the year 1550 firmly seated there, and the exercise of authority by a prince of the indigenous dynasty would have been impossible. But if Viśa-Śēkhaṇ did not rule at Tanjore, he might have lived and reigned at Trichinopoly, which was as much a Chōja capital as Tanjore. Indeed, one of the Poligar memoirs distinctly says that his seat of government was Trichinopoly. It is not improbable that he was a relation and successor of the Chōlas, Channayya and Bāgya, who, as we have already seen, ruled about 1530 at Turaiyur, and who acknowledged Krishna Dēva Rāya as their suzerain.

(To be continued.)

17 Inscription 64 of 1896. This king is also called Venru-mān-Koṭa-Bhāta-Mārē-Vīrāmanna-Mārō of Jētunganālē.
18 His head-quarters seem to be Trichinopoly. (See Ins. 273 of 1901). Ins. 557, 558 and 559 of 1911 record grants to Koṭai Alagur temple at Madura by Timmappa Nāik, son of Basavana Nāik, for the merit of Viśhåla, whose subordinate officer he was. It is plain from all these that about 1651 A. D. there was a Governor at Madura named Timmappa Nāik who was subordinate to Viśhåla.
19 The exact date of Sevappa's accession to the Tanjore throne is unknown. In 1644 Tanjore was under Viśhåla. By 1649 it was under Sevappa, for an insc. of Shumeer Ali's tomb mentions him, though not as king. According to one account Sevappa took Tanjore by his valor. According to another, he got it as a dowry of his wife Mōrti Aṁmāj, a sister of Aychyām Rāya's queen (Tirumalābba). The question is an interesting one for investigation, but is not possible here. Here it is enough that it be understood that by 1550 the Tanjore Nāik dynasty was firmly established. See T. S. Kuppussäm Sāstrī's Short History of the Tanjore Nāik Princes; Tanj. Gazz., 38-40, and the MS. history Tanjñavur Vairāchārya, the summary of which is in Tanj. Manual and Rāj. Cōd., III, 176 ff.
20 Genealogy of Kadirmalai Muttu Mădar, Nāik of Dummaphṣi Pāyavum. Appendix VII.
A SKETCH OF THE HISTORY OF THE MADHVA ACHARYAS.

BY G. VENKOBA RAO, OOTACAMUND.

The fourteenth century A.D. was a remarkable period in the history of Southern India. It was marked with the extinction of some of the most ancient and powerful kingdoms; it saw new dynasties, equally powerful, rising in the seats of old ones; it also witnessed the peace and happiness of the people overtaken by grief and consternation by a cruel foreign invasion. Just before the dawn of this century the political dominancy of the ancient race of the Cholas came to an end and their kingdom passed into the hands of the rising Pāṇḍyas of Madura. In the early part of the century another ancient family of kings, the Hoysaḷas of Dvārasamudra, was subverted by Malik Kāfūr, the avaricious general of 'Alāūd-dīn Khilji. The virgin south suffered that molestation, which the unhappy north had long been accustomed to, from the vandalistic hands of the Musalmāns, headed by that low caste convert, Malik Kāfūr. Harrowing tales of woe suffered by Hindu temples during this period are found recorded in the inscriptions on their walls. This Muhammadan torrent left here and there puddles of Musalmāns, who snatched for themselves small tracts of country and began to rule over them. One such colony was established at Madura and swayedy the destiny of the country round it for nearly half a century; the island of Srīraṣṭigam is said to have been occupied by another band of these men for an equally long period.

The last remnants of the power of the Yādavas of Dēvagiri became extinct with Rāmachandra and his son-in-law Harapāla, who was slain alive by Mubārik, the ruthless son of 'Alāūd-dīn. The mighty empire of Vijayanagara, which was going to play such an important part in protecting the south from further Muhammadan havoc, rose at the bidding of that sage, cyclopaedic scholar and statesman, Vidyāraṇya, from the ashes of the Hoysaḷa kingdom. With this intellectual giant at the helm of the State, the early sovereigns of Vijayanagara were able to conquer the whole of what is now known as the Madras Presidency, drive off all the Turushka hoards, and establish order and peace where there was rapine and slaughter.

The intellectual and philosophical activities were also in full swing; the Viśiṣṭhādīvaṇa philosophy propounded by Rāmānujāchārya had already taken deep root. The new school of the Dvaita philosophy started by Madhvāchārya found many converts to his faith in the beginning of this same century. The Advaita school was represented by Vidyāraṇya, who was then head of the Sri-gērī Maṭha. The schism in the Viśiṣṭhādīvaṇa school was brought in by the teachings of Veṅκaṭaṇāṭhārya, better known by the name of Vēṅkaṭadēśīka. It is the purpose of this paper to trace as far as possible the history of the Madhva Achāryas, paying particular attention to the chronological side of it and leaving the philosophical part to abler hands than mine. For achieving this purpose, I have, for obvious reasons, chosen to take my stand upon epigraphical records, and to admit tradition wherever it does not militate against epigraphical facts.

1 Annual Report of the Government Epigraphist, Madras, for 1900, para. 29.
2 Fleet's Kenarast Dvainlas, p. 509.
3 Inscriptions recording the Musalman invasion are found in Tirupātu, Tiruvāṇāty, Tirupputur (Madura), Tiruvaṅgai, Srīraṣṭigam, &c.
There have been several attempts at the construction of a scientifically accurate history of the life of Madhvacharya in the past three or four years. Mr. C. N. Krishnasami Ayyar, M.A., of the Coimbatore College, was the first, as far as we know, to attempt the solution of the question of the age of Madhvacharya in his dissertation for the Master of Arts Degree examination. The same gentleman brought out quite recently a revised edition of his booklet, in which a certain amount of anxiety to deal with the subject in a most scientific manner is exhibited by him. However, we are sorry to remark he has not made use of all the available sources of information for the elucidation of the period under consideration, and it is no wonder that he has arrived at conclusions which, we fear, are not reconcilable with unshakably sure facts; we mean those that are given in inscriptions, both on stone and on copper. If he had only taken the trouble to have gathered all available facts for the construction of the history of the period chosen by him for study, we have no doubt, he would have arrived at true results. His summary way of disposing of the conclusions arrived at by Mr. H. Krishna Sastri is, we consider, rather hasty. In fact there are several points in his essay which we feel are not acceptable to us.

The next serious attempt at fixing the age of the great Dvaita Acharya was made by Mr. H. Krishna Sastri, B.A., of the Archaeological Department. His paper was based upon an inscription discovered in the Srikrurram temple, belonging to the time of Narahari Thirtha, one of the direct disciples of Madhavacharya, and dated in the Saka year 1203. One thing came out of this paper. The Madhva community was bestirred to reconsider the date of their Acharya, as also the chronology of their heierarchy in general, and to adjust the dates to suit irrefutable facts of Epigraphy. At the Madhva-Siddhanta-Umnaini Sabha, which is annually held at Tiruchchhnur, near Tirupati, during the Christmas holidays, the question of the exact date of the birth of Madhavacharya was taken up for discussion and, as might be expected from such an orthodox body as the Sabha, a condemnation of the methods and results of Mr. Sastri was expressed.

The orthodox denunciation started at the meeting of the Sabha reached its climax in the writings of Mr. Subba Rao, M.A., of the Salem College. This gentleman in the introduction to his translation of the Gita-Bhashya of Madhavacharya, emports the vial of his wrath first on the epigraphical information gathered by the archaeologist, which he brands as "of impossible and inadmissible character" and later on by saying "supposing the above information is obtained on correct interpretation of the inscriptions he insinuates that the people in the Archaeological Department cannot interpret inscriptions properly. Then again he inweights against the impudence of the very inscriptions themselves in recording dates and facts which are contradictory to the lists maintained in the mathas. Truly, the piety of this Madhva in believing that the matha lists are infallible surpasses that of the orthodox Roman Catholic who holds firmly in the infallibility of the Pope. Regarding the inscriptions he writes: "It is not our business at present to investigate still further the erroneousness or correctness of the inscriptions themselves" as though he could prove that a public stone record is likely to be more erroneous than a private list recorded on a palm-leaf or paper and preserved in the matha. In making statements such

---

6 Madhvacharya—A Short Historical Sketch.
7 Epigraphia Indica, Vol. VI, pp. 260-68.
8 The Bhagavad-Gita, printed at the Minerva Press, Madras.
9 Ibid. p. xi of the introduction.
10 Ibid. p. xii of the introduction.
11 Ibid. p. xvii of the introduction.
as these, our irate friend is guided only by a few extracts from the paper of Mr. Krishna Sastri, which he has read in the Sabha Report. He has certainly not seen or read the whole of Mr. Sastri's paper before passing his strong strictures on epigraphy and its methods.

Of quite a different stamp from Mr. Subba Rao, is Mr. C. M. Padmanābhāchārya, B.A., B.L., of the Coimbatore Bar. With the feeling of a true Madhva, he records first of all faithfully the events of the life of the greatest of the teachers of the Vdāta school of philosophy as obtained from tradition, and tries his best to reconcile them with the solid information derived from epigraphical sources. If some of his conclusions do not appeal to us it is not because his method is incorrect, but that the materials are not sufficiently numerous for him to work upon. The method of research adopted by him being excellent in every detail, we are sure he must have arrived at the same conclusions at which we ourselves have arrived, had he only been in full possession of all the facts available from the epigraphical sources. A point which obviously strikes the reader throughout Mr. Padmanābhāchārya's book is his sentimentality, which exhibits itself rather markedly. But it is excusable in a devotee.

In our own humble way we shall try to contribute our mite to his literature with the same scientific spirit which actuated some of our predecessors. No one is more conscious than ourselves of the fact that many small errors might creep into our results and our only plea to appear in print is to induce better minds than ours to tackle the question with greater energy and resources than we are in possession of at present.

In the village of Pājaka near Udipi in the South Canara District, there lived a Brahma named Madhyagēha (Tulu, Naugvaantillaya, the middle-house man). A not very opulent person, moderately cultured, Madhyagēha was leading a quiet householder's life. Two male children were born to him, but they both died young. He had only a young daughter left. To a Hindu householder nothing is more painful than being sonless, and Madhyagēha was feeling intensely for a son. Happily his prayers were heard and he was blessed with a son, whom the father named Vāṣudēva. The regular Brahmanical ceremonies, such as chauja, upanayana, etc., were celebrated in due course of time and the boy entered under the tuition of Achyutaprēkshāchārya, also known as Parushottams Tirtha. The boy Vāṣudēva was strongly inclined to assume sanyāsārama, but was often prevented by his father from giving way to his desire. At last the father and son came to an agreement that as soon as another son was born to the former, Vāṣudēva must be allowed to fulfil his wish of becoming a Sanyāsin, for the father was loth to lose his only son. After some time another boy was born to Madhyagēha, and young Vāṣudēva was permitted by the father to assume the robes of a Sanyāsin. The holy orders were given to him by his guru Achyutaprēkshāchārya under the name of Pāṇḍaprajña. Some years were spent by Pāṇḍaprajña under his religious teacher in mastering the systems of philosophy then current, and in having a firm foundation in the Vēdānta. He began to reflect thereupon on the various interpretations given by the various commentators on the Bāddarāyaṇa Sūtras. From the beginning Pāṇḍaprajña's mind revolted against the tenets of the Advaita school; therefore he began to elaborate his own Vdāta explanation of the Bāddarāyaṇa Sūtras.

12 The Life of Madhūchāchārya, printed at the Progressive Press, Madras.

13 For a detailed life of Śrī-Madhūchāchārya, we refer the readers to the excellent book of Mr. Padmanābhāchārya.
Achuytaprêksha was growing old, he therefore resolved upon making Pûrânaprâjña his successor in the seat occupied by him. On the day appointed for installing his disciple in his own place, Achuytaprêksha performed all the ceremonies and anointed Pûrânaprâjña under the name of Ânanda Tirtha. Thereafter Ânanda Tirtha was brought into conflict now and then with leaders of different schools of thought, and in all these dialectic disputations he is represented to have come out victorious.

By this time Ânanda Tirtha had already built up his system completely, and desired to start out on an extensive tour of pilgrimage to the south. With a number of disciples and admirers he visited Trivandram, Râmâvaram, Sríraîgam, Srimushîgam, etc. In the first of these places he had an encounter with the then head of the Śrîgérî-mâṭha, Vidyâsâṅkara who lived about A.D. 1228. The Mâdhva chronicles state that Ânanda Tirtha vanquished Vidyâsâṅkara.¹⁴

At the end of his pilgrimage he returned to Uḍipi and spent some time there before he thought of undertaking a journey to the Bâdarikâśrama on the Himâlayas, reputed to be the residence of the immortal Rishi Vyâsa the author of the Vêdánta Sûtras. Taking permission from his master and accompanied by his co-disciple, Satya Tirtha, he left Uḍipi and after several months' journey reached the foot of the Himâlayas. Finding Satya Tirtha a drag on his progress, Pûrânaprâjña ordered the former to stop behind and continued his journey up singly. He soon reached the hermitage of Vyâsa in Badaît and placed himself directly under his tuition, and learned from his lips the meaning he had designed in his mind of the Sûtras when he wrote them. Thereupon, he began his commentaries on the Brahma Sûtras and several other works. He then took leave of the hoary sage Vêda-Vyâsa and reached the foot of the mountain, where he was rejoined by Satya Tirtha. Both of them took an easterly direction and journeyed through the Vaiga and Kaliâga countries. In the Telugu country Ânanda Tirtha entered into a hot discussion with a powerful Advaitin, named Sôbhana Bhaṭṭa. After a good deal of wrangling on both sides, Sôbhana Bhaṭṭa admitted his defeat and expressed his willingness to become the disciple of his vanquisher. Ânanda Tirtha converted him to his faith, made him a sanyâsin and conferred upon him the name of Padmanâbha Tirtha.

The defeat and conversion of Sôbhana Bhaṭṭa induced another great man to vindicate the faith of his forefathers in a fresh discussion with the teacher of this new school of philosophy. Sâmâ Sâstrin was the name of this disputant. He occupied the great social dignity of the prime minister of the king of the Kaliâga country and was a very learned man. His erudition had to give way before the extraordinary capabilities of Ânanda Tirtha and Sâmâ Sâstrin, like Sôbhana Bhaṭṭa, urged upon his vanquisher to take him as his disciple and make him a sanyâsin. He preferred to give up his exalted social position, home and wealth to follow his Âchârya wherever he went. Pûrânaprâjña ordained him a sanyâsin and gave him the name of Narahari Tirtha.

Soon after the events detailed in the previous paragraph had taken place Ânanda Tirtha returned to Uḍipi with his new disciples. One day, while he was sitting in samâdhi on the sandy beach, he heard the distressed cry of the crew of a ship which was being tossed on a rough sea and was about to be drowned. With his unbounded grace, Ânanda Tirtha bade the ship reach the shore safely and it did so. The crew in gratitude offered the whole cargo of the ship to their deliverer, but he would have none of it. When he found

¹⁴ In Ep. Curr., Vol. VI. intro. p. 29, Mr. Rice refers to the temple of Vidyâsâṅkara at Śrîngîtri and states that it must have been built during the Vîjayanâgarâ period.
he was pressed hard to accept a trifle at least from them. He asked for a clod of earth used in ballasting the ship, for, he knew it contained the image of Kṛṣṇa. As soon as it was brought, the clod was broke open and was found to contain the image of Kṛṣṇa. Ānanda Tīrtha built a temple for it in Ucīpi, consecrated it with great pomp and festivity, and ordained eight boy-sanyāsins to do pāja to this image by rotation. These were the originators of the eight monasteries at Ucīpi.

Somewhere about this time the king of Kaliyga died, leaving behind an infant son. There was no capable and trustworthy officer in the State to act as the regent during the minority of the child. Naturally the minds of the subjects ran to their old minister, Śāma Śastrin, now a Sanyāsī with Ānanda Tīrtha, but did not care for worldly honours and would not accept the offer to administer the State. Ānanda Tīrtha, however, insisted upon his taking up the office of the regent in the Kaliyga country, if not for any material gain, at least to help an infant king, and at the end of the tenure of his office to procure for him (Ānanda Tīrtha) much coveted images of Rāma and Sītā, which were secured in the royal treasury. Reluctantly Narahari Tīrtha (Śāma Śastrin) assumed charge of the regency and conducted the affairs of the State satisfactorily for a period of twelve years at the end of which he managed to get from the young prince the images required by his preceptor, and which he loved so much to worship.

In the meanwhile Ānanda Tīrtha had paid another visit to Badarī in company with Satya Tīrtha and Upendra Tīrtha. On his return journey he visited Kāśi, Hṛṣīkēśa, etc., and passed Goa and reached Ucīpi. After his return from Badarī he was obliged to enter into a religious dispute with Padma Tīrtha of the Advaita persuasion. While preparing himself to meet his adversary, Ānanda Tīrtha was told that Padma Tīrtha had run away in fear. But goaded and taunted by his followers, Padma Tīrtha once again appeared at Ucīpi and entered the ring of combat with Ānanda Tīrtha. Very hot discussions took place and before sunset the Advaitins was completely defeated. The next morning Padma Tīrtha and his followers were found to have run away. Before their flight they managed however to carry away the valuable library of Ānanda Tīrtha. The run-aways were chased and overtaken, but Jayasimha the chief of the country interceded on behalf of both the parties and got back the library to its rightful owner. The place where this happened is known as Visvāṣma-gala. At Visvāṣma-gala, Ānanda Tīrtha was met by an Advaita, named Trivikrama Paṇḍita, who desired to discuss religious matters with the former. His wish was agreed to, and in the course of his conversation, Trivikrama found the method of the Dvaita Āchārya very logical and his arguments convincing. He immediately joined the camp of Ānanda Tīrtha by embracing Madhvaism.

Just about this time news reached Ananda Tīrtha of the demise of his parents in the village of Pājaṅka, the bearer of the tidings being his own brother. He implored Ānanda Tīrtha to admit him in the fold of sanyāsins under him. Ānanda Tīrtha conferred upon him the robes of holy order and named him Visvāṣa Tīrtha. On this occasion seven others also took the sanyās ārama.

Eighty days after the return of Narahari Tīrtha from the Kaliyga country, with the images of Rāma and Sītā, the Āchārya is said to have finally retired from the world to Badarī, to take his abode with Vyāsa eternally. This event is said to have taken place on the ninth thithi of the bright fortnight of the month of Māgha in the year Piśāla which corresponded with the eightieth year of the age of Ānanda Tīrtha. Thus is the traditional account of the life of Ānanda Tīrtha, better known in later days by the name of Madhvacārya. We do not get any idea of the chronology of the life of Madhvācārya from the account narrated above, but epigraphy and other sources supply us with information enough to fix the age of Ānanda Tīrtha.

(To be continued.)
THE DATE OF SANKARACHARYA.

Sir R. G. Bhandarkar identifies ‘Aditya of the race of Manu’ mentioned by Sarvajñatman in his Sankha-sapt-Stotra with the Chālu kya king Vīnālāditya. With due deference to his high authority one may be excused for calling this identification in question on the following grounds:

1. Aditya is not in this case a name or surnames of the king, but only a component part of his compound name. There are many such compound names to choose from in the dynastic lists of the Chalukyas and the Cholas, and both these dynasties claimed descent from Manu. One may mention Vijayaditya and Vārmanaditya of the Chalukya line and Rājāditya and Gopālāditya of the Chola dynasty. The passage in question implies that the Aditya referred to was a very powerful king.

2. The Chalukya power was eclipsed by that of the Rājās, and the Cholas before the 10th century. It would therefore be a piece of fulsome flattery to speak of the Chalukya king as ‘ruling the earth’ and as ‘having his commands never disobeyed.’

3. There is no evidence, nor is there any tradition, that Sarvajña visited the Chalukya country or was patronised by its king.

Now, the Cholas also claim descent from Manu, and in an even more positive way than the Chalukyas. Whereas the latter claim to be of the Manavva-gotra, the former have Manu Chola as one of their (mythical) ancestors. There is more than one Aditya in Chola history, but the earliest of them is Rājākāraviraman Aditya I, the father of Parantaka I, who most probably ruled from 880 to 907 A.D. The Tiruvālindu plates refer to his conquest of Tōpāli Maḍḍalaim (the Pallava country) in these terms: ‘Having conquered in battle the Pallava with his brilliant army though (he was) Aparājita which means literally ‘the unvanquished’ he took possession of his queen the earth and accomplishments in object in this direction also.’ (Verse 49. See Annuial Report of the Madras Epigraphist for 1906. Part II page 66).

The epithet Aditya would therefore be appropriate if applied to this king. Further, Aditya is the name of the king and not merely a component part which is the common factor of various compound names. Lastly, there are traditions which suggest to us that we should look in this direction for the patron of Sarvajña. Tan Sankaracharya of Conjeevaram (the Kīma Kṣitipūra) claims apostolic descent from Sarvajña, and I am told that the seat of the Aditya in that math is styled Savān Pāṇi in the Sankara-vijayas. It seems so far as likely that the Matha of modern times are of so early origin. But if it is accepted that Sarvajña had some sort of connection with Conjeevaram it would appear natural that he should extol the exploits of the Chola king (probably his patron), who had conquered at least the southern and western portions of the Pallava dominions.

The year of Parantaka only. See Madras Epigraphist’s Report for 1912-13, page 94.

The initial year of Parantaka is 907 A.D. So Aditya, who ruled for 27 years, must have ruled between 880 and 907. If Sarvajña belonged to this period, Sankaracharya who was his Guru’s Guru must have lived in the earlier half of the 9th century A.D.

Traditions of the Kera’s country point to the same conclusion. Sankaracharya is believed to have introduced some peculiar customs among the Nambutiri Brahmins. The date of their introduction is represented by the Kali rock-on of the Nambutiri Brahmins. This works up to 133109 days after the beginning of the Kaliyuga, i.e., 822 A.D. One school of Kera’s tradition holds that the Kollam era commemorates the introduction of these customs into Malabar. According to another school, the era commemorates the departure to Mecca of Cheraman Perumal, the last of the sovereigns of United Kera, who, we are told by Mr. Logan, (Malabar Vol. I page 258), “died at Zaphir (in Arabia) where his tomb is still to be seen.” According to the Keralamkari this ruler was a contemporary of Sankaracharya.

S. V. VENKATESVARAN.

Kumbakonam, College, 16th Dec. 1913.

1 The earliest epigraph which mentions the Matha of Sankaracharya at Conjeevaram is probably the copper-plate of Vijayagopala, which I have sent for publication in the Epigraphia Indica. It belongs to 1291 A. D. The stone inscriptions of Tiruvālindu copied by the Archaeological Survey in 1905 are useless for our purpose, as their date are uncertain.

2 Conjeevaram was already under the Cholas in the reign of Vijayalaya, the father of Aditya I. His inscriptions have not been discovered there. (See Madras Epigraphist’s Report for 1909. Sec 35).

3 If the Kongutā Kāthal be believed, he was the conquer of the Kongu as well, in which case the conquest must have been completed by Parantaka II, who is known to have subdued the Konga. The Chera king was his friend and ally (Ep. Rep 1912, p. 61); if not a dependent ally (Ep. Rep 1911 p. 59). Aditya was the most powerful king of his time, as the Pāṣyapa power had been already crushed by the Pallava Aparājita at a battle near Kumbakonam. (See Hultsch: South Indian Inscriptions Vol. II, p. 384).
NOTES AND QUERIES.

SOME HOBSON-JOBSONS.

ACH-TAISON-SHAHCTEMES-ALYMELUS-ALVANTE—

"As an instance of the absurd translations current in France as in England [in the seventeenth Century], the word ach-taixon may be mentioned. It is explained in [Sir John] Chardin's [traveller, 1643-1713] text to mean 'les hôpitaux à Tauris : c'est à dire lieux où l'on fait profusion de vies,' [the hospitals at Tabriz (in Persia): that is to say, places where they make lots of victuals.] Chardin's Editor remarks: 'La dernière partie de ce mot est inconnaisable, et je ne puis deviner quel mot Persan signifie profusion a pu donner naissance à la corruption qu'on voit ici.' [The last part of this word is beyond recognition, and I cannot guess what Persian word meaning 'profusion' can have given birth to the corruption which one sees here.] In other words the first syllable ach (Anglice ash) was used in its common acceptance for 'food' or 'victuals,' but taixon was naturally a puzzle. The solution of the whole difficulty is, however, to be found in the Turco-Persian ۶۶ کشتاه کشوان, pronounced by Turks kash kashom, or more vulgarly kasth-khon, and even to a French ear asb-taixon, a hospital, literally a sick house. This word is undoubtedly current at Tabriz and throughout Northern Persia." Sir Frederick Goldsmid in Enge. Brit. (XI Ed.) Vol. XXI, p. 230 footnote 6.

This note was drawn from the author by the corruption Shakhthames by the Venetian traveller Angiolello (16th Cent.) for Shah Tahmasp, the well-known second ruler of the Safavi Dynasty who reigned 32 years (1524-1567) and was the 'Great Sophi' (Safi-Safavi, through Angiolello's Sophi) to whom Queen Elizabeth sent Anthony Jenkin as ambassador in 1651.

Sir Frederick Goldsmid also points out (p. 228) that the identity of a remarkable man of those days, the Ak-khyunlu, or White Sheep Standard, Turkish ruler of Persia (1448-1478) Uzun Hasan (Long Hasan), was so lost by the corruptions, which his not very difficult name assumed in traveller's reports, that he has never received adequate justice at the hands of historians, Knolles Purchas (1575-1628), Caterino Zenze (late 15th Cent.), Sir Frederick says, called him so differently as Alembeis, Asembeis, Asembe, Assimbe, and Usan Cassano. We can get at the corruptions, however, reading Alembeis as a mistranscription for Assimbeis. The termination beo, beis similarly arise out of misreadings for bezo-beg. So that all these words represent Hasan Beg. Usan Cassano offers no difficulties as an Italianization of Uzun Hasan.

Sir Frederick (loc. cit.), in describing the confused times between the death of Uzun Hasan and the rise of Isma'il Safavi (1478-1499), says that Zenze's account is, he was succeeded by his son Ya'qub (1478-1485), and Ya'qub by a son Allamut, known also as Al'amut, Alvante, El-wand and Alwung Beg. Allamut and Al'amut (a name made famous through the Assassins (Haashirah) of Al'amut, are obviously the same word, and as obviously Alwung Beg is the original form of Alvante and El-wand.

R. C. TEMPLE.

BOOK NOTICE.

JOANNES DE LAET ON INDIA AND SHAHJAHAN.

De Laet—De Imperio Magni Mogoliae, sive India Vera; Commentarius et variis auctorisibus congruentes. Olim privilegio. Lugduni Batavorum. Ex officina Elzeviriana. Anno 1670. CXXXI.

The valuable little book published at Leyden in 1681 under the above title was brought prominently to the notice of students of Indian history and geography for the first time by the late E. Lethbridge. That gentleman published a disquisition, entitled 'Topography of the Mogul Empire' (Cana. Rev., October 1870; Jan. 1871), which, as Mr. E. Thomas observed, 'traces with equal patience and ability the geographical details furnishing the opening chapter' of De Laet's book. Mr. Lethbridge (in Cana. Rev. 1873) followed up that disquisition by a translation of another section of the book, namely, the Fragmentum Historiae Indicis, as far as it relates to the reigns of Humayun and Akbar, promising to complete the version. But, for some reason or other, the task was never completed.

Since 1873, other writers have referred occasionally to De Laet's testimony, without making full use of his small volume. My studies having lately led me to examine it closely, I hope to find opportunities for publishing the results of my investigations, so far as they concern the reign of Akbar. At present I desire, in the first place, to draw attention to a discovery made by me, namely.
that the book exists in two issues, impressions, or editions, both bearing the same date, 1631. The discovery was made accidentally while comparing a copy bought from a bookseller, with one borrowed from the India Office Library, and finding that the volumes differed. In future, whenever De Laët’s book is quoted, it will be necessary to specify which of the two issues is referred to, because the pagination differs. The India Office Library possesses a copy of each, but the Bodleian has the second issue only.

I have now before me (I) The India Office copy (shelf-mark, 45 a, 18) of issue 1, and my own copy (II) of issue 2.

Both issues have the same engraved title-page and generally agree, but exhibit the following differences.

I has 299 pages, excluding the index, while II has only 298 pages of text. The saving of space in the later impression was obtained by better printing, not by omission of matter. For instance, the table of contents, which occupies more than two pages in I, is printed much more neatly on a single page in II.

The Fragmentum Historicum Indi I extends from p. 172 to p. 291, ending with the words—

Haece gesta susur ad finem anni 1600 XXVIII, that is to say—‘These events happened up to the end of the year 1628.’

In II, the Fragmentum extends from p. 165 to 278, and after the words cited, two new sentences are inserted as follows:

Voluit hic monarcha post illa appellari Sultan-Shah-Bedir Mohanum. Et to suorum cadibus adididit et incensum: nam dicitissima conjugie ipsa coronationis sua die defuncta, sumit ibi conjugem filiam eam de functa illa; or in English:

After those events this monarch wished to be known as Sultän Shihab-ud-din Muhammad. And to so many murders of his relatives he added incest also; for, when his beloved wife had died on the very day of his coronation, he took to himself as wife his own daughter by that dead woman.

The beloved wife of Shâhjahân, named Arjumand Bânâr Bégâm, and entitled Mumtâz Mahal, or in current speech, Tâj Mahal or Tâj Bibi, died on July 7, 1631, old style, equivalent to Zil-Hijja, 17, a. H. 1040. Her death cannot have been known in Europe earlier than the end of 1631, and the second issue of De Laët’s book, consequently, cannot have been printed before 1632, although, like the first issue, it bears the date of 1631. Probably the first issue had sold out quickly, and the publishers, having resolved to reprint the book in an improved style, added the story about the alleged incest as soon as they received it from India. There can be hardly any doubt that the second impression containing that addition must have been printed in 1632 or 1633, and not later. If its printing had been delayed longer, the date on the title-page presumably would have been altered, and other editorial insertions would have been made. Both impressions as they stand carry the narrative professedly only to the end of 1628, although the second impression, without giving a new date, inserts the scandalous statement implying a knowledge of the happening of 1631.

Joannes, or John De Laët, a learned and copious author, died in 1649. Several of his books on various subjects are in the Bodleian Library. In his preface to the Description of India he informs his readers that he has taken scrupulous pains (mihi religio fuit) to follow only the best and most trustworthy authorities, English and Dutch. Among the English authorities he names specially Sir Thomas Roe and Purchas. He also used the work of Peter Texeira, the Portuguese.

The ‘Fragment of Indian History’ was kindly contributed by a gentleman of distinction, Peter van den Broecke, who resided for several years at Surat and faithfully administered the business of the Dutch East India Company. He was at Surat in 1620, and later.

The book, although scarce, and rather difficult to procure, is not all so rare as Lethbridge supposed it to be. The India Office Library, as already observed, possesses both issues; the Bodleian Library and I have each a copy of the second issue, and the late Mr. Sidney J. Owen had a copy, but I did not note the issue to which it belonged when I examined his library after his death. Lethbridge mentions the existence of a copy in Calcutta, and, no doubt, the work is to be found in the British Museum and various other libraries. It appears occasionally in the catalogues of second-hand booksellers, priced ten shillings. I got my copy for half that sum.

So far the paragraph inserted in the second impression of De Laët’s book has been dealt with.

1 I cannot explain the origin of the statement ‘ipsa coronationis sua die.’ Jahângîr died October, 28, 1627, and his son Shâhjahân ascended the throne at Agra on February 6, 1628; whereas Mumtâz Mahal died on July 7, 1631 (Bādshāh-Nâma, in E. & D., VII, 5, 6, 27).
from a bibliographical point of view. The substance of the inserted passage also deserves consideration because it raises the question as to the truth of the allegation that Shaibjahin was guilty of incest with his daughter. De Laët's statement, which is of the most positive kind, intensifies the horror of the story as current in later times by asserting that the criminal relations between the pair began immediately after the death of Muntaz Malal, the mother of the princess. Inasmuch as Muntaz Malal died in July, 1631, and the second impression of De Laët's book probably was published in 1632, the crime, if real, must have been committed immediately after the queen's death. Moreover, the alleged fact was so notorious that it became known at once in distant Srat and was thence reported to Europe as ascertained truth. The Dutch author must have obtained his new information as he obtained the earlier history, from correspondents in the Dutch Factory at Srat. De Laët's testimony is the earliest mention of the alleged incest and possesses special importance on account of its early date. Although the subject is an unpleasant one, the evidence deserves critical examination in the interests of historical truth.

The Statement of the case by Mr. Talboys Wheeler will serve as a basis for the discussion. He wrote in his book:

"Shaib Jahain had a daughter by Taj Mahal; she was known as Begum Sahib; she made the Begum Sahib his mistress. The appended note runs: 'The relation between Shaib Jahain and Begum Sahib are too notorious to be denied; they are mentioned by all contemporary writers; the fact is broadly stated by Herbert Bernard, Tavernier, and the author of the Sigur-ul-Mukhterin. Manouchi tries to discredit it, probably on the authority of the Moghul chronicle which would take some pains to contradict the charge. The fact, however, is too apparent. It not only finds expression in the history; it is the key to the history.'"

The context indicates that Wheeler considered the enormous value of the gifts bestowed on Begum Sahib by her father, and the excessive influence enjoyed by her to be evidence of the unlawful relation. He attributed the undoubted corruption of the administration in Shaibjahain's reign to the 'foul conditions' under which it existed, one of those conditions being the criminal intercourse between father and daughter. If we are to believe De Laët whose testimony has been quoted, the unlawful relation with its evil consequences, had existed from 1631 or 1632. Shaibjahain was not deposed until June 1658, when Begum Sahib was forty-four years of age. By that time it may be presumed that the guilty connection, if real, had come to an end.

The evidence as far as I can ascertain, is wholly that of European writers, unless the note to the "Sigur-ul-Mukhterin" be considered an exception. De Laët, about 1632, is the earliest witness. After him comes Sir Thomas Herbert, whose travels lasted from 1626 to 1629. He was at Srat when, as he writes in the first edition (p. 29), 'we had certaine report of Sultan Curromeo's [scil. Khurram's] coronation at Agra, 1627. In joy of which, the English Merchant Ships, then in Swally rode, shot off two hundred pieces of great Orande. Herbert never travelled in the interior of India. He spent all the time that he was in the country either at Srat or in the vicinity.

His interesting book passed through four editions in his life-time, the last and best, of which I possess a copy, being issued in 1677. I have examined the first and second editions in the Bodleian Library, but have not seen the third. The omission is immaterial so far as my present purpose is concerned.

Herbert returned to England in 1629, being then a young man 23 years of age, and set himself to work at the preparation of an account of his travels. The first edition, published in 1634, has two title-pages. The first, with engraved figures of 'A Cozel-bash [Kizil-bash], etc. gives the name of the book as A description of the Persian Monarchy now being the Oriental Indies, and other parts of the Greater Asia and Africa. The second title-page designates the volume as A Relation of some Yeares Travails, begun: Anno 1626 into Afrique and the greater Asia, etc., etc.

1 The History of India, Vol. IV, Part I (1876), p. 264. The decorous allusion to the scandal attributed by Wheeler to 'the author of the Sigur-ul-Mukhterin' will be found on p. 349 of Vol. III of the rare quarto translation (1789). The text states: 'In vain did his beloved daughter implore at his death-bed for his forgiveness for her brother Aoreng-zib.' The appended note 15 runs thus: 'The Princess (Roshen-ara Begum, i.e. Princess Roxana, 'luminous' or 'beautiful')... chose to shut herself up with her father upon whose heart it is universally reported and believed her person had made the deepest impression.' The note, which probably is from the pen of the translator, confounds Roshanara (or more correctly, Roshan Rane; Begam, the ally of Aurangzib, with her elder sister Jahangir, entitled Begam Sahib or Padshah Begam, who supported Dina Shukoh, and remained with his father. Wheeler exaggerates when he says that the scandal is mentioned by 'all contemporary writers.' The authorities in the Persian language seem to ignore it.
The series of atrocious crimes by which Shāhjāhān (Khurram) had cleared his way to the throne is narrated on pp. 30-35, and summed up as 'the murder of Father, three Brothers, three Nephews, and two Cozen Germans. Since which, his Queen (Assaf Chawm's Daughter) died, and he hath taken his own daughter to be his wife. These crying sinnes have apparently drawn down God's heavy judgments upon these Countries; by those immediate and late Plagues of Pestilence and Famine, never heard of in the like in those parts before, the Sword will doubtless follow in God's appointed time. For he will have glory by punishing those from whom he cannot have glory. And Curroon (or Shāh Jehan) is not yet sensible of those castigations.'

Herbert, like De Laet, evidently kept up communication with India, most probably with Sūrāt, and continued to be informed of events which had happened since he came home. There is nothing in the wording of the passage cited from the 1st edition to suggest indebtedness to De Laet's book.

The second edition, entitled Some Years Travels into Divers Parts of Asia and Afrique, etc., etc., revised and enlarged by the Author, appeared in 1638, with an expanded version of the Mughal history. On p. 105 we are told of the death of Jahāngir, ' (suspected of poison) the twelfth of October or Ardabelish, in the year of our accord 1627 and of the Hegira 1007.'

Page 107 gives details of the murder of eight princes, relatives of Shāhjāhān, all of whom were without any respect buried in a garden in Lahore; near the entrails of Jangheer; but their heads (as an assurance of their death) sent to Curroon, to glut his eyes (by so horrid a Spectacle) with infernal ambition.'

On the same page the author proceeds: — 'Thus has Curroon (through a sea of blood) attained the highest post and dignity of the eastern world, but these sinnes he makes nothing of, have apparently in these our times drawn down the heavy Judgments of God Almighty, both, in taking his beloved wife away the week of his inauguration, since when he has made his daughter (by that dead Lady) his wife; incest of so high a nature that that yeare [1634 in margin] his whole empire was so wounded with God's arrows of plague, pestilence and famine, this thousand years before never so terrible. The sword also seems to threaten him,' etc.

This passage clearly shows that the author had perused De Laet's second impression, which, consequently, cannot be dated later than 1634. The words 'by that dead Lady,' in particular, are obviously a translation of De Laet's ' e defuncta illa.'

The whole passage, with some slight verbal changes, is repeated in the fourth edition of 1677, p. 99.

I conclude, therefore, that in 1633 or 1634 Herbert heard of the scandal independently of De Laet's book, although in all probability he obtained his information from Sūrāt, as the Dutch author did. Between 1634 and 1638 Herbert evidently saw the second impression of De Laet's book, and borrowed its language, which he continued to use in later editions. He never quotes his authorities, but there are other indications that he was familiar with De Laet's work, which in 1628 was the best available book on the subject of the Mughal history.

The scandal is referred to by Bernier, who was in India from 1659 to 1667, by Tavernier, whose Indian travels extended from 1640 to 1667, by the Dutch author, Valentyne, whose book was published in 1726, and by Manuel (1653-1708). The author last named discredits the accusation.

Bernier writes: — 'Bēgam-Sahib, the elder daughter of Chah-Jehan, was very handsome, of lively parts, and passionately beloved by her father. Rumour has it that his attachment reached a point which it is difficult to believe, the justification of which he rested on the decision of the Mullocks, or doctors of their law. According to them, it would have been unjust to deny the King the privilege of gathering fruit from the tree he had himself planted.'

Mr. Constable appendes the note: — 'This statement is repeated by Valentyne, in his Beschuytving ... von de Levens der Grote Mogul, Dordrecht and Amsterdam, 1726, in these words: —'Bēgam Sahib, die om haare schonheit van haaren Vader zer, ja te veel, bemind wierd; ' that is to say: —'Bēgam Shīhib, who, on account of her beauty was

2 The Hijra year was 1037, for which 1007 is a misprint. According to the Bādsānāh-Nāmu (E. 2 D. VII, 5), the date was Safar 28-Oct. 28. Such differences in dating are met with constantly in the authorities.
greatly, may, too well beloved by her father.” That
vague statement, probably, is merely an echo of Bernier, without independent value.

The evidence of Tavernier, such as it is, appears to be based upon rumours heard by him, personally, and not derived from Bernier. After relating the death of Shâhjahan in 1666, Tavernier proceeds:—

"As soon as Aurangzeb had news of it he came to Agra and seized all the jewels of the late king his father, which he had not touched during his life. Bégum Sâhib also had a quantity of precious stones, which he had not taken from her when he placed her in the fortress, being at that time satisfied with securing the gold and silver with which her chests were full. These jewels afforded certain evidence to Aurangzeb’s sense of propriety, as for other reasons the Princess, his sister, had already been suspected of having had improper relations with Shâhjahan, and he found means to obtain them which appeared honest and far from criminal, by treating the Bégum Sâhib with much honour and attention; but he removed her to Jahânsâhab [seat Delhi], and I saw the elephant pass upon which she was mounted when she left Agra with the court, as I was entering it on my return from Bengal. In a short time after, news was spread of the death of this Princess, and all the world believed that it had been hastened by poison." 3

As a matter of fact, Bégum Sâhib did not die until Sept. 16, 1681 (Ramzân 3, A. H. 1092), as stated by Irvine, Storia do Mogor, II, 256 n., quoting the Tarikh-i-Muhammadî. She was then an old woman of 67, and the story about her being poisoned is ridiculous. 5

Manucci states that the first daughter whom Shâhjahan had was Bégum Saeb (Bégam Sâhib), the eldest of all, whom her father loved to an extraordinary degree, as most lovely, discreet, loving, generous, open-minded, and charitable. She was loved by all, and lived in state and magnificence . . . . She exerted herself a great deal to secure the throne to her brother Dârû; this was due to her eagerness to marry, Dârû having promised to give his consent as soon as he was crowned. With this end in view, she employed all her cleverness and energy to satisfy her father, she served him with the greatest love and diligence in order that Shâhjahan should accede to her petitions. It was from this cause that the common people hinted that she had intercourse with her father, and this has given occasion to Monsieur Bernier to write many things about this princess, founded entirely on the talk of low people. Therefore, it is incumbent on me, begging his pardon, to say that what he writes is untrue. 7

The foregoing extracts give, so far as I can ascertain, the whole of the evidence concerning the disgraceful charge against Shâhjahan and his daughter. Little weight need be attached to the rumours repeated by Bernier, Tavernier, and Valentyn. As against them, if they stood alone, the contradiction by Manucci might perhaps be accepted as a sufficient counterpoise. But the extremely positive assertion of De Laât stands on a different footing. It was published, as has been shown, most probably in 1632, and certainly not later than 1634, during the lifetime of Shâhjahan, who did not die until 1666. The accusation as set forth in De Laât’s pages is peculiarly horrible, because it represents Shâhjahan as forming the incestuous connexion with his daughter immediately after the death of her mother, who had borne him thirteen other children and beyond doubt was ardently loved by him, as her unique monument testifies to this day. Although it is undeniable that Shâhjahan was excessively devoted to sensual pleasures, and there is reason to believe that his daughter engaged in various illicit amours, it seems almost incredible at first sight that both father and daughter could have been so utterly depraved as they are alleged to have been. Yet similar practices prevail, or prevailed a few years ago, among the puritan Boers of South Africa, who are said to have adduced scriptural warrant for their conduct, just as Shâhjahan, according to Bernier, found Mullahs compliant enough to provide an excuse for him.

My conclusion is that the unpleasant accusation against Shâhjahan and his daughter, even if it be

1 Bernier’s Travels, ed. Constable (1861), p. 11. Bernier goes on to relate two stories of amours of the princess, both ending in tragedy. Manucci, while expressing disbelief in Bernier’s stories, gives others of his own, equally scandalous.

2 Tavernier, Travels in India, transal V. Ball (1891) I, p. 344.

3 De Thevenot has the same story that Bégam Sâhib’s death was hastened by poison (English transal., 1686, Part III, p. 35). Although he censures the crimes by which Shâhjahan cleared his way to the throne this author does not mention the accusation of incest.

7 Irvine, Storia do Mogor, I, 216.
not conclusively proved, certainly is not disproved. Although it may be reasonably regarded as improbable, it cannot be dismissed summarily as incredible. I should like to treat the scandal as a product of the prurient imagination of a corrupt court and credulous populace. All officials of long experience know that the people of India, even to this day, are prepared to believe the most fantastic stories concerning their rulers' imaginary crimes. Decent Christian, British gentlemen are often credited with atrocious iniquities, such as kidnapping and murdering victims in order to place their bodies under the foundations of bridges. In an atmosphere of that kind the exceptionally affectionate relations between Shāhjahān and his daughter, which certainly existed, would readily afford occasion for the most malignant possible interpretation. The informants of De Laët, whoever they may have been, no doubt believed the scandal current in India, and it is evident that their report was accepted by both De Laët and Herbert in good faith and with conviction. The strangest part of the business is that the scandal should have become current so soon after the death of Mumtāz Maļā. and should have reached so quickly the ears of the Dutch merchants at Surat, who personally transmitted the story to Europe. That wide and early diffusion of the story undoubtedly supports the view of those, who like Wheeler, are convinced of the truth of the accusation. Shāhjahān had a very evil nature, and was utterly devoid of scruple. He has received from modern historians, except Wheeler, treatment much more lenient than he merited. Tavernier's ill-deserved certificate that he was "a father of his people" was thoughtlessly adopted by Elphinstone, and so has passed into an article of faith. In reality, I believe, Shāhjahān was in character far inferior to his son Aurangzēb, and was guilty of atrocities not less than his to gain the throne. He equalled his father Jāhāngīr in cruelty and excelled him in beastly sensuality, nor did he succeed in securing good government by the capacious ferocity which his flatterers extol as his justice. The beauty and magnificence of the Tīj and other architectural works on which he lavished the countless riches wrung from the suffering people have blinded the critical judgment of recent historians. The European authors of the seventeenth century who unapologetically denounced the many crimes of Shāhjahān formed a judgment of his character much nearer the truth than that made current by the authority of Elphinstone. It is not unreasonable to hold that Tavernier's exceptionally favourable opinion may have been biased by the fact that Shāhjahān was a good customer for his jewels. The more I study Shāhjahān the less estimable he appears, and I regret that it is impossible to feel assured that he was incapable of the disgusting offence charged against him by De Laët, Herbert, and later writers. In such a case conclusive evidence is not to be had, and different people may legitimately form divergent opinions concerning the value of the existing testimony as fully set forth in this article.

Although that evidence must have been known more or less completely to Mr. Beale, and his editor Mr. Keene, the second edition of the Oriental Biographical Dictionary (1894) treats Jāhānārā Bēgām (Bēgām Sāhh) as a saint. We are told that "the name of Jahnārā will ever adorn the pages of history as a bright example of filial attachment and heroic self-devotion to the dictates of duty, more especially when we view it in contrast with the behaviour of her sister Roshan Ārā, who, by aiding the ambitious designs of Auranțzāb, enabled him to dethrone Shāhjahān. The amiable and accomplished Jahnārā not only supported her aged father in his adversity, but voluntarily resigned her liberty and resided with him during his imprisonment in the fort of Āgra. Her tomb is of white marble, open at the top, and at the head is a tablet with a Persian inscription inlaid in black marble letters, to the following effect: — "Let no one scatter over my grave anything but verdure, for such best becomes the sepulchre of one who had a humble mind." On the margin is written: —"The perpetual food for Jahnārā Bēgām, daughter of Shāh Jahnān, and the disciple of the saints of Chisht, died in the year of the Hijra, A. H. 1092."

Whoever will, may believe that charming version of the relations between Shāhjahān and his favourite daughter.

I have used de Laët's book (India Office copy) and Lethbridge's Ed. extensively in editing Vol. II. of Peter Mundy's Travels for the Hakluyt Society, issued for 1914. Mundy was in Āgra in 1630-1633, and tells the story of Shah Jahan's alleged incest, but attributes it to his third daughter, "Chimni Begum," who died in 1616.—R. C. Temple.

Vincent A. Smith.

8 This great monarch reigned more than forty years, less as a king over his subjects than as a father of his family, over his house and children. (Tavernier, Travels, transal. Ball. I, 329)
NOTES ON THE GRAMMAR OF THE OLD WESTERN RAJASTHANI
WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO APABHRAṢṬA AND TO GUJARATI AND MARWARI.

BY DR. I. F. TESSITORE, UDINE, ITALY.

(Continued from p. 216.)

(1) kanhā is identical with the postposition of the dative, the origin of which has been given § 71, (1). The ablative meaning of this postposition, however, is not to be explained as having derived from the dative, but it has a separate origin, it having derived directly from the locative, which was the original meaning of kanhā. The passing of the locative meaning into the ablative is quite natural, and it is well illustrated by the example of the cognate locative apikārē, which occurs in the Rigveda both in the original sense of "Behind" and in that of "From behind." In the Old Western Rājasthāni kanhā is used to give the idea of the ablative, in connection with verbs of asking, begging, hearing, etc., and obtaining. Examples are:

Caturaka-kanhā pūchā vana-dhāri “The king of the forest asks Caturaka” (P. 585),
Indra māgai Jina-kanhā dākṣīṇā e “Indra begs this gift from the Jina” (Ṛg. 131),
maṭṛi-Mahāvīra-kanhā sūbhālii “I heard from the reverend Mahāvīra” (Daś. iv),
Vajrasena-tīrthānkarā-kanhā saṅgale dākṣā līḍhī “All received the dākṣā at the hands of the tīrthānkarā Vajrasena” (Ādi C.).

In the last mentioned MS. one instance also occurs of kanhā, an ablative from the same base, of which kanhā is the locative:

bhagavanta-kanhā dākṣā dīvarāvi “He caused the Venerable one to give him the dākṣā.”

Many other instances of kanhā occur in the Old Jaipuri of the MS. F 760. It is to kanhā that I trace the accusative-dative postposition nā (possibly for nā), which Kellogg ascribes to the Western Hindi (Hindi Grammar, § 173), and which is very frequent in the Marāṭhi of the Nāsiketa-ri kalhā.

(2) tāu (tu), in my opinion, is a curtailment from kalhā, the equivalent form of hātāu < Ap. kantaui < Skt. bhavantakāh. A good evidence in favour of my identification is P 681, where an instance occurs of tāu used in the original verbal meaning of hātāu “Being > was” (See § 113). It is therefore the present participle of the substantive verb, that is used absolutely in the masculine singular as a postposition of the ablative. The employment of the present participle kantaui to form the ablative was frequent enough in Apabhraṣṭa, as is born out by the following two quotations by Hemacandra:

jahā hontau āgato “Whence [he is] come” (Siddh., iv, 355),
tumhāhā hontaui āgato “[He is] come from you” (Siddh., iv, 373).

Whether the Prakrit ablative termination-hinto stays also for honto, as suggested by Dr. Hoernle (Comparative Grammar, § 376), it is difficult to decide. Anyhow it is certain that the Old Western Rājasthāni inherited from the Apabhraṣṭa the practice of employing the present participle of the substantive verb to make the ablative, and made a large use of it, both under the original form hātāu and under its derivates thāu and tāu. Examples of ablatives with tāu are the following:

devilā -tāu pūchāu valī hātu “Being returned from the temple” (Yog. iii, 127),
teha kārāṇa -tāu “From that cause” (Kal. 6),
pākhiyā ḍiči ḍiĉi-taĩ āvya"

"Birds [that are] come from every quarter" (Ādi. 12),
mārga-tu bāhiri nikalaï"

"Steps out of the way" (Dañc. i, 10),
samsāra-taĩ āpasi jiva mukāvī chaî"

"[By them] their own soul has been liberated from the samsāra" (Dañc. iii, 1),
leha-taĩ jiva tiva dukkha pāmaï"

"Therefrom the individuals reap sharp pain" (Saṅg. 10).

Of taĩ inflected in the locative, as is the case with hātai and thaï, no instances occur in Old Western Rājasthānī. But they occur in some of the cognate vernaculars and chiefly in Western Hindī, where we have for the ablative the postposition te, tē, from *taï < Ap. *hontai̯.

(3) thaï may be also explained as a curtailment of hatai, the present participle of the substantive verb. That initial h was capable of being thrown after the following consonant, when a dissyllable word was curtailed into a monosyllable one, is evidenced by Mārvāṭī vhai < huvai. An other explanation of thaï had formerly occurred to my mind, and it is that it might be a curtailment from thāyaai, the past participle of the verb thāvai "To be or become.' In favour of the latter derivation there would be the analogy of the ablative postposition thi, which likewise might be explained as a contraction of thäi, the conjunctive participle from thāvai, and all the more so as H. 51 one instance occurs of thaï for thi. But the former derivation is supported by the analogy of the imperfect tense of the substantive verb, which in the Old Western Rājasthānī has the same origin as some of the so-called postpositions of the ablative, both being formed from the present participle. Now, P. 70 one instance occurs of thaï being used for the imperfect of the substantive verb, in the place of the regular form hatai, and at the present day the form tho (for hato) is found in many dialects of the Rājasthānī and in Kanauji, where it is used by the side of hato (Cf. § 113).

Ablatives with thaï are rare rather in Old Western Rājasthānī, much in the same way as are rare periphrastic imperfects with thaï. I have noted the two following:
te kih -thaï āru "Whence has he come?" (P. 409),
ḥā -thaï jau "Go away from here!" (P. 427).

Notice that in both the examples above thaï is used after pronominal ablatives, thereby perfectly coinciding with the employment of hontai in all the three Apabhraṃśa quotations by Hemacandra, sūtra iv, 355 of his Prakrit Grammar. Another testimony to the thaï being a participial form is in the following passage from the MS. Up., where thaï is inflected in the nominative plural:

The form thākaï, (thakû, thākaï, thikû thiku) is from thākiu, thākiu, the past participle of thākai, thākaï < Ap. *thakkai, thakkei (Hc., iv, 10, 370, 3) < Skt. *sthakyati (Pischel, § 488). The form thikai is to be regarded as the intermediate between *thakiu and thakaï, and it has derived from the former through metathesis of t (See § 50). No doubt—as it may be also gathered from the analogy of Sanskrit sthitāḥ—the common meaning of Apabhraṃśa thakku, when used attributively, was practically that of a present participle ("Staying"), and so there is nothing irregular in its being employed in Old Western Rājasthānī as an equivalent of hātai, to form the ablative. That Old Western Rājasthānī thakaï is equivalent with the latter is also born out by the fact that both of them may be optionally added after participles used adjectively (See §§. 122, 129). In the examples I have seen, thakaï occurs either in the masculine or
in the neuter singular form, and the noun governed by it is not unfrequently put in the locative case. Ex.: 

*pichali thakaii " From behind " (Cra.),
*bhāra varasa-thākaii " For twelve years " (Up. 31),
*ne visarai te mujha mani thikaali " She does not slip from my mind " (P. 338),
*hā sari yuddha krrail bal-s-thikaail " I will certainly fight with strength " (P. 501),
*jā ahā-thīcaali " Go away from here! " (P. 641).

(5) thaki is but the contracted form of *thakii, the locative (absolute) from *thakii (thakaii), and is therefore practically identical with the conjunctive participle of thākavā (See § 131). It is employed in the same way as thakaii, namely both after the locative and after the genitive, only it is more common than the latter postposition and its use becomes larger and larger by the subsequent development of the language. Ex.: 

*nabha-thaki niicāi utaryāla " He came down from the sky " (F 783, 352),
te nagara-mā thaki . . . . āvii " He came from that city " (P. 293),
e dukha-thaki mujha maraṇa āvai " From this distress death comes to me " (R. 192).

For examples of thaki being employed to form comparatives see § 79.

(6) thi bears to thāi the same relation as thaki to thakaii, i.e., it is a contraction from *hatii (< hatai) the locative absolute of the present participle of the substantive verb. An evidence in favour of the above derivation is afforded by the MS. F778, where, a few lines before the end, an instance occurs of thāi (< hatai) for thi. There is, however, another explanation possible of thi, which has been already alluded to above, and it consists in deriving thi from thāi the conjunctive participle of thāvāi. Those, who prefer to hold to the latter explanation, may derive an argument in their favour from R. 51, where thāi seems to be used as a postposition of the ablative instead of ordinary thi. The passage in question is:

Uttarāśādhi nakṣatri thi " From the Uttarāśācha nakṣatra ".

In my opinion the employment of a conjunctive participle like thi after a locative to give the idea of the ablative is so natural that it can well be explained without assuming it to be identical with the ordinary ablative postposition thi. In the following passage from Banarasī Dāsa's Paramajyotistola, 7:

āvai pavana padama- sari hoya "The wind [which] is coming from the lotus-lake (<after having been in the lotus-lake) "

we have an Old Braja ablative formed exactly in the same way as Old Western Rājasthāni nakṣatri thi. Of, also the ablative with dekhi, which is peculiar to Naipāli, and is likewise formed from nouns in the locative (See Hoernle's Comparative Grammar, § 376).

In Old Western Rājasthāni thi is used in the same way as thāi, viz: both with the locative (including ablative-locative) and with the genitive. Ex.: 

*kiḥ thii " Whence? " (P. 136),
tujha kanhai thi " From thy presence " (P. 303),
hūla-āvii veci thi muś siḍā " From [having put himself] between the heads of the [two] goats, the jackal died " (P. 290),
tujha-thi dukha pāma pāzi hāa " From thee I derive distress " (P. 641),
vādala -thi . . . . ravi nīkalya " The sun came out from the cloud " (F 335, ii, 2),
vana- māhī thi " From inside the forest " (Ādi C.)

(7) pāsai is identical with the locative postposition, for which see § 74, (3). It is used for the ablative in connection with verbs of asking, begging, etc., much in the same way as kanhai, which has been discussed above. Ex.:
Rukmani rasi aigaja naga | epasa priya-nai padaire | "The queen Rukmini demands [her] son from her beloved" (F 783, 64),
puchi eka-pasi "They ask someone" (Cāl. 87).

(8) pahi (pahi) has long been recognized as a locative from Apabhramṣa pakhke or pakkhi < Skt. pakeśa. In Old Western Rājāsthāni it takes the meaning of the ablative, when used in the formation of the comparative. In the MS. Saṣṣṭ, two instances occur of pahanti, which is possibly from Apabhramṣa pakhkante < Skt. paksānte, and is equivalent with pahi both in meaning and employment. An example of the use of pahi as an ablative postposition is:

indrajala-pahi capala "Unsteadier than magical illusion" (Indr. 86).

For other examples see § 79.

(9) lagai and lagi are both from the Apabhramṣa participial locative laggaśi < Skt. *lagnasmin (-lagne), the former having remained uncontracted and the latter having firstly changed "ai to "ii and then to "i (See § 10, (3)). For the shortening of the vowel in the initial syllable accounts § 43. When not used in the function of a postposition, the past participle lagai retains its long vowel, as shown by the example quoted § 126, (4). These two post positions are used to denote: (a) "Up to ", (b) "From", (c) "In consequence of". In the two former cases they often require the noun, wherewith they are connected, to be in the locative. Ex.:

eka jaya-lagai cāli rahayāi "After having gone as far as a yojana, he stopped" (Adi. C.)
eka-[sahase] varaśa-lagai "Up to [the end of] one thousand years" (Ibid.),
dhuri lagai "From the beginning" (Vi. 132).

tahi lagai vigrāha - ārambha "Hence the beginning of the war" (Kāṅh. 13),
te pāpa-lagi Śīna-dharma gadhaśu dūkkaśu hui "In consequence of that sin, the religion of the Śīna becomes very difficult [to be attained]" (Saṣṣṭ. 11).

karma-kaya-lagi mokṣa hui "In consequence of the destruction of the actions, final emancipation is produced" (Yog. iv, 113).

(10) hūsaś (hūṣaśi) needs no further explanation, after what has been remarked with reference to its derivatives taśi and thaśi above. It is plain that it is identical with the present participle hostai, which already in Apabhramṣa was employed to form ablatives, as evidenced by the instances found Ho., iv, 355, 373. Examples of the use of hūsaśi have been preserved only in the MS. Saṣṣṭ.:

maraśa-hūsaśi rākhiśi "Saved from death" (Saṣṣṭ. 4),
dharma-hūsaśi na vīśi "They do not turn away from religion" (Saṣṣṭ. 30),
je samśaśa-hūsaśi bikhata nathi "[Those] who are not afraid of worldly existence" (Saṣṣṭ. 60).

(11) hūśi (hūśi) is contracted from hūśai ( > hūśii), the locative form of hūśi. It is commoner than the latter, as indeed all locative absolute forms of the ablative postpositions are commoner than the forms in the direct. In Modern Gujarati and Marwār it is only the locative forms that have survived. Examples of hūśi are:

dharma-karyā ātma-jñāna-hūśi hui " Destruction of kārman is produced from the knowledge of the ātman" (Yog. iv, 113),
dva-hūśi virāmaś "Desists from vice" (Indr. 97),
ambūdi-hūśi bhūkhi "Even hungrier than we" (Adi. C.)

§ 73. The Postpositions of the genitive are generally old adjectives and agree in number and gender with the noun, on which they are depending.
(1) kaû (ku) is very rarely met with in Old Western Râjâsthâni, where, it being mostly confined to poetry, it may be possibly explained as having been borrowed from the Old Braja of the East. It is from Apabhraṣṭa kaû < Skt. kṣatāh, as it has long been recognized. Ex.: Deva-kaû pāṭaṇi “In the city of the God (viz. Somanâthapâta)”. (Kânh. 78, 86).

mohà-ki nīdrā “The slumber of delusion” (Ja. 19).

(2) keraû is identical with Apabhraṣṭa keraû (He., iv, 422, 20) < Skt. *kâryakâh (Pischel, § 176). It is pretty frequent in poetry. Ex.: 

jâňe Girivara-kerâû cñiga “[So high] as the top of mount Meru” (F 591, ii, 3), 

tâ kaviyâya-japa-keri mâyâ “Thou art the mother of poets” (F 715, i, 3), 

kâhisu carita Nemesara-kâdâ “I will sing the life of Nemiçvara” (F 715, i, 14) [For kâdâ see § 29]. 

nâhi para-keri re êsâ “There is no hope from anywhere else” (F 722, 32),

tribhuvana-kerâ-nâtha “Lord (plural majestatis) of the three worlds” (Ṛg, 158).

(3) caû appears to be only exceptionally used in the MSS. I have seen. The only example I have noted is:

hi sevû sahi tuma-câ páya “I sincerely worship your feet” (F 722, 4).

Sundry instances thereof are, however, found in the Vasantavîlása (Saûvat 1508), according to Mr. H. H. Dhruva’s description in Transactions of the Ninth International Congress of Orientalists, Vol. i, p. 327. It is clear that the use of the caû postposition must have been confined to the tract of Rajputana bordering with the Old Marâṭhi area. The origin of this postposition is, I believe, to be traced to Apabhraṣṭa * kiccaû < Skt. kṣâvyakâh, as already suggested by Dr. Konow and Sir George Grierson (On Certain Suffixes in the Modern Indo-Aryan Vernaculars, Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Sprachforschung auf dem Gebiete der Indogermanischen Sprachen, 1903, p. 490).

(4) tanû is identical with Apabhraṣṭa tanû (He., iv, 422, 20), and since the time of Mr. Beames has been explained as having originated from the Sanskrit affix -tana, which is used to form adverbial adjectives. I do not think, however, that the above explanation is right. The chief objection that can be made thereto is still that which already occurred to the Rev. S. H. Kellogg, namely that in view of the fact that postpositions generally are separate nouns or adjectives, the derivation of a postposition from an affix would be an unprecedented exception to the general rule. Sir George Grierson has very ingeniously tried to remove the difficulty by the remark that even in Sanskrit -tana can be attached to an oblique case, as in agre-tana, aijanas-tana, pûrvâhaka-tana, etc. (On Certain Suffixes, etc., p. 489), but this does away with the difficulty only apparently, for, if one looks more inside the question, one will see that in the above examples the suffix -tana is not added because of the agre, etc., being in an oblique case, but simply in consequence of their having assumed an adverbial meaning. It is clear that when -tana was added to agre, the latter was not viewed in the light of a locative, but only of a real adverb of time, and we may be sure that in adding -tana it was quite immaterial to Sanskrit whether adverbs were original or derived from nouns in an oblique case. These are the reasons that have led me to search for a different explanation of Apabhraṣṭa tanû, and I believe I have hit upon the right one. According to my inquiries, tanû is from appa-ñçai (< Skt. *útmanakâ), by the dropping of the initial vocal syllable agreeably to § 2, (4), and the common change of p to t agreeably to § 25. Of the reflexive pronoun útman both the forms
with ṭāṇṇā and with it occur already in Prakrit (See Pischel, § 401). The meaning Hemacandra ascribes to ṭāṇṇā is that of sambandhīn “Belonging or related to” (Siddhn., iv, 422, 20), and such a meaning is quite in accordance with appaṇṇā, which Hemacandra explains as an adeca of ātmiya (Siddhn., iv, 422, 4). In the two examples of the use of ṭāṇṇā, which are evidenced by Hemacandra, viz.:

imnu katu tusahaan-ṭāṇṇā “This family [is] belonging to thee” (Siddhn., iv, 361), and:

bhagga amhahā ṭāṇṇā “Ours are defeated” (Siddhn., iv, 381, 2),

it is plain that ṭāṇṇā has the sense of “One’s own,” and, if we were to translate the two examples above into Sanskrit, we ought to render ṭāṇṇā by *ātmanaka or ātmiya. Observe that in the latter example ṭāṇṇā is used substantively, a construction which is likewise common to Sanskrit ātmiya and to its equivalents sva, staka, etc.

The postposition ṭaṇṇā is largely used in poetry and in a few old texts in prose also. Ex.:

carira suryā ṭaṇṇā-tanja “His deeds have been heard of” (P. 364),

deva-ṭaṇṇā kusuma-ṭaṇṇā vṛśi “The raining of flowers of the gods” (Kal. 20),

ghīṛa-ṭaṇṇā śīgu “The young of the owl” (Kal. 3),

mañci-ṭaṇṇā mañci “In the mind of the mother” (Ratn. 109),

gheṭa-ṭaṇṇā phoja “A troop of horses” (Kāνh. 46),

deva-ṭaṇṇā prasaddā “In the temple of the god” (Kāνh. 87),

ha ṭaṇṇā-ṭaṇṇā nāra “I [am] not belonging to her” (Dac, i, 10).

(5) nai (nu) cannot be explained as a curtailment of ṭaṇṇā, for medial n of Apabhramṣa never changes to n in Old Western Rājasthānī, but it is congener of the postposition nai of the dative, which has been shown above to be a curtailment of kahā. Whether there ever existed a genitive postposition *kahā, whereof nai would be the regular curtailment, or nai was directly formed from nai it cannot be ascertained to-day, but I am strongly inclined in favour of the latter alternative, which is supported by the considerations following:

(a) It is not very likely that, whilst kahā survived long after nai had become of general use, *kahā should have died out so early as not to leave the least trace of itself in the Old Western Rājasthānī materials that have been preserved to us;

(b) The absence of the genitive postposition nai in Mārvā)” where both kahā and nai have survived up to the present day, is perhaps a sign that the use of the former postposition is not so old as that of the two latter, and therefore nai has derived from nai;

(c) In the MS. Aḍī C. occasional instances occur of nai used in the sense of nai as an uninflected postposition of the genitive, as:

e bhagavanta-nai teramārī bhava “This [is] the thirteenth existence of the Venerable one.”

Now, it is very likely that such an employment of nai is a survival of an old practice of forming the genitive by means of a postposition of the dative (cf. the use of raha as a postposition of the genitive), and if so it is plain that nai has been formed from nai simply by making the latter capable of agreeing with the noun, on which it was depending.

In most of the Old Western Rājasthānī texts I have seen, nai is by far the commonest postposition of the genitive. In poetry, however, taṇṇā is likewise frequent and it is freely used by the side of nai, generally indiscriminately, though in many cases it seems that taṇṇā still retains its original meaning of “Related or belonging to,” and so nai its own meaning of “Situated near to, or proceeding from.” The only prose texts, in which taṇṇā and nai are,
used side by side are Daq. and Up. In the latter, however, tāqāi is very rare. The MS. Kal. has no traces of naī, but employs tāqāi throughout. Ex.:

aṁhālā-naṁ cauṁhālā maṇavādu ‘‘The fourth month of the summer’’ (Ādi C.),
tēhā-nī putri ‘‘His daughter’’ (Dd. 6),
Ūjeṇī-naṁ maṛiγa rājā ‘‘After having murdered the king of Oojin’’ (Vi. 8),
vaṭa-nā koṛa-nāḥ ‘‘In the hollow of a fig-tree’’ (P. 633),
dīhādā-naḥ viśay ‘‘By day’’ (Yog. ii, 70),
mecccha-nā lākha ‘‘Hundreds of thousands of barbarians’’ (Kānḥ. 43).

(6) rai is a curtailment from keraī, as it has since long been recognized by students of Neo-Indian Vernaculars. This postposition having grown to be peculiar of Modern Māravāri, it is only exceptionally met with in Old Western Rājasthāni, except in the MS. Ādi C., which exhibits many points of agreement with the former language. A few examples are:

sonā-ṛi viṣṭi ‘‘Raining of gold’’ (Ādi C.),
pratijā-ṛai viṣṭa ko ṅahi ‘‘The promise is of no account whatever’’ (Ibid.),
Takṣacādā-puri-ṛai pariṣarai ‘‘In the surroundings of the city of Takṣacāda’’ (Ibid.)

(7) rahāi is used as a postposition of the genitive in the following examples, chiefly from the MSS. Kal. and Daq.:

duḥkha-rahāi pātra ‘‘Receptacle of sorrow’’ (Kal. 38),
mākalīka-rahāi gharā ‘‘Abode of bliss’’ (Kal. 1),
duḥkha-rahāi ḫāra ‘‘Cause of sorrow’’ (Kal. 33),
vrata-rahāi ṭīṭā ‘‘vrataṁ paṇḍā’’ (Daq. v, 9),
pūja-ṛaγa yogyo cha ‘‘Are worthy of reverence’’ (F 580).

The use of rahāi as an uninflected postposition of the genitive has not gone lost in Modern Māravāri, where rai is still employed instead of the regular oblique rā, especially when the genitive denotes possession or relationship.

§ 74. The postposition of the locative are the following:

(1) kanhaī. The origin of this postposition has been already discussed above, when dealing with the postpositions of the dative and ablative cases. It is used in the original locative meaning in the examples following:

na jāṁī kīḥ-kāri acha ‘‘I do not know where he is’’ (Rī, 192),
mīṭyācī-ṛi-loka-kanhaī ḫravākī vasīvaṇ naḥ ‘‘A ḫravāka should not live near to heretics’’ (Saṁt. 49).

P. 286 an instance occurs of naī (which is a curtailment from kanhaī, as shown above) used as a postposition of the locative after a noun also in the locative:

vānī naṁ ekā nirmanoṁ nīra ‘‘Close by the road [there was a lake of] limpid water.’’

(2) tī. This postposition, which has not yet been satisfactorily explained, is from Apabhṛṣṭa tānāhī or *tānāhī, a locative form corresponding to Sanskrit tāvatī. The intermediate steps are probably *tānāhī > *tāā > *tāī > *tī. For the metathesis of the nasal see § 49. In Old Western Rājasthāni this postposition means ‘‘Up to, till, as far as’’, exactly as its Apabhṛṣṭa and Sanskrit originals. Ex.:

aṁa-tī ‘‘Up to to-day’’ (Ādi C.),
sahasa vurasa-tī ‘‘Up to the completion of one thousand years’’ (Ibid.)
Observe that in Modern Mārvāḍi and Hindi tāhi has become capable of the dative-accusative meaning too, when in construction with pronominal genitives. Cf. Kellogg, Hindi Grammar, § 320.

(3) pāsāt (pāsāi, pāśi). This is from Apabhraṣṭa pāsahī < Skt. *pāṟcvasmin (-pārye).
Examples of its use are:

Vakkhārāgiri -pāsai “At the side of the mountain V.” (Ṛṣ. 6),
Tūraka -pāsai daivā ma pāsasi “Do not make us fall, O Fate!, into the hands of the Turks!” (Kānḥ. 73),
rahi rāya-pāsī “He remained beside the king” (P. 128),
īth jā vṛgye te-pāsā “Go thou speedily to him” (P. 217).

(4) majhāri. This postposition is from Apabhraṣṭa *majjhāre < Skt. *madhyakārye, an adjective formed from madhya by the same affix kārya, which is used to form pronominal possessives. Deśināmamālā, vi, 121, Hemacandra gives maṇjhārā as an equivalent of maṇjha (< Skt. madhya). It being an adjective in origin, Old Western Rājasthāni majhāri is capable of being construed both adjectively and substantively, i.e., both with a preceding locative or (more commonly) with a preceding genitive. Ex.:
pe i maṇjhāri “In the stomach” (Cāl. 33),
Aṣṭala-pura-majhāri “In the city of A.” (Kānḥ. 67),
vana-majhāri “In the forest” (P. 55, 297, 411, 533).

(5) mājhi. This is from Apabhraṣṭa maṇjhe < Skt. madhye, and is therefore an original adjective like the foregoing postposition. The only instance of mājhi I have noted is the following, in which it is used with a preceding locative:
āvīghari mājhi “She went into the house” (P. 295).
Cf. the identical use of madhya in Sanskrit and of mediō in Latin.

(6) mā (māḥ). This is probably from *mājha < Ap. maṇjha, the ablative of maṇjha, through the intermediate steps māḥā > māḥā. Both the last forms have been preserved in the MS. F 722. Ex.:
seha-mā nahi sa-deha “In this there is no doubt” (F 636, 5),
ākhi bhu-mā anāra kisa “Which is the difference between the two eyes!” (F 783, 31),
Andra va to sura-māh “Indra is the greatest amongst the gods” (F 722, 13),
mahā-mā maṭi esi “In my [mind I have ]this intention” (P. 82).

(7) māhi (māhi, māhāi, māhe, māhii). This postposition is derived from mājhi (< Ap., maṇjhe) by ḷh passing into ḷ. In Old Western Rājasthān this is the commonest locative postposition. Ex.:
haraviv hāi-māhāi “He rejoiced in [his] heart” (P. 212),
peta-māhi “In the stomach” (Indr. 15),
bhaya-samudra-māhi “In the Ocean of wordly existence” (Ādi. 80),
dina khaṭṭil-māhi “In a few days” (Īṣ.),
vanah-māhi “In the forest” (F 728),
vana-māhe “Ditto.” (Ādi C.),
gadha-mahii “In a fortress” (P. 410).

(To be continued.)
THE HISTORY OF THE NAIK KINGDOM OF MADURA.

BY V. RANGACHARI, M. A., L. T., MADRAS.

(Continued from p. 202.)

Nagama’s Expedition and Defection.

Evidently a man of energy and ambition, Vira-Sékhara desired to extend his kingdom at the expense of the Pádyan. The weakness and incompetence of Chandra-Sékhara stimulated his ambition and inspired his confidence. The result was, Chandra-Sékhara was soon deprived of his crown and kingdom.81 Overcome by this misfortune, he proceeded, with his son, to the imperial court, and appealed to the emperor. Sadasiva Ráya was highly indignant. He despatched, we are informed, Nágama Naík, “in whose charge was the southern part of the Empire,” to chastise the ambition of the Chóla and restore the dignity of his victim. Nágama accordingly invaded the dominions of the aggressor, traced a line of devastations therein, vanquished him in battle, and compelled him to abandon the lands which he had so unlawfully seized. The object of the expedition was thus accomplished and the formal restoration of Chandra-Sékhara remained. But at this crisis, the sight of the weak and renowned city of Madura, the tempting prospect of an easy acquisition of spoils, and the distance of the scene of war from Vijayanagar, apparently had the effect of turning the victor into a traitor. Taking advantage of the large army which was under his command, of his probable hold on its affections, and of the difficulties which the emperor had with his turbulent noblemen at home, Nágama renounced his allegiance to his suzerain, seized the crown of Madura, threw the helpless Pádyan king into captivity, garrisoned the different parts of the realm with his men,82 and awaited with calm resolution the attack of the emperor’s punitive legions.

Visvanatha’s Punitive Expedition.

When Sadasiva was informed of the success, the treason and revolt of his aspiring general, he was affected by a deep sense of injury as well as insult at the ingratitude with which Nágama repaid the favours he had enjoyed at his hands. He wrote a letter of threat and remonstrance to the unruly commander, but could not make him renounce his acquisitions or designs. Anxious that such a dangerous example should not be imitated by similarly inflamed minds, he summoned hastily an assembly of his ministers, feudatories and generals, expatiated upon the danger which threatened the peace and perhaps the existence of the Empire, and asked in words of fire who, among the many that had assembled there, would undertake to punish the rebel’s insolence and bring his head in triumph to the imperial court. The response of the assembly to the emperor’s appeal was feeble, as it was well-known that the ability and resources of Nágama Naík were great enough to offer a valiant and protracted resistance to the forces of the State.

81 The account of Rámadádra Naík, the Polygar of Periakulam (see Appendix IV) says that Chandra-Sékhara was actually restored by Nágama Naík; but as the former was unable to maintain his power against “the Five Pádyanas” of Kayattár and its neighbourhood, he voluntarily renounced his crown and kingdom in favour of Nágama, on condition that he was to be given pension for maintenance. Nágama accordingly took possession of the country. But Chandra-Sékhara repented, and resorting to treachery, went to the Ráya and complained that Nágama had usurped his throne. This version is unique and not supported by any other MS. It is, as Mr. Taylor says, an ex parte statement. See Rait. Catal. III, 377 and Appendix IV.

82 The chronicles do not mention the Ráya’s name, but are almost unanimous in this account.
At length, however, there arose, from amidst the assembly, a solitary figure, a man with a majestic manly grace, just in the prime of manhood, with a fine physique and soldierly bearing, an object of admiration to one and all. To the astonishment of the whole audience, Viśvanātha—for it was he—spoke with grave, though justifiable, censure of the perfidy of his parent, assured his sovereign of his own loyalty and gratitude, and prayed with earnestness that he should be honoured with the command against him. The emperor at first hesitated with a natural suspicion and scepticism; but the bold and honest behaviour of the young hero, the eloquence of his pressing solicitation and the strength of his past reputation convinced Sadāiva that his favourite was a fit object of his confidence, and that, in case he was chosen, his sense of loyalty would prevail over his filial affection.

The Restoration of Chandra-Sekhara.

It thus happened that, by a strange irony of fate, the man who was most instrumental in thwarting Nāgama’s designs was his own son and heir—that son for whose birth he had, years back, devoted himself to much rigorous penance and extravagant self-infliction; that heir for whose sake he had, at the evening of an honest and unblemished life, sacrificed his honesty, banished his conscience, and blackened his fair name. With unexpected celerity Viśvanātha marched at the head of the imperial forces. He promptly entered the confines of Madura, and after a fruitless correspondence with his father, engaged him in battle. The chronicles do not enlighten us as to the site of this remarkable engagement; but they describe how Viśvanātha, partly because of the justice of his cause and the excellence of his leadership, but mainly because (it is said) of his divine birth, emerged successfully out of the contest. Nāgama himself was taken captive; and his forces either vanished or went over to his son. Chandra-Sekhara, whose weakness was the sole cause of these events, was then restored to the throne and crowned by his deliverer with pomp and ceremony.

The Pardon of Nāgama Naik.

It seems that, immediately after the restoration of Chandra-Sekhara, Viśvanātha returned to Vijayanagar, leaving a capable friend and lieutenant of his, Aryanātha Mudali, by name, to stay in the Madura court and represent, in his name, the imperial interests. No sooner did the gallant soldier return to the Court than, we are informed, he shewed to an admiring world that his loyalty to his sovereign was not at the expense of his love for his parent. His sole desire now was to save his life and, as might be expected, he did not fail to avail himself of the good impression he had produced, by his unrivalled political sincerity, in the mind of Sadāiva Rāya. He pleaded that the fidelity of the son should atone for the guilt of the father. He expatiated, we may be sure, on the past history and services of Nāgama, and pointed out how his disgrace would necessarily cast a stain on his own name, and how posterity, while praising his loyalty, would in the same breath condemn him as a parricide. The emperor, we are told, too prudent to pursue a vindictive policy, perceived that his clemency would have a healthier effect than his zeal for justice. He therefore pardoned Nāgama, and restored him to his old position. One of the manuscript chronicles gives a different picture of Viśvanātha’s conduct after his return from the south. It says that Nāgama Naik was brought in chains before the indignant emperor, and ordered to be decapitated; that

---

83 For the early part of his career see Chap. III. 84 C. f. the Murtanjiya MSS. Appendix I. 85 See Appendix IV.
Vāsānātha himself promptly unsheathed his sword, and was about to shed, for the sake of his suzerain, the blood of his father, when Sadāśiva, surprised at such an extraordinary devotion and sense of duty, stopped the tragedy, and pardoned the father for the sake of the son. The memoir of the Sukkampatī Polygars gives a slightly different version. It says that their ancestor—Balamukunda-Mutthia-Nāik, once the leader of the vanguard of Nāgama's army, and then a lieutenant of Viśvanātha Nāik, offered to sacrifice himself in the place of his old benefactor, and that the Rāya, impressed with the loyalty of the son and the fidelity of the servant, pardoned Nāgama Nāik for their sake.

As for the man who was the cause of these scenes in the imperial court, he was not destined to enjoy his restored fortunes for long. A few months—according to one MS. three years—after his recovering the throne, Chandra-Śekhara joined his father; closing thereby a chequered career of momentous significance in South Indian History.

The Death of Chandra-Śekhara.

His death was instantaneously followed by important events. One set of chronicles describe him as the last of the Pāṇḍya's, and aver that, immediately after his restoration, he adopted his deliverer and benefactor as his son and heir, and that as a result of this, the responsibilities of the royal office devolved on his death on Viśvanātha. Another set of chronicles, on the other hand, maintain that Chandra-Śekhara was not the last of his dynasty: that he was really succeeded on the throne by his son Vīrya-Pāṇḍya; but that Vīrya-Pāṇḍya soon followed his father to the grave,—leaving none to continue the Pāṇḍyan line and thereby giving rise to the grave question as to who was to be his successor. The power of decision, these chronicles continue, lay in the first instance with the emperor. The absolute master of the Empire, he had the power of making and unmaking kings, of creating and abolishing royalties; and he promptly exercised this privilege in favour of Viśvanātha. In appointing Viśvanātha, moreover, he was only fulfilling the promise which his predecessors had made on the occasion of Viśvanātha's service during the Navarātri festival. Again Viśvanātha had been the Viceroy, the de facto king, of the Madura country for years. He had moreover been adopted into the Pāṇḍyan line, and so was from the viewpoint of law, not a foreigner. Above all, he had distinguished himself as a staunch and faithful servant of the Empire, as a fine soldier, as a loyal vassal, as an ideal servant. If he had willed, he might have joined his father and secured the southern part of the Empire months back for himself, but he had voluntarily preferred honour to ambition, and sovereign to parent. Considering all these, the claims and qualifications, the services and attributes, of his favourite, the emperor felt that, by raising him to the vacant throne, he would not only give virtue its reward and possess a vassal according to his own heart, but fulfil the promise of his predecessors and at the same time respect the principle of hereditary right.

Viśvanātha's Elevation to the Throne.

The elevation of Nāgama's son seems, however, to be due as much to popular desire as to imperial initiative. If verbal tradition is to be believed—and there is nothing incredible or improbable about it—the people of Madura, Brāhmans and Śādrās, soldiers and citizens, priests and merchants, were united in their solicitation to the Emperor to have Viśvanātha for their sovereign. They had already had a taste of Viśvanātha's capacity to rule and protect them. Both during his vice-royalty (1554-44) and after Chandra-Śekhara's restoration, Viśvanātha had been the real ruler of Madura. Chandra-

---

66 See Appendix IV

67 The Pund. Chron. The Supple. MS. represents the majority of the chronicles when it attributes the event to S 1357; Purāṇa, Kali Kavi Rāya's account says that it took place in S. 1356. One of the Mārtanda MSS. says it took place in Mārgalī 11, of Raudri S. 1482. There is thus a slight difference between the Pund. Chron. and this MS.
Sêkharā had lost the respect and forfeited the affections of his people. He had been too incompetent to protect them from external enemies or internal commotions. Viśvanātha on the other hand had displayed many useful and benevolent virtues which shone with greater effect in comparison with the glaring frailties of the Pāṇḍya monarch. His keen efforts to secure the welfare of the country had gained for him the esteem of the wise and the love of the multitude. His guiding hand had been seen in every act of administration, and the country enjoyed the full fruits of peace and good government. His magnetic personality, in short, had asserted itself over his mild ward. The deliverer and benefactor had become unconsciously the master and dictator. It is not surprising that, on the death of the Pāṇḍya, the people clamoured for Viśvanātha's elevation.

His Coronation at Vijayanagar.

The consequence was, on an auspicious Friday, the 15th of Mārgali; year Raudri, S. 1481, corresponding to January 1559, amidst the chant of Śvetas, the blessings of the pious, the cheers of the soldiers, the noise of festivities, and the acclamation of the crowds, the fortunate son of Nāgama was crowned with splendid and gorgeous pomp by holy men at Vijayanagar, after the purification of his body with water brought from the distant Ganges and in the presence of the tutelary goddess Durgā. Wheeler gives a glowing account of the ceremony. The golden diadem was placed on the hero's head. "His ears were adorned with emeralds and pearls, his neck with costly carcanets, his breast with gems set in different figures, his fingers with amulets, his waist with bracelets, his arms with amulets of carbuncles. He was arrayed in royal vestments of cloth and gold, and was placed on an elephant richly caparisoned. An umbrella of silver brocade was held over his head, and the chowries were waved about him on either side. He was also honoured with the royal insignia of Krishna Rai. A crimson shield was carried before him, together with the standards bearing the bird Garuda and the monkey Hanumān. He was conducted in procession through the streets of Vijayanagar, escorted by troops, charioteers and footmen, all clothed in rich apparel. After the procession he was entertained by Krishna Rai in the banquetting house and feasted on milky food." A number of presents were then showered on the hero, and he was then sent to Madura. The singular favour which Viśvanātha enjoyed at the hands of the Rāya can be realised from the fact that even his request to have possession of Durgā, the guardian of the Empire and the life of its glory, was, in spite of the solemn warnings of his advisers, readily granted. With the departure of Viśvanātha to Madura, then, Durgā also departed, and with this the prosperity or independence of Vijayanagar.

His Coronation at Madura.

At Madura, Viśvanātha was received with frenzied enthusiasm. The Brāhmans were the leaders of the jubilee. Triumphal arches of divers colours adorned the streets of the smiling city. Viśvanātha entered it on a richly adorned elephant, surrounded by badges of royalty bestowed by his suzerain. The great procession reached the temple of Minākahi where, we are informed, the 'Kārti' alighted, and paid worship. He, then, we are told by Wheeler (on what authority we do not know) proceeded to his father's

---

98 Wheeler's Ind. Hist. IV, p. 571-2. As usual the author has not given the authorities on whom he based his account.

99 See Appendix I.

99 Ibid: Wheeler IV, p. 573. It is very doubtful if Nāgama Naik was alive at this time. No MS. says anything about him after his unsuccessful rebellion.
residence and received his blessing after laying gold and silver flowers at his feet. The coronation ceremony was then once again gone through in the temple. A diadem of virgin gold beset with jewels, and a sceptre of gold, first worn by the goddess, were now presented by the priest to Viśvanātha; and he, after the worship of the deity and prostration before his father, assumed the sceptre and the diadem. Eighteen bands of music then filled the air with harmony. From the temple Viśvanātha proceeded to the court of Lakšmiṇi and there, amidst the panegyrics of heralids, took his seat on the throne of the Pāṇḍyavas, gave presents to Brāhmans and invested Aryanātha with the two rings of the Dalavāi and Pradhāni.

Wheeler's Version of the Naik Advent.

Such is the account, usually given, of the origin of the Naik dynasty of Madura. There are also some versions not so authoritative or true. Wheeler, for instance, a historian with more imagination than capacity, gives, on the basis of doubtful authorities, a version quite different from that which we have just seen. He attributes the foundation of the dynasty to the reign of Krishna Rai.1 Wheeler, in the latter, he says, lightened the burdens of the imperial office by dividing his empire into various administrative divisions each of which he entrusted to a favourite servant. To his chief favourite he gave Mysore, to his betel-bearer Tanjore, and to the overseer of his cattle, Nāgama Naik, the kingdom of Madura. On the death of Krishna Déva, his son and successor Rāma Rāja (Wheeler is of course wrong) could not, in consequence of his troubles with the Muhammadans attend to his dominions in the South. They, therefore, thanks to the ambition of the provincial chiefs, became practically independent or subject to disorder. The affairs of Madura drifted into chaos. "The twelve kings of Malabar" ceased to pay tribute. A vassal, Tumbichchī Naik, set up the standard of rebellion. Oppressed by these revolts, the Pāṇḍya felt himself unable to remit the tribute he owed to the emperor. Nāgama Naik communicated this state of things to the emperor (whom Wheeler inconsistently calls here Khriśna Rai and not Rāma Rāja). The latter promptly despatched Viśvanātha the son of Nāgama Naik, together with the gallant and faithful Aryanātha Mudali, to restore order in Madura. Kāra Pāṇḍya,2 the then Pāṇḍya king (1) received the imperial leader with joy. The latter easily defeated the kings of Malabar and compelled them to pay tribute to the Pāṇḍyans. He vanquished the troops of Tumbichchī Naik at Paramakudi,3 and beheaded that chief in the Pāṇḍyan’s presence. Viśvanātha’s services were thus valuable and disinterested. But success turned his head and inspired schemes of ambition in his mind. The saviour became the spoiler. Forgetful of loyalty and justice, he turned against the very person whom he had come to save, and seized the crown. With a wise promptness he then took precautions to secure his usurpation. He distributed his army throughout the kingdom, put the forts in defence, and killed such of the king’s troops

1 Wheeler has evidently taken this version from one of the histories which Wilson refers to in his article on the Pāṇḍyan kingdom in J. R. A. S. III. Wilson also attributes the whole to the reign of Krishna Déva Rāya. It is unfortunate that the original MSS. on which Wilson depended are not available. If available, we can find out how far Wheeler is true to them. Wilson based his article on Mutthia’s Hist. of the Kings of Madura; Hist. of Telugu Rulers of Madura, translated by Wheatley; etc. The Madu. Manu. gives a very good summary of the circumstances under which the Naik Rai was established and the correct date 1559; but it wrongly says that it took place in the time of Khriśna Déva. See also for very short but modern account Madu. Gaz., chapter on Political History.

2 This is absurd.

3 In reality the Paramakudi affair took place in the time of Viśvanātha’s son and successor Kumāra Krishnappa. See Chapter IV.
as had resisted. He then, it is said, placed Kāśa Pāḍya in prison, massacred his women and children so as not to leave even a single member of the family, and then, placing the conquered region in his father's charge, set out for Vijayanagar with a view to pacify the indignant emperor. The golden head which he placed at the Rāja's feet and the heap of money and spoils which he brought, were sufficient atonement for his conduct, and 'Krishna Rai' did not only embrace him with affection and honour him with an equal seat and the title of partner in the government of the empire, but crowned him, on the first day of January 1560, King of Madura at Vijayanagar. Wheeler then describes the coronation ceremony both at Vijayanagar and in Madura, and concludes by showing how with the confirmation of his crown in Minākshi's presence, with his father's joyous blessing, and with the fidelity of Aryanātha, Viśvanātha firmly established his dynasty on the old Pāḍyaṇ throne.

Discussion of the Date of the Naik Advent.

The version of Wheeler is so full of inaccuracies and so directly contrary to the chronicles in regard to the character and conduct of Viśvanātha, that we can dismiss it altogether as false. With regard to the other versions, however, we are not without difficulties. First of all, there is the inconsistency in regard to dates. A large number of the Polygar memoirs ascribe Nāgama, Chandra-Sēkhnara and Viśvanātha to the first half of the 16th century. The Hīst. Carn. Governors and scores of other chronicles take this view. The Pand. Chron. and some other MSS. on the other hand, clearly say that Viśvanātha's coronation took place in 1559. Where such a conflict of opinion exists, inscriptions should decide; and inscriptions unmistakably prove that it was 1559. Taking then that Viśvanātha founded his dynasty in 1559, two questions remain to be answered. Was the conquest sudden or was it a prolonged process of years? If it was an achievement of years, how many years elapsed between the beginning of it and the actual coronation of Viśvanātha in 1559? Secondly, what were the exact circumstances under which Viśvanātha assumed his crown? Taking the first question, we find that opinions vary among historians, Mr. Taylor, for instance, believed that not less than a generation must have passed between the punitive expedition of Nāgama Naik and the invasion of his son. Between the first conquest of Nāgama Naick, he says, 'his usurping the kingdom, being deposed, the death of Chandra Sēkhnara, and the final election of Viśvanātha Naicker, an interval of some few years must have occurred. Hence to fix the conquest by Nāgama Naicker at about SS. 1460 and the instalment of his son Viśvanātha at about SS. 1480, seem to us best to accord with the true state of the question; supposing that the interval of twenty years may be tolerably well accounted for, and not pretending to exact

14 The absurdity of Wheeler is clear from this. Krishna Raya died in 1530.
15 Wilson was for an intermediate date, viz. 1530. He rejected Mūthiah's date 1560 and also Wilks' date of 1550. 'Mūthiah's history enumerates,' he says, 'between 1560 and 1742 or 182 years; the other MS. 14-princes in 367 years,—former giving about 17 and the latter 22 years to a reign. But this proportion is too improbable as three of the 14 princes are brothers who reigned consecutively and the average of whose reign could not have exceeded half this number. We shall have a more probable result if we suppose the number of princes to be including Nāgama 15, and the number of years 272; from 1520 to 1742, which will give us something less than 15 years to each reign.' See J. R. A. S. III. Wilks says: 'Nāgama Naik, described to be head of the bullock department to Achyuta Deva Rayal of Vijayanagar, founded the dynasty of Naicker of Madura about the year 1522, with the aid of a colony of Telingas, which seems to have been planted in that country sometime before by the government of Vijayanuggur.' Mysore, I, p. 34 footnote. The Madr. Manus., with Wilson, attributes the event to the reign of 'Krishna Raya.' (See Vol. I, p. 154), but gives the date as 1559: (Ibid p. 121); see also Vol. II, p. 96.
and definite certainty. Later on, Mr. Taylor revised his calculation in the light of the theory of Wilson that it was Krishna Deva Raya that sent Nagama Naik against the Chola, and the theory of Wilks that it was Achyuta Raya that did so in 1532; and concluded that the latter might be "the exact truth"; for "it is some confirmation that it accords with the date assigned to Visvanatha Naik in the Pandyan chronicle, which is SS. 1451, or 1550 A.D. allowing 27 years for intermediate events. . . . . Nagama Naik, at all events, must have been general to Krishna Rayer, having the southernmost portion of that king's extensive conquests assigned to him as his military government. It is also probable that the complaint of Chandra Sekhara Pandyan was preferred to Krishna Rayer towards the close of his reign; and that the orders to repel the Soren (Chola) and replace the Pandyan king were given by him. During the accomplishment, Krishna Rayer in all probability died; and the circumstance immediately following his decease would no doubt encourage Nagama Naik to set up for himself in the newly conquered kingdom. For Krishna Rayer had no legitimate male children; and Achyuta Rayer, the nearest heir, variously termed brother, cousin and nephew, was absent; and the late Rayer's minister, ostensibly according to the deceased king's order, set up Sada Siva, a pageant prince under his own tutelage, until the return of Achyuta Raya, and his assumption of the sovereignty. Here are circumstances very favourable to Nagama Naik's rebellion; and even without expressed treachery to his former master. If such were the state of circumstances, we must presume that, though Visvanatha Naik rose into notice and employ under Krishna Rayer, yet it was by one of the latter's successors, that the founder of the Carnatic dynasty was formally designated to the viceroyalty of Madura. One more quotation from Taylor illustrates his position clearly. "From Mr. Campbell's list of the Rayer dynasty," he says, "it appears that Krishna Rayer ruled 21 years, from SS. 1430 to 1452 (1500-1530 A.D.); Achyuta Raya 12 years, from SS. 1452 to 1464 (1530-1542). There then succeeds an interval of usurped powers on the part of Timma Raja and Rama Raja, though Sada Siva is nominally king for 22 years, from S. 1464 to S. 1486 (1542-1564). . . . . . . . . . . . . Now from the foregoing dates, it will appear probable (as before inferred) that Nagama Naik received his orders to support Chandra Sekhara Pandyan from Krishna Rayer; that he had effected the conquest in two or three years after; but that, availing himself of the unsettled state of things at Vijayanagaram during the earlier years ascribed to Achyuta Raya, when Timma Raja's influence as minister was predominant, he took measures to confirm himself in the independent sovereignty of Madura; that Achyuta Deva himself, having taken the reigns in hand, despatched Visvanatha on the expedition against his father; that Chandra Sekhara Pandyan ruled as a tributary for some little time; supported by the northern army with Aranyak Mudaliar at their head; that, his death, occurring, Visvanatha Naik was installed by Sada Siva by virtue of the Pandyan's asserted adoption, and the promised protection of the two former Rayers; that he actually entered on his government about six years previous to the battle of Tellicotta." The conclusions of Mr. Taylor, however, do not seem to be incontrovertible. In the first place, they were made at a time when the evidences of epigraphy were very meagre. Secondly, they were not the results of a many-sided consideration of all the manuscripts and chronicles available. A study of these shows plainly at least one thing—that the

\[O. H. MSS. II, 88.\]

\[O. H. MSS. II, 95.\]

\[O. H. MSS. II, 123.\]
establishment of Viśvanātha on the Madura throne was a short, sharp, decisive affair. No doubt, as we have already seen, he was viceroy for years before his elevation to the royal dignity; but his actual elevation to the Pāṇḍyan's throne was posterior to his earlier viceroyalty and the immediate outcome of his father's revolt and the Pāṇḍyan's weakness. Almost every chronicle seems to imply that Nāgama Naik's expedition to the south was promptly followed by his revolt and then his subjugation by his son. They seem to imply that the various stages of these events followed one another in rapid succession. They do not seem to say that they covered the long period of a generation. The evidences of inscriptions moreover give a passive proof of this fact. They clearly point out that Achyuta Rāya led an expedition to the south in 1532, that he wielded a real power throughout his reign, that his successor Sadā i va Rāya was an equally powerful sovereign. They also point out how from 1535 to 1557 Viśvanātha Naik and Viṭhala were the imperial viceroys. If Nāgama Naik's revolt had taken place during the administration of these viceroys, it would certainly have been recorded in some at least of the inscriptions of the day. In fact we have positive reasons to shew that he could not have rebelled in this period; for the first of the two viceroys was his son, the other his relative. If he had attempted independence, it must have been before 1535; but we have already seen how in 1532-33 Achyuta Rāya had Nāgama as a loyal lieutenant of his and how his power was not menaced after his victorious campaign. All these facts go to prove that Nāgama's defection must have taken place in 1557 or 1558 and that his defeat and his son's elevation must have been accomplished in 1559.

The Nature of the Naik Accession.

The date having been thus disposed of, the circumstances under which Viśvanātha's elevation took place remain for consideration. It is to be feared that no solution can be reached in regard to this question. We have already seen how variant are the accounts of his relations with the Pāṇḍyas. We have seen how some say that Chandra-Sēkhara was the last of the line and that the crown naturally devolved on Viśvanātha as he was adopted by him; and how others say that Chandra-Sēkhara was succeeded by his son Vira-Pāṇḍya who, however, died childless, bequeathing his crown to Viśvanātha; and how still others maintain that Viśvanātha destroyed the Pāṇḍyan family and usurped the crown. All agree that the Rāya supported Viśvanātha and recognized him to be the ruler in place of the ancient Pāṇḍyan dynasty. Was Viśvanātha a usurper or legitimate claimant? Was he in reality a destroyer of the old Pāṇḍyan line or an adopted and therefore legitimate heir? The question will perhaps be never solved. The chronicles unanimously give a favourable view of Viśvanātha's conduct; but Wheeler gives, as we have already seen, a diametrically opposite version. The late Mr. Nelson also points out that, even after his full attainment of power, Viśvanātha had under his control two Pāṇḍyan princes.

The Characteristics of Naik Rule.

However it was, there can be no question that the establishment of the Naik dynasty was of immense significance in South Indian History. For the next two centuries the country from the Kāvēri to the Cape and from the western mountains to Ceylon, was under the sway of Viśvanātha's descendants. They were not great men, as a rule, in the ordinary sense of the word. High statesmanship was comparatively rare among them, but they left, throughout the land which acknowledged their rule, a series of monuments which will never die, and which will ever keep their memory fresh in the annals of India and of art.
Temples and choultries, tanks and villages, without number, owed their existence to their benevolence or liberality, and a chain of forts of skilful design and patient labour even now testify to their martial spirit. Thousands of Brāhmaṇ villages of the south remind us of the enlightened interest of some Nāiḳ king and the great veneration he had for the Brāhmaṇs, and almost every temple or house of charity traces its history to the piety or generosity of a Nāiḳ. No greater example have we in history of a line of a kings so uniformly industrious in the promotion of religious architecture and military fortification, and no line which so heartily co-operated with the intellectual aristocracy of the land. It may not be quite possible to endorse the statement of an able English writer that the Nāiḳ dynasty "raised the country probably to the highest level of civilization attainable by it under a native government." 109 For, as we shall see later on, the Nāiḳs sometimes displayed their enthusiasm for building at the expense of good government, and their munificence at the expense of popular welfare. Under their exorbitant sway the burden of taxation was, as a rule, very great, and the security of people precarious. Not even for a decade, during their rule of two centuries, did they cease from the horrors of war and the hardships of military exercises. Entirely oblivious of their subject’s needs, they very often readily courted military engagements with an easy mind and a culpable recklessness which made settled government a mockery. Nevertheless there is much of truth in what Mr. Nelson says. Misrule was not continuous. It had welcome breaks, while statesmen of the stamp of Viṣvanātha are not entirely wanting. Above all, the service they rendered to Hindu religion and civilization is incalculable. Guided at every step by Brāhmaṇs, the Nāiḳs seemed to be more the servants of the Church than the masters of their kingdom, and as the establishment of villages, the construction of canals, the excavation of tanks, and similar tasks of utility and benefit were, in the eyes of their advisers, at once acts of policy and religion, it is not difficult to see how Brahmanical influence was calculated to benefit the masses and the cause of civilization.

NOTE.

Manucci’s Theory of the Origin of the Nāiḳ Kingdom.

The Venetian traveller Manucci gives an even wider account of the origin of the southern kingdom than Wheeler. "More than 200 years ago," he says, "there reigned an emperor called Rāma Rāja who was so generous that it is remarked in the chronicles that he never refused any favour asked." (Storia do Mogor, III, p. 98). His liberality gained him a high renown and a host of servants from alien countries. His empire extended from the Narbada and Jagannath to the Cape and included the Coromandel, Travancore and Konkan coasts. His empire was highly prosperous and abounded in pearls and diamonds, in food-stuffs and grains, in cities, forts and harbours, and was consequently the resort of adventurers of all nations, especially those of China and Aχin. The emperor, continues Manucci, gave with characteristic liberality the government of the different provinces to his servants and slaves. Bijāpur, for instance, he bestowed on a Georgian Yusuf Ali, {\textit{the carver at his table}}; Gulbarga, to his huntsman Abrahâm Māly (Ibrahim Malik); Daulatbād to his Abyssinian slave and chamber-servant, Nīzām Shāh; Golcondah, to another of his slaves who had charge of the hawks, falcons, etc., and of the royal hunting establishments, and was known as Baram (falcon) Kub Shāh; Burhānpur, to his carpet-spreador; and so on. "The remaining lands of the Carnatic were divided among his Hindu pages, while he retained some territory and a few fortresses scattered here and
there in the middle of the said Carnatic. This splitting up of his realm and giving it away, was the cause of this emperor’s ruin, for not many years passed before the princes, called Naiks, rebelled. One of these took possession of Madurey (Madura) and another of Tanjavur (Tanjore), another of Maxur (Mysore), another of Cholomangalao (Choromandal). They ceased to send in their tribute, giving him nothing but a small sum just sufficient for his support. Upon his death, they crowned themselves and announced themselves princes of the countries they held. All of them were rich and powerful, taking no notice of, nor acknowledging, the descendants of the Emperor Rāma Rāja, their former suzerain.\(^a\) (III, p. 235). After Rāma Rāja’s death, Manucci continues, his descendants lost the allegiance of the governors, and remained in the Carnatic territory in poverty, subsisting on the charity which the rebel governors gave. “There still survive some of them,” he concludes (i.e., in 1700), but “they keep in obscurity not to be recognized, otherwise Aurangzeb and his governors would most certainly take their lives. They subsist by begging for alms. One of them discovered himself to the Rev. Father Paul, Carmelite, and held several conversations with him. In one talk he requested him to prevail on one of the kings of Europe to send an army to his assistance. He promised that if such help were afforded, he would give a great reward, with much land and many privileges. The said father, I well know, made proposals to several European nations, but his efforts had no results.” (Storia do Mogor. III, p. 235-6).

Manucci’s theory in regard to the Muhammadan kingdoms of the Deccan is absurd, but it is noteworthy that it corroborates Ferishta’s statement that Rāma Rāja treated the Sultans as more or less servants of himself. It is also curious that something similar to Manucci’s version is given by Dr. Fryer who travelled in India about 1680. (See edition 1879 p. 399).

(To be continued.)

SKETCH OF THE HISTORY OF THE MADHVA ACHARYAS,
BY C. VENCABA RAO, OOTACAMUND.

Continued from p. 222.\(^b\)

For fixing the exact dates of birth and death of Madhavacharya, we must first enter into the details of the life of Narahari Tirtha, for whom we have several dates given in inscriptions, discovered in the Telugu districts. If we fix the landmarks in the life of Narahari, it would become easy to arrive at the dates for the various events in the life of Madhavacharya.

In a short poem entitled Narahariyati-stōtram, written by one Krishṇa, a disciple of Appayyāchārya of Vyāghrapuri,\(^c\) it is stated that the name of Narahari Tirtha before he assumed the sāmyyātsā-rāma was Śama Sāstrī, and that he having met Ānanda Tirtha, implored the latter to make him his disciple and a sāmyyāsīn. Ānanda Tirtha gave him the kāṇḍhāya and named him Narahari. Leaving his guru he went by his command to the Kaliya Country to act as the regent during the minority of the prince of that country, and at the end of his tenure secured for his master the images of Rāma and Sītā.\(^d\) His Regency extended to twelve years. Ānanda Tirtha is said to have worshipped the images for a period of eighty days and finally made them over to Padmanābha Tirtha, and went eventually to

---

\(^{a}\) Published in the Collection of Stōtras, called Stōra-mahā-chadhi, at Belgaum.

\(^{b}\) दूर से यह शामिल नहीं मुझे रखने की आवश्यकता नहीं है तथा भारतीय मध्य युग का पत्रकार भारत मध्य युग के पत्रकार।

\(^{c}\) श्रीमण्डल नरहरिकृष्णगुप्त तपाय स्वरूप: श्रीमण्डल ग्रः श्रीमण्डल तपाय स्वरूप तपाय स्वरूप तपाय स्वरूप।

\(^{d}\) एक घनिष्ठ समय में नाराधरी स्वरूप राम और सीता के मूर्तियों को प्रस्तुत कर दिया और अंबादास विने को इसे देखा।
Badarkrama. Padmanabha Tirtha ruled as the pontiff of the Madhvas for six years, nine months and twenty days. He was succeeded by Narahari Tirtha, whose pontificate extended to nine years, one month and twenty-three days, beginning from the 14th titi of the month of Kārttika of the year Raktakshin. During this period, he set up in a temple the image of Nārāyaṇa found in a lake, and renamed the village Nārāyaṇadēvarakere (in the Bellary District). He died on the 7th titi of the bright fortnight of the tenth month in the year SrImukha.

As already stated, there are a number of inscriptions in the Telugu districts mentioning Narahari Tirtha. The records range from S. 1186 to S. 1215, i.e. for nearly a period of 30 years. The earliest of these mentions that Narahari Tirtha made a gift of some gold to the temple of Kūṁrēśvara. Two others dated S. 1205 mention a certain Narasimha Mahābhattopādhyāya, who is described as a contemporary of Anaigabhīma. This Narasimha Mahābhattopādhyāya is said to have constructed an enclosure of black stone for the temple of Kūṁrēśvara. Another inscription informs us that Anaigabhīma belonged to the family of the Gaṅgas of Kaliṅga.

No. 290 of the Government Epigraphist's Collection for the year 1896 describes Narahari Tirtha as the disciple of Ānanda Tirtha, who was a disciple of Purushottama Tirtha. Narahari is therein represented "as a (dutiful) son following the profession of (his) father, practising high politics in a righteous manner (and) himself facing the frightened garrisons (?) of the fortresses of crowds of hostile kings; and being devoted exclusively to the great services of the Lord of Śrīkāatha, holds, in order to prevent the ruin of this (temple), an excellent sword (which is) a thunderbolt to the mountains—the Sabaras,—(but) the proper action of which was totally imperceptible because no victim was left, the enemy having lost his life through its mere flash." This inscription is dated Saka 1203. One other inscription states that the S. 1215 corresponded to the 18th year of the reign of Aṭṭa Pāda Narasirahadēva; that is, the last known dated record which mentions Narahari Tirtha belongs to the 18th year of the reign of Narasirahadēva. Hence, the first year of his reign or the year of coronation of this prince must have taken place in S. 1197.

With these facts gathered from epigraphical sources let us scrutinise the life of Narahari Tirtha as given in the stōtra. That Narahariyati followed the footsteps of his father in protecting the Kaliṅga country enables us, as was rightly observed by Mr. Krishna Sastrī, to infer that his father was also like himself the prime minister of the kings of Kaliṅga. The country appears to have been always subjected to attacks from the wild mountain race, the Sabaras, and Narahari's attention was constantly bestowed upon his troublesome neighbours. From the statement that one Narasirah Mahābhattopādhyāya was a contemporary of Anaigabhīma, we are inclined to take that Narahari is meant thereby. If this...
surmise is correct, we can assert that Narahari served Anaśigabhīma as his minister and later on as regent to his son. The prince Pratāpa Vīra-Narasīhadeva, whom we know as the son of Anaśigabhīma, assumed sovereignty in the year S. 1197, and hence the regency of Narahari must necessarily have come to a close that very year. The same year Narahari returned to Udipi with the images of Rāma and Sītā and made them over for pūja to his master, Ānanda Tirtha, who, as we have already seen, worshipped them for a period of eighty days and finally retired to Badarī (i. e. died). It means that Ānanda Tirtha died in the year S. 1197.

Now, the year S. 1197 must according to the Narahari-yatī-stōtra must be the twelfth year of the regency of Narahari; the regency therefore must have begun in the year S. 1185. As a matter of fact we find records mentioning Narahari only from the year S. 1186 and not earlier. We consider this evidence corroborates well the statement of the stōtra that he reigned over Kaliṅga a regent for twelve years. After the demise of the great Dvaita leader in S. 1197, Padmanābha Tirtha ruled as the pontiff of the Mādhvas, according to the swāyata lists, for 6 years, 9 months and 20 days. The same list gives 9 years, 1 month and

25 The followers of Ānanda Tirtha believe that their great teacher still lives in the jungles of Badarī on the Himalayas. He is considered to be an aśīva of Vāyu in the latter's third incarnation (avatāra), the three avatāras of Vāyu being Hanumān, Bhima and Ānanda Tirtha. It appears that something like the following is the probable explanation of the phrase that a man is the aśīva of a particular deity: e.g., Kumārila Bhaṭṭa is considered to be the incarnation of Kumāra (Subrahmanya), who heralded the advent of his father Saṅkarā (Śiva) on this earth as Saṅkarācārya. Saṅkarācārya is similarly believed to be the aśīva of Śiva or Saṅkara. People seem to have wondered at the prodigious intellect of this remarkable man and in their admiration they began to attribute such extraordinary powers to something supernatural. The name indicates of whom he might be an aśīva: “Verily he must be another Saṅkara (Śiva) that has come down upon the earth for the purpose of reclaiming humanity.” The feeling that Saṅkara might be Śiva grows stronger as the mist of ages thicken round such a faith, till in the long run the analogy is forgotten and identity is established between the object of comparison and the object compared to it.

The great Vaishnava reformer Rāmānuja, is asserted to be an avatāra of Adiśeṣa. Rāmānuja was called Lakṣmāna (Lajjāyār) by his father. When he took the sanyāśa, he came to be known by the name of Rāmānuja (the brother of Rāma, i. e. Lakṣmāna). When Viṣṇu desired to be born on the earth as Rāma, he made Lakṣmāna, Adiśeṣa, the saṅkha, the chakra, etc. be born also as Sītā, Lakṣmāna, etc. Adiśeṣa was represented by Lakṣmāna. Hence Rāmānuja of vast learning must be as wise as Adiśeṣa (Lakṣmāna, i. e., Rāma's saṅkha in this case).

An exactly similar reasoning has been applied by the Mādhvas in identifying Ānanda Tirtha with Bhimaśeṇa and Hanumān. Like the former, he has also performed several gastronomic feats (see pp. 176, 177, and 36 of Mr. C. M. Padmanābhaṭchāryā's book). He lifted a huge boulder like Hanumān and threw it in the river Tugābbhadrā (Ep. Carn. Vol. VI, Mg. No. 89). That the Ācārya possessed an uncommonly strong digestive faculty and consequently a very healthy frame of body has to be inferred from these facts. He was not like many intellectual giants weak in health. Having posited that Mādhvācāryā was a strong man and resembled Hanumān and Bhima, in course of time he passed to be avatāra of these Puranic heroes. This supposition being granted, it follows as a logical consequence that Mādhvācāryā must also be as immortal as these heroes. Hence he could not or did not die. He lives like the others in a manner we ordinary mortals cannot see or know.

It is extremely repulsive to the mind of the Mādhva to be told that his Ācārya died. He is said to have gone to Badarī, whereas all other Ācāryas are distinctly mentioned as dead. If their Ācāryas also had actually died, surely his biographers would have also written “died” instead of ‘gone to Badarī.’ In this connection we should refer our readers to the euphemistic way in which the death of a person is referred to among the Śrīvaishnavas, which is “Śūmi tiru-nādiṇke śundarākṣinār,” meaning that he went away to Śvarga (lit. to the sacred land).
23 days as the length of the pontificate of Narahari Tirtha. That is, the last year of Narahari must be the last year of Madhvacharya's life plus the periods of the pontificates of Padmanabha Tirtha and Narahari Tirtha, which comes to nearly the Saka year 1214-5. If fact, the latest date we get from the inscriptions for Narahari was S. 1215. The records engraved between Saka 1186 to 1197 might have been written at his own command, whereas those found after S. 1197 and till S. 1215 must have been caused to be written by the command of the prince Narasimha, for the merit of his late regent. The striking coincidence of the dates with the facts given in the stotra make it more than probable that S. 1197 might be the last year of Madhvacharya. This Saka year corresponds to the cycle year Yuva.

According to the traditional lists Madhvacharya was born in the Cyclic year Puigala and lived for 80 years (until Yuva), the year of birth of Madhvacharya, must therefore correspond with the Saka year 1117 or 1118. We find from the tables that 1118 is Puigala. Hence the date of birth of Madhvacharya must be S. 1118.

The year arrived at by this process of reasoning is in close agreement with the dates given in the Bhurata-tolpatya-niranya and Chhalari-smriti. The first gives Kali 4300 (S. 1120) as the date of birth of the Acharya,23 where as the second states that Madhva-guru was born in S. 1128. The first is almost the date that we have arrived at from a study of the epigraphical records. The second perhaps refers to the date of assumption of saumya by Vasudeva,—for, tradition says that he became a saumyasin in his eighth year,—hence both might be correct, referring each to an incident in the life of the teacher. When a person takes the saumyasanara he is believed to have entered a new life and the rebirth of Vasudeva as Ananda Tirtha might therefore have been recorded by Chhalari. The words—vipra-tanu and Madhva-guru—used to denote the individual are very suggestive. The former signifies physical birth and the latter the spiritual birth.

It now remains to explain how the date of the Acharya came to be recorded as the year S. 1040, corresponding to the cyclic year Vijambin, in the matha lists. The date of the death of each acharya is observed as a holy day among the Madhvas and these days are known as punya-divasa. But in the case of Madhvacharya, who is believed to have never died at all, there cannot be a punya-divasa and consequently perhaps his day of birth was taken as the punya-divasa. In later times, when the lists of the mathas were written, the punya-divasa of Madhvacharya must have been taken, as in all other cases, as the date of death of the Acharya (i.e., his departure to Badari) and knowing from tradition

26 पुनुस्तत्रे विश्वामित्रे गते संवत्सरोऽस्तु कः कहै पुन्यस्यसः।
भासनं पुन्यस्यस्य सत्येऽपि प्रहोक्ते विश्वायमित्रोऽस्तरात्।

It appears improbable that the verse belongs to the original work, and is more likely to be an interpolation. For, it is quite unlikely that the Acharya would boast of himself as the incarnation of Bhima, taken to destroy the daityas. Besides there is no need, in the present instance, for him to give the date of his birth. It must be that the interpolation was made by some pious hand with a desire of recording the date of the birth of the Guru, in his work itself.

27 कथितं पदेन वीरस्वरूपमेवं दशानुवस्य न तथा।
भवनात्मकं मेवरयत्वं स्वरुपस्वरुपं न तथा।

There is no other date Saka 1049 mentioned herein the relevancy of which is not clear. Can it be that it refers to the advent of Ramana?
that he lived for eighty years, they must have deducted this number from S. 1120 (the
date given in the (Bhārata-tātparya-nirṇaya) and arrived at S. 1040 for the date of birth
of Madhvāchārya.

If, according to the matha list, we take the date of demise of Madhvāchārya to be
S. 1120, the date of the end of Padmanābha Tīrtha’s pontificate would become
S. 1126-7, and of Narahari, S. 1135-6. Then Narahari could not be represented as
making or causing others to make gifts to temples in the years between S. 1186-1215,
that is, fifty years after his death in S. 1135-6.

In a foot-note in his paper on the Srikurman inscription of Narahari Tīrtha,
Mr. Krishna Sastri writes that the Svāmi of the Phalārī matha told him that his matha
list gives Piṅgala and Iśvara as the dates of birth and death of Madhvāchārya and this
is very near the dates arrived by us.

The Madhva-vijaya mentions that a certain king named Iśvara was ruling over the
Mahārāṣṭra country when Madhvāchārya passed through it. This king is identified by
Mr. Krishnasamā Ayyar with Mahādeva of Dēvagiri who ruled from A. D. 1260-1270
(S. 1182-1192), his reason being that both of them possess a name which refers to Siva,
and poet Narayana Panditāchārya, the author of Madhva-vijaya, might have, for exigencies
of metre, rendered the real name Mahādeva into its equivalent, Iśvara. We do not know
how far this identification is tenable. In case the identification is assumed to be correct
the meeting of Madhvāchārya and Mahādeva must have taken place in the last part of
the life of the former, which is not what the Madhva-vijaya has. Therein the event is said
to have taken place in the middle of the life of the Āchārya, that is, when he undertook
his second journey to Badari.

A second prince is also mentioned in the Madhva-vijaya; viz., Jayasiṃha of Kumbla.

We confess we are at present unable to identify this king with any hitherto known to
history.

The facts noticed in the previous paragraphs may be tabulated as follows:—

Birth of Madhvāchārya ... ... ... ... ... S. 1118 (or 1120),
Assumption of holy orders... ... ... ... ... S. 1128,
Tour to the south,
Pilgrimage to Badari,
Conversion of Sōbhana Bhatta, Sāma Sāstrin, and Govinda

Bhatta.

Second tour to Badari
Narahari's regency begins... ... ... ... ... S. 1186
Do. do. ends ... ... ... ... ... S. 1197
Death of Madhvāchārya and the accession of Padmanābha ... S. 1197
Death of Padmanābha Tīrtha ... ... ... ... ... S. 1204
Narahari's pontificate ... ... ... ... ... S. 1204-1215

(To be continued.)

SOME ANGLO-INDIAN WORTHIES OF THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY.

BY LAVINIA MARY ANSTEY.

(Continued from Vol. XXXIV. p. 176.)

No. IV.

JOHN SMITH.

John Smith, the fourth of our "Worthies," resembles William Jearsey, the fiery chief of Masulipatam, rather than either Walter Clavell or Ambrose Salisbury, his contemporaries in Bengal. Like Jearsey, Smith, as head of a subordinate factory, openly defied his superiors, was dismissed the service, refused to return to England, and turned "interloper." Here, however, the resemblance ends, for Smith had no powerful supporters among those in office, and his attempt at independent trading ended prematurely and disastrously.

The first mention of John Smith in the Records of the East India Company is on the 18th October, 1667, when he was elected by a Court of Committees to serve as a factor in the Bay of Bengal at a salary of £20 per annum. In this capacity he was obliged to give security for £1000. His sponsors were "James Smith of Withington in Salop, Clerk," and Matthew Shepherd. The former, who was incumbent of St. John the Baptist, Withington, from 1654 to 1684 was probably a relative.

John Smith sailed to India in one of the five ships sent to Madras in 1668, probably in the Blackmore, with Richard Edwards, another newly elected factor. Fort St. George was, at this time, in a state of turmoil owing to the actions of Sir Edward Winter, the late Agent, who, for over two years had defied the Company, had ignored their orders for his return to England, and had imprisoned his successor, Sir George Foxcroft. While the "Commissioners" empowered to reduce the mutinous Sir Edward to obedience were carrying out their instructions, the ships, with the Company's junior servants destined for Bengal, sailed to Masulipatam. Here they were detained by bad weather, and were unable to land their passengers at Balasor until early in 1669.

Smith appears to have been immediately ordered to Hugli, where he arrived on the 5th March, leaving Edwards at Balasor. The two had apparently struck up a friendship during the voyage from England and had already arranged to assist each other in private trade. Smith lost no time in buying and selling on his own and Edwards' account at Hugli, where he had temporary charge of the Company's factory, with a "diet allowance" of Rs. 30 per month. He began with some sword blades, but considered that the price offered by the local governor was too low.

In April, 1669, Edwards was sent to Kasimbazar to join Thomas Jones, another of the Company's newly arrived servants, while Smith accompanied John March on a special mission to Dacca. March was selected by Shem Bridges, head of affairs in Bengal, to plead the cause of the English to the Nawab Shāista Khān and to endeavour to obtain

---

3 The Shropshire Parish Registers mention James, Joseph, Mary and Rachel as children of the Rev. James Smith, but there is no record of any child of the name of John.
6 O. C. No. 3255. 7 O. C. No. 3255.
8 O. C. No. 3255.
redress from the grievance imposed on the Company's servants by Malik Kāsim, the native governor at Hūgli. A halt was made at Kāsimbāzār, and Dacca was reached about the end of May.¹⁰ Six weeks later March wrote to Edwards that "Business goes on soe slowly in this cursed Durbar," that it would be another month before he could accomplish his mission and be ready to "return for Cassambazar," when he should leave John Smith in charge of the Company's investments at Dacca.¹¹ At the same time Smith himself wrote to Edwards, posing as a champion of the Company's rights. He regretted that Roger Broadnax was under suspicion of "Trechery" and feared the Company would be sufferers by the "unworthy Dealings" of William Blake, the late Agent in Bengal. During the remainder of the year 1669 he was presumably in sole charge at Dacca. Two letters addressed to him by Edwards at Kāsimbāzār are extant, the one¹² acknowledging the receipt of money which arrived too late for the investment of 1669, and the other¹³ expressing sympathy that "the Mogull who made a bargain with Mr. March ... Should t and of [off]."

In the following year, 1670, there is no record of Smith, except in a private capacity, nor any indication to show whether he was as busily employed in the Company's affairs as he was in carrying out his own and his friend's investments. In March he wrote to Edwards¹⁴ that he had procured his "Tangeeba" (तंजेबा) and would shortly forward the "Jelolsies"¹⁵ desired. In reply, he received a letter from Edwards, sent per Thomas Jones, "who is to reside with you,"¹⁶ giving directions about the "Jelolyean" and arranging for the payment of them. Jones fell ill immediately on his arrival, which, "discouraged him soe much" that he returned to Kāsimbāzār. He was, however, sent back a month later, when he was again the bearer of a letter from Edwards to Smith with directions about various "adventures" and "2 ps. braid."¹⁷ Edwards had apparently offered to act as matrimonial agent for his friend, for on the 23rd August 1670, Smith wrote,¹⁸ "I humbly thank you for your news and for your kind offer of an English Lady. My confidence in you is great, yet not see as I can trust you to choose a wife for mee when you are unprovided your Selfe, which want pray first supply, and if there's none left for mee, I'm content to stay till another Spring."

Beyond a short letter from Edwards, on the 31st January 1671, regretting the failure to dispose of his swords at Dacca,¹⁹ there is no further reference to Smith until December of that year, when he officially informed Walter Clavell, who had succeeded Shem Bridges as "Chief" in "the Bay," that he could find a market for the Company's lead or tin.²⁰ Smith had apparently realized that the new chief was not favourably disposed towards him, for in January 1672, he wrote to Edwards at Kāsimbāzār,²¹ "I writ severall times to Mr. Clavell for the Bale Silk Mr. Elwiaes provided for mee but hee did not deliver it, by

---

¹⁰ At "Hutchona Hattee" (Hajrahati) Smith missed his "little carpet" which had been left at Kāsimbāzār through the "Rougie" of Edwards' "man." (O. O. No. 3277).
¹¹ O. O. No. 3306.
¹² O. O. No. 3370.
¹³ O. O. No. 3411.
¹⁴ O. O. No. 3339.
¹⁵ Fine piece goods, probably jalajAM. See Sir Richard Temple's note on this word, Diaries of Streynsham Master, I. 430n.
¹⁶ O. O. No. 3419.
¹⁷ O. O. No. 3439.
¹⁸ O. O. No. 3483.
¹⁹ O. O. No. 3533.
²¹ O. O. No. 3522.
which I am greatly disappointed. I heare he hath two of my Europe Letters in his custody, which hee sends not, nor have I received any answer to any Generall or particular sent him this five months; I understand not the meaning of it." The remainder of the letter refers to Edward's own affairs and to their mutual trade—"I am sorry you are like to come to a losse for your trouble in packing the Company's goods, but glad to heare of your advance in Sallary and place, in which wish you much happinesse and prosperity... I have at taste sold our Pepper at 19 rupees, a poore price, feare there will bee Little or noe preffet. As soone as I have opportunity, shall remitt your mony with your lace etc. here, which I intended to have carried with mee if had gone last Shipping. Your Success as well as mine is bad in trading here; the swords believe will ly as long as the Pepper, here being many arrived." From the above it seems that Smith had intended to leave Dacca in 1671, but there is no record of any request to that effect. On the 31st March, 1672, he again wrote officially to his chief about investments that could be made at Dacca, adding, "This is the only place for Cosases (khàsà), Adathies (adhòtar, dhet) and Hummums (hàmmàm)."

Meanwhile, Clavell's enquiries had convinced him that Smith was mismanaging affairs with the officials at the darbàr, and he consequently dispatched James Price, who had had previous experience, to act as the Company's vakil at Dacca. Edwards sent a timely warning to his friend, and Smith, who either would not, or dared not, brook investigation into his methods at Court, refused to allow the vakil to carry out his orders, alleging that most of the "troubles" were ended before his arrival. The following extract of Smith's reply to Edwards shows the charge, made later, of his high-handed treatment of Price was not unfounded—Dacca 20 June 1672.

"By James Price received a letter from you and thank you very kindly for your advice concerning him; wee have used him accordingly and never employed him in a Cowryworth of service; wee doe this day dispose him with a Letter and your Brother [brother-in-law] J. V. [John Vickers] hath been honourd with another. Thank God wee have now ended most of our troubles and got two Phirwànas (pàruvnà), which will send in a few days; hope shall now please them all. If you hear of James, as 'tis like he will, that he ended this business, doe mee the favour to tell him from mee that hees a lying Rogue and never was employed."

On the 24th June, 1672, Smith reported his success in his negotiations with the Court officials, and stated that "Malik Cossum" (Malik Kàsìm) had promised to pay what "he forced from the English." This letter did not modify Clavell's opinion of Smith's incapacity, but still no steps were taken against him until the following year. He continued to trade on his own account, and in November, he sent a consignment of cloth to his friend Edwards.

However, on the 17th January 1673, Robert Elwes, then at Patna, was ordered forthwith to repair to Dacca, "Sundry causes having moved us to dismiss Mr. John Smith from his Imployment and to constitute you in his place." Writing to the Agent at Fort St. George on the 16th March, the Council at "the Bay" detail these "sundry causes" as follows:

"Having many just reasons to complain of the slackness of Mr. John Smith in

---

23 O. C. No. 3652.
25 O. C. No. 3761.
Dacca, as well in giving us advices, as in dispatching away the Company’s goods provided by him and giving us his accounts, we recalled him from thence and ordered Mr. Elwes to leave Pattana and proceed to Dacca there to receive the Company’s remaines and dispose of their goods . . . and have confidence that from him and Mr. Hervy wee shall have a more strict correspondence and compleance with our orders then hitherto wee have had from those who reside there.”

Elwes duly notified his arrival at Dacca and the delivery of the Council’s order to “John Smith for his surrender of the Company’s remaines and repaire” to Balasar within ten days, and Smith’s representation thereon. In reply, Clavell remarked that the allotted days were ample for preparation, since Smith was apprised of his recall in January and therefore had had plenty of time to arrange his business. His presence was required at Balasar “to perfect his accounts, which for want of a good correspondence with him lye in no good plight, and its high time they were better methodized.” Clavell also imputed to Smith’s mismanagement the fact that so large a peeshkash or forced offering, had been demanded by the English by the Nawab—“The Company have so much the more to thank Mr. Smith for that by his negligence and bad correspondence hath drawne upon them such a charge.”

Smith, however, ignored the summons to return to Balasar. On the 3d April 1673, Clavell again wrote to Elwes that they “know not what there might bee remaining of Mr. Smith’s [at Dacca], having scarce received any advice from him what hee had done;” and with regard to alleged outstanding debts to Tilok Chand and others, he added, “The business of the brokers wee can say nothing to till wee heare further from you, but admire that there should bee such large remaines as you intimate, which concerne Mr. Smith to looke unto, hee having had now almost a yeares warning to get them in, but of this wee shall not write much, expecting Mr. Smith suddainely here, and then wee shall understand the state of his accounts, for wee expect he make no delay or frivolous pretences for his stay.” In spite of these peremptory orders Smith did not hurry away from Dacca. In a letter from Samuel Hervy, of the 29th April 1673, to that popular correspondent, Richard Edwards, there is the remark, “Mr. Smith departs hence within three or four dayes and takes Cassimbazar in his way.” However, a month later, on the 29th May, Smith was still at Dacca, and Hervy stated that he “departs hence I think tomorrow,” leaving “musters of his silke” in Hervy’s charge. In the end, it was the 9th June 1673, before Smith started for Kasimzâr en route for Balasar.

During his leisurely journey, he wrote to Edwards from “Hudgara Hatte [Hajawat], Friday June 20 [1673] if mistake not—Esteemed friend I am now arrived at Hudgara Hatte and expect this day to reach Merdadpore [Mirdâudpur] to which place would intreate the favour from you to provide and send me a Pallakee [palanquin] and a set of Cahars [kahar, porter] that I may, havinge this opportunity (which is my great desire) see you [in] health and prosperitie; therefore hope you will not fayle mee in sendinge Cahars and Pallakee, which I desire might bee on my accompt. I shall stay at Merdadpore about 24 hours and

28 At the time of his dismissal, Smith was in receipt of a salary of £20 per annum and ranked as 29th in the Bay.”

31 O. C. No. 3793.
32 O. C. No. 3794.
then if they arrive not shall put forward for Hugly. If you think I may meet with any aéraunt, pray advise me, and how to avoid it."

The last sentence is written in a simple cypher, which, from this time, Smith frequently employed in his correspondence with Edwards. The reply to the above letter does not exist, but it seems probable that Smith was advised not to break his journey nor to come in contact with Matthias Vincent, the Chief at Kásimbázár, for, on the 28th June 1673, Clavell wrote to Dacca that Mr. Smith had "lately arrived" at Balasor, and that they should "now suddeainely" examine his accounts. He had been told of the "difference in broad cloth," but attributed the mistake to Elwes.35

For three months there is no mention of Smith and his affairs. On the 27th September he was still at Balasor, writing in cypher to Edwards,36 "I am sorry you are out, and E. L. [Edward Littleton] made third: we have had noe words of my going to Decca; when goe about that must go through quick." This seems to imply either that he expected reinstatement, or was hoping to return to Dacca to settle his own concerns. Finding himself mistaken and in ill odour with the authorities in "the Bay," Smith decided to appeal to headquarters, and on the 12th October 1673, he voiced his grievances in a letter to Nathaniel Herne, then Governor of the East India Company. He wrote,37 that he "had served the Company in Dacca nearly five years and eight months," and that Vincent had sought his ruin because he was unsuccessfull in a private matter he undertook for him. Further, he stated that Vincent had been heard to declare he would not rest till he had ruined him "the it cost him half his fortune," and to Vincent's influence with Clavell be attributed his recall from Dacca. He complained that the time limited was insufficient for him to settle his affairs and that, consequently, he was practically ruined, but he left the Company in ignorance of the fact that he had taken three months instead of the allotted ten days in which to arrange for his departure. He objected to the appointment of Hervy at Dacca on the ground that he was his avowed enemy and a "known atheist." With regard to the large peshkash given to the Nabob in 1672, for which he was blamed by Clavell, Smith pretended that no such bribe would have been necessary had not Clavell most injudiciously neglected to pay a ceremonial visit to the Governor of Húglí before he started for Dacca. Finally, Smith accused Vincent of forcing money unjustly from some of the native servants at Kásimbázár and of being answerable for the death of Raghú the poddar, an affair which cost the Company Rs. 15,000. He concluded by assuring the Court of Committees of his faithful service and by begging to be restored to his chiefship at Dacca in order to secure the Company's estate, and, as a secondary consideration, his own, for Clavell was detaining some of his goods at Balasor as security for debts which he repudiated.

This letter does not appear to have been sent to England until late in the following year, for, on the 20th August 1674, the Council at Fort St. George wrote to the Company, enclosing "papers from Mr. John Smith late chief of Decca, who complains, of much injustice done him; we have sent Coppies thereof to the Chief and Factors there, desiring them to cause things to be duly examined, which is all that we can do at present untill we can send some person to enquire into these matters. In the mean time your honours great prudence will be pleased to give us your sense and directions upon the premises."38

(To be continued.)

38 O. C. No. 3992.
THE DATE OF SARVAJñATMA.

Last year if I remember aright there was a discussion on the date of the abovementioned person in the pages of this Journal by Mr. D. R. Bhandarkar. The date he arrives at is also borne out by the succession list of the Śrīśi Rājñīyaṇaṇaśāsta, which list he says he got from the then Jagadguru. Except for the date of śrīśi Rājñīyaṇaṇaśāsta, the list seems to be quite reliable, but it is very surprising that Mr. Suryanarain Row should have himself fallen into a good deal of inaccuracy in defending the accuracy of the statement in the list about śrīśi Rājñīyaṇaṇaśāsta, who according to it sat for a trifle of 800 years on the ‘pontifical throne’! We might safely accept A. D. 773 as the date of śrīśi Rājñīyaṇaṇaśāsta’s death, but there seems to have been an interregnum of three years unaccounted for in the list. Sarvaññatma succeeding only in A. D. 789 and ruling for 90 years.

G. D.

NOTES AND QUERIES.

The Judge reports that [at] a General Sessions held on the 10th and 11th Instanta Richard Caswell an Englishman and Adrian van Reed a Dutchman were found guilty of felony, for being concerned in the running away with the H. Company’s Ketch Josia out of this road and Brigantine Gingerlee from Anjengo. But claiming the benefit of their Clergy did both read, and were burnt in the hand and returned to the custody of the Marshall.

R. C. Temple.

BOOK NOTICE.


The Royal Society of Philosophy at Göttingen has issued a very interesting prospectus of a Commission, which has been appointed to investigate the developments and history of the various World Religions. The Members of this Commission are all well known scholars, who have made a life study of this most fascinating of all human problems, and Herr Oldenburg will be the President of the whole undertaking. The first beginning of a scheme of this kind was due to Julius Boehner, under the title of Religions-Urkunden der Völker, and this will be associated with the new enterprise which is to be called the “Quellen der Religionsgeschichte,” the sources of the History of Religion. The task of the Commission will be, to examine all the religious books of the East, the traditions and developments of the early creeds of Oceania, South America and Africa, to publish critical texts of all available documents; in fact to produce a world-embracing study and history of this most important branch of the slow education of the human race. The scheme will embrace the entire religious history of the world, illustrates by contemporaneous literature, folk-lore, and tradition, and will be corrected and brought up to date, by the experience of men actually working in various parts of the world. There will be twelve groups, of religious investigation.

1. Religions of the Indo-German Races in Europe.
2. Egyptian and ancient Semitic.
4. Islam.
5. Religions of the Ural-Altaic and Arctic Races.
7. Indian Religions (Buddhism excepted).
8. Protestantism.
10. African Religions.
11. American Religions.
12. Primitive Religions of Southern Asia and Oceania.

We wish all success to the gigantic work, projected and begun by this Commission, and we are sure that our readers will watch the further developments with interest and sympathy. Five volumes have already appeared, and another two are in the Press, and thirty more volumes have been assigned to distinguished scholars, and will appear in due course.

T. H. Hart Davies.

1 Benefit of Clergy arose in the 12th century. Psalm LIII., Vol. I., was the usual test of literacy and was known as the “neck-verse.” Felons who passed the test were only burnt in the hand instead of being hanged. The privilege was abolished by a statute of 1827.
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</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
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<td>Sup. 45</td>
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<td>109</td>
</tr>
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<td>Būrusapur under Rāma Rāja</td>
<td>261</td>
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<td>43</td>
</tr>
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<td>33–35 n.</td>
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<td>111</td>
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<td>173</td>
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<td>Čiṃundya, Čiṃundā and Sīttāpatra or Tārā</td>
<td>53 and n.</td>
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<td>Čānaka, Čānaka, and the last Nanda 168; and Candragupta, etc. 174, f; and the Arkaśāstra</td>
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<td>Canarese, and the Pāñjīyas 27 n.–29; 31;</td>
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<tr>
<td>Candragupta, Chandragupta, dates etc. 167 and n., 168 and n., 170 n., 171, f. and Seleucus</td>
<td>175, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cannibals, the Yākasas and Khaśas 144 and n. 145; the Čaśi tribe</td>
<td>149, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cañatō, subdue 3; and Rāma Rāja</td>
<td>101, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>carral, coral</td>
<td>106 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>case, in Old W. Rājaśahāni 182–150, 212–216; 225–228; 245–251; in popular Sanskrit</td>
<td>Sup. 70–72; 74, 77</td>
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<tr>
<td>Čaśi, of Plīyā, the Khaśras 144, cannibals</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>F. K. I, 2. 142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chaturāṃśa—consisting in four restrictions, applied to Jain creed</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
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<td>Caves, of the Thousand Buddhas, poṭṭhīs from Sup. 64; in Kolaṇḍa district</td>
<td>F. K. 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cerseyes, trade in</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceylon, and Virupaṇaka, etc. 9, 10 and n.; and Lakkana the Naik 11; and Immudi Naraśimha 17; and Krishna Dēva 45; and Auyuntā Rāya 188; reputed Conquest of 190 n.; and Mahinō 202; and Auyuntā Naik 218; and Sadaśiva</td>
<td>230 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceylonese, era 167; Chronicles and dates 168 and n.–172 and n.</td>
<td>74, 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chābārī, choutrye, office</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chagtal Turks, Mughals</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chakrapāṇidatta, medical author</td>
<td>Sup. 50, 51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalmers, and Jain dates.</td>
<td>127n, 177n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>champā āśāli, ceremony</td>
<td>F. K. 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Čāṇaka, and the Mudrāṇākasa 65, 67;</td>
<td>168, 174, f, 175 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chāṇaka</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chanda, poet, and Old W. Hindi</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chanda Kumāra, Pāñjīyan k.</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandragupta, in the Mudrāṇākasa 65–67; and the Araṇās 124 and n.; and Chandragupta 167 and n., 168 and n., 170 n., 171, f, 175, f.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandragupta</td>
<td>F. K. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charnayya, Chālōa chief</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chāpas, Gurjara Sub-division</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charaka, physiologist of Kashmir, and the Chāraka Sānāhita</td>
<td>Sup. 54 and n., 56 f, 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charaka Sānāhita, quoted in the Bower MS. 180; Sup. 53–57, 59, 60, 62, 64, 67 n</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandrāṃ, Śākka, Pāñjīya k. 27–30; and Madura 229, 232; and Vīra Śākka 253 and n; restoration of 254, 259; death of 255, date etc.</td>
<td>259–260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles, the ship</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>charms, against snake-bites, in the Bower MS. 180;</td>
<td>Sup. 50, 51, 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charpentier, Prof., and the word Lūmmini 18 n.; and the date of Buddha’s death</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chart, of the true and exact day of Buddha’s death</td>
<td>198, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chaturāṃśa and chātrīti, thāthi</td>
<td>F. K. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chauhān, seat of Gajara, of Swat 160; Chauhānānas</td>
<td>163–164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chautādhi, etc., cotton cloths</td>
<td>70 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chappār, chaptops, thatched roof</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chedulīc, myrobalan, monograph on</td>
<td>Sup. 82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Čhāra kgs., and the Kāvunjang chiefs</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Čhāramān Perumāl, ancestor of the Kāvunjangs</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Čhēti̇s, the Saurākātras</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chidimānā, āsi, author</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>children, diseases of</td>
<td>Sup. 50, 51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chīmīnī Beagum, daughter of Shāh Jāhan</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinaware, trade in</td>
<td>71, 83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDEX</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chintamani, the, commentary, and the Asmopaha-sutta, etc.</td>
<td>205-208; 211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiranjivis, immortals</td>
<td>F. K. 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chitra ha kai, the, on plumbeq root</td>
<td>Sup. 62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cholappa, Vira Narasimha Naikar, Chel-lappa</td>
<td>159 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cholisa, conquered 2:3; and Vijayanagar etc., 7, 13 and n.; and Pāṇḍyas 27, 30, 31; 134; 232; 232; 259; and Canarese 112 and n.; and the Kavugu chids 134; 139; in S. India, etc.</td>
<td>232, f.; 238 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cholomandel, Cholamangalao, and the Naika</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronology, Jain, its foundation 119-123; 125; 126; Indian</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>church, powders</td>
<td>Sup. 82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>civilization, Indian</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clavell, Walter, E. I. Co's servant</td>
<td>267-271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claw, the Thunderbolt</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clergy, benefit of</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cloth, as writing material in spells 54 and n.; trade in 70, 72, 73, (ordoceo), 79; 83, 89, f.</td>
<td>109, 260, 271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cobra Masilla, (derivation of), the Indian water snake dansana</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coconut day</td>
<td>K. F. 4:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cochin, trade with</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coimbatore, and the Badugas 113 n.; and Salem 133; home of the Rejja 138; Canarese immigrants to</td>
<td>139, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coin, copper, attributed to Lakkana (Danda-nayaka)</td>
<td>11 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>colonies, Telugu, in Tamil lands</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cornets</td>
<td>F. K. 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Mission to India, the first English documents relating to</td>
<td>69-83; 97-111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>commodities vendable in India in 1620, list of</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comorin, c, raided</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conception, influenced by the sun and the moon</td>
<td>F. K. 3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conjevaram, and the Pāṇḍyas 33 and n., 36; and the Kāppilyana 139, f.; and Achyuta Naik 218; and Śankaśantiyā etc.</td>
<td>238 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consonants, in Old W. Rājaśthānī, single 84, ff.; compound 87, ff.; metathesis of 99, f.; in the Bower MS.</td>
<td>Sup. 63.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consonantal bases, in Old W. Rājaśthānī 181 f.; 213</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>copperplate grant of Bhāskararwam of Kāmarupa, newly discovered 68; 95, f.; others</td>
<td>238 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coral, coral, trade in</td>
<td>72, 106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cordier, Dr. F., Les Récits Découvertes Sup. 53 n., 64 n., 59 n., 81, 62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coromandel Coast</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cosmene, khaba</td>
<td>71, 269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cough mixtures</td>
<td>Sup. 81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councils, Buddhist</td>
<td>168—171, 176, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>creeds and castes of immigrants into the Kon- gu, co., etc.</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cubomanev, in the Bower MS., 183; Pāṇḍiya-kāvya</td>
<td>Sup. 84, 86, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cunda, friend of Buddha</td>
<td>128; 177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cunningham, Gen., on Buddha</td>
<td>131, f.; 197, 204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle of Jupiter</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dacca and J. Smith, etc.</td>
<td>267-271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dahāka, discount</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dahāka, faires</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dāmalipta and Tamraliptī</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dānapāla, Sh'hu? translator Sup.</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dērā Shukoh, son of Shāhjāhān</td>
<td>241 n., 243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dar'aka or Hariaka 133; and Darbaka</td>
<td>167 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dasārī, commission</td>
<td>70, 71, 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayus, out caste tribes</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>date of the Mahāvīra 118-123; 125-133</td>
<td>167-178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>date of Śankaraschārya</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dates, traditional, of Pāri history</td>
<td>151, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dattārāya, g.</td>
<td>F. K. 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daulatbad, under Rama Raja</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>day of Buddha's death</td>
<td>197, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayāpāla, author</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>days of religious importance</td>
<td>F. K. 6, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dead, treatment of, among the Tōtityāns</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>death of Buddha</td>
<td>125; 197, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deccan, Mussulman conquest of 1; Deccan</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dakhan 107 and n.; and Vijayanagar</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deities, of the Tōtityāns 137; minor, local</td>
<td>F. K. 1; and seasons, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delhi, c. and Parikrama Pāṇḍya 3; and Malik Kāför etc., 4, 5 and n.; the New c., 48; and Agra, painting and engraving at</td>
<td>124, 243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jahānābād</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>demons</td>
<td>F. K. 3 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devadatta, apostate</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devagiri, and the Saurāstra</td>
<td>138; 141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devānampiya Tissa, anointment of</td>
<td>201, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devanandin, Digambara writer</td>
<td>208, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dēva Rāya</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devardhigāna, and the council of Vala bhi</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dhana-trayoszā day</td>
<td>F. K. 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dhana-trayoszā vow</td>
<td>F. K. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhavantari Sup. 58, and the Cauira Kalpa</td>
<td>62, and surgical science 63, the divine surgeon Divbdasa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhārāmangalam, a Kōnū Pālāyam</td>
<td>134, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index Entry</td>
<td>Page(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dharaqi, or Indian Buddhist Protective Spells</td>
<td>144f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhritta philosophy of Madhva-charya</td>
<td>233, 235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwara-sarasvatī and Vira-sarasvatī</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwara-samudra, Hoya-sa cap.</td>
<td>2, 6 n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyamod, the Ship</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earth Worship</td>
<td>F. K. 11, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earthquakes</td>
<td>F. K. 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East India Company, and Peter Mundy 69; and S. India</td>
<td>11f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eclipse</td>
<td>F. K. 8, 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edict of Khāravela 150; of Tolerance to the Paravas</td>
<td>199 n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eezana Era</td>
<td>198–200, 202–204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ekadashī day</td>
<td>F. K. 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elephants, teeth of, trade in 72; and rain, F. K. 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elwicke, Elwicke, Mr. and J. Smith</td>
<td>268–271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El-wand, Allamur</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embroidery, embrodares, trade in</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emigration, Pāṇḍya, to Tinnevelly</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enamel, anast,</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Commercial Mission to Patna, The First Documents relating to</td>
<td>69–83, 97–111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Factories in India, by Foster. 69 n., 108 n. engraving and painting as Agra and Delhi</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eranian Avesta, and the language of the Khaṣa tribe</td>
<td>144 n. 150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eras, Ceylonese 167; Kaunza, Eezana 198–200, 202–204; New Religion, 200; Burmese 200 n.; Buddha 202; Kollam</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erkollar, Telugu Eragolla, Tōtityan subdivision</td>
<td>135, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excommunication, among the Parivārans 137 n. eye-sight, and the moon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farsān, firman</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers, their superstitions</td>
<td>F. K. 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fasting, fasts</td>
<td>F. K. 8, 10, 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feathers, feathers, trade in</td>
<td>70, 83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feng, Chinese, Phoenix, Garuda</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferishta, historian, on Malik Kāfur etc. 2 n., 3 n., 4; 229 and n., 230 and n.</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Festivals, Temple, mentioned by R. Hughes 75–77, 97, 99, 102, death of</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firmicus Maternus, first mentioned the doctrine of kōra</td>
<td>F. K. 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishtype, Dr. and the Rummīndal inscrip. 17, 19, 20; and Buddha's death, etc., 132 n.; 197, 200–202, 204; and the Māurya era 170 n.; and the Jains</td>
<td>175 n. F. K. 26, 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florence, has Old W. Rājastrān MSS. 21, 23, 25, 26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forcari, possibly Tukhár</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort St. George, and Sir Ed. Winter</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foxcroft, Sir G., E. L. Co's servant</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fryer, Dr., traveller</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>galáya, ancient gápa</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaddabhilla-rajjan</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gajapati</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>galíya, 19, an unbroken, idle horse, and</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>víaša</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gápa, modern, galáya, probably meant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sections of the Jains</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gandharvás, eaters of human offerings</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gónaš chaturthi day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gúna, hot spring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gangadhar, and the charaka Sāhíbhí</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gandhis, riv., Duđha Ganga</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gangpati</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardabhilla (Gaddabhilla-rajjan?) 120 k.,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardiner, Prof. and the Dipavíkasas 174 n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and the Mahávása</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gender, in Old W. Rájasthání 181—185, 213,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246; in Popular Sanskrit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gharí, grease, a native hour</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ghee, ghíha,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghati Mudašír of Dhárámaçalam, famous</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coimbatore chief</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghulam Raza, Indian painter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gingeries, E. L. Co's ship</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girha, g., and eclipses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gir, a griy, a measure</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girvar, inscrip.</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goa, Gaspar Antonio and the Stone</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gohdínga, heroic</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gods, Brahmanical etc., of Madura</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gokul-áshtami day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golcondah, and Ráma Rája</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>goldust, of Tibet</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golio, Hāggí</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gondhá, agent</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gondháli dance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gondophere, Gudaphara</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gopal Aiyer, Mr. V., and Buddha dates</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gopanmañya, Brahman, lieut. to Kampaša</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Udayär. II. 7, 12; Gopanmañya, restored</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinduism in Śrīrangam</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gopa Timma Nripati, Śājiva Tirumalaiya</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Děva Mahá Rája, first Śājiva governor of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. India</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Góriká, speak E. Pahírí</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gostlai, Makkhati Gostlai 126, 127 and n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manškhalihutta</td>
<td>129—131; 177 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Góri, hill near Xoton, where the Da-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>treul of Xhins MS. was found</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Govinda Bhat, conversion of</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gómadasvarí, village deity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar of the Old Western Rájasthání with</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>special reference to Apabhramasa and to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gújaráti and Marwari, Notes on, 21—26;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55—63; 84—91; 181—186; 213—216; 225—230;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245—252 Sup. 86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Great Sophie' for Shah Tahmasp</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek drama, and the Indian</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grierson, Sir G., and Rájasthání etc. 21 n.</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gregels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sup. 82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gryps, Greek, Garuda</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gudaphere, Gondophere, and Vikramádiyá</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gudhi-páda, first day of the year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sup. 62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guérinot, and Jainism</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guhesána I, II, kings</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gújaráti, and the Gújarás 22—24; 159, f.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saurashítra 138; and Amogávára</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gújaráti, as connected with Old Western</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rájasthání, see Grammar of 21—26; 55—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63; 84—91; 181—186; 213—216; 225—228;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245—252 Sup. 86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gújarás, Gújars, the Gújarás 159 and n. or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gújars etc., 160, 162, or Ja:ja, Ja:ja:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Rájpútá .163 and n. 164 and n., 165 f.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gújánwála, and the Gújarás 159, andGújárás, 166</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gújárát, two districts of the name</td>
<td>159, 166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gújars</td>
<td>143, 160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guhbadan Bégam, princess and poetess, poem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by</td>
<td>219, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guhbadas, and Ráma Rája</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gúłma, a disease</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sup. 57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gúmulaka, trade in</td>
<td>105, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guptés, kings, of Maçadhá and the Manthiros</td>
<td>67; early, and the cycle of Jupiter 211;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>script and the Bower MS. 179; or charac-</td>
<td>47, 48, 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tern Sup. 45 n. and the letter y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gújarás, of Sanskrit literature 143, in India,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dates etc., 159 and n., 160—164, 166</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gújarát</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INDEX

Haidar Ali, and the Saurashtra..... 139 n.
Hajrah, Hutchora Hattee, tn., and J. Smith.... 268 n., 270

hammam, towelling, trade in 70, or hammomes.... 77, 81, 100, 107, 269

hanumand, ceremony, F. K. 19; g. 21, 22, and n.

Harapala, of Devagiri.... 233

Haribhara, Emp. 6; II.... 9 and n. 10

Harita, pupil of Atrīya..... Sup. 54, 66

Harłakai Kalpa or Abhayā Kalpa....... Sup. 62

Hārītā Śakābdita, mediaeval epoqraphal work
Sup. 56, or Atrīya..... 62

Harṣaka, Dariāka k. 133; or Darbhaka, 167 and n.

Harāhcharita, a work by Bāna, and K. Bhasharavarman.... 95, f.

Hastings, his Encyclopaedia 128 n.; 174, 178 n.; and dates.... 130 n., 131 n.

Hastipālaka, k., Hatthipālā, and Mahāvīra.... 122 and n. 128

Hāthal Pases of (Paramara) Dhārāvarsha
[Vikram] Samvat 1237 (1180 A. D.).... 193, f.

Hāthalājī, Hāthal, village, ancient Brahmasthāna.... 193

Haunkridge, Thos., and J. Parker.... 109

Hazara, dist. ancient Uraas.... 144

Helbaze, Allabhād.... 100

Hemachandra, and the Caurasea Apabhranṣa etc.; 22: 38, 59, 63, 64, 246; and the date of Mahāvīra 119, 173, 174 and n.-177; and the Sāsinīgas; 167, f.; and the Nandas 173; and the Amọgapariṇātika.... 209-212

Herbert, Sir Thos., traveller.... 241, f. 244

Hem, Nat., E. I. Co.'s servant.... 271

Herodotus, mentions ant-gold.... 144
heroes, immortal.... F. K. 22 n.

Herry, Mr., E. I. Co.'s servant.... 270

hides, hydes, trade in.... 70, 72, 77, 100
hills, sacred.... F. K. 15-17

Himalayan languages, Pahāri etc.; 22; Tibet-Burman etc.; 142, 143, 164 n.

Himalayas, barbarians of 149; and Khasias 160; and Gurjara settlements.... 163-165

Hindl, Ohi W., used by Chanda 23; and E. 142; and the Gurjars etc.... 160

Hindu, kingdom, in S. India, conquered 1, 2; Chronicles and the Muslim invasion of S. India 3, 4; worship, etc., under Kamaṭa Udaya 27—29; 31; method of reckoning 170 n.; and Musulmān in S. India 230, 233; religion and the Naiks.... 261

Hinduism, in Madura 7, during Muhammadan power 163, 155; 168; and foreign tribes.... 162

Hindu Kush dist. and ancient cannibalism 144; home of the Kambējas etc. 145 and n.; and the Kasia mts.... 150

Hindus, and sun worship F. K. 2; and the suvatīs 3; and the moon etc. 4, 7; their gods.... 8-11; 13, 16, 20-22 and n.

Hindustan, and Shāhābū'ddin Ghoor 1

Hindūstān, and Gujarā 166

History of the Mādhva Achāryas, A sketch of.... 233-237, 293-266

History, Parsi, The Traditional dates of 161, f.

History, The, of The Naik Kingdom of Madura 1-17; 27-36; 111-118; 123-124; 153-158; 197-192; 217, f.; 229-232; 253-262

Hian Tsang, and the Rummindei inscrip. 19; and the Gurjara kingdom.... 153

Hobson-Jobson, Some.... 239

Hoeine, and Jaimism 119; 127 n., 129 n., 130 n., 131 n., 174 n., 175 n., and the Bower MS.... 179, f.

holi-paurnima day .... F. K. 7

hōrā-fūrānā, knowledge of doctrine of lunar mansions.... Sup. 87

Hormuz, Old, and The Zoroastrians.... 152

Hospet, tn., destroyed by lama'il Adil Shah 187

Hoyasale of Dwārasamudra 2 and n.; overthrown 6; and the first Vijayanagara dyn. 8 n.; and Malik Kāfūr.... 233

Hughes Robert, in Patna etc. 69 and n. 72; 75—76, 82, f.; and J. Parker 97-99, 102, f., 106, f., recalled from Patna 108—111

Hūglī, Golyco, Portuguese fort 83; J. Smith at 267, f. 271

Hūmāyūn, emp., and prince Kāmān 220, f. 239

Hūngas, and Mechinhash 67; and India 159—161; or Huna, coins of etc. 162, 163 n.

hund, bill of exchange.... 99, 101

Ibbetson, the late Sir D., and the Rājputs and Gōjars.... 199 n., 161 n. and 163 n.

Ibrāhīm, Lādli k., 219

Ibrāhīm Adil Shah and Achiyuta Rāya 187 and n.

idol-worship, and Siva Sādhāntaism 157

Huppūr, pālayam, date of 114 and n.-116

immigrants, Telugu 135; Canarese 139

immigration, of the Badugas 112, 115

immorality, among the Parivārāms 137 n.

Immosdi Narasingha, Sāluva chief 16, inscrips.

of 17 and n.; or Immosdi Narasingha 45
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDEX</th>
<th>281</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>India, pre-Aryan religion of 37; dramatic literature of, etc. 64—67; <em>Travels of Peter Mundy</em> in 69; visited by Jean de Thévenot 124; Scythian power in 122 n.; (British); and the G. Pathari lang. 142, f.; various tribes of 143—147 n.; 159, f.; immigrations into 162, 164; 175; and the tobores of the Bower MS. 175, f.; and the Mughals 219; N. rise of Tangan in 155 n.; and the Gurgarias etc. 162, 164; S. and the Muhammadans 1—3, 6; and Vijayanagar rule 8, 111, f., 114, 153 and n.; and the Sêrvâs 14; and Krishna Dêva 44, 46, 48; tribal migrations into 138; 188; in the 14th cen. 233; under Nair rule 290; E.; and the Jains 121, 122 and n.; N. W.; conquered by Oniena Kadphises etc. 125 and n.; tribes of 165; and the Bower MS. etc. Sup. 45 and n., 48; 52; medical literature of 62, 64; and popular Sanskrit etc. 65; and subcomancy 67.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Buddhist protective spells, see Dharani 37—42; 49—54; 92—95; Parsis 161; medicine and civilisation etc. in the Bower MS. 170, f.; History, fragment of 240.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indo-Mughal art 124.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indra, g. and the Saurastra 141; and thunder 12.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ndra shanushayâ, rain-bow 9, f.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indranâ, rain-bow 67, 70, f.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inscription, Padaraja or Rummindie, note on it 17—20.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inscriptions, at Tirupat 5; and the Ballalas etc. 9 n., 7 n., 8 and n. 9 and n.; of the Naiks etc. 10 and n., 11 and n. Sâjuva 13 and n., 14; 16; 17 n. Tuluva 15 n., 43 and n.—n.; Bana 32 and n.; Pâlîyân 33 and n.—n.; of Bhaskaravarman 66, 65, f.; at Dholpur 121; of Aîkôka 132, 172 n.; 212; Sanskrit and the Gurgarias 181, 163; of Kharaâvela etc. 167 n., 170 n., 173; Nâgârjun 175 n., 178; Mt. Abû etc. 193 and n.; Râshtrakuta 207; relating to Achyuta Râya etc. 186 and n., 189 n., 190, 191 and n., 218 and n.; to Visvânâtha Naik etc. 229—234; 238 n., 258, 260; to Narahari Tirtha etc. 263, 265, f.; illustrating development of the character i.; Sup. 47 and n.—52; at Isôpur 65.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iskara, protection against rain 18.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isôpur, near Mathura, Brahmanic inscription at 65.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ñadadusdi, chosen delites 21.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jâvâra, k., identified with Mahâdeva of Devagiri 266.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jâvarakshâ, Varshaganyâ, author 211.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It-sîng, translator Sup. 58.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacobi, Prof., and the date of Vâsîkhandatta 67; and Jain dates 118—123 and n.; 125—131; 175 and n.—178.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jahândab, Delhi 243, f.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jahândab, Begam, daughter of Shâhjâhân 141 n. 144.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jahângir, emp., and Malik 'Ambar 107 n. 242, 244.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jainsendra-yaçakirâ, and Sâkta-yaâya's sûtras 210, f.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jains, 118; chronology of, its foundation, etc. 119—123, 125, and Mahâvirâ, Buddhist relations concerning them 126—131, 133, 173; and Vaiśhāvia faiths 158; tradition, and the Nâagas 167, f.; 175 n. 172, 176, and n.; Creed, called sûtryâna 178; and Sanskrit 65.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jakkamma, g. of the Tottiyans 136, f.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jâñalîkâhi, fine piece goods, perhaps 'jelolás' 268 n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jarâs, and Jâts 145 n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jatâvarman Parâkrâma Paâjyâ 30, 34 n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jatâvarman Sunâra Paâjyâ I. 33 n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jâtâvarman, Sârâvallâha 47 and n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jâts, Jâts, and the Gîjharas 101; and Râjapûta 162.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jâtâkara, pupil of Atriya 54 and n. 66.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jâunjpur, Junapore, carpets from 71.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jayaśînha II, Châlukya emp. 212.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jayaśînha of Kumbala, unidentified 266.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jharesh, Wm. E. I. Co.'s servant 267.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jehanger coved, a measure 98, f.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jelolás, probably jâñalîkâhi 268.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jetavana, ti., and Buddha 131.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jinji, ti., under Krishna Dêva 46.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jîvadhâni, goddess and smallpox 15.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jîvakâ, medical writer Sup. 36, 38, reputed friend of Buddha 60.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jîvânânda Vidyâsâgâra, and the Chakras 63.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sâhîh 63.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joannes De Laet on India and Shâhjâhân, book notice 272.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones, Thos., E. I. Co.'s servant 267, f.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josia, the ship 272.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julien, and the Rummindie inscription 19 n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junapore, Junajpur 71.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jupiter, Cycles of 211; Brahaspati F. K. 4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guru 10.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kadamba, kings, early, and the Cycle of Jupiter
Kadhena, Parshvanatha, the, and Parsi dates
Kādi, Arab victory at
Kapdisa II, and Indra
Kājī, caffalo
Ka-gyur, the Mahāyāna Canon 37; Ka-gyur Gyud
Ka-hār, caharr, porter
Kāche-khārī or caiocony, kind of cloth
Kālakaśārya, story of 122 n.; Kālaka, enemy of Gardabhina
Kālakaśārya, removed the Pañjānas
Kāladhāryapattānaka, and Śaka
Kālakakṛtā, tn., and Mārtāpja-Varma
Kālakasoka, k. 168 in n. 169, 171 in n.; perhaps a Nanda
Kālayar Kōll, home of Māviliṃśa 10, 31; inscrip.
Kālayār Somarān, Pāṇḍya chief
Kalbarga, fort and Kṛishṇa Dēva
Kālbhāravā, g. F. K. 19
Kalpo, and the Piśāchās 144; and the Khasas
Kali Age
Kalinga, oc. and Kṛishṇa Dēva; conquest of 169 and n. 170; raised 173; and Śīma Satrīn
Kalpaka, minister of the first Nanda
Kalpos, small monographs
Kalpaśātra, the 119, 121 n.; 122 in n. 123 n.; 127 n., 128; and Durvavāna
Kalpo-kāvakas, medical treatise.
Kaman, Kampana Udayar
Kambarangā, girdle
Kāmarūpa, kingdom
Kambalāma, Tāṭe-vyjan sopes
Kambājāṭāra, Telugu colonists of Kongu
Kāmbōja, 144 and n. 145 and n.
Kampāna, k. 4 n., Udayar 5–9; and the Sañjūvās 12; Vijayanagar general 27; or Kaman 28 and n.; a Canarese 29; 30, f.; reduces the South 34; 153, f.; II. and the Chōja and Pāḍyān kingdoms
Kāmraṇ, son of Bābar, poems by him
Kām-rākṣā, unfinished cloth
Kānarese chiefs and Vīra Nārasiṃha
Kānaṇa, and Nāgabhaṣa II. 162; Gujara-rājāt cap.
Kānča, and Kāṇḍīndas 148 n.; or Khasas
Kānta, and Kāṇḍāindas 148 n.
Kān̄ya, date of 65, 66, patron of Charaka 180
Kākās, unidentified tribe of N. W. India
Kākāyana, medical writer
Kāṇṭāṇur, vil. and fort
Kānivāḍi chiefs
Kapilavastu, tn., and Buddha
Kāpiṣā, and Kāpiṣā
Kāppaliyana, Canarese caste
Kārī, cārī, cārīya, fast, ingrain
Kārīkāśva, coroconn, workshop
Kārṣeṣuvaṣan, dist., and K. B. Kākaśāvarman
Karnata, kingdom, and Narasinga the Sāluva
Karnatakā, and Kṛishṇa Dēva
Kas, kassar, discount
Keshar, Khaṣāl, and Khaṭālaya
Kashgar, and the Khasas
Kashmir, under the Khasa 149, f.; and birch bark 179
Kāshmir, and the Ajara
Kasīs, the Hindu Kōsh or Kāsās enjoying 180
Kālī, goddess, messenger
Kāśikītāvyā, work by Pānini
Kāśīra, probably Divādāsa
Kāyṣapa, legendary saint, and Kāshmir
Kāyṣapa, medical writer Sup. 58, two of the name
Kaktal-tirtha, sacred pond near Nāsik F. K. 15
Kauḍā grām, ceremony
Kauṇḍās, 147 n., identified with the Kāṇṭa
Kāuḍāśīya
Kauṭilya
Kauṭilya, and the Araṇijas
Kāveri, and the Vijayanagara
Kavunja, chief, and Śīvaśā, Kavunja, and Kongu Pólygar
Kāya, body, and Sk. kāya
Kāya-chikita, internal medicine
Kāyaṣṭha, writer- caste, and Kāyaṣṭha
Keene, Mr. and Jāhānra Bēgam
Kēraḷās
Kerridge, Mr. and R. Hughes 69, 72, 79, 106
Kēraḷās, trade in
Kēraḷās, hair-dyes
Kētu, g. and eclipses
Khādalīk, n. e. of Domoko, scene of the find of the Stein MS
Khakha, tribe, and the Khasa 149, of the Jehlum Valley
Khandera, g.
Khandobas, g.
Krishna, Dēva Rāya, and Nāgama Nāik 30; 35; from 1590—1530, called the 2nd or Andhra Bhāja 43 n.; —47. death of 48; 115; 187 and n—189 and n.; 191; and Viśvanātha Nāik 192, 258 and n.; 299, 232; 557 and n.; 259

Krishnapuram plates, and Nāgama Nāik 191 and n.

Krishnāstra, Mr., on Achyuta Rāya... 188
Krishnātṛtya, medical author ... Sup. 61
Krōdāvāsa, wife of Kāsypa, and ancestress of the Piśācās ... 144
Kahārapāyā, people of Athrāya ... Sup. 54, 56
kahatakeśīya, subject treated in the Kālanidāsīka ... Sup. 64

Kahātriya, and the Khaśas 150; and Rājputas etc. 109, 181 and n.; and the Gujarās ... 164, f.

Kaarhātra, punya sthānas, sacred places ... F. K. 22
Kuchar and the Bower Ms. ... 179
Kuchean, unknown lang. of Kuchar, used in a pūṭī ... Sup. 64

Kundūlimalai, in Pudukottah State, and other places has Bāna inscription ... 32

Kuih-i-huang, King of, Kēsamo Shao Kōshana, ... Yue hī title ... 66
Kuhn, Dr. and the name Lāmūmini ... 18
kuladewata, family deities ... F. K. 21, 23
kuladharman, days of worship ... F. K. 23
Kulaiṣkēhara, Kales Dewar, or Mārvāman, Pāṇḍya k., murdered 2 n.; 33 n.; dates ... 34—35 n.
Kularatā, pāḷiyam, date of ... 114 and n., 115
Kula Vardhana, Pāṇḍya, conquered ... 28, f.
Kuliūgas, Kāliūgas ... 146 and n.
Kulūtas, people of Kulu ... 147 and n.
Kumāra, Subrahmaṇya, and Kumārīla Bhaṣṭa ... 264 n.

Kumāra, ancestor of Ghetto of Mudaliar ... 134
kumāra-bāha, children's diseases ... Sup. 56
Kumāra Gupta, emp. and the Saurāśtras ... 138
Kumārajīva, translator ... Sup. 88
Kumāra Kṛishṇa, son of Viṣṇuṇātha ... 257 n.

Kumārīla Bhaṣṭa, an incarnation of Kumāra (Subrahmaṇya) ... 264 n.
kumāra-kāri, potter-woman, etc. * Sup. 86
kumāra-kāri-māṭaṅgoyuktā, applied to dice ... Sup. 86

Kūṣa, Pāṇḍya k. ... 257, f.
Kupāla, k., and Ujjayanī ... 175 and n.
Kunāsajja, and Kunāsajja ... 148 n.
Kundras, and sun-worship etc. ... F. K. 3, 7, 8

krishna, g., and the Tōttiyans 135; and the Greeks 146; image, given to Ananda Tiṣṭha ... 237

INDEX

Krishnavela, his edict, etc. 150, 167 n., 170 n., 173, 175
Khroshtthi, dialect and the Purāṇas ... 196
Khasa, E. Himalayan Aryan-speaking caste ... 143 and n.
Khaṣa, wife of Kaśyapa, ancestress of the Yakṣhas and Rākṣasas ... 144, 146
Khaśālaya, Valley of Khaśāl, or Khaśer had Khaśa Settlements ... 148
Khaśas, tribe, mentioned in Sanskrit literature, or Kaśātra, etc. 143 and n., Cassio of Pliny 144, 145—151, 159; earliest historical immigrants 164, and the Piśāchas ... 155 and n.
Khaśakurā, Naipāl or E. Pahāri lang ... 142
Aṣṭamana, casamāna, letter of introduction ... 75, 101, f.
Aṣṭas, casamānas, trade in ... 71, 269
Aṣṭadā, food offering ... F. K. 3
Khijjī, dyn ... 1
Khotanese lan ... Sup. 64
Khurram, Śahbāshan ... 241, f.
Khusru Parviz ... 152
Kielborn, Pref., and the Pāṇḍyas, 34 and n. the Vikrama era etc. ... 121; 205, 207
Kisah-i-Sonjān, and Parsi dates ... 152
Klatt, and Jains history ... 177 n.
Kohistan, and the Zoroastrians ... 162
Kolāba, dist. ceremonies in F. K. 6; and sages etc. 10; 12; sacred pond etc. 15—17; and rain ... 18, 23
Kolamba, c., Quilon ... 3 n.
Kolāpūru State, and moon worship F. K. 5; sacred waters in 13, ceremonies ... 22
Kollam era, in Kērāla co. ... 238
Kollar, Telugu, Golla, Tōttiyan subdivision ... 135
kōtu, Tamil, darbār ... 114
Kondavidu, fort ... 43, f.
Kongu, co. (Salem and Combatore), the Pāṇḍavas of 123. f.; and the Saurāśtras 130; and Canarese tribe 140 n.; and Sādāśiva 230 n.; people, conquered ... 238 n.
Kopīya, Kōṇiyā ... 127, 133
Kosala, k., and Ajāṭhatrāstu ... 174
Kottar, battle field ... 231
Kōṭtiyām, Nāgama Nāik ... 28; 135
Kōṭṭe, cōttawalla, Nāvāb's agent ... 74
Kōgītōgyūj, Tamil work, on conquest of Trichinopoly 3 n., 4 n., 5 n., 7 n., 8 n.; on Virupanna etc., 9 n.; 10 n. and the Sādāśivas etc. 13 n., 14 n., 16 n.; and Pāṇḍya history 22 n.; and the Muhammadans in S. India 153 and n., 154 n., 158 n.; and Trichinopoly ... 218 n.
Krishna, g., and the Tōttiyans 135; and the Greeks 146; image, given to Ananda Tiṣṭha ... 237
INDEX

Küniya, Küniya, k. Ajátsatru, and Mahâvira 127, n. 134; or Küpi... 173, f., 178
Kúniyûr plates, of Venkata II. 229 n.
Kushâna, and Śaka 228
Kusinârâ, visited by Buddha 223 n.
lace, bobbin lace, trade in 79 and n., 97... 100, f., 129
lac, dye 78, gumlac... 105, 110
taghu-rudra, rain-rite 271
Lakhâwar, Lackhowre, market town near Patna 70, 73-75, 78-82, 88-100, 104-105, 109, f.
Lakkana Danda Nayaka, first Naik Viceroy 19 and n., 13; and the Pâñjûya succession in Madura 31
Lakshmi, goddess, and the Saurâksharas 141; F. K., 5, 6
Lakshmîdharâ, Prakrit gramian 147 n.
Lassen, M., and Rock-Edict 13 132
lātâ, garlic Sup., 43, 71
Launa-kupra, treatise on garlic Sup. 81
Laws of Manu, and the Khâsas 147
lead, trade in 72, 268
Left and Right Hand Castes 140
lûka, linctus Sup., 82
Lethbridge, E., author of Topography of The Mogul Empire 239, 244
Leumann, M., and Jain dates 129 n., 179 n.
Lhasa Expedition of 1904, and Tibetan MSS. 37 and n.
Lhasa, era, and the date of Buddha's death 197
lightning 118, 129 n. F. K., 12
lignum, lignum Alloc, trade in 75, (or samudaka) 81, 82, 105
linctus, lûka Sup. 82
linen, linctus, trade in 105
liniments Sup. 82
Literature, Indian Medical Sup., 64, 81
Littlejohn, Ed., E. I. Co.'s servant 271
looking-glass, trade in 100
luck, and the planets F. K., 9
lumbi, a creeper, etc., and Lumbini 18 and n.
Lumbini, birthplace of Buddha, and Lumbinî Sup., 123, 20
Lumbini Pillar inscr. 132
Lyon, the ship 82

Madana, Cupid, and the moon F. K., 5
Mâdhava, author of the Siddha-yoga Sup., 59, 61, 63
Mâdhava, and the Dvaita philosophy 233, 234 and n.; 255 n.; 262, 264-266
Mâdhâvâcharya, a sketch of the history of 233-237, 262-266
madrasa, meditated mead Sup. 82
Mâhâyâna, (Nâgâyântillaka) father of Vasudeva 335
Madras, F. O., and the Vijayanagara 333
Madura, Naik Kingdom, History of 1-17; 27-30; 43-48; 111-118; 133-142; 153-155; 157-193; 217-218; 229-232; 233-235
Magadha, kingdom, and the Jains 121, f.; and Mahâvîra, etc., 126; list of kings 168 n., 170; and the Mauryas 172, 175 n.; and Jains 176
Magadhà Nâdu, or Nâdu Nâdu distr., 179 and n.
Magadhi dialect 65, 66, 80
Maga of Cyrene, k., Maka, 132, death of 133
Magic, among the Tottiyan Polygarsi 198; or witch craft F. K., 8; and inscription Sup. 65, 66, 80
Mahâ Alipur, Mohulhapor, Mobalepoor 109 n.
Mahâbalipuram, and Mâyalvaneram 31, 32 and n.
Mahâbhârata, the, mentions the Khâsas and other tribes 144-149, 151, 159, 161, n.
Mahâbhâgya, the, and Sâkâtyâs 210, f.
Mahâdeva, k., of Devagiri, and Ívara 266
Mahâman-dâlâvara Tirumalaiya, Mahâraja, 168 n.
Salaka chief, under Achatyâ Râya 189, f.
Mahâmancâlâvara Vittalâcâka Mahâ-Râya, Viñâha g., et c. 211
Mohâmâyâri Vidyârajya, Sûtra or Dhârani, Sup. 87, f.
Mahânâman, Sâkya-prins, and Buddha 127
Mahârâjanand, k., and Mahâpâla Manâra 167
Mahârâjkra, co, conquered 2
Mahârâski, dial, 68
mahârasâs, medical authorities Sup., 54, 57
mahâ-rudra, rain-rite 128, f.
Mahâsa, a Mahâkârâiga, epithet, applied to Avalokite 92, f.
Mahâshthma, identified with Anandepura 176
Mahâvâra, the, and dates 168, 170, f.; stories in 174 and n.; treatises on 178
Mahâvira, The Date of 118-123, 126-133; 179-183
Mahênârapâla, k. 163
Mahindo, in Ceylon 202
Maina, mynas, Indian talking birds 69, 78
Mahârâki, the, and Buddha 127
Maka, k., Magas of Cyrene 132
Makkhali Gosâla, heretical teacher and k. Ajjâtsatru 126, f.; Maṇḍkaliputra, 129
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Malacca, Mallacka, Portuguese trade with 83
Malayalam, co. 31
Malda, tn., trade with 71, 77, 110
Malik 'Ambar and Jahangir 107 n.
Malik Kafur, in S. India l. 2, Nabu or Naib 3 and n., 4 and n.; 6, 42, 28 n., 29
and Hoyasala of Dvarasamudra 233
Malik Kāsim, gov. of Hydi 269
Malik Nabu, or Naib, Malik Kafur 3 and n.
Malla-linkara Woutoo, Burmese Chronicle 200 and n.
Mallikārjunā, inscr. of 11 and n., and the Sahuvass 138
Malwa, and the Saurāshtras 138
Maṇḍhalingitta, Goāla 129
Maṇḍābhārāna, k., and Arīkēari Parākkrama 36, 47 n.
Maṇḍabhūṣaṇa, k., defeated 35
Maṇḍapāyra, pāḷayam, date of 114, 115 and n.
Manavilā Mahāmuni, leader of Tāngalism 155 and n. 156
Mānd, māndī, grease, etc. 76 and n. 80
Mandaagad, vīla, has a sacred well F. K. 13
Mandara, mt. 207, f.
Mandaros, inscr. 138 n.
māndil, mandle, turban cloth 71, 82
manes, pītras F. K. 5, 6, 8
Mangammālī, dist. 141
Mānu, greatest of the Sahuvass 12 and n.
Mānuṣīkhaṇḍai, Tamil Buddhist poem 197
Manora, Goa State, ponds in F. K. 13
Manu, his 'besoar' or 'cordial stone' 36
or Manouche, on Shahjiān 241—243 and n.; his theory of the Naik Kingdom 261, f.
Manu Chola, mythical ancestor of the Cholas 238
menālil, manūlil, stage 103
Marāli, Ratnagiri dist., sacred water fall at F. K. 13
Māravarman Kulexkha II, Pāṇiya k. 30
Māravarman Parākkama, Pāṇiya k. 30
Māravarman Sundara Pāṇiya l. 33 n.
Maravas, of Tinnevelly, and Vījvānatā 134
March, John, E. I. Co.'s servant 267, f.
Mārtālāvarma, at Tāmbārapurī 217; 231 n.
Marriage customs of the Tōttiyana 136 and n., 197; the Beegia 138; the Asippas 140; and nymphs F. K. 15
Maruti, monkey god F. K. 21, f.
Marvāri, see Notes on the Grammar of the Old W. Rājāsthānī 21, ff.
maṭhā, a measure 106 and n.
Masulipattam, and J. Smith 267
madītanga, elephant, etc. Sup. 81
Math, Matha, of Śankarachārya, at Conjec-
varan 248 and n.
Mathurā, tn. and Kriṣṇā 146; Council of 176
Maṭts, eight, established by Manavāla 155, 156 n.
Maukharī, and the Gupta of Madgāha 67, f.
maund, the Jāhāngirī man 78 and n., 81, f.
Maurya, dym., rise of 64, 67; dates 120, 122, 167; Era 170 n., and the Seleucid era 175 and n. 174
Māvālīvāna, kings (and Māvālīvaram) 31, f.; or Rāyās, and Māvālīvānada, inscrs. of 33
Māvili Vanathī Raya, Sundarathol, a Pāṇiya chief 10, 11, 31
Māvālīvaram, or the Seven Pagodas 31, f.
Max Muller, and Buddhism 131, f.
māra and māsārā 82 and n.
medicine, treatises on, etc., Indian, in the Bower Ms. 179; Sup. 54, 64—66, 68, 75, 78, 91, 81
Megasthenes, and the Hindus 170 and n.; and Pāṭaliputra 172
Mokail, angel, Michael 266
men, ceremonies for F. K. 19
Menander 175 n.
Mobilepoore, Mahāb Allāpur 109—111
Mogollána, disciple of Sahājaya 128 n., 130 n.
mohair, moheres, trade in 100, f.
monasteries, eight, and at Udipi 237
Mongools, merchants from Upper India or Persia 71, 73
moon, spots, and worship, etc. F. K. 4
and n.—6, 8, 9
morality, of the Tōttiyana 137 n.
Morris, and the name Lūvomīnī 18 n.
mosque, built in Ramesvaram 2, 4
Mrīchhakātikā, the, and the Greek drama 65, possible age 66
MS., the Bowern, book-notice 179, f.
MSS., Old W. Rājāsthānī, and others 21, 23—26 and n., 35, 38, 66, "The Supple."
Mr. Taylor, dealing with the Pāṇiya 27 and n.,—32 n.; 34 n.; Sanskrt, and the Dhāraṇī or spells 37; 60 n., 61 n.; histori-
cal, and Telugu Colonies 113—118 n.; and Hāstipālaka 128; the Madura 133, f.
Mackenzie, etc., 133 and n.,—137; the Mack 189 n.; from E. Turkestan Sup. 45 and n.
Mubkri, son of 'Alāuddīn' 233
Much-kund, sage F. K. 15
Muckeb Con, Mukarrab Khan 69, 99, f.
102, 105, f.
Mucksoudabad, Makāhābād, Murshidābād 71, 98, 102
Mudkal, tn., captured 187
mudrākṣaṇa, by Visakhadatta, book-notice 64–68
Mugdārabodhikamautika, elementary Sanskrit grammar 21, 24
Mughal, ravages in S. India 116; art 124; oppression of the Gūjar-Rājput 165
Mughals, Chagrá Turks 219; The Great Gardens, book-notice 48
Muhammad, in S. India 1, 2 n., 3 and n., 5; or Musabaha 7 n., 12 and n.; 111; 153, f., 257; and the Pāṇḍyas 28 and n., 29; in Madura 30, f.; and the Tōtīya 136 n.; and the Deccan 262
Mujāhid Shāh, Bahmani k., and Jatsvarman Parkrama Pāṇḍya 34
Mukarrab Khān, Muekrob Con, and R. Hughes 69, 99, f. 102, 105, f.
mukha-lēpa, and face-plasters Sup. 81
Mullis, for Malik Kāfūr 28 and n., 29
Munja, k. 168, 171
Munivandabhudayaya, a work by Chidānanda-kavi 208
Munthās Mahāl, Arjunand Bānā Bēgam, wife of Shāhjāhān 240 and n., 241, 244
Murai, dedicated girl F. K. 22
Murshidabād, Muksoundabad, silk from 71, 98, 102
Musalmān, Musalmāna, conquest of S. India 1–6; 138; 233; defeats, in Madura dist. 7 n.; influence in 153; and Vijayanagar 14, 187, 188 and n.; and Kāmpāḍa Udaya 27; invasion of Pāṇḍya co. 31; and mlecchas 68; oppression of the Cauvery 139; and the Saurashtra 141; tyranny in Gīranga 155; and the Gūjar-Rājputa 164, f.; States, and Rāma Rāya 230 and n.; musters 108, 109; Mrtaśva, k. 171
Muthār, dark lore F. K. 19
Mutteras, Tirumalai Māvili Varāha, Pāṇḍya chief 10, 11, 31
Mysore, S., and Kumira Karnataka 9; and the Saurashtra 139 and n.; under Krishṇa Rai 257; or Maxur 262
Nagama Naik, chief supporter of Narasimha the Sāluva, his supposed identity with Kotiyam Nagama Naik 14 and n., 15; conquered the Pāṇḍya co. 28, 117, 231; at Madura 223; restored Chandra Sēkhrana 30, 116; 218; his expedition and defection 253 and n., pardoned 254–260
Nagarā, father of Viṣvavāhana Naik 231
Nāgārjuna, identified with Sūkrata the Younger Sup. 66
Nāgārjuni inscr. 175 n.
nāgas, dragon spirits 38–42
Nāgas, kings 46, 52, f.
Nāgari, characters in Hāthul inscr. 193; form, of letter "y" Sup. 47
nayapanchamani, day F. K. 7
Nāhāpēna, or Naḥāvahāna, Sātrap 120, and Nabhovahana 122 and n.
Nainār Achariya, or Varaḍāchārya, son of Vēdāntāchārya 155 and n., 156 n.
Nāk, to dishonour a bond 101
Nakodness, and rites F. K. 19
Nālanda, and Mahāvīra 127 n., and Buddh. 128 n.
Nanda, k., successor to Udaya in 173, 174 and n. 183 n.
Nandaraja, its connection with Mahāpadma and Mahanandak 167 and n.
Nandas, the, fall of 64, date 120–122; 124 and n.; nine 167 and n., 168 and n., 171, f., 174
Nandivardhana, k. 167
Nandrus, and Alexandrus 167 n.
Narahari Tirtha, name given to Śāma Śāstrī 236, f.; Jaina Pontiff 282–286
Nahorixut-situtram, and Narahari Tirtha 282–284
Narasā Naik, chief, supported Narasimha the Sāluva, founded the Tuluva dyn. 15 and n.; viceroy and usurper in Madura 16 and n.; begins to rule 31; and the Māvalivānda Rāyā, etc., 33; and Arikēvari Parākrama 35 and n., 36; deposed the emperor, etc., 43, 45, 47; 229.
Narasara Rāja Udayār 43 n.
Narasimha Mehetā, poet, and Old W. Rajas-thānl 25
Narasimha or Narasimha, Sāluva chief 12–16; and the foundation of Ariyalur 115
Narasimhadēva, Vira Pratāpa 153, f.
Narasimha Mahabhartōpādhya 283
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<td>Navārī, tn. to which the fire temple was removed</td>
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<td>151, f.</td>
</tr>
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<td>Nāyars of Travancore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nehāvend, battle of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepāl, E. limit of Pahāri lang. 142, f. ; and the Khaśas 147 and n. ; 150, f. ; 165 ; and Bhadrabāhu 176 ; and the development of the letter 'y.'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sup. 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nātrāja, collyria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sup. 82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nidhanpur, Sylhet dist., where Bhāskaravarmā's copperplate grant was found</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigantsa Nāt (h) a—putta, Buddhistic heretical teacher, identified with Mahāvira 126 ; or Nirgrantho Jñātpurthā, 126 and n. ; 127, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nilakkottai, Pālayam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nīlīghiri, hills, and the Badugās</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nimi, epic ruler of Viḍēha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sup. 56, 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nirgranthas 127, 131 ; and schisms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nirgrantho Jñātpurthā, and Nāraputtra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nirman, Thānsa dist., has a kunda lake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. K. 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nirvānā, of Buddha 132, f. ; 167, f. ; 170--172 and n. ; Era 203, f. ; of Mahāvira 119, f. ; 122, f. ; 125, 174, 176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nizam Sīkh of Ahmadnagar, and Rāma Rāya 230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note on the Padariya or Rummindel Inscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17--20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes on the Grammar of the Old Western Rājaśāhī with Special Reference to Aparbhraṣṭa and to Gujarāṭī and to Mārvārī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21--26 ; 55--63 ; 84--91 ; 181--186 ; 213--216 ; 216--225--228 ; 245--352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nouns, declension of, in Old W. Rājaśāhī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181--186 ; 215--216 ; in 'popular' Sanskrit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sup. 65 n., 67, 70, 76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>numerals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sup. 68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numia, on Achyuta Rāya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187 and n. ; 188 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nymphs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. K. 13, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pāñjikā, battle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panjāb, tribes 190, and the Gurjars, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169,--161 ; or Gujar 163 n. ; 166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panjābi language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paper, as writing material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sup. 45 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pāṇapuri, in Patna dist., and Pāva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parākrama, Pāṇḍya, probably Jajāvarman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 and n.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Parākrama, Arikiṣari .......... 35 and n.
Parākrama Pāṇḍya, Ponnunpermūl .......... 35
Paramakudi, battle .......... 257 and n.
Paramāra Clan, founded by Dhumarājadeva .......... 103, f.
parāmāraśi, supreme medical authority .......... Sup. 56, f.
Paramārtha, and dates .......... 172 n.
Paranjodhamunivar, Saiva Siddhāntist teacher .......... 157
Parāntaka I., Chōja k., and the Bānas .......... 32
Parāśara, pupil of Ātreyā .......... Sup. 54, 56
Parāśu Rāma, and the Saurāśtras .......... 141
parīda, curtain .......... 100 and n.
Parīhār, or Prathihar Rājpūts, and the Gūju-ras .......... 162
Parīti-jāponsan, or Sthāvīravāsalicarta .......... 173
Parītā, magical texts, see ‘Dharinī’ .......... 37 and n.
Parivāraṃs, domestic servants of the Tōtti-yaṇa 137; and the Kavuṭgan chiefs .......... 140
Parker John, and Roht. Hughes, in the First English Commercial Mission to Patna 69, 83, 97, 99, f., 100—111
Parīs Histry, traditional dates of .......... 151, f.
Parīva, tirthakara .......... 131, 178
particiies, in ‘popular’ Sanskrit .......... Sup. 72
Parule, vil., has a temple for sun-worship .......... F. K. 2
Pārvataka, a medical authority .......... Sup. 56
Parviz, Perviz, Sultan, in Patna .......... 99, 102, 104
Pāsaka-kēvala, cubomancy .......... Sup. 84, 86
pāth, divination die .......... Sup. 86
Pātāliputra, and the mudrākṣaraḥ 67; visited by Megasthenes 172; and Udāyan .......... 173
pathology .......... Sup. 64
Patna, First English Commercial Mission to 69—83; 97—111; and Mr. Elwes .......... 209, f.
Patnūlākāraṇa, low-caste weavers .......... 140 n.
Paṭṭinattu Pillai, Saiva Siddhāntist teacher .......... 156 n., 157 and n. 158
Pattiragiyar, continued Meyland’s work .......... 156 and n., 157
Paṭṭukōṭṭai, Naik chief .......... 232
Pāvē or Pāpē, tin, and Mahāvīra 122 and n.; or Papūpari, and Nataputta 128; two places of the name .......... 177
Pegu, date of Buddha’s death .......... 197
pepper .......... 209
Peramdr, pājyan, date of .......... 114 and n., 115
Periya, trade with .......... 81, f., 97, 105, 108, 110
pēshkaḥ, forced offering .......... 270, f.
philology .......... 21, 179
philosophies of S. India .......... 233
phonetics of Old W. Rājasthānl .......... 55, f.
phonology of popular Sanskrit .......... Sup. 68
Pieppully, Pipli .......... 83
pills .......... Sup. 82
Pīṇālī- Apabhraṃṣa, its composition, etc. .......... 23, f.
pipīḷa, ant gold, etc. .......... 144
Pipli, Pieppully, Portuguese port .......... 83
Piśācha, dialect, and the Ajars .......... 160
Piśāchas, or Piśāchās, cannibals, the Khaīas 144 and n., 145 and n., 150, 165, their language and Rājasthānl .......... 166
Pischel, Dr. and the Rummindei inscrip. 17 and n.—20
pūrās, manes, worship of .......... F. K. 5
Piyadasa, Asoka 17 and Piyadarin .......... 20
planets, worshipped .......... F. K. 9, 22
Pliny, mentioned the canni of Casiri .......... 149, f.
plumbago root .......... Sup. 59, 62, 82
Poems of Prince KāmAṇa .......... 210—224
Poh Śrīmātra, translator .......... Sup. 88
poisons .......... F. K. 13
polar star .......... F. K. 9
polyandry, among the Tōttiyaṇa 136, and Apūppans .......... 140
Pōygar, ancient Udaya 114 and n., 115, of Śivagiri, history of 117, f.; of Kongu 133; 137, memoirs 136; and Vīsvanaṭha 135, Tōttiyaṇa 140; adopt Tengalism .......... 156
ponds, sacred .......... F. K. 13, 15—18
poomu, tree sacred among the Tōttiyaṇa 136 n., and Canarese .......... 139
pūthi, form of the Bower MS. 180; pūthiḥ from Chinese Turkestan .......... Sup. 64
Portuguese, Fortingall, in Bengal 71, 73, 83; and Bijāpur .......... 230
postpositions, in Old W. Rājasthānl 215, f. .......... 225, f.; 228, 245, f., 248—252
powder, chārā .......... Sup. 82
Prakrit, and the Jains 120 and n.; prākṛta .......... Sup. 65, prākṛticism .......... 64—68
Prākṛta-Pāṃgala, and the Apabhraṃṣa .......... 22 and n.
prāṇaka, pāṇaka Sup. 84 dice .......... 87
Prathhāra, Parihar Rājpūts .......... 162
Praudha Dēva, Viṣayanaṉarga emp. .......... 13, 14 n.
Praschana, Sk. Prāchya, and pārbīya, inhabitants of Eastern co. .......... 71 and n.
prāśas, prescriptions .......... Sup. 81, f.
Prasēp, and Buddha’s death .......... 226,
pronouns, in Old Western Rājasthānl .......... Sup. 67, f.
Ptolimaiōs II, k. of Egypt, Turamaya .......... 132
INDEX

Ptolemy, mentions the Taryñav, 144 n.; and other tribes, etc. 145, 146 n., 149, f.
Pugajendhi, poet, suggested dates of 35
Pālyapāda, date 210, f.
Purlindas, two tribes of the names, 145 and n.
Punavasa, or Atriya 54
Purāṇagārāvatākhañjaka, a work by Rāma Chandra 23
purāṇa, date of an Achārya's death 265
purāṇa, wedding ceremony 3 F. K. 3
Purāṇa, Text of the Dynasties of the Kali Age, book notice 105, f.
Purāṇa, the Viṣṇa, f.; and K. Udaya 172
and n.; Purāṇas, refer to the Khañas 146
Pūrāṇa, Kassapa, heretical teacher 128, 130
Pūrāṇaprajñā, Vasudeva 235, or Ananda Tirtha 236
Purushottama Tirtha, Achyutapriyakshāchārya 233; puru of Ananda 263
Pūrñā, lang, and the Ajāyas 169, 162
Pushtamitra, Pusumitta, k. 120, 122, and the Mauryas 175 n.
Puttana, Patna 99, 72, 75, 79-83, 99, 105, 111
Qazil, Ming-ol W. of Kuchar, scene of the finding of the Bartus MS. 45 and n.
quicksilver, trade in 72, 77
Quilin, c. Kolamba, destroyed 2 and n.
Quintus, trade in 32, f.
Qum Turā, Ming-ol where the Bower MS. was found 45
Qutub Urdū Stūpa, MS. fragments from 45 n.
rahmootes, perhaps raukat or chautūth 70 and n.
Rahu, and eclipses 70, f.
Rācharād, under Karnataka Dēva 44 and n.; and Ishmall Adil Shah 187 and Vijayanagar 230
rain 12, 17, f.
raṇbow 12, 17, f.
Raja Gambhira Raya, name given to the Chāḷa and Panjāyāna kingdoms 7, 8
Rājagriha, th. and Buddha, etc. 120-n. 128
133, 178
Rājapurakhi Gangā, sacred spring 13 F. K. 13
Rājapur, modern Rajasam and the Khañas 148
Rājasthānī, The Old Western, Notes on the grammar of, with special reference to Aparabhāṣa and Gujarāti and to Mārāvā 21-
26, 55-63, 84-91, 181-186, 213-216, 225-228, 245-252
Rājputāna, and the Gaurjaras, etc. 22, 162-166; its language 23, 24, and Pahāri 143
Rājpura, and the Gaurjaras, etc. 150; some tribes founded by the Gaurjaras 150 and n. 161, the three
Fire-born clans 162-164
Rājya, Śthāpanahārāya, Śri-Vallabhā-Pāñjaya, death of 230
rājas and spells 51, 40 n.
Rākṣas, character in the Mādūrākṣaka 67
Rākṣinda, pre-Vedic 'Mother sends' 37, n
Rākṣas, 40 n., 41 n., 51
Rāma, image given to Ananda Tirtha 237
262, 264
Rāmahandhra, or Divāgni, and Malik Kāfūr 1, 233
rāmal, cubomancy 387
Rāmānuja, in Bengalia 155 n., in Śaiva-
Siddhāntism 156; and the Viśiṣṭādvaita philosophy 233; etc. 264, n. 265 n.
rāma navami day 334, K. 7
Rāma-Rāja, Rāṣṭrīya chief 229 and n. 231
237, 238; f. Manucci's account of him 261, f.
Rāma Varma, k. of Travancore, and Viṭṭaṅgha
231 and n.; or Venkata-muša-Bhūtajavīra-Irāmavamar 232 n.
Ramesvaram, tn., Sect Bunder Ramessar, and Malik Kāfūr 2, 4
Rānakūtha, g. of Madura 7 n., 12
Rao, sub-division of the Kanča 143, 150 and n. 104
rāṣṭra, alternatives 81, n.
Rāṣṭrīya, inscription, and Amoghavaraha 207
Rastell, Mr., and R. Hughes 104, 109
rāthī sapam, day for sun worship F. K. 2, 2, 3
Ratangiri dist., and sun worship F. K. 2, 5
and moon spots, eclipses, etc. 7, 9-12, sacred springs, etc. 13, 15, 17, 23, f.
Ratnākara, poet 67
Rāvivarā, k. of Travancore, Bhutalavīra-
Vira-Udaya 231 and n.
Rāy, and the Viṣṇu-pātā 260
Rāyā, the, and Viṣṇu-pātā 260
reṣai, rassayes, cloth of narrow width 80 and n.
Red Sea, trade 107, f.
Rejīśa, Kāpūs, Telugu colonists 138 and n.
religion, pre-Aryan, of India 33
religious effects of the Vijayanagar conquest of S. India 153, f.
Religious, New, Era 200, 203, f.
reptile bite 13 F. K. 13
reṣa, scrap, fragment 80
Rhyms Davids, Prof., and dates 130 and n. 200
Right and Left Hand Castes 140
rīkhi-panchāma, site 9 F. K. 19
rivers, sacred 13 F. K. 13
Rock Edict XIII of Aśoka 132 and n., 169 and n.
roč, rakṣ, or sīnumā, of the Persians, Garuda 33
INDEX

Sāluva Nāyakkan ............................................ 218
Sāluva Timma, and Kirāya Deva Rāya ............ 43 n. 
Appāji ......................................................... 44
Sāluvas, governors of the North 12 and n. of the South 13—15; and the Pāṇḍya, etc. 33; 45; and Salakas .................................................. 189 and n. 
sālaya śāvara, treatise on major surgery .............. Sup. 56
Sāmājana, in Śākapalana, visited by Buddha ......... 128; 177
śamaleh, simmulye, wood .................................. 81 and n.
sāmāna, samin, cloth from Samāna, in Patāla .......... 98
Śāma Śāstrī, Advaitins 236 or Narahari Tirtha ........ 237; 262, f., 266
Śamantapāśadikā, the, and dates ......................... 168 and n.
Sambhūtavijaya, Jaina pontiff .......................... 175, f.
Śampat Saundarya, wealth-giving Saturday .......... F. K. 21
Samprastavaṇa, in old W. Rājasthāni .................. 91
Sampratī, grandson of Āśoka 173; and Sampadi .......... 175 and n.
Śādchi Buddhist sculptures ................................ 38
śantai, Sk. saudhē, and shandy ......................... 195
śadvē, euphonious combination ......................... Sup. 70
Śarga, k ........................................................... 146
Sages ............................................................. F. K. 9, f.
śachatana, sahanee, fine sheeting, trade in 70, 73, 
77, 81, 99, f., 105, 106
śāhāyuṣkā, king of kings .................................. 125 and n.
Śāhasanatunga—Dansidurga, Rāshtrakūta k. ........ 210
Śāhāṣām in script ............................................. 132, 172 n.
śahi, governor of provinces in Sakakula, 125 and n. 
Śaidabād, Sīdeabaude, silk from ......................... 71
Śalānūga, dyn ................................................. 172
śāliva, Śiddhāntism, popular movement in śaivism ........ 156, 157 n.
śaivism, in S. India ......................................... 153—156
śaka, k ............................................................. 122, 125
śaka era ......................................................... 119, f.
śakakula, co., and Kalāka ................................. 125
Śāka, Dharma-pratima, cap. of the Madras .......... 146 n.
Śakas, and India 123; and Kushās 125; 
Śākyas 128; Ścythians etc. 145, 146 n., 147
Śakāṭāla, minister of the last Nanda .............. 174
Śakatāyana, Jaina grammarian ......................... 205—212
Śalakas and Śaluvas .......................................... 189
Śāliṅkya-tantra, treatise on minor surgery ...... Sup. 56
Sāmājana, king of the higher castes 150; 
date, 238 and n.; asias of Sīva ......................... 264 n.
Śaṅkarāchārya, and the higher castes 150; 
date, 238 and n.; asias of Sīva ......................... 264 n.
Śaṅkarāvarman, of Kashmir, and the Gurjara 
kingdom ......................................................... 159
Śankaras, MSS., from C. Asia 37 and n., 38; 
language, used by Jain authors 120 and n.; 
and the Khasās 143—145 n.; 159—161; 
165; in Hāthāli inscr. 193; and Brahmanical 
sacred literature 196; and the Bower 
MS. ............................................................... Sup. 65, 66, 78, f.
sauḍāvis, ascetics .......................................... F. K. 4
Śappādalakas, co., in N. W. India, and the 
Gurjaras ......................................................... 22; 163—166
Śāniṭāpitta, disciple of Śājaya 129 n., 130 n. 
sarākū, court ................................................ 77
sarrāf, sherafoes, money-changer ...................... 78
Śarvaśī ṣāmaṇe, author ..................................... 238
Śarvaśī ṣāmaṇe, date of .................................... 272
Śarvaśī ṣāmaṇe, author ..................................... 238
ṣatī, 101; among the Tūṭigivas 137 and n.; 
and the Canarese 140; and Saurāstraas .............................. 141
Śaṅkala, Saṅgām, scripts from ......................... 71, 73, 77
sātā ḍhāraṇi, quarrells about bonds ................. 101
Śātyamangalam, vil., and Vēḷuṇṭacarya .......... 153
Śātya Tīrtha, and Ananda Tīrtha ......................... 236, f.
INDEX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saurashtra, clothiers, etc., Teluguised</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sāvitrī, sacred river</td>
<td>F. K. 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>savūti, savoyā, 25% profit, 71, 79 and n., 80</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and n., 162</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>savūtā-lākh, and Sāpadalakṣaḥa</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>schisms, among the Nirgranthas, etc.</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scribes, of the Bower MS. (writers), 179, f.</td>
<td>Sup. 46, 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scythian, power, in India 122 n., 123, 129</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peoples, Śakas</td>
<td>145, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sea, worshipped</td>
<td>F. K. 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seamorse, watarus</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seasons</td>
<td>F. K. 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seet Bunder Ramesar, Ramesvaram</td>
<td>2, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seleucidan, and Maurya eras</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sevappa Naik, of Tanjore</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seventeenth Century Anglo-Indian Worthies, contd., from Vol. XXXIV p. 176, No. IV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Smith</td>
<td>267-271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shahbuddin Ghori and Hindustan</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shahjahân, Joannes De Laet on India and, book-notice</td>
<td>239-244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shah Tahmæsp, or Great Sophie, of the Satavā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dyn.</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shahâ, shawe, banker</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaiâta Kâhan, Nawâb</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shandy, and shindhy</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaanoano Shaq Koshane, kings of Kuehuâhu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yue-chi title 66; and Śâhânuâshi, Kushana title</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shad-yës, or 'mothers</td>
<td>40, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She-hwang-ti, contemporary of Āsiokā</td>
<td>172 n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shem Bridges, 'Chief' of Bengal</td>
<td>267, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shepherd Matts. and J. Smith</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheha and earthquakes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sh'hu, Dânâpâla</td>
<td>Sup. 88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shicchâmes, Shah Tahmæsp</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shibbâm-ud-din Muhammad, Shâhjahân</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shih-li-che-to-lo, Sylhet</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shikdâr, shekdar, revenue officer, shindhy and shandy</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shiva, g., and the asârika, etc.</td>
<td>F. K. 3, 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shringâraî, sage</td>
<td>F. K. 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siddâpur inscription</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siddhânta, the, 129 and n., revised, etc.</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siddhā-sūtra-Śāstrā, Khotanese pûdāt</td>
<td>Sup. 64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidesaûde, Saidaûbad</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śīha, general</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śilâjatu kalpa, a treatise on bitumen</td>
<td>Sup. 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>silâsīgaśābhigī, word in the Rammendei inscr. 17, and silâsīgaśābhī</td>
<td>18, 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>silk, varieties of, trade in 69-71, 74 and n., 75, 77-79, 81-83, 97-99, 101-103, 105, 107, f. weaving among the Saurastras 138, 139 and n., 141</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simhamāla, k. of Lohara</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>simples, vegetable and mineral</td>
<td>Sup. 82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>simurgh, vēc, rūk and Garuda</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sins, and earthquakes</td>
<td>F. K. 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapirâ, a Brahman</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sîs-ja, as writing material</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sîrbandâ, sîrbandy</td>
<td>71 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sirîvērācara, Kâyastha sub-division</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sîta, images</td>
<td>237, 292, 294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sîtâpatra, Târâ</td>
<td>53 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sivagiri, the Polygars of</td>
<td>117, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sivagrâyâgin, Saiva Siddhantian teacher</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sîvâ Vâkya, Saiva Siddhantian teacher</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sîvîlî Mârān, alleged Pâjîyâna</td>
<td>k. 118 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sîyâr-ul-Mu'takîhân, the, on Shâhjâhân 241</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skanda Purâna, and the Saurâstra</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skandîl, president of the Council of Mathurâ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slave-kings of Delhi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>small pox</td>
<td>F. K. 14, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smârta cult, in S. India</td>
<td>153 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, Jaa. and J. Smith</td>
<td>267 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, John, an Anglo-Indian Worthy of the Seventeenth Century</td>
<td>267-271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, V. A., on the Rammendei inscr. 17 and n., 18; on the Jains, etc., 127 n., 175 and n. on Buddha's death 132, 133 n.; and the Gurjaras 159 n., 160 and n., 163 n., 166, 167 n.; and dates 172 n</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>snake bites</td>
<td>80; Sup. 87, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sôbhâna Bhaṭṭa, Advaita, Padmanâbha</td>
<td>F. K. 5, 8, 13, 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tîrtha</td>
<td>236; 266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sâdhu-nivarâna vow</td>
<td>F. K. 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sôma Sêkhara, Pañjîya k., 27-30; and Kâmpa Uçâyâr</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>somâya rite</td>
<td>F. K. 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sômîdeva, Árâvîju chief</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sources of the History of Religion, book-notice</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spelling, in Sanskrit</td>
<td>Sup. 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spells, Indian Buddhist, Dhrasâ 37-42, 49</td>
<td>-54; 92-95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spence Hardy, on the Jains</td>
<td>128 and n., 130 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speyer, and Lumbîni 18 and n.; and the Mâdârvâkâsahsa</td>
<td>66, f.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The image contains a page from a book with text in English, including various entries with page numbers.*
INDEX

spices, trade in .................................................. 83
spicknard, spikenard, trade in ................................ 76
springs, hot ......................................................... F. K. 13, f; 16
Sravaṇa Belgoj inscription ........................................ 212
Sravasti, where Gāda lived ........................................ 174
Sṛṇa, Bāmbiṣṭa k ...................................................... 173
śrīśarabhaścharita, the, and the Grijas ................................ 159
śrīśūrameśvara temple inscription .............................. 234
Sri Miṣṭa, and Vidyārany 233; and Vidyāśāṅkara 236
Srīragam, inscriptions, etc. 7 n., 12 and n., 13 and n., and the Muhammadans 153 and n., f., 233 and n.; and Tengalasā 155; and Achyuta Rāya 217, and Ananda Tirtha ............................................ 236
Srī Rāmaṇātha, g. of Madura ...................................... 5, 7 n., 12
Srī-Sūla, Śrī-Vaishnavas leader .................................... 153, 155
Śrīvallabha, Pāṇḍya k. 33 n.; Rāja-Pāṇḍana-chārya 47 n.; Yātīlavārman ........................................... 229, f.
Śrīvira Ramavarma, k ............................................. 231 n.
stars, worshipped, etc. ........................................... F. K. 9, 20
Sein, Sir Aurel, and MSS. from Central Asia 37, 38 n., and spells 50 n.; and the Klaas 148; and MSS.......................................................... Sup. 64
stem formation, in Sanskrit ....................................... Sup. 79
Śhāmādevatā, local deities ........................................ F. K. 21
sthānapati, agents .................................................. 114
Śhavīrā, Śhavīrā, a work by Hemachandra, called Partīṣṭha-praṇi .......................................... 173
Śhīlamāddra, 7th or 9th Jain pontiff ................................. 174, f.
stones, and rain, etc. ............................................. F. K. 18, f.
stūpa in which the Bower MS. was found ......................... 180
Śudarśan, is, and the moon ........................................ F. K. 5
Śuddhodana, father of Buddha ..................................... 198, f.
sugād, object worshipped ......................................... F. K. 19
sun, worship F. K. 2, 3 and n., eclipses ......................... 8, 9
Sunodrā, k. 2 and n., 3 n., 5, 34 and n.; II ........................................... 6
Sunodrāttalkudaiyān Mālāvīnārādāya, opposed Nārāya Nāik .................................................. 33
Sunodrāvāra, g ......................................................... 33
Suprabha, probably a physician .................................... Sup. 58
Surat Factory and R. Hughes ..................................... 69, 72, 75—79, 82, f., 97, f., 100 n. and n., 102—109, 112
Sureivānpr̥ṣastra ................................................................ 222
surgery ................................................................. Sup. 56
Surya-Vasi, sacred spring in Kolhapur, F. K. 13
Śuvūra, and the Śuvūra Sākhṛī Sup. 55, the Elder, and the Younger 58 or Śuṅgāt. 57, 60, 62, L, 81
Śuvūra Sākhṛī, work quoted in the Bower MS. 180; Sup. 53, or the Āyurveda Śastra .............................................. 55—57, 60, 81
Śuṣumna, minister, k ................................................. 168, 170—172
Sutgong, Satgong ..................................................... 71, 82
Śvāti, monk ................................................................ Sup. 88
takṣaṇa, subject treated in the Bower MS. ......................... Sup. 64
Śvētāmbara Jains 119, rise of 175, 176 and n.; and Digambara writers 208; Canon ........................................ 128 n.; svasaṅkara, and sun worship ................................ F. K. 2, 3
Śvāt Valley, and the Grijas 160, L, 163, f., language ........................................................................... 166
Sylhet, Śhāh-li-eša-to-lo ................................................................................. 95, f.
Sylvin Levi, M., and Aïoka dates 132 n.; discovered medical pāṭhi ................................................. Sup. 64
syntax, in Sanskrit ................................................................ Sup. 74
tastes, trade in ................................................................ 98
tāṭī, medicated oils ................................................... Sup. 82
tāṭa, tōko, coin worth from a half, to one anna ................................................................. 103 and n.
Talimalai, Pāṭiyam in Kongu ........................................ 133
tāḷi, Pāṭiyam in Kongu ................................................. 133
tāḷi bharrone, family rite .............................................. F. K. 23
Talkottā, battle .................................................................. 230 n.
śāla, aṣṭagaṇa, knucklebone die .................................. Sup. 88
Tāmāliṭī, Dravidian ān ........................................................ 64
Tāmbraparai, battle ......................................................... 217
Tamil, co., and Telugu genealogy 111 ; people, conquered by the Badugas 113; pāṭiyam 114, 117; women, marry the Brāhjas 138; lands, and the Vaduga caste 140; kings, and Hinduism 153; Buddhists, their date of Buddha’s death ................................................................. 197
Tamralipti, and Dīnālipita, the ethnic origin of ......................... 64
Taigas, Tāyava, of Ptolemy ........................................... 144—147 and n.
Tan-gyur, Encyclopedic Commentaries ................................... 37
Tanjore, and Achyuta Rāya 218; and the Chāḷas 232 and n.; and Krishṇa Rai 257; or Taniyar ......................................................... 263
tanka, weight .................................................................. 106 n.
Tantābhīṣṭakī, the, and the Budrākāhāsas .......................... 66
tandrās, large treatises ................................................... Sup. 54, 57, 60
Tandravahana, sage, and the Saurāśtras ......................... 140
tandōs, tùngōs, cloths .................................................. 268
tapisery .............................................................. 70, 100 and n.
Tappobane, co. ................................................................ 171 n.
Tārā, Buddhist goddess, and Uṣṇa-Vijaya 38 and n.; Urga Tārā 51 and n.; Sitātapatra .............................................. 53 n.
tasa, tussure silk ................................................................ 69
Tāṭāchāryas, family of Vadaga teachers .................................. 156
Tāṭe Pinnama, Arawidu chief ........................................... 229
Tavernier, on Śhāḥjāhān ................................................ 241—244 and n.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index Page 293</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taxila, tn., home of Aśoka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teliça, newly coined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telengana, Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telengas, Madras tribe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tellicotta, battle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telugu, agents, over Pāṇḍyas chiefs 31; co., and the Bādugas 32, 112, f.; and the Reśjas, etc., 138 n., 139; visited by Ananda Tirtha 236; inscriptions in 262, f.; general 111; customs 113; colonists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>temples, benefited by Kṛṣṇa Dēva 45 and n.; fire-temple, moved to Navsāri 151, f.; Hindu, closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tengalai, Vaishnavism sect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tengalai, popular Vaishnavism, rise of 155 and n., 156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenkai, tn., occupied by the Pāṇḍyas 31; chiefs of, and the Bādugas 33, 34 and n.; the Beinas of the South, etc., 35 and n., 47, 118 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thāna, dist., and the svatātika F. K. 2, and the moon, etc., 5, 6, 8; 10, 12; kundas, etc., in 13—16; and the seasons, etc., 18—20 Therapeutics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thevenot, M. Jean de, on Agra and Delhi paintings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas, Mr. E. and the Jainas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas, Dr. F. W., and the word ubalik 20, 29; and Buddha dates 132 and n.; 178; E. F. thunder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thuri, and Huma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tikol Chand and J. Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timmas Raiga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timmappā Naik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tin, trade in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tinnevelly, co., Pāṇḍyan emigration to 31; 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— 35 and n.; 47; 112; Pāḷayas 117, 118 and n.; and Vīśvanātha 134, f.; and the Tōṭiyans 136; Achyuta Rayā’s expedition to 188, 189 and n.; 218; attacked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tipanjam-kōvils, Tōṭiyans wayside tombs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tirandaz, tierandazes, archer, guard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tirikka, anaparikka, title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tirumala, of Vijayanagar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tirumala, ārādita chief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tirumalla, son of Achyuta Rāya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tirumalaiya, general under Achyuta Rāya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tirumalatya, son of Kṛṣṇa Dēva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tirupati, refuge of the gods of Madura.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tirupatur, temple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiruppanagnostū, and other inscriptions of Achyuta Rāya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiruvadi, Śāluva cap. 45; 189 n., 190 and n.; battle 218; invaded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiruvā-nilakṣav, inscriptions of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiruvā-nilakṣav, inscriptions of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiruvelangadu plates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tissa, death of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tithis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance, edict of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teyyas, Canarese tribe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tōṭiyans, Tōṭiyans colonists of Kongu 135 and n., 136 and n., 138—140; and Tengalai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>toys, trade in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travancore, and the gods of Madura 153, f.; and the Pāṇḍyas, etc., 189, 190 and n.; and the Vijayanagara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travels of Peter Mundy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tree bark, as writing material for spells</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribhuvana, S. E. of Madura, and Saivism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trichinopoly, c., conquered 3; 112; and the Tōṭiyans 136; Pāḷayas 114; modern, and the Reśjas 138; seat of a Muhammadan governor 154; Chōla cap.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tripūri-paurīnī day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trishika, k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trivikrama Paśita, converted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tukhras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tukkakas, and Achyuta Rāya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulvanka, and the Sāluvas 14 n., 15 and n., 43; usurpation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tumbchichi Nāik, Pāṇḍyan feudatory, or Kumāralinga 189 and n., 190 and n., and Achyuta Rāya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tungi, famous Khaśa character</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turṣyur pāḷayam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turamayya, Ptolemaios II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkistan, E. exploration in 179, book from 180; Sup. 45, 46 and n.; Chinese MSS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnchur, on the Mahāvīra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turushkas, and the Vijayanagara kings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tussoresilk, tusser, introduced into England</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ubalikī, word in the Rummindae pillar inscription | 17 |
ubori, an estate held on quit-rent, and ubalikī | 17 |
such-chhalika, free from octroi, and ubalikī | 17 |
uda, water spirits | F. K. 14 |
udara, abdominal complaints | Sup. 62, 64 |
Udaya, k. 133, or Udayāvā, Udayi, last of the Saśūnagās 167, 171 and n., 172; 174 and n. |
Udayabhaddaka, Udayābhadda. | 133; 168, 170 |
Udayagiri, fort | 43, f. |
Udaya Mārṭanda Varma, k. of Travancore, and the Pāṇḍyas. 189, 190 and n., 231 and n. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>121 n., 127</td>
<td>Udayana, k. of Vatsa, contemporary of Mahāvira, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114 n.</td>
<td>Udayar, and Pōlygar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-12</td>
<td>Udayars, as rulers in S. India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>Udayabhāda, Udayabhādaka, k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188 n.</td>
<td>Udayin, Udayabhāda, k. of Magadhā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173, 174 n.</td>
<td>Udayān, a rent free grant, and ubalişne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>Ummathur, Mysore State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>Upādi, and Buddha, and Mahāvira 123 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237</td>
<td>Upendra Tirtha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 n.</td>
<td>Uraiyūr, under the Cholas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>Urama, modern Haṣare dist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Usan, founder of the Aṣanaka school,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239</td>
<td>Usan Cassano, Usan Hasan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144, 149</td>
<td>Uttarakuru, Attacoar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56, f.</td>
<td>Uttarattra, second part of the Sūtra Saṅhitā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239</td>
<td>Usan Hasan, Usan Cassano, and other names, Turkish ruler of Persia 239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93 n.</td>
<td>Vāch, Vedic goddess of speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>Vadagalaism, orthodox form of Vaishnavism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>vadana-pratipalas, face-plasters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>Vādīrāja, author</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135, 140</td>
<td>Vadugas, immigrants into Kōngu co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59, f.</td>
<td>Vādīvali, writer, and the Nānākṣataksa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58, 79</td>
<td>Vāgbhāsu I, author of the Ashṭaṅga-Suśrūṣha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Vāgbhāsu II, and the Ashṭaṅga Hiddaya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Vairocana, Buddha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Vaishnavism Śri, in S. India 153 and n., f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>and Tengalism 155 and the Tottiyas 156 n. and Jain faith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>Vaiyappa, Aiyakara, Vījayanagara viceroy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218</td>
<td>Vaiyappa, subject treated in the Bower MS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Vaiyapāya, name in a Dhāraṇi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176, f.</td>
<td>Valabhi, Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>Valabhi princes, and the Gurjaras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242</td>
<td>Valenth, Dutch writer, or Šahjāhan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54 n.</td>
<td>vallkal, SK., the bark of a tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>Vallabha-Amoghavasara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Vallabha Dēva, oitās Ate Vīra Rāma, Pāṇḍya k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218 and n.</td>
<td>Vānada Rāya, Pāṇḍya k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Vānada Rāya, Bānas 32, and the Pāṇḍyaśa 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47; 229; 232</td>
<td>and n., in Madura dist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Vanagopādi, on the S. Pennar riv, and the Bānas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32, f.</td>
<td>Vanakōvariyana, Rāja, and the Chōlas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Vanas, Bānas 32, inscriptions of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Vāṅgaśāna, medical writer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>Vārañātchariya, Nainār Āchārya,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>Varāhamihira, his mention of the Khaṇaśa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>Varaṇu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208, 211, f.</td>
<td>Vardhamāna, author</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>Vārṣaṅgaṇya, k. 172 n.; or Vārṣaṅgaṇya (Agniśar-manāya) Ṣvara Kṛṣṇa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Vāsaśeka, Kusana k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Yaśōmitra, monk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>vasti-karma, on enemas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235</td>
<td>Vasudeva, birth of, or Pāṇaprajāna 235 or Ananda Tirtha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>265</td>
<td>Vaiṣau-divadasi rite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>Vatsarṣikā, k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Vaiṣāṅga kalpa, and gruels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>Vaiṣṇa Purāṇa, the, and the date of Mahāvira</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264</td>
<td>Vaiṣṇu, of whom Ananda Tirtha is an acārā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153, 158 and n.</td>
<td>Vaiṣṇatāchārya, Śri-Vaiṣṇa leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233</td>
<td>Vedāntadēśika, a schiastic teacher, Veṣṇi-katāṭhārya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157, f.</td>
<td>Vedas, etc., and Śaiva-Siddhāntism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>velvet, trade in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222, 230 and n.</td>
<td>Vēṅkaṭādirī, Ārāvīla chief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233</td>
<td>Veṣṇi-katāṭhārya, Vedāntadēśika</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46, f.</td>
<td>Veṣṇatappā, viceroy of Madura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>Vēṇu Udaya, Kavvyan of Kākaraśi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 n., 68, 71</td>
<td>verba, Sanskrit,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>vermeal trade in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233</td>
<td>vernaculars, modern Indo-Aryan, from the Apabhraṃṣa, etc. 21–23; 182, f., 226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>Veṣali, th., and Śiṅha 127; 2nd Buddhist Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Vetere, Sāvāntavādī State, has curative ponds,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Vīceroys of the South during Achaśuta's rule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>269</td>
<td>Veckers, J. E. I. Co.'s servant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233</td>
<td>Vīyāṅgana, and Vīyāṅgana 6,233; and the Smārtā cult 153; death of 155 f. and the Avadāna school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Vīyāṅākara, and Ananda Tirtha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Vīyāṅākara, and Ananda Tirtha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Vīyāṅākara, and Ananda Tirtha</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INDEX

Viṣṇu, g. and Garuda 38; and Wāman, F. K. 9, 11
Viṣṇumāgala, and Ānanda Tīrtha 237
Viṣṇuvardhāna, E. Chalukya k. 58
Viṣṇuvāmitra, reputed brother of Śrāvuto Sup. 60; 79
Viṣṇuvāmitra, sages 237
Vīśnūśākta philosophy of Rāmānuja 233
Vīśvanātha, g. 35 f., 192 and n.
Vīśvanātha Nāg, founder of the Nāg dynasty of Madura 14, f. and the Pāṇḍyas 23–30; a Baduga 113 n. – 118, 134, f.; 189 n. history of 191; 229, 231, f.; his punitive expedition against Nāgama Nāg 233, his defence of 254; elevated to the throne 255, double coronation 256–258, date, etc. 259 f.
Vīṇāla, viceroy of Travancore 230 n., 232 vocal bases, in Old W. Rajasthani 181–183, 213 voice, in Sanskrit grammar Sup. 72 vowel, single, in Old W. Rājasthāni 35–60; in contact 60–62; in Sanskrit Sup. 68, f.
Vīṇāspati, Bīnaspati, founded the Barhapatyāya School Sup. 38
Vīśīṣṭa, aphrodisiacs Sup. 82
Vīśīghramukha, Chāpa ruler of Bhārāmi Sup. 132, 153 n.
Vāsā, viṣi, visited by Ānanda Tīrtha 262, f.
Vāgīśya, dedicated boys F. K. 22
Vāsī, teeth, seminor F. K. 72
Vāman, fifth incarnation of Viṣṇu F. K. 91
Vāmanamātā day F. K. 7
Wang Hieu Tsai, Chinese invader 98
Wārangal, c. Musulman conquest of 2; 6
Wārangal, and Achyuta Rāya 188
Wassif, writer, and Malik Kāfir 3
Weber, M., and dates 129 n.; MS. 46
Wells F. K. 13, f.
Wheeler, Mr. Talboys, author of The History of India 241 and n. 214
Widows, remarriage of, among the Tōtiyāns 137; and the Rejīs 138; and the Ayūppas 140; F. K. 11
Witlowby, Mr. R. Hughes 111
Windisch, and the word Luvāmini 18 n.
Winter, Sir Ed., at Fort St. George 267
Witchcraft P. K. 8
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Women, ceremonies for</th>
<th>F. K. 18, f.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Xandrames, Agrammes, k. of Magadha</td>
<td>167 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yaśamitra, Yaśomitra supposed scribe of the Bower MS.</td>
<td>180 : Sup. 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yesiga, gruels</td>
<td>Sup. 81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yazdajird</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young, Robt., with R. Hughes in Patna 69 and n., 76, 82, f.; 104, 108, f., 111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuan Chwang, mentions Sylhet</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y., character in the Bower MS., various forms of Sup. 47—49, illustrated</td>
<td>50 and n.—52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yādavas of Devgiri</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yokro, in spells</td>
<td>51, 53 and n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yakshavarman, author</td>
<td>205—208, 211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zefir, conyes, a kind of cloth, trade in</td>
<td>98, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoroastrians, Persian, leave their early home</td>
<td>151, f.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER V.

THE DATE OF THE WRITING OF THE BOWER MANUSCRIPT.

None of the seven Parts of the Bower Manuscript is dated. Nevertheless it is possible from its paleographic conditions to determine the date of the manuscript within comparatively narrow limits. In doing so, two preliminary points must be taken into consideration.

In the first place, the Bower manuscript, though recovered from Eastern Turkestan, is essentially a product of north-western India. It is written on birch-bark. The use of that bark, as a writing material, was according to all available evidence, limited to north-western India. In Eastern Turkestan, whence the Bower Manuscript has come, the birch which yields the writing bark does not appear to grow at all. With a very few exceptions, all the manuscript books, discovered in Eastern Turkestan in the course of many recent explorations of its ancient ruined sites, are written on various kinds of paper. Those few birch-bark manuscript books, which are known to have been discovered in that country, are the Bower Manuscript, the Dutreuil de Rhins Manuscript, a manuscript found by Mr. Bartus, a member of Professor Grünwedel's expedition, and a manuscript found by Sir A. Stein. The Dutreuil de Rhins Manuscript was said to come from the sacred cave on the Gōshiga hill near Khotan; but the story of the native finder has been fully exposed by Sir A. Stein, who examined the cave in the course of his first expedition in 1900-1. Nothing is really known of the find-place of that manuscript. The Bartus Manuscript was found in the course of Professor Grünwedel's expedition in 1902-3, in one of the rock-cut caves, close to the Ming-oï of Qizil to the west of Kuchar, a little higher up the river Muzart then the Ming-oï of Qum Turā (see the Sketch Map). The Stein Manuscript is a recent discovery. It was excavated by Sir A. Stein in the course of his second expedition, 1906-8 in Khadalik, a site north-east of Domoko, which was abandoned probably in the second half of the eighth century A.D. As to the Bower Manuscript, there is no sufficient reason to doubt the story of its having been found in one of the ruined stupas of Qum Turā near Kuchar (see Chapter I, pp. xi ff). All these birch-bark manuscripts must have been written by Buddhist pilgrims or immigrants, from north-western India. Most of them probably were written by them in their original home, in Kashmir or Udīyāna, and imported into their new settlements. The Bower Manuscript, on the other hand, as has been shown in Chapter II (p. xx), and Chapter III (pp. xxviii ff).

* An essay on the date of the Bower Manuscript was published by me in the Journal As. Soc. Beng., Vol. LIX (1891), Part I. It was reprinted, with additions, in the Indian Antiquary, Vol. XXI, pp. 29 ff. The date assigned to the Bower Manuscript in that essay was the middle of the fifth century A.D. In the meantime, much new information has become available, necessitating a fresh consideration of the problem. The result is that there now appear good reasons for dating the manuscript by about three-quarters of a century.

* This paper was published in the Journal As. Soc. Beng., Vol. LXXIX (1900), Part I, pp. 32 ff.

* This remark refers to manuscript books only. Letters and documents, official or private, have been found written also on wood, leather, silk, and other materials, but birch-bark has never been found in use for such non-literary purposes; nor, I may add, palm-leaf.


* This Manuscript, according to Dr. A. von Le Coq's information, formed part of a library, the manuscripts of which were found interred in a mass of dry mud. Some of its folios have been cleaned and now writing in Gupta characters, closely resembling those of the Bower Manuscript. In another part of the Qizil Ming-oï, in a cave temple manuscripts were found, more or less fragmentary, which were written on palm-leaves. This circumstance is of particular interest because manuscripts written on palm-leaf, in this case of the Corypha umbraculifera, (see my "Epigraphical Note on Palm-leaf, Paper, and Birch-bark," in the Journal As. Soc. Beng., Vol. LXXIX, Part I, pp. 93 ff.) are of distinctly Indian provenance and thus corroborate the equally distinct Indian character of the birch-bark manuscripts. Minute fragments of a palm-leaf manuscript, which apparently proceeded from the Quiliq Urdá Stūpa (see Chapter I) are described by me in the same Journal, Vol. LXXVI (1897), Part I, p. 213 ff. The manuscript, which is shown in Fig. 6 and 7 of Chapter II, was found in the same cave temple of Qalā Ming-oï, but is written on paper.

xxxv ff.), in all probability was written by them, in their new settlement, on birch-bark brought with them from their original home. But that, though written probably in Eastern Turkestan, their writers certainly were natives of north-western India, is proved by the occurrence in Parts I-III of a particular form of the letter γ, hereafter called the "new form," which, as will be shown in the sequel, originated in north-western India, and which, as proved by the Weber Manuscripts and all other ancient paper manuscripts discovered in Eastern Turkestan, was never in use in the latter country.  

In the second place, the Bower Manuscript, as shown in Chapter III, p. xxviii is the work of four distinct scribes, who wrote Parts I-III, Part IV, Parts V and VII, and Part VI respectively. The scribe who wrote the second portion (Part IV) commenced his writing on the reverse page of the last leaf of the first portion (Parts I-III), while the scribe who wrote the third portion (Parts V and VII) inscribed a remark on either of the two other portions. This circumstance proves that these three portions of the Bower Manuscript are practically contemporary writings. It is obvious that the production of Part IV cannot be earlier in date than the production of Parts I-III; and it is equally obvious that to the writer of Parts V and VII, both Part IV and Parts I-III were accessible. As to the fourth portion (Part VI), it is written for the benefit of the same person (Yaśomitra) as the beneficiary of Part VII. From the co-ordination of these facts it follows that the production of these four portions of the Bower Manuscript must be compassed by the space of about one generation. Now, as may be seen from Table II, Travresses 13-15, and as will be explained in the sequel, the writer of Parts I-III makes use, though sparingly, of the "new form" of the letter γ, while the writers of Part IV-VII employ the "old form" exclusively. It follows hence that the production of the Bower Manuscript must be referred to the very point of time when the "new form" of γ was beginning to come into fashion in north-western India, that is, to the time when it was being adopted by some scribes, while it was still avoided by others.

The salient point, then, of the enquiry is to determine the epoch of the introduction of the "new form" of γ into the scribal usage of north-western India, whence the writers of the Bower Manuscript must have come. The determination of that point determines the date of the production of the Bower Manuscript within very narrow limits, practically within the space of about one generation.

Fig. 19 illustrates the gradual development of the character for γ. Its original form in the Aoka period, was a perpendicular stroke set on a segment, or less commonly on two segments, of a circle, as in (a) and (b) respectively. Later, in the Indo-Ecythric period, the right side began to be straightened and angularized while the left side began to take the form of a curl, which might turn either to the right, as shown in (c), or to the left as in (d). The former is found, almost exclusively, in epigraphic and numismatic records;" the latter is preferred in manuscripts (see Table I). The base line might be straight, as in (e), or bent angularly, as in (f). At this time it required two movements of the hand to write the character: one from the top of the medial line downwards, and towards the left, in order to write the curled portion of the character; the other, from the base of the medial line towards the right, in order to write its angular portion. About the same time the habit arose of joining the end of the curl with the base line, so as to form a loop, as shown in (f); and gradually the point of junction was moved to the right, so as to coincide with the point of junction of the left and right portions of the character, as shown in (g) and (h). When this stage—

14 The forms of γ, which, in two varieties of script, were peculiar to Eastern Turkestan, are shown in Fig. 15, and explained in Chapter III, p. xxvii.
19 The latter form may be seen in the Nàthia and Mathia inscriptions, Ep. Ind., Vol. II, p.243.
31 Examples of the use of the adustorous curl may be seen in the Purushth grants, Ind. Ant. Vol. XXXIX (1910) p.193, Plates I-III.
merely transitional stage, as we shall see presently,—was reached, the character would be
written with a single movement of the hand. Beginning with the top of the medial straight
line, the hand moved down to the base line, then upward and leftward, round the loop, back
to the point of junction, and finally onward to the angle on the right. But it soon began
to be observed that the letter could be written with greater speed, and with more economy
of effort, if the downward movement of the hand was carried at once to the loop on the
left without touching the base line at all. This slight change produced what is practically
the modern form, as shown in (i) and (k). Thus, there were now three forms: the old,
the transitional, and the modern. The old form persisted in the Gupta script
of the southern area. The transitional form arose in the northern area about the
middle of the fourth century A.D., and disappeared about the end of the sixth century.
The modern form arose practically at the same time as the transitional form; but it gradu-
ally extruded the latter; and it persists to the present day in the slightly modified Nāgarī
form of the letter which only projects the perpendicular below the base line.

The transitional and modern forms, or, to use an inclusive and more convenient term,
the “new form” of y was, so to speak, invented in the western portion of the northern area.
Thence it gradually spread over the eastern portion. This may be seen clearly from
the epigraphic records of the Gupta period. See Fig. 20.

It first appears in the year 372 A.D. in the stone pillar
inscription of Vishnudharmas at Bijayagadh
(Long. 77° 20'), in śrēḡ (a) (F.G.I., No. 59, p.
252, Plate xxxvi, l. 4), and about 400 A.D. in the
rock inscription at Tusām (Long. 76° 0'), in yōga (b),
(F.G.I., No. 67, p. 269, Plate xc, l. 3)
The boundary of the two areas, as previously stated (Chap. III, p. xxvii), is E. Long
81°. In the eastern area the new form makes its first appearance in the stone inscription
of Īśvaravarman at Jumpur (Long. 82° 43'), in anuvaśḡ (c),
(F.G.I., No. 51, p. 228,
Plate xxxii, A, l. 2). Unfortunately this inscription is mutilated, and its date, if there was
any, is lost; but it belongs to the middle of the sixth century. The first dated inscription
in which the new form is found, is that of Mahānāma, in 588 A.D., at Bodhgaya
(Long. 85° 2'). Here both new forms, the transitional and modern, occur numerous: e.g.
the former (d) in yuktia, the latter (c) in gema, (F.G.I. No. 71, p. 274, Plate xliA, l. 1).

For writing the single y, the new form appears to have come into use about the middle
of the fourth century, but for the subscript y, as the second part of a compound letter, it
was in use about three centuries earlier, from the beginning of the Indo-
Scythic period. See Figure 21. An example of the transitional form (a) of
the subscript y, from a Kashana inscription, is shown in plate III, line 42,
No. 3, of Bührer's Indian Palaeography (in the Encyclopaedia of Indo-Aryan
Research). Examples of the modern form of the subscript y (b) occur
numerously; e.g., in Kanishka's inscription of his seventh year, i.e., in the year 51 B.C., in
the Epigraphia Indica, Vol. I, p. 391, No. XIX. It can hardly be doubted but that it was
the economy of time and effort in writing the new form of y, which led to its adoption in
the case of the subscript y. But in the case of the single y,
there operated an additional reason. This is brought out very
strikingly by a certain circumstance in the use of the new
form in the Bower Manuscript. This is the circumstance that
in writing the syllables ȳ, yai, ȳa, yau, the new form of y is employed whenever the vowel (i, ai, o, au) is made with a
lateral stroke, but the old form is used when the vowel is made
with a superior stroke. These vowels, namely, are indicated by attaching to the head of the

\[ ^{43} \text{In the second line of the accompanying Plate. It is also shown in Bührer's Indian Palaeography,}
\[ \text{Plate III, I, 41, No. 5. —As to the Kushana dates, I follow Dr. Fleet's theory, which I now believe to be}
\[ \text{correct, that they are to be reckoned from 57 B.C., being dates of the so-called Śaṅkara Era.} \]
consonant a certain number of slightly curved strokes, see Figure 22. These strokes may be made in two ways: either they may slant from above downward to the top of the perpendicular line, as in ë (a), or they may run laterally, level with the top, as in ë (b). It will be seen at once that if the lateral stroke was used with the old three-pronged form of y, its attachment to the top of the medial or the right prong was likely to interfere with the left prong, and thus to obscure the true form and meaning of the syllable (see Figure 23 c). It was to obviate this inconvenience that the fashion arose to write the syllable with the new form of y, whenever the lateral stroke was used, as in yé (c) and yö (d), but to retain its old form, whenever the superior stroke was employed as in yé (c) and yö (d). This rule is invariably observed by the scribe of the first portion (parts I-III) of the Bower Manuscript. The scribes of the second portion (Part IV) and of the third and fourth portions (Parts V-VII) never use the lateral stroke, and accordingly they never use the new form of y.

The subjoined Table exhibits all the occurrences of the letter y in the first portion of the Bower Manuscript:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLUMN</th>
<th>Parts</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>VI</th>
<th>VII</th>
<th>VIII</th>
<th>IX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>DETAILS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>old</td>
<td>old</td>
<td>new</td>
<td>y old and</td>
<td>y old</td>
<td>new</td>
<td>y old</td>
<td>new</td>
<td>y old</td>
<td>new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>1,303</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-III</td>
<td>1,611</td>
<td>1,170</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,026</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>583</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Parts I-III the consonant y, old or new, and in combination with any vowel, occurs altogether 1,511 times (col. I). In 1,170 cases (col. II) the old form is used, and in 441 cases (col. V), the new form (transitional or modern). In the 1,170 cases of the old form, any vowel combination (exc. yā) occurs (yā, yā, yī, yī, yu, yū, yē, yē, yai, yō). Among them the combination with the vowels é, a, ó, ó, é, occurs 142 times (col. III, and detailed in col. IV), and in all these 142 cases the vowel is made with the superior stroke. On the other hand, in the 441 cases of the new form (col. V), the only vowel combinations which occur are those with é, a, ó, a, and au; and in all those 441 cases the vowel is made with the lateral stroke. The total number of the combination of the vowels é, a, ó, au with the consonant y is (142 plus 441, or) 583 (col. III), and that number is so large that it is out of the question to attribute to mere accident the clean distribution of the superior and lateral strokes between the old and new forms of y respectively: it can have been made only of set purpose. And if it is so made, the explanation of its reason, above given, appears to be the most probable. But whatever be the true explanation, the fact of the clean distribution is indisputable; and so is the other fact that the new form (transitional and modern) never occurs except in combination with the vowels é, a, ó, au.

Turning now to the evidence of the dated, or practically dated, records of the Gupta period in north-western India, they show that the two facts, just mentioned, occur, in conjunction, only in the earliest portion of that period, that is, before 400 A.D. It is this circumstance which enables us to determine, to a degree of close approximation, the date of the writing of the Bower Manuscript. The following is a list of the inscriptions which, for the present purpose, come into consideration.

(1) 372 A.D., a calligraphic stone inscription of Vishnuvardhana, at Bijayagad, Long. 77° 20' (F. GL., No. 59, p. 252, Plate xxxvi:C). In several ways this is an instructive record. The total of the cases of y with any vowel (e.g., yēṣā, pūrṇavāṃśa, yāṇo, etc.) is eleven. Among them there are two cases of yē and one of yō (Fig. 23). All three are made with the lateral stroke, but yō (a), in ēryā, line 4, is made with the modern form, while yē (b) in dhēṇa, l. 3, and vriddhāṭe, l. 4, shows the transitional form. In Gupta inscriptions, as
a rule, the lateral stroke is made with a comparatively straight line, while the superior stroke has a more decided curature. In the present inscription, however, which is written in a particularly ornate style, the lateral stroke, also, is given a distinct curvature. This is seen most strikingly in the sandhii-syllable mē (c), in mē-tasyām, 1. 2. Per contra, we have a good example of the superior stroke in the syllable niē (d), in viśēṣhu, 1. 1. Respecting the inconvenience of using the lateral stroke in conjunction with the old form of y, we have a very good illustration in another, equally early, though undated, inscription at the same place Bijayagāth (F.G.I., No. 58, p. 251, Plate xxxviB). Here the syllable yau (e), in yauḍhēga, 1. 1, is made, on the left side, with the lateral stroke, curved exactly as in the syllable mē (c), above noticed, the effect being that the form of y is quite obscured through the interference of the lateral stroke of the vowel au above it; in fact, it would seem that the form of y, intended by the engraver of the record, was the old rather than the new. It was, no doubt, this kind of interference, which, as previously explained, led to the rule to use the superior stroke with the old form, but the lateral stroke with the new (transitional or modern) form. But at this time we seem to see the rule still "in the making."

(2) About 400 A.D., a rock inscription at Tusām, Long. 76° 0', (F.G.I. No. 67, p. 269, Plate xlA). Here the total of y is seven; and ṣau occurs twice (Fig. 24); once in yōga, (a) line 3, with the new (transitional) form and the lateral stroke and again in pādōpayō, (b); line 6, with the old form and the superior stroke. In this case, the observance of the distributive rule is clearly marked.

(3) 425 A.D., a cave inscription (calligraphic) at Udayagiri, Long. 77° 30' (F.G.I. No. 61, p. 258, Plate xxxviii A). Here the total of y is eleven. Combinations with the vowels ē, ai, ō, au do not occur. But once the new (transitional) form occurs in the syllable ya (Fig. 25), in annaya, 1. 4, showing that by this time that form was no longer limited to the combination of y with those vowels.

(4) 454 A.D., a stone image inscription (cursive) at Mathurā, Long. 77° 43' (r.G.I. No. 63, p. 262, Plate xxxixA). The total of y is eight. Each, yē and yō (Fig. 26 a and b), occurs once in āptaye, 1. 2, and niyōga, 1. 4, made with the old form and the superior stroke. But here, again, the new (transitional) form (c) occurs once with the vowel a in yad, line 2.

In the two preceding records the appearance of the new form, outside the range of the vowels ē, ai, ō, au, is exceptional, and perhaps not altogether above suspicion. In the following case it is quite plain and certain.

(5) 465 A.D., a copper-plate inscription (cursive) of Skandagupta, at Indor, Long. 78° 18' (F.G.I. No. 15, p. 68, Plate ixB). The total number of y is twenty-five. Among them the new (transitional) form occurs five times (Fig. 27); quite plainly in shtirayāh, 1. 9, and more or less clearly in viyaya, 1. 3, pragachchhāti, 1. 8, dāyam, 1. 11, and vṛiddhayē, 1. 4. Here we have the new form not only with ya and yā (a), but in the case of vṛiddhayē (b), even with the superior stroke of the vowel ē. On the other hand, the old form occurs once (c) with the superior stroke of d in vṛiddhayē, 1. 8, and four times (d) with the superior stroke of d in rātyayāyē, 1. 6, pāyayēja, 1. 7, yōga, 1. 9, and yō, 1. 11. Thus, in vṛiddhayē we have, contrary to the original rule, the superior stroke of the vowel ē written either way, with the new form in

---

There are two other dated inscriptions, the stone pillar inscription of 415 A.D. at Bihāsad, Long. 79° 10' (F.G.I. No. 16, p. 42), and the Jalō inscription at Mathurā, Long. 77° 43' (Bp. Ind., Vol. II, p. 210; No. xxxix); but neither presents any instance of the new form.
line 4, and with the old form in line 8. Clearly, at this time, the original rule, governing the use of the new form, had become entirely obsolete. It might be used, at pleasure, in combination with any vowel, and in combination with either of the two kinds of stroke.

(6) 482-533 A.D. This period of about fifty years includes a group of similarly worded copper-plate inscriptions (cursive), which all come from the same neighbourhood, near the boundary of the eastern area; viz., from Khāhā, Long. 8° 51', dated 482, 496, 516, 528, and 533 A.D. (F.G.I. Nos. 22, 25, 27-31, pp. 100 ff.), from Kārtalālī, Long. 8° 45', dated 493 A.D. (F.G.I. No. 16, p. 117), and from Mahāgawānā, Long. 8° 47', dated 510 A.D. (F.G.I. No. 23, p. 106). At this time and place the new form, both transitional and modern, is found in not infrequent use (35 times in a total of 256 y, or upwards of 13.5 per cent.) irrespective of any rule. Thus we have the transitional form with ẏa in jayavānī (a), l. 3, jaya and déya, l. 5, yathākṣa, l. 7 (F.G.I., p. 118), and yathākṣa, l. 6, yat (b), l. 16, yadā, l. 19 (F.G.I., pp. 122-3); again with ẏa in pulikāyāna, l. 6, niyā, l. 11, pratyāyā, l. 12 (F.G.I., p. 118), and vidhikāyā, l. 12, pratyāyā, l. 13, vikāyāna, l. 20, yānat (c), l. 26 (F.G.I., pp. 122-3); and pratyāyā (d), l. 20 (F.G.I., p. 127); and mayā, l. 11 (F.G.I., p. 131); again with yu in yukt (e), l. 15 (F.G.I., p. 122). So also the old and new forms are used promiscuously with the superior stroke. Thus we have transitional ẏe in vriddhayā, l. 17 (F.G.I., p. 118), l. 8 (ib., p. 122), l. 7 (ib., p. 107), lopayā (f), l. 14, pratyāyā, l. 17 (F.G.I., p. 122); and modern ẏe in pāñayā, l. 17, ẏe (g), l. 18 (F.G.I., p. 108), two good and clear examples. On the other hand, we have old ẏe in ṣe, l. 10, lopayā, l. 12, pratyāyā (h), l. 16 (F.G.I., pp. 118-9) vriddhayā, l. 14, ṣe, l. 18, lopayā, l. 21 (F.G.I., p. 127), l. 2 (ib., p. 133). Again, we have transitional ẏo in chhrēyā (i), l. 15 (F.G.I., p. 119), l. 16 (k, ib., p. 122); and modern ẏo in chhrēyā (l), l. 14, ẏo, l. 16 (F.G.I., p. 108), two good examples; but old ẏo in pratyāyā (m) (l), 9, ṣe, l. 20 (F.G.I., pp. 118-9) anvayā, l. 10, ahayā, l. 18 (F.G.I., p. 108); nāgayā, l. 12, pratyāyā, l. 17, chhrēyā, l. 23, ẏo, l. 28 (F.G.I., pp. 127-8); chhrēyā (n), l. 5, ṣe, l. 9 (F.G.I., pp. 133-4), all good examples. And, again, the new form is found, used at pleasure, with the lateral or the superior stroke. Thus, the transitional ẏe with the lateral stroke occurs in nāgayāna (o), l. 13, ẏe, l. 16, but with the superior stroke in pratyāyā (p), l. 9 (F.G.I., pp. 136-7).

(7) 530-533 A.D., the famous group of calligraphic stone inscriptions of Yasodharman, at Mandasor, Long. 75° 8' (F.G.I., Nos. 33, 34, 35, pp. 142 ff. Plates xxiiB, C, and xxii), These records further exemplify, in the interior of the western area, the use of the new form in combination with the superior and lateral strokes. In bhrayāyāna (Fig. 29a), l. 8 (ib., p. 153, Pl. xxii), we have the two kinds of stroke side by side, the superior stroke in ṣo with the old form, and the lateral stroke in ẏo with the new (transitional) form. Again in the phrase avajnayā ṣo, l. 4, which occurs in duplicate (ib., pp. 146 and 149), we have, in one copy (b), the two forms of ṣo side by side, the old in ṣa and the new (transitional) with the lateral stroke in ẏo. In the other copy (c), both ẏa and ẏo are written with the old form, but ẏo has the superior stroke. In these calligraphically written inscriptions we find still in observance the old rule, which we saw growing obsolete in the cursive written inscriptions of Nos. 4-6. Another, still more striking example of this conservatism, or archaism, will be noticed in No. 9.

Another example of a modern ẏu occurs in a copper-plate inscription (cursive) of the same period, of Saśkshēha, at Betul, Long. 78° 22', published in Ep. Ind., Vol. VIII, p. 284, in yudhisthira, l. 22.
(8) 550-600 A.D., a group of stone inscriptions (calligraphic) from Bodhgaya, Long. 85° 2' (F.G.I., Nos. 71, 72, 76, pp. 274, 278, 281, Plates xliA, B, and xliID). The first (No. 71) is dated in 588 A.D., the third, undated, must be some 40 years older. This group shows that by this time the new form had not only penetrated far into the eastern area, but had also fully superseded the old form. The latter is entirely absent from these inscriptions: among a total of 34 cases of $y$, there is not a single instance of the old three-pronged form. The transitional form still predominates over the modern, there being 26 cases of the former to 8 of the latter. In agreement with the obsolescence of the old form, the original rule respecting the distributive use of the new form is now entirely inoperative: that form is now used with every kind of vowel. See Figure 30. Thus we find $ya$ in No. 71, lines 1 (modern, a), 2, 3 $bis$, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 $bis$, 11 (ten times, all transitional, $b$); in No. 72, three times (modern); in No. 76, 1, 1, twice transitional.

Again, we have $ya$ in No. 71, II. 4, 6, 9, 12, 13, 14 (all transitional, c), and $yi$ in No. 71, I. 11 (transitional, d); and $yu$, in No. 71, II. 1, 4 (both transitional, e). Further, the new form is used ad libitum with the superior or the lateral stroke. Thus we have $y$ with the transitional form and superior stroke ($f$) in $yena$, No. 71, I. 3, and in avdpayata, No. 76, I. 2; and with the modern form and superior stroke ($g$) in avdpayata, No. 72, and with the same form and lateral stroke ($h$) in yena, No. 71, I. 1. Similarly we have $y$ with the transitional form and lateral stroke ($i$) in yodhast, No. 71, I. 1, and possibly also ($k$), in the superscript $y$ of acharyyato, No. 76, I. 1, and in senayat, No. 76, I. 1. So also, we have $yu$ with the transitional form and lateral stroke in upadhya, No. 76, I. 1.

(9) Seventh century.—The prevailing conditions are, on the whole, the same as in the preceding period, except that the transitional $y$ is gradually giving way entirely to the modern $y$. The last instances of it appear to occur, in 672 A.D., in two stone inscriptions of Adityasena, at Apsaad, Long. 85° 44', and Shahpur, Long. 85° 43' (F.G.I., Nos. 42 and 43, pp. 200 and 208, Plates xxviii and xxixA). Here we find both $ya$ and $y$, in the transitional form (Fig. 31 a and b): viz., $ya$, in prajaga, I. 7 of No. 42, and $y$ in yodhapata, 1. 4 of No. 43. At this time the old form of $y$ has become entirely obsolete, except in two archaic and highly ornate inscriptions, of 625 A.D., at Vasantgadh, Long. 73° (Epigraphia Indica, Vol. IX, p. 187), and of 661 A.D. at Udaipur, Long. 73° (ibid., Vol. IV, p. 29). Their ornate forms of $y$, $yai$, $y$, with the old three-pronged $y$, are shown in Fig. 31 c, d, e. But the use of the old form of $y$, in these two inscriptions, is not their only archaism: there are several other examples of archaism in them which have been pointed out by Professor Kielhorn (ibid., Vol. IV, p. 29). It is obvious, therefore, that the use of old forms is intentional: they belong to the studied ornate character of the inscriptions in question. Being archaic, the occurrence of the old form of $y$ really corroborates the fact that in ordinary writing, whether calligraphic or cursive, that form of $y$ was no longer in use in the seventh century. Even in ornate inscriptions the use of the old form is exceptional, as shown by the highly ornate Jhalrapatan inscription of 689 A.D. (Indian Antiquary, Vol. V, p. 181), which uses the new form exclusively (Fig. 31, f, g). For the purpose of dating ordinary writings (as in manuscripts), therefore, the rule laid down by me in 1891 (Journal, As. Soc. Beng., Vol. IX, p. 90) still holds good: that the form of $y$ is

---

65 Examples are the calligraphic Bunshehrs copper-plate of Harsha, 628 A.D. (Ep. Ind., Vol. IV, p. 208), and the calligraphic, but undated, Lakhamaungal and Kudarkot inscriptions (ibid., Vol. I, pp. 10, 179), which are referable to the middle of the seventh century.
the test, and that Indian writings must be referred before or after 600 A. D., according as they show the use of the old or of the new form of that letter.

(10) Seventh century in Nepal.—All the known Nepalese inscriptions are from the neighbourhood of Kātmādū. Long. 85° 60', which is within the eastern area. The northwestern new form of \( y \), comes into these records first in the second half of the seventh century, in an inscription of 677 A.D., 66 (Bendall’s Journey in Nepal, No. III, p. 77), and in another undiscovered, but slightly earlier, of about 655 A.D. (Indraj’s No. II, in the Indian Antiquary, Vol. IX, p. 174). It is always in its modern variety, and from the beginning it appears independent of the original rule, being used with any vowel as well as with either kind of stroke. Thus we have modern \( ya \) in No. III, I, 18, yathā; in No. 11, I, 5, yah; modern yā in No. III, I, 21, dēyā, and in No. 11, I, 13, praṇālikāyā; modern yī, in No. 11, I, 2, kakobhāyītiva; modern yu, in No. III, I, 29, yuvārāja, and in No. 11, I, 1, yuktē. Again we have modern yē; with the superior stroke in No. III, yē, II, 25-26; modern yai with the superior stroke, in No. 11, I, 25, kayāyē; modern yō, with the superior stroke, in No. III., I, 12, yō, and in No. 11, I, 22, bhūyō, but with the lateral stroke in No. 11, I, 4, yō.

The statistics, given in the foregoing paragraphs, may be summarised as follows. The distributive rule referred to in them is based on the two facts, (1) that the new form is used only with the syllables ye, yai, yō, yau, while with other syllables the old form is used; and (2) that the new form is used with those syllables when they are made with the lateral stroke, but when they are made with the superior stroke, the old form is used. About 372 A.D., this rule is “in the making”; about 400 A.D. it is in full force; from about 425 A.D. it gradually obsolesces; about 550 it has become inoperative. This information enables us to sketch, with considerable precision, the progress of the fashion of applying the new form of \( y \), which was already in use in ligatures, to that letter when it occurred as a non-conjunct.

(1) This fashion arose in the western portion of the northern area of the Gupta script, about the middle of the fourth century A.D. Thence, in the latter, half of the sixth century (in India, but of the seventh century in Nepal), it spread into the eastern portion of that area.

(2) The fashion was at first limited to the syllables ye, yai, yō, yau, when their vowel was written with the lateral stroke. This is shown by the way in which the new form is used in the Bower Manuscript; and the period of this stage of the fashion is fixed by the epigraphic records of Northern India (ante, Nos. 1 and 2) as the second half of the fourth century A.D.

(3) The limitation was soon abandoned. From early in the fifth century (ante, No. 3), the fashion of using the new form began to extend to any vowel combination, and to either the lateral or the superior stroke.

(4) By the end of the sixth century the new form had become so fully established in all conditions of the latter \( y \), as to extirpate altogether, in all ordinary writing, the old form (ante, Nos. 8-10).

The preceding sketch of the chronology of the origin and spread of the new form of the letter \( y \) determines the time of the writing of the Bower Manuscript as having been in the second half of the fourth century A.D. And it is probable that it should be sought rather nearer the beginning than the end of that period. The Table, given on p. xlvi, shows that in the earlier portion (Parts I-III) of the Bower Manuscript the letter \( y \) occurs 833 times (col. III) in the vowel combinations ye, yai, yō, and yau. Outside these combinations, it occurs no less than 1,028 times (col. I). If at the time of the Bower Manuscript the fashion of extending the use of the new form of \( y \) to cases outside those combinations had already begun to develop, it is hardly conceivable that not a single example of such an extension should occur among those 1,028 cases. The probability, therefore, seems to be that the writing of the earlier portion of the Bower Manuscript should be placed about 350-375 A.D. And seeing that the three later portions of the Bower Manuscript (Part IV, Parts V and VII, and Part VI) must be, as shown in Chapter III, p. xxxv ff., practically contemporaneous with the earlier portion (p. xlvi), it follows that the production of the whole of the Bower Manuscript must be referred to the third quarter of the fourth century A.D.

---

66 According to the local era, discovered by Professor Sylvain Lévi; see Ép. Ind., Vol. V, Appendix, p. 73, note. By the Harsha era it would be 688 A.D.
CHAPTER VI.

ON THE SOURCES AND THE DATE OF THE NAVANİTAKA.87

The name and identity of the author of the Nāvanītaka are not known. The final colophon which perhaps would have supplied that information is, together with the last chapter of the work, unfortunately missing in the manuscript. But from the sources which the author utilized in making his compilation, it is possible to estimate approximately the time when his work was written. So much is certain that the date of writing the work cannot be the same as that of writing the manuscript in which it has come down to us. The latter is not an autograph. This is proved by a number of clear indications. For example, on page 28, in verse 45, we find, in one of the medical formulæ, three dots marking the omission of three syllables (ante, Chapter IV, p. xlii). At the time of editing the text the emendation tṝṇi cha[vya-paṇḍi] was suggested by me, but in the meantime the true reading paṇcha cha[vya-paṇḍi] has been discovered by Dr. P. Cordier88 in an ancient medical compendium, called Bhēda Saṁhitā, from which the Nāvanītaka has quoted the formula in question. Obviously the substitution of the dots shows that the writer of the Bower Manuscript had a defective original from which he copied. Again, on page 58, in verse 723 of the pippali-vardhamāna formula there is the curiously blundered phrase yavād-daiva-vārshās, instead of yavād-avakarshas. Such a blunder is unthinkable in an original writer: it could proceed only from one who copied from a defective original. Again, on page 67, to verse 879 we find appended the gloss sraṇchini-kā pāṭhā, for the purpose of explaining an unusual name of the drug commonly known as pāṭhā. Such a gloss is not likely to have proceeded from the author himself. As usual, it must have stood originally on the margin of the manuscript, or perhaps between the lines. By a subsequent copyist it was transferred, in the body of the manuscript, to the position where we now find it in the Bower Manuscript. The writer of the latter may, or may not, have been the first to make that transfer; but, in any case, the present position of the gloss shows that the existing Bower Manuscript was not copied from the author's autograph, but from some intermediate copy of that autograph.

The conclusion which, indeed, is already suggested by the three dots and the blundered phrase, is that there must have been some interval, perhaps of not inconsiderable duration, between the writing of the autograph and the copying of the existing manuscript. The date of the latter, as explained in Chapter V, p. lxi, must be referred to the third quarter of the fourth century, somewhere between 350 and 375 A.D. This supplies us with the lower limit for the date of the Nāvanītaka, which, in view of the above-mentioned necessary interval between the autograph and the existing manuscript, may be placed provisionally in the beginning of the fourth century, or about 300 A.D.

The upper limit is determined for us by the circumstance that the Chāraka Saṁhitā and the Suīrūta Saṁhitā are two of the sources from which the author of the Nāvanītaka quotes.

87 For a somewhat fuller treatment of the subject, see the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society for 1909, pp. 857 ff.
88 See his Récents Découvertes, p. 21. The three missing syllables are paṇcha cha.
copious extracts. In the opening verse the author advises his readers that in his treatise he is going to bring together the best-known formulæ of the maharshis, or medical authorities of his time. Following the usual practice of Indian writers, he does not name those authorities, assuming, of course, that the reader would at once recognize the standard work from which some particular formula was quoted. Still in the case of not a few formulæ we find he does name their authors. From the distinction thus made, it may reasonably be concluded that the formulæ, thus singled out by naming their authors, were quoted from what may be called the floating medical tradition,—it being necessary to indicate the authority for their recommendation,—while those formulæ, in the case of which no author is named, were quoted from standard works of well-known authorities.

By far the largest number of formulæ, brought together in the Nāvanitaka, belongs to the latter class. The most conspicuous among the earliest medical teachers is Punarvasu, the son of Atri, commonly known as Ātreyā. According to the Indian tradition he was a physician, teaching medicine in Taxila, in the north-west of India, about the time of Buddha, in the sixth century B.C. He is famous as the head of a great medical school of internal medicine. He is said to have had six disciples, who committed their master's teaching to writing, in tantras, larger treatises, or kalpas, smaller monographs. Some centuries later, attempts were made to epitomize these early tantras and kalpas, and gather their substance into sahhitās or compendia. Only two of these sahhitās have come down to our day. These are the Charaka Sahhitā and the Bheda Sahhitā. They are compendia based on the tantras and kalpas of Agniveṣa and Bheda respectively. Of the writings of the other four pupils of Ātreyā, viz., Harita, Jāśikarnā, Kshārapāṇi, and Parāsara, nothing has survived, except occasional short quotations in the mediæval medical literature. The compendium, known as Charaka Sahhitā, which professes to give Ātreyā’s teaching, as reported by his pupil Agniveṣa, was compiled by a physician of Kashmir, called Charaka. The author, or rather compiler, of the Bheda Sahhitā, which professes to give, in the main, the teaching of Ātreyā as reported by his pupil Bheda, is not known.

Both these sahhitās, or compendia, must have been well-known standard books in the time of the author of the Nāvanitaka, for he makes copious extracts from them without naming them as his sources. From the Bheda Sahhitā the following formulæ are taken:

(2) Rasayana-gṛīta, vv. 165b-169a, in Bh. S., VI, 4 (fol. 106b).
(3) Dākṣiṇa-gṛīta, vv. 201-3, in Bh. S., VI, 5, vv. 179-20a (fol. 105a).
(4) Sakraham-grītā, vv. 529-36, in Bh. S., VI, 24 (fol. 153b), mutilated.
(5) Madhuyashita-līla, vv. 337-43, in Bh. S., VI, 4 (fol. 103b), mutilated.
(6-8) Three Amṛitāra-yōga, vv. 407-12, in Bh. S., VI, 10 (fol. 11 6a).
(9) Kṣaṣa-yōga, vv. 474-9, in Bh. S., VI, 19, vv. 269-32 (fol. 143-4).
(10) Karṇāḥa-cōya, vv. 5345-7a, in Bh. S., VI, 22 (fol. 147-8).

99 For an example of such a quotation from Jāśikarna see Śrīkaśnādatta's commentary to Siddha-yōga (c. 123 C. A.D.). pp. 21, 36, etc.
100 Actually only two-thirds of the compendium were written by Charaka, probably in the 1st cent. B.C., the other one-third was added by the Kashmir physician Ṭrijāhabala, in the 9th cent. A.D. See my Article in the Journal, R.A.S., 1908, pp. 977 ff., and ibid., 1929, p. 857.
101 These were first discovered by Dr. P. Cordier, see his Récents Découvertes, p. 21. The references in the text are to the folios of the unique Tanjore Manuscript of the Bheda Sahhitā.
To these may be added three formulæ which are no longer traceable in the single existing mutilated Tanjore Manuscript of the Bhūda Saṁhitā, but which are attributed to Bhūda in the Yāga-ratna-samuchchaya of Chandraśīla. These are—

(13) Balā-ghrīta, vv. 250-6.
(14) Gau-sana-yāja, vv. 390-401.
(15) Laukūsā-śarpiḥ, vv. 1026b-60a.

From the Charaka Saṁhitā the following formulæ are taken:

(1) Tailāsaka-chōra, vv. 11-13, in Charaka Saṁhitā, VI, 8, vv. 1403.
(2) Shālava-chōra, vv. 14-17, in Ch. S., VI, 8, vv. 136-9.
(3) A kalī śāla, v. 24a, in Ch. S., VI, 5, v. 88b.
(4) Vardhamānaka-chōra, vv. 25-6, in Ch. S., VI, 8, vv. 101-3.
(5) Mātsulūga-chōra, vv. 29-34, in Ch. S., VI, 5, vv. 73-80.
(6) Tīkṣṭa-ghṛita, vv. 133-6, in Ch. S., VI, 7, vv. 137-40.
(8) Chalpolā-ghṛita, vv. 150-1, in Ch. S., VI, 5, vv. 142-4.
(10) Vasāgūḍha, vv. 153-4, in Ch. S., VI, 5, vv. 122-3.
(11) Chādgātāgūḍha, vv. 155-7, in Ch. S., VI, 9, vv. 110-12.
(13) Chayavantāgūḍha-ghṛita, vv. 188-200, in Ch. S., VI, 1, vv. 59-71.
(16) An unnamed cough mixture, vv. 460-2, in Ch. S., VI, 5, vv. 119-21.
(17) Pratīkha-vīra, vv. 484-90, in Ch. S., VI, 5, vv. 156-16.
(18) Madhavaśāravīgya, vv. 491-3, in Ch. S., VI, 6, vv. 39-42.
(19) An unnamed fever mixture, vv. 494-5a, in Ch. S., VI, 3, vv. 201-2a.
(20) Another unnamed fever mixture, vv. 496b-9a, in Ch. S., VI, 3, vv. 196-8.
(22) Pichchā-puruṣa, vv. 645-9, in Ch. S., VI, 10, vv. 70-4.
(23) An unnamed tonic mixture, vv. 742-3, in Ch. S., VI, 1, vv. 130-1.
(24) Pī ṁ tali-prayoga, vv. 745-8, in Ch. S., VI, 1, vv. 132-5.

Besides the forty-four formulæ, comprised in the foregoing two lists, the Nāvānītaka contains a considerable number of other formulæ, the authors of which are not indicated, and the source of which it is, at present, impossible to identify. It does not seem improbable, however, that they were extracted by the author of the Nāvānītaka from the tantrās or kalpas of the other four above-mentioned pupils of Ṛṣyāṇa. None of their writings have survived to the present day; but there is evidence which renders it very probable that they still existed at the time when the Nāvānītaka was compiled. In the latter occur six formulæ, which occur also in the Āyurveda Śāstra of Suśruta, also known as Suśruta Saṁhitā. They are the following—

(13) Three Ántāṣāra-yāga, vv. 407-8, 409-10, and 411-12, corresponding to Suśruta Saṁhitā, VI, 40, vv. 350-35a, v. 35c, and v. 46 (pp. 703-7).
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(4-6). Three Vājīkarana-yogas, vv. 829-30a, 833b-4a, 834b-5a, corresponding to Sūrūta Sādhita, IV, 26, vv. 27, 20, 21.

The important point with regard to these parallels is that the Āmātiṣāra formulae are quoted, not directly from the work of Sūrūta, but immediately through the Bhēda Sādhita. For in the latter and in the Nāvanitaka the text of these three diarrhoea formulae is identical (see Nos. 6-8 in the list of quotations from the Bhēda Sādhita), while their common text differs from Sūrūta's text in such a manner as to show that the latter is their common source. The Nāvanitaka quotes the three formulae from the Bhēda Sādhita and the latter derives them from Sūrūta's work. Now the latter, as is well known, is a composite work of two chronologically widely separate authors. The earlier portion was written by Sūrūta the Elder, who lived probably in the sixth century B.C., while the later portion, which calls itself Uttarā Tantra, or the Later Treatise, was added by an anonymous writer, who may provisionally be called Sūrūta the Younger. Medieval Indian medical tradition identifies him with Nāgārjuna, the reputed contemporary of King Kanishka. This would make him also a contemporary of Charaka, so that both the Sādhita of the latter and the Uttarā Tantra of the former would have been compiled at much the same time. Each link in this chronological chain is still a matter of doubt and dispute; but fortunately that circumstance does not affect the point at issue in the present discussion. Whatever the true identity and date of Sūrūta the Younger may be, there can be no doubt that his work belongs to the early sādhita period of the Indian medical literature, that is, the period to which also the Charaka Sādhita and the Bhēda Sādhita belong. Sūrūta the Younger not only added his Uttarā Tantra, a Śāṅkya-tantra or treatise on Minor Surgery, as a complement to the earlier tantras, a saiga-tantra or treatise on Major Surgery, of Sūrūta the Elder, but he also revised the latter work. Thus the result of his labours; that is, the Āyurveda Śāstra of Sūrūta, as we now have it, is essentially a sādhita work, a compendium of older materials, similar to the Charaka Sādhita; and therefore it is rightly known also as the Sūrūta Sādhita.

The Uttarā-tantra does not profess to be an original composition. In its introductory verses it expressly describes itself as a compilation, and enumerates the tantras, or treatises, on which it bases itself. These are, firstly, a treatise on śāṅkya, or minor surgery, by Nimi, the Vidēka-pati or ruler of Vidēka; secondly, treatises on kumāra-bāha, or children's diseases, composed, according to the medieval commentator Dālana (in the 12th cent. A.D.) by Jivaka, Pārvataka, and Bandhuka; thirdly, the six treatises on kāya-chikita, or internal medicine, composed by the six paramarshi, or supreme medical authorities, that is, obviously by the six well-known pupils of Ātrēya. It is equally obvious, that in the connection in which the six treatises are mentioned, they cannot refer to any sādhita, but must refer to the original tantras of Agniveśa, Bhēda and the rest. In fact, there is no evidence that any sādhita, based on the tantras of the four other pupils, Kṣhampā, Jātākāraṇa, Harita, and Parāśara, ever existed; for the so called Hūrita Sādhita is now generally admitted to be a medieval apocryphal compilation. It is evident, therefore, that in the time of the compiler of the Uttarā-tantra the original treatises of those four "supreme authorities" were still extant, and were accessible to him.

For detailed proof, see my paper in the J.R.A.S., 1909, pp. 884-5.

See my Osteology of the Ancient Indians, pp. 5, 9.
Of the six parallels in the *Suiruta Saṁhitā*, above listed, the three āditiśāra formulē (Nos. 1-3) occur in the *Uttara-tantra*. Two conclusions follow from this circumstance. First, as the *Uttara-tantra* complements the so-called *Suiruta Saṁhitā*, or the Āgurēda Śāstra, the latter work must have been in existence at the time of the compilation of the *Nāvanitaka*. Secondly, as all the six treatises (*tantra* or *kalpa*) of the pupils of Ātrēya existed at the date of the compilation of the *Uttara-tantra*, it is not unreasonable to assume that they still existed somewhat later when the *Nāvanitaka* was compiled; and that those formulē which cannot be identified either in the *Charaka Saṁhitā* or in the *Bhēda Saṁhitā*, and of which the *Nāvanitaka* does not expressly name the author, may have been extracted from the works of the four pupils of Ātrēya, which were still current as great medical authorities (*paramarshi* or *makarshi*), and which might be quoted without any necessity of specification.

To return to the question of the upper limit for the date of the *Nāvanitaka*, it is now seen that both, the *Charaka Saṁhitā* and the *Suiruta Saṁhitā*, must have been in existence at the time when the *Nāvanitaka* was compiled. Moreover there must have been some interval of time between the compilation of the *Nāvanitaka* and the *Suiruta Saṁhitā*. For the three āditiśāra formulē, above referred to, are quoted by the *Nāvanitaka*, not directly from the *Uttara-tantra*, but indirectly from the *Bhēda Saṁhitā*. The latter itself presupposes the existence of the *Suiruta Saṁhitā*; for it not only refers to Surāuta by name (as *Suirōta*), but also teaches one of his distinctive doctrines (regarding the *gulma* disease).\(^{94}\) Also, some not inconsiderable interval of time must be allowed for the two *Saṁhitās* of Charaka and Suiruta acquiring that acknowledged position of standard works which enabled the author of the *Nāvanitaka* to quote formulē from them without the necessity of naming them as his source.

The upper limit, accordingly, is determined by the dates of the three *Saṁhitās*, of Charaka, Suiruta, and Bhēda. About the date of the *Bhēda Saṁhitā* we know nothing whatsoever. That of the *Suiruta Saṁhitā*, as before intimated, is entangled in a net of uncertainties. The date of the *Charaka Saṁhitā* alone offers an apparent chance of settlement. It is bound up with the date of the celebrated King Kanishka, at whose court, as tradition tells us, Charaka lived as the royal physician. Unfortunately the date of Kanishka itself is still in dispute; but the most probable theory is that which places him in the middle of the first century B. C., as the founder of the well-known Saṁvat Era.\(^{25}\) Taking this date for Kanishka as the upper limit, and allowing the necessary interval for the growth of the *Saṁhitās* into standard authorities, the second century A. D. may be taken provisionally as the time of the compilation of the *Nāvanitaka*.

There are two points in the *Nāvanitaka*, which favour the assignment to it of such a very early date. One concerns its language, the other its sources. The former will be dealt with in Chapter VII. As regards its sources, all those which the *Nāvanitaka* specifically

\(^{94}\) For the evidence, see my paper in the *Journal, R. As. Soc.*, for 1909, pp. 883.

\(^{25}\) Much less probable are the two rival theories which place Kanishka in the first century A.D., as the founder of the Saka Era in 78 A.D., and in the middle of the second century A.D. respectively.
names, have a very archaic appearance. Their list comprises the following names. One formula each is quoted from:

(1) Kākāyana, vv. 935.
(2) Nimi, vv. 881-4.
(3) Suprabha, vv. 633-7.
(4) Uśanas, vv. 846-7a.
(5) Vāḍvali, vv. 319-24.
(6) Vṛihapati, prose, 784.

Two formulae each are quoted from:

(7) Agasīya, vv. 588-9 and vv. 995-9, 98.
(8) Dhanvantari, vv. 232-40 and vv. 968-76.
(9) Jīvaka, v. 1081, and vv. 1097-9a.

A whole series of formulae are referred to:

(10) Kāyapa, vv. 1011-1040.

None of these formulae, with one exception, can be traced elsewhere. All the names, except those of Jīvaka and Kāyapa, belong to semi-mythical or prehistoric personages. Suprabha does not appear to be known as a physician outside the Nāvanitaka. The only mention of Vāḍvali, at present known, occurs in the Kālyāṇa-Kāraka, a medical treatise written by an unknown author at the court of the Eastern Chalukya king Vishnuvardhana. The mention by Pāṇini of a patronymic Vāḍvala (see note 168, on p. 109) points to a very early date. So does the name of Nimi, who is the epic ruler of Viśaka, and the reputed founder of the Indian ophthalmic science. Similarly Dhanvantari is the reputed semi-divine founder of surgical science. On the other hand, Jīvaka is a historical, or at least semi-historical, personage. For tradition assigns him to the court of king Ajātaśatru, in the sixth century B.C., and makes him a contemporary and friend of Buddha. One of the two formulae (v. 1081), which the Nāvanitaka quotes from him, forms the single exception, above noticed, of occurrence elsewhere. It is quoted by Vangaśena (see note 481 on page 178) with two variants, and without naming its author. Kāyapa (or Kaśyapa, see note 457 on p. 179), also, is probably a historical, or semi-historical, person, being likewise a contemporary of Buddha. Medical tradition knows of two men of that name, an elder (widdha) and a younger. It is, no doubt, Kāyapa the Elder, whom the Nāvanitaka quotes. Both, he and Jīvaka, are reputed to have been skillful children's doctors; and, as a fact, the formula, quoted from them, do refer to children's diseases. Also, it may be added, the use of the phrases iti kṣaṇṇa Jīvaka (v. 1081) and iti bhaṣṭati Jīvaka (v. 1099), i.e., thus spake (speaks) Jīvaka, and the phrase Kaśyapaḥ vacaḥ yathā (vv. 1020, 1022, 1027), i.e., according to the saying of Kāyapa, which the Nāvanitaka applies to their formula, apparently indicates them to be their ipsissima verba. Uśanas and Vṛihapati (or Vṛihapati) appear to be historical personages, being the founders, respectively, of the Aṣianasa and Bārhaspatya Schools, which flourished in the fourth century B.C. 81

81 There is a formula of his quoted also in the Lāhuma Kālpa, which is included in Part I of the Bower Manuscript.
82 But see Journal, Roy. As. Soc., 1893, p. 337.
83 The Kālyāṇa-Kāraka was discovered by Mr. Narasimhachar of the Mysore Archaeological Survey. See his report for 1906-7 (5, 59, p. 15).
84 For further particulars, see Professor Jacob's article in the Sitzungsberichte der Kgl. Preuss. Akademie der Wissenschaften, on the Frühgeschichte der indischen Philosophie, vol. xxxv (1911), pp. 733-41.
In addition to the ten sources, named in the preceding list, the Nāvanitaka draws on two other archaic sources, viz.:—

(11) Átréya himself, the head of the Taxila medical school, and
(12) The mythical Āśvin pair (see note 126 on page 100).

The formulae, attributed to Átréya, are the following:—

(1) Lagūda-chārūṣa, vv. 35-7.
(2) Śārdūla-chārūṣa, vv. 71-5a.
(3) Amśītaprāsa-grhitā, vv. 108-19a.
(4) Mahākāliyānaka-grhitā, vv. 126b-32.
(5) Balā-taila, vv. 251-76.
(6) A mutilated formula, prose 715.

The fact that these six formulae are specifically assigned to Átréya's authorship shows that they did not exist in the Charaka Saṁhitā in the condition in which that work was known to the author of the Nāvanitaka. If they had occurred in it, one may reasonably say he would have quoted them from it without naming their author, precisely in the same way as he cited the other formulae above listed (p. 1v). For the same reason it may be inferred that he did not quote them from the Bhāda Saṁhitā, nor from any of the (at that time still existing) tantrās of the other four pupils of Átréya. The probability is that the author of the Nāvanitaka quoted them from the floating medical tradition of his time, and the fact that in his time there still existed a living tradition of this kind, points to an early date for the compilation of the Nāvanitaka.

There are in these six formulae some peculiarities which point in the same direction. The first of the formulae is not traceable elsewhere. The second (vv. 71-75a) is found in Mādhava's Siddha-yoga, chapter VI (on ajīra, or indigestion), vv. 27-32, but there is a characteristic difference. In substance the two versions are identical throughout; even in diction they are practically identical in the initial three half-verses (Nāv., vv. 71-72—a=S, Y., vv. 27-28a). In the fourth half-verse (Nāv., v. 72b=S, Y., v. 28b) an additional ingredient (vyāha) is introduced, and thence forward to the end of the formula the diction is quite different. Also the reference to Átréya is omitted, and the formula is given the different, though synonymous, name agnimukhahārṣya,100 or plumbago-root powder. This modified recension is quoted by Chakrapāṇidatta in his Chikitsā Saṁgraha (Chap. VI, No. 17), and by Vangāṣena (Chap. V, vv. 56-6). In the Charaka Saṁhitā neither the original, nor the modified formula is found. In fact, that compendium includes no special chapter on ajīra complaints, for which the formula is designed. It would almost seem that the author of the modified formula is Mādhava himself, who, accordingly, omitted the reference to Átréya, and altered its name,101 The third, fourth, and fifth formulae occur, with the same names, in the Bīhataśiṣṭa, unmāda, and vītā-vyādi chapters of the Charaka Saṁhitā, (sthāna VI, chap. (16, vv. 32-40, chap. 14, vv. 53-4, chap. 28, vv. 144-52, pp. 624, 612, and 783). But here, though practically identical in substance, they appear in entirely different versions, nor are these versions attributed to Átréya. This circumstance is explained by the fact that those

100 Under this name (agni-grhitā) there occurs in Part III, vv. 25, 76, a plumbago-root formula for the preparation of a grhitā. It too is ascribed to Átréya, but its composition is quite different.

101 According to Dr. Corréard, the original formula, though with a few variants, occurs in the second chapter of an anonymous work, called Bīhata-vaidya-pradīpaka,
three chapters (14, 16, 28) belong to that complementary portion which was added to Charaka’s Compendium several centuries after its author’s death, at a time when probably the tradition of Ṭrēyā’s teaching no longer survived. Of the sixth formula unfortunately only the closing words survive. But the phrase ityāha bhagavān Ṭrēyāḥ, “thus spake the blessed Ṭrēyā,” which they comprise, appears to indicate, as do the similar phrases used with reference to Jivaka and Kāśyapa, that the mutilated formula was quoted in the ipseissima verba of Ṭrēyā.

The formulae attributed to the Āśvin pair are the following:—

1. Āśvin Mālātuṅga-guṭikā, vv. 759-77a.
2. Another Āśvin Mālātuṅga-guṭikā, vv. 80-84.
5. Āśvin-muśāna-ṛaṁga, vv. 216-22.
6. Āśvin-śeṣhara-ṛaṁga, vv. 223-25.
8. Āśvin-buṇḍu-ṛaṁga, vv. 251-5.
10. Āśvin-raktapitā-ṛaṁga, vv. 418-23.
13. Āśvinhīr Āśvagandhā-vasti, vv. 618-26a.
15. Āśvin-rāṣṭhaga, vv. 772b-81a.
17. Āśvinhīr-ḥaṁdrā-ṛaṁga, vv. 917-49.

The names of thirteen of these formulae (Nos. 1-8, 10, 13, 15-17), which occur in their colophons, assign them to the Āśvins. In the case of the remaining four (Nos. 9, 11, 12, 14) the assignment is made in a remark, which is embodied in the formula itself. A similar remark, confirming the assignment in the colophon, is embodied also in the text of the five formulae Nos. 5, 8, 10, 15, 16.

With regard to the authorship of these remarks, that in the Āśvin-rāṣṭhaga formula (No. 15) is particularly instructive. The last half-verse (v. 781b) implies that by the medical tradition the formula was ascribed to the ancient physician Viśvāmitra, apparently the reputed father of Suśruta (see Suśruta Sāṁhitā VI, 18, v. 1, and 66, v. 1/; pp. 706, 914). That inscription is contradicted, however, by the initial verse (v. 773b) and by the name in the colophon, which attribute the formula to the Āśvins. This discrepancy seems best accounted for by the explanation that the initial verse which has no essential connection with the medical prescription, as well as the colophon, are due to the author of the Nāṣanītaka. He would seem to have had reason to believe that the formula was really devised by the Āśvins. Accordingly he so named it in the colophon, and prefixed the initial verse, in order to explain that it was really the Āśvins who communicated the formula to Viśvāmitra.

The same conclusion is suggested by the Āśvin-raktapitā formula (No. 10). Here the actual medical prescription begins with verse 419, and is preceded, in v. 418, by a lengthy explanation that that prescription was taught to Indra by the Āśvins, although the attribution to the latter is actually embodied in a brief remark in the final verse 423. In the compilation
of Vangaṣēna (chap. VIII, vv. 93-9, pp. 226-7), where the formula, with its final attribution, is also quoted, the lengthy introductory verse 418 is omitted. And that this omission is not due to any accidental cause is shown by the fact that the formula, in the colophon, is called chandana-grītra. For as the medical prescription begins, in v. 419, with chandana, and as the rule is to name a formula by its initial drug (see note 29, on p. 82), it is apparent that the introductory verse 418 is not an essential part of the formula, and was not present in the source whence Vangaṣēna gathered the formula for his compilation; but that its addition is due to the author of the Nāvanitaka himself, and (in view of the final verse) is really a piece of supererogation.

The same may be the case with the attributive remarks in the other formula. Thus the two formulas, Nos. 11 and 12 (vv. 575 and 579), which are quoted by Madhava and Vangaṣēna (see notes 281 and 284 on pp. 134, 135) are cited by them without the attributive remark of the Nāvanitaka. Again the formula, No. 8, which consists of five verses, is found, in another version, identical in substance, but compressed into two verses, in Vangaṣēna's compilation (Chap. XXX, vv. 106-7). In the same, or a similar short version, according to Dr. Cordier (Recen. Découvertes, p. 21), the formula is ascribed to Kṛishmātraṇyā by Nāśhakara, in his Ratanaprabhā, and by Chandra in his Yogaratnamānuchchaya. From this it is clear that the formula occurred in different versions, in different treatises, by different authors, but that the author of the Nāvanitaka preferred the longer and more archaic version ascribed by tradition to the Aśvin pair.

The case of No. 14 is similar. This is a long formula of 22½ verses, describing a curiously complicated treatment with daily increasing and subsequently decreasing doses of a ments of long pepper. The whole course of treatment (see note 329 on p. 144) occupies a period of 100 plus 99 plus 21, or 220 days. It also involves the consumption, within that period, of not less than 10,000 aments of long pepper. By the side of this complicated formula, the Nāvanitaka has another, in verses 749-52, which is much more simple. It is modeled on the longer one, but it greatly reduces the length of the period, as well as the total of the consumed peppers. It also admits several options: while in every case the period is twenty days, the ratio of peppers may vary between 10, 6, 5, or 3, and consequently the total of peppers consumed is, 1,000 or 600, or 500, or 300. From the largest option, this shorter formula is, in verse 750, distinguished as the pippali-sahasra or "the one thousand pepper formula." It seems reasonable to conclude that it was the unwieldiness of the original formula, both with respect to the length of the period and the enormous total of the consumed peppers, which led to the simplification. As a matter of fact, even the simplified formula survives, at the present day, only in its mildest form, which prescribes the consumption of 300 peppers in a period of twenty days at the rate of three peppers a day (see note 343 on p. 147). While the longer formula is, in verse 736, expressly ascribed to the Aśvins, the author of the shorter is not mentioned. We know him, however, from the fact that it occurs in the Charaka-Saṃhitā (sect. VI, chap. 1, vv. 136-40, ante, No. 24, p. lix). As that saṃhitā is based on the tantra of Agnivesa, and the latter embodies the teachings of Ātreya, it follows that the simplified formula goes back to Ātreya. It also follows that the longer formula, on which Ātreya's simplification was modeled, and which certainly impressed one as more archaic, goes back to the mythic or semi-mythic, time antecedent to Ātreya. That explains its attribution
to the mythical Aśvin pair, as well as its gradual obsolescence. It is ignored already in Śauruṣa’s Compendium, the pippali-vardhamāna of which (sect. IV, chap. 3, clause 14, p. 406; see ibid., v. 194 on p. 770) is practically identical with the shorter version of Ātriya-Chitaraka. In fact the longer version does not appear to have survived in any medical work, except the Nārāyanitaka. The single indication of its former existence that I can recall, occurs in a formula in Vāgbhaṭa II’s Ashtāṅga Hridaya (sect. IV, chap. 12, vv. 39-41), which, in the case of abdominal complaints (udara), recommends, in addition to other remedies, either the pippali-vardhamāna, or else the pippali-sahasra. It is evident that the author of that formula knew both, the longer as well as the shorter, versions of the treatment with pepper, but who he was, and when he lived, we do not know. It was not Vāgbhaṭa II: he is a mere compiler, probably in the eighth or ninth century. Nor was it Vāgbhaṭa I, the author of the Ashtāṅga Saṅgraha, in the early seventh century. That work, though it is the usual source of the Ashtāṅga Hridaya, mentions (if one may trust the Bombay Edition, Vol. II, p. 47, l. 8) only the pippali-vardhamāna, by which name the shorter version had, long since, come to be understood.103

As regards the Haritaki Kalpa (No. 17), we have the interesting information of Dr. P. Cordier (see note 439 on p. 166; also his Récentes Découvertes, p. 29), that he possesses fragmentary manuscripts of two distinct works, both calling themselves Āśvinī Saṅhitā, and both containing versions of a Haritaki Kalpa. These versions are printed on pp. 1806-1807. Though they present many points of contact with the version in the Nārāyanitaka, they differ widely from it both in length and matter. And as they differ equally widely from each other, it is evident that neither of them can have been the source of the Nārāyanitaka version. On the contrary, they must have gradually grown up, on different lines, from the original, simple and archaic, version which has been preserved in the Nārāyanitaka. In fact, the two existing works, professing to be an Āśvinī Saṅhitā, seem to have every mark of being medieval apocryphal productions similar to the Ātriya or Hārita-Saṅhitā.

The existence of what thus appears to be the original form of the Haritaki Kalpa (also called Abhayā Kalpa, in verse 7), is one of the striking marks of the archaic character of the Nārāyanitaka. It has already been pointed out (p. lvi.) that the kalpas belong to the earliest period of the medical literature of India. It is interesting, therefore, to note that there are three other such kalpas, or monographs, incorporated in the Nārāyanitaka. For its seventh, twelfth, and thirteenth chapters are constituted respectively by the Yavānī Kalpa, on the preparation of gruels (vv. 785-813), the Sīlaśuṭa Kalpa, on bitumen (vv. 950-67), and the Chitraka Kalpa on plumago-root (vv. 968-76). The first, as suggested by the colophon to verse 804 (see Chap. IV, p. xli) may be the work of Bhāda. It may have stood in the Bhāda

103 In this connection it is interesting to observe that Aruṇadatta, the commentator of the Ashtāṅga Hridaya (about 1210 A.D.), appears to have no longer understood what the two versions were. For, commenting on the optional treatment recommended in his text, he explains that the pippali-vardhamāna should be taken as directed in the chapter on rasaśuṇa, but the pippali-sahasra he does not explain. On referring to the chapter on rasaśuṇa, we find the only pippali formula there given (A.H., sect. VI, ch. 39, vv. 988-1005) is the shorter version: and commenting on this Aruṇadatta says that it is the pippali-sahasra. So that he practically identifies the two versions, despite their clear differentiation in the formula of the Ashtāṅga Hridaya (IV., 12 vv. 39-41): evidently he was at a loss what to make of that differentiation.
Saṁhitā, and quoted thence anonymously, though in the incomplete Tanjir MS. copy, the only one now existing, it cannot be traced. The second is quoted from the Charaka Saṁhitā, (ante., No. 29, p. ix.). It, therefore, stood originally in the Agnīśastra, and is the work of Ástrīya. The third, the latter part of which, unfortunately, is missing, appears to be ascribed to Dhanvantari (vv. 968-9). To these may be added the Laśuna Kalpa, on garlic, which forms the early portion (vv. 1-430) of the treatise contained in Part I of the Bower Manuscript, and the authorship of which is vaguely ascribed (v. 42a) to the "ancient sages," while at the same time it professes itself to be delivered by the "sage-king of Kāśi" to Śrīrūta (vv. 9, 40, 42a).

Though, in the main, the Nāvasanātaka is professedly a compilation from various sources, it does contain a few formulae which give the impression of being contributions made by the author himself. Thus the formula in verse 641, merely advises how the preceding formula (vv. 638-40) may be usefully varied. The formulae in verses 576, 614, 783 have a similar object. It should be observed that none of these formulae can be traced elsewhere; and it is quite possible that some others of the short formulae of that kind, such as those in vv. 576, 603, are really the author's own compositions. Again in some other formulae we seem to be able to trace the author's hand in the alterations which he has introduced. To this order belong the two short formulae in vv. 575 and 579, which have already been referred to previously (p. lx). The second part of these formulae, as quoted elsewhere (by Madhava and Vangaseva), has been altered to admit their attribution to the Aśvins (ante, Nos. 11, 12 on p. lx). More or less lengthy remarks, inserted by the author with the same object have also been noticed already in the case of some of the wellknown longer formulae (ante, Nos. 10 and 15, p. lx). To the author, of course, belong also all the introductory remarks which are met with in various places of the Nāvasanātaka. To this order belong the remarks in verses 108 and 261, which introduce the second and third chapters, as well as the prose remarks preceding verses 916, 950, and 963, which introduce chapters XI, XII, and XIII; likewise the prose remark which introduces the formula in verse 784. Above all, there belongs to this order the long paragraph (vv. 1-10) which forms the introduction to the whole treatise.

The fact of the Nāvasanātaka containing quotations from the Charaka Saṁhitā is one of peculiar importance on account of its bearing on the question of the authorship of that Saṁhitā. That the Charaka Saṁhitā, in the condition in which we now possess it, is the work of two different authors is well known. Charaka is said by the Indian tradition to have left his saṁhitā unfinished. At all events, its Kalpa Sthāna and Siddhi Sthāna, as well as seventeen chapters of its Chikitsita Sthāna were added, some centuries later, by a Kashmirian physician, named Drīḍhabala. He states that fact himself in two places of the saṁhitā (sect. VI, vv. 273-5, and sect. VIII, vv. 77-9); but he omits to record the names of the seventeen chapters which he contributed. And the difficulty of their identification, which is thus created, is enhanced by the circumstance that we have two contradictory Indian traditions on the subject. One of them is represented by the Berhampore edition of Gangādhar (also the Calcutta edition of Deendayal Nath Sen and Upendra Nath Sen); the other by the Calcutta edition of Jīvānanda Vidyāsāgara. The former has the support of the oldest existing manuscript, the
Nepal Manuscript of the year 1183 A.D. (303 Nepal Era); the latter, that of the oldest commentator, Chakrapânidatta, who lived about the year 1060 A.D. With regard to six of the eleven chapters, which must have belonged to the original saṁhitā, both traditions agree. They differ only with regard to the three chapters on ariṣa, ātisāra, and visarpa, which Chakrapânidatta assigns to Charaka, while the chapters which the Nepal Manuscript assigns to him, are those on kṣhatakṣiṇa, śvayathu, and udara. Now the Nācanitaka contains quotations from the former, but none from the latter three chapters; and as its author lived many centuries earlier than Drīḍhabala, it is obvious that, to judge from this testimony, the tradition of the commentator is to be preferred to that of the Nepal Manuscript. For a detailed statement of the case, which does not strictly come within the scope of the present Introduction, reference may be made to two papers of mine on the Composition of the Charaka Saṁhitā in the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society for 1808, pp. 997 ff., and 1909, pp. 857 ff.

Note.—With regard to the loss of early Indian medical works, referred to on p. liv, I may now (Feb. 1914) add that among the manuscripts recovered by Sir Aurel Stein in the course of his second tour of exploration in Chinese Turkestan, 1906-8 (ante. p. iii), from the immured temple library in the Caves of the Thousand Buddhas near Tun Huang (see his Rains of Desert Cathay, Vol. II, pp. 28, 29, 171-194, 211-219), there were two incomplete but extensive pōthīs, which have since, upon examination, been found by me to be medical works. They are written in Khotanese, one of the two hitherto "unknown" languages; one written in upright, the other in cursive Gupta characters; but they are obviously translations from Sanskrit originals, apparently no longer surviving in India. One of these two incomplete pōthīs still comprises 65 folios, and professes to be the Śiddha-sūrya Saítrā, that is in Sanskrit Śiddha-sūra-Sāstra. It appears to treat of Pathology, in which the names of chapters on ariṣa, bhagandara, pāṇḍurāga, hikkā, ādāna, kāsa, mūtra-kṛchchhāra, udvortta, unmāda, apasnāra, vātavyādi, visarpa, krimi, nētravāga can be distinguished. The other pōthī which is written in cursive script, and of which 71 folios survive, appears to treat of Therapeutics; but its name is not known.

Both pōthīs are still awaiting a thorough examination and translation, but a somewhat more minute examination of a portion of the text of the cursive pōthī has disclosed the fact that it contains a number of formulae which are practically identical with corresponding ones in the Charaka and Bhējā Saṁhitās, while the majority of them can, for the present, not be traced elsewhere. It suggests itself as possible that the two pōthīs, between them, may represent the Nidāna and Chikitsita portions of a Saṁhitā, which is based on the same sources as the Charaka and Bhējā Saṁhitās, but of which the original Sanskrit text is no longer surviving in India.

Fragments of a third medical pōthī in Kucheian, the other hitherto "unknown" language of Kuche, or Kucha (ante, p. 1, footnote 2), has also been discovered by Professor Sylvain Lévi. This pōthī, too, includes formulae reminiscent of similar ones in the Charaka Saṁhitā; and it may possibly be a translation of the same original Sanskrit text.

Whether, and in what way, the text of these pōthīs may affect the question discussed in Chapter VI must wait till after the completion of the thorough examination and translation of them which is now in progress.
CHAPTER VII.

LANGUAGE AND COMPOSITION IN THE TREATISES
OF THE BOWER MANUSCRIPT.

The language in which the treatises of the Bower Manuscript are written, is a kind of ungrammatical Sanskrit, or what has sometimes been called “mixed Sanskrit,” i.e., a mixture of literary and popular Sanskrit. The popular element is far more conspicuous in the more popular treatises on divination and incantation in Parts IV-VII, than in the more scientific treatises on Medicine in Parts I-III.

The term “popular Sanskrit” is not strictly appropriate. “Sanskrit,” i.e., prepared or polished, was the name of the form of language (bhaṣā) which was elaborated, from about the seventh to the fourth centuries B.C., in the ancient Brahmanic grammar schools of India, out of the previously existing language of the sacred poetry (ekhandas) of the Veda. That language owned a great wealth of inflectional forms and syntactical usages, not very clearly demarcated, and used with great freedom. The object of the grammar schools was to elaborate out of this more or less “rank growth” a well-ordered (saṃskṛita) language by eliminating some forms and usages, and demarcating the remainder. The elaboration was a long continued process, which finally resulted, probably at some time in the fourth century B.C., in the production of Pāṇini’s celebrated standard grammar. In its intermediate condition, the language is illustrated in the priestly writings of the so-called Brāhmaṇa period. For its ultimate condition, the first witness appears in the Brahmanical treatises of the so-called Śūtra period; but the earliest, actually existing original record of that condition, known at present, is in the Brahmanic inscription, incised on a sacrificial post at Isāpur, near Mathurā, which is dated in the year 33 B.C. In consequence of its origin, the Sanskrit language tended to perpetuate the phonetic conditions of its Vedic parent, and thus came to bear an air of artificiality.

Outside the Brahmanic schools, the language of the people followed the usual course of linguistic evolution. While it preserved much of the Vedic inflectional forms and syntactical usages which had been discarded in the scholastic Sanskrit, it suffered, on the other hand, the usual process of phonetic deterioration. In was this natural (prākṛita) language, of spontaneous growth, in which the early literature was written of the two great religious movements, Buddhism and Jainism, which, in the sixth century B.C., and subsequently, agitated the people outside the Brahmanic schools. But after a time, the prestige of the latter produced its natural effect on the writers of the non-brahmanic communities. With the rise of the Mahāyāna School of Buddhists in Northern India, about the first century B.C., attempts began to be made by Buddhist writers to imitate their Brahmanic rivals in the use of the scholastic Sanskrit. Ultimately they fully succeeded in their endeavours; but at first their efforts were attended with but partial success, differing according to the amount of literary knowledge they possessed. It is this earlier period of literary endeavour, which, as will be shown in the sequel, is reflected in the several treatises of the Bower Manuscript.

---

103 See Professor Langman’s remarks in the Journal of the American Oriental Society vol. X, p. 326: “upon both, the field of the noun and that of the verb, the Veda shows a rank growth of forms which die out later ... The inflectional system of the nouns has become contracted, rigid, and uniform, but not, like that of the verb, essentially mutilated.”

104 That is, in the 245th year of the Kusana king Vasiṣṭha; see Dr. Ficut’s remarks in the Journal, Royal Asiatic Society, 1910, pp. 1315-7.
As already stated, the prakritic, or popular, element is much more in evidence in that portion of the Bower Manuscript, which contains the treatises on divination (in Parts IV and V) and on magic or incantation (in Parts VI and VII). In the more scientific portion, which contains the three medical treatises (Parts I-III), the examples of prakriticism are comparatively rare. In fact, with one or two exceptions, they occur only in Part II, which contains the longest of the three treatises.

The following is a list of the prakriticisms which occur in Parts I-III. There are five examples of the prakritic contraction of the elements aya and aya to ē and ō respectively. They are ēmēti (for ēmāyati) in II 42 28,105 500 51, 809 63; ēmēnti (for ēmāyantī), II 84 30; and dhōvitā (for dhāvāṣitvā), II 530 53. The normal forms ēmāyati and ēmāyantī, however, are more frequent, as may be seen from the Index (p. 327). The nominative plural chaturāḥ occurs once, in I 108 8; but the normal form chātvāraḥ occurs in II 846 65 and 1063 74. In udāvi-piṇyāka, II 800 62, the final t of udāvit is dropped. In ambilavētasa, II 78 30, and kriyērā, II 420 47.580 54.805 63 we have two examples of diacresis of a conjunct; but the normal forms ambilavētasa and kriyērā occur with equal frequency (see Index). Examples of the insertion of an euphonic m we have in dēha-mātmanah (for dēhāmātmanah), II 239 38; āmura-m-aunihika (for āmura-aunihika), II 798 62; opesum-m-iyān (for opesum-iyān), II 886 67; rātri-m-ananda, II 887 67, and nakta-m-ananda, II 890 67, but we find also the normal forms rātriyanah, I 181 35 and naktañdhā, I 103 8. Similarly, there is an euphonic r in tu-r-upōvakā (for tiptōvakā), II 801 63. In all these cases, however, the prakritic forms are required by the metre of the verse in which they occur. Once we have sōmyyān (for saumyān), in II 718 58. Once we have also the nominative singular masculine in ō, in bhāgō (for bhāgai) purāṇatilasa, II 517 52, and the accusative plural masculine in āu, in tānu (for tānu) kṛitā, II 872 66. Examples of prakritic vocalic sandhi are chaivañad (for chaivaitad), II 818 64; sākshmēlā (for sākshsmilā, from sākshma-ēlā), II 61, 63, 64, 65 col, 29, et passim,106 and regularly in compounds with ōdana, as sūpōdana (for sūpāudana) II 328 43, āmishōdana (for āmishāudana), II 441 48, rasōdana (for rasaudana), II 490, 51, 724 58, paṣyōdana (for pasyudana), II 724 58 (but pasyā udana in II, 374 45 722 58). Other, more doubtful, examples are parimukshayēt (for parimokshayēt), II 571 54, upōvakā (for upōdakā), II 801 63, and rajātā (for rajātalē), II 951 70, where the reading is doubtful or corrupt. In bhagandālāṇā (for bhagandaranā) we have the, also occasionally in Sanskrit observable, changes of r to l, and of masculine to feminine. In māgadhyē kudava (for māgadhyēkūdava), II 60 29; kaliṅga (for kaliṅgākā) paṭilāsya, II 496 51; ṳpōkāh (for ṳpōkahā) II, 592 55, and prastha (for prastha) syāt, II 826 64,107 the visarga is dropped; but examples of similar omissions occur in the Vedas (M. Ved. Gr., § 2, 3, p. 71).

In Parts IV-VII the cases of prakriticism are far more common. Thus of the above mentioned contraction of aya and aya to ē and ō respectively we have the examples vichintē (vichintiayasi), V 49 207, vichintē, V 3, 9 204 18 206 47 247; and bhōntu (for bhavantu), VI 16 225, ākṛṣṭa (for avakṛṣṭa), VI 1 223, orōka (for avarōka), VI 2 223, ostāraka (for avostāraka) VI 6 223. It is noticeable, however, that while the contraction occurs regularly with the compound root vichint-, it is as regularly neglected with the simple root chint; thus we have chintayanā, IV 7 193, 23, 2428, 36 194. An example of the opposite case of elision of y occurs in saṁbhāvyaśaya (for saṁbhāvaśya), V 33 206. Examples of the

105 The numbers in antique type refer to the pages of the edition; those in arabic type, to verses.
106 The normal form sūkṣmāilā appears to occur once in II 115 32, but the reading is doubtful.
107 But correct, in II 396 46 775 61.
well-known prākritic diacresis of a conjunct with an antecedent r are dārīṣaya (for dārīṣaya), V 1 203, pradārśīṣita (for pradārśīṣita), V 54 207, varāṣē (for varāṣē), V 60 207, and śīrśhōrtti (for śīrśhōrtti), VI 4 223; but the normal form varṣha also occurs in V 4 204, 17 205, 40 206. Examples of the change of r to u we have in avī (for api), IV 11 193, upavadayatē (for upavadayatē), V 11 204, 57 207. Once we have pi (for api) after an anusvāra, in suvṛūt pi, VI 3 224; but the normal api also occurs in IV 3 192, V 2 204. Other miscellaneous prākriticisms are chīchēka (for chītya), VI 1 223; śīṅghasya (for śīṅghasya), IV 1 192; dakkha (for duṣkha), V 12 204, 21 205; sattakahuto (for saptakrūtah), VII 6 236; also dveśiyaka (for dvaițiyaka), VI 2 223, and śēlāya (for śailāya), VI 4 223. More to the category of prākriticisms in sandhi belong the following examples: apiṭu (for apiṭatū) in VI 2 203, and upaśhyati (for spāśhyati), IV 20 193. A final consonant is almost always elided; thus, kāraṇa (for kāraṇa), IV 3 192 6, 20 193 40, 43 195; tasmā (for tasmāt), IV 16 193; āchārē (for āchārēt), VI 11 225; kāraṇa (for kāraṇa), V 48 207; avācō (for avāchot), VI, 1b 222; so also chīrē, V 38 206; and kūchē, IV 35 194, 52 195; V 27 205 36 206; but the normal chīrē occurs twice in IV 29 194 44 195, and the normal kūchē once in IV 20 193. In the nominative and accusative singular neuter of pronouns, the elision of t or d, alternates with the anusvāra. Thus we have tu in V 28 205; ēta, V 25 205 37 206 47 207; ya, V 1 203 3 204; but also the equally prākritic forms tan, V 24, 25 205; ēta, V 4, 7, 14 204 28, 31 205 43 206 52 207, and yau, V 47, 60 207. On the other hand, the normal forms tad, ētad, yad occur before vowels, e.g., tad-avāpya, IV 13 193; ēta-avācha, VI 1 222, yad-ipcā, IV 1 192; but exceptionally also before consonants, tad-yathā and yathātā, V 3 203. Occasionally the anusvāra is added to the end of a word, as in kāraya (for kāraya), V 6 204, dēciē (for dēciē), V 58 207; or it may take the place of the final visarga, as in tata (for tataḥ), IV 3 192. But more often such a visarga is dropped altogether; as in lāḥa (for lāḥāḥ), IV 48 195, vṛttā, V 36 206, avādā, VI 5 222; priti (for pritiḥ), V 21 205; prāhu (for prāhuḥ), V 2 203, bhikṣa, VI 2 222; sumitrai (for sumitrai), IV 30 194, dāvatāi choiāi nairityikāi, V 17 205; hētō (for hētōḥ), V 27 205. Or it combines to ṝ, as in itō (for itāḥ) shāśīha, V 13 204. Or, its omission may give rise to double sandhi, as in tatūtāmāḥ (for tata-uttamaḥ from tata-uttamaḥ), IV 10 193. Occasionally some consonant is inserted to avoid a hiatus, or a vocalic sandhi. Thus (a) n in nai-n-rītikāi (for nair-rītikāi), V 17 205, maitri-n-airavāṇēsau (for maitriy-airavāṇēśu), VI 1 224; (b) m in pari-m-apanaya (for para-papanaya), VI 4 223; Vāṣūkinā-m-api (for Vāṣūkināpi), VI 2 224; for other examples, see page lxii (c) r in jāni-r-upāravān (for jany-upāravān), IV 3 192; for another example, see above, p. lxvi; (d) s in gāmān-s-tathā, V 21 205, jānē-s-tathā, V 50 207; but in these two cases the reading is uncertain.

Examples of prākriticism in inflexion are the following: (1) With nouns: in the nominative singular masculine, a final a may be dropped at the end of a verse, as in mahā (for mahān), V 36 206, or before a consonant, as in bhagāvā (for bhāgāvān) chhēhrēvāntāyā, VI 1 222. But the normal form also occurs, as in bhāgāvān śrāvāṇārakāḥ, VI 6 224; and before vowels it is used always, as in mahān arthāḥ, IV 10, 11 193, bhagāvān āyūrannantaḥ, VI 1 222. Similarly curtailing forms, however, occur also in the Vedas, see M. Ved. Gr., § 315, p. 193. In the case of dhanavā-īcā, as indicated by the interpolated t, the omission of the anusvāra is probably a scribal error, and the reading should be dhanavān. In the accusative plural masculine, ána and úrā replace anā and únā, respectively, before consonants, as in kāmaḥ

108 In padāla-ta (for padāla-ta), V 5 204, the anusvāra is a mere clerical error.
109 In sūddhi-rāhīkātu, VI 5 222, the reading is doubtful.
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(for kāmā) préṣyaśā, IV 33 194; mitrān (for mitrāṇa) deśhāsi, IV 52 195; pājāyaśā, viṛdhaṅ (for viṛdhaṅ) deśantāḥ, V 10 204; viśēṣyāsī rīpūn sarvānā (for rīpūn sarvānā) pratyarthi, IV 47 195. But the normal form occurs before palatais, as in svajātāṁ iś-chas... manyasi, V 10 204, and before vowels, as in bhāgavān avai, IV 11 193. Other examples are: nominative singular masculine dviśāgō (for dviśāh kūṭaḥ), IV 16 193, kuladevō (for kuladevu) cha, V 6 204; singular neuter, janmaṁ (for janma), IV 33 194; instrumental plural, dviśāghā (for dviśākhabhā), VI 12 224; and the vowel lengthenings in rīshīru (for rīshīru), IV 4 192, and vādīnu (for vādīnu), IV 2 192.—(2) With pronouns: the nominative or accusative singular neuter tr or taḥ (for tad), etc., have already been referred to above, p. lxvii, of the stem ।, there occur the nominative singular feminine imā (for igam), V 4 203, and the genitive singular masculine imasya (for asya), IV 3 192. The latter occurs once in the Vedas; see M. Ved. Gr., p. 302, footnote 7; and the normal form asya also occurs in VII 6 237. Other examples are the instrumental plural masculine tēhi (for taḥ), VI 12, 224, and once the genitive singular tuva, V 13 204, by the side of the usual normal tava, IV 6 193 V 1, 2 204, et passim (see Index).—(3) With numerals: we have the locative singular masculine ekasmi (for ēkasmin), VI 1 222, and the locative plural chaturasa (for chaturasu), VII 6 237.—(4) With verbs: the second person singular present, ārābhastē (for ārābhastē), IV 55 196, and kurvase (for karosāi), IV 22 194; the second singular imperative karōhi (for kur), VI 2 222/3 223; pājagāhi (for pājaya), V 33 206, viṃchitēā (for viṃchitāya), V 3, 9 204, 18 205 47 207, or viṃchintya, V 18 205; the third singular aorist jani (for ajani), IV 3 192. In future forms, the element ।, when it is the last in a treble conjunct, is frequently omitted; thus, prāpsaśi, IV 2 192, 11 193, or prāpsasi, IV 11 193; but the normal forms are more usual, prāṣyaśi, IV 21 193, 37 194, prāṣyaśa, IV 5 193, 28, 33 37 194 1 2195, 54 196. Similarly we have also yakshasē (for yakṣayasē), IV 58 196, vipramōkhasi (for vipramōḥkasya), IV 17 193. In the past participle passive of the causal we find kārāvita (for kārita), V 45 206. Examples of the exchange of "voices" are: (a) paraśaipada, for ātmane pada in ēkāsī (for ēkāsā), V 41 206, kliyasi (for kliyase), V 4 204, pratipadārē (for pratipadāyē), VI 1 222, pratikeshā (for pratikeshava), IV 13 193, passive vihāyasi (for vihāyase), V 47 207; and (b) ātma, for parasmi, in prichėhās, IV 6 193 (but normal prichēhās, IV 39 195), and pājadē (for pājaya), V 10 204.

Examples of prakriticism or rather semi-prakriticism, in stem formation, are mātāpiṭarā, V 10 204, apparently meant as two separate accusatives singular for the normal dual mātāpiṭaraḥ; bhrāti-samagama (for bhrāty-samagama), V 22 205; yām-mitra (for yaōm-mitra), VI 6 225 VII 3 237; puḷāmba (for puḷāṁba), IV 51 195; putrāyā (a pleonasm for putrāya or putrala), IV 13 193; chaturthā, IV 22, 26 194 (for the normal feminine chaturthā, IV 32 194).

From the prakrit speech we must distinguish the "popular Sanskrit," properly so called; that is to say, the Sanskrit of the Brahmanic schools as it was spoken and written by the literate, or semi-literate among the people outside those schools, especially in the non-Brahmanic portion of it. This popular Sanskrit permitted to itself occasional lapses from the strict rules of the scholastic correct Sanskrit, and occasional intrusions of the usages of the generally prevailing Prakrit speech. It is the language in which the medical treatises, contained in Parts I—III of the Bower Manuscript, are written. Its peculiarities are assembled in the following classified list:

1.—Phonology.

(1) Substitution of vowels: ri for ri, in triṣṭ, I 61 5; triṣṭā, II 88 31 144 33 252 39; and triphalā, II 605 56; but the normal forms triṣṭ, triṣṭā, and triphalā occur quite
as frequently (see Index). Similar examples in Part IV-VII are trika, V 29 205 (but normal trika in II 406 46), niṣṭā (for niṣītā), VI 11 224; and even triṣi (for triṣi), V 40 206.

On the other hand, we find ri for rī, in ṝiṣa (always for normal ēṭa), I 73 75 6, II 612 56, etc. (see Index).

(2) Substitution of consonants: (a) n for ṇ, in garbhēna, II 535 53, jatharāṇi, II 940 69, jārayāṇām, II 169 35, pēṣayaṇī, II 45 28, pranāṣyaṇe, III 64 184,10 prayāgēṇa, II 256 39, 275 40, brāhmaṇa, II 643 58, mūṣikāṇāṃ, II 239 38. On the other hand, ṇ for n, in kushūṇī, II 53 29 86 31 249 39, but normal kusṭhāṇi, in II 141 33 and III 49 183;—(b) n for ṑi, in ariṇāi, (for arāṇi), II 185 36; and similarly ṇ for ṇi, in viṇāti, II 232 38, vṛīhaṇa, II 176 35, 752 60, saṁhāraṇa, II 186 36.—(c) b for v, when second or third in a conjunct, as once in pūrva (for pūrva), II 200 36, and yathoktaṃbā (for yathokta vā), II 583 55.

Otherwise always regularly rūv; see the Index, s., pūrva, mūrva, saṁeva, etc.—(d) s for ś, in saṁada (for śāma), III 56 184, and srośī (for śrośī), II 1076 74, both examples being doubtful. On the other hand, we find sa for s, in saḍyakṣaṇa (for sadyakṣaṇa), II 576, 579 54.

(3) Prefixation of a vowel: a in alatā (for latā), I 94 7, and amrīṇāla (for mrīṇāla), II 346 43.

These are the only two cases of such prefixation; the two words, which are of frequent occurrence, are, at all other times, spelled normally latā and mrīṇāla.

(4) Augmentation of a conjunct: b is invariably inserted in the conjunct ml; thus we have ambla (for aṃbla), I 121, 122 9 II 14 12 726 59, amblaivāsa, II 64, 66 29 75, 80 30 219 37, amblaivāsak, II 106 31, āmbla, I 26 3 II 93 31 302 41 441 48 577 64, āmblika, II 79 30. Occasionally, m is turned into anuvāra, as in aṃbla, II 790 62, aṃblaivāsa, I 62 5 II 14 26 29 27, āmbla, II 15 2.

(5) Reduction of a conjunct: for the sake of the metre (ūkṣa) nn is reduced to n in samāpanāḥ (for samāpannāḥ), in II 498 51. This is the single example of such a change.

(6) Dissolution of a conjunct: the only two examples ambilavāsa (for ambilavāsa) and hirivēra (for hirivēra) have already been quoted as prakritis; see ante., p. lxvi.

(7) Shortening of a syllable, always for the sake of the metre: apasmāriṣa (for apasmāriṣa), II 378 45; gūḍhāmaḥ (for gūḍhāmaḥ), II 405 46; manuṭkarpaṇi (for manuṭkarpaṇi), I 52 5; mālaḥbayaḥ (for mālaḥbayaḥ), II 799 62; mṛittika (mṛittika), II 1063 74; varṣahabḥāḥ (for varṣahabḥāḥ), II 345 43; śantu (for šantu), II 40 28; samupkramet (for samupkramet), II 1067 74; hitasce (hitasce) II 726 58. Also ṅhāṭi and nigrīṇati, see pp. lxii under Verbal Inflection.

(8) Lengthening of a syllable, always for the sake of the metre: aṣṭika (for aṣṭika), II 798 62; often in compounds, as ārū (for āru) with da음을, II 388 45, or with skhābha, II 316 42 334 43; 349, 357 44; rīt (for rītu) with sthitam, III 21 182; satāpupṣpānum (for satāpupṣpānum), II 346 43; and in genitives plural like pitiṇāṇi (for pitiṇāṇu) etc., see under Nominal Inflection, p. lxvi.

(9) Rare letters or spellings: (a) the upadhanayya occurs in chaturā, pippalyaḥ, II 183 36, and atah paruḥ, II 41 183. On the other hand, the jihāmaṭi is found only in the second portion of the Bower Manuscript, in duḥkhāṃ, V 3 203 and kākāḥ, VI 1 223.—(b) The long vowel rī occurs three times, in niṇāṃ, II 108 32 636 57, and kriṣchhrāṇi (for kriṣchhrāṇi), II 644 58.—(c) The guttural nasal ṇ, occurs once, in samyāṁ-namayēta, II 916 68.—(d) Assimilated śi occurs in manāśiḍ, III 6 181; only once; otherwise always manāśiḍ, I 97 7 II 848, 880 65 III 55 184, et passim (see Index).

See M. Veda. Gr., § 786, p. 71.

10 In Sanskrit (Pāṇini VIII 436) ṇ occurs only when it is changed to sh, as in pranāṣṭas, pranāṣṭa.
II.—Euphonic Combination (Sāndhi).

(1) Hiatus occurs exceptionally, at a caesura or at the end of a paśa; thus, gadgadā ārū, II 349 44 (at the caesura in an āryā verse); yavāgā udāvī, II 800 62 (at the end of the first paśa of an Indrācāryā); vā āsahāgā, II 974 71 and nāma Atrīyā, III 36 183 (at the end of the third paśa of a ślokā); once otherwise, in nihaatā arāhā, III 7 181 (between the sixth and seventh feet of an āryā). This conforms to Vedic usage; see M Ved. Gr. §§ 67, 71 pp. 61, 65.

(2) Double sāndhi is found occasionally: (a) between words, in gudikātha (for gudikā atha from gudikā atha), II 78 30; tataddharēt (for tāta uddharēt from tata uddharēt), II 369 44; mahātmanēti (for mahātmanīti from mahātmanēti), II 132 33; (b) within compounds, in ārdghātēsā (for urū-urdghātēshu from uras-urdghātēshu), II 1099 75. An intervening final consonant may even be dropped; thus, m in aivibhāyānumatō (for aivibhya-anumatō, from aivibhyām-anumata), II 425 47; and r in aśeṁnūrnamataṁ (for aśeṁnūr-anumatā, normal for aśeṁnūr-anumataṁ), II 253 39. Both are met with in Vedic usage, see M, Ved. Gr. § 3 a, b, p. 64.

(3) Doubling of consonants: k, in the ligature kr, is doubled when it begins a word in a sentence, cha kkrīmī, II 1107 76, kantī kkrīmī, II 79 62; tu kkrāmā, II 767 60; mālā kkrīyā, I 51 5; jverē kkrīyā, II 617 56; or (b) in a compound, ādi-kkrīyā, I 18 9; gala-kkrīḍ, I 23 3; pailya-kkrīmī, II 857 65; yathā-kkramā, II 735 59; rasa-kkrīyā, II 885 67; ātā-kkrātā, II 35 28; sa-kkrīmī, II 203 37. There are, however, a few exceptions, graha-kṛmī, I 141 4; yathā-kkramā, II 963 71; rasa-kkrīyā, II 832 65. After a consonant the doubling does not take place, chēt kramā, II 490 51; nor after the anusvara, aṇi kkrīmī, II 52 29; kāmalā kkrīmī, II 142 33; mālā krośchādana, II 292 41; nor after the visarga, tata kramena, II 726 58, except once in vīvādāb kkrīyā, II 1024 72. In the middle of a word k is doubled invariably, as in chakṛa, takṛa, takṛa, etc.; see the Index. See M, Ved., § 30 p. 21. W. Skr. Gr. § 229, p. 72.

(4) Elision of ā after e or o. Thus in jalādhakē *tmauguptyāḥ (for jalaḍhakē ātmaguptyāḥ), II 825 64; and kudavō *maḷakā-ṛasāt (for kudava ūmaḷakā-ṛasāt), II 252 39; in both cases to suit the metre.

III.—Nominal Inflection.

(1) Nominal singular feminine in iḥ for i, only once in tanaṃyāḥ (for tanaṃyā), I 19 2; in all other cases normally i as in nāri, haritaki, etc. (see Index); also in Vedic, see W. Skr. Gr., § 356, p. 115. On the other hand, in u for uh, nearly always, in yavāgū, as in yavāgīya (for yavāgīya), II 787 62; altogether eleven times (see Index), but twice yavāgāḥ, as in yavāgūr-yamaka, II 800 62, and yavāgūr-ṛlagha, II 1030 72; also normal in varahā-bhūḥ, II 343 45.

(2) Accusative singular masculine, in im for inam, only twice, to suit the metre (ślokā) in arōchākīm (for arōchākīm), II 26 27; and pratyarthām (for pratyarthām), IV 32 194. Otherwise normal, e. g., jālinam, II 26 27.—Again, singular feminine in yam for im, in vartyam (for vartiṃ), II 887 67; the reading vartyam-hāsaḥ is blundered for vartyam-aśhāsā;—Again, plural feminine, in yas for is, as in aśūmatyā (for aśūmatī), II 301 41; guruva (for gurī), II 232 38; parī (for parī), II 188 36; pippalyā (for pippaliḥ), II 134 33 188 36 314 42 386 45 505 51 745 59 930 69 1055 73 haritakyā (for haritakiḥ), II 245 39 484 50; altogether thirteen times, but the normal ending is occurs twice, gajapippaliḥ,
II 314 42 and hariyakih, II 226 38. In the Vedas is is nowhere met with, see W. Skr. Gr., § 359, 368, pp. 316, 318, and M. Ved. Gr. § 378, p. 273.—Also, accusative ōpās (for apas), II 804 63; as often in Vedic, see W. Skr. Gr., § 393, p. 133.

(3) Instrumental singular neuter, once dadhīnā (for dadhīnā), II 428 47, to suit the metre (śoka); otherwise always normal dadhīnā, II 149, 150 34 785, 801 62 853 65 1053 73. Also, feminine, rānāyā and balayā (for rānāyā and balayā), II 177 35, shown to be instrumentals by the accompanying undoubted instrumentals mūrē and madhukēnā; otherwise they might be taken to be genitive substitutes. They may, but need not, be due to the metre (śoka); for we have an undoubted example in prose in vidyārāyā, VI 2 222 and (with the normal qualifying anagā, VII 6 237; but normal vidyārāyā, VII 3 237. In all other cases, the instrumental is normal; e.g., salkkaraṇā I 81 6 107 8 II 504 51 1037 75, echaṇā, II 80 30, etc. (see Index).

(4) Genitive singular feminine, aūganayā (for aūganayā), I 84 7; and sūkṣmālayā (for sūkṣmālayā), II 115 32; or also, gudikāya (for gudikāya), II 1035 72, and madhurasīya (for madhurasīya), II 67 29. In all other cases, normal, e.g., sūkṣmālayā, II 61 29; gudikāya, II 1022 72; chādāyā, II 856 65111. Again, plural masculine, gṛḍhāsāmā (for gṛḍhāsāmā), II 377 45; pittinām (for pittinām), II 164 34 418, 423 49; pramēhānām (for premēhānām), II 230, 243 38 971 71, rōgīnām (for rōgīnām), II 254 39. In all other cases, normal, e.g., apasmārāṇām, II 378 45, udārānām, II 971 71, kāśiṇām, II 164 34, kāḥiṇām, I 89 7, II 291 41, dēhānām, III 33 183 prāṇānām, I 46 5, mēkānām, II 606 56, sārāṇām, II 244 38, śākānām, II 940 69, etc., the proportion of normal to normal cases being 8:14. Similarly, once, parvānām (for parvānām), II 335 43. Also, plur., masc., only once, vaṇānām (for vaṇānām) II 774 61; elsewhere normal, as narānām, I 92 7 II 37 28, etc. All the preceding abnormalities occur in verse composition, and seem to be due to the exigencies of the metre; but there is one example in prose, sarvavādinām (for vādinām), IV 3 192.

(5) Locative singular neuter: once the syncopated form nāmni, II 918 69, and optionally ahī, I 29 2 II 908 68, by the side of ahī, I 63 5 II 723 58 784 61; but elsewhere the full form, as mārdhāni, I 11 2 II 79 35, karmanī, II 962 71, etc.

IV.—VERBAL INFLECTION.

In the main the abnormalities in verbal inflection refer to changes with respect to "class" and "voice." Most of them have the support of Vedic and Epic usage.

(1) Change of "class": Thus I. class for II., rōḍatī (for rōḍitī), II 1041 73, but normal II. class, rūḍyat, I 99 8; both classes also in Vedic and Epic112. Again, VI., class for II., parasā, līhēt (for līhayēt), II 475 50 590, 594, 596 55 608 56 1081, 1088 75, or åtm, līhēta (for līhitā), III 21 182; but almost equally frequent (7:8) is the normal līhayēt, I 128 9 II 21 27 433, 439, 446 48 450 49 779 61, and the VI., class is also epic. Similarly VI., class for II., dvāhāsi (for deśāhī), IV 52 195; also epic. Again, VI., class for VIIth, pīshēt (for pīshhayēt), II 850 65 896 67; in this case, as well as in the compound prapīshēt, there is the abnormal lengthening of the root vowel, which, however, is restricted to the tenses; for the participles are pīshētā, II 41 28, etc., or pīshahā, II 887 67 and prapīshayēt, II 82 30, pīshē, II 54 4 II 430 48, etc. (see Index). The same lengthening occurs when the root is inflected normally in the Xth class or causal, pīshayēt, II 404 46 550 53 871 66 889 67, and prapīshayēt, II 97 31 211 37 577 54. The lengthened root vowel occurs once also in the

111 It would seem that the abnormal forms occur only when the normal visarga drops off by reason of sandhi.
112 In the Rigveda the II. class does not occur; see M. Ved. Gr., § 450fr. footnote 8, p. 395.
Athravaveda, apishan (see M. Ved. Gr., § 436, footnote 2, p. 330).—Again, VI, class for IXth, pradhati, II 828 64; once, to suit the metre, (sloka), but usually (3: 1) normal, pradniyat, II 778 61 824 64 III 59 184. So also, nigrishati (for nigrishati), II 342 43 1083 75, in both instances to suit the metre (sloka); for analogous cases in the Vedas, see M. Ved. Gr., § 475a p. 349.—Again, VI, class for VIIth, participle present, prayuvamana, I 54 5, an anomalous form for prayuyama, which would not have suited the metre (aryya); only once; elsewhere normal, prayuyama, II 95 31 312 42 783 61 (for another anomaly, prayuyita see below 2b).

(2) Change of "voice;" (a) parasmaipada for atmanepada; adhati, II 147 34, an anomalous confusion of the two forms adhati (atm.) and adadhati (par.), to suit the metre (aryya) which requires a short syllable. Again, bhoshati (for bhoshat), II 169 76, required by the metre (sloka); but normal bhasha, II 969 71; the parasam, is epic.—Again, labhati (for labhat), II 727 59, and labheta (for labheta), II 363 44, in both instances due to the metre (sloka), elsewhere normal (4: 2), labhati, II 513 52, and labheta, II, 200 36, etc. (see Index); in Parts IV and V, occasionally irrespective of metre, lapya, IV 9 193, and labhisyati, V 12 204; examples also in epic. Again, vardhati, I 60 5, once, irrespective of metre; elsewhere normal vardhati, I 46 5 II 757 60, and vardhante, II 618 66; but parasam, also vedic and epic.—Again, prayuyati (for prayuyita), II 865 66; a quite anomalous form, apparently suggested by the normal atmanepada form prayuyita, which occurs in I 36 4 52 5 II 198 36 751 60; the normal parasmaipada form prayuyitya occurs in II 269 40.—Again, passive, lakshyanti (for lakshyanti), II 104 73, to suit the metre (sloka).

(b) Atmanepada for parasmaipada; gachchheta (for gachchheta), II 830 64 840, 841 65; only in the optative, and to suit the metre (sloka); elsewhere normal, gachchhanti, II 827, 828, 833 64; atmanepada also epic.—Again, chitkhati (for chitkhati), II 949 70; only once, to suit the metre (upendra-varjat); elsewhere normal, II 273 40 309 49 288 69; but atmanepada also epic.—Again, jive, II 51 28; only once; elsewhere normal, jive, I 42 4 50 5 II 744 59 932 69; atmanepada also epic.—Again, picat (for picati), II 248, 253, 39 and piceta (for picet), II 82 30 327 42 593 55 845 65 1116 76, to suit the metre, but as a rule (55: 5) normal; e.g., piceta, I 25, 26, 27, 3 II 24 27 II 17 182, etc. (see Index), prayiveta, I 20 2 21, 23 3; atmanepada also vedic and epic.—Again, samayati (for samayati), II 274 40, due to the metre (sloka).

(c) Conjunctive participles: grihya, II 401 48 525 52 646 58 IV 12 193; always, for the normal grihyata, which never occurs; also vedic, but apparently only in composition with nouns, as karna-grihya, see M. Ved. Gr., § 591 a, p. 413.—Again, pixhya, II 887 67; only once; elsewhere normal, pixhyata, II 41 28, etc. (see Index); also epic.—Again, sravya (for sravita), II 371 44.—Again, samannayita, II 1114 76; but normal, samanya, II 214 37; similarly once in vedic, pratyopayita, M. Ved. Gr., § 590b, p. 412.

V.—Stem Formation.

(1) Stems ending in as, or is, or us may have alternative endings in a, or i, or u, as a rule with change of gender from neuter to masculine. Thus (a) with as neuter and a masculine; aris, accusative plural, arisasi, II 52 29 31 7 181, etc., twelve times (see Index); and ari, accusative plural, arisan, II 107 31, only once; similarly in composition, arias (ariot), II 136 33, etc., eleven times (see Index), and aria, II 644 58, only once.—Again, tamar, accusative singular, tamra (tam), II 84 30 941 69; and tamra, only in compounds, tamara-ras, II 479 50, tamopasrayita, II 424 47.—Again, payas, accusative plural, payasai, II 599 55, etc. (numerously, see Index), or in composition, payas (paya), I 59 6 II 814 63 III 68 184, anomalously payasodana, II 374 45 722 58; and paya, only in the compound
(b) With is neuter, and i masculine: *iśchis (iśchir, for Sanskrit ṭḥchis), only in composition, I 20 2 II 105 31 753 60; and *iṣchi (only adjectival), II 269 40, etc. (see Index).

(c) With us neuter and u masculine: *chakshus (chakshur), nominative singular, chakshur, II 309 42; and chakshus, though anomalously neuter, nominative singular, V 1 203.

(2) Miscellaneous new stems: kantāra (for hantri), nominative singular neuter, kantāram, II 365 44; if the form be taken as a normal, it would be the accusative singular masculine of hantri with an anomalous change of case as well as of gender,—Again, feminine ghnā (for ghānī), in mukha-ṛgā-ghnā, I 42 28; only once; elsewhere normal ghnī, as in kshata-ghnī, II 801 63. Similarly, chaturthā, IV 22, 26 194; but normal chaturthī, IV 32 194.—Again, gupta, VI 2 222, but normal giptī, VI 6 237.—Again, cardinals in the place of ordinals, as chatur, ashta, daśa, for chaturtha, ashta-ma, daśama, regularly in composition with bhāga, as in chatur-bhāga, fourth part, I 105 8, ashta-bhāga, eighth part, II 153 34, and with bhāgāvatiṣṭha, etc., I 126 9 II 178 35 etc. (see Index).

VI.—GENDER.

(1) Exchange of masculine and neuter. (a) Neuter for normal masculine: nominative singular, adhyāyām, I 4 26; only once; elsewhere normal, adhyāyaḥ, I 107 32 260 39, and plural, adhyāyaḥ, I 9 26.—Again, accusative dual, karavāj, II 345 43, but normal karakjian, II 1100 75.—Again, nom. acc., kalpan, I 32 42; only once; elsewhere normal, acc. plur., kalpan, I 30 3, nom. dual, kalpav, I 29 3 (see Index).—Again, nom. plur. neuter grihāni (for mase. grihāḥ), II 1117 76.—Again, acc. dual neuter, grāhī (for masculine graham), II 332 43.—Again, nom. sing., prayogam, II 762 60; only once; elsewhere normal, nom. sing., prayogal, II 86 31 750, 751, 60, etc. (see Index).—Again, nom. plur. pravādaṇi, II 1106 76, only once; elsewhere normal, nom. plur. pravālap, II 1106 76, acc. plur. pravādaṇa, II 23 27; 1086 75.—Again, acc. sing. prastam (etad), II 916 68; only once; elsewhere normal; nom. sing., prasthā, II 109 32, nom. plur., prasthāḥ, II 39 45, nom. dual, prasthau, II 777 61, etc. (see Index).—Again, acc. plur. bhagandarāṇi (for bhagandarāṇi), III 9 181; once also feminine, see below.—Again, nom. plur., rasāsī, II 814 63; only once; elsewhere normal, rasāḥ, II 173 35 601 56, etc. (see Index).—Again, nom. sing., vidākām, II 861 66; only once; but twice normal, vidālakāh, I 109, 111 8. Also in Part V, nom. sing., gandham (for gandhah), V 2 203, and chakshu (for chakshuh), V 1 203.

(b) Masculine for normal neuter; acc. plur., amalakān, II 226 38 291 41; only twice; elsewhere normal, nom. sing., amalakaṃ, II 223 37, nom. plur., amalakāni, II 129 33, etc. (see Index).—Again, nom. sing., áchāryaḥ, I 83 6; only once; elsewhere normal, áchāryaṇaṃ, I 70, 73 8 II 367, 870 66, etc. (see Index).—Again, acc. plur., aukhadhan, II 192 36; only once; elsewhere normal, aukhadhāni, II 369 44 621 57.—Again, acc. plur., kushthān, II 238
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38 493 51 942 70; but usually normal, kushiṭhāni, II 53 29 III 61 184, etc. (see Index).—Again, nom. plur., chūrṇāḥ, II 57 29; only once; elsewhere normal, nom. sing., chūrṇam, II 22 27, nom. plur., chūrṇāṇi, II 471 50, etc. (see Index).—Again, acc. plur., nāgarīn, III 66 184; only once; elsewhere normal, nom. sing., nāgarām, II 63 29, etc. (see Index). Again nom. sing., nāgarakāḥ, II 104 31; but normal, nāgarakam, II 1119 76.—Again, nom. plur., patāḥ, II 193 36 588 55, acc. plur., pātān, II 901 68; but usually normal, nom. sing., palam, II 75 30, nom. plur., pālāṇi, II 60 29 III 57 184, etc. (see Index).—Again, nom. plur., mūlāḥ, III 63 184; only once; elsewhere normal, nom. sing., mūlam, I 89 7 III 266 40, nom. plur., mūlāṇi I 72 6 II 628 57 III 37 183, etc. (see Index).—Again, nom. plur., śukrāḥ (for śukrāvī), II 350 44; no examples for the normal neuter.—In the second portion of the Bower Manuscript there occur: nom. sing., pataḥ, V 1 204; only once; elsewhere normal, nom. sing., padam, V 5 204 55 207, nom. dual. padē, V 58 207, and acc. plur., mītrāḥ (for mītrān), IV 52 195 V 10 204; elsewhere, apparently normal, nom. sing., mītrim, V 33 206.—For other examples where the change of gender is due to change in the stem (e.g., acc. plur., arśāṇī for arśāṇi, see ante, section V, p. Lxxii).

(2) Exchange of masculine and feminine: (a) feminine for normal, masculine, acc. sing., bhagandālām, II 53 29; only once; elsewhere, apparently masculine, loc. sing., bhagandārā II 221 37 III 64 184, etc. (see Index); but once also neuter, see ante, 1a, p. Lxxiii.

(b) Masculine for normal feminine, acc. plur., dēvātān (for dēvātāḥ), II 721 58. In the second portion of the Bower Manuscript, dēvāta is always masculine, acc. sing., dēvātām, IV 5 192; nom. plur., dēvātāḥ, IV 21 194 48 195; I instr. plur., dēvātāḥ, IV 30 194 abl. plur., dēvātābhāyāḥ, IV 22 194. Again, nom. dual, mēdau, II 297 41; only once; elsewhere normal, nom. sing., mēdām, II 128 33, acc. dual, mēdē, II 112 32, etc. (see Index).—Again, loc. sing., viharīkātē, II 1034 72; only once; elsewhere normal, nom. sing., viharīkā, III 49 183; acc. sing., viharīkām, II 342 43 III 8 181. Again, loc. sing., sṛṣṭē, IV 14 193; but normal, nom. sing., sṛṣṭi, IV 30 194.

VII.—Syntax.


(1) Exchange or mixture of "cases": (a) nominative for accusative in the object of a sentence; as in II 237 38 vṛiddhayāḥ (for vṛiddhīḥ) jāyē; II 253 39 vindavaḥ (for vindūn) pibatē; II 293 41 prīgaṇgatāḥ (for prīgaṇgāḥ or prīgaṇgūn) grāhīyatē. As a rule, such nominatives are found joined with accusatives, as in II 246 39 gāvantaḥ (for gāvataḥ) pibatē vindūn; and II 782 61 iilān bhakṣhayita saumīrāḥ (for saumīrān). Or they are mixed with accusatives, as in II 102 31 shaṭi (nom.) . . . guḍān (acc.) bharjītāvē II 12 32 vīraḥ (nom.) . . .

dantī (acc.) pachē; II 128 33 vīrā (nom.) . . . médān-cha (acc.) suhāret; II 134 5 33 pippalaḥ-trayamāṇi-cha (acc.) mustā (nom.) kalkikivē; II 201 2 36 haritakīna (acc.) vachāḥ (acc.) . . . yavakṣhārō (nom.) vīraḥ (nom.) vipāchayē; II 23 38 pippalī (nom.) . . . cha suhān-cha (acc.) āsānē; II 252 39 palāṇi chaukā (acc.) kudavō (nom.) pachē; II 320 42 rāmā (nom.) balavagandhā (acc.) dadyē; II 326 42 rāmaḥ (acc.) pāthō (nom.) cha guḍān-cha (acc.) pishē; II 802 63 iddāḥ (acc.) pītē pittatahāravā vīraḥ (nom.) II 816 7 84 āmalakāvantu-prasthāḥ (nom.) . . . ghrīta-prasthān-cha (acc.) sāhāyē. The following are some examples from the second portion of the Bower Manuscript: IV 9 193 agnaḥ sparṇō bhoṣē; IV 11 193 prāpnaḥ nayam uttamanam; IV 28 194 prāpnaḥ sūrē; IV 44 195

110 Here the reading suunukha-sātva dēvāta; should be suunukha-sātva dēvāta; thus making the gender of dēvāta masculine throughout.
rāja-lambhas-tu lesyaś; VI 12 204 vimoksha-ṛṇa bhūti kāmā labhishyati; VI 5-6 222 Svātir
(nom. for Svātim) bhikšaḥ (acc.)...dvijśte.

(b) Accusative for nominative, not uncommon in the subject of a sentence; thus a series of several accusatives in I 78 30 syād rasāṇa sa-nuktaṁ ambīvaśeṣasāva viṁāna yasvāṁ; II 80 30 syāc-chitra-ṛṇa yutāṁ avagandhāṁ; II 169 35 śikṣa-mālaṁ kāndākṣhāṁ śkṣu-vālikāṁ etc.; II 204 37 chitra-śūna trimānaṁ vṛihalaṁ kañṭakārikāṁ, etc. Sometimes, however, the word syāt is a mere plonastic adverb of permission (“may be”), and the series of accusatives depend on dadyaḥ, or a similar transitive verb, as in II 182-3 35 syāt tṛyuskaṇāṁ...syād aśta dēvādūrā...syād atma-grāpāma atha...mēdā-ṛṇa dadya-ṛṇa śatātariṇī-ṛṇa. Sometimes nominatives and accusatives are mixed, as in II 35-28 kaputrikāḥ (nom.) tikta-kārakīṁ (acc.) yasvāḥ (acc.) chirāvatiktāḥ (nom.)...tha śatākratār-yavāḥ (nom.) samāḥ svur-ṛṇāī; II 40 28 āśāṁ (acc.) bhadrakumārāḥ (acc.) agārādhumāṁ (acc.) kāñṭakārikāḥ (nom.) keśārī (nom.) sāhas (nom.) chēt samātāḥ (nom.) bhāgāḥ (nom.) samāś-chūrana-kritāḥ (nom.); II 291 41 amalakān (acc.) keśa-ṛṇāḥ (nom.) svuḥ.

(c) Accusative for dative: once in II 207 37 virākaḥ (acc. for virāka) tu yuvāgu...bhūjanaṁ dāpyaḥ; probably an instance of double accusative.

(b) Ablative for instrumental, regularly with prayogā (for prayoṣṭa), in II 198, 200 36, 308, 310 42 462 49 830 64.

(e) Genitive for nominative: only once in II 111 76 pīvāta balāsya (for balāḥ); but the construction of the whole verse is abnormal, and probably corrupt.

(f) Genitive for accusative: in II 295 41 kāśyapa-madhurānāḥ (for madhurānī) sītāy-apī cha...vīpāk-ṛṇa; II 300 41 mukta-vīdura-saṅkhaṁ (for saṅkhaṁ) chandarakaṁ-śrīnadanilaukāḥ (for śrīnadanilaukāḥ)...maṁ pachet; II 928 69 daridrānāḥ (for daridrān) chikitsati, and II 949 70 naḥūṇāḥ (for naḥūṇ) chikitsāte.

(g) Genitive for instrumental, in II 253 39 Aśvinī 'numataḥ (for Aśvinīḥ); so also matam-Aśvinī in II 575 and 579 54.—Again, in II 1022 72 guḍikāyāḥ (for guḍikāyā) pralāpasyaḥ; II 1077 74 gandha-tailaya (for gandha-tailēna) purasyaḥ.

(h) Genitive for dative: in II 222 37 ēkāṇga-ṛōgaṁ dadyaḥ; II 315 42 hitaṁ nriṅgāṁ; II 324 42 strīnaṁ cha deyaḥ; II 800 62 vyāpanna-tailayaḥ kātā; II 1013 72 bālāsya dāpyaḥ; II 1015, 1017, 1020, 1026, bālānāḥ dāpyaḥ; II 1029 72 bādhyāmahāṣya dāpyaḥ. But the normal dative occurs in II 1011 71 kumāraya pradāpyaḥ, and II 1045 73 bālāya dāpyaḥ.

(i) Genitive for locative, in I 102 8 vīdrutasa-ṛṇa (for vīdrutasa) jantōrā...vadana-pralēpe, possibly by false assimilation to the adjacent genitive jantōrā.—Again, in II 63 29 ariṣṭaḥ hridrogaṁ hikkaśeṣu hiṣu (for hridrogaṁ) hitaṁ; II 94 31 vīchārakīya (for vīchārakīya) ariṣṭaḥ...prāyajñānaḥ, though here possibly a clerical error of ś for ma.—Again, in II 357-8 44 mukkānaṁ (for mukkānaṁ)...ardheṣaṁ...auhaḥnēṣu...sahandhaḥ; II 1081 75 liṅgha-omkhyātīsti (for omkhyātīsti).

(k) Locative for instrumental, in II 1038 73 guḍikāyāḥ (for guḍikāyā) pralāpasyaḥ.

(l) Mixture of accusative, genitive, and locative, in II 221 37 vātālēshmāni 114 (acc.) pāṇīnaṁ (gen.) ariṣṭaḥ (loc.)...dadyaḥ. Similarly in II 377-8 45 kampanaḥ (acc.) grīḍhakṣaṇāṁ (gen.) tathāiva ca bhagandāre (loc.).

(2) Exchange of "Numbers": (a) singular for dual; not uncommon; as in II 29 27 tīniśṭāṁ-āmbavāṭasāva, but normal tīniśṭakāṁ-āmbavāṭasāva in II 64 29. Similar plāmā-bhagandāraḥ, II 341 43-gaṇaṁ-lāḥ-bhagandāraḥ (for bhagandarāḥ); II 249 39-dhāna-gaṇaṁ-kākha-chandanaḥ; II 138 33-nilāṁ-kadākhaṁ; II 233 38-padmak-āguruḥ, (for āguruḥ); II 256

114 Conjectural for the original reading vāta-śikṣaṁdā which is erroneous. It may be intended for śikṣaṁdā, or śiṣṭaṁdā, in either case for śiṣṭaṁdā or śiṣṭaṁdā; or it may be śiṣṭamārti.
40; pushkar-águru, II 189 36; must-ájirā, II 137 33; vachá-hiṅgu, II 399 46; eke-
ágnumana, II 188 36; vēpāh-ámnāda, II 333 43; hāsa-kāsā, II 341 43; hikkā-sūstå (for ṭeśasyāh), II 33 27. In the preceding instances; the gender is the normal neuter; but in bal-áśvagandha, II 320 42, and yashāmadhuka-mājujita, II 301 41 we have the feminine. Similarly, we find the masculine singular nand-śpanandō (for nandopananda) combined with the plural ye nāgoṭ. But the normal dual occurs equally frequently, e.g., chandrakānt-
endranīlāyō, II 300 41; jivak-arshabhakakau, II 189 36 297 41; pippali-
śrīgasārābhīyān, II 212 37; bal-āśvagandha, II 266 40; lāmājukā-dhanājaya, II 294 41; yudha-catakan, II 56 29. In most of the preceding examples, moreover, the minor grammatical rule that a briefer and vowel-initial member should stand first, and that one ending in a ō should be placed last (see W. Skr. Gr., § 125c, p. 429) is not observed.

(b) Singular for plural; in sapta saptāhā (for saptāhā), II 956 70, and in the copulative compounds kāmalā-jaara-pāṭutēnā, II 342 43; madhuka-mājujita-tarā, II 266 40, with the normal neuter gender; but an instance with an abnormal feminine occurs in phalgu-karjira-
māripikā, II 187 36.

c) Dual for plural, only once, in patēla-pichumandā-parpaṭakau (for *parpaṭakā, plur. masc, or *parpaṭakan, sing. neut.), II 137 33; but the normal plural is usual, as in muktrā-
vidrumā-jaokkāhā, II 300 41; see also II 57 29, et passim.

d) Plural for dual; vṛishtāh (for vṛishtāyu,) III 47 183; also dādhyamblākā-čājikānā (for kāuchikāyō), II 313 42.

(3) Absence of concord: (a) with respect to "number": thus, singular verb with plural noun, in II 767 60, saṅyuktāḥ-śeṣyāmamā-śamapāmāyey; in this case the plurals saṅyuktā and śeṣyāmamā are erroneous, for the subject of the whole formula is the singular ēka prajoguḥ. Again, in II 1066 74, yasya visphōtaka gātur pariđāhau-čcha lakṣyatē (for lakṣyantē); but here the singular verb is due to the influence of the preceding singular noun pariđāhā. —On the other hand, plural verb with singular noun, in II 469 49, kālasya mulaḥ madhu-sa īprajuktā ... śamajayātī (for śamajayati); III 65 184, viduḥ vadanti (for vadati). So also, in IV 56 196, iduḥ sthānaḥ dhiyāntē (for dhiyāyate). —Again, singular verb with plurality of nouns; often with syāt; e.g., in II 78 30, syān-māṭunāh gṛ̣ ṛṣiyā ṛṣiyā-āyaviśaṁvatānā-čha; II 80 30, syāch-chitrakaṁ trikaṭukaṁ-kustuṁ-būrūnī ...; II 472 50, lājāi, supiṣṭā badara-
sthimajjā syād-aśājanam. In these examples the singular syāt may be due to the attraction of the plural noun; for when the adjacent term happens to be plural, the plural syā is used, as in II 467 49, tryuṣānaḥ triplā-śrānā ccha sarve ātulyā syā. But more probably the term syāt is used adverbially; and it is obviously so used, e.g., in II 182-3 35 and II 241 38, where it occurs with a series of nouns in the accusative case governed by the transitive verb dadyāt.

(b) With respect to gender: masculine with feminine, once, in II 275 40, bandhya labhatē garbhāṅg samācharan, for samācharaṁ which would not suit the metre (Īlōka). So also once, in IV 45 195, paribhāṣhā (for paribhāṣhāḥ) samagrāḥ. —Again, masculine with neuter; several times; in II 98 31, rōga-jātaṁ tān (for tān) śrīnu; II 183 36, arānaṁ kahubhān (for kahubhānī) niḥantu; II 471 50, chāprasāmad madhudeviyā vinīhātī (though in this case there is probably a clerical error for *deśiyāni niḥantu); II 637 57, annam-iva kāla-bhōjya (for bhōjyaḥ); II 725 58, rasaḥ bhōjyaḥ (for bhōjyaḥ); II 735 59, nīyama-čha yatādā-
drīkṣatā (for yathā-driṣṭaḥ); II 1111 76, sarkaraṁ madhu-saṅyuktaṁ (for saṅyuktāḥ) trishnā-
śamanam-uttanam. So also in V 61 207, kālaṁ-tē samupasthitam (for samupasthitē).
Peculiar Construction: (a) Cases absolute; the nominative; e.g., in II 148-9 34, vaidānga chitrākō dāntī—grīta-prasthānā pachēd-ēbhiḥ, lit. "baberang, plumago-root, -dāntī—these boil a prasātha of ghee;" or II 603 56, sarvākevādāro triphalā sa-mustā kashāyasāmeukatviḥpič; i.e., lit. "deodor, three myrobolans with musta; having decocted them, drink (it)."—Similarly we have the accusative absolute, e.g., in II 314-5 42, rāṣṇā balāḥ...prativishāḥ garbhēn-ānēna pāchāyāt, i.e., lit. "rāṇā, bala...prativīṣāḥ; with a paste of these let (it) be boiled."—And again, a combination of both, the nominative and accusative absolute occurs, e.g., in II 169-72 35, saramulēksha-mulāni kāḍēkshēnā ikshunālīkāmb (three ace)...ūkhandā tripālikā bhāgāḥ (nom)... jaladrāgo ṣipaktrīṣa-ālīkām avasēśayāt, e.g., "roots of sara and of sugarcane, (pieces of) kandēkshū, (and) ikshunālīkāmb of these (drugs) quantities of three pala each; let (the whole) be boiled in a drōṇa of water till it is reduced to one āṭhaka."

(b) Interpolation of pleonastic particles within a compound word; thus, atha in II 112. 32, śravasyāvathūma (for śravasyāvathūma); and II 720 58, punarvasūvakaṃ pushyāna (for punarvasūvakaṃ-pushyāna). Similarly eva, in II 323 42, etadvidhācivākṣam, (for etadvidhācivakṣam, i.e., etadvidhācivakṣam eva) and II 310 42, ērimēvābhivarddhānan (for ērimēvābhivarddhānan, see below d). So also tathāka in II 807 63, daunā-ghrita-taila-tathāka-taṣṭājanām (for daunā-ghrita-taila-taṣṭājanām). And again, cha and chaiva, in II 1019, 72, sārkkarā-chāmari-chaiva-mātragrahē (for sārkkarā-āmari-mātragrahē); or eva in II 802 63, sārkkarā-ṣyāivāḥ (for sārkkarā-ṣyāivāḥ).

(c) Interpolation of pleonastic particles within a sentence; thus, chēt in II 40 28 490 51 794 62 807 63; and eva (used adverbially), in II 78, 80 30 182-3 35 207 37 229, 241 38 1075 74.

(d) Abnormal compounds; thus, purāṇāḥ kṣauḍra-sa-ḥyutam (for purāṇāḥ-kṣauḍra-sa-ḥyutam), II 461 49, and bīvē-kalkaḥ vīpakevam (for bīvē-kalkaḥ-vīpakevam), II 1075 74; though in these two cases the anusvāra may be a clerical error; also, sa-ālmaśīḥ pūṣpaḥ (for sa-ālmaśīḥ-pūṣpaḥ); but see similar cases in W. Skr. Gr., § 1316, p. 456, also § 1250, p. 427, and § 1267b, 1269b, p. 434.—Again, vāstā-viriktaṁ (for vāstā-viriktaṁ), II 719 58; ērimēvābhivarddhānan (ērimēvābhivarddhānan with interpolated eva, see above under b), an accusative compound like the Sanskrit compounds vara-i-karaṇa, etc. (see W. Skr. Gr., § 1271b, p. 435); kṣaśārā-kaṅkā-satām (for kaṅkā-kṣaśārā-satām), III 2 181, where the transposition appears to be due to the necessities of the metre (ārga)—Again, II 902 68, bhrāmara-sa-varṇāni (for bhrāmara-varṇāni), or sa-bhrāmara-varṇāni; and II 1115 76, sa-āśirv-ōśra-sa-nāgapuṣpam (for sa-āśirv-ōśra-sa-nāgapuṣpam), or sa-āśirv-ōśra-nāgapuṣpam, neither of which however would have suited the metre upajāti. In other cases sa takes the, place of the copula cha, as in II 233 37, kāṣṭāḥ sa-hikkaḥ sa-hkrimiś-api; so also in II 182 35 35 44, et passim.

(e) Abnormal constructions; thus in II 349-50 44, where there is a series of nominatives; ardhitāh—vijñākaḥ—avabhogānāḥ—sāndhānāḥ—khalanāḥ—khataḥ—sāvydhāḥ—grihītāḥ without any verb, but where the verb upayūnijyuh, or prayūnijyuh, is to be understood as suggested by the preceding, upayūnaḥ. Again, in II 1055 74, where the transitive verb viṇāṣayāt is to be supplied to the accusatives absolute dāhāḥ trishyānāḥ cha chhārddhiṇāḥ cha, from the following sarva-rūga-viṇāṣayā. Other examples, the construction of which is explained

118 In Charaka Samhitā VI, 6, verse 24, whence this formula is quoted (see ante Chapter VI, No. 21, p Lv), the nominatives are turned into accusatives, in the existing text.
119 For curious cases of transposition in Vedic compounds, see W. Skr. Gr., § 109, p. 432.
The character of the composition in the treatises of the Bower Manuscript is, in the main, metrical. In fact, in the three medical treatises which constitute Parts I-III, the composition is practically entirely metrical. With the exception of some brief introductory remarks (before verse 50 in Part I, and before verses 404, 917, 947, 950, 968 in Part II) which are in prose, and three formulae (viz., 393-5, 715, and 784 in Part II) which probably are in prose, the three treatises are entirely written in a variety of metres. These metres, arranged in the order of frequency, are the following:


(4) Vasantā-Tilaka, Part I, vv. 1-8; Part II, vv. 80-82, 85, 86, 805, 806; total 7 verses; Part III, none. Or a grandtotal of 15 verses.

(5) Vāyu-sthūla (a kind of Jāgati), Part I, v. 22; Part II, vv. 35, 36, 41, 42, 500, 786; total 6 verses. Part III, none. Or a grandtotal of 7 verses.

(6) Sāravā-vikrīdiṭa, Part I, vv. 19, 41, 42; total 3 verses; Part II, vv. 63, 879; total 2 verses. Part III, none. Or a grandtotal of 5 verses.

(7) Asvapattasūkta, Part I, vv. 17, 20, 21, 27; Parts II and III, none. Or a total of 4 verses.

(8) Suvadānā, Part I, v. 15; Part II, v. 782; Part III, none. Or a total of 2 verses.

(9) Prithvi, Part I, v. 34; Part II, none; Part III, v. 65. Or a total of 2 verses.

(10) Mandakrāntā, Part I, vv. 9, 35; Mālinī, Part I, vv. 13, 43; Sālini, Part I, vv. 24, 32; Kusumita-latā-veḷliṭā, Part I, vv. 31, 35; Mallaṭamāḷaṇa, Part I, vv. 37, 38. Five metres which, two times each, occur only in Part I.

(11) Tōtakā, Srugḍhara, Sudhā, Pramāṇikā, Pramāṇāśhārd, and one unidentified; six metres, occurring only in Part I, and only once, viz., vv. 16, 18, 25, 26, 33, 36 respectively. Also, Ruchīra, Pushpinīgṛd, Sainkṣīlī; three metres, occurring only in Part II, and only once, viz., vv. 84, 807, 887 respectively.

The preceding list shows that practically the three medical treatises are written in three metres, the ślokā, tristubh, and Āryā. In a total of 1,323 verses, comprised in the three
treatises, those three metres occur 933, 121, and 109 times respectively; and among them, again the śloka is by far the predominating metre, taking up about 70 per cent. of the whole.

The total number of different metres is twenty-three. Of these, Part I, in proportion to its extent, contains an extraordinarily large number, not less than 19, distributed over 132 verses. In Part II there are 9 metres to 1,119 verses; and in Part III, 4 metres to 72 verses. It is evident from this familiarity with metrical writing that the author of the three medical treatises was well-versed in Sanskrit composition. Of course, the substance of Part II is not actually his own original composition, for as he informs us himself in the opening verse of that treatise it is a compilation of extracts from the standard medical works and the floating medical tradition of his time (see details in Chapter VI). Still there are in it certain portions which have every appearance of being his own contribution. These comprise, above all, the ten introductory verses (śloka), describing the contents of the treatise, which are clearly the author's own composition. But there occur also scattered instances of verses in the body of the work which are clearly additions made by the author to formulae which he quotes from other sources. To this class belongs, for example, verse 119a (p. 32) which is a śloka appended to a formula consisting of eleven ārāya verses, and in which that formula is ascribed to Atreyā. If this ascription had formed a part of the original formula, it would no doubt have been in the same ārāya measure. The fact that it is in the different śloka measure, seems to indicate that it was added by the author of the Nāvanātaka for the purpose of explaining the source of his information, namely, the floating medical tradition of his time. There is a similar instance in verse 147 (p. 34) which is an ārāya, appended to a formula consisting of three śloka verses. We have another in the two trishṭubh verses 199 and 200 (p. 36), appended to a formula consisting of eleven śloka verses (186-198). And again another instance is the trishṭubh verse 324 (p. 42), which is added to a formula of five śloka verses, to explain its ascription to Vāḍvalī as well as some more of its benefits. A slightly different instance is the śloka verse 345 (p. 43) which is inserted within a formula, otherwise consisting of four and a half ārāya verses (344 and 346-50). There are some other examples, equally suggestive of authorship, in which, however, no change occurs in the metre. Thus we find a half śloka (v. 312a, p. 42) appended to a long formula consisting of twenty-five other ślokas (vv. 287-311), which adds a futile amplification to a formula fully ending with verse 311. An exactly similar case is the half śloka verse 781a (p. 61), which is appended to a formula consisting of seven other and a half ślokas (vv. 773b-780v). It is not only added to a formula which obviously ends with the śloka 780b, but it corrects the ascription of the formula which was given in the first śloka (v. 773b-774a) of the original formula. In that śloka it was ascribed to the Āvins, while in the added half-śloka, it is attributed to Vīśvāmitra. Another striking case of this kind is the prefix of one śloka and a half (vv. 418 and 419a, p. 47) to a formula consisting of other six ślokas and a half (vv. 419b-425). The prefixed ślokas not only repeat the ascription of the formula to the Āvins, though that ascription was already stated in the original concluding śloka (v. 425), but they are found omitted in other medical works which quote the formula. Another instance, probably of the same kind, is the half-śloka verse 366a (p. 44), which is added to a long formula of fifteen ślokas (vv. 351-365). An instance of again a different kind, though no less suggestive of authorship, is the śloka verse 783 (p. 61), which follows a verse in the complicated svapananā measure (v. 782). It indicates a useful modification of the formula given in the preceding verse, and suggests itself as due to the author of the Nāvanātaka.

himself. Probably there is another example of this kind in the Uṣṇa verse 850 (p. 65), which adds a pharmacopoeic direction to the preceding formula, consisting of the two Uṣṇa verses 848 and 849.

In contrast with the treatise in Part II, the two treatises contained in Parts I and III are very different productions. They do not profess to be compilations from preexisting sources, but rather suggest themselves to be original compositions. For, with a few exceptions, such as verses 105, 129, 131 in Part I, and verses 25-36, 37-53, 55, 56, in Part III, they contain nothing that either professes to be, or can be shown to be, a quotation from some earlier work. They may, in fact, very well be original compositions of the same author as he who compiled the Nāvanītaka.

The case is rather different with the treatises on divination and incantation which are contained in Parts IV-VII of the Bower Manuscript. There is nothing in the character of the composition which is distinctively in popular Sanskrit, that would point to an author more intimately conversant with scholastic Sanskrit. A considerable portion of the treatises is written in prose; and whatever is in metrical form, is written entirely in the easy Uṣṇa measure. Part VII, or at least the surviving fragment of it, is written entirely in prose; and the only portion that is metrical in Part VI is the charm made of seventeen verses (pp. 224, 225). On the other hand, Part V is written entirely in verse; and so is also Part IV, with the exception of its five introductory lines (p. 192) which are in prose.
CHAPTER VIII.

SUBJECT AND CONTENTS OF THE TREATISES IN THE
BOWER MANUSCRIPT.

(1) In the existing fragmentary state of Part I, it is difficult to determine the particular class of medical literature to which the treatise contained in it should be assigned. It commences with a kalpa, or small pharmacographic tract, on garlic (*Allium sativum*, Linn.) This tract consists of the initial forty-three verses, including between them eighteen or nineteen different, mostly more or less unusual, metres. Their list, given at the end of Chapter VII, shows that the most frequent among them is the *vasanta-tilaka* with eight verses, while the well-known *śūkha* comes only second with six verses. The tract is preserved in almost perfect order; the end of every verse (except two, vv. 29 and 35) is marked with a double stroke. The concluding verse 43 alone is seriously mutilated, but fortunately its statement as to garlic (lāśuna) being the subject of the tract (kalpa) is preserved. That subject is represented in verse 9 as having been communicated by the sage (munī) King of Kāśi (Kāśi-rāja) to Suśruta. By the sage, in all probability, Dvīdaśa is intended, also known as the divine surgeon Dhanvantari; and Suśruta undoubtedly refers to the celebrated author of what is now known as the Suśruta Sārañjita. But it may be noted that in the concluding verse 43, the author, whoever he was, refers to himself in the first person (āktē mayā).

The tract, or kalpa, on garlic is followed by another tract which might be described as a short tantra, or text-book, comprising a number of very miscellaneous sections, arranged in a rather unmethodical fashion. It commences with remarks on the importance of regulating digestion (vv. 44-51), and with some pharmacoeutic directions (vv. 55-59), such as are usually found in the so-called śūtra-sthāna, or section on the principles of medicine, of a sārañjita. Interspersed are some alterative and aphrodisiacal formulae (vv. 52-54, 60, 61-67), such as are usually given in the Sārañjita sections on rasa-yana and vājikaraṇa. Next comes a section with formulae for various eye-lotions (ādhyaḥāna, vv. 68-86). This is followed by another on face plasters (mukha-lēpa, vadana-pralēpa, vv. 87-105) and collyria (*aṭṭa*, *vīḍālaka*) and remedies for the hair, etc. (vv. 106-120); and finally there is a section on cough-mixtures (vv. 121-124). This second tract differs from the preceding in two respects. First, it employs only three metres, the *śūkha* (44 verses), *trishūkha* (30 verses) and *āgyā* (6 verses); and secondly, it uses the double stroke to mark, not the end of a verse, but the end of a formula (consisting of one or more verses) or of a section. In both respects it resembles the treatise in Part II.

(2) Part II contains a practical formulary, or handbook of prescriptions, covering the whole field of internal medicine. It is called the Nāvanitaka or "Cream," and professes to give, for the use of the practitioner, a selection of the best prescriptions found in the standard medical works of the time; and though these standard works are not actually named, it is possible in many cases to identify them. But in addition to these, it gives some formulae which seem to be taken from the floating medical tradition, as well as a very few which appear to have been added by the author himself. The details may be seen in Chapters VI and VII, as well as in the subjoined Table of Parallels.

The formulary was originally divided into sixteen chapters. This, at least, was the intention of its author, as may be seen from his introduction (vv. 8 and 9), which enumerates the headings of the sixteen chapters. There is no good reason to doubt that the intention was accomplished; but whether or not the formulary was ever actually completed, it is now impossible to say, seeing that the solitary existing copy of it in the Bower Manuscript is incomplete, as the fifteenth and sixteenth chapters, as well as apparently the conclusion of fourteenth, are missing.
The division of the chapters, and the distribution of the formulæ over them, are not made on any unitary principle. Some formulæ are put together on the principle of the form which is given to the medicament; others, on the principle of the purpose which the medicament is to subserve; others, again, on the principle of the kind of patients to whom the medicine is to be administered; and finally, some chapters are added describing some important “simples” vegetable or mineral. Thus, under the first principle we have the initial three chapters, which enumerate formulæ for preparing compound powders (chûrana), medicated ghee or clarified butters (ghrita), and medicated oils (taila) respectively. The second principle is applied from two different aspects, according as the purpose of a medicament is, either to relieve or cure an abnormal condition of the system, or to stimulate or improve its normal functions (see note 327 on page 144). Under the former aspect a large number of formulæ are collected in the fourth chapter, referring to some twenty-two or twenty-four, not always clearly distinguished, diseases, the details of which may be seen in the Table of Contents, prefixed to this edition. The principle, however, is not quite strictly observed in the chapter; for right into the middle of it, two formulæ are pitchforked, which belong to the preceding principle (the form of a medicament), viz., one (vv. 484-490) referring to the preparation of a linætus (lēka), the other (vv. 491-493), to the preparation of a kind of medicated meed (madhurāsana). The reason why they are inserted here apparently is that their purpose is purgative and alternative respectively; but even in that case, their proper place would be under the second aspect of the therapeutic principle. In this connection it may also be noted that none of the formulæ in Chapter IV may be understood as a “specific.” In most cases the formula is stated to cure a number of, sometimes, very different diseases; but one of these was thought to be its principal object, and this particular disease was, as a rule, indicated by being named at the head of the number. Under the second aspect of the therapeutic principle, formulæ are distributed over the six Chapters V-X, treating of enemis (vasti-karma, see note 142 on page 105), alternatives (rasāyana), gruels (gavāgā), aphrodisiacs (vīshya), collory (nētraṇjana), and hair dyes (kēa-raṇjana) respectively. Under the third principle, referring to the kind of patient, we have the three concluding chapters of the treatise, of which, however, only the fourteenth chapter on the diseases of children survives, while chapters XV and XVI, dealing with barren and child-bearing women, respectively, are missing. Intermediately there come in the three chapters XI-XIII, containing small monographs on chebulic myrobalan, plumbago-root, and bitumen respectively.

(3) Part III is another specimen of an ancient formulæry, or manual of prescriptions. It is probably, however, a mere fragment of what was, or was intended to be, a larger work. The existing fragment corresponds to the initial portion, that is, to Chapters I-III, of the formulæry in Part II; for it contains formulæ put together on the principle of the form of the medicament. But though put together on that principle, the formulæ are not arranged in any consistent order: powders, ghee, oils, pills, tinctures and liniments are mixed up, as shown in the subjoined list:

(1) Oils, formulæ Nos. I, II, III, VII.  (4) Ghee, formula No. VI.
(2) Powder  No. XIV.  (5) Pills, Nos. X, XII, XIV.
(3) Liniments  Nos. V, VIII, IX, XIII  (6) Linætus, No. XI.

(4) Table of Parallels in Parts II and III.

Column I gives references to verses and pages of the edition; columns II and III, to identical or similar formulæ in other works; column IV indicates formulæ to which no parallels...
are known, and column V, formulæ or parts of formulæ which were probably written by the author himself. The initials are explained in the List of Abbreviations prefixed to this edition. For further details on parallels, see the notes on the translations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref. to verses and pages</th>
<th>II. Identical</th>
<th>III. Similar</th>
<th>IV. No. per.</th>
<th>V. Author</th>
<th>Ref. to verses and pages</th>
<th>II. Identical</th>
<th>III. Similar</th>
<th>IV. No. per.</th>
<th>V. Author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>v. 1-10, pp. 77-8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a</td>
<td>v. 277-279, p. 195</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 11-17, p. 78</td>
<td>Ch.</td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>v. 280-286, p. 196</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 18-20, p. 79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>v. 287-311, p. 103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 20, p. 79</td>
<td>D. Ch.</td>
<td></td>
<td>v. 312a, p. 108</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 22, p. 79</td>
<td>V.</td>
<td></td>
<td>v. 318-318, p. 108</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 23, p. 79</td>
<td>D. Ch.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>v. 319-323, p. 109</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 24d, p. 80</td>
<td>Ch.</td>
<td></td>
<td>v. 324, p. 109</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 24b, p. 80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a</td>
<td>v. 325-328, p. 109</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 25-26, p. 80</td>
<td>Ch.</td>
<td></td>
<td>v. 329-343, p. 110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 27-28, p. 89</td>
<td>D. Ch.</td>
<td></td>
<td>v. 344, p. 111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 29-34, p. 81</td>
<td>Ch.</td>
<td></td>
<td>v. 345, p. 111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 33-37, p. 82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>v. 346-366a, p. 111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 38-42, pp. 82-3</td>
<td>D. Ch.</td>
<td></td>
<td>v. 366a-382, p. 113</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 43-55, p. 83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>v. 383-389, p. 114</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 50-59, pp. 84-5</td>
<td>V.</td>
<td></td>
<td>v. 390-398, pp. 114-5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 60-62, p. 85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pp. 399-401a, p. 115</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 63, p. 85</td>
<td>Bv.</td>
<td></td>
<td>v. 401-403, p. 115</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 64-70, p. 85-6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>v. 404-405, p. 116</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 71-75a, p. 86</td>
<td>Bv. Sv.</td>
<td></td>
<td>v. 406, p. 116</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 78-107, pp. 87-9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>v. 407-412, pp. 117-7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 109-115, p. 99</td>
<td>D. Ch.</td>
<td></td>
<td>v. 413, p. 117</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 119a, p. 59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>v. 418-423, p. 118</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 119-127a, p. 91</td>
<td>D. Ch.</td>
<td></td>
<td>v. 429-431, pp. 118-9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 127a-132, p. 91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>v. 432-433, p. 119</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 133-143, pp. 92-3</td>
<td>Ch.</td>
<td></td>
<td>v. 434, p. 119</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 144-146, p. 93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>v. 435, p. 119</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 147, p. 91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>v. 436-440, p. 119</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 148-149, p. 94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>v. 441-444a, p. 120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 150-157, pp. 94-5</td>
<td>Ch.</td>
<td></td>
<td>v. 444-448a, p. 120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 158-159, p. 95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>v. 449-450, p. 120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 160-161, p. 95</td>
<td>Sy.</td>
<td></td>
<td>v. 449-450, p. 120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 162-165a, p. 96</td>
<td>D. Ch.</td>
<td></td>
<td>v. 449-450, p. 120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 165a-169a, p. 96</td>
<td>Bv.</td>
<td></td>
<td>v. 450-451, p. 121</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 169-170, p. 96</td>
<td>Ch.</td>
<td></td>
<td>v. 452, p. 121</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 177-185a, p. 97</td>
<td>D. Ch.</td>
<td></td>
<td>v. 453, p. 121</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 183-198, p. 98</td>
<td>Ch.</td>
<td></td>
<td>v. 454-459, p. 121</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 199-200, p. 98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>v. 460-462, p. 122</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 201-203, p. 99</td>
<td>Bv.</td>
<td></td>
<td>v. 462, p. 122</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 204-209, p. 99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>v. 463-464, p. 122</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 210-215, p. 100</td>
<td>Bv.</td>
<td></td>
<td>v. 465, p. 122</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 216-222, p. 100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>v. 466, p. 122</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 223-231, p. 101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>v. 467-468a, p. 123</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 241-244, p. 102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>v. 473, p. 124</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 244-239, p. 103</td>
<td>Chd.</td>
<td></td>
<td>v. 474, p. 124</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 251-237, p. 103</td>
<td>R. V.</td>
<td></td>
<td>v. 475, p. 124</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 255-269, p. 104</td>
<td>V.</td>
<td></td>
<td>v. 473-476, p. 124</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 261-276, p. 104</td>
<td>D. Ch.</td>
<td></td>
<td>v. 480-481a, p. 125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref. to verses and pages</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>Ref. to verses and pages</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 482-483, p. 125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>v. 805-818, pp. 155-6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 484-495, p. 126-6</td>
<td>Ch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>v. 819, p. 156</td>
<td>Ch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 495-496, p. 126</td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>v. 820-828, p. 157</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 496-499, p. 127</td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>v. 829-830, p. 157</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 500-509, p. 127-8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>v. 830-833, p. 157</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 510-511, p. 128</td>
<td>Chd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>v. 835-838, p. 157</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 519-513, p. 129</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>v. 836-856, p. 158</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 514, p. 129</td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>v. 837-858, p. 159</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 515-521, p. 129</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>v. 838-859, p. 159</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 522-528, p. 130</td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>v. 840-854, p. 159</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 523-524, p. 130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>v. 844-846, p. 159</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 525, p. 130</td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>v. 850, p. 159</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 526-533, p. 130-1</td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>v. 851-855, p. 160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 533-534, p. 131</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>v. 856-857, p. 160</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 539-537, p. 131</td>
<td>Bh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>v. 858, p. 161</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 535-537, p. 132</td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>v. 859-860, p. 161</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 539-544, p. 132</td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>v. 860-866, pp. 161-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 545-546, p. 132</td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>v. 869-870, p. 162</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 547-548, p. 132-3</td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>v. 871-873, p. 163</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 549-548, p. 133</td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>v. 880-882, p. 163</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 562-565, p. 133</td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>v. 883-886, p. 163</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 565-568, p. 133</td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>v. 887, p. 163</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 569-574, p. 133-4</td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>v. 888-889, p. 164</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 575, p. 134</td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>v. 899-900, p. 165</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 576, p. 134</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>v. 901-916, p. 165</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 577, p. 134</td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>v. 917-949, pp. 166-9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 578, p. 134</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>v. 950-976, p. 170-1</td>
<td>Ch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 579, p. 135</td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>v. 968-976, pp. 171-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 590-594, p. 135</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>v. 1011-1040, pp. 172-4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 595-598, p. 135</td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>v. 1041, p. 175</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 599-592, p. 136</td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>v. 1042-1059, p. 175-6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 603, p. 138</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>v. 1060-1069, p. 176</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 604-641, p. 138-43</td>
<td>Ch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>v. 1072-1078, pp. 176-8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 624-644, p. 143</td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>v. 1080, 2, 3, 6, 7, pp.</td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 645-649, p. 143</td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>178-9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 716-741, p. 144-6</td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>v. 1091-1109, pp. 179-80a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 742-743, p. 146</td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>v. 1112-114, 18, pp. 180a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 744, p. 146</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Part III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 745-752, p. 146-8</td>
<td>Ch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>v. 1-36, pp. 185-7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 753-758, p. 148</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>v. 37-58, p. 188</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 759-762, p. 148-50</td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>v. 54, p. 199</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 763, p. 151</td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>v. 55-66, p. 189</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 784, p. 151</td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>v. 57-69, p. 189</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 785-801, p. 151-4</td>
<td>Bh</td>
<td>Ch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>v. 61-62, p. 190</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 802-804, p. 154</td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>v. 63-72, pp. 190-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(5) Parts IV and V contain two short manuals of Pāṇaka-kēvalī, or cubomancy, that is, the art of foretelling a person’s fortune by means of the cast of dice (pāṇaka, or as spelled in Pt. IV, 1, 2, p. 192, pāṇaka). The mode of exercising this art can be best seen from the manual in Part IV, which is practically complete, while the manual in Part V is apparently
very fragmentary. The former manual shows that the die which was used was marked with the four numbers 1, 2, 3, 4; and that each cast, or rather (as we shall see) set of casts, consisted of three of these numbers. Accordingly there could be no more than sixty-four possible casts. These are shown in the subjoined table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Groups</th>
<th>Names of Groups</th>
<th>Figures of Groups</th>
<th>Number of Variations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Class of Four Groups with the same figure thrice.</td>
<td>Chaṭṭayāṣṭa (?)</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Navikkī</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paṭṭabandha</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kālaviddhi</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sāpata</td>
<td>443, 434, 344</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vṛisha</td>
<td>442, 424, 244</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kūṭa</td>
<td>441, 414, 144</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>334, 343, 433</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Viś</td>
<td>332, 323, 233</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kāṇa</td>
<td>331, 313, 133</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prēshyā</td>
<td>224, 242, 422</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sajā</td>
<td>223, 232, 322</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pāṇchi</td>
<td>221, 212, 122</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Karṇa</td>
<td>114, 141, 411</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cunēchuna</td>
<td>113, 131, 311</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kharī</td>
<td>112, (121), (211)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bahula</td>
<td>432, 324, 243, (234), 423, 342...</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bhadrā</td>
<td>421, 214, 142, (124), 412, 241...</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Saktī</td>
<td>341, 413, 134, 143, 314, 431...</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dundhubhi</td>
<td>321, 213, 132, 123, 312, 231...</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total of variations of casts: 64

All but four of these sixty-four variations occur in Part IV. The four which are missing (121, 211, 234, 124, put in brackets) have clearly been omitted through some inadvertence on the part of the scribe; viz., 234 on the reverse of the second folio, 124 on the obverse of the third folio, and 121 and 211 at the very end of the manuscript, on the reverse of the fifth folio. In Part V less than one-third (20 out of 64, shown in antique-type), occur. No fewer than forty-four variations are missing; viz., the whole of the first class of groups (444, 333, 222, 111); one-half of the second class, namely, the whole
groups vii, kāṇa sajā, pānchī, chuṅchuna, and khari; and nearly the whole of the third class, only two variations (243 and 412) being preserved. What the cause of this mutilation whether intentional or other, may have been is not apparent.

At the end of the Pānaka-kāvalī manuscript, No. 70 of the Deccan College (sic. A in the list on page 214, in the Appendix to Part V), there is an appendix written in the modern Gujarātī vernacular language, which explains the modus operandi in this kind of cubomancy. It runs as follows:

Tatthe sakamvatii-nā paśī nākṭa-vā ni vidhih laṅkhi chhaī || paśī sakan jīṭē, thānaś 3 vār nāṅkhih || pehelā paḍē thēṅkā saṅkā ganjī || tēkīs pagadān paḍē, tō 100 ganjī || bē pagadān paḍē dhāri, tō 200 ganjī || tranī pagadān paḍē pehelā, tō 300 kāhi || chhār pagadān paḍē, tō 400 ganjī || phani paśō bījjī vār nāṅkhih thānaī pagadān paḍē, tō ēk āṅk ēk’dō ganjī || im bē pagadān paḍē, tō 2 || tranī paḍē, tō 3 || chhār paḍē, tō 4 || im triji-nār paṇi jānaṇu || pachhī pehelān saṅkādān || anā bīj triji-bār-nā āṅk kāṭhā kījāi || jetalā āmē, tetalā upari āṅk jōjāi sakan jōī || etalā || pehelān ēk paḍē — pachhī bē paḍē — pachhī bē paḍē — pachhī triji-bār tranī paḍē || to 123, ēk sō nāi trisūś āṅk thāi || im pehelān bē paḍē — pachhī ēk paō pachhī tranī paḍē to 213, bē saṅā nāi tēr-nā āṅk āmēi || ēnī ritān jōjā sahā ||

This may be thus translated: “The mode of throwing the divination die (paśī, singular) is as follows. When the die is wanted for an oracle (Skr. sakā), it must be thrown three times; and the first cast must be counted as hundred. Thus, if one pip (pagadām, sing.) falls, it counts 100; if two pips (pagadā, plur.) fall, they count 200; if three pips fall in the first cast, they represent 300; if four pips fall, they count 400. Next, the die (paśī sing.) is thrown for the second time. Then, of the pips that fall, one counts as the figure (āṅk) 1; similarly if two pips fall, they are 2; if three fall, 3; if four fall, 4. In the same way, the cast of the third time must be understood. Finally, the hundred of the first throw, and the figures (āṅk) of the second and third, must be placed together. Whatever (combined) figure results, upon that the oracle must be pronounced. Thus, if first one falls, next two fall, next, at the third throw, three fall, then it is the (combined) figure 123, one hundred and twenty-three. Similarly, if at the first (cast) two fall, next one falls, next three fall, the result is the figure 213, two hundred and thirteen. This is the correct manner of proceeding.”

It is clear from this explanation that in the ancient Indian art of cubomancy only a single die was used; and that the die indicated only the four numbers, respectively represented by 1, 2, 3, 4 pips on four different facets. A die in the form of a tetrahedron would satisfy these conditions; but the existence of a tetrahedral die at any time is, I believe, an unheard-of thing. It seems probable, therefore, that the die was one of that elongated kind, with four long sides and two rounded ends, which is known as talus or astragalus, or knucklebone, and on which the four long sides were marked with pips. If the die had the ordinary cubical form, two of its six equal sides would have borne no pips; and then there would have been the not infrequent chance of one of the two unmarked facets turning up in any of the three consecutive casts. In such a case, of course, the throws would have had to be repeated, till some pip-marked facet turned up; but the explanation above-quoted does not seem to contemplate the occurrence of such an eventuality, which is not even alluded to. At the same time there occurs in the Introduction to the manual in Part IV (1, 3, on page 192) an obscure phrase which may point to the die having had the form of a six-sided cube. There the dice are described as kumbhakāri.māṭaṅga-yaktā, lit. “joined with a kumbhakāri and a māṭaṅga.” This may mean marked with the figures of a kumbhakāri, or potter woman (or the girl kumbhakārī), and māṭaṅga, or elephant (or Chaṇḍa man). These two figures might have stood on the two sides not marked
with pips. Another explanation of the phrase, however, is possible which is given in note 1 on page 197. There is also another difficulty in the circumstance that the introduction (ll. 2, 3 on page 192, speaks of dice in the plural number, prasakā [ह] gatantu, “may the dice fall,” but the reference may very well be, not to the number of several dice, but the number casts of a single die. If more than one die should really have been used, the number of the dice, of course, would have been three; and each act of divination would have required but a single cast, the three dice being thrown at one time. They would probably have been loose; though at the present day the dice of the Indian cubomancer, which moreover are four in number, are strung on a short thin iron rod. A description of this kind of modern cubomancy is given on pp. 44-46 of Peterson’s Third Report on the Search of Sanskrit MSS. in the Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, Extra No. for 1887, in connection with a work called Ramalāmriya, or “the fine art of Ramal.” The Arabic term ramāl signifies geomancy, or any kind of divination, specially cubomancy. The performer always, or often, is a Muhammedan. In the above-mentioned case, reported from Bombay, the four dice seem to have been immovably fixed on the rod; but in a case examined by me in Calcutta, they were loosely strung on the rod round which they could rotate freely, though they were secured from falling off the rod by two rod-heads. This mode of cubomancy, however, seems to be a comparatively modern importation into India, and is, therefore, hardly relevant to the understanding of the mode of cubomancy which forms the subject of the two manuals.

These two manuals are quite independent works. Their oracles, though of course touching on similar subjects, are totally different compositions, of much greater length in Part V than in Part IV. In early Indian times several cubomantic manuals appear to have been current. The manuals, which survive at the present day and are ascribed to the authorship of the Sage Garga, possess a few striking points of agreement with the manual in Part V. The subject of these agreements is fully discussed in the appendix to Part V, pp. 214 ff. The evidence points to the existence of three rather widely different recensions of what may possibly have been originally a single manual. The latter might possibly be represented by the recension preserved in the Bower Manuscript. This recension is of considerable antiquity. As shown in Chapter VI, it may have existed as early as the second century A. D. (ante, p. Lvii), and of course it may go back to a much earlier time. The other existing recensions cannot be older than the end of the fourth century, because in the fifth verse of their introduction they speak of cubomancers as possessing hādā-jānaa, or the knowledge of the doctrine of hādā (Greek ὁδὸς), or lunar mansions (Latin domus). The first mention of that doctrine has been traced by Professor Jacobi (in his dissertation de astrologiae indicae hādā appellatae originibus, Bonn 1872) to Firmicus Maternus, who lived about 335-350 A. D. in the West, whence it came to the knowledge of the Indians. For some further information on the subject of Indian cubomancy the student may be referred to A. Weber’s paper in the Monatsberichte der Kgl. Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Berlin, 1859, pp. 158 ff, and in the Indische Streifen, vol. i, pp. 274 ff; also to Dr. J. E. Schröter’s Inaugural Dissertation on Pāṇḍaka-kēvāli, ein indisches Würfelorakel (Borna, 1900). The latter contains a critical edition of the recension of the manual on cubomancy, ascribed to Garga.

(6) Parts VI and VII contain two different portions of the same text, which is a Sūtra or Dhāraṇī referring to a charm protective against snakebite and other evils. The name of the Sūtra is Mahāmāyūri Vidyārājī (scl. Dhāraṇī), lit. the ‘great peacock’ queen of charms. It apparently takes its name from the fact that the peafowl (māyāra) is the great traditional enemy of the snake. It is a charm of great repute among the Buddhists, and is included in the highly valued collection of Dhāraṇī, called Paṇcha-rakshā, or the Five Protective

In the Pañca-rakṣāh collection, however, the Mahāmāyūrī charm exists in a greatly expanded form. This expanded recension, as may be seen from the Chinese translations of the charm, appears to have developed in the course of the fifth or sixth centuries A.D. There are six such translations enumerated in Nanjio's Catalogue of the Chinese Tripitaka, Nos. 305-311. Three of them are based on the expanded recension of the Sūtra, while the three others exhibit the Sūtra in a more primitive and much less developed form. To the former belong two translations of the eighth century A.D. (Nos. 306 and 307), done by It-sing in 705 A.D., and Amōghavajra in 745-771 A.D. respectively; and a somewhat shorter translation of the sixth century (No. 308), made by Saṅghapāla in 516 A.D. The three more primitive recensions (Nos. 309, 310, 318) belong all to the fourth century A.D., viz., two by Poh Srimitra under the Eastern Ts'iu dynasty, 317-420 A.D., and one by Kumārajīva under the later Ts'iu dynasty, 384-417 A.D. At the time these six translations were made, the Mahāmāyūrī Sūtra seems to have still existed as a separate work, and not yet to have formed a component part of the Pañca-rakṣāh collection. That collection would seem to have originated in Bengal under the Buddhistic Pāli dynasty, not earlier than the tenth or eleventh centuries A.D. For another of the later component parts of the Pañca-rakṣāh, namely, the Mahā-sahasra-pramardini Sūtra, was translated into Chinese (Nanjio's No. 784), when it was still a separate work, by Shih (Dānapāla?) about 980-1000 A.D., while the Pañca-rakṣāh collection itself, being a late production, does not seem to have been translated into Chinese at all.

The relative extent of the two recensions of the Mahāmāyūrī Sūtra, in the Pañca-rakṣāh collection and the Bower Manuscript, may be seen from the Appendix to Parts VI and VII (pp. 240a ff.). Those two Parts include only an extremely small portion (about one-seventh) of the modern expanded version of the Sūtra, viz., its second and third section. The former relates the story of the monk Śvātī and his recovery from the fatal bite of a snake through the application of the Mahāmāyūrī charm; the latter, the story of the obtaining of that charm by Buddha in one of his former births (jātaka) as the king of the peacocks (māyūra-rāja). These two stories would seem to have made up the whole extent of the original Sūtra before its subsequent enormous accretions. From the Bower Manuscript it appears that the copy of the Sūtra included in it was written for the benefit of a person (probably a monk or abbot), called Yaśomitra, whose name, as usual in such cases, was inserted at the end of the copy. This copy, being written on birch-bark of an inferior quality (see Chapter II), after a time became seriously damaged: the reverse of the folio, on which the second story commenced, flaked off entirely, and that portion of the manuscript which contained the first story appears to have been destroyed altogether. The latter was now replaced by a fresh copy, written on a new supply of birch-bark of a superior quality. This fresh copy is the existing Part VI of the Bower Manuscript.